



<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz>

ResearchSpace@Auckland

Copyright Statement

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

This thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognise the author's right to be identified as the author of this thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from their thesis.

To request permissions please use the Feedback form on our webpage.

<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/feedback>

General copyright and disclaimer

In addition to the above conditions, authors give their consent for the digital copy of their work to be used subject to the conditions specified on the [Library Thesis Consent Form](#) and [Deposit Licence](#).

Note : Masters Theses

The digital copy of a masters thesis is as submitted for examination and contains no corrections. The print copy, usually available in the University Library, may contain corrections made by hand, which have been requested by the supervisor.

‘Shakey Notions’
Settlement History on Display

Anna Boswell

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in English,
The University of Auckland, 2011.

Abstract

This thesis offers a critical examination of strategies employed by museums and heritage sites in representing settler-colonial history. Its concerns are focused through the lens of the northernmost region in Aotearoa New Zealand, Te Tai Tokerau, an area selected for its strong significance in this history. While several chapters deal with museums and heritage sites located within the region—including Waitangi National Trust, Ruapekapeka pa, the Kauri Museum at Matakoho, Te Rerenga Wairua, and the Kerikeri basin—the thesis interprets this designation in a broader way, too. Acknowledging that the region's history is not confined within its own geographical boundaries, it also discusses displays which have been staged in Canberra and in Salem, Massachusetts, and which relate to Te Tai Tokerau through the movement of materials, figures and stories.

The thesis draws on a range of sources and theoretical models in order to devise approaches to loosely-framed phases of settlement. In its course, it deals with international trade carried out on distinct-but-related early cross-cultural frontiers; considers the concerted transformation of new world environments in terms of historical re-enactment; examines modes of display at the so-called birthplace of the nation in relation to 'privileged settings', 'hard facts' and historic turning points; explores counter-conventional ways of making sense of frontier conflict; and reflects on how notions of progress may be applied to emergent possibilities for tribal museums. In each of these cases, the thesis is concerned to examine the impact of postcolonial critiques on museum story-telling, and to examine the role that resurgent indigenous populations have played in shaping or re-shaping certain kinds of representations. The thesis pays particular attention to strains evident in contemporary modes of display, interpreting these as markers of the extent to which representations of settlement continue to be unsettled by the 'shakey notions' (Maning 1967, 44) upon which they are necessarily founded. While its interests are primarily analytical, the thesis does offer a number of 'experimental' possibilities for alternative displays—possibilities which may well, because of their own 'shakey' nature, prove impossible in the context of a settler society.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge with thanks the help of Joanne Duke, curator of *Outlawed: The world's rebels, revolutionaries and bushrangers*, who facilitated my research at the National Museum of Australia; and Dr Jo Diamond, research assistant and advisor for the same exhibition, who shared with me her time and expertise. Jonathan Carpenter, archaeologist at the Northland Conservancy Area Office in Whangarei, and Carolyn Smith and Doug Te Wake, community relations officers at the Northland Conservancy Area Office in Kaitaia, provided access to a range of unpublished reports which have proven invaluable to my research. Karen Kramer, curator of Native American art at the Peabody Essex Museum in Salem, Massachusetts, went out of her way to make my visit as productive as possible, as did Kathy Flynn and staff at the Phillips Library in Salem. The librarians at the Auckland War Memorial Museum have also sourced materials for me where needed. Alex Calder has provided an inspiring model of scholarship and I am extremely grateful to him for his advice, encouragement and support. Completion of this thesis has also been made possible by doctoral scholarships from the University of Auckland and the Foundation for Research, Science and Technology.

More personal debts that I have incurred are to Roy and Shelagh McCauley, Jimmy and Doris McCauley, Larry and Amy Ruberl, the extended Flanagan family, Michelle Barnes, Jane Horan, Mark and Lucy Gibson, David MacNamara and Liz Catherwood, Kelvin and Carole Morgan, Miriam Ruberl, Nathan Morgan, Deirdre Holmes and Florence Nathan, Roy and Gloria Holmes, Jim Boswell and Katie Kerr, Tom Boswell and Emily Davenport, John Boswell and Cho Saehee, and Ross and Rosheen Boswell. Most of all, my heartfelt gratitude goes to Sam, Maisie, Jack and Ollie Morgan—for their limitless tolerance and good humour—and to Conrad, for sacrificing so much and yet always managing to keep the plates spinning . . .

Contents

Abstract	3
Acknowledgements	5
1. Introduction: museums and settlement	9
2. Material encounters: trade & exchange on the early cross-cultural frontier	42
3. No going back? Kerikeri and the nature of change	79
4. ‘New Zealand’s most historic spot’: privileged settings and hard facts at Waitangi National Trust	119
5. Framing the northern war: frontier conflict revisited	163
6. Making progress: ‘closure’ at Te Rerenga Wairua	199
Bibliography	
a. Works cited	237
b. Unpublished sources	249
Notes	251

Introduction: museums and settlement

The Auckland Institute and Museum celebrated its centenary in 1967 with the publication of an account which undertook ‘to review with pride the progress made’ during the first hundred years (Holland 1967, 5).¹ Comprising almost one hundred pages, this publication charts the Institute and Museum’s growth from modest origins, pays tribute to past and present personnel, highlights milestones in the development of facilities, describes the building up of collections, acknowledges significant bequests, notes changes associated with modes of display, and emphasises the fruits of scientific research conducted and disseminated by associates and employees. The publication also draws on a range of sources—including newspaper reports, public notices, maps and photographs—for illustrative purposes and as part of its historical method: as the then-president explains in his foreword, contributors to the volume ‘have been indefatigable in searching archives for information to establish the historical pageant of [the institution’s] development’ (ibid., 5). Through its use of this conventional format, *The Centennial History of the Auckland Institute and Museum* produces what might seem a standard slippage between the specific and the generic: at first glance this could be the story of any museum of a similar vintage situated in any former British settler-colonial outpost. A five-page-long section of material which is reprinted midway through the volume, however, counters such a reading. Documenting the other side of a correspondence conducted with Thomas Kirk and Thomas Cheeseman, two successive secretaries and curators of the Auckland Institute and Museum, this material was written between 1871 and 1879 by F. E. Maning, a settler based in the Hokianga district of the north.

E. G. Turbott, the editor of this section of the 1967 publication, proposes that Maning’s seven letters ‘throw much light on the place of the Institute at this stage in the development of the Colony’ and ‘need little explanatory comment’ (1967, 44). According to Turbott, Maning’s ‘amusing show of recalcitrance over his subscription, his violent aversion to any suggestion of the pedantic, and his strong interest in Maori artefacts together with deep involvement in the welfare of the Maori race and concern for its fate, were characteristic’ (ibid.). Maning is, however, a complex figure who was recognised within his own lifetime as possessing ‘an extraordinary story’ (Morton-Jones, cited in Lee 1996, 185). Soon after arriving in Te Tai Tokerau from Van Diemen’s Land as a young adult in 1833, Irish-born Maning had ‘crossed the beach’, marrying the daughter of a prominent Hokianga

chief. He is known to have advised his wife's people against signing the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 and to have participated in the northern war of 1845-46 on the side of Hokianga-based hapu. By the early 1870s he was, however, seeking to distance himself from aspects of this past as a 'Pakeha Maori' or acculturated settler and had become politically active in other ways, as both a published author and judge of the Native Land Court. Given Maning's own background, it is perhaps unsurprising that difficulties coalesce around his letters to Kirk and to Cheeseman. These letters are unable to be integrated with ease into the chronologically and thematically-arranged *Centennial History* and so comprise a stand-alone chapter. In one sense they stand out because they are so different in tenor from the surrounding material. 'I never was intended for a Philosopher', runs the opening gambit of the first of these letters:

[. . .] I never in my life could get hold of, or discover, one single good, substantial, substantive fact, what are all these great truths which you of the Institute sometimes fancy you have fairly captured? Just shakey notions depending on contingencies as tottering as themselves [. . .].²

Maning's letters also stand out because they deal with problems peculiar to this place. Presenting in small compass some of the distinctive contradictions and challenges which find expression in his more widely published writings, they convey sentiments which have historically been—and continue to be—decidedly uncharacteristic of settler culture in Aotearoa New Zealand.

On their most basic level, the letters which are reprinted in the 1967 *Centennial History* document Maning's relationship with the Auckland Institute and Museum. During the course of the correspondence, Maning renews his subscription and acknowledges receipt of copies of the *Transactions and Proceedings of the Auckland Institute and Museum*, the museum's in-house research publication and the nation's first scholarly journal. He also supplies the museum with 'curiosities' found on his estate with a view to having these examined and displayed; contributes images of historical scenes and proposes extracts from his own published *History of the War in the North* (1862) to accompany these; and makes an offer of accommodation for the purpose of what he terms 'a scientific irruption' into the Hokianga (1967, 45). The letters allude, too, to Maning's commercial interests and to his domestic life and health. Despite the seemingly straightforward nature of their business, however, the letters themselves are by no means straightforward: as is the case with much of Maning's other writing, their shifting tone and unsettling insights and implications make them difficult to stabilise.

Within the course of the correspondence, Maning does—as Turbott notes—make several amusing shows of recalcitrance, joking repeatedly about his bondage to the institution and about the ‘value’ of his subscription. He also makes a number of sly digs at ambitions associated with scientific research, commenting at one point ‘I find that I must leave off here or this will *degenerate* in to a “paper”’, and elsewhere punning on the risk of his being ‘drawn in and implicated in some *Transaction*’ (ibid., 44 and 45). Maning splits hairs, too, for humorous effect, qualifying his statement that he was the last man to leave one of the battlefields during the war in the north, for instance, by explaining that he had piggybacked a wounded sailor who ‘may be said to have been a little behind me’ (ibid., 46). At times his correspondence also contains more sustained comical capers. The earliest letter, for instance, contemplates the investigation of ‘the whole truth, all that might be known, and is known perhaps somewhere, about as simple a thing as the walking stick of one of the members [of the Institute]’, and proceeds with a mock threat:

I shall [. . .] get up a sedition, a thorough rebellion, against *The Real* which is never at all satisfactory, even when we fancy we have it, there shall be a defection, a falling off, an Exodus, I shall lead away many to the Country of the *Ideal* [. . .] we shall sail for some port in Atlantis, there we shall live like kings in fairy land, gambolling and frisking (I have the gout in my left knee and can’t stir a step—so much for the real—Psha!) where was I? Oh aye—Gambolling and frisking like lambs in Arcadia [. . .].³

Maning signs off, tongue-in-cheek, as ‘The Unscientific Member’.

There is, however, a more serious side to these sentiments. As is the case in a number of his other writings, Maning’s ‘habitual comic mode’ (During 1999, 299) gives way to—or signals—something else. One of the most notable qualities of these letters to Kirk and to Cheeseman is the way in which they do document an obsessive (or, to use Turbott’s term, ‘pedantic’) preoccupation with factual accuracy. Early in the correspondence, Maning objects to being misquoted in the published notice of a meeting of the institute and requests that his true position be made known. In subsequent letters he insistently and indignantly seeks to correct the misconception that a battle-scene image which he has provided for the museum is a copy, and he repeatedly expresses concern that the name which the museum has attributed to the image refers to the wrong locality. These issues are initially presented in a straight rather than humorous way although Maning’s testiness eventually gives way to downright sarcasm: he claims at one point that alternative images held by the museum’s officers are

‘so bad as to be not worth having either of them would stand for a representation of the battle of Trafalgar or a pig sty on fire quite as well as a scene of the war in the North’ (1967, 47). The final letters express his disappointment that the museum’s scientists will not take seriously the ‘geological vagaries’ (ibid.) which he has sent for examination: his last communication begins in defensive manner and becomes increasingly haughty as its syntax dissolves. Files held in the Auckland Museum archive document two further dealings between museum personnel and Maning. The first of these—clearly produced in response to a number of criticisms—is Maning’s own defence of a translation of a Maori myth which he had earlier provided for the museum. The second is addressed to Judge Gillies, one of Maning’s colleagues, and dates from April 1879, the same month as one of the final letters written to Cheeseman. It gleefully relates a hoax played by Maning who had supplied the museum with an image of a faked ‘fossil dodo’ in order to ‘see what the Philosophers will say to it’.⁴ Even without mention of these two episodes, however, it is clear from the 1967 *Centennial History* that relations between Maning and the Auckland Institute and Museum had become strained by the end of the period of correspondence.

Maning’s fixation with truth can perhaps be seen as the manifestation of a personality trait; letters written by him to other recipients on other occasions make it plain that he was frequently and combatively determined to assert the ‘unquestionable rightness’ of his own views (Lee 1996, 186). The fixation might also be seen as a symptom of the delusions of persecution which are known to have afflicted him towards the end of his life: this condition is, by definition, an abnormal tendency to suspect and mistrust others and is characterised by difficulties in reading signals, by problems surrounding notions of truth and truth-production. Maning’s suspicion of ‘great truths’ appears, however, to be motivated by other things as well. In the opening lines of one of his letters, Maning self-deprecatingly submits:

I am so fearfully unscientific in my propensities and inclinations that I scarcely even look at [the *Transactions*] and when I have done so once or twice I have found much that to me that was quite uninteresting, much that I could not understand, and a good deal that I utterly contradict and dissent from, so now you see what a promising member I am and how unlikely I am ever to set the Thames, or Manukau, on fire, the books are just wasted on me and I think that you had better give them to somebody else.⁵

In utterly contradicting and dissenting from the institution’s publications, it seems likely that Maning was referring, among other things, to William Colenso’s ‘On the Maori Races of New Zealand’. This

essay had been produced for the New Zealand Exhibition held in Dunedin in 1865 and was subsequently published with a great deal of fanfare in the first volume of the *Transactions* in 1868. It occupies almost one-fifth of the volume's 490 pages and is described by its editor as a 'very important' contribution which is 'especially worthy of attention under the present circumstances of the colony' (Hector 1868, vi)—a reference to ongoing conflicts between the government and tribes in Taranaki and in the Waikato in the 1860s. Despite Colenso's disclaimer that it was written in haste and that many of its passages are 'rough and fragmentary' in appearance (1868, 423), his essay strives for comprehensive coverage of its subject. It comes complete with its own two-page-long table of contents and is divided into numbered sections and subsections: 'physiological' characteristics, for example, are separated under the headings 'colour', 'height', 'physiognomy', 'hair', 'frame', 'sensorial faculties' and so on. Maintaining an even tone and a detached perspective on its subject, the essay endeavours to formulate a number of general rules through extensive use of evaluative adverbs: 'usually', 'often', 'commonly', 'rarely', 'never'. Colenso's pretence of diffidence is belied, too, in the stated pretext for his writing:

Much has been said of late about the New Zealanders [. . .] Not many, however, of those who have talked or written the most concerning them, have really understood them; and it is not wholly without hopes of making them to be a little better known, that the following brief Essay has been undertaken [. . .].⁶

Colenso was, himself, a missionary printer and an amateur botanist; like Maning, he had lived in close connection with Maori since arriving in the country in the 1830s. It remains unclear whether he was deliberately seeking to undermine Maning, but Maning's own most significant works—*History of the War in the North* and *Old New Zealand*—had been first published earlier in the 1860s and were also intended as guides of sorts to Maori customs. Colenso's essay does, however, offer a form of ethnography which is stylistically and methodologically opposed to Maning's own.⁷ *Old New Zealand* was described by its author as being 'ironical, satirical semipolitical with lots of fun, and many serious and striking scenes from old native life and habits and in a word shews indirectly without ostensibly pretending to do so what sort of creature this Maori is who we have to deal with' (2001, 213-14). While the text does contain passages which adopt a would-be academic tone and which attempt to moralise, generalise and sum up these are, as Stephen Turner has noted (2002, 42), its least successful aspects, and they are destabilised by its vivid anecdotes, and its drama and hyperbole and sly humour, among other things.

Maning's text is written as a first-person narrative, making clear the impossibility of disengaging its subject from its mode of telling: the conditions of proximity and entanglement implicit in the settler-colonial context mean that there can be no objective vantage point from which to appraise 'the Maori race'. *Old New Zealand* repeatedly and self-consciously draws attention to the question of its own veracity—'my story is a true story, not 'founded on fact' but fact itself', its narrator insists (Maning 2001, 96)—, and to the tensions and strains which deform its story. Whereas Colenso uses parentheses on rare occasion to insert information based on his own personal experience, the Pakeha Maori narrator of *Old New Zealand* notes at one point that 'by no effort that I can make can I hold fast to the thread of my story and I am conscious the whole affair is fast becoming one great parenthesis' (Maning 2001, 167). *Old New Zealand* schematises in places only in order to point up the absurdity of such an approach: it explains, for example, how the worth of a Pakeha may be evaluated in quantities of muskets or tomahawks or fishhooks (or as protein), and parodies the conventions of legal contracts to suggest that a person might become part-payment for a parcel of land. Colenso gives a carefully circumscribed discussion of tapu: '[t]heir *quasi* "sacred" or taboo (*tapu*) duties, (of which much could be written,)' he explains, 'could only be performed by a "sacred" person; for although in some few cases, a person not "sacred" might act, yet he sometimes most inconveniently became "sacred" by his doing so!' (1868, 359). The 'inconvenience' of this institution is, by contrast, one of the defining elements of *Old New Zealand*. The narrator explains that he has been 'tapu'd', and while he professes not to take the tapu seriously, he can't quite dismiss it, either: its effect warps his story ('If I could only get clear of this *tapu* I would 'try back'', he says (2001, 167)). Revealing some of the tensions that surface when a European realises there is more than one way of looking at things, Maning's writing suggests that a topic of this kind is more likely to own you than you are to own it: safe distances cannot be maintained, confident schemas and linear narratives come unstuck, and distinctions between fact and fiction slip away.

Both Maning and Colenso were very aware that Maori society was—in the 1860s—in the process of profound change; their writings are aligned in some ways on the subject of population decline, visible (as both men note) through traces in the landscape which reveal the much greater extent of Maori habitation in former times. Their attitudes towards this change are, however, markedly different. Colenso's descriptions of Maori are given in the past tense, recording a pure way of life which has

already vanished; Maning, on the other hand, registers more clearly a people in the midst of upheaval—‘between two tides’, as he puts it in *Old New Zealand* (ibid., 145). While contemporary Maori customs and practices might be compared unfavourably with ‘by-gone’ ones (‘degenerate young hussies’, for instance, are said to hold back from cutting themselves in lamentation ‘as their mothers used to do’ (ibid., 121)), Maning’s writing is grounded in its contemporary milieu. As this suggests, divergences are apparent in relation to the conclusions drawn by these two commentators. Colenso offers a list of twenty-five ‘preparations’ and ‘actions’ to ensure ‘a better state of things’ once the open conflict between tribes and the government has been ‘ended well’ (1868, 419). These include the shoring-up of tribal units, the firm but steady supporting of the authority of paramount chiefs, and the continued recognition of Maori ‘modes of reparation, fines, forfeitures, semi-banishment from the village and tribe’ and so on, in preference to imposing ‘our Draconian laws’ (ibid., 420-1). It seems likely that Maning would have held these recommendations in contempt as being naïve and unworkable; his own deep involvement with the welfare of the Maori race and concern for its fate were not, as Turbott implies, of a consistently sympathetic nature. *Old New Zealand* is torn in its vision for the future: to ‘civilise’ or ‘by our mere contact exterminate’ are its understandings of the likely fate of Maori in the new settler society (2001, 138). As the conflicts of the 1860s wore on, however, Maning came to believe that Maori needed to be subdued by means of a crushing military defeat and that tribal structures needed to be dismantled. With the effects of disease and warfare increasingly observable, too, Maning’s writings from the late 1870s evince mounting pessimism about the future prospects for tribal populations. ‘The Maori are now surrounded by a medium not made for them, or such as they, as Maoris, were not made for’, he wrote to Cheeseman in 1878: ‘When the water becomes too salt then *all* the fish of the lake must die’ (1967, 45).

Maning’s letters to Kirk and to Cheeseman and his earlier writings suggest a further context for the querying of ‘great truths’ within the context of the museum, too. The *Centennial History* makes it clear that the ‘collection of treasures which record the culture of the Maori people’ is ‘undoubtedly the finest asset of the Museum’: this collection was a highlight of displays from the institution’s earliest days when public notices and advertisements made special requests for ‘Weapons, Clothing, Implements, &c., &c., of New Zealand, and the Islands of the Pacific’ (Powell 1967, 6-8). In a small way the collecting of such material is, as Turbott notes, documented in Maning’s museum correspondence. Maning describes uncovering the skeleton of a Maori dog in ‘a very ancient

“Kitchen Midden” and discusses his recent finding of ‘several stone implements and many human bones which shewed that they had been baked’ (1967, 47). For Maning these objects may have served on one level as allegorical or tangible evidence of the inevitable demise of Maori.⁸ As sediments dating from an earlier time, however, objects of this kind also suggest difficulties associated with settler occupation of a land which continues to disclose its prior history of inhabitation, and whose previous owners have an uncanny ability to ‘return’. These bones and fragments can be seen as troubling reminders of the price of European presence and as ‘icons’ (Hohepa 1999, 189) of whakapapa, whenua and tapu—of the fact that Maori continue to possess a spiritualised connection with the land. *Old New Zealand* vividly conveys Maning’s awareness of this connection: the narrator becomes ‘tapu’d’ for meddling with the bones of the dead, and he is subject to a raid carried out under the law of muru or plunder for accidentally setting alight a tree in which are concealed the remains of a chief. Fragments of precisely this kind, then, have the potential to complicate seemingly-straightforward tenses and unsettle western ways of knowing.

Old New Zealand describes the entry of objects into museums, too: a greenstone mere and a number of preserved human heads are among those mentioned. The text lampoons the motives of those who circulate and trade in such objects and who may be seeking to make a quick buck, to secure their own prestige or to further their reputation. It also describes a woman mourning over her son’s preserved head—suggesting, perhaps unintentionally, an affective side to this story—, and shows personal and ancestral weapons and artefacts in use in ceremonies, war dances and so on: the narrator becomes, at the end of the text, the inheritor of his own chief’s mere, described as ‘a weapon of great mana’ (ibid., 195). Maning, then, rejects the possibility that museum specimens might be abstracted in lofty or theoretical ways; that they might be detached from their original contexts and subsumed within western knowledge-systems. Making it plain that these kinds of objects come trailing their own problematic pasts which refuse to stay properly past, he insists on the ‘murkiness’ (Turner 2002, 39) of actual transactions, markets and values, and on the bearing of lived and ongoing history.

* * *

Maning’s letters to Kirk and to Cheeseman—and the context of their publication in the 1967 *Centennial History*—provide a way in to the concerns of this thesis, bringing into focus a number of

historical continuities and a number of historical disjunctions. First, given their tone and content, Maning's letters are likely to have given their recipients pause in their own time and to have produced a similar effect on a wider readership when they were published in 1967: they are personal, provocative, playful and petulant all at once. Part of what is so striking about them for a twenty-first century reader, though, is their apparent prescience. In its course, the *Centennial History* does acknowledge the Auckland Institute and Museum's 'cultural debt to the Maori', referring to the collections as being 'of increasing scientific and general interest to an ever-widening circle of scientists and other people including many of the Maori race' (Holland 1967, 6). It discusses the fact that the museum's collection has, 'in a special way, served the Maori people' (Powell 1967, 20), explaining that examples of Maori art held in the museum served as guides in the revival of wood-carving in the 1930s and as inspiration for the work carried out in producing several new meeting houses. It also explains that one of the institution's stated objectives is '[t]o encourage the better understanding of the Maori people and other Pacific peoples' (ibid., 37). The 1967 publication makes it plain, too, that the museum's exhibits have been revised and replaced, emphasising that '[d]isplay arrangements are not regarded as permanent; some have been frankly experimental, all are regarded as capable of improvement, and visitors, we believe, welcome change' (ibid., 28). It is, however, unambiguously celebratory and commemorative in outlook and it does not make any attempt to account for Maori perspectives: these qualities position it on the 'before' side of a cultural boundary which has shifted in significant ways.

Since the closing decades of the twentieth century, and as part of the burgeoning trend in both the academic and wider communities towards the interrogation of structures of power and politics of knowledge, ethnographic collections and exhibitionary practices have attracted considerable critical attention. Commentators working in the relatively new field of museum studies have sought to overturn the museum's long-standing pretensions to objectivity and neutrality.⁹ The museum has come to be characterised as a cultural institution of privileged status which emerged during the colonial era and which has served as a 'handmaiden' (Healy and Witcomb 2006, 2) to colonialism and imperialism; it is understood to embody unequal relations of power whereby one portion of humanity has sought to 'select, value and collect' the cultural products of another (Clifford 1988, 213). Radical re-examination of the role of the museum within society has taken place and the political, ideological and epistemological dimensions of collecting and display have been extensively

investigated: the very nature of exhibiting, it is now understood, makes the museum both a contested and an inherently contestable terrain. As Peter Vergo put it in his introduction to *The New Museology* (1989, 2-3), '[w]hether we like it or not, every acquisition (and indeed disposal), every juxtaposition or arrangement of an object or work of art, together with other objects or works of art, within the context of a temporary exhibition or museum display means placing a certain construction upon history'. In this context, one of the most startling features of Maning's ideas about 'great truths' and 'shakey notions' is that they seem to prefigure, by more than a century, critical interest in the museum: Maning's distrust seems to belong to our own time.

Second, Maning offers a point of entry to this study in that he is a figure 'of the north' and his correspondence helps to historicise this region's shifting fortunes. Maning had arrived in the Hokianga at a time when European settlement in Aotearoa New Zealand—the farthest-flung periphery of European activity—was young, and when Te Tai Tokerau was beginning to boom. From the final decade of the eighteenth century, scattered shore-based settler stations had begun to be established on the region's northern and eastern coasts in order to provision the whaling, sealing and trading vessels swift to capitalise on opportunities identified during James Cook's Pacific voyages of the 1760s and 1770s. By the 1830s the Bay of Islands had become home to the country's earliest substantial settler population. Europeans were attracted to Te Tai Tokerau in preference to other New Zealand regions, as Maori tribes had been before them, by its extensive coastline studded with deep-water harbours, sheltered bays and navigable rivers; by its mild climate and fertile soils; and by its hills and valleys thick with kauri forest. Given the need for sponsorship to ensure the safety of their lives, vessels and settlements, Europeans had also been attracted by the region's tribal populations. Cook had been particularly struck by the fact that the Bay of Islands was 'much more populous' than any other area he had seen, commenting on the numerous towns and plantations, on the seemingly peaceable disposition of the inhabitants, and on their eagerness to engage in trade (cited in Williams 1997, 77).

Hokianga, a deep tidal inlet on the western side of the Tai Tokerau peninsula, had been slightly slower to be explored and developed as a centre of European commerce because its sand bar made entry difficult, although its proximity to the millable kauri of the north and to direct shipping routes across the Tasman Sea made it attractive enough in time. The area had first been visited by

Europeans in 1819. Missionaries who made these initial journeys overland from the Bay of Islands were both disheartened by the area's remoteness and difficult access, and awed once they were able to survey its immense forests 'like a level sea as far as the eye could reach' (Marsden 1932, 183); by the end of the 1820s the European population in the area still numbered fewer than a hundred but seemed to be climbing. Augustus Earle, an itinerant artist who travelled through Hokianga in 1827, describes scenes of enterprise and industry in his *Narrative of a Nine Months' Residence in New Zealand*: in the course of his journey he comes across a dockyard with a newly-built vessel awaiting a cargo of timber and spars, and visits another European settlement on the shoreline where migrants are 'busily employed in cutting timber, sawing planks, and making oars for the Sydney market' (1966, 66-67). The area was, then, when Maning arrived, a very new frontier of settlement, a place of opportunity and promise.

Within a decade, however, the modern New Zealand nation had been founded with the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi, the capital had been shifted from the Bay of Islands to Auckland, and preparations for full-scale colonisation had begun. As a result of these changes, Te Tai Tokerau faded in significance and directly lost many of its European inhabitants to Auckland. Land was abandoned by would-be settlers in exchange for scrip which was invested in areas further south, and partial evacuations of the European settlements in the Bay of Islands and Hokianga were effected during the northern war which was fought in part as an expression of frustrations felt by local chiefs as the region ceased to be the pre-eminent focus for European settlement. Te Tai Tokerau did continue to function as a centre for extractive industries, with revenue derived from the sale of kauri timber and gum providing the foundation for some degree of prosperity in the second half of the nineteenth century. Emigration was also encouraged, with areas of land made available through government schemes in the 1850s and 1860s for the purposes of organised settlement. The region did not, however, seem as well-suited to large scale pastoral and agricultural development as did areas further south and it never achieved the status of a province: the name by which it came to be known by the settler population, 'North Auckland' (contracted to 'Northland'), indicates that it was defined in relation to its own neighbouring centre. Over time Te Tai Tokerau became characterised as a 'forgotten' region—variously known, as A. H. Reed has explained, as the 'poor North', the 'roadless North' and the 'neglected North' (1956, 11).

By the 1870s, then, when Maning penned those letters to Kirk and to Cheeseman, Hokianga had failed to develop as a centre of population and had become a backwater, one of the most isolated areas within a region that was itself considered isolated, and located within a country that was, in turn, remote from its European centre. Something of this background filters through Maning's letters. Maning plays up the caricature of the Hokianga district as being backward and inhabited by those who are 'incurably lazy' (1967, 45), and this sense of his own distance seems to permit him to behave in certain ways: he is avowedly non-metropolitan and non-scientific. He plays on his personal experience, too, adopting at times an enigmatic air—as Alex Calder has noted, Maning liked 'to cultivate a mystique as one who had lived beyond the pale, who knew dark things [. . .] no white man should know' (1996, 14). If Maning's performances seem to be executed in part for the entertainment of his urban audience, these performances capitalise on the fact that Maning himself is an outlier, a figure from an older order. Seen in this light, his correspondence is useful because it marks the passing of an early phase of settlement history—'those good old times', as the narrator refers to them, not entirely tongue-in-cheek, in the opening lines of *Old New Zealand* (2001, 93). Helping to historicise the emergence of a new phase of settlement with its 'Governors [. . .] and law, and justice, and all that' (ibid.), it introduces tensions between some of the key binaries marked within the spatial and temporal 'vocabularies of colonisation' (Smith 1999, 53): centre and periphery, past and present, old and new.

And third, not only does Maning's correspondence 'throw much light on the place of the Institute at this stage in the development of the Colony', as Turbott proposes, but it also provides a valuable historical perspective on more recent developments within the museum sector: it reminds us to see this sector as a cultural phenomenon which has an ongoing history of its own. In 1871, the Auckland Institute and Museum was one of a handful of nascent museums established in Aotearoa New Zealand in budding urban centres of population as a component of the 'and all that' of civic life invoked in *Old New Zealand*.¹⁰ By this time, influenced by the emergence of the modern European nation-state during the nineteenth century and by the flourishing of industrial and commercial capitalism, museums had been transformed from personal cabinets of curiosity to encyclopaedic representations of nature and humanity. Based on European and American models and intended both to serve a learned audience and to educate a wider public, organisations like the Auckland Institute and Museum undertook to amass collections of 'artefacts, antiquities, scientific instruments,

minerals, fossils, human and animal remains, objects of every conceivable kind' (Vergo 1989, 2). These objects were initially classified within Linnaean taxonomies and later in the nineteenth century, as scientific disciplinary specialisation emerged, came to be presented within evolutionary hierarchies which provided typologies of various societies and which were intended to impart an understanding of the history of the world.

Museums did special duty within settler societies in the nineteenth century. As an imported 'high' cultural form, they functioned as one of the key signs of aspiring nationhood, as a marker of modernity and a statement of 'arrival' (Bell 2006, 109), and in tangible ways their activities supported and enacted the civilising purpose of settlement. While local artefacts and specimens were included within displays and were used to trade with other museums internationally to enable the building-up of broad collections, settlement history did not tend to be dealt with explicitly or knowingly in exhibits: Maning expresses surprise and gratification that the council of the Auckland Museum 'think the little [battle-scene] picture I sent is worth a place in the museum' (1967, 46). His letters do, however, document the beginnings of the visiting of sites for their historical associations: 'any one wishing to see the locality' of this battle, he insists, 'would never find it by inquiring for Okaihau' (ibid., 47). By the 1870s, then, there was developing a tentative sense of a history worth marking and a thin scattering of memorials associated with the northern war—including the flagstaff at Russell (formerly Kororareka) which was re-erected as a symbol of peace by local tribes in 1858, and the memorial church built on the battle-site at Ohaeawai in 1872—had begun or were beginning to be erected in Te Tai Tokerau.

Since the mid-twentieth century, the museum as an institution has been overhauled in a number of significant ways. Museums are no longer expected to be attached to scientific institutes: there has been 'a blurring of the boundaries' (Gurian 2005) and the term is now 'used in an umbrella sense to cover all types of institutions, from the major multi-purpose to the mini specialist, from the contemporary art gallery to the reconstructed folk village' (Thomson 1981, 2). It is also extended to other institutions of memory and to sites of cultural performance and display which transmit stories about the past; that is, to a range of heritage sites, exhibits, monuments, memorials, nature reserves and so on within the 'public historical sphere' (Bennett 1988, 3). If museums are connected in more fluid ways to the idea of the past 'on display' and to exhibitionary practices more generally, their

representations are supposed to mark out what is locally distinctive, and social history has become a major focus. In other words, museums have become interested in progress of a different scale: their emphasis is less on universal or geological time and more on human or historical time—on the settling of the land, the establishing of communities, the putting down of roots. Related to these changes, there has been a dramatic expansion of the public historical sphere in ‘quantitative terms’ (ibid.): museums and displays are no longer confined to metropolitan centres and have burgeoned in number in remote and rural areas. By the time the Auckland Institute and Museum *Centennial History* was published in 1967, Te Tai Tokerau boasted a local authority museum in Whangarei and an exhibition complex at Waitangi; historic reserves had been set aside at Ruapekapeka and Te Rerenga Wairua; and community or private museums had recently opened in Waipu, Matakoho, Dargaville and Russell.¹¹ A decade on from this, a local authority museum in Kaitaia had been established and further museums had opened at Houhora, Whangaroa, Paihia, Kaikohe, Mangawhai and Warkworth. A number of significant old properties—such as the Stone Store and the former mission houses in Kerikeri and Te Waimate, and Pompallier House in Russell—were also acquired during this period and restored for public visitation by the New Zealand Historic Places Trust, and allied exhibitionary complexes such as Rewa’s Village in Kerikeri had begun to be established. Maning’s former property in the small settlement of Onoke, rumoured in one tourist guidebook to have ‘solid 4in. thick, bullet-proof walls’ (Robson 1975, 9), has not become a component of this heritage estate. Since the end of the 1970s, however, Hokianga has offered the opportunity to visit Mangungu Mission House, the former Wesleyan headquarters in Hokianga which dates from 1827; Clendon House in Rawene, the former residence of the first American consul and resident magistrate in the area; and the Museum and Historical Society in Opononi, a ‘museum of Hokianga’s yesteryear’ (Sale 1981, 85).

In many ways, these changes within the museum sector in Te Tai Tokerau are not exceptional: they have occurred as part of a well-documented and conspicuous increase in the number of heritage sites and institutions in remote and rural areas worldwide since the middle of the twentieth century. This proliferation can, in part, be seen as a function of the most recent phase of capitalism, with the assertion of local histories and identities as points of difference within an increasingly globalised world. In Aotearoa New Zealand, however, it also marked the strengthening of that early and tentative interest in local history into a more fully fledged ‘national historic sense’ (Bledisloe 1934,

5), coinciding with the period after the nation's centennial in 1940 and with the emergence of cultural nationalism in literature and the visual arts. In Te Tai Tokerau in particular it also corresponded with the final decline of the kauri timber and gum trades, occurring at a time when the need for new prospects to secure the region's prosperity was becoming apparent. With the development of a more comprehensive roading infrastructure within the region from the second quarter of the twentieth century, and in particular with the completion of the harbour bridge in 1959 which provided a direct motoring route between metropolitan Auckland and the north, hopes were expressed by several Tai Tokerau business organisations that the region would become a key centre for industrial and agricultural expansion and would serve as an 'Area of Great Potential Wealth' (Young 1966, 1). It is clear, however, that even at this time, tourism was seen as the region's key 'sunrise' industry, its new form of opportunity and promise.

From the mid-twentieth century, commentators began to note that because Te Tai Tokerau had not become a major centre of population, many of its historic sites were still relatively intact. The region was said to possess 'remarkable' and 'authentic' links with the colourful past; as one commentator put it, wherever you travel in the north, 'history is only just beneath the surface, if at all' (Odell, cited in Reed 1968, 5). The region's lack of development, then, has come to be seen as a virtue. And while the importance of particular events and sites associated with the north had already been recognised in publications such as Maning's *History of the War in the North* (1862) and Colenso's *Authentic and Genuine History of the Signing of the Treaty of Waitangi* (1890), the idea that the region as a whole might be of foundational historical value is a relatively recent one: the 'discovery' of the significance of the region's past dates from the mid-twentieth century. Since this time, the past has come to be seen as central to Te Tai Tokerau's importance and to its appeal as a destination for visitors. The region is said to be 'the birthplace of New Zealand history' (Odell, cited in Reed 1968, 5), to be 'rich in its romantic and colourful associations with the country's early years' (ibid.), and to contain 'more of the origins of New Zealand's history—Maori and pakeha—than any other part of the country' (Sale 1981, vii). As A. H. Reed explained in 1956:

Historically [the region] can rightly be termed the Cradle of New Zealand; to mention only a few "firsts," it was in Northland that the first Christian service was held, the first plough put into the ground, the first newspaper established; it was here that the Treaty of Waitangi was signed, New Zealand proclaimed a British Colony, and the first capital set up.¹²

Changes within the museum sector which have unfolded since Maning's time, then, have not simply involved the loosening, dispersion and de-centring of activities: as the case of Te Tai Tokerau shows, they have also involved processes of re-centring.

The other fundamental change which has occurred within the museum sector—and closely linked to the scrutiny to which the museum as an institution has become subject—has been the forced acknowledgement of the interests of indigenous stakeholders. As James Clifford has asserted, it has become widely apparent within the dominant culture that many populations whose cultures were officially declared moribund, who were 'converted' to Christianity, whose cultural traditions were 'salvaged' in textual collections and whose 'authentic' artefacts were massively collected a century ago, have not disappeared (1988, 145). In visible ways since the second half of the twentieth century, indigenous peoples have begun to recover forms of cultural heritage; to speak and act for themselves; to assert social, political, and economic claims; and to seek reparation for historical grievances. The museum as an institution has assumed a special prominence in these cultural and discursive politics: as Alice Te Punga Somerville has noted, since the museum space suggestively stands in for colonialism, it 'provides a compelling and salient site of resistance' (2007a, 34). As tribal communities have begun to dispute the right of majority institutions to control the presentation of their cultures, it has become increasingly apparent that recognition of museums' 'cultural debt' and reference to the 'general interest' of tribal peoples in their collections—as expressed in the Auckland Institute and Museum *Centennial History*—do not go far enough. Museums have become 'theatres' (Thomas 2001, 312) for the renegotiation of the histories which they showcase, and those communities whose cultures and histories are at stake in exhibits are able to mobilise 'to seriously trouble the museum' (Clifford 1997, 205).¹³ While Maning does refer in his correspondence with Cheeseman to the possibility that Maori may 'begin to look up again' (1967, 45), the extent of this future is not glimpsed by him—although this thesis will argue that his writing is able to illuminate such a future in specific ways.

* * *

The ideas expressed by Maning and the continuities and changes that have occurred since his time give rise to the concerns addressed in the following chapters. Offering a critical analysis of museum

exhibits and heritage displays which represent aspects of the history of settlement, this thesis visits a number of sites in Te Tai Tokerau. It is also interested in displays which have been mounted in Australia and in the United States and which are linked to Te Tai Tokerau through the movement of materials, figures and stories. The thesis examines how the past is dealt with in these sites and exhibits, and considers the role that resurgent indigenous populations have played in shaping or re-shaping certain kinds of representations. Each chapter pays particular attention to strains evident in contemporary modes of display, interpreting these as markers of the extent to which representations of settlement continue to be unsettled by the ‘shakey notions’ upon which they are necessarily founded.

The thesis itself has grown from earlier graduate work which focused on the Canterbury Museum in Christchurch. Both that earlier project and this one have been enabled by developments in the interdisciplinary field of museum studies which has emerged since the mid-1980s and which has harnessed, among other resources, literary theory and techniques of literary textual analysis. The present discussion has, however, been developed in ways which mark out frustrations with aspects of this field. Museum studies has attracted an increasing number of proponents worldwide and has achieved a vast publication output: in the early 1990s, Henry Barnard and David Butts felt able to assert that ‘there is now a rich and sophisticated literature that draws on a wide range of critical and social theory to theorise the museum and its practices’, noting approvingly that ‘there is every indication of intellectual ferment’ in this area (1992, 2). This ongoing ‘intellectual ferment’ has had remarkably little to say about museums and heritage sites which are found in regional situations, and about those which do not have their origin in either the nineteenth or twenty-first centuries. Discussing this trend, Darryl McIntyre and Kirsten Wehner have proposed that major metropolitan museums of these vintages ‘are arguably more intensely exposed to public commentary than smaller museums’, and that the question of how they resolve issues is consequently more fraught (2001, xvi). It is clear that museums and exhibitionary sites of contested and national significance can be found well beyond the city limits, though, and that critical examination of the vastly-expanded display of settlement history within non-metropolitan localities since the mid-twentieth century is overdue. This thesis, then, refuses and reworks the metropolitan bias of conventional museum studies discourse.¹⁴ Focusing its interests within the wider heritage landscape, it sets out to examine how the past is encoded in specific and far-flung places.

A further point of departure from conventional museum studies relates to shifts which have been observable within the museum sector as a result of the recognition of indigenous stakeholders. Pursuant to its demand that museums must ‘address the inheritance of colonialism’ (Barringer and Flynn 1998, 1), museum studies is eager to find evidence of postcolonial practice in contemporary museums. Commentators now duly read for signs that museums have moved beyond the colonial paradigm and redressed imbalances of power, that they are making room for indigenous access and involvement and are becoming more welcoming, inclusive and relevant to diverse social groups. Frequently in this literature, and functioning as an extension of the longstanding myth of the nation’s ideal race relations, Aotearoa New Zealand has been invoked—by New Zealand commentators as well as those from Britain, Canada, North America and Australia—as a prominent and progressive example on the world stage.¹⁵ New Zealand museums are held to have responded promptly to the demands of these new critical practices and to be at the forefront of developing groundbreaking procedures which allow Maori ‘to define their own heritage’ (Karp and Lavine 1991, 2). In the New Zealand context, the so-called ‘bicultural agenda’ (O’Regan 1997, 7) has come to characterise postcolonial museum practice. Biculturalism has, as Nicholas Thomas has noted, no parallel in the evolution of any other settler nation (1999b, 253-4). Held to be ‘a unifying concept for the two cultures that are bound by the treaty’ (O’Regan 1997, 7) and currently applied to a wide range of state institutions, biculturalism is a philosophical framework for policy development which rose to prominence in the 1980s and 90s as a response to Maori activism. Some of the strongest expressions of its aspirations and imperatives have been effected through the medium of the museum: biculturalism is said to have been catalysed in part by the *Te Maori* exhibition which opened at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York in 1984, and which toured the United States and Aotearoa New Zealand between 1984 and 1987, and to have achieved its fullest form in the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa which opened in Wellington in 1998—although this thesis will argue that its origins are traceable in the north.¹⁶

There can be little doubt that some of these changes in museum practice have been constructive. As Somerville has noted, ‘the involvement of Indigenous peoples in the museum staff and with control over exhibits and display can make certain kinds of connection and rekindled relationship possible’ (2007a, 34). Maori communities have, in some instances, been able to introduce protocols through

which the space of the museum can be textually recoded as a treasurehouse or pataka, and have been able to participate in ways that reframe their involvement as ‘activism’ (ibid., 33-34).¹⁷ Changes which have been effected to date, however, are starting to be lauded as a sign that museums are ‘becoming indigenised’ (Healy and Witcomb 2006, 4). While acknowledgement has been made in some cases that a range of new difficulties has arisen and that there remains ‘much to be done’ (Butts 2002, 241), there is an overall sense of complacency and congratulation which has come to characterise discussions of New Zealand museums and their modes of display.¹⁸ This thesis does not take for granted this country’s reputation for ‘progressiveness’; or, to put it another way, it borrows a healthy dose of scepticism from Maning. Aiming to historicise the bicultural agenda and the postcolonial practices with which it is allied, it investigates the impact of these on story-telling in the museum context and considers their uses and limits: What do biculturalism and/or postcolonialism suggest about settler anxieties connected with the past? How might they be linked to earlier forms of assimilationism and/or to historical revisionism? What kinds of difficulties do they produce or encounter in practice? To what extent do they allow tribal peoples to define their own heritage and tell their own stories? In what other ways might they serve or hinder tribal agendas? What kinds of alternatives can be imagined which may, in practice, push further?

A third significant departure, as these concerns suggest, is the interest of this thesis in issues connected with the ongoing history of settlement. Conventional museums studies barely acknowledges the fact that settler-colonial societies—in which indigenous populations were dispossessed and eventually outnumbered by considerable numbers of Europeans—are characterised, as Maning’s writing shows, by sustained, direct, complex and continuing engagements between indigenous and settler cultures; a recently published study of the New Zealand museum sector has gone so far as to claim that Aotearoa New Zealand is a ‘post-settler’ nation (McCarthy 2011, 5).¹⁹ The thesis, then, adapts many of its theoretical contours from commentaries which deal with settler-colonial contexts in Aotearoa New Zealand, Australia, the United States, Canada and the islands of the Pacific, and which emerge from overlaps between fields which include history, anthropology, art history, indigenous studies and literary studies. Like many of these commentaries, it sets out to assess what cultural productions reveal about how the past is able and required to be conceptualised at specific historical junctures, investigating ways in which foundational problems of settlement are enacted, repeated, modified and continued in certain cultural forms (Calder and Turner 2002, 9). The

thesis proceeds on the understanding that the settling of a new country is as much an imaginative undertaking as it is a matter of the physical habitation of a territory, and that dealing with the past forms a crucial component of this project: as Alex Calder and Stephen Turner have suggested, '[p]erhaps the strongest legacy of settlement is the simultaneous necessity and apparent impossibility of writing the history of settlement' (ibid., 13).

Desires and difficulties associated with settlement history are dealt with more fully in the chapters which follow but can be summarised briefly here. First, settler societies need history since it founds or gives authoritative basis to the nation and it offers a means of establishing a sense of identity and place. Second, given that events within settler-colonial situations generate an excess of signification—carrying difficulties associated with cross-cultural translation and with competing modes of interpretation—history is needed in order to stabilise the past. Securing the future of settlement, it strives to bring events under control by gathering them 'into the fold of meaning' (Muecke 1996, 2). Third, history is needed because it serves as a marker of maturity: settler-colonial societies must demonstrate that they can account for their pasts since an ongoing refusal or reluctance to deal with these signals misgiving or bad faith. And fourth, because its conventional narrative structure is ideally suited to teleological stories of progress, history seems to offer the possibility of neatness and resolution: it mobilises the past in ways which promise to transcend problems associated with this past, and it can be freighted in ways which explain or justify the present.

While reasons for the appeal of history are clear, the past in settler societies rarely co-operates with these kinds of aspirations. In the initial stages of settlement, history is difficult to manage because of its immediacy; as James Cowan puts it in his introduction to *The New Zealand Wars and the Pioneering Period* (1922), sufficient time needed to elapse 'for the episodes of our nation-making to be viewed in their correct perspective' (1955, v). A lack of 'accumulated weight' (Bennett 1988, 4-5), however, makes this past inherently volatile: as Maning's writings will show in later chapters, the question of whether a war has been won or lost, or whether a piece of land was sold or not, can be a matter of opinion until—or even long after—history has been able to adjudicate the matter. Settlement history is also tricky to manage because as it unfolds, prior expectations are not always met and unintended and/or disturbing outcomes—including violence and destruction—occur. These produce immediate and formative tensions between the need to remember and the need to forget.

Initially, too, there is a pervasive sense that the past in a settler-colonial society is shallow, that proper history is what has happened elsewhere: there is a lack of any strong ‘historic sense’. In combination, these factors contribute to an underlying lack of assurance, to an awareness of the ‘shakey’ nature of settlement and its history which Maning’s writing both documents and enacts.

As time goes by, settlement history becomes increasingly unwieldy for a range of further reasons related to what Turner has termed ‘the contradictory inner-history of settlement’ (2002, 40). In Aotearoa New Zealand, one of the youngest of ‘new world’ countries, the pace of change has been so compressed and the extent so vast that there are, as Geoff Park has explained, real difficulties in connecting past and present (2006, 219). Re-valuings and reversals have caused objects acquired by museums in the nineteenth century as ‘artificial curiosities’ to become reclassified as taonga, and prescriptive notions of authenticity to be overturned. They have caused ‘forgotten’ or overlooked sites to be reclaimed as inalienable national treasures which have in turn been mobilised as stages for protest and activism. They have caused notions of progress effected through the wholesale transformation of new world environments to be replaced by conservationism which is now under threat from indigenous claims. They have caused existing narrative and interpretative frameworks to be stretched and distorted to accommodate experiences which they have previously excluded. As these problems suggest, the fact that so-called ‘dying races’ have recovered and reasserted themselves in ways which challenge both the basis and future of European settlement has had profound implications for how history is dealt with in settler-colonial societies. ‘The rewriting and re-righting of our position in history is’, as Linda Tuhiwai Smith has explained, ‘a critical aspect of the struggle for [indigenous] self-determination’ (1999, 28).

Given the preoccupations of this thesis, it should be apparent that the choice of Te Tai Tokerau as its area of interest is integral to its approach. The selection of a spatially distant and historically and critically overlooked region seems an appropriate extension of what Calder and Turner have described as the concern of settlement studies with ‘the curious status of so-called second world societies’ (2002, 8). Te Tai Tokerau also possesses a vivid past which exemplifies a wide range of interactions and permits consideration of an era of history which is said to have been ‘over before that of most parts of New Zealand began’ (Sale 1981, vii). While the thesis is interested in the early and first-of-their-kind engagements which can be traced there, it is also interested in the ongoing

history of this region. Among other things, Te Tai Tokerau possesses a vigorous tradition of resistance: it has served as the foundation for the earliest formal protests against breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi, and as both a focus for modern activism and a point of origin for several groundbreaking claims to the Waitangi Tribunal for the redress of historical grievances. It is also associated with quieter forms of resistance. In the 1930s, for instance, it functioned as a centre for the revival of tribal traditions which is described in the Auckland Institute and Museum *Centennial History* and which is expressed in material form in the marae complex located at Waitangi National Trust. In turn, this has led to the revival of traditions associated with waka building and navigation: within the Pacific region, Te Tai Tokerau has become an important centre for the rejuvenation of waka culture (Ellis 2007, 34-5). The region has recently been the subject of important publications which have documented and celebrated its cultural, artistic and architectural heritage, as well as those prompted by Waitangi Tribunal hearings which have begun to gather ‘the various histories and stories of our ancestors into a form that makes them accessible to our young people’ (Jones 2002, xii).²⁰

Te Tai Tokerau’s geographical qualities are another key reason for its selection. In part, these have enabled the delimiting of a field of study: the region is a discrete zone located on an elongated peninsula of land which is bordered by and connected to the Tasman Sea and the Pacific Ocean.²¹ Because of its location in the northern part of the country, Te Tai Tokerau has historically functioned as a node within wider international spheres of activity and travel: it is stitched to trade and migratory routes across the Pacific and the Tasman, and has long been associated with mobility and dwelling, arrival and departure, beginnings and endings. Tribal histories refer to Hokianga as both the place where Kupe made landfall and as the place from which he departed to return to his homeland in Hawaiki, and explain that this is where his descendants later arrived, following his directions and tracing his sea path (Hohepa 1999, 187-88). Hokianga is also believed to be the very first area in Aotearoa New Zealand to have been permanently settled, serving as the locus from which exploratory journeys north and south were staged as tribal populations expanded: as Deidre Brown has explained, Tai Tokerau’s Maori history is marked by successive internal migrations and battles over land (2003, 27). Within tribal traditions, too, Te Rerenga Wairua, located on the northernmost tip of Te Hiku o te Ika (the tail of the fish), is the final departure place of the spirits of the dead: it is a

‘precious ancestral treasure’ for which the people of the Far North act as guardians on behalf of all Maori (Cloher 2002, 36).

Te Tai Tokerau possesses no single or pre-eminent focal point; its scattered localities are a legacy of the days of communication by water. These localities are presently accessed overland by means of the Twin Coast Discovery Highway, an 800-kilometre touring route which opened in 1998 as an initiative to encourage tourism and which ties the region together with a ‘navigable’ path of asphalt (Solnit 1999, 365). The nature of the museum sector in Te Tai Tokerau makes the region suited to the kind of study undertaken in this thesis, too. While the region does possess local authority museums which serve its largest concentrations of population in Whangarei and Kaitiaia, these are overshadowed by institutions and sites which have higher public profiles and which are found in the context of more remote localities along the Twin Coast Discovery Highway. Chris Prentice has explained that museums established in small communities and in rural places work on metonymic and synecdochal levels: while they ‘represent’ the immediate area, they also stand for national history as much as they do local history (1998, 301-2). Many of the sites and displays which are dealt with in this thesis, however, are special cases: Te Tai Tokerau furnishes stories, places and things which are both widely and officially recognised as being of direct national and international significance.

* * *

The thesis proceeds by examining a range of heritage sites and museum displays. Its method involves reading the museum-as-text: it attends to artefacts, labels, inscriptions, plaques, interpretation panels and video and audio materials. It also attends to discursive practices which may be less overt, including those implied through the creation and maintenance of ‘buffer zones’ (Bennett 1988, 3) which regulate the visitor’s entry to and exit from the demarcated space of the past; through modes of installation; and through spatial relationships and sequencing—those juxtapositions and arrangements which, as Vergo has explained, place a certain construction on history. The question of the ‘indefatigability’ of its research remains open, but in addition to considering what can be seen or inferred from visiting the displays, the study makes use of information derived from museum archives, Department of Conservation files and unpublished reports, and—where possible and

appropriate—discussions with curators or stakeholders. It also consults a range of published sources including exhibition catalogues, reviews, articles, visitor pamphlets, tourism brochures, media reports, websites, photographs, images, Waitangi Tribunal reports, and scholarly and popular histories.

Special mention should be made of the fact that within its course, the thesis deals with a number of key historical sources. These include voyage accounts published by James Cook, Joseph Banks and George Forster; residence narratives like the one produced by Earle; letters and journals like those written by Samuel Marsden; early histories like Colenso's dealing with the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi; and 'literary' accounts such as Maning's *History of the War in the North*. They also include a number of early- and mid-twentieth century sources such as publications by Lindsay Buick and Vernon Reed on Waitangi, and discussions of the collections of the Peabody Essex Museum by Ernest Stanley Dodge. In part, these sources are used because they form a crucial component of the historical record: it has seemed important to attend to writings which form the points of origin for ideas related to aspects of the history of settlement. In part, too, many of these sources are used here because they underpin the stories that are presented in museum and heritage sites. The thesis examines ways in which these texts are currently mobilised and—where appropriate—signals possible alternative uses. It does not consult these sources in an attempt to retrieve 'the truth' of the past in any simplistic sense: these texts are viewed as imperfect interpretations or mediations, as components of what Alex Calder, Jonathan Lamb and Bridget Orr have termed the 'compromised archive' (1999, 15). The thesis does proceed in the expectation, however, that these mediations—both despite and because of their limitations—can help to make sense of things in the present. In some cases they show more than they think they do; in others they show things which have subsequently been forgotten or have needed to be forgotten. Providing view-shafts on processes of historicisation, these writings serve as reminders of the important need to look carefully at how history is produced. It should be made clear from the outset, too, that the use of these texts is not intended to signal that written or literary forms are inherently richer and more nuanced than other forms of representation. This study is undertaken in the belief that museum exhibits and heritage displays can be highly sophisticated in their own ways. Not only can they register multiple perspectives and make use of reflexive methodologies, but they can also, as Thomas has pointed out, present the past as something other than a realm of foreclosed possibilities, and they can enable

incompatible histories to be presented in tension (2001, 307). The encouraging of tolerance, the rewiring of epistemologies, and the production of dissonance and discordance are all, as Ian Wedde has proposed, the potential ‘civic yield’ of such displays (2006, 11).

Unlike other publications on the north, the thesis is not planned ‘as an itinerary, taking in the various places in sequence’ (Reed 1968, 6): the tour which it takes is not geographically determined along a linear route, although it is possible (or has, at least, been possible for me) to visit all of these places. And while the thesis does designate Te Tai Tokerau as its region of interest, it is not geographically bounded in a strict sense—its concerns come from and relate to the north, but are not fixed there. When the discussion departs from Te Tai Tokerau, however, it does so in pursuit of specific aims. The displays in Canberra and in Salem, Massachusetts, which are examined within its course enable an otherwise ‘local’ or ‘national’ history to be seen in international contexts. In part, as is the case with Auckland Museum, the inclusion of the two overseas metropolitan museums can be seen as a means of historicising ideas of centre and periphery. The Tai Tokerau collection which is currently held and displayed in Salem, Massachusetts is a legacy of that town’s maritime prowess, but Salem has become a quiet backwater better known for its seventeenth century witchcraft trials and for its Halloween celebrations than for its international trading activities; the presence of a major metropolitan museum beyond the outskirts of the modern city of Boston is, in some ways, anomalous. Reflecting a different set of geographical tensions, the new National Museum of Australia is situated in Canberra, the purpose-built capital founded after Australian federation in 1901. Canberra is extremely well-endowed with national cultural institutions but has never rivalled Sydney or Melbourne in terms of its population mass, and it can only be accessed by international visitors through larger Australian gateway cities.

In part, too, consideration of displays mounted overseas raises important questions concerning the portability or mobility of settler histories: What might be at stake when materials or stories that relate to one nation’s history of settlement are transported and displayed in another settler context? How do such displays relate to the long history of the movement of things across the globe which has been a product of museum practices and imperatives? How might contemporary treatments of these materials and stories serve or resist the kinds of globalising effects which seek to collapse difference? What might such displays enable? What might they foreshorten or foreclose? Consideration of such

displays also necessitates the development of tailored comparative approaches to these histories: In what specific ways has the settlement of Aotearoa New Zealand been similar to and/or different from that of Australia or of the United States? How might bringing geographically distant settlement histories within the same compass illuminate conditions of culture within their respective places of origin? What kinds of blindspots might be produced? The thesis is interested, too, in the possibility that ‘cross-cultural’ approaches may be authorised by settler-colonial and/or indigenous histories themselves. In certain ways these histories are, as the relevant chapters try to make clear, already aligned along specific geographical and temporal axes, and related through matrices of travel; they share ‘routes’, as Clifford would say (1997, 2).

The chapters, then, are organised around phases of settlement history: they deal with ‘discovery’ and first contact, the transformation of new world peoples and environments, turning points related to colonial annexation, ‘clashes of arms’ (Reed 1956, 155) associated with frontier conflict, and processes through which frontier-to-region conversion is undertaken. It should be made clear from the outset, though, that the thesis is written with distrust for modes of history which embody narrative structures of growth and fulfilment: this is not a sequential story whereby rungs on the ladder are gained and destinies achieved. First, arbitrary distinctions have needed to be made in order to periodise in this way: as the chapters themselves attempt to signal, New Zealand settlement history is patterned in some ways which are typical and in other ways which are distinctive. Second, within this broad scheme the material is not approached in any true chronological order: in practice, the sequence tracks back and forth since each chapter deals with contemporary displays and with surviving accounts of the older histories to which these displays refer. In this sense, the ‘phases’ which are marked are thematic: they provide a set of concerns, a means of differentiating and structuring the material. And third, this organising principle is moderated by others which are mobilised for their potentially disruptive effects. Starting in with Maning, for example, is no accident. Maning’s awareness of ‘shakey notions’ and his interest in ‘trying back’ provide concerns which have become increasingly topical: as Wedde has noted, Maning’s writings are perhaps ‘even more’ potent as contemporary agents (2002, 175). Maning, then, is a figure who crosses history. And while geographical organising principles are not given primacy, it is not entirely coincidental that the discussion has begun—via Maning—in the Hokianga, that it pivots on Waitangi, or that it ends at Te

Rerenga Wairua. These shaping devices are intended to raise questions associated with beginnings and endings, centres and margins—and points in between.

It should be made clear from the outset, too, that the thesis is not structured around a single argument. Conceived as a collection of separate-but-related investigations, it seeks distinctive ways to frame its concerns, mapping these onto exhibits and testing them for mileage. Some of the provocations come from within the material itself, as in the case of the Salem chapter which uses comments made by a mid-twentieth century commentator on the Peabody Essex Museum's history as its place of departure. In other cases, the starting points come from statements or arguments advanced in the writings of those in academic fields like literary studies or historical re-enactment studies, or more generally from identifying a gap or problem with the existing discourse. While the chapters are disparate in their interests, the thesis is held together by a number of interlocking historiographic concerns: In what ways do the needs and desires of the present shape the telling of stories from the past? How might the past bear on the present in ways which the present does not or cannot acknowledge? What kinds of continuities and discontinuities between past and present do certain forms of history produce or depend upon? In what ways might engagements with history be 'a-historical' or 'anti-historical' (McCalman 2004, 484) in practice?²² Each of the chapters is also concerned with the politics of representation: How and why do particular stories come to be told in particular places at particular times? In what kinds of ways might different representations be contested, or be developed in ways that seek to enhance or diminish the risk of their being contested? How might the interests of various stakeholders converge and/or diverge? Questions associated with progress recur within the thesis, too, and are addressed more directly in its final chapter: What role does this concept play in the structuring of histories of settlement? Over time, how have notions of progress changed? What kinds of concessions and compromises might progress involve? Is it possible to conceive of modes of display which reject or displace conventional ideas of progress?

* * *

A disclaimer of sorts is, of course, in order. As is the case with all writings on such subjects, this thesis is personal and contingent. It does not aim to cover the history of Te Tai Tokerau in any comprehensive way and it discusses only a small number of the historical sites and museums found

in or associated with the region. It is by no means representatively balanced in terms of the locations with which it does deal, either: it has, among other things, an obvious Bay of Islands bias, and a tendency to focus on sites which are of national and/or international importance—such as those under consideration for UNESCO world heritage status and those currently receiving government funding or attention for other reasons. Because the chapters pick up and leave the traces in places which seem appropriate to their chosen concerns, principles of selectivity have determined where each one begins and what ground it covers. The main criterion in making these decisions has been to use material which allows for the fullest possible engagement with settlement issues and which might help to alter the scope of the existing discussion. In accordance with this approach, I have followed research opportunities which have arisen and have created opportunities when these have seemed in the best interests of the thesis. I have also tried to achieve a balance between depth and breadth: while this study functions as a mode of travel, it tries to ‘dwell’ (Clifford 1997, 36) for long enough within each chapter to enable the development of a detailed discussion. Of necessity, too, coverage of what is found within each of the sites and institutions is highly subjective. Given that museums are, as Prentice has explained, ‘actualized within the practices of the visitor’, in each case the ‘walk-through’ performed by another visitor would be likely to yield a different reading, a different museum-text (1998, 295-97).

What the thesis tries to convey within its limits are some of the patterns of connection which help to develop a picture of the complex and intertwined nature of the histories with which it does deal. It is interested, for example, in Pacific voyaging and trading—both European and non-European—which link Te Tai Tokerau and far-distant localities. A number of figures also crop up repeatedly: Maning will be met again in the chapter which deals with the northern war, and he is mentioned in a minor but significant way in the final chapter; Colenso, the author of the early ethnography which was published in the *Transactions and Proceedings of the Auckland Institute and Museum*, later appears as a missionary-botanist and as the author of the earliest dedicated history of the events at Waitangi in 1840; Earle, who has already assisted briefly in the Hokianga, will turn up again as the painter of a view of the mission settlement at Kerikeri, and so on. It is beyond the scope of the thesis to deal in greater depth with the biographies of these figures, but what the thesis does aim to show—without giving the appearance of too formal a coherence—is that much of New Zealand settlement history

has occurred within the lifespan and orbit of individuals, and that things, people, places and events are interconnected.

Some explanatory words are also needed in relation to how the conclusions of each chapter are intended to function. The thesis is written with the ‘ambition’ (as Maning might term it) of making a contribution towards existing modes of discussion, and in some instances of beginning a new conversation or series of conversations. It proceeds with the view that settler-colonial history is inherently problematic—that it involves contradictions, paradoxes, elisions, omissions, selective rememberings—and that it is not possible to solve problems associated with the task of representing this history: you can’t ‘just tell it like it is, or was—it’s not so simple’, Turner points out (2002, 64). As each of the chapters tries to make clear, too, the strains that are most striking in contemporary modes of display are precisely those which arise from a desire to fix the problems associated with this task; the desire to represent the past *as settler culture would like it to have been*, and the desire for neatness and narrative closure, are what warp these displays most. Within its course, the thesis does, however, strive to imagine alternative approaches to this material. These are not offered as prescriptions or blueprints. In fact, most are tendered with the clear understanding that they could not actually be implemented, or at least not yet, anyway: like the recommendations made by Colenso in the 1860s, they may well seem naïve and unworkable in their own time. They are, however, put forward on the understanding that recognition of the distance between what is currently possible and what may actually be required is an invaluable exercise within the context of a settler society. They are also put forward in the tentative hope that some of these things may be—or may *need* to be—‘displayable’ at later junctures: not only do museums index ways in which history can be conceptualised at given historical moments, but they can also be responsible for cultural ‘dreamwork’ (Mitchell 1994, 10). In some senses, then, the conclusions can be considered ‘experimental’, although this term is used with some hesitation.

The thesis does not concur with the idea that experimental displays should necessarily be ‘welcomed’ by a (settler) public as the Auckland Institute and Museum seems to have proposed in 1967. Nor does it seek to align itself with Tony Bennett’s recent proposal that museums should be viewed as ‘civic laboratories’ (2005), or with Chris Healy and Andrea Witcomb’s soft-focus formulation of museums as ‘open-ended experiments in culture’ (2006). Rather, its conception of the ‘experimental’ is

borrowed from Stephen Muecke who understands this to be a term which carries shades of meaning derived from the domains of science and art (1996, 2-3). Muecke is suspicious, on one hand, of the suggestion of the dispassionate distance which might be maintained through scientific experimentation and of the unsurprising results which tend to emerge from controlled investigative procedures. On the other hand, he is cautious of associations with ‘harmless’ aestheticism, libertarianism and/or irresponsibility. With these reservations in place, however, he proposes that experimental histories might usefully involve testing things out, that they might operate with uncertainty, and that they might be motivated by the recognition of a gap between what has made sense in the past and what no longer makes sense. Experimental displays, then, might allow for modes of representation that engage with risk; they might convey difficulties implicit in settler-colonial histories and offer competing and unresolved conceptions of how these histories can be understood; and they might portray a past which some visitors may not recognise or for which they may not be prepared. Such experiments are not intended as flights of fancy or mock threats—like Maning, I have sober purposes—but they are intended to engage with the notion of ‘shakeyness’.

The conclusions, then, are produced in ways which seek to acknowledge stakes implicit in these histories. Significant disparities are currently apparent within Te Tai Tokerau. Many of the region’s worked-out gumfields, once thought to be barren land, have proven suitable for fruit-growing, dairying and exotic forestry and have been transformed into prosperous and productive orchards, farms and plantations—new emblems, as Park has proposed, of an extractive economy (1995, 24). Boat-building is still a key industry in Whangarei, which has developed a reputation as a repair and service centre for luxury yachts on South Pacific journeys. Because of the region’s mild sub-tropical climate, alternative lifestyles have taken off, too, in the vicinity of old-world towns like those found in the Bay of Islands, and coastal property has boomed. The region has been described as ‘a holiday-maker’s paradise’ (Reed 1968, 7) and as the country’s ‘most fantastically varied natural playground’ (Robson 1975, 1-2). It is marketed as a destination not only for historical tourism but also for scenic tourism and for leisure activities which include diving, deep-sea fishing, dolphin-spotting, kayaking, surfing, horse riding and golfing. These markers of affluence, however, are countered by signs of poverty and unemployment. Te Tai Tokerau is officially acknowledged as having one of the worst records of Maori social and economic disadvantage in the country: discussing the history of the Far North, for instance, the *Muriwhenua Land Report* published by the Waitangi Tribunal has explained

that the alienation of lands and the advent of the gumdigging industry reduced the local people ‘to penury, powerlessness, and, eventually, State dependence’, and that these people ‘became, and still are, a people at risk’ (1997, 1 and 8). Margaret Mutu, too, has commented on the fact that the region is home to communities which are among the country’s most impoverished, neglected and deprived (2011, 82 and 99). These circumstances serve as clear reminders of the contemporary repercussions of the region’s mixed historical fortunes, and of injustices and losses which occurred in the past but which are by no means past. The thesis, then, endeavours to take account of historical and contemporary conditions and constraints within which tribal cultures operate, and of the treaty claim and treaty settlement processes which form a context of immediate struggle in which the ownership of history counts. Questions related to historical narratives assume, as Clifford has made clear, ‘a more than theoretical urgency’ (1988, 8) when they are understood as being enmeshed in real-world situations. But then Maning already knew this.

As a judge of the Native Land Court, Maning was charged with establishing ‘good historical order’ (Calder 1996, 8) in endeavouring to ascertain Maori ownership over land, and he delivered an important judgment in April 1871, the same month in which he penned his first letter to Kirk at the Auckland Institute and Museum. On the surface, Maning’s involvement in a mechanism of state which dispensed ‘justice’ in ways which effected the dispossession of tribes to the tune of many millions of acres of land, and his apparent lack of sympathy for Maori customs and epistemologies, come down from history badly. Again, though, his writings repay closer inspection. The 1871 judgment has, as Calder has noted, a satirical parallel in *Old New Zealand*, which was published before Maning’s appointment as a judge but which assisted him in attracting notice as a candidate suitable for such a position (ibid.). The text describes a land purchase in which facts, dates and observable truths are displaced by a set of what are supposed to be outlandish considerations:

One man said his ancestors had killed off the first owners; another declared his ancestors had driven off the second party; another man, who seemed to be listened to with more respect than ordinary, declared that his ancestor had been the first possessor of all, and had never been ousted, and that this ancestor was a huge lizard that lived in a cave on the land many ages ago, and sure enough, there was the cave to prove it. Besides the principal claims there were an immense number of secondary ones—a sort of latent equities—which had lain dormant until it was known that the pakeha had his eye on the land [. . .] One man required payment because his ancestors, as he affirmed, had exercised the right of catching rats on it, but which he (the claimant) had never done, for the best of reasons, *i.e.* there were no rats to catch [. . .] Another claimed because his

grandfather had been murdered on the land, and—as I am a veracious pakeha—another claimed payment because *his* grandfather had committed the murder! Then half the country claimed payments of various value, from one fig of tobacco to a musket, on account of a certain *wahi tapu*, or ancient burying-ground, which was on the land [. . .] ²³

Maning's text is, however, destabilised by the possible knowledge that these claims may not be laughable or spurious after all. Raising the troubling spectre of other ways of knowing and of other temporalities, rights and stakes which may in due course be asserted and deemed valid, it suggests a further underlying context for Maning's ideas about 'great truths' and 'shakey notions'.

Brief comment needs to be made, too, about changes which have occurred during the period of study. As the Auckland Institute and Museum *Centennial History* makes clear, display arrangements are not permanent and the museum as a way of seeing (and saying) is continually subject to change. It follows that projects which deal with institutions and exhibits can, as Meaghan Morris has noted, encounter methodological difficulties in stabilising the objects of analysis: presence and durability cannot be taken for granted; places mutate; identities are renovated, sometimes drastically; 'evidence' is destroyed (1998, 14-19). Along with 'place', this thesis tries to hold ideas related to 'time' firmly in view as a crucial consideration: all of its chapters deal with changes that have taken place during the course of the research and are the result of tourism initiatives, of new government funding commitments, of institutional birth or re-orientation, or of developments within wider public culture. Many of these changes have been high-profile and obvious: the installation of the new Oceanic Art gallery in the Peabody Essex Museum; the opening of the inaugural temporary exhibition at the National Museum of Australia; the upgrading of visitor facilities and erecting of interpretation panels at Ruapekapeka; the installation of displays and tar-sealing of the access road at Te Rerenga Wairua. A number of the sites under consideration have also been marked with modifications of a less conspicuous nature and scale: the maturing of landscapes which act as framing devices; the quiet, continued programmes of planting, weeding and fencing; the issuing of subtly updated visitor pamphlets. Some, too, are the subject of developments and potential developments occurring at other levels altogether, as part of the treaty claims and settlement processes and/or as part of UNESCO world heritage status bids. The thesis strives to situate the sites and displays that it discusses within ongoing historical contexts, and to treat forms of revision as integral components of the objects of study. Construing these revisions as a sign of the timeliness of

an analysis of this kind, it is interested in the changes which have already occurred, and in changes which are yet to come.

Material encounters: trade & exchange on the early cross-cultural frontier

On 25 June 1805, Captain William Richardson struck out from Salem, Massachusetts, in the brig *Eliza* on a trading voyage bound for the Far East. The surviving logbook of the journey is sketchy and incomplete but the vessel is known to have rounded the Cape of Good Hope and to have traversed the Pacific Ocean, making stops in New Guinea and Port Jackson before collecting a cargo of sandalwood from Fiji to trade in Canton.²⁴ In March 1806, en route to Fiji, the ship is reputed to have touched at the Bay of Islands to replenish its supplies of food, water and wood.²⁵ The *Eliza* returned to Salem in June 1807 and in July that year, in a vote held in Salem by members of the East India Marine Society, it was unanimously agreed ‘[t]hat the president of standing Committee be empowered to purchase a collection of objects brought from New Holland by Captain William Richardson provided he will sell them at the cost of charges’ (East India Marine Society 1824, n.p.). This vote was, in fact, a mere formality: Richardson was, himself, a charter member of the society, an elite organisation of shipmasters and supercargoes formed in August 1799, and the collection of objects obtained during his voyage had always been destined for the society’s newly-established museum. In acquiring these objects, Richardson had been following the society’s instructions to members: one of its principal purposes, as expressed in its founding documents, was ‘to form a Museum of natural and artificial curiosities, particularly such as are to be found beyond the Cape of Good Hope and Cape Horn’ (cited in Whitehill 1949, 6).

Richardson’s collection did not contain any material from New Holland (as Australia was then known), but it did include seventeen artefacts from Aotearoa New Zealand.²⁶ And although the *Eliza* was probably the first New England trading ship to reach the New Zealand coast, the items brought back were not the first Maori ‘curiosities’ to enter the museum of the East India Marine Society: a handful of other objects acquired by the society prior to Richardson’s departure had been collected by visiting American whaling ships or by American crew on British ships in New Zealand waters. The museum’s collection of Maori artefacts was soon supplemented with around twenty items deposited in 1812 by Captain William Putnam Richardson, another member of the East India Marine Society, who sailed from Salem in the bark *Active* on 1 June 1810 and is believed to have touched at the Bay of Islands as well as Tonga, Fiji, Australia and China before returning to his home port on 27 March 1812.

The artefacts donated by these men are listed—and in some cases briefly described—in the 1821 *Catalogue of the Articles in the Museum of the East India Marine Society*. They include war clubs ‘of the Chiefs in New Zealand’, ‘Common Battle Axes’, ‘Paddles’, ‘Spears made of iron-wood’, ‘A wooden instrument, curiously carved, and edged with the teeth of a Shark [. . .] used by the natives (and formerly by the Sandwich Islanders) to cut up human bodies, both those taken prisoner and those slain in battle’, ‘An instrument made of the bone of a whale, used by the natives of New Zealand, as a war-weapon, a paddle, &c. called Patoo-Patoo’, ‘A Wooden Box, curiously carved’, ‘New Zealand Fifes’, ‘Sculptured Heads of “Eaticky”, a New Zealand Idol’, ‘Ear Ornaments of the New Zealand Women’, wooden and bone fishhooks and lines made from New Zealand flax, pieces of ‘Wove Cloth, made of New Zealand flax, by the natives, without any machinery’, and a ‘Stone Chisel’. If overall the articles listed in the catalogue are, as Walter Whitehill has noted, ‘of bewildering variety’ (1949, 37), the ordering of this register reveals certain attitudes towards the Maori materials: weapons and singular personal items are accorded greater significance on its scale than everyday objects such as fishing equipment, textiles and tools. The positioning of the Maori materials within the catalogue’s register also tells a story about the relative importance of the things collected from New Zealand and from other Pacific islands within the museum as a whole. In this publication, the 2,269 objects are broadly arranged according to type. ‘Artificial curiosities’ relating to the inhabitants of the Pacific—materials which would later come to be termed ‘ethnographic’, although this classificatory label did not exist at the time the collections were made and the catalogue printed—occupy pride of place in the ranked array, ahead of artificial curiosities obtained from other parts of the globe and ahead of the zoological, botanical and geological specimens. Maori material culture in particular features conspicuously in the earliest pages of the 1821 publication, with at least twelve artefacts in the first fifty, and twenty three in the first two hundred, identified as being of New Zealand origin.²⁷ This catalogue reflects the physical arrangement of the earliest museum gallery: the numbering in the publication corresponded with markings on the exhibits, enabling visitors to identify items on display. Maori artefacts, then, were a valued component of the museum’s collections from the outset.

These same Maori artefacts, together with others acquired by the museum over the course of its history, have—by and large—continued to enjoy a high profile in the museum in the two centuries

since they entered its collections. Selected examples currently occupy a prominent position in the recently-installed Oceanic Art gallery of the Peabody Essex Museum, the modern institution formed through the amalgamation of the museum of the East India Marine Society with the Essex Institute in 1867.²⁸ Scholarly interest in this collection has also been keen. As a group, these artefacts were amongst the first to be singled out for individual cataloguing by the museum with the publication in 1941 of Ernest Stanley Dodge's *The New Zealand Maori Collection in the Peabody Museum of Salem*, and further discussions of this collection, and of the museum's Oceanic materials more generally, have since been published in a number of books and scholarly articles.²⁹ The contemporary importance of these Oceanic artefacts, as many commentators have noted, is owed to several factors. First, the collection is substantial in size, since it was formed through the activities of commissioned collectors who were able to procure a significant number of pieces. Second, the artefacts donated by Salem seafarers have early acquisition dates: the nucleus of the collection which is now held by the PEM was formed at the beginning of the period in which Oceanic material culture began to undergo its dispersal across the globe. Third, and following on from this, the collection is regarded as being 'distinguished' in quality (Dodge 1965, viii). As Christina Hellmich, a former curator at the museum, has observed, while Salem captains were often far more interested in business and seafaring than in art or the study of indigenous cultures, and while examples of expert craftsmanship are intermingled with common and utilitarian objects in the collections they formed, they nevertheless returned with many items now considered 'masterpieces of great rarity' (1996, 69 and 72). And fourth, unlike the materials collected during Cook's Pacific voyages and by whaling ships which touched at Pacific island shores in the 1790s and early 1800s—which were rapidly scattered and have largely become detached from their histories of acquisition—the artefacts deposited in the PEM have remained intact as a collection within a stable institutional context and have comparatively well-established provenances. Because the society published early catalogues of its collections, the Oceanic materials are—by international standards—unusually well-documented, with the name of the donor and date of accession recorded for most pieces.

The perceived importance of these Oceanic collections in the museum's early days could not have been based, of course, on these modern criteria. It cannot have been clear to the Salem captains who obtained the material that the attachment of their names and the dates of their journeys, for instance, would prove so significant for future generations, and while they must have hoped that their

museum's legacy would endure, there can have been no guarantee. What would undoubtedly have been clear to them was that this Oceanic material was, as Dodge has put it, 'romantic in origin' (1965, vii). The artefacts played a starring role in the museum because of their apparent exoticism—as far as the museum's collectors and viewing audience were concerned, these things had travelled from seas only very recently charted, from islands newly opened up to exploration and trade, from distant and untamed shores. The extent to which Salem captains may have been aware that they were acquiring masterpieces of great rarity remains uncertain. The Oceanic material does appear, however, to have been highly regarded at the time it was collected because of its perceived authenticity—that is, because it was understood not to be of a souvenir or trade nature. Dodge makes the point that in eighteenth-century China many of the wealthy mandarins and merchants were collectors and connoisseurs of their own fine things and were loath to part with them, so captains would have been unable to obtain good porcelains and bronzes even if they had known what to look for. 'But from the Pacific Islands, the northwest coast [of America], and other uncivilized regions where no highly technical civilization and no wealthy collectors existed, but only natives living by their own hunting, fishing and elementary agricultural economies,' Dodge continues, 'it mattered not what the captain received in exchange for his hatchets and glass beads. Anything collected at that early period, judged in the light of present day ethnology, was certain to be good' (1949, 2-3).

Dodge's reference to the northwest coast is, for the purpose of this discussion, significant and his comments raise questions about the Salem captains' background experiences and intentions—questions which become more clearly focused in a later passage from the same text:

As a group the Polynesian collections in the Museum are the most important from a scientific point of view. There is good reason for this. The Salem captains collected curios at nearly every port at which they called. The South Seas, however, were newly opened up to trade and sailors' descriptions of the Polynesian Islands, particularly, peopled by a beautiful race leading a Utopian life strongly appealed to the imagination of the early nineteenth-century New Englander [. . .] Little did the captains realize that this fascinating native life, together with its arts and crafts, would collapse like a house of cards under the impact of white traders and missionaries, and their trade goods and new philosophy.³⁰

On one level, of course, these assertions are hyperbole and fabrication. Dodge dramatically recounts a fatal impact story which, at the time he was writing, simply could not be supported: by the mid-twentieth century it had become clear that despite the destructive effects of contact and settlement,

indigenous life-ways in many settler-colonial societies had survived, and tribal arts and crafts had not only endured but were beginning to flourish once more.³¹ Dodge's comments do help to pinpoint a crucial set of issues, though, relating to the role played by Americans in the opening up of Pacific trade. Salem had been founded in 1626 by Roger Conant and his followers on the site of the deserted Pawtucket village of Nahumkeke, and the town's Euroamerican residents had taken an active and ongoing part in events which shaped the lives of indigenous peoples throughout the Americas from the seventeenth century onwards. In what ways might the Salem captains' experiences at home—their attitudes towards Native peoples of America, their expectations of what contact with western cultures would entail for indigenous populations—have affected their activities in the Pacific in the early years of the nineteenth century? How might the museum's Oceanic collections be understood in relation to its Native American collections? What kinds of ideas and forces have shaped these distinct groups of artefacts over the course of the institution's two century-long history? This chapter uses the collection of Maori artefacts held in the Peabody Essex Museum, currently considered to be the earliest and one of the most important collections of Tai Tokerau provenance held by any institution worldwide (Brown 2003, 72; Ngarino Ellis 2007, 22), as a point of entry to the exploration of these issues. In its course, the chapter deals with a set of ordinary concerns associated with the movement of things 'across the edges of societies, civilizations and trading regimes' (Thomas 1991, 123), and with ways in which early phases of culture contact are represented in the context of the museum. Its ultimate aim, though, is to trace a shifting set of relations between what might be termed the 'new world' and the 'second new world'.

* * *

The acquisition of objects from the islands of the Pacific was one of the particular results of the concerted expansion of United States trading networks in the wake of the revolutionary war in America. With the formal acknowledgement of American independence in 1783, Yankee traders were no longer bound by the monopolies held by the South Sea Company and the East India Company which had governed trade between Britain (and its colonies) and the Far East since 1600, and were free to pursue the lucrative new markets opening up in the Pacific. Their activities in the region were both inspired and facilitated by recent European exploration. Captain James Cook of the Royal Navy was the first European to make extensive contact with Pacific peoples; his three

scientific ‘voyages of discovery’ began in 1768 and were widely publicised in official accounts from 1771 onwards. Cook’s voyages had been enabled by advancements in navigational technology and by improved awareness of the need to preserve the health of sailors. As a result of his voyages, winds and ocean currents in the region were better known, landforms were mapped with precision, surveys of coastlines were completed, and the imagined existence of *Terra australis incognita*, the great southern continent, was ruled out; as David Mackay has proposed, ‘fabrications gave way to firmly placed dots and then lines, which rendered the ocean a surer and more accessible place in European eyes, and one now ready for economic exploitation’ (1999, 101). It was precisely these kinds of mercantile motives that drew Salem’s captains to the Pacific. Their activities were part of the surge that occurred in Cook’s wake as those who were able sought to reap ‘the full advantage’ of his discoveries in commercial terms (Douglas, cited in Williams 1997, 530). Copies of the official publications of Cook’s three voyages—listed in the 1821 *Catalogue* between numbers 1532 and 1536—were among the earliest accessions to the museum of the Salem East India Marine Society and were widely circulated for reading by the society’s members. These accounts documented the collecting of tribal artefacts in exchange for western articles of merchandise (iron, hatchets, beads, cloth and so on) at almost every port visited, and must have encouraged Salem’s captains to expect the widespread availability of tribal artefacts for acquisition.

Discussing the Salem captains’ collecting practices, a number of commentators have offered the explanation that these men were following specific models, noting that they paid tribute to past European maritime pioneers like Cook in their speeches and toasts; that the instructions given to Cook by the Admiralty (and published in the accounts of his second and third voyages) were used as the template for collecting guidelines devised by the society; that some of the widely travelled Salem captains had undoubtedly visited European institutions such as the British Museum and the Leverian Museum which, from as early as 1771, contained within their displays artefacts brought back from Cook’s Pacific voyages; that the society’s members were inspired by the emergence of other early American museums in the late eighteenth century, and so on.³² It is perhaps more instructive to look at ways in which the Salem captains’ activities were exceptional. The museum of the East India Marine Society was unlike other early American museums in that it was affiliated to a marine society and so had commissioned collectors travelling the globe. The society itself differed from other early American marine societies both in its rigorous requirements for membership (limited to individuals

who had, as masters or supercargoes, rounded the Cape of Good Hope or Cape Horn) and in its additional chartered purpose—that of forming a museum of materials brought back from lands visited on these voyages. The society did not simply ‘encourage’ collecting for this museum, as Hellmich has proposed (1996, 69); it *required* its members to collect for its museum, and, as seen in the reimbursing of Captain William Richardson, it invested funds in the forming of these collections. The Salem captains’ activities also differed in significant ways from those of Cook: their voyages had no lofty scientific objectives and were of a directly commercial nature, representing a second wave of western entry into the Pacific in which economic exploitation was beginning in earnest.³³ Cook had been instructed by the Admiralty *to give things away* as a means of laying the foundation for interaction; while his patrons may have expected to be presented with gifts on his return, the accumulating of objects was not part of Cook’s explicit mandate. In contrast to this, Salem’s captains were instructed by their own society *to bring things back*: written directions state that ‘[a]rticles of the dress and ornaments of any nations, with the images and objects of religious devotion, should be procured’ (East India Marine Society 1801, n.p.). The commercial motivations that underpinned this are made plain: in addition to collating navigational information, the captains were instructed to provide an account of currencies (‘coin, weights and measures’) used in the places they visited, to record for ‘public utility’ any ‘remarks on the commerce of the different places touched at, with the imports, exports, and manner of transacting business’, and were reminded that ‘[w]hatever is singular in the manners, customs, dress, ornaments, &c. of any people, is deserving of record’ (ibid.). That the society’s members were merchants rather than naturalists also helps to explain some of the more striking features of the collections they built in the early decades of the nineteenth century, such as the fact that these reverse the preference for natural history specimens which prevailed at the time. It is notable, too, that while the society’s members were businessmen, they do not appear to have been motivated for personal profit in their collecting. Cook and his crews were the first of a large number of western visitors to the Pacific who subsequently gifted, exchanged and sold tribal artefacts for financial or strategic gain—in some cases, to other indigenous populations—at ports around the globe and on return to their metropolitan homes. While the Salem men may have capitalised on the availability of artefacts through these kinds of channels, they did not themselves re-circulate such things.

What, then, was the specific value of Pacific artefacts to the society and its members? In part, Salem's captains would have understood their own collecting of these artefacts as a means of showcasing and asserting the American nation's cultural maturity and global aspirations. In the late eighteenth century, with the stabilising of internal affairs after turbulence caused by decades of fighting between British, French, Yankee and Native American interests in the American colonies, and as a counterpart to the concerted expansion of its international trade and commerce, towns within the United States began to develop a wide range of civic institutions. The formation of public museums was understood to be part of what was required to transform the fledgling American republic into a mature member of the international community and in Salem's case, this cultural transformation was carried out at the same time and by the very same individuals who were developing the nation's sphere of economic influence. Hopeful anxieties surrounding the status of the society's museum are signalled in local newspaper reports published in the early 1800s which proclaim that the museum's exhibition hall, 'filled as it is by the rare and curious productions of nature and art from the four corners of the globe, forms a cabinet unrivalled in this, and excelled perhaps by few in any country' (cited in Whitehill 1949, 27). It is not the case that Americans were exploring new lands in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries with the intention of immediate annexation—despite the early flexing of muscle, foreign powers were relatively slow to proclaim sovereignty over lands in the Pacific and, as will be discussed shortly, the territorial expansion of the United States at this time proceeded determinedly across continental America instead—but Yankees were certainly keen to extend their national economic interests and to challenge European hegemony in places like the Pacific.³⁴ The East India Marine Society's museum and its collections, then, were always intended to function as more than simply 'a captain's hobby' (Dodge, cited in Peabody Museum of Salem 1951, 7); they were to represent to Americans and to a wider global audience *the fact of pervasive American presence* in places like the Pacific.

Part of the artefacts' value, too, lay in the fact that they weren't all that easy to obtain. While considerable advances in navigation had been made by the beginning of the nineteenth century, the South Seas trade was still a dangerous one: voyages were lengthy and covered immense distances, natural hazards such as fog, ice and irregular soundings had to be negotiated, and the indigenous inhabitants were viewed as 'an uncertain element' (Dodge 1965, 100). European and Euroamerican visitors were dependent on local inhabitants and their trading activities were usually conducted on the

terms of indigenous populations who held clear numerical and strategic advantage: as Pat Hohepa has noted, '[i]n current terms, my ancestors were using, living on, and controlling access to the beaches and oceans and lands' at the time of early contact (1999, 180). Cook's accounts demonstrated—in graphic detail, at times—the potential dangers of engaging with Pacific peoples and the risk of 'fatal consequences' (cited in Williams 1997, 318). Indigenous peoples were viewed as being 'unpredictable and savage customers' (Dodge 1965, 100); unarmed with 'culturalist' explanations, western visitors were at a loss to comprehend, for instance, that the same law of *utu* which made Maori sociable and eager to trade was also the motivating force behind violence. As was the case with Cook and his crews, Salem's mariners do not appear to have been put off by these dangers: opportunities existed in the Pacific for those who were prepared to pursue them. In part, then, the value of the acquired objects lay in their ability to signal the subduing or domesticating of the threats that were implicit in the experience of contact. More broadly, though, their value lay in the wider relationships they expressed since they spoke, to some extent, of the transactions which had caused them to be detached from their previous purposes (Thomas 1991, 156). The artefacts' presence in Salem was understood as a material index of Pacific peoples' readiness, capacity and desire to enter the world of capitalist trade.

If part of the value of these collections lay in the fact that Pacific island populations were considered powerful, it also lay in a contradictory impulse. These peoples' entry into the world of capitalist trade was largely viewed by westerners in a positive light, seen in terms of 'progress', as the beginning of an ascent from primitivism to civilisation. There was, however, a darker side to this process since it was understood this would result in their decline and eventual destruction. Tribal peoples were expected to be unable to withstand the changes that would inevitably occur when their vulnerable and unadaptive life-ways came into contact with dynamic western ones (Calder, Lamb and Orr 1999, 16). Concerns about the 'tarnishing' of the endeavour (Thomas 1999a, 9) are evident in the accounts of Cook's voyages which express misgivings about the already-evident ravages of venereal disease. The western understanding that Pacific peoples were on the cusp of calamitous change is also expressed by John Savage, another visitor to the Bay of Islands around the same time as *Eliza* is believed to have touched there, who noted that within a short span of time Maori would 'in no respect [resemble] the hardy inhabitants of the island, previously to their unhappy communications with civilized man', and would 'bear about them the traces of the injuries we have inflicted' (1966, 90).

For these reasons, the value in the collection of objects amassed from the Pacific islands in the early years of the nineteenth century resided in part in its *timeliness*, a notion underpinned by three key ideas. First, the changes that were anticipated in tribal societies can be characterised both as passive by-products *and* as intended outcomes of cross-cultural contact. Early exploration and trading in the Pacific were not interventionist projects in any immediate sense, but as Cook and Savage make clear, it was expected that more significant intervention would follow. Second, it was understood that material culture would serve as an index of these changes: as the intensity of contact increased and as Pacific populations fell into decline or adopted westernised ways of life, it was expected that there would be a corresponding decline in the quality and variety of tribal artefacts produced. And third, the shaping influence behind these ideas was the history of contact that had already occurred in continental America. Cook refers to this history in explicit ways in the accounts of his voyages, as seen in his stated belief that he is following in the footsteps of ‘our first discoverers of the New World and navigators of the Indian and Pacific Oceans’ (cited in Williams 1997, 312), and in the occasional direct comparisons he makes between Pacific and American peoples. The American example is also suggestively evoked in other ways in his accounts, too, in the borrowing of the term ‘Indian’ to describe the indigenous inhabitants of the Pacific, and in the discussion of the negative effects of contact that were already playing out in the South Pacific. An entry in Cook’s journal in June 1773 elaborates on these implied connections, reflecting that:

[. . .] we debauch their Morals already too prone to vice and we interduce among them wants and perhaps diseases which they never before knew and which serves only to disturb that happy tranquility they and their fore Fathers had enjoy’d. If any one denies the truth of this assertion let him tell me what the Natives of the whole extent of America have gained by the commerce they have had with Europeans.³⁵

Savage’s comments about the ‘injuries’ to be inflicted on Maori, like Dodge’s later ones about native life ‘collapsing’ like a house of cards’, invoke the history of the United States as their almost-palpable referent, too. Discussing the collecting of artefacts from the islands of the Pacific in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, Nicholas Thomas has proposed that ‘[j]ust as later colonial engagement took quite a different form, depictions of people, customs, ethnological discriminations, and artifacts were subsequently burdened by adjudications and larger political projects’ (1991, 139-40). While this—as will soon be discussed—was plainly true, in certain ways the earliest collecting activities in the Pacific were *already burdened* by the experiences of United States history.

* * *

By the time the Salem captains began their activities in the Pacific, the history of Native American and western interaction was extensive. As would later be the case in the Pacific, the budding imperatives of modern international capitalism had been the driving force behind European interest in America. By the beginning of the sixteenth century, European fishermen had begun to work the Atlantic fishing grounds off the eastern American shore, and from the 1590s shore stations and fur trading posts had been established on this coast. Organised permanent settlement by the British began in the early decades of the seventeenth century. America was seen as being rich in timber, fish, game and freehold land that could be obtained without charge or at low cost, and the thirteen British colonies established between 1607 and 1733 on the Atlantic coast began as business projects driven by individual merchants and companies seeking to make profits and to expand Britain's trade and industry. In general, relations between the first waves of settlers and Native tribes had been friendly, since the colonists were few in number and were, to a large extent, dependent on Native peoples for their survival: as Stephen Greenblatt has noted (1991, 104), these settlers had 'practical interests' in cultivating relationships with Native populations. Artefacts acquired from North America for display in European cabinets of curiosity were not initially valued as the products of primitive or past civilisations; they were believed to occupy a category of the marvellous, of a present 'Golden Age' (Clifford 2002, 222). As history unfolded, however, this view changed drastically: by the early eighteenth century, Native Americans had come to furnish Europeans and Euroamericans with their standard view of the savage condition and developmental paths from it (Moloney 2001, 160). These ideas were influenced by the rapid decline in Native populations which occurred in the seventeenth century, both as a result of pandemics and of the intensification of tribal conflicts which were fuelled by the widespread introduction of liquor and firearms, and by the presence of increasing numbers of settlers. Native peoples' vulnerability to European disease and their inferior technology meant that they were seen as being doomed or fatally weakened (Greenblatt 1991, 63): these peoples' vanishing was construed as divine intervention or as part of an unfolding natural order.

The 1821 *Catalogue* reveals that almost no material from the museum's sphere of domestic interest was acquired in the early decades of its history: a 'Tobacco Pipe used by the American Indians'

featured at number 196, and ‘A pair of Moccasons, worn by the North American Indians’ at number 1526, are the only identified objects of possible eastern Native American manufacture which would have been obtained through purchase or trade.³⁶ While it may seem possible that the society’s charter which encouraged donations from beyond the Capes influenced this scarcity of domestic materials, in practice this criterion was not strictly enforced; natural history specimens obtained from within the United States are well-represented in the 1821 *Catalogue*, suggesting that the museum accepted any and all donations. Rather, as Mary Lou Curran and John Grimes have put it, ‘the absence of Native objects from eastern North America is due to a lack of perceived value or exotic interest’, and to a lack of commercial incentive for the society’s members to become familiar with Native American culture (2002a, 52-3). Salem’s captains must have been aware of the birch-bark canoes in their own port (‘a common sight among the tall ships’ (ibid., 53)), from which Native traders sold souvenirs—model canoes, quillwork, baskets and so on—to mariners, as a way of making a livelihood in a drastically-altered economy. In many cases, these market-oriented arts and crafts were stylistically hybrid in obvious ways, and the fact that they were readily available is said to have given them ‘a suspicious aura of promiscuity’ (Phillips 1998, ix). As far as Salem’s captains were concerned, these objects were not worth acquiring—they seem to have represented a warping of the categories of the exotic and the already-known. In place of collecting Native American artefacts themselves, the society commissioned artworks on Native American themes by artists working in refined European modes. Displayed in East India Marine Hall, these ‘dying race’ depictions allegorised local Native American populations in terms similar to those used to depict the vanishing wilderness.

There was, however, another category of Native American material that did make its way into the museum’s early displays. Around thirty of these items appear in the 1821 *Catalogue* between numbers 671 and 703, and include stone chisels, gouges, knife blades, arrowheads, spearheads, pestles and axes, all given the designation ‘found in New England’ or ‘found in Salem’ or ‘found in Danvers’, a nearby Massachusetts town. In some cases, specific information about these objects’ acquisition is provided: one object is described as a ‘Hatchet, found on Col. Pickman’s farm, in South Salem’; another as a ‘Mortar and pestle, found in making the Salem Turnpike road’; another as a ‘Pestle, found on Salem Common’; yet another as a ‘Stone Axe, found by the donor on his land near the Turnpike’. As these descriptions make clear, artefacts were surfacing as fields were being ploughed, roadways established, and excavations made for houses: they were literally rising from the

ground in Euroamerican settlers' backyards as sediments of settlement. It remains unclear whether these materials—like those uncovered by Maning—may have served as troubling reminders of the displacement and dispossession inherent in the project of settlement, or whether they were simply seen to confirm popular understandings that Native American culture was passing. The 1821 *Catalogue* groups these materials with classical antiquities, indicating that they were seen as relics from a long-distant past. The fact that stone implements from the Marquesas and New Zealand are also included within this grouping is suggestive: if the Native American specimens may have seemed, to the Salem captains, to be dusty and dry in comparison with rich carvings, textiles and greenstone acquired from the South Pacific, the idea that the societies which produced these artefacts will share a common fate does nevertheless seem to be signalled.

The American example, then, served as a point of reference for collectors in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Salem captains' firsthand knowledge of this history must have given them little cause to be optimistic for the indigenous inhabitants of the Pacific, and suggests another dimension to the 'imaginative appeal' that Dodge proposes the Pacific region had for them (1949, 6). It seems implausible that they can, as Dodge has contended, have 'little known' what would likely transpire in this region, and improbable that their voyages to destinations in the Pacific merely 'filled them with feelings of wonder and opportunity, a sense of the world unfolding', as John Grimes has recently proposed (2002, 18). That these Yankees had missed the chance to obtain 'authentic' Native American objects suggests that in collecting from the Pacific they were also, in some senses, 'trying back'. Mindful of lessons already learned on the North American frontier, they appear to have been acquiring from the islands of the Pacific precisely the kinds of artefacts which were no longer available to be collected back home.

In setting out the relationship of Oceanic artefacts to Native American ones at the time the society's museum was first formed, however, it is important to stress the still-limited geopolitical extent of the United States in the early 1800s. At the end of the revolutionary war, this nation was located mainly on the eastern seaboard of North America, a collection of thirteen former British colonies whose territories stretched only as far as the Mississippi River; there were various other European interests in the rest of the continent, and the regions to the north, west and south did not fall within the museum's sphere of domestic interest. The case of the northwest coast complicates the picture in

certain ways, triangulating the connections between the histories of the eastern seaboard of the United States and the islands of the Pacific, and in some senses, there are direct historical links between these regions. The purpose of Cook's third voyage had been to seek the western end of the 'Northwest Passage', an imagined shortcut through Arctic America which would shorten and thus make more profitable voyages to the Far East. On the course of this voyage, having visited Aotearoa New Zealand and unexpectedly 'discovered' the Hawaiian islands, crew members touched on the northwest coast of America. Acquiring a handful of sea otter pelts as part of their routine trading activities, they learned on their homeward journey that there was great demand for these pelts in China. The resulting trade in sea otter fur was the first major enterprise which attracted New Englanders into the Pacific in large numbers; as the trade declined in the early nineteenth century as a result of over-hunting, merchants began looking further into the Pacific for other commodities to round out their cargoes, like the sandalwood picked up by the *Eliza*.

In marked contrast to the paucity of east coast materials in the 1821 *Catalogue*, entries for northwest coast artefacts are frequent. The first—'A Paddle, from the North-west Coast of America'—is numbered forty-sixth on its list, followed by 'Bows and Arrows', 'An Iron dagger', 'models of canoes', fish-hooks, a basket, a gourd, a fishing line, a tobacco pipe, a number of dresses and capes 'of a Native on the North West Coast of America, made of the Intestines of the Sea-Lion', a harpoon, wooden ornaments 'worn in a slit in the under-lip, by the natives on the North West Coast of America', a beaded purse, a neck ornament and a pair of bracelets. More than 30 of these items appear in the first 800 entries, with sixteen of these in the first 200, interspersed in the *Catalogue*'s extended opening list of artefacts collected from the islands of the Pacific. The inhabitants of the northwest coast were understood to have been exposed to European influence for longer than those in the Pacific islands, since the Spanish presence to the south and the Russian to the north meant that European trade goods had been passed along the coast among Native peoples for more than a century. Because of this history of influence, and because northwest coast populations were visibly producing artefacts intended for sale from the early nineteenth century onwards as the fur trade declined, artefacts from this area are likely to have been seen by Salem's captains as being less 'authentic' than those able to be acquired from the islands of the Pacific. They were clearly considered worth collecting, though, tangibly demonstrating the extent of Salem's trading activities

in the northern Pacific and seeming still to compare favourably with their contemporary east coast counterparts.

The history that would join the two coasts of North America unfolded as the Salem captains built up their museum and its collections. As Frederick Jackson Turner's theory of the American frontier articulated in 1893, United States history was characterised by a broad, repeating pattern of invasion, settlement and community formation. In addition to securing for Yankees the right to extend their trading and commercial activities internationally, the revolutionary war had also been fought to enable westward expansion. Pressure for land from settlers and speculators meant that from 1783 onwards Euroamericans began encroaching on Native lands in interior regions and bringing them under United States jurisdiction. In 1825, as President John Quincy Adams was officiating at the dedication of East India Marine Hall, the building which forms the core of the modern museum complex, debates concerning the status of Native Americans were reaching 'boiling point' (Curran and Grimes 2002a, 53), eventually producing the Indian Removal Act (1831) which legitimised the clearing of Native tribes from the east of the Mississippi River to lands that settlers did not want on the other side. By the 1840s floods of settler 'emigrants' (Rose 2006, 231) had driven Native peoples from the region west of the Mississippi River, too, and reserves were set aside in Oklahoma for the forced resettlement of tribes from all over North America. By 1846 the United States stretched from the Atlantic coast to the Pacific, and in 1890 the superintendent of the census announced that a frontier no longer separated the settled and unsettled parts of the United States—although the nation's territorial expansion did continue into the twentieth century, with Alaska and the Hawaiian islands becoming the forty-ninth and fiftieth states of the union in 1959. This 'second phase' history of settlement in North America occurred at the same time as indigenous inhabitants of Pacific islands like Aotearoa New Zealand were beginning to experience their own settler-colonial upheavals; the settlement history of the United States, then, has been both prior to that of the Pacific and parallel with it, and extends its reach into the Pacific too.

* * *

As artificial curiosities entered the society's museum they were integrated into its exhibits, 'resocialized' (Fisher 1991, 5) with other items of disparate origin which had similarly been

estranged from their previous functions. The modes of display to which these materials were subject, and the categorical shifts they underwent, broadly mirrored contemporary practices and developments internationally. In the museum's earliest days, the articles (along with 'natural curiosities') were combined in arbitrary juxtapositions in wooden and glass cases which lined the exhibition hall, and in wall displays featuring 'intricate patterns of spears and other weapons 'arranged in a decorative manner' (Whitehill 1949, 48) which almost certainly included taiaha brought back on the *Eliza* and the *Active*. As Thomas has proposed (1991, 172-4), such displays located artistry as much in the ordering as in the tribal artefacts themselves, marking a moment of privileged vision and appropriation, mastery and domination. The 1821 *Catalogue* shows that more sustained attempts to group 'things of a similar nature' (Whitehill 1949, 36) according to Linnaean principles were occurring in the 1820s. These efforts were strengthened in following decades with the more systematic assembling of 'such articles as bore a resemblance to each other or were used for the same purpose in the economy of life by different nations, such as the cooking utensils, shoes, hats, warlike instruments, etc., etc.' (Whitehill 1949, 49). In such displays, as Thomas observes, '[o]n the one hand, the diversity of materials manifested the unity of the species and suggested a variety of relationships between populations; on the other, they made it clear that humanity was ranked, and that successive technological advances could be noted from one population to another' (1999a, 167). The merging of the society's museum with the Essex Institute in the late 1860s produced displays which reflected new scientific understandings of tribal artefacts. These artefacts were reclassified as specimens under the new disciplines of ethnology and archaeology and were exhibited with accompanying labels providing data about their formal properties. Significant change occurred in the 1880s—again, reflecting developments internationally—when the ethnological specimens were reorganised according to their countries of origin. Arrangement in this way, with whole cases devoted to particular peoples, was supposed to give 'at a glance, an idea of the culture of any given people' (Whitehill 1949, 89)—facilitating formal evolutionary assessment—and was intended to show more readily gaps in the collection. Further changes were made to these exhibits from the 1930s onwards by Dodge, the museum's then-curator of ethnology, who reduced the number of specimens on view and displayed those which remained 'according to more recent practice' (ibid., 117). Dodge's 1941 catalogue of *The New Zealand Maori Collection in the Peabody Museum of Salem* indicates that these changes probably involved the addition of background information to elucidate their original use, stylistic properties and method of construction. Comments made by

Dodge in other publications of this period show that the artefacts were still understood to exemplify evolutionary principles: in 1949, for instance, he stated that the quality of the material donated to the museum in its earliest days had ‘varied (by and large) with the cultural level of the people where the material was collected’ (Dodge 1949, 2). While Dodge does recognise that indigenous peoples have survived colonisation—acknowledging, for instance, that the Maori population in New Zealand has rebounded and is ‘increasing more rapidly than the white’, with ‘natives [. . .] making large and valuable contributions to their native islands’ (1941, 5)—his discussions of the artefacts and their cultural significances are given in the past tense, implying the redundancy of tribal technologies and ways of life.

Within this broad institutional history, specific and related histories can be traced with regard to the treatment of Oceanic artefacts and those from North America (both east and northwest coast). In the earliest displays, objects from all of these regions were combined as part of the museum’s miscellany. With the subsequent grouping of objects according to type they were made to compete—along with the others—in evolutionary hierarchies. The 1901 *Guide to the Peabody Academy of Science* makes clear that in 1889, when the artefacts were reorganised by geographical origin and ‘ethnology’ was given its own dedicated gallery, the Oceanic and Native American materials were brought into a more concentrated relation. A floor plan shows that the room’s eastern wall was lined with display cases devoted specifically to Native peoples of the Americas (South, North and Arctic) and the Pacific Islands, with the material relating to New Zealand positioned immediately adjacent to the Native American displays. The 1901 *Guide* shows, too, that at this time, the museum’s ‘archaeological’ specimens, including the ‘Stone implements, pottery, etc., from different parts of North America’ (Peabody Academy of Science 1901, 18), were grouped together and housed in a separate gallery as a component of the museum’s natural history displays. It is perhaps coincidental—but certainly striking—that these ‘archaeological’ materials, largely from the east coast of North America, were separated from the Native American ethnological materials at the same time as the frontier was understood to have closed. In this way, at this time, artefacts from the northwest coast *became* the museum’s main Native American collection.

As the 1821 *Catalogue* signals, the Oceanic artefacts functioned as more than simply part of the museum’s great accumulation of articles from the beginning. The continuation of the high profile of

these materials was not, however, assured and a crossroads in their fate was reached at the time when the society's museum merged with the Essex Institute in 1867. This joining occurred in order to secure the museum's future after the decline of Salem as a port and centre of trade, and among other things, it occasioned critical evaluation of the museum's holdings. In 1880, the museum's new director advocated that all efforts towards building up a large scientific collection should be relinquished, proposing instead that the museum should 'endeavour to perfect those departments which already give it pre-eminence above all other museums in the country' (Morse, cited in Whitehill 1949, 87). In particular, it was urged that concentration of effort should be placed on enlarging the 'unrivalled ethnological collections, the result of the intelligent interest of [early] Salem sea captains', along with 'the collections of animals and plants of Essex County' (ibid.). This determination to focus on the collection's strengths, then, resulted in the consolidating of interest in the Oceanic collections, since by the mid-to-late nineteenth century it was recognised that the artefacts relating to Pacific island ethnology were the museum's 'most useful contributions to the history of human knowledge' (Whitehill 1949, 37).

The museum's new concentration of interest on 'the local' also prompted fresh interest in the archaeological collections from the eastern seaboard. When it was 'discovered' in the mid-twentieth century that the museum had an important collection of Native American artefacts, it was the east coast archaeological specimens (rather than the northwest coast ethnological materials) that were recognised as being of particular value. Whitehill has commented that whereas it had been 'obvious for many years that the museum's Pacific islands collections were notable because of the early period in which they were given and the manner in which they were documented', it had not been generally realised 'that among the possessions of the [East India Marine Society] there was a small nucleus of equally early and important eastern American Indian objects' (1949, 129). The northwest coast materials which, as the 1821 *Catalogue* shows, had been equated with the Oceanic materials early in the museum's history, appear to have declined in perceived significance from the time the ethnological collections were constituted, perhaps tarnished by the unfolding of North American settlement history and by their newly-apparent relation to the centuries-old experience on the east coast. It took considerably longer for this material to be valued: for many decades it was largely invisible, treated as a poorer relation of the artefacts originating from islands of the Pacific. Published *Reports of the Director* in the twentieth century trace a perceptible rise in the esteem in which this

material was held from the late 1970s onwards, but prior to this, comments about the Native American collection of artefacts had consistently comprised the tail end of the ethnological reports, reflecting these objects' low standing and profile. In terms of timing, the shift in the balance of acquisitions which led to the increase in status of the Native American ethnological collection occurred as resurgent indigenous populations around the globe began to make their presences felt and to campaign for the righting of historical wrongs. At about this time, too, legislation like the New Zealand Antiquities Act (1975) was introduced, restricting the ability of institutions like the Salem museum to continue to acquire historically significant material from overseas.³⁷

From the 1860s onwards until that point, the museum's ethnological collections had been supplemented through gifting and bequest: as Dodge noted in 1965, 'New England attics still produce clubs, wooden pillows, fans, tapa cloth, spears, wooden bowls, carved coconuts, tapa beaters and other treasures' (184). Other artefacts had entered the museum's collections through exchanges with museums in the United States and around the globe, and from the early twentieth century donor funds began to be used to secure additions which would 'complete and amplify the original holdings' (Whitehill 1949, 112). The Pacific islands ethnology collections in particular held strong interest for a number of the museum's staff and directors and had several benefactors engaged in the concerted acquisition of materials. In keeping with wider contemporary curatorial practices during this period, these ethnological collections appear to have been treated by those who were purchasing and soliciting for them as still being metonymically 'representative' of whole cultures in a general sense; the supplementing of the Maori material, for example, was made without consideration of the regionally-specific significance of its nucleus. Materials that entered the museum's ethnological collections over this middle period of the institution's history were also disparate in terms of their comparative values within what James Clifford has termed the 'modern art-culture system' (1988, 223), and included those that were old and recent, rare and kitsch. Additions to the Maori collection in the second half of the twentieth century, for instance, included an oil painting of a *New Zealand Maori village* (c 1880), 'a New Zealand Maori carved headrest in the shape of a dog', a scale model of the 82-ft Maori war canoe on exhibit at the Auckland Museum, and greenstone and plastic hei tiki (Peabody Museum of Science 1980, 26 and 1966, 17). While these kinds of additions broadly attest to the totalising logic behind western practices of collecting, it is clear from reports published during the twentieth century that among these accessions, the things that were esteemed by the museum

were ‘authentic’ older ones. Modern articles manufactured for the tourist trade which were entering the museum’s collections were compared unfavourably by Dodge, the museum’s then-director, with ‘pre-historic material from the Moa-hunters’ and ‘Stone Age material of pre-contact days’ acquired at the same time (Peabody Museum of Science 1952, 19). It seems unlikely that the modern material was displayed in the galleries: Dodge explains that while it is ‘of little intrinsic value it does show that contact with modern civilization has not destroyed the islanders’ skill in the utilization of native manufacturing techniques’ (cited in *ibid.*).

Similar hierarchies of value are apparent in relation to Native American acquisitions. The historical importance of certain objects—including garments worn by Mohawk representatives who met Queen Victoria in the 1860s; early porcupine quill boxes made by Micmac communities of Nova Scotia; a ‘fine example’ of the rare Mission Indian baskets from California, and so on—is explicitly commented on in the museum’s publications in the third quarter of the twentieth century.³⁸ The extent to which the museum may have attempted to rectify the east coast/northwest coast balance in the Native American ethnological collection remains unclear: east coast objects are infrequently referred to in accession reports but are highly prized when they do appear. It is notable, though, that in the mid-1950s the museum accepted gifts of a Penobscot wooden box and 22 northeastern Native American baskets—materials of precisely the kind that its founding members had declined to acquire in the early 1800s.

* * *

In 1999 the Peabody Essex Museum (PEM) celebrated its bicentennial by commencing a major programme of expansion and gallery reconstruction described by one of the curators as ‘a dramatic transformation featuring more than 250,000 square feet of new and renovated galleries and public spaces’ (Hellmich 2003, 51). While many of the changes effected in the course of this process evince the influence of recent demands for the updating of museums and their practices in accordance with postcolonial principles, there are some deliberate points of continuity with older styles of display. Changes made to East India Marine Hall, the museum’s oldest exhibition space, have been described by commentators as ‘highlight[ing] the importance of the room as the intellectual and spiritual core of the ‘new’ museum’ (Grimes 2002, 24). Significantly, this hall has been returned to a version of the

concept that underpinned the original museum and now contains the kinds of juxtapositions that were characteristic of the earliest displays. Wooden and glass cases which line the walls are stocked with objects collected from distant lands in the nineteenth century including *coco- de-mêr* seed pods, a Tahitian pounder, a West African quiver and arrows, a drum from Calcutta, a wasps' nest from South America, Indian musical instruments and ornaments, Marquesan stilt-steps, Peruvian pottery, Samoan decorative combs, an Aboriginal shield, a Native American pipe bowl and so on, while fanned displays of clubs and chiefs' staffs from the Pacific region adorn the gallery's walls. The text dedication printed on the wall emphasises that this room was the '[f]irst permanent home of the Peabody Essex Museum' and states:

To this hall, members of the East India Marine Society [. . .] brought the art and cultural objects they saw and admired as they circled the globe in search of opportunity. These adventurers and entrepreneurs were among the first Americans to recognize the remarkable diversity of people in the world and the extraordinary objects of their creativity. Today, this room [. . .] is a reminder of the legacy left to us by those whose portraits line these walls. Let this be the launching point of your journey into world art.

Discussing the refurbishment, one of the museum's curators has commented that the hall has been installed in this way in order to give visitors a sense of what the early museum was like.³⁹ The gallery also seems intended to contrast with others which contain displays of materials historically reconstituted by the PEM as components of this 'world art'—in particular the Oceanic and Native American Art galleries which are adjacent to (and accessed through) this hall and which are believed by the museum to demonstrate 'cutting-edge' modes of display.⁴⁰ East India Marine Hall is supposed to serve as a baseline, showing how far the museum has come in the span of two centuries.

The Oceanic Art gallery which opened in June 2003, and the Native American Art gallery which opened in May 2006, contain the same kinds of materials as some of those included in East India Marine Hall but employ a conspicuously different approach to displaying them. The very names of these galleries are politically charged, intended to mark the museum's commitment to postcolonial practice: the term 'Native American' is now widely used when referring to the indigenous peoples of North America, superseding the terms 'Indian' and 'American Indian' which were in use at the time the society began its collections, while the designation 'Oceanic' has been gaining currency since the phrase 'the new Oceania' was coined by Albert Wendt in 1976. Epeli Hau'ofa has explained that when nineteenth century imperialism drew imaginary lines across the sea it erected 'the colonial

boundaries that confined ocean peoples to tiny spaces [. . .] transforming a once boundless world into the Pacific islands states and territories that we know today' (1993, 7-10). 'Oceania' is intended to function as a world-enlarging term linked to cultural revival and creative resilience, emphasising a shift from the western idea of isolated 'islands in a far sea' to an indigenous understanding of movement and mobility within a 'sea of islands' (ibid., ix and 7). The galleries' names also reinforce the fact that the museum's tribal artefacts have been reclassified: these things are no longer regarded as artificial curiosities or ethnological specimens, but rather as works of art.

In its inaugural configuration, the Oceanic Art gallery contains around 60 items on display. According to Hellmich, the curator who oversaw its installation, the gallery 'does not attempt to represent every island nation or cultural group or art form in Oceania' (2003, 53). Though the gallery does follow a geographical arrangement (with exhibits clustered according to country of origin), the curators have made a deliberate decision not to include maps of the Pacific region.⁴¹ This strategy seems an attempt to evade the thickening of anthropological context which such materials might evoke. The gallery's labelling is also kept to a minimum; the curators have commented that for visitors who wish to access information relating to the exhibits, text is provided which permits the identification of each object and gives visitors some sense of their 'origins, use, and/or collection' (Hellmich 2003, 53). Primarily, though, visitors are encouraged 'to admire [the] exceptional objects' (ibid.), which are displayed in the manner that has become commonplace since the watershed *Te Maori* exhibition. In accordance with the privileging of the materials as artworks, the mode of display is based on principles of selectivity, with only the finest examples—or 'masterworks', as they are termed in the gallery's main text panel—chosen for exhibition. The displays are designed to '[showcase] individual objects from the collection for the first time' and seek 'to emphasize their aesthetic strengths' (Hellmich 2003, 53), strengths that are highlighted by the gallery's dramatic darkened interior and boutique lighting, which contrast with the airy and spacious East India Marine Hall. As has become customary since *Te Maori*, the museum explicitly acknowledges the artefacts' status as taonga or treasured possessions: a text panel at the gallery's entrance explains that '[s]ome of these works were created as objects of spiritual devotion and remain icons today', and that '[f]or visitors who wish to make offerings in accordance with their beliefs, a space is provided within the exhibition for leaving leis, flowers, or other appropriate items'. This panel also makes it clear that

‘[m]useum staff collaborate with cultural practitioners, artists, and scholars to enhance, interpret, and present the collection’.

Exhibits from Aotearoa New Zealand are the first major grouping encountered by visitors as they enter the Oceanic Art gallery. The materials have a mixture of collection dates: six of the artefacts brought back to Salem by the two Richardson captains are displayed, and these are intermingled with objects acquired in the later nineteenth and early twentieth century, reflecting the variety of the historical processes through which this material has entered the museum. In significant ways, the display actively affirms the vitality and continuity of tribal cultures, with present tense labels explaining, for example, that ‘Maori meeting and storage houses, comprised of ornately carved wood panels and architectural elements, are centers of tribal life and symbols of its structure’. As a sign of the continued evolution of museum practice since *Te Maori*, the museum also forcefully demonstrates that indigenous technologies of production are not obsolete: the gallery’s main text panel states that ‘[m]any of the spiritual, functional, decorative, and celebratory traditions that [the objects] embody are still active’, and that ‘[t]oday, the artists of Oceania draw inspiration from time-honored traditions and express them in contemporary materials such as glass and plastic’. Hellmich has expanded on this elsewhere, explaining that the work of contemporary artists using new materials and artistic methods ‘challenges our preconceptions of what defines Oceanic art’ and ‘help[s] visitors experience the dynamic nature of Oceanic art’ (2003, 54). At the time the gallery was opened, two newly acquired contemporary artworks were included in the installation, ‘marking the first time that contemporary Oceanic art has been exhibited with the permanent collection’ within the museum (ibid., 53). These exhibits, both purchased by the museum in 2002 and both produced by Hawaiian artists, have since been supplemented with a fluorescent green hei tiki, handcrafted in Aotearoa New Zealand in 2003 from ‘Corian®’ (a synthetic resin), which now shares a display case with historic pieces from the museum’s New Zealand collection. An accompanying label, again in the present tense, explains that ‘*Hei tiki* made of *pounamu* (nephrite) are the most characteristic and highly valued of all Maori personal adornment articles. The word *hei* indicates something suspended from the neck; carvings of human figures in any material are called *tiki*’. Another label provides a quote from the modern tiki’s maker, Rangi Kipa:

The pursuit of customary forms using new materials is as old as ‘innovation’ itself. This relatively new material Corian® is a non-stain, heatproof material that [. . .] has a similar structural integrity to bone and ivory. As access to customary materials becomes more

restricted, I have sought out new ways to fulfill the desires of our communities to express who they are in the new millennium.

Arguably the most striking aspect of the Oceanic Art gallery however, which the contemporary Hawaiian artworks and the Corian® tiki serve to highlight, is its position in relation to the Native American display. The contemporary pieces in the Oceanic Art gallery are linked not only to each other but also to contemporary pieces which are displayed alongside historical pieces in the adjacent Native American Art gallery. ‘Organizational structures’ which ‘illuminate relationships and connections between objects’ are suggested not only within the Oceanic Art gallery, as Hellmich has proposed (2003, 53), but also cross over into the Native American Art gallery, too. These galleries share a foyer, and the common boundary wall which runs the length of the two rooms is cut away in places with open doorways and unglazed windows. Discussing the Oceanic Art gallery, Hellmich has proposed that ‘[a]rchitectural elements such as curving walls and intriguing openings in partitions create a unique atmosphere’ (ibid.). These architectural devices produce a more specific effect than this, however, directly accentuating connections between this gallery and its neighbour. The holes in the wall frame vistas from within each gallery onto the other, encouraging and facilitating the cross-penetration of ideas and histories. There are also strong visual links between the materials exhibited in both rooms: patterns in the tapa cloth exhibited in Oceanic Art gallery, for example, are echoed in the enlarged textile print panels used as display dividers in the Native American Art gallery, and model canoes, stylised human figures, items of personal adornment and so on are present in both galleries. The effect of the installation is a powerful statement of connection which demands that the Oceanic materials and the Native American materials be seen and read in relation to each other.

* * *

In some ways, the mode of display currently employed by the PEM can be seen as successful. In recent decades many institutions have responded to criticism of colonial collecting practices by privileging local material and by removing from display earlier and more wide ranging collections—particularly those which have come to be grouped under the rubric of ‘foreign ethnology’ (Henare 2005, 16)—which in many instances have become difficult to hold and exhibit in parts of the globe distant from their places of origin. The extent to which the PEM’s collections may have been subject

to repatriation claims remains unclear.⁴² What *is* clear is that the museum has not dealt with its Oceanic materials by relegating these to the stores: the PEM is still demonstrating a commitment to exhibit some of its oldest and most ‘exotic’ collections, and to continue to update these displays in accordance with contemporary practice, and it has, as its current displays make clear, a strong sense of duty to indigenous stakeholders in both the islands of the Pacific and the United States. Undertaking to help visitors see its historic collections ‘in a new light’ (Monroe 2002, 7), the PEM is consulting and collaborating with tribal sources as part of its commitment to ‘explore, in partnership with indigenous communities, the rich legacy represented in the collection’ (ibid.). As one of the current curators has stated, the museum aims to connect the dots, to demonstrate creative continuity, to show that Native artists are still producing and that Native cultures are alive and well.⁴³ The museum is also demonstrating a sense of special responsibility in supporting contemporary artists in both regions, actively expanding its holdings by collecting ‘exciting’ and ‘culturally meaningful’ new work (Haukaas 2002, 64).

The collecting of contemporary art is intended to highlight and build on the legacy of creative change and growth which is now understood to be represented in the museum’s historical holdings. This is made clear in the introductory text panel to *All of My Life*, another exhibition currently staged at the PEM and exclusively dedicated to displaying works produced in the twenty-first century by emerging and established Native American artists:

The PEM houses one of the oldest collections of Native American art in the hemisphere, dating to its first acquisitions in 1799. These now-historic objects were contemporary creations at the time they were acquired. The museum continues to acquire contemporary Native American art and recognizes the importance of presenting Native artists as members of cultures with continuities.

Desires to ‘question the notion of purity or isolation’ and to ‘illuminate the nurturing dialogue between tradition and innovation’ are repeatedly expressed in text panels in the main Native American Art gallery, which emphasise that ‘[f]rom its beginnings, Native American art has reflected a continuous evolution of design and media’, and that ‘works deeply rooted in specific artistic traditions have regularly shown evidence of stylistic, aesthetic, and cultural borrowing’. The museum, then, has reversed the prescriptive system of value on which its collections were originally based. The ‘inauthenticity’ of these materials, as members of the East India Marine Society understood it in the early nineteenth century and as successive generations of curators have

understood it, has now become their virtue. The museum's historic artefacts have become highly valued because they mark moments of social transformation: they are emphatically post-contact, hybrid forms showing responses to settlement history and functioning as signs of resistance. These materials—as “impure” objects constructed from the debris of colonial culture’ (Clifford 1988, 192)—are now interpreted as showing inventiveness, adaptation and the expansion of creative repertoires; their display in conjunction with contemporary artworks is intended to demonstrate that ‘good tribal art’ is still being produced (ibid., 200), and to expose notions of ‘traditional’ tribal art and ‘genuine’ indigenous culture as ‘fictions’ (Monroe 2002, 7).

The museum's drawing together of its Oceanic and Native American collections in a strongly implied connection can also be seen as fruitful in certain ways. Historically, these objects have shared exhibition spaces and been represented in relation to one another before, in displays of the kind currently shown in East India Marine Hall, and in later ethnological displays where they were displayed according to function and then country of origin. In the PEM's current configuration, these collections have dedicated galleries of their own which are adjacent and closely linked by the fenestrations between them; their pairing means that they complement and inform one another. By recognising that North American and Oceanic materials can be understood within the same compass, and by beginning to draw attention to some of the paradigmatic connections between these collections, the PEM displays negotiate a path away from the complete isolation of national histories on the one hand, and the blithe uniting of diverse stories from around the globe on the other, which have become characteristic of much contemporary museum practice.⁴⁴ Serving as a reminder of the long, ‘distinguished’ and ‘in some respects close, relation’ between the regions of New England and the Pacific (Dodge 1965, 182), the PEM displays suggest the foundations of a methodology for significant historical and comparative work.

* * *

In a number of significant ways, however, the museum's positing of a relation between its Oceanic and Native American collections raises more problems than it settles. While these galleries have not been set up to compete with one another in any crude way, their proximity does draw attention to differences in the materials and the ways in which they are treated. One of the curators has

commented that as a result of this latest installation, the Oceanic material has obtained an entire dedicated gallery—that if anything, it has gained visibility and status.⁴⁵ The new arrangement does, however, indicate a change in the relative significance of these two collections: the increased proportion of exhibits which relate to North America attests to a distinct revision of institutional focus. It is planned that the museum should continue to acquire contemporary art from the Pacific—a painting by an Aboriginal artist was being hung in the foyer shared by both the Oceanic Art gallery and the Native American Art gallery at the time I visited in March 2007—but even so, the PEM seems to view the acquisition and display of Native American material as being more urgent and pressing. The Native American Art gallery has a larger floor area than the Oceanic Art gallery, contains a greater number of objects on display and a greater number of contemporary pieces, and although it was completed later than the Oceanic Art gallery, it is not, in fact, the first installation of this kind to be mounted by the PEM: it was preceded by the temporary exhibitions *Gifts of the Spirit* (1995-96) and *Uncommon Legacies: Native American Art from the Peabody Essex Museum* (2002), and when the PEM reopened its permanent galleries in 2003 an exhibition of Native American art titled *Power and Beauty* was mounted in the same space that is now occupied by the Native American Art gallery. The continuing presence of *All of My Life*, the dedicated exhibition of contemporary Native American art which opened in August 2005, serves further to increase the profile of Native American material culture within the museum.

In tangible ways, then, the Oceanic collection has become an adjunct to the Native American one. This situation is not inherently problematic; indeed, it seems appropriate that this American museum should prioritise recognition of Native American peoples in its displays. There is, however, a distinct sense given that these collections are being made to participate in ‘evolutionary hierarchies’ of a new kind, and that the Oceanic material is being used to soften the museum’s approach to the domestic material, facilitating this by feeding more conservative values back into the Native American gallery. One of the curators has commented that the museum encountered resistance from its audience in relation to some of the other recent exhibits of Native American material which were not very well received, that it can be difficult to do new things since a general visitorship may not be ready, and that the Oceanic gallery gives visitors more of what they expect.⁴⁶ If the Native American material now leads the way, the Oceanic material is not simply being carried along in its slipstream but is serving, to some extent, as its brake.

‘Giving visitors more of what they expect’ produces difficulties for the historic Oceanic materials: these artefacts suffer from the museum’s reversal of attitude towards ‘authenticity’, since there is still a strong sense given in the displays that they are untouched by outside influence. Despite the fact that they have a range of acquisition dates, the Maori materials on display seem to have been selected largely because of their traditional qualities: the gallery does not include any obvious ‘contact’ forms and the artefacts that have been selected are implicitly presented as examples of pre-contact craftsmanship. No comment is offered on what these items might reveal about the skewing of the scope of the museum’s early materials (in terms of the kinds of things that Maori were prepared to give away and/or the kinds of things the society’s captains particularly sought from tribal societies), or on what they might reveal about the Maori appropriation of new materials and technologies—the fact that, as Cook’s voyage accounts make clear, hybrid artefacts and those intended for sale were being produced from the earliest days of contact, and that hoop iron and nails for use in carving came rapidly to be sought by Maori as trade items. Failure to examine any of these issues means that the materials on display remain mutely ‘authentic’ in a conventional sense, seeming to have less to show than many of the Native American ones which were produced after a longer period of exposure to western trade goods. This impression is reinforced by differences in the ambience of the galleries. In contrast to the dynamism and vitality suggested by the warm, earthy tones used for the walls in the Native American Art gallery and by the video loop accompanying one of the exhibits which introduces contemporary Native American voices, the Oceanic Art gallery is sombre and still, dominated by shadows and evoking a long-distant world.

Regional dimensions to the Maori material are also obscured; as has been the case throughout the history of its display within the museum to date, this material is imagined to ‘represent’ Maori art in a broad and general way. Discussing this issue, one of the curators has commented that it is not possible for the PEM to represent comprehensive tribal art histories within its displays and that the museum undertakes to maintain and supplement its collections with a national rather than regional emphasis.⁴⁷ Such an approach, however, risks distorting and diminishing the importance of some of the museum’s oldest holdings. Because it is not made clear to visitors that many of the items on display are components of one of the most important Tai Tokerau collections held anywhere in the world, the present historical significance of this material is obscured. No regional provenance, for

instance, is currently suggested for an early nineteenth century pare donated to the museum by William Richardson in 1807: visitors are told that it dates from the early nineteenth century, that it originated from the North Island, and that ‘*Kauri*, the wood from which this lintel is carved, is native to New Zealand’. Visitors are not informed that while this carving is produced from timber probably sourced from Te Tai Tokerau, it evinces a Bay of Plenty decorative idiom; that it is understood to have been acquired in the Bay of Islands; or that the curators believe it may have been customised for the emergent market in selling artefacts to foreign visitors.⁴⁸ Other regionally-specific issues, like the fact that the introduction of western tools, which replaced South Island greenstone as a carving implement, resulted in a flourishing of decorative art in Te Tai Tokerau at this time are not registered either. As a result, the possible significance of the artefacts held in the PEM’s collection in relation to debates about ‘the myth that Ngapuhi-nui-tonu did not have any woodcarvings of merit and that major works in the region came from master carvers south of Auckland’ (Hohepa 2003, 7) cannot be addressed. Avoidance or neglect of these kinds of background details contributes to the impression that the Maori material predates the influence of the western world, that it supplies a ‘baseline’ for cultural change (Kaepler 1978, xii).

Problems coalesce around the Corian® tiki, too. Like the contemporary artworks in the Native American Art gallery, this piece has been selected for display because of its ability to signify processes of cultural survival and adaptive innovation: it is an example of traditional craftsmanship applied to a space-age material. While the tiki seems loud—injecting, as it does, an unexpected jolt of lime green into the dimly lit and heavily traditional Oceanic Art gallery—answers to the question of what it might ‘say’ within this particular gallery context prove difficult to pin down. The tiki seems markedly less politicised than a number of the contemporary exhibits which feature in the Native American Art gallery, like *Sugared Up: A Waffle Garden* (1999), an installation of soil, clay, aluminium cans and sugar which recreates a traditional Pueblo garden and ‘replaces Native plants with United States government ‘commodity cans’ of processed food [. . .] powerfully demonstrat[ing] how consumerism has been force-fed to Native Americans’, as its text panel explains. A number of other contemporary works in the Native American Art gallery and the text panels which accompany them also comment directly on the commercialisation of Native identity, on racism, on enforced ‘reservation existence’ and its associated problems—socioeconomic disadvantage, gambling, alcoholism and so on. In contrast to this, in many respects, Kipa’s tiki seems a safe choice for the

PEM. Rather than presenting a critique of the effects of modern capitalist society on Maori, this tiki appears to be the ultimate kind of consumer item—it is appealingly candy-coloured, easy to imagine slipping over your head to wear.⁴⁹ The museum provides few clues as to how this tiki might be understood in light of the long history of the appropriation of symbols of Maori identity by Pakeha and by other foreign visitors. It provides few clues, either, as to how the tiki might relate to historical counterparts which include not only those ‘traditional’ artefacts with which it shares its current display case, but also those mass-produced from plastic as clichéd tourist souvenirs—of which the museum holds examples in its stores.

If the distortions and omissions that have occurred in presenting the Oceanic material become sharper because of its proximity to the Native American material, the reverse is true as well. While part of the problem for the Oceanic Art gallery is that the contemporary component of its display is underdeveloped, the opposite problem is evident in the adjacent gallery. More than thirty of this gallery’s roughly seventy items were made in the late twentieth or twenty-first century, and unlike the historic Oceanic materials, which for the most part date from roughly the time they were collected by members of the East India Marine Society, a significant number of the Native American artefacts which date from the early nineteenth century were acquired by the museum after the mid-twentieth century. These discrepancies between the dates when things were made and the dates when they were acquired attest to the fact that this collection has been back-filled to a much greater degree than the Oceanic collection: only nine of the items on display in the Native American Art gallery are identified as having been acquired by the museum in the first half of the nineteenth century. Problems are apparent, too, in terms of the gallery’s geographical representativeness. Again, as is the case with the Oceanic material, the fact that the museum does not undertake to represent tribal art histories, and that its acquisition efforts are being undertaken with a national rather than regional focus, produce specific difficulties. The Native American Art gallery is arranged thematically and while the labels that accompany exhibits do record the tribal affiliations of the artefact or maker (where this is known), this information is not used as a primary organising tool, meaning that the nuances of Euroamerican attitudes to Native American material culture over time and space are not able to be registered. Currently, a disproportionate number of items (and in particular, historic items) originate from the tribes of the northwest coast: Yup’ik, Aleut, Unagan, Tlingit, Haida and Coastal Salish artefacts account for roughly a quarter of those on display, while the east coast is represented

only by a 1993 Cherokee painting and a 2005 Penobscot basket. The text panels ignore the fact that the museum's Native American holdings are skewed towards the northwest coast; no sense is given, either, that eastern items are scarce or that the existing bulk of the museum's materials relating to east coast peoples is in storage as archaeological specimens; and no broader national history of settlement which might explain these phenomena is offered. The gallery's main text panel evades these issues, explaining that '[o]ur selections in this exhibition [. . .] cross boundaries of time and geography, materials and techniques, to explore meanings in Native American art'.

Both the Oceanic and the Native American materials share difficulties associated with the designation 'art', too. The PEM's use of this term is supposed to function as a way of honouring tribal traditions: in the modern art-culture system, art is the highest order of category. The text panels in the Native American Art gallery in particular make it clear that the PEM is writing against previous ways of viewing these artefacts not only as impure forms, but also as ethnographic specimens: it is writing against prior histories of classification, display and valuation which privileged the providing of a cultural context, which stressed the artefacts' form, symbolism and function over their formal and aesthetic qualities, and which encouraged quantity over quality. Problems associated with the use of this term in relation to tribal things are manifold: Clifford has cautioned that 'art' is a changing western cultural category characterised by a 'thoroughly institutionalized system of aesthetic (and market) value' (1988, 195-6), and has shown that the 'promotion' of tribal artefacts to the status of high art can be made to serve deeply conservative and strongly Eurocentric ends.⁵⁰ In the case of the PEM displays, ethnological background information for the historic artefacts has not been dispensed with altogether: this is still present to some degree in the explanatory labels. Reasons for this are not entirely clear: it may be that the materials are considered by the museum to be too remote and too strange for (non-indigenous) visitors to understand; or it may be that this information still provides a strongly relevant context for tribal authorities who have advised the curators. The continued inclusion of this information, and the acknowledgment in the gallery of these materials' special status as taonga or treasured possessions do, however, signal that things produced within non-western traditions cannot readily be subsumed under the umbrella of western object-systems: there is, in other words, a problem of translation. The PEM might usefully have questioned in its displays the ways in which tribal artefacts do not conform to (and indeed problematise and resist) western ideas of 'art'—issues which open up a number of

important considerations: Whose criteria are being used to determine what is selected for display? In what ways might the PEM be inscribing new kinds of ‘authenticity’? What happens to works that are not considered masterpieces, like bulk of the Oceanic collections, and the east coast Native American archaeological specimens? In what ways does the current designation of the exhibits as art serve to obscure forms of material disadvantage that indigenous peoples have experienced since their material culture began to be collected by the west? Why might it suit indigenous peoples to allow their traditions to be exploited as art in the present? How do contemporary indigenous artists work within and/or challenge the larger capitalist ‘system of objects’ (Clifford 1988, 220) in which their work circulates, particularly in the present era of accelerated globalisation?⁵¹ Can tribal art that is commercially successful still be political?

* * *

As these issues begin to suggest, the source of the problem with the PEM’s current displays is the way in which history is handled. The text panels and artworks in the Native American Art gallery do make explicit some of the contemporary political, social and economic realities for Native peoples in the United States. They also refer to complex historical processes of cross-cultural interaction including the commissioning of hybrid forms by European and Euroamerican fur traders as souvenirs and gifts; the rise in production of commodity artefacts as specific trading ventures like the fur trade declined; the fact that ‘Penobscot and other Native Maine-based artists have sold decorative and utilitarian baskets [. . .] for more than 200 years’ and so on. Equivalent issues and processes in relation to the Oceanic materials are suppressed altogether. No explanation is given as to how or why the Richardson captains were able to acquire Maori artefacts in the early nineteenth century, and no sense is given of the history that unfolded in the Pacific after the arrival of western capitalism, or of specific United States involvement in this. Missionary activity in Hawaii and the Marquesas is the only aspect of subsequent Pacific history that is fleetingly referred to, and the current resurgence of indigenous cultural production remains uncontextualised in relation to specific histories of dispossession—not only of the settler-colonial kind which unfolded in Aotearoa New Zealand, but also the mirroring of smaller Pacific nations in economic and aid dependency, the appropriation of Hawaii as the fiftieth state in the union, the twentieth century use of Pacific atolls as testing grounds for United States nuclear weapons, and so on. The PEM’s refusal to deal with Pacific history in a

politicised way prevents the closure of the loop: if the proximity of the Native American and Oceanic Art galleries suggestively implies relations between the Native American experience and the Pacific islands experience, the downplaying of actual histories of connection means that the role of the United States in this relation is able to be obscured.

The seeds for this approach are apparent in East India Marine Hall. Rather than showing how far the museum has come, this hall brushes up the past in certain ways, implying that the Salem captains were ‘enlightened’ in current terms at the time when they began forming the museum’s collections. The display of materials presented in this gallery is carefully restricted: pared back rather than crammed; ‘representatively’ balanced in its inclusion of various cultures including Pacific island and Native American ones; and diluted with a considerable amount of nautical material of a kind that did not feature in the museum’s earliest displays. As well as oil paintings and scale models representing exploratory and trading ships, which the 1821 *Catalogue* does show as being present in the earliest displays, the hall currently exhibits ropes, reels, knots, knuckle-dusters and manacles, plane quadrants and octants, an eighteenth century telescope, ships’ figureheads and bow ornaments representing figures of range of nationalities, and an East India Marine Society voting box. Computer terminals stationed around the hall also update the original mode of display, supplying contextual labels of a kind currently found in galleries like the Oceanic and Native American Art ones. These labels provide more modern understandings of these artefacts than were evident in the 1821 *Catalogue*: the tribal provenance and accession date and donor of a Native American pipe bowl, for instance, are recorded, along with the comment that ‘[t]his pipe bowl, aesthetically pleasing in its own right, was probably a personal item owned and used by a Sioux Indian for offering thanks to the Creator, and in binding agreements, decisions, and friendships. It was a significant article to use and own’. Such displays make the society’s collecting activities seem less excessive, less skewed and less uninformed than the 1821 *Catalogue* shows them to have been. The dedication panel in this gallery frames this work of reclaiming the past. Value-laden verbs (‘bringing’, ‘seeing’, ‘admiring’, ‘recognising’) are used to describe the Salem captains’ activities, and while these men are acknowledged as ‘adventurers and entrepreneurs’, the ‘opportunity’ that they were ‘circl[ing] the globe in search of’ is made to seem of less an economic than a philanthropic kind. This dedication panel amounts to a celebration of the Salem captains’ heroic foresight in collecting what they are now supposed to have understood all along as works of art from strong and adaptive indigenous

peoples. Nowhere is it made clear that this foresight might have arisen from their own experiences at home, or that their activities were stimulated in part by a desire to salvage 'the pure products' of others before they disappeared (Clifford 1988, 1). The fact that their collecting appetite was a counterpart to the economic imperatives that were driving the expansion of United States trade in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries is downplayed.

By refusing to take a critical stance in relation to its own origin and history, the PEM tries to have it both ways, attempting to honour the artefacts' indigenous makers at the same time as it honours those who collected the material. As a result, there remains a rupture underlying the museum's displays. The indigenous peoples (both in the United States and in the Pacific islands) whose materials are featured in the museum have had to recover from the exploitative and destructive effects of a global economy which Salem's captains were some of the first to introduce to them. In the case of local Massachusetts populations, these injuries were compounded in that Salem's success as a centre of international trade was founded directly upon former tribal territories. Dodge makes some of these connections apparent in his writings, commenting that the early economic vitality of Salem was linked to the history of activities in the islands of the Pacific and on the northwest coast, that fortunes made in the China trade still exist in New England, and that these profits served to catalyse the later prosperity of the region, funding factories and industries which in turn supplied financial resources for cultural institutions (1965, 84 and 182). The extent to which the East India Marine Society might be implicated in specific histories of colonial exploitation is, however, avoided in the PEM's current displays. Even in the case of the Native American Art gallery, where the exhibits and text are of a more overtly politicised nature, the traction is hindered by the museum's overall lack of reflexivity: the historical critique that is presented is carefully circumscribed.

Acknowledging the effects of these histories of contact more comprehensively might enable the PEM to go beyond what seem their resoundingly negative outcomes. These histories were not, as Thomas has reminded, 'merely an imposition of the west upon the rest' (1991, 83), and it remains possible to recover what were for western visitors moments of ambiguity and uncertainty during which indigenous peoples still held the balance of power; to understand tribal motivations for entering into trade; to look more closely at strategies of accommodation, appropriation and resistance. In this way, rather than naturalising the presence of tribal objects in Salem, the PEM might begin to explore the

questions of exchange and entanglement for which their trade stands. Consideration of what Alice Te Punga Somerville terms ‘the dynamics and possibilities of indigenous—indigenous connection’ (2007b, 102) might also open up alternative histories of engagement, enabling the foregrounding of tribal relationships. Again, artefacts like the kauri pare and others crafted with greenstone implements, or the historic tiki which use greenstone as a medium, might be used to exemplify these issues, since they suggest the existence of trading networks within Aotearoa New Zealand which enabled regionally-specific materials to be obtained by iwi from beyond their own tribal boundaries. Tribal economies and conventions of trade could be explored not as pre-adaptations which made these peoples receptive to capitalism, but as systems that have been and in some cases continue to be subversive of western ideas of capitalist trade.

Consideration of ‘indigenous—indigenous connection’ might enable the recovery, too, of a wider web of movements between the regions of the South Pacific and the Americas, not just as a history that began with the dispersal of peoples and artefacts occasioned by the arrival of western voyagers and traders, but as a range of histories occurring prior to western entry to the Pacific and after. Poet Robert Sullivan reminds us that Pacific and Native American peoples are connected in ways that stretch back in time—that the kumara, for instance, which became the staple root crop of Pacific island peoples, had been acquired by voyagers who reached South America (‘just think of the geography’, says Sullivan (1999, 48)). The museum might note, too, that there are in existence Native American oral traditions which speak of ancestral visits from waka which followed their own ‘powerful trade winds that flow at different times northward and southward connecting New Zealand and North America’ (cited in Reading and Wyatt 2006, 30-31). These historical and imaginative contacts between Pacific islanders and Native American peoples fan out into more recent histories of collaboration, too. After the opening of an exhibition of Maori art in Seattle in 1994, for example, Rangitihī Tahuparae, one of the participants, commented:

All that korero with the Indian people showed me that a long time ago we shared their campfires. Like us, they are *waka* people. In the short period of time we had with them I wanted to be at their campfires. Such a short time for us to catch up on thousands of years of talk.⁵²

The PEM’s commitment to contemporary art in the United States and the Pacific might usefully be extended to exploring these kinds of exchanges: the movements of people and artworks for exhibition, the cross-pollination of ideas and the intertwined nature of the cultural and artistic scenes

in these regions. Such attention might begin to make more apparent the current conditions of diaspora and migration in which indigenous artists live and work: a single object in the Native American Art gallery—a watercolour and glitter painting by an artist who has multiple Native American tribal affiliations and who is also of Hawaiian and Portugese descent—suggests some of the issues. Recognition is required that identity is constituted in complex ways, that cultures ‘travel’ (Clifford 1997, 17): In what ways might it be relevant to the PEM’s displays that Aotearoa New Zealand is now recognised as a major centre for Pacific arts? That Maori artists live in New York, complete artists’ residencies in Niue, teach in Hawaii, and so on?⁵³ Such issues suggest cultural dynamism of a type alternative to that currently presented in the PEM’s displays, dots of a very different kind to connect.

In light of these kinds of links there is, ultimately, an uneasiness which arises from the current arrangement of the PEM’s Oceanic and Native American displays. The imposition of contemporary geopolitical boundaries in the current gallery configuration gives a misleading sharpness and certainty to the initial formation and subsequent development of these collections, and threatens to come unstuck altogether in relation to contemporary conditions of culture. In what ways, for instance, is it problematic that the Native American display fails to account for geographical differences relating to processes of acquisition across the American continent? If, at the time of their collection, the northwest coast artefacts came from a distant region beyond the frontier of settlement, should these materials sit in the Native American Art gallery or would it be more instructive (or more historically accurate) to position them with the Oceanic materials? Conversely, given the more recent ‘settlement’ of Hawaii, do the Hawaiian materials properly belong in the Oceanic Art gallery, or should they be housed with the Native American material? In what ways might the denser mesh of actual and imaginative connections between the histories of the United States and the islands of the Pacific be acknowledged and explored? How can the work of artists with multiple tribal and/or national connections be dealt with? The relative openness of the current gallery configuration both raises and obscures these questions of classification and relation: in order to tackle them, it would be necessary to push the displays considerably further. Much might be achieved through dismantling of the entire wall that separates the Oceanic and Native American galleries so that the materials which they house could be reorganised from scratch. Geographical markers might then be used as a way of enabling close attention to be paid to the entwined histories of these collections, upsetting ‘settled’

ideas of place in order to help visitors think differently about historical forces which have given these collections shape.

No going back? Kerikeri and the nature of change

When Cook's *Resolution* limped in to Dusky Bay from Antarctic waters in March 1773, its crew—exhausted, dispirited and suffering the effects of scurvy—imagined they had reached an earthly paradise. George Forster, one of the naturalists on board, recollected the scene in his 1777 *Voyage Round the World*, describing the 'delightfully fair' weather conditions; the landforms 'where numerous evergreens were sweetly contrasted and mingled with the various shades of autumnal yellow'; the pleasing 'wild notes' of birdsong; the bounteous fish that seemed to leap out of the water onto the men's lines; the welcoming hand extended by nature in the form of a horizontal tree which served as a gangway, and so on (2000, 79). Forster explains that 'we looked upon the country at that time, as one of the most beautiful which nature unassisted by art could produce' (ibid., 79-80). As the vessel prepared to depart after a six-week long stay, however, Forster offered a markedly less fulsome view:

The superiority of a state of civilization over that of barbarism could not be more clearly stated, than by the alterations and improvements we had made in this place. In the course of a few days, a small part of us had cleared away the woods from a surface of more than an acre, which fifty New Zealanders, with their tools of stone, could not have performed in three months. This spot, where immense numbers of plants left to themselves lived and decayed by turns, in one confused inanimated heap; this spot, we had converted into an active scene, where a hundred and twenty men pursued various branches of employment with unremitting ardour:

Qualis apes aestate nova per florum rura
Exercet sub sole labor.

VIRGIL

Such was their toil, and such their busy pains,
As exercise the bees in flowery plains,
When winter past and summer scarce begun,
Invites them forth to labour in the sun.

DRYDEN

We felled tall timber-trees, which, but for ourselves, had crumbled to dust with age; our sawyers cut them into planks, or we split them into billets for fuel. By the side of a murmuring rivulet, whose passage into the sea we facilitated, a long range of casks, which had been prepared by our coopers for that purpose, stood ready to be filled with water. Here ascended the steam of a large cauldron, in which we brewed, from neglected indigenous plants, a salutary and palatable potion, for the use of our labourers. In the offing, some of our crew appeared providing a meal of delicious fish for the refreshment of their fellows. Our caulkers and riggers were stationed on the sides and masts of the vessel, and their occupations gave life to the scene, and struck the ear with various noises, whilst the anvil on the hill resounded with the strokes of the weighty hammer. Already the polite arts began to flourish in this new settlement; the various tribes of animals and

vegetables, which dwelt in the unfrequented woods, were imitated by an artist in his novice; and the romantic prospects of this shaggy country, lived on the canvas in the glowing tints of nature, who was amazed to see herself so closely copied. Nor had science disdained to visit us in this solitary spot: an observatory arose in the centre of our works, filled with the most accurate instruments, where the attentive eye of the astronomer contemplated the motions of the celestial bodies. The plants which clothed the ground, and the wonders of the animal creation, both in the forests and the seas, likewise attracted the notice of philosophers, whose time was devoted to mark their differences and uses. In a word, all around us we perceived the rise of arts, and the dawn of science, in a country which had hitherto lain plunged in one long night of ignorance and barbarism!

The passage concludes with a qualifying coda:

But this pleasing picture of improvement was not to last, and like a meteor, vanished as suddenly as it was formed. We re-imbarked all our instruments and utensils, and left no other vestiges of our residence, than a piece of ground, from whence we had cleared the wood. We sowed indeed a quantity of European garden seeds of the best kinds; but it is obvious that the shoots of the surrounding weeds will shortly stifle every salutary and useful plant, and that in a few years our abode no longer discernible, must return to its original chaotic state.⁵⁴

Nicholas Thomas has proposed that Forster sees the Europeans' sojourn as a moment of enlightenment which is 'poignantly brief': 'it was as if the spot was illuminated by a shaft of sunlight which broke momentarily through heavy cloud' (1991, 151-2). According to Thomas, Forster shows that progressive development of the land is remote to the point of being impossible. Leaving aside for a moment Forster's final pessimistic sentiments, I would argue that what he vividly demonstrates is the potential transformability of Aotearoa New Zealand: his account shows the hewing of its landscape into a different shape, and the introduction of western life forms and life ways with productive results. The significance of the activeness of this vision becomes clearer when the passage is compared with the *Endeavour* journal kept by Joseph Banks. Like Forster, Banks had spent a considerable amount of his time in Aotearoa New Zealand engaged in 'botanical excursions' (Forster 2000, 1) and collecting specimens to take home; like Forster, too, Banks had demonstrated interest in uses (both indigenous and European) for natural products and plant species, and had observed the local inhabitants and hazarded guesses at their mode of life. Unlike Forster in Dusky Bay, Banks had come across a landscape that was already—obviously—under cultivation: Banks frequently noted the nature and extent of plantations in districts like the Bay of Islands. Ultimately, however, and again unlike Forster, Banks' goal was to identify plant species that might prove 'usefull' for Britain (Banks 1983, 10): in his writing, transformation of the land to facilitate European settlement is only a distant

and hypothetical prospect. By contrast, the scene of purposeful activity in Forster's passage—the actual 'alterations and improvements' he describes—makes such an eventuality much more immediate and real. Forster enacts processes of occupancy, showing in practical and symbolic ways how the making of a new settlement is undertaken.

This chapter is interested in the kinds of changes to the landscape that were wrought in Aotearoa New Zealand after Forster's visit, in the earliest phase of organised European settlement. Its story is centred in Kerikeri, the Bay of Islands site that was selected by the Church Missionary Society (CMS) for what is now the oldest surviving European settlement in the country. The missionaries who took up residence in the Bay of Islands did so as the first group of Europeans to 'put down roots' (Carter 1996, 1), inhabiting Aotearoa New Zealand in a planned way and on a permanent basis. They did not see the country as an earthly paradise but they did believe in the kinds of 'alterations and improvements' described by Forster, and they arrived with distinctly interventionist purposes in mind. CMS missionaries saw themselves as being divinely ordained both to transform Maori through conversion to Christianity and to superintend wider social and moral changes, transplanting European ways of life through a deliberate programme of acclimatisation. These purposes meshed in a single scheme whereby Maori were to be encouraged to adopt European methods of agriculture. Before turning to this story, however, it is instructive to examine the Dusky Bay passage in a little more detail since as well as supplying a precedent for the kind of vision that inspired this missionary activity, Forster's comments form a useful frame for other important and interlocking reasons.

These can best be unravelled by considering the context of this passage within Forster's *Voyage*, a back-story which has largely been overlooked. The extravagant quality of the prose at this point in Forster's text—its vantage point from on high, its ennobling classical allusions, its elaborate rhetorical structuring, its adjectival flourishes, its purposeful verbs, its stark evaluations of human societies and its exclamatory vision—mark this passage out from the rest of his account; it reads as if the quote marks have already been inserted around it. Many recent commentators have recognised its landmark quality: Anne Salmond, for example, has proposed that '[t]he European argument for 'progress' has seldom been so clearly stated' (1997, 63).⁵⁵ Less frequently, it has been noted that the confidence of this evocation 'is in many ways untypical' of Forster (Thomas 1999a, 18): Nicholas Thomas has pointed out that Forster 'has a good deal more to say about the barbarism of British

sailors than that of any Pacific Islanders' (ibid.), while Jonathan Lamb has explored some of the anxieties, ambivalences and misgivings expressed in the surrounding pages of the *Voyage*.⁵⁶ For my purposes here, what is striking about Forster's Dusky Bay narrative is that it does not chart a steady course from one pole of perception to the other. Forster swiftly begins to distance himself from those early feelings of rapture, stating that the men's initial reaction to the land ('at that time') has been caused by the deprivations they have experienced on their journey: from the very moment of arrival there is an uneasiness used to moderate those Edenic sentiments.⁵⁷ From the beginning, too, Forster expresses—at times despairingly—the idea of the landscape as an anarchic and threatening wilderness. He does, however, seem to continue in his hope for Dusky Bay as a kind of paradise almost right up until the time of departure: he is still looking for and admiring signs of 'perfection' (2000, 91), still praising the beauty of the landscape, still marvelling in the variety of its flora and fauna. In large part, then, the moment of 'vision' seems to be inspired by the abrupt conclusion to the pattern of contact between the crew of the *Resolution* and the local people which immediately precedes it in the text.

Specifically, problems flare around the use of a hatchet—an incident which might now be recognised as an instance of cross-cultural appropriation in which European technologies were put to Maori uses. Forster reports with dismay that the 'native man' with whom the crew had formed a relationship has left off, making 'signs of going to kill men, and employing the hatchet [a gift from Cook's men] as an offensive weapon' (ibid., 103). Earlier, Forster believed the hatchet's agricultural value had been clearly demonstrated, explaining that 'to shew the use of it, we cut several chips out of a tree, and left it sticking there' (ibid., 83), and he had interpreted Maori eagerness to acquire more hatchets as evidence this teaching had germinated. Dismayed at the prospect of European hatchets being used to settle tribal scores, he now laments that '[t]he pleasing hope of facilitating the oeconomical operations of these people, and of encouraging some degree of agriculture among them, by presenting them with useful tools, was defeated' (ibid., 103). Thomas has proposed that when it came to the moment of hindsight, Forster denied what had been shared in his meetings with the local indigenous people and insisted 'on a gulf between European and Maori—a distance that seems conflated with the time between primeval nature and civilisation itself' (1999, 18). The passage can, in fact, be read as a direct response to these interactions with Maori, a retrenchment in the face of a realisation of difference. One of Forster's mistakes has been to assume a unity of purpose between

Maori and Europeans: he wants Maori to want what he wants for the landscape, namely the application of legible forms of ‘human industry’ in order to draw out greater beauty, utility and regularity than are offered by nature in its ‘rude unimproved state’ (2000, 81). Another has been his failure to imagine how the ‘wealth’ (ibid., 102) distributed to some of the local people by the European visitors might affect existing relations between tribal groups—in this case, Ngati Mamoe and Ngai Tahu. The larger context in which this passage occurs, then, provides a prologue to the missionary story which follows: it plays out in miniature what will happen in Kerikeri on a much larger scale.

Other blindspots are apparent in Forster’s vision, too. This vision elaborates a number of ideas about New Zealand nature which must have chimed with missionaries who subsequently undertook to transform the land. Forster enumerates the things that do not seem to be there, finding ‘enabling absences’ (Rose 1999, 10) everywhere: no arts; no science; no industry; no zeal; no purpose; no iron tools. He uses tropes of darkness and light, strange and familiar, descent and ascent, savagery and civilization which are pre-adapted to missionary purposes. He also elucidates what Geoff Park has termed ‘the wilderness notion’ (2006, 166), characterising the forest as a negative, repressive force which needs to be subdued: it is seen as the antithesis of culture and advancement, as a threatening signifier of chaos. Appealing to European understandings of the need to occupy and master the landscape based on Christian scripture, Forster sees the Maori presence as ephemeral and ungrounded: the woods are said to be ‘unfrequented’, plants are ‘neglected’, life forms have gone ‘unnoticed’ and uncategorised, environments remain unmodified. A couple of small but significant contextual details are worth picking out of the *Voyage* in relation to this. One is an assumption that Forster had earlier made about the spears carried by the local women. Subsequent commentators have explained that it is likely these were for kereru hunting (Salmond 1997, 536; Thomas 1999a, 57), but Forster presumes they are weapons of war: the fact that their owners cannot be induced to part with them as articles of trade contributes to what he interprets as a cumulative picture of violence and aggression. As well as registering problems associated with the translation of signs in the context of a new country—European tools can be converted by indigenous peoples into weapons; Europeans can mistake as weapons things that are in fact indigenous tools—Forster’s account suggestively demonstrates difficulties that Europeans had, and would continue to have, in reading ways in which the existing environment might already nourish its inhabitants and support their modes

of life. During his visit, Forster samples a wide variety of bird flesh, gorges himself on fish, brews ‘medicinal’ infusions from native plants and notes that the local inhabitants have a ‘superfluity of food’ and ‘all the necessaries of life’ (2000, 103), but he does not seem to conceive of the landscape as supplying diet or resources on anything other than a temporary basis.

Another significant detail is the description Forster presents of his experience of camping out, which occurs towards the end of the *Resolution*’s visit. As the men consume their meal they knowingly dispense with the etiquette to which they are accustomed, and after enjoying a kind of ‘primitive’ sociality around the campfire they settle down for the night on a bed of fern leaves. In minor but telling ways, Forster has entertained the beginnings of the possibility of slipping, of ‘overcom[ing] these ideas of indelicacy, which civilized nations connect with this way of living’, as he puts it (ibid., 99), of adopting local ways. Again, this helps to catalyse the vehemence of his subsequent vision, and it also helps to explain those final pessimistic sentiments. Forster’s difficulties with local Maori, and his own preparedness to begin to transform in the other direction, seem to haunt his vision, inspiring the disquiet and disillusionment expressed in his coda. His vision thus evokes what Paul Carter has described as a sense of the ‘ungroundedness’ of settlement, the ‘fragility of the claim on the soil’ (1996, 2); it is destabilised by the possibility of reversal, by precisely what it doesn’t understand, what it can’t control and can’t account for. To return to the terms used by Nicholas Thomas, transformation of the land in European ways is not shown by Forster to be ‘impossible’, but rather is shown to exist in tension with other possible outcomes. In other words, transformation may be commenced but its trajectory is not able to be controlled since it contains within it the potential for subversion, disorder and ‘uncontainable effects’ (Clark 1999, 136)—a notion which again has important implications for the Kerikeri story.

Forster’s passage also provides a point of entry to a discussion of historical re-enactment, since events in Dusky Bay—and Forster’s account of these, in particular—have become a touchstone for recent theoretical contributions to this field.⁵⁸ Vanessa Agnew, for example, has emphasised the fact that Cook’s crew saw themselves as re-enactors, commenting that ‘[b]y invoking Aeneas watching the founding of Carthage, Forster frames the voyagers’ presence as a foundational moment in the history of New Zealand, one that was invested not just with local significance but also with the

imprimature of classical tradition' (2004, 332). According to Agnew, however, Forster's description of Dusky Bay is not particularly promising in terms of latter-day re-enactment:

To script the Dusky Bay episode as 120 sailors encamped in a remote South Island fjord, engaged in tree felling, building, repairing, botanizing, star gazing, and painting, would pare away what late-eighteenth-century voyagers thought they were doing, what they wanted to be seen doing and why. Paradoxically, such a reenactment, by reducing history to the discrete event, would lack a means of retaining (and exposing) what historian Greg Denning calls the "theatricality" of history—historical agents staging events, often self-consciously, for a particular effect.⁵⁹

Agnew goes on to commend the imaginative revisiting of Dusky Bay undertaken by Nicholas Thomas and Mark Adams in their 1999 collaborative project *Cook's Sites*. The ideological and symbolic significance of the activities described by Forster can, however, be registered through other kinds of historical re-enactment. This chapter takes a broader understanding of such an enterprise than Agnew seems to propose: while the kind of re-enactment which it considers does involve repetition, and does function as an engagement with the past, it doesn't necessarily have to be scripted or planned. Re-enactment can be carried out unknowingly: it doesn't require conscious intent; or it can be begun on a cursory basis with conscious intent, yet produce outcomes which are closer to the original events than may be expected or realised. Nor does it require, as Agnew seems to presume, people in fancy dress—or people at all, for that matter; as Alex Calder has noted, there is a special relationship between landscape and re-enactments of settlement.⁶⁰ In part, this is because the cyclical qualities of nature seem to lend it to endeavours to begin again, offering the twin promises of origin and timelessness. In part, too, it is because nature has potent symbolic value as a kind of tonic. Nature offers possibilities for corrective or redemptive re-enactment: it can be deployed in a restorative capacity, especially when things have gone wrong in transformations wrought through processes of settlement.

This chapter travels to Kerikeri in order to explore these ideas. It proceeds by examining the 'vision' of transformation which underpinned the establishment of the CMS mission settlement at Kerikeri, and looks at the kinds of runaway changes that were produced as this transformation unfolded. It then examines the displays that are currently exhibited in the historic precinct at Kerikeri, paying particular attention to the newly-created 'Discoverers' Garden'. The chapter argues that this garden seems intended to offer a way of re-enacting the origins of settlement, a way of starting over. In considering some of the problems associated with the substitution of nature for history, it is interested

in how this site might relate to Forster's vision—not just of transformation, but also of the return to 'an original chaotic state' that is expressed in his coda.

* * *

The Reverend Samuel Marsden, senior chaplain in the colony of New South Wales and superintendent of the CMS mission in Aotearoa New Zealand, first visited Kerikeri during his first trip to this country in 1814-15. On his second trip in August 1819 he announced his intention to establish a mission station at Kerikeri, describing this area in his journal as 'the most promising for a new settlement of any I had met with in New Zealand, the soil being rich, the land pretty level, free from timber, easy to work with the plough, and bounded by a fine freshwater river' (1932, 147-8). He confidently proclaimed that '[a]t Kiddee Kiddee any quantity of grain, etc., may be grown that the settlement may want for years to come, either for victualling the native children in the schools or Europeans belonging to the mission' (ibid.). Kerikeri, then, was selected by Marsden for its potential for large-scale European agricultural transformation. It was also chosen as a place where the missionaries would enjoy the protection of Hongi Hika, the local Ngapuhi chief who Marsden described as 'one of the greatest' in the country (ibid., 166). The marking out of building sites, clearing of fern and brushwood, and landing of provisions began immediately:

We had soon fourteen natives sawing timber, others cutting trees, and all the beach exhibited a scene of happiness and busy civilization. A more grateful sight could not possibly be seen by a benevolent mind. Our hearts overflowed with joy and gratitude. We viewed the various operations with inexpressible delight, and considered them as the dawn of civil and religious liberty to this land of superstition, darkness, and cruelty.⁶¹

Two months later, Marsden again visited Kerikeri and described being:

[. . .] much gratified with the progress that had been made in our new settlement [. . .] a considerable quantity of ground had been broken up and part planted with maize. A number of seeds had been sown in the garden, which had been brought from England to Port Jackson, and were up. The vines were many of them in leaf. The fruit trees had also been planted, and the whole settlement began to put on the appearance of civilization than which nothing can be more gratifying to the mind. A building has also been erected for the accommodation of the labouring natives. From what I saw I was convinced that all hands had been very busy, and much done in a short time with the small means that [the CMS missionaries] can command.⁶²

Marsden had read Cook's voyage publications and had enjoyed a personal and professional relationship with Joseph Banks. It is not possible to establish with certainty whether he had read Forster's *Voyage*, which was published when Marsden himself was only twelve years of age, but it is likely that he was familiar with it: missionaries—and particularly those with an interest in the South Seas—were among the avid readers of the range of publications arising from Cook's voyages, and wider debates about these publications, and about events unfolding in the Pacific region, continued for several decades. In any case, and in many respects, Marsden's tableaux are reminiscent of the 'active scene' described by Forster in Dusky Bay almost half a century earlier. Visible changes have been wrought on the land in a concerted way and a European observer is able to survey the view and take satisfaction and comfort in identifying elements that he recognises. As is the case in Forster's vision, there is a closing of distance—seeds that were once in England are now sprouting at the opposite end of the earth—and a revelling in 'newness' which is also familiar and old. There is, too, a sense that the events being described are not just incidents, but that they amount to an historic 'moment' (Thomas 1999a, 17): as well as being literal, the changes are symbolically charged.

The context of Marsden's vision is also more similar to Forster's than might be immediately apparent, given that Kerikeri did not present a sublime, 'antediluvian' (Forster 2000, 79) wilderness of the kind found by Cook's men in Dusky Bay. By 1819, Kerikeri had begun to be integrated into circuits of European visitation and a large part of its appeal for Marsden lay in the fact that it was, like much of the land seen by Banks on the *Endeavour's* voyage, already partly domesticated. The area had no major tracts of forest or mountainous peaks and was manifestly transformable, marked with cultivations and plantations and 'well adapted'—to use Marsden's term (1932, 100)—to the missionaries' purposes. In Marsden's journals, however, the culminating scene of the founding of the Kerikeri mission station occurs on the return from his first overland expedition to the Hokianga. Marsden was only the third European to have made this journey and it had presented a difficult terrain marked with swamps, rivers, dense bush and twisted tree roots: he describes feeling as though he is 'literally at the ends of the earth' (ibid., 182). The gratification he expresses when he sees those buildings and those little shoots and leaves in Kerikeri is enhanced by his recent experience; this is a welcome and welcoming sight in an otherwise estranging environment.

There are, of course, several important differences to note between Marsden's vision and Forster's. For evangelising purposes, the CMS mission station needed to be sited near a large Maori population base and close to the Maori-European relations that were centred in the Bay of Islands; in a very real sense, missionaries were supposed to compete with whalers and traders for the souls of the local people. Unlike the sparsely inhabited and remote Dusky Bay, Kerikeri was marked by the presence of a large pa, Kororipo, adjacent to the site selected for the mission station, and there were also sizeable kainga and permanent gardens located nearby. As a centre of tribal power, Kerikeri was situated in a river basin at the core of a network of coastal and overland routes, and its inhabitants appeared to Marsden to be 'very industrious' (ibid., 100): they took serious interest in horticultural matters and he had eyed their kumara and potato grounds with approval. A further key difference between Marsden's vision and Forster's is the fact that in Kerikeri, Maori are pictured working alongside Europeans—they are being harnessed to effect the outward changes to the country, an important step in Marsden's plan for inward spiritual conversion and for securing the permanence of these changes. Marsden was, himself, a practical agriculturalist, and he believed that the failure of earlier mission stations (such as that established by the London Missionary Society in Tahiti in 1796) had suggested a failure of the premise that the preaching of Christ crucified would inevitably lead to the desire for civilisation. Adopting a more concerted approach than that undertaken by Forster in Dusky Bay, Marsden hoped to encourage some degree of agriculture in the local population by presenting them with 'useful tools': he expected that resultant lifestyle changes would begin to effect the civilising process. In his mind's eye, then, Marsden can already see the not-yet-marked-out mission school and the agronomic patchwork of maize and wheat fields—tended by Maori workers—spreading out over the surrounding hills; he expects both that the area will be made to look like England and that it will soon produce, for its swelling population, the staples and luxuries of home.

Marsden's vision seems optimistic and future-orientated, showing belief in a clear plan for the settlement's development: it appears to demonstrate confidence that European ways of life can be imported and rolled out, that it really is possible to re-create a world elsewhere. Marsden had already carved out a farm in the eucalyptus forest at Parramatta, and he seems to have perceived an opportunity in Aotearoa New Zealand to put European settlement on a better footing than it had enjoyed in New South Wales; he was personally acquainted with the problems arising from the

founding of this colony as ‘a receptacle for the criminal population of Britain’ (ibid., 57). He was certainly aware of precedents and parallels offered by other recent and contemporary missionary activities in the South Pacific, too, and earlier in his journal had expressed a strong sense that his agents in Aotearoa New Zealand were to re-enact the scriptures, proposing that ‘like Caleb and Joshua of old, [they] might open the way for others at a future time to take possession of the land’ (ibid., 61).⁶³ The assurance of Marsden’s vision at Kerikeri, which appears untroubled by the kind of coda offered by Forster, seems to stem from this experience and this larger purpose: Marsden’s background, his vocation and his sense of duty and historical destiny are likely to have supplied him with an inbuilt sense of faith. His assurance on paper may also stem from the reason for which his narrative was being recorded: given that he had exerted long and hard for the establishment of his mission in Aotearoa New Zealand, he could not readily admit uncertainties in journals destined to be read by his CMS superiors in London. In fact, as is the case with Forster’s vision at Dusky Bay, the vision expressed at Kerikeri is occasioned by a calamity perceived by its author, a rupture in the unfolding order of events. Marsden had cause to be deeply apprehensive about the direction any future transformations in Aotearoa New Zealand might take, since this was his second attempt at founding Zion.

By 1819, the mission station that Marsden had established in the Bay of Islands four years earlier at Rangihoua was deeply mired in difficulties. This station had been launched as the culmination of a series of what Marsden believed to be ‘providential’ events and circumstances, and had presented him with the first opportunity to implement his unconventional ideas relating to religious conversion through cultivation. Two key points relating to Marsden’s scheme should be emphasised here. The first is that there is a special relationship between theology and nature. Nature supplies a pool of organic similes and metaphors—growth, expansion, fruitfulness, cyclical processes and so on—which provide an analogy for the progress of the spiritual life from conversion to death. Human intervention in nature, in the form of European-style agriculture, also offers direct scriptural parallels: ‘sowing’, ‘tending’, ‘raising up’, ‘harvesting’, ‘shepherding’, ‘gathering in to the fold’ and so on. As W. J. T. Mitchell has proposed, the fact that Aotearoa New Zealand was originally settled by missionaries whose aim was to effect conversion in agricultural as well as religious terms meant that there was a redoubling of these notions (1994, 21): the concept of the ‘pastoral’, for instance, and the idea of the ‘wilderness’, rang twice for Christian settlers in this country. As his plans for the New

Zealand settlement took shape, Marsden began to develop his own literalised versions of these tropes. He proposed that the local peoples' minds 'appeared like a rich soil that had never been cultivated, and only wanted the proper means of improvement to render them fit to rank with civilized nations' (1932, 60), and he figures Maori—sleeping rough outdoors—as 'a flock of sheep upon the grass' and 'beasts of the field' (ibid., 89). Tellingly, too, Marsden conceives of Aotearoa New Zealand as 'the land of promise', but he asserts that it is not yet 'the promised land' (ibid., 146 and 340): there are, in his literalising of this metaphor, no flowing milk and honey—no cows, no bees.

The second point to make is that from the outset, Marsden was well aware that Maori were 'a warlike race' (ibid., 128). Reports of massacres of foreign visitors at the hands of Maori circulated widely in the international arena, and the founding of the first CMS mission in Aotearoa New Zealand was, in fact, delayed for several years because of the burning of the *Boyd* in Whangaroa harbour in 1809. When he first arrived in the country in 1814, Marsden quickly became aware of lingering tribal problems relating to this incident. He was also forcefully acquainted with the Maori desire for muskets: '[i]ron is the only article which they at present value', he noted, 'firearms excepted' (ibid., 129). Marsden's particular concern, however, was to ensure that violence would not be directed towards his missionaries; while he did act as a mediator in calming tribal tensions, he confidently expected that once Maori turned their attention to agriculture and improvement, fighting and bloodshed would cease. Pacification of Maori, then, was intended to be one of the key outcomes of the agricultural transformation undertaken by the CMS in Aotearoa New Zealand.

As far as Marsden was concerned, the station at Rangihoua had started out promisingly. Marsden himself had offered preparatory instruction on the advantages of growing wheat to Maori chiefs who had visited his home in Parramatta, and had sent ahead gifts of iron tools and English flax and wheat seed. Pockets of this wheat were ripe by the time he arrived in the Bay of Islands on Christmas Eve 1814 with his 'Noah's ark' (Nicholas 1971, 38) of livestock, a large supply of agricultural tools and seed, and the artisan missionaries he had recruited to teach the crafts of European civilisation. Against the advice of his missionaries who preferred the look of the rolling hills of Waitangi, Marsden selected Rangihoua as the site for the first settlement, 'in consequence of our long acquaintance' with the chief Ruatara (Marsden 1932, 95). By the end of his 1815 visit, Marsden noted (as he would later in Kerikeri) that Rangihoua was 'assuming the pleasing appearance of

civilization' (ibid., 110). Problems, however, surfaced immediately. Ruatara died only days after Marsden had sailed for Port Jackson—'cut down like a flower', Marsden afterwards lamented (ibid., 178)—meaning that tribal protection was no longer secure, and the land at Rangihoua proved too steep and the soil too shallow to be cultivated using European methods. The missionaries remained dependent on the uncertain supplies sent from New South Wales and on those who they had come to convert, and Maori demand for muskets and powder, which could also be procured through trade with visiting whaling ships, meant that these became the only currency for significant transactions. Private trade of this nature rapidly destroyed the idea of communal settlement and the mission became torn with bitter personal rivalries. Transformation had not proceeded in the right direction at all at Rangihoua: four years on, the missionaries were very obviously failing to convert either the land or the people in accordance with Marsden's plan.

These circumstances explain Marsden's emphasis on the agricultural potential of Kerikeri and his perception of the need to secure strong Maori stewardship and protection. Setting out to correct the mistakes made in the first attempt to establish a settlement, Marsden was starting over, beginning again. Problems with the Rangihoua mission station are not explicitly mentioned in Marsden's journals from this period. At the time of his 1819 visit to Aotearoa New Zealand, though, it was impossible for him to ignore evidence of increased levels of tribal violence. From the moment of arrival, his journal contains reports of an attack by Hongi against the people of Whangaroa which is first rumoured and then carried out, despite Marsden's own efforts to calm the situation. Marsden also describes meeting prisoners of war taken during Hongi's recent expedition to the East Cape, and his eye is continually drawn to the sight of the prominently-displayed tattooed heads of those slain in battle. Marsden, however, persists in his belief that Maori are on the verge of becoming farmers and artisans: his confidence for the Kerikeri mission is bolstered by other kinds of 'proof' (ibid., 166) which seem to assail him. He estimates that there has been a tenfold increase in land under cultivation in the Bay of Islands districts in the four years since his first visit: wherever he goes he meets with a 'universal cry' for hoes and spades (ibid., 176), and his journals convey great distress, anger and even threats of suicide within communities which do not yet have iron. In one scene, Marsden describes the yard in which a crowd has assembled as being 'as full of men or women calling out for an axe or a hoe as a sheep-pen' (ibid., 175), with villagers scrambling onto the roofs of their huts to try to get close enough to him to procure a tool of their own. On another occasion, a

chief offers own head in exchange for tools which might benefit his hapu, and when Marsden makes the overland journey back from the Hokianga, almost fifty residents accompany him on foot to the Bay of Islands (a distance which Marsden estimates at 140 miles) in hope of receiving ‘an axe or a hoe, or some small edge tool’ (ibid., 200). Tribes are also desperate to have CMS stations sited on their lands: at Manawara, Waitangi, Kororareka, Paihia, Kawakawa, and in the districts of the Hokianga, the people all ‘earnestly solicit’ missionaries to live with them (ibid., 161). While he is, at times, overwhelmed by the extent of the demand, Marsden believes this is a sign that the nation is on the cusp of dramatic change. Envisaging potential future sites for European settlement wherever he goes, Marsden is giddy with his own success: triumph through Kerikeri seems, to him, to be imminent.

Again, at Kerikeri, things seemed to start out promisingly. In February 1820, in a letter to his CMS superiors, Marsden proclaimed ‘there is now every reason to believe that success will attend the Society’s labours in these islands’ (ibid., 328).⁶⁴ Additional livestock were shipped from New South Wales and during his third visit to the country, in May 1820, Marsden ‘had the gratification to see the plough for the first time at New Zealand enter the ground and make the first furrow’, proclaiming ‘I could not but anticipate the day when these valleys and hills will stand thick with corn and the wilderness blossom like roses’ (ibid., 242). By this time, however, transformation was again proceeding in directions which Marsden had not intended. Like Rangihoua before it, the Kerikeri mission station was unable to achieve self-sufficiency because the surrounding land was unsuitable for European-style crop farming, with the result that the missionaries again remained dependent on Maori for staple supplies. All CMS personnel stationed at Kerikeri began or resumed participating in the musket trade, and Hongi was accompanied to England on an arms-gathering trip by Thomas Kendall, one of the disgraced founding missionaries from the Rangihoua station. By the early 1820s, Ngapuhi parties had waged war against tribes in Tauranga, Kaipara, Tamaki and Hauraki, and campaigns originating from Kororipo pa continued throughout the mid-1820s. As Pat Hohepa has explained, ‘[t]he results were disastrous. An estimated eighty thousand Maori were killed or died as a result of [these] wars and the arms race between tribal nations’ (1999, 184).

Detailed accounts of the observable effects of tribal violence are included in Marsden’s journals and letters from the 1820s: he provides eyewitness reports of councils of war and describes fortifications

that have been pock-marked by musket balls, villages burned, pa destroyed, beaches ‘covered with dead bodies like a butcher’s shop’ (1932, 253), tribes in hiding, armed warriors defending their lands, guides too fearful to accompany him into enemy territory, prisoners afraid for their lives, and scenes of anguished lamentation. He also provides participants’ own accounts of campaigns and battles, describing these as ‘wanton cruelties’ (ibid., 298) and ‘dreadful outrages’ (ibid., 299). Acknowledging that some of these activities were paraded in front of the Kerikeri missionaries, he recalls with horror hearing for himself the ‘hellish’ songs and rites of what he presumes is a ‘cannibal feast’ conducted on the Kerikeri riverbank (ibid., 373 and 489), and explains to his CMS superiors the way in which Ngapuhi deaths in battle were avenged, stating candidly that ‘[a]t Kiddee Kiddee, on Shunghee’s return from war, some slaves were killed and eaten. The missionaries saw some human flesh dressed for eating’ (ibid., 408). Throughout the 1820s, Marsden’s plan for agricultural transformation continued to be subverted in ways Marsden himself had been entirely unable to envisage, with prisoners of war used to provide the labour to grow larger crops which could be used to fuel war parties or to trade for more muskets and powder. Despite occasioning a massive increase in the amount of land under cultivation, the CMS introduction of agriculture to Aotearoa New Zealand actually produced famine during this period, too, with crops in many districts destroyed, storehouses plundered, hogs killed and tribes forced off their lands. Marsden acknowledges as early as 1820 that numbers are ‘greatly distressed for food’ (ibid., 296) and that affected tribes are ‘perishing’ with hunger (ibid., 298): he is appalled that these ‘murders’ and ‘depredations’ should be taking place ‘for the sake of a few potatoes’ (ibid.).

The extent to which these events might be typical (if larger scale) re-enactments of the problems experienced in other areas of early Pacific island missionary activity cannot be addressed in detail here: the philosophy behind Marsden’s New Zealand mission, with its emphasis on transformation through agriculture, was intentionally different to that undertaken in the late 1790s in Tahiti, for example, but replicated the escalation of tribal violence which was the earlier mission’s outcome. What is striking for the purposes of the present discussion is that a number of the factors which contributed to the disastrousness of the outcomes associated with the Kerikeri mission station are versions of what had happened during Forster’s brief stay in Dusky Bay. Crucially, like Forster before him, Marsden had made serious mistakes in his assumptions relating to the resource inferiority of Maori. Marsden was unable to read the Kerikeri area as a *kete kai* or ‘food basket’ for its

inhabitants; as Gavin McLean has proposed, in the early nineteenth century, in addition to offering lands for cultivation, Kerikeri had sheltered waters which teemed with fish and bird species, and areas of bush which offered hunting and plant gathering resources, and the fact that fern-root grew in abundance around the estuary meant that Kerikeri could support a year-round population (1994, 31-32). At the time of his first visit Marsden does note—with seeming surprise—a group gathering cockles from beds in the Kerikeri River, but he subsequently appears unaware of the wider range of activities supported by the land. Throughout his time in Aotearoa New Zealand, Marsden partakes of refreshments prepared for him by Maori on almost a daily basis—not just European pork and potatoes, but also kumara, fresh and dried fish, shellfish, wild duck, native pigeon, taro, karaka berries and ground fern-root. As is the case for Forster, though, this is only conceived as a makeshift diet: Marsden's emphasis is on the food-sources that Maori lack, not on those they already have. In his writing, Marsden does make passing reference to other resources supplied by the surrounding land: plant and animal species which provide textiles, tattooing instruments and ink, building materials, raw materials for weapons and other taonga, greenery for ceremonies and so on. While he occasionally notices these in use, they only attract his attention in a peripheral manner; as far as he is concerned, they belong to a primitive way of life that is to be overhauled.

Despite his apparent interest in agriculture, Marsden remains largely ignorant of indigenous cultivation practices, too. The question of legibility is again crucial: Marsden is impressed with signs of human agency, but can only read certain kinds of 'alterations and improvements'. From the time of his first visit, Marsden notes with approval the way that Hongi's people weed their cultivations and fence them with rails and upright stakes, and he also describes their techniques for digging, weeding and mulching. Overall, though, he is more interested in asserting the inferiority of the gardening implements used by Maori, and in proclaiming the need for iron tools, than he is in gaining insights into agronomic techniques used to prepare the land for planting. Marsden notes that some soils appear richer than others, repeatedly pointing out that some of the land around Kerikeri is 'exceedingly good', some is 'stony', some 'swampy', and some is 'of a gravelly nature'. Believing that these soils are all 'natural' (1932, 217)—that is, unmodified by people—he remains oblivious to Maori horticultural methods, which include the burning of areas of bush to enrich the soil with ash and promote the growth of fern for food, and the deliberate adding of gravel and sand to the soil to aid drainage and heat retention and thus increase its yield: the name 'Kerikeri' is derived from

‘kirikiri’ which means ‘to dig’, and it is also the term for ‘gravel’.⁶⁵ Marsden also seems to have remained unaware of the rotational basis of land development and cultivation practiced by Maori, and of the value of systems of tapu for protecting the land’s productivity. On his first visit to Kerikeri, when he examines the cultivations being managed by Hongi’s people and notes that he ‘had never seen finer potatoes under the best culture’ (Marsden 1932, 99), and that the imported English flax seed has ‘come to great perfection’ (ibid., 100), it does not seem to occur to him that Maori could have anything to teach his missionaries.

Marsden appears not to have understood more recent changes to Maori horticulture, either. His relationship with Banks suggests he probably knew that certain cultivars—kumara, yam, taro and hue (gourds)—had been brought by Maori from Polynesia. Marsden has little to say about these deliberate plant introductions, however, and hazards only one guess that an unusual variety of kumara has been imported from elsewhere. By the time of his first visit, European potatoes were already widely cultivated and pigs were being raised in a number of tribal districts. These species had first been released—in small numbers, and with little success—on Cook’s voyages, but had been reintroduced in Te Hiku o te Ika (the Far North) in 1793 by Philip Gidley King, then-governor of New South Wales, to encourage the provisioning of whaling ships which had begun calling at the Bay of Islands. These introductions had been adopted by Maori because they were close approximations of staple foods: potatoes were similar to kumara, which Marsden recognised was ‘esteemed’ as ‘the choicest food’ (ibid., 95), and pigs provided a convenient source of protein in a country with no native mammals. Another appeal—as Maning’s *Old New Zealand* suggests (2001, 185)—was that neither of these foodstuffs required intensive supervision. Pigs could be permitted to wander free (although fencing, which Marsden approvingly noted, became necessary to prevent them from destroying plantations), and potatoes only needed to be planted twice a year, meaning that war could be waged in spring and summer months after these had been sown. Both could be traded as commodities with Europeans, and both could also be used to feed war parties on long distance raids. The potato crops and herds of swine that Marsden noticed from the time of his first visit, then, were already signs transformation. Rather than providing, as Marsden believed, a ‘scanty subsistence’ (ibid., 166), they offered capabilities for the expansion of existing modes of living and the development of new kinds of tribal economies.

Like Forster, too, Marsden had failed to foresee the possibility for change in alternative—unplanned—directions. Marsden himself suffers privations on his travels in Aotearoa New Zealand, ‘camping out’ in the way that Forster had, but often on tribal terms and with no Europeans for company. Unlike Forster, though, Marsden does not openly entertain the possibility for slipping. Viewing the sacrifices he makes as necessary in the path of duty, he seems to remain steadfast and aloof: even when he sleeps outside, he does not count himself as one of those ‘beasts of the field’. Possibilities for the spectacular reversal of the civilising process were, however, embodied in his missionaries. Kendall experienced a crisis of faith, admitting by 1822 that ‘I have been almost completely turned from a Christian to a Heathen’ (cited in Binney 2005, 11), and the Reverend John Butler, the Kerikeri-based head of the CMS mission in Aotearoa New Zealand, was also accused of serious misconduct and described by Marsden as a ‘fallen’ and ‘ruined’ man (1932, 393-4). Both Kendall and Butler were eventually dismissed from the CMS on Marsden’s advice. Marsden’s reaction to these outcomes is likely heightened by remorse relating to his own conduct. While his journals and letters maintain his exemplary and scrupulous firmness against the ‘abominable’ and ‘accursed’ traffic in firearms and express indignation that missionaries have been furnishing Maori with ‘instruments of death’ (ibid., 333), in private he had been prepared to dabble in this trade: as well as making the payment of ‘Forty-eight Falling Axes’ specified on the land deed at Kerikeri, Marsden sealed this deal with gunpowder (Binney 2005, 68).

Like Forster, Marsden had also failed to foresee possible outcomes for transformation as a result of the application of Maori interests. Inga Clendinnen has proposed that civilising missions of the kind undertaken by the CMS relied upon the locals’ willingness to see their condition as ‘impoverished’ (2005, 242). One of the mistakes made by Marsden was to overestimate the apparent value of Christianity to Maori. As Pat Hohepa has explained, Hongi considered Christianity a religion possibly fit for slaves but irrelevant for warriors: ‘[m]issionaries were classified as *paakehaa tuutuaa* (European commoners), fit companions for Maori commoners or slaves if their only function was preaching the Gospel’ (1999, 200). As is the case with Forster, Marsden misrecognises reasons for the eagerness with which European agricultural technologies (and, by extension, the missionaries themselves) are being embraced. He fails to imagine the prospect not only that might Maori not convert to Christianity, but they might convert Christianity and ‘civilised’ ways of life to their own ends—in Hongi’s case, fulfilling tribal ambitions by reversing the defeat of Ngapuhi by the tribes of

the Hauraki Gulf at Puketona in 1793, and by Ngati Whatua in the battle of Moremonui in 1807. Because Maori were 'of another mind' (Marsden 1932, 198), agriculture did not offer a substitute for war as Marsden had expected; for several years it fuelled war. Like Forster before him, Marsden is oblivious for a long time to ways in which the European presence causes and exacerbates tribal tensions. While he acknowledges that Ruatara returned from Sydney 'comparatively very rich' (ibid., 82), he dismisses apprehensions voiced by other chiefs about the situating of the mission station on Hongi's land, failing to understand until it is too late that '[t]he firearms of Shunghee's tribe gave them such an advantage over other tribes that none could now stand against them' (ibid., 296). Marsden's continued misreading of signs is conveyed in the figures of speech that he employs in his writing. During his second visit, when he agrees to give the Kororareka chiefs a number of iron tools, he says that they 'return to their own districts as happy as kings with the spoils of war' (ibid., 165), a simile which is more apt than Marsden seems to realise. In another episode, in response to his promise of shipment of tools from England, local chiefs are said to reply 'that many of them would be in their graves before the ship could come from England, and the hoes and axes would be of no use to them when they were dead' (ibid., 177). In the context of escalating tribal warfare, where cultivating crops in order to obtain firearms has become the new basis for tribal economies, and where hatchets and axes themselves are being used as weapons of war, this argument takes on an additional weight which Marsden does not see.

Eventually forced to acknowledge the seriousness of the situation, Marsden responds by becoming preoccupied with what has gone wrong in the Kerikeri mission. One of the most striking aspects of his writing in this period is the change in his metaphors. He proposes that '[t]ares were again sprung up amongst the wheat'; explains that one of the few things that had flourished in the Kerikeri mission was 'a most rooted Hatred' between Butler and Kendall; describes the 'propagating' of charges amongst the missionaries themselves; suggests that what needs 'subduing' are not the land or the people, but the minds of his agents; expresses hope that these evils have been 'cut up by the roots', and so on (ibid., 401-2). His letters and journals openly acknowledge that the crisis precipitated by the Kerikeri mission station constitutes a turning point: by 1822, the CMS in London had already published accounts of the failure of the evangelical cause in Aotearoa New Zealand. Marsden refuses to relinquish the cause, though: he proceeds by 'digging in', encouraging the CMS to send out more strength to carry on the work. One of the telling outcomes of the Kerikeri experience, however, is

that Marsden undertakes to re-define the terms of the scriptural re-enactment which he believes the CMS is carrying out in Aotearoa New Zealand:

When the Israelites came to the borders of the Promised Land, Moses commanded that twelve princes, one from every tribe, should be sent to examine the good land [. . .] There were only two who proved themselves honest men [. . .] If the Society get two good men in every twelve they must be satisfied [. . .].⁶⁶

Another relates to Marsden's founding, in 1823, of the third CMS mission station in the Bay of Islands. Paihia had not been Marsden's first choice of location for this station and because the local chiefs were away at war there was a delay in finalising the land purchase; Marsden himself was still busy dealing with the personnel problems at Kerikeri and was distracted and harried at the time this station began to take shape.⁶⁷ It may also be that the novelty of inaugurating the process of transformation had, by the third time, worn off. Whatever the reason, the founding of the Paihia station is figured as an anticlimax in Marsden's account; given that this station was founded as the new headquarters of the CMS in Aotearoa New Zealand, it seems significant that no accompanying vision of transformation is offered.⁶⁸

While tribal disturbances continued into the 1830s and 40s, within Marsden's lifetime the CMS mission in Aotearoa New Zealand did begin to bear fruit. The Paihia station was successful and in 1830 a further Bay of Islands station was founded inland from Kerikeri at Waimate; by 1835, the CMS had a total of nine frontier mission stations between Kaitaia and Rotorua. Marsden did not, however, live long enough to learn about the afterlife that his vision of transformation achieved through Waimate. The English naturalist Charles Darwin visited the area in December 1835 and expressed delight and admiration at the scene he found there:

[. . .] after having passed over so many miles of an uninhabited useless country, the sudden appearance of an English farm house & its well dressed fields, placed there as if by an enchanter's wand, was exceedingly pleasing [. . .] fine crops of barley & wheat in full ear, & others of potatoes & of clover were standing; but I cannot attempt to describe all I saw; there were large gardens, with every fruit & vegetable which England produces and many more belonging to a warmer clime [. . .] Around the farm yard were stables, a threshing barn with its winnowing machine, a blacksmiths forge & on the ground ploughshares & other tools; in the middle was that happy mixture of pigs & poultry which may be seen so comfortably lying together in every English farm yard [. . .] At a distance of a few hundred yards, where the water of a little rill has been dammed up into a pool, a large & substantial water mill had been erected. All this is very surprising when it is considered that five years ago nothing but fern here flourished. Moreover native workmanship taught by the missionaries has effected this change [. . .].⁶⁹

Darwin afterwards invoked this as the ‘one bright spot’ (1988, 395) in his New Zealand sojourn.⁷⁰ He also commented on the ‘entire annihilation’ of the native rat by the ‘common Norway kind’ introduced by foreign ships, and noted that European weeds were ‘widely disseminated’ and had begun to ‘overrun whole districts’ around the Bay of Islands (ibid., 390). These experiences were foundational in the development of his theory of evolution: in his 1859 book *The Origin of Species*, Darwin cites the fact that indigenous species around the world are ‘rapidly yielding before the advancing legions of plants and animals introduced from Europe’—a process which he believed he witnessed in the Bay of Islands in 1835—as a classic example of the struggle for life (cited in Park 2001, 397). The drastic reduction of the Maori population, as a result both of European diseases and of changes to ‘the whole system of warfare’ after the introduction of firearms (Darwin 1988, 382), is likely to have played a part in the formulation of his ideas, too. Darwin’s theory, which was used to defend the spread of settler culture and which has come to be known in popular terms by the shorthand ‘survival of the fittest’, can be seen as another ‘runaway’ outcome of Marsden’s vision. From a theological viewpoint, the theory caused a rupture between science and the church but Marsden is likely to have been appalled by it for other reasons, too. Marsden had enjoyed a long acquaintance with Maori and proved to be a reasonably attentive observer of aspects of Maori culture. While he did aim to make over the landscape and life ways that he found in Aotearoa New Zealand, he was not seeking to supplant one form of human life with another; his desire was that Maori should rank with ‘civilised’ nations and enjoy the comforts of civil life. Although sometimes naive, and often producing results that were contrary to what he intended, Marsden did, ultimately, have humanitarian concerns at heart. He also knew—as Forster had in a small way, too—that things weren’t as smooth or straightforward as Darwin’s theory would suggest; his own lived experience made him aware that transformation could be a fraught and hard-fought process.

In this regard, some of the most striking details in Marsden’s journals have to do with incomplete or partial change, and with the ‘deep rootedness’—to use Marsden’s own term (1932, 69 and 121)—of Maori institutions and cultural practices. Marsden describes holding lengthy conversations with Maori chiefs who advise him that the institution of polygamy has become more necessary than ever as a result of the introduction of European agriculture, since it is the most reliable means of ensuring their planting lands will be cultivated. He also describes improvised weapons—long spears with

bayonets fixed at the point; carpenters' axes with long handles—that have been fashioned by tribes who are still naked but have access to iron tools, and comes across chickens which have been distributed not through orderly trade, but rather through plunder or through banishment because they have polluted sacred buildings. On a couple of occasions he has to resort to using the notion of tapu—one of the key cultural practices which he is seeking to supplant with Christian doctrine—to explain to Maori how to rear livestock, or to convey why Europeans are horrified at being served roast cat. He also observes with surprise that pigs can survive on fern-root alone, frequently coming across these animals roaming in the bush under the protection of tapu, and in the absence of European-style pasture, the cattle he imports from New South Wales are forced to graze on fern, bracken, and other indigenous ground cover. Marsden's own account makes it clear that at Paihia and Kerikeri in 1830 most of the clergymen were still living in 'miserable bulrush huts' (ibid., 475): there is said to be no suitable place in either of these settlements for the remaining Rangihoua missionaries to be lodged while their station is relocated or dismantled. Images of Kerikeri painted by visiting artists like Augustus Earle in the mid-to-late 1820s also show that an agronomic patchwork had failed to materialise on the hills behind Kerikeri.⁷¹ Heavily fenced compounds belonging to the settlers appear as tiny stockaded islands in this landscape: in Earle's representation, these structures are dwarfed by a Maori burial shelter, positioned on a promontory across the river from the mission station, which affirms the endurance of traditional practices and the failure of Christian teachings to take root. Even on a small scale, then, 'alterations' did not necessarily produce what Forster had described as a 'pleasing picture of improvement'. While many of the changes described by Marsden are not really ones that he had hoped for, and while many must have shown him how far there was to go rather than how far things had come, they vividly index the uneven and halting ways in which transformation often proceeded on a grassroots basis.

* * *

The lands around Kerikeri are, today, blanketed with regular squares—not of fields thick with wheat or maize as Marsden had pictured, but of blocks that have been subdivided and planted with orchards and shelterbelts. The development of commercial horticulture from the mid-1920s largely replaced the logging and dairy farming that were carried out in the surrounding area in the decades after the mission station closed in 1848, and stimulated the growth of the township that now exists in Kerikeri.

This transformation, which was the product of another ‘vision’—a planned scheme to turn the area into ‘a Citrus centre’, the California of the South Pacific—can in some ways be seen as an extension of Marsden’s original plan.⁷² As the present discussion has shown, there is a long tradition of horticulture associated with Kerikeri, and some of the same ‘exotic’ species for which the area is now a specialised production district (oranges, lemons, grapes, varieties of nut and so on) were first introduced through seed and saplings brought by Marsden. The slogan that is currently used to market the area to visitors—‘Heritage, Horticulture, Hospitality, Creativity, Lifestyle’—indicates that as well as being known for its prosperous organic industries, Kerikeri has also become known for its heritage assets. Cultural tourism has helped to promote the town’s growth as well, with more than a million people now visiting the basin’s ‘core heritage zone’ each year (Department of Conservation 2007, 8). This zone contains two main European structures: the mission house built in 1821-22 as a residence for Butler, and occupied by another missionary family after Butler’s removal until it was presented to the nation in 1974; and the ‘Stone Store’, built in 1832-36 as a granary and trading post when the CMS mission in Kerikeri was already in decline, and subsequently used, among other things, as a kauri gum and general trading store and a small museum. It also comprises sites associated with Maori occupation of Kerikeri, including Kororipo pa, which passed through various private European owners after Hongi’s death in 1828 before being vested in the Crown as an historic reserve in 1957; ‘Rewa’s Village’, a replica of a small unfortified kainga which opened in 1970; and the ‘Discoverers’ Garden’, a botanical reserve adjacent to Rewa’s Village which opened in May 2000.

All of these elements of the basin are now in the hands of the Crown, acting through the Department of Conservation (DOC) and the New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT), and the area is managed in consultation with regional and district councils, and with stakeholders that include a local residents’ group formed in the late 1960s and a tangata whenua committee. Active interest has recently been taken in the area by central government: Kerikeri has come to be seen as a paramount heritage concern, with funding provided for a \$19 million vehicle bypass which opened in July 2008 and additional acquisitions of land in the basin occurring as recently as September 2008. A *Sustainable Development Plan* was produced in 2007 to support the basin’s government-sponsored nomination for UNESCO World Heritage status. According to the terms of this nomination, Kerikeri is said to comprise ‘a cultural landscape of the highest significance’, and to comply with the

requirement of being ‘an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement or land-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change’ (cited in Department of Conservation 2007, 3).

Explaining the basin’s specific heritage value, the UNESCO bid states that Kerikeri is ‘notable for its integration of a mission settlement and the adjacent Maori settlements’.⁷³ As this suggests, Kerikeri is widely recognised as an important ‘landscape of early Maori and European interaction’ (Department of Conservation 2007, 3), a ‘crucible’ (Phillipson 2007, 59) or ‘meeting pool’ (Binney 2007, 9) for early cross-cultural exchange. The other key aspect of Kerikeri’s significance has to do with what the UNESCO bid terms its ‘intactness’. Kerikeri is the oldest unbroken European settlement site in Aotearoa New Zealand. Containing the oldest surviving European residence, the oldest stone building and the oldest trading building, it represents foundational history in a literal sense: its structures stand on the earliest surviving European foundations in the country. Integral to this ‘intactness’ is the fact that Kerikeri looks right, too. As Judith Binney, the editor of a recent collection of essays on Kerikeri, has proposed, in visual terms Kerikeri retains ‘the power of place’: ‘[u]nlike many other meeting places between Europeans and indigenous peoples, which now lie buried beneath concrete or skyscrapers, Kerikeri remains almost as it was, its buildings and landscapes open to the air’ (2007, 9). Again, this quality has been widely noted. Kerikeri is said to be, ‘by its conjunction of sites, probably the most significant visual testimony that we have to the meeting of two worlds in Aotearoa/New Zealand’ (Department of Conservation 2007, 13); one commentator has suggested that it remains possible ‘in the mind’s eye to re-people this small world with the Maori of centuries past and with the first Europeans who made their home here’ (Easdale 1991, 10).

For the purposes of the present discussion, the ‘Discoverers’ Garden’ is the most significant component of the Kerikeri heritage zone. As the most recently added visitor attraction, it suggests the kinds of priorities that concern those who currently administer the area. It also appears to have arisen as the result of a striking series of reversals. First, the style of exhibit that it adopts has a very long pedigree, stretching back to the botanic gardens that were planted in European centres using live specimens collected from the Pacific region by visiting naturalists like Banks and Forster. The Discoverers’ Garden inverts this tradition, however: it contains native species which are being made

to sprout again in their original context, in what was formerly understood as the rim of settlement (Lamb 2002, 26-7). Second, as this suggests, the Discoverers' Garden functions as a sign of the seeming success of the transformative visions proposed and pursued by figures like Forster and Marsden. Aotearoa New Zealand has been so altered in the process of European settlement that the 'ordinary' landscape is now the 'replicated European food-producing systems' (Park 1995, 21) which Marsden had hoped to roll out: the 'islands' are no longer the European enclaves, but the areas of indigenous vegetation. Third, the garden serves as a testimony to the revalorisation of native flora and fauna, a turnaround of earlier enthusiasm for acclimatisation. In part, this was one of the outcomes of what Geoff Park has termed 'settler Darwinism' (2006, 215): from the end of the nineteenth century, as it became apparent that indigenous species were under threat, a newfound regard emerged for what was being lost in the process of transformation, and the modern conservation movement—espousing environmental values unimagined by CMS missionaries in the first half of the nineteenth century—grew out of this impulse. In part, too, this revalorisation occurred through the workings of a nascent nationalism, which found in native flora and fauna symbols of a distinctive identity: nature is now used by settler culture to facilitate the identification of Aotearoa New Zealand as 'home'. And fourth, it suggests the reassertion of Maori perspectives and histories as a result of the cultural resurgence that began in the twentieth century. Maori did not die out in accordance with the predictions of Darwin's evolutionary theory, but have become an increasingly forceful and insistent presence.

The role that the Discoverers' Garden fulfils within the Kerikeri basin area provides insights into some of the reasons for its development. The UNESCO bid makes it clear that the two CMS mission buildings, which stand close together, 'dominate' the former wharf frontage to the river.⁷⁴ Several commentators have also noted that the wider basin area is strongly characterised by established exotic vegetation—stands of large eucalyptus and Norfolk pines, as well as a gnarled pear tree believed to be the sole survivor of the mission orchards—which can be seen to serve 'as memorials to early settlers' (Pickmere 1994, 164). As one commentator has suggested, this kind of environment, 'when read as "English rural landscape" by the visitor, can be misconstrued as evidence of the steady, relentless, and even natural, dominance of the civilising influence of the invading English culture' (Gorbey 1994, 53); the same commentator proposes that such a 'far-side-of-the-world, dominant culture vision of New Zealand is not a productive theme at a time when we as people are

forming a view of ourselves that celebrates and honours the diversity of our origins and the uniqueness of our nation' (ibid.). The Discoverers' Garden, then, functions in part to correct the balance. Serving as a conspicuous symbol of pre-European occupation, it complements Kororipo pa and Rewa's Village, and the native vegetation which has been planted or encouraged to regenerate in the wider basin area, giving indigenous forms a stronger presence and enabling the contemporary landscape to stand 'as a metaphor for a maturing nation' (ibid.).

This principle of balance informs the displays that are contained within the garden, too. According to the main information panel displayed at its entrance, the Discoverers' Garden ('Te Wao Nui a Tane') contains almost two hundred native New Zealand plant species. Within the garden, information is supplied for fifty of these species on a series of ten panels distributed throughout the planted areas and devoted to 'Traditional Plant Use by Maori'. These are paired with a set of 'botanical' labels for around fifty species, and another seven larger panels devoted to some of the early European naturalists who visited the Bay of Islands. This arrangement within the garden mirrors the diptych effect that is created in the main text panel. Both Maori ('Nga tangata whenua') and Europeans ('The Botanists') are supposed to be figured as 'discoverers' in the garden's narrative: the sign at the entrance carefully balances an image of Polynesian arrival in Aotearoa New Zealand in a fleet of double-hulled canoes with an image of Cook's *Endeavour*, and all species within the garden are labelled—on both the 'Traditional Plant Uses' and 'botanical' text panels—with their Linnaean and Maori names. In this way, the Discoverers' Garden strives to demonstrate commitment to bicultural ideals of partnership and equality which have become central to cultural representations in Aotearoa New Zealand; it mobilises nature in order to map a set of social and cultural relations. The sign at the entrance makes it clear that the garden was officially opened in 2000 by Dover Samuels, then-Minister of Maori Affairs and a descendant of Hongi Hika, reinforcing the fact that the garden is intended to speak for processes of national maturation and growth.

The Discoverers' Garden also seems intended to offer a way of resolving some of the trickier aspects of the history associated with European settlement in Kerikeri. While a pamphlet published for visitors explains that the idea for the garden arose as a means 'to celebrate the Millennium', in practice, history presents problems at Kerikeri.⁷⁵ As this discussion has shown, the events associated with the CMS mission station veer off in problematic directions: this is not the kind of story upon

which a celebratory history of national origin can easily be founded. Binney has made this clear, explaining that while there is widespread agreement about the importance of these sites, there is continuing disagreement about the history associated with them (2007, 9): she proposes that this is a ‘challenging’ history whose ‘enduring legacies’ can be assessed in different ways (ibid., 24). Another commentator has identified some of these problems too, stating that one of the key challenges for those responsible for the Kerikeri basin’s interpretation is ‘to preserve within this landscape the values of maturing nationhood while dealing in a realistic manner with an actual and complex history that contains elements of hope, tension, achievement, disappointment, privation, failure, deceit, success and altruism’ (Gorbey 2004, 53).

This ‘actual and complex’ history has, to some extent, begun to be acknowledged in the wider narrative presented in the basin’s sites and in associated pamphlets produced for visitors. The sign at the entrance to the display currently housed within the Stone Store explains that at Kerikeri in the period 1819-23, ‘Maori and British entered into new relationships with each other—relationships often fraught with misunderstanding, and highlighting both the similarities and the deep differences between the cultures’. Within the wider narrative, reference is made to missionary musket trading, to the increase in Ngapuhi war activities from 1818, and to the fact that captives were used to expand the cycles of production, warfare and slavery. The narrative also deals with personnel problems within the mission, acknowledging that the station had declined by the time the Stone Store was built, and that Marsden’s original plan to convert Maori to Christianity by first persuading them to take up European agricultural methods ‘failed’, with the earliest conversions only occurring in the 1830s once the CMS had changed its approach. Other strands to the Kerikeri story are suggested by a label in the Stone Store which explains that gorse, one of the species deliberately introduced by missionaries for grazing sheep, rapidly ‘ran wild’, becoming ‘one of the worst weeds’; and by a display in the Rewa’s Village visitor centre devoted to the North Island brown kiwi, which acknowledges that this species, now considered an icon of national identity, is under threat as a result of the introduction of predators and the extensive loss of habitat.

These elements could be developed to show ways in which the history of the country’s earliest surviving European settlement fans out into the range of outcomes that it helped to produce—including massive long-term impacts on Maori populations and tribal boundaries as a result of the

escalation of tribal warfare in the 1820s, and massive environmental impacts that occurred as transformative settlement proceeded. It would also be possible, as the present discussion has attempted, to consider what can be learned from the ‘dreamwork’ (Mitchell 1994, 10) that underpinned this history: when the Kerikeri story is approached in ways that do not attempt to make it fit the pattern of a stable point of national origin, other forms of patterning emerge. Rather than addressing the weight of this history, however, or examining more closely ways in which the mission’s founding assumptions were ‘compromised in practice, or thwarted or appropriated’ (Thomas 1991, 152), producing ‘runaway’ outcomes that were unforeseen by its architects, Kerikeri mobilises a very different kind of approach: the Discoverers’ Garden seems intended to function as a kind of re-enactment. By re-staging the moment of first contact between European and Maori cultures, it tries to reverse precisely those forms of irreversible change with which the basin is associated: reaching back to a time before the beginning of European endeavours to remake the land and its people, the garden strives to allow settlement to begin again in a purposive, controlled and equitable way.

As this discussion has tried to show, the desire to ‘try back’ is a prevalent one in relation to transformations carried out as part of the project of settlement: when change has gone wrong, settlers start over. The substitution of ‘nature’ for history can also be seen as a solution which has a history of its own: the natural world is, as Philip Fisher has proposed, ‘a setting of origins’ in settler-colonial societies (1985, 12). Seeming to offer a magical proximity to the past, nature is both ‘temporal and timeless’ (Calder 2009, 261). While it bears traces of change, its cycles and patterns of growth and regeneration can also overwrite change: as the Kerikeri *Sustainable Development Plan* explains, within the basin, vegetation is seen as being ‘an essential linking element for the past, present and the future’ (Department of Conservation 2007, 20). In this light, the fact that the Discoverers’ Garden is visually and symbolically connected to the indigenous vegetation which is being encouraged to grow in the wider basin area is significant. The *Sustainable Development Plan* explains that this vegetation acts as an important ‘buffer’, screening the Kerikeri heritage sites from the surrounding orchards, pastureland, suburban developments and so on (ibid., 8 and 15)—in short, screening them from the wider effects of transformation; screening them from the history which they helped to inaugurate.

The Discoverers' Garden, then, strives to offer an opportunity for the regaining of the kind of 'earthly paradise' that was perceived by Forster on his arrival in Dusky Bay. It presents a setting where visitors can take delight in visiting a world elsewhere; appreciate the beauty of the surroundings; look for and admire signs of perfection; marvel at the variety of the species; note the colours of the vegetation 'sweetly contrasting' and 'mingling'; and be enchanted by the chorus of birdsong. That the garden is supposed to function as a place which offers opportunities for renewal is suggested by the strong emphasis in its narrative on the restorative qualities of nature. Discussion of the therapeutic properties of plants constitutes a significant component of the 'Traditional Plant Uses' panels: nineteen of the fifty plants are described as having medicinal uses. These range from remedies for bathing sore eyes, to products used as poultices and bandages to 'check bleeding' and 'aid recovery', to extractions prepared for the treatment of skin diseases, sprains and bruises, to cures for toothache and other ailments, to foliage used in what are termed 'remedial' vapour baths. Because of the prevalence of such references, emphasis in the text largely falls on processes of repairing and healing; nature is represented as a life force and curative. To use Forster's terms, in the Discoverers' Garden, the shoots of native plants themselves are shown to have 'salutary' properties.⁷⁶ As this suggests, the Discoverers' Garden reworks the idea of a return to 'an original chaotic state' that is expressed in Forster's coda. Forster had expected that in a powerful and spontaneous act of nature, the 'shoots of the surrounding weeds' would take over. In the Discoverers' Garden, the return of native plants is the result of intentional seeding: it is not accidental, inadvertent or wild. In fact, as the visitor pamphlet explains, the site for the garden was 'cleared of unwanted weed growth' before the planting of native species commenced—the implication here is that the weeds concerned were introduced ones like gorse.⁷⁷ There also appears to have been a shift in terms of what is meant by the idea of 'an original chaotic state'. In Forster's formulation, this referred to the erasure or negating of the observable effects of settlement history; in the Discoverers' Garden, this 'chaotic state' seems to refer to settlement history itself.

If the garden is intended to function as a place of peace and harmony, as a tranquil retreat from history, there also appears to be a markedly spiritual dimension to this enterprise: as Andrew Cunningham has proposed, the 'renewal' that nature offers is, fundamentally, a spiritual one (1996, 39). In the redemptive formulation enacted in the Discoverers' Garden, the fact that Christian spiritual values are not explicitly invoked the narrative is revealing. It registers not only the

secularising of New Zealand society (the rise and fall of Christian influence), but also suggests the kinds of ‘quasi-indigenous modes of belonging’, expressed through a love for the natural environment, that have become characteristic of settler culture (Calder 2009, 260-1). As Park has proposed, ‘[d]espite the urgent insistence with which they have alienated Maori from their tribal territories, Pakeha have tended to perceive the relationship of Maori to the land as more intimate and more natural than their own’ (2006, 83). For settler culture, the adopting of certain kinds of ‘local ways’ and local values has become desirable: ‘impoverishment’—experienced in terms of the lack of a deep connection to the land—is a condition that now seems to characterise settler culture itself. By mobilising nature as a remedy for the difficulties associated with history, the Discoverers’ Garden, then, enacts a complete reversal. The anarchic, threatening wilderness which Forster and Marsden had perceived as a backward force has become, in this garden, a ‘sacred symbol’ (Park 2006, 165) and model of advancement.

The display that is presented in the Discoverers’ Garden can be seen to make ground in a number of ways. Significantly, the ‘Traditional Plant Use’ panels refuse the distinction that is conventionally made in western discourse between nature and culture: they do not insist that the New Zealand landscape at the time of European arrival was a ‘terra nullius’, an unpopulated wilderness (Park 2006, 98). To use Forster’s term, the forest is shown not to be ‘unfrequented’. Deliberately introducing a human component, the garden evokes a landscape overlaid with cultural values. Plant products are shown to provide what the garden’s visitor pamphlet describes as ‘basic needs’, or what Forster understood as ‘all the necessities of life’: foods, textiles (clothing, cordage, weaving, bedding, containers), construction materials, tools, and implements for fishing, hunting, boatbuilding and weaponry.⁷⁸ The text panels within the garden demonstrate, however, that such plant uses are far from ‘basic’. Maori culture is shown to have sophisticated and differentiated applications for the wide range of products available in the surrounding environment. Many of these products require specialised knowledge and skilled preparation to transform them into a useable state: the labels make it clear that plant material might be steamed, soaked, immersed in running water, dried, cooked, roasted, pounded, infused, carved, plaited, cut, separated, bundled, woven, rubbed, heated, waved, hollowed, lashed, shaped, fashioned, burned or extracted. Describing diverse uses for products

derived from a single plant, the text also shows that these may be obtained from different types of material: the trunk of a given species might be used for one purpose; the young shoots, stems, brushwood and leaves (separated into tips, pith, and upper and lower surfaces) for others; seeds (kernels and fleshy coverings), flowers (petals, pollen, stamens), fruit, bark (inner and outer), roots, gum (formed at the base of the leaves, or on the outside of the bark), shavings or wood chips for others, and so on. Such uses might also vary according to whether the plant is in its juvenile or adult form. Again, to use Forster's terms, the prevalence and variety of verbs in the Discoverers' Garden text panels show significant 'activity' and 'industry' in relation to the environment, and the differences and uses of plants are clearly marked: native flora is not presented as a 'neglected', 'confused' or 'inanimate' heap.

Within its panels, the garden sets up deliberate patterns of cross-cultural correspondence intended to illustrate the sophistication of Maori culture. Describing innovations and technological proficiencies which parallel those found in the west, it explains that certain types of logs might serve as skids to move heavy canoes; that complementary pairings of wood types need to be rubbed together to produce fire; that differentiated treatments have been developed for a wide range of ailments. The garden includes references, too, to 'luxury' items—hair products made by pounding oil from seeds; cosmetics like a 'scented balm to rub on the skin' made from flowers or gum mixed with bird fat; natural chewing gum, and so on. Again, to use the terms set in place by Forster, these are presented as the hallmarks of a 'civilised' way of life: they show that developed modes of living can be sustained without western conveniences and manufactured goods. At the same time as it encourages visitors to read closeness between Maori and western cultures, however, the text does insist upon certain differences. Plant uses relating to what the panels term 'beliefs' and 'ceremony' receive mention. The text states that certain types of branches might be used or interpreted as omens or signs, and reference is also made to what are termed the 'elaborate rituals' that might accompany the felling of a tree intended for use as a canoe, to types of greenery made ready for use at a tangi, and to ceremonies performed by the tohunga in lifting the tapu from food or in ensuring a good kumara crop. The impression given is of a culture with its own systems of regulation which both derive from, and extend to, the natural world.

The garden can be seen to have made ground, too, in relation to what might be termed its ecological perspective. This principle governs the organisation of the displays, with plants arranged in ways that provide samples of different habitat zones. Within its stands of bush, the garden contains an area devoted to plants found in rocky, coastal areas; another devoted to wetlands and swamps; another to varieties of timber; and another to shade-dwellers. Such an arrangement—while necessarily unnatural in its representative balance and inclusiveness within such a small area—does promote understandings of landscape that reach towards indigenous perspectives, showing the natural environment as an interacting whole. Suggesting processes of hunting and harvesting, of ‘living in’ and ‘living with’ nature, the garden enables visitors to begin to see the landscape as what Park has termed a ‘life-supporting resource system’ (2001, 249).

These markers of advances in understanding are, however, hindered by several problems which arise from the insistent exclusion of history from the garden’s narrative. Emphasis on ‘two waves’ of entry seems to fudge some of the enduring contradictions between indigenous presence and ‘heroic’ European arrival, offering a version of the kind of history that is conventionally deployed to diminish or un-ground Maori claims to the land. There is also a distinct taint to the term ‘discoverer’: Pat Hohepa has explained that ‘right from the outset the European voyagers arrived with an inbuilt faith that they were discoverers of Australia and Tasmania and Aotearoa New Zealand’ (1999, 184), while Linda Tuhiwai Smith has asserted that ‘[w]e did not ask, need or want to be ‘discovered’ by Europe’ (1999, 24). That ‘discovery’ is a peculiarly European notion is suggested by the fact that its emphasis in the garden’s text falls on the European side: while Maori remain nameless and undifferentiated, dedicated text panels for each of the European figures explain their educational background and training, career highlights, connections (professional and, in some cases, familial), specimen collections, institutional affiliations and significant publications. Each of these text panels is headed with the phrase ‘The Discoverers’—a term that is not specified on any of the ‘Traditional Plant Use’ panels. While the garden does acknowledge prior Maori understandings of the natural world—what it terms ‘useful knowledge in the utilisation of plants’—in its larger narrative these are overshadowed by what are termed the ‘valuable contributions’ made by European naturalists in identifying, naming and classifying individual species and subspecies.⁷⁹ The systematic approach to plant-hunting that was taken by these men is said to have inaugurated ‘scientific’ endeavours in Aotearoa New Zealand: a pamphlet published for visitors to the Discoverers’ Garden expands on this, explaining that

‘[a]lthough the Maori people had named many of the plants found here, from the scientific point of view botanical exploration began when Captain James Cook first dropped the anchor of H.M. barque *Endeavour* in New Zealand waters’.⁸⁰ The garden’s evocation of naturalists’ ‘adventurous forays’ into ‘unexplored territory’ also jars with the fact that, as the ‘Traditional Plant Uses’ panels strongly suggest, Aotearoa New Zealand was by no means unexplored by its indigenous population. The Discoverers’ Garden, then, reproduces a version of Forster’s ‘no science’ thesis, refusing to recognise forms of knowledge which do not resemble Enlightenment taxonomies.

The arrival of European science in Aotearoa New Zealand is not a history that is generally celebrated by Maori. As several commentators have noted, the ‘culture of collecting’ (Cherryl Smith 2007, 71) which underpinned Enlightenment botanical practices is antithetical to indigenous ways of perceiving nature and constitutes a key component of ‘the powerful remembered history of scientific research and colonialism’, which, over time, denied, among other things, ‘the survival of forms of cultural knowledge, natural resources and systems for living within our environments’ (Smith 1999, 1). These divergences—and this history—are not acknowledged in the Discoverers’ Garden display. The two types of plant labels that are offered in the garden ought to register some of the profound differences between Maori and western understandings of nature. In practice, however, the ‘Traditional Plant Use’ and ‘botanical’ labels appear to have been written in the same detached style which highlights technical information. Certain descriptive characteristics are more prevalent in one or other of the two labelling types: the ‘botanical’ labels supply a graphic representation for each plant, along with measurements, flowering season, rate of development, comparisons between species, observable characteristics of leaves, bark, fruit and so on, while the ‘Traditional Plant Use’ labels concentrate on the practical applications of plant products. In many instances, however, the information that the two systems provide actually overlaps, enabling these labels to sit together seamlessly. Such an approach has important implications. While reference is made to tapu and to rituals and ceremonies relating to nature within the ‘Traditional Plant Use’ panels, these references are dispersed throughout the text: as a result, the forcefulness that they are permitted to carry within the garden’s narrative is distinctly limited. The visitor pamphlet does state that the name and knowledge of each plant species were ‘passed down through the generations’, but Maori epistemological systems are not permitted to constitute an organising principle for the display itself.⁸¹ Maori ecological perspectives—with attendant understandings of rights held and responsibilities owed in relation to the environment—are

nowhere discussed. By refusing to challenge Eurocentric assumptions, the Discoverers' Garden seeks to ensure that settler culture can share in the spiritual values that are on display: the garden's 'spirituality' is carefully circumscribed.

As part of this flattening of difference, many of the 'botanical' labels supply contextual details: they discuss the relationships of plant species to the wider environment through habitat type, note whether these plants are a source of food for particular bird species, describe how these plants have been used by Maori, and so on. By overlaying within these labels (and within the garden's wider narrative) information to which European naturalists often did not have access at the time they visited Aotearoa New Zealand, the garden enlarges the scope of the knowledge that appears to have been gained by these men, over-reading the certainty and comprehension with which they made their 'discoveries'. This expanding of the labels towards ethnobotany is undertaken without reference to the fact that many of the naturalists themselves were trying to imagine how certain plants might be used: strikingly, the garden has nothing to say about the ethnographic observations and inferences made by early European visitors or about the significance of these to transformations that were subsequently initiated. The question of whether or not Maori had 'bread', for example, had been of particular concern to early European visitors: Banks had speculated that fern-root functioned as the equivalent of bread in the Maori diet; Marsden could not identify any products that came close to his understanding of those made from wheat starch or maize. Dispelling these uncertainties and drawing a deliberate parallel between Maori and western cultures, the Discoverers' Garden text panels refer to a kind of 'bread' baked from ground karaka kernels, and to another type of 'small cake' prepared from raupo pollen. Nectar 'gathered from the open flowers of flax' is also said to have provided 'a seasonal touch of sweetness', suggesting a form of 'honey' that Marsden had been unable to see.⁸² By making this information available and by failing to mention the difficulties these kinds of questions had presented for early European visitors, the garden suggestively implies that Maori uses for plants were transparently available to, and valued by, European naturalists.

References to manuka and kanuka as 'tea tree' present another opportunity for the exploration of related issues. This name derives from Forster's experience in Dusky Bay: repeating an experiment that had been tried on Cook's first voyage, Forster produced an infusion from manuka (or myrtle, as he called it), which he speculated 'probably contributed greatly to restore [the crew's] strength, and

to remove all scorbutic symptoms' (2000, 82). While Forster is said to have made 'important finds' and to have been responsible for significant publications on New Zealand plants, his name is not mentioned on the panels in the garden which are dedicated to manuka and kanuka.⁸³ The 'Traditional Plant Use' panels simply state that Maori uses for these plants include the construction of buildings and fashioning of weapons. The space that opens up here shows European 'discoverers' struggling to produce authoritative forms of knowledge. The garden's text makes no attempt to explore how European use of these plants to treat scurvy may have differed from or related to conventional Maori uses; to consider the kinds of ethnographic knowledge that European visitors may have related—or failed to relate—to plant hunting and plant identification on a wider basis; or to explore the kinds of ideas that constituted western scientific knowledge in the late-eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Questions are raised, too, by the statement made in one of the text panels that Maori guides sometimes accompanied European naturalists in the course of their botanical activities. The Discoverers' Garden text makes no mention of the kinds of information that may have been offered—or withheld—by these guides, or of what they may have learned in the course of such excursions about western attitudes to the local environment.

While it over-reads the clairvoyance with which European botanical 'discoveries' were made, in many ways the garden's approach under-reads the implications of these 'discoveries', too. Its narrative makes no mention of the global 're-presentation' and 're-distribution' (Smith 1999, 62) of indigenous plants that these men initiated—the fact, for instance, that specimens were collected for deposit in institutions like the Royal Botanic Gardens at Kew. Nor does it mention that in many cases these men were looking for opportunities to rationalise and enhance colonial natural resources by identifying and classifying plant species with potential value for an industrialising Britain, or for use in international mercantile schemes or as medicines (Mackay 1999, 103-4). Nor does it discuss the fact that many of the earliest visiting European naturalists—among them, Banks and Forster—characterised indigenous environments negatively and according to what they did not already possess, undertaking to seed new world countries with 'superior' biota from home and imagining or enacting processes of change. The overlaying of the modern science of ecology in the garden's arrangement also obscures the fact that in practice, European naturalists placed primary emphasis on identifying and classifying individual species and genera. When they did observe differentiated habitats, it was usually with the view that these were temporary obstructions in a land otherwise

suites to settlement: forests to be felled, as in Dusky Bay, or ‘Swamps, which might doubtless Easily be drained’ (Banks 1983, 3).

As part of this failure to link the naturalists’ activities with the origins of processes of environmental and social transformation, the Discoverers’ Garden narrative also evades connecting these activities with the history of more permanent settlement. While it does include among its ‘discoverers’ William Colenso—the CMS missionary printer based at the Paihia mission station who was also an amateur naturalist and ethnographer—no effort is made to consider ways in which his experience of living in Aotearoa New Zealand, in pursuit of a consciously interventionist purpose, might have informed his plant-gathering activities. Nor is it made clear that traditional Maori plant uses (and associated knowledge and belief systems) represented a way of life that CMS missionaries specifically intended to eradicate. There is a direct and conspicuous relationship between the Maori plant uses and products described in the garden’s panels, and the products that were traded by the CMS missionaries and are still being sold in the Stone Store (musket balls and gunflints, iron tools and garden implements, flower and vegetable seed for non-native species, and so on). Rather than naturalising and neutralising missionary activity, the Kerikeri displays might usefully address these connections. Questions are raised, too, by the statement made in the main text panel in the entrance to the Discoverers’ Garden that several of the indigenous plants utilised by Maori ‘were also beneficial to early European settlers’. While details in the other sites in the Kerikeri basin and in historical accounts do suggest themselves—the native timbers used to construct the mission house and the woven harakeke mats that serve as rugs on its bare floorboards; the ‘miserable bulrush huts’ described by Marsden and the ground fern-root that he ate in the absence of bread—this statement is never expanded upon, and it sits awkwardly with the acknowledgements made in a number of the ‘botanical’ labels that certain plant species are now rare. As the present discussion has tried to show, too, there is a complex web of connections that needs to be examined in order to produce a fuller picture of what was intended—and what actually took place—in the transforming of ‘new world’ environments. Forster’s *Voyage* and Darwin’s and Marsden’s journals, for instance, vividly demonstrate that both naturalists and missionaries saw nature as an expression of a wider set of meanings and values: their understandings of the environment were not only literal, but were symbolically and figuratively charged.

The Discoverers' Garden also under-reads ways in which Maori modified the land: while the display makes visible signs of culture in nature, it only registers certain kinds of signs. To some extent, then, the garden replicates Forster's blindness, positing an environment that is 'unassisted by art', that lacks 'alterations and improvements', that is still in its 'rude unimproved state'. The main text panel at the garden's entrance does mention that Maori brought from Polynesia 'some of their most treasured possessions—seeds and plants on which their very survival depended', and it does state that '[o]ver time the earliest inhabitants progressed from food gathering to subsistence cultivation, even rotational cropping'. The garden's emphasis, however, falls on entirely on processes of gathering. Ways in which land was actually modified through large scale cultivations by the time the first Europeans arrived are not explicitly dealt with, and these imported food sources are not included in the garden's botanical displays. While kumara is obliquely mentioned in relation to tapu rituals associated with certain greenery and to wider cycles of nature (the flowering of a certain plant species, for example, might signal the time to plant kumara), there is no attempt to recreate the plantations which were so central to Maori settlement in the Kerikeri district, and which were clearly visible to Banks. A very small patch of taro planted in Rewa's Village, with a label that simply states '[l]eaves and tubers eaten', is the only live cultivar displayed in the basin's 'core heritage zone' that has been brought from elsewhere in the Pacific. Crop management practices are alluded to in one text panel which refers to a type of insecticide—'[t]he foul smell given off from burning leaves' of a particular plant is said to have 'deterred insects from food crops'—but no reference is made to wider environmental modifications like the enrichment of the soil before planting, or to the burning of hinterland forest in the area, which Marsden's account shows the missionaries failing to understand. Potatoes are not mentioned in the Discoverers' Garden either, despite the fact that Banks was part of the voyage that first undertook to introduce these, and that they were well established in the landscape by the time CMS missionaries and subsequent naturalists visited the area.

The Discoverers' Garden, then, only selectively illustrates Maori presence in the area at the time of the establishment of the Kerikeri mission. Relying on shallow cross-cultural correspondences, it pushes Maori culture so far back in time that it disconnects this culture from anything that might explain the dynamic ways in which it responded to the arrival of European agriculture. As a result, the status of Maori culture in historical time remains uneasy in the narrative. The garden is described in a visitor pamphlet as being 'designed to show indigenous plants and how they were used in pre-

European times by Maori—and indeed still are’, but the way this final clause is left hanging makes it seem like an after-thought.⁸⁴ While the entrance panel to the garden states that ‘[t]he production of *terongoa* traditional herbal medicines is still popular’, almost all of the ‘Traditional Plant Use’ panels within the displays employ the past tense. Within the entire garden, there is only one instance where a single plant species is decisively said to be still used; in one glaring example, the weaving of flax is presented in ways that imply this practice no longer occurs. Emphasis in the garden largely falls on peacetime pursuits, too. Only three of the fifty plants mentioned in the ‘Traditional Plant Use’ panels are described as being used for weaponry, and while references to healing and to the bandaging of wounds suggestively evoke a sense of what occurred in Maori society in the first few decades after European arrival, this is not developed within the text. The garden achieves the ‘pacification’ of Maori, but the effect of this approach is to freeze Maori culture in a distant, dislocated past.

There are, as the foregoing discussion has suggested, ways in which the existing narrative could be modified in order to address aspects of this history: the seeds and spores of another story are already present within these displays. By way of conclusion, I’m more interested in two other possible outcomes which suggest that history might not permit an escape into nature. First, the Kerikeri basin cannot evade history since the very ground it sits on is destabilised by it. Rewa’s Village and the Discoverers’ Garden both occupy lands that contain wahi tapu which were used, among other things, for the ritual cleansing and display of the bones of chiefs who died in the tribal wars of the 1820s. At present, two rahui posts in Rewa’s Village signal areas of land that are tapu, stating that the area behind them is ‘restricted’. The areas directly behind these posts are blocked with fallen trees and with short, palisaded fences woven with brushwood, but a sign still invites visitors to follow a path down one of the banks guarded by these posts to the water’s edge in pursuit of what it terms a ‘photo opportunity’. It has been recognised in the Kerikeri *Sustainable Development Plan* that both Rewa’s Village and the Discoverers’ Garden need to be shifted. The plan comments that these are ‘inappropriate developments or activities’ on such an area and notes that the NZHPT has attempted to register the sites for protection: this issue is said to be ‘the subject of ongoing discussion’ (Department of Conservation 2007, 17 and 14). As well as suggesting Maori spiritual connections to the land that run deeper than settler culture likes to imagine, this issue shows the limits of the reach

of the missionaries' transformative efforts. Missionaries did not untie the strongest bonds of the Maori community, as Keith Sinclair has suggested (cited in Park 1995, 138). Institutions like tapu are still vital to Maori senses of identity and place; they remain, as Marsden himself came to understand, 'deep-rooted'. Nowhere in the current displays at Kerikeri is it made clear that the positioning of Rewa's Village and the Discoverers' Garden is problematic. Strikingly, though, one of the new pamphlets produced by the NZHPT in 2009 for visitors to the basin features Earle's 1828 image of Kerikeri.⁸⁵ This image fills the length of the page, and because of the way the pamphlet folds, the wahi tapu depicted in Earle's image squarely fills the front cover. This site is the only key feature of the panorama which is not identified in the pamphlet, serving as a reminder that, in some senses, settlement is still incomplete and partial—transformation has not been wholesale—and that settler culture continues to be ungrounded by what it cannot see and does not understand.

And second, the possibility for forceful subversion of the Discoverers' Garden display is also presented by WAI 262, the claim concerning indigenous flora and fauna, which is currently before the Waitangi Tribunal. Described by an international expert on indigenous peoples' rights as one of the most important claims of its kind anywhere in the world, WAI 262 was filed in 1991 and has pan-tribal support.⁸⁶ It contains a demand for redress for the cumulative economic impact of changes wrought through processes of European settlement. As one of the reports prepared for the Waitangi Tribunal states, the ecological transformation that has been integral to European agricultural settlement of Aotearoa New Zealand has eroded Maori relationships with indigenous flora and fauna: environments have been destroyed and degraded to the point where they cannot sustain human life (Park 2001, 167), and legislative restrictions have prevented customary activities like the hunting and snaring of birds, and the harvesting of plants for purposes such as raranga (weaving), whakairo (carving) and rongoa (traditional medicinal practice). The claim also arises from concerns that indigenous plant and animal genetic resources face the threat of expropriation, and that intellectual property relating to Maori knowledge of the natural world is at risk of exploitation for its potential value in the manufacture of pharmaceuticals—in other words, that a new wave of 'discovery' is at hand (Smith 1999, 24). As a sign of the rupture between matauranga Maori and western knowledge systems, the WAI 262 claim also includes as a grievance Crown research into indigenous flora and fauna undertaken in the name of science.

It is nowhere apparent in the current display in the Discoverers' Garden that nature is currently being contested in this way—that it is a site of struggle for both contemporary and historical grievances—despite the fact that much of the ethnobotanical information made available in some of the text panels is of precisely the kind at stake. While the Kerikeri *Sustainable Development Plan* purports to recognise 'oral traditions, spiritual values, social practices, rituals, knowledge and practices and commemorative or symbolic associations' concerning, among other things, 'nature' (Department of Conservation 2007, 17), and to allow for 'the ongoing exercise of kaitiakitanga' over the sites contained within the basin (ibid., ii), this does not presently encompass the terms envisioned in WAI 262. This claim suggests a possible future which powerfully illustrates the fragility of the European claim to the soil, and which represents the terms of a re-enactment that can be seen, in significant ways, as uncannily faithful to Forster's vision. If the 'return to an original chaotic state' that Forster envisioned can be thought of as an upsurge of indigenous strength which undoes European endeavours to remake the land, the Discoverers' Garden at Kerikeri may yet experience its return.

‘New Zealand’s most historic spot’: privileged settings and hard facts at Waitangi National Trust

In his 1985 study *Hard Facts: Setting and Form in the American Novel*, Philip Fisher proposes that every settler nation has, in addition to its actual historical sites, a small list of privileged settings:

These are not at all the places where key events have taken place. Instead, they are ideal and simplified vanishing points towards which lines of sight and projects of every kind converge. From these vanishing points, the many approximate or bungled, actual states of affairs draw order and position. Whatever actually appears within a society can be interpreted as some variant, some anticipation or displacement or ruin, of one of these privileged settings.⁸⁷

Applying Fisher’s ideas to the New Zealand context, Alex Calder has invoked Waitangi—the Bay of Islands site where the treaty of settlement (known to history as the Treaty of Waitangi) between Maori and the British Crown was first signed on 6 February 1840—as an example not of a privileged setting, but of ‘one of those key places where history got made’ (2000, 64).

Waitangi can, in fact, be seen not merely as a place ‘where history got made’, but as a place where history was *intended* to be made. The journal entry for 5 February 1840 penned by Felton Mathew, acting Surveyor-General for the country, makes it plain that history was expected to change course at Waitangi: ‘This is the important day’, Mathew wrote, ‘big with the fate of “Hobson and New Zealand”. On the success of our negotiations with the Chiefs today must depend our future operations. I trust it will be auspicious’ (1940, 32). In anticipation of British annexation of Aotearoa New Zealand, Mathew had been appointed to his provisional post in New South Wales in January 1840 by Captain William Hobson of the Royal Navy, who had in turn been sent as consul by the British Colonial Office, under instruction to obtain sovereignty over ‘the whole or any parts’ of the country (cited in Buick 1914, 62). By the time the official party arrived in the Bay of Islands on H.M.S. *Herald* at the end of that month, Hobson had been sworn in as Lieutenant-Governor; a series of proclamations had begun to be issued in order to extend the jurisdiction of New South Wales to include ‘certain territories’ which might be acquired by the British Crown and temporarily to halt land transactions in Aotearoa New Zealand; and a timetable for the acquisition of sovereignty had been set in place.

As Mathew's journal documents, over the next few days Hobson collaborated with James Busby, the British Resident who had been domiciled at Waitangi since 1833, drafting English versions of a treaty which was translated into Maori with the assistance of local CMS missionaries. Several hundred northern chiefs then attended a public meeting held on 5 February at Busby's Waitangi estate to be informed of the treaty's content and to debate its merits, and the signing ceremony took place there the following day. When Mathew exclaims in his journal entry for 7 February that 'by mere accident, as it were, we accomplished our most important business yesterday' (1940, 42), he refers to the fact that the signing ceremony was brought forward by a day. The timetable may have changed without warning, but there was nothing accidental about British entry into the treaty, which was undertaken with acute awareness of what Paul Carter has termed 'the intensely theatrical nature of the imperial pageant' (1999, 58): Mathew's attention to the number of guns appropriate for the *Herald's* salute at each stage in the process, for example, conveys this keen sense of performance. Even as it shows his impatience to get on with matters so that his post in the new colony can be formalised, Mathew's journal registers—both prospectively and retrospectively—a clear understanding of the importance of these proceedings, and a sense of their perceived 'progressiveness' filters through it too. In describing 'the grand conference with the Chiefs', Mathew takes very seriously the business of entering into formal treaty-making with an indigenous people, and in reporting Hobson's speech from 5 February he emphasises the 'proviso' that the consent of 'the native chiefs and tribes' must be secured before Britain can 'assume the government of these isles' (1940, 31 and 34). Mathew, then, shows he was never in any doubt that history was being made in a number of ways at Waitangi in early 1840.⁸⁸

If these events were always intended to be seen as the 'outstanding historical statement of settlement' (Turner 1999, 20), it may not seem surprising that Waitangi is now widely held to be the foundation of the modern nation. The estate was described as 'New Zealand's pre-eminent historic site' in a recent government report which recommended it, along with Kerikeri Basin, as a cultural site of high priority for immediate UNESCO world heritage nomination (Department of Conservation 2006, 18). In a nationwide public vote held by multi-national board-game manufacturer Hasbro in 2007 in preparation for the production of a New Zealand version of 'Monopoly', Waitangi was deemed to be the county's top historic icon, and the estate's own contemporary marketing materials proclaim it to be 'Our birthplace/Te pitowhenua', '[t]he very heart of New Zealand's history', the place 'where

New Zealand's modern history began' (Waitangi National Trust 2007, 4). Pronouncements of this kind, however, have a distinct historical origin of their own: the treaty and its place of signing have not consistently been well-known or valued by the settler population. When William Colenso, the Paihia-based CMS printer and amateur scientist who had, like Mathew, been present at Waitangi in February 1840, produced his *Authentic and Genuine History of the Signing of the Treaty of Waitangi* in 1890, he noted that 'no special account of what then took place had ever been published' (1890, 6). Conceiving of his 'historical reminiscence' as a marker for what he considered a significant milestone, 'the jubilee of [the colony's] foundation, dating the same from the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi', Colenso advanced the modest hope that his account might be seen as 'interesting, but also of a colonial, if not of a national, importance, especially in days to come' (ibid., 5-9).

Two full decades after the publication of Colenso's *History*, it was discovered that several of the original treaty papers—placed in storage in 1841 after narrowly escaping destruction in a fire, but subsequently neglected—had sustained water damage and been nibbled by rats. As these documents were being restored, Lindsay Buick set about producing the treaty's first professional history, *The Treaty of Waitangi, or How New Zealand Became a British Colony* (1914). When Buick made the plea in the preface to his text that the treaty was 'in very truth the foundation of our nationhood', he had already been constrained to acknowledge that it had 'been frequently derided and denounced' (1914, vii). Elsewhere in his text he commented that the treaty had been 'generally misunderstood' and 'persistently misinterpreted':

More than once in high places its utility has been denied, its simple contracts have been repudiated, and its existence has been ignored. Lawyers have repeatedly questioned its legality, courts have discussed its constitutional force, [and] parliaments have debated its wisdom.⁸⁹

Explaining that 'to-day the Maori is more insistent upon a due observance of its covenants than is the European', Buick also took care to document aspects of the history of Maori protest related to the treaty which had unfolded since 1840—including the King, Kotahitanga and Te Whiti movements, the frontier wars which were followed by confiscations of Maori land, the attempts by Maori to establish their own parliament in order 'to secure the full measure of political justice to which they believe themselves entitled', and the petitions made to Queen Victoria 'against what they regard as breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi' (1914, 294-7). In so doing, however, Buick carefully explained that he had 'not attempted to arraign or to defend the various, real or alleged, breaches of the treaty

committed by our Governors or Governments’, since ‘[t]hat phase of the subject is necessarily so controversial in character, that to do it justice would require a volume of its own’ (ibid., ix). Referring to the treaty as ‘the beginning of things’, as ‘the birth of law and order’, and as a ‘triumph in diplomacy’ in that it was the first arrangement of this kind ‘entered into between Britain and a savage race’ (ibid., viii-ix), Buick, like Colenso before him, sought to rescue it from official disavowal and public obscurity, ‘making history’ by treating it as a worthy subject for history.

The fate of Waitangi itself has been directly linked to the fate of the treaty. For several decades after 1840, the estate was largely absent from the fledgling nation’s consciousness. Having begun to deteriorate during the Busby family’s ownership, the property changed hands in the early 1880s and by the early twentieth century, according to the builder who carried out the 1933 restoration work,

The old house was in rather a bad condition, floors sunk, plates rotten, roof leaking, doors and windows awry [. . .] We found that the kitchen chimney was offset and half carried on the ceiling joists. It was almost a miracle that the place had not burnt down as the brickwork was loose and rotten [. . .] [The building] had been used not only as a residence, but also as a wool-shed, shearing shed and barn. There was outstanding evidence of this. Also, for years there had been heavy seepage of rain water from the higher ground at the back, under the house, which combined with the very leaky roof, brought about a most unhappy state of affairs.⁹⁰

In the context of the same dawning interest in New Zealand’s past which was inspiring historians like Buick, the then-Member of Parliament for the Bay of Islands, Vernon Reed, became ‘much impressed with the historical significance of the place’ (1957, 11-12); from 1908 onwards he repeatedly attempted to persuade the New Zealand government to purchase the estate. Reed’s efforts were unsuccessful but in early 1932 he was responsible for taking Lord and Lady Bledisloe, the then-Governor General and his wife, on a tour around the estate, persuading them of the urgent need to rescue Waitangi from further decline and from the perceived immediate threats of subdivision and foreign ownership.⁹¹ The Bledisloes were enthusiastic supporters of the preservation movement which was already well-established in England and were ‘so impressed with the historical importance of Waitangi, and its beautiful setting’ (ibid., 14) that they swiftly determined to acquire the estate and to gift it to the people of New Zealand, referring to it in official correspondence as ‘New Zealand’s most historic spot’, as ‘the cradle of New Zealand’, and as the site of ‘the founding of the Colony’ (cited in ibid., 15-18). Their gift was received by Prime Minister George Forbes with an assurance

that the site's historical significance would 'ensure its being conserved for all time with a real sense of national pride' (cited in *ibid.*, 20).

The property was renamed the 'Waitangi National Reserve' (later changed to 'Waitangi National Trust'), with the former British residency designated the 'Treaty House' and the area around it known as the 'Waitangi Treaty Grounds', and a governance board was established by a deed of trust in November 1932. Restoration and development work proceeded the following year and the estate was dedicated to the people of New Zealand at celebrations held on 5 and 6 February 1934. As Claudia Orange has proposed, more than any other single factor, the Bledisloes' gifting of the property as a national memorial contributed to a renewal of Pakeha interest in Waitangi and the events of 1840; indeed, as part of the centennial celebrations held at Waitangi in 1940, the original treaty documents were temporarily exhibited inside the former residency, marking the first time they had been on public display (2004, 234-6). As this staging of significant centennial celebrations there suggests, in addition to serving as a regular visitor attraction and exhibition complex, Waitangi soon became the paramount venue for nation-building pageantry. The estate began to be included on the itinerary for royal visits to New Zealand and from 1960, when the Waitangi Day Act was passed, annual celebrations—attended by the Governor-General, members of the government and the armed forces, and encompassing re-enactments of the historic events, performances of waiata and haka, regattas featuring waka taua, and so on—began to be staged there to commemorate the treaty's signing. Except for a period during the Second World War when it was in use by the army and access was restricted, the estate has been continuously open to the public since 1934. 'Progressive rehabilitation' (Department of Conservation 2006, 21) of the grounds and development of visitor facilities has continued, with further major restoration work on the former residency carried out immediately prior to the sesquicentennial celebrations in 1990 and a number of new displays mounted in conjunction with—or in some cases, soon after—this event.

Although it helped to inaugurate the treaty's elevated presence in the life of the nation, the Waitangi gift occurred at a time when many of the treaty's meanings were little understood or anticipated by the settler majority. While, since the 1930s, the treaty has, as Orange has noted, increasingly become a 'touchstone' (2004, 226) for notions of national pride, it has also increasingly become a 'touchstone' (*ibid.*, 185) for protest. Anger and resentment swelling in part from the use of the treaty

as a symbol of unity and good race relations have forced widespread recognition of incompatibilities between its versions: the Maori language text—which the majority of chiefs signed, but which was not until recently regarded by settler culture as authoritative—is now understood not to be a literal translation of any one of the English versions which promised Maori less and assured Europeans more. As Ranginui Walker has explained, ‘what [the chiefs] thought they gave and what the coloniser claimed, were separated by an abyss that was to have cataclysmic consequences for the Maori people’ (2004, 96). Countless hours of debate—in the courts, before various commissions, tribunals and official enquiries, in the media, in Parliament, in bars and on talkback radio’ (Smith 1999, 33), among other locations—and a proliferating volume of specialist and lay analysis, have attempted variously to defend particular positions, to bridge differences, or to interpret the treaty’s status and spirit. Disagreement remains, though, over whether the treaty preserves Maori sovereignty or demands that this be ceded; whether the phrase uttered by Hobson as he shook hands with each chief after the signing—‘he iwi tahi tatou’, ‘we are now one people’—should be seen as the foundation of a bicultural partnership, or as assimilationist rhetoric heralding the subjugation of Maori.⁹²

The fact that history was made at Waitangi in February 1840, then, is now widely acknowledged but assessment of the nature of that history remains controversial: at different times and for different constituencies, the treaty and its place of signing have signified vastly different things. The Maori political resurgence which has forced recognition of these issues has gained momentum during the museum-life of the Waitangi estate. Because of its high profile and its national and historical significance, Waitangi has become a focus for activities intended to attract both official and wider public attention to Maori grievances—for what Chadwick Allen terms a direct “politics of embarrassment” conducted through public confrontation or shaming (2002, 28)—, and it remains a ground of contestation, a flashpoint for protest. When Calder proposes that Waitangi ‘isn’t and can’t be’ one of those privileged settings described by Fisher—‘can’t be because our attitudes to that place are much too complex, too nuanced, too divergent’ (2000, 64)—he invokes these aspects of its history: Waitangi clearly belongs to the ‘approximate or bungled, actual states of affairs’ to which Fisher refers. This chapter uses the ideas about privileged settings put forward by Fisher and Calder as a point of entry to a discussion of Waitangi and its current displays. While it does not set out to argue that Waitangi *is* one of Aotearoa New Zealand’s privileged settings, it does look at what might

be at stake if the modes of display which are mobilised at the estate deliberately evoke certain privileged settings, and it considers Fisher's allied proposition that privileged settings are necessarily bound to the 'hard facts' of settlement.

In pursuing these ideas, the chapter is also interested in the relevance of wider aspects of Fisher's argument to the displays and histories associated with Waitangi. The fact that Waitangi has been reclaimed by settler culture as the birthplace of the nation, transformed from a disregarded ruin into an inalienable national treasure, accords with the assertion made by Fisher that culture acts on the past, giving shape to and sorting out the past as it can be of use to a particular present. His study is also concerned with reclaiming the work which is instantiated in or performed by certain cultural forms:

Culture [. . .] does work that, once done, becomes obvious or unrecoverable because it has become part of the habit structure of everyday perception. Within the present, culture stabilizes and incorporates nearly ungraspable or widely various states of moral or representational or perceptual experience. It changes again and again what the consensus of the human world looks like—what it includes or excludes—and it often does so in tandem with changes in social fact or legal categories that make, from the standpoint of a later perspective, the facts seem obvious [. . .] Where culture installs new habits of perception, [. . .] it accomplishes, as a last step, the forgetting of its own strenuous work so that what are newly learned habits are only remembered as facts. Once what had only recently been a risky and disputable claim has come to seem obvious, the highest work of culture has been done, but because the last step involves forgetting both the process and its very openness to alternatives or to failure, the history of culture has trouble in later remembering what it is socially and psychologically decisive for it to forget.⁹³

Cultural shifts of this nature are described by Calder, too: 'The beliefs and practices that people share, and the boundaries they maintain and cross, are not only what makes a community hold together over time but also part of what helps it to change over time. In other words, culture works in ways that allow some things to happen and in ways that prevent other things from happening' (2000, 62). Drawing on these ideas, the chapter seeks to regain a sense of Waitangi as a locus where 'hard facts' cannot be banished, where history has persistently been made, and where turning points—which have power to effect shifts in the culture—continue to unfold.

* * *

Ways in which Waitangi has been memorialised since it was set aside for the nation in 1932 are in evidence all over the estate. Some of these—like the names of the estate’s features (Mt Bledisloe, Hobson Hill); the imposing flagstaff erected on the lawn in front of the former residency by the New Zealand Navy to mark the location where the treaty was signed; the direction table ‘showing distances of the chief cities of the World and the chief historic spots in New Zealand’ (Reed 1957, 85-6); and the engraved granite slab laid as the foundation stone for the whare runanga or carved meeting house—date from Waitangi’s official dedication in 1934 or from earlier. Others—like the whare runanga itself; *Ngatokimatawhaorua*, the large ceremonial war canoe which is housed in a shelter on the waterfront; the stone memorial dedicated to William Hobson by the New Zealand government; the plaque honouring the services to the country of James Busby, again dedicated by the government; and the stone seat which serves as a memorial to Admiral Sir Joseph Nias, commander of H.M.S. *Herald*—were raised in 1940 for the centenary of the treaty. A number of pohutukawa trees in the grounds bear plaques which record the date of their planting (the majority on anniversaries of the treaty signing on 6 February, but some to mark events like the silver jubilee of the reign of George V, and the visit of Elizabeth II in 1953) and name of planter (Governors-General, Prime Ministers, royalty and other visiting dignitaries). More recent plaques testify to the continued development and upgrading of facilities: ‘Te Ana o Maikuku Canoe House, Officially Opened by His Excellency The Governor-General of New Zealand, Sir Denis Blundell, 5 February 1976’, ‘Waitangi Visitor Centre, Opened by His Royal Highness The Prince of Wales, 29 April 1983’, and another, dating from 4 February 1991, to mark the official opening of the restored portion of the Waitangi Treaty House ‘by Her Excellency the Governor General Dame Catherine Tizard’. If memorials can be said to give self-conscious and concrete form to a nation’s ideals, traditions and values (Phillips 2004, 273), visitors to Waitangi are left in no doubt as to the ‘official’ and nationally-significant character of the aspirations associated with the estate.

Given that Waitangi is understood to mark the cornerstone of New Zealand nationhood, however, the inclusions and omissions in the historical narrative that is currently displayed on-site are revealing. A report prepared by the architects engaged to carry out the 1989 refurbishment of the former residency had recommended ‘that the restoration and interpretation of the Treaty House be directed at illustrating the “Busby” period of occupation, with special emphasis given to the period 1833-1840’ (cited in Johnson 1990, 1). In accordance with this recommendation, the on-site narrative does

discuss the early history of missionaries and traders in Aotearoa New Zealand, filling in both the New Zealand background to Busby's appointment as Resident and Busby's own background in Scotland and New South Wales. It also catalogues what it terms variously the 'key moments of an emerging nation' and the 'political milestones' achieved under Busby's leadership—the formation of the Confederation of United Tribes, the selection of a national flag, and the build-up to the treaty itself—noting the role of the French Baron de Thierry in precipitating British annexation of Aotearoa New Zealand, and identifying key personnel involved in the treaty drafting on the British side and signing on the Maori side.

When it comes to dealing with the treaty itself and to making assessments about the larger significance of the 1840 'turning point' associated with the estate, however, the on-site narrative becomes rather reticent. Inside the parlour of the former British residency, a text panel states:

It was in this room on the morning of 5th February 1840, that Lieutenant Governor William Hobson, Admiral Joseph Nias, James Busby and the Reverend Henry Williams met to make final adjustments to the Treaty of Waitangi. Having concluded arrangements, Hobson received the dignitaries and settlers. People entered by the hall door and left by the French doors to the verandah. The official party then proceeded to a marquee on the lawn where the first treaty meeting was held. The Treaty was signed there on 6 February.

The aura of place ('it happened in this room'), the mechanics of human locomotion ('they arrived through this door and left through that one'), and the matter-of-fact logic of narrative ('this happened, and then that and that') supply a truth-effect which smoothes over massive underlying historical issues and disputes. The legitimacy of Hobson's office as Lieutenant-Governor over a country to which Britain had, as yet, no formal claim, is accepted without question and the nature and significance of those 'final adjustments' to the treaty documents are not discussed, while the perfect tense ('having concluded arrangements') conflicts with the resolutely unresolved nature of treaty debates. Elsewhere in the former residency, in the skillion or rear verandah whose displays are dedicated to the history and structural elements of the house, the narrative proposes:

During the six years of James Busby's appointment as British Resident, to 1840, the Residency was the symbol of British presence. It developed an identity as a place of mediation, associated with the recognition and encouragement of Maori independence, the protection of European life and property, and consultation between the parties. In early 1840, the Residency performed unique functions in the generation of the Treaty of Waitangi.

The sense of passivity which is produced in this paragraph derives from its sequence of soft and implied verbs (the residency ‘was the symbol’, ‘developed an identity’ and ‘performed unique functions’, while the treaty ‘[was] generated’), and from its recurring use of the gerundive forms of another set of soft verbs: mediation, recognition, encouragement, protection, consultation. No attempt is made to deal with the political, social or economic ramifications of the treaty and the text adopts a distinctly settler perspective in its eliding of alternative histories: it does not consider that the residency may, for example, have been seen by some as a symbol of British intrusion rather than benevolent British presence.

The character of the approach taken to history at Waitangi is conveyed in other details, too. One of the more suggestive of these is the fact that Waitangi National Trust currently markets itself, on its website and in pamphlets and other publications available on-site, as being ‘The Perfect Place for the Perfect Match’:

Waitangi Treaty Grounds is where, in 1840, two peoples forged a relationship that has grown into nationhood. Now this historic place of partnership can be an auspicious, inspiring venue for your special day. Our choice of settings is almost unlimited: magnificent lawns with sweeping vistas of the Bay of Islands, cherished historic buildings, native bush, or Gardens of National Significance. Anniversaries, recommitments, civil unions and renewal of vows ceremonies are all made more memorable when Waitangi sets the scene.⁹⁴

Another involves the display of a copy of Colenso’s *History*, which is encased in glass below a text panel devoted to the treaty’s signing in the ‘James Busby of Waitangi’ gallery within the former residency. Colenso’s account could have been used to show ways in which events at Waitangi in February 1840 belong to the ‘approximate or bungled, actual states of affairs’ invoked by Fisher. It could, for example, have been used to document the content of the chiefs’ arguments for and against the treaty; or to show that concerns were raised during the treaty discussions about inaccuracies in the translation of speeches; or to demonstrate that Busby and other settlers were forced to defend their land dealings during these discussions, having been directly challenged by local chiefs with demands for their landholdings to be returned. It could have been used to show that the treaty signing proceeded ‘by accident’ on 6 February and without the intended pomp and ceremony in part because Hobson had failed to supply sufficient food for the gathering of chiefs: according to Colenso, Hobson was taken by surprise, arriving at the signing ceremony ‘in plain clothes, except his hat, and unattended by any of the officers of the “Herald”’ (1890, 29-30). It could have been used to consider

the author's own interjection as the treaty was about to be signed—Colenso tells us that he temporarily halted proceedings by asking 'your Excellency whether it is your opinion that these Natives understand the articles of the treaty which they are now called upon to sign?' (ibid., 32). It could have been used as a starting point for discussion of the fact that Hobson's proclamations confirming sovereignty over New Zealand, issued on 21 May 1840, claimed the South Island and Stewart Island 'on the grounds of Discovery' and the North Island on the grounds of cession by treaty (cited in ibid., 41-2), even though treaty signings had not been completed in all proposed locations around the country and several important tribes had either not been consulted, had refused to sign, or had already demanded that their marks be removed from the treaty documents. In practice, however, the text is open on pages 12 and 13, in which Colenso provides a lyrical description of 'the spectacle of the most animated description' at Waitangi on 5 February. The passage notes the 'canoes gliding from every direction towards the place of assembly' and the animated performances given by their Maori crews; the European and American ships and vessels 'decorated with the flags of their respective nations'; the spacious tent 'tastefully adorned with flags, &c., &c.', erected 'in the centre of the delightfully-situated lawn at Waitangi'; the crowds of settlers milling about and 'socially chatting with each other'; the 'countenances and the gestures of the Natives, who were squatting grouped together according to their tribes'; the particularly fine weather and even 'the *cicadae*', which are said to have sung 'louder than usual'.

As these details indicate, the predominant emphasis within the on-site narrative is on qualities of the estate *as setting*, an approach which dates from the time the estate was first opened to the public. Vernon Reed's *The Gift of Waitangi* (1957) shows that while the estate's early trustees were 'much impressed' with its historical significance, their concern was largely for its symbolic historical value: in Reed's account, recognition of the estate's historical interest is always entwined with and overshadowed by admiration for its actual and potential scenic merits. Reed makes clear that while the stated intention of the first trust board was to return Waitangi as fully as possible to its condition in 1840, in practice this was largely overridden by the desire to create a place of 'recreation, enjoyment and benefit to the people' (1957, 67). Leisure facilities like a golf course, bowling-green and yacht club were set aside, permitting the estate to function as an *escape from* history, and the estate's 'historic' elements were enhanced through strategic landscaping: coastal walkways were gravelled, lawns manicured, pathways plotted, formal garden beds re-established and sown with

vegetables and flowering shrubs, commercial forests and plantations of native bush developed to provide ‘a fitting “hinterland”’ (ibid., 16), and those groves of pohutukawa trees planted by visiting dignitaries to supply an immediate frame. Reed makes it clear, too, that careful consideration was given to the balancing and arrangement of elements: the selection of a site for the whare runanga which would give Maori culture a permanent home within the estate, for instance, ‘was not easily settled and caused some discussion. It was known the building would be large and, it was thought, might over-shadow the Treaty House, or be too conspicuous on the skyline’ (ibid., 41). Reed explains that he resolved this by ‘[obtaining] the Board’s approval to the present site, which gives space for a marae in front of the Whare-runanga and permits each building—the Treaty House and the Whare-runanga—to have its distinctive setting. The buildings are near each other and have an interesting break of trees between them’ (ibid.). The cumulative result of these developments is that Waitangi has *become* the settler homestead, the marae, the beach, the bush and the sports-field; the estate’s physical features, and the on-site narrative which discusses these, connect to constructs which have deep and enduring resonances within New Zealand culture.

Likely reasons for the development of the estate in this way are discernible in accounts which date from this period. Reed explains in the opening paragraph of his publication that when he first came to the Bay of Islands in the late 1880s, ‘Waitangi was looked upon as a place where a document had been signed which no-one understood, except that through it the Maoris were claiming the ownership of the New Zealand forests and birds, lakes and rivers, and even the sea and all the fishes therein!’, and he concedes that ‘the meaning of the written words of the Treaty of Waitangi’ may be ‘obscure’ (ibid., 9-12). Difficulties associated with the treaty and its history are also signalled in Bledisloe’s letter of gift to Forbes, which stresses his desire that Waitangi might assist in ‘healing for all time to come any old controversies which may have existed in the past between those who in different ways have contributed so materially to the peace, unity and successful settlement of the country’ (cited in ibid., 19). Bledisloe’s use of litotes is also suggestive: concluding his speech at the 1934 dedication ceremony, he expressed ‘fervent hope’ that a nationalised Waitangi ‘may be instrumental in developing throughout the whole community of this Dominion a greater sense of solidarity, a deeper spirit of nationhood, based upon pride in its not unworthy beginnings, and of a past history of which it has no reason to be ashamed’ (cited in Buick 1934, 79). On his own part, Forbes defensively proposed in his public acknowledgement of the Bledisloe gift that in looking back over the ninety-

two years since the signing of the treaty, ‘the white people of New Zealand can feel satisfaction that in spirit, if not in every letter of that document, they have maintained the trust reposed in the British race’ (cited in Reed 1957, 21).

Buick’s 1914 account of the treaty had also addressed some of these issues, showing not only that there was a history of Maori protest associated with the treaty, but that Waitangi itself had been a primary focus for this protest. The frontispiece of his book showcases a photograph of the stone monument inscribed with the Maori text of the treaty and erected by Ngapuhi in 1881 at Te Tii Point, the area of land directly across the Waitangi River from Busby’s estate where the chiefs had camped on the night of 5 February 1840. This monument was raised in the grounds of Te Tiriti o Waitangi Marae, a facility built in 1875 by Ngapuhi as a potent symbol of the significance of the treaty and as a place where iwi could gather annually on the anniversary of its signing to discuss treaty-related grievances. Buick also notes the fact that this marae had, in 1892, been the scene of the first of the Kotahitanga parliaments which were conceived as a constitutional method of securing ‘the full measure of political justice to which [Maori] believe themselves entitled’ (1914, 294-5). As ‘the eminent historian of the Treaty’ (Bledisloe, cited in Buick 1934, 94), Buick was engaged to organise the pictorial adornment of the former residency building prior to its opening in 1934 and served as chairman of the trust board’s inaugural ‘Maori life and customs advisory committee’; his own understandings of the contested nature of treaty history and of the Waitangi estate’s continued relevance to this history must, in some ways, have informed the mode of display.

Pakeha concerns at the potential for the intrusion of history to ‘taint’ the atmosphere at Waitangi (Reed 1957, 116) were realised almost immediately: the celebration staged at Te Tii in 1934 as part of the ceremony to mark the dedication of the estate was, as Buick made plain in an account published soon after, ‘seized’ as an ‘opportunity [for iwi] to represent their views on things governmental, and the relations between the Maori and Europeans’ (1934, 47). In the course of the performance of their haka, for instance, Ngati Porou lamented the loss of tribal lands and called on the treaty for protection: they were led in this haka by Sir Apirana Ngata who was, at the time, Minister of Native Affairs and an ex officio member of the Waitangi trust board. ‘To the natives’, Buick explains, ‘the meanings were easily understandable, and not a few of the *Pakehas* gained some idea of the import of their chants’ (ibid., 47). The 1934 ceremony had, in fact, almost been boycotted

by Maori because of contemporary political unrest. In practice, feelings of resentment drove many to the meeting ‘to show as it were a united front to the enemy’ (Ngata, cited in Walker 2001, 272); as Ngata noted, the presence of such a large and nationally-representative crowd of Maori was ‘a speech in itself’ (cited in Buick 1934, 44). While the privileged settings which have been cultivated at Waitangi since the 1930s were—as this discussion will later show—groundbreaking in their day, they can also be seen as a form of ‘risk-management’ (Wedde 2005, 10). Intended to encourage visitors’ imaginative identification and to give both ‘Maori and Pakeha alike’ a stake in the estate (Forbes, cited in Reed 1957, 21), they have been used to give force to the myth of nationhood posited at its centre. They have also been used to support the stated intention that the estate should encourage in visitors ‘a prevailing sense of dignity and pride’; as Reed explains, ‘pride in Waitangi gradually increased as the Treaty Grounds became more attractive and the beauties of the natural scenery better displayed’ (1957, 87-89).

In this sense, the development of privileged settings at Waitangi has been closely linked to processes of idealisation and simplification, which have manifested in the care taken to ensure the estate is presented in ‘immaculate’ condition.⁹⁵ Reed’s account is illustrated with photographs of key settings within the estate—‘The Treaty House and Hobson Memorial, with part of the golf course and “Hinterland” in the distance’; ‘The Whare-runanga and Canoe-house, with marae in front’; a view of the estate’s coastline with the water of the Bay of Islands beyond, and so on—which are emptied of people and which convey a sense of serenity and splendour, and Reed praises visitors who are careful ‘not to injure the appearance of the Grounds by mischief or litter’ (1957, 89). In one suggestive anecdote he also describes ordering the removal of a weather-beaten yet ‘historic’ willow tree on behalf of Lady Bledisloe during her visit to the estate, so that when she arrived next morning, ‘there was nothing unsightly to mar the view!’ (ibid., 109). By insisting that he ‘wanted no trace of its existence to remain’—its stump was to be cut below the surface and concealed with strips of turf, and ‘not even a fallen leaf or twig’ was to be left on the ground—Reed seeks to convey that Waitangi is cared for as a showcase of and for the nation. He also seeks to halt and ‘throw into reverse’ the passage of time (Bennett 1993, 223), ensuring that the estate itself is removed from—and made immune to—the processes of history.

Over the course of Waitangi's museum-life, as the estate itself has increasingly become a focus for controversy related to the treaty and its history, several of these privileged settings have been developed as strands in their own right within the on-site interpretation panels. The current prominence of these settings has important implications for elements of drama which are included in the on-site narrative since it seems, on the surface, to allow major difficulties to be displaced with minor ones: the most openly conflictual elements relate to the strained relations between Busby and New South Wales Governor Richard Bourke over the scaling-down of the residency building from its original plans. Two complementary clusters of privileged settings, however, evince some of the deeper tensions traceable in modes of display employed at Waitangi. In outlining these, it is necessary to bear in mind Fisher's proposition that privileged settings have complex relationships to 'hard facts'. According to Fisher, the privileged settings of any settler nation encode and refract certain kinds of guilt associated with the processes of settlement (1985, 10). While they strive to transcend these hard facts, Fisher argues, privileged settings cannot completely achieve this. In effect, the attitudes, values and ideals which privileged settings set out to celebrate are undermined by the hard facts they inevitably convey; or, to put it another way, at Waitangi we might look for the return of difficulties associated with 'the middle distance' of history (Calder 1990, 86), the intrusion of unwelcome elements into the narrative.

* * *

The first cluster of privileged settings to be considered, the house-and-garden complex, carries particular significance in the context of settler societies. As Stephen Turner has explained, the house is 'a new-country dream', an incentive to immigration in the materially deprived environment of old countries, and 'the need for a home of one's own is strong in both Australian and New Zealand settler cultures' (1999, 32). The house-and-garden complex also stands both literally and metonymically for processes of establishment: the division of landscape into enclosed sections of property and the erecting of permanent dwellings to provide a protected, domestic zone involve what Paul Carter has termed the translation of 'space' into 'place' (1987, xiv). A large volume of material related to these settings is exhibited within the former residency in the 'James Busby of Waitangi' gallery, serving to diffuse the gallery's ostensibly chronological thrust. This material registers many of the generalised yearnings associated with these settings. Busby's interests in horticulture and

viticulture are dwelt upon in some detail, with a panel devoted to ‘The Garden’ explaining that the early garden at Waitangi was much admired, and that Busby was ‘known as the father of viticulture in Australia’ and ‘the first to make wine in New Zealand’. Explorer Dumont D’Urville is quoted reviewing one of Busby’s vintages (‘a light wine, very sparkling and delicious to taste’), and glasses presented by the French Commodore du Petit Thouars in 1838, ‘in recognition of Busby’s hospitality, and possibly, the excellence of his wine’ are included on display. The narrative makes it clear that some of Busby’s trees—including a large Norfolk pine—still survive, and a copy of one of Busby’s orders of plant cuttings from the Sydney Botanic Gardens is exhibited, along with pressed leaf specimens, a copy of ‘one of at least six works’ on the subject of viticulture published by Busby between 1825 and 1840, and images and plans of the house and its surroundings during the Busby occupancy which show the placement of trees, paths and fences. Two panels set outside in the grounds and titled ‘The Lawn’ and ‘The Garden 1840’ indicate the site of the marquee erected for the treaty discussions and draw on Colenso’s description of the ‘scene’ at Waitangi on 5 February 1840, noting that the marquee was ‘decorated with colourful flags’, that large crowds gathered on the lawn, and so on.

A further sequence of panels devoted to ‘The People of the House’, ‘Visitors to the House’, and ‘Life at Waitangi’, again interspersed within the narrative sequence in the former residency building, describes the development of domestic routines and community and social networks. The budding of friendships with local families is portrayed: Marianne Williams, for example, is said to have been present for the births of the Busby children, and the daughters of missionaries are said to have helped with preparations for entertainments hosted at the residency. Overseas visitors are frequently mentioned, too, serving to inscribe the residency’s place within larger histories: du Petit Thouars, Charles Darwin, Martha Marsden and Edward Markham are among those cited as guests who ‘have left a record of the hospitality they received in this house’. These panels also provide excerpts from diary entries and from letters written to Busby’s family in Scotland and New South Wales which index a maturing sense of place: in these, Busby discusses his planting of vines, his exploration of the countryside and his procuring of botanical specimens to send to England, and requests clothes and toys for his growing brood of children and reading material for himself.

The narrative and displays pay particular and reflexive attention to the architectural and structural aspects of the house, too: the text panel which is displayed in the parlour and which mentions the drafting of the treaty, for instance, is overshadowed by a much fuller panel which explains the Busbys' use of the room, compares its design and layout with other rooms in the house, and discusses its construction materials and furnishings. A number of other text panels within the rooms of the former residency and the skillion meticulously detail the original and revised plans for the building, the alterations and extensions which were carried out in the early years after the house was first constructed, the building works which occurred during both the 1933 and 1989 restorations, and the conservation concerns and methods which were implemented in the course of each of these restorations. Discussing the authenticity of the fittings and décor which are currently on display, they also point out where floors have been renewed, where chimneys have been reconstructed, and so on. Related to this, the narrative takes care to ensure that the former residency, in its current form, constitutes a domestic tableau to which visitors can relate. The fact that it is 'an impressive building on a commanding site', but that it is small (a 'four-roomed cottage') and was crowded, are played off, enabling the house to have it both ways: it is at once suitably gracious, yet modest too, with the deliberate exposing of brickwork and timber framing inside the skillion enhancing this effect.

Despite its affirming aspirations, however, the Waitangi narrative cannot dispel hard facts connected with these settings. As has already been noted, the narrative avoids mentioning that the lawfulness of Busby's occupancy was questioned in the public debate which preceded the treaty's signing. The final panel in the 'James Busby of Waitangi' gallery does, however, acknowledge that Busby's title to the estate was officially re-examined, along with all other pre-treaty land transactions, after 1840. This panel is positioned uncomfortably as a post-script in the narrative; not only does it make the concession that Busby's relationship with local iwi was difficult, but it also describes the event which had prompted Busby to make payment for the land that he occupied:

On 30 April 1834, at approximately midnight, the Residency was attacked by Rete, one of the owners of the land. Agnes Busby had given birth to their first child John, just 30 hours earlier.

Busby was shot at on the front verandah and later in the kitchen doorway, where a bullet shattered the weatherboard, missing him by inches.

A splinter struck Busby and blood trickled down his face. Two other bullets were also discovered in the walls.

These problems surrounding Busby's occupancy—his lack of protection from local chiefs—arose in large part because he had originally purchased the deed to the land directly from William Hall, a CMS missionary whose own title was dubious. While the Waitangi narrative's melodramatic account of this event sympathises with Busby and stops short of joining the dots in this story, the land dispute nevertheless stands as a concrete example of widespread and serious problems: that land purchases were often acts of bad faith and that the treaty itself sanctioned the acquisition of land in unjust ways, with the results that native title was systematically alienated and that Pakeha became the beneficiaries of Maori land and resources.

As this incident suggests, too, the Waitangi narrative also shadows 'hard facts' related to the nation's history of racial conflict. Displayed at the entrance to the estate are images of the pa at Ruapekapeka constructed for the final battle in the northern war, a conflict ignited in part over the terms of the treaty which erupted within four years of its signing. Although no explicit connection is made between the treaty and the war, the narrative does acknowledge that the residency gardens were damaged by the British army and by Maori raiding parties during Busby's absence in 1845 and 1846, and that the large Norfolk pine is 'the only survivor of a row planted by Busby but felled in 1845 by Maori'. Other admissions link these histories, too. The fact, for instance, that Busby's family spent periods of time in Sydney because of local conflicts and skirmishes is made clear: one panel states that '[i]n March 1845 war broke out in the Bay of Islands and Agnes joined her husband in Sydney', while another reports that '[o]n 12 January 1836 a dispute over land between two groups of Maori ended in gunfire with two dead and four wounded in front of the residence. Agnes and the children were sent to Sydney for their safety, but returned a year later.' The narrative also notes that William Hall and Thomas Kendall, the missionaries who had initially purchased the land at Waitangi from Ngati Pou in 1815, had themselves been 'driven from it by Nga Puhī fighting for control of the area'. The Waitangi narrative, then, is constrained to show that Pakeha efforts at creating a safe domestic zone are inherently vulnerable. This threat is given further force in the reluctant mention of a raid on the residency by 'armed Maori intruders' in 1835, too, in which 'the interior of the house became part of the scene'. While the narrative tries to construe this incident in positive terms, noting that local missionaries and seamen came to the Busbys' aid, and repeatedly emphasising that the Busbys' baby was picked up by one of the men and 'sheltered [. . .] under his cloak to protect her from the fracas', it clearly demonstrates the permeability of the settler home to invasion.

Despite the narrative's carefully egalitarian approach, the house-and-garden complex carries with it, too, hard facts associated with social inequalities in an emerging settler society. One text panel defensively explains that '[i]n common with others of their time and social background the Busbys employed servants', and goes on to suggest that 'in their colonial environment servants found better opportunities and did not stay long. Busby said there were times when he had to take over "*the management of domestic affairs*"'. Elsewhere, it strives to put a positive spin on the subject of Maori employment, stating that 'Pakeha and Maori servants were hard to keep. When twenty Maori workers were employed in the gardens, Busby gave lessons in the afternoon to encourage them to return to work each day. The family did most of the work around the home, especially in the early years'. The use of 'Maori help' and 'canoes' to transport the materials for building the house, and labour to split the kauri shingles for the roof, is mentioned too. Apirana Ngata has noted that Maori made a major contribution of labour to Pakeha settlement in almost every part of Aotearoa New Zealand, felling bush, fencing sections, transporting incoming supplies and outgoing produce, cutting drains through raupo swamps and so on (cited in Sutherland 1940, 44). As this suggests, not only were Pakeha reliant on Maori assistance in helping them to establish 'homes' in their new environment, but economic relations were structured so that as settler society became more developed and entrenched, and as tribal land and resource bases diminished, Maori were left with few options but to become an underclass of labourers and domestic staff.

Finally, too, the narrative shadows hard facts relating to the potential for failure and forgetfulness: for the settler house, as a 'visible sign of settlement', to become 'shorthand for the problems of newness, generational dysfunction and short history' (Kavka 2006, 58). As Jennifer Lawn has shown, privileged settings readily turn into 'gothogenic zones'; in settler societies, she explains, 'home' is a dangerous sign 'in part because mythologies of security, safety, and fulfilment continually work overtime to obscure their own fragility' (2006, 13 and 15). At Waitangi, the obsessive detailing of forms of expert knowledge about the house and emphasis on the successive waves of 'best' conservation practice can be read as a means of compensating for the fact that 'New Zealand's most historic spot' was, for a time, one of those 'empty, wooden, decaying houses' which litter the New Zealand countryside (Edmond 2006, 24). Constrained to acknowledge this fact in order to make sense of the Bledisloe gift and the restoration work which has since been carried out, the narrative

discloses in a text panel dedicated to ‘The Estate After 1840’ that after the plundering of the grounds by Maori in 1845 and the occupation by the British army in 1846, ‘[t]he estate continued to decline as Busby battled through the courts and parliament to gain title to land he had purchased’. Another text panel briefly notes that after the sale of the property in 1882, ‘[t]he house fell into disrepair and seems to have been abandoned. It was used for the storage of hay’. The narrative tails off altogether at this point, resuming in the ‘Bledisloe Gift’ gallery with a panel titled ‘A Forgotten Heritage’ which explains that ‘[b]y 1932 the significance of Waitangi was largely forgotten [. . .] The former British Residency was in a state of neglect’. The distance between these historical moments is represented in the physical distance between the two exhibition areas; visitors are made to experience this gulf since they must traverse a courtyard to move from the pre-1840 gallery in the south wing to the post-1932 gallery in the north. As it works to provide reassurance that the estate—and the treaty, which it symbolises—are valued as ‘patrimony’, the on-site narrative necessarily comes up against these hard facts of history.

The other cluster of privileged settings to be considered in this discussion is the marae; at Waitangi this ‘cultural complex’ (Ngata 1940, 311) includes not only the open ground in front of the whare runanga, but also the whare runanga itself, the waka taua and the carved shelter in which it is housed. The marae is imbued with enormous significance as a symbol for Maori identity and community life and has strong associations with heritage and tradition; it has been a longstanding component of Polynesian settlements, serving as a sacred place of connection with the ancestral world, and it is widely regarded as a ‘highly charged icon of “traditional” Maori culture’ (Allen 2002, 48). By emphasising these qualities, the Waitangi narrative deals with the marae complex in ways which largely present Maori culture as static and de-politicised. No written information is supplied inside the whare runanga, although a text panel in the grounds outside does state that the house was officially opened on the centenary of the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1940. This panel notes that the proposal to build the house was made by Maori in response to the Bledisloe gift and offers the explanation—drawn from Buick’s 1934 account—that ‘[a] Maori house standing beside the European house would symbolize the words of Hobson in 1840, “He iwi tahi tatou,” We are now one people’. It also states that some 10,000 people attended the ceremony in 1934 during which the foundation stone for this structure was dedicated, ‘among them Maori representatives from throughout the country’; it identifies the principal carver as Pine Taiapa, noting that the timber was

supplied by Ngapuhi and that the work was overseen by Tau Henare, MP for Northern Maori; and it explains that the carvings in the interior of the house ‘represent the ancestral history of all tribal groups’. These carvings are described in greater detail in a visitor pamphlet: for each of the 14 pairs of poupou (wall slabs) the regional style is noted, the level of relief of the carving and extent to which the patterns are executed in a ‘characteristic’ way are discussed, and the ancestors who are depicted are identified, with whakapapa connections made in some instances, particular weapon types noted, and so on. The traditional nature of the materials, modes of production and motifs is also noted for the tukutuku panels which are set between these carvings and for the painted rafters which connect each pair of carvings.

Within the canoe shelter, three text panels discuss the origins of the Maori canoe tradition in the Maui legend and in ‘Te Hekenga Nui—The Great Migration’; describe customary processes involved in tree selection and felling (including what the narrative terms ‘special rituals’ such as blessings and karakia offered by the tohunga); and record the various types of waka, describing stylistic characteristics and explaining the ways in which certain types of craft were used to support traditional life-ways. With the exception of the present tense statement that ‘[e]ach iwi within Aotearoa today traces its whakapapa (genealogy) to an ancestral migratory waka’, the information in these panels is presented in a distinctly ethnological mode and does not deal with post-contact history—no reference is made, for instance, to the use of canoes for transporting building materials for European settlers, despite its mention in a text panel within the former residency. Two further panels deal with *Ngatokimatawhaorua* itself, explaining that inspiration for its building came from Princess Te Puea Herangi of Waikato:

Her dream was for Maori to build a fleet of canoes including this waka and several large, fully carved war canoes, as a worthy Maori contribution to the 1940 Centennial celebrations of the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi [. . .] The project was a sacred undertaking and all rites and customs of ancient times were observed. All of the work was tapu.

These panels also provide ‘empirical’ information about the waka’s construction, size, capacity and so on, while a final panel devoted to ‘Waitangi Day 1990’ deals with the ‘Kaupapa Waka’ project initiated by the Maori Standing Committee of the New Zealand 1990 Commission. All of the text panels within the canoe house—and the single panel which deals with the whare runanga—are illustrated with drawings and/or black and white photographic images. Notably, the final panel in the

canoe house features black and white photographs of waka being launched in 1990 to mark the sesquicentennial of the treaty. James Clifford has explained that in relation to ethnographic subjects, photographs are coded historically according to style and colour: sharp black and white registers a documentary past, whereas ‘true’ colour connotes contemporary culture (1997, 157-9). In their use of historical tone, then, the displays at Waitangi appear to unmoor the events of 1990 from modern time and bracket them instead with an older past.

Despite this unwillingness to deal with historical aspects of the marae complex at Waitangi, certain details in the narrative do stand out. Captions for photographs of the hui held at Waitangi in 1934 at which the marae complex was dedicated, for instance, echo Buick’s 1934 publication by acknowledging that on Te Tii marae, ‘[i]n their haka (dances) and waiata (song-poems), iwi took the opportunity to present their views on the nature of government and Maori relations’, and that ‘[i]n some performances, traditional lyrics were modified to express issues of concern to Maori, particularly the loss of their land’. The ‘historically significant’ presence of Koroki Mahuta, the Maori King, at these celebrations is also noted, as it is in Buick’s publication. While the relevance of the King movement to treaty grievances is not explained in the Waitangi narrative, and while the specific content of those haka and waiata is not made available, these elements strongly contradict the idea that Waitangi and the treaty were, for Maori, ‘a forgotten heritage’. In relation to the Te Arawa panels inside the whare runanga, the visitor pamphlet also alludes to ‘hard facts’ associated with population decline and cultural devastation:

This tribe, more than any other, kept alive the art of carving after the impact of European colonisation had so drastically affected much of Maori culture. The development of Arawa carving continued without break, leading to the establishment in the 1920s of the School of Maori Arts and Crafts in Rotorua by Sir Apirana Ngata, then Minister of Maori Affairs.⁹⁶

While the second sentence neutralises the force of the first, treating the founding of the school as if it were a logical step rather than an intervention, it does strongly imply that carving traditions in other tribal regions were not so fortunate. Within the canoe shelter, too, the narrative notes that since waka taua ‘had not been built for the best part of the last century’, many of the required skills had to be relearned in the 1930s, and the fact that approval was granted for the recording and filming of the project indicates that it was seen as being of an ‘historic’ nature. Another panel states that Ngata and Te Puea ‘made up a formidable partnership in striving for Maori civil rights and self-determination’.

These admissions suggest another side to the story of the development of the marae complex at Waitangi; rather than simply being symptomatic of an organic, peaceful and contained cultural renaissance, it intimates that these activities may have been prompted by, and may in turn have prompted, dramatic and far-reaching changes.

* * *

When Waitangi was set aside for the nation in 1932 and its modes of display began to be developed, those who were involved clearly recognised not only that ‘history’ had been made at Waitangi in 1840, but that history was being made there again. This sense of moment is demonstrated in part in the formal and publicised letters of gift and acknowledgement prepared by Bledisloe and Forbes, in the statutory incorporation of the deed of trust and in the distinguished membership of the first trust board—which included Bledisloe, Forbes, Ngata and Mahuta, among others. It is also shown in the minting of a new coin depicting the signing of the treaty, to mark the occasion and to ‘show the outside world that to New Zealand the treaty means everything’ (Coates, cited in Buick 1934, 49). It is shown, too, in the erecting of several memorials on the estate at Waitangi, and in the staging of the official dedication ceremony in 1934 which was attended by members of parliament and eminent overseas visitors and which attracted the presence of press reporters, photographers, moving-picture operators, and so on.

The fact that these events were known to be ‘historic’ is demonstrated as well in the publication of those two accounts by participant-observers: one by Buick (*Waitangi: Ninety-four Years After*), printed in the same year as the dedication ceremony took place, and the other by Reed to mark the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Bledisloe gift. Like Mathew’s report of the events which took place at Waitangi in early 1840, both of these twentieth-century publications register a clear understanding of the importance and ‘progressiveness’ of the proceedings they witness. Both publications reprint documents relating to the incorporation of the trust board and feature ‘embalmed’ speeches—‘classics of their kind, as Buick calls them (1934, vii)—made during the 1934 ceremony which stated directly that this was an ‘historic occasion’ and which theatrically linked events of 1934 to those of 1840; Buick himself proposes that ‘[e]xcept that age had enriched and mellowed it, the scene was much the same as on that memorable day’ (ibid., 81). Both publications also include photographs

taken during the official ceremonies as well as those of people ‘making history’ in other ways early in the estate’s career as a national reserve: trust board members consulting the freshly-prepared survey map of the estate; the Bledisloes posing in front of the flagstaff or planting a pohutukawa sapling near the former residency; and so on. That this was an ‘historic’ moment is signalled, too, by the understanding that Waitangi was being preserved—with what Reed refers to as ‘a long view’ (1957, 74)—for the benefit of future generations who would visit these saplings as mature and stately specimens. The two contemporary accounts of this history were written with the same long view in mind, preserving for future generations the history of this modern ‘turning point’ at Waitangi.

As both Buick and Reed show, in specific terms, at the time when it took place, the Waitangi gift was understood to be making history in a number of ways. First, the very act of viewing Waitangi and the treaty as being ‘of considerable interest’ (Bledisloe, cited in Reed 1957, 19) was known to be historic. This gift was designed to stimulate ‘throughout the Dominion a desire for knowledge of New Zealand’s history’, and to inspire New Zealanders ‘to realize their history in a manner never before known’ (Reed 1957, 101-2 and 125-6); those who were involved in the development of Waitangi were actively campaigning for recognition of the treaty and its place of signing. Second, the act of setting aside the estate ‘in perpetuity as a National Monument for the benefit and enjoyment of the people’, as the deed of trust proclaimed (cited in Reed 1957, 17), was also known to be historic. The former residency at Waitangi was the very first building associated with New Zealand settlement history to be reserved in this way: it emblemised a new kind of national monument, a new conception of ‘heritage’.⁹⁷ By the early 1930s, inspired by activities in Britain and in the wider international arena, tourist resorts had been established at Ohinemutu and Whakarewarewa to exploit the ‘spectacular geothermal phenomena’ of their settings (Thomas 2009, 14). Scenery preservation had commenced, too, with provision for the setting aside of ‘scenic’ and ‘historic’ reserves made under a series of acts from 1881 onwards, and lands acquired at Tongariro in 1887 and in Fiordland in 1904 for national parks. While plaques or monuments like those erected in Ship Cove in 1913 to commemorate the landfall of James Cook were sometimes set in place, reserves gazetted in these ways were not generally associated with significant built structures or ‘historical attractions’, as Reed called them (1957, 65). The fact that Waitangi was unlike any other location which had previously ‘passed into the possession of the people of New Zealand’ (Buick 1934, 12) is suggested by the ‘places of historic interest’ named on the distance and direction table at Waitangi which dates from

1934. Of the few sites mentioned—almost all former mission houses—Ruapekapeka pa (the site of the final battle in the 1845-6 northern war) is the only one which was not still in private ownership at the time.

Geoff Park has explained that lands which came under state protection in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were usually preserved in their existing condition; these ‘ferny glades, waterfalls and forest clearings’ were intended as ‘beauty spots’ for bush picnics (2006, 116 and 201). While Waitangi was set aside with recreational purposes in mind, the stated objective of the Bledisloes and the first trust board was to ‘present’ it for display through significant restoration and improvement, and a comprehensive scheme of development was provided for in the deed of trust. Discussing the proposed restoration work, Buick noted with admiration that this was to be ‘complete to the degree of reinstating the shingles on the roof and to the flags of Sydney stone with which the verandah was originally paved’ (1934, 7). As part of Waitangi’s development, too, it was always intended that the estate should mobilise a reflexive museum function. In making the gift, Bledisloe expressed the hope that ‘perhaps at least one of [the former residency’s] rooms might be equipped, not only with a facsimile copy of the Treaty of Waitangi, but also, by the generosity of friends, with relics of the chief actors in the memorable scene enacted in its garden’ (cited in Reed 1957, 19). In his account, Reed describes that gallery which did take shape:

Over 100 portraits, pictures and documents relating to New Zealand’s early history are placed in sequence on the walls. Beginning with portraits of Tasman and Cook, with pictures of their ships which visited New Zealand’s coasts, the illustrations trace Maori life and customs, whaling, Church missions, European settlement, political personages to the signing of the Treaty, and prominent Maori signatories and the Treaty itself.⁹⁸

Reed explains that the gallery, furnished in this way, is ‘unique’ in New Zealand, enabling visitors to ‘get pleasure and instruction from an easy study of events and of people connected with the country’s early history’ (ibid., 86). Waitangi, then, was the first New Zealand site to have been dedicated as a permanent and developed heritage attraction. In this sense, it stood in the 1930s as a concrete symbol of the origin of historical-mindedness, of the sense that Aotearoa New Zealand—‘our young nation’, as Forbes repeatedly described it in his acknowledgement of the Bledisloe gift (cited in Reed 1957, 20-1)—had a history worth preserving and presenting.

Third, building upon the tentative hope expressed by Colenso four decades earlier that the site and its history might one day be considered of national importance, the setting aside and developing of Waitangi intentionally broke historic ground in its determinedly ‘national’ agenda. In one sense, the Bledisloe gift was made for the nation: the estate itself became ‘national property’ and was insistently referred to as a ‘great national heritage’ (Reed 1957, 15, 39 and 108). In another sense, though, the gift was made with the intention that it should function in a constitutive way. Bledisloe was particularly anxious to develop widespread consciousness of the estate, proposing in his letter of gift to Forbes that emphasising ‘the *national* character of the memorial’ would help to heal lingering controversies (cited in Reed 1957, 19, italics in the original). In his speech at the 1934 celebrations, Bledisloe again stressed the value of Waitangi in its ability to engender ‘complete national solidarity’ and ‘healthy national sentiment’, proclaiming ‘[l]et Waitangi be to us all a “*Tatau Pounamu*”—a happy and precious closing of the door for ever upon all war and strife between races and tribes in this country—the place where all erstwhile antagonists have clasped hands of eternal friendship’ (cited in Buick 1934, 79 and 71). The nationalising of Waitangi, then, was supposed to bring about changes in the way in which New Zealanders saw themselves, and was to repair divisions associated with history. Significantly, and unlike the scenery preservation movement to which its career as a national reserve is linked—which was undertaken in the belief that ‘the passing of the forest’ was being paralleled by ‘the passing of the Maori’ (Park 2006, 11)—Waitangi was conceptualised in ways which saw Maori as having an ongoing and vital stake in the modern nation.

Fourth, and related to this, Waitangi was known to be making history in terms of the composition of its trust board. As a means of enacting the nationalising of the estate, ‘all sections’ of New Zealand society were said to be represented on this board (Bledisloe, cited in Buick 1934, 79). In practice, and as a result of discussions between Bledisloe, Reed and Ngata, the deed of trust which incorporated the Waitangi trust board made provision for at least three places out of twelve to be held by Maori representatives. These included ‘a member chosen from the Hone Heke and Maihi Kawiti and Tamati Waka Nene and Pomare families’, ‘a representative of the Maori people living in the North Auckland Peninsula’, and ‘a representative of the Maori people living in the North Island south of the City of Auckland’ (cited in Reed 1957, 25). Additional scope for Maori representation was provided in the allocation of seats for ‘a representative of the people, Pakeha and Maori, living in the South Island’ and for ‘a person prominent in the life of the country as a statesman, historian, archaeologist, natural

historian or otherwise’, and in three *ex officio* seats, including one for ‘the Member of the Executive Council charged with the administration of Native Affairs’ (ibid., 25-6). The deed of trust also provided for the appointment of expert advisory committees ‘for the purpose of furnishing the board with expert or technical advice in relation to Maori life and customs’, among other things; it is clear from Reed’s account that Tau Henare, the first trust board representative for ‘North Auckland’ Maori, sat on this particular committee. At the time when it was implemented, the span of this representation was unprecedented, extensive and enlightened: a real sense of the careful consideration which went into shaping the trust board, and of pride in the result, is conveyed in Reed’s account.⁹⁹

And fifth, and again following on from this, the development of Waitangi was known to be making history not only in its recognition that Maori had a significant role to play in the modern nation, but also in its active sponsoring of the Maori cultural revival which was known to be taking place in the 1930s. As the twenty-first century pamphlet which describes the carvings in the whare runanga notes, Ngata—who was, by virtue of his office, a member of the first Waitangi trust board—had established the Rotorua School of Maori Arts and Crafts in 1926 to effect the recovery of various techniques and styles of carving and to train artists in other traditional skills. The written accounts by Reed and Buick both show that Ngata and Henare perceived an opportunity at Waitangi to expand the programme of development recently commenced in other localities, influencing the way in which the estate was developed by initiating the scheme to erect and dedicate the marae complex. This was not a foreseen outcome of the Bledisloe gift—it appears not to have been anticipated by Bledisloe or Forbes, and Reed describes the proposal as ‘spontaneous’ (1957, 42)—but it was taken up with enthusiasm by other members of the trust board once the question of its siting had been resolved. As he laid the foundation stone in 1934, Bledisloe expressed the clear understanding that:

This is destined to be an historic structure. Let those whose brilliant conception it is endeavour to typify in it the nobility of the Maori Race, enshrining within its walls all that is best and loftiest in their ideals and thus provide a fitting rendezvous to which their people can resort on occasions of national rejoicing or national mourning.¹⁰⁰

Buick and Reed both rapidly realised that Maori involvement at Waitangi would produce other effects, too: as well as providing a platform for further programmes of cultural recovery like the canoe-building project initiated by Te Puea, it assisted with the renewal of a number of forms of traditional knowledge. Karakia and tapu-placing and lifting ceremonies were used in preparing the

timber for these constructions, while the dedication and ongoing use of the marae required iwi to become proficient in various forms of performance and oratory, to regain knowledge of techniques for the preparation of flax in order to produce textiles, and so on. As Buick put it, '[t]hus there was brought about a tremendous revival of Maori culture, a renaissance of Maori domestic and social art, which one ventures to hope will not be spasmodic, but that it will be nurtured into an abiding influence in modern Maori life' (1934, 26).

The culture, then, was supposed to shift in specific ways as a result of the Bledisloe gift. Those who were involved *knew* they were making history, both in the sense that they were 'selecting out' and 'giving shape to' some part of the past, and in the sense that they were working towards what Fisher has termed 'the active transformation of the present' (1985, 3 and 7). From a later perspective, ways in which history was 'made' at Waitangi in the 1930s can be stated in even stronger terms: Waitangi can be seen to have set in place several crucial aspects of the current framework of national self-imagination. First, within the New Zealand context, it 'invented' or 'made up' (*ibid.*, 6) a new representational form—that of the national heritage site—and it undertook to use the past in a new kind of way in order to foster national pride; the 'national heritage site' is, like the historical novel described by Fisher, a vehicle for claiming and defining a national identity. In this sense, Waitangi changed the landscape: the government agency which now administers all other national heritage structures, the New Zealand Historic Places Trust, was formed by statute two decades after the Bledisloe gift, in recognition of the kinds of values that the Waitangi estate itself was seen to embody, and in acknowledgment of the fact that it was 'the duty of the Government' to purchase and preserve for the nation places of key historical significance (Reed 1957, 15).¹⁰¹

Second, Waitangi helped to install within the cultural imaginary key types of privileged setting—specifically, what I have called 'the house-and-garden complex' and 'the marae complex'. It should be clarified that there are in existence earlier images, texts, songs and stories which have identified and characterised these settings; older meeting houses and waka, including those which have constituted a longstanding and distinctive feature of museum collections and international exhibitions; and older settler homesteads—like the former mission station at Kerikeri, which was set aside for the nation in the 1970s. Waitangi, however, lodged these settings in the cultural realm in a form which was both tangible and symbolic, giving them a permanent home, high-profile national

status and ongoing contemporary relevance. And third, Waitangi can be seen as a key point of origin for the ‘bicultural agenda’ (O’Regan 1997, 7). Half a century before the *Te Maori* exhibition is said to have represented an historic ‘turning point’ (McCarthy 2007, 136) in its involvement of Maori stakeholders in the display and management of cultural property held in institutional settings, statutory provision for this kind of collaboration had already been made at Waitangi. By elevating the status of the treaty in the life of the nation from the 1930s onwards, Waitangi helped to set in place the conceptual basis for the development of biculturalism as a wider public policy, while in its own emphasis on balance and national unity, and on the need to heal and transcend problems associated with history, the estate also embodied what would become key bicultural ideals.

According to Reed, when Waitangi was opened to the public in 1934 a commemoration tablet (‘in grateful recognition that Lord and Lady Bledisloe made Waitangi a heritage and possession of the people of New Zealand’) was erected on the front wall of the entrance hall of the former residency and flanked by official portraits. Recognition given to the donors and to the ‘moment’ of their gift has since been expanded into a whole gallery: the plaque itself has been removed from display, but a dedicated gallery (‘The Bledisloe Gift’) currently occupies the north wing of the former residency. This display, in conjunction with a number of panels exhibited within the skillion, undertakes to deal with the modern ‘turning point’ at Waitangi, covering the span of time from the 1930s to the present. Picking up the narrative which fades after 1840 in the ‘James Busby of Waitangi’ gallery, the ‘Bledisloe Gift’ gallery is organised in a straightforwardly chronological way, detailing the timeline of events surrounding the purchase and development of the Waitangi estate: Reed’s petitioning; the Bledisloes’ decision; the threats posed by subdivision and American deep-sea fishermen; the legal formalities in establishing the trust; the proposal by Ngata and Henare to erect the whare runanga, and so on. Much of this material comes directly from the written accounts published by Buick and Reed, although under the headings ‘Development of the Waitangi National Reserve’ and ‘Continuing the Bledisloe Vision’, the narrative does detail some of the more recent changes on the estate—the building of a hotel by the Tourist Hotel Corporation in 1963, the completion of the second restoration of the former residency in time for the sesquicentennial celebration of the signing of the treaty, the approval of a lease for the Paihia Pony Club in 1992, and so on, culminating with the installation of the ‘James Busby of Waitangi’ display in 1995 and the ‘Bledisloe Gift’ display in 1997. The gallery also displays copies of several of the photographs reprinted in Reed’s and Buick’s accounts, and in a

panel devoted to ‘Features of the Waitangi National Reserve’ it exhibits vivid colour equivalents of the early black and white images of particular settings within the estate.

Given that the significance of the Bledisloe gift ‘moment’ can be stated so strongly, however, it is telling that the on-site narrative makes so little of it. The closest the narrative comes to evaluating the importance of this moment is in the vague contention that ‘[i]t was in the form of the 1933 restoration that the Treaty House, after over 90 years as a private house, again assumed a national role as a focus of constitutional history and political and social processes and events’. As is the case with the assessment of the significance of events of 1840, this statement uses soft and implied verbs (the former residency ‘assumed a national role’, and ‘[became] a focus of’). No recognition is given to the fact that this site constituted a new form of cultural heritage at the time when it opened to the public, and the only efforts made to expand upon Waitangi’s ‘role as a focus of constitutional history and political and social processes and events’ are the statements made elsewhere in the gallery that ‘[t]he Bledisloe gift drew attention back to Waitangi and to the Treaty as the cornerstone of New Zealand nationhood’, and that ‘[t]he news media referred to Waitangi as “the cradle of the nation” and the Treaty as New Zealand’s “Magna Carta”’. These do little to assist visitors in understanding the distinct historical origin of pronouncements about the importance and value of Waitangi, and they—and the ‘Bledisloe Gift’ displays more generally—also fail to account for the fact that, as Buick and Reed both demonstrate and as the text panels related to the marae complex hint, the significance of the treaty and of the site of its first signing had not been forgotten by Maori.

In other ways, too, information is lifted from Reed and Buick without any real recognition of what their accounts show. The Waitangi narrative fails to pick up on the significance of the fact that ‘[t]he Bledisloes recommended a nationally and historically representative Board of Trustees for the administration of the Waitangi Reserve’, making the bland observation that ‘[t]he original Board was representative of all the major regions and many families of historical importance’. While it does describe the Bledisloes’ ‘vision’ as being ‘far-sighted’, it again formulates this in weak terms: ‘The Bledisloes’ vision, fostered and shared by Reed, was of an historically and environmentally enriched Waitangi—a vision which arose from their knowledge of early New Zealand, their appreciation of Maori language and culture, and their love of the indigenous landscape’. In a further panel, the narrative offers the explanation that:

From the outset, the main objective of the Trust Board was to create a place of historic interest, recreation and enjoyment, with a strong emphasis on conservation. Early meetings were held informally at Waitangi, where ideas flowed freely and decisions were made about the Treaty House restoration, the proposed golf-course, museum and sanctuary, the reforestation of the estate and the appropriate site for the Whare Runanga.

No attempt is made to show how forward-thinking these forms of ‘enrichment’ were in their time or to give critical consideration to their legacy. Those historical photographs of features of the estate, for instance, could be used as a means of examining the conceptual underpinning of the estate’s development since they depict privileged settings which are not-quite-bedded-in: gardens are yet to be planted, patchy areas of lawn await seeding, temporary fencing is still in place, the former residency’s pohutukawa frame has not yet been established. These images are instead used in a straightforwardly documentary way, while their contemporary equivalents indicate that over time the estate has not ‘aged’ in a conventional sense. These images suggest that Waitangi has *become more like itself*; that it has taken the shape that it was always intended to possess. In this case, the use of true colour serves to evacuate Waitangi from its actual place in contemporary culture, effecting its removal from history.

Where the current displays do attend to the cultural ‘work’ that was undertaken in the 1930s, then, they flatten out its significance. This lack of any real sense of historicisation of the Bledisloe gift moment suggests that many of the ideas and concepts which Waitangi helped to set in place in the 1930s have become normal or ‘ordinary’, to use Fisher’s term. The contemporary familiarity of this form of heritage, these settings and this mode of dealing with history indicates that the culture has shifted in ways which make it difficult to recognise how ‘far-sighted’ this moment really was. In other words, the significance of the 1930s turning point associated with Waitangi is not acknowledged because the new cultural constructs which it helped to install—the form of the national heritage site, certain privileged settings like the house-and-garden complex and the marae, and the bicultural agenda— have become ‘obvious’. The history-making work which was carried out at Waitangi is now largely invisible precisely because this work has helped to alter the ‘habit structure of everyday perception’. It is also, as Fisher explains, ‘socially and psychologically decisive’ for the modern settler nation to ‘forget’ the strenuousness of the work that has gone into effecting these changes. As the Waitangi displays demonstrate, the bicultural agenda takes the treaty

as its foundation and source, and strives to posit seamless continuities between 1840 and the present. Back-projecting its own ideals, it does not readily admit ‘openness to alternatives or to failure’ and it resists more rigorous forms of historicisation which might make visible the moment of its own conception.

As a counterpart to this under-contextualising of the moment of the Bledisloe gift, the current displays are not obliged to examine other ways in which the culture has continued to change since the 1930s. Given that information supplied in the accounts by Reed and Buick forms the basis of the contemporary displays, the fact that certain aspects of their work are avoided or downplayed is, again, instructive. Ways in which Waitangi deals with the organised programmes of settlement which are associated with Edward Gibbon Wakefield and the New Zealand Company, and which helped to precipitate British annexation of Aotearoa New Zealand in 1840, for instance, are revealing. Bledisloe’s speeches from the 1930s repeatedly invoke Wakefield as ‘the far-sighted founder of prudent Empire colonization’ (cited in Buick 1934, 79), and Bledisloe himself was insistent that a member of Wakefield’s family should be represented on the Waitangi trust board.¹⁰² The current Waitangi narrative avoids mentioning the reasons for (or significance of) this trust board inclusion. Its sole reference to this history—whose investment in land is now understood to have secured the survival of capitalist production in the new colony and to have established the socioeconomic conditions that have so severely disadvantaged Maori—is in the hazy and euphemistic phrase that ‘an expected influx of British settlers’ in 1840 was one of the factors which ‘persuaded the British government to act’.

Further shifts in the culture since the 1930s are discernible in the letter of acknowledgement written by Forbes and cited at length—and with apparent support—by Reed. While Forbes’ notion of Waitangi as a place where ‘the meeting of cultures’ occurred and where ‘mutual admiration and respect were forged’ may still resonate, his invocations of Pakeha as ‘the stronger race’ and Maori as ‘the weaker people’ are, from a later perspective, less palatable (cited in Reed 1957, 21). Forbes also labours the point that ‘[a]t Waitangi, the proud Maori aristocrat surrendered his primitive policy to a political conception founded on acts in English constitutional history, and consecrated in the Sovereignty of the British Queen’ (ibid., 20-1). Extolling the benefits to Maori of the political system rolled out after British annexation, he goes on to surmise that:

Our Maori friends, whom we are proud to acknowledge as fellow citizens with equal rights and privileges with ourselves, will I am sure, concede on their part that under British Sovereignty they have developed their excellent qualities more fully and with greater freedom and consideration than could have been possible under any other political system.¹⁰³

Bledisloe, too, in his speech at the 1934 celebrations, proclaimed the relevance to the New Zealand situation of ‘that inexorable law—the survival of the fittest’, and explained that:

Upon us devolves the responsibility of seeing that our Maori brethren are given the chance of living their lives with some reasonable prospect of success. Whatever capacity they have for assimilating the benefits of western civilization should not be starved, but should be warmly encouraged.¹⁰⁴

In these ways, accounts from the period show the distance between their moment and our own: they testify the fact that Aotearoa New Zealand in the 1930s was, to use Inga Clendinnen’s phrase, ‘another country’ (2006, 25).

Reasons for the reluctance to deal with these issues are apparent. The bicultural agenda—as it is exemplified in the on-site narrative currently displayed at Waitangi—tends to produce soft versions of history which avoid the fact that the ‘act’ carried out by the British Crown resulted in annexation—that the Treaty of Waitangi was, as Buick phrased it, ‘How New Zealand Became a British Colony’—and which rely on the complete ‘marginalising of empire’ (Williams 2006, 1). Proceeding on the basis of a quite-different conceptualisation of the nation, the bicultural agenda also avoids acknowledging the imbalances of power between settlers and indigenous peoples which produced the crises of population decline and cultural devastation for Maori in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and it does not remember the more blatant forms of assimilationist public policy which gained currency once the Maori population had begun to recover. Among other things, stronger historicisation of the Bledisloe gift moment would necessitate consideration of the fact that the ‘birth’ of biculturalism occurred within—and is therefore in crucial ways tied to—a larger cultural paradigm of assimilation. It would also necessitate consideration of the ongoing history associated with Waitangi which has rejected assimilation and which continues to reject notions of national pride based on a shared history.

Again, there is a displacement which occurs in the narrative at this point. The only area in which the culture is said to have shifted since the 1930s is in relation to conservation practices; there is, in other

words, another way of reading the insistent emphasis which is placed on the advancement of restoration techniques implemented in relation to the former residency building. While the current narrative explains that the architect engaged to oversee the 1933 restoration ‘was a foremost New Zealand architect of the early twentieth century’ and that ‘by the standards of the day, great efforts were made to determine authenticity’, no real attempt is made to understand the initial restoration and development of the estate in its own time. Taking pains to demonstrate that with the benefit of hindsight it has become possible to see that ‘considerable latitude was taken with matters of design’, the narrative assures its contemporary audience that improved understandings enabled a superior restoration to be carried out in 1989. These statements obscure the ideas held in the 1930s about the important cultural work that was being performed at Waitangi, and stand in place of a much larger set of issues connected with shifts in the culture during the museum-life of the estate.

* * *

As this discussion has shown, privileged settings have an important history of their own at Waitangi: they are integral to the ways in which the estate has been developed for display since 1932 and are inseparable from its modern history. While the current on-site narrative naturalises these settings and the forms of cultural work which they have enacted—allowing the settings to function both as an ‘insitutionalised mode of forgetting’ and a ‘fabricated mode of remembrance’ (Bennett 1993, 232)—strains and displacements signify areas where processes of idealisation and simplification falter, where hard facts cannot be banished, where history refuses to be kept in check. Given the nature and extent of these problems, it is worth considering what might be effected by inverting the angle of vision and openly exhibiting the settings as ‘variants’—to use Fisher’s term—rather than as ideal examples of their kind.

Recognition of what might be termed the ‘non-traditional’ or ‘new-traditional’ aspects of the marae complex, for instance, would make it possible to view this as a truly ‘historic’ structure. The on-site narrative might begin by considering the evolution of the modern marae as a cultural form. While the institution of the marae as the open courtyard or forum where oratorical skills were displayed and consensus decisions arrived at in a community has deep roots in the malae of Polynesia, the carved meeting house which has come to serve as a focal point of the modern Maori marae is a post-

European development. As a number of commentators have explained, it is an innovation marking the end product of a long series of changes in settlement patterns since European contact and colonisation.¹⁰⁵ Emerging from the 1850s onwards, these houses were influenced in form and size by European churches and halls and were a response to pressing issues surrounding the loss of Maori land. Deliberately set apart ‘as a symbolic place which visibly stated the survival of *Maoritanga*’ (Salmond 1975, 81), they were built by tribal leaders to host meetings for discussing political issues such as land sales, and to stage negotiations with Pakeha, serving as ‘sets’ or ‘theatres’ of confrontation and conciliation: the name ‘whare runanga’ translates as ‘council house’. Through recovery of this background, the on-site narrative might make it clear that modern marae like the one at Waitangi encode forms of cultural adaptation and resistance.

Situating the Waitangi marae in its historical context, the narrative might acknowledge more fully the fact that this complex is entwined with—and inseparable from—the Maori renaissance which was, itself, knowingly undertaken as a means of changing the culture. As part of such an approach, the narrative might deal more openly with ways in which the impact of European colonisation drastically affected Maori culture, noting, for instance, that the building of meeting houses became less frequent and that traditions associated with carving fell into disuse as tribal economies shifted and as population decline was produced by changed conditions associated with European settlement. It might also acknowledge that by the time tribal populations had begun to recover in the early twentieth century, carving skills and associated knowledge had faded altogether in regions like Tai Tokerau, where missionary influence had been early and pervasive, where tribal warfare had been a major preoccupation in the early nineteenth century, and where no lasting tourism infrastructure had developed to promote the production of carved commodities for sale. In this way, the Waitangi narrative might more fully account for what the current visitor pamphlet fudges as being ‘[t]he strong Arawa influence in the Waitangi house’; as Deidre Brown has explained, when work on the Waitangi whare runanga began, the Ngapuhi carving style had not been practised for nearly a century (2003, 58-9). Since it registers the crisis point which had been reached by the mid-1930s, expressing the clear understanding that Maori culture was at risk of being lost, Buick’s 1934 text might serve as an important source for this background. Describing the discovery that ‘the patriarchs of the race had passed away, and carried with them much of the ancient culture that had given the Maori a distinguished place among the Polynesian peoples’, Buick explains that ‘[t]he craze for apeing the

Pakeha had resulted in the neglect of their own folk-lore and traditional knowledge' (1934, 24-6). While these terms are now tinged with more than a little 'sepia foxing' (Calder 2006, 10), they nevertheless point towards the latter-day role that policies of assimilation played in contributing to these cultural losses. In this way, Buick helps to show that the Waitangi marae stages the 'fact' of persistent indigenous presence (Allen 2002, 11), and that it can be seen to stand as a rejection of patent forms of assimilation.

By making these circumstances more explicit, the narrative might account for the urgent and concerted forms of cultural recovery and renewal which are associated with the development of the Waitangi marae. Since the accounts by Buick and Reed both register a sense of how groundbreaking these activities were in their day, they could be used as a starting point for the re-conceptualising of the moment of the Bledisloe gift. The strenuousness with which Maori cultural recovery was undertaken might also be conveyed through acknowledgement of the fact that—as the *Auckland Institute and Museum Centennial History* notes—en route to the Bay of Islands, the Te Arawa carvers who had been commissioned to manufacture the Waitangi whare runanga spent several weeks in Auckland. Based in a workshop purpose-built for them on the roof of the Auckland Museum, these carvers studied the regional characteristics of the artefacts held in the institution's collections; as Brown has shown, it is possible to identify specific carvings held in Auckland as the direct inspiration for the various tribal styles showcased in the Waitangi whare runanga (2003, 59-60). In supplying this information, the Waitangi narrative might explain, too, that Ngapuhi representatives were selected to work under the school's carvers on the project: these men came from areas in the north where further large-scale meeting house projects were proposed, and a number of them accompanied the school's instructors to Auckland to study the Tai Tokerau collections. This determined re-acquisition of skills and knowledge is evident in relation to the waka project associated with Waitangi, too. In preparation for the establishment of a carving school at Turangawaewae and the commencement of a series of ambitious cultural projects, Te Puea sent Waikato students to the Rotorua School of Maori Arts and Crafts so that they could re-learn traditional carving techniques and associated practices, and she, too, sent a team to the Bay of Islands to supervise the construction of the waka and to train representatives from the northern tribes (Kernot 2004, 65). Indicating a 'long view' of another kind, these circumstances suggest specific ways of reading the elements of the Waitangi marae complex: Ngata explicitly conceived of the Waitangi whare runanga as functioning

in some ways as ‘a museum of tribal contributions and a picture gallery’ (cited in Brown 2003, 61), while the early monochromatic photographs displayed in the canoe shelter appear to have fulfilled a specific documentary purpose, too, intended in their own time to function as step-by-step guides for future reference.

As part of such an approach, the narrative might give consideration to the assertion made by Roger Neich that carved meeting houses assumed the role formerly held by carved pataka and war canoes as lifestyles changed and tribal warfare receded in the mid-nineteenth century (2001, 174). Neich explains that these houses became ‘the focus of hapu pride, prestige and identity’ at the same time as canoes became ‘obsolete’, noting that in some instances, parts of old war canoes were incorporated into houses (ibid.). In setting out the connections between these forms and in identifying the cultural changes which they represent, the narrative might note that while Ngata perceived the revival of interest in waka taua construction and decoration as a means of maintaining tribal mana and traditions and of showing that ‘the past is not altogether forgotten’, he expressed hesitance about their future relevance in contemporary cultural life (1940, 335): the building of carved meeting houses was the central plank in his own plan for cultural recovery. In this way, as well as recognising the Waitangi marae’s role in what Roger Neich has termed ‘a unique and fascinating story of a dynamic art form changing as it adapted to the demands of a new colonial situation’ (2001, xii), the narrative might convey some of the uncertainties of the 1930s moment. Militating against the risk of overdetermining this story, such an approach would require the de-familiarising of contemporary ‘givens’ like the waka taua regattas which are part of the convention of modern Waitangi Day celebrations. Discussion of background debates would enable visitors to see Te Puea’s initiative as the ‘pilot project’ (Brown 2003, 55) that it was in its own time, helping to retrieve some of the practical and conceptual underpinnings of Maori cultural revival in the first half of the twentieth century when favourable outcomes were not assured and when possible futures had not yet been glimpsed; it was not clear to Ngata or to Te Puea, for instance, that interest in waka building might lead to the subsequent study and recovery of Polynesian navigational techniques. Consideration of the separate-yet-related components of the Waitangi marae complex would also help to register differences between the approaches taken by figures like Ngata and Te Puea: while they shared many of the same concerns and pursued many of the same aims—the use of land development schemes to

stimulate the recovery of art, architecture, performance culture, and so on—their Waitangi projects were not unified under an official ‘partnership’ and were not seamless.

As well as considering ways in which the Waitangi marae worked to renew certain cultural traditions, the narrative might look at how it helped to set new traditions in place. It might, for instance, acknowledge the significant fact that the particular complex at Waitangi is the earliest pan-tribal marae. Serving a different kind of commemorative function from that fulfilled by earlier carved meeting houses, the Waitangi whare runanga was unique at the time it was built precisely in the fact that it undertook to represent the ancestral history of all tribal groups—there was, in the early 1930s, no precedent for such a production.¹⁰⁶ The narrative might point out, too, that while the dedication of this house to the tribes of the nation supported the inaugural trust board’s plan to nationalise the estate, this dedication was necessitated in part because of demographic changes and cultural losses; the carving knowledge and expertise required to complete such a house did not survive in Te Tai Tokerau at this time. The narrative might locate this marae as an influence on the subsequent development of pan-tribal whare whakairo in urban centres and on tertiary campuses, ‘de-familiarising’ these features of the contemporary landscape by recovering the history of their emergence. It might also note that the Waitangi marae is noteworthy for being the first permanent and functional marae in an institutional setting; its history undermines the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa’s recent claim to be the world’s only museum complex to have an operational cultural complex of this kind (cited in Williams 2006, 10).¹⁰⁷

In considering more fully the role of Waitangi in the cultural renaissance, the displays might acknowledge tensions associated with this particular marae’s intended function and purpose which have been evident from the time of its conception. As well as citing the observation made by Buick that the former residency and whare runanga were intended by Pakeha to stand ‘side by side, thereby symbolising the friendly relations of the two races, and lending an emblematic colour to the historic words of Captain Hobson’ as it currently does, it might also accommodate his allied observation that there were alternative ways of viewing the Maori structure:

To the Maori the *Whare Runanga* is to carry the additional significance that it will ultimately represent a building of pure Maori construction, a tangible monument to their native handicraft, in which there will be visible the revived art of all the schools of Maori

carving. It is to stand as a classic example of their ancient architecture, and as a testimony vibrant of their restored culture.¹⁰⁸

The narrative might note, too, Ngata's insistence that the wave of activity in building such houses was not merely 'an academic proposition' or a 'sentimental revival' or a 'clinging to relics', but that it was a 'social necessity' and was to serve 'some living purpose' (1940, 329-30). In showing that cultural recovery was always intended by Maori to be linked to social and political revival, the narrative might also seek to recover the complex mesh of accommodations and refusals enacted by leaders of the 1930s. Te Puea sourced government funding for her centennial waka project and forged working relationships with several leading politicians, maintaining, too, a close personal association with Bledisloe in the mid-1930s; Ngata was, himself, a member of the Young Maori Party which was formed at the end of the nineteenth century to secure Maori aspirations by working within the government. Given their official ties, to what extent might these figures have been compromised or constrained in working for their constituencies? In what ways did their own aims dovetail with and/or diverge from those of figures like Bledisloe and Forbes?¹⁰⁹ How do we 'read' the fact that Ngata and Te Puea staged the first protests to be made at Waitangi after its opening as a national heritage site, using the marae complex which they had developed as a platform for a direct politics of embarrassment? Rather than evade the issue as it currently does by superimposing a portrait of Te Puea over images of the launching of *Ngatokimatawhaorua* at Waitangi in 1940, the narrative might acknowledge the fact that she boycotted this event—in company with Mahuta and the Waikato and Taranaki tribes—on the grounds that the government had refused to settle claims related to lands confiscated after the frontier wars of the 1860s and 1870s.¹¹⁰ It might also acknowledge that Ngata, who had already led the haka of protest at Te Tii in 1934, drew attention in his 1940 speech to mark the opening of the whare runanga to the red blankets which were worn by the Ngapuhi hosts as an allied form of protest. Explaining that these symbolised the gifts distributed by Hobson to chiefs who had signed the treaty, and calling on the government to settle outstanding land claims, Ngata expressed his own deep disenchantment:

I do not know of any year the Maori people have approached with so much misgiving as this centennial year. In retrospect what does the Maori see? Lands gone, the powers of the chiefs humbled in the dust, Maori culture scattered and broken. What remained of all the fine things said 100 years ago? What remained for the Maori to celebrate with the European at this centennial?¹¹¹

Because of their insistence on the continuing relevance of the treaty and its history, these protests call for the bridging of the two key historical moments which are currently dealt with in the displays at Waitangi, suggesting the need for ‘cultural recovery’ of another kind. The narrative might link the origin of the Waitangi marae’s modern use to the content of the 1840 treaty speeches and debates which are reported by Colenso and—to a more limited extent—by Mathew. Acknowledging the long history of conflict associated with the treaty, it might also situate the Waitangi marae in relation to other earlier forms of Maori protest. Kynan Gentry has noted that Maori have seen the Waitangi whare runanga ‘as a reminder to Pakeha of the agreement they had entered into and that had conspicuously not been honoured’, and have increasingly come to see Waitangi ‘as a powerful symbol of discontent and broken Pakeha promises’ (2006, 23-4). The monument and marae erected at Te Tii in the 1870s and 1880s, however, constitute an earlier expression of this view. Making clear the relationship between these two marae, the narrative might recover the ‘middle history’ which is presently missing from display at Waitangi. To what extent is it significant, for instance, that the Young Maori Party was formed at the same time as the Maori parliaments began to falter? In what ways were Ngata and Te Puea taking up causes advanced and campaigned for by earlier activists and protesters? Buick’s 1914 history of the treaty could serve as an aid for consideration of such issues, since it shows ways in which Ngapuhi began to develop Waitangi as a centre for tribal discussions on treaty-related matters. Buick’s text also reprints the first petition against breaches of the treaty which was made directly to Queen Victoria in 1882 by a Ngapuhi deputation sent as a result of discussions held at Te Tii. A number of commentators have recently hailed this petition as a key international point of origin for indigenous minority activism, suggesting the need for the Waitangi narrative to consider other historic turning points associated with the estate—events which evoke ‘birthplace’ marketing slogans of a very different kind.¹¹²

In order to assess the extent to which the aims of figures like Ngata and Te Puea have been met, have dated or have remained relevant, the narrative would need to link this history of protest forward, too; as William Renwick has noted, the use of those red blankets and the nature of the speeches made in 1940 can be seen as ‘a portent of political theatre to come’ (2004, 110). Providing an alternative timeline of post-1932 events, the narrative might consider problems which unfolded during the 1953 royal visit—described by Reed as ‘boisterous and undignified’ proceedings, during the course of which ‘Waitangi had lost that charm and dignity for which it had become renowned’, and ‘New

Zealand's reputation was injured' (1957, 117). It might acknowledge the important protests staged by groups like Nga Tamatoa, the Waitangi Action Committee and Te Kawariki at Waitangi since the 1970s, including the landmark action in 1971 when protesters wore black armbands and called for the treaty to be ratified, declaring Waitangi Day a day of national mourning for the loss of 25.2 million hectares of Maori land. It might also examine more recent forms of protest which have involved the disrupting of official proceedings; the heckling and direct challenging of Prime Ministers, Governors-General, royals and other officials and dignitaries; the baring of buttocks; the trampling of the New Zealand flag; the hurling of T-shirts, eggs, insults, spit and fists, and 'mud-slinging of the literal kind' (Harris 2004, 147); as well as more temperate demonstrations like hikoī and official speeches which have used Waitangi as a platform not for civil disobedience, but for the registering of oppositional stances nonetheless. It might consider, too, government responses to these forms of protest, which have ranged from decisions to boycott or to cancel commemorations of the treaty signing at Waitangi, to the dismissing of protesters as a 'malcontent fringe element' (cited in *ibid.*, 115), to the staging of national hui at Waitangi to consult with iwi over appropriate forms of remembrance and legislative change, to the use of force. Surviving newspaper accounts—like this, from 1983—evoke Waitangi in ways which make it seem a less-than-auspicious venue for wedding nuptials, and which serve as a striking counterpoint to Colenso's description of the scene in 1840:

The Governor-General's sleek black Daimler with the royal crest crawls towards the Treaty House.

On each side of the car run police with riot helmets and long batons. At the rear are other police dressed in firefighting gear. They carry fire extinguishers and bolt cutters.

Explosive-detecting dogs circulate. A military field hospital is in readiness. Spectators are body-searched before being allowed to enter the cordoned area [. . .].¹¹³

Photographs, too, could be used to powerful effect. In an image taken on 6 February 2002, for instance, the flagstaff and gleaming waters of the Bay of Islands beyond are almost obscured by the dense crowd of protesters, young and old, who are gathered on the lawn.¹¹⁴ These protesters fill the ground which stretches back towards the line of the horizon and out towards the edges of the frame, and bear an enormous, elongated banner emblazoned with the slogan 'Honour the Treaty'. The image is not an action shot—tino rangatiratanga and kotahitanga flags quietly flutter in the breeze, but the scene is dignified and serene—and an integral part of its effectiveness is its use of monochrome; this image indicates the capacity for historical tone to convey a sense of the hard fight which undergirds the making of certain forms of history.

An approach which was prepared to foreground hard facts in these ways would enable the displays to map more recent historic ‘turning points’ which have been effected as a result of events staged at Waitangi. As Hone Harawira—an activist-politician who has himself made use of Waitangi as a platform for airing grievances—has proposed, protest has an important place in society and is often the basis of positive change, working in tandem with ‘national reflection’ and functioning as part of the wider ‘debate’.¹¹⁵ In assessing the tangible changes ‘in social fact and legal categories’ (Fisher 1985, 9) which have occurred, the narrative might note that the protests staged at Waitangi in the early 1970s directly contributed to the establishment in 1975 of a tribunal to investigate Maori claims under the treaty and to make recommendations for their settlement—itsself ‘a significant turning point in Maori/Crown political and legal history’ (O’Sullivan 2007, 55). The narrative might also note that ongoing protests at Waitangi in the 1970s and 1980s secured the extension of the scope of the Waitangi Tribunal’s jurisdiction and obtained other forms of legislative recognition of the treaty, and that within this changed political and legal environment, biculturalism has been developed as a philosophical framework for policy reform across the public sector. In this way, the narrative would be able to pinpoint specific gains which have been secured by Maori: assimilation has come to be broadly understood as being morally dubious and has been abandoned as an official public policy; the government has been forced to engage in dialogue with Maori individuals and communities; state institutions and regulations have become more responsive to Maori concerns; and consultation and collaboration mean that Maori are now able to contribute towards decision-making in institutional settings (O’Sullivan 2007, 21). The narrative might acknowledge that in broader ways, too, protest associated with Waitangi has assisted in installing new habits of perception. Forcing recognition of problems associated with the treaty, it has, for example, prompted new directions in scholarship and research; while published commentaries have by no means all agreed with Maori viewpoints, a number have been written by former protesters themselves or by those who have actively supported the protest movement in various ways.¹¹⁶ The fact that Pakeha activists and many of the mainstream churches have participated in and defended forms of protest staged at Waitangi suggests, too, that incremental developments have been made towards a society ‘more respectful and tolerant of cultural difference’ (ibid., 33).

By acknowledging the key role of the Waitangi marae in the ‘close’ and ‘pressing’ history of Maori protest (Turner 1999, 22), the displays would make it possible to see Waitangi as a place where the ground of culture has continued to shift. Bringing into focus Waitangi’s actual role ‘as a focus of constitutional history and political and social processes and events’, such displays would show not only that Waitangi set in place the conceptual foundation for biculturalism, but also that it has constituted one of the key platforms for the staging of action which has driven the implementation of the bicultural agenda. Addressing this history, the Waitangi narrative might assist visitors in understanding the range of Maori viewpoints concerning kaupapa for appropriate forms of protest, enabling discussion of ‘internal differences’ (Harris 2004, 76) and recovering what this marae—and what the treaty itself—has meant to various constituencies at different times. The narrative might also show that while Waitangi has helped to shift the ground of culture in more liberal directions, these advances are circumscribed in certain ways. Aroha Harris has noted that protest at Waitangi has demonstrated a capacious ability to absorb new issues as they arise (ibid., 115): Waitangi Day actions have come to be overlaid with topical issues from the Maori agenda like rejections of the ‘Fiscal Envelope’ and foreshore and seabed legislation; protests against the prison development proposed for Ngawha; heated debates for and against the appropriateness of the official use at Waitangi of the tino rangatiratanga flag, and so on. Such issues will continue to arise precisely because the nation’s cultural boundaries have shifted in ways which have permitted change in some directions but not in others. As Dominic O’Sullivan has explained, biculturalism has facilitated limited progress toward self-determination and has in some senses served Maori interests, but its underlying assumptions about where power properly lies prevent the more comprehensive or far-reaching realisation of autonomy:

Successive New Zealand governments and most political parties [. . .] have outwardly accepted that Maori have legitimate grievances against the Crown, that they have a legitimate right to retain their language and culture, and that at least some form of self-determination is properly accommodated. Subtly, however, there remain pervasive assimilationist influences over Maori public policy. In this context, biculturalism, though outwardly respectful of Maori, constrains further autonomous aspiration.¹¹⁷

Biculturalism is, O’Sullivan contends, a conservative strategy for managing or controlling resistance: it tends towards the superficial and is in significant ways continuous with earlier forms of assimilation (2007, 30-2). Shane Jones, another Waitangi protester-turned-politician, has made much

the same point, arguing that consultation and participation rights which have been guaranteed by law since 1990 are ‘a very cheap way of covering Maori aspirations’ (cited in *ibid.*, 20).

The twin strands of pragmatism and of deeper-held Maori ambitions can be traced through the treaty debates which Colenso and Mathew document, through protest activities centred on Te Tii and on the Waitangi estate, and through the work of key figures like Ngata and Te Puea. The persistence of these deeper ambitions helps to explain the continuing relevance of those hard facts which are part of Waitangi’s history but which are by no means merely historical: the estate is currently the subject of a claim before the Waitangi Tribunal and the claimants are very aware that they are making history in new ways; theirs is the first claim on private land to be ‘given the green light’ and thus marks ‘the start of a new phase’ in treaty history.¹¹⁸ These deeper ambitions also indicate that while a bicultural paradigm continues to flourish within cultural and bureaucratic institutions, activism at Waitangi will continue: protesters can be expected to maintain an ongoing refusal to observe boundaries, an ongoing power to cause unease. Given these circumstances, displays which could engage with the inherently ‘risky’ history associated with this ‘most historic spot’ and which could make clear the issues at stake would—fittingly—push boundaries, capture new imaginative space, perform the radical work of culture.

Framing the northern war: frontier conflict revisited

The problem of how to deal in retrospect with episodes of frontier conflict is one that confronts all settler nations. Such episodes threaten to undermine the moral basis of settlement, requiring the admission of acts of violence and the use of force against indigenous populations. Despite these obvious difficulties, however, such episodes need to be acknowledged. Imprinted in each nation's documentary archive and enduring in public memorials and in individual and collective historical consciousness, they form insistent—if at times spectral—presences, testifying to chaotic and confused moments which mark the entanglement or collision of cultures on the frontiers of settlement. By their very nature, episodes of frontier conflict produce an excess of signification which poses problems for the business of their narration; in order to render such episodes safe, settler nations must undertake to contain them by gathering them 'into the fold of meaning' (Muecke 1996, 2). If there are clearly risks associated with the handling of these episodes, there are also powerful promises. Told in certain ways, from certain perspectives and with certain emphases, stories of frontier conflict can be used to legitimise the nation's existence and to rationalise its foundation and footing.

Over time, settler nations develop their own interpretative frameworks for stabilising episodes of frontier conflict. Specific local conditions determine the terms on which these frameworks operate: whether, for instance, the conflict is figured in oblique ways or whether partial or direct avowal is possible; whether and to what extent indigenous resistance efforts are recognised; whether the conflict in question is celebrated or treated as an aberration in race relations which has subsequently been resolved. In addition to rendering the conflict honourable and necessary, these frameworks serve to reinforce the supposed characteristics of the indigenous populations involved and to establish the lexicons used in discussing the conflicts in question. Gaining resonance for settler populations, the frameworks themselves become virtually invisible, guiding interpretation by mapping out seemingly self-evident boundaries within which debates take place. Because the circumstances of culture that give rise to the need to deal with stories of frontier conflict are characterised by continual shifts, it is inevitably the case that these stories acquire different inflections as they are retold over time. It is not usual, however, for the interpretative frameworks

used to make sense of these episodes to be overhauled in radical ways or to be dispensed with altogether, as the nation's self-imagining relies heavily on their continuing relevance.

Since the 1980s, stories of frontier conflict have come to be marked in new and distinct ways. As part of the global critique of imperialism which has gained momentum during this time, widespread recognition has emerged that indigenous versions of these stories are important. Increased interest in what historical discourse has termed 'the other side of the frontier' (Reynolds 1981) has meant that indigenous perspectives are now being accommodated as part of a desire to redress representational imbalances. As the need for revisionist versions of these stories has become apparent, and as emphasis has increasingly fallen on indigenous agency and resistance, older accounts have come to cause embarrassment and discomfort and to be seen to signal 'prejudice' and 'misunderstanding' (King 1981, 24). In many ways, though, the magnitude of these changes appears to have been overstated. Revisionist practices have not yet placed undue pressure on existing interpretative frameworks; their tendency has been to incorporate additional material to round these stories out, or to read these stories against the grain but still within the parameters of the frameworks in question. Contemporary developments in dealing with frontier conflict have, however, begun to show potential for challenging these frameworks in more fundamental ways. Settler nations are aware that relations between settler and indigenous populations are showcased in treatments of these stories within the public historical sphere: it is now not only expected that indigenous perspectives will be included, but also recognised that tribal authorities are the appropriate source of this information. As well as contributing to official ventures in consultative or collaborative capacities, iwi have begun to create their own opportunities for telling these stories, seeking representational modes which might enable them to recite these histories both 'in their own terms' (Calder, Lamb and Orr 1999, 2) and on their own terms. The following discussion considers the ramifications of such developments; it is particularly interested in possibilities which might disrupt and transcend the terms of conventional interpretative frameworks by registering different kinds of 'historical imaginings' (Thomas 1999c, 4) altogether.

The particular episode of frontier conflict which this chapter takes as its focus has been central to revisionist historical analysis in Aotearoa New Zealand. The conflict is known to history as the 'northern war' and comprises the first of the major confrontations which are currently known as the

‘New Zealand wars’ but which have, over time, been known variously as ‘the Maori wars’, ‘the Pakeha-Maori wars’, ‘the Anglo-Maori wars’ and ‘the land wars’. As these terms indicate, the conventions of military history form the dominant paradigm for the telling of stories of frontier conflict in Aotearoa New Zealand: while the adjectives have changed over time, the noun has remained constant. Characteristics and exclusions of this interpretative framework will be dealt with more fully during the course of this chapter, but a few introductory comments can be made. In relation to the northern war, it has been widely understood that the conflict arose as a result of the protest staged by Ngapuhi chief Hone Heke Pokai against changed patterns and processes of settlement inaugurated by the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840. The conflict is said to possess a set of key figures: Heke and Te Ruki Kawiti as leaders of the ‘rebel’ Ngapuhi and Ngati Hine forces, ranged against governors Fitzroy and Grey whose imperial troops, led by Colonel Despard, were supported by Tamati Waka Nene and other ‘pro-government’ Ngapuhi chiefs. It is also said to possess a series of key events: the repeated felling of the British flagstaff on Maiki Hill in 1844-5, followed by the sacking of the town of Kororareka and major military campaigns at Puketutu, Ohaeawai and Ruapekapeka. The conflict tends to be figured as a more-or-less straightforward clash between Maori and Europeans, with its tribal dimension acknowledged but downplayed, and accounts of the conflict run through the events in chronological sequence, building to the climax of the battle at Ruapekapeka. While this interpretative framework has not promoted celebration of frontier conflict in an exultant way and while the northern war, like the New Zealand wars more generally, has largely been treated as an uncharacteristic episode in race relations, the military paradigm has nevertheless enabled conflict in this country to be invested with decency and dignity. James Cowan’s *The New Zealand Wars* (1922) was the first to endeavour to provide a comprehensive history of these campaigns ‘in convenient compass’ (Cowan 1955, v); Cowan did not invent the military interpretative framework which has been used to make sense of frontier conflict in this country, but he did give expression to it in a formal way, and he sought to place the conflict in its proper perspective. According to Cowan, the wars ‘redeemed our history from the commonplaces of a sleek commercialism’ and provided the first occasion for the developing of ‘a strong mutual respect, tinged with real affection, which would never have existed but for this ordeal by battle’ (ibid., 2-3); since Cowan’s time, it has been understood that these wars supplied a necessary foundation for joint nationhood.

As this sketch suggests, the military framework has always provided for acknowledgement of Maori soldierly skill since it is predicated on the depiction of the rebel chiefs as worthy foes. According to James Belich, the most prominent of the recent revisionists of the New Zealand wars, this longstanding recognition of courage and chivalry served to obscure understandings of Maori success in the conflicts and to conceal the need for review. Belich undertook to amend the terms on which Maori military achievements might be understood. His analysis of the New Zealand wars, first published in 1986 and screened on national television as a documentary series a decade later, formed part of a concerted effort to re-shape the signifying contours of the past (Bennett 1988, 3), emerging at a time when changing responses to colonisation, ignited in Aotearoa New Zealand in part by highly publicised Maori protests over Treaty of Waitangi grievances, had begun to give these wars a potent contemporary relevance. Defining his analysis in progressive terms against earlier histories like Cowan's, Belich sought to rehabilitate the northern war by demonstrating that it inaugurated a proud tradition of heroic resistance. While this revisionism has been described by subsequent commentators as being 'so dramatic that Maori are now said to have won a war they had previously lost' (Williams 2002, 158), and while Belich's self-proclaimed achievements in dismantling myth, uncovering past interpretative deficiencies, confronting and overthrowing dominant interpretations and producing alternative understandings of frontier conflict in Aotearoa New Zealand have generally been applauded, his project is, in fact, continuous with earlier interpretations in several crucial ways. Despite demonstrating critical awareness of the development of a dominant framework for dealing with conflicts such as the northern one, his analysis nevertheless perpetuates its terms. His study is explicitly a 'military history' (Belich 1988, 11-12), and it, too, is concerned to show that episodes of frontier conflict of this kind have been 'crucial in the development of New Zealand race relations' and have marked 'a watershed in the history of the country as a whole' (ibid., 15).

Of primary importance to Belich's argument is a desire to reclaim 'the Maori side' of the conflict and in the case of the northern war, the vast majority of the material that Belich uses to support his revisionist analysis and to counterbalance 'the problem of one-sided evidence' (ibid., 330) is derived from one of the earliest published accounts, Maning's *History of the War in the North* (1862). Belich mines Maning's *History* for quotes to supply 'the Maori view' and uses it as the basis for several of his theories. His preoccupation with determining the factual accuracy of the *History*, which he regards as a repository of 'embalmed evidence' (ibid., 334-5), precludes recognition of the fact that

foundational problems associated with the telling of this story are implicit in this text, or that it might offer a foundation for alternative ways of conceptualising the conflict. Maning's text has been reprinted several times since its initial publication and while its reception has been characterised by confusion and misunderstanding—as recently as 1987 it has been treated as 'an enchanted account of the war' that was 'given to Maning by an anonymous chief of the Ngapuhi' (Sahlins 1987, 66 and 60)—it is undoubtedly a significant historical source. The text forms part of the considerable body of wartime literature and dates from the period during which the military interpretative framework began to gain ascendancy. Maning was—as has already been noted in the introduction to this thesis—a participant in the war, and his *History* is presented as a narrative told from the perspective of a 'pro-government' Maori chief. While the *History's* double-edged satire in some ways supports the military framework, there is also a strong sense that the text is written against this emergent paradigm. Undermining the possibility that a singular, unified narrative of this episode might be produced, Maning's *History* suggests that Maori versions of the conflict may focus on an alternative set of events and concerns—that the key co-ordinates of such accounts may lie elsewhere.

If Belich's revisionist conclusion is reliant on Maning's account, it is also, to a certain extent, destabilised by it. Belich's assertion that the British did not win the battle of Ruapekapeka (and therefore lost the northern war) rests on the intimation in Maning's *History* that the defenders of the pa made a deliberate tactical withdrawal as means of a trap. Vehemently refuting Belich's conclusion as 'myth-making', military historian Christopher Pugsley has maintained that the vacating of the pa signals the rebel chiefs' defeat (1994, 32). Crucially, Pugsley, too, uses Maning's *History* as the main source for his claims. These two myths of the battle, both of which are derived from Maning's *History*, and neither of which is conclusively authorised by that text, have been hashed and re-hashed in the public domain, achieving extensive exposure.¹¹⁹ This emphasis on untangling the 'mystery' of Ruapekapeka, on determining which of the parties won or lost, and on appraising Maori military genius and tactics in Eurocentric terms, has effectively stalled the scope of discussion that relates to the northern conflict. This chapter takes the view that these are quite possibly the wrong questions—the wrong focus for debate, the wrong use of Maning.

Until recently, the story of the northern conflict had barely been dealt with in New Zealand museums. Where the story has previously appeared in the public historical sphere, its presentation has been

governed by the conventions of military history, with the result that memorial plaques and battle-scene images like the one supplied to Auckland Museum by Maning have constituted the most publicly visible acknowledgements. In the majority of other cases the story has tended to be stabilised by more glorious war stories, shown as a precursor to the forging of the nation in overseas theatres of conflict. Objects such as cannonballs and muskets have hovered on the fringes of displays of military interest, and taonga associated with the conflict have been presented as ethnological specimens shorn of specific historical significance. In the first decade of the twenty-first century, however, the story of the northern conflict has been the subject of new displays at Ruapekapeka pa and in the National Museum of Australia. That this has occurred is perhaps not surprising, since the story is now being forcefully reclaimed by iwi groups with interests in its telling. In its current revisionist form, it also seems to furnish a tale of indigenous agency of a kind that cultural institutions are eager to represent, and to offer opportunities for the collaborative practices that have become cornerstones of contemporary museum practice. This chapter evaluates the extent to which these recent treatments can be seen to have shifted the terms of the debate, and traces potential uses of Maning's *History* in future treatments of this story.

* * *

Hone Heke Pokai, one of the leaders of the 'rebel' Ngapuhi forces in the northern conflict, starred as one of the most prominent international representatives in *Outlawed: The world's rebels, revolutionaries and bushrangers* (2003-4), the first major temporary exhibition to be developed in-house at the National Museum of Australia (NMA). The exhibition took two and a half years to produce and eventually grew to include 23 outlaw figures from nine countries. While promotional material emphasised its ambitious scale and global perspective, in practice the building of a national story was one of the curators' primary objectives. Outlawry was selected as the exhibition's subject because of its strong resonance for the local settler population: bushranging, the local variant of outlaw legend, has provided the leading interpretative framework for dealing with frontier conflict in Australia, giving rise to the country's earliest settler-colonial literary and cultural traditions. Celebrating stories of 'ordinary' men with their bonds of mateship and anti-authoritarian, rebellious spirit, this framework has provided the defining characteristics of Australia's most distinctive type and continues, as the exhibition sought to demonstrate, to have widespread currency in channels of

popular culture. One of the fundamental features of the outlaw legend in Australia is that it has been used to figure a form of frontier conflict that occurred between settlers and their governments. Perceiving that the exhibition needed to feature an indigenous strand as a sign of its commitment to postcolonial practice, the NMA sought to grant Aboriginal communities a share in this foundational myth. The exhibition catalogue states that in frontier societies the conflict can take another form, too: ‘that between Indigenes and colonizers’ (Seal 2003, 13). This inclusion was the most strongly revisionist aspect of *Outlawed*. Modifying the major ‘known’ story and expanding on a phenomenon that had received virtually no mention in the body of work on the subject of outlawry on which the exhibition drew, the NMA undertook to offset the story of (white, settler) bushrangers with that of (indigenous) rebels and revolutionaries to produce an encompassing national narrative.¹²⁰

Heke’s inclusion in *Outlawed* was intended by the curators to resolve a number of problems that attended this revisionist undertaking. Soon after its opening in March 2001, the NMA became a focus for acrimonious and widely-publicised criticism concerning the treatment of settlement history in its permanent galleries. The use of the term ‘massacre’, and the framing of Australian frontier conflict as ‘wars of conquest’ on the part of colonists and as ‘wars of resistance’ on the part of indigenous populations were, according to those who made the complaints, among the most ‘fictitious’.¹²¹ An inquiry was ordered by the Australian federal government and although the museum was exonerated in the resulting report, the controversy cost the museum’s Aboriginal director her job. Public statements issued by the NMA at the time when *Outlawed* was being developed resolutely maintained that the museum would not shy away from addressing ‘the tough issues’ and finding itself ‘in plenty of trouble’, that it would continue to ‘startle’ and ‘disturb’ its visitors and provide ‘a physical and intellectual space in which debate could take place’.¹²² *Outlawed* was, however, intended as an instrument for generating positive publicity and the NMA undertook to contain the potential for this inaugural exhibition—which would cover closely related terrain, and which would announce the museum’s arrival on the global stage—to arouse similar controversy. The exhibition catalogue acknowledges defensively that there is ‘little information’ available about indigenous outlaws in Australia’s colonial past and that details of these figures’ activities are only sketchily known (Weber 2003, 35 and 41), and the curators have explained that they experienced difficulties in sourcing objects and stories relating to Aboriginal resistance activities.¹²³ With a national indigenous

story that seemed—to them—to be far from convincing and likely to cause controversy, the curators turned to overseas figures to strengthen and insulate this strand of the myth.

Heke's centrality in *Outlawed* belies the fact that he was a chance and relatively late inclusion: the role of a strong indigenous resistance fighter had originally been intended by the curators to be fulfilled by Sitting Bull, the Sioux chief who fought Colonel George Custer at Little Big Horn. Heke came to be proposed for inclusion by one of his descendants, a doctoral student who was living in Canberra, in response to a memo circulated by one of the exhibition's curators at a time when it became likely that Sitting Bull would be withdrawn.¹²⁴ Notably, Aotearoa New Zealand had not been included within any of the cross-cultural studies of outlawry on which the NMA curators were drawing, and when it was named on the list of 'possible' countries on the memo, no prospective outlaw figures were known or named by the NMA.¹²⁵ These circumstances make it clear that settler nations, frontier conflicts and indigenous figures were largely interchangeable for the exhibition's purposes. Heke's descendants, however, saw things in it for themselves: this was an opportunity they created and actively pursued. One of the challenges immediately apparent to descendants was that although Aotearoa New Zealand has a strong tradition of indigenous resistance, it does not have a strong tradition of framing of episodes of frontier conflict as outlawry: as Jo Diamond, the Canberra-based descendant and doctoral student who initially proposed Heke's inclusion within *Outlawed*, has explained, 'bandit and bushrangers' are not part of the academic or popular perception of national history or culture in Aotearoa New Zealand' (2004, 253). Keen awareness that the exhibition's subject seemed to constitute a novel—and potentially controversial—interpretative framework for this story led descendants to debate whether Heke should feature in the exhibition, and care was taken to produce a written mandate, signed by forty descendants, authorising his representation. Likely implications of this decision were apparent to descendants and their decision did not go unchallenged in Aotearoa New Zealand. Newspaper articles published at the time the exhibition was launched reported that Auckland Museum had 'declined'—to use its director's term—to release any artefacts for the exhibition because of reservations held by the institution's taumata-a-iwi and by northern iwi about 'the potentially negative association of Hone Heke with villains and rebels'.¹²⁶

In electing to proceed with Heke's inclusion in *Outlawed*, perceived benefits prevailed over potential concerns for descendants and it is clear that a range of overlapping and diverging objectives was

being pursued. Some descendants saw an opportunity to pay tribute to an important tupuna within the precincts of a prestigious national museum and to widen public knowledge of his story; some saw an opportunity to assert and augment their own leadership and authority; and some saw an opportunity to elevate the profile of Ngapuhi on the international stage. *Outlawed* seemed to present a unique occasion for the realising of many of these ambitions. Differing from the usual requirements entailed by the military framework, the outlaw framework permitted a biographical approach to be taken to telling the story of the northern conflict, with Heke figured explicitly as its centre, and it called for the story to be presented in a bold, forceful way. By determining for themselves the appropriateness of telling tribal stories in this way, descendants seem to have believed they were effecting the representation of their tupuna if not strictly ‘in’ their own terms, then certainly *on* their own terms. This impression was reinforced by the fact that the exhibition was developed along collaborative lines: Diamond was employed by the NMA as a research assistant responsible for sourcing objects and giving advice on Maori protocols; a senior descendant was engaged to act as a cultural advisor to the NMA; and family members were able to nominate an author to write the text for their tupuna’s display. The impression that they were controlling the terms of Heke’s inclusion was also reinforced by the descendants’ ability to make headway in their initial negotiations with the NMA. Significantly, they were able to effect modification of the exhibition’s title, which was originally intended to include the term ‘bandits’ as a nod to the seminal study by Eric Hobsbawm on which the exhibition drew, but was changed because of concerns that this term would be offensive to a Maori audience.¹²⁷

Individual descendants also nurtured expectations for what Heke’s inclusion within the particular framework of outlawry might offer. Drawing together Maori and Aboriginal stories within the same compass, *Outlawed* seemed to provide opportunities for the developing of a comparative perspective which appealed strongly to some: Diamond, for instance, had been adamant from the outset that Heke would need to be included alongside Aboriginal figures and others that she recognised as being ‘similar’ if his story was to be presented in the context of the Australian bushranging tradition.¹²⁸ Another ‘promise’ related to the exhibition’s professed deconstructive aims: *Outlawed* claimed to be interested in reviewing from a critical perspective what it termed the process of ‘legendising’, explaining how and why representations of figures such as Heke change over time, ‘as a country or culture’s social and political circumstances change’ (Casey 2003, x). Diamond’s own hope that the

outlaw framework offered a fresh approach for telling Heke's story, and her faith that the NMA was 'making space' (Smith 1999, 176-77) for indigenous communities to effect the representation of their own histories, were expressed in academic papers written during the course of her museum consultancy. Perceiving an opportunity to move beyond the standard military paradigm, Diamond registered her disaffection with aspects of the interpretative framework conventionally used to deal with this story, expressing hope for 'a more even-handed representation' of Heke than the usual simplistic portrayal of him as a 'savage' or 'warrior' (2004, 363). She commented that it would be 'tempting to attach war, weapons and macho masculinity alone to Heke in the planned 'Outlawed' exhibition. But that would be out of balance because [. . .] most of his imagery is draped in cloaks, some of exquisite quality and all evoking his mana' (ibid.). In order to do justice to this complex tupuna, she proposed, the invisible yet palpable weavers of the finery which features in his representations needed to be acknowledged.

* * *

In practice, Diamond did not exercise as much authority over the nuances of Heke's presentation in the exhibition as she had anticipated: this was an instance in which, to use James Clifford's cynical formulation, the museum had undertaken to consult 'after the curatorial vision [was] firmly in place' (1997, 207). In order to strengthen its case for indigenous resistance, the NMA capitalised on—rather than interrogating or dispensing with—the military paradigm, depicting Heke as a warrior whose 'amazing' tale (Duke, cited in Ansley 2003b, n.p.) turned on open warfare. Heke occupied a central position in the exhibition hall, and the conflictual aspects of his story were accentuated. The major display that was used to effect his inclusion was dramatically positioned midway through the gallery sequence in the entrance to the 'Confrontations' room, whose facade was pock-marked with simulated bullet holes and overlaid with enormous shards suggestive of shattered glass. A number of portraits and images of Heke, mounted on the wall of a black antechamber and spot-lit to enhance their potency, stared out to confront visitors as they approached the room, and a number of weapons—including Heke's personal patiti or tomahawk; taiaha, patu and mere (fighting staffs and clubs); adapted axes with carved handles; single and double-barrelled muskets; and cannonballs recovered from Ruapekapeka pa—commanded attention. The sense of immediacy and challenge was heightened by the provocative quote used on the major text panel to introduce his story: 'Do you

suppose that I am afraid of anyone?’ The positioning of the exhibit clearly demonstrated the crucial role Heke played in facilitating the inclusion of the NMA’s chosen Aboriginal figures: immediately inside the ‘Confrontations’ room on either side of the Heke display was the material used to represent Musquito and Walyer.¹²⁹ This arrangement in the gallery sequence echoed the composition of references in press releases and in the exhibition catalogue, in which Heke was used to enhance the profile of these figures. In the gallery, Heke’s appearance also marked a point of climax in the exhibition’s story. None of the indigenous resistance figures featured again until the final room devoted to ‘Popular Culture’, where Heke was represented by three recent artworks. These images were the final exhibits on the wall of the gallery leading to the exit, providing an arresting visual reminder of indigenous resistance in a room where the NMA had been unable to source further objects to make possible an Aboriginal presence. Heke literally stood-in for an Aboriginal figure in this gallery to complete the national narrative.

Problems arising from the NMA’s treatment of Maori and Aboriginal histories in *Outlawed* were considerable and wide-ranging.¹³⁰ While the museum professed deconstructive aims, in practice a diverse range of stories from around the globe was assembled and processed through the same filter; the exhibition’s comparative perspective served what Thomas has described as a globalising view in which we are all different, yet somehow different in the same way (1999b, 281), revealing more about the institutional aims, aspirations and constraints of the NMA than it did about the ostensible objects of study. The exhibition made no effort to recover any of the actual historical links between Heke’s story and the Australian context in which it was shown—the fact, for instance, that troops were sent from New South Wales to support the government forces in New Zealand during this conflict, or that (as the Busby family’s case suggests), the war precipitated a flow of traffic in the direction of Australia. Refusing to upset the fundamental premises of either of the dominant frameworks conventionally used to make sense of frontier conflict on opposite sides of the Tasman, the exhibition also ignored the particular conditions of culture that made the indigenous stories different from others presented in the exhibition. The first opportunity for this kind of acknowledgement arose early in the gallery sequence, in the display of the proclamation made against Heke by Governor Fitzroy in 1844. The existence of such an edict was one of the anchoring devices used to connect almost all of the major stories in the exhibition. In Heke’s case, however, it should have occasioned exploration of difficulties in characterising as outlawry conflict between

peoples who might both understand themselves to be sovereign, since a reciprocal proclamation was subsequently issued by Heke against Fitzroy.¹³¹ *Outlawed* made no mention of this counter-proclamation, unwilling to acknowledge the fact that the participants in this conflict did not operate under a shared set of understandings or conventions.

This simplification was symptomatic of the NMA's approach to Heke's story: for the exhibition's purposes, only certain kinds of indigenous resistance and agency could be acknowledged. Text panels made it clear that the exhibition sought to emphasise 'daring and desperate deeds', 'pursuits and escapes', 'battling the odds', 'fighting without surrender', and 'the inevitable last stand' in relation to each figure's story. Aspects of Heke's story which are usually accommodated within the military framework but which may have undermined his inclusion in the outlaw framework—such as the fact that the fighting took the form of staged battles rather than the guerrilla raids that are typical of outlawry; that throughout the northern war, Heke was not on-the-run; and that he engaged in diplomatic negotiations with his Pakeha adversaries, written records of which still survive—were downplayed or avoided in the text panels and catalogue. In other significant ways, too, the NMA's treatment of Heke led to a more extreme and more simplified version of this story than is usually told in Aotearoa New Zealand. It was noted in one text panel that Heke and other chiefs believed their region was not receiving the benefits they had expected from the Treaty of Waitangi, but elsewhere the exhibition failed to make it clear that Heke was almost certainly fighting for *more* British intervention in the Bay of Islands, contorting Heke's story in order to depict him as a strong and unambiguous liberator of his people, 'a revolutionary fighter against an intrusive government' (Duke, cited in NZPA 2003, n.p.).

As is typical of post-1980s revisionist approaches to this story, the exhibition accentuated the superiority of Maori strategies and contrasted these with blunders made by the British, emphasising the differences in weaponry between the two combative forces, the ineffectualness of British artillery and tactics when bombarding Ruapekapeka, and the innovative features of the design of the pa. Hardening the lines of opposition between the British and Maori 'sides', however, *Outlawed* entirely elided the fact that the northern conflict was complicated with tribal dimensions—that Heke fought against other Ngapuhi warriors, too—meaning that it was blind to some of the key elements of his story. Mediating between the extremes of Belich and Pugsley's conclusions, text panels asserted that

months of conflict resulted in a truce with neither side able to claim absolute victory, although the exhibition catalogue went further than this, distorting Belich's revisionist conclusion that the rebel chiefs achieved a tactical victory in the battle of Ruapekapeka (and thus won the northern war) by asserting inaccurately that the war finished 'without Heke ever having lost a single battle' (Weber 2003, 47). The fighting at Te Ahuahu in which European soldiers did not participate, which Heke lost decisively and in which he was badly wounded, which the conventional military paradigm does usually acknowledge to some degree, and which Maning's *History* strongly suggests might be the climax of Maori versions of the conflict, was excluded altogether in the text panels and catalogue.

Backing away from its stated intention to examine continuities and changes related to how stories such as Heke's have been told over time, the exhibition's approach to processes of 'legendising' simply sought to display material evidence of the fact that Heke had lived on in popular culture. The collection of 'historic' or 'primary' objects that was used to effect his inclusion—sourced by Diamond from the Pioneer Village in Kaikohe, as well as from the Alexander Turnbull Library and the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa—was notable for being the largest and strongest in the exhibition. These objects' sacred and ceremonial nature was repeatedly invoked in NMA media releases, permitting the museum to make it clear that conservators and curators were seeking advice and assistance from descendants in relation to the handling of these objects; as Diamond has explained, Heke became a central icon for the exhibition and a 'flagship' for media coverage.¹³² The NMA curators have conceded, however, that 'secondary' objects to illustrate the ways in which Heke's story had lived on in legend could scarcely be found.¹³³ Those objects that did come to be displayed in the gallery—*Honi Heke in Two Cantos* and *Extracts from the Diary of Rev. R. Burrows*, both published in the 1840s, and three late-twentieth century artworks—gave the strong impression of the existence of a vast temporal chasm in relation to the story of the northern war. Editions of Maning's *History*, which has been available in print almost continuously since the 1860s and which has served as a crucial source for the kinds of revisionist versions of the story of the northern war that underpinned the exhibition's own approach, were notably absent from Heke's display.

Perhaps the most urgent problems that attended Heke's inclusion in *Outlawed*, however, related to media coverage of the dispute between descendants and Auckland Museum officials. While the NMA was not prepared to examine this dispute within the exhibition hall, passing off Heke's

inclusion within the outlaw frame as unproblematic, it did capitalise on the clash for publicity purposes. Breaking the story in a press release at the time the exhibition was being launched, the museum re-staged a dispute that had actually taken place almost eighteen months earlier when Auckland Museum had advised of its decision not to support Heke's inclusion in *Outlawed*.¹³⁴ Evoking the challenging of authority which the exhibition set out to celebrate, and drawing attention to the inclusion of indigenous figures without risk of arousing domestic controversy over the Aboriginal component of the exhibition, the dispute provided the NMA with a dramatic and expedient angle for publicity which fuelled the first feature articles on *Outlawed*. David Rankin, the senior Heke descendant who had been appointed to act as a cultural advisor to the NMA, obligingly posed for photographs brandishing a firearm in an aggressive stance, and it was duly reported that artefacts of Hone Heke had arrived in Canberra 'amid ground-shaking thunderstorms and the first shots in a new war between Nga Puhī and the Auckland Museum'.¹³⁵ In the media, the dispute was portrayed as pivoting on Auckland Museum repudiating the appropriateness of the inclusion of Heke within the outlaw frame, reinforcing the idea that this framework constituted a groundbreaking way of framing Maori tribal histories. The real tensions which unfolded behind the scenes were, in fact, exacerbated by the use of this stunt. Diamond was dismayed by the continued emphasis on contemporary Maori 'warriors' in media coverage on both sides of the Tasman (2004, 264), and has described the NMA's decision to pursue this angle as resulting in a 'media circus' (ibid., 265) which restricted *Outlawed* to the same, worn-out stereotypes that she had hoped the exhibition would overturn: Diamond believed that there were other ways of drawing international media attention to Ngapuhī involvement and representation in the exhibition. She has also been critical of the NMA's decision not to publicise the powhiri she arranged for the artefacts' arrival in Canberra, proposing that superficial understandings of Maori as a warrior race on one hand, and as merely a 'performance group' for concerts on the other, were thus maintained (ibid., 263). The problem for Diamond, in other words, was that there was *not enough* difference or novelty offered by the outlaw framework; the exhibition had failed to enable the re-conceptualising of this story in any significant way.

The dispute between Rankin and Diamond threatened to spill over into the exhibition hall, with Rankin advising the exhibition's curators to exclude the replica whariki (woven mat) that Diamond had commissioned for display (ibid., 363-4). Diamond speculated at the time that there was a possibility this dispute would become the subject of media reports, although it seems unlikely that the

NMA would have sought to make it public. The NMA's approach to handling of the complex web of various interests in relation to *Outlawed* involved endorsing those which dovetailed with its own objectives and ignoring those which diverged from its own in significant ways. Registering of acute internal division among descendants might have threatened to undermine the NMA's case for including Heke in *Outlawed* as part of its revisionist programme; for publicity purposes, the NMA required a simplistic evocation of Heke's representation as being supported by a resurgent indigenous population. After the exhibition opened, Diamond expressed disappointment that divergent Maori views were not better-handled by the NMA (2004, 364), and she concludes the section of her doctoral thesis which discusses *Outlawed* by posing the following question for other 'scholars of Maori culture': 'shall we remain silent on [such issues] in order to achieve our ultimate goal of adequate Maori representation [. . .], or not?' (ibid., 266). Making it clear that the question is one of strategy, Diamond perceives that if descendants make it too difficult, institutions like the NMA won't bother. Seeming to propose that a compromise solution which falls short of individually-held expectations may be better than nothing at all, she notes that continuing power plays within communities complicate the practical working-through of the consultation process, and that the outcome of extensive negotiations between museums and stakeholders is likely to be multiple and contested interpretations (ibid.).

Although Heke's inclusion in *Outlawed* did not explicitly acknowledge or explore these behind-the-scenes debates, it did mark out some of the entanglements that surrounded the representation of this story in this way. If, on the surface, it appears that Diamond's hopes for overhauling the conventional military framework were barely met, her role in sourcing objects for display did leave a legacy of sorts, and closer inspection of the range of objects displayed in *Outlawed* does reveal traces of negotiations between particular contributors. Diamond's insistence that women's experiences and influences would be used to modulate Heke's story did result in small number of textiles and objects being displayed in the gallery space. The replica whariki which was commissioned by Diamond and made by Ngapuhi weavers specifically for *Outlawed*, and which Rankin had attempted to exclude, was, in the end, present in the gallery. While it did allude to some of the background tensions, the accompanying label failed to make clear that problems surrounding this object represented a flashpoint for a much deeper dispute: it simply read, '[d]iffering opinions exist about the purposes of such mats. Some claim that chiefs like Hone Heke, when travelling outside his [sic] tribal area,

would use a mat like this, when claiming the right to speak. Others state that chiefs needed to stand on the land to speak with authority.’ A greenstone mere wahine, ceremonially used by women when welcoming guests onto the marae, also appeared in the gallery. Other objects, too, sat at a variance to the main thrust of the exhibition’s narrative. Competing conceptions of warfare and systems of belief were introduced with the inclusion of a wooden god stick said to have been used by Papahurihia, a Ngapuhi tohunga, when predicting the course of the battle of Ohaeawai. In another label, too, Heke’s renown as an orator was discussed in relation to tokotoko (oratory sticks) used by Ngakahi tohunga in their teachings. The inclusion of *Teku Tanumia*, Heke’s personal tomahawk ‘named in commemoration of the rape and murder of his mother by Ngati Whatua under the direction of Rewharewha’, also stood as a marker of deep and complex tribal histories.

The beginning of an explicit deconstruction of the conventions of settler history-making, too, was pointed towards with the inclusion of the late-twentieth century oil paintings. Lester Hall’s *Psst Hone Heke Was a Tattooed Savage*, one of the final images in the exhibition, presents a caricatured portrait of the chief set on a page torn from a diary marked with accession numbers typical of archival sources. The image is bordered with ink-smudged handwritten script which parodies conventions of European historical discourse, ironically ascribing motivations for Heke’s actions (‘But the last provoking straw came for Heke when . . .’). Basing its deliberately reductive and tendentious approach on a relation exclusively drawn between Pakeha and Maori, the image suggests that Eurocentric ways of dealing with the northern conflict may have obscured understandings of the complex cultural dynamics that surround this story. While none of these objects was permitted to undermine or overshadow the exhibition’s central narrative, while these objects did not enable the re-conceptualising of the northern conflict in distinctly non-Eurocentric ways, and while they may perhaps have been notable only to those who were actively seeking such signs, they nevertheless indicated strands that complicated Heke’s inclusion within the exhibition’s interpretative framework. There was, in other words, latent potential in some of the materials displayed in *Outlawed* to tell a story of a different kind.

* * *

For the NMA's revisionist purposes, one of the most compelling characteristics of frontier conflict in Aotearoa New Zealand was the fact that its telling has been governed by a military framework. Tom Griffiths has explained the attraction of this kind of history for Australians, noting that '[i]t was a frustration to many colonists that the constant domestic tension and sporadic conflict of the Australian frontier did not fit their image of a war, although they often used that term' (2003, 143). 'Proper', full-scale wars, Griffiths suggests, offer psychological relief to settlers by dignifying their violence against a respected foe, allowing them the romance of heroes and campaigns, baptising their nationhood and consolidating their emerging identity (ibid.). Cowan had made much the same point in 1922, noting that while 'the story of New Zealand is rich beyond that of most young countries in episodes of adventure and romance', in contrast to this, 'Australia's pioneering work was of a different quality [. . .] mainly because the nation-makers of our neighbour encountered no powerful military race of indigenes to dispute their right of way' (1955, 1). In practice, while frontier conflict in Aotearoa New Zealand may seem to offer the raw materials for such a nation-building project, and while the local settler population may have striven to make use of local episodes of frontier conflict in precisely these ways, the military interpretative framework used to deal with this conflict has carried its own attendant difficulties. Problems associated with this framework have perhaps been nowhere more striking than in relation to Ruapekapeka.

Occupying a crucial place in New Zealand's mythology of settlement, Ruapekapeka has been figured in European accounts as the climax of the northern conflict because the battle fought there in January 1846 involved the third and largest British expeditionary force, and because it was the final, supposedly determining, battle of the war. This battle was fought at a time when British rule in Aotearoa New Zealand was still vulnerable. As Cowan pointed out:

In Hone Heke's day the Maori population so greatly outnumbered the whites, who were here on sufferance, that the confidence of such commanders such as Despard and some of the officials and administrators of the hour is inexplicable except on the theory of an overwhelming faith in the white man's military invincibility [. . .] it is apparent that a combined effort by the natives in the 'forties' or early 'fifties' could have driven the *pakeha* population into the sea.¹³⁶

Settlement, then, *depended* on this story being told in a certain way, and British administrators wasted no time in proclaiming victory, declaring in official accounts that Ruapekapeka had been taken by assault and that the result had been the 'complete defeat of the rebels Heke and Kawiti by

Her Majesty's Forces' (Grey, cited in Belich 1988, 59-60). Competing significances of the battle were, however, rumoured at the time. Maning wrote in a letter to his family in Tasmania two months after the fighting at Ruapekapeka that 'anyone to read [Colonel] Despard's despatches would think that we had thrashed the natives soundly whereas they really have had the best of us on several occasions'. 'I really begin to think,' Maning went on, 'that it is perhaps all a mistake about us beating the french at Waterloo. I shall always for the rest of my life be cautious how I believe an account of a battle' (cited in Belich 1988, 69). Over time, as settlement itself has become more firmly entrenched, this once-subversive view of the battle has come to find favour; the ongoing project of settlement now depends on this story being told with a distinct change of emphasis.

The course of Ruapekapeka's on-site interpretation has mirrored this historiographical trend. Ruapekapeka was put firmly 'on' the map with the publication of Belich's revisionist study in the late-1980s, since it was used as the cornerstone of his argument that the British lost the northern war. At the time when Belich's analysis was published, Ruapekapeka was owned by the New Zealand government and managed by the Department of Conservation (DOC) (known as the Department of Lands and Survey up until 1987), having been gazetted as a scenic (later historic) reserve in 1914. In 1980, the Department of Lands and Survey had overseen the erecting of seven on-site pictorial and descriptive panels at Ruapekapeka, a development which was the culmination of several decades of petitioning by MPs and members of the public for the site to be interpreted for visitors (Gardiner 1983, n.p.). The narrative that was presented in these panels appears to have conformed to the requirements of the military framework as they stood at the time. According to a management report for the reserve prepared by John Gardiner in 1983, materials that were exhibited at Ruapekapeka included images and text which briefly introduced the two 'sides' (Heke and Kawiti on one; the British and their Ngapuhi allies on the other) and provided sketches of the pa and images and diary extracts relating to its bombardment, largely concentrating on the kinds of facts and figures privileged by military conventions (dates, numbers of troops, quantities of ammunition, technical descriptions of the fortifications and so on). The narrative emphasised British heroism in overcoming the difficulties posed by having to haul artillery over steep and wooded terrain. Maori determination and 'gallantry' in the battle were also commended, and the strength of the construction of the pa was applauded (cited in Gardiner 1983, n.p.).

In order to maximise Ruapekapeka's 'full interpretative potential' (ibid.), Gardiner prepared supplementary material for the erecting of additional on-site display panels; his proposal makes it clear that he has read, among other sources, Maning's *History*. Although he treats the *History* as a straightforward eye-witness account of events which can be used to verify mechanical details and supply descriptions of scenes, and although he stops considerably short of recognising the fuller implications of its approach to telling this story, his report and the draft text he prepared evince the influence of some of Maning's ideas. The new interpretative material was, for example, to have discussed tribal aspects of the conflict: one recommendation involved the adding of a panel early in the narrative sequence that would explain the importance of deeper residues of Maori history, in particular the wars of the first few decades of the 1800s, in aligning the factions of Ngapuhi in the northern war, with the conflict offering 'the chance to settle old scores' (Gardiner 1983, 177). The display was also to have included a panel detailing skirmishes in the bush between Kawiti and Waka Nene's men during the battle of Ruapekapeka which would have begun to signal the awkward place of the British: the proposed text makes it clear that the soldiers were confused and that they stood back, fearing they might shoot their Maori allies. Another panel would have pointed towards the importance of portents, marking the spot where Kawiti raised the flag which showed that he was ready for the battle to begin and which was destroyed first hit. The panel was to have explained that this incident caused amazement for Ngapuhi on both sides, with many believing it to be a bad omen for the defenders of the pa (ibid., 67). A further proposed change was the addition of an excerpt from Maning's *History* as a caption to provide a viewpoint of the bombardment from within the pa:

One man was killed by a cannon-ball, which came through the fence and knocked his leg off as easily as if it had been a boiled potato [. . .] When he saw his leg was off above the knee, he cried out, Look here, the iron has run away with my leg! What playful creatures these cannon-balls are! When he said this he fell back and died, smiling, as brave warriors do.¹³⁷

While there is no indication that these elements would have been permitted to overshadow the strongly asserted military paradigm, and while Gardiner was selective in his use of Maning, failing to push many of these points as far as the *History* suggests they can be taken, they might have served to modulate the military framework in subtle ways.

These proposals, however, never made it onto interpretation panels at Ruapekapeka. None of the changes were adopted and the existing on-site materials were subsequently removed. This occurred

because the overall ‘construction on history’ which was displayed, and which the supplementary materials prepared by Gardiner would have endorsed—which pre-dated Belich’s revisionist account of the war and which emphatically concluded with the forced retreat of Heke and Kawiti and the storming and capture of the pa by the British—became ‘outdated’, as is stated in a hand-written note added to the master copy of the 1983 report. Ruapekapeka was caught at the turn of the tide of revisionist history: not only did the material that had been produced for the site fail to give sufficient emphasis to Maori agency, resistance and success, and fail to arrive at the required revisionist conclusion, but it had not been developed along the kinds of appropriately collaborative lines that came to be required from the mid-1980s onwards. Gardiner had been aware of the need to obtain ‘the support of the Maori people’ in opening and interpreting historic sites for the general public, and had advocated the need to seek ‘a balance in understanding [. . .] our historic and cultural heritage’ (ibid., n.p.). When he called for iwi involvement in the developing of materials for Ruapekapeka, however, he expected that this would be less in an interpretative capacity and more to provide symbolic endorsement for plans that had already been made; in other words, his curatorial vision was already firmly in place. In fact, Gardiner specifically cautioned against the usefulness of forming of committees to oversee interpretation because it could lead to the stifling of progress and ‘the inherent danger of people with different views but without experience in interpretation affecting the quality of the plan’ (ibid.).

* * *

By the early twenty-first century, no physical traces of the first on-narrative remained on the reserve. Ruapekapeka lay empty—between histories—until the New Zealand government announced in May 2003 that it would spend \$200,000 on its redevelopment. The then-Minister for Conservation stated that the reserve had been selected for immediate work because of its strong national and international significance and its unique range of historic, technological, architectural and traditional values, and because of its ‘potential to provide a memorable experience for visitors’.¹³⁸ I would also argue that the New Zealand government recognised that it *needed* to be seen to be dealing with this site in the right kind of way. The story of this conflict is one that cannot be ignored or neglected: it is one that a mature settler nation ought to be able to handle. The reserve’s ‘rudimentary’ facilities had also been strongly criticised in an archaeological baseline report produced in 2002, which made it clear that

‘[a]lthough there is a sign at the entry to the pa requesting that people treat the pa with respect, some visitors may interpret the overall impression, including the presence of plant pests, lack of visitor facilities and inconsistent and limited signage, as an indication that the Reserve is not of significance’ (Greig 2002, 37). The Ruapekapeka upgrade was, according to a DOC spokesperson, seen an opportunity to implement ‘new and exciting interpretation techniques’ and was intended to function as a ‘best practice’ model for processes of consultation and interpretation.¹³⁹

Like the opportunity presented by *Outlawed*, the Ruapekapeka redevelopment hinged on iwi involvement: as a DOC spokesperson commented in a media report, ‘the telling of this story had to be a joint venture with Maori’.¹⁴⁰ The Ruapekapeka upgrade differed from *Outlawed*, however, in that it was not seen by descendants as an opportunity to try out a (seemingly) dramatically different approach to telling this story. Local and permanent rather than experimental and temporary, Ruapekapeka’s re-interpretation was intended to be innovative in a safe kind of way. The Ruapekapeka upgrade also differed from *Outlawed* in that it was worked towards for roughly a decade: a management committee comprising representatives of the hapu and iwi of those who fought on both sides of the battle had first been established in 1994 to work in partnership with DOC, although the committee lapsed after two years before being re-activated in 2000 as the Ruapekapeka Pa Management Trust.¹⁴¹ Several aspects of the collaboration process—such as reasons for the lapsing of the first management committee, the extent to which the government announcement may have forced resolution of some of the lingering issues, and the nature and scope of what a DOC spokesperson has described as the ‘ongoing discussions over the content of the interpretation’—remain unclear.¹⁴² Larger debates about how the site’s overall interpretation would be effected are, however, signalled in a redevelopment plan produced for DOC and the management trust by Visitor Solutions, a communications consultancy firm, in 2003.

This report shows that one of the major effects of iwi involvement has been the problematising of assumptions made at earlier junctures about how to deal with Ruapekapeka. The primary objective of the redevelopment, as stated in the 2003 report, was to link the two main areas of the reserve, the hilltop pa and the ‘advanced British position’ (which is sited lower down the hillside), which were—at the time—separated by the reserve’s car park. The report proposes that the two components of the site should be ‘unified’ through the shifting of the car park to a new location below the advanced

British position, and through the creation of a one-way track to control visitor movement around the entire reserve. The stated intention in the 2003 report is that visitors should adhere to ‘the path of the British’ (Visitor Solutions 2003, 56) and be encouraged to experience ‘the far superior weight, type and number of armaments used by the British, and then move to the Pa to see how it was specifically designed to nullify them’ (ibid., 44). This intention to place visitors in the footsteps of the British is made even more explicit in the proposal to create sculptural features such as ‘Colonel Despard’s footprints’ as under-foot artwork (ibid.). The idea is not that visitors should *identify* with the British—the narrative presented in the text panels sympathises with the rebel chiefs—but that the key place of the British in the story should be firmly inscribed; in this regard, the approach is modelled on that taken by Belich.

This ‘construction on history’ has, however, been challenged by some members of the management trust. As one of a range of future possibilities—and, according to Visitor Solutions, as ‘likely an end point’ in the site’s development (2003, 43)—the report discusses the prospect of the construction of an iwi-run museum or visitor centre which would act as a base for interpretation and learning, and would serve as a repository for the storage of artefacts from the site. The report states that two distinct approaches have been identified by the parties to the consultation process. One of these—the ‘view from a battle perspective’—would retain the car park and entrance to the reserve in the new position below the advanced British position, which would be the location for the museum. The other—the ‘view from the pa perspective’—would require that the car park and visitor facilities be moved to the opposite end of the reserve, to a position above the pa, where the museum would be sited instead. According to the report, while this second option would be ‘perhaps the most complex and expensive’, the commencement of the story at the pa would make certain chronological and interpretative sense and the area behind the pa would offer the most desirable location for a visitor centre (ibid., 43). The report indicates that this option is favoured by some members of the trust, since it would strengthen the story of the defenders of the pa by placing them first in the narrative sequence, and since it would ensure that the pa is regarded as the focal point of the entire complex. According to the report, however, other iwi representatives would prefer that visitor facilities such as car parks, toilets and the museum be positioned further away from the pa in order to protect the wairua or spiritual integrity of the site (ibid., 44). These behind-the-scenes negotiations have parallels in the concluding chapter of this thesis; as well as testifying to differences of opinion within iwi, they

demonstrate clear understanding that the narrative sequence has strong implications for the construction on history. The extent to which DOC may be seen to have consulted with the curatorial vision in place remains uncertain, although Gardiner's 1983 report makes it clear that DOC had always intended for the car park to be shifted to the area below the advanced British position, and for the narrative sequence to begin by establishing the place of the British. The negotiations detailed in the 2003 report do, however, suggest that the early phases of the redevelopment may be seen in some senses as a stop-gap measure by iwi representatives: since the trust would expect to operate a museum or visitor centre, the eyes of its members may very well be on this 'ultimate goal' (Diamond 2004, 267). It is possible, then, that the descendants' position recalls the terms of Diamond's dilemma—that a compromise solution in the interim may be preferable to having no representation at all.

These debates were not featured in media coverage of the dawn powhiri which was held to mark Ruapekapeka's reopening in December 2003 and which was attended by DOC staff, representatives of the Ruapekapeka Pa Management Trust, the Minister for Conservation, New Zealand Defence Forces staff, and members of the public. Media reports sought to emphasise qualities of support and goodwill and to signal commitment to a new collaborative approach in developing displays that deal with aspects of settlement history. The relationship between DOC and the management trust was characterised in publications at this time as having evolved from 'humble beginnings' and 'initial dialogue' into a 'strong partnership', with emphasis on 'close liaison', 'joint commitment', 'co-operation', and the need that had arisen to develop 'a mutual respect'.¹⁴³ While these statements strongly hint at challenges presented by the collaboration process, no conflict or tension was explicitly reported and the redevelopment was intended by DOC to effect a very public show of unity with the trust. A DOC spokesperson commented that:

We are grateful that the [Ruapekapeka Pa Management] Trust embraced this collaborative process, which ensured that the words and pictures reflect an honest and balanced interpretation of the historic events. DOC and the Ruapekapeka Pa Management Trust are very happy with the end product of this joint exercise with tangata whenua. We can proudly say that every effort has been made to respect traditional Maori values, with the new track being 'tika' (done in the right way), and done in the right spiritual context (taha wairua).¹⁴⁴

* * *

The most distinctive and prominent marker that has been added to Ruapekapeka since its 2003 redevelopment is the newly installed waharoa or carved gateway, which is positioned at the main entrance to the pa (above the advanced British position, midway through the newly-devised walkway sequence). Actualised in a more significant way than the ‘modest and perhaps symbolic’ carving tentatively proposed in the 1983 report (Gardiner 1983, n.p.), this gateway is, according to a DOC spokesperson, intended as the most ‘impressive component’ of the early stages of the re-development and as an aid to understanding since it:

[. . .] makes a clear statement that the earthwork defences of the pa are a product of Maori culture, but also signifies a gateway to the sharing of stories from all sides of the battle and as such forms a key component of the battle interpretation. It will allow people to enter the [pa] site in the right spirit, giving it the respect it deserves.¹⁴⁵

The positioning of the waharoa visibly seems to announce a form of history that is told both in and on iwi terms, and the fact that this element serves as a focus for the concepts of taha wairua and tikanga invoked in publicity for the site’s re-development seems to suggest that it will open up possibilities for dealing directly with Maori viewpoints and epistemologies. In practice, however, it functions to signal not only the achievements of revisionism—the recognition that there is ‘a Maori side’ to this story, and the active involvement of iwi collaborators—but its limits, too. The substantive potential for the waharoa to mark the beginnings of other ways of understanding Ruapekapeka is countered by the standard revisionist narrative which is presented in the text panels located on the pa site; these panels sit seamlessly with the ones presented in the advanced British position.

The new on-site narrative draws heavily on Belich’s revisionist study which, in turn, filters selected aspects of Maning’s *History*—aspects that are notably different from those Gardiner had proposed to utilise. Re-weighting the story strongly in favour of the rebel chiefs, the narrative highlights Maori tactical superiority, emphasising that the rebel chiefs led the British from site to site so that they always had the benefit of choosing the battle ground and were able to prepare themselves and plan escape routes (the ‘valueless pa’ theory which is presented in the narrative comes from Maning via Belich). It also examines failures of British tactics and comments on the blunders of British leaders. Discussing the innovative features of the pa’s design and the quality of its construction, it applauds Maori military ingenuity and engineering skill, and while it stops short of claiming directly, as Belich

has, that Maori ‘independently invented the anti-artillery bunker’ (1988, 52), it does link the fortifications and interior defences forward to bomb shelters that were later used in the First World War. In telling the story of the battle and its aftermath, the narrative does not fully endorse Belich’s trap theory, although it does leave open its possibility. Mediating between the extremes of Belich and Pugsley’s conclusions by describing the battle’s result as inconclusive, it does tend towards Belich’s view in highlighting the fact that government troops were left with an empty pa while Heke and Kawiti remained at large, and that ‘[w]hile [Grey] made much of this British ‘victory’ in dispatches to England, no land was confiscated and no mana was lost’. As has consistently been typical of the military paradigm, and in contrast to the version of the story that was presented in *Outlawed*, the narrative works to try to resolve the conflict within the story, emphasising the arbitrating of peace in the final panel, although it stresses, as Belich has, the uneasiness and precariousness of this resolution at the time it was effected.

Unlike *Outlawed*, the narrative does not set out to depict Heke as a liberator of his people, although there is a comparable starkness in the opposition it establishes between the Maori and Pakeha ‘sides’. More than one panel makes mention of those who supported Heke and Kawiti—Pomare and Pene Tau are, for example, named—but the narrative avoids discussion of tribal histories, giving no sense of how or why these alliances were formed, or of what they might shadow on the other side of the conflict. While the narrative does link the battle to events that occurred in Kororareka and at Puketutu and Ohaeawai, the fighting in and around Te Ahuahu is mentioned only obliquely and occasions the first uncomfortable mention of the tribal aspects of the northern war. In contrast with the 1980 on-site panel which acknowledged straightforwardly in its opening paragraph that Despard’s Maori allies included Tamati Waka Nene, the new narrative cannot comfortably accommodate such information. It states that after the fighting at Puketutu, ‘[b]attles continued between opposing Nga Puhi forces (Chief Tamati Waka Nene’s men supported the British)’, and while reference is made to the fact that Heke was badly injured during these exchanges, the narrative glosses over this with the immediate assertion ‘but Kawiti was ready to make another stand’. Parentheses are used again in relation to Ngapuhi input into British military strategy in the panel devoted to ‘The Plan of Attack’. The panel states that ‘Waka Nene and Mohi Tawhai (who were both present at the Ohaeawai disaster) persuaded Despard and the new Governor, Sir George Grey, that the defenders were still able to repel any challenge’. Pro-government Maori do appear in one of the

illustrations used on the panels—Cyprian Bridge's *View of the pa from the lower stockade* (1846) includes in its foreground two figures with their backs to the viewer—but the extent of Ngapuhi support is not made explicit until the fourth (and final) narrative panel, which states that the combined attacking force included 'more than four hundred Nga Puhi allied to the Crown'. Ngapuhi who opposed Heke and Kawiti, the Ruapekapeka narrative implies, are only significant insofar as they support and assist the British.

According to the 2003 report, additional panels are currently being prepared to supplement the existing narrative. It seems unlikely, however, that these will resolve the problems. One set of proposed new panels will look more closely at figures involved in the conflict, serving to reinforce the lines of opposition already drawn between Pakeha and Maori: Despard, Fitzroy and Grey are to feature on a panel sited on the side of the walkway in the advanced British position; Kawiti and Heke will feature on another sited on the pa. Sculptural pieces that are being developed for display will heighten the effect of this simplistic binarisation, too, using distinct symbols for 'the attackers' side' (such as mortars, cannon and British flags) and 'the defenders' side' (carvings, hapu emblems and Kawiti's flag) to stake the differences between the parties on each side. It is proposed that one panel will look at division within Ngapuhi, identifying the bonds and conflicts between the groups who fought with and against Kawiti and Heke. This panel is, however, to be positioned up on the pa itself; since the narrative sequence begins below the advanced British position, this panel will be one of the final elements encountered by visitors on their circuit, effectively obscuring the tribal dimensions of the conflict until the close of the narrative. Another closing panel will look at life in the attackers' camp, discussing, among other things, the soldiers' adopting of indigenous style accommodation, rations and medical care, and the role of the pro-government Ngapuhi in setting up camps and providing advice. Again, the effect of this will be to contain the significance of Maori who fought on the British side, showing them to be important only in a supporting role. No suggestion is made that the proposed panels will acknowledge or explore incompatibilities in understanding between Maori and Pakeha. Cross-cultural differences are posited as simply being to do with armaments: British mortars and cannon are to be contrasted with Maori fighting sticks and muskets.

The final panel in the narrative sequence will look at 'Telling the Story', discussing 'the spin that was put on the story by the British' in the nineteenth century and 'the dominance of the written word and

the printed picture', and examining how this creates bias 'when the oral traditions are confined to a restricted audience' (Visitor Solutions 2003, 32). This approach to deconstructing Pakeha historiography is derived from Belich, who devoted a significant portion of his own study to 'the Victorian interpretation of racial conflict'. Specific acknowledgement is also made in the Visitor Solutions report that an oral history programme needs to be implemented to collate iwi and hapu stories relating to the battle. While this undertaking may achieve more than the approach to 'legendising' adopted in *Outlawed*, the stated aim of this method is to 'balance' the fundamentally European view of the battle set out in numerous books and articles (ibid., 18). This idea of 'balance' is crucial, suggesting an assumption that material from 'the Maori side' can be added in; that the story can simply be rounded out in certain ways. The report states that the oral traditions to be collected should tell personal stories and cover the different views of the battle—'acknowledg[ing] the different perspectives people have today' (ibid., 49)—, while a DOC spokesperson has commented that these oral testimonies are intended to fill in the background now that the 'big picture' has been presented.¹⁴⁶ It seems doubtful that the intention is to permit Maori to be authors of this story in ways that undermine the existing narrative conventions. These oral traditions will, in other words, be required to sit within the parameters established by the military interpretative framework and to fit within the pre-defined limits of the revisionist programme—their function, achievements and disruptive potential are already circumscribed. At best, the content of these oral histories might serve in the same way that some of the objects in *Outlawed* did, and in ways that elements of the mid-1980s interpretation planned for Ruapekapeka might have, suggesting latent rather than developed possibilities for the reworking of this story.

* * *

What, then, might Maning's *History* contribute to the reconceptualising of approaches to the northern conflict? As the preceding discussion has made clear, the aspects of the *History* that revisionists have used are those which seem to support the presentation of a story of indigenous agency and resistance: the *History*'s perceived usefulness for revisionism has been that it tilts the story in favour of Maori. If the text does authorise this to some extent, however, it also tries to undercut it in ways that revisionist approaches have failed to acknowledge. Reasons for the fact that key aspects of the *History* have been ignored in revisionist treatments of this story to date are immediately apparent. As is the case

with Maning's other writings, this text is by no means a straightforward historical source: the feature which seems to have proved most troubling and off-putting for historians—and which provides the key to its significance for alternative ways of dealing with frontier conflict—is its narrative perspective.¹⁴⁷ Based in part on Maning's own eyewitness account of the conflict, and supplemented with information gathered at second hand from Hokianga Maori (Calder 2001, 6), the *History* adopts a viewpoint which has otherwise been ignored in accounts since the time of the conflict; that of a 'pro-government' Ngapuhi chief. The text is framed by Maning as being a 'little tale' which is:

[. . .] an endeavour to call back some shadows from the past: a picture of things which have left no record but this imperfect sketch. The old settlers of New Zealand—my fellow pioneers—will, I hope, recognize the likeness. To those who have more recently sought these shores, I hope it may be interesting. To all it is respectfully presented.¹⁴⁸

Written in the manner of an oral testimony, the text offers a chronological account of events relating to the northern conflict, fleshed out with a limited amount of background material. Its narrator directs his story to an intended Pakeha 'you' and employs the personal pronoun 'I', although by far the most widely used pronoun in the main body of the text is the inclusive 'we' (as in, 'we Ngapuhi'); the narrator speaks for a broader iwi constituency, too.

The adopting of this particular narrative perspective serves as the main vehicle for Maning's heavily satirical purpose: while the *History* was intended to function in a corrective capacity as a vehicle for conveying the 'interesting incidents that have occurred' and the 'many things worth telling' that were excluded from official accounts of the conflict (ibid., 211), it was also explicitly intended for 'amusement' (ibid.). The use of this narrator enables Maning to deride the British and expose their 'superior' modes of understanding and historicising. Within the *History*'s main text, Pakeha follies, failings and absurdities are exposed and attitudes of wry amusement, contempt and scorn are evoked towards them—it is precisely these qualities which have been capitalised on by revisionists like Belich, who have failed to account for their programmatically satirical purpose. At the same time, however, Maning seeks to poke fun at what he perceives as the 'primitive' or 'inferior' worldviews held by Maori: one of the key features of the text which revisionists have avoided altogether is the fact that the narrator is supposed to serve, to some extent, as the butt of authorial humour, too. To achieve this dual purpose, Maning inverts one of the formal conventions of satire in which an astute and urbane speaker remarks insightfully from a superior vantage point. The narrator of his *History* is set up as a naïf; operating from a limited and partisan position, he is deliberately made to function as

an unreliable source, to misunderstand and misrecognise aspects of British conduct and behaviour, to possess a shortfall of knowledge. The implication strongly given in the text, however, is that he knowingly acts in this way: the audience is made to appreciate that he perceives considerably more than he professes to grasp, or to sense that his strings are being pulled by a crafty puppeteer. In this way, creating slippage between inferiority and superiority, ignorance and insight, darkness and enlightenment, Maning suggestively registers the difficulties that attend endeavours to stabilise and make sense of cross-cultural encounters. Allowing certain things to escape, his text evokes the sense that there are meanings bigger than or working in opposition to the ones which are able to be ascribed from a single position, that different understandings of the same incidents are produced by those whose worldviews do not neatly coincide. One of the main effects (or perhaps side-effects) of Maning's use of this narrative perspective is it draws the audience towards sympathising with Maori points of view. Rather than simply deconstructing or endorsing features of the military interpretative paradigm, the text steers its audience towards recognition of the kinds of imaginings that have conventionally been excluded from European modes of historicising.

The *History* appears to have exceeded Maning's intention in this regard and it becomes unclear whose mouthpiece the narrator really is. Authorial notes and a concluding section added after the central narrative was written index changes in Maning's own attitudes over time. Introducing an explicitly hostile tone, these notes have generated considerable confusion, leading critics and historians to presume that Maning was not responsible for writing the main body of the text—that he simply transcribed and edited an oral history. In some senses, however, this supposition pinpoints a crossover that has occurred in the text. Striving to pull back the balance of the satire, Maning attempts to rein in his narrator, signalling that his *History* has acquired a force of its own. The authorial notes are clearly intended to re-distance the audience from the narrator and they directly address the same imagined Pakeha audience, making appeals to shared understandings and like-mindedness and clearly establishing a dynamic of 'them' (Maori) versus 'us' (Pakeha) (ibid., 35). Providing a counter-ethnographic perspective on the narrator (and, by extension, on Maori more generally), the notes call into question his dependability and apologise for the 'mistakes and misapprehensions' evident in his descriptions and understandings of Europeans (ibid., 34). They also explicitly discuss ways in which Maori narratives are different to Pakeha ones, commenting that Maori tend to produce accounts in which ideas are wrapped up in figurative and ambiguous terms

and that ‘true’ native ways of telling stories involve considerable detail and digression—which Maning goes on to caricature. Rather than effecting the kind of push-and-pull that Maning seems to desire, these comments can be read as being simply consistent with the content of the main text. They serve, as Alex Calder might argue, to re-inscribe its ‘central obviousness’: that there are profound differences between Pakeha and Maori cultures (2001, 10). They can also be seen to heighten, rather than to diminish, the narrator’s achievements, serving as a marker that a text which was intended to operate on a satirical level has become, somewhere along the line, something else instead.

The narrator’s adopting of an ethnographic approach to Pakeha culture is one of the key satiric techniques employed in Maning’s *History*. The ‘outsider’s perspective’ that is afforded by this ethnographic perspective serves to expose assumptions and features of the military interpretative framework that was already being mobilised to make sense of this episode of frontier conflict at the time when Maning was writing. Maning employs a technique which is calculated to throw off balance his intended Pakeha audience: his narrator goes further than merely parodying European modes of understanding other peoples, reflexively turning these conventions back on Pakeha culture itself. Pakeha are presented as an unknown species or alien race, ‘made strange’ through descriptions of their appearances, actions, weapons and so on. Soldiers are characterised as ‘a dangerous people whose only occupation is war’, ‘a people who wear red garments, who do no work, who neither buy nor sell, who always have arms in their hands’ (ibid., 19 and 25), and comparisons between the soldiers and sailors as types are drawn. De-naturalising European cultural norms in this way, the *History* is able to undermine fundamental and seemingly-obvious military practices. Characterising the soldiers as servile, the narrator expresses incredulity that they will unquestioningly obey orders to attack, ‘no matter whether there was any just cause or not’ (ibid., 25), that they will fight furiously until the last man is killed and that nothing can make them run away. Maori participants in the fighting are said to be astonished by the soldiers’ repeated doing of things considered ‘dreadfully unlucky’ (ibid., 35), such as carrying stretchers with them to the sites of military engagements—an infringement which is said to call death and destruction upon them by transfiguring their war party into a funeral procession—and other conventions of European warfare, such as the shooting of wounded men and deserters, and the abandoning of the dead and injured, are said to alarm and appal Maori observers.

In further ways, too, satire against the British is developed through the function of the narrator. The narrator recounts several instances where European soldiers ignore the advice of Ngapuhi chiefs, using mock-deference to propose that, '[w]e Maori did not think the soldiers did wisely in this respect [firing at the pa at Ohaeawai in a haphazard way] but they may have had some reason for it which we could not understand, for we don't know much about big guns' (ibid., 56), and to speculate that 'perhaps, these European warriors could do things above the understanding of us Maori' (ibid., 59). Undermining official accounts of the conflict, the narrator slyly suggests that Ohaeawai was stormed with 'as much uproar *as if* the place had been taken by storm' (ibid., 66, my italics), and discusses with indignation the fact that the death of a soldier has been misreported in the account of the battle written by Despard for Fitzroy. He also exposes Pakeha hypocrisy, showing that Maori are chastised for making war on the Sabbath because of the stated European convention that no fighting takes place on Sundays, only to discover that 'the soldiers did not mind Sunday at all when any harm could be done on it, but when there was nothing else to do they always went to prayers' (ibid., 67). The interpretative framework that has come to be privileged in Eurocentric versions of this story, then, is brought into view only to be destabilised and exposed.

As a corollary to its strategies of reversal and distancing, the *History* posits Maori beliefs and worldviews as familiar and normal. Foregrounding mana, tapu and utu as principles which govern Maori conduct, it provides openings for the kind of approach to this story desired by Diamond which might be informed by Maori values, understandings and terms of reference, and in which war, weapons and warriorhood would be tempered with alternative guiding concepts. The *History* highlights the role of the tohunga and the importance of prophecies and omens in planning for war: the fact that the soldiers are 'quite ignorant and inexperienced in omens' (ibid., 27-8) and that they do not have a tohunga to provide spiritual guidance, for example, are of grave concern to the narrator. For Maning's satirical purpose, these kinds of superstitions and beliefs are supposed to function as signs of Maori credulity: there is meant to be a double edge to the satire. These elements go beyond their intended purpose, however, pervading the text and acquiring a force of their own. The narrative opens with a prophecy made by Hongi Hika and goes on to describe the throwing of darts to divine the outcome of the final assault on the flagstaff at Kororareka. It also presents the vision experienced by Hauraki after he has been fatally wounded and offers supernatural explanations for events of battles: the Ngakahi spirit, for example, is said to have blown away the rockets fired at the pa in the

battle at Puketutu, and the defenders of Ohaeawai are blessed and made tapu, while the tohunga's chanting of karakia is said to enable Heke to escape after the fighting at Te Ahuahu by rendering his bearers invisible to the enemy. As matters of course, the text presents descriptions of Maori ceremonies and traditions of war, such as the rendering tapu of pa and defenders, and the performing of funeral chants, rites, victory songs and dances, and it details the removal of flesh and scalps from British corpses on advice of the tohunga, 'for food' (to reduce the mana of British) and for divination purposes (ibid., 65). Explanatory information which is provided in relation to some of these elements is necessitated by the occasion—the fact that the narrative is addressed to a Pakeha audience—but the *History* becomes less self-conscious about its use of these elements; again, they acquire a logic and force of their own. The importance of the maitaika, the first man killed in battle, customs such as paora mamai (the entering of an enemy's territory to fire a volley of shots in honour of the death of a chief of importance), and the observing of rules relating to plunder or muru, are among those detailed in the text.

The narrator in Maning's *History* also strives to make sense of cross-cultural encounters with reference to the terms supplied by his own system of beliefs. Supposed to function in ways that show the distance between Maori and Pakeha which and register the narrator's simple-mindedness—the limits of his worldview—, this technique again evades a straight satiric function in the text, inscribing Maori concepts and understandings in potent ways. The *History* is informed by a strongly-held sense of protocol: at each stage of his story the narrator assesses whether certain actions are fair or just (tika) in accordance with Maori customs and codes of behaviour. He offers tongue-in-cheek appreciation of the soldiers' 'noble-mindedness' and 'generosity' in giving up Kororareka because they fail to understand that this is not required under Maori protocols of warfare, and in trying to make sense of the soldiers' firing of shots at Maori who were quietly (and 'rightfully') plundering the town, he supposes they might have thought their chief was dying and fired a volley (waipu) for his sake (ibid., 30). Striving to comprehend the fact that the British do not lament their dead as loudly as do Maori, the narrator speculates that the British 'have perhaps the same thought as some of us, who say that the best lamentation for a Toa is a blow struck against the enemy' (ibid., 67). As these details suggest, the *History* enacts a powerful reversal of the dominant lexicon used to make sense of this story, inverting at a fundamental level the process through which knowledge is constituted. As well as invoking individual soldiers as 'toa' or braves, its narrator describes European commanders as

‘chiefs’, and refers to soldiers and sailors as ‘hapu’ of the English ‘iwi’. Soldiers (‘European warriors’) are said to be seeking utu (revenge) in subsequent fights for the relatives they lost at Kororareka, while parties of soldiers and sailors are invoked as ‘tawa’, and the leading party of soldiers at Ohaeawai is described as a wakaka (forlorn hope).

Because Maori figures are positioned at the forefront of the text, Maning’s *History* is also able to register a multiplicity of indigenous perspectives—the heterogeneous and sometimes competing beliefs held by Maori in relation to the reasons for, and significance of, certain events. Again, this technique is supposed to support Maning’s satiric intent, providing for the lampooning of Maori ignorance and self-interest—as well as internal squabbling and the canny hedging of bets—but again, it develops its own power and purpose within the text. The narrator repeatedly uses an equivocating formulation (‘Some of us thought this; others thought this; others said that . . .’) to show Maori striving to make sense of Pakeha motives and actions. This technique, which allows for complexities and differences within and between various tribal understandings to come to light, is recalled in the NMA’s formulation for the handling of the dispute between descendants in relation to the display of the whariki; in this way, Maning’s text might offer a model for the examination of competing perspectives held by tribal stakeholders. More generally, too, the *History* testifies to intricate sets of relations—concords, differences, rivalries, alliances and obligations—between various iwi and hapu groupings. Foregrounding the conflict’s tribal dimensions, the sense in which this can be regarded as ‘a family quarrel amongst Ngapuhi’ (cited in Gardiner 1983, n.p.), it partially endorses the stated view that Waka Nene was, in the early stages, ‘only fighting on his own thought’ (Maning 2001, 32), without the support or sanction of the governor. The *History*’s narrator also documents the complexities of Maori motivations in joining the fighting: the seeking of revenge, the settling of historical scores, the calling in of family favours, the desire of particular warriors to perfect themselves in the practice of war or to elevate their names and seek personal glory, and so on.

While the narrator repeatedly uses the term ‘the enemy’ to describe Heke and his supporters, and towards the end of the story expresses disappointment on behalf of the pro-government chiefs that Heke’s people have not been starved and scattered, he more generally evokes a compelling fluidity between the two main tribal factions involved in the conflict. He and his allies are said to be ‘sorry for Heke and his people’ (ibid., 34) when they see the weapons that the soldiers intend to use against

them at the pa at Puketutu, and to hold their breath and have fear for the defenders of the pa during the bombardment, ‘for they were, although against us, all Ngapuhi—the same *iwi* as ourselves, and many of them our near relations’ (ibid., 36). Describing as ‘foolishness’ a young warrior’s proposal to eat the flesh of the dead at Te Ahuahu, the narrator makes it clear that ‘we were all Ngapuhi together, and more or less related to each other’ (ibid., 50). This fluidity is strongly enacted in the *History*’s narrative perspective: not only does the narrator demonstrate obvious admiration and sympathy for Heke, but he knows more than he could be expected to know about Heke and Kawiti’s activities. His citing of speeches made by defenders of the pa at Ohaeawai and Ruapekapeka suggests cross-tribal storytelling and sharing of information, the closeness of the two sides. Distancing the pro-government chiefs from the Pakeha participants in the conflict, too, the narrator states that they were pleased to finally see the full strength of the soldiers at Ruapekapeka (an authorial note pushes this point further, making it clear that the chiefs are scrutinising British capabilities in case they end up fighting against them). In this way, showing considerable permutability in the aligning of the participants, the *History* might suggest a vastly different possibility for dealing with the story of the conflict at Ruapekapeka—a possibility for achieving seamlessness and ‘unification’ in a way which was not entertained in the 2003 report as one of the possible future scenarios for on-site interpretation. Rather than inscribing the place of the British and obscuring the role of the Ngapuhi attackers, the narrative might revise this emphasis; by foregrounding instead the experiences of Ngapuhi participants on both sides of the battle, it might point towards collaborative efforts of an entirely different kind.

The emphasis on Ruapekapeka as the key site in the northern conflict is, however, destabilised by Maning’s *History*: its narrative imparts a strong sense that the centre of this story for Maori may not map onto the same event which has been privileged in European accounts. Rather than relegating tribal conflicts to the background or sideline, the *History* makes it clear that these were—in large part—the main event: the narrator notes that daily fighting which occurred after the sack of Kororareka led Heke to express concern that too few men would be left to fight the red soldiers (ibid., 31-2). The vivid and compelling sequence of events at the heart of the narrator’s story begins with the raid on the Kapotai (Kawiti’s allies), proposed by Waka Nene’s party to avenge their dead after the fighting at Puketutu and supported by the soldiers because ‘they were angry at not having been able to take Heke’s pa’ (ibid., 40). This raid results in the death of Hauraki, one of Waka Nene’s

allies, and precipitates the subsequent fighting at Te Ahuahu.¹⁴⁹ According to Maning's narrator, 'this was the greatest battle in the war', since '[t]he best men of both parties were there' (ibid., 49). Conducted between Ngapuhi factions and supported by warriors from other parts of the country, this episode forms the climax of Maning's narrative. Heke's reaction to the death of Te Kahakaha, an esteemed elder relative, causes his downfall: 'being mad with haste, and rage, and grief' he is said to break the sacred rules of war by touching 'the bloody spoils of the slain' (ibid., 51), acting against the advice of the tohunga and losing his invulnerability. Satire falls away at this point, and the following sequence is notable for its intense and evocative language. The narrator proposes that as the warriors charge, '[n]ot one of us remembered the light of this world, nor thought of life' (ibid., 49); Heke's heart is said to roll about 'in the hollow of his breast' when he hears of Te Kahakaha's death (ibid., 50); and the tohunga is said to try in vain to bind a flowing river of deserting warriors (ibid., 51). This sequence also differs from the surrounding narrative in that its events are related with ease and pace. Unlike the subsequent descriptions of the fighting at Ohaeawai and Ruapekapeka, which are stilted and awkward and have confusion as their dominant motif, the battle of Te Ahuahu is unencumbered with the kinds of cross-cultural misunderstandings caused by the presence of the British.¹⁵⁰ In this instance, all participants operate under the same shared set of beliefs and protocols of warfare—they all know the rules, even as, in Heke's case, they may transgress them.

Fundamentally, then, Maning's *History* calls into question the centrality of European soldiers to the story of the conflict at all. Having established an expectation that a clash between cultures is to transpire, the *History* revises the role of the British in its story because they fail to fill the place that has been open to them. The point is not just that these men blunder, as revisionist readings have emphasised, but that they are unimportant to the unfolding drama. The *History* shows them being drawn into participating in the initial raid on the Kapotai, unwittingly helping to cause the key sequence of events at the story's heart. As the momentum gathers they lose their interpreter and fail to understand the urgent need to retrieve Hauraki from the enemy territory. Stalling the action and succumbing to literal confusion, they eventually disappear altogether until the commencement of the battle at Ohaeawai, and the remainder of the fighting in and around Te Ahuahu is deliberately conducted before they are able to return from Auckland; as the narrator explains, 'Heke was very desirous to destroy Walker [Waka Nene] in one fight before the soldiers should return; and Walker, on his side, wished to show that he could fight Heke without the aid of the soldiers' (ibid., 49).

Woven into the fabric of Maning's text, then, and going beyond the bounds of simple satire, is the strong sense that European soldiers are irrelevant to the conflict, or that they are relevant only inasmuch as their presence exacerbates existing tensions and hampers what would otherwise be a straightforward tribal conflict. Not only are they unable to 'read' signs (the absence of the noise from a pa, for instance, which might indicate that it has been deserted), but they fail to understand the rules and protocols of the engagements in which they participate. They are, if anything, a liability for the Ngapuhi who fight on their side—they make bad decisions which cost lives. One of the most telling features of the *History's* narrative is its identification of heroes in the northern conflict. Other than Lieutenant Philpots, the naval officer killed at Ohaeawai who is singled out for mention and whose scalp is considered desirable for divination purposes because of his bravery and rank, European participants remain largely anonymous: their names are only occasionally provided in parentheses. The conflict's distinguished participants are from the ranks of the iwi and hapu on both sides, a dynamic that is made explicit in the account of Te Ahuahu where Waka Nene and Tao Nui line up against Heke and Te Kahakaha.

Maning's *History* shows, then, that the northern conflict furnishes a story of indigenous agency and resistance to settlement in the strongest possible terms. The authorial notes added to the text by Maning attempt to reverse the grain of the story and to re-inscribe the primacy of a European perspective; while these notes may create a screen or diversion, they remain largely powerless to overwrite or undo the ideas advanced in the main body of the text. Not only does Maning's telling of this story compellingly demonstrate that Maori conceptions of warfare are not consistent with, or assimilable to, European traditions, but it raises one of the most threatening and inadmissible spectres imaginable for a settler nation, subverting the possibility that any founding myth of settlement might be constructed from an episode of this kind. *This story isn't really about you*, it provocatively suggests to its intended Pakeha audience.

Making progress: ‘closure’ at Te Rerenga Wairua

The Kauri Museum at Matakōhe invites visitors to ‘[d]iscover the mighty kauri tree, its timber and its gum’.¹⁵¹ While the museum does deal with this subject—conveying characteristics of the kauri as a species and detailing aspects of the history of the kauri timber and gum trades centred in Te Tai Tokerau until the mid-twentieth century—the larger theme to which it is devoted is that of progress. Many of its displays show the use of axes, crosscut saws and other basic tools in felling kauri; exhibit sledges and bush trains of the kind pulled by bullock teams; illustrate how waterways were used to float logs to riverside mills; and demonstrate how timber was pit-sawn by hand. These are juxtaposed with more elaborate installations which provide a model of a trapdoor dam, showcase a working reconstruction of an original 1920 steam-engine powered sawmill complete with moving breakdown- and band-saws, and so on. Text panels emphasise the fact that the internal combustion engine enabled ‘important advances’ in the New Zealand economy, with captions exhibited alongside a 1929 model of the ‘Caterpillar 60’, for example, proclaiming that this tractor took the place of eight bullock teams (or 112 animals) in hauling logs. The petrol-powered chainsaw is exulted, too, as ‘the ultimate labour-saving device’. Adjacent displays make it plain that both the worked-out kauri fields and the machines which were deployed in clearing these ‘shepherded in’—to use the museum’s phrase—a new era of pastoralism. The end-point of the walk-through is a gallery devoted to farming which contains replica milking and shearing sheds, and engines used to drive water pumps, top-dressers and chaff-cutters. The museum, then, both celebrates and naturalises the advances which assisted the development of the kauri timber and gum industries and which facilitated the second wave extractive industries that followed.

Progress can readily be charted in relation to technological modernisation in this way but it is, in a broader sense, a key Enlightenment principle. As one of the defining ideologies which underpinned settler-colonial expansion in places like Aotearoa New Zealand, it has provided one of the fundamental discursive structures of settlement (Calder 2009, 261). Misgivings about settlement as decline and degeneration began to be voiced by individuals as this history first unfolded and have—along with nostalgia for a simpler past—been a recurrent feature of settler-colonial histories. Officially and more widely, however, changes undertaken in the name of progress have been freighted in positive terms: the story of settlement is supposed to be plotted as a line whose *x* and *y*

co-ordinates are forever increasing in value. As this suggests, progress is firmly tied to settler notions of time as continuous sequence, ‘leading in one forward direction, from origin to destination, which are understood as opposites’ (Armstrong 2003, 23). It is also tied to capitalist models of growth: as Nicholas Thomas has explained (1999, 57), improvement, advancement and development are some of the key terms found in their shared lexicon.

Some important and paradoxical characteristics of progress should, however, be noted. First, while progress is understood to be cumulative and to involve organic processes of evolution, expansion and maturation, it also implicitly involves supplanting, anachronising, making-over and reinventing; it is neither as stable nor as morally sound as it’s imagined to be. And second, progress is—as the museum’s coy use of the verb ‘shepherd’ signals—marked in complex ways by intention and faith. On one hand, progress is *made*: it requires motivation and hard work, and may well involve the overcoming of impediments. On the other hand, though, it generally involves movement towards a destiny which is believed to be inevitable and yet which cannot be defined in advance. In other words, settlement is commenced in belief of the superiority of western civilisation—it is a project which tries to make the new place more western, more like home (or, in Aotearoa New Zealand’s case, better than home, a ‘better Britain’)—but the goal is elusive because western civilisation itself is understood to be constantly advancing. Stephen Muecke has suggested that the road is one of the most potent metaphors for progress in settler cultures: the road is a symbol of modernity which seems to offer up ahead ‘the shimmering glimpse of something half-seen, half-dreamed’ (Muecke terms this ‘the space of desire’ (1997, 125)). So while settlers might pause for breath and look back on what they’ve achieved (and these achievements may seem obvious or self-evident when accounted for in retrospect), progress itself is future-oriented and its end-point remains beyond grasp. For this reason, as both a verb and a noun—an undertaking as well as a never-quite-reached destination—progress gives settlers and their histories a strong and ongoing sense of purpose: as Stephen Turner has explained, it drives ideas of ‘the country-to-come’ (2009, 250).¹⁵²

A cornerstone of the Kauri Museum’s approach to progress is signalled in its treatment of the nation’s longer history of settlement. The museum opened in 1962 to mark the centennial of Matakōhe which had been established when the so-called ‘Albertland’ settlers took up residence around the eastern reaches of the Kaipara Harbour. No reference is made within the museum’s

displays to the pre-European history of the Kaipara area. Nor do the displays refer to the early kauri timber industry which Augustus Earle documents in the Hokianga district to the north in the 1820s, and which fostered an early phase of Maori travel to New South Wales and beyond. Nor do they refer to the tribal warfare which Samuel Marsden documents affecting all districts in Te Tai Tokerau in the first few decades of the nineteenth century—causing the realignment of boundaries, the forced or voluntary evacuation of tribes from lands like those around the Kaipara, and so on. Nor do they mention the wars fought between tribes and the government further south, which Maning shows providing a very real context in the 1860s for questions connected with the feasibility of settlement. Nor do they discuss the significance of organised land settlement schemes like the Albertland one. In fact, little reference is made to the initial arrival of European settlers in the surrounding Otamatea district: a text panel for a scene presented in the museum's replica boarding house and titled 'A new place to call home' sparingly explains that '[t]he mother recovers from her journey while the children unpack [. . .] The woman's husband is out building a nikau whare for the family to live in before a more permanent house can be built'. The museum, then, begins its story *in medias res*. Taking the prior history of almost a century of contact between Maori and Pakeha as given and suggesting that Maori constitute neither an impediment to progress nor even a defining presence, it shows European settlers getting on with the business of turning a makeshift frontier into a settled region.

To this end, strong connections are made within the museum's displays between the economic success associated with kauri-related industries and the flourishing of pioneer life. 'Period' rooms representing 'a quality six-roomed kauri house 1880-1920' convey the role of kauri in the development of the area: this is shown to have generated local prosperity, to have provided the structural components of dwellings, and to have been used to craft furnishings and domestic items which were, in turn, finished with lacquer produced from kauri gum. Elsewhere in the museum, exhibits make it clear that the kauri industry supplied both the raw materials and the need for the building of bush tramways, bridges, dams, and logging scows and other barges used to transport timber and gum to sawmills and trading stores (themselves constructed from kauri). The museum explains, too, that kauri was later cut to build farm fences and stock yards. In these ways, kauri is shown to have served as the basis for much of 'the infrastructure through which the idea of a viable settlement is increasingly realized' (Turner 2009, 251).¹⁵³ In mapping the transition from frontier to region, the Kauri Museum also details some of the more generic aspects of community formation.

The museum complex includes public buildings like the local pioneer church which was built in 1867, the district school room used between 1878 and 1972, the post office which was ‘the centre for the local community’ from 1909, and the local war memorial hall—again, all constructed from kauri. The museum itself also forms part of this infrastructure. A number of displays deal with the institution’s own history: photographs show the laying of the foundation stone, plaques explain the history of each wing and commemorate key figures in the museum’s development, and so on. These displays strongly suggest parallels between the pioneering spirit of the early settlers and that of museum volunteers: qualities of enterprise, determination and resourcefulness are among those emphasised in relation to both groups.

One of the effects of these displays is to evoke the swelling of the settler population which, as A. H. Reed has put it, reversed ‘the numerical proportion of the races’ in areas like Te Tai Tokerau in the second half of the nineteenth century (1956, 294). The formation of this settler majority was, in turn, part of what enabled the shift from ‘nominal’ to ‘substantive’ sovereignty (Belich 1988, 21), which has been construed as a key milestone in the nation’s story of progress: the entrenching and extending of the institutions and authority of government have tended to be regarded as one of the clearest indications of the receding of the frontier.¹⁵⁴ Dealing directly with the subject of political maturation, the Kauri Museum contains a number of displays which pay tribute to Joseph Gordon Coates, a local statesman who became, in 1925, the first New Zealand-born Prime Minister. The museum also offers a sizeable war memorial display and shows settlers responding to their local surroundings: native flora and fauna supply decorative motifs for artistic productions displayed within the galleries (furnishings, sculptures, carvings, inlaid timber marquetry panels and so on), indexing the extent to which settlers have come *to feel at home*, to view this as their homeland (Turner 2009, 246). In several ways, then, the Kauri Museum suggests the fulfilment of early and nebulous ideas of the country-to-come. Conveying the establishment of an enduring and enlarging settler footprint on the landscape, and showing how the development of regions has helped to forge the modern nation, the museum makes plain the role of the kauri as the emblem for—and foundation of—these forms of progress.

* * *

From a twenty-first century perspective, the Kauri Museum's theme and its narrative form may seem, in some senses, unremarkable. Whether they are concerned with evolution on a global scale or whether they chart incremental gains made in breaking in a new locality, all museums, it could be argued, deal with progress; it is both their 'natural' subject and their default mode, and is one of the key reasons for which museums have, from the earliest days, been integral to settler-colonial enterprises. In part, this is because museums format the past from the perspective of the present: performing a stocktaking role, they tend to look back to determine not just how things have changed, but *how far things have come*. Museums are also bound to the concept of progress in a very real sense since they are, themselves, susceptible to anachronising processes. It is expected that museums will keep pace with advances in knowledge and understanding: as these change, displays are changed or they risk becoming 'dated artefacts' (Wedde 2005, 77). Museums, then, strive to be future-oriented, to offer leading-edge modes of display. It should be clear, too, that the narrative implications of their layout make museums an ideal vehicle for stories of progress: because museums require the physical movement of visitors through an exhibition space, they tend to encourage the recapitulation of history as a journey towards a pre-destined future. Conventionally, museums have also tended to operate on the assumption that the ideology of progress is shared: they have taken for granted the idea that all societies evolve according to common social and economic processes; that a desire for material betterment is universal; that all events can be enfolded into chronological national and/or global time.

While these observations form an important context for the discussion which follows, for now it is sufficient to note that at the time when it opened, the Kauri Museum did embody a very distinct form of progress. Two months after laying the foundation stone for the whare runanga at Waitangi in 1934, Lord Bledisloe, the then-Governor General, had addressed a crowd gathered to watch him lay the foundation stone for the Dominion Museum in Wellington with the theme of progress very much on his mind. According to Bledisloe, while New Zealand museums were in some respects 'unrivalled' in any part of the Empire, there was still 'much room for improvement' (1934, 5). Citing as inspiration the open-air museums which had begun to emerge in Europe and which did not aspire to provide universal surveys, and probably buoyed by the new modes of display which were being implemented at Waitangi, he recommended that:

There is great scope in this land of farmers for an agricultural museum [. . .] which illustrates the methods and implements of rural industry, commencing with the primitive cultural processes of the Native Race before the advent of western civilisation and extending down to our present time [. . .] Why should you not also have a comprehensive nautical museum in this sea-girt Dominion? You have your Maori canoes and your flat-bottomed New Zealand “scows” [. . .] The importance of plants in human economy and the unique character of New Zealand’s native bush would justify on grounds of education and inspirational recreation the organization of botanical collections to a much larger extent [. . .].¹⁵⁵

Bledisloe’s sentiments were echoed a decade later by W. R. B. Oliver in his overview of the national museum sector. Noting that ‘there is in New Zealand no technological museum’ (1944, 11), Oliver called for displays which would deal with the productive and industrial achievements of the country and with the evolution of transport and other branches of material culture.¹⁵⁶

The Kauri Museum was the first institution in the country to be dedicated and developed along these lines: as one of its text panels explains, this museum had its origin as ‘the first transport museum in New Zealand’. Initially opened in 1956 as the Old Time Transport Preservation League, the museum had the bulk of its early exhibits transferred to Auckland in 1961 to form the nucleus of the Museum of Transport and Technology. A smaller collection was, however, retained at Matakohē and re-opened the following year; given Matakohē’s location on the rolling hills between Brynderwyn and Dargaville on which dairy farms had replaced kauri forest, the decision was made by local enthusiasts who were driving the project to focus on the kauri as a specialised subject.¹⁵⁷ As this shows, the Kauri Museum is not, as Claudia Bell has proposed, simply a typical local museum which articulates the shape of the past based on a particular occupation or industry (1996, 55). Rather, it instantiates the kind of re-orientation that Bledisloe and Oliver had sought. Emerging at the time when the timber and gum trades had declined in Te Tai Tokerau and when tourism was beginning to take off, it helped to set in place and elaborate the theme of progress on a local level. Its specific subject—previously only dealt with in museums as a component of conventional botanical exhibits—was arguably the most important plant in human economy in the first century of European settlement and the pre-eminent icon of the unique character of New Zealand’s native bush, and it was seen to provide ample opportunity for conveying the story of some of the nation’s key productive and industrial achievements.

Since its opening in 1962, the Kauri Museum has consistently been singled out for special mention in published discussions of the north.¹⁵⁸ The fact that its story is focused through the subject of the kauri means that the museum stands out among other pioneer-type museums; or, to put it another way, while the Kauri Museum speaks to and for its local community, it has always aspired to be more than a locality museum. Unlike the majority of pioneer museums which operate, as Chris Prentice has noted (1998, 301-2), on metonymic or synecdochal levels, the Kauri Museum deals with a history involving the direct transportation of commodities that were foundational in the development of settlements and economies in places as far flung as Southland, Sydney and San Francisco. It also differs from other pioneer museums in terms of its size and the scale of its collections. Extended in successive ways and currently boasting 4,000 square metres of exhibition space, it has, as a plaque at its entrance explains, developed into ‘a public museum of international repute’—an accomplishment marked by the fact that it publishes a glossy fifty-page souvenir guidebook currently available for purchase in English, German and Japanese.

More recently, the Kauri Museum was held up as a flagship in a strategic plan for development of the museums of Te Tai Tokerau which was commissioned in 2004 by Te Papa National Services and the Northland Museum Association. Ken Gorbey, the author of this report, proclaimed that the museum is ‘an exemplary cultural institution’ and ‘an accepted leader among the museums of Northland’ (2004, 57). While the museum’s high visitation levels are not in doubt, I would argue that it has become difficult to see this institution as a ‘best practice’ model. Challenges for the Kauri Museum have arisen from the fact that the theme of progress which it sponsors so strongly has undergone significant change in recent decades. It isn’t that this theme has become dated, exactly: despite distrust which has mounted in relation to the teleologies that have served settlement and museums for so long, progress never seems to go out of fashion—or, rather, it has a canny ability to reinvent itself. The problem for the Kauri Museum is that the goalposts have shifted; ideas of the country-to-come have moved on. In specific terms, changed environmental values make it difficult to celebrate the logging of almost a million hectares of kauri-type forests, especially given that it is now known that kauri take around 400 years to reach maturity, that some trees have a lifespan of up to 2,000 years, and that they support complex ecosystems. Twenty-first century visitors are likely to feel disturbed to discover the extent to which modern-day settlement has depended on the exploitation of the kauri resource and are likely to see the Kauri Museum’s story as one which has global environmental

ramifications. They are also likely to perceive disjunctions between ‘modes of belonging’ which are expressed through the clearing of the land, and those (‘creole or quasi-indigenous’) which are expressed through a love of the natural environment (Calder 2009, 260-1).

The moral force of settlement has come under scrutiny in other ways, too. From the earliest days of contact it had been understood by Europeans that Maori would have to make trade-offs in exchange for the forms of progress being extended to them: the contaminating and eventual passing of their ‘antique world’ (Williams 2009, 229) was viewed as being regrettable but necessary, an integral part of the cost-benefit projections built into settlement. Claims lodged with the Waitangi Tribunal since 1975, however, have made apparent the extent to which the settlement histories which have unfolded in places like Aotearoa New Zealand are stories of displacement, dispossession and struggle. The period of settlement which is dealt with in the Kauri Museum is the same one which saw the spectacular decline of the Maori population and the influx of settlers which rendered Maori a minority in their own country; the passing of vast tracts of land (and related forest and fishery resources, which were supposed to have been protected under the Treaty of Waitangi) from tribal ownership through the bureaucratic workings of the newly-empowered state; the enacting of various forms of legislation which constrained customary activities and were intended to phase out tribal cultures; and the emergence of a changed economy characterised by forms of industry like the kauri gum trade which left Maori with few options but to participate in these on the lowest levels. ‘Progress’, in other words, has come to be understood as a force with which indigenous peoples have had to reckon (Clifford 1988, 16). As this thesis has already made clear, growing Maori political assertiveness during the 1970s and 1980s led to the development of biculturalism as a philosophical framework for policy development across the public sector. Given the extent to which bicultural imperatives have come to influence New Zealand museum practice, it is likely to seem problematic to twenty-first century visitors that Maori are barely mentioned in the Kauri Museum—especially since close inspection of the displays reveals that decorative motifs (koru, kowhaiwhai and so on) used in kauri timber and gum carvings are drawn from Maori culture, and that Maori themselves are disproportionately represented in photographs taken in the gumfields of the Far North.

In recognition of the fact that the value-structures of settlement have moved on—and that Maori now constitute both a defining presence and a potential impediment to settler progress—, the Kauri

Museum has made attempts to update its exhibits. Displays devoted to conservation issues (titled ‘The Waipoua Forest Trust and the Restoration of the Kauri Forest’; ‘Caring for Tane Mahuta’; ‘Collecting the Seeds’; ‘Planting a New Forest’; ‘Turning Farmland into Forest’, and so on) have recently been installed. A scene in the dining room of the new replica boarding house, too, stages a fictional meeting between mannequins representing publisher and former-bushman A. H. Reed, Kauri Museum founder Mervyn Sterling, photographer Tudor Collins, and former Prime Minister Gordon Coates. A label explains that these men possessed ‘the foresight not only to preserve kauri trees but also to record the heritage of the kauri industry’. Celebration of the rise of conservationism should not, however, be compatible with celebration of the virtually wholesale destruction upon which European settlement was founded—or should, at the very least, require careful explanation. The museum’s professed concern for the history of environmental protection is, for example, strongly undermined by the enthusiastic captions provided for Collins’ photographs (themselves displayed prominently throughout the museum), which fête the felling, transporting and milling of forest resources and romanticise Maori gumdigging activities as though these were a recreational pastime or a lifestyle choice. The museum’s displays also evince no anxieties about the impact of the technologies which they showcase: the advent of the ‘Caterpillar 60’ is said to have spelled ‘the beginning of the end of the bullock team’, but no mention is made of the fact that it also hastened the end of the kauri timber industry precisely because it was so efficient.

According to Gorbey, the Kauri Museum is also seeking to ‘extend’ its treatment of the subject of the kauri and the local community: ‘recently introduced is the interaction between the pioneers and local Maori’ (2004, 57). Again, though, these displays produce specific problems. One of the newest, a fictional ‘arrival’ tableau with the caption ‘European Settlers Assisted by Te Uri o Hau’, depicts a Pakeha couple stepping ashore and being greeted by a Maori couple—dressed in blankets and European garments—who hold up an offering of fish. An accompanying text panel explains:

Under the guidance of the local Maori, [the Albertland settlers] learned to survive, to adapt to this alien environment. The local Maori people taught them to fish, grow vegetables, and helped them to build boats and their first homes. Without this the settlers would have been unlikely to have stayed permanently in the Otamatea.

Within the larger panel, this soft-focus version of the ‘friendly, accommodating’ phase of settlement is overshadowed by extensive praise for the settlers’ bravery and tenacity. This representation is also notable for the fact that the mannequins are the only four within the museum whose models are not

identified: these are generic rather than historical figures. An adjacent display, titled ‘Union of Ancient Trees: Hononga Rakau’, deals with a 2009 agreement which acknowledges parallels between ancient Japanese cedar forests and New Zealand kauri forests. The sentiments conveyed within the display—‘Tane Mahuta and Jomon Sugi [the largest-surviving New Zealand and Japanese specimens] stand as rare living treasures and symbols of our communities, continually reminding us of the importance of protecting our natural environments, our cultures and our people’, and so on—are again at odds with the bulk of the museum’s displays. The fact that kauri forests have historically constituted vital ecological and spiritual resources for Maori is nowhere else mentioned; visitors are not informed, for instance, of the fact that kauri were ceremonially felled with stone adzes and carved to construct prized war canoes. The museum does not deal in any way, either, with problems arising from the fact that modern conservation activities have in many instances worked against indigenous interests. Bitter controversy has arisen, for example, over conservation lands which continue to be administered by the government after they have been successfully claimed before the Waitangi Tribunal: as Margaret Mutu has made clear, establishment of the Northland Kauri National Park in the Waipoua forest was proposed against tangata whenua wishes and after the publication of the *Te Roroa Report* which recommended that these lands be returned (1994, 12-13). Press reports which surfaced in 1999 indicate that the Kauri Museum’s then-director was directly involved in agitating for this park’s formation.¹⁵⁹

In a more general sense, the obscure location of the Kauri Museum’s newest displays in marginal spaces adjoining the toilet facilities in the new entrance lobby and on the mezzanine level of one of the display halls means that these representations are neither high-profile nor commanding. They function as a post-script: the museum’s unwillingness to re-orientate its displays more comprehensively is signalled by the fact that a 1975 tourist guide to the displays would still serve a twenty-first century visitor.¹⁶⁰ In one sense, then, these newest displays show the limits of the Kauri Museum’s ability to keep pace with progress; overall, the museum’s narrative *is* remarkable precisely in its devotion to a conception of progress that has become dated. In another sense, the uneasy place of these displays within the museum begins to convey the fact that progress is linked to what Turner has termed ‘the contradictory inner-history of settlement’ (2002, 40), producing *x* and *y* co-ordinates which may appear to back-track or to be discontinuous with the vectors of points plotted earlier. According to Gorbey, the Kauri Museum’s approach to cross-cultural interaction ‘offers ample scope

for further development' (2004, 57). Instead, it could be argued that the Kauri Museum's displays indicate 'progress' might now require a different kind of story, a different museum model. As this thesis has already suggested, 'progress' has come increasingly to look as though it necessitates ways of finding a mode of reciting local histories both in their own terms and on their own terms; it calls for approaches that reach 'beyond biculturalism' (O'Sullivan 2007) and towards Maori control of Maori things.

The remainder of this discussion travels to Te Rerenga Wairua. Known in the European record as Cape Reinga, this site is located at the very tip of the Aupouri peninsula in Muriwhenua, or Te Hiku o te Ika, the country's most northerly district, and is understood within Maori culture as the final departure place of the spirits of the dead on their homeward journey to Hawaiki. The site currently forms part of the Te Pahi recreation reserve managed by the Department of Conservation (DOC), and is directly implicated in current debates to do with progress. A draft strategy for sustainable tourism growth and development in Te Tai Tokerau published in 1996 noted that the site 'has long been a Northland icon and a site of national significance', but was critical of the fact that:

The standard and range of facilities currently provided falls short of visitor expectations. Meaningful interpretation of the spiritual, natural and historic values associated with the site is lacking. [. . .] There is evidence that Cape Reinga is losing market share to better serviced and better interpreted destinations'.¹⁶¹

The report proposed that redevelopment of the reserve's facilities could provide the catalyst for the expansion of employment opportunities and economic growth throughout the Far North—an area which has been characterised by particularly high levels of Maori poverty and deprivation since the 1860s, in large part as a result of the kauri gum industry. In the decade following this publication it was expected that Te Rerenga Wairua would become the site of one of the very first iwi museums in the country; Gorbey advised in 2004 that '[p]rogress is well advanced' (68). The development, however, has not gone ahead. In part, this outcome is linked to the fact that Te Rerenga Wairua maintains the distinction of being one of the most heavily contested areas in the country: like the Waipoua forest, this is 'conservation land' which has continued to be managed by the government after being claimed before the Waitangi Tribunal. Recovering this site's history and examining interpretative material which has been installed in lieu of the construction of an iwi museum, the chapter is interested in how Te Rerenga Wairua might help to refocus ideas about progress.

* * *

From the very earliest European explorations of the New Zealand coastline, the area around Te Rerenga Wairua began to function in the European record in ways which marked out its distinctiveness. At the time when blank spaces on the map of the great southern ocean were being filled in, this headland furnished important navigational landmarks which signalled points of progress in the course of a voyage. Its most visibly obvious features were charted and named by Abel Tasman in 1642-43 and by Cook in 1769: these included Cape Maria van Diemen, the Three Kings Islands, and North Cape—the name which subsequently came to be used to refer to the wider headland area. In the initial period of European settlement, the area served as a geopolitical reference point and marker of the extent of the known country. Hongi's name as a soldier, for example, is said by Marsden to have struck terror 'into all the inhabitants from the North to the East Cape' (1932, 166). In Marsden's journals, the people of the Far North are frequently mentioned. Because of their geographical location, they were exposed to foreign trade earlier than most areas and were able to supply pork and potatoes when Marsden made his first ever New Zealand landfall on the head of the Aupouri peninsula; as he departed for Rangihoua for the first time, Marsden commented that this was 'one of the most interesting and pleasant days I had ever enjoyed', and that 'I was never more amused and gratified than upon this occasion' (ibid., 83). The people of the area are also shown in his account to be mobile and politically active, maintaining strong ties with Ngapuhi and becoming directly involved in campaigns and war parties of the 1820s and 1830s. Marsden continued to enjoy a good (if intermittent) relationship with the people of the Far North; for this reason, even before the founding of the CMS mission station at the base of the Aupouri peninsula in Kaitaia in 1833, he would also claim that missionary influence extended as far as this northernmost district.

From relatively early on, the area around Te Rerenga Wairua also became known for its strong Maori spiritual significance. It is apparent from the surviving copy of a map drawn by Tukitahua in 1793 for the then-Governor of New South Wales that Te Ara Wairua (the spiritual pathway which extends over the northern part of the peninsula) was signalled to a European audience early on, although whether this message was understood remains unclear: while Marsden relates the story of Tuki in his journals, he makes no mention of the special nature of the northern peninsula. Richard Cruise appears to have been one of the first to recognise the importance of Te Rerenga Wairua itself. Cruise visited

Aotearoa New Zealand in 1820 with Marsden on H.M.S. *Dromedary*, to procure a cargo of spars cut from ‘the lofty and luxuriant cowry’ (1974, 87). In his account of this journey, first published in 1824, he claimed:

[. . .] whenever [the New Zealanders] pass the place where a man has been murdered, it is customary for each person to throw a stone upon it; and the same practice is observed by all those who visit a cavern at the North Cape, through which the spirits of the departed men are supposed to pass on their way to a future world.¹⁶²

Augustus Earle, too, discussed these beliefs in his *Narrative of a Nine Months’ Residence*: as Elsdon Best later explained in his own *Maori Religion and Mythology*, while Earle ‘makes the mistake of locating the Reinga on an island near North Cape’, he ‘did well’ for a commentator of the 1820s (1974, 77). It remains unclear whether this knowledge precipitated the establishment of the CMS mission station in Kaitaia. It is clear from written accounts, however, that from December 1834, Kaitaia-based missionaries made trips to ‘Te Reinga’ or ‘Cape Reinga’, as it became known, with the expressed intention of cutting the roots of the tree by which the spirits of the dead were said to descend to the sea. The first missionary to make this journey proclaimed that the scenery at Te Rerenga Wairua was ‘most uninviting, and not only so but calculated to inspire the soul with horror’ (Puckey, cited in Best 1974, 90). His aim—and that of his colleagues—was to promote Christian ideas of an alternative place of horror and thus facilitate Maori ‘progress’ of a spiritual kind.

Since the start of European settlement, then, this area has been viewed as extraordinary and has been associated with a number of distinct forms of progress. It also had—until the mid-1960s—a more ordinary history too; that is to say, its history up until this point also fitted the pattern of a more typical story of settler progress. In the wake of skirmishing between Muriwhenua tribes which had seen Te Rarawa displace Te Aupouri and Ngati Kuri from the area, a deed of purchase for the land was signed on 21 January 1840 by the Reverend Richard Taylor, a CMS missionary based in Kaitaia.¹⁶³ Taylor had not yet visited the area and had no real idea of its size or boundaries; when his purchase was investigated in 1843 in a Land Commission hearing it was recorded at 50,000 acres, although it is now known that it amounted to around 65,000 acres. No records survive to indicate how the timing of the transaction (seven days after Hobson’s proclamation prohibiting further land dealings) was handled, but the Crown grant issued to Taylor by Governor Fitzroy in 1844 described the land by the same boundaries as in the original deed. The land was subsequently claimed as surplus by the government, however, and its status remained uncertain until an application for

investigation of its title—funded by the Pakeha gum trader and storekeeper who was the land’s prospective purchaser—was made to the Native Land Court in the late 1860s. After much deliberation, an opinion that native title had been extinguished was eventually provided by the then-Attorney-General, who cited one of Maning’s judgments as a key authority for his recommendation. As a result, a vast estate on the tip of the Aupouri peninsula was able to be acquired by Samuel Yates in 1873.

Yates established a gumdigging enterprise on the land which was operational until around 1920; during this time, the land yielded an average of 400 tonnes of gum annually, all of which passed through Yates’ trading store. Surviving photographs show that a gum sluicing plant was set up on the northern part of the peninsula at this time: as E. V. Sale has explained, sluices were used to recover gum chips from areas which had already been picked over for their larger pieces, with whole landscapes systematically trenched to obtain the last pieces of this ‘fossil gold’ (1981, 64). Te Paki, as this upper block was named by Yates, later became the country’s ‘farthest flung’ farm station (Reed 1956, 356); cattle were driven down the sweeping beach on the peninsula’s western coast which acquired the name ‘Ninety Mile Beach’, and wool was shipped from a tidal stream just south of Te Rerenga Wairua. Te Paki was sold in 1930 and continued to be farmed privately until 1966 when it was purchased by the government—according to the Department of Lands and Survey (later the Department of Conservation), ‘not only for its farming potential but also in order to preserve areas of scientific interest and for recreation’ (Department of Lands and Survey 1986, 5). This purchase was not, strictly speaking, the government’s first land acquisition in the area. A block at Cape Maria van Diemen had been gazetted as a reserve for the erecting of a lighthouse in the late 1870s, and an area at North Cape had also been set aside as a scenic reserve in 1964, although a biological survey conducted soon afterwards had indicated this reserve was too small to offer adequate protection to remnant ecological communities (Park 2001, 606).

As this suggests, the area around Te Rerenga Wairua had, by this time, become known for its scientific significance. Two scientific ‘irruptions’ (to use Maning’s term) in the Far North had been made by Thomas Cheeseman, then-curator of the Auckland Museum, in the late 1880s. These led to recognition of the fact that the area around Te Rerenga Wairua possessed distinctive geological characteristics and that many of its species of flora and fauna were not only unique, but were among

the nation's rarest. Oliver's 1944 report on the museum sector mentions further significant field trips made in the Far North in the 1930s. Archaeological investigations conducted in the early 1960s had also begun to reveal evidence that the area around Te Rerenga Wairua had been one of the longest- and most densely inhabited areas of the country. Further surveys were carried out after the government purchase in 1966, with a portion of the estate set aside by the Department of Lands and Survey as a scenic (and from 1980, scientific) reserve, and the remainder becoming administered as a 'coastal park'—part farming enterprise, part recreational area.

At this point in its history, when it became clear that the area was anything but ordinary, Te Rerenga Wairua seemed destined to fit another conventional model of progress—that of a successful visitor attraction. After its purchase by the state and because of its remote and isolated location at 'land's end', Te Rerenga Wairua became a site of pilgrimage for national and international visitors. Changed environmental values and travel patterns since the early phases of European exploration and settlement mean that the area has come to be admired for its 'spectacular' aesthetic value and for its 'diversity and elegance' (Department of Lands and Survey 1986, 33 and 26). As a number of commentators have explained, the area includes sandy bays, coastal cliffs, bold headlands, offshore islands and stacks, freshwater wetlands, vast dunelands, indigenous shrublands and the only natural areas of kauri forest to be found on the peninsula. The fact that it is associated with Maori spiritual values appears to have assisted (rather than hindered) its increasing appeal: as Nicholas Thomas has explained (1999, 12), the deep association between indigenous people and the land has come to provide strong and condensed reference points for a settler culture that has sought to define itself as native. Te Rerenga Wairua is said to have immense physical presence and is *profound* in a way that seems accessible, promising the possibility of intense and 'emotional' connection to place (Gorbey 2004, 68).

This is not to say, however, that the site is devoid of signs of 'progress'.¹⁶⁴ Te Rerenga Wairua can still be accessed by boat but is more usually reached either by way of a former farm track which has been classified as a section of State Highway 1, or by Ninety Mile Beach which has the official status of a road. The site's lighthouse, erected in 1941 to replace the one at Cape Maria van Diemen, and its distance and direction marker—which signify human domination over the natural world—have become iconic landmarks 'which every Far North traveller sees' (Sale 1981, 61). The lighthouse was

automated in 1987 and later computerised (in a familiar trajectory of progress), but until then Te Rerenga Wairua was occupied by successive lighthouse-keepers and their families. Because of this, and because of the site's increasing appeal to tourists, it also began to take on the appearance of a small settlement comprising keepers' houses, a single men's quarters, a storage shed and garage, a generator building, a store hut, a seismic hut, a post office, and a shop run by the Department of Lands and Survey selling souvenirs, postcards and refreshments. Further progress of a directly commercial kind was being made in the area, too. As well as running the farm at Te Paki and establishing controlled public camping grounds in the area's bays, the Department of Lands and Survey began to issue licenses for spin-off commercial enterprises including scenic helicopter flights and 'sand safari' minibus, 4-wheel drive vehicle- and horse-trekking tours. By 1981 it could be claimed that the lighthouse at Te Rerenga Wairua was 'the destination virtually every day of the year of tour buses from Kaitaia and the Bay of Islands' (Sale 1981, 63).

As is the case with Waitangi National Trust, however, as it has gained visibility, the area has become increasingly bitterly contested. When Te Paki was purchased by the state, Maori occupants at Kapowairua—the bay to the east of Te Rerenga Wairua—were removed so that a public camping ground could be established. This community believed that the land had been held in trust for them since Taylor's initial transaction and an unsuccessful petition on behalf of Ngati Kuri and Te Aupouri concerning the eviction was made to the government in the early 1970s. The ownership of Ninety Mile Beach was unsuccessfully contested too, around this time, in a case which was heard by the Supreme Court: the diminishing of populations of shellfish, and of toheroa in particular, was a critical aspect of the iwi application which stated that in exercising control over the beach, the Marine Department 'has failed in its duty through its ignorance of the mana and tapu the Maori have on this beach and fishing ground' (cited in Park 2001, 108). In frustration, northern tribes organised a demonstration which departed for parliament from Te Hapua, the remaining northernmost Maori settlement, in 1975. This so-called Land March became a major protest action, gaining wider tribal support and attracting extensive media coverage: along with protests mounted at Waitangi, it has been cited as one of the key forces which impelled official recognition of Maori grievances. The Waitangi Tribunal was established in the same year as the Land March took place and claims were soon filed with the tribunal by tribes with ancestral links to Muriwhenua; the terms of these claims made it clear that progress 'has not dealt kindly' to the tribes of the Far North (Waitangi Tribunal

1988, xvii). Among other things, claimants expressed concerns that neither Te Ara Wairua nor Te Rerenga Wairua was now in Maori possession or control. They sought information on how this land—‘one of the most sacred of all areas to Muriwhenua Maori, and the Maori people as a whole’—had been alienated, and sought recognition of its spiritual status. Ownership of Ninety Mile Beach was sought, too; complaints were made about habitat despoliation through land usages; and objections were made to the proposed establishment of marine reserves in waters which were supposed to have been protected by the treaty as customary fishing grounds.¹⁶⁵

From this time onwards, problems associated with how to administer the site and present it to the public became increasingly acute. A management plan for the Te Paki reserves complex was published by the Department of Lands and Survey in 1986: this was said to differ from a draft prepared two years previously in that it placed greater emphasis on the ecological, cultural and social values of the reserves complex and it withdrew plans for the development of a number of further areas of the reserve, advocating instead that these be managed in such a way as to ‘to preserve their ecological and cultural values’ (Department of Lands and Survey 1988, xv). The plan also promised to place greater emphasis on the involvement of the local Maori community, recognising that this would be ‘the key to success’ (ibid., 127). Reconciling the apparent conflicts between Maori and Pakeha values as they applied to the area were seen as being ‘essential’, and it was understood that this process would require ‘sensitivity, skill, understanding and great care’ (ibid., 126-7). The plan noted, too, that preparations were underway for the development of a reception and information centre as a ‘basic requirement to cater for public use’ of the reserves complex (ibid., 77). The visitor centre did not materialise and strengthening tensions—fueled in part by the government’s attempt to exclude conservation lands from treaty settlements—led to the targeting of existing developments at Te Rerenga Wairua in April 1999. The shop and the wooden storage building used by tour bus drivers for tea breaks were set alight, other buildings were tagged with graffiti, and a number of windows in the lighthouse were smashed. This protest drew attention to iwi resentment that visitor facilities were located on an area considered sacred and that the ground had been scarred through the erecting of buildings. It also drew attention to the fact that this was, as the sprayed slogans made clear, ‘Stolen Ngati Kuri Land’. One senior Ngati Kuri spokesperson who was quoted in support of the actions explained that while the Ngati Kuri Trust Board seemed finally to be ‘making progress over a planned visitor centre at Cape Reinga’, there was frustration at a grassroots level, ‘particularly

over the lack of progress in settling the outstanding Muriwhenua land claim'.¹⁶⁶ Te Rerenga Wairua, then, began to stand as an emblem for the fact that notions of progress have been reconstituted and re-orientated: progress now involves coming to terms with the past, finding ways through impasses, getting things going again once they have stalled. As the case of Te Rerenga Wairua shows, too, progress may necessitate the stripping away or 'unmaking' of Pakeha forms of community and infrastructure, and has become linked to alternative notions of 'settlement'—the resolving of conflict and the making of redress.

* * *

Further information about the proposed visitor centre was made public in December 2000 when it was reported in the media that Ngati Kuri intended to build a \$4.5 million museum complex for visitors at Te Rerenga Wairua, and that the contract for its design had been awarded to JASMAX—the same architectural firm earlier engaged to design the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa. The report noted that the plan envisaged 'visitors being led along an underground tunnel where they would hear the history of the area before emerging to panoramic views of the Cape'. It also explained that:

The iwi and DOC are broadly agreed on the concept, even if funding issues are still to be settled, and the site's inclusion in the Muriwhenua land claim is a complication. A sense of goodwill prevails where once there was fractiousness. Symptomatic of this was the creation last year of a 75 ha historic reserve in recognition of the spiritual pathway.¹⁶⁷

Acknowledging at that time that proceedings were slow and had been delayed, the report offered an already-revised timeframe: '[c]onstruction of the centre was [. . .] due to start last year. Now, work is planned to begin within the next twelve months'.

No visible changes took place at Te Rerenga Wairua, however, until after the government announcement in May 2007 that funding of \$6.5 million would be allocated for the upgrading of facilities at the site. An accompanying parliamentary speech described the project as the culmination of thirty years of work. Using the familiar lexicon of progress, this speech explained that the redevelopment was a means of 'improving' and 'enhancing' the site, and that it was intended to 'safe-guard' and 'future-proof' it, too.¹⁶⁸ Work was to include the removal of existing toilets, car parks and above-ground water tanks, as well as the erasing of all evidence of lighthouse keepers'

houses and other buildings. New car park facilities were to be sited 100 metres further back along the road, a new toilet block with underground water tanks was to be installed, and earthworks were to reshape the land back to its original contours—‘healing [. . .] the damaged areas of earth’ and ‘rehabilitating’ the spiritual pathway.¹⁶⁹ Half a million native plants grown especially from seeds collected in the area were to be planted, too, and new walking tracks to the lighthouse were to be installed. As part of the project, Transit New Zealand was to tar-seal the northernmost nineteen kilometres of State Highway 1 which were still in gravel: this was said to ‘mark an important milestone for New Zealand’s roading network’.¹⁷⁰ At this time, construction of a visitor centre to be run by an iwi trust was again reported:

Mid-2008 will see the start of construction on the visitor centre, subject to resource consents and funding being secured. With an estimated cost of \$10 million, this facility is due to open the following year. The location of the new visitor centre was chosen by local iwi and will have a minimal imprint on the environment. It is intended that the centre be a place to appropriately welcome, inform and educate visitors about the unique geographic, environmental and cultural characteristics of the area.¹⁷¹

The reason for the change of architect remains unclear but a developed design for the visitor centre—complete with hand drawn sketches, computer-generated artists’ impressions, side elevations, floor plans, cross-sections, site plans showing lines of sight, and a schedule of finishes for each of the elements—was completed by Pacific Environments in November 2007. This document explains that the visitor centre was designed after four public hui and as a result of a series of consultation meetings with representatives from Ngati Kuri, Te Aupouri and DOC who are said to ‘have come together to progress the project’ (Pacific Environments 2007, n.p.). The centre was intended to ‘honour Te Ara Wairua’ and to ‘enhance tangata whenua and visitor experiences of the area’ (ibid.). Since it was seen as being essential that tikanga could be observed in all aspects of engaging with manuhiri or visitors to the site, the design was founded on a number of protocols. Careful provision for welcoming was made: visitors were to assemble in front of a stylised waharoa or entrance portico built into the hillside off the main car park for briefing on the significance of Te Rerenga Wairua, and were then to proceed through the waharoa, and—with accompanying karanga—make their way to the centre for formal powhiri. The design also incorporated chapel-like quiet spaces for karakia and provided a dedicated area where kaumatua and kuia would be able to sit in comfort and engage with visitors; accompanying images of marae and whareniui settings suggest a relaxed and informal

atmosphere in this area. Dedicated audiovisual, wananga and interpretative display spaces were also intended to enable visitors ‘to gain a deeper understanding of Te Ara Wairua and tangata whenua histories’ (ibid.).

The content of interpretative material, which was to be developed under the guidance of iwi representatives, is not supplied in the document but the plans show that Kupe was intended to be a key figure. The document explains:

Kupe established Te Rerenga Wairua as the point from which his descendants would travel in spirit form back to Hawaiiiki. The daughters of Kupe were left behind [. . .] at Te Rerenga Wairua and are thus seen as kaitiaki for the area for other descendants on their journeys back to Hawaiiiki. A series of pou kaitiaki [guardian posts] in honour of these women are located at the entry portico from the upper carpark and at the entry to the centre [. . .].¹⁷²

Tohe—described as ‘one of Muriwhenua’s most important ancestors’ (ibid.)—also features prominently in the design. The document explains that since Tohe is recorded as naming more than 25 places along Te Ara Wairua as he travelled the length of what became known as Te Oneroa a Tohe (Ninety Mile Beach) and beyond, ‘the Tohe narrative is an important inspiration for the centre’. Sculptural timber screens attached to the exterior western wall of the building—intended to shield the centre from storm winds and western sun, and to be interpreted as ‘te arai’, or the veil between the world of the living and that of the dead—were to feature silhouette figures of Tohe and to depict the various places recorded on his final journey. On the inside of this screen, on the western side of the hall, a mural made from cast glass elements was also proposed. A ‘Hall of Memories’ is detailed in the plans, too: this central corridor was to contain a mural contoured in relief on a rammed earth surface which would acknowledge the undersea pathway travelled by the spirits of the dead from Te Rerenga Wairua to Manawatawhi (the Three Kings Islands). The mural was to make particular reference to Te Taha Wahine or the east coast (‘the feminine element, manaakitanga and noa’) and Te Taha Tane or the west coast (‘the male warrior element and tapu’). Unique species of flora and fauna—including pupuharakeke (flax snails) and kuaka (godwits)—were to be referenced in the design of the visitor centre as well, in slab steps made from concrete and swamp kauri, and in lintels and other artworks.

For the purposes of this discussion, the key significance of this proposed visitor centre is that it represents a new museum model—of a kind significantly more radical than Bledisloe had been able to envisage. Tribal museums and cultural centres founded on indigenous concepts, values and histories have become a strong feature in other settler-colonial nations in recent decades. Embodying resistance, appropriation and innovation, these institutions represent a form of progress which directly challenges the museum as a symbol ‘of the global reach of Western institutions allied with capitalist markets and the projects of national elites’ (Clifford 1997, 8-9). They are also, as Lisa Watt has explained, expressions of sovereignty and self-governance (2005, 11). Refuting the idea that history is linear and that all events can be enfolded into national or global chronologies, these institutions are enmeshed in local meanings, histories and traditions, and they function as community centres—as sites of gathering, storytelling, education, mobilisation. Frequently, too, as James Clifford notes, they aspire to wider national or international recognition: ‘[t]hus, a constant tactical movement is required: from margin to center and back again, in and out of dominant contexts, markets, patterns of success’ (1997, 122).

Within Aotearoa New Zealand, it has routinely been expected that Maori cultural centres will emerge: this is seen as a form of progress which is both natural and inevitable, part of what Clifford has termed ‘the evolving context’ (ibid., 110). In public statements made at the time of the *Te Maori* exhibition in the mid-1980s, Hirini Moko Mead commented that there was a felt need among Maori that tribal groups needed to design and run their own cultural centres which would meet their specific heritage and cultural needs:

The Maori people want to control their heritage; they want to be the people who handle their taonga; they want to have the knowledge to explain them to other cultures; they want to explain them to their own people; they want to define their past and present existence; they want to control their own knowledge (*matauranga Maori*) and they want to present themselves in their own way to the world and to themselves.¹⁷³

Citing as inspiration the fact that a directory published by the Smithsonian Institution in 1998 had listed more than 150 tribal museums in the United States, Gorbey’s 2004 report on the Tai Tokerau museum sector expressed the confident expectation that Maori museums would soon be forthcoming and discussed in brief the project plan for the visitor centre at Te Rerenga Wairua.¹⁷⁴ Given the international reputation Aotearoa New Zealand has for ‘progressive’ museum practice, it seems striking that such developments have been so delayed here. The bicultural agenda—which has

encouraged Maori to work in and with existing museums—appears to have forestalled the development of independent iwi museums. Aotearoa New Zealand’s comparatively small size may, in part, explain this: the number of metropolitan museums here is few, and these museums have not been keen to repatriate taonga, particularly to remote and rural locations. In part, too, it may have suited iwi for their stories and treasured possessions to be displayed in high-profile institutions which serve urban centres of population. As this thesis has argued, however, biculturalism has only facilitated limited gains for Maori. There is, as Ella Henry has made clear (cited in Melbourne 1995, 16), a view among Maori that separation rather than integration may well be required in order for fuller self-determination to be achieved.

* * *

In February 2008, it was announced that further government funding of \$90,000 had been allocated for the development and installation of interpretative material at Te Rerenga Wairua. Such material had not been provided for in the initial budget for the site’s redevelopment, and a *Cape Reinga Interpretation Project Plan* produced by DOC in February 2008, followed by commissioned *Concept Design* and *Developed Design* reports produced by Visitor Solutions in August and September 2008, confirm that this initiative was a new one. According to a DOC spokesperson, the iwi-run visitor centre that had earlier been proposed will not proceed: the on-site interpretative material which has been installed through this process is considered by DOC to be ‘full and final’.¹⁷⁵

Those who head north along the Aupouri peninsula towards Te Rerenga Wairua (either by driving the length of Ninety Mile Beach or by following State Highway 1) now encounter at Te Paki junction a row of stylised pou constructed from solid timber and overlaid with strips of laser-cut steel. This installation has been designed to evoke a traditional palisade, marking the entry to the Te Paki reserves complex and marking out a roadside rest area for vehicles. The rest area contains DOC overview panels which introduce the significance of Te Rerenga Wairua, explain environmental care codes and detail local walking tracks and camp grounds. Displayed within a landscaped zone adjacent to this rest area is a cluster of panels which emerge from the ground and are set at various heights. These are angled in the direction of the prevailing winds and act as ‘compass points’ (Visitor Solutions 2008a, n.p.) directing attention to particular aspects of the surroundings. Each of these

panels uses one of three distinct materials—limestone, steel or totara—which is etched, laser-cut or carved with text and images, and which corresponds to strands of narrative devoted to the geology, history, culture and ecology of the area. The landscaped area in which these panels are set is not formal—it is comprised of gravel and bark chip paths, and subtle contouring—and while the plants are still young, the signs themselves are already weathering: they are exposed to sun, rain, salt spray and bird droppings, and spiders have begun to make homes in their corners and crevices. From the junction, visitors proceed along the newly tar-sealed access road which winds through the Te Paki Coastal Park. Three further rest areas are signalled by roadside pou: text panels clustered at these stopping points continue the four narrative strands established at Te Paki junction and identify features in the landscape. The narrative strands are again picked up at Te Rerenga Wairua, where visitor arrival is carefully orchestrated. The new car park has deliberately been set down behind the crest of the hillside, with the walking track to the lighthouse accessed on the far side of an imposing modern waharoa. Designed so that it initially permits only glimpses of the water, this structure has taken the same form as had been proposed in the 2007 visitor centre plan and is decorated on its interior surfaces with artworks based on enlargements of Tuki's map. As visitors pass beneath it, the 'broad panorama of the Cape site' opens up before them (Visitor Solutions 2008a, n.p.).

Given the circumstances behind the site's redevelopment it is perhaps unsurprising that progress is the clear underlying theme of this interpretative material; in a number of ways, real progress does appear to have been made. Seeming to pick up at the point at which the Kauri Museum's displays begin to falter, the narrative at Te Rerenga Wairua registers some of the new key value-structures of settlement. First, the material foregrounds the ongoing relevance of Maori culture and beliefs. All text panels devoted to Maori culture are presented in both English and Te Reo, and an introductory text panel sited in the car park at Te Rerenga Wairua presents a strong iwi voice:

Nau mai, haere mai, whakatau mai!

We welcome you as a manuhiri (special guest) to Te Rerenga Wairua (Cape Reinga), one of the most significant cultural sites in Aotearoa (New Zealand). For Maori, this is where a person's spirit comes after death and departs for their eternal home.

In travelling here, you follow a path taken by countless others. We invite you to explore the meaning of this special place and your shared journey.

We also ask you to follow the tikanga (custom) of not eating or drinking while you are here.

The fact that Te Rerenga Wairua is ‘a place of great spiritual significance for Maori’ is reiterated several times within the on-site narrative, and present tense descriptions of the movements of spirits along Te Ara Wairua ground these traditions firmly within the contemporary world. The opposing elements which had been intended to form the basis of the undersea corridor in the visitor centre appear, too, in a dedicated text panel:

Te Rerenga Wairua [. . .] marks the separation of the Tasman Sea (to the west) from the Pacific Ocean. For Maori, these turbulent waters are where the male sea Te Moana Tapokopoko a Tawhaki meets the female sea Te Tai o Whitireia. The whirlpools where the currents clash are like those that dance in the wake of a waka (canoe). They represent the coming together of male and female—and the creation of life.

Second, and again unlike those at the Kauri Museum, the displays at Te Rerenga Wairua describe the landscape in ways that acknowledge longstanding Maori connections. The narrative explains that this is ‘one of New Zealand’s oldest areas’ of human habitation and describes it as a ‘hotspot for settlement’: ‘[e]verywhere you look in this landscape you can find evidence of human settlement—for hundreds of years, probably as long as people have lived in New Zealand’. Ngatongawhiti, ‘a very old Maori settlement’, is mentioned and the site of a ‘commanding’ fortified pa at Paetotara, close to State Highway 1, is pointed out. The narrative explains that more than 2,000 people lived in this pa at the peak of its development: the remains of kumara pits nearby are said to be ‘signs of the extensive gardens needed to support such a population’, and it is stated that ‘[f]orests, coasts and wetlands were abundant sources of food for hunting and gathering’. The importance of Tohe as an ancestor is mentioned and the names which he and other tribal sources gave to features of the landscape take precedence, with parentheses used for English equivalents: the narrative refers to ‘Manawatawhi (Three Kings Islands)’; ‘Te Oneroa a Tohe (Ninety Mile Beach)’, and so on.

Third, the narrative places environmental concerns up-front: these are not an afterthought or postscript. Misgivings are expressed in relation to the spread of marram grass planted by farmers to stabilise the sand dunes, and in relation to the fact that toheroa ‘used to be plentiful’ on Ninety Mile Beach: ‘This large shellfish, a delicacy for Maori, became hugely popular, particularly canned as soup. For decades, toheroa were carted off in sackloads, and their numbers plummeted’. The narrative also deals explicitly with forms of progress related to a ‘newer’ generation of technological innovations than the Kauri Museum presently accommodates. A text panel devoted to ‘Eco-Design’

which is attached to the new ablution block in the main car park emphasises that all elements have been designed to minimise their impact on the natural world: concrete floors and walls ‘provide thermal mass to minimise temperature extremes’; timber battened screens ‘buffer driving rain while still allowing air movement for ventilation’; translucent roofing ‘eliminates the need for electric lighting while heavy weight glass reinforced polyester sheets provide UVA and UVB protection’; water usage ‘is minimised by using recycled water [. . .], waterless urinals and waterless hand sanitising gels’, and so on. DOC has also made it clear that this building is painted in a colour that links it to the deep red of the earth in the area, and that all timber used in construction of the ablution block and waharoa is ‘certified sustainable’.¹⁷⁶ While environmental concerns are currently in vogue—an inscription makes it clear that the new structures sited at Te Rerenga Wairua won gold in the ‘Tourism and Leisure Building’ category of the 2009 Registered Master Builders awards—, DOC’s developing of the site in this way seems to have been driven in large part by iwi interests. Camouflaging structures sympathetically within the landscape, using ethical building products, ensuring that all waste water released into the environment is clear of contaminants, and making use of solar energy in order to avoid the intrusion of reticulated power are seen to be of crucial importance given the sacredness of the site.

And fourth—and possibly contrary in some ways to DOC’s intention—, the narrative differs from the one presented at the Kauri Museum in that it makes no overt attempt to effect closure. Introductory text panels make it clear that a treasure trail (‘te ara taonga’) has been set up, that ‘[t]he large posts (pou) that greeted you as you entered Te Paki mark the beginning of a journey of discovery’. Because the narrative is multi-stranded, however, and because it operates within a number of different temporal registers, it is organised as series rather than by teleology. Geological time provides a ‘deep context’: reference is made to sea levels rising and falling; to climate changes and movements in the earth’s crust over millennia; to minerals that are billions of years old; to offshore islands becoming joined to the mainland through sand drifts; to ‘young and shifty’ dunes filling valleys and blocking streams to form wetlands. This timescale is inter-spliced, however, with stories and episodes from mythic and/or historical time: farming and gumdigging; Tuki’s 1793 map; a shipwreck off the coast in 1966; Tohe’s journey to Hokianga and beyond; a 2006 car crash which ignited a large stand of regenerating bush; centuries during which whales have scratched themselves against rocks to remove barnacles from their skins; land yacht races held on local beaches since the 1830s. As it moves

towards the lighthouse, no real sense is given that the narrative is building to an 'end' point or resolving in an overall way: within its course, the lighthouse 'appears' as a response to the bombing of Pearl Harbour in 1941 before it is prophesied by T. W. Ratana in 1928, and these events in turn occur before Tasman sights and names the Three Kings Islands on the eve of Epiphany in 1643. Linear time is displaced: emerging instead are forms of historicity which transmit occurrences that do not demand to be plotted in a coherent way, and which evoke experiences that do not seem to belong on the same page.

* * *

The 2007 visitor centre plan and the 2008 publications which document behind-the-scenes writing and revising of interpretative material provide insights into what-might-have-been. In combination with reports and briefs of evidence prepared by and for the Waitangi Tribunal during the period in which Te Rerenga Wairua has been managed as a public reserve, these highlight issues which make it difficult to view the newly installed displays as being 'exemplary'. Rather than showing how far things have come, these displays show in very real ways how far there still is to go. It is clear from the visitor centre plan, for instance, that the 'greetings' panels stand in for modes of welcome and exchange effected through powhiri and dialogue which would have presented a more powerful iwi voice, and that reference to the meeting of the two oceans has taken on a much less significant form than was originally intended. Other concepts which were supposed to be defining ones are omitted altogether: the pou which have been installed make no reference to Kupe's daughters; no representation has been given to 'te ara' or the veil between the two worlds. The Visitor Solutions publications show that considerably more information than is currently supplied would have been devoted to Kupe and to waka traditions; this would have given more of a sense of the 'homely matrix' (Armstrong 2003, 23) provided by the Pacific, and would have connected Te Rerenga Wairua to the spiritual departure points that are found within and shape each Pacific tradition. In turn, these elements might have offered an alternative conception of progress to the one emblematised by the settler road. As Ian Wedde has explained, the sea functions within Pacific histories as a highway for movement both backwards and forwards, as a vital and fluid nexus, and as a focus for stories of migration, trade and exchange: it represents connectedness and mobility rather than distance, isolation and exile as it does in settler-colonial cultures (2005, 74).¹⁷⁷ The Visitor Solutions

publications show, too, that Tohe would have featured more prominently and that reference would have been made to other important tupuna like Moehau, a blind kuia; that connections to the land would have been stated and evoked through songs and proverbs; that the personal pronoun ‘we’ and the possessive determiner ‘our’ were to have been rhetorical features carried throughout the displays rather than being confined to the initial ‘greetings’ panels as they are in practice. Tribal histories, then, have not fully been permitted to be recited in or on their own terms.

The reduction in scope of this material appears to be a result of the division of the narrative into those four strands: because relative balance has been sought, the ‘culture’ material has been circumscribed, meaning that Te Rerenga Wairua’s significance as a cultural landscape is also downplayed. According to the Muriwhenua *Land* and *Fishing* reports, the area at the north of the peninsula is known to have supported more than 150 pa and a population of several tens of thousands; within the boundaries of the Te Paki recreational reserve there are close to 1,000 recorded archaeological sites (fortified pa, storage pits, shell middens, stone heaps and walls, stone-faced terraces and so on). Since only two clusters of these are identified in the on-site narrative, the actual density of Maori patterns of land use in the area is obscured: to the untrained eye, evidence of human settlement will not be found ‘everywhere you look in this landscape’. Significantly, too, the two sites of habitation that are identified are both located several kilometres south of Te Rerenga Wairua itself, suggesting difficulties associated with the idea of this landscape as ‘lived-in’. In this way, the narrative endorses western assumptions that landscape is for viewing or for recreational purposes only, that spiritual places must be set aside, that distance must be maintained. The fact that the narrative stops short of conveying ‘the intensity of settlement and the people’s intimacy with the land’ (Waitangi Tribunal 1997, 19) is also significant because these issues have strong political valence: archaeological evidence confirming the great importance of marine resources and the scale and extent of tribal fishing activities, for example, was presented during the hearings for the Muriwhenua fishing claim and was critical to the claim’s success. The on-site narrative makes no mention, either, of the fact that Motuopao is the burial place of the paramount chiefs of Muriwhenua; that archaeological evidence confirming occupancy of Manawatawhi has been a factor in its being claimed as Maori land; that Kapowairua was still inhabited by Maori as recently as the 1960s, and that recreational use of this bay and others as public camping grounds is known to have caused disturbance of midden deposits and former agricultural ditches (Department of Lands and Survey 1986, 129).

Far-reaching difficulties are evident in relation to the ecological material, too. While there is, as has already been suggested, a dovetailing of iwi and DOC interests in relation to some ecological concerns, divisions are also submerged within the narrative. Again, these problems become visible through the organising of the narrative into the four strands—and specifically, through the fact that the text devoted to ‘ecology’ has no signifying panel-type or material-type of its own. This information is accommodated within the text panel-types of the other three narrative strands. Hand-written changes to the Visitor Solutions reports show the difficulties associated with assigning this information: in practice, almost all of the ecological material is presented using the same material as the ‘historical’ (that is, ‘European historical’) panels—laser-cut steel. In some ways this is perhaps fitting, since it implicitly acknowledges that significant problems have arisen since the beginning of the ‘ecological revolution’ (Park 1995, 24) inaugurated by European settlement. Given that DOC has supplied the ecological information, the use of this panel-type also accurately reflects DOC concerns and priorities. Huge emphasis is placed in these panels on the area’s ‘many biological treasures’—‘from kauri trees to orchids, from skinks to *pupuharakeke* (flax snails)’; on the fact that a large part of North Cape is fenced off as a scientific reserve in order to ‘[protect] a unique and fragile community of plants and animals’; on the fact that island sanctuaries have been established at Motuopao and Manawatawhi.

In other ways, however, the assigning of the ‘ecological’ material in this way is deeply problematic: it seems intended to counterbalance the representation of Maori culture (which has its number of text panels ‘doubled’ through translation), and effectively suggests that ecological matters are of little concern to iwi. Only three text panels—one relating to a predator-control programme implemented to ‘safe-guard’ the oi or grey-faced petrel; another to the fact that Maori ‘manage the [restricted] take’ of toheroa on Te Oneroa a Tohe; and another to pingao as a ‘prized weaving material’—indicate iwi interest and involvement. It is not the case that the ecological material has gained greater presence within the narrative than the cultural centre plans indicate it would have had; these plans show that elements of the natural world were to have been incorporated into the design of the building as representations of a world view in which culture and nature are interconnected and interdependent. The Visitor Solutions reports begin to suggest, too, other ways in which this material was destined to have been presented. Moehau, for instance, is known for performing *karakia* to call whales in to

shore: her story was to have been used to explain the significance of whales in Muriwhenua tribal culture—the fact that these are seen as descendants of Tangaroa, the spirit of the oceans. Her story was also seen as significant by iwi for the fact that she provides the inspiration for a Maori plant name. In practice, the only mention she receives is on a text panel which states ‘[r]arest of the plants here is Bartlett’s rata (rata moehau), a white-flowered tree among red-flowered relatives, only ever found in the Te Paki area’. The ‘ecology’ strand of the on-site narrative, then, brings visitors no closer to understanding the natural environment as a vital ecological and spiritual resource than does the Kauri Museum: the conservation values which it naturalises and celebrates are peculiarly western ones, meaning that a ‘density of local meanings’ (Clifford 1997, 129) is obscured.

Because the ecological material is presented in this way, the narrative is again able to defuse issues which have been highly significant in claims made to the Waitangi Tribunal by Muriwhenua tribes. Mention of toheroa collecting, for instance, elides important issues addressed in the *Muriwhenua Fishing Report*: this report sought to understand how it could be ‘that we have come to associate Maori fishing with the gathering of a few shellfish at the seashore’, and noted that iwi attribute the depletion of toheroa in part to the use of Ninety Mile Beach as a public road (Waitangi Tribunal 1988, xix and 24). Disputes which have risen to prominence as a result of the filing of the WAI 262 claim by Far North claimants in 1991 are also evaded. As Geoff Park explained in a brief of evidence prepared for the Waitangi Tribunal, the area around Te Rerenga Wairua ‘is doubly significant’ for the WAI 262 claim since it is a specific location where Crown activities concerning indigenous flora and fauna were a factor in the claim being lodged, and since it was also the locality for some of the initial evidence given by Ngati Kuri claimants (2001, 607). Pupuharakeke is one of three species of indigenous fauna specifically cited in the claim. As Park explains,

In Ngati Kuri history, pupuharakeke is a kaitiaki and special taonga, and at certain times was a food resource. The claimants assert that land clearance led to a marked decrease in its numbers, and that loss of Maori title to land has meant effective loss of access by Maori to pupuharakeke. They attribute the disruption to the large colonies of pupuharakeke which once stretched across the northern Muriwhenua peninsula to the land use policies of the Crown.¹⁷⁸

Evidence has also been presented in the course of this claim which states that the Crown’s reserving and fencing of wetland areas at Kapowairua has denied Ngati Kuri access to ‘a customarily significant indigenous flora resource’—flax or harakeke, which is used ‘in the important tikanga of

raranga or traditional weaving’ (ibid., 608 and 630-1). Reference to pingao as ‘a prized weaving material’, then, serves as a means of sidestepping these difficulties: as is the case in the Kauri Museum’s displays, the on-site narrative at Te Rerenga Wairua gives no hint of the conflicts that have arisen precisely because modern conservation activities have refused to recognise indigenous relationships with the land and its resources.

The Visitor Solutions and Waitangi Tribunal reports bring into sharper focus, too, problems associated with the temporal organisation of the on-site narrative. Important issues to do with names and naming, for instance, are currently masked in the on-site narrative. The reinstating of Maori place names is a marker of postcolonial exhibitionary practice and appropriately accords primacy to iwi relationships with the land. It obscures the fact, though, that tribes have had to fight hard—through the courts and through the Waitangi Tribunal—to have these names acknowledged. As the *Muriwhenua Land Report* has explained, the names given to landmarks by figures like Tasman and Cook, and used by subsequent waves of voyagers and settlers, did not recognise the systems of rights and obligations, and forms of ancestral knowledge, which already extended across the country (Waitangi Tribunal 1997, 19-20). The narrative does not acknowledge, for instance, that the official renaming of Ninety Mile Beach as Te Oneroa a Tohe is a key element of a proposed treaty settlement which has yet to be finalised.¹⁷⁹ Nor does it mention that Tuki’s map is significant for being the first recorded use of the name ‘Muriwhenua’ (written by Tuki’s translator as ‘Moodoo Whenua’), and that this appellation did not have general currency until it was adopted by elders of the Far North during the preparation of their fishing claim to the Waitangi Tribunal in the 1980s (Cloher 2002, 2).

Text panels proposed in the Visitor Solutions reports would have made reference to the Kaitaia mission station; to the Kaitaia signing of the Treaty of Waitangi; to Taylor’s land purchase; to the fact that by 1890, local tribes no longer had sufficient landholdings to maintain traditional ways of life; to problems associated with the more recent dispersal of Muriwhenua peoples through urban migration. Mythic and historical time would have been interwoven in more evocative ways, too. According to both publications it had been planned, for example, that the narrative would cite the Waitangi Tribunal’s 1992 *Te Roroa Report*: ‘In the valleys, between the hilltops, beside the rivers and along the coast, the tapuwae (footprints) of the ancestors remain poignant reminders that time past is time present is time future’. Inclusion of these elements would have begun to make clear the

fact that the official channels and processes through which iwi have sought recognition of their concerns and the return of tribal lands and assets have *necessitated* the telling of tribal histories in chronological ways. In turn, such elements would have refused assimilation within a narrative in which temporalities are diffused, in which problems associated with the history of the country since European settlement are fragmented and dispersed—or would at least have made apparent the fact that such a narrative makes a highly political statement.

These problems illuminate the fact that, like the Kauri Museum's displays, the narrative at Te Rerenga Wairua almost entirely fails to account for Maori histories dating from the beginning of European settlement: the strands of its narrative do not appear to belong on the same page because they barely overlap in historical terms. No sense is given of the political strength and mobility of Far North tribes that is documented by early writers like Marsden; in practice, the strongest post-European element in the 'culture' strand of the narrative relates to the pilgrimage undertaken in 1928 by T. W. Ratana, who is said to have come to Te Rerenga Wairua seeking enlightenment. Ratana functions within the narrative to reinforce Maori spiritual values and—as has already been suggested—to naturalise the development of the lighthouse:

On the hill opposite, [Ratana] heard the 'atua peruperu'—the snuffling sounds of the spirits of the dead—as they passed along Te Ara Wairua [. . .] The hill has been called Atua Peruperu ever since.

Ratana's message of unity and social justice brought thousands of followers together.

Today the church he founded has a strong presence in many Maori communities [. . .]

During his visit, he prophesied that a great light would one day shine on the world here.

Some see the Cape Reinga lighthouse as fulfilling that prophecy. Certainly, millions of people from across the planet have been drawn to visit this significant place.

No real sense is given of the significance of the Ratana movement: as Ranginui Walker has explained, Ratana 'turned his 20,000 followers into a political force by selecting candidates to contest the four Maori [parliamentary] seats' (cited in Melbourne 1995, 29).¹⁸⁰ Further complications associated with Ratana's intentions are also omitted. The Visitor Solutions reports show that Ngati Kuri intended for it to be made clear that Ratana 'advocated the rejection of certain Maori traditions such as carving, tribalism, tapu'. In this way, the narrative might have begun to deal with the fact that his northern tour—like those of CMS missionaries before him—was undertaken with the intention of cutting the roots of the sacred pohutukawa at Te Rerenga Wairua and thus liberating Maori from what he believed were constricting superstitions.

Perhaps the most fundamental underlying problems associated with the narrative's treatment of time are signalled in a panel titled 'Farming & gumdigging'. This panel opens by explaining that for almost 100 years, the northern end of the peninsula was run as a large cattle farm, first by Samuel Yates:

Cattle grew fast in the warm, wet climate. Te Paki Station workers used to drive thousands of the animals every year along Ninety Mile Beach.

The Keene family took over the farm in 1930. The crown bought the land from them in 1966 to create the reserve you are visiting today.

People also came here digging for kauri gum—the resin that had oozed from ancient kauri trees. Kauri gum was sold mainly for making varnish. The digging industry lasted almost 50 years, until the 1920s.

This is one of the very first panels that visitors encounter and is the only one which deals with the matter of the land's ownership. Avoiding mention of the complex back-story to Yates' purchase, it also fails to account for the fact that the Waitangi Tribunal found in favour of the Far North claimants who argued that the notion of 'land sale' did not exist in Maori culture in the 1840s and that land transactions in the area were Maori custom 'tuku whenua' which gave usufructuary but not proprietary rights (Mutu 2011, 62). While the format of the on-site narrative at Te Rerenga Wairua differs from the Kauri Museum's one, then, its effect is the same: this story, too, begins *in medias res* and it too naturalises changes wrought by settler culture in the name of progress, and fails to account for Maori historical experiences. A shadow story to this one is recorded in the *Muriwhenua Land Report*, which explains that Far North Maori were forced into gumdigging because their lands had been systematically alienated, and became:

[. . .] ensnared in a system of debt peonage, where children laboured with the adults and where conditions were such that a quarter of all infants died before reaching the age of three years. There followed forlorn attempts to farm what were clearly remote and marginal lands. Communities disintegrated as people moved away. Social controls could not be maintained. The Maori people in Muriwhenua became, and still are, a people at risk.¹⁸¹

While the narrative at Te Rerenga Wairua appears to have dispensed with the kind of teleology presented in the Kauri Museum, then, it nevertheless takes this teleology as its foundation. Despite the regrets it expresses about the spread of marram grass, the narrative itself proceeds on the assumption of an established and secure settler footprint on the land—a message reinforced by the

fact that the newly tar-sealed road at Te Paki marks the entrance to almost 3,000 hectares of rolling farmland still leased by the government and grazed by cattle and sheep.

* * *

Signage and overview panels make it clear that despite the presence of the Maori greetings, first-authorship of the on-site narrative is claimed by DOC. It seems reasonably straightforward to perceive why DOC has led the redevelopment in the ways that have been described. According to a spokesperson, the proposed iwi-run visitor centre has not gone ahead because it proved ‘too political’.¹⁸² DOC has instead pursued an interpretation scheme which gives—on the surface—the appearance of being a ‘best practice’ model, and which seems to enable difficulties to be diffused and dispersed. Given what had seemed possible, however, it might appear that Ngati Kuri have been short-changed: by giving up the opportunity to establish their own museum or visitor centre, and by agreeing to the site’s interpretation in ways that maintain consensus, they seem to have settled for less. Intricacies of behind-the-scenes debates—including decisions about the editing of material for the on-site narrative—remain obscure, but some information concerning the issues related to the visitor centre has entered the public domain, and this in turn enables further possible iwi motives for and understandings of this outcome to be sketched.

First, media reports make it clear that there remained deep divisions within Ngati Kuri and between DOC and Ngati Kuri. One of the key issues at stake appears to have been public access to Te Rerenga Wairua: DOC was adamant that this should not be affected and that the visitor centre must be located at the site itself.¹⁸³ It was reported in September 2007, however, that some members of Ngati Kuri believed the development should be located at Te Paki: it was their intention that iwi guides should then escort people to Te Rerenga Wairua and to other points of interest in order to control traffic flows, manage visitation, preserve the site’s wairua, and strengthen the iwi voice. Reports also indicate that conflict arose over the fact that heavy machinery was being used to ‘dig up’ land that Ngati Kuri regarded as part of the tribe’s Treaty of Waitangi settlement claim; fears were held that Crown entities were moving in ‘to take possession of Cape property before Ngati Kuri got their claim settled’.¹⁸⁴ Postings on the DOC website after two information days had been held for members of the public—when the earthworks had begun at Te Rerenga Wairua and when the visitor

centre was still being proposed—reveal the extent of the backlash. To the question ‘Can we stop what is happening now’, the response was given by DOC that phase one (the ‘healing’ of the site) was ‘legal’ since resource consents had already been granted, but that consents for phase two (the visitor centre) had not yet been sought. The final three postings indicate the basis and depth of iwi opposition:

Q: How can you carry out works on land under claim?

A: Works on sites under claim (and virtually all lands administered by DOC have been claimed) can proceed, but must proceed in a way which does not exacerbate current grievances and does not lead to further grievances.

Q: Why is my wairua made heavy and saddened by these processes?

A: There may be many causes for such feelings.

Q: Who do we think we are to tutu with the spiritual world? To put land marks over the land marks of nature?

A: Given the request from Ngati Kuri to the then Minister of Conservation [. . .] to heal the landscape at Te Rerenga Wairua, the ‘do nothing’ option was not judged to be valid.¹⁸⁵

Much of the argument centred on the question of whether Transit New Zealand held the right to tar-seal the road. Among other things, this suggests that while settler culture still understands the road as a metaphor for progress (the opening up of a tourist route, the expression of the fact that a site is included in national circuits of visitation and is part of the ‘navigable’ labyrinth of asphalt (Solnit 1999, 365)), the fact that it can be construed in precisely these terms remains deeply problematic: for some members of Ngati Kuri, the road still firmly symbolises the *setting back* of iwi progress. Physical protests were, in the end, made during the road sealing; because of the lack of tribal consensus, the high profile nature of the site and the fact that anger had spilled over in the past, the threat of hostility never seemed far from the surface. Ngati Kuri may, then, have agreed to the current low-key development as a compromise, as a way of settling internal discord. Given the very real potential both to exacerbate existing grievances and to give rise to further grievances, it seems unlikely that the centre could have proceeded while the Muriwhenua land claim remains unresolved.

Second, media reports suggest that over time the visitor centre came to be pushed for more by regional tourism organisations and operators and by Pakeha commentators than by iwi. The 1986 Department of Lands and Survey report noted that the Te Paki reserves complex was likely to come under increasing development pressure because of its central importance to tourism and recreation in the Far North. The question of whether progress was being made rapidly enough surfaced in media

reports in 2000. Destination Northland, a promotional organisation for the region, was cited as saying that visitor facilities at Te Rerenga Wairua were ‘a disgrace’ and that there were ‘virtual sheds’ where there should be ‘a world-class visitor centre’.¹⁸⁶ Tourism operators vented frustration at this time that the area was ‘a major disappointment for visitors’; other commentators declared that the absence of quality visitor facilities was ‘an insult’ to the site’s spiritual significance, and that Te Rerenga Wairua had the potential ‘to become a showcase of Maori culture’.¹⁸⁷ This suggests an expectation that the development would cater for the tourist industry’s interest ‘in things Maori’ (O’Regan 1997, 7), that it would be akin to ‘traditional’ forms of Maori cultural tourism developed in Aotearoa New Zealand since the early days of settlement—concert parties, model Maori villages set up for international exhibitions and so on. It also raises the important issue of desire. As Muecke has explained, indigenous cultures need to be wary of being ‘wanted’ by settler nations, of being used for completion of a national lack or to satisfy a general desire for narrative outcomes, of having their histories and cultures recolonised by settler nations as part of these nations’ own struggles to find a route to a ‘postcolonial’ future (1997, 222-5). Meaghan Morris has made much the same point, noting that conceptions of indigenous culture as an object of tourism may have little relevance for tribal peoples who are negotiating for themselves new futures in the context of their own histories of survival, struggle and self-determination (1998, 27-8). The questions of exactly whose business this was, whose interests were to be served and what kinds of visions were held for the development, then, appear to have been a factor.

Third, and related to this, it is clear that over time, Te Rerenga Wairua had become entangled in debates to do with the ‘inevitability’ of the march of progress. That the visitor centre was expected to encourage visitation to Te Rerenga Wairua was touted in the media and in Gorbey’s report on the Tai Tokerau museum sector: visitor numbers were firmly forecast to rise and hope was expressed that the centre would be a catalyst for further investment by accommodation providers and activity operators—that there would be ‘flow on’ economic benefits. The question of whether the area could still be managed sustainably and without detracting from or disturbing its sacredness, however, became a very real issue for Ngati Kuri, requiring new kinds of cost-benefit projections. Consumption of food and drink at the site, for example, is considered inappropriate but the provision of dining facilities would have been necessary if visitors were to be encouraged to stay for longer: the 2007 visitor centre plan includes a café, but this remained a contentious issue. In practice, because of

the way in which the site has been developed, visitation levels seem unlikely to increase in dramatic ways. ‘No eating or drinking’ signs appear in at least three separate locations and there remains nowhere on-site for visitors to buy a Coke or a cappuccino. Those who are accustomed to the fact that heritage places tend to be ‘arranged and managed to encourage consumption’ (Graham, Ashworth and Tunbridge 2005, 31) find that the only thing they can buy, for a small charge, is a tree propagated by an iwi-run nursery to assist with the replanting process. The redevelopment of Te Rerenga Wairua, then, suggests modes of progress which might involve ‘resisting’ neoliberal imperatives (Bargh 2007), withdrawing tactically from dominant markets, redefining the parameters of ‘success’ in accordance with goals of another order: this site is by no means being run as a money-making venture or a tourism draw-card.¹⁸⁸

Fourth, and again related to this, are issues of funding and administration. Studies which cited the Kauri Museum as a model for calculating likely visitor spend and length of stay were commissioned by DOC in 1999 and 2001 in order to assess the financial feasibility of the Te Rerenga Wairua visitor centre proposal. The question of how the development would be paid for up-front, however, was always delicate. The 2007 visitor centre plan explains that funding for the development would be sought from charitable organisations, sponsors and other agencies, but that potentially there would be a cost to iwi. Information supplied on the DOC website—when it became clear that the bill for the development had more than doubled—did not discuss capital investment, but did state that Ngati Kuri would be responsible for ongoing operational and maintenance costs: it was hoped that revenue generated by the visitor centre would cover these costs, but this was not guaranteed. Given that treaty settlements are still outstanding in Muriwhenua, it is possible to understand why iwi may have been unwilling to risk going into debt to pay for this development. It is also clear why the obtaining of funding through external sources may have been viewed as problematic. Discussing the likely composition of the trust which would be established to manage the visitor centre, the second financial feasibility report recommended that all positions on the board should initially be held by Ngati Kuri, but that some of these would need to be given up for representatives from organisations which pledged funding—on a basis proportionate to the level of financial support offered (Visitor Solutions 2001, 86). The fact that management was to be tied to funding in this way, and the fact that Ngati Kuri sovereignty would have been watered-down, may well have reduced the attractiveness of the planned visitor centre.

And fifth, the interpretative material that has been installed at Te Rerenga Wairua may not, from iwi perspectives, be considered ‘full and final’ at all. It was reported in the media in January 2010 that the Crown had signed an agreement in principle with the Far North iwi. The deed of settlement is, however, still pending and the WAI 262 claim remains in process. In this light, the decision not to proceed with the visitor centre can be interpreted as a refusal by iwi to allow Te Rerenga Wairua to be used as a platform for the symbolic resolution of grievances while these remain unresolved on political and material levels. That is, the presence of an iwi-run institution would send the wrong message while the land and its resources continue to be contested; it would be, to borrow a formulation of Turner’s, complicit in a project which sought to enable the country to be looked back on as if ‘from an ideal point in the future when its current problems with historical claims will have been resolved’ (2009, 253-4). Ngati Kuri, then, may be biding their time: as is the case at Ruapekapeka, the present displays may well function as a pragmatic solution which does not preclude the pursuit of larger aspirations, the fostering of alternative ideas of the country-to-come. In this light, it seems fitting that a larger resolution at Te Rerenga Wairua continues to be ‘elusive and intractable’ (Thomas 1999, 11) at this stage: for iwi stakeholders, the cultural centre functions as a palpable absence, a reminder that this business remains unfinished.

* * *

Given the nature of the issues at stake it would seem wrong to offer a ‘final word’, but as a place to rest or perhaps a way to begin again, I want to ‘try back’ to an intention expressed in first of the two Visitor Solutions publications. According to this publication, it had been proposed that the very opening text panels in the on-site narrative at Te Rerenga Wairua would refer to the shelving of the visitor centre plan, to iwi protests about existing developments on the site, and to the fact that car park and toilet facilities have needed to be shifted. In practice, none of this information is displayed: in fact, the subsequent Visitor Solutions report shows that as the interpretation scheme was advanced, decisions were made which would fudge these issues altogether. The second report proposes that the text panels are to have an ‘aged appearance’ and that contemporary digital printing technologies are to be avoided, explaining that this approach is supposed to obviate the risk of the panels becoming ‘dated’ and at the same time to signal that they ‘have long been a part of this landscape’ (Visitor

Solutions 2008b, n.p.). In other words, this approach is intended to suggest that the site has always been and will always be valued in these ways. The report makes it clear, too, that the ongoing risk of physical protest has directly affected the development of the interpretative material. It advocates that the signs should be constructed from solid materials in order to meet ‘the demands and challenges of vandalism in this remote location’, and that the timber pou should be partially-covered with steel ‘for strengthening’ (ibid.). A handwritten note added to the document states that all installations are to be concreted in position with deep footings so that they cannot be pulled out with a 4-wheel drive vehicle, and that they need to be ‘chainsaw proof’—a possible use for settler technology which is not envisaged in the Kauri Museum’s displays.

For interlocking and independent reasons it may suit both DOC and iwi for background disputes to be avoided in the on-site narrative. Foregrounding of some of these issues would, however, have enabled sensitive discussion of some of the very real difficulties that continue to flare around this site and make it impossible to future-proof. Such an approach would have offered a way of starting *in medias res* without taking anything for granted; a way of acknowledging, as Nicholas Thomas has explained (1999, 281), that although we tend to regard the frontier as a marker of an earlier stage of history, the conditions associated with that disorderly, shifting border appear to be with us still.

Bibliography

a. Works cited

- Adams, Mark and Nicholas Thomas. *Cook's Sites: Revisiting History*. Dunedin: University of Otago Press and Centre for Cross-Cultural Research, Australian National University, 1999.
- Agnew, Vanessa. 'Introduction: What Is Re-enactment?', *Criticism* 46(3), Summer 2004, 327-339.
- Allen, Chadwick. *Blood Narrative: Indigenous Identity in American Indian and Maori Literary and Activist Texts*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2002.
- Ansley, Greg. 'Museum angers Heke family', *The New Zealand Herald*, 27 September 2003 [2003a], http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=3525759 [accessed 26 January 2004]
- -- 'Powerful allure of rebels with causes', *The New Zealand Herald*, 22 November 2003 [2003b], http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=3535464 [accessed 26 January 2004]
- Armstrong, Philip. 'Ocean-going Craft: The Writing of Contemporary Polynesia', *Landfall* 201, November 2003, 21-38.
- Attwood, Bain and S. G. Foster (eds.). *Frontier Conflict: The Australian Experience*. Canberra: National Museum of Australia, 2003.
- Banks, Joseph. *The Endeavour Journal of Joseph Banks 1768-1771, Volume I*, (ed.) J.C. Beaglehole. Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1963.
- Barnard, Henry and David Butts. 'Editorial: Thinking Libraries and Museums Together', *Sites* 25, Summer 1992, 1-8.
- Barringer, Tim and Tom Flynn (eds.). *Colonialism and the Object: Empire, Material Culture and the Museum*. London and New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Barrington, Mike, 'Iwi send protest group packing', 5 September 2007, <http://www.northernadvocate.co.nz/local/news/iwi-send-protest-group-packing/3747458> [accessed 23 July 2010]
- Bay Chronicle. 'Upgrade for Ruapekapeka Pa', 1 December 2003, <http://tiki.knowledge-basket.co.nz/newzagent/inlstuff/text/2002/STF/12/01/132215/doc> [accessed 28 October 2004]
- Belich, James. *The New Zealand Wars and the Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict*. Auckland: Penguin Books, 1988.
- Bell, Claudia. *Inventing New Zealand: Everyday Myths of Pakeha Identity*. Auckland and London: Penguin Books, 1996.
- Bell, Leonard. 'Auckland's centrepiece: unsettled identities, unstable monuments', in *Rethinking Settler Colonialism: History and Memory in Australia, Canada, Aotearoa New Zealand and South Africa*, Annie E. Coombes (ed.). Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2006.
- Bennett, Tony. *Out of Which Past? Critical Reflections on Australian Museum and Heritage Policy*. Nathan [Qld.]: Institute for Cultural Policy Studies, Division of Humanities, Griffith University, 1988.
- -- 'History on the Rocks', in *Australian Cultural Studies: A Reader*, John Frow and Meaghan Morris (eds.). St Leonards [N. S. W.]: Allen & Unwin, 1993.
- -- *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics*. London and New York: Routledge, 1995.

- -- 'Civic laboratories: museums, cultural objecthood, and the governance of the social', *Cultural Studies* 19(5), 2005, 521-547.
- Best, Elsdon. *Maori Religion and Mythology, Part II*. Wellington: P. D. Hasselberg, 1982.
- Binney, Judith. *The Legacy of Guilt: A Life of Thomas Kendall*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2005.
- -- 'Introduction', in *Te Kikeri 1770-1850: The Meeting Pool*, Judith Binney (ed.). Wellington: Bridget Williams Books and Craig Potton Publishing, 2007.
- Blackley, Roger. 'Beauty and the Beast: Plaster Casts in a Colonial Museum', in *On Display: New Essays in Cultural Studies*, Anna Smith and Lydia Wevers (eds.). Wellington: Victoria University Press, 2004.
- Bledisloe, Charles Bathurst, 1st viscount. *The Proper Function and Scope of a National Art Gallery and Museum*. Auckland: Wilson and Horton, 1934.
- Boswell, Anna. 'Cross-cultural comparison and the making of outlaws: a cautionary tale', *JNZL* 24(2), 2007, 185-204.
- -- 'Re-enactment and the museum case: reading the Oceanic and Native American displays in the Peabody Essex Museum', *JNZL* 27, 2009, 48-69.
- Brown, Deidre. *Tai Tokerau Whakairo Rakau: Northland Maori Wood Carving*. Auckland: Reed Publishing, 2003.
- -- 'Museums as cultural guardians', in *South Pacific Museums: Experiments in Culture*, Chris Healy and Andrea Witcomb (eds.), Victoria [Australia]: Monash University ePress, 2006.
- -- 'Icons, monuments and temples: The Christian influence on Tai Tokerau Maori architecture', in Deidre Brown and Ngarino Ellis (eds.), *Te Puna: Maori Art from Te Tai Tokerau Northland*. Auckland: Reed Publishing, 2007.
- Brown, Deidre and Ngarino Ellis (eds.), *Te Puna: Maori Art from Te Tai Tokerau Northland*. Auckland: Reed Publishing, 2007.
- Buick, T. Lindsay. *The Treaty of Waitangi, or How New Zealand Became a British Colony*. Wellington: S. and W. Mackay, 1914.
- -- *New Zealand's First War, or the Rebellion of Hone Heke*. Wellington: W. A. G. Skinner, Government Printer, 1926.
- -- *Waitangi: Ninety-Four Years After*. New Plymouth [N.Z.]: Thomas Avery and Sons, 1934.
- Butts, David. 'Maori and Museums: The Politics of indigenous Recognition', in *Museums, Society, Inequality*, Richard Sandell (ed.). London and New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Calder, Alex. 'Through a Long Lens: The 1990 Commission's Treaty of Waitangi Unity Campaign', in *Now See Hear!: Art, language and translation*, Ian Wedde and Gregory Burke (eds.). Wellington: Victoria University Press, 1990.
- -- 'Maning's Tapu: Colonialism and Ethnography in Old New Zealand', *Social Analysis* 39, April 1996, 3-26.
- -- 'Reading culturally: an approach to issues of cultural identity and difference in Aotearoa/New Zealand', *English in Aotearoa*, September 2000, 61-66.
- -- 'Introduction', in F. E. Maning, *Old New Zealand and Other Writings*, Alex Calder (ed.). London: Leicester University Press, 2001.
- -- 'Introduction: James Cowan and the Last Frontier', in James Cowan, *Tales of the Maori Bush*, Alex Calder (ed.). Auckland: Reed Publishing, 2006.
- -- 'Reenactment and the Natural History of Settlement', in *Settler and Creole Reenactment*, Vanessa Agnew and Jonathan Lamb (eds.). Basingstoke [England] and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

- Calder, Alex, Jonathan Lamb and Bridget Orr. 'Introduction: Postcoloniality and the Pacific', in *Voyages and Beaches: Pacific Encounters, 1769-1840*, Alex Calder, Jonathan Lamb and Bridget Orr (eds.). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1999.
- Calder, Alex and Stephen Turner. 'Introduction: Settlement Studies', *JNZL* 20, 2002, 7-17.
- Carter, Paul. *The Road to Botany Bay: An Essay in Spatial History*. London and Boston, Faber and Faber: 1987.
- -- *The Lie of the Land*. London and Boston: Faber and Faber, 1996.
- -- 'Footings: The Mythopoeic Foundations of Imperial Time', in *Quicksands: Foundational Histories in Australia and Aotearoa New Zealand*, Klaus Neumann, Nicholas Thomas and Hilary Ericksen (eds.). Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 1999.
- Casey, Dawn. 'Modern museum is meant to startle those who visit', *The Canberra Times*, 14 March 2002, <http://www.canberratimes.com.au/news/local/news/columns/modern-museum-is-meant-to-startle> [accessed 26 January 2004]
- -- 'Foreword', in *Outlawed: Rebels, Revolutionaries and Bushrangers*, Therese Weber (ed.). Canberra: Hyde Park Press and the National Museum of Australia, 2003.
- Chiu, Melissa (ed.). *Paradise Now? Contemporary Art from the Pacific*. New York: Asia Society, 2004.
- Clark, Nigel. 'Wild Life', in *Quicksands: Foundational Histories in Australia and Aotearoa New Zealand*, Klaus Neumann, Nicholas Thomas and Hilary Ericksen (eds.). Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 1999.
- Clarke, Chanel. 'Witches, Writers and Whalers: A New England Adventure in Salem', *Te Ara: Journal of Museums Aotearoa* 31(1), May 2006, 47-49.
- -- 'Nga taonga tuitui tangata: treasures weaving together the generations', in *Te Puna: Maori Art from Te Tai Tokerau Northland*, Deidre Brown and Ngarino Ellis (eds.). Auckland: Reed Publishing, 2007.
- Clendinnen, Inga. *Dancing with Strangers: Europeans and Australians at First Contact*. Cambridge [England]: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- -- 'The History Question: Who Owns the Past?', *Quarterly Essays* 23, 2006, 1-72.
- Clifford, James. *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art*. Cambridge [M.A.] and London: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- -- *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge [M.A.] and London: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Cloher, Dorothy Ulrich. *The Tribes of Muriwhenua: Their Origins and Stories/Iwi o Muriwhenua*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2002.
- Colenso, William. 'On the Native Races of New Zealand', *Transactions of the Auckland Institute and Museum* 1, 1868, 339-428.
- -- *The Authentic and Genuine History of the Signing of the Treaty of Waitangi, New Zealand, February 5 and 6, 1840: Being a faithful and circumstantial, though brief, narration of events which happened on that memorable occasion; with copies of the Treaty in English and Maori, and of the three early proclamations respecting the founding of the colony*. Wellington: George Didsbury, Government Printer, 1890.
- Cowan, James. *The New Zealand Wars: A History of the Maori Campaigns and the Pioneering Period, Volume I: 1845-64*. New York: A. M. S. Press, 1969.
- Cresswell, John C. M. *Maori Meeting Houses of the North Island*. Auckland: P. C. S. Publications, 1977.

- Cronon, William, George Miles and Jay Gitlin. 'Becoming West: Toward a New Meaning for Western History', in *Under an Open Sky: Rethinking America's Western Past*, William Cronon, George Miles and Jay Gitlin (eds.). New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1992.
- Cruise, Richard. *Journal of a Ten Months' Residence in New Zealand*. Christchurch: Capper Press, 1974.
- Cunningham, Andrew. 'The culture of gardens', in *Cultures of Natural History*, N. Jardine, J. A. Secord and E.C. Spary (eds.). Cambridge [England]: University of Cambridge Press, 1996.
- Curran, Mary Lou and John R. Grimes. 'Salem and Native America: Towards a Dialogical Perspective', in *Uncommon Legacies: Native American Art from the Peabody Essex Museum*, John R. Grimes, Christian F. Feest and Mary Lou Curran (eds.). New York: American Federation of Arts, 2002 [2002a].
- --, and John R. Grimes. 'Peabody Essex Museum Collection: Nations Within', in *Uncommon Legacies: Native American Art from the Peabody Essex Museum*, John R. Grimes, Christian F. Feest and Mary Lou Curran (eds.). New York: American Federation of Arts, 2002 [2002b].
- Curthoys, Ann. 'Constructing national histories', in *Frontier Conflict: The Australian Experience*, Bain Attwood and S. G. Foster (eds.). Canberra: National Museum of Australia, 2003.
- Darwin, Charles. *Charles Darwin's Beagle Diary*, (ed.) Richard Darwin Keynes. Cambridge [England] and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Department of Conservation, 'Cape Reinga work/ Healing Te Rerenga Wairua', <http://www.doc.govt.nz/parks-and-recreation/plan-and-prepare/alerts/northland/cape-reinga-work> [accessed 5 September 2010]
- -- 'Questions and answers on Cape Reinga work', <http://www.doc.govt.nz/parks-and-recreation/plan-and-prepare/alerts/northland/cape-reinga-work/questions> [accessed 5 September 2010]
- Diamond, Jo. 'Rere atu, rere mai: the trans-Tasman negotiation of Hone Heke Pokai', Centre for Cross-Cultural Research, Australian National University, 26 April 2002, http://www.anu.edu.au/culture/activities/sixpack/ethno_papers/jo_diamond.htm [accessed 19 September 2004]
- Dodge, Ernest S. *The New Zealand Maori Collection in the Peabody Museum of Salem*. Salem [M.A.]: Peabody Museum, 1941.
- -- 'The Ethnology Department', in *Handbook to the Collections of the Peabody Museum of Salem*, Ernest Stanley Dodge and Charles H. P. Copeland (eds.). Salem [M.A.]: Peabody Museum, 1949.
- -- *New England and the South Seas*. Cambridge [M.A.]: Harvard University Press, 1965.
- During, Simon. 'What was the West?', *Meanjin* 48(4), 1989, 759-776.
- -- 'Pacific Colonialism and the Formation of Literary Culture', in *Voyages and Beaches: Pacific Encounters, 1769-1840*, Alex Calder, Jonathan Lamb and Bridget Orr (eds.). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1999.
- Earle, Augustus. *Narrative of a Residence in New Zealand*, E. H. McCormack (ed.). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966.
- Easdale, Nola. *Missionary and Maori: Kerikeri 1819-1860*. Lincoln [N.Z.]: Te Waihora Press, 1991.
- East India Marine Society. *Catalogue of the Articles in the Museum of the East India Marine Society*. Salem [M.A.]: East India Marine Society, 1821.
- -- *Records of the East India Marine Society, 1799-1824*. Salem [M.A.]: East India Marine Society, 1824.

- Edmond, Martin. 'The Abandoned House as a Refuge for the Imagination', in *Gothic NZ: The Darker Side of Kiwi Culture*, Misha Kavka, Jennifer Lawn and Mary Paul (eds.). Dunedin: Otago University Press, 2006.
- Ellis, Elizabeth. 'Foreword', in *Te Puna: Maori Art from Te Tai Tokerau Northland*, Deidre Brown and Ngarino Ellis (eds.). Auckland: Reed Publishing, 2007.
- Ellis, Ngarino. 'Te toi whakairo o Te Tai Tokerau', in *Te Puna: Maori Art from Te Tai Tokerau Northland*, Deidre Brown and Ngarino Ellis (eds.). Auckland: Reed Publishing, 2007.
- Enterprise Northland, 'Improvements to Te Rerenga Wairua/Cape Reinga announced', 15 May 2007, http://www.enterprisenorthland.co.nz/news/news_2007/15_may_2007.htm [accessed 5 September 2010]
- Fisher, Phillip. *Hard Facts: Setting and Form in the American Novel*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- -- *Making and Effacing Art: Modern American American Art in a Culture of Museums*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Foot, Rob. 'Bias at the National Museum', *Quadrant*, October 2003, 22-27.
- -- 'The grand narratives of the National Museum', *Quadrant*, March 2004, 37-39.
- Forster, George. *A Voyage Round the World, Volume I*, Nicholas Thomas and Oliver Berghof (eds.). Hawaii: University of Hawaii Press, 2000.
- Gentry, Kynan. 'Introduction: Place, Heritage and Identity', in *Heartlands: New Zealand Historians Write About Where History Happened*, Kynan Gentry and Gavin McLean (eds.). Auckland: Penguin Books, 2006.
- 'Government funding for Cape Reinga Visitor Centre', 21 February 2008, <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/node/32216> [accessed 5 September 2010]
- Graham, Brian, Gregory John Ashworth and John E. Tunbridge, 'The uses and abuses of heritage', in *Heritage, Museums and Galleries: An Introductory Reader*, Gerard Corsane (ed.). London and New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Greenberg, Reesa, Bruce W. Ferguson and Sandy Nairne (eds.). *Thinking About Exhibitions*. London and New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Marvelous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- Gregory, Angela. 'Cape fire in wake of Maori tensions', 13 April 1999 [1999a], http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=5064 [accessed 23 July 2010]
- -- 'Survey on kauri forest park offends Maori', 13 July 1999 [1999b], http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=9928 [accessed 23 July 2010]
- Grey, George. *Ko Nga Moteatea: Me Nga Hakirara O Nga Maori* [facsimile edition]. South Island [N. Z.]: Naibu Press, 2010.
- Griffiths, Tom. 'The language of conflict', in *Frontier Conflict: The Australian Experience*, Bain Attwood and S. G. Foster (eds.). Canberra: National Museum of Australia, 2003.
- Grimes, John R. 'Introduction: Curiosity, Cabinets, and Knowledge', in *Uncommon Legacies: Native American Art from the Peabody Essex Museum*, John R. Grimes, Christian F. Feest and Mary Lou Curran (eds.). New York: American Federation of Arts, 2002.
- Gurian, Elaine Heumann. 'A blurring of the boundaries', in *Heritage, Museums and Galleries: An Introductory Reader*, Gerard Corsane (ed.). London and New York: Routledge, 2005.

- Harawira, Hone. 'The importance of protest and national reflection', 2 February 2005, <http://www.converge.org.nz/pma/co020205.doc> [accessed 14 August 2010]
- Harris, Aroha. *Hikoi: Forty Years of Maori Protest*. Wellington: Huia Publishers, 2004.
- Haukaas, Thomas 'Red Owl'. 'Museums, Dialogue, and Contemporary Indian Artists', in *Uncommon Legacies: Native American Art from the Peabody Essex Museum*, John R. Grimes, Christian F. Feest and Mary Lou Curran (eds.). New York: American Federation of Arts, 2002.
- Hau'ofa, Epeli. 'Our Sea of Islands', in *The New Oceania*, Eric Waddell, Vijay Naidu and Epeli Hau'ofa (eds.). Suva: University of the South Pacific, 1993.
- Haworth, Jennifer. 'Museum at Matakoho', *Historic Places*, November 1993, 49-50.
- Healy, Chris and Andrea Witcomb. 'Experiments in culture: An introduction', in *South Pacific Museums: Experiments in Culture*, Chris Healy and Andrea Witcomb (eds.). Melbourne: Monash University ePress, 2006.
- Hector, James. 'Preface to First Edition', *Transactions of the Auckland Institute and Museum* 1, 1868, v-vii.
- Hellmich, Christina. 'The Pacific Collection in the Peabody Essex Museum, Salem, Massachusetts', *Pacific Arts*, July 1996, 69-84.
- -- 'A new Oceanic galley at the Peabody Essex Museum', *Tribal Arts*, Autumn 2003, 50-54.
- Henare, Amiria. *Museums, Anthropology and Imperial Exchange*. Cambridge [England]: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Hobsbawm, Eric. *Bandits*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 2000.
- Hohepa, Pat. 'My Musket, My Missionary, and My Mana', in *Voyages and Beaches: Pacific Encounters, 1769-1840*, Alex Calder, Jonathan Lamb and Bridget Orr (eds.). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1999.
- -- 'Korero Tuatahi: Foreword', in *Tai Tokerau Whakairo Rakau: Northland Maori Wood Carving*, Deidre Brown. Auckland: Reed Publishing, 2003.
- Holland, H. C. 'Foreword', in *The Centennial History of the Auckland Institute and Museum*, A. W. B. Powell (ed.). Auckland: Auckland Institute and Museum, 1967.
- Hutcheon, Linda. 'The post always rings twice: the postmodern and the postcolonial', *Textual Practice* 8 (2), 1994, 205-238.
- Hyde, Tom. 'Going Up North for a While', *Metro*, March 1989, 82-91.
- Jackson, Daniel. 'Row over Cape Reinga facilities', 27 December 2000, http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=166486 [accessed 27 July 2010]
- Jacobs, Sally and Warren. *Northland*. Auckland: New Holland Kowhai, 2003.
- Johnson, Leigh. *The Waitangi Treaty House: The home of New Zealand's first British Resident: A preliminary report on the Stage 1 archaeological investigations*. Wellington: Department of Conservation, 1990.
- Jones, Shane. 'Foreword', in *The Tribes of Muriwhenua: Their Origins and Stories / Iwi o Muriwhenua*, Dorothy Urlich Cloher (ed.). Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2002.
- -- 'Cornerstone of the Nation State', in *Waitangi Revisited: Perspectives on the Treaty of Waitangi*, Michael Belgrave et al. (eds.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Kaepler, Adrienne. "*Artificial Curiosities*": *An Exposition of Native Manufactures Collected on the Three Pacific Voyages of Captain James Cook, R.N.* Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1978.
- Karp, Ivan and Stephen D. Lavine (eds.). *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*. Washington [D.C.]: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991.

- Kavka, Misha. 'Out of the Kitchen Sink', in *Gothic NZ: The Darker Side of Kiwi Culture*, Misha Kavka et al. (eds.). Dunedin: Otago University Press, 2006.
- Kernot, Bernard. 'Maori Buildings for the Centennial', in *Creating a National Spirit: Celebrating New Zealand's Centennial*, William Renwick (ed.). Wellington: Victoria University Press, 2004.
- Kidman, Fiona and Jane Ussher. *Gone North*. Auckland: Heinemann, 1984.
- King, Michael. *New Zealanders at War*. Auckland: Heinemann, 1981.
- -- *Te Puea: A Life*. Auckland: Reed Publishing, 2003.
- Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara. *Destination Culture: Tourism, Museums and Heritage*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.
- Lamb, Jonathan. *Preserving the Self in the South Seas 1680-1840*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2001.
- -- 'Metamorphosis and Settlement', *JNZL* 20, 2002, 18-38.
- -- 'History and its others: the obstacle of the past and the impediment of the beach', *Journal of Pacific History* 42(3), December 2007, 361-68.
- Lawn, Jennifer. 'Introduction: Warping the Familiar', in *Gothic NZ: The Darker Side of Kiwi Culture*, Misha Kavka, Jennifer Lawn and Mary Paul (eds.). Dunedin: Otago University Press, 2006.
- Lee, Jack. *Hokianga*. Auckland: Reed Publishing, 1996.
- Mackay, David. 'Myth, Science, and the Experience in the British Construction of the Pacific', in *Voyages and Beaches: Pacific Encounters, 1769-1840*, Alex Calder, Jonathan Lamb and Bridget Orr (eds.). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1999.
- Maning, F. E. 'F. E. Maning Correspondence', in *The Centennial History of the Auckland Institute and Museum*, Powell, A. W. B. (ed.). Auckland: Auckland Institute and Museum, 1967.
- -- *Old New Zealand and Other Writings*, (ed.) Alex Calder. London: Leicester University Press, 2001.
- Marsden, Samuel. *The Letters and Journals of Samuel Marsden 1765-1838*, (ed.) John Rawson Elder. Dunedin: Coulls Somerville Wilkie and A. H. Reed, 1932.
- Mathew, Felton. *The Founding of New Zealand: The journals of Felton Mathew, first Surveyor-General of New Zealand, and his wife 1840-1847*, (ed.) J. Rutherford. Dunedin and Wellington: A. H. & A. W. Reed, 1940.
- Matiu, McCully and Margaret Mutu. *Te Whanau Moana: nga kaupapa me nga tikanga: the customs and protocols / the teachings of McCully Matiu kaumatua rangatira of Te Whanau Moana and Ngati Kahu as told to Margaret Mutu*. Auckland: Reed Publishing, 2003.
- McCalman, Iain. 'The Little Ship of Horrors: Reenacting Extreme History', *Criticism* 46(3), Summer 2004, 477-86.
- McCarthy, Conal. *Exhibiting Maori: A History of Colonial Cultures of Display*. Wellington: Te Papa Press, 2007.
- -- *Museums and Maori: Heritage Professionals, Indigenous Collections, Current Practice*. Wellington: Te Papa Press, 2011.
- McComb, Ralph. *Restoration of the Treaty House, Waitangi, B[ay] o[f] I[slands], 1933*. Papatoetoe [N.Z.]: [s.n.], 1965.
- McIntyre, Darryl and Kirsten Wehner. 'Introduction', in *Negotiating Histories: National Museums*, Darryl McIntyre and Kirsten Wehner (eds.). Canberra: National Museum of Australia, 2001.
- McKenzie, Donna. 'History, Identity and Community: The Huia Settlers' Museum', *Sites* (new series) 2(1), 2005, 173-185.

- McLean, Gavin. *No Continuing City: A History of the Stone Store, Kerikeri*. Wellington: New Zealand Historic Places Trust, 1994.
- McNaughton, Howard. 'Staging Polynesia in the 1906 Christchurch International Exhibition', in *Figuring the Pacific: Aotearoa & Pacific Cultural Studies*, Howard McNaughton and John Newton (eds.). Christchurch: Canterbury University Press, 2005.
- Mead, Sidney Moko. 'Concepts and Models for Maori Museums and Cultural Centres', *AGMANZ* 16(3), 1985, 3-5.
- -- *Maori Art on the World Scene: Essays on Maori Art*. Wellington: Ahua Design & Illustration and Matau Associates, 1997 [1997a]
- -- *Landmarks, Bridges and Visions: Aspects of Maori Culture*. Wellington: Victoria University Press, 1997 [1997b].
- Melbourne, Hineani (ed.). *Maori Sovereignty: The Maori Perspective*. Auckland: Hodder Moa Beckett, 1995.
- Message, Kylie. *New Museums and the Making of Culture*. Oxford and New York: Berg, 2007.
- Middleton, Angela. 'Potatoes and Muskets: Maori Gardening at Kerikeri', in *Te Kerikeri 1770-1850: The Meeting Pool*, Judith Binney (ed.). Wellington: Bridget Williams Books and Craig Potton Publishing, 2007.
- Mitchell, W. J. T. 'Imperial Landscape', in *Landscape and Power*, W. J. T. Mitchell (ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- Moloney, Pat. 'Savagery and Civilization: Early Victorian Notions', *The New Zealand Journal of History* 35(2), October 2001, 153-76.
- Monroe, Dan L. 'Foreword', in *Uncommon Legacies: Native American Art from the Peabody Essex Museum*, John R. Grimes, Christian F. Feest and Mary Lou Curran (eds.). New York: American Federation of Arts, 2002.
- Moon, Paul. *Hone Heke Pokai: Nga Puhi Warrior*. Auckland: David Ling Publishing, 2001.
- Morris, Meaghan. *Too Soon Too Late: History in Popular Culture*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1998.
- Muecke, Stephen. 'Experimental history? The 'space' of history in recent histories of Kimberley colonialism', *The UTS Review*, 2 (1), 1996, 1-11.
- -- *No Road: Bitumen All the Way*. Freemantle: Freemantle Arts Centre Press, 1997.
- -- *Ancient & Modern: Time, Culture and Indigenous Philosophy*. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 2006.
- Murray-Oliver, Anthony. *Augustus Earle in New Zealand*. Christchurch: Whitcombe & Tombs, 1968.
- Mutu, Margaret. *Maori Participation and Input into Resource Management and Conservation in Aotearoa/New Zealand*. Wellington: New Zealand Conservation Authority, 1994.
- -- *The State of Maori Rights*. Wellington: Huia, 2011.
- Neich, Roger. *Carved Histories: Rotorua Ngati Tarawhai Woodcarving*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2001.
- Neill, Anna. 'National Culture and the New Museology', in *On Display: New Essays in Cultural Studies*, Anna Smith and Lydia Wevers (eds.). Wellington: Victoria University Press, 2004.
- Newton, Douglas. 'Old Wine in New Bottles, and the Reverse', in *Museums and the Making of 'Ourselves': The Role of Objects in National Identity*, Flora Kaplan (ed.). London and New York: Leicester University Press, 1994.
- New Zealand Archaeology, 'Ruapekapeka Pa to be Restored and Upgraded', 12 May 2003, <http://www.nzarchaeology.org/enews/12may03.htm> [accessed 7 June 2005]

- New Zealand Conservancy Authority. 'History the Winner!', 7 May 2003. <http://www.nhf.govt.nz/Community/004~New-Zealand-Conservation-Authority-and-Boards/NZCA/Media-Releases/086~History-the-Winner.asp> [accessed 7 June 2005]
- New Zealand Herald, 'Editorial: Tourist centre will enhance the Cape', 29 December 2000, http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=166686 [accessed 23 July 2010]
- -- 'New name for Ninety Mile Beach possible under Treaty deal', 18 January 2010, http://www.nzherald.co.nz/waitangi/news/article.cfm?l_id=500569&objectid=10620791 [accessed 26 September 2010]
- New Zealand Tourism. *Tourism in Northland: A draft strategy for sustainable growth and development*. Paihia [N.Z.]: New Zealand Tourism, 1996.
- Ngata, Apirana T. 'Maori Arts and Crafts', in *The Maori People Today: a general survey*, I. L. G. Sutherland (ed.). Christchurch: Whitcombe & Tombs Ltd., 1940.
- Nicholas, J. L. *Narrative of a Voyage to New Zealand, Volume I*. Auckland: Wilson and Horton, 1971.
- NZPA. 'Hone Heke elevated to outlaw Hall of Fame', *Otago Daily Times*, 25 September 2003.
- Okerua, Hon. Mahara. 'Cape reinga upgrade', 15 May 2007, <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/viewdocument.aspx?documentid=29313> [accessed 23 July 2010]
- Oliver, W. R. B. *New Zealand Museums: Present Establishment and Future Policy*. Wellington: T. P. R. Printing, 1944.
- Oram, Rod. 'Northern Lights', 1 March 2003, <http://www.sharechat.co.nz/features/unlimited/article.php/fc11c053>, [accessed 16 March 2011]
- Orange, Claudia. *The Treaty of Waitangi*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books: 2004.
- O'Regan, Gerard. *Bicultural Developments in Museums of Aotearoa: What is the Current Status?* Wellington: Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa and Museums Association of Aotearoa New Zealand, 1997.
- O'Sullivan, Dominic. *Beyond Biculturalism: The Politics of an Indigenous Minority*. Wellington: Huia Publishers, 2007.
- Park, Geoff. *Nga Uruora: The Groves of Life: Ecology and History in a New Zealand Landscape*. Wellington: Victoria University Press, 1995.
- -- *Effective Exclusion? An Exploratory Overview of Crown Actions and Maori Responses Concerning the Indigenous Flora and Fauna, 1912-1983*. Wellington: Waitangi Tribunal, 2001.
- -- *Theatre Country: Essays on Landscape and Whenua*. Wellington: Victoria University Press, 2006.
- Peabody Academy of Science. *Guide to the Peabody Academy of Science*. Salem [M.A.]: Peabody Academy of Science, 1901.
- Peabody Museum of Salem. *Report of the Director*. Salem [M.A.]: Peabody Museum of Salem, 1951.
- -- *Report of the Director*. Salem [M.A.]: Peabody Museum of Salem, 1952.
- -- *Report of the Director*. Salem [M.A.]: Peabody Museum of Salem, 1955.
- -- *Report of the Director*. Salem [M.A.]: Peabody Museum of Salem, 1966.
- -- *Report of the Director*. Salem [M.A.]: Peabody Museum of Salem, 1974.
- -- *Report of the Director*. Salem [M.A.]: Peabody Museum of Salem, 1975.
- -- *Report of the Director*. Salem [M.A.]: Peabody Museum of Salem, 1980.

- Phillips, Jock. 'Afterword: Reading the 1940 Centennial', in *Creating a National Spirit: Celebrating New Zealand's Centennial*, William Renwick (ed.). Wellington: Victoria University Press, 2004.
- Phillips, Ruth B. *Trading Identities: The Souvenir in Native North American Art from the Northeast, 1700-1900*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1998.
- Phillipson, Grant. 'Religion and Land: The Church missionary Society at Kerikeri, 1819-1850' in *Te Kerikeri 1770-1850: The Meeting Pool*, Judith Binney (ed.). Wellington: Bridget Williams Books and Craig Potton Publishing, 2007.
- Pickmere, Nancy. *Kerikeri: Heritage of Dreams*. Russell [N.Z.]: Northland Historical Publications Society, 1994.
- Portus, Martin. 'Warrior's weapons leave NZ for first time', 24 September 2003, http://www.nma.gov.au/media/media_releases_index/warriors_weapons_leave_nz_for_first_time [accessed 26 January 2004]
- Powell, A. W. B. (ed.) *The Centennial History of the Auckland Institute and Museum*. Auckland: Auckland Institute and Museum, 1967.
- Prentice, Chris. 'Trafficking in history: roadside museums and post-colonial displacement', *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies* 12(3), 1998, 295-308.
- Pugsley, Christopher. 'Walking Heke's war: The battle for Ruapekapeka—victory or defeat?', *New Zealand Defence Quarterly*, Autumn 1994, 28-33.
- -- 'Maori did not invent trench warfare', *New Zealand Defence Quarterly*, Spring 1998, 33-37.
- Rankin, Elizabeth. 'The Auckland War Memorial Museum, Tamaki Paenga Hira', in *South Pacific Museums: Experiments in Culture*, Chris Healy and Andrea Witcomb (eds.). Melbourne: Monash University ePress, 2006.
- Reading, Nigel and Gary Wyatt. *Manawa: Pacific Heartbeat: A Celebration of Contemporary Maori and Northwest Coast Art*. Auckland: Reed Books, 2006.
- Reed, A. H. *The Story of Northland*. Wellington: A.H. & A.W. Reed, 1956.
- -- *Historic Northland*. Wellington: A.H. & A.W. Reed, 1968.
- Reed, Vernon H. *The Gift of Waitangi: A History of the Bledisloe Gift*. Wellington: A. H. & A. W. Reed, 1957.
- Renwick, William. 'Reclaiming Waitangi', in *Creating a National Spirit: Celebrating New Zealand's Centennial*, William Renwick (ed.). Wellington: Victoria University Press, 2004.
- Revington, Mark. 'War of words', *New Zealand Listener*, 18 July 1998, 24.
- Reynolds, Henry. *The Other Side of the Frontier: An Interpretation of the Aboriginal Response to the Invasion and Settlement of Australia*. Townsville [Australia]: History Department, James Cook University, 1981.
- Robson, Frank N. *Historic-Romantic-Scenic Northland: New Zealand's Sub-tropical Playground*. Christchurch: Whitcombe & Tombs, 1975.
- Rose, Deborah Bird. 'Hard Times', in *Quicksands: Foundational Histories in Australia and Aotearoa New Zealand*, Klaus Neumann, Nicholas Thomas and Hilary Ericksen (eds.). Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 1999.
- -- 'New world poetics of place: along the Oregon trail and in the National Museum of Australia', in *Rethinking Settler Colonialism: History and Memory in Australia, Canada, Aotearoa New Zealand and South Africa*, Annie E. Coombes (ed.). Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2006.
- Sahlins, Marshall. *Islands of History*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Sale, E. V. *Historic Trails of the Far North*. Auckland: Reed Publishing, 1981.

- Salmond, Anne. *Between Worlds: Early Exchanges Between Maori and Europeans, 1773-1815*. Auckland: Viking, 1997.
- -- *Hui: A Study of Maori Ceremonial Gatherings*. Wellington: Reed Publishing, 1975.
- Sandell, Richard (ed.). *Museums, Society, Inequality*. London and New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Savage, John. *Some Account of New Zealand; particularly the Bay of Islands, and surrounding country; with a description of the religion and government, language, arts, manufactures, manners, and customs of the natives, &c. &c.* Dunedin: Hocken Library, 1966.
- Seal, Graham. *The Outlaw Legend: A Cultural Tradition in Britain, America and Australia*. Cambridge [England]: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- -- 'Introducing *Outlawed*', in Therese Weber (ed.), *Outlawed: Rebels, Revolutionaries and Bushrangers*. Canberra: Hyde Park Press and the National Museum of Australia, 2003.
- Simmons, D. R. *Catalogue of Maori Artefacts in the Museums of Canada and the United States of America*. Auckland: Bulletin of the Auckland Institute and Museum (12), 1982.
- Skill Development Associates Limited. *National Training Framework for Museums: Te anga kaiako a iwi mo nga whare taonga o te motu*. Wellington: Museum of New Zealand, 1999.
- Smith, Cheryl. 'Cultures of Collecting', in *Resistance: An Indigenous Response to Neoliberalism*, Maria Bargh (ed.). Wellington: Huia, 2007.
- Smith, Huhana. 'The Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa', in *South Pacific Museums: Experiments in Culture*, Chris Healy and Andrea Witcomb (eds.). Melbourne: Monash University ePress, 2006.
- Smith, Huhana, Oriwa Soloman, Awhina Tamapara and Megan Tamati-Quennell (eds.). *Taiawhio: 18 New Conversations: Contemporary Maori Artists*. Wellington: Te Papa Press, 2007.
- Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. New York and Dunedin: Zed Books and University of Otago Press, 1999.
- Solnit, Rebecca. *Savage Dreams: A Journey into the Landscape Wars of the American West*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
- Solomon, Maui. 'A Long Wait for Justice', in *Resistance: An Indigenous Response to Neoliberalism*, Maria Bargh (ed.). Wellington: Huia, 2007.
- Somerville, Alice Te Punga. 'The Lingering War Captain: Maori Texts, Indigenous Contexts', *JNZL* 24(2), 2007, 20-43 [2007a].
- -- "'If I close my mouth I will die': Writing, Resisting, Centring", in *Resistance: An Indigenous Response to Neoliberalism*, Maria Bargh (ed.). Wellington: Huia, 2007 [2007b].
- Sullivan, Robert. *Star Waka*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1999.
- Sutherland, I. L. G. 'Introduction', in *The Maori People Today: A General Survey*, I. L. G. Sutherland (ed.). Christchurch: Whitcombe & Tombs Ltd., 1940.
- Taspell, Paul. 'Taonga, marae, whenua—negotiating custodianship: a Maori tribal response to the Museum of New Zealand', in *Negotiating Histories: National Museums*, Darryl McIntyre and Kirsten Wehner (eds.). Canberra: National Museum of Australia, 2001.
- Te Kawariki. *20 Years of Protest Action 1979-1999*. Kaitia: Te Kawariki, 1999.
- Te Waka Toi: Council for Maori and South Pacific Arts. *Taiarotia: Contemporary Maori Art*. Wellington: Te Waka Toi, 1994.
- Thomas, Nicholas. *Entangled Objects: Exchange, Material Culture, and Colonialism in the Pacific*. Cambridge [M.A.]: Harvard University Press, 1991.
- -- *Cook's Sites: Revisiting History* (with Mark Adams). Dunedin: University of Otago Press and Centre for Cross-Cultural Research, Australian National University, 1999 [1999a].
- -- *Possessions: Indigenous Art/Colonial Culture*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1999 [1999b].

- -- 'Introduction', in *Double Vision: Art Histories and Colonial Histories in the Pacific*, Nicholas Thomas and Diane Losche (eds.). Cambridge [England]: Cambridge University Press, 1999 [1999c].
- -- 'Indigenous Presences and National Narratives in Australasian Museums', in *Culture in Australia: Policies, Publics and Programs*, Tony Bennett and David Carter (eds.). Cambridge [England] and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001
- -- 'The uses of Captain Cook: early exploration in the public history of Aotearoa New Zealand and Australia', in *Rethinking Settler Colonialism: History and Memory in Australia, Canada, Aotearoa New Zealand and South Africa*, Annie E. Coombes (ed.). Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2006.
- -- 'Introduction', in *Rauru: Tene Waitere, Maori Carving, Colonial History*, Nicholas Thomas (ed.). Dunedin: Otago University Press, 2009.
- Thomson, Keith W. *Art Galleries and Museums of New Zealand*. Wellington: Reed, 1981.
- Transit New Zealand. 'About this project: Cape Reinga, a special place', <http://www.nzta.govt.nz/projects/capereinga/about> [accessed 26 September 2010]
- 'Tribunal Gives Green Light to Treaty Grounds Claim', 13 May 2008, <http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/PO0805/S00184.htm> [accessed 20 May 2010]
- Turbott, E. G. (ed.). 'F. E. Maning Correspondence', in *The Centennial History of the Auckland Institute and Museum*, Powell, A. W. B. (ed.). Auckland: Auckland Institute and Museum, 1967.
- Turner, Stephen. 'Settlement as Forgetting', in *Quicksands: Foundational Histories in Australia and Aotearoa New Zealand*, Klaus Neumann, Nicholas Thomas and Hilary Ericksen (eds.). Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 1999.
- -- 'Being Colonial/Colonial Being', *JNZL* 20, 2002, 39-66.
- -- 'Reenacting Aotearoa, New Zealand', in *Settler and Creole Reenactment*, Vanessa Agnew and Jonathan Lamb (eds.). Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
- UNESCO, 'Kerikeri Basin historic precinct', <http://whc.unesco.org/en/tentativelists/5123> [accessed 16 May 2008]
- Vergo, Peter. 'Introduction', in *The New Museology*, Peter Vergo (ed.). London: Reaktion Books, 1989.
- Waitangi National Trust. <http://www.waitangi.net.nz> [accessed 6 April 2010]
- -- 'The Perfect Place for the Perfect Match', *Korero*, Spring 2008, 2.
- -- 'Ahead of the game', *Korero*, Spring 2007, 4.
- Waitangi Tribunal. *Muriwhenua Land Report*. Wellington: Waitangi Tribunal, 1997.
- -- *Muriwhenua Fishing Report*. Wellington: Waitangi Tribunal, 1988
- Walker, Paul and Justine Clark. 'Museum and Archive: Framing the Treaty', in *On Display: New Essays in Cultural Studies*, Anna Smith and Lydia Wevers (eds.). Wellington: Victoria University Press, 2004.
- Walker, Ranginui. *The Genesis of Maori Activism*. Auckland: University of Auckland Centre for Continuing Education, 1983.
- -- *Nga Tau Tohotohe: Years of Anger*. Auckland: Penguin Books, 1987.
- -- *Nga Pepa a Ranginui: The Walker Papers*. Auckland: Penguin Books, 1996.
- -- *He Tipua: The Life and Times of Sir Apirana Ngata*. Auckland: Penguin Books, 2001.
- -- *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou: Struggle Without End*. Auckland: Penguin Books, 2004.
- -- 'The Treaty of Waitangi in the Postcolonial Era', in *Waitangi Revisited: Perspectives on the Treaty of Waitangi*, Michael Belgrave et al. (eds.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

- Watkin, Tim. 'Heke relative sets deadline for museum', *The New Zealand Herald*, 13 October 2003, http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=3528405 [accessed 26 January 2004]
- Watt, Lisa. 'American Indian Tribes and Their Museums', *Te Ara-Museums of Aotearoa* 30(1), May 2005, 9-13.
- Weber, Therese (ed.). *Outlawed: Rebels, Revolutionaries and Bushrangers*. Canberra: Hyde Park Press and the National Museum of Australia, 2003.
- Wedde, Ian. 'Bungy Whakapapa', *Landfall* 204, November 2002, 174-178.
- -- *Making Ends Meet: Essays and Talks 1992-2004*. Wellington: Victoria University Press, 2005.
- -- 'Tuning the museum: the harmonics of official culture', in *South Pacific Museums: Experiments in Culture*, Chris Healy and Andrea Witcomb (eds.). Melbourne: Monash University ePress, 2006.
- Whitehill, Walter M. *The East India Marine Society and the Peabody Museum of Salem: A Sesquicentennial History*. Salem [M.A.]: Peabody Museum of Salem, 1949.
- Williams, David. *Matauranga Maori and Taonga: The Nature and Extent of Treaty Rights Held by Iwi and Hapu in Indigenous Flora and Fauna, Cultural Heritage Objects, Valued Traditional Knowledge*. Wellington: Waitangi Tribunal, 2001.
- Williams, Glyndwr. *Captain Cook's Voyages, 1768-1779*. London: The Folio Society, 1997.
- Williams, Mark. 'The history man', *Landfall* 203, May 2002, 158-161.
- -- "'The finest race of savages the world has seen": How Empire Turned Out Differently in Australia and New Zealand', in *Settler and Creole Reenactment*, Vanessa Agnew and Jonathan Lamb (eds.). Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
- Williams, Paul. 'Reforming nationhood: the free market and biculturalism at Te Papa', in *South Pacific Museums: Experiments in Culture*, Chris Healy and Andrea Witcomb (eds.). Melbourne: Monash University ePress, 2006.
- Wilmer, Franke. *The Indigenous Voice in World Politics*. Newbury Park [C.A.]: Sage Publications, 1993.
- Windschuttle, Keith. 'How not to run a museum', *Quadrant*, September 2001, 11-19.
- Witcomb, Andrea. *Re-Imagining the Museum: Beyond the Mausoleum*. London and New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Young, Robert E. *Northland, November 1966*. Auckland: Breckell and Nicholls, 1966.
- '\$6.5m makeover for spectacular Cape Reinga', 15 May 2007, <http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/PA0705/S00351.htm> [accessed 23 July 2010]

b. Unpublished sources

- Department of Conservation. *Sustainable Development Plan for the Kororipo-Kerikeri Basin* [unpublished plan], 2007.
- -- *Our World Heritage: A Tentative List of New Zealand Cultural and Natural Heritage Sites: A Report to the Department of Conservation by the Cultural and Natural Heritage Advisory Groups* [unpublished report], 2006.

- Department of Lands and Survey. *Te Paki Reserves Complex Management Plan* [unpublished management plan], 1986
- Diamond, Josephine G. *Revaluating Raranga* [unpublished Ph.D. thesis completed at the Centre for Cross-Cultural Research, Australian National University], 2004.
- East India Marine Society. *Directions to Members* [pamphlet], 1801.
- Eliza* logbook, 1805-06 [unpublished museum manuscript], Salem [M.A.], Phillips Library, 656 1805E.
- Gardiner, John. *Ruapekapeka Pa Historic Reserve: Management Plan Proposal* [unpublished report prepared for the Department of Lands and Survey], 1983.
- Gorbey, Ken. *Northland Museums as Attractions: A Rich Tapestry of Experiences* [unpublished strategic plan commissioned by Enterprise Northland, Te Papa National Services and the Northland Museum Association], Wellington, 2004.
- Greig, Karen. *Ruapekapeka Historic Reserve: Baseline Inspection Report* [unpublished report prepared for the Department of Conservation], 2002.
- Kauri Museum. *The Kauri Museum: An Excellent Choice* [promotional pamphlet], n.d.
- Maning, F. E. *Maning Papers*. Auckland War Memorial Museum, MS 419.
- New Zealand Historic Places Trust. *The Kerikeri Basin* [visitor pamphlet], 2009.
- Pacific Environments. *Developed Design: Te Rerenga Wairua Visitor Centre, Revision 2* [architectural proposal], November 2007.
- Society for the Preservation of the Kerikeri Stone Store. *The Discoverers Garden Te Wao Nui a Tane* [visitor pamphlet], n.d.
- -- *Traditional Plant Use by the Maori* [visitor pamphlet], n.d.
- Visitor Solutions. *Financial Feasibility Report: Te Rerenga Wairua Visitor Centre* [unpublished report], August 2001.
- -- *Concept Design: Te Rerenga Wairua-Cape Reinga* [unpublished design document], August 2008 [2008a].
- -- *Te Rerenga Wairua-Cape Reinga: Site Interpretation Developed Design Document* [unpublished design document], September 2008 [2008b].
- -- *Ruapekapeka Pa and Battlefield: A Development Plan* [unpublished plan commissioned by Ruapekapeka Pa Management Trust and the Department of Conservation], 2003.
- Waitangi National Trust. *Souvenir Guide* [promotional pamphlet], n.d.
- -- *The Carvings: Te Whare Runanga: The meeting house at Waitangi Treaty Grounds* [visitor booklet], n.d.

Conversations with:

- Joanne Duke, National Museum of Australia, Canberra, 26 March 2004.
- Jo Diamond, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, 21 May 2004.
- Jonathan Carpenter, Northland Conservancy Area Office, Whangarei, 28 October 2004.
- Karen Kramer, Peabody Essex Museum, Salem, Massachusetts, 30 March 2007.
- Doug Te Wake, Northland Conservancy Area Office, Kaitaia, 8 November 2010.

Notes

- ¹ It should be clarified that Auckland Museum had opened in 1852 but little is now known of its first fifteen years of operation. The museum merged with the newly-founded Auckland Institute in 1867. See Powell (1967) for discussion of this history.
- ² Maning (1967, 44).
- ³ Maning (1967, 44).
- ⁴ *Maning Papers*. Auckland War Memorial Museum, MS 419.
- ⁵ Maning (1967, 47).
- ⁶ Colenso (1868, 340).
- ⁷ It should be stressed that Colenso's and Maning's were by no means the earliest ethnographies produced in relation to Maori, or the earliest western 'collecting' projects undertaken in this country. See for example Grey (2010).
- ⁸ A subsequent letter makes it clear that the dog serves as an allegorical example: 'When I first came to the country fifty years ago within a few months, I saw a few of the old Maori dogs quite pure but even then the pure bred Maori dog was scarce, our dogs being so much stronger' (Maning 1967, 47).
- ⁹ See for example Vergo (1989), Karp and Lavine (1991), Hutcheon (1994), Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (1994), Bennett (1995), Greenberg, Ferguson and Nairne (1996), Barringer and Flynn (1998), McIntyre and Wehner (2001), Clifford (1988 and 1997) and Sandell (2002).
- ¹⁰ By 1871 public museums had been established in Auckland, Wellington, Nelson, Christchurch and Dunedin.
- ¹¹ Te Rerenga Wairua was set aside in 1966 as a recreational reserve but was known by this time to have strong historical significance. These issues are addressed in Chapter 5.
- ¹² Reed (1956, 11). Further 'firsts' associated with Te Tai Tokerau are recorded in Reed (1956) and (1968).
- ¹³ As McCarthy makes clear (2011, 40), Auckland Museum itself became a focus for protests in the early 1970s with members of Maori activist group Nga Tamatoa arrested for painting graffiti on the institution's walls.
- ¹⁴ In relation to Aotearoa New Zealand, this concentration on metropolitan museums can be seen in Thomas (2001); Tapsell (2001), Blackley (2004), Walker and Clark (2004), Neill (2004), Henare (2005), Williams (2006), Rankin (2006), Wedde (2006), Smith (2006), McCarthy (2007), and Message (2007). The few studies which have dealt with regional institutions and sites in Aotearoa New Zealand (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (1998), Bell (1996), Butts (2002) and McKenzie (2005)) have tended to be insubstantial, although Thomas's work (1999a, 2001 and 2006) is an exception, and Bell (2006) makes gains in examining the heritage landscape in Auckland. Useful models which deal with regional institutions and situations overseas include Bennett (1988), Muecke (1997), Prentice (1998), Clifford (1988 and 1997), and Rose (2006).
- ¹⁵ See for example Newton (1994), Phillips (2001), Butts (2002), Rankin (2006), Smith (2006), Message (2007) and McCarthy (2011).
- ¹⁶ It should be made clear that it is beyond the scope of this thesis to deal with *Te Maori* in a sustained way. For discussion of this exhibition, see for example Clifford (1988), Karp and Lavine (1991), Mead (1997a and 1997b) and McCarthy (2007 and 2011).
- ¹⁷ See Allen (2002, 13-14) for discussion of this potential for reframing of museum encounters as 'activist events'.
- ¹⁸ Consideration of the effects of biculturalism on representations of history has begun to be offered in recent essays. See for example Thomas (2001), Walker and Clark (2004), Neill (2004) and Williams (2006).
- ¹⁹ Witcomb (2003) is an example of a text which might have benefited from development of a 'settlement' perspective in dealing with its (Australian) material and case studies. Henare (2005) makes some gains in mobilising settlement as a lens through which to examine museums in Aotearoa and Scotland, although this discussion formulates settlement in weak terms and it rejects the possibility that displays themselves might be analysed in light of such concerns, thus foreclosing significant avenues of research and analysis.
- ²⁰ See for example Brown (2003), Brown and Ellis (2007), Cloher (2002), and Matiu and Mutu (2003).
- ²¹ It should be noted that there is a lack of clear consensus as to where Te Tai Tokerau ends and where Auckland begins. See Reed (1956), Robson (1975), Kidman (1984) and Matiu and Mutu (2003) for discussion of this issue. It should also be noted that regional boundaries have been redrawn with the formation of the Auckland 'Super City' in 2010; for the purposes of this thesis, the region is understood to lie on the northern side of Johnsons Hill tunnel which marks the end of the northern motorway at Puhoi.
- ²² For further discussion see Boswell (2009).
- ²³ Maning (2001, 127).
- ²⁴ *Eliza* logbook [unpublished manuscript], 1805-06.
- ²⁵ See Dodge (1941, 7 and 1965, 88), Hellmich (1996, 71), Salmond (1997, 528), and Brown (2003, 72).

-
- ²⁶ The minutes in the East India Marine Society's record refer to the objects as having been brought back from New Holland, although in the 1821 *Catalogue* only the distinctive pare carved from kauri is recorded as originating from New Holland; all of the other artefacts are given New Zealand provenance in this publication (East India Marine Society, 1821). The misattribution in the records seems to have arisen because the *Eliza* had spent a portion of its voyage at Port Jackson; Simmons (1982), Brown (2003), and Ngarino Ellis (2007) all agree that a majority of the objects donated by Richardson in 1807 originate from Te Tai Tokerau. No other material donated by Richardson is recorded in the 1821 *Catalogue* as being of Australian origin; reasons for his non-acquisition of such objects remains unclear, but suggest an angle for comparison in another handling of this story.
- ²⁷ It is difficult to determine exact figures because of inaccuracies in the 1821 *Catalogue*: one of the 'Marquesan clubs' listed in the first four items is actually of New Zealand origin, and vagueness characterises many of the attributions for the Pacific islands objects—some of the fishhooks and 'pattoo-pattoo' with no specified provenance, for example, may also be of New Zealand origin.
- ²⁸ From 1867 the museum became known as the Peabody Academy of Science. This name was changed by an act of legislature in 1915 to become the Peabody Museum of Salem, and then again in the late twentieth century to the Peabody Essex Museum. East India Marine Hall, the core of the current facility, has been the home of the museum since 1824.
- ²⁹ See, for example, Dodge (1949 and 1965), Simmons (1982), Salmond (1997), Hellmich (1996) and (2003), Brown (2003 and 2006), Clarke (2006) and Ngarino Ellis (2007).
- ³⁰ Dodge (1949, 5-6).
- ³¹ Dodge made similar comments in other publications dating from this period (for example (1941, 5)). By 1952, however, he noted that while modern material manufactured for the tourist trade 'is of little intrinsic value it does show that contact with modern civilization has not destroyed the [Pacific] islanders' skill in the utilization of native manufacturing techniques' (cited in Peabody Museum of Science 1952, 19).
- ³² See for example Hellmich (1996, 69-70), and Grimes (2002, 18-19).
- ³³ As Mackay has commented (1999, 103), it is debatable whether the primary objectives of Cook's voyage were scientific or strategic/commercial. The evaluation of new lands as possible sites of imperial expansion and the mercantilist aims of identifying and classifying species likely to be useful to an industrialising Britain were part of the purpose of these voyages, but the ships were also sent out with serious scientific objectives, too, such as the observation of the transit of Venus in Tahiti in 1769.
- ³⁴ Cook had proclaimed possession of parts of New Zealand in the name of King George, in accordance with the instructions he was given, but this was not substantiated until formal British annexation in 1840. The arrival of the First Fleet in New South Wales in 1789 marked the beginnings of concerted European expansion in settling the Pacific.
- ³⁵ Cook, cited in Thomas (1999a, 100).
- ³⁶ Again, as is the case with the Oceanic materials, it is possible that the catalogue is not entirely reliable.
- ³⁷ See McCarthy (2007, 53-4), for discussion of the Maori Antiquities Act (1901), the piece of legislation which predated the 1975 Act. The earlier legislation was supposed to have prevented the export of cultural property, but in practice does not seem to have been enforced.
- ³⁸ See for example Peabody Museum of Science (1955, 18; 1974, 25-6; and 1975, 18).
- ³⁹ Kramer, conversation with the author.
- ⁴⁰ Kramer, conversation with the author.
- ⁴¹ Kramer, conversation with the author.
- ⁴² While Ngarino Ellis has commented recently that '[i]f we can appreciate the little we have [remaining] now, we can try and have returned—to New Zealand shores, if not to Te Tai Tokerau—the huge number of taonga that are currently held in museums overseas' (2007, 17), neither she nor Brown (2003 and 2006) nor Clarke (2006) has referred to such claims in their discussions of the artefacts held in the Peabody Essex Museum.
- ⁴³ Kramer, conversation with the author.
- ⁴⁴ Chapter 4 addresses this issue in relation to a temporary exhibition staged in 2003-4 at the National Museum of Australia. For further discussion see Boswell (2007).
- ⁴⁵ Kramer, conversation with the author. The fact that this exhibition space is 'dedicated' is also emphasised by Hellmich (2003, 51).
- ⁴⁶ Kramer, conversation with the author.
- ⁴⁷ Kramer, conversation with the author.
- ⁴⁸ Kramer, conversation with the author.
- ⁴⁹ More strongly political contexts for Kipa's work are suggested in comments he has made elsewhere: the fact that, for instance, he is concerned to replicate old forms so that these are not lost, and that he is proposing to use resin moulds to

produce musical instruments (puoru)—of a kind that the green tiki currently shares a display case with in Salem—to make such works more broadly accessible, particularly to kohanga reo and kura kaupapa (schools run on Maori cultural principles). See Smith et al. (2007, 131-45).

⁵⁰ See ‘Histories of the Tribal and the Modern’, in Clifford (1988), for fuller discussion of these issues.

⁵¹ Clifford makes it clear that his discussion of this ‘system of objects’ is influenced by the work of Jean Baudrillard.

⁵² Cited in Te Waka Toi (1994, 34).

⁵³ See Chiu (2004) for further discussion of these issues.

⁵⁴ Forster (2000, 105-6).

⁵⁵ See also Agnew (2004, 332), Park (1995, 168 and 2006, 167-8), and Henare (2005, 83).

⁵⁶ See Lamb (2001, 240-9).

⁵⁷ This hindsight view can be accounted for by the fact that Forster’s *Voyage* was written after the *Resolution* had returned to England, and is based in part on his own recollections, and in part on his father Johann Reinhold Forster’s journal. For discussion of these issues connected with authorship see Forster (2000, xiii-xxvii).

⁵⁸ See for example Adams and Thomas (1999a), Lamb (2001) and Agnew (2004).

⁵⁹ Agnew (2004, 333-34).

⁶⁰ See Calder (2009).

⁶¹ Marsden (1932, 150-1).

⁶² Marsden (1932, 201-2).

⁶³ The idea of founding a ‘New Jerusalem’ was not uncommon in relation to ‘new world’ settlement activity. See Lamb (2001) and Rose (2006) for further discussion.

⁶⁴ It should be pointed out that Marsden had a vested interest in claiming this success since he was seeking reimbursement from the CMS in London for the cost of the purchase of the mission brig *Active*.

⁶⁵ See Middleton (2007, 33), Binney (2007, 11-12), McLean (1994, 2), and Easdale (1991, 12).

⁶⁶ Marsden (1932, 332).

⁶⁷ Marsden had expected to establish the mission in Whangaroa, but learned on his voyage to Aotearoa New Zealand that the Wesleyans had already settled there. See Marsden (1932, 341-3).

⁶⁸ In his edition of Marsden’s *Letters and Journals*, John Rawson Elder has to supply a footnote with Marianne Williams’ vision of Paihia since Marsden does not offer one himself. See Marsden (1932, 374-5).

⁶⁹ Darwin (1988, 389).

⁷⁰ Marsden had estimated in 1820 that Hongi’s people had more than 100 acres of potatoes and kumara in cultivation at Waimate (1932, 245); Darwin cannot have known that the English cultivations he could see represented only a fraction of the amount of land that had been in cultivation 15 years earlier.

⁷¹ See Earle’s *Kiddy-Kiddy, New Zealand, a Church Missionary Establishment* (1828) in Murray-Oliver (1968, 72-3), and Antoine Chazal’s *English Missionary Settlement at Kerikeri, New Zealand* (1824) in Marsden (1932, facing p.384).

⁷² See Pickmere (1994) for a discussion of this history.

⁷³ UNESCO, ‘Kerikeri Basin historic precinct’, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/tentativelists/5123>

⁷⁴ UNESCO, ‘Kerikeri Basin historic precinct’, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/tentativelists/5123>

⁷⁵ Society for the Preservation of the Kerikeri Stone Store, ‘The Discoverers Garden Te Wao Nui a Tane’ [visitor pamphlet], n.d., n.p.

⁷⁶ It should be noted that in Forster’s *Voyage*, the term ‘salutary’ slips: Forster first uses it to refer to infusions brewed from native plants, but invokes it in his coda to refer to European vegetation only.

⁷⁷ Society for the Preservation of the Kerikeri Stone Store, ‘The Discoverers Garden Te Wao Nui a Tane’ [visitor pamphlet] n.d., n.p.

⁷⁸ Society for the Preservation of the Kerikeri Stone Store, ‘The Discoverers Garden Te Wao Nui a Tane’ [visitor pamphlet] n.d., n.p.

⁷⁹ Society for the Preservation of the Kerikeri Stone Store, ‘The Discoverers Garden Te Wao Nui a Tane’ [visitor pamphlet] n.d., n.p.

⁸⁰ Society for the Preservation of the Kerikeri Stone Store, ‘The Discoverers Garden Te Wao Nui a Tane’ [visitor pamphlet] n.d., n.p.

⁸¹ Society for the Preservation of the Kerikeri Stone Store, ‘The Discoverers Garden Te Wao Nui a Tane’ [visitor pamphlet] n.d., n.p.

⁸² Society for the Preservation of the Kerikeri Stone Store, ‘The Discoverers Garden Te Wao Nui a Tane’ [visitor pamphlet] n.d., n.p.

⁸³ Society for the Preservation of the Kerikeri Stone Store, ‘The Discoverers Garden Te Wao Nui a Tane’ [visitor pamphlet] n.d., n.p.

-
- ⁸⁴ Society for the Preservation of the Kerikeri Stone Store, ‘The Discoverers Garden Te Wao Nui a Tane’ [visitor pamphlet] n.d., n.p.
- ⁸⁵ New Zealand Historic Places Trust. *The Kerikeri Basin* [visitor pamphlet] 2009, n.p.
- ⁸⁶ See Solomon (2007), Williams (2001) and Park (2001) for further discussion.
- ⁸⁷ Fisher (1985, 9).
- ⁸⁸ Despite the certainty of purpose (and even impatience) with which he suggests the negotiations were entered into by the official party, Mathew does fleetingly entertain the possibility of failure, too: he reports that after the initial speeches which denounced the treaty and advised that the Governor should not be received, ‘matters, I thought, began to look very blue’, and ‘the tide seemed setting all against us’ (1940, 35), although it is clear that an outright rejection of British authority by Maori would have been deemed historic in its own way.
- ⁸⁹ Buick (1914, 214).
- ⁹⁰ McComb (1965, 1).
- ⁹¹ The estate had been divided into town lots for auction and it was rumoured that American deep-sea fishermen were trying to purchase the former residency building. See Reed (1957, 12-13 and 16).
- ⁹² For discussion of this phrase, see for example Mead (1997b, 102-3 and 104) and Walker (2004, 96).
- ⁹³ Fisher (1985, 3-4).
- ⁹⁴ Waitangi National Trust, <http://www.waitangi.net.nz>; see also Waitangi National Trust (2008, 2).
- ⁹⁵ Waitangi National Trust, *Souvenir Guide* [promotional pamphlet], n.d., n.p.
- ⁹⁶ Waitangi National Trust. ‘The Carvings: Te Whare Runanga: The meeting house at Waitangi Treaty Grounds’ [visitor booklet] (n.d., n.p.).
- ⁹⁷ In 1928, a preservation order was put in place to protect the Canterbury Provincial Chambers building (erected in 1859), although this structure served as a symbol of provincial pride and identity rather than as a national one. See Gentry (2006, 22-3) for discussion of this case.
- ⁹⁸ Reed (1957, 85). According to Buick (1934, 3), a copy of the original architect’s plan of the house was exhibited too.
- ⁹⁹ The span of iwi representation at Waitangi is extensive, too, in comparison with late twentieth and early twenty-first century insitutional provisions. See O’Regan (1997) and McCarthy (2011) for discussion of this issue.
- ¹⁰⁰ Bledisloe, cited in Reed (1957, 56).
- ¹⁰¹ Waitangi is now unusual in that, while it maintains provision for government representation (and reserves an *ex officio* seat for the Prime Minister), it is controlled by a private trust board and is not a feature of the ‘property portfolio’ which has subsequently been developed by the state (McLean cited in Gentry 2006, 14). The Minister of Conservation (formerly known as the Minister charged with the administration of the Scenery Preservation Act 1908) is entitled to hold an *ex officio* seat on the Waitangi trust board, but the estate is not run by the Department of Conservation.
- ¹⁰² See also Bledisloe (1934, 3).
- ¹⁰³ Forbes, cited in Reed (1957, 21).
- ¹⁰⁴ Bledisloe, cited in Buick (1934, 77).
- ¹⁰⁵ See for example Walker (1987, 143-4 and 1996, 33), Neich (2001, 174 and 178), Salmond (1975, 77-8), and Thomas (2009, 166).
- ¹⁰⁶ Thomas does note that carvings produced by Tene Waitere for the *Rauru* meeting house (opened in 1900) include representations ‘of specific characters, not from local history but from pan-Maori myth’, describing this house as being the first ‘that explicitly embraced a wider, effectively national, range of reference’ (2009, 20-22).
- ¹⁰⁷ McCarthy (2011, 143) also supports this view of Te Papa’s exceptionalism.
- ¹⁰⁸ Buick (1934, 13).
- ¹⁰⁹ See McNaughton (2005) for discussion of related issues.
- ¹¹⁰ See King (2003, 228-9) for discussion of this boycott.
- ¹¹¹ Ngata, cited in Walker (2001, 352).
- ¹¹² See Wilmer (1993, 211) and Allen (2002, 250).
- ¹¹³ Cited in Walker (1983, n.p.).
- ¹¹⁴ This image, taken by John Miller, is reprinted in Harris (2004, 123).
- ¹¹⁵ Harawira (2005), <http://www.converge.org.nz/pma/co020205.doc>
- ¹¹⁶ See for example Walker (1983, 1987, 2004 and 2005), Smith (1999), Harris (2004), and Jones (2005).
- ¹¹⁷ O’Sullivan (2007, 3).
- ¹¹⁸ See for example ‘Tribunal Gives Green Light to Treaty Grounds Claim’ (2008), <http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/PO0805/S00184.htm>
- ¹¹⁹ See for example Pugsley (1994 and 1998) and Revington (1998).

-
- ¹²⁰ See for example Seal (1996) and Hobsbawm (2000).
- ¹²¹ See for example Windschuttle (2001) and Foot (2003 and 2004).
- ¹²² Casey (2003), <http://www.canberratimes.com.au/news/local/news/columns/modern-museum-is-meant-to-startle>
- ¹²³ Jo Duke, conversation with the author.
- ¹²⁴ According to Greg Ansley (2003b, http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=3535464), concerns were raised by tribal authorities in the United States in relation to the exhibition's theme: one of the NMA curators travelled to Washington DC and to convince a meeting of Sioux chiefs that Sitting Bull would not be portrayed as a criminal, winning agreement for his inclusion. He was, however, withdrawn from the *Outlawed* line-up when it became apparent that the exhibition would clash with the opening of the Smithsonian's new National Museum of the American Indian.
- ¹²⁵ Graham Seal supplied the introduction for the *Outlawed* exhibition catalogue and his own work functioned as one of the NMA curators' key sources; he had previously offered the ambivalent comment that outlaw heroes and noble robbers are 'not unknown' in cultures such as New Zealand (1996, xiv).
- ¹²⁶ Wilson, cited in Ansley (2003a), http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=3525759
- ¹²⁷ Duke, conversation with the author.
- ¹²⁸ Diamond, conversation with the author; see also Diamond (2002), http://www.anu.edu.au/culture/activities/sixpack/ethno_papers/jo_diamond.htm
- ¹²⁹ Musquito was an Aboriginal convict transported from New South Wales to Van Diemen's Land and later employed as a tracker to capture bushrangers and bolters; having been ostracised from the local community, he formed a gang which included local Aboriginal people and which perpetrated attacks on outlying settlements. Musquito was captured in 1824 and hanged the following year. Walyer was born to the Plair-Leke-Liller-Plue people in Van Diemen's Land. As a teenager she was abducted by members of another tribe and traded to sealers. She escaped after a number of years and went on to lead violent attacks against settlers and other Aboriginal groups before being captured and dying in custody in 1831. See Weber (2003, 34-41 and 105) for further discussion of these two figures.
- ¹³⁰ For fuller discussion of problems arising from the exhibition's comparative approach see Boswell (2007).
- ¹³¹ See for example Moon (2001, 68). The omission of details such as this is particularly striking given that Moon was the author nominated by descendants to assist the NMA in producing the written material for Heke's story. It remains unclear whether Moon himself or the NMA is responsible for these omissions and for other distortions in Heke's presentation.
- ¹³² Diamond, conversation with the author.
- ¹³³ Duke, conversation with the author.
- ¹³⁴ See Portus (2003), http://www.nma.gov.au/media/media_releases_index/warriors_weapons_leave_nz_for_first_time
- ¹³⁵ Ansley (2003a), http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=3525759. See also Ansley (2003b), http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=3535464, and Watkin (2003), http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=3528405
- ¹³⁶ Cowan (1955, 5).
- ¹³⁷ Cited in Gardiner (1983, 129).
- ¹³⁸ See for example New Zealand Conservancy (2003), <http://www.nhf.govt.nz/Community/004~New-Zealand-Conservation-Authority-and-Boards/NZCA/Media-Releases/086~History-the-Winner.asp>, and New Zealand Archaeology (2003), <http://www.nzarchaeology.org/enews/12may03.htm>.
- ¹³⁹ Carpenter, conversation with the author.
- ¹⁴⁰ Robinson, cited in Bay Chronicle (2003), <http://tiki.knowledgebasket.co.nz/newzagent/inlstuff/text/2002/STF/12/01/132215/doc>
- ¹⁴¹ Carpenter, conversation with the author.
- ¹⁴² Carpenter, conversation with the author.
- ¹⁴³ Bay Chronicle (2003), <http://tiki.knowledge-basket.co.nz/newzagent/inlstuff/text/2002/STF/12/01/132215/doc>; Visitor Solutions (2003, i-ii).
- ¹⁴⁴ Bay Chronicle (2003), <http://tiki.knowledge-basket.co.nz/newzagent/inlstuff/text/2002/STF/12/01/132215/doc>
- ¹⁴⁵ Bay Chronicle (2003), <http://tiki.knowledge-basket.co.nz/newzagent/inlstuff/text/2002/STF/12/01/132215/doc>
- ¹⁴⁶ Carpenter, conversation with the author.
- ¹⁴⁷ Cowan appears to make oblique reference to Maning's *History* in the preface to his own text, explaining that some 'contributions to the story of the campaigns are scarcely written in the impartial spirit of the historian' (1955, v).
- ¹⁴⁸ Maning (2001, 18).
- ¹⁴⁹ Hauraki was the brother of Maning's wife Moengaroa and a close friend to Maning; this personal connection suggests reasons for the emphasis on this sequence of events in Maning's *History*, and for its intensity.

-
- ¹⁵⁰ The impulsive suggestion made by the younger warriors that they should eat the flesh of the dead ‘raw at once’ (Maning 2001, 50) is the one exception, but this is swiftly brushed aside by the narrator.
- ¹⁵¹ Kauri Museum [promotional pamphlet] (n.d., n.p.).
- ¹⁵² Turner (2009), too, notes that the road is a metaphor for settler progress.
- ¹⁵³ Several commentators have noted that—paradoxically—the kauri industry actually hindered progress in Te Tai Tokerau by delaying the development of a roading infrastructure. See for example Sale (1981, 38-40).
- ¹⁵⁴ See for example Cronon, Miles and Gitlin (1992, 17).
- ¹⁵⁵ Bledisloe (1934, 10-11).
- ¹⁵⁶ These had been dealt with in temporary international exhibitions but were not at this time the subject of permanent displays.
- ¹⁵⁷ The museum re-opened as the Otamatea Kauri and Pioneer Museum. This name has subsequently been shortened to the Kauri Museum.
- ¹⁵⁸ See for example Robson (1975), Haworth (1993), Kidman (1984), and Hyde (1989).
- ¹⁵⁹ See for example Gregory (1999b), http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=9928
- ¹⁶⁰ See Robson (1975, 5-7). Kidman (1984) and Hyde (1989) also provide brief descriptions which show how little the museum has changed.
- ¹⁶¹ New Zealand Tourism (1996, 37).
- ¹⁶² Cruise (1974, 179).
- ¹⁶³ Information about the land and its history is drawn from the *Muriwhenua Land Report* (Waitangi Tribunal, 1997).
- ¹⁶⁴ As Muecke has explained, this is a familiar paradox: settler modernity is characterised by an inconsistent set of claims and values relating to nature and culture (2006, 26).
- ¹⁶⁵ Waitangi Tribunal (1988, 29) and (1997, 21).
- ¹⁶⁶ Cited in Gregory (1999a), http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=5064
- ¹⁶⁷ New Zealand Herald (2000), http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=166686
- ¹⁶⁸ Okeroa (2007), <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/viewdocument.aspx?documentid=29313>
- ¹⁶⁹ Department of Conservation, www.doc.govt.nz/parks-and-recreation/plan-and-prepare/alerts/northland/cape-reinga-work. See also Enterprise Northland (2007), http://www.enterprisenorthland.co.nz/news/news_2007/15_may_2007.htm
- ¹⁷⁰ Transit New Zealand, www.nzta.govt.nz/projects/capereinga/about
- ¹⁷¹ Enterprise Northland (2007), http://www.enterprisenorthland.co.nz/news/news_2007/15_may_2007.htm
- ¹⁷² Pacific Environments (2007, n.p.).
- ¹⁷³ Mead (1985, 4). This essay is reprinted in Mead (1997a).
- ¹⁷⁴ The other development mentioned is the Te Hua Kawariki cultural centre proposed for Opononi in the Hokianga, another iwi partnership with DOC. For further discussion of proposed iwi cultural centres see Gorbey (2004) and McCarthy (2011).
- ¹⁷⁵ Doug Te Wake, conversation with the author.
- ¹⁷⁶ Department of Conservations, www.doc.govt.nz/parks-and-recreation/plan-and-prepare/alerts/northland/cape-reinga-work
- ¹⁷⁷ See Hau’ofa (1993) for fuller discussion of this conception of the Pacific.
- ¹⁷⁸ Park (2001, 608).
- ¹⁷⁹ See New Zealand Herald (2000), http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=166686
- ¹⁸⁰ See Brown (2007) for discussion of Ratana’s legacy in the north.
- ¹⁸¹ Waitangi Tribunal (1997, 8).
- ¹⁸² Doug Te Wake, conversation with the author.
- ¹⁸³ See New Zealand Herald (2000), http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=166686, and Barrington (2007), <http://www.northernadvocate.co.nz/local/news/iwi-send-protest-group-packing/3747458>.
- ¹⁸⁴ Cited in Barrington 2007, <http://www.northernadvocate.co.nz/local/news/iwi-send-protest-group-packing/3747458>.
- ¹⁸⁵ Department of Conservation, www.doc.govt.nz/parks-and-recreation/plan-and-prepare/alerts/northland/cape-reinga-work/questions-a
- ¹⁸⁶ Cited in New Zealand Herald (2000), http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=166686; see also Jackson (2000), http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=166486.
- ¹⁸⁷ Oram (2003), <http://www.sharechat.co.nz/features/unlimited/article.php/fc11c053>; New Zealand Herald (2000), http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=166686
- ¹⁸⁸ Hau’ofa (1993) also discusses tensions between ‘development’ and indigenous interests and concerns.