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ABSTRACT

Pacific islands artifacts and imageries have had a strong appeal to the popular imagination of the West over the years. However, in recent years the question of ownership of intellectual property rights has emerged as many indigenous groups around the world call for the repatriation of their cultural objects taken away, with or without their ancestors’ consent, as a way of reasserting their cultural rights and in rediscovery of their roots and identity.

The question of repatriation of cultural objects is now a contentious issue, as indigenous peoples demand the return of their cultural goods from metropolitan museums while museum owners claim ownership of the objects. The creation of indigenous museums adds to this contention as these museums are still deeply entrenched in colonial legacies. It has however shifted indigenous peoples’ views of museum collections and artifacts. The development of cultural centers and the increasing number of indigenous people trained in museology and archaeology goes hand in hand with the political shift in indigenous leadership and self-determination.

The anthropological purists tend to view cultural objects fundamentally on the basis of their uses rather than their aesthetic qualities. The interface between functionality and aesthetics makes museum cultural objects a very intricate area of study. Cultural objects are associated with a whole range of cultural and historical contexts including social rank, social change, environmental adaptation, spirituality and daily survival. This research is not meant to examine these in detail but focuses primarily on the appropriation and repatriation of Fijian cultural artifacts.

The thesis will attempt to critique the imperial discourse, which conceives of the museum as a space for high culture to sustain European civilisation and the neoliberal approach, which sees cultural objects as commodities and museums as money-making
enterprises. It will do so using the postcolonial approach and the application of the *Fijian Vanua Research Framework* (FVRF). Applying this research framework and enhancing it by using *Talanoa* as a methodology added value to this research. The combination of interviews and archival research highlighted that the main reason of collecting in the late 1800s and early 1900s was to collect the remaining tangible culture of indigenous societies, in this case Fiji, that were quickly changing under a lot of economical, social and political pressures from outside powers. The research findings highlighted the need to continue discussing *repatriation, ownership and cultural rights* on all levels of society-from local, national, regional and international platforms.

Fiji and its Pacific island neighbors must work together to develop new theories, research frameworks and methodologies that work for and by Pacific peoples. It is widely known that Pacific heritage art is an area that is in dire need of research. Indigenous writers and researchers need to support one another to conduct more evidence based writing on the arts from a Pacific Islander standpoint. The hope is that this research will contribute to the ongoing debate and policy formulation on cultural consolidation and reform in the Pacific face of globalisation as Pacific people attempt to relive history, reconnect with the ancestral past and reconstruct their identities.
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1 CHAPTER ONE

I KAU - INTRODUCTION

That the past is ahead, in front of us, is a conception of time that helps us retain our memories and to be aware of its presence. What is behind us [the future] cannot be seen and is liable to be forgotten readily. What is ahead of us [the past] cannot be forgotten so readily or ignored, for it is in front of our minds' eyes, always reminding us of its presence. The past is alive in us, so in more than a metaphorical sense the dead are alive – we are our history ~ Epeli Hauofa

1.1 Background

This thesis centres on repatriation as a means of restoring cultural identity to indigenous peoples. It examines how cultural artifacts were taken out of their source communities to international museums and private collectors and proposes how the reverse cycle can be undertaken in mutual agreements between all parties concerned. This study explores veiwekani (relationships) born out of cultural exchanges in the nineteenth century between iTaukei (Indigenous Fijians) chiefs and colonial administrators, as well as collectors and explorers. It emphasises the importance of veisolisoli (cultural exchanges) at all levels in the iTaukei society and how such exchanges can be so influential that they sealed agreements between Fiji and the British monarchy in 1874. Even though events such as the Deed of Cession are documented in the history books of Fiji, more understanding and appreciation of relationships and alliances can be borne out of studying artifacts that were exchanged at that time, and that are now kept at the Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology (MAA), in Cambridge, England. The political relationship between Fiji and Britain can be studied through artifacts that were exchanged during this time.
This thesis also focuses on the iyau (treasures or valued properties) that were exchanged and their significance (Ravuvu, 1985, p. 25). The term yau means something that does not stay in one place, but is taken about from place to place. When a great gathering takes place, iyau are taken along, and brought back again, and so from this originates this name ai yau or nai yau\(^1\) (Toganivalu, 1917). Ratu Deve Toganivalu, a renowned chief from Bau, was describing Fijian property and gear, which Fijians used before the arrival of foreign goods in Fiji. He also noticed changes taking place as modern materials began to replace Fijian properties (ibid). Ravuvu (1985, p. 25) supported this observation in saying that iyau is defined as valued property. This would include tabua (whales-tooth), yaqona (kava) and magiti (food). Depending on types of ceremonies, some foods are presented raw (piles of yams and taro) or cooked from the lovo pits (underground oven).

Artifacts that were collected or exchanged (vei\(\text{\textsigma}a\)) reflected the veiwekani between the two parties. Ravuvu (1985, p. 35) confirms this when he notes that ‘ceremonial offering of objects of wealth is an integral aspect of the peoples’ way of life, and a means of upholding their social and cultural systems, then it is indeed in itself a worthwhile object in life.’ Even though the quality of such exchanges were not documented in the same manner, the talanoa (stories) that were recorded by museum curators sheds more light onto the nature of the exchange and can trace how such artifacts ended up in a collection in England or Canada.

\(^1\) Ai yau and Nai Yau have the same meaning, however Ai yau is used by Lauan speakers (Eastern Fiji).
The goal of this research is to provide an opportunity to reconceptualise the role of the cultural objects not only in terms of the dominant imperial interests of past grandeur or the neoliberal notion of commercialisation and market value of the cultural object, but in a broader sociological framework of the postcolonial theory to uncover some of the underlying cultural, political and ideological assumptions relating to colonial museums. Of significance here is the notion of power and domination, which facilitated and justified the process of appropriation in the first place. This thesis will also attempt to critique the imperial discourse, which conceives of museums as spaces for high culture to sustain European civilisation and the neoliberal approach, which sees cultural objects as commodities and museums as money-making enterprises. It will do so using the postcolonial approach.
In this thesis, I will refer to Indigenous Fijians as *iTaukei* (literally meaning ‘owner’, in this case, owners of the land and resources in Fiji). Some literature omits the ‘I’ and just refers to the people as Taukei. Another option is the use of the word ‘Fijian’ and ‘kai-Viti’ (meaning, to be from Fiji), which is more informal. The term Fijian once referred to Indigenous Fijians only, while other ethnic groups were referred to as ‘kai Idia,’ ‘kai Loma,’ and ‘kai Jaina’. Additionally, the current government in Fiji has redefined the term Fijian to exclude indigenous Fijians and only include other ethnic groups such as Indians, Chinese and Europeans. Indigenous Fijians are now officially known in Fiji as iTaukei, and this is the option I will use.

The focus of this thesis then is on iTaukei artifacts that were collected from Fiji in the early 1800s to the early 1900s. I will only focus on the 100 years from first contact with early explorers to the time of the formation of the Fijian Society in 1904, which later became the Fiji Museum.

### 1.2 Aims and Objectives

This thesis aims to highlight the indigenous Fijian way of giving and sharing, which will be juxtaposed with the western way of acquiring materials. CHAPTER FIVE will decipher more of the nature of iTaukei giving that is based on mutual agreement, love and alliances, which therefore reinforces the relationship between the giver and the receiver at the present time and for the future. The Fijian word for future is *gauna mai muri* (behind the time) and for past is *gauna e liu* (in front of the time). It is fascinating to compare the indigenous ways of viewing the world compared to the western views, which has opposite meanings.

---

2 I will use iTaukei in this thesis rather than Taukei, as I believe that the term iTaukei is more formal and respectful.
This research aims to:

a) Critically examine the process of dispossession of the Pacific communities of their cultural objects by Europeans and the cultural, political, artistic or religious basis for this dispossession using postcolonial discourse.

b) Explore the notion of cultural ownership and how this can be used to explain the process of repatriation of cultural objects and the implications of this in Fiji.

c) Explore the process of repatriation of appropriated cultural objects and some of the social and cultural implications on Fijian world-view.

1.3 Research Questions

The four primary research questions that guide this study are:

a) What were some of the motives for the appropriation of Fijian cultural objects?
b) How important is the notion of cultural ownership in the study of museums, in particular the issues of appropriation and repatriation of indigenous cultural artifacts?
c) What are the social, political and cultural challenges associated with repatriation of cultural objects?
d) How are b) and c) applicable to Fiji?

1.4 Rationale

This investigation is to provide an analysis on past, present and future repatriation of Fijian cultural objects.
Although some organisations, such as the Pacific Islands Museums Association (PIMA), have been involved in issues of repatriation, this research is very important because there has been no systematic study of Fijian collections located overseas that include the study of repatriation.

This study will contribute immensely to a deeper understanding of the process of appropriation of Fijian cultural objects and the possibility of more repatriation in the future.

Museums have been viewed as foreign institutions due to their European origin. As a result, Fijian people living in Fiji and abroad feel disconnected from these places. This study will hopefully connect museums to these communities and provide a sense of ownership by connecting museums to their past.

Further, there is hope that this research will contribute to the ongoing debate and policy formulation on cultural consolidation and reform in the Pacific face of globalisation as Pacific people attempt to relive history, reconnect with the ancestral past and reconstruct their identities.

1.5 Significance of this Research

In my professional experience as former Director of the Fiji Museum and as Secretary-General of the Pacific Islands Museum Association (PIMA), I have developed a deep appreciation of the social and commercial significance of cultural artifacts, as well as concern regarding the issue of ownership and repatriation. This study is an attempt to provide a comprehensive analysis of these issues, with proposals as to how future repatriation of Fijian cultural artifacts might take place.
This thesis provides an opportunity to reconceptualise the role of cultural objects not only in terms of the dominant imperial interests of past grandeur or the neoliberal notion of commercialisation and market value of the cultural objects but, in a broader sociological framework of the postcolonial theory, to uncover some of the underlying cultural, political and ideological assumptions relating to colonial museums. Of significance here is the notion of power and domination, which facilitated and justified the process of appropriation in the first place. Because of their European origins, museums have often been seen as foreign by the Fijian community and this study will hopefully connect museums to the communities and provide a sense of ownership by connecting museums to their past.

1.6 Research Sites as Context of Study

The main focus of my research is on the ‘iyau vaka iTaukei’ (Fijian treasures, which I will refer to as artifacts) that were in use in Fiji prior to European arrival in the 1800s. No doubt they would have been manufactured in the earlier centuries. As far as museums are concerned, research and investigations were undertaken at the Fiji
Museum (Suva), Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology (MAA) in Cambridge, England and the Museum of Anthropology (MOA) in Vancouver, Canada.

Before discussing factors surrounding the choice of these museums, it is important to highlight key facts about Fiji.

Fiji’s location is known as the ‘hub of the Pacific’ and, as a result, has affected the historical and contemporary relationships of Fiji with its neighbouring islands. Fiji is located in the centre of the southern Pacific Ocean (below the equator) and sits on the border of Melanesia to the west and Polynesia to the east. Three thousand years ago, the Pacific was colonised by the Lapita people, whose archaeological mark has left its footprints on many islands, such as Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, New Caledonia and Fiji. Evidence of such migration can be found in Natunuku in Ba, Sigatoka Sand Dunes in Nadroga and the outer islands such as Naigani, Mago, Yasawa, Beqa and, recently, in Vorovoro, Vanua Levu (see Figure 1.4).

Figure 1.3. Map of Oceania, showing location of Fiji. Source: www.worldatlas.com/webimage/countrys/oceania
There are over 300 islands in Fiji and approximately one-third of the islands are inhabited. There are 14 provinces or *yasana* in Fiji and one major language spoken, which is known as the *Bauan* language. This language was collated and written down by early missionaries, notably Rev. William Cross and Rev. David Cargill. People that make up Fiji are predominantly *iTaukei* and Indians who came to Fiji from India in 1879 under the colonial Indentured system. As a result, languages used in Fiji are English, Fijian, Hindi and Urdu.

### 1.6.1 Case Study 1: Fiji Museum, Suva, Fiji

As far as this research is concerned, conducting interviews and analysing the collections at the Fiji Museum makes perfect sense as the Fiji Museum is the only national museum in Fiji. This was the best opportunity to learn more about the collection and to also analyse how the current collection was accumulated over the years. It was also timely.
to find out whether repatriation had taken place in the past and to find out what plans there are for the future of the museum (see CHAPTER SEVEN for interview details).

1.6.2 Case Study 2: Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology (MAA), Cambridge, England

With Fiji’s historical and political link to England, an English museum would be ideal to include as a case study. It is common knowledge that the majority of artifacts appropriated from Fiji ended up in England. The MAA at the University of Cambridge was the best choice for study in England because the founding collection for the MAA was from Fiji, collected by Baron Anatole von Hügel. von Hügel spent three years, from 1875 to 1878, collecting artifacts from villages up the Rewa River and into the interior provinces of Naitasiri, Namosi, Navosa, Ra and Ba. He also collected from the neighbouring island of Vanua Levu (see Figure 1.4). With support from the Fijian Arts Research Project, through Professor Steven Hooper, I was able to participate in the 2013 “Chiefs and Governors” exhibition and its associated workshops. This was an opportunity to view the collections collected by von Hügel, interview the Fiji Museum’s previous and current Directors, Fergus Clunie and Sagale Buadromo, as well as interview Professor Steven Hooper and MAA curators Dr. Anita Herle and Dr. Lucie Carreau (see CHAPTER EIGHT).

1.6.3 Case Study 3: Museum Of Anthropology (MOA), Vancouver, Canada

The choice of a third museum came at the right time when MOA Curator Dr. Carol Mayer sent out an invitation for a study of their Fijian collection to be done. This collection was collected by Frank Burnett (see CHAPTER NINE). This was the best choice as, after research and analysis of the collection, it was discovered that Burnett was previously a Board Member of the Fijian Society, the predecessor of the current Fiji Museum. He was living in Fiji during the colonial period. While he was in Fiji, he was collecting artifacts and, upon his return to Canada, his collection ended up at the MOA. I would have selected Australian or New Zealand museums since they are closer
to Fiji, but I was keen to find out what factors had led to these Fijian artifacts being found in a museum far away from Fiji, in Canada.

1.7 Research Designs and Methodology

A qualitative method of research was applied for this particular research. This involved interviewing individuals who work in the field of museums, researchers and iTaukei community leaders and members. In the early parts of the research, there was an intention to analyse data relating to artifacts that are kept in museum collections. This involved quantifying types of artifacts and associated numbers kept in a particular museum. The idea was to conduct interviews as well as to quantify Fijian artifacts in their museum databases and manual records. This would include conducting an analysis of the percentage of a certain type of artifact that had been collected by a certain collector, then comparing this data with that of other collectors in order to understand their collecting motives. It was decided that I would focus only on the qualitative rather than the quantitative aspect of this research.

1.8 Research Sampling

With reference to my Research plan, part of my sampling was identifying individuals to be interviewed. The interview process involved the following methods

- Direct interviews (structured or semi-structured)
- A questionnaire (set of questions that would be used during the interview or given to participants to fill out in their own time)
- Participant observation (as the lead researcher, I would be part of the observation as well as participating in some museum discussions).

1.8.1 Fieldwork Preparation

During the early part of my thesis development, relevant participants were identified as key participants for the fieldwork interviews. Fiji, England and Canada were identified as my three case study countries and the following categories of people were identified and included into three categories: museum staff, researchers and iTaukei community
leaders. The last category (community leaders) includes a sub-category of community members. Community leaders comprised those who hold high position based on their traditional roles (such as chiefs), or had attained their positions (such as church pastors). Community members, on the other hand, included contemporary artists, heritage artists and general community members of iTaukei background who could share their views on my research topic. Museum staff included those who work directly with Fijian collections in their respective museums, researchers included academics and government department staff, and community leaders included iTaukei chiefs, artists and those that consider themselves Fijian and live in Fiji and abroad.

1.8.2 Preliminary Research (PIMA)

As Secretary-General of PIMA (Pacific Islands Museum Association), I was privileged to see reports and documentations written over the years pertaining to its support for the repatriation of Pacific collections from international museums. For instance, a report was written in 2006 to assess the number and nature of Pacific collections within national and international museums. Within the same report, it was enlightening to see that surveys of Pacific collections have been done resulting in the production of documents such as the Survey of Oceanian Collections in Museums in the UK and Irish Republic (1979), Oceanic artifacts holdings in Australian Museums (1980) and the Survey of Pacific Island and Australian Aboriginal artifacts in public collections in the United States of America and Canada (1982). These reports signified that the organisation is concerned in researching where Pacific collections are located in the region and overseas. There is huge potential for more research to be done in order to assist Pacific museums to know what is in their current museum collections and those located overseas. My thesis is the result of reading these reports and aiming to do something about it.

One question that arose was: who developed these museums in the Pacific and for what purpose? Most of the Pacific museums were formed in the mid-1900s, many with colonial administrators’ support. These museums were built for research purposes, and for the education of visitors (not so much for the local people). During this time, locals were still coming to terms with formal education and getting used to the colonial way
of learning. Similar situations can be seen in other parts of the world where indigenous communities were struggling to understand the purpose of museums. In the case of Canada, museums were largely responsible for the view that Indians were extinct or that, if they were alive, they must follow their traditional culture or cease being Indian. Native culture was viewed in a classic phase. This meant that the common view at the time was that Indian art was dead and it should be mummified, packed into mortuary boxes and tucked away into museums (Jacknis, 2002, p. 307). The same view was apparent in the Pacific. Many museums in the Pacific were established leading up to or after political independence. With the support of colonial governments and administrators who saw the value of safeguarding tangible cultural heritage, museums and cultural centres were built and can be found all across the Pacific (Stanley, 2002).

The second question was: how did Pacific artifacts come to be found in many international museums? How did they get there? It is important to note that there are many different ways that Pacific artifacts reached their overseas locations. Some were directly or indirectly traded with missionaries, explorers, military personnel, traders and others. Sources have revealed that a number were stolen amid acts of extreme violence (Daley, 2015). In the case of the Cook Islands, it was observed that some were given as gifts to overseas dignitaries, as was the custom of Pacific people. In 1777, when Captain Cook visited the islands of Mangaia and Atiu, he was lavished with gifts from the islanders. In the early nineteenth and twentieth centuries, islanders continued to sell artifacts to visitors and some of these reached the hands of private collectors and art dealers (Cowling, 2006). The above example would make determining their provenance difficult as information relating to who made it, when and for what purpose would have been lost during transactions. The focus was more on acquiring artifacts rather than recording who the artists were and what artifacts were used for.

1.8.3 Fieldwork Approach

The first approach was to officially contact the three institutions via email and inform them of my interest in undertaking research at their museums. This email included the University of Auckland consent form, which contained the background of my research (see Appendix C). The Director of the Fiji Museum was the first staff member to be
contacted. Upon my arrival in Fiji, staff from other departments at the museum such as those working in collections, archaeology, front-of-house and exhibitions approached me expressing their interest in being part of my research. The decision to include interviews with them was important in collecting the views of departmental staff for the research to reflect a cross-section of the museum setting. More importantly, the Fiji Museum will eventually be the host institution that will receive repatriation in the future. As for the MAA, I decided to interview the Curator and Co-Curator of the “Chiefs and Governors” exhibition, an exhibition that showcased key artifacts that were collected and gifted by Baron Anatole von Hügel, Gordon and Maudslay. Similarly, when working with the MOA, I only interviewed the lead curator who manages the Pacific collections as well as collections from other parts of the world, including Africa and Asia.

The researcher category of field interviews included academics, scholars, government department workers, regional organisations’ representatives and those that work in statutory organisations. In Fiji, this included academics and staff from the two main tertiary institutions in Fiji; the University of the South Pacific (USP) and the Fiji National University (FNU), as well as those from the Department of Culture and Heritage. Also included in this category are the staff of regional organisations such as UNESCO (United Nation Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization) and the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC), as well as Fiji-based organisations such as the iTaukei Trust Fund, a statutory body that is jointly governed by a Board and the iTaukei Affairs Ministry. Including these institutions is vital so that this study can find out if these institutions are aware of the issue of repatriation, and may be a stepping-stone for future courses such as museum studies and repatriation studies to be incorporated in Fiji and the Pacific region in the near future.

The community leaders I interviewed in Fiji represented two provinces out of the fourteen provinces of Fiji. They were the provinces of Tailevu and Namosi. These community leaders are paramount chiefs from the island of Bau and Namosi village respectively. Even though I contacted the Roko Tui Dreketi (who is currently a Member of Parliament and Leader of the Opposition), as well as a chief from Ra Province, I was
not able to meet and interview them due to work commitment. I initially selected the
four provinces of Tailevu, Namosi, Rewa and Ra given the high number of artifacts
from these provinces that are in international museum collections. Chiefs from these
provinces were often mentioned in the journals of collectors or in museum acquisition
papers. For future research, I would be keen to interview other leaders or chiefs from
the other twelve provinces, to provide a broader perspective and much better
representation of the iTaukei communities of Fiji.

As for the artists, I interviewed practicing artists both from the heritage and
contemporary sectors of the community. The heritage sector included key talented
artists in the field of *tulituli* (pottery making), *talitali* (basketry), *kesakesa* (tapa-cloth-
making) and *sivisivi* (carving). Three prominent iTaukei artists who represent Fiji in
these art forms were interviewed. Contemporary artists included painters, dancers and
musicians, most of whom were younger and some of mixed heritage (e.g.,
Fijian/Chinese, Fijian/European). In England, I interviewed key iTaukei artists and
families who attended the opening of the “Chiefs and Governors” exhibition. Similarly,
in Vancouver, iTaukei residents attended the Pacific Arts Association (PAA) that I also
attended. I approached a number of them who were willing to share their views on
repatriation.

1.9  Postcolonial Theoretical Framework

No doubt museums are western constructs that continue to perpetuate colonial rule over
indigenous communities around the world. Postcolonial theory became the most
realistic theoretical framework to use in this research due to the impact of colonialism
on the development of museums in Fiji, and how repatriation reflected what
postcolonialism is all about. Postcolonialism is the study of the struggle by the
oppressed against inequality and injustice. Thinkers such as Bentham, Marx, Mao,
Fanon and Ghandhi believed postcolonial theory to be a tool to frame the big picture of
cultural rights and museums. Cultural rights emerged out of the attempts by indigenous
peoples in former colonies to reassert their control over cultural artifacts.
Smith (2012) reaffirms how research and museums are linked to imperialism and colonialism. The collective memory of imperialism has led museums to view knowledge about indigenous peoples as something to be collected, classified and re/presented to the world (Smith, 2012, p. 8). To the colonised, the issue of race and gender comes to the fore. This is also true for Fiji, where the Fijian Society (predecessor of the Fiji Museum) was formed in 1904 with the notion of capturing the history and valuable information about the iTaukei before the impact of colonial domination. This way of thinking was evident through the membership make-up of the society, which was dominated by Europeans. It wasn’t until 1917 that iTaukei members joined the society and engaged in discussions and debates about iTaukei culture and traditions at that time. One such individual was Ratu Deve Toganivalu, who was a chief and also an administrator in the colonial government (Toganivalu, 1910, p. 1).

There is also the belief that repatriation is a process that continues to remind indigenous people about past colonial oppression and their continued struggle to get over such legacies. Partly as a result of this struggle, indigenous activists continue to fight for the return of artifacts and human remains that are known to have been taken from the Pacific without the consent of their owners.

It is critical to explore the depth to which the iTaukei maintain their traditional lifestyle. This depends greatly on how they meet the costs and labour towards providing materials and other necessities required for ceremonies such as weddings, deaths and other cultural events (Ravuvu, 1983, p. 52). Every member of the family (in particular adults) has certain responsibilities in the creation of wealth. For instance, a number of mats will be required to be woven over a period of time to prepare for a wedding. Others in the household will be expected to prepare tabua (whales-tooth) and yagona (kava), and kakana dina (staple food) must be planted to be presented on the wedding day. Kinship responsibilities and obligations are paramount, therefore there is an expectation that everyone must contribute to maintain their identity within the family (Ravuvu, 1983, p. 62). After the wedding day, wealth such asibe (mats), masi (tapa-cloth) and tabua are exchanged, and these are circulated until the next event. Strict protocols are
adhered to in the form of who is given this wealth depending on seniority and their close relationship with the bride and groom.

It is important to note that certain items of wealth were made only in certain areas. For example, mat-weaving is a craft known and practiced by Fijian women all over Fiji. However, there are certain types of mats only woven in certain places and not in others. These variations can be determined by the patterns, designs and type of raw material used. As for museums, such knowledge is important when adding provenance to mats in the collections. In Fiji today, weaving mats has become the key responsibility and occupation of women and have thus become a source of income for most. Many women have sold mats or exchanged them for other goods in places where these special mats were not made. Since solevu (gatherings) are still part of iTaukei life and mats are key components of ceremonies and exchanges, mats are properties that can now be sold to procure money (Toganivalu, 1910, p. 2).

Names of artifacts also commemorate relationships, for instance the ancestral link between Fiji and Tonga. In the case of the masi (bark cloth), various types signify its Tongan origin such as the kumi or gatu vakatoga (tapa of Tongan origin). The kuveti, derived from the word upeti or kuveji, is a board made up of sewing together leaves of the screw pine, to be equal in breadth to the staining board, which is called the papa ni kesakesa. There is also a type of kumi, which is stained quite black and is called the black gatu. This is common in Tonga and is a highly valued property for Tongan women (Toganivalu, 1910, p. 3). Here we can see that through masi, one can see the close relationships between Tonga and Fiji and, even though many are in storage in overseas museums, the practice of making them and its associated ceremonies where masi is used them still continues today. It is then imperative for current generations to pass on this knowledge to future generations of Fijian and Tongan women.

The source of materials from which these artifacts are made will provide evidence of which region they were taken from. For example, water containers are also found in museum collections. Some are made from large coconut shells called kitu. Smaller kitu are made for storing drinking and cooking water as well as the sea water used for
cooking. In places where there are no coconuts, they use bamboos, and clay water-jars made of earth to draw water, both for drinking and cooking (Toganivalu, 1910, p. 6). Coconuts can be seen more in coastal villages and outer islands. Bamboos are found in the highlands of Viti Levu, including the provinces of Namosi, Naitasiri, Navosa and Ra. Earthenware is found in the provinces of Rewa, Kadavu and Nadroga (Clunie, 1985).

1.10 Data Analysis

All the interview data were recorded and later analysed for inclusion in this thesis. Some were recorded on tape recorders or videos, and notes were taken on note books while interviews were conducted. Follow-up emails and correspondence also contributed to the data collected, which added a lot of value to the initial interview notes taken face to face (see CHAPTER SIX on Methodology for details).

1.11 Ethical Considerations

As a scholar of the University of Auckland, I had to ensure that the ethics process was followed through. I made sure that all the research participants were aware of their rights prior to interviews. As an indigenous Fijian, I also had to adhere to iTaukei ways of undertaking interviews. The language I used and the protocol I applied had to suit the circumstances I was faced with. Even though most of my interviews were not undertaken in the Fijian village setting, where strict traditional protocol has to be applied, I still made sure that elements of respect was applied to those I spoke to in Fiji, England and Canada (see CHAPTER SIX on Methodology).

1.12 Summary of Findings

This research has taught me a lot about research in general. The initial hypothesis I made alluded to the idea that repatriation of Fijian treasures in international museums must take place immediately. Based on indigenous rights, it is only lawful that artifacts that were taken out of Fiji in the 1800s under trying circumstances must be returned. I also did not take the Fijian diaspora into consideration when I started this research
journey nor the physical spaces needed to house these repatriated treasures should they be returned in the near future.

1.13 Challenges Faced During The Research

Overall, I found everyone friendly and easy to talk to. However, Figure 1.5 below is the summary of challenges faced. This is followed by a brief outline of how these difficulties were encountered during the course of my research. CHAPTER SIX further elaborates on how these challenges were countered in order to assist future researchers who may find themselves in the same situation.

Figure 1.5. The ‘5C’ Challenges of Indigenous Research. Source: Vunidilo, 2015.

a) Cultural Insider/Outsider dilemma – The first group I interviewed in Fiji were the Fiji Museum staff. Adhering to the University of Auckland Ethics requirement, I had to ensure that museum staff were aware of my intentions to discuss my topic of research and were not coerced in any way. Due to the fact that I had worked there previously, not crossing that delicate line was difficult. I had to make sure that my Fiji Museum participants did not feel forced to be interviewed just because of our close acquaintances. (see Appendix A for Questionnaire). Smith (2012, p. 10) mentioned that
as an indigenous researcher, we are frequently judged by insider criteria such as family background, status, politics, age, gender, religion and perceived technical ability. These challenges are often welcomed by outside researchers compared to indigenous researchers (ibid.).

b) Communication & language – Due to the technical nature of my topic, some non-museum participants found it difficult to understand the topic of my research. Moreso, the iTaukei participants struggled in understanding the meaning of repatriation in English. I had to continuously refine the English definition and translate the questionnaires into Fijian.

c) Categories of interviews – Some of the iTaukei participants I interviewed included government officers that work for the iTaukei Ministry (Indigenous Affairs Ministry) and the Department of Culture and Heritage. Even though I classified them under the ‘researchers’ category, most found it difficult to only speak as the professional person rather than as an indigenous person. I hope this will not affect my interview data. On a positive note, I was privileged to interview a senior staff member of the I Taukei Trust Fund who is mandated to project manage the building of a new museum in five years’ time.

d) Cost of fieldwork – Initially, there were no research funds available for my research. However, I have to acknowledge PIMA, the Fiji Research Project and PAA for supporting my research travel costs in order to undertake fieldwork in Fiji, England and Canada respectively. Overall, the University of Auckland Graduate Studies supported my administration research needs.

e) Community leaders/members recruitment – Since I was based in New Zealand, endeavouring to recruit these participants in Fiji, England and Canada was not easy (see CHAPTER SIX). I had to think creatively and to identify other ways in reaching out to suitable participants. In the end, I had to develop my own criteria, blending my indigenous and professional understanding.
1.14 Research Assumptions

Today, there are Fijian artifacts in many museums around the world. Ideally, it would be preferable to have all these artifacts returned to Fiji. The case studies I will discuss at great length in this thesis are the Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology (MAA) at the University of Cambridge in England, the Museum of Anthropology (MOA) at the University of British Columbia in Canada, and some references to the Museum of Victoria in Melbourne, Australia and the Smithsonian Museum in Washington DC in the United States of America.

This thesis aims to research and find out how and why these Fijian artifacts are located in these international museums. As the lead researcher, I have also made references to repatriation examples affecting artifacts that originally belonged to indigenous people from New Zealand, Australia, Canada and the USA.

The ideal answers to the questions raised in this research are for Fijian collections in international museums to be returned to Fiji. This may sound easy however the work that entails such process to be undertaken is rather difficult (but not impossible). After conducting interviews with fellow museum colleagues and iTaukei living in Fiji and abroad, the meaning of repatriation took a different path. With repatriation discussions now on-going, there are absolutely numerous opportunities for Fijian collections in international museums to be researched, documented and developed more into exhibitions and included in the education curriculum in Fiji. It is also envisaged that revival workshops will be organised in Fiji and linked with international museums where artisans such as weavers, pottery makers, carvers and singers, to name a few, can be able to teach younger generations these artforms so they are not lost in the midst of westernisation and modernisation.
1.15 Claim to Originality

This piece of research will contribute immensely to the study of museums’ indigenous collections and repatriation. Since no such study has been done before in this field in the Pacific, including Fiji, this research will:

a) Highlight the need to investigate circumstances surrounding how indigenous artifacts were acquired in the first place and

b) Put in place hands-on solutions of ensuring that indigenous museum collections can benefit contemporary Pacific people to learn more from their past

c) Encourage Pacific and Fijian youths to appreciate their culture and be proud of their identity.

1.16 Outline of Thesis

This thesis is divided into eleven chapters. The purposes and the content of each chapter is outlined below.

CHAPTER ONE provides an overview of the study whose purpose is to examine repatriation of iTaukei treasures in international museums. This chapter contains general discussion of the research topic, rationale and research questions and outlines what this research will aim to achieve in the three areas of appropriation, collections in museums and repatriation.

CHAPTER TWO consists of the Literature Review for this research. This chapter provides a bigger picture context of this research, alongside the postcolonial theory.

CHAPTER THREE consists of discussions on theories of museums, appropriations and repatriations. This chapter examines the anthropology of museums globally and its impact in the Pacific. There are discussions on the overview of museum development
and their roles and functions. Understanding the origin, evolution and role of museums is valuable in this research because it helps researchers to appreciate the mechanisms and purposes that they were formed in the first place. It will also clearly articulate the relevance of museums today and for the future.

CHAPTER FOUR discusses museum collections specifically and looks at cultural appropriations, issues of ownership and repatriation in general. This chapter aims to clarify and de-mystify the museum process of collecting. The term used is appropriation. The governance and repatriation of cultural property have become a new frontier in international law due to the interest they have generated, making headlines and attracting the varied interests of academics and policy-makers, museum curators and collectors, human rights activists and investment lawyers, and artists and economists.

CHAPTER FIVE is focused on the importance of cultural rights, indigenous peoples and repatriation. This chapter will highlight the importance of cultural rights to indigenous peoples in the past and in modern times. In order to extend this discussion to Pacific peoples and with particular focus on Fijians, it is also important to understand the definition of cultural rights from an indigenous perspective. In many indigenous communities around the world, cultural rights also included rights to land and associated natural and cultural resources. These rights were protected under customary laws. Cultural rights is a subset of the discussion of human rights and this chapter will discuss these links and relationships. With some references to pre-colonial examples of cultural rights and ownership, the topic of intellectual property right is presented, and examples from post-World War I shift the focus to the role of the United Nations in recognising the rights of indigenous communities.

CHAPTER SIX consists of the Methodology discussions as to how the research was conducted. As this research was conducted from an indigenous perspective using indigenous methods, it was fitting to highlight methods of interviews and acquiring data that only indigenous scholars can experience and understand. Sharing these experiences will be beneficial.
CHAPTER SEVEN showcases my first case study, the Fiji Museum. This chapter discusses the characteristics and evolution of the Fiji Museum since its establishment in 1904. The changes in the museum’s role were associated with the political situation facing Fiji at the time, and also reflected the decisions made by the various museum boards over the years. The foci for the Fiji Museum were tangible heritage and cultural identity, primarily focused on the Indigenous Fijians’ (known as iTaukei) culture.

CHAPTER EIGHT consists of the second case study, from the Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology in Cambridge, England. Museums in many postcolonial societies reflect their historical ties with the colonial powers. In the case of the United Kingdom and its association with Fiji, this chapter will discuss the political link between the two countries on a macro-level. On a micro-level, there will be a series of discussions relating to the history of the Fijian collection at the Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology (MAA) at the University of Cambridge in UK. This will give us an understanding of how Fijian artifacts were collected in the 1800s, and how they came to be in existence in large quantities at the MAA. The main collector, Friedrich von Hügel, will be the focus of this chapter. He was known to have collected a tremendous amount of Fijian artifacts, which formed the major part of the Ethnology Collection at the MAA.

CHAPTER NINE consists of the third case study, featuring the Museum of Anthropology in Vancouver, Canada. The question of how Fijian artifacts came to be in the MOA is an interesting one to ask and it is fascinating to see the connection between the Fiji Museum and the MOA through the collector Frank Burnett. Numerous changes have taken place in Canada since the critical museum period of museum building in the 1840s. Visiting the MOA and interviewing researchers and academics from the Simon Fraser University make us appreciate how Fijian artifacts came to be in the collections of museums in Canada.

CHAPTER TEN contains research data analysis and results. One such result highlighted the important role that the Pacific Islands Museums Association (PIMA),
Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC), United Nations Education Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and ICOM (International Council of Museums) play in the protection of valuable Fijian treasures.

And finally, CHAPTER ELEVEN is the concluding chapter that suggests a way forward for how Fijian collections, and generally Pacific collections should be viewed and treated with utmost respect within museums and their creator communities. One such method is cultural revival projects, such as skirt revival programs to benefit iTaukei I Fiji and in the diaspora.
2 CHAPTER TWO

VAKALALAWA VA-KOLONI

Postcolonial Theory: Theoretical and Conceptual Perspectives

*This place built on the beach that you call a museum, we have not had such a thing among our people. It is like a storage box, a box of treasures the old people used to have.* (Agnes Alfred, Kwakwakawakw elder, Canada)

2.1 Introduction

Over centuries, cultural objects from various cultures in the colonised world including the Pacific have been collected by amateur and professional collectors (explorers, traders, anthropologists, colonial officials, casual travellers, etc.) and many are stored in international museums. Pacific islands artifacts and imageries have had a strong appeal to the popular imagination of the West over the years. However, in recent years the question of ownership of intellectual property rights has emerged as many indigenous groups around the world call for the repatriation of their cultural objects taken away with or without their ancestors’ consent, as a way of reasserting their cultural rights and in rediscovery of their roots and identity.

Indigenous communities, including those in the Pacific, created many types of functional items for their everyday use. They utilised their surrounding environment for sources of raw materials such as wood, shells, stones, human and animal bones and plants. Anthropologists have categorised these resources into two groups, as ceremonial and everyday use. Those that were created for ceremonial use had more elaborate designs and were created by experienced artisans. Even the quality of the raw material is of higher grade than those that were for everyday use. The quality of the designs
reflected the high status of the current owners of these objects. As a result, such objects were treated with utmost respect.

In a more modern context, some museums debate the concepts of art versus artifacts. In other words, a debate about works of art versus anthropological objects. Conn (2010, p. 29) highlighted how this debate has still not been resolved. Some museologists who have an anthropology background still push the idea that anthropological objects can also be viewed as works of art, even while others disagree. I am interested to explore such debate in this research. This highlights the issue of ownership and associated identity of such objects.

2.2 Museum Definition

According to the Oxford English Dictionary (2015), ‘a museum is a building where objects of historical, scientific, artistic or cultural interest are stored and exhibited.’ (Oxford Dictionary Online, 2015). The International Council of Museums (ICOM) defines the museum as ‘a non-profit, permanent institution in the service of society and its development, open to the public, which acquired, conserves, researches, communicates and exhibits the tangible and intangible heritage of humanity and its environment for the purposes of education, study and enjoyment.’ (ICOM website, 2015). Museums are places where objects are meant to invoke associations to trigger memories and to generate questions (Healey, 1994, p. 34). Some view museums as keepers of the past.

Museums are without a doubt important institutions in any society. Museums are repositories for knowledge and objects of value in many nations. Some view museums as a place for finding solace, cultural reflection and inspiration. Others compare museums to schools and view them as educational institutions where one can learn about their past, culture and tradition. Some view museums as keepers of the past, as museums manage artifacts that previously were used by a group of people, many of whom have passed on. They believe that their elders have left behind a legacy for the new generation to carry on the culture and tradition of a people. Even though museums
may be compared with other institutions, such as schools, it has been argued that museums can provide services to the community that other institutions cannot (Karp, 1992, p. 5).

There are many types of museums. Art museums offer a visual experience to their viewers, while museums of cultural and natural history produce exhibitions with more narrative content. In terms of museum classification in the United States, there are six types of museums and they are: museums of art, historical museums, anthropological museums, natural history museums, technological museums and commercial museums (Conn, 2010, p. 8). Museums are not free from political implications, as communities will always attempt to have a say on how the museum is run and what exhibitions they show (Karp, 1992, p. 2).

Museums help people understand the world by using objects and ideas to interpret the past and present and to explore the future (Museum Australia Constitution, 2002). According to Parman (2006), museums are themselves part of history; they are living institutions that must continually cope with the present and imagine how to prepare for the future. Museums play key roles as they become the link from the past to the present. Key museum activities are collecting, preserving, studying, interpreting and exhibiting (Karp, 1992, p. 3).

From an indigenous perspective, museums are western institutions. The word ‘museum’ has classical origins. In its Greek form, *mouseion*, it meant ‘seat of the muses’ and designated a philosophical institution or a place of contemplation (Lewis, 2012). Museums in the third century were only for the elite, where one could only visit the museum based on their status and educational background. Through time, museums began to open their doors to other members of society. The word ‘museum’ was revived in fifteenth-century Europe to describe the collection of Lorenzo de’ Medici in Florence, but the term conveyed the concept of comprehensiveness rather than denoting a building. This was in the 1700s where, for instance, in Europe learned societies were establishing themselves in regional towns rather than in major cities where the elite were based. Museums were moving away from having private collections to developing
exhibitions for the public to view. The first public museum was the University of Oxford which opened its doors to the public to visit and view its collection (ibid).

In the 1950s, left-wing writers on museums took a critical approach and supported the idea that museums could be perceived as instruments of the elite that are used to assert class-based claims to interpret and control high culture (Karp, 1992, p. 9). Through time and with new forms of museum studies and new ways of collecting, a move towards the new museum was developed. There has been international research and debate around the roles of museums, collections and repatriation that is critical to this research.

2.3 Role of Museums

The role and status of museums are often taken for granted however at the same time, museums were seen to be dominant features of our cultural landscape as they frame our most basic assumptions about the past and about ourselves (Marstine, 2008, p. 1). In comparison with other heritage-led institutions such as libraries and archives, museums are versatile (Bouqet, 2012, p. 3). They are versatile because museums are able to be adaptable to political and cultural changes in society and declare themselves as active players in the making of meaning. Theorists such as McClellan support this by saying that museums have great flexibility and have been metamorphosing continually since their founding (Marstine, 2008, p. 22). According to the new museum theory, it identifies four archetypes of museums: shrine, market-driven industry, colonising space and post-museum (Marstine, 2008, p. x).

Museums were also viewed as a place where artifacts were rescued in times of distress. For example, in the case of the British Museum, it has in its possession artifacts taken from its former colonies under the guise of being rescued during turbulent political turmoil. For instance, the Elgin Marbles that originally belonged to Greece have now became part of the British heritage. The belief at one time was that Britain had come to inherit democracy from ancient Athens, which then justified political decisions including the colonisation and domination of colonised people (Marstine, 2008, p. 2).
Education was a fundamental factor influencing the way museums were built and what audiences could partake in the delivery of exhibitions. Elitism was another factor, where only individuals of high rank were privileged to view exhibitions and take part in the research and what took place behind the scenes. Between 1825 and 1925, there was a rapid increase in the number of museums in the United States (Genoways & Andrei, 2008, p. 9). Marstine (2008, p. 3) supported this when she said that museums have grown exponentially in number, size and variety, and more people go to museums than ever before. Then how did museums begin in the first place? Bouqet (2012, p. 3) highlighted that the field of anthropology has a lot to offer to the field of museum studies.

To further explore the roles of museums, let me outline three views that are commonly discussed: (1) imperial, (2) postcolonial, and (3) neo-liberal.

### 2.4 Museum Perspectives

#### 2.4.1 Imperial view

The word ‘imperial’ has as its Latin origin ‘imperialis’, which means to command, has authority or an empire (Oxford Dictionary, 2015). Another associated word ‘imperialism’ goes hand in hand with colonialism. Both words are associated with power, control and political domination. Some features of imperialism include the increased division ‘between the core and periphery, the competitive hunt for colonies or semi-colonies, the extraction of surplus and securing raw materials to bring back to mother country’ (Magdoff, 2003, p. 14). Upon their return from their conquests, colonialists often made great efforts to mark cities with the signs of empire that included monuments that commemorated battles that were lost and won, churches that contain relics of martyrs, as well as heritage sites that confirmed colonial domination. Particularly interesting and which must be added to the list is the existence of museums that exhibited empire. London, Paris, Brussels and Amsterdam are some cities that have survived the colonial times. Changes that occurred over time can be seen in the way in which their immediate transformation reflected the heritage of imperialism. As a result,
Museums are recording these changes and enabling a process of rediscovery of the legacy of empire. For example, terms such as the ‘British Empire’ and ‘Commonwealth Association of Museums’, as well as new museum initiatives such as the Quai Branly Museum in France, have naturally found themselves at the forefront of important imperial debates. These are examples that comprise major colonialist institutions that possess colonialist collections and displays. With some countries going through the process of decolonisation, objects and displays in their museums that were once designated as ‘colonial’ simply melded into general collections. The challenge facing the inheritors of colonial museums and collections comes from assessing the legacy of the past and establishing its connection with contemporary postcolonial communities (Robert, 2009, p. 2).

Museums were also reserved for the powerful and the elite. This imperialist view began as far back as Babylonian times where King Nebuchadrezzar and Nabonidus collected antiquities. Archaeologists have unearthed remains of a temple school and a tablet that was later identified as a museum label. This discovery revealed that Nabonidus’s daughter had a small museum at that time. In Asia and Africa, Chinese emperors continued to promote art and even in Japan, many temples housed treasures that remained there for centuries. In Islamic communities, people were making collections of relics at the tombs of the early Muslim martyrs. This practice spread into Europe, where the Uffizi Palace in Italy was converted into a museum. This museum consisted of valuable collections that belonged to merchant and banking families. This movement gave rise to “royal collections” and was evident in Hungary, Denmark and England. Museums at that time were viewed as institutions for the learned society and were established to promote corporate discussion, experimentation and collecting. From such arrangement, organisations such as the Royal Society of London (1660) and the Academy of Sciences in Paris (1666) were born (Lewis, 2012).

Even modern museums that are now open to the public still hold the imperial view that museums continue to symbolise high culture, civilisation and cultures of people. The British Museum, for example, is an imperialist institution. The museum owns art and antiquities that it acquired under the aegis of empire. The current debates over the British Museum’s collections raise profound questions about the relationship between
museums and modern nation states and their nationalist claims to ancient heritage. As a result, this illuminates the challenges inherent in presenting empire and its legacy to contemporary, post-imperial audiences (Duthie, 2011, p. 2). Much has been written about the historic role of mainstream museums in Western societies: their concentration of priceless works of art, their collections of meaningful artifacts, and their assertion of themselves as authoritative producers of knowledge about the colonised world (Lonetree, 2008, p. 47). Historically, mainstream museums have been considered the centres of knowledge-making. For instance, in some large museums, Native American communities are represented only on the periphery of discovery. They are only part of the content but not the authors. This pattern of museum representation of North American indigenous peoples is analogous to representation practices associated with colonisation and nation-building elsewhere (ibid). From this discussion, this highlighted the major point that imperial views of museums reflected the power of the colonisers over the colonised. This view includes the idea that museums reflected the powerful and the elite, showcasing their power over the societies such powerful colonisers had conquered.

2.4.2 Postcolonial view

The postcolonial view can be defined as a style of thought which is generally critical not simply of the colonial past but of the continuing effects of that past in the present (Lawson, 2010, p. 2). Even throughout the years, with many nations being part of decolonisation, many museum critics still believe that museums are agents of colonial influence on the colonised nation. In the nineteenth century, the museum was a powerful symbol of empire and the representation of the world. The British Museum, for example, was known as the ‘imperial archive and the most spectacular repository of the material culture of empire’ (Duthie, 2011, p. 15). There is an element of resistance in this view, in particular with those who sympathise with the colonised against the colonisers. For instance, in the case of the United States of America, the Native American communities’ museums and cultural centres embody, represent, and reinforce tribal knowledge, sensibilities, and morality in ways that are not necessarily consonant with conventional museum practices (Lonetree, 2008, p. 44). She goes on to say that for generations, native knowledge structures have been marginalised relative to official versions of knowledge. This does not necessarily mean that these subjugated
knowledges remain marginalised, however – on the contrary, Native American communities’ museums have proven themselves to be innovative centres that attempt to infuse alternative ways of knowing into a public sphere (ibid).

Sterling (2010, p. 192) wrote about Chinua Achebe’s first novel, *Things Fall Apart*, and highlighted how colonists in Nigeria were imperialistic, prejudiced and condescending towards native villagers. Colonisers have negatively changed the society in which Achebe was raised. Before the arrival of missionaries and government officials, local villagers were content with their lives and obeyed cultural customs that ensured stability, order and tradition. Barker (1994, p. 5) highlighted two contrasting views: firstly, how the power of colonialism continued to patronize societies that are colonised, and secondly, how the colonised continue to resist such colonialist ideologies. The latter appropriately sums up the particular view that museums are exploitative to indigenous communities, even in this modern form. The postcolonial view of museums then highlights the never-ending influence of colonial power in the affairs of colonised nations, often giving the first voice to the colonisers within museum exhibitions and story-telling.

### 2.4.3 Neo-liberal view

Neoliberalism is a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterised by strong private property rights, free markets and free trade (Harvey, 2007, p. 2). This theory came about in the 1970s and 1980s as historians viewed this time as a revolutionary turning-point in the world’s social and economic history (ibid). Freedom, creation of wealth and improved well-being are key components of this theory (Harvey, 2007, pp. 5–7). The application of this view to museums is due to the fact that museums are now administered as money-making establishments where profits made are reinvested into the enhancement of museum experiences to patrons.

Recent research has classified museums within the same groupings of theme parks and entertainment centres. Such museums have moved away from their traditional form to a more inclusive, modern way of enticing their visitors who are viewed as customers as
they are required to pay for many services within the museum. Some museums employ full-time grant-writers to request funding from philanthropists and businesses to continue to meet the economic demands of their museum. With high turnover of exhibitions and museum programmes, associated costs have pushed museums to make money, some through paid exhibitions, cafeterias, museum shops and other paid events. Museums within this category are managed like a business and funders expect profits to be made at the end of every year. Marsten (2006, p. 11) highlights how museums today have become part of a market-driven industry. Most museums need funding to operate and the work of museum directors, trustees, development officers, and even curators involves financial decision-making. As a result, many museums have become more open to economic realities and have adopted business models to generate adequate revenues (Marsten, 2006, p. 12).

From these three viewpoints of looking at museums’ roles, it is not difficult to see the impact of early museum theories, from the first century to the present. Let us explore some major theories that I will be basing my research on.

2.5 Theorising Museums

The dominant theoretical movement in the field of heritage and museums that I will be focusing on in this chapter is post-colonial theory. Including this theory in my research supports the notion that there is a strong need to be more explicit about theoretical perspectives. Museum studies will only benefit from some critical theoretical discussions, as it adds quality to heritage debates and its associated research. Theories in museum studies remain influential and successful in understanding museological heritage as a system of production and a method of displaying the past to be understood in the present. Similar to the heritage debates of the mid- to late-1980s in the UK, when there emerged the view that heritage had become an ‘industry’, museums indeed contribute to recording the nation’s past and sharing it for today and for the future. This was a historically informed and culturally significant commentary that moved thinking about heritage away from its objects towards its social and cultural context and significance (Watson & Waterton, 2013, p. 547).
2.6 Postcolonial Theory

The question of how ‘indigenous’ a museum can be, is illuminated by discussions of postcolonial theory. Postcolonial theory, according to Rukundwa (2007), is a means of defiance by which any exploitative and discriminative practices, regardless of time and space, can be challenged. This theory, according to some writers, is linked to race, culture and gender, and concepts of the settler and the native. Most indigenous communities are still not entirely free from colonialism. Despite the past of colonialism in exchange for political independence for some nations, there are still no economic independence. Imperialism and colonialism are still active in various new forms (Rukundwa, 2007, p. 1173). The image below represents how dependent colonies relate to their colonial power.

Figure 2.1. The Motherland and her dependant colonial offspring. (William-Adolphe Bouguereau, 1883).

Colonialism is known as the time period in which colonial rule binds her colonies to herself with the primary object of promoting her economic advantages. According to Rukundwa (2007, p. 1173), colonialism is characterised by mechanisms involving power through direct conquest or through political and economic influence that effectively create a form of domination by one nation over another. There is also a new
form of colonialism often referred to as ‘neo-colonialism’. What differentiates the two is that neo-colonialism is another form of imperialism, where industrialised powers interfere politically and economically in the affairs of nations that have become independent.

Postcolonial theory attempts to focus on the oppression of those who were ruled under colonisation. Some of the factors to be taken into consideration are political oppression, economic oppression, social and cultural oppression and psychological oppression. The oppressed are the ones who were formerly colonised. The word ‘colonised’ in postcolonial theory can mean literal colonisation as well as abstract colonisation. There are numerous examples from around the world where the colonised resisted the colonisers. This can be seen in Haiti, South Africa and India (Costa, 2010). According to Parry (1994, p. 172), the colonised, in most cases indigenous communities, were never fully decolonised. The process of decolonisation was often long and discontinuous. Resistance to such processes often builds up over time and turns into the coloniser/colonised opposition. This is where the resistance theory is played out within society. This is quite similar to the postcolonial theory where the colonised continue to be oppressed. From a Eurocentric point of view, the colonised continue to be subordinate and continue to be dominated (Barker, 1994, p. 22).

Postcolonial theorists believe that the colonisers (usually Europeans) impose their values on the colonised. For instance, language is introduced to replace indigenous languages, and land boundaries are drawn not on tribal land interests but on political purposes. In South America, the Spanish language was introduced and is now prevalently used across the region. In Africa, political boundaries are drawn to reflect the geo-politics of the colonisers. As a result, many colonised people have issues with identity. Many ask themselves why they speak more than one language, or why their families belong to a certain denomination. Museums, as a by-product of colonialism, have to use their collections and exhibitions to reveal such struggles or what some term a “state of limbo”. Hybridisation and double consciousness are the results of postcolonialism (Costa, 2010).
Other museum theories that were developed during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries are *museology* and *museography*. These were the two bodies of theories directly associated with museums. Museums were suffering from a lack of clear identity. In some cases, museums were managed as government services while in other places, professional associations were formed to develop new ideas and provide training where needed. Later, universities and colleges began to take on the responsibility for museum training and research (Lewis, 2012).

Many museums have not trained their staff well in the field of repatriation. Repatriation refers to the return of artifacts to their culture or country of origin regardless of the circumstances under which they were first removed. As once-colonised countries and peoples gain greater autonomy and strength, they are increasingly demanding the return of cultural property. Museums are concerned with acquiring artifacts for their collections and ensuring their future preservation. Repatriation may appear to conflict with the founding principles of museums, however many anthropologists recognise the rights of indigenous people over their cultural heritage (Simpson, 1997, p. 1).

Some museums have developed an arrangement called ‘shared ownership’. This is due to curatorial staff showing their concern over the security and conservation of artifacts that were earmarked for return. Other staff members are concerned with cases of artifacts being looted and destroyed during civil unrest. Some artifacts have even surfaced in international markets, raising the concerns about security and the experience of museum staff in third world nations. Even though such shared arrangement has already been achieved, some are still being contested. Some high profile cases include the Egyptian mummies, Benin bronzes and Parthenon marbles from Greece. They have received high-profile media coverage and have put pressure, in this case on the British Museum, to release such artifacts (Simpson, 1997, p. 1).

The issue of ownership comes to mind when artifacts are requested for repatriation. Since most artifacts that belong to indigenous communities are communally owned, according to the 1989 National Museum of American Indian Act “it was recognised that certain categories of material, being communally owned, could not have been
alienated, transferred, or conveyed by any individual native American (therefore) the museum’s claim to it is invalid, and such items will be repatriated upon request” (Simpson, 1997, p. 67). This is a move that many museums are following, however other museums are debating the role of museums under any repatriation programme. Some argue that the indigenous community, which was part of the repatriation request, should work with a credible host museum so that artifacts that are repatriated must go to this host museum first, as a neutral venue, before it is given back to the community that requested the artifacts in the first place. Host museums are encouraged to take legal ownership of the repatriated artifacts. Some museum staff in international museums are concerned that repatriated artifacts will be sold on the art market or dealt with fraudulently (Simpson, 1997, p. 85).

Some reasons for repatriation in the United Kingdom, according to Simpson (1997, p. 84), were that claimants need these artifacts for religious use or that these artifacts are sacred and used for secret rites. Others claim that based on evidence, they were taken illegally from a host nation. For instance, one of the repatriation claims that attracted considerable attention in recent years was the Benin bronzes, which were looted from Benin City in 1897 by the British Punitive Expedition. The Benin bronzes are figures, plaques, and other items removed from the Oba palace and the homes of chiefs. The claimant was a collective known as African Reparations Movement (UK), letters were sent by its Chairman Bernie Grant, requesting the return of these artifacts, as their return would coincide with the 100-year anniversary of the attack on Benin City. Similar claims are also based on tourism purposes, where repatriated artifacts can be used as tourist attractions. For instance, the Mayor of Pergamon was requesting the return of the Pergamon Gate, now in Berlin (Simpson, 1997, p. 84).

In the case of the Pacific, this research aims to critically examine the issue of ownership and cultural property rights relating to the appropriation of Pacific cultural artifacts now housed in international metropolitan museums. It explores the historical, sociological and legal aspects of cultural ownership and how they apply to Pacific cultural objects and explores the socio-legal and cultural implications of their repatriation.
2.7 Museum and Collections

Museums have a long history that responds to the human natures of collecting and keeping memories alive. Before the modern era, some individuals spent their time and resources collecting artifacts of interest. Through time, some interested individuals have worked in groups to achieve their goal of collecting. Museums have now become institutions that preserve and interpret artifacts that are important to a group of people or for the human race. Museums started collecting in ancient and medieval times and continue to do so today.

Museums though (to some researchers) have plundered to create their collections from a Eurocentric perspective. Marstine (2006, p. 14) highlighted that many claim to have had a benevolent motivation, which was to salvage objects that could not be protected by the source communities. The focus of such collecting was more for the wealth and status of the collector, the museum and the state. It is thus important to identify the key motivating factor for collecting in the first place.

Another debate regarding collections is whether museums need a collection to make it a museum. It is indeed true that collections make a museum, however with new technologies being used in museums today, some are challenging the notion that museums still need museum objects to qualify as a museum. Conn (2010) challenged the known museum reality that collections created museums. In this book, Conn demonstrated that museums are no longer seen as houses of objects but seen as places of knowledge, a place of reflection between culture and politics. Objects, according to Conn, have begun to lose their centrality within the museum. Education officers are hired within the museum to create experiences within the museum. Films and moving images have taken over the focus on objects (ibid).

2.8 Museums and Repatriation

In recent times, repatriation has become an integral issue which involves the federal law of any country. As many indigenous people are involving themselves in research, many are pushing scientists, which includes anthropologists, archaeologists and
museologists, to treat repatriation seriously and respond to this, as an act of human decency (Simpson, 1996, p. 215). The sensitivity surrounding repatriation applies to all types of artifacts, more so for human remains.

Yew (2002) highlighted that a large number of indigenous art and cultural artefacts are kept in western museums, viewed and enjoyed by the European upper class – or hidden away in the private collections of businessmen, travellers, tomb raiders, and soldiers in contact with the colonial world – have had a long and troubled history. Over recent years, such collections have now come under scrutiny by a state, which has found such treatments of collections problematic. He continued to say that

at the same time the claims of ownership by native communities are equally unsettled as issues of the right of ownership, the identity of the owner, and the circumscription of global capitalism and modern property law persistently colour these claims. Hence, much like the diasporic peoples around the world, indigenous art once displaced becomes caught in in-between hybrid spaces, never fully belonging to the countries that host them or to the places they originated. (Yew, 2002, p.1)

Yew (2002) highlighted the issue of ownership here, which will be discussed in CHAPTER FOUR. Within the museum context, the allocation of the rights of ownership is a difficult one to ascertain as numerous artifacts would have changed hands and ownership/custodianship over the years. In certain situations, such transactions are not well documented which makes further documentation even more difficult. Yew (2002) highlighted that some objects were collected in open, legal and transparent circumstances while others were not. For instance, certain objects were given as gifts while others were collected by missionaries as objects of curiosity or to discourage idol worship. He also said that the parties in possession of these cultural objects had wrongfully acquired (the terms ‘plunder’, ‘looting’ and ‘theft’ are often used) them and must, under the purview of modern property law, return them to the rightful owners.
A number of international organisations embody such views, one of which is UNESCO. UNESCO's Convention on the Prevention of the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property and UNIDROIT's (International Institute for the Unification of Private Law) Convention on Stolen or Illegally Exported Cultural Objects. According to Yew (2002), without doubt the discrepancy in the meaning of these artifacts between those who currently possess them and their claimants casts an enduring shadow on contemporary imperial discourse. For the museums that acquired the cultural objects in the heyday of colonialism, the artefacts were to be put on public display to celebrate the vastness and greatness of the empire while reducing these symbols to mere objects under the imperial gaze. Today the attitude towards indigenous art may have shifted to a different register but a similar condescension prevails. Why repatriate them to some obscure private palace in Africa while millions of people can see them at the British Museum? Here a persistent attitude prevails over how the imperial centre values art; art is meant for public edification and its belonging in a museum really depicts cosmopolitan ownership (ibid).

Amidst these debates there are also a number of issues that must be considered. Global capitalism has dramatically transformed the modes of exchange and the use value of objects, and it is through global capitalism and its colonial antecedent that indigenous art becomes commodified. This has led to a fair amount of incommensurability between the original provider and the recipient of native art. What may at one time have been a tribal religious statue may have existed in a relationship with its native possessors in a way that cannot be articulated through the lens of modernity and capitalism. How this transaction occurs becomes untranslatable; at best interpreted under very violent forms of physical force. In other words, this might gives the new owners of indigenous art the right to interpret the circumstances of the exchange. A similar amount of incommensurability also pervades the claims for the repatriation of such art. The original communities that possessed the disputed art have become transformed by colonialism and capitalism in varying ways. New sovereign states may have superseded these communities, and hybrid notions of ownership trapped between traditional and modern views may have become the very elements that propel these claims for artistic repatriation (Yew, 2002).
2.9 Past and Recent Repatriations

Over the years, there have been successful repatriation projects that have taken place in New Zealand, Canada, the United States of America and Australia. Curator of Pacific Anthropology John Edward Terrell and Curator, Robert Martin travelled to New Zealand in September 2007 to participate in the official repatriation of Maori ancestral remains held by the Field Museum. This was the first repatriation of Maori ancestral remains from a mainland museum in the USA (Field Museum website, 2012).

Another unusual aspect of the repatriation was that John and Bob were accompanied by a delegation of seven American Indian representatives, including Joe Podlasek of the Ojibwe Tribe and Executive Director of the American Indian Center in Chicago and Mavis Moneeka Neconish (Menominee Nation, and an American Indian Center Board member) of the Department of Anthropology. The American Indian Center has developed a close and special relationship with Ruatopuke II, the Maori meeting house at the Field Museum. A moving ceremony took place at The National Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa in Wellington on Monday 10th September, 2007, on the marae (forecourt) of the visually stunning modern marae that had been built at Te Papa as a cooperative effort by numerous Maori artists. Favourable news items concerning this event were published the next day in The Dominion Post and in the New Zealand Herald. After the official proceedings at Te Papa, John Terrell and the full Native American delegation travelled on to Pakirikiri Marae at Tokomaru Bay, accompanied by two representatives from Te Papa. Tokomaru Bay is where Ruatepupuke II originally stood until the house was dismantled and sold to a foreigner who exported it to Germany some time late in the last decade of the nineteenth century (ibid). This is a classic example of collaboration between institutions that share the same vision for the benefit of the indigenous people of New Zealand.

With the above example, New Zealand has taken the lead in terms of setting clear pathways on how human remains are repatriated. They have also learnt so well from numerous examples from North America, the United States of America and Australia. The Pacific has a lot to learn from these nations, in particular in dealing with human remains.
Many museums are still not clear with their mandate on dealing with repatriation issues or simply on how to collaboratively work with their communities. It is timely that certain debates on the roles of museums be discussed. Apart from this debate, it is also important to research debates on collection and repatriation.

### 2.10 International Initiatives on Indigenous People

Globally, many international organisations have placed indigenous communities as their paramount focus. This is supported by major organisations such as the United Nations (UN), the International Labour Organization (ILO) and the United Nations Indigenous Peoples Partnership (UNIPP). The United Nations has the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. This declaration outlines the following:

- **Affirming** that indigenous peoples are equal to all other peoples, while recognising the right of all peoples to be different, to consider themselves different, and to be respected as such.

- **Affirming** also that all peoples contribute to the diversity and richness of civilisations and cultures, which constitute the common heritage of humankind.

- **Affirming** further that all doctrines, policies and practices based on or advocating superiority of peoples or individuals on the basis of national origin, racial, religious, ethnic or cultural differences are racist, scientifically false, legally invalid, morally condemnable and socially unjust.

- **Reaffirming** also that indigenous peoples, in the exercise of their rights, should be free from discrimination of any kind.

The International Labour Organization (ILO) also has a convention that supports indigenous people. In the ILO Convention No.169, Article 3(1), it highlights that indigenous and tribal peoples shall enjoy the full measure of human rights and fundamental freedoms without hindrance or discrimination.
The United Nations Indigenous Peoples Partnership (UNIPP) is another international organisation that supports the work and life of indigenous communities. The UNIPP is a collaboration between the International Labour Organization (ILO), the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) to work together to promote the rights of indigenous peoples. UNIPP will be the first global inter-agency initiative with a programmatic focus on indigenous peoples at the country level, supported and complemented by strategic interventions at regional and international levels. While the initiative was launched by leading agencies involved in the promotion of indigenous peoples’ rights worldwide, UNIPP can be expanded to involve other UN-system agencies that express interest in contributing to its goals and thus make the UN work for indigenous peoples (UNDP Fact-sheet, 2012).

2.11 Pacific and Fiji Situation

In the case of the Pacific, colonial administrators were influential in the development of museums. For instance, in the case of Fiji, the Fiji Museum was developed in the 1960s, even though one of its old legislations (the Archaeological and Palaeontological Interests Act) has been in use since 1904. This reflected the growing interest in archaeology and palaeontology in Fiji at that time. Missionaries also took part in collecting artifacts after converting locals to Christianity and destroying their objects of worship, though some of which they took with them. For instance, in 1825, when Rev. John Williams visited the islands of Aitutaki in the Cook Islands, he collected 31 wooden statues (idols) and replaced them with bibles. These statues were taken to the London Missionary Society Museum, and later given to the British Museum. As museum collections started filling up to the brim, some curators began selling artifacts, some of which have reached secondhand shops, or have changed hands amongst art dealers and collectors. Apart from selling, some families (where family member who collected such items have died) have donated collections to museums (Cowling, 2006).
2.12 Concluding Remarks

The extent of where Pacific artifacts are located has spread around the globe. In the case of the Cook Island collection, *Te Rangi Hiroa* (also known as Sir Peter Buck) searched to locate Cook Island objects from the 1920s to 1940s. He located many in the British Museum, in Liverpool, Oxford, Edinburgh, Massachusetts, Auckland and at the Bishop Museum in Honolulu, Hawaii. Given the list of these geographical locations, one has to ask why these places became the final destination of these artifacts. Simpson (1997) noted in her research that requests for the return of artifacts were coming from former colonies in which European nations undertook extensive collecting during the eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Postcolonial theory provides an answer to enable critics to understand.
3 CHAPTER THREE

ITUKUTUKU MAKAWA NI VALE NI YAU MAROROI

History of Museums, Appropriation and Repatriation

[...] museums are not mysteries [...] they are rationally organized institutions directed toward articulable purposes. (Weil, 2002, p. 3)

3.1 Introduction

The present study aims to provide a general overview of the past and present development of museums and the utilisation of heritage by Pacific museums and cultural centres. In achieving this, a better and clearer understanding of what makes a museum different from other heritage institutions should emerge. Defining concepts of museums, appropriation and repatriation is important so that readers understand how museums began and how their roles have developed through time. These concepts and definitions not only facilitate discussions of museums and collections in the course of this thesis but provide a better understanding by which they can be considered and valued by other heritage institutions and relevant bodies. Mead (1983, p. 227) observed that museums do not exist in isolation. He also added that modern day museums are a fusion of traditional and contemporary, international and transnational, indigenous and non-indigenous elements. Placing these museums into contexts enables a more focused examination on how museums have developed over the years and how they have now become important cultural institutions in the Pacific.

This chapter will examine the anthropology of museums globally and its impact in the Pacific. There will also be discussions on the overview of museum development and their roles and functions. Understanding the origin, evolution and role of museums is valuable in this research because it helps researchers to appreciate the purposes to
which they were formed in the first place. It will also clearly articulate the relevance of
museums today and for the future. As far as repatriation is concerned, I will highlight
selected repatriation projects, and will discuss their successes, failures and lessons
learnt. Firstly, I have divided this discussion in terms of historical stages where I discuss
museums in ancient times, and later discuss museums in modern times. Secondly, I will
discuss the origins of museums in the Pacific. Thirdly, I will discuss some Pacific case
studies of repatriation. Overall, this chapter endeavors to articulate the historical
development of museums, the theoretical approaches of museum development in the
Pacific and around the world and relevant case materials in relation to repatriation.
These discussions will be framed in the context of the postcolonial theory.

3.2 History of Museums

The beginning of museums goes back to the time of renaissance when human desired
to understand the world through seeking universal knowledge. Knowledge, according
to Foucault, is acquired through discovering hidden relationships among objects. The
curiosity cabinet involved knowledge-seekers such as aristocrats, scholars, wealthy
merchants, artists and physicians of the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to
create precursors of the museum to represent the world in miniature (Marstine, 2008,
p. 22). The curiosity cabinet became a space of collectibles in the form of objects of
nature and those of humankind. Collectors would fill their cabinets with varying types
of animals, plants, mineral specimens, ethnographic materials, metalwork, mirrors and
many more items. The most highly prized are the rare varieties, those with unusual
shapes such as carved ivory. The diversity of collections reflects the complexity of the
world and centralises humankind’s place in this universe (ibid).

Initially, the curiosity cabinet was only used among collectors as a private space and
not a museum. At this time, the word ‘museum’ was seldomly used and it only meant
a reading room where the muses can be studied. This cabinet however, over time,
expanded and provided viewing opportunities not just for dignitaries but for a cross-
section of scholars, artists, bookbinders, jewellers and other craft-workers as a
professional resource of learning. Some employed agents later became curators and
their role was to obtain objects for the collections. Inventories were developed, which
is now known as catalogues. Some others employed conservators, who were mainly artists hired to repair damage to the collections (Marstine 2008, p. 23).

### 3.3 Museums and Memories

It is best to reflect on human memories, and how we, as individuals or as a social group, tribe or society attempt to keep our memory and history alive for the sake of our future generations. This is an action that can be done in the confines of our homes (through our family heirlooms, photo albums etc.) or done publicly, through physical spaces and proper buildings that one must enter to view displays that evoke memories and allow the viewer to learn about their history (Crane, 2000, p. 1). Memory is not a passive process as it evokes emotions and desires, either positive or negative, and is also driven by a desire to remember or forget. One way of solidifying memories is through creation of forms of representation, in objects that we touch and see (ibid). Museums then have become storehouses, a repository of memory, and the location of the collections that form the basis of cultural or national identity (Crane, 2000, p. 4). Ernst (2000, p. 17) supports this position, that “all museums are store-houses or containers of cultural heritage. They all participate in a universal adherence to preservation of memories”. Museums, then, have become places where memories are forged in physical form to prevent the natural erosion of memory, both personal and collective (Crane, 2000, p. 9).

### 3.4 Museums of Ancient Times

*Musaeum* was traditionally defined as the place where muses dwell (Findlen, 2000, p. 164). Wittlin (1949, p. 1) believed the word ‘museum’ to have originated in ancient Greece. The Museum of Alexandria is believed to be the world’s first museum (Genoway & Andrei, 2008, p. 13). It was built in the third century BCE by Ptolemy Soter (Butler, 2007, p. 17). Prior to the building of this museum, temples were built and dedicated to the nine goddesses and used by *muses* or learned men and women that studied the ancient Greek philosophies. Later museums have become known as the houses of knowledge (Findlen, 2000, p. 164). Greek author Timon of Philius wrote about the muses:
[I]n the populous land of Egypt, they breed a race of bookish scribblers who spend their whole lives pecking away in the cages of the Muses. (Findlen, 2000, p. 164)

The museum was also connected to the Great Library of Alexandria. This museum began the process of collecting astronomical and surgical instruments, as well as elephant tusks and hides of rare animals (Wittlin, 1949, p. 1). Supporting Genoway and Andrei (2008), collections that began in the museum in Alexandria were scientific collections. As time went by, other types of artifacts were collected and added to the existing ones. Elements of sacred temples and of an educational institution seem to have been combined in the Greek schools of Philosophy. These museums became the source of inspiration for the development of museums in the beginning of the Renaissance (Lee, 1997).

Strabo, the Greek geographer and historian of Amaseia, mentioned that the museum was part of the royal palace. There was also a large house where learned men (mostly philosophers) would gather with their leader, a priest, who was also in charge of the museum. Such priests were appointed by the King and later, priests’ appointments were made by Caesar (Genoway & Andrei, 2008, p. 15). Philosophers utilised museum spaces as their place of intellectual research and debate. As a result, the study of philosophy was regarded as a service to the Muses (Wittlin, 1949, p. 1). The significance placed on Alexandria as the birthplace of museums has made the British Museum and the Louvre, among others, feel that they all share the same ancestry and therefore they are referred to as the latter day Alexandrian mouseion (Butler, 2007, p. 18).

Ernst (2000, p. 18) mentioned that the musaeum was an epistemological structure that encompassed a variety of ideas, images and institutions. He further added that the museum was a text, occupying a position in the field somewhere between *bibliotheca*, *thesaurus*, *studio*, *galleria* and *theatrum*. The muses focused a lot of their time and
energy on developing new philosophies that related to life in the ancient world. In contrast, the role of postmodern museums is to teach museum users how to cope with information in museums. Museums became known as the inventory of the world (ibid).

3.4.1 Museums in Medieval Times

In medieval times, storehouses, royal treasure troves and curiosity cabinets began the process of museum development. The Enlightenment and Romantic thinkers added historical values to economic, scientific and aesthetic values of objects and this prompted the construction of museums for the preservation of the past. In modern times, historical museums and heritage museums have expanded tremendously and scholars are now focused on the way the past has been interpreted for the present and for national audiences (Crane, 2000, p. 4). Museums, then, have become more than cultural institutions and showplaces of objects. They have become sites of interaction between personal and collective identities and between memories and history (Crane, 2000, p. 12). Hagen (born in 1876) who was a Professor of Entomology at the Museum of Comparative Zoology at Harvard University (1867 to 1893), noted that temples were used in the past to house artifacts that were collected from travels around the world. For example, Alexander the Great gave the horns of the Scythic bulls, which were exceedingly rare, to the temple of Delphi. Similarly, the horn of the steer from Macedonia presented by King Philip to the temple of Hercules (Genoways & Andrei, 2008, p. 40). Over time, these temples became repositories of such artifacts, however the methods of how items were kept and their associated maintenance has been a subject of interest. Many artifacts, most of them from the natural sciences, were lost and destroyed. Preservation, as a result, through time became apparently important, and scientists began to develop ways of ensuring that they last long and can be enjoyed over many years (ibid).

After Christ’s death on 33 CE, the collection of natural materials slowed down. Historians noted the emphasis placed on written materials and language translations from Arabic to Latin. In the middle ages, collection of natural materials continued. During the time of the crusaders, collections of medicinal plants, fossils, minerals and shells increased due to their frequent voyages to foreign countries. Fortunately, many
of these collections were preserved; for example, the feet of a griffin and some teeth of
the hippopotamus were kept in the treasury of St. Denis in France (Genoways & Andrei,

3.4.2 Museums in the Fifteenth Century

By the middle of the fifteenth century, the invention of printing began and, at the same
time, the way around Africa to the East Indies and the Americas was discovered. These
new discoveries led to the overwhelming amounts of gold and silver that were taken
from these newly discovered countries. Europe was inundated with these new materials
(Genoways & Andrei, 2008, p. 41). Soon after was the time of the reformation where
fashion, study and knowledge became commodities that were sought after by all levels
of society, not only the elite. Art definitely advanced further than science, due to the
arrival of the learned Greek after the destructions of the Greek empire. Soon after the
discovery of these materials, came the invention of alcohol. Apart from its use for
preservation of natural materials, it was also used for medicines and for social use.
Alcohols use for preservation in the museum context increased after 1483, even though
alchymists had known the fluid in the past (ibid).

The use of paper was well known in the East, however due to the large taxes placed on
them, its use became gradually less. Cotton paper was carried by Arabs to North Africa
in the tenth century, and two centuries later, to Spain. The cost of producing papers was
quite high, so manufacturers developed new ways of producing them cheaply. This led
to the development of botanical collections and the name ‘herbarium’ was born

There was a huge interest in studying new objects collected overseas. As the use of the
printing press increased, lists of collections were developed with the idea of sharing
their facts to be known around the world in a short space of time. Traders and merchants
were influential in the quick spread of such lists. Samuel Quickelberg, a learned
physician of Amsterdam, published his list in 1565 in Munich. His was followed by
Conrad Gesner who published a catalogue of the collection of Johann Kenntmann, a prominent physician in Torgau, Saxony. This collection was contained in a cabinet with thirteen drawers, each with two partitions, and about sixteen hundred objects which included minerals, shells and marine animals. (Genoways & Andrei, 2008, p. 42)

These collections became so important that students made long journeys to view them (Genoways & Andrei, 2008, p. 41). Such catalogues became important methods of informing those interested in their collections. Similar catalogues were published by Mercati from Rome, Imperati from Naples, Palissy from Paris and Thurneisser from Berlin. Princes and others of noble birth began to possess their own collections. They contained celebrated medicines that were paid according to their weight in gold (ibid).

The high demand of such collections led to the creation of new and important officers called conservators. They were trained to ensure that collections were maintained and would be enjoyed by students of the future. As the collection “revolution” heightened, collections began to change from remaining private to becoming public museums, as we have today. In comparison to the private collections, only those who could afford to view such collections were able to do so. French museums took the lead in opening up their museums to the public and others around the world followed (Genoways & Andrei, 2008, p. 47).

3.4.3 Museums in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century

During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, scholars were favouring museums as key sites for a wide variety of cultural endeavours. Rooms were set aside and filled up with objects such as books, manuscripts, paintings, sculptures, medals, scientific instruments and other artifacts from around the learned world. Every artifact was important, and even those that were large in size were disassembled and divided up into pieces to make them easy to transport (Findlen, 2000, p. 161). The majority of museums were enjoying regular visits from princes, clerics, and scholars who wrote about the
qualities of museums in their letters and travel journals and discussed in their conversations. By the end of the Renaissance, the museum had become the standard reason of travel for learned visitors, which gave status to collectors. Collectors aimed to revive the past and their collections reflected their claim to possess historical information that belongs to the human race (Findlen, 2000, p. 162).

During the birth of the Renaissance in Europe, memory was still the central feature in the birth of museums. Cicero described it as the Thesaurus of inventions, while sixteenth century scholars labeled it as the mother of knowledge and Vico mentioned it as the mother of muses (Findlen, 2000, p. 162). Egypt, Greece and Rome were important places through the creation of a genealogy of knowledge by Renaissance collectors. Collectors then argued that without tangible artifacts and/or gifts, the permanency of one’s legacy was never assured (Findlen, 2000, p. 168).

3.4.4 Museums in the Eighteenth Century

In the mid-eighteenth century, the need to impose order led to the development and reliance on systems of classification. The system of Carl Linneaus (later known as the Linnean taxonomy) was adapted and classifications and hierarchies were set in motion. Collections of natural history and art were separated and each genre developed its own protocols of display. New priorities for collections were developed as a result of this new classification (Marstine, 2008, p. 23). In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the French Revolution and the rise of Napoleon marked the end of the elitist institution and the beginning of a democratic culture. For example, the Louvre Museum, which was opened in the former royal palace, was decreed in 1792 to be a public museum. This museum was a tool to further nation building and opened to all citizens to view and learn from. As Napoleon collected more objects across Europe, the staff employed to manage the collections in this museum increased, and physical space for storage also increased (Marstine, 2008, p. 25).
3.4.5 Museums in the Nineteenth Century

In the 1800s, the emergence of modern museums took place. Museums began to be specialised and compartmentalised into specific categories of arts and sciences. Fine arts were particularly differentiated from other “arts fields” such as what researchers refer to as “academic arts”, which includes history, auxiliary sciences, poetry, philology, physics and mathematics (Ernst, 2000, p. 19). For Greeks, art took place in temples. As time moved to more recent history, museums now began as substitute temples. This meant that special buildings should be built to cater for the proper display of fine arts such as paintings (ibid). One example is how Anton Raphael Meng’s painting of the Museo Pio-Clementino in Rome (1772) on the ceiling of the Camera dei Papiri not only links the Vatican Library with the Vatican Museum but can link two discourses of history and archaeology (Ernst, 2000, p. 21).

Through time, one aspect of ancient museums has changed and this is the notion of museums as belonging only to or visited only by the elites of society. The understanding of the word ‘culture’ has become more universalist and humanistic rather than being elitist. Race, anthropology and geography have become more inclusive and, in the discussion of museums in this modern time, have moved on much further from when the concept of museum began (Marchand, 2000, p. 198). For instance, Buddhas, African figurines, and Oceanian masks are highly valued in intellectual and in monetary terms. Trading of such artifacts can take place now in comparison to the early days of museums in the third century (ibid).

3.5 Summary of Museums of Ancient Times

Thus far we can see that the main features of museums in ancient times involved worship of gods and goddesses and that the temple was viewed as the place of worship and a knowledge bank. As museums became known as houses of knowledge, the reputation of learned men and women soared and the muses, as they were known then, were on an equal level to philosophers. Access to these places was only for the elite. As time passed, the collections varied and included collections of astronomical and surgical instruments, and hides of rare animals which led to the development of the
zoology field of study. Alcohol was manufactured and used to preserve animals. Some collectors began developing records and lists, which were exchanged among collectors. As travel became popular among the nobles, they also wanted to develop their own collections that reflected their interests and knowledge of the world. Overall, most of these muses and collectors were interested in the formation of the human race and classes of humankind. The classification of people had begun, in particular in the categorising of those who are powerful over those who are not. There was also a quest for knowledge and the studies of the animal kingdom, of minerals, and of astronomy added value to their search for knowledge. The result of such quests was the formation of museums in many parts of the ancient world.

3.6 Museums in Modern Times

Today, museums vary in their origin, discipline, scale, governance, structure, collections, sources of funding, endowment, staffing, facilities and community setting (Weil, 2002, p. 5). There are many types of museums. Some are privately owned while others are publicly funded. There are also science museums while others are based on art, ethnology and history (Genoways & Andrei, 2008, p. 10). The origin of museums goes back to the ancient times, where artifacts were kept for educational and religious purposes (see section on Museums of Ancient Times).

Museums in modern times are increasing in numbers and they vary in size, types and narratives (Macdonald, 1996, p. 1). In the 21st century, the term ‘museum’ and its meaning has been debated. One such debate is questioning whether the focus of museums is collections or people. Modern museums are more inclined to satisfy the need of visitors, moreso if they have to pay to enter and to ensure that programmes and activities in the museum satisfy the needs of these museum visitors. Another debate is whether funding is paramount in order to provide a service, compared to the past where the learning from the objects was the priority. Museums, then, should be accessible places for encounters for everyone (Butler, 2015). The narrow meaning is of a particular building or institution but now museums are looked upon as a “potent social metaphor and as a means whereby societies represent their relationship to their own history and to that of other cultures” (ibid). Museums today are more than just buildings, however
Dana (in Genoways & Andrei, 2008, p. 137) is critical of new museums who are so focused on their sheer size and architecture that they remain isolated from their communities.

Museums today are frequently seen on the news and also in the ever-expanding literature on museology. As mentioned earlier – that the number of museums have increased in an unprecedented rate – museums are also diversifying in form and content. Some museums are tackling controversial subjects for example, the Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington DC; the Museum of Famine, Ireland and exhibitions on colonialism, warfare, gender and on sexuality (Macdonald, 1996, p. 1). They have also opened themselves up to diverse communities and exhibiting collections that would not have been thought of before, for instance, the Canadian Fluffs and Feathers exhibition (ibid).

Overall, the past is always the concern of museums (Lumley, 1988). Through the last century, technological advancement has greatly influenced the way museum experiences and are programmes are offered to museum visitors. More emphasis is given to sound, electronic buttons and experiential exhibitions that enable visitors to be physically engaged in activities. Macdonald (1996, p. 2) noted that museums are using new media and new techniques of creativity. Some museum critics compare these museums to theme parks, deviating from how traditional museums should be. In New Zealand, one example is the newly built five-storey Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa, located in Wellington. It has a lot of interactive machines for its visitors and its galleries are in no way close to its predecessor, the Museum of New Zealand (previously located on Buckle Street), which had a much more traditional feel (ibid).

Museums today are also used to celebrate political events that celebrate certain cultures. For instance, the Holocaust Museum in Germany is a museum dedicated to the effects of the two World Wars that devastated the Jewish population under the leadership of Adolf Hitler. History, in this case, is used as a political resource whereby national identities are constructed and forms of power and privilege are justified and celebrated (Lumley, p. 1988).
In the United Kingdom, the development of heritage museums has increased over the years. Even though the British Museum was founded in 1753 and is one of the oldest and greatest public funded museums, it is one of the museums that has contributed to the development of new museums around the UK. Many smaller museums pay tribute to the British Museum for setting standards and leading the way in the field of museology. Over the years, museum developments are proceeding at different rates, bringing with them demand for professionalism and training (Wilson, 2002, p. 2).

3.7 Types of Museums

As discussed earlier, there are many types of museums, and this is highly dependent on the type of artifacts being collected and exhibited as well as the target audience. Science centres, natural history museums, history museums, university museums and historic houses are some types of museums that are found around the world.

Most science centres around the world were built in the 1980s. Those who were behind the development of science centres were science academics who envisaged science learning outside the school and university system. Others felt that there were lower numbers of enrolments in the science fields and the development of such centres was an effective way to engage with communities who least understood science. Science centres should not be compared with science museums as these museums, such as the natural history museums, have collections with a focus on scholarly research and static exhibitions. The focus of science centres, on the other hand, is excitement, interactivity and as one advocate said, they are ‘minds on, not just hands on’ (Gore, 2011). Some museums have a science centre within their infrastructure, for instance the Waikato Museum of Art & History in Hamilton, New Zealand. One of the benefits of such centres, according to Miles and Zavara (1994, p. 2) is that museums and science centres were putting cities and regions on the cultural map. They also cater to schools that have a science focus and allow pupils to have a hands-on experience in experimenting with scientific processes. In the case of Australia, the first science centre was opened in Canberra in 1983 and was called Questacon. Soon after, many more science centres
opened up around the country. Since the UNESCO World Conference on Science in 1999, there has been a worldwide recognition of the significance of science education and public engagement (Gore, 2011).

Natural History Museums are museums of science that mainly focus on scholarly research and exhibit their collections in a usually static manner. Staff of these museums must have a science background with a high degree of dedication, understanding of science and communication skills (Gore, 2011). According to Genoway and Andrei (2008, p. 23), the Charles Wilson Peale’s Philadelphia Museum is the first public natural history museum in the United States, and was founded in 1794. Peale’s collection was merged with the collections of the American Philosophical Society (APS). Even though his collections contained more scientific materials, he was able to exhibit his own paintings, and those that he painted of his sons.

History museums focus on the history of a place and the artifacts and stories being told through the exhibits lean more towards the origin of the people that live there and the social activities that make that particular place unique and special. These museums are in contrast to the science museum, where the content leans towards the sciences while history museums document the peopling of a place and how they have come to live in a particular place in a given period of time. University museums, on the other hand, were established within the confines of the universities. For example, the Ashmolean Museum at the Oxford University in the United Kingdom is the first museum to be established within the confines of a university. In 1677, Elias Ashmole donated his collections, or cabinet of curiosities, which included natural history specimens, antique coins, books and engravings to the university (Genoway & Andrei, 2008, p. 19).

Historic house museums are common in many cities in the United States. These museums form a very important part of the cultural heritage of a nation as they represent places and homes of individuals who have contributed tremendously to the country (Butcher-Younghans, 1993, p. 3). In New Zealand, internationally famous author Katherine Mansfield’s Wellington home was turned into a museum after she died. Her residence has become a place where her fans travel to from many parts of the world to
visit and learn more about her. Her home showcases her typewriter that she used for her writing, and has been left as it was since she passed away in 1922 (katherinemansfield.com, August 2015). In Hamilton, the Waikato Museum of Art and History manages a historic house known as Beale Cottage. This is one of the last remaining cottages in New Zealand from the 1870s, an historic house that belonged to a surgeon by the name of Dr. Charles Bernard Beale. His house was used as a registry and a surgery in 1872. The Hamilton City Council manages the property and it is a well-preserved example of the modest domestic architecture of 1870 and is relatively in its original order (NZ Heritage, 2014).

In this industrial world, a new type of museum, called Open Air Museums, aims to preserve and display structures and customs of their more recent past. One example is the Open Air Museum in the Netherlands that opened in 1912, and the Welsh Folk Museum, opened in 1947 in Cardiff, Wales. These types of museums preserve and restore buildings or entire settlements in situ (History of Museums, 2015). Ecomuseum is another recent museum development where the community members themselves, rather than specialists, interpret human and natural environments, generating a better understanding among its inhabitants of the reasons for cultural, social, and environmental change. Virtual Museums are popular in this new millennium where museums use a website through the internet to showcase collections of digitally recorded images, sound files, text documents and other data of historical, scientific or cultural interest that can be accessed through electronic media. Even though it does not house actual objects, it works through digitised representation that can be a powerful tool for comparative study and for research into a particular subject material or locality (History of Museums, 2015).

### 3.8 Functions of Museums

Why do we have museums? What do they do? These are two fundamental questions that concern museums in general. Answering these questions will enable us to understand the functions of museums. From the outset, it is important to mention that social issues of the day influence the way museums are run (Genoway & Andrei, 2008, p. 49). Lumley (1988, p. 2) says that museums’ function has been to present ideas to a
wider public in three dimensional and accessible forms. Museums thus have become an important vehicle for representing the past. Some researchers have included memory as an indicator of a museum in comparison to other institutions. Crane (2000, p. 1) asked the question: in what ways do museums and memories shape each other? One key function of the museum is engagement with professional museum activities concerning collections, research, exhibitions and the public (Bouquet, 2012, p. 3). These are the activities that I will discuss in detail in this section.

3.8.1 Function of Museums as a Memory Keeper Through Collections

According to Crane (2002, p. 2), memory is not a passive process; it evokes emotions and desires, positively or negatively charged and memory has become sensible and visible. She continues to say that museums, like memories, exist on several levels: visitors encounter them as spaces; buildings in the physical space of architecture; portable versions via catalogues; life experiences of visitors, and in the theoretical sense, encompassing cultural identity and scientific knowledge

In the 1980s, a considerable amount of research on the history of museums started. A new body of research and discussion found the importance of knowing the social, cultural and institutional significance of museums to any community. The result of this research found that there was an increase in the building of new museums and also an increase in visitor attendance. Museums have thus become increasingly familiar institutions in daily life and in scholarship. Museums have become part of everyone’s life. Museums have become known to be a choice for visits or to learn about the past. Museums have now become a place where people reflect on their personal experiences, and learn to view the world differently from the knowledge that exists in our memories (Crane, 2002, p. 2).

Genoway and Andrei (2008, p. 51) mention how museums were described as object libraries. This confirms my position that what makes a museum is the collection it holds. Museums give value to collections, as well as the information the museum visitor
acquires (Crane, 2000, p. 2). Following are some ways that artifacts are collection sources: a) by gift, b) by purchase, c) by exchange, d) by collection and exploration, and f) through deposit or temporary loan (Genoway & Andrei 2008, p. 119).

The following museum roles, which are directly related to objects and collections in general are listed here: collecting, ordering, representing and preserving information. The function of collection is therefore critical for any museum. Museums employ physical objects within the field of culture, and they, in turn, materialise artifacts. They have also specialised in displaying these objects, as well as helping museum visitors to structure their way of seeing and comprehending the world (Macdonald, 1996, p. 7).

![Figure 3.1 Four key museum roles.](image)

**3.8.2 Function of Museums through Research**

Museums have become sites of anthropological research into public culture (Bouqet, 2012, p. 3). Generally, museums refer to a collection of specimens of almost any character that is connected with education or enjoyment. There was a big emphasis on research and intellectual thinking, not so much on the collecting of artifacts. Wittlin (1949, p. 2) discussed how subjects of research were wide ranging, from medicine, to religion, myths, geography and philosophy. Power of knowledge was significant at this time. From the 1600s to the 1700s, publications resembling the name museum/muse developed; for example, in 1600 the *Museum Metticulum* was available and it contained
information on metals, by metal collector Aldrovandi of Bologna. In 1704, Dr. M.B. Valentini published *Museum Museorum*, which is a survey of all materials and spices for chemists and their customers. More publications were also published, featuring different topics and materials from both the natural worlds and the arts (ibid).

### 3.8.3 Function of Museums as Educational Institution through Exhibitions

Museums, over time have developed the role of displaying objects to inform and educate their visitors. Exhibitions have given voices to the ignored and allowed representation of multiple voices (Macdonald, 1996, p. 8). Modern museum displays tend to freeze time, achieving a state beyond time (Crane, 2002, p. 3). Museums are known to have displays or exhibitions that showcase stories of artifacts for visitors to view, read and learn from. Grouping of objects began with zoological and botanical collections first (Ward, in Genoways & Andrei, 2008, p. 241). This types of classification later moved to also include geological and anthropological materials, which was pleasing to the visitors. Ward also highlighted the method of display and labels, and the quality of information that should be included on labels. It is important to note that labels for the type of exhibition (scientific or anthropological) differs, however the key is to ensure that visitors understand and appreciate the message that curators are trying to send through the displays and exhibitions. Lumley (1988, p. 2) confirmed that museums have become a place for visiting exhibitions, eating, studying, conserving and restoring artifacts, listening to music, seeing films, holding discussions and meeting people.

### 3.8.4 Functions of Museums Through Services to the Public

Museums provide the opportunity for physical movement of visitors through galleries, which creates encounters between a visitor and an artwork. Museums can add to nation building, where a nation can be imagined. Museums are also contact zones where people who were formerly spatially and politically separated through colonialism are brought together through historical collections in new and unpredictable ways (Bouquet, 2012, p. 3). One example is the Quay Branly Museum, whose reason for its existence
was based on this notion. Diaspora from the African continent, many of whom live in Paris, found themselves fortunate to have access to valuable collections originally collected from their home country. Such collections often provide different and mixed feelings between visitors from their home country and those of the diaspora. Both views on such collections are valid, whether one lives on mainland Africa or lives as an immigrant in France.

Over time, there has also been an increase in the amount of critical commentary on museums. At the end of 1980s, there was increased number of publications whose aim was to develop the study of museums. As a result, museology was born (Macdonald, 1996, p. 13). In the UK, new museums are being set up at the rate of one a fortnight. In France, they were building new museums or reusing current buildings to make new ones. In West Germany, the Frankfurt City Council was creating eleven museums along the River Maine in 1990. In Japan and USA, the boom was also on an even bigger scale. Attendance also increased. It is timely for Lumley (1988, p. 2) to say that museums are “no longer a building at all, but is a site, as in the case of open air museums, and is found in the towns and countries too.”

The increase in numbers of museums at the end of the twentieth century is indicative of the fact that societies are changing. Voices of people that are not normally heard or listened to are shared through museum exhibitions. Each exhibition is a statement of position. This new wave of museum change has also been taking place in the Pacific. Before and during the colonial independence of many Pacific countries, museums were built to facilitate research and collection of Pacific artifacts repatriated from international museums, or collected by museum directors and anthropologists who worked among the islands in the early 1900s. There are 45 museums and cultural centres in the Pacific that are registered with PIMA.

### 3.9 Origins of Museums in the Pacific

It is important in this section to identify factors that contribute to the development of museums in the Pacific in general. I will endeavour to discuss museum development in
the west Pacific islands of Papua New Guinea, Fiji, New Caledonia and the Solomon Islands. In the northern Pacific, I will discuss Belau National Museum and Guam Museum. To the east of the Pacific, I will highlight the islands of Marquesas, Hawaii and New Zealand and their museums as case studies.

The museum is a western concept, however it is critical to note that historically, learned men and women operated an educational system within their communities. In Polynesia, indigenous curators traditionally exist to put together educational programmes for the young and old. Those who specialise in song and dance are called Punake in Tonga, Kumu Hula in Hawaii and Tufunga in Samoa (Tonga, 2012). Museums, to western individuals, are different to people of the Pacific. Welsh (2007, p. 207) mentioned that for most Pacific communities, artifacts stand for important traditions, ideas, customs and social relations that are required to continue within their community. Preservation might be an important process for outsiders as, to indigenous Pacific people, artifacts were always remade, re-carved, re-painted or newly assembled for a purpose. In some Pacific societies, ritual paraphernalia should be destroyed following a ritual or performance and should not be preserved. For Pacific people, if an object is lost or damaged or destroyed, it can always be made once more. To them, stories, traditions, performances and relationships among people and between people and places are more important (ibid). In the Pacific, the community and culture itself was the museum rather than a specialised institution.

3.9.1 Museum Development in the Western Pacific

3.9.1.1 Papua New Guinea

Stanley (2007) discussed the development of museums in the Western Pacific with a specific focus on Papua New Guinea. Lessons from this part of the region could be applied across the Pacific. Even though the Pacific is geographically situated in the southern hemisphere, mostly in isolation from the rest of the developed world, Pacific museums are part of the international fabric and do not exist in isolation (2007, p. 227). The earliest Pacific museum to be built was in 1908, by Richard Thurnwald who settled on the island of Buin, to the north of Bouganville, in Papua New Guinea. He built an open-air museum, which consisted of models of houses from different parts of Papua
New Guinea and furnished with indigenous furnishings (Stanley, 2007, p. 2). People flocked to see this museum and paid an entrance fee in natural products, which Thurnwald collected with the notion of keeping them for posterity purposes, knowing that there is constant threat to indigenous cultures of the Pacific (ibid).

Figure 3.2 Entrance to Papua New Guinea National Museum, Port Moresby. Source: PNG Museum

Apart from this open-air museum, Papua New Guinea then built their National Museum and Arts Gallery, which is situated in Waigani, next to the National Parliament in Port Moresby. The museum was filled with collections that were collected by patrol officers from the early 1900s. Other staff continued to collect until the formation of the colonial Department of District Services and Native Affairs in 1953. This museum holds the largest national ethnographic and archaeological collection. Papua New Guinea has an interesting political history as it was ruled by both Germany and Britain. These political affiliations affected the nature of how Papua New Guinean artifacts were collected and distributed internationally (Welsh, 2007, p. 209). One example is the first official collection accumulated by Sir William Macgregor, who served as the Lieutenant-Governor of British New Guinea from 1888 to 1898. During these ten years, he intended to document pre-contact material culture of the communities that he visited and this established a strong relationship with the people. This collection consisted of nearly 8000 artifacts, which he lodged in trust with the Queensland Museum in
Australia. Before his death, he made it clear that the collection belonged to the people of Papua. This collection was repatriated to Papua New Guinea in the year 2000.

3.9.1.2 Fiji

Most Pacific museums were formed by expatriates who were working in colonial administration and could foresee the importance of museums to local communities. For example, the Fiji Museum was established based on the Friends of the Museum Society, which comprised scientists who had a lot of interest in Fiji’s history and its associated cultural and natural heritage. I deliberately mention natural heritage given the fact that most members were scientists in the fields of botany, biology, archaeology and geology. Bruce Palmer, who was museum director in the 1960s, was influential in the development of proper museum collection during his time. The arrival of Fergus Clunie twenty years later contributed to the increase in the number of wooden carvings such as utilitarian items (bowls, food pounders), war clubs, spears and kava bowls. Clunie also contributed to the development of Yalo I Viti, a publication that showcased Fijian artifacts. Many of the artifacts in this book were brought back to Fiji from the United Kingdom through the generous sponsorship of British Petroleum (BP) in 1980s and have formed the core part of the current museum collection. Staff that manage such collections are local indigenous Fijians who are trained on the job and also overseas.

Figure 3.3. Fiji Museum. Source: Fiji Museum website.
3.9.1.3 New Caledonia

The development of cultural centres is critical to discuss as this became popular in the early 1990s (or example, the Tjibaou Cultural Centre in New Caledonia). According to Losche (2007, p. 73), it is not just a cultural centre but the “star of cultural centres” in the Pacific. It has the ability to harness global interests as well as local ones, in particular for the Kanak people. The Centre was funded by the French government and was designed by Renzo Piano, an Italian architect, who won the tender to build this outstanding architectural wonder, one of the best in the region. The centre was named after Jean-Marie Tjibaou, who was assassinated in 1987. He was not simply a Kanak leader but the voice of a generation and the leader who was destined to lead New Caledonia into the future (ibid).

Figure 3.4. Tjibaou Cultural Centre, Noumea, New Caledonia. Source: [http://www.office-tourisme.nc](http://www.office-tourisme.nc)

Apart from the Tjibaou Cultural Centre, there are other museums in New Caledonia, one of which is the Museum of New Caledonia, which is based in downtown Noumea. This is a history museum that showcases both traditional and modern aspects of New
Caledonian society, as well as other cultures that call New Caledonia home. In contrast to the Tjibaou Cultural Centre, Kanak culture is also a core part of its exhibition programme but also features other cultures from the Pacific and around the world.

New Caledonia also has a Maritime Museum and other regional museums that spread across the country. One such cultural centre is located on the island of Lifou. The centre also has a dance group called the *Troupe de Wetr*, where most of the members are indigenous Kanaks who performed at the Festival of Pacific Arts in the Cook Islands in 1992. This dance group was formed at the request of Chief Paul Sihaze of Lifou, who saw the cooperation required to bring the community together. During the late 1980s, the pro-independence Kanak people fought the French government. When the newly formed *Troupe de Wetr* was formed, it not only served in community cohesion, it also developed into a cultural think-tank for the people of Lifou (LeFevre, 2007, p. 79). Even though the cultural centre in Lifou also caters for the tourism demand on the island, it has indirectly given a voice to the Kanak people of Lifou to share their culture and traditions with their island visitors. It is also difficult to compare such cultural centres with the Tjibaou Cultural Centre in Noumea.

![Figure 3.5. Entrance to Solomon Islands National Museum, Honiara.](image)

### 3.9.1.4 Solomon Islands
The Solomon Islands National Museum was established in 1969 with financial assistance from the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation in the United Kingdom. A group of expatriates, many of whom were colonial officers in the 1950s visited villagers and later kept gifts that were given to them during their visits. Over time, these officers collected their gifts and placed them together on top of filing cabinets in government offices corridors. The collection was moved to the Teachers College prior to the establishment of the museum (Foanaota, 2007, p. 39).

The concept of museum to local Solomon Islanders was very foreign and considered a place for dead objects. The current museum also has a cultural village located next to the museum. This is where live performances take place. Similar to the practice that was common in Papua New Guinea, keeping artifacts as museums do was never practiced. Once an artifact had served its purpose, they were discarded and a new one made. For a long time, locals had to make way for new expatriate staff members to lead the museum. There are other privately run museums in the Solomon Islands, one of which is a War Museum, where it exhibits war relics to tourists. This museum is mandated to showcase the Second World War history of the Solomons, and links to diving programmes where visitors conduct diving expeditions to view sunken ships and other war-related materials.

3.9.2 Museum Development in the Northern Pacific

The development of museums in the north of the Pacific varies from one island state to the next. Islands that come under the Northern Pacific banner are Guam, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Republic of Belau (also known as Palau), Kiribati, the Marianas, Saipan and the Federated States of Micronesia (which includes Chuuk, Kosrae, Pohnpei and Yap). During the 1970s, Nero and Graburn found that an increasing number of Micronesias are actively supporting museums and the reconstruction of traditional meeting centres in an effort to retain those arts and crafts which still exist….However, at times the filling of the museums is another problem, as this entails removing the objects from their social context and
meaning, something which Micronesians and other Pacific Islanders resist to this day. (1978, p. 153)

3.9.3 Museum development in the Eastern Pacific

In the island groups of Samoa, the Cook Islands, French Polynesia (including Tahiti and the Society Islands, the Marquesas Islands, the Austral Islands, and the Tuamotu Archipelago), Niue, Tokelau, Tuvalu, Tonga, Wallis, Futuna, the Hawaiian Islands, Pitcairn Island, and Rapa Nui (also known as Easter Island), interesting development is taking place there. New Zealand’s original inhabitants, the Maori, are also Polynesians, and Fiji is sometimes included in Polynesia because of the proportion of its population that is currently considered Polynesian (Crawford, 1993). Political influences on these islands affects the development of museums and contributes to the disparity of museum sizes, content and overall funding support. For instance, Tahiti is governed by France, Amerika Samoa by the United States of America and Pitcairn Island by Britain. Rapa Nui, on the edge of the Polynesian triangle, has been governed by Chile since 1888 and has been influenced by the Spanish culture since then (Johnson, 2007, p. 17). The sizes of museums and the number of museums on each island nation depends on the funding by each government. Overall, the best-funded museums are found in New Zealand, Tahiti, and the Bishop Museum in Hawaii. The Auckland Museum in New Zealand is one of the most impressive museums in the Pacific due to the size of their collection and the financial support it receives (Johnson, 2007, p. 26).

3.9.3.1 Marquesas Islands

There are six museums in the Marquesas Islands. Support, focus and funding for these museums are not the same. Three of the museums are culturally oriented museums as they reflect the past history and culture of the Marquesan people. There is one fine art museum, one natural history museum and the other has an archaeology focus. All but one museum is privately owned and only receive donations from tourists and/or the local community. This is the Museum Grelet located on the island of Fatu Hiva (Johnson, 2007, p. 20).
There is also the Paul Gauguin Cultural Centre, which is a museum devoted to the life of Paul Gauguin, the French artist who lived the latter years of his life in Tahiti and the Marquesas, and eventually died on the island of Hiva Oa in 1903. This museum was opened in May 2003 and funded by the French government. This is the most popular museum on Marquesas, as it is the only one that can be accessed online and listed on travel websites. It is interesting to note here the use of the words “cultural centre” over “museum”. In actual fact, some art critiques believe that it should be a fine art museum due to the content of the exhibition space and associated facilities and staff.

Figure 3.6. Bishop Museum, Honolulu, Hawaii

3.9.3.2 Hawaii

One of the large museums in Polynesia is the Bernice Bishop Museum in Honolulu, Hawaii and has been adding to its Polynesian collection for more than a century. Built in 1889, the museum was intended to house the extensive collection of Hawaiian artifacts and heirlooms of the royal family, and to eventually expand to include millions of artifacts, documents and photographs about Hawaii and other Pacific island cultures. Today, this museum is the largest in the state of Hawaii and is one of the highly respected museums in the Pacific and the world (Johnson, 2007, p. 34).

3.9.3.3 New Zealand

Apart from the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa, which is based in Wellington, the museum that is most impressive is the Auckland War Memorial Museum. This museum was established in 1852 and holds a vast amount of Pacific collections known to be some of the best in the world. It has loaned artifacts to the
Pacific, for instance to the Cook Islands National Museum in Rarotonga (Stanley, 2005). It has two renowned exhibition spaces called “Masterpieces” and “Pacific Lifeways”. The latter gallery includes stories associated with the Pacific diaspora, in particular Polynesians that have migrated to New Zealand over the years. Even though it has a large collection base, most of these artifacts are not able to be exhibited due to the restricted space available in the current exhibition spaces. Much of what is kept in storage can still be accessed for research and for conservation efforts (Johnson, 2007, p. 34).

3.10 Indigenous Museums

In the 1980s, there were proposals for the advancement of indigenous museums, all of which questioned aspects of the western notion of a museum. Dr. Hirini Mead, an indigenous Maori academic and anthropologist from New Zealand (Ngati Awa Tribe) was the first to explore the practical and intellectual issues of indigenous museums. He also differentiated western museum concepts to indigenous ones. He defined western museums as “secular institutions with academic and professional aspirations”. He also added that such museums were expensive to maintain and usually do not have a good relationship with any local communities (Stanley, 2007, p. 3).

Hirini Mead (1983) critiqued the western model of museums and proposed indigenous models that were more conducive to the way Pacific people relate to their objects and associated history. In his article Indigenous Models of Museums in Oceania (1983, p. 98–101), he argues that there was a distinctive difference between indigenous models and western examples. As time went by, in particular from the 1980s to the 1990s,

Figure 3.7 Cover page of the Future of Indigenous Museums in the Pacific

this divergence has become more apparent as people in the Pacific begin reassessing and accessing indigenous cultures.
According to Hirini Mead (1983), there are two types of indigenous museums. Type 1 is a single-purpose building that tells a peoples’ story from prehistory to modern times. The other type is a multi-functional tribal cultural centre known as a *marae* in New Zealand, with various functions and purposes. For instance, as for the Ngati Awa Tribe in New Zealand, they expected a library, research centre, community hall and an events centre to be built alongside the main building, which will be viewed as a museum. The second option has more interactive functions and also has an inclusive feature, where young and old, urban and rural dwellers can learn about their culture and heritage through hands-on programmes and its learning atmosphere. He also highlighted the *custom houses* in the Solomon Islands which have become a repository for culturally valued and historic artifacts, and also serve as ceremonial locations for religious and cultural practices (Stanley, 2007, p. 3).

Other qualities that set the *marae* and *custom houses* apart from modern museums relates to audiences. Both venues have cultural restrictions on who may enter, when they may enter, and what class of objects they may view. Another distinction relates to “economy and technology”. Indigenous museums do not have funds to employ large numbers of specialists or to maintain special climatic conditions of storage to sustain the collections’ physical integrity. In such situations, indigenous museums turn to local knowledge and expertise.
In the 1990s, the influence of regional organisations such as The Tourism Council of the South Pacific (TCSP), the Australian South Pacific Cultures Fund (ASPC), UNESCO and the Pacific Islands Museums Association (PIMA) made a huge impact in the growth of museums and cultural centres in the Pacific.

3.11 Birth of the Pacific Islands Museums Association (PIMA)

![Figure 3.8.: PIMA logo resembling a frigate bird.](image)

In 1993, directors of museums in the Pacific met at a culture meeting in Honolulu, Hawaii. The inception of PIMA was born out of this meeting. Most of those who were part of this meeting went on to become government ministers in their respective countries. Some of the islands included in this meeting were the Republic of Palau, Papua New Guinea, Fiji, Tonga, Vanuatu and New Caledonia. Through the support from the Samoa-based UNESCO Office, PIMA was formed and the first Secretariat was hosted at the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) in Noumea and later, at the Fiji Museum in Suva. Through the financial support of the Canada Funds, a volunteer was selected to run PIMA from Fiji. The support of the Fiji Museum was tremendous and very effective, and Fiji’s geographical location was beneficial in many ways. Most regional meetings took place in Fiji, which provided a central base for PIMA to hold its board meetings when everyone was in the country. PIMA has now become well known for piggy backing on regional events, which prove beneficial for local museum staff of any country that host such meetings.
One of PIMA’s achievements were providing specialised training to museum staff across the region. Another highly acclaimed achievement was the ability for museums across the Pacific to communicate with one another through quarterly newsletters, emails and through its website. In 2007, repatriation began to be discussed over board meetings and was included in the 2009–2013 strategic plan. The inclusion of repatriation in PIMA’s Strategic Plan and other high-level documents raised the profile of repatriation and appropriation (both historical and recent), which led to many Pacific museums discussing international appropriation, as well as assessing the return of Pacific museum artifacts to their rightful places of origin (PIMA Report, 2006).

### 3.12 Concluding Remarks

This discussion has shown a shift in power relationships between western museums and indigenous communities as far as repatriation is concerned. This is also reflected in the continuing development in the relationships between museums and their local communities and users. Museum curatorship has changed, where now cultural beliefs, values and traditions of the communities that traditionally owned and used the artifacts are elevated. In the past, the authority of the curator was largely unchallenged, however time has changed this, where authority is shared with museum users such as individuals or community groups whose cultural heritage is represented in the collection. Museum staff are becoming sensitive to such practices and are adhering to the protocols required by the communities concerned. The Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa is an example of a museum, of international standing, that is putting into place cultural Maori protocols that have to be followed by museum staff and visitors alike.

The notion of shared ownership is an interesting concept. With reference to ethnographic collections, negotiations over repatriation often take place between former colonies and the colonial government that ruled over them, mostly in the past, although some are still being ruled at present, for instance France, New Caledonia and French Polynesia. No doubt there have been changes over the years; for instance, some museum professionals in Britain feel that the relationship between Britain and its former colonies is significantly different from that of the Australian government and
the indigenous people of Australia. The question is whether Aboriginal collections in the UK will be treated similarly to Aboriginal collections in Australian museums? The future, I believe, looks bright as communities are becoming more aware of their rights and museums are becoming more understanding when repatriation requests are received from overseas museums (Simpson, 1997, p. 93).
4 CHAPTER FOUR

I YAU MAROROI

MUSEUM COLLECTIONS: Appropriation, Ownership
And Repatriation

“Real museums are places where Time is transformed into Space.”
– Orhan Pamuk, *The Museum of Innocence*

4.1 Introduction

Art and heritage do matter in this day and age of globalisation. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, European explorers returned home with artifacts that shed light on the way people from other cultures lived and what they believed. These pieces included everything from ceremonial works of art with meaning to beautiful yet functional everyday objects (Miller, 2006, p. 7). The governance and repatriation of cultural property have become a new frontier in international law due to the interest it has generated through making headlines and attracting the varied interests of academics and policy-makers, museum curators and collectors, human rights activists and investment lawyers, and artists and economists (Vadi, 2014). This chapter aims to clarify and demystify the museum process of collecting. The term used is ‘appropriation’. According to the Oxford Dictionary (2014), appropriation means to make one’s own, which is derived from Latin, *appropriare*. Within the context of a museum, it is important to understand how artifacts were collected and kept in museum stores for many years. Once this process is understood, then those who work in museum collections will appreciate the process of repatriation. Museums can only repatriate artifacts provided the associated documents and historical information are clear and transparent.
4.2 Background

Museums around the world are struggling over issues of repatriation and, to some, the sacrilege inherent in displays of sacred objects and human remains. Some museums have responded to calls for such objects to be removed from view and even from museum holdings. Some indigenous American tribes have gone against such museums and have developed separate museums and participated in their own museum processes that are more appropriate to their own collective memories (Crane, 2000, p. 9). The concept of repatriation may appear to conflict with the founding principles of museums, however there is growing recognition of primary rights of indigenous peoples by anthropologists and museologists. Many museums, as a result, have developed a much more flexible approach to repatriation and to formulate new policies and practices that are built on shared ownership (Simpson, 1997, p. 1). Apart from this flexibility arrangement, curators are always concerned with the condition of artifacts that have been repatriated. Some concerns surround issues such as security, climatic controls and unavailability of trained curatorial staff. Other serious concerns regard repatriated artifacts appearing on the international art market or being looted or destroyed during civil unrest (ibid).

4.3 Appropriation

Thomas (1991), in his book *Entangled Objects: Exchange, Material Culture and Colonialism in the Pacific*, analysed the entangled histories of objects that passed between populations involved in various kinds of colonial encounters. There is a renewed engagement between historical ethnographic collections and contemporary source communities. Source communities are contemporary communities who now identify historical collections that were made from their ancestors in terms of their cultural property and heritage (Bouqet, 2012, p. 98). One example is the collections made from communities such as Torres Strait Islanders by the Cambridge Torres Strait Expedition of 1896. A new type of relationship was established between the Cambridge Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology and Torres Strait Islanders. Other similar examples can be drawn from First Nations of Canada, the USA, Australia and New Zealand given their nature as settler colonies (ibid).
With regards to artifacts being requested for repatriation, collections of ethnography, archaeology, antiquities and art are the common ones. The most notable claims to have received media coverage and public attention in the United Kingdom are the Parthenon Marbles, the Benin bronzes and the Egyptian mummies. There were other less well-publicised requests and they included Australian Aboriginal artifacts, Native American artifacts, and natural history specimens (Simpson, 1997, p. 1). Issues associated with repatriation requests vary and these may depend on the type of artifact requested, the source from which they originated and their contemporary significance for traditional owners, as well as the museum staff and the public (ibid).

The processes of appropriation and repatriation in the museum context are vital in understanding how artifacts are taken from their source to a new location. The term ‘appropriation’ is defined as the process of how an artifact is taken by various means, from its source to another location or to another museum. Words such as ‘plunder’, ‘looting’ and ‘theft’ were used to refer to artifacts that were wrongfully taken (Yew, 2002). Repatriation, on the other hand, is the opposite of appropriation. This is when an artifact is returned from where it has been housed back to its source location. ‘Source location’ is referred to here as the place where the artifact was made or where it has direct cultural links. An example can be shared from the National Museum of Ethnology in Lisbon where a small ethnographic collection from Papua New Guinea ended up in Portugal. The Melanesian collection arrived at the University of Oporto in 1926 as part of an exchange with the museums in Berlin. After a series of research by curators in Portugal, they found out that these Melanesian artifacts were part of many different German colonial expeditions to mainland New Guinea and island Melanesia in the late nineteenth century (Bouqet, 2012, p. 97).

In the history of museum development, it is well known that objects were acquired and reshuffled with other institutions. Since the Second World War, more collections were returned to their rightful owners due to decolonisation and reassertion of indigenous and minority culture (Bouqet, 2012, p. 10). Many museums around the world have had a re-think of their position and responsibilities in relation to repatriation. Negotiation processes are in place to legally prepare museums on demands by legal or moral
owners. The most sensitive topic under this heading is the human remains collections. This section outlines some selected case studies from the Pacific in relation to appropriation and repatriation.

4.4 Global Appropriation

Collectors and the objects they collect provide great insight into the early history of archaeology and anthropology (Gosden, 2007). As seen in CHAPTER THREE, the first museums began from artifacts collected by people from different parts of world that tell stories of a particular culture from a period of time. Histories of the early modern global culture of collecting have focused for the most part on European cabinets of curiosities, however the passion of acquiring unfamiliar items was popular across the globe. In the early modern age, many people travelled farther than at any earlier time in human history. Most returned home with stories of distant lands and at least some of the objects they acquired during their journeys. There were others who did not travel but eagerly awaited objects that arrived from faraway places. Objects travelled various routes – personal, imperial, missionary and trade. Some moved not only across space but also across cultures (Bleichmar & Mancall, 2011). For instance, African princes traded captured members of other African groups so they could acquire the newest forms of cloth produced in Europe. The Native Americans began trading coloured glass beads made in Europe with other indigenous tribes. As items exchange hands, it often gains new and valuable meanings in the process. An object that may seem unimportant in one society can gain popularity in another (ibid).

In the early twentieth century, writers became concerned mainly with works of art. However, a groundbreaking conference organised by the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford in 1983 revealed that the diversity of collections ranged from shells, carvings to scientific instruments to fossils (Baker, in Bleichmar & Mancall, 2011, p. xv). Since the 1500s, there has been a lot of fascination and interest in New World objects from European viewers. For instance, soon after the arrival of Hernan Cortes in Mexico from Spain in 1519, he recognised that he had entered a world very different from the one he was familiar with. Just like Christopher Columbus and others who had arrived in the Americas after 1492, he knew it was important to record what he saw. One way was by
writing letters to King Charles V, who sponsored his travel. Another method was
sending gold and silver artifacts, gems and feather-works to Spain. This impressed the
King and his audiences in Europe, which demonstrated his authority over places that
eventually became his colonial domain (Bleichmar & Mancall, 2011, p. 1). Cortez, on
the other hand, increased his reputation as a collector, and he later proved himself to be
an important general fighting against the Aztecs of Mexico in 1519 (Pohl & Robinson,
2005, p. 9). Figure 3.7

The act of collecting has aesthetic, religious, scientific, political and social resonances.
Collectors in the eighteenth century – particularly the European naturalists – used the
Linnean systems to communicate findings in a standardised fashion. Artists who
traveled drew what they saw and this helped viewers see what existed on the other side
of the world. Collectors and artists have equally gathered the world around them and
also shaped it. As a result, those in power (for instance Princes) used their cabinets to
demonstrate their wealth, connections and strength (Bleichmar & Mancall, 2011, p. 3).
A critical point to highlight is that the desire to collect and display objects was
reciprocal between cultures. It is argued that even though Europeans collected and
displayed more wares, non-European parts of the world often act just as acquisitively
as their European counterpart. For example, in South East Asia, near the end of the
reign of Phra Narai who served as King from 1656 to 1688, he became fascinated with
European technology in particular the scientific and optical instruments such as
telescopes, spy-glasses, spectacles and mirrors. He sent a diplomatic mission to the
court of Louis XIV, King of France to acquire these items (Bleichmar & Mancall, 2011,
p. 7).

At times travelers or missionaries created manuscripts. This was the case of the
Capuchin friars, who went to Central Africa from the mid-seventeenth to the mid-
eighteenth century. They took up residence in the Portuguese colony of Angola and
they described natural phenomena such as flora and fauna, as well as local customs.
They wrote home to provide other clerics with information to facilitate future
encounters in the mission field (Bleichmar & Mancall, 2011, p. 7).
As collecting became a global phenomenon, collectors were obsessed with the encounter between the Old World and the New. After the first voyage of Columbus, many Europeans became fascinated with obtaining things American. At times, this meant indigenous peoples. Beginning in the later fifteenth and sixteenth century, efforts to bring people across the Atlantic increased, with the whole idea of facilitating their conversion to European ways (notably Christianity) (Bleichmar & Mancall, 2011, p. 8). In the nineteenth century, many Europeans began creating visual depictions of Indians with the idea that they were about to vanish from this world. This led to the increase in the excavations of indigenous graves for the purpose of collecting skulls for scientific purposes. As time went by, history could be written by taking new paths in the collection of material, non-classical texts, hieroglyphs, drawings, monuments and oral traditions (ibid). The influence of royalty also affected the level of collecting that was taking place. In the case of the establishment of the Royal Cabinet of Natural History in Madrid in 1771, instructions were sent forth from the monarchical authorities to Spaniards in the field specifying what and how to collect, and multiple were funded throughout the empire. This included archaeological excavations in Peru, in the Mayan City of Palenque, as well as objects gathered from scientific expeditions to South America, the pacific Northwest, Alaska and the Pacific (Bleichmar & Mancall, 2011, p. 9).

Exchange of government documents in the 1800s between countries was also encouraged. This was true between the United States of America and France, where Vattemare (1848, p. 3) informed Congress in Washington of the vast collection of legislative documents, scientific works and objects of art that were presented to him in good will and mutual agreement while in France. He was aware that the rich fruits of such exchanges would benefit the United States of America, in particular the intellectual labour of the best minds of the old world, in Europe. This example shows how the USA and France made an agreement to exchange and trade valuable government documentation for educational purposes and safe-keeping in the Library of Congress.
The early stages of modern collecting meant more than just accumulating and displaying unusual or rare items. Naturalists were able to gather basic knowledge about the world. Artists were able to show off their talents and contributed to the spread of information around the world. Objects in collections taught cultural lessons about unfamiliar people and their crafts. They also taught religious lessons too, in particular comparing old religion to new. Merchants were able to make possible profits from establishing trade in new areas (Bleichmar & Mancall, 2011, p. 10). Modern curators, however, have the challenge of balancing people’s expectation over certain objects. They have been collected by a certain collector, and later passed on to relatives who inherited the collection (Gosden, 2007, p. 154). Objects do indeed provide both hard data and scope for a broad view of anthropological study. Material culture provides a vital window on human nature (Gosden, 2007, p. 171)

4.5 Appropriation of Pacific Artifacts

Evidence has shown that Pacific objects have made their way into collection stores of museums around the world. While some of these objects were given away for safekeeping by an indigenous individual, others were sold during economic strife, while some were part of assimilation policies or simply stolen (Tuensmeyer, 2014). In the case of the Lowie Museum at the University of California (Berkeley), there were 1843 tiki (pendants) that had been taken in battle (Grayburn in Neich, 1979, p. 13). Archaeological materials including pottery, human remains, adzes, flora and fauna are included in these movements. As far as this chapter is concerned, I will focus mainly on historical artifacts that are classified under ethnographic collections. Such collections, according to Bouquet (2012), originally started from fieldwork during the nineteenth to early twentieth centuries. Fieldwork became the hallmark of modern and academic anthropology. In the early 1990s, the interpretation of history was under revision and this was reflected in the increase in interest in collections by anthropologists, which led to an increase in related exhibitions in museums. Anthropologists were now fascinated to research the social lives of the objects and images in the collections (Bouquet, 2012, p. 96).
4.6 Nineteenth Century Examples

Some ways objects were collected were through personal contacts and gifting. Another was through imperial or government roles, played mostly by colonial administrators. Missionary work and direct trading are the other popular methods of collecting in the past.

4.6.1 Personal – Beatrice Blackwood, who spent her early career working in the Human Anatomy Department in the Oxford University Museum of Natural History, set out on a field trip to Papua New Guinea and the Solomon Islands in 1929. She spent most of her time on the island of Buka and Bouganville where she studied local life and collected over 400 objects that were donated to the Pitt Rivers Museum. When she later returned to work with the Anga people in southwest New Britain, she collected over 2000 objects that were accessioned into the collections (Gosden, 2007, p. 167).

4.6.2 Imperial – Dr. Jan Pouwer, a government anthropologist, was sent by the Netherlands government to be a field collector in Papua New Guinea and was employed by the Bureau of Native Affairs of the Netherlands. This new role was created in response to the reduction of collections being donated to museums due to artifacts from colonies acquiring market value. District officers, missionaries and soldiers randomly donated artifacts and more and more developed their own private collections. Institutions began to compete with their own collectors (Jacobs, 2012, p. 57). For example, between 1926 and 1962, around 300 artifacts were collected and ended up in museums as opposed to nearly 2000 artifacts gathered during the early expeditions (ibid).

4.6.3 Missionary – At the Pitt Rivers Museums in Britain, a collection from Niue that was collected by Rev. William George Lawes included clubs, bark-cloth beaters and pieces of bark-cloth, fire sticks and stone weapons. They were given to the University Museum in September 1880 (Gosden, 2007, p. 159). Lorimer Fison, a Wesleyan Methodist missionary based in Australia and Fiji, sent numerous objects to the University of Oxford museum in the 1880s (Gosden, 2007, p. 160).
4.6.4 Trade – Missionaries, boat captains and collectors were hard at work collecting and trading objects. For instance, in 1883, Fison forwarded three fish hooks of pearl shell and turtle shell, and a bamboo box from the Solomon Islands that were collected by Captain Martin, who was in charge of the missionary schooners. He said:

I got the hooks and box from Captain Martin of our Mission Schooner ‘John Hunt’ and promised him that they should be presented to your museum in his name. When you write next, please devote a small scrap of paper to an acknowledgment of receipt that I may hand it over to him as a bait to catch more specimens. (Gosden, 2007, p. 161)

Not only outsiders were keen to exchange goods with locals. Locals themselves saw the value in trading locally carved items such as model canoes, spears and clubs in exchange for tobacco, iron and steel. In the case of Blackwood’s experience in New Britain, her friendliness with the local people and the length of her stay on the island made trading and exchanging easier and desirable. In comparison with the work done by physical anthropology, such as taking blood samples and collecting human remains, which may upset people, collecting ethnological materials was much friendlier and locals were more inclined to trade (Gosden, 2007, p. 198).

4.7 Modern Examples (1990s)

The following case studies are from the Kingdom of Tonga and Fiji. Canadian archaeologist Dr. David Burley from the Simon Fraser University relayed the Tongan story to me while the example from Fiji was shared with me by Fiji Museum Director Sagale Buadromo.

4.7.1 Tonga Case Study – In 1995, reports were received at the PIMA Secretariat in Suva, Fiji, of archaeological materials being taken out of Tonga by art dealers who entered the country under tourist visa. There were concerns also from
archaeologists who worked in Tonga with the number of stone adzes sold to tourists by local Tongans. They were sold at a very cheap price of $2 (Tongan Pa’anga) per piece, while it fetched hundreds or even thousands of dollars in overseas markets.

4.7.2 Fiji Case Study – The disappearance of the only surviving Ivory Goddess called the Radini Waimaro, sent shockwaves among collectors and the Fiji Museum staff, as well as the International Council of Museums (ICOM). Previous Director of the Fiji Museum, Mr. Fergus Clunie was an integral figure in the investigation of the demise of this valuable artifact. Apparently, the Fiji Museum had in the past visited the village of Waimaro, to seek the safekeeping of the ivory goddess. After a series of visits by museum staff, the ivory goddess was not released by the traditional keeper. To the surprise of the Fiji Museum Director and her staff, the goddess was smuggled out of the country by an art dealer who befriended the traditional keeper over a period of time, possibly over a number of months.

4.8 Repatriation

According to the Oxford Dictionary (2015), repatriation means to return something back to its original source or country. Within the museum and heritage contexts, this involves the return of cultural artifacts or objects to their places or country of origin. The return of cultural artifacts to their legitimate owners, the recovery of underwater cultural heritage, and the protection and promotion of artistic expressions are just some of the pressing issues to be discussed in this segment (Vadi, 2014). Before the discussion of repatriation begins, it is imperative to highlight the issue of threat to cultural heritage all over the world. One such threat is war, which opens the door to direct damage to archaeological sites and looting of museums and other heritage institutions such as libraries and archives. For example, the war in Iraq in 2003 and the subsequent looting of the Iraq National Museum three years later is testament to the real issues faced by museums on the ground, in particular those that are directly involved in war conflicts (Nafziger & Nicgorski, 2009, p. xvii).
Until recently, requirements to return cultural material to territories of origin, dating back to Persian, Greek and Roman times, were addressed almost exclusively to military-related problems of plunder, the spoils of warfare, and occupation. For example, The Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907 on the laws and customs of war, followed by the reparation provisions of the Treaties of Versailles and Saint-Germain after the First World War, underscored the illegality of military plunder and articulated basic remedies for victim states. The spoils of war and occupation still threaten the world’s cultural heritage, as in the wake of the 2003 military intervention in Iraq, but for several decades a booming art market has shifted attention to peacetime trafficking as well (Nafziger, 2010, p. 17).

Despite a long history of issues of war and looting, the global community acted to put together cultural, comprehensive laws to regulate and protect the cultural heritages of humankind. For example, in the United States of America, the first comprehensive legislation to address the plight of the fragile and non-renewable archaeological heritage was the Antiquities Act of 1906 (Nafziger & Nicgorski, 2009, p. xvii). Later in this chapter, I will also discuss other international agreements such as the Roerich Pact of 1935 and the 1954 Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict. Contemporary intersections between art, cultural heritage and the market are complicated by a variety of ethical and legal issues, which often describe complex global relations (Vadi, 2014).

Four global developments sparked the repatriation movement worldwide in the 1960s. The first one was the concern raised by archaeologists around the world on questionable excavations, which has lead to the high number of illegal trafficking of cultural objects. Collectors, museums and other legally recognised institutions were acquiring these looted materials. For example, in 1897 when the British military looted numerous Benin bronzes, they made their way into private collections and museums in Europe. Conquest, colonisation and commerce have truly generated tensions and provoked ethical and legal questions concerning cross-cultural pride and human solidarity. The second development was the pressure placed on governments to bar the certain importation of these illegally acquired materials. There was a need for all governments
to work together to curb this illegal problem through their ports of entry. For instance, the government of Mexico placed pressure on the United States of America to cooperate in the return of valuable materials back to their country of origin once they had been confiscated. The third development was the Native Peoples Movement whose effort was to regain possession of indigenous materials. The fourth development was that the theft of cultural materials was linked to money laundering and organised crime. Apparently, the illegal trafficking of cultural materials was placed third highest behind drugs and weapons (Nafziger & Nicgorski, 2009, p. xviii).

From these developments, one can see that repatriation affects all countries on domestic and international levels. On the domestic level, tribal and indigenous groups are interested in reclaiming their identity through efforts in repatriating their cultural materials from museums, art galleries and private collections. On the international level, the recovery of stolen cultural materials, which can be valued to $3 billion annually, requires cooperation among international organisations, governments, private institutions and individuals. Custom officials moreso are expected to commit to exert substantial diligence in their line of duty (ibid).

Cooperation among governments to curb illegal activities associated with cultural materials is very difficult to maintain and encourage. This is more to do with the direct association to conflict and underworld crime. The good intentions of a few individuals, organisations and government are often taken over by a few that are controlled by greed and financial power. Most efforts made take a long time to take effect and often are met with great animosity.

In the cases of Australia and Canada, they share a common colonial identity through the colonisation of lands that were occupied by indigenous people. Both countries are members of the Commonwealth and are the homes of indigenous groups who have lost objects during colonialism. The Aborigines of Australia and the First Nations of Canada have, over the years, demanded the return of objects to their communities from which they were taken. These objects ranged from household items to religious artifacts to ancestral remains (Tuensmeyer, 2014). With the adoption of the United Nations
Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People, there are still many issues that remain unresolved. However, both Australia and Canada have worked hard through their legislations to repatriate cultural properties. It is imperative that for indigenous communities to lay claims through repatriation processes, their home countries must have solid legal frameworks and legislations to enable the process to be fulfilled.

4.9 Repatriation in the Pacific

Apart from Australia and New Zealand, there has not been any major repatriation that has taken place in this part of the world. The Pacific is learning from these two neighbouring countries and hopes that mistakes that they may have encountered will not be repeated in the Pacific. I would like to highlight in this section four real examples of how Pacific museums have actively participated in separate situations relating to repatriation. The first one is a virtual repatriation between Fiji Museum and the Museum of Victoria in Australia. This led to the creation of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the two institutions. The second case study is concerning a Ni-Vanuatu tam-tam drum (see Figure 4.1) that was illegally traded and was awaiting auction in Australia. Through the repatriation intervention of the Vanuatu Kaltoral Senta (VKS) Director, this trade process was stopped and the drum was returned to Vanuatu. The third example is one that I am personally involved with that relates to what I call voluntary repatriation, whereby a donor has willingly approached PIMA to facilitate the return of the rare Solomon Islands Feather Money from New Caledonia to the Solomon Islands. The fourth one is regarding human remains, which were proactively repatriated with the support of the staff of the Bishop Museum in Hawaii.

4.9.1 Fiji Case Study

In 2007, the Fiji Museum took part in a virtual repatriation with the Museum of Victoria in Australia. This involved certain artifacts being physically returned to Fiji, while the rest of the Fijian collection was digitised and uploaded onto the two respective museum databases. Museum online visitors can easily view these artifacts and, as a result, both collections are linked online. The Memorandum of Understanding that was born out of
this professional collaboration saw staff members from the Museum of Victoria visiting the Fiji Museum and working with staff in their collections. They helped with shelving, purchase of archival boxes and training of conservation staff. They also undertook conservation of “at risk” artifacts in the collection store. In this case study, what can be learnt is that even though space at the Fiji Museum was seen to be an issue, photographs of Fijian artifacts in Melbourne were taken and images uploaded on the MOV database which can be accessed by both museums. Apart from the digitisation of collections, staff of the Fiji Museum were trained in how to manage those that were repatriated. Such help was a one-off, however with the existence of the MOU, future training and collaborations can be developed and delivered between the two institutions.

Figure 4.1.

4.9.2 Vanuatu Case Study

The Director of the Vanuatu Kaltoral Senta (VKS), Mr. Marcellin Abong, a PIMA Board member, had also been the PIMA Board advocate on illicit trafficking of Pacific artifacts. Based upon his own research, he had identified a route that illicit traffickers used to trade artifacts illegally from Papua New Guinea, via the Solomon Islands, to Vanuatu and later en-route to Australia. Using his own contacts in Papua New Guinea, Australia and the Solomon Islands, he was able to intervene and remove the artifacts from being further traded in the market. A number of artifacts had been repatriated to Vanuatu from Australia, including a tam-tam (traditional Vanuatu drum), which was to be bought by an Australian buyer. Through the timely intervention of Marcellin Abong and the staff of the Australian Museum in Sydney, the tam-tam was safely returned to Vanuatu.
4.9.3 Solomon Islands Case Study

A traditional red feather money or *Tevau*, originally from the Santa Cruz Island or Temotu, was bought by Mr. Roy Benyon, a Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) staff, based in Noumea during the Festival of Pacific Arts in 1988. Due to the precious nature and fragility of this artifact, he decided to place this *tevau* on loan with the Museum of New Caledonia. Mr. Benyon contacted the PIMA Secretariat in 2012 seeking advice on the repatriation of this artifact from the Museum of New Caledonia to the Solomon Islands. This repatriation project arose from the SPC Culture Workshop, held in Honiara during the 2012 11th Festival of Pacific Arts. Mr. Benyon was translating my presentation at this workshop, and he was moved to return the feather money to the Solomon Islands, where he felt the artifact truly belonged. PIMA has been facilitating this repatriation process and collaboration among all museum staff in the Solomon Islands and New Caledonia. The Solomon Island airline has been approached to sponsor this project by way of sponsoring the air-ticket of Mr. Benyon to fly from New Caledonia to the Solomon Islands, to physically give back this *tevau*. The staff of the Solomon Island National Museum is organising a traditional welcome ceremony to officiate the repatriation of the *tevau* to the museum. Once it has arrived back in the country, it will be exhibited in the newly revamped gallery for all visitors to enjoy.

4.9.4 Bishop Museum Case Study

The repatriation of human remains continues to be the most sensitive type of repatriation around the world. Debates on the reburial of human remains stored in ethnographic and other museums arose in the 1970s and 1980s. Between 1850 and
1950, human remains were taken from one country to another with scientists attempting to explain human diversity by measuring and comparing physical differences (Bouqet, 2012, p. 153). The Bishop Museum has proactively contacted Pacific museums with the intention of returning human remains that were excavated during archaeological excavations in the early 1900s. Human remains have been returned to the Kingdom of Tonga while Vanuatu and Fiji are in preparation for the return of human remains from Honolulu, Hawaii. These human remains were collected through archaeological excavations on these islands in the early 1900s. The human remains that have been returned to Tonga now remain at the Tonga National Museum in Nukualofa. As for the Vanuatu and Fiji human remains, both museum directors will discuss with their respective Boards as to what they will do, whether reburial is an option or keeping them in the collection store for further research may be the other option.

This discussion has shown a shift in power relationships between western museums and indigenous communities, as far as repatriation is concerned. This is also reflected in the continuing development in the relationships between museums and their local communities and users. Museum curatorship has changed, where cultural beliefs, values and traditions of the communities that traditionally owned and used the artefacts are elevated. In the past, authority of the curator was largely unchallenged, however time has changed where authority is shared with museum users such as individuals or community groups whose cultural heritage is represented in the collection. Museum staff are becoming sensitive to such practices and are adhering to the protocols required by communities concerned. The Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa is an example of a museum of international standing that is putting into place Maori cultural protocols that have to be followed by museum staff and visitors alike.

The notion of shared ownership is an interesting one. With reference to ethnographic collections, negotiations over repatriation often take place between former colonies and the colonial government that ruled over them (mostly in the past and with some still being ruled at present); France and New Caledonia and French Polynesia are examples of current colonial states. No doubt there have been changes over the years; for instance, some museum professionals in Britain feel that the relationship between Britain and its
former colonies is significantly different from that of the Australian government and
the Indigenous people of Australia. The question is whether Aboriginal collections in
the UK will be treated similarly to Aboriginal collections in Australian museums? The
future, I believe, looks bright as communities are becoming more aware of their rights
and museums are becoming more understanding when repatriation requests are
received in overseas museums (Simpson, 1997, p. 93).

4.10 Ownership: Indigenous versus Mainstream

Claims of repatriation often involve indigenous peoples who wish to reclaim materials
looted from them during colonial conquests. Over the last two or more centuries,
indigenous communities have experienced cultural domination, first in the hands of
colonial powers and later by government institutions (Vadi, 2014). Unfortunately,
native communities have become a minority based on population numbers for over a
number of centuries (Tsotsie, 2009, p. 3). In recent times, the historical and cultural
identity of tribal and indigenous groups is often at stake in the efforts to reclaim
significant artifacts from museums, art galleries and private collections (Nafziger &
Niegorski, 2009, p. xix). In order to resolve difficult situations, cultural materials were
sometimes placed in exclusive rights of ownership and the elaborations of rules for the
restitution of stolen property or return of illegally exported property. Litigation has been
a preferred means of resolving disputes by those in power, even though community
groups or indigenous stakeholders would prefer mediation and other informal means of
dispute resolution. Unfortunately, in the world involving commercial art trade, the
stakes are often too high to resort to informal ways of mediation (ibid).

It is clear that definitions of ownership differ between indigenous communities and
mainstream ones. For example, the First Nations of Canada have no concept equivalent
to the western or legal understanding of cultural property. They view the possession of
such an object in terms of guardianship for the sake of the entire community. The act
of guardianship is intrinsically linked both to the right to use a specific object as well
as to the responsibilities to care for it and, eventually, provide the necessary training
for the next generation (Tuensmeyer, 2014). As a result, key differences continue to
exist which have contributed to a lot of misunderstanding between communities and
institutions such as museums, art galleries and libraries. In Canada, the forcible removal of native children to boarding schools, the prohibitions on speaking native languages and the criminalisation of native religion added to a huge cultural divide between these two groups. The above three activities of the past are now denounced as inhumane and unconstitutional to contemporary societies (Tsotsie, 2009, p. 3).

In recent repatriation claims, one non-legal obstacle faced by community groups is to present a comprehensive history of the objects. Some real issues to think about included the suppression of the indigenous culture whose objects are at stake. Indigenous languages were not even encouraged to be spoken. Since such objects were either taken by force or under economic duress, the contemporary government had worked very hard over the years to suppress the same indigenous culture. In a society that rests on the oral recitation of legends, religious practices and laws, any threat to its language also threatens the traditional way of life necessary for community survival. For example, the disruptions of ownership transfers in Canada were caused by the anti-potlatch laws and the prohibition of Sundance rituals, which both find their origin in the Indian Act. It is interesting to see that one of the main criteria of repatriation was restricted to the same group a couple of centuries earlier. The suppression of such cultural activities during the colonial days would provide a disjointed cultural history that may not be suitable to what the museum expects. This is an excellent example of setting up a project to fail (Tuensmeyer, 2014, p. 185). Migration is another difficult issue to contend with. Given the increasing migration of young members of the First Nations to Canadian metropolitan areas, access to knowledge may, in fact, be decreased through the return of items to the traditional indigenous areas (Tuensmeyer, 2014, p. 186).

Another issue with repatriation is the debate posed by museums or collectors that not all of the objects in their collections that are subject to repatriation claims were taken under what could be classified as illegal circumstances. Some were sold while others were given willingly by indigenous community leaders for safekeeping in museums. In the case of the First Nations, some objects were given to museums for safekeeping with the idea that their culture was dying out (Tuensmeyer, 2014, p. 186). Another argument
can be based on the nature of their use prior to these objects being taken in the first place. Even though it is great to have objects displayed in museums for everyone to learn from, these objects still hold cultural and religious value to indigenous communities. Although many younger people have moved from their traditional villages in search of work in urban areas, and they would not be practicing the cultural activities represented by objects that were collected, what is important is that they represent a culture distinct from other new cultures that have now dominated the new nation (ibid).

In summary, numerous issues still exist in most repatriation claims. The mainstream or dominant society most times cite broader social interests on sacred sites or native claims for repatriation of ancestral remains which then leads to the discrediting of specific cultural claims. These are the works of assimilationists who pursue such cases in courtrooms which brings cultural harm to native peoples. The other issue is that there are different perceptions and definitions of cultural heritage between native and mainstream peoples and groups. As a result, native people’s cultural claims are viewed as different and therefore not given the full protection they deserve.

The other issue is the use of different terminologies that is meant to limit native rights. For instance, the use of the words ‘religious freedom’ and ‘cultural property’ give more power to individuals rather than communities. Words such as ‘art’ and ‘artifacts’, similar to the words ‘discovery’ and ‘conquest’, have privileged values through the establishments of rights to certain aspects of cultural heritage (Vadi, 2014). Communities have to struggle to justify themselves through these language hurdles to prove their rights to the ownership of these objects. There are even problems within the mainstream languages themselves, for example translating a concept from English to French. Problems arise when concepts written in legal English have to be translated into a language spoken by one of the First Nations, for example. The latter language is normally for oral use and their understanding usually links the relationship of an individual with its environment. For instance, ownership in the mainstream language (French) refers to titles and other legal documentation that rules in favour of individual titles. As for First Nations and other indigenous communities, possession of an object
belongs to the entire community. The act of possession is based on intrinsic methods of ownership that come with responsibilities to care for it now and for the next generation (Tuensmeyer, 2014, p. 186).

Communal ownership often presents difficulties when repatriation is granted and when economic benefits must be allocated to one community and not another, particularly where more than one community “owns” the oral tradition or other cultural innovations and creation associated with such objects. Certain knowledge systems are common to more than one country and, in some cases, more than one region. In legal terms, this is called multi-ownership. One example is the kava plant (piper methysticum), which is grown in most island nations in the Pacific. Kava is traditionally used for ceremonial and social events. Another example is tapa cloth, made from the paper mulberry plant. This plant is cultivated and used in the Pacific Islands as part of the Pacific Island culture and tradition, and recently came into the public domain when Fiji Airways proposed for the trade-marking of selected patterns or motifs (WIPO Report, 2001, p. 71).

4.11 Concluding Remarks

On moral grounds opinion demands that respect shall be paid to the rights claimed by natives over their lands and resources (Legge, 1958, p. 173). Caution must be exercised on crown control over the lands of the territory. If the crown is guardian over native lands, then it must look after the right of alienation and determine the nature of native tenure. In the case of Fiji, it is imperative to find out the Indigenous method of land sale even though the Deed of Cession was a treaty that gave courts power to make final judgement on land transactions. Land is important to indigenous people as their works of art and oral traditions.
5 CHAPTER FIVE

NA DODONU VAKA-TAUKEI

CULTURAL RIGHTS: The Importance of Cultural Rights and Indigenous Peoples

Some outsiders will be interested in protecting areas where indigenous peoples live or in managing the local resource. (Posey, 1996, p. 6)

5.1 Introduction

This chapter will highlight the importance of cultural rights to indigenous peoples in the past and in modern times. In order to extend this discussion to Pacific peoples and with particular focus to Fijians, it is also important to understand the definition of cultural rights from an indigenous perspective. In many indigenous communities around the world, cultural rights also include rights to land and associated natural and cultural resources. These rights were protected under customary laws. Cultural rights also subsets into the discussion of human rights and this chapter will aim to discuss these links and relationships. With some references to pre-colonial examples of cultural rights and ownership, the discussion of intellectual property right will be discussed, as examples from post-World War I shifts the focus on the role of the United Nations in recognising the rights of indigenous communities. Modern day organisations such as the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), UNESCO, Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) and PIMA, as well as other international organisations, are working collectively to give voice to numerous indigenous communities that have been alienated from their land, language and culture as a result of colonialism.
5.2 Background

The importance of discussing cultural rights spans many decades when indigenous communities first encountered visitors from other parts of the world, including Europe. The eighteenth and nineteenth century voyagers used the term ‘discovery’, however critics are voicing their opinions that it was rather through ‘encounter’ that numerous changes took place. In the Pacific, such encounters led to aggressive retaliations, wars and death. It is important to understand the cultural tensions and clashes that occurred between indigenous communities and newcomers. There were many differences, such as the use of different languages, landuse methods, religion and ways of life. To both parties, either culture was alien to one another. This chapter aims to lay the foundation and clear the path towards understanding cultural rights, ownership of traditional knowledge and how these contributed to exchange of artifacts that led to the formation of Pacific museums during the period of encounter (Calder et al., 1993, p. 8).

5.3 Defining Cultural Rights

Cultural rights are rights related to art and culture, both understood in a large sense. Article 15 (1) (a) of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESR or the Covenant) recognises the right of everyone to take part in cultural life. Several other international human rights instruments also mention culture, cultural development and cultural life (Hansen, in Chapman & Russell, 2002, p. 281). The key feature of cultural rights is the collective or communal aspect of it. All other rights based on international conventions tend to focus more on individuals. In addition, they can be considered not only as a set of specific rights but also as underpinning all other human rights (Huffer, 2006, p. 2). Pollack (1966, p. 5) supported this criteria when she highlighted that a feature of international convention laws has made individuals responsible for any acts they have done, for instance in the case of genocide. Cultural rights, on the other hand are always different from other rights due to its inclusive nature. For example, when comparing cultural rights to intellectual property rights, the latter was initially developed in European and North American law as a mechanism to protect individual and industrial inventions. The western legal definition alludes to the commercial value placed on traditional lifestyles, knowledge and biogenetic resources, which therefore have placed these indigenous resources as goods to be bought and sold.
Many researchers feel that IPR protection is limited when applied to traditional knowledge, while others feel that it is not the appropriate mechanism to empower indigenous peoples (Posey, 1996, p. 1).

The right to enjoy ones’ culture carries specific reference to indigenous peoples. There are particular features, which differentiate indigenous groups from others, one of which is the strong link between land and resources on one hand, and material and spiritual manifestation on the other. Indigenous peoples’ status must be taken seriously, which provides a platform for self-determination (Francioni, 2008, p. vi). With the adoption of the Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples by the United Nations on September 13, 2007, this proved that the highest authority of global governance has stated that indigenous peoples have basic human rights and these rights must be respected and adhered to at every level of governance, from global to local (Minde, 2008, p. 1).

5.3.1 Importance of Cultural Rights

Cultural rights are human rights that aim at assuring the enjoyment of culture, group identity, sense of being, claim to territory and resources, legitimacy and historical continuity. Some of the components include language, cultural and artistic production, participation in cultural life, cultural heritage, intellectual property right, authors’ rights and minorities’ access to culture. The components listed here complement one another and often are subsets of each other. To indigenous peoples, dividing intellectual, cultural and scientific property into three separate areas is strange and unwelcome. Communally shared concepts and communally owned property are fundamental aspects of traditional societies. In the western concept of culture, intellectual, scientific and cultural properties are separate from one another. Privatisation and commoditisation of culture is part of the norm in western societies (Posey, 1996, p. 1).

Over the past two decades, there has been a gradual shift towards an understanding of cultural rights as a collective right, in addition to an individual right. There are three main reasons for this: firstly, the progressive global acknowledgement of cultural
diversity and difference, especially through UNESCO; secondly, the ‘regionalisation’ of human rights and thirdly, the recognition of rights of indigenous peoples. This shift has helped in giving more prominence to cultural rights within the UN system, internationally and within the Pacific (Huffer, 2006). As far as the recognition of the rights of indigenous peoples is concerned, numerous declarations and agreements have been developed over the years to counter the misuse of ceremonies and traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples for the sake of tourists and scientists who conduct research and studies for their own benefit. For instance, the Declaration of Belem, which was the outcome of the First International Congress of Ethnobiology in Belem, Brazil, outlines the importance of developing programmes that guarantee the preservation and strengthening of indigenous communities and their traditional knowledge (Posey, 1996, p. 2). This declaration was the first time that an international scientific organisation recognised a basic obligation that can compensate indigenous peoples for the utilisation of their knowledge and biological resources (ibid).

5.3.2 Understanding Cultural Rights

Cultural rights seem to be the least understood and developed of all human rights, both conceptually and legally. Issues of culture, cultural values and cultural rights are often complex and political in nature, and remain some of the most contested issues in the human rights arena (Hansen, in Chapman & Russell, 2002, p. 281). In the Pacific context, Huffer (2006) highlighted at the 1998 Conference on the Collective Human Rights of Pacific Peoples that the following collective rights, all of which could be considered cultural, included political, economic and social rights. The list shows the difficulty to take culture out of other rights including sustainable development and the environment. Somehow, culture is embedded in all other rights. The collective rights discussed above are: firstly, the promotion and enhancement of indigenous Pacific cultures including language and customs; secondly, the forms of sustainable development which are consistent with the interests, cultures and economies of Indigenous Pacific peoples themselves; thirdly, the sustainable management of the land, fisheries and other resources of Indigenous Pacific peoples; and fourthly, the protection and conservation of the environment of the Pacific (ibid).
In the Pacific, it is difficult to separate nature from culture. To many Pacific societies, they work symbiotically. Rights of people include their relationships with one another, as well as their interaction with the environment. This will include their access to land, sea and resources contained within. Social norms developed within social groups or tribes further regulate rights between one tribal group from another using land boundaries that consist of place names and landmarks. Over the years, such knowledge is passed down from one generation to another. Pacific thinkers and philosophers Hau’ofa, Meleisea, Helu and Mahina emphasised the important link between myths and history in the Pacific. In the case of Samoa, its conversion to Christianity between 1830 and 1869 completed the delegation of political power decreed by the Goddess Nafanua in respect of the great chief Malietoa (Calder et al., 1993, p. 11). Chiefs’ roles in land ownership, power and authority were all recorded by Sahlins and other writers. Although place names, songs and myths may not be taken seriously by historians, according to Sahlín:

Canons of myths do present a clear picture of cultural transformation. Myths can give us a picture of how communities have changed. (ibid)

5.3.3 Cultural rights and Human Rights

Cultural rights should be treated as truly enforceable rights (Francioni, 2008, p. 3). Two of the provisions concerning cultural rights that are often referred to are Article 27 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and Article 15 of the Covenant. Article 27 (1) of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that:

everyone has the right to freely participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits.

Article 15 (1) (a) of the Covenant restates this right in a more abbreviated form, declaring the right of everyone “to take part in cultural life” (Hansen, in Chapman & Russell, 2002, p. 282). No doubt cultural right is an important right however some international law experts believe that it is problematic as a specific category of human
rights. Human rights such as civil, political, economic and social rights are premised on the notion of shared humanity and dignity among all human race. Cultural right, on the other hand, is not inclusive, as only segments of our human race categorise themselves as indigenous. To some, exclusivity may encourage separation and hinder cultural exchange and development for fear of contamination of a jealously guarded tradition (Francioni, 2008, p. 3). The other issue is on individual right versus group rights. Cultural rights promote group and shared ownership while human rights are consistent with individual rights. Practice shows that rights of a group may conflict with the right of an individual. Examples of individual rights are rights to property and rights to free speech. For instance, a state may assess a cultural claim for the return of antiquities that were unlawfully removed from its territory and transferred to another state, only to find out that the claim is barred by property rights as acquired by the purchaser of the object under a foreign law (Francioni, 2008, p. 4).

5.3.4 Cultural Rights and Protection

It is reassuring to see many conventions and articles aiming to address issues relating to cultural rights. One key element is the protection of cultural rights. The question is: protection from whom? The UDHR and ICESR address intellectual property protection in the same articles as culture and science, declaring the right of everyone to the “protection of the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary or artistic production of which he (or she) is the author.” The link between culture and intellectual property is made in both documents through protection of the moral and material interests resulting from ‘individual authorship’ of literary, artistic and creative works (Hansen, in Chapman & Russell, 2002, p. 282). In the case of New Zealand, while the Treaty of Waitangi guarantees the tino rangatiratanga over Maori taonga (treasures), there exists little protection of Maori cultural heritage (Lai, 2014, p. 49). The 1954 Hague Convention on the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict requires states to:

Undertake….all necessary steps to prosecute and impose penal or disciplinary sanctions upon those persons, of whatever nationality, who commit or order to be committed a breach of the present convention. (Francioni, 2008, p. 12)
Other protocols were added to the present convention to include prosecution of offences against cultural heritage. Tribunals were also in place to take into account criminal responsibilities of states that attack religious or cultural institutions (ibid).

5.3.5 Cultural Rights and Ownership

For many traditional societies, land and resources are an integral part of their cultures. Many of these indigenous groups do not recognise individual ownership of natural resources but maintain a collective and symbiotic relationship with nature. The word ‘guardianship’ is often used in place of ownership due to the belief that natural resources were provided by ‘mother earth’ and people have been given the task to manage these resources for current and future generations. Maori identity and language revitalisation are strongly associated with whanaугatanga (sense of relationship through shared ancestry). Most cultural resources are communally owned and shared (Hirsch, 2014, p. 120). Forsyth (2011, p. 279) supported this notion when she highlighted that for indigenous communities, including the Pacific, ‘guardianship over their resources is indefinite.” Ownership in the western world is often defined within the context of acquiring ‘monetary return’ from the use of these resources, which often contradicts with how indigenous people live their lives.

Another difficulty with endowing ownership rights is when communities themselves are finding it difficult to determine the rightful owners. These situations often take place when elders have passed on and information was not documented. Another complicating situation is when the knowledge is widely shared and the boundaries of ownership are blurred. Despite the difficulties to determine rightful owners of resources, indigenous people often assert their rights of ‘birth’ that gives them the ‘lifetime ownership’ of their resources until death. The Maori term of kaitiaki reflects this belief, where Maori people are not seen to ‘own’ their resources but are meant to be guardians for many generations and benefit from its use when appropriate (Lai, 2014, p. 49). This was true in the case of a Maori tribal leader Panakareao, who responded when asked about his role in land transactions in the 1860s (Mutu, 1993, p. 321). His comment was:
I did not trade the land (like a commodity), I released or allocated it out of a sense of compassion, with my back to Te Reinga.

In other words, he was saying that even though he gave out land to be used by visitors, the body, the essence and the power and authority derived from the Gods in the land would remain with the Maori people (Mutu, 1993, p. 22). Another interesting point arose from the New Zealand example which echoes across the Pacific, including Fiji. Many land agreements between indigenous peoples and non-indigenous were spelt out orally whereby for English speakers, written documents were more binding (ibid).

5.3.6 Cultural Rights and Land

Land is the fundamental resource of any indigenous community. It has its physical definitions and also spiritual connections to people. Most Pacific communities view land as a living being, often referred to as ‘mother earth’. Maori refer to mother earth as *Papatuanuku*. They also refer to themselves as *tangata whenua*, which is translated as people of the land. Their tribal affiliations and connections strongly identify them with traditionally owned lands (Hirsch, 2014, p. 120). The World Bank acknowledges ‘indigenous peoples’ connection to land through its Operational Directive by pointing out that indigenous peoples can be identified by the characteristic that they have ‘close attachment to ancestral territories and natural resources.” (Hitchcock, 1994, p. 4). Article 1 (2) of the covenant states that all peoples may freely dispose of their natural wealth and resources and may not be deprived of their own means of subsistence (Hansen, in Chapman & Russell, 2002, p. 293). In some countries such as Australia and Brazil, indigenous peoples have resorted to take matters to the courts in order to get their land rights back. In 1919, leading international lawyer A.H. Snow, who wrote a book on Aboriginal rights, noted that some states have begun to accept the idea that they were obligated to carry out actions on behalf of indigenous peoples. Referred to as ‘positive duty’, this was documented within the Covenant of the League of Nations and later replaced by Chapter XI of the United Nations Charter (Hitchcock, 1994, pp. 7–8).
It is imperative that governments must recognise traditional ownership and possession of lands occupied by communities and to protect the rights of peoples to use their lands, and also lands to which they have traditionally had access for their subsistence. Governments must also respect the established traditional procedures for the transmission of land rights. Unfortunately, over the past 500 years, millions of indigenous peoples have been killed and dispossessed (ibid). Many have to cope with state policies that aimed at assimilating them into national societies through forced acculturation; for example, indigenous peoples in West Papua, Malaysia and Peru have been jailed for opposing the actions of logging companies. Mining activities in the Amazon have led to a huge number of deaths through murders and diseases (Hitchcock, 1994, p. 5).

Even the term ‘terra nullius’, which meant land which was empty, was often used by settler states through its legal instruments to give open occupation to colonial powers and to give them the right to remove indigenous peoples residing there and relocating them (Hitchcock, 1994, p. 7). For instance, in the case of Aotearoa, Margaret Mutu shared her view on the indigenous Maori land tenure system, which was vastly different from the notions of property brought in by early voyagers. Tuku whenua was a Maori version of leasehold land tenure. The custom of Tuku Whenua involves tribal leaders who held the mana whenua for the tribe to allocate land for a particular individual and his family to live on and use. Provided there was no offence committed during the time of living on this land which can go for generations, they could willfully return the land back to the allocating chief after their tenure. The changing hands of land ownership can be marked through an exchange of a mana tunga, perhaps through an exchange of a cloak or club or through sworn words through a waiata (song) or whakataukii (proverb) (Mutu, 1993, p. 319). However, leading up to the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1940, numerous acts of violence around the country accompanied the clash of conceptual systems governing the retaining of the ownership of the tribal lands against those who wanted to appropriate as freehold (Calder et al., 1993, p. 21).

Similar customs existed in the Pacific. In Tongareva, Cook Islands, a similar system to tuku whenua existed and is called so’o henua, which is similar to the one practiced in
Aotearoa. In the case of Fiji, land is passed down through generations mainly through the male line (however in some instances through the female line, as in the case of Macuata Province, Northern Fiji). The English method of land sales that took place in Aotearoa pushed many islands in the Pacific not to sell their land to outsiders and this is the case in Rarotonga, where land is prohibited to be sold to outsiders (Mutu, 1993, p. 321). In Chuuk, Federated States of Micronesia, land was held privately both by individuals and matrilineal, corporate-descent groups. Rights in undeveloped spaces, productive soil, trees and gardens were separable. When soil and breadfruit trees were given in grant, the grantor retained residual rights and the grantee acquired provisional rights. Grantors and grantees could be either individuals or corporations. Full rights went to the survivor on the death or extinction of the other (Goodenough, 1951, p. 5).

5.3.7 Cultural Rights Issues

With organisations and individuals aiming to protect cultural rights, some of the issues that are needed to be looked at include recognising the ‘collective’ nature of rights, reconciling cultural diversity and international human rights standards and interpreting cultural rights to include the right of self-determination.

Even though cultural rights must be ‘equally’ enjoyed by everyone, issues have been raised when rights belonging to members of special groups are violated. Such groups include indigenous groups and other cultural minorities (Hansen, in Chapman & Russell, 2002, p. 286). As much as these groups should enjoy the same level of cultural rights as members of a majority, cultural minorities require special attention as their rights may not be as protected as they are for the majority. This can result in the degradation of their entire way of life, including their means of subsistence, loss of their natural wealth and resources and eventually their cultural identities (ibid). One of the most important issues facing indigenous peoples is that of self-determination. Numerous indigenous groups around the world lack political power at the national or even regional level where they reside (Hitchcock, 1994, p. 5).
In 1992, the Declaration of the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities was adopted by the UN General Assembly to protect the cultural rights of minorities. The United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous People (UNDRIP) recognises the existence and rights of indigenous peoples (Hansen, in Chapman & Russell, 2002, p. 287). The International Labour Organization (ILO) also developed the Convention No. 169 Concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries (Francioni, 2008, p. 5). The UNDROIT Convention is the convention on the return of cultural objects. This convention contains specific provisions for facilitating restitution of ceremonial objects removed from indigenous communities in violation of their cultural rights. This is a noble move which, to many, is long overdue in order to redress to indigenous communities the wrongs perpetrated against them in the colonial period by those who conquered their land by force and plundered their heritage (Francioni, 2008, p. 6).

Another issue is the politicisation of culture, this is, when groups turn to their cultural distinctions in order to resist external threats to their integrity, prosperity and survival. This may not be in the best interest of a pluralistic society, as groups individually promote their own distinct identity rather than working together to build a nation (Hansen, in Chapman & Russell, 2002, p. 288). In some countries, indigenous peoples have deliberately tried to hide their identity so as not to suffer racial prejudice or poor treatment at the hands of others (Hitchcock, 1994, p. 4).

One solution that has arisen is when indigenous and non-indigenous standards are incompatible, international human rights standards will serve as the appropriate resolution (Hansen, in Chapman & Russell, 2002, p. 292). The state and indigenous communities need to work together in good faith for the benefit of everyone concerned. Working together in democratic governments allow indigenous peoples to exercise control over their own institutions, resources, ways of life and their economic, social and cultural development (ibid).

Another solution is for development in the three areas of economic, social and cultural arenas to be viewed as interdependent of each other rather than viewed separately.
Development must face cultural growth, respect for all cultures and the principle of cultural freedom (Hansen, in Chapman & Russell, 2002, p. 293). Through self-determination, communities should have the ability to choose and maintain a level of control over their futures as development often brings with it threat of a loss of identity, tradition and community (Hansen, in Chapman & Russell, 2002, p. 292). Indigenous communities are still struggling to gain recognition in this area in this modern day, even though history showed that countries such as England (a colonial power) attempted to raise the issue of indigenous peoples’ protection in parliamentary discussions in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In the case of the United States, it entered into treaties with indigenous peoples indicating the recognition of sovereignty (Hitchcock, 1994, p. 7).

In terms of land and resource ownership, one solution is that governments must involve indigenous people in the formulation of laws and policies dealing with their lands, and resource management Article 1 (2) of the covenant states that all peoples may freely dispose of their natural wealth and resources and may not be deprived of their own means of subsistence (Hansen, in Chapman & Russell, 2002, p. 293). Even though this may be recognised through policies and laws, situations on the ground differ greatly. From the mid-1940s through to the mid-1980s, many international programmes such as large-scale hydro-electric projects, agricultural programmes, mining and petroleum extraction activities deprived indigenous peoples from decision-making involving the use of their lands and natural resources. Many indigenous groups felt themselves to be ‘victims of progress’ as these projects were in the interest of governments, international agencies and non-local people (Hitchcock, 1994, p. 10).

5.3.8 Use of Cultural Rights in Indigenous Communities

With the increased recognition given to cultural rights of indigenous peoples, this has given solidarity to many such groups to continue with the raising of awareness of the human rights effort worldwide. This still has not changed the indigenous world-view of property rights as being collective and communal in nature. They are seen as a means of maintaining and developing group identity rather than furthering individual economic pursuits. The solution to the issue of communal ownership is to ensure that
the use of indigenous heritage is sanctioned by the community as a whole or by its traditional custodians acting with the mandate of the community, and on terms agreed by the group as a whole regarding use of cultural rights in indigenous communities (Hansen, in Chapman & Russell, 2002, p. 297). The concept of kinship as argued by Sahlins and Johansen prove that the whole tribe rather than the individual is a legitimate form of ownership common among indigenous communities (Calder et al., 1993, p. 8). Over a thousand different grass-root organisations among indigenous peoples in various parts of the world are seeking to enhance their livelihoods and gain greater control over their areas. For example, survival schools have been set up by Mohawks in Canada and Inuit in Alaska. Australian Aborigines and Native Americans have also established indigenous health facilities and child-welfare projects (Hitchcock, 1994, p. 11). Even though such programmes are continuing today, other indigenous peoples continue protesting mistreatments at the hands of their own government and multinational corporations. Many are using the media to further their interest. In addition, many indigenous leaders have emerged as a result, and legal services have been established by indigenous groups to represent them in court (Hitchcock, 1994, p. 14).

5.4 Colonial definition of cultural rights versus indigenous cultural rights

Definitions of cultural rights from both camps differ greatly. As discussed earlier, one of the key differences is the communal and individual component of such rights. Through colonialism, most settler agents had legal instruments to declare that lands were found empty, thus giving them the power to occupy (Hitchcock, 1994, p. 7). Due to such differences, issues of indigenous rights often arise in international discussions concerning land and traditional knowledge (TK). Indigenous rights are linked to human rights (WIPO Booklet 2:3). Indigenous and local communities justly cherish TK as a part of their cultural identities (WIPO Booklet 2:3., p. 1). This reaffirms that they possess ethnic, religious, or linguistic characteristics that are different from the dominant groups in their society where they exist (Hitchcock, 1994, p. 4).
The non-indigenous view of TK leads debates over intellectual property right. The issue to many indigenous communities is that existing intellectual property (IP) norms are essentially related to promoting economic development. Over the last decades, there has been an increase in the use of cultural heritage of indigenous peoples for commercial purposes. Little or no benefit goes back to the source communities. Businesses want to piggyback on the ‘perceived exoticness of indigeneity’ (Lai, 2014, p. 49). Some challenging questions that arise are:

whether the IP system is compatible with the values and interests of traditional communities, or does it privilege individual rights over the collective interests of the community? Can IP bolster the cultural identity of indigenous communities and local communities, and give them greater say in the management and use of their TK? Has the IP system been used to misappropriate TK, failing to protect the interests of indigenous and local communities? What can be done – legally, practically – to ensure that the IP system functions better to serve the interests of traditional communities? What forms of respect and recognition of TK would deal with concerns about TK and give communities the tools they need to safeguard their interests? (WIPO, p. 3)

There needs to be a distinction or balance between individual and collective human rights. In many indigenous groups, consultation within cultural heritage groups for permission for use of TK should be encouraged. This can encourage cultural groups as to cultural rules of engagement, so that individuals within such groups are clear on what can or cannot be done. Even without drastic changes in existing laws, common law and equitable doctrines can be used legally to prevent breaches by individuals against the collective (Lai, 2014, p. 50). More so, indigenous groups must be encouraged to learn from one another. Even though a ‘one size fits all’ may not apply, sharing success stories can empower other groups to strongly protect their rights.
5.5 **Modern Ways In Which Cultural Rights Is Being Promoted**

The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) is a specialised agency of the United Nations, established by the WIPO Convention in 1967. It is dedicated to developing a balanced and accessible international IP system, which rewards creativity, stimulates innovation and contributes to economic development while safeguarding the public interest (Popova-Gosart, 2007, p. 150). WIPO started to work on TK in 1998. The first step was listening to over 3000 representatives of TK-holding communities in sixty locations around the world. Their insights will guide the work of WIPO. In 2001, the WIPO Intergovernmental Committee on Intellectual Property and Genetic Resources, Traditional Knowledge and Folklore (IGC) was established. One of the key tasks of the IGC is the protection of TK against misuse and misappropriation (WIPO Booklet No.2, p. 3).

The Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC), which is a regional organisation based in Noumea, New Caledonia, aims to assist Pacific communities to learn and understand their cultural rights through collaborative community workshops. The UNESCO (Samoa) office also conducts advocacy work alongside SPC and the Pacific Islands Museums Association (PIMA). The most recent collaboration these organisations undertook was in 2012 during the 11th Festival of Pacific Arts in Honiara, Solomon Islands. Those in attendance listened to papers that were presented by individuals and organisations hoping to ensure that indigenous communities and people in the Pacific are informed of their cultural rights and what they are required to do when their rights are being compromised. Round-table discussions also centred on the effective management of their cultural and natural sites.

The United Nations is also an international body that aims to recognise the rights of indigenous peoples. One way it showed this support was through international conventions, including the Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. This declaration promotes cultural rights that include the following rights:
the right of access to cultural life; the right to participate in cultural life; the right to cultural identity; the right to cultural survival; the right to use one’s language, as well as to access and establish media in one’s own language; the right to be educated in one’s own language and in culturally appropriate ways; the right to protection of cultural heritage, and the right to forms of development which are consistent with culture. (Huffer, 2006, p. 2)

5.6 Customary Ownership In The Pacific

Prior to colonial rule, indigenous communities had their own system of authority. Most Pacific societies, including Fiji, displayed a ranking system, some of which are still evident today. Some authors, such as Legge (1958, p. 203), refer to it as the Native Authority System. In the case of Fiji, Basil Thompson (Legge, 1958, p. 204) recognised that the natives have a complex social and political organisation in vigorous activity. Furthermore, Thompson preferred the native arrangement by saying that:

…it was not enough to abstain from seeking hastily to replace native institutions by unreal imitation of European models, but it was also of the utmost importance to seize the spirit in which native institutions has been framed, and develop to the utmost extent the capacities of the people for the management of their own affairs, without exciting their suspicions or destroying their self respect. (Legge, 1959, p. 204)

This also played a key role in Fijians not being used to work in sugar-cane farms, which led to the recruitment of Indian indentured workers from 1879 to the early 1900s. Sir Arthur Gordon, the first governor, played a part in merging colonial rule and Fijian rule together. This was evident when he himself assumed his role as the chief of rank from Britain. He spoke about this at his formal installation in Bau, and this made other rulers of provinces to look at him as one of them (ibid).

As discussed above, this ranking system places those of higher rank on the top of the hierarchy and these people are mostly revered by their subservient counterparts. Chiefs
are known to have powers that have been passed down over many generations. They are also known to be the human manifestation of kalou (supreme-being) on this earth. As a result, certain cultural privileges were given to them as individuals or within their family. Aristocratic chiefs know that their privileges are given to them based on their genealogies and blood-line. Others, such as bati or warriors can be given privileged authorities based on merits. Some acquire their rights through marriage. This is often applied to women in Fiji, where their rights and privileges change once they marry. When a woman’s husband dies, there is a traditional ceremony that takes place where a whales-tooth is presented from her family, to request her to return to her family of birth. In addition, within the Vaka Viti (Fijian) concepts of veikerekerei (to request) and veisolisoli (to give), there are elements of veivakaturagataki (in a chiefly manner) where veiwekani (relationship) is bounded by cultural rights that are customary to Indigenous Fijians. Such customary rights were observed by missionaries and other colonial administrators that were in Fiji in the early 1800s. Some observations showed how tabua (whales-tooth) were presented during yaqona (kava) ceremonies to reaffirm customary relationships through marriage, death or other occasions. Tabua, and other Fijian articles such as masi (bark-cloth) and tanoa (kava bowls), led to the collection of such artifacts by collectors with the aim of retaining such customary rights over time (Ravuvu, 1989). A visit to the Fiji Museum will surely take one back in time, to visually experience what life was like during the contact period of the 1800s. The museum has thus become an institution that contains artifacts that were used in the past, reflecting the past, present and future of cultural rights of the iTaukei, the Indigenous Fijians.

In the case of Papua New Guinea, Dr. Jacob Simet mentioned in his WIPO report:

…we have had songs, traditional knowledge and so on for hundreds of years. There was no doubt as to who originally owned them – they were originally owned by one person, who later passed them on to his or her own clan. There were clear customary laws regarding the right to use the songs and the knowledge. There was no problem in the past. Why are there problems now? We should begin with communities, and see how they protected their cultural
expressions and knowledge. Then we should use the same customary tools or tools adapted from them. (2001, p. 76)

In Africa, at the end of the nineteenth century as Europeans were demanding more land for commercial use, attention was not given to the original inhabitants. In Kenya, Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland, individuals and companies acquired considerable areas by agreements with native rulers, or by purchase, though it was not always certain that those rulers had the power to alienate the areas in question (Legge, 1958, p. 52). In many Native American communities, it was often important to consult with them before any sort of public discussion of the action, because they may have cultural concerns that cannot be revealed to the public. For instance, they may know of a spiritually important place located within an area of development (King, 1998, p. 53). Such knowledge was known within communities and may also be enshrined in their customary laws. Consultation with federally recognised tribes must be carried out on a government-to-government basis that respects tribal sovereignty. In any development process that includes scoping, agencies are encouraged to figure out what sorts of socio-cultural issues may need to be addressed, and what socio-cultural aspects of the environment may be affected.

In New Zealand, the Treaty of Waitangi became a living document that intended to reassure local Maori (including chiefs and their respective tribes) that there is a guarantee to the possession of their lands as long as they wished to retain them, and by providing for a Crown right of pre-emption (Legge, 1958, p. 52). In Fiji, it is important to note that when discussing customary law in Fiji, the topic of land ownership will always be discussed. In a book on the History of Macuata, it was mentioned that:

the high chief, the sovereign, represented everything...he was the heart and soul of his people – revered by lesser chiefs and their followers who grouped themselves around him. Possessing power of life and death over his subjects, and feared and respected by his neighbors, he was easily able to maintain peace in the areas under his authority. (Gardere & Routledge, 1991, p. 44)
Rivalries among chiefs, or the plots of ambitious rebels, were not rare and immediately suppressed by the law of the club. In this manner, disastrous feuds were avoided (Gardere & Routledge, 1991, p. 45). The problem of land acquisition in Fiji, as seen by Europeans in the 1800s, was that land was a matter of collective interest (Legge, 1958, p. 50). Rights to land in Fiji were vested in either a mataqali or the itokatoka, and though individuals had the established right to use of their land, they had no power to dispose of others (ibid).

An interesting example was when Cakobau undertook an act of submission to Sir Arthur Gordon where he laid down a large quantity of yams before the governor, and he also broke off a piece of a root of kava and placed it in the hands of Gordon, as a sign of his allegiance to the Crown. As a result of this act, Fijians regarded Gordon as a high chief, and he was given the tama or native shouts (Legge, 1959, p. 206). A year later, at Cakobau’s own suggestion, a further ceremony took place where all chiefs were pledged to their new ruler. He was given yaqona to drink and followed by claps of unison by those present. He later conducted an oath of allegiance to all the Roko’s (most of whom were chiefs in their own right), reappointing them to their offices. A present of cloth was then made to chiefs to distribute to their subjects (ibid).

In Fiji, a vasu was one who stood in the relation of nephew to the chief of a tribe – a position which, in Fijian custom, carried extensive rights over the property of the uncle (Legge, 1958, p. 193). Even a chief was no more than a joint owner of lands and had, therefore, no right to dispose the lands of his subjects (Legge, 1958, p. 50). A valid transaction could be made only by the decision of the group as a whole (ibid). More importantly, there was no such thing as “alienated land”, as a mataqali or itokatoka could part with the use of land, but not with the land itself (ibid).
5.6.1 Chiefs and Communal Rights

There have been cases where hierarchy plays a part in negotiations of the past. One example is the paramount chief of Namosi, Ro Kuruduadua who had this conversation with Colonel Smythe in 1860 (Legge, 1958, p. 189):

Q: What is the law or custom about the sale of land in your territories, so that the purchaser may have a clear title?
A: I alone can sell
Q: What course should a white man pursue who wished to purchase land?
A: He must come to me, as I alone can sell
Q: Do you acknowledge the authority over you of any other chief in Fiji?
A: I rule alone.

In this example, we see an absolute type of right given his sovereign rule of his domain. Another example is self-proclaimed King of Fiji, Ratu Seru Cakobau, when he promised the Americans land for cotton planting. In some cases, when settlers were moving in to the upper reaches of Rewa River, native occupants of the land refused to move from it. Even though Cakobau acted in totality to white settlers, some local chiefs did not waiver as their own decisions were more likely to be effective than that of Cakobau (Legge, 1958, p. 54). It is important to discuss this topic as decisions made by either party influences purchases or exchanges.

As far as land ownership is concerned, one can learn from events that took place leading up to indigenous lands and its people being ruled by a new colony. Two situations are often seen, firstly is striking the balance between native needs and settler demands (Legge, 1958, p. 171). Figure 5.1 sums up what Legge (1958, p. 177) discussed in relation to how indigenous people were treated when colonial rule took over.
There is a Pacific Regional Framework for the Protection of TK and Expressions of Culture, 2002. This model law is aimed at protecting rights of traditional owners in their TK and Expressions of Culture. It permits tradition-based creativity and innovation, including commercialisation, subject to prior and informed consent and benefit sharing. The model law complements and does not undermine IP laws. Cultural expressions are the main focus of the law and examples are: stories, chants, riddles and similar (Huffer, 2006).

5.7 Modern Protection of Traditional Knowledge (TK)

The World Intellectual Property Right Organization (WIPO) has undertaken a lot of work to protect traditional knowledge worldwide. There are still debates on whether the use of intellectual property to protect TK is one of the best practical ways. Some indigenous groups, such as New Zealand Maori, felt that the formal trademark system is not their system. One indigenous person made this remark:

One should not attempt to amend Western laws to cater for indigenous peoples. Attempts to do so will be doomed, because the IP system and the needs of indigenous peoples are too distinct. (WIPO Report, 2001, p. 75)
According to WIPO, testing the IP system for TK protection would involve the following: (i) raise awareness (ii) undertake practical and technical examinations of the application of the IP system to various categories of TK and (iii) provide training on the IP system. As in the case of Australia, they are using the Federal Government’s Access and Equity Strategy, under which,

all Australians, including those from non-English speaking background or indigenous background, should receive a fair deal from Government services. (WIPO Report, 2001, p. 75)

Australia and New Zealand are actively exploring collective certification of trademarks to protect tradition-based innovations and creations. For instance, in New Zealand the trademark called Toi Iho was developed through Creative New Zealand as a marker for high quality work made by indigenous artists. Similarly, in Australia in 1999, an Indigenous Label of Authenticity was launched. The label was developed by the National Indigenous Arts Advocacy Association (NIAAA) with the backing of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSIC) and the Australia Council for the Arts (ibid).

In terms of Prior Informed Consent (PIC) in trademark applications, all applicants must be required to disclose any traditional symbols, signs or other materials used to create the mark applied for as evidence that the PIC of the relevant community has been obtained for the application. In terms of the use of existing copyright law, it is critical to be aware of what laws are already in place. Having this knowledge will enable artists or communities to use these laws as a basis if the need arises to defend themselves. For example, in Australia, two Aboriginal artists sued, through the Federal Court system, non-indigenous parties for copyright infringement in respect of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander works. The Australian Court appear to have shown a measure of creativity in approaching such claims and some sensitivity to the customary laws,
traditions and practices of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait islander community in Australia (ibid).

As far as patents are concerned, tightening of the Prior Informed Consent (PIC) has been encouraged in the process of patents. All applicants for patents ought to be required to disclose any TK and/or associated genetic or biological resources used to produce the invention concerned and must demonstrate that the PIC has been received. The process of PIC must also be stringent so that assessors can see all disclosures are true and complete (WIPO Report, 2001, p. 75).

5.7.1 Intellectual Property Rights

Copyright is an aspect of IP, which includes literary and artistic works, such as novels, poems and plays, films, musical works, drawings, paintings, photographs and sculptures, computer software, databases and architectural designs (WIPO Report, 2001, p. 24). Copyright normally vests in the work’s author. The copyright owner has the exclusive rights to prevent the unauthorised reproduction, performance, broadcasting, translation and adaptation of the work. These are sometimes referred to as economic rights. Apart from the use of the copyright legislation as the foremost legal authority over such matters, there are other avenues that can be pursued to maintain the protection of copyright. These include copyright, information technology and cultural heritage. This is the process of digitising artwork held at institutions such as museums or art galleries. For example, The Fine Arts School at the Northern Territory University in Darwin, Australia, embarked on a pilot project to digitise Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander artworks held by it and other institutions such as the Museum and Art Gallery of the Northern Territory, in Darwin, Australia. The main aim of this project is visual repatriation where artworks are disseminated back to their originating communities. In this case, copyright exists in the following forms: as digitised form, original work, new copyright on those doing digitisation, those who own electronic storage and relevant indigenous groups.
WIPO has looked into some practical methods of protecting the rights of indigenous people, one of which is the need for the protection of databases to keep endangered languages (WIPO Report, 2001, p. 75). In terms of the moral rights concept of copyright law, this is also regarded by certain informants as being potentially useful for indigenous persons, under which royalties continued to be paid out for the use of literary and musical works in the public domain (ibid). Indigenous arts markets are other situations where the role of art dealers and auctioneers in the protection of indigenous artists must be tightened. It was suggested that dealers and auctioneers should not facilitate the sale of non-genuine indigenous artworks and should assist indigenous artists to obtain a fair return for their creativity.

The ‘Look and Feel Protection’ requires that the copyright protection be afforded to the “Look and Feel Protection” software and other works under copyright law. For example, the appropriation of Aboriginal and Torres Islander styles by non-indigenous persons should be avoided at all cost. Geographical indications are crucial as it is useful in regulating the import and export of counterfeit and fake indigenous products, such as the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander musical instrument, the didgeridoo. A PIC requirement in this process is also important to include (WIPO Report, 2001, p. 76). Research must look into the development of new ‘rights’ for new ‘norms’. This is where a separate system of rights may be needed (ibid). It is very crucial that indigenous communities must learn to collaborate with other domains such as self-determination, health, justice and cultural heritage. The IP needs of TK holders cannot be dealt with in isolation (WIPO report, 2001, p. 77). Mostly these areas subset into each other. Another point is the strengthening of policies such as The Mabo v Queensland case (WIPO report, 2001, p. 78). While a lot of activities are taking place, it is critical that there is a great need for awareness-raising. Local communities can regulate access to TK and associated genetic resources (ibid).

IPR laws are generally inappropriate and inadequate for defending the rights and resources of local communities. IPR protection, as mentioned earlier, is purely economical, whereas the interests of indigenous peoples are usually partly economic and partly linked to self-determination. Holders of restricted traditional knowledge,
even though they may possess skills and know-how as an individual, will still not have the right to commercialise such TK for personal gain. Communities, though, can still develop their own systems for protecting traditional resource rights. A number of models and concepts are emerging. These are intended to help people develop new, appropriate bases for future legal systems to protect their knowledge and resources (Posey, 1996, p. 93).

5.7.2 Ownership: IP and Museum Collections

Cultural heritage and traditional cultural expressions (TCEs) are first accessed by folklorists, ethnographers, enthnomusicologists, cultural anthropologists and other fieldworkers. TCEs are also documented, recorded, displayed and made available to the public by museums, inventories, registries, databases, archives and the like (WIPO Background Paper, 2003, p. 59). The role of museums as educational institutions is pivotal for learning by all museum visitors, both young and old. Collectors, fieldworkers, museums archivists aim to preserve, conserve, maintain and transmit tangible and intangible cultural heritage, for the benefit of our future generation (ibid).

The difficulty arises when cultural heritage and TCEs are placed in the public domain. Protecting IP at this stage is difficult, in particular when trying to protect the interests of indigenous and local communities. One example is the digitising of museum collections where heritage collections are available for museological and/or curatorial, as well as commercial, purposes (ibid).

Indigenous peoples and traditional communities have expressed certain concerns associated with the collection, recordal, and making available of their tangible and intangible cultural heritage, particularly in relation to indigenous and customary obligations, and these concerns must also be addressed. Some have proposed that possible development of IP-related protocols, codes of conduct and guidelines must be developed. There must also be an IP checklist developed and model IP contractual clauses created. More importantly is the development of model IP-related Rules of Use and Copyright Notices for use in connection with websites, CD-Roms, specialised databases and other electronic multimedia products (WIPO Background Paper, 2003, p. 59).
5.7.3 Cultural Rights, Intellectual Property and Museums

Case Study: Fiji Museum

Since the opening of the new museum in 1955, there has been a shift in the way the museum was managed and perceived by the colonial government and the local communities. Directors of museums continued to be white males who had some training in government and interest in history. Moving towards independence in 1970, there was a shift to localise management positions.

After independence, the museum continued to deliver its role as a statutory body. The government became more involved in the affairs of the institution and became concerned with the physical structure and the proper management of the collections. This led to the extension of the museum building in which a conservation laboratory and more storerooms were built. Local staff were also employed and visitor numbers from the local communities increased. This included both the iTaukei and Indian families. Museum visitor numbers also included tourists, most of whom traveled in cruise ships and docked in Suva harbour.

The perception of the museum by locals was beginning to shift. Families that were visiting included both parents and children. As for Indian families, this often included visits of three generations, where grandparents were visiting with their children and grandchildren. Attitudes towards museum visits were leaning more towards education in the cultural heritage of Fiji. The museum was seen as the institution of learning. From the governments perspective, it was a cultural institution with museum legislations to support its deliverables through cultural education.

From 1970 to 1980, the Fiji Museum was always included under the Ministry of Education. This reflects the view of the government that the museum holds that educational role. In the 1990s, it shifted between the Ministry of Women and Culture and the Ministry of Education. The Fiji Museum was viewed as an educational institution for all cultures in Fiji, rather than the focus on the iTaukei. Despite this
change, the iTaukei Ministry (formerly known as Ministry of Fijian Affairs) indirectly supports the museum in its activities. Through a collaborative project called the *Duavata Program* in the mid-1990s and led by the iTaukei Ministry, the Fiji Museum was invited to be part of this collaborative approach as part of a collaborative cultural mapping exercise across the country. The National Trust of Fiji, Department of Environment, Ministry of Tourism, Department of Town and Country Planning and the iTaukei Trust Board were part of this initiative. As the head of the archaeology department at that time, I was actively involved in this program. We visited the island of Ovalau, and conducted assessment on Levuka Town and neighbouring villages. As a result of such visits, there was a push to nominate Levuka as a World Heritage site. This nomination became successful in 2013, an event that took more than a decade to eventuate. The seed for this nomination, however was planted through the Duavata programme.

The current set-up requires the Fiji Museum, along with the Fiji Arts Council (FAC) and the National Trust of Fiji (NTF) to report to the Department of Culture and Heritage. This is the national body that manages cultural policies and develops frameworks for all Fijians (including the *iTaukei*) across the country. The Institute of Fijian Language and Culture is another body that focuses only on indigenous language and dialects and is managed under the Ministry of I Taukei Affairs. The current understanding is that the Fiji Museum caters for all cultures in Fiji, and this is represented by the exhibitions that it currently displays. The prehistory gallery discusses the first arrival of Indigenous Fijians to Fiji 3000 years ago and the maritime history it boasts. Not only does it share histories from the coastal areas of Fiji but also provides a rich history of the inland tribes and villages. The history gallery, however, signifies the arrival of outsiders, including Europeans and other Pacific islanders who have shaped Fiji to be what it is today. There are three other galleries: a masi gallery that focuses on *masi* (tapa-cloth), an Indo-Fijian gallery and a contemporary art gallery. Even though the initial focus of the museum was the collecting of indigenous materials, through time this has changed as the museum is expected to be representative of all cultures in Fiji.
5.8 Modern Laws and Agreements Supporting Repatriation

Repatriation laws and agreements reflect the progressive refinement of the system of definitions and processes that would be applied to repatriation. Such laws become guide-posts for years to come. The detailed processes leading to the enactment of laws provide the new generation with the references needed to apply them in new situations. Every agreement and piece of legislation reflects the evolving confrontation, negotiations and agreements between various groups, such as indigenous groups, museums, governments and collectors (McKeown, 2013, p. ix). The adoption of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples prompted huge progress on the debate over indigenous rights in international law relating to repatriation. Even though it has now been adopted, one issue that remains a concern was how repatriation can be done today when objects that are to be returned were taken from communities one or two centuries ago (Tuensmeyer, 2014, p. 183).

International recognition of indigenous peoples has been a long struggle. The United Nations finally opened its doors for negotiations from the 1970s onwards, however in the 1950s and 1960s, anticolonialist currents still existed but the issue of the colonial problem remained untouched. The first indigenous diplomatic missions took place in the eighteenth century when several requests were addressed to the British Crown in London by several indigenous ambassadors. In 1710, four leaders of the Five Nations of the Iroquois Confederacy in Canada set sail to see Queen Anne (Lepage, in Leger, 1994, p. 2). The creation of the League of Nation in 1919 became a beacon of light to many indigenous leaders. Subsequent visits to England and Washington continued to take place afterwards. With the creation of the United Nations in 1945, this offered a little more hope to indigenous leaders because one of the purposes of the UN and written into its Charter is the necessity of:

developing friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples. (Lepage, in Leger, 1994, p. 7)
The Charter also recognised that member states recognise as a sacred trust their obligation to favour the well-being of the inhabitants: in particular, to ensure respect for cultures, to encourage their advancement and see to it that they were treated justly and protected against abuses (ibid).

In the 1960s, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to colonial countries and peoples (UN Resolution 1514). It constituted condemnation of colonialism and a moral recognition of the validity of the passionate desire of all dependent peoples for freedom (Lepage, in Leger, 1994, p. 10). The next major international instruments adopted by the UN were the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the two United Nations Covenants on Human Rights. The main key points from these instruments were that:

Member States will respect the rights of everyone and are protected without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion. (Lepage, in Leger, 1994, p. 13)

The International Labour Organization (ILO) adopted the Convention 107 entitled Convention concerning the Protection and Integration of Indigenous and other Tribal and Semi-Tribal Populations in Independent Countries. This was adopted in 1957. It was in this capacity that ILO wanted to protect the exploitation of indigenous workers (Lepage, in Leger, 1994, p. 15). With the birth of numerous indigenous NGOs around the world, this gave voice to numerous communities seeking recognition and respect. The Universal Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples opened the door to the possible repatriation of indigenous cultural objects.

In the case of the United States of America, November 28, 1989, was date that President George W. Bush signed into law the National Museum of the American Indian Act (NMAI Act), which included provisions requiring the repatriation of human remains and funerary objects in the possession or control of the Smithsonian Institution. Almost a year later, on November 16, 1990, Bush approved the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA). These two legislations together establish
a national framework for achieving three goals. First of all is the repatriation of Native American human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects and objects of cultural patrimony that are in the possession or control of all federal agencies and institutions receiving federal funds. Secondly is the disposition of cultural items excavated or removed from federal or tribal lands. Thirdly is the prohibition of commercial activities involving indigenous cultural items (McKeown, 2013, p. ix).

5.9 Concluding Remarks

On moral grounds opinion demands that respect shall be paid to the rights claimed by natives over their lands and resources (Legge, 1958, p. 173). Caution must be exercised on crown control over the lands of the territory. If the crown is guardian over native lands, then it must look after the right of alienation and determine the nature of native tenure. In the case of Fiji, it is imperative to find out the indigenous method of land sale even though the Deed of Cession was a treaty that gave courts power to make final judgement on land transactions. Land is as important to indigenous people as their works of art and oral traditions.

To conclude, the regional work being done on human rights as well as cultural rights of indigenous people has highlighted the importance of acknowledging our rich cultural heritage and the changes that have taken place over the last hundred years. Many Fijians today understand that change through modernisation and colonisation is inevitable. Many are able to juggle such change and have learnt to adapt to modern way of thinking and living. Two things that many still hold on to are traditional connections to tribal chieftainship and land ownership. Despite the political turmoil that Fiji faces, the iTaukei remain steadfast knowing that these two cornerstones will remain in years to come. The Fiji Museum thus has become the institution that upholds such cultural changes over the years. This is reflected in the form of its exhibitions and rich collection.
6 CHAPTER SIX

TUVATUVA NI VAKADIDIKE: Research Methodology

Tell Me and I will Forget
Show me and I May not Remember
Involve Me and I will understand

~Native American Saying~

6.1 Introduction

This chapter outlines the research process designed for this research. It provides a description of how data was gathered and the analysis method applied during the research process. My research topic focuses on repatriation of Fijian artifacts currently kept in international museums. I have chosen three museums as case studies. They are the Fiji Museum (Suva), Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology (MAA, Cambridge) and the Museum of Anthropology (MOA, Canada). Most of my interview participants were of iTaukei background while others, including overseas curators and researchers, were of European descent. As for non-iTaukei participants, they still managed to contribute to my qualitative inquiry developed by Dr. Unaisi Nabobo-Baba, known as the Fijian Vanua Research Framework (FVRF).

6.2 Qualitative Research Method

Qualitative research, also known as qualitative inquiry, is an umbrella term used to cover a wide variety of research methods and methodologies that provide holistic, in-depth accounts and attempt to reflect the complicated, contextual, interactive, and interpretive nature of our social world. For example, grounded theory, ethnography, phenomenology, ethnomethodology, narratology, photovoice, and participatory action research (PAR) may all be included under the qualitative label, although each of these
individual methods is based on its own set of assumptions and procedures. What unifies these various approaches to inquiry is their primary reliance on non-numeric forms of data (also known as empirical evidence) and their rejection of some of the underlying philosophical principles that guide methods employed in the physical and natural sciences and frequently in the social sciences. This requires using philosophical frameworks which informs qualitative research and qualitative research designs (Staller, 2015).

### 6.2.1 Case Study Research Approach

In a qualitative research methodology, there is a focus on identifying how individuals and/or small groups make meaning of or understand key concepts of your research (Walter, 2010). I selected the case study research approach because it applies to my research as this methodology encourages researchers to select their participants according to their characteristics and knowledge. Case study research involves the study of an issue explored through one or more cases within a bounded system, setting or context (Creswell, 2006). This method allows the researcher to explore the case studies over time through a detailed in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information such as observation, interview, audio-visual materials, documents and reports. One benefit of using this approach in my study is that I am able to purposefully select multiple cases to show different perspective on the issue. Yin (2003) suggests that multiple case study design uses replication in which a researcher replicates procedures for each case. The Fiji Museum, Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology (Cambridge, England) and Museum Of Anthropology (Vancouver, Canada) were the three case studies in this research and I replicated my interview procedures across all the cases.
6.2.2 Procedure For Conducting Case Studies

With reference to the image above, researchers must determine whether the case study approach is suitable for the research. Next, researchers need to identify their cases. This may include an individual, more individuals, a program, an event or an activity. Researchers should also try to find out which type of case study is useful or the most promising. The case could be single or collective, multi-sited or within site (Yin, 2003). Data collection in case study research is typically extensive, drawing from multiple sources of information such as observations, interviews, documents and audio visual materials. Data analysis can be holistic (analysing the entire case) or embedded (specific aspect of the case study). Here, the researcher provides a detailed description of the case studies, captures the history and chronology of events and the day-by-day activities of the case study. The researcher can then identify common themes that transcend the case studies. A data collection matrix is a handy tool to have in order to tabulate the amount of information that is gathered from the case studies (Yin, 2003). In the final interpretive stage, the researcher provides the meaning of the case studies. As Lincoln and Guba (1985) mention, this phase constitutes the lessons learned from the case studies.
6.2.3 Research Sampling

Sampling is the process of selecting a number of individuals for a study in such a way that the individuals represent the larger group from which they are selected. The purpose of the sampling is to gather data about the population in order to make an inference that can be generalised to the population (Hajimia, 2014). With reference to my research plan, part of my sampling process was identifying key individuals in Fiji, England and Canada to be interviewed. Snowball sampling was also applied in order to identity potential interviewees from existing acquaintances. This involved identifying potential interviewee from the ones I have just spoken to. It is a type pf convenience sampling where recommendations are made by colleagues or by those just interviewed.

The key people identified as the sample were, firstly, the selected museum staff in the three museums that I visited. Secondly were the researchers who were directly or indirectly involved in the process of repatriation. Thirdly were the iTaukei community members in Fiji, England and Canada. The initial number that was agreed to earlier was 50. During the course of my fieldwork, I was able to acquire more 51 responses to my questionnaires and interviews. This number was revised to thirty (35) as 51 was deemed too many.
The interview process involved the following methods:

- Direct interviews (structured or semi-structured)
- Questionnaire (set of questions that will be used during the interview or given to participants to fill at their own time)
- Participant observation (as the lead researcher, I was part of the observation and participated in some museum discussions).

The main methods for collecting qualitative data were individual interviews, focus groups, observations and action research. The interviews I conducted were semi-structured. I developed a series of open-ended questions based on the topic which was written in a questionnaire format. The first part of the questionnaire had a series of broad questions. There were also some open-ended questions that defined the topic but provides opportunities for both interviewer and interviewee to discuss some topics in more detail. This method allowed the researcher to prompt or encourage the interviewee if they are looking for more information or find what the interviewee is saying interesting. This method gives the researcher the freedom to probe the interviewee to elaborate or to follow a new line of inquiry introduced by what the interviewee is saying. It also works best when the interviewee has a number of areas he/she wants to be sure to address. Good quality qualitative research involves thought, preparation, the development of the interview schedule and conducting and analysing the interview data with care and consideration.

There were times when iTaukei participants needed extra time to think about the questions and respond at a later date. I was open to this option and set a timeline and date to make contact through a method preferred by the participant. Email was the preferred method. I then sent a courtesy email a day before the responses were due as a reminder. In most cases, responses came on time. For some, I had to pursue through other means such as using social networking sites such as Facebook. Interestingly enough, the responses from Facebook were a lot faster than contacting some of them via normal email. This experience alone showed me other options of contacting people. This would be cheaper (as they are free) and efficient. Others, I used Skype with to
discuss further ideas on their responses.

### 6.2.4 Purposeful Sampling

In choosing which case to study, I used purposeful sampling. It is also known as judgemental, selective or subjective sampling. It relies on the judgement of the researcher when it comes to selecting case studies, individuals, organisations or other types of data. The main goal of purposeful sampling is to focus on particular characteristics of a population that are of interest, which will best enable you to answer your research questions. The sample being studied is representative of the population (Lund Research, 2012). A form of non-probability sampling in which decisions concerning the individuals are included in the sample are taken by the researcher, based upon a variety of criteria which may include specialist knowledge of the research issue, or capacity and willingness to participate in the research. Some types of research design necessitate researchers taking a decision about the individual participants who would be most likely to contribute appropriate data, both in terms of relevance and depth. For example, in life history research, some potential participants may be willing to be interviewed, but may not be able to provide sufficiently rich data (Oliver, 2006). Purposeful sampling allowed me to choose individuals who provided specific knowledge about the topic of repatriation (Hajimia, 2014). This was applied to staff of the museums as well as researchers whose work intersects with the museum fraternity. Gathering their stories, experiences and perspective was refreshing and empowering.

### 6.2.5 Research Sites

Fieldwork was conducted in Fiji (December, 2012 – February, 2013), England (June, 2013) and Canada (July, 2013). Three case studies were chosen to provide a good cross-section of Fijian artifacts in these museums and to develop a story-line as to how they got there. Prior to my field visits, there were email communication between myself and the curators of these museums. In terms of researchers and iTaukei community leaders, I was able to identify them during the pre-research field visits.

During the course of my research, changes occurred in the list of institutions that I was interested in studying. Careful consideration was placed on identifying the best sites due to limited funding. For example, Australia and the United States of America were two research sites that were identified. I had genuine reasons on choosing these sites.
The Museum of Victoria in Melbourne has an active MOU with the Fiji Museum and I was interested to study how virtual repatriation works (see CHAPTER SIX). Similarly, with the Smithsonian Museum, I was interested to study the Ro Veidovi remains and the history behind it. The Bishop Museum was the other museum selected due to the recent repatriation of human remains to the Kingdom of Tonga. The solution that was put in place was to undertake archival research on these three sites of interest and include them where appropriate in the final thesis.

6.2.6 Participants

The planning process ensured that a cross-section of people was interviewed in order to obtain a wide range of ideas and experiences. The categories of participants in my proposal and questionnaires are listed below and described herein.

6.2.6.1 Group 1: Museum staff

Museum staff were identified as key informants. They are the ones that have experienced repatriation issues in their line of work. Museum directors and curators were identified to be interviewed. In Fiji, apart from those who work in the collections department, I was able to also interview staff who work in other departments such as exhibition, archaeology and visitor experience. In England, I was fortunate to interview the two curators who work directly with Fijian collections. They were also curators of the “Chiefs and Governors” exhibition. As for Canada, I had the opportunity to interview their curator who manages Pacific collections. She also has a strong relationship with the Fijian community in Vancouver. Through her networks, I was able to meet Fijian community members who became participants in my research.

6.2.6.2 Group 2: Researchers

Participants in this category included government department staff, academic staff at tertiary institutions, researchers and non-iTaukei artists. Interviewing these individuals was empowering. They were able to share some of their own projects and experiences. Approaching these individuals was easy as I had worked with some of them in past projects. Others that I met during my fieldwork willingly shared their thoughts and
consented to be interviewed. Some related that they were keen to be interviewed as they knew that my research is valuable to them and their families. Many of them were interviewed face-to-face, while others mainly answered e-questionnaires. Many of them preferred email as the best method of communication and others continued to communicate with me through Facebook. One participant continued to send me links related to repatriation from other parts of the world. She works in the field of repatriation as well, helping return indigenous materials including human remains from the USA to Canada. I was able to read more on the subject through her kind assistance.

6.2.6.3 **Group 3: iTaukei Community Leaders**

This category included iTaukei community members that I met during my field visits. Even though my target participants were older and long-term resident leaders, I was able to also interview younger community members who were active in the arts and culture of the Fijian communities, in particular in England and Canada. I am indebted to their willingness to share their views and feelings openly. I was able to record these conversations and others were able to answer the questionnaire that I sent to them. I was also able to get others recruited as a result of these selfless individuals.

**The Participants Summary: Experiences Faced in the Field**

The 51 informants interviewed, included those in Fiji, England and Canada. In addition to these countries, I was able to interview other participants in Australia, New Zealand, Barbados and the USA. The latter category included those in the Fijian diaspora, a group of people whose views have affected the way I look at repatriation.

One of the difficulties I faced was ensuring that I was not biased in selecting informants from the Fiji Museum. This was due to the fact that I was a previous employee there as well as that I am currently the Secretary-General of the Pacific Islands Museums Association (PIMA) and its office was based at the Fiji Museum when I was employed there. With the advice of the Ethics Committee at the University of Auckland, I had to make sure that my recruitment process was unbiased and participants were willing to share their views rather than feel coerced to participate. The consent form was one way
of ensuring that their participation was above board and not influenced in any negative way.

Another difficulty was the availability of my informants for face-to-face interviews. Before undertaking fieldwork in Fiji, England and Canada, I informed potential informants by email of my presence and possible dates for interview. However, upon my arrival, some informants were not available due to work and other commitments. My back-up plan was to either interview them through other means such as Skype or Viber. The most effective methods that I found were through email and communicating with them through Facebook. Facebook was the most effective method of locating informants and the best way to interview, as many were not answering their emails but responded to the Facebook private messaging system. For non-responsive informants, interview back-ups from New Zealand, Australia and the USA were used as replacements.

Language was another hurdle that I had to overcome, not only for the use of the iTaukei language, but also the use of the most relevant level of English. For English speakers who found the museum topic technical, I used a simplified version of the questionnaire. As for fluent iTaukei language speakers, I proposed asking them simplified revised questions, which was welcomed by all. My ability to adapt to the correct level of language was beneficial at all levels, as these informants were able to share more than they would have shared if I used the main questionnaire that I used for museum staff and researchers.

One other benefit that I gained from my fieldwork was the online existence of the Fiji Museum, MAA and MOA. I was able to visit these museums’ websites to gain more insight into these institutions, and this benefited my writing. In terms of museum policies, MAA and MOA have these policies available online. As far as museum databases are concerned, MOA was the easiest to navigate. The names and numbers of Fijian artifacts were available online, which made it easy to include in CHAPTER EIGHT. Dr. Carol Mayer (2014), whilst being interviewed, kept referring to the online database as a point of reference.
When visiting MAA and MOA, I was able to recruit my iTaukei community participants from respective museum events that took place. I knew some from before I began conducting this research while others were new to me. Once they understood the main purpose of my visit, they willingly offered their views and feelings about repatriation. Before the topic of repatriation was introduced, many were surprised to know that Fijian collections existed in museums in England and Canada. This was one direct benefit of my fieldwork, which was the raising of the profile of Fijian collections in international museums. As for others outside these two countries, they were following my online updates on social networking sites. When I approached informants and artists in New Zealand, Australia and the USA, many were forthcoming in wanting to support my research.

The Questions and Interviews

Question and answer sessions were conducted through in-person interviews. Email questionnaires and telephone interviews were the main methods of information-gathering with informants. For in-person interviews, an audio recorder was used to record conversations, and these recordings became valuable during the write-up as I referred to the interview transcripts for clarifications. I also took notes during the interviews.

The questions centered on repatriation and what this meant to the participants. Although I asked similar questions of each informant, I then tailored the remaining questions for the informant. For instance, I would query repatriation activities to curators who had had previous experience in repatriation (see Appendix A for questionnaire). At most times, these follow-up questions, based on their experiences, encouraged the participant to remain engaged in the interview. There would be a limitation in using this method, as not all museum staff have experienced repatriation and therefore, follow-up questions would be limited to only a few. When interviewing participants, my goal was to gain an understanding of how they understood repatriation, and also their views on whether repatriation can take place between their international museums and the Fiji Museum. These questions were also meant to draw them out, so they were able to
highlight any problems that their institutions have in relation to repatriation, and for them to explain why repatriation is a good idea or otherwise. They had to explain why they felt the way they do in their responses and suggest a positive way forward for the Fiji Museum.

Most of the questions that were asked were met with great enthusiasm, while other questions made some participants struggle to respond. I attribute this to unclear questions and lack of relevance of the question to the participant. It was at this point in time that I clarified the question and even rephrased the question to suit the participant’s understanding of the topic.

6.3 Fijian Research Methodology

Research methodology is the theoretical lens or paradigmatic frame of reference through which the research is conceived, interpreted, designed, conducted, analysed and presented (Walter, 2010). The methodology chosen is designed to facilitate deeper understanding rather than a surface-only understanding of participants in Fiji, England and Canada. Since most of my participants are iTaukei, the Fijian Vanua Research Framework methodology applies perfectly.

6.3.1 Talanoa as a Methodology

There are a range of methodologies within the field of social science research including institutional ethnography, narrative autobiography, storytelling and participatory action research (Brown & Strega, 2005). Talanoa, the Fijian word for storytelling, was the most appropriate in my research because it involved sharing personal stories and experiences. Even though I developed a set of questions, I encouraged them to share their further experiences and thoughts on the topic. The research methodology that I applied in my research was based on the Veiwekani Framework (see CHAPTER 10) or 3R Framework (in English). The 3Rs are Respect, Reciprocity and Relationship (see Figure 6.3). The Veiwekani Framework consists of Vakarokoroko, Veisolisoli and the fundamental one is Veiwekani. Relationship is the foundation of the other 2Rs. In other words, respect and relationship are subsets of relationship.
6.3.2 The Vanua as a Methodological Framework

Conducting research in the Pacific in the 21st century can be a difficult exercise, especially if the indigenous knowledge protocols, including languages, philosophies and principles are not adhered to (Nabobo-Baba, 2008). It is empowering to see indigenous peoples developing their own research methodologies they know first-hand to work for their communities. One such framework is called the Fijian Vanua Research Framework (FVFR), which guides researchers to undertake research concerning Fijian histories, knowledge, skills, arts, values and lifeway (ibid). As a scholar, I had to adhere to the research protocols and ethics approval process of the University. On the other hand, I had to consider the rules and guidelines associated with the *vanua* (tribe) and its associated protocols. Even though I did not conduct research in a village setting, I still wanted to apply some customary processes in the discussions. I knew that I was discussing a topic that was associated with Fijian culture and heritage, as well as talking to individuals who are of iTaukei heritage, therefore the FVRF was the most relevant.
Similar to Nabobo-Baba (2008), I was confronted with the ‘insider-outsider’ dilemma, where I was faced with academic expectations and those of the vanua.

6.4 Indigenous Methodological Framework

The Fijian Vanua Research Framework (FVRF) was largely informed by the related ideological positioning of Kaupapa Maori Research (Smith, 1999) and other Pacific equivalents like the Tongan Kakala Framing (Thaman, 1997, 2006). Over the years, many indigenous researchers have been pushed to develop their own research frameworks that are relevant and applicable for their communities. Hau’ofa (1993), Smith (1999), Thaman (2008) and Nabobo-Baba (2008) have actively looked into the creation of new indigenous frameworks that decolonises research and methodologies (Nabobo-Baba, 2008, p. 142). Such moves empower indigenous researchers and allows them to re-establish their own engagement with their own people over their own knowledge systems, experiences, representations, imaginations and identities. One direct benefit of using such indigenous frameworks is that indigenous people, in this case Fijians, are not just objects of research but are proactive actors in the creation of solutions and new knowledge-bases of research (ibid).

6.4.1 Kaupapa Maori Methodology

This methodology is based on Maori beliefs and thinking. This is one of the wider moves by indigenous researchers and thinkers within academia to decolonise the academy, which lead to the decolonising methodologies put forward by Maori academic Linda Smith (1999). Research was seen as a colonisation tool and not used for the self-determination and development of indigenous people.

Kaupapa Maori theorises the assertion of ‘greater socio-political, emotional, psychological, philosophical and spiritual control for Maori (people) and their lives.’ In comparison to the past, research that was conducted then was very disruptive, intrusive and, many times, exploitative among indigenous people and the establishment of this research model is to counter such negative methods of research (Nabobo-Baba,
An interesting feature of Kaupapa Maori is what Smith (1999, p. 184) suggested, that ‘this type of research needs Maori researchers who regard themselves and their research as fitting within a Kaupapa Maori Framework.’ She continued on to say that:

One of the challenges for Maori researchers has been to retrieve some space: first, some space to convince Maori people of the value of research for Maori; second, to convince the various, fragmented research communities of the need for greater Maori involvement in research; and third, to develop approaches and ways of carrying out research which takes into account, without being limited by, the legacies of previous research and the parameters of both previous and current approaches. (Smith, 1999, p. 183)

### 6.4.2 Tongan Kakala Framework

This framework was developed by Tongan academic and poet, Professor Konai Helu-Thaman (1993, 1997), who used the metaphor of the kakala or garland. Kakala is a fragrant flower that has mythical or legendary origins. Stringing or weaving together kakala into garlands involves three processes: toli, tui and luva. Toli involves the gathering of fragrant flowers and leaves. Like research, this process demands not only knowledge of the materials to fashion the garland but the skills of how to obtain them (e.g., picking the flowers without damaging them). Tui involves the actual stringing of the flowers and the method used depends on the occasion with which the kakala is to be worn. The final process, luva, involves the giving away of the kakala garland by the weaver or bearer to somebody else, because the kakala is never retained or kept indefinitely by the wearer. Similar to knowledge, the kakala has to be transmitted and promoted in the proper manner following all protocols (Thaman, 2008; Nemani, 2012, p. 25).
This metaphor was developed as a result of the marginalisation of indigenous knowledge. This is a Tongan concept of knowledge construction that is used as investigative or research methodology. Kakala, according to Thaman, is Tongan for fragrant flowers and leaves woven together in special ways according to the needs of the occasion. Kakala is either worn around the waist or neck. Some Tongan academics such as Dr. Timote Vaioleti (2011) also refer to this framework as the Talanoa Research Methodology. These frameworks acknowledge Tongan identity and respect the polity and culture of the Tongan people. This approach incorporates a sense of being Tongan, which is one who is a balanced, spiritual social being and who is in harmony with themselves, family, the environment and his or her God/s (ibid).

6.4.3 Fijian Vanua Research Framework

This framework was initiated by Dr. Unaisi Nabobo-Baba. It details the processes used when researching indigenous Fijian histories, knowledge, skills, arts, values and lifeways (Nemani, 2012). It takes into account ‘standards, protocols and epistemological bases of research and knowledge production’ and ‘in order to manifest Pacific cultural aspirations, preferences and practices that will ensure the achievement and outcomes of the research’ is reached (Nabobo-Baba, 2008, p. 142). Additionally, FVRF empowers iTaukei to conduct research about ourselves, using our own language.
of communication in order to record complex systems of philosophies that are reflected in our arts and culture, such as songs, carvings, weavings, paintings and oral traditions. Even though such research findings may not be in written form as expected by academic institutions, there are other ways that research findings can be transmitted such as ‘story-telling’ (ibid). The following processes are followed to ensure access to indigenous knowledge:

(Adapted from Nabobo-Baba, 2008)
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Figure 6.5. FVRF Part 1.

The above chart only shows the beginning part of the process. Talanoa is the most appropriate methodology used when undertaking research. Mostly it involves sharing in an informal manner around the *tanoa* (kava bowl). Other processes that take place after the talanoa are depicted in Figure 6.6 and Figure 6.7 below:

(Adapted from Nabobo-Baba, 2008)
There are also two processes post-research that are critical in the success of any indigenous Fijian research. The first one is called the *vakarogotaki lesu nai tukutuku* (reporting back to the community for knowledge shared) and *the vakilai na revurevu ni vakadidike* (articulated the transformative to the local community as a result of the research).

In support of the FVRF, a new perspective is proposed to encourage indigenous researchers to view their research from a different set of lenses. This is based on planting and how ideas are nurtured to grow into something useful.
One aspect of *teiteivaki* that was and is still common in Fiji is time. To know the right time to nurture and plant will ensure that your plant will grow well. Similar to research, knowing the right time to nurture your ideas and to conduct interviews is a stepping-stone to success in research. For example, timing fieldwork that coincides with your participants being in one place and being able to talk and share their views are critical to good research. In the case of planting, the *Vula Vakaviti* (traditional calendar) highlights the planting of certain plants and trees at the certain time of the year. For instance, the month of September is the *Vulai Vavakada*, which is the time of putting young yam plantings attached to sticks as by this time, the young creeping plant will attach themselves to the sticks as it grows (Nimacere, 2015).

### 6.5 Talanoa Research Model

Scientific research communication models between researcher and participants are normally clustered under the following categories: structured, semi-structured or unstructured. In a similar arrangement, within the Fijian setting, there is *talanoa*, also known as free talk (Koya-Vakauta, 2013). *Bose*, on the other hand is structured meeting, where only certain speakers are allowed to speak, giving prominence to those of certain hierarchical positions.
Talanoa is a term that is common in Fiji and other Pacific islands, which refers to chatting, conversations or sharing information between two people or a series of conversations between two or more people over a period of time. Pacific academics, over time, have developed talanoa into a research model that indigenous and non-indigenous researchers are using now in their research.

In the Fijian context, talanoa refers to the process where two or more people talk together or when one person is the storyteller and has an audience. There are formal talanoas, where kava is served and only selected people are chosen to be part of the conversation, while the informal talanoa are usually lighthearted and others can join in and participate (Nabobo-Baba, 2008, p. 148). Others may simplify it as the Pacific way of collecting information. Talanoa is also a window to the minds and hearts of those you are talking to, which makes it uniquely Pacific, and in this case Tongan or Fijian (Vaioleti, 2011, p. 136).

In this research, particularly with the iTaukei participants, the talanoa model was used to request the sharing of knowledge and experiences. I believe that the talanoa method of gathering information was the appropriate approach that guided the conversations and was based on respect, reciprocity and relationship. As Nabobo-Baba (2008) highlighted, ‘talanoa does not happen in a void, a talanoa or a request for talanoa is a request given in a cultural context with concomitant expectations as may be articulated by the people concerned.’ I will share some examples of those I experienced in my fieldwork.

6.5.1 Talanoa with Museum Curators

English language was used during talanoa sessions with museum curators. Fiji Museum curator and Director (even though a iTaukei) preferred English as the mode of conversation. Recordings of the conversations were done through note-taking and a tape recorder. The Director also requested emailing additional points she may have missed in the talanoa sessions. A post-talanoa visit of the collection-store was organised. The talanoa session in England reversed this order. The collection visit was
organised before the face-to-face interview. I found this method rewarding as I had the opportunity to refer to the collections in the interview. As for Canada, a special visit to the exhibition space by the curator, Dr. Carol Mayer was organised. A collection store visit was not organised as most of the Fijian artifacts are available to view online through the MOA website. This website is one of the most well-presented museum websites where an online visitor can easily navigate to find Fijian artifacts. The face-to-face interview was conducted in Auckland (New Zealand) in October (2013) when Dr. Mayer was traveling to Fiji via New Zealand. I was able to also record our interview and received her typed questionnaire responses. It was positive to see that face-to-face interviews with all the curators were undertaken successfully. Another factor that made these interviews flow well was that the questionnaires were sent to them prior to my arrival. A bonus was the benefit of interviewing them onsite, and the rare opportunity to visit galleries, exhibitions and collection stores where Fijian artifacts are safely kept.

6.5.2 Talanoa Between iTaukei Museum Staff

Even though the context of this talanoa is based not in a village but within the confined spaces of the museum, somehow the format of a speaker and audience was applied. The setting of the interview included the lead researcher and the staff member engaging in a conversation in the Bauan language, which prompted most of the participants to feel at ease and encouraged them to share their thoughts and feelings about the topic more eloquently. To choose the museum as the setting for discussions made it more relevant as participants were able to point out places of interest within the museum space that trigger their thoughts and emotions. For instance, the interview location at the collection store with Mereia Lesi enabled her to point out the evidence of support given by the Museum of Victoria in Melbourne, the Australian museum that was part of the Virtual Repatriation project in 2008. Our conversation also involved walking in the collection store, which encouraged more animated conversations and sharing.

Talanoa with other museum staff was positive and encouraging. Some of the staff willingly came forward and requested to share their thoughts, ideas and feelings with me. Eventually, I was able to interview staff members not only from the collection department but from the archaeology and exhibitions departments as well. Even though
I tried my best to keep the discussions within the topic of repatriation, other topics concerning storage, exhibition space and museum funding were also discussed. In a way, these issues also have indirect connections to the repatriation topic.

6.5.3 Talanoa Between a Chief and a Commoner

A higher degree of cultural protocol is expected for this particular talanoa session. Given my previous experience conducting archaeological fieldwork for the Fiji Museum years ago, a i sevusevu (kava presentation) is required to open the veitalanoa and veiwasei. In my current research situation, two high chiefs from the Provinces of Tailevu and Namosi are included in my list of research participants. Even though I was not able to meet them face-to-face during my Fiji fieldwork, I contacted them via email. The process of contacting them through this means of communication still required the use of vosa ni vakarokoroko (respectful words) and indirect contact through others who acted as matanivanua (spokesperson) on my behalf. I had to watch the way I worded the email to be respectful so as not to appear to be of rude manner (Nabobo-Baba, 2008, p. 150).

Apart from being a commoner, I was also a woman. This was another layer of conversation that required further protocol. For example, as a woman married to a man from Namosi, approaching the Tui Namosi was not an easy task. I had to approach my husband to get his advice on how I can make contact with the Tui Namosi. Since my husband shares a close kinship link with him, I allowed him first to make the contact. Then, when the positive response came for the questionnaire to be sent across, my husband continued to be the conduit between me and the Tui Namosi. Up to a certain point, I was allowed to make direct contact. From here, I used the Namosi dialect to communicate to explain my research and what I needed to complete my work. The questionnaire I sent to him was in the Bauan language, which he answered clearly. He chose to also handwrite his responses and reassured me that if I needed more information, I could just email or call him.
Speaking of the use of appropriate language, The Turaga na Roko Tui Bau communicated directly and indirectly to me in English and in the Bauan language. His academic background enabled him to clearly articulate himself in English until at a later conversation, when I informed him that I also have a translated questionnaire. The analysis of this experience is in CHAPTER NINE, however I would like to highlight here that using the correct language of communication in any talanoa methodology is key to successful sharing and discussions.

6.5.4 Talanoa Between iTaukei Artists

Part of the sampling process was to include iTaukei artisans who specialise in the field of visual arts. The selection process included the late Finau Mara (Master Weaver), Paula Liga (Master Carver) and Selai Buasala (Master Masi-Maker). All these artists are from the Lau Province, they speak fluent Bauan and they lived in Suva. Tuliana Druava became the conduit between myself and these high-profile artists. The same matanivana concept discussed earlier was applied here. All the questionnaires sent to them were more simplified and in Bauan. According to Druava (2014), these three artists felt privileged to be interviewed in order to have their views included in this research. She visited them, sat down in a talanoa format, and read out the questions in Fijian. With prior approval, she typed their responses while they were having a conversation. The result of the talanoa was later emailed to me.

6.5.5 Talanoa Between iTaukei Community Members (Diaspora)

iTaukei community leaders that I met in Cambridge and Vancouver also required similar protocols but these were not as strict as those applied in Fiji. I noticed that our conversations were much more relaxed although the language used was still formal. I met most of the participants at the “Chiefs and Governors” exhibition and many were keen to have a talanoa with me during and post exhibition. Our talanoa continued with further emails exchanged between us in order to clarify further points on their thoughts regarding repatriation. Apart from the emails, social networking sites were also used to maintain contact and dialogue.
It is fitting to summarise the research process through a diagram that visually record the paths and decisions taken for choosing the most relevant research methodology in this study. It is anticipated that future researchers can learn and improve from this experience. The FVRF Framework was the key research framework that formed the basis of this 5-step research process.

![Diagram of research process]

**Figure 6.9 Summary of research process (Vunidilo, 2015)**

### 6.6 Culturally Informed Tools

Una Nabobo-Baba’s Fijian Vanua Research Framework was indeed a useful tool. Her work inspired me to be brave to capture Fijian stories and experiences; no matter if others may think that such stories are unimportant. I now realise that everyone’s story is valuable in very special ways. Also viewing the work conducted by the late Professor Asesela Ravuvu on his work with his people in Naitasiri also added value to my research. Additionally, I had the opportunity to subscribe to the iTaukei Affairs quarterly newsletter. This newsletter informs me on various developmental projects taking place around the country, which included topics associated with iTaukei culture and history. I also read and analysed past Fijian research so I could glean indigenous methods of research that I applied in my thesis. ICOM and ICH are two organisations
that capture through their E-newsletters research experiences of indigenous cultures from around the world. I found these case-studies equally inspiring and added value to my research analysis.

6.6.1 Visual Ethnography

This category of research uses photography, motion pictures, the web and interactive CDs as a way of capturing perceptions and social realities of people. Pictures featuring Fijian artifacts in the home and museum settings were equally inspiring. All museums had collections databases that enabled me to visualise artifacts that I was studying. This made my work a lot easier as I was reading on the history, how they were made, how they were used and how they moved from Fiji to their new location. My personal Samsung phone was my most valuable recording tool. Images and voices of interviewees were recorded. Some images that were taken have been included in this thesis, while recorded voices was useful when analysing responses to the questions asked during interviews.

6.6.2 Field Notes

Field notes were taken prior to, during and after the fieldwork. Each case study had a dedicated note book that captured the discussions, events and comments made by those I met and spoke to. These notes were in three formats: hard copy, audio and electronic. Exercise books were my note-taking resource. As for audio, I used the audio recorder in my Samsung phone. It recorded high quality interviews. The electronic notes included notes recorded in my phone (typed) and laptop.

6.7 Data Analysis

Once the interview recordings were conducted, all the information were collated and classified in groups based on their site name and number. Clusters were developed under the sites names of Fiji, England and Canada. Responses were colour-coded based on which site it represented. Answers from questionnaire were compared and main points grouped together (see CHAPTER TEN). With specific reference to Section 10.4, the main key questions in the questionnaire are: repatriation, intellectual property rights (IPR), ownership, PIMA and The way forward. Under each case-study cluster,
responses were recorded based on how they answered each of the set questions under these categories. Then the second step was to cluster the responses based on the groupings of museum staff, researchers and community leaders (see Figure 6.9). The third step was to cluster responses from museum staff across the 3 nations, similarly for researchers and community leaders. This enabled me to find out, for example, which of these countries and which group understood the notion of repatriation, ownership and cultural rights. If there are more understanding of the process of repatriation in England in comparison to Fiji, then I will need to draw new conclusions as to why this is such a case. As a result, in CHAPTER 11, I developed suggestions for way forward on how to better understand the importance of repatriation for Fijians living in Fiji.

Similar process was applied to interview data collected Australia, New Zealand, USA and Barbados. I anticipated not to overcrowd but to enhance data from the 3 main case studies of Fiji, England and Canada. As my interviews progressed, I realised the importance of Fijians in the diaspora, which I did not consider to be a significant factor in my research, hence the reason to include the other countries of Australia, New Zealand, USA and Barbados. I was encouraged to include similar interview themes as I applied to Fiji, England and Canada. The whole purpose was to collect as many Fijian voices as I could and make them relevant.
6.8 Ethical Considerations in Data Collection

It is the researcher’s ethical responsibility to safeguard the storyteller by committing to safeguard the storyteller by maintaining the understood purpose of the research. The relationship should be based on trust between the researcher and participants. First and foremost, as an indigenous Fijian, it was important for me to identify myself as a researcher. Locating oneself as a researcher is important, particularly within an indigenous research framework (Absolon & Willett, 2005; Baskin, 2005; Restoule, 2004). Then, it is important to inform all participants of the purpose of the study. In this case, I emailed potential participants beforehand and clearly articulated the purpose of my study and what is expected in the research. I also developed an Ethics Form that was sent to participants first before the interview was undertaken.

6.8.1 Permission

Initially I made contact with potential participants through emails and phone calls. For iTaukei community members in my three case study locations, I used the ‘relationship’ method where I based it on those whom I knew. This was easy for me to do however I kept in mind the academic requirement of conflict of interest. I kept this in mind, analysing who was able to provide me feedback and knowledge about my research topic. Once the email or phone call had been done, the time was set for the interview to be undertaken (at a time convenient for them). As the lead researcher, I made sure that I did not push my way into making them adhere to my timetable.

The University of Auckland permission form was given to them to read and time given for them to process the information. For English speakers, it was a straightforward exercise, however for iTaukei participants, I translated the consent form verbally, then once the approval was made, the recording of the interview began. Then, I had the hard copy available for signing. As for the others, I had to email the forms to them to sign, then they scanned it and emailed it back to me. The use of technology was used well.
Since interviews were conducted outside the village setting, no kava ceremony was conducted. Requests and permissions were given verbally, then forms were signed. For some of the elderly participants, I had the kind assistance of the Pacific Islands Museums Association administrator who assisted these older ones in the answering of the questionnaires. She read the questions to them, then they answered. Their responses were recorded via a notebook and through phone recording.

6.8.2 Protocol

Protocol based on my experience is divided into two categories. Firstly, was the institutional protocol that I had to adhere to when conducting research and interviews in the museum premises. Secondly, was the vanua protocol, based on respect when conducting interviews. I found myself moving between these two modes of protocol.

6.8.3 Translation

This research pushed my knowledge limit in the field of languages. Fortunately, I was able to speak English as well as the commonly used Fijian (Bauan) language. Translations were carried out in two ways. The first was verbal, where translations of my questionnaire was done in verbatim. When they responded, I later translated their responses from Fijian to English. The second one was written, where I translated the questionnaire from English to Fijian. I then further translated the questionnaire into a simplified version for non-curators. This meant that I edited out museum jargon and replaced it with simple English words that were easier for non-museum people to understand.

6.9 Challenges Faced in the Research

(i) Cultural Dilemma – As an indigenous researcher and an active museum staff member and advocate, I had to deal with the insider/outsider dilemma. The first group I interviewed in Fiji were the Fiji Museum staff. Adhering to the University of Auckland ethics requirement, I had to ensure that museum staff were aware of my intentions to discuss my topic of research and were not coerced in any way. Due to the
fact that I worked there previously, not crossing that delicate line was difficult. I had to make sure that Fiji Museum participants did not feel forced to be interviewed by me just because they knew me (see Appendix A). Smith (2012, p. 10) mentioned that as an indigenous researcher, we are frequently judged according to insider-criteria such as family background, status, politics, age, gender, religion and perceived technical ability (ibid.).

(ii) **Communication & Use of Appropriate Language** – I knew from the beginning that due to the technical nature of my topic, some iTaukei participants would struggle in understanding the meaning of repatriation in English. There was other museum jargon that non-museum people do not understand. I had to therefore continuously refine the English questionnaire, simplifying it as much as I could without reducing the essence of the questions. I had to do the same simplification process for the Fijian copy of the questionnaire for the benefit of the iTaukei participants.

(iii) **Categories of Interview** – Some of the iTaukei participants I interviewed, even though classified as researchers (these included government officers that worked for the I Taukei Ministry (Indigenous Affairs Ministry) and the Department of Culture and Heritage) often commented only on their own personal views and experiences. It was difficult to get some of them to only speak as the professional person rather than as an indigenous person, and I hoped that this did not affect my interview data. On a positive note, I was privileged to interview a senior staff member of the I Taukei Trust Fund who was mandated to project-manage the building of a new museum in five years’ time. Her participation in my research has benefited her planning for the new museum collection to be built through repatriation with other international museums.

(iv) **Cost** – The research presented major challenges. The fieldwork in particular was costly. cost was paramount from the planning stage, in particular fieldwork costs. In the early parts of research planning, costs were incorporated including costs from the University as well as other funding I could acquire through PIMA, Pacific Arts Association (PAA) and the Fiji Research Project. These organisations are truly
acknowledged for their kind support that enabled me to undertake the work I set out to do in 2012.

(v) Case Study Selection – From the start, Fiji, England and Canada were to be my case studies. As I began to interview people in these three locations, other interested participants from Australia, New Zealand, Barbados and the United States of America showed interest in participating. Some of their remarks and comments are also included in my thesis.

6.10 Chapter Summary

This chapter aimed to highlight the process of data gathering that was undertaken. It highlighted the theoretical framework that was adopted with research methodologies that are culturally sound and relevant to this study. It was empowering to learn from other indigenous research frameworks from Tonga and New Zealand and compare them with the Fijian Vanua Research Framework (FVRF). Even though any research was not free from problems, as a researcher I was able to learn from those mistakes as well as learn from those before me on how they managed similar situations. I believe that cultural and ethical considerations are critical for any success of any research. Overall, all researchers must be respectful of the research venue, reciprocity, using ethical interview practices, maintaining privacy and cooperating with participants. For indigenous researchers, adhering to indigenous values is of utmost importance.
CHAPTER SEVEN

Case Study 1: Nai Tukutuku Makawa ni Vale ni Yau
Maroroi e Viti – The Fiji Museum

7.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the characteristics and evolution of the Fiji Museum since its establishment in 1904. The changes in the museum’s role were associated with the political situation facing Fiji at the time, and also reflected the decisions made by the various museum boards over the years. The focus for the Fiji Museum was tangible heritage and cultural identity, primarily focused on the Indigenous Fijians’ (known as iTaukei) culture. Over the years, the nature of the collection changed, when artifacts from other Pacific countries were accepted into the museum. Exploring such changes is significant in understanding the history of the museum, how artifacts were acquired, which individuals collected these artifacts and how they were kept. Also highlighted in this chapter is the development and challenges associated with repatriation as well as how Fijian communities in general view the museum, and how the museum developed its programmes to suit all races of Fiji. In the early 1990s, the museum began connecting to other museums in the Pacific region and also with other international museums. Despite all these positive developments, the key question of ownership keeps recurring.

7.2 Background

There were numerous individuals who have contributed to the development of the Fiji Museum since its inception. Depending on their roles and contexts, the artifacts that were collected and donated conveyed different meanings and served different purposes. In order to understand them and to answer the question of why they have been preserved in spite of the easily perishable material they are made of, it is critical to outline the motivations of the major actors through whose hands they passed (Hermann, 2011). These artifacts have somehow offered us a window into the past, a time when these
Artifacts were made before any contact with Europeans. Most of them were free from any imported materials from Europe. They somehow convey authenticity, which is a proof of a time that was much better than that which followed in the wake of first contacts, oppression and colonialism (Hauser-Schaublin, 2011, p. 20).

As far as representation goes, these artifacts provide us, like a kaleidoscope, with a variety of perspectives and patterns of thoughts. Every onlooker establishes a new view and a specific relationship with the artifact. More so now that artifacts have left their original contexts in respective villages and moved into museums, the issue of representation becomes an issue to many anthropologists and collectors. Information shared about these artifacts can be disjointed and incomplete, thus forcing museum curators to only show part of its relevant information. As a result, many imagine or reconfigure the original contexts to reconstruct their own truth about their own history. Viewers can also visualise how indigenous people did not shy away from contact with those who came to collect (Thomas, 2004).

Figure 7.1. Map of Fiji. Source: www.vidiani.com
7.3 European Contact

Contact with Europeans started in the seventeenth century and European influence increased steadily, culminating in the cession to Britain in 1874. Whilst the iTaukei were going about their normal daily lives, the arrival of outsiders brought in many new ideas that changed lives. During the Enlightenment, science was not split into a number of sub-disciplines. The study of humankind was prevalent among scholars of the Enlightenment. Scientists were on a mission to investigate the world where humans live and provide a holistic view including the properties of human natural habitat such as flora and fauna, physical appearance, social life and culture. The development of ethnographic collections was a tangible way that they could represent groups of people and a way to record their lifestyle and cultural creations. Noting that most collectors were of European descent, no doubt we agree that one of the consequences of European influence was conquest and colonialism. The Enlightenment became the overarching framework within which we can explore the meanings that Fijian collections had in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Hauser-Schaublin, 2011, p. 25).

In the nineteenth century, the disciplines of anthropology and archaeology underwent major development. These developments were taking place in Europe unbeknown to Pacific peoples. There was a feeling of urgency to record indigenous cultures before they disappeared, or before changes occurred amongst these societies. Moreover, the artifacts and images that explorers and collectors brought back to Europe from the Pacific (including Fiji) documented peoples and cultures that were different to theirs. Little information about indigenous history of the Pacific had reached Europe and through scientific expeditions, travel accounts formed an impression of the part of the world that was least known and documented (Riviale, 2011, p. 255). Organisations such as the Societe Ethnologique in Paris, founded by William Edwards, were formed throughout Europe as a network to exchange information on anthropological matters, particularly information relating to knowing the different races of humans that were scattered on the earth (Riviale, 2011, p. 258).
In the case of Fiji, Christianity arrived in 1830 and Fiji became a British colony in 1874 which as a result, opened possibilities for colonial rulers to have direct access to its people including their natural and cultural resources. Overseas diplomatic missions were created to make contact with the new government, businesses began to grow in Levuka and Suva, while lands on the main islands of Viti Levu and Vanua Levu were explored for commercial gain. With the arrival of merchants and the establishment of the indenture system by Sir Arthur Gordon in 1879, the European and Asian presence was felt all over Fiji.

Another interesting element that came in the wake of eighteenth century navigators was the exploration of the historical and anthropological mysteries of Fiji. The diversity of the people that was encountered threw doubt on existing anthropological theories. In the Americas, various authors defended the idea of the plurality of human races, human species and even proposed different classifications of humans. Colonial administrators began to collect a variety of scientific material, mainly skulls and artifacts, in order for Europeans to interpret the cultural origins of their indigenous people (Riviale, 2011, p. 256). This also holds true for Fiji. Anthropologists were keen to find out where the iTaukei originated. As a result of this curiosity, Lorimer Fison, who was also a colonial administrator, proposed a competition in 1892 to gather stories from around the country on the origin of the iTaukei. Stories were published through the Fijian Affairs newsletter known as Na Mata. This programme attracted many stories from all over Fiji, and the winning story, known as the Kaunitoni Migration, was born. This story was based on the migration of Fijians from Tanganika in Africa (now known as Tanzania) and this story has thus been incorporated into the Fijian cultural framework and mythology (Vunidilo, 2010, p. 23).
7.4 Birth of the Fiji Museum

The idea of the Fiji Museum was conceptualised in 1904 and, later that year, Acting Governor Sir William Allardyce (pictured) presented his collection, later known to be the Allardyce Loan Collection, to the Fiji Museum (Stephenson, 1997, p. 45). This collection comprised a very large and very valuable collection of island curios, which were presented to F.J. Barnett, who was the then Warden of Suva, Fiji’s capital. This presentation was done prior to Allardyce taking up his new governorship role in the Falkland Islands. Numerous colonial administrators and governors have been collecting Fijian artifacts, but were shipping them back to England or to countries where they had originated from. Mr. Barnett, according to the Fiji Times (1904, June 26), was working hard towards the development of a museum with the support of the Suva Town Board. Governor Allardyce had now set a precedence which was welcomed by Suva residents at that time (Stephenson, 1997, p. 45). We can thus see that the Fiji Museum represents colonial interest through the support from colonial administrators.

Donations from the first colonial administrations made up the initial collection exhibited for public display. According to Fergus Clunie, one of the main aims of the Fiji Museum when it was set up was to:
rapidly promote a deep and realistic awareness of Fiji’s ancient and remarkably complex human and natural heritage, and of the very real threats to it. (Clunie, 1983, p. 55)

One can see that the focus of the establishment of the Fiji Museum was the need to record and promote the iTaukei’s cultural and natural heritage due to threats such as westernisation and modernisation of culture and way of life that can cause danger to indigenous societies. While artifacts were being collected and concerns raised by outsiders that an early demise of indigenous Fijian culture would occur if their history was not recorded for future posterity, the iTaukei were not aware of such concerns (Clunie, 1986). Supporting this notion, one of the Fijian Society’s primary goals was to assist in the formation and care of a museum and to also ‘endeavour to collect information about the past and early history of Fiji that was fast passing into oblivion’ (Transaction of the Fijian Society for 1912–1913). The establishment of mission stations and development of businesses such as copra, cotton and sugar-cane plantations brought about major changes to the lives of Fijians, which became a distraction, therefore not giving the iTaukei time to be aware of what the museum was doing. Even membership to the Fijian Society was limited only to Europeans. A few years later, the inclusion of Fijians gradually changed when Rule 7b of the Fijian Society stated:

Native Fijians, who contribute papers to the Society, may be elected as members of the Society without paying ordinary subscription. (Transactions of the Fijian Society for 1915, 1–36)
This special rule was an effort to make the Fijian Society more inclusive and to reach out to the iTaukei, who were not joining the Society in substantial numbers (Ramsay, 2013, p. 30). It wasn’t until the 1950s, leading up to Fiji’s independence in 1970, that the iTaukei people were encouraged to be part of the museum setting. It seems that the politics of the day were reflected in the development of the museum.

There were also missionaries who had a keen interest in anthropology. One such individual was Lorimer Fison, a missionary and anthropologist who attempted to collect oral traditions from Fijians, whom he met during his work among the Fijians (Stuart, 2007, p. 273). He could not see a unifying story of where Fijians originated. Artifacts that were collected, as well as the languages that were spoken among Fijians, pointed to Fiji’s heritage as:

one of immigration and emigration, and of restless internal movements. Since time immemorial, the islands have suffered sporadic intrusions from east and west, swallowing some without much apparent effect, while others threw up such waves of cultural disruption that they burst beyond the feeble confines of archaeological knowledge. (Clunie, 1986)
The Allardyce collection was displayed in the newly built Town Hall, which was also known as the Queen Victoria Memorial Hall (Stephenson, 1997, p. 45). A.H. Ogilvie was the first curator. In 1908 the Fijian Society was formed with the specific aim of researching and preserving Fiji’s history and culture. Connolly Colman Wall, who founded the Society, was appointed as the paid caretaker. He later became the official curator in 1914 and held this post until his death in 1922 (ibid). The formation of a museum was included in the aim of the Society. In 1910 the government approved an annual grant of £25 to appoint a collection caretaker. With the passing of the Fiji Museum Ordinance in 1929, the museum was formally inaugurated as a Government Statutory Body with a Board of Trustees (Nakoro, 2011).

7.5 The Fijian Society

As far as the Fijian Society was concerned, they continued to reflect the earlier vision that the iTaukei people exist in Fiji, thus the collection and management of what was to remain of their culture was critical. There was a sense of urgency for stories and histories of indigenous peoples to be recorded. Colonial administrators who had served in other countries prior to coming to Fiji had seen the cultural devastation and the loss of language and identity among communities they had served in. This was taking place in Asia and African territories and throughout the British Empire. Fiji was no different and, in 1904, the idea for a new museum was formed. Sir William Allardyce knew that his own collections of Fijian materials, gathered during his term of service as an administrative officer, would one day be the founding collection of a bigger national museum. The Fijian Society was inaugurated at a meeting in the Queen Victoria Hall on 23 May, 1908 (Fiji Times and Herald, 1925). The meeting was held on the invitation of Mr. Colman C. Wall who served as a curator and was a member of the society, part of the time as the honorary secretary and, for the last few months of his life, as a treasurer. A month after the inauguration, membership of the society increased and Table 1 shows the names of those who were elected. The list of the elected members is evidence of the colonial view of setting up the Fiji Museum. There is no iTaukei person in this line-up. If this was raised, it would have been tokenistic only.
The total number of members during the inauguration was 23 and by 1910, the number increased to 60. With reference to the above list, all were of European descent signifying the lack of local interest to join such groups. In 1913, the numbers increased to 71 and there were three papers presented by iTaukei members Ratu Ravulo, Ratu Deve Toganivalu and Pita Tatawaqa. Although it was an achievement to have three iTaukei members presenting papers, membership in 1914 was reduced to 43 due to a high number of resignations and also the death of member Gabriel J. Marks in the catastrophe of the steamer *Empress of Ireland*. Additionally, difficulties arising from the First World War stopped the printing of the transactions for some time (Ramsay, 2013).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Members of the Fijian Society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Queen Victoria Memorial Hall was the first location of the Fiji Museum, which later became known as the Town Hall (Ramsay, 2013, p. 45). The meetings of the Fijian Society were held at the same venue even up until 1918. In 1917, according to the annual report of the Society, there were eleven ordinary meetings, and also seven meetings of the committee (ibid).

Local residents presented pieces and collections to the Town Board and some artifacts were purchased by the Trustees. These contributed towards a growing collection, which filled the Town Hall. The collection remained on display in the Town Hall until 1919 when a substantial part of the hall was destroyed by fire. This event was a major turning point in this new museum. The collection was moved to a variety of venues such as the Immigration Depot at Korovou and later transferred to the Government Rest House at Nasova, where it was opened again to the public in May, 1921. In 1930, the collection was moved to the upper floor of the recently enlarged Carnegie Library (Stephenson, 1997, p. 46). In the 17 years from 1908 to 1925, there were four presidents altogether, whose names are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Fijian Society Presidents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. William Sutherland</td>
<td>1908–1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Gabriel J. Marks</td>
<td>1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. C.A. La Touche Brough</td>
<td>1920–1925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *Transactions of the Fijian Society for the Year 31st December, 1910.*

7.5.1 Philosophy and Role of The Fijian Society in Relation to Fijian Culture

As noted earlier, the idea for a museum was first discussed in 1904. The idea was to display and preserve traditional Fijian culture. With the involvement of Europeans in
the formation of a museum, it is certain that the iTaukei were not involved in this process at all. To the iTaukei, their culture is changing but their indigenous way of life can be preserved in other ways than a museum. It would also be interesting to see if the 1904 decision makers would have considered other means to preserve traditional Fijian culture.

Four years later, the Fijian Society was formed (in 1908) with the specific aim of researching and preserving the country’s history and culture. The formation of a museum was included in this aim. The government of the day gave its full support and approved an annual grant of £25 to appoint a collection caretaker in 1910. With the passing of the Fiji Museum Ordinance in 1929, the museum was formally inaugurated as a Government Statutory Body with a Board of Trustees.

As the Trustees became full functional members, they began purchasing artifacts while local (white) residents began presenting pieces and collections to the Town Board. These contributed towards a growing collection which filled the Town Hall. From 1904 to 1929, events that took place signified the important role museums and associated collections played for the preservation of culture and traditions. The government grant for hiring a curator and the passing of the 1929 Ordinance to the identification of appropriate buildings to house the growing number of artefacts being purchased by the Trustees revealed the seriousness of the Fijian Society’s view to ensuring Fijian culture was not lost and forgotten. They have indeed left a legacy to the current museum set up to continue the mission they initially set in 1908.

7.6 Appropriation of Fijian Artifacts

As far as the Fiji Museum collection is concerned, most of the original collections that established the formation of the Fiji Museum in the early 1900s were donated. Donation is one of the key methods of how museums acquire their collections. Museums are a characteristic part of the cultural pattern of modern Europe (Pearce, 1992, p. 1), and it is evident that the expatriate communities in Fiji of the early 1900s were influential in the early formation of the Fiji Museum. As a result of such donations, an ethnographic museum was formed. The mobilisation of expatriates to contribute donated artifacts
was undertaken by those of high authority, in this case by Governor Allardyce in 1900. This act of mobilisation was similar to those that took place around the world, for instance in Denmark when C.J. Thompsen was tasked to assemble representative series of objects that would provide knowledge of humankind under various conditions of climate, race and religion (Bouqet, 2012, p. 71). Even though he had limited means of acquiring new artifacts, he succeeded in mobilising colonial officials, merchant captains and Danish businessmen throughout the world as enthusiastic donors to the collections.

Colonial officials and missionaries played key roles in the acquiring of artifacts. Reasons for collecting and acquiring artifacts differed from one collector to another. Collections are an important way in which we construct our world. Collectors, most of whom were non-Fijians, were collecting artifacts from around Fiji. Most of these artifacts were given as gifts, while some others were bought out of curiosity. Pearce remarked that

many individual collectors and collection show elements of more than one mode…either as a souvenir for one person will be an object of desire for another, and may finally become part of a systematic museum display. (1992, p. 38)

In the case of Governor Allardyce, he donated most of the artifacts to the Fijian Society (to be later known as the Fiji Museum) before his posting to the Falkland Islands. Similar to the rest of the world, plantation owners, merchants, diplomats and bankers were among those who were drawn into the museum circle. In the nineteenth century, exchange of what was referred to as duplicate objects was another way in which museums built up their collections. Washington and Copenhagen swapped artifacts in 1868 and a huge number of scientific expeditions took place in the nineteenth century, building on an already well-established eighth century practice and one that was to continue into the twentieth century. These expeditions collected on a much bigger scale, documenting and archiving natural history and ethnography of remote places (that includes the Pacific), often at the instruction of the colonial administrations (Bouqet,
2012, p. 71). This was similar to what took place in Suva, currently the capital of Fiji, on a smaller scale.

Apart from Governor Allardyce, there were other key donors that deserve a mention. According to the *Yalo I Viti – A Fiji Museum Catalogue*, some of the major donors were Mrs. Sabrina Wishart, Frank Ryan, Adi Litia Maopa, Adi Pateresia Vonokula, Mrs. Emma Patterson, Lady Moira Hedstrom, the Overseas Division of the Methodist Church, the Methodist Church in Fiji, Dr. Ethel Ogilvie, Ratu Imanueli Roseru, Senitiki Dau, H.H. Giesen, Dr. Steven Hooper and the executors of the estate of the late James Hooper, and Dr. E.M. Pat Stephenson (Clunie, 1986). Dr. Stephenson was the author of *Fiji’s Past on Picture Postcards* published by Cainnes Jannif in 1997. The largest single acquisition in recent times was the Hon. James B. Turner Collection which was made possible through the support of Mrs. Mary Ragg and the support by Dr. Ahmed Ali and Colonel Paul Manueli. The Australian South Pacific Cultures Fund and assistance provided by the Australian High Commission played a very important role. In 1996, the Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA) also gave a substantial amount of archaeological equipment and storage systems and exhibition cases, which was a boost to the museum. Apart from those listed here, there were numerous private funders who supported the Fiji Museum over the years.

Artifacts that were collected varied in type. Apart from the anthropological artifacts used by Fijians, there were also natural materials including botanical and zoological material. Shells and geological materials were included in the collections in the mid-1900s. In 2013, the Fiji Museum developed a new exhibition on shells. This collection of shells was an acquisition given by a family who lived in Fiji for a number of years (Buadromo, 2014).

### 7.7 Collectors for the Fiji Museum

It is important to note that artifacts that have become part of the Fiji Museum collection came into the museum from a great number of people with different backgrounds, motivations and goals. Some of these collectors came into direct contact with
Indigenous Fijians as archaeologists, anthropologists, chiefs, collectors, colonial administrators, ship captains, crew-members, photographers, missionaries and scientists. Others were art-dealers and collectors who bought artifacts singly or in bulk. Best (1993, p. 43) supported this when he said that “in the first decade of the nineteenth century, through explorers, missionaries, anthropologists, enthusiastic amateurs, and archaeologists, much information (about Fiji) has been gathered.” Most of the information was recorded through these artifacts that were collected. War-clubs and spears were obviously examples of the volatile times Fiji had during contact period in the early-1880s. In the book *Yalo I Viti: A Fiji Museum catalogue*, Clunie (1986) clearly identified ways of how Fijian artifacts were appropriated by different individuals over a period of time. This list evidently records the variety of ways that collecting took place around Fiji, and how they came to be included in the Fiji Museum collection.

Archaeologists such as Elizabeth Shaw presented a *Tikiniuto*, a breadfruit splitter from Tavua, Mamanuca Group to the Fiji Museum (Clunie, 1986, p. 151). Ms. Shaw was an archaeologist who was working in Natunuku, Ba Province in 1969. She was affiliated to the University of Auckland during her fieldwork in Fiji. The Fiji Museum also boasts a rich collection of Lapita pottery that was excavated from the Sigatoka Sand Dunes, Yanuca Island and Natunuku, in Ba. Other pottery collections which included paddles, anvils, pots and yaqona bowls were collected from Rewa, Malake, Kadavu and Yanuya, in the Mamanuca Group (Clunie, 1986, p. 141–142). Such archaeological collections are important for the Fiji Museum as it supports the research work currently done in Fiji, placing Fiji on the international platform of archaeological research. Furthermore, Best (1994, p. 408) who himself was an archaeologist, noted how ceramics located on the island of Lakeba were also evidence of trade and village relationships. There were two sets of ceramics, the first set were a *dari* (broad-rimmed bowl) and a *saqa* (used for mixing water) that were both decorated. The second set was known to originate from Rewa, and these were evidences of links between the Tui Nayau (Paramount Chief of Lau) and the Rewa Delta, including Bau. Oral traditions date back to 1760, and both lines were connected. Archaeology and oral traditions both complement a rich archaeological history currently stored at the Fiji Museum.
Anthropologists are key contributors to the Fiji Museum collection. Due to their deep interest in societies, wherever they travel they tend to collect artifacts that serve as tangible reminders of a place or group of people they encountered. Best highlighted that

the first anthropologists in Fiji, who bridged the time gap between the early observers and the start of archaeological research, recorded inland hill-sites and their traditions. Hocart, a school teacher, conducted his Lauan field work in 1927, and made little mention of fortifications...In another work, Hocart records that the summit of Taveuni, Nggalau Hill, known as the dying place, was once a settlement. (1993, p. 35)

Another anthropologist, Laura Thompson, visited Fiji between August 1933 and April 1934.

She visited and mapped some seven hill-forts in the Southern Lau Islands, commenting on the differences between forts on limestone ridges and those on volcanic summits. Of those on ridges she noted that walls of stone were used to supplement the natural defenses and to cut off access routes. (Best, 1993, p. 42)

Chiefs were also gifting artifacts to the museum. The Fiji Museum records reveal that there were notable chiefs who contributed to the current Fiji Museum collection. Ratu Rabici, Tui Cakau (Paramount Chief of Cakaudrove) presented the iTagaga, an old mast-head carved from vesi (Intsia Bijuga). This was a mast-head of the Ramarama, one of the last great druа (outrigger hulled canoe) of the nineteenth century. The Ramarama is the final link in a chain of great druа built for the Tui Cakau by his mataitoga, who were the descendants of a clan of Samoan boat-builders, known as the Lemaki, who were brought in to Fiji from Tonga in the late eighteenth century (Clunie, 1986, p. 143).
Another chief from Naitasiri province, Ratu Ilaitia Ro Ratu Balenaivalu of the yavusa Waimaro, presented a *civavonovono*, a chief’s breastplate, known as *Raravono Salusalu*. This breastplate is composed of a central core made of *civa* or black-lipped pearl shell, inlaid and surrounded by plates split from sperm-whale teeth (Clunie, 1986, p. 163). Apart from artifacts presented by chiefs, three *kali* or headrests belonging to Cakobau (Vunivalu of Bau), Ritova (Tui Macuata) and Kinivuai Nacagilevu (Tui Tavuki of Kadavu), all of whom were part of the signing of the Deed of Cession in 1874, are currently kept at the Fiji Museum. These headrests were presented to the Fiji Museum by John Goepel (Clunie, 1986, p. 153).

Rod Ewin, a collector and ethnologist, who currently lives in Tasmania also collected and donated artifacts such as a *tabekasere* (bamboo packing basket) from Nanoko, Navatusila in the western highlands of Viti Levu (Clunie, 1986, p. 149). The James Hooper Collection comprised of various artifacts that were repatriated to Fiji, and were originally collected by Rev. Joseph Nettleton, who served in Fiji from 1861–1973 (Clunie, 1986, p. 155). Dr. Steven Hooper, an anthropologist who conducted research on the island of Kabara in the early 1980s, and a direct family member of James Hooper, an ardent collector, facilitated the repatriation of Fijian artifacts from England to Fiji. Fergus Clunie was the key facilitator of this repatriation and was sponsored by Mobil Oil (Clunie, 2013). Another ardent collector was Baron von Hügel, who collected a lot of artifacts throughout Viti Levu. Some of the spears he collected, one of which is called *saisaitavevatu*, were collected in 1876 (Clunie, 1986, p. 180).

The colonial administrator who collected the most and the best examples in this category is Sir William Allardyce. His contribution to the Fiji Museum became known as The William Allardyce collection, which included an *iribuli* or coconut leaf fan from Daku, eastern Viti Levu. Other cultural materials are included in his donation. Another Fiji Society member and well-known colonial administrator is G.K. Roth. According to Best (1994), G.K. Roth was the colonial administrator in Namosi from 1934. He spent most of his years in the provinces of Naitasiri and Namosi. As a result, he collected numerous artifacts such as a *ulutoa* (dart-head) from Nasirotu, Waimaro, Naitasiri (Clunie, 1986, p. 160). The Gerogius Wright collection comprises artifacts
collected by Sergeant Wright when serving in the Ba campaign of 1873 against anti-colonial rebels, from the Little War of 1876, and when stationed at Fort Carnarvon, Natuatuacoko. Some artifacts included a davui, an end-blown Bursa shell trumpet, from western Viti Levu (Clunie, 1986, p. 154). The Hon. James B. Turner also made a major contribution to the Fiji Museum collection, and included artifacts such as saunidaliga (earlobe ornaments), suinigata (snake bone necklace), sovui (Chief’s shell pendant) and the drua (double hull canoe) called the Ratu Finau (Clunie, 1986, p. 158).

Explorers in the early 1830s also traded and collected Fijian artifacts. For example, a Yankee beach-de-mer trader collected a imilamila, a turtle shell hair-dressing needle for his collection. They were used as a head-scratcher and were usually placed projecting alongside the temple, back of the head or from over the forehead. This particular needle was repatriated to Fiji by arrangement with the Peabody Museum of Salem, Massachusetts, (Clunie, 1986, p. 154). The USS Wilkes Exploring Expedition of 1840 collected a matakau (male idol) from one of the priests in Rewa province. This expedition also included an artist, whose role was to illustrate artifacts they encountered, one of which was the civavonovono (chief’s breastplate), known as Raravono Salusalu, known to only belong to high-ranking chiefs; this example belonged to Ratu Tanoa, the Vunivalu of Bau (Clunie, 1986, p. 163). As with the USS Wilkes expedition, the HMS Herald had an artist by the name of J.D. Macdonald who, in 1856, drew a sketch of Komai Navunibua, who was Rokotui Waimaro, wearing a breastplate presented to him by Cakobau, when he was defeated in one of the Nasorovakawalu wars in Naitasiri province (Clunie, 1986, p. 165). Images or drawings hold important historical information of Fiji, and they are as important as the artifacts themselves.

Inheritance is another method whereby many Fijian artifacts were acquired through family links such as direct inheritance from earlier generations. For example, a civatabua, or breastplate, was presented by Miss A.L. Woods to the Fiji Museum. This breastplate was collected by her grandfather Mr. Thomas Loxton Woods, who was manager of the Bank of New Zealand, Levuka, in the late 1800s (Clunie, 1986, p. 165). In the case of the Tasmanian Museum in Australia, Rev. John Waterhouse visited Fiji
in 1840 and 1841 and was known to have brought back to Hobart Fijian artifacts. His two sons Joseph and Samuel also continued the legacy of missionary work, as well John’s three great-grandchildren. Several artifacts listed under the Waterhouse family were probably linked to these men who spent part of their lives in missionary work in Fiji. Their living families donated most artifacts to the Tasmania museum (Ewin, 1982, p. 2).

Medical doctors also played in a huge part in collecting and according to Best (1994): in 1856, Dr. J.D. Macdonald, assistant surgeon in the HM Herald explored the Rewa River and its tributaries, and collected artifacts from these areas. When in Namosi, he mentioned how a large amount of human bones for sail needles (about 200 of them) were hanging in the branches of large trees in the rara (village green) (Clunie, 1986, p. 186). Dr. R.B. Lyth, and his wife Mary Ann Lyth, collected a yalewa matakau (female idol) called Bui ni Nakauvardra (the old woman of the Nakauvardra Range) between 1839–1854 (Clunie, 1986, p. 167). Dr. William McGregor, who was for a long time resident in Fiji, held the positions of Chief Medical Officer, Colonial Secretary, and finally Acting Governor, and was given a yalewa matakau by Ro Matanitobua, the Roko Tui Namosi in 1875. This idol has been part of the Tui Namosi family for eight generations, dating the artifact back to the 1700s (Clunie, 1986, p. 167).

Missionaries also collect from missions where they serve. The Rev. Richard B. Lyth, who was a Methodist missionary and a surgeon by profession, served in Fiji from 1839–1854. He collected some Tongan and Samoan trolling lure, as well as some Fijian iTaraki or prawning net made of wayaka twine (Clunie, 1986). Rev. Sidney Beveridge, of the London Missionary Society, served at Matautu, Savai’i, from 1895 to 1900 and collected an ie tonga (Samoan fine mat) decorated with red feathers collected from Fiji. This mat was later acquired by James Hooper, and given to the Fiji Museum, as part of the 1980 repatriation (Clunie, 1986, p. 150). This particular mat signifies the strong traditional link between Fiji and Samoa prior to European arrival. Other missionaries that contributed to the Fiji Museum collection were Rev. Thomas Williams (1842), Rev. Joseph Waterhouse and the Methodist Missionary Society of London.
Scientists including botanists & metallurgists also collected from places they travelled. Berthold Seeman was a botanist who travelled around Viti Levu, including Namosi and Solevu, Bua, on the island of Vanua Levu (northern Fiji). In 1870, when he visited Namosi to collect a rare species of fern, he noticed that they were growing among old cannibalised human bones (Clunie, 1986, p. 186). Four years earlier, another botanist by the name of William Milne, who came on board HMS Herald, recorded similar observations, that amongst ferns and mosses, he saw human bones lodged among tree branches, most of them trophies. Human bones were also collected from Namosi and taken to the Museum of Mankind in London. These human bones (with the tree trunk also) were repatriated to the Fiji Museum. Both Milne and Seeman recorded most of their experiences and sketches in their private journals (ibid).

Voyagers and sea captains collected wherever they berthed in Fiji. Numerous ships visited Fiji between 1831 and 1875. Some of these ships were USS Flying Fish, HMS Havannah, HMS Pearl and HMS Herald. Passed Middleshipman Sinclair of the USS Flying Fish noted in 1840 how a Bauan chief gave him a long bone, which was a head decoration. The chief told him that the long bone was a mark of friendship, and it was made from the shin-bone of the first man he had ever killed in battle, who was later eaten (Clunie, 1986, p. 189). Captain Erskine of HMS Havannah noted in 1849 how cannibalism was part of Fijian life at a burenisa, of Naulunivuaka, on Bau Island (Clunie, 1986, p. 188). There are also records from Captain Eagleston who traded for bech-de-mer and turtle shell in 1831. Commodore Goodenough of HMS Pearl travelled through Wakaya and Captain Denham visited Gau Island on HMS Herald. These travels would no doubt eventuate into trade and exchange with local chiefs and islanders alike.

Photographers also play a key role in record-keeping as water-colours and sketches, as well as photographs became powerful mediums of recording history. Many of these photographs have become key components of the Fiji Museum collections. For example, Reverend George Brown was in Fiji in 1875. The importance of photography within the mission became more explicit when missionaries became amateur photographers and photography came to serve as propaganda for the missions. These
images also contain pictorial stories that captured people, their dress, architecture and modes of transportation that shaped Fiji in the past (Clunie, 1986, p. 188).

7.8 Fiji Museum and the iTaukei

For a long time the museum served as a storehouse for cultural items and as a centre for an elite community, who were a minority at that time. The majority of local people did not show much interest. From 1913–14, Ratu Alifereti Finau, the Tui Nayau, high chief of the Lau group of islands, received financial assistance from the Honorable J.B. Turner, one of Fiji’s best-known early citizens. Ratu Finau used the services of Aminio Moimatagi, a master carver from Fulaga, to build a drua (double-hull canoe) with traditional patterns for posterity (Stephenson, 1997, p. 227). In 1914, the newly built drua sailed from Fulaga to Suva, and in the late 1920s, it was part of the film The Adorable Outcast. The drua was stored until 1981 when it was presented to the Fiji Museum by a member of the Turner family. The necessary restoration and conversion were funded by public support (Stephenson, 1997, p. 227). Visitors today can enjoy it gracing the main gallery of the Fiji Museum, as pictured below.

Figure 7.3. Ratu Finau, double-hull canoe in the Maritime Gallery, Fiji Museum. Source: Fiji Museum

7.9 Fiji Museum and Cultural Rights

Museums are institutions that are generally mandated to promote cultural identity and heritage of the community they serve (Ramsay, 2013, p. 20). The Fiji Museum then is the physical manifestation of all the cultures that makes Fiji what it is today. Even though the majority of its collections reflect the iTaukei culture, the development of its exhibition space over time reflects the social change taking place in the country.
Cultural rights are human rights that give people and communities access to enjoy culture, through language learning, cultural and artistic production and participation in the lifestyle of a particular culture. The Fiji Museum becomes the mirror for visitors to reflect the past and understand the present.

Governor Allardyce’s call for donations of artifacts for the new museum was associated with social prestige and national pride. Cultural and national identities are intertwined in spaces such as museums (Ramsay, 2013, p. 23). The museum is one of the three institutions of power that has shaped the way in which a State imagined its dominion. As a result, museums become the guardians of tradition. Museums such as the Fiji Museum, that has its origin to the colonialist era, were founded and assembled with the same motivation (Ramsay, 2013, p. 24). One wonders whether such prestige and national pride also holds true for the iTaukei, or was it merely felt and seen by Europeans. As in the case of Denmark, when the royal collection became the national museum during the second half of the nineteenth century, the nationalisation of such collections would transform donor activities from donating as a hobby or through collegial association to a more serious activity of creating nationalism through collection development. Such donors had prestigious stakes in the ethnographic museum (Bouqet, 2012, p. 71).

In Fiji, the new museum was opened in 1955 by Governor Sir Ronald Garvey. This building was used to house the displays, reserve collection and provide storage. Today the building has two adjoining sections, the first constructed in 1972 and the second in 1978. Together, these buildings provide a history gallery, masi gallery, art gallery, Indo-Fijian gallery, temporary exhibition space, storerooms and gift shop. The archives, photographic studio, editing suite, library and administration offices are located in what was the Nawela Hostel for women, adjacent to the main museum building (Nakoro, 2011).

In the 1960s, a series of education and craft programmes was initiated by the newly appointed director, Mr. Bruce Palmer. Prior to this appointment, he was the curator of the Fiji Museum when he arrived in Suva early in July, 1963. He took over from the
Acting Curator Mr. C.A. Leembruggen. Mr. Leembruggen had been responsible for looking after the Museum since 1960 and the Board of Trustees expressed their appreciation of Mr. Leembruggen’s valuable services and the manner in which he kept the Museum in fine order (Journal of Polynesian Society, 1964, p. 250). Local residents were gradually informed of the activities the museum was doing at that time. Even though a lot of efforts were made to showcase museum programmes to the wider community, expatriates and international visitors made up the largest number of frequent visitors. There was a huge need to devise more programmes to attract local residents to the museum, however a long-term injection of funds to maintain such programmes was not made (Nakoro, 2011).

Over the years, collaboration with the outside world built the museum’s reputation in the field of research. Directors such as R.A. Derrick, B. Palmer, and Fergus Clunie developed the Fiji Museum as a research institution in the field of science and the arts. Their work, along with that of other world-renowned scholars, was published by the museum, establishing it as a small centre of academic excellence. The lack of funding by government ministries that the museum was administered under restricted research and publishing programmes. Over the years though, the archaeology department worked together with archaeologists from various institutions around the world to develop a thriving archaeological programme, which is one of the best in the Pacific. Such collaboration briefly alleviated the issue of funding, as these institutions brought in outside funding that supported continuous research.

7.10 Survey of Fijian Collections in Overseas Museums

Fijian collections are located in many parts of the world. They are located in New Zealand, Australia and the United States. The two case studies of the United Kingdom and Canada will be covered in CHAPTER SEVEN and CHAPTER EIGHT respectively.

In 1970, the General Conference of UNESCO approved the inclusion of a study of Oceanic cultures. The term ‘Oceanic’ was another terminology often used by writers referring to the Pacific region. The study reflected the urgent need for international action to save cultural heritage that is in danger of disappearing. Its aim was to help in
preserving the essential values and elements which make up the heritage of all humankind. It was pleasing to see a worldwide inventory of Oceanic artifacts held in collections around the world, which included the United Kingdom and the Irish Republic (completed in 1979) and a pilot survey in Australia (published in 1980). New Zealand published its survey in 1982 (Neich, 1982).

The survey of Pacific collections in New Zealand museums provided a numerical summary of all Pacific artifacts in public ownership in New Zealand museums. The survey was also intended to locate collections of historical and ethnographical photographs related to the Pacific. The benefits of this survey are threefold: firstly, as a research tool for New Zealand, Pacific Island and foreign students and researchers; secondly, as a directly available source of information for New Zealand and Pacific Island museums and thirdly, to allow a more rational and balanced consideration to be given to the question of repatriation by both New Zealand and Pacific Island authorities.

The third point relates well to my research, as Pacific museums are now beginning to discuss the topic of repatriation in order to support the development of museums and cultural centres in the Pacific. Figure 7.4 shows the number of Fijian artifacts located in New Zealand museums.
One major collection in New Zealand is the W.O. Oldman Collection. This collection was purchased by the New Zealand Government in 1948 and was distributed among the four metropolitan museums listed above (see Figure 7.4) (Neich, 1982, p. 10).

In the provincial museums, there were other collections apart from the Oldman collection that represented a mix of Pacific Island collections, some of which also had Fijian artifacts in them. For example, at the Nelson Museum, the F.V. Knapp Collection consists of 12 items from Vanuatu (previously known as New Hebrides), including three old masks, a bowl, mats and flutes; 12 ornaments and domestic items from the Solomon Islands; four items from Samoa; five adzes from the Cook Islands; two tabua from Fiji; one tapa beater from Hawaii, and 14 other items from Papua New Guinea, Australia and Niue (Neich, 1982, p. 11).

There were numerous benefits that came from this project. Both museums were able to be more familiar with their own collections. They were able to focus on the Fijian collection and identify gaps and areas that need conservation and further research, or even to develop new ideas for potential exhibitions. This project also opened opportunities for museum staff in Australia to contribute to professional development.
programmes for Fiji Museum staff. The Museum of Victoria also contributed to the refurbishment of the collection store at the Fiji Museum (ibid).

7.11 Past Repatriation Projects

Over the years, the Fiji Museum has taken part in a series of repatriations, mostly facilitated under the directorship of Fergus Clunie. The interview with Clunie (2013) shed more light into how numerous repatriations took place in the 1980s. These consisted of a variety of artifacts such as postcards, photographs, weaving and carvings. According to Clunie:

Many museums need to be sure that objects that were returned will be safe and well looked after. Museum institutions need to be stable and have the ability to manage these objects. It is harder now, as Fiji goes through political instability, which may affect future repatriations. It is also important to study the collection in Fiji and find out which Fijian objects can be located in any overseas museum. Another important point to remember is the importance of building relationships with international museums. This is a must before you can secure a successful repatriation (personal communication, 2013).

The first set of repatriations took place in the 1980s between the Fiji Museum and with various collectors and museums in the United Kingdom. A wooden idol (matakau), a female wooden figure similar to the famous Bui ni Kauvadra, that was used for old Fijian religious ceremonies was returned to Fiji from London. The London Methodist Missionaries gave this Fijian idol to the Fiji Museum on a long-term loan.

Also repatriated was an album of photographs given by Mrs. Barbara Bowden known to have been taken on the cruise ship of ‘HMS Royalist’ during a cruise in the Pacific, specifically in Fiji and the Solomon Islands in 1892. Photos of great interest, both historical and anthropological, were included in this repatriation.
Dr. Elsie Stephenson is the daughter of the late Arthur Berry Thomas, who managed Stuart & Ogilvie Ltd in Suva until his death in 1934. His collection of postcards and photographs of Fiji were repatriated to the Fiji Museum in the 1980s. All these pictures and postcards have now been made into a book called ‘Postcards from Fiji’. During the same time period, the repatriation of a large collection of Fijian artifacts, later known as the Hooper Collection, was sponsored by Mobil Oil. These artifacts, which included head-rests, drums and clubs, were repatriated with the kind assistance of renowned British anthropologist Dr. Steven Hooper, who undertook his fieldwork on Kabara Island, Lau Province, in 1979. He is connected to this collection through his grandfather James Hooper, who was a collector in the early 1900s.

The return of human remains is always a delicate issue to handle. The British Museum instigated the return of human bones that were attached to the branch of a shaddock tree, which held the bones of enemies. This tree branch used to be displayed in the Prehistory gallery, which is now known as the Maritime gallery. In addition to the tree branch, also returned was another object that had human bone in it.

The United States of America and Australia also took part in two separate but similar repatriations. War veterans of the United States of America repatriated all kinds of photographs including WWII’s photos from families of soldiers (mainly Americans who were based in Fiji). Twenty years later, an Australian family donated pictures of Ratu Popi (drawn with charcoal), and Tanoa that was given to their grandfather (one leg broken) during his term in one of the offices, most probably the current iTaukei Land Trust Board office. In addition to photographs, there were also old masi and tanoa that was given to a family from Ratu Sukuna and they have donated it to the Fiji Museum.

In 1999, a landmark repatriation programme which involved the linking the two museum databases of Fiji Museum and the Museum of Victoria, Melbourne, Australia took place. A memorandum of understanding was signed between the two institutions however no object was repatriated. This is a classic case of ‘virtual repatriation’ where only online databases of the two museums are linked online. The two museums decided...
to share their collections through an online portal due to concerns of the Fiji Museum that there was lack of physical space to house Fijian artifacts from Melbourne. With reference to the issue of physical space Sipiriano Nemani, a senior staff member of the Department of Culture and Heritage, said the following when asked the question on virtual repatriation:

_I think this is most opportune given that we lack the space and proper physical structure to safe-keep and exhibit artifacts would they be physically_ (personal communication, 2014).

This view was supported by Cresantia Koya-Vakauta, an academic at the regional university in Suva, when asked about his view on museums and repatriation:

_I am really torn when it comes to repatriation because on the one hand, it would be wonderful and on the other, we simply do not have the facilities to ensure their upkeep to the same standards as they have internationally. To be honest, much of the artifacts would deteriorate in no time if handed over simply because we do not have the capacity, facility, funding and the political will to manage and house, maintain and safeguard these artifacts_ (personal communication, 2014).

Similar to the views expressed above, staff of the two institutions began the project in 2001 selecting and creating digital images of the objects from the collection at the Museum of Victoria. In 2002, photographs were selected for reproduction from Fiji Museum’s collection to add cultural and historical meaning to the objects. This exercise involved not only the photography department but also staff of the archaeology, exhibitions and collections department of the Fiji Museum (Fiji Museum, 2013). The website interface between these two museums looked like the image below. The online portal was titled ‘Fiji’s Treasured Culture: Highlighting the Collection of the Museum of Victoria and the Fiji Museum’.
This project was the first of its kind to take place in the Pacific. The portal of the Museum of Victoria and the Fiji Museum is an online collaboration that presents Fijian artifacts located at the Museum of Victoria to be available online. Instead of these artifacts to be physically returned to Fiji, both museums agreed that due to restricted availability of space at the Fiji Museum, making these images available online was the best way forward. As online visitors click on photographs of these artifacts, pieces of stories are revealed. Not only did the museums want to show the fine ornaments made from shell, teeth and bones, they also wanted to show the contexts of ritual and social use of priest oil dishes and kava bowls made from the finest sacred woods called vesi. The intricacies of bark-cloth production and their rituals were also revealed online.

Repatriation is significantly important to Fiji. The reasons are multi-fold. When returned, these artifacts that were once part of our culture can reignite cultural knowledge that was lost to live again. Some iTaukei are not keen to have these returned, however its cultural values are significant to our identity as a people.
Past directors of the Fiji Museum have continued and expanded the traditions of the Fiji Society to emphasise the need to conduct research on Fijian culture. Not only was culture the focus, the Fijian Society began to include topics such as trade, industry and tourism. In the early 1970s, the late Fiji Museum Director Bruce Palmer made a comment that he hoped he would be able to contribute something significant to the understanding of Fijian warfare, which he was researching. Unfortunately, he died in 1974, however his replacement Fergus Clunie continued with the project that Mr. Palmer initiated and produced the book *Fijian Weapons and Warfare* (Clunie, 1977, p. 121).

In 1984, under the leadership of Fergus Clunie the *Domodomo Journal*, which is published bi-annually, was implemented as a way of sharing scholarly research from museum staff, researchers and friends of the museum to the rest of the world. Topics included in this journal range from archaeology and anthropology to geomorphology and other scientific work that took place in Fiji. This publication provided publicity for the Fiji Museum internationally, expanding its membership with museums and individuals overseas. iTaukei staff of the museum began to contribute to this journal and have become part of the museum staffing arrangement (Fiji Museum, 2013).

Governed by the Fiji Museum Act and the Preservation of Objects of Archaeological and Palaeontological Interest Act, the institution has six professional departments, namely the Conservation department, Education department, Collections department, Pre-history Archaeology department, Historical Archaeology department and Exhibitions department. These departments form the core functions in the maintenance and operations of the institution.

The Archaeology department was established in 1994 and consisted of two fields – Pre-history Archaeology and the History Archaeology departments. Even though the legislation that governs the work of the department was endorsed by Cabinet in 1940, most research that took place then was conducted in a very adhoc manner. The
formation of this department provided opportunities for staff to plan archaeological programmes across Fiji, with support from international archaeologists and funders.

This department focuses on Fiji’s pre-history period and from results of a recent excavation that was collaboratively undertaken by the Archaeology Department and the University of the South Pacific, Suva. Fiji’s human settlement dates back to approximately 3050 years BP/1100 BC to European contact within the group. The findings of the earliest settlement in the southwest of Fiji predate most oral narratives known by Fijians today.

The Historical Archaeology department deals with all the events and history from European contact period to the present day. The department’s role is to identify, research and provide for the protection of the maritime and historic sites of Fiji. In this capacity, the department carries out legislative review, identification and recording of historic and maritime sites, and cultural heritage management-related activities. The department also assists in the enforcement of the Objects of Archaeological and Palaeontological Interest Act around the Fiji islands. The Historical Archaeology department maintains a Register of Historic Sites, including maritime sites. This is an ongoing project through which a comprehensive database of all known historic and maritime sites is being compiled. This department is interested in documenting heritage buildings in Fiji, especially in Suva and Levuka, where many colonial buildings are.

7.12.1 Current Status of Fiji Museum Collections

Most artifacts currently in store and exhibited at the Fiji Museum were given via European collectors and some of the major collections are named after donors such as Allardyce, Ragg, Brown and Wishart. Artifacts collected included both Fijian and Pacific items and items from other countries outside of the Pacific. Recently, local Fijians are bringing in artifacts such as tabua (whales-tooth) and iwau (clubs) for safekeeping (Buadromo, pers comm, 2013).

The entire museum collection is managed by the Collections Department under the
guide of Director, and sometimes displayed in temporary exhibits every three months. Lately, the Fiji Museum has been approached by outside organisations such as the Methodist Church, Westpac Banking Corp, Japanese Embassy, and so on interested in doing their own exhibits and sometimes using our own collection. Most of the objects have been catalogued, with the exception of new acquisitions such as the shell collection, which was recently acquired in September 2013. This is a large but undocumented collection that will take a while to catalogue. Only a section of the photography and oral history recordings have been digitised. Most objects have just recently been catalogued, but there is still a long way to go (Buadromo, pers comm, 2013).

In relation to plans for conservation, maintenance and exhibitions, this has been put forward by the museum for the next five years. The museum aims to have someone trained in this position and later have a couple of other staff in to be trained under this person in the next five years. As far as exhibitions are concerned, people are coming in to use the museum as a place to exhibit their items. The people of Fiji are grateful for this proactive move as it fulfills an area of interest for the Fiji Museum to be the place where members of the community can come and showcase what they are most interested in. This is far more engaging than just being a place to display objects of history. The Fiji Museum staff are, however, trying to put more of their collections on permanent displays, in particular clubs, spears and cannibalism items. The latter items are the most popular artifacts that many local visitors request to view (Buadromo, pers comm, 2013).

Maintenance is currently going on, for both exhibitions and offices. Some old cases have been taken down and replaced by new ones. There is also renovation of displays. Currently, the History Gallery is being upgraded. Upgrading facilities with new funding from government will ensure that the museum will have new public conveniences including proper access for the disabled, a new catering kitchen and a cafeteria and extension of the verandah. The museum has been receiving new objects in the form of books and objects throughout the years. The museum feels that as long as it is a small quantity, this is manageable. As for large collections, such as the shell collection that was donated by the Wishart Ryan family in September 2013, the museum struggles to figure out where to put them (Buadromo, pers comm, 2013).
7.12.2 **New Fiji Museum**

The new Fiji Museum currently portrays all cultures that call Fiji home. The old colonial museum was focused on the indigenous communities and their associated culture. These changes can be seen in the galleries and are testament to changes in politics and museum personnel. As far as exhibition spaces are concerned, the current museum has moved from only showcasing indigenous artifacts to including those from other Pacific islands and the Indian community. The Indo-Fijian Gallery was officially opened in 1999 and funded by the Indian High Commission.

The collection store has a rich Pacific collection, where one can view artifacts from the Pacific neighbours of Tonga, Samoa, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands, Kiribati and Papua New Guinea. It also contains scientific and biological collections. The geological collections at the Fiji Museum reflected the time of Director Bruce Palmer as he was a geologist. His keen interest in the subject of geology increased the number of collections in this field. When Fergus Clunie took over the reign from Palmer, he instigated the repatriation of artifacts from England through the support of the British Petroleum (Ramsay, 2013).

After the first military coup of 1987, changes took place within the museum leadership. Clunie returned to New Zealand and management positions was handed over to locals. Culture still remained the key essence of the institution however the focus began to change as the inclusivity of other cultures expanded. Even the development of archaeology departments recognised indigenous sites over historical and modern sites. In the late 1990s, the Historical Archaeology department was created to cater for the management of sites such as Levuka, Bilo Gun Site and World War II sites around Suva (Ramsay, 2013).

It is interesting to see the change of focus as time passed. With the colonial administration, the entire focus was on indigenous Fijians and their culture. With the new Fiji Museum, multi-culturalism is now the focus. There is an element of a shared history rather than a monoculture. The inclusion of Rotuma under Fiji was a colonial
undertaking. The islands of Rabi and Kioa are homes to the islanders from Kiribati (previously known as Gilbert Islands) and Tuvalu (previously known as Ellice Islands), respectively (ibid).

The Fiji Museum has become a national identity. No longer are we separate, as Indians, Rotumans, Rabi or Kioa Islanders; everyone is a Fijian. The new museum has now acknowledged other recent migrations into Fiji and the new population and ethnic groups. There is also an inclusion of the voices of those of mixed heritage (*kai loma*). This is in a form of a contemporary gallery currently in existence, and a new one being built to give space to many more contemporary artists who have Chinese, European, Indian and Pacific ancestry. In a nutshell, the new museum reflects that elements of the indigenous culture are still intact and, to be included with other racial groups, tells the world that Fiji is stronger as it was, before European contact (ibid).

Over time, the colonial nature of the museum has slowly changed from a time where colonial whites managed the institution yet with a lack of interest from local people. I believe this lack of interest was due mainly to the many economical and political responsibilities locals were involved in, in order to take on the new changes creeping into the Fijian society. World War II took a lot of iTaukei men to the wars in Malaysia and the Solomon Islands. The demand to make ends meet meant leaving the comforts of their village to newly built towns to earn money for the family (Ramsay, 2013).

Post-1970, with the changes in the management of the Fiji Museum, the underlying principle of the institution was to record and preserve as much of what the Fijian culture was known to be. It still serves the purpose of preserving cultural rights, with elements of other cultures included. The Fiji Museum has truly reflected the political fabric of Fiji since the early 1900s to Independence in 1970 to the new Millenium, incorporating other cultures that have called Fiji their home (ibid).
7.13 Interview Analysis

From the interviews conducted in Fiji, there is general appreciation of this new museum process called repatriation. Due to the Fiji Museum’s involvement in repatriation in the 1980s and with less iTaukei involved in the process, there was a total lack of repatriation awareness in Fiji. Local artisans were not familiar with the process of repatriation at all. However, informants who have read and learnt about repatriation in school and universities, some of whom are working at the Fiji Museum and other regional institutions such as the University of the South Pacific, were familiar with the term. Those who work in the Department of Culture and Heritage, some of whom understand the repatriation process, felt there is not enough attention given to this process. They felt that the Fiji Museum is satisfied with artifacts that are in the Fiji Museum collection now, with lack of vision to further acquire Fijian artifacts from overseas museums. There is a general consensus that it can be a valuable exercise to enhance the link between Fiji and other international museums and collections. With greater foresight, the Fiji Museum can benefit from working with international museums in order to enhance its current collection. Sachiko Soro (2014) remarked that:

Every time I visit a city [overseas], I am always interested in what they have in terms of Pacific artifacts in their museums, such as the British Museum and the one in Paris. I have noticed that there are different things to what we have in the Fiji Museum, and often interesting things that I have never seen before (personal communication, 2014).

The main issue highlighted by some respondents was the availability of collection storage space and exhibition spaces in the current Fiji Museum building. Some felt that there should be better financial support from the current government to support the extension of the current museum, which will surely take into account the issue of space, conservation and security. In terms of space, the current Fiji Museum holding is at full capacity and cannot take in additional artifacts. Previous museum management were in the process of building a new building called the National Centre for Culture and the
Arts (NCCA) but unfortunately funding did not come through at the time expected and the plan did not come to fruition.

Conservation and security are two issues that go hand in hand. Interviewing a research associate based in France who has done a lot of research on Fijian artifacts around the world, she remarked that:

*Most institutions that I have worked with were afraid of massive repatriation. One key reason is the issue of conservation….conservation of artifacts can become big responsibilities particularly to the Fiji Museum (personal communication, 2013).*

In terms of ownership and access to these artifacts by the iTaukei people, the recognition of indigenous knowledge was rated as important. The Fijian Art project based in the UK has tried to associate source communities with the projects they do. They have included the Fiji Museum in the project, as well as outsourcing the building of a modern day double hull canoe to be exhibited in France in 2015. Staff of the Department that was interviewed also highlighted that:

*The rights of indigenous communities and original custodians of these artifacts are often deprived and have less or no access to these collections. Often they do not have any powers upon how the museum exhibits artifacts. In 2003, the department received a concerned email regarding the sale of Fijian war clubs online. The manner in which clubs were exhibited were provocative. Half naked women were used to sell the war-clubs online. This is a grave concern (personal communication).*

Another interviewee, who is a High Chief of his province and a lawyer commented that:
The return of cultural objects will raise awareness of their significance and a corresponding interest in what our ancestors achieved and how we might strengthen our understanding and appreciation of our ancestors’ accomplishments and how they were able to coexist equably with their environment (personal communication, 2014).

Overall, there is a general appreciation of repatriation, however there is a huge need for advocacy on the part of the Fiji Museum to lobby with the current government to support the improvement to the current museum building. Following that is the need to strengthen the professional ties the Fiji Museum has with international museums so there is some reassurance that when artifacts are repatriated, they can be looked after well, in temperature-controlled storage rooms and exhibition spaces. With the support of regional organisations such as the Pacific Islands Museums Association (PIMA) for staff training, this can raise the standard of collections care in the areas of conservation and security. In the meantime, whilst awaiting these developments to take place, virtual repatriation has become a widely accepted museum process that encourages dialogue and relationship-building among museums, so that artifacts kept in collection stores are virtually available through website portals, such as the example between the Fiji Museum and the Museum of Victoria, in Melbourne, Australia.

7.14 Analysis Factors

7.14.1 Knowledge of Museum Repatriation

Not all museum staff members were clear on the process of repatriation. Once repatriation was re-defined to them (either in English or in the iTaukei language), they were able to understand and a lot of emotions were visible in their expressions. Even though they were all optimistic to have Fijian artifacts repatriated back to the Fiji Museum in the future, they equally showed their concern on the limitation of physical space to fit new artifacts. Those that worked in the exhibition spaces also shared their concern over the lack of exhibition space when these newly returned artifacts are to be exhibited in the future.
As for the researchers, some of whom were senior civil servants of the government and academics, they understood the meaning of repatriation but lacked the detailed museum processes that the museum staff were familiar with. Despite the uneven levels of understanding, their concern regarding the lack of space was clearly articulated by everyone I spoke to. As for the iTaukei participants, there was a general consensus that they all want Fijian artifacts to be returned, with cultural education and cultural revival as the main reasons for repatriation. However, one artist in particular wanted the artifacts to remain overseas so as to promote Fiji to those who want to learn more about the country.

7.14.2 Knowledge of Fijian Collections in Overseas Museums

All of the Fiji Museum staff I spoke to have been overseas and participated in museum research projects and workshops. They understood quite clearly that Fijian artifacts are kept in overseas museum collections. This is quite similar to the responses of the researcher and the iTaukei community leaders and artists. One Fijian artist said:

Every time I visit a city, I am always interested in what they have in terms of Pacific artifacts in their museums, such as the museum in London and the one in Paris. I have noticed that they have different things to what we have in the Fiji Museum, and often interesting things that I have not seen before. (Soro, personal communication, 2014)

7.14.3 Knowledge of Repatriation Laws

This was a topic that was least known among participants and is evidence of an area that the Fiji Museum needs to look into in terms of advocacy among its heritage and culture stakeholders. One participant, whose role at the Department of National Heritage, Culture and the Arts involves policies and conventions, said:

My work is focused on the development and implementation of policies and protocols relevant to the culture sector including the ratification of appropriate
UNESCO and UN Conventions and international treaties that will enhance work in the sector in Fiji. The implementation of any repatriation requires sound policy to be in place, and although not obligatory, the ratification of certain UN treaties and UNESCO Conventions to facilitate ease in the repatriation of Fijian artifacts. Setting the protocols and standards assist in the transition process, maintenance of the repatriated items, storage, exhibition once it is in its original place. (Nemani, personal communication, 2014)

7.14.4 Knowledge of Museum Collections’ Ownership

Responses to this topic was quite uniform, in the sense that most participants said that Fijian artifacts, in particular those that were traded or exchanged, legally belong to museums, but the rights of custodianship still belong to the iTaukei people. Some iTaukei participants feel the connection with artifacts that binds them in a spiritual manner still exists in artifacts as these artifacts becomes the link to the past.

When questioned regarding their view on IPR, there is a huge concern shown in particular with

[the misappropriation of intellectual property that has been rife in Fiji such as music piracy, plagiarism, duplication of art-work and so forth. Our Department of National Heritage, Culture and Arts] concern over current intellectual property regimes is the lack of recognition for communally owned knowledge which thrives in indigenous communities and similarly the lack of monitoring by enforcement agencies which see the thriving piracy in our society. (Nemani, personal communication, 2014)

7.14.5 Knowledge of Repatriation Issues and Opportunities

Due to the polarised understanding of repatriation, as discussions continued with participants, many became more optimistic of what can be done to secure the successful return of Fijian artifacts from international museums.
7.14.6 Knowledge of Repatriation and Link to Cultural Identity

The common responses highlighted how repatriation is connected to cultural identity. Many of those interviewed remarked on how repatriation can boost the cultural identity of Fijians – those living in Fiji and those living overseas. The former would mean that repatriation of lost art can be revived if museums can work with local communities to re-learn lost artforms and revive elements of Fijian traditions that were either banned by missionaries or lost due to modernisation.

7.15 Concluding Remarks

The Fiji Museum clearly plays an important role in Fiji. Roles have changed from 1904 when it began to the present. When the idea of the Fiji Museum was mooted in the early 1900s, it started as a professional group of European men whose aim was to collect Fijian indigenous artifacts for the sake of posterity. Over time, as the museum moved from place to place, and eventually with the new building being built in 1955, the museum collection began to also include artifacts from other Pacific islands. From 1970 to the present time, the Fiji Museum continues to be a statutory body, directly reporting to the Department of Culture and Heritage, under the Ministry of Education. In the 1980s, iTaukei staff were employed, taking various roles from auxiliary staff to director positions. There has been a shift in the selection of staff and board members. Now local staff are now employed to run the affairs of the Museum compared to the early years when they were excluded. This shows the process of staff empowerment and the need for locals to manage their own affairs in institutions such as the Fiji Museum.
8 CHAPTER EIGHT

Case Study 2: iYAU VAKAVITI E IGILADI

Fijian Collections at the Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology (MAA), Cambridge, England:

Cultural Rights and Repatriation

_He was half-starved on native food, had spent all his money, and even cut out the buttons off his clothes in exchange for native ornaments._ (Maudslay, 1930, p. 87)

8.1 Introduction

Museums in many postcolonial societies reflect the historical ties with the colonial powers. In the case of the United Kingdom and its association with Fiji, this chapter will discuss the political link between the two countries on a macro-level. On a micro-level, there will be a series of discussions relating to the history of the Fijian collection at the Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology (MAA), at the University of Cambridge in UK. This will give us an appreciation of how Fijian artifacts were collected in the 1800s, and how they came to be in existence in large quantities at the MAA. The main collector, von Hügel, will be the focus of this chapter. He was known to have collected a tremendous amount of Fijian artifacts, which formed the major part of the Ethnology Collection at the MAA. Most artifacts, which belonged to Ratu Seru Cakobau (self-proclaimed King of Fiji) formed part of the Fijian collection. Apart from the MAA, there will also be discussions on Fijian collections currently kept at the Sainsbury Research University (SRU) at the University of East Anglia in Norwich and will be discussed under sub-heading of the Fijian Arts project. There will also be some references made to the British Museum and the Museum of Ireland.
8.2 Background

No doubt, since 1874, past governors of Fiji played a key role in the numerous acquisitions that was received by the MAA. The key figure in this regard was Sir Arthur Gordon, Fiji’s first British governor. Further research highlighted that his whole family was involved in the appropriation of such Fijian artifacts. The Fijian artifacts collected by von Hügel and Gordon became the founding collection for the MAA even though it was known then as the Museum of General and Local Archaeology (Herle, 2013, p. 2).

Some key questions that arise are: what happens to these artifacts and what opportunities are there for their use in these in modern times, for both Fijians and non-Fijians? The collaborative research project on Fijian art funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council and led by Professor Steven Hooper has provided an exciting platform for positive engagement with the Fijian collection, not only for the MAA but also in England and internationally.

The notion of collecting seems to fit in well with the purpose of ethnography, which is to record in the last hour the cultural heritage of ‘intriguing’ populations (Buschmann, 2009, p. 143). Collectors and colonial administrators were recording ethnographic information to be sent back to their home country. In the case of Fiji, information was sent to England. Following what was taking place around the world, there was also a scientific approach to address the anthropological background of indigenous communities. It came to a point where anthropologists were excluding missionaries and colonial officials from ethnographic work. In the case of German residents in the colonies, they were encouraged to consult with local museum officials before venturing out into the field (Buschmann, 2009, p. 142).

8.3 The History of Artifact Appropriation in Britain

In order to understand the impact of postcolonial theory in this discussion, it is critical to know the colonial past of Fiji and its relationship with England. The colonial
expansion of Great Britain was felt in Pacific in the eighteenth century. Initially there was great optimism about these colonial annexations, however there were hostilities from indigenous communities. In the case of Fiji, as the British colonial foothold remained strong, certain colonial administrators who had interests in anthropology began collecting material culture. Such collections began to illustrate and represent imperial accomplishments. According to Buschmann (2009), such anthropologists became ‘colonial apologists’ to illustrate Britain’s rule over Fiji.

A global movement of collecting ethnological materials was taking place around the world in the 1800s. The world powers of Germany, France and the United States of America were establishing museums as collectors were returning from colonies with loads of artifacts. By 1886, the Berlin Museum was known to have holdings ten times that of the British Museum (Gosden, 2007, p. 38). During this period in Britain, some collectors exchanged artifacts in shops and auction rooms. Others were aware of the value of these artifacts through interactions between people, mostly in social situations such as presentations in learned societies where publications were read, in popular journals and the press and from conversations in members clubs. For instance, collectors at the Pitt Rivers Museum were members of the Anthropological Society (later known as the Royal Anthropological Institute), the British Association for the Advancement of Science and the Royal Geographic Society (ibid.).

As annexations spread across the globe, large metropolitan museums were established throughout Great Britain during the eighteenth century. Access to these museums tended to be restricted to respected individuals but gradually museums opened to the public. Although museums were in direct competition with other forms of popular entertainment, museums became places established to represent the world and to instruct its citizens. As much of the Pacific was incorporated into the colonial museum movement, animals, plants, minerals, people and cultural materials travelled to Europe and England as part of this global network of exchange (Healy, 1997, p. 84). Many of these items that were collected were assembled during voyagers by scientists, crew members, missionaries and colonial administrators under varying circumstances. Once they reached Europe, some remained together while others exchanged hands through collectors, art dealers or between museums. For over 200 years, many collections remained physically separated by thousands of miles from their place of origin (Hauser-Schaubalin, 2011, p. 2). In the United Kingdom alone, the highest number of Pacific
artifacts can be seen at the British Museum. The MAA is next in line, with Pacific materials that are equally important. There are also a lot of materials in private collections and in the hands of dealers (Skinner, 1917, p. 135).

The colonial legacy of Britain is felt throughout the world, including the Pacific region. The annexation of New Zealand to Britain took place in 1840 and Fiji in 1874. In the case of Fiji, leading up to 1874 and immediately after saw a high number of Fijian artifacts leaving Fiji to other parts of the world, more so to Britain.

In terms of Maori material in English museums, most are found at the British Museum, the MAA in Cambridge University, the Liverpool Museum, and the Rosehill (Lord Northesk’s) Collection, now on loan at the Tudor House, Southampton. Others of similar importance are found at the Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh, the Bristol Museum, the Hancock Museum, Newcastle, and the Royal Museum in Canterbury. As for Maori artifacts, nearly every provincial museum has them, and they are often extremely rare and beautiful pieces. Skinner (1917) mentioned an important point in that the sizes of the objects in British museums are small and light. To him, the typical sizes and weight of artifacts arises out of the necessities of travelers and explorers. Due to the distance from the Pacific to England, collectors have to consider the sizes of artifacts collected and the space they will take as cargo. It is then rare to see large sizes of artifacts such as really large pieces of carving. For the same reason the collections of stone implements and weapons, as well as greenstone, are of smaller sizes but in large quantities. British collections excel in the smaller articles of wood, and in objects made from bone and greenstone (ibid).

8.4 Fijian Art Research Project

The Fijian Art Research project, led by Professor Steven Hooper, provides a starting point for finding out how Fijian artifacts came to be present in museums in the United Kingdom.

This is a three-year project led by Professor Hooper of the Sainsbury Research Centre at the University of East Anglia, in Norwich. There are nine partners in this project.
8.4.1 Sainsbury Research Unit

The Sainsbury Research Unit (SRU) is based in the Sainsbury Centre for Visual Arts at the University of East Anglia. The Sainsbury Centre houses the Robert and Lisa Sainsbury Collection, which include high-quality Oceanic materials, including those from Fiji.

The Robert Sainsbury Library at the SRU has extensive holdings of publications and archives about Fiji, including material donated by Philip Snow, author of *A Bibliography of Fiji, Tonga and Rotuma* (1969). Snow was a Cambridge graduate who worked in Fiji for the Colonial Administrative Service from 1938 to 1952. The SRU has hosted a series of research projects, including one on Polynesian Visual Arts (2003–2006) (Fijian Arts Project website, 2013).

8.5 Birth of the Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology (MAA), Cambridge

The MAA is one of the nine museums at the University of Cambridge. The University’s collections are a world-class resource for researchers, students and members of the public. Cambridge has the country’s highest concentration of internationally important collections outside of London (MAA website, 2013).

Figure 8.1. iTaube (Ivory Necklace), MAA Fijian Collection.
Many collections existed in Cambridge before the MAA was formally established in 1884. Such collections were owned by the city and the colleges. The local Cambridge Antiquarian Society began gathering material in 1839, while a number of Cambridge colleges also had important collections. From its beginning, the museum was overcrowded and under-resourced. von Hügel drew on his personal resources and his network of wealthy academics and friends to develop the museum and build up the collections (Herle, 2013, p. 118).

The campaign to establish a proper institution to bring these Cambridge colleges together was led by the local Cambridge Antiquarian Society (CAS), which grew dramatically in the 1870s and 1880s as a result of the efforts of a particularly dynamic secretary. The lobbying resulted in the founding of the museum in 1884, initially named the University’s Museum of General and Local Archaeology, based in Little St. Mary’s Lane, behind Peterhouse College.

The MAA at the University of Cambridge holds world-class collections of art and artifacts from many parts of Oceania, Africa, Asia and the Americas. These ethnographic objects include masks, canoes and sculptures, some collected during the voyages of Captain Cook to the Pacific, others assembled by Cambridge fieldworkers
from the late nineteenth century onwards. The museum also displays archaeological
discoveries, ranging from the very earliest hominid tools excavated by Louis Leakey
from Olduvai Gorge in eastern Africa, through to early South American textiles, to
Roman and Anglo-Saxon finds from various parts of Britain (Elliott & Thomas, 2011).

The MAA also holds artifacts ranging from stone tools and pots to sculptures and
paintings that represent cultures and histories over millennia. Great recent and
contemporary works reflect the diversity of peoples worldwide, and the resilience of indigenous cultures confronted by globalisation. Included in such cultures are tribal antiquities from the Pacific. Some of the largest collections were from the voyages of Captain James Cook, when he was undertaking his voyages in the Pacific in the 1770s. Altogether, the objects cover nearly two million years of human history from the earliest stone tools to contemporary life in indigenous communities. A temporary exhibition space within the museum also allows the MAA to showcase communities and themes that emerge from the vast collection of nearly one million objects (MAA website, 2013).

8.5.1 Survey of MAA – Cambridge collections

The materials in the museum are organised into a number of key areas. Firstly, is the archaeological collection. The Museum holds archaeological finds from every part of the inhabited world. They range from some of the very oldest, such as early hominid tools discovered by Louis Leakey in Olduvai Gorge, east Africa, to medieval and post-medieval finds from sites within Cambridge. They include finds from major excavations crucial to the development of archaeological science, such as those conducted by Kathleen Kenyon at Jericho in the Jordan valley, one of the oldest continually occupied cities in the world, and material from Star Carr in Yorkshire,
excavated by Grahame Clark from 1949 to 1951. MAA holds one of the finest pre-
Columbian collections in Britain, including remarkably preserved early textiles;
important prehistoric Arctic materials; wide-ranging collections relating to early
research in southern Africa, on rock art among other topics; and – of special interest to
Cambridge communities – finds from major Roman cemeteries at Great Chesterford
and Litlington, as well as many other prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon finds from
the city and region (MAA website, 2013).

8.5.1.1 Anthropological collections
MAA cares for works of art and artifacts from Asia, Africa, Oceania and native
America, and those representing British and European folklore. Among the Museum’s
most famous collections are those deriving from the voyages of Captain Cook to the
Pacific in the 1770s. The Museum’s founding curator, Anatole von Hügel spent several
years in Fiji and assembled the single most important collection of nineteenth century
Fijian art outside Fiji itself, and went on to be highly energetic, soliciting collections
and donations from fieldworkers and travelers in many parts of the world. Major field
collections include those made by Alfred Haddon during the 1898 Cambridge
expedition to the Torres Strait, by Northcote W. Thomas from Nigeria and Sierra
Leone, by Charles Hose from Sarawak, by Gregory Bateson from the Sepik River,
Papua New Guinea, and by Christoph von Furér-Haimendorf from the Nagas (MAA
website, 2013).

8.5.1.2 Photographic collections
The Museum holds over 220,000 photographic objects, one of the largest and most
significant anthropology and archaeology collections in Britain. The Museum has
always collected photographs, viewing them as important sources of information. The
earliest photographs were taken in 1860 by Louis Allen Goss, a school inspector
working in Rangoon, Burma. The collection includes material from the late-nineteenth
and early-twentieth century – when there were significant developments in the way
photography was used – as well as recent works by contemporary anthropologists and
artists. Many photographs are on regular display and the reserve collection can be seen
by appointment (MAA website, 2013).
8.5.1.3 Modern and contemporary art

Since the 1990s the Museum has acquired works of modern and contemporary art, especially works that are from communities represented in the Museum’s historic collections, or that are otherwise relevant to the Museum. Since a surprising number of the historic objects that they hold were in fact distinctive, innovative creations, the much-debated distinctions between ‘traditional craft’, ‘material culture’, and ‘art’ have become less useful or meaningful. With the support of the Art Fund among other bodies, the Museum is now building a wide-ranging collection of sculpture, prints, paintings and digital and installation works, that foreground indigenous perspectives from various parts of the world, and include works by British and other artists that respond to both anthropological and archaeological collections, and to western traditions of collecting and museum-making (MAA website, 2013).

8.5.1.4 Archival material

The Museum’s archives are a rich resource that relates to MAA’s collections as well as to the history of the Museum itself and its role in the development of the disciplines of archaeology and anthropology. Among the archives are excavation notebooks and site plans from sites such as Jericho and Pat Carter’s excavations in Lesotho, the Fijian journals of Baron Anatole von Hügel, and the correspondence of museum staff and collectors (MAA website, 2013).

8.5.1.5 MAA – Cambridge legislations

The MAA has the status of a division within the Department of Archaeology and Anthropology at the University of Cambridge. This forms part of the School of the Humanities and Social Sciences. The museum reports to the Museum Committee, drawn from across the University, which meets once a term. The Museum is also one of eight accredited University of Cambridge Museums and Collections. Together, these institutions form a partnership – the University of Cambridge Museums (UCM). In 2012, they were successful in a bid for significant funding from Arts Council England, as a Renaissance Major partner (MAA website, 2013).
8.6 The MAA and Cultural Rights: How did Fijian Objects Reach this Museum?

Ethnography was a method of furthering the imperial mission through the study of the indigenous peoples under its rule. This can also be applied to Fiji when the British colonial mission was furthering the empire’s reign over Fiji through the study of iTaukei people and their material culture. Sir Authur Gordon, Fiji’s first Governor, from 1874 supported the work done by collector Baron Anatole von Hügel, the MAA museum’s founding curator. His collecting work resulted in a large Fijian assemblage of artifacts at the MAA, which became the core of the Fijian collection. Other members of the then Governor Sir Arthur Gordon’s household during the period of Fiji’s cession to Britain in 1874 also contributed to this collection. In 1884, the bulk of this collection, which was kept at the Government House were offered to the University of Cambridge (Herle, 2013, p. 2). Evidence showed that the iTaukei were not aware of the movement of these artifacts which were exchanged for European items such as buttons, glass, mirrors and firearms.
8.6.1 MAA Collectors

8.6.1.1 Baron Anatole von Hügel

Baron Anatole von Hügel (1854–1928) was a key figure among early ethnologists of the Pacific. He developed a keen interest in the peoples and cultures in Fiji. By focusing on his travels and collecting in Fiji, we can gain a deeper understanding of the genesis and value of what he has left behind. In doing so, one can reassess the British contribution to the ethnological knowledge of Fiji. This case study also reveals von Hügel’s contribution to the wider history of the discipline, examining the intersection between the scientific endeavour and colonial reality.
von Hügel was a key figure in the history of at least three Cambridge institutions. He became the first curator of the University’s Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology in 1883 and worked tirelessly throughout his life to expand its collection and to construct buildings suitable for their display and study. Although educated at Stonyhurst College, Anatole never formally attended university but he was not a mere gifted amateur. He gained his love of natural ethnographic, zoological and botanical subjects from his father and from his own extensive travels, particularly in Australasia and the Pacific. In particular, he made a famous exploration of Fiji where he was found by the British Governor, Sir Arthur Gordon, ‘half starved from trying to live on native food, and having parted with everything down to the buttons on his clothes, in exchange for native earrings and other small ornaments’ (Hooper, 1980). Figures 8.7 and 8.8 are some artifacts collected by von Hügel.

Figure 8.8. Tabua. Source: MAA, Cambridge.

On his return to England, the Baron soon settled in Cambridge. He became one of the very few to hold an official position in the university. He became a member of Trinity and was awarded an honorary MA, the first Catholic to take a Cambridge degree since the revolution of 1688. He became the central figure in the small world of Cambridge
Catholicism and was to remain so until his death. He used all of his links and networks to secure and advance the position of Catholics in Cambridge (ibid).

Upon his arrival in Fiji, the Baron began his collecting trips, going as far as the inland of Viti Levu. He moved from village to village, trading artifacts, documenting and noting ethnographic details. With so many artifacts collected, he returned to Levuka, the colonial capital. He was invited by the newly arrived governor Sir Arthur Gordon to settle both himself and his collections at Government House, Nasova (Hooper & Roth, 2004).

von Hügel took up residence with the Gordon family and, sooner or later, the passion for collecting spread to other members of the Governor’s household. Not just Sir Arthur Gordon with his appreciation of ‘the scientific value of ethnological collections’, but also to Lady Gordon, Constance Frederika Gordon Cumming, and A. Gordon as well as others like A.P. Maudslay and Captain Louis F. Knollys, each vying to outdo the other (Hooper & Roth, 2004).

Figure 8.9. Lady Constance Cumming. Source: Fiji Museum
8.6.1.2 **Sir Arthur Gordon**

Sir Arthur Gordon arrived in Fiji on June 25, 1875, after his term of governorship in New Brunswick, Trinidad and Mauritius. He was known as a champion of native rights after his experience of seeing planters fending for themselves in Trinidad and Mauritius. He was influential in the protection of Fijian land to remain in the hands of Indigenous Fijians in 1875. In 1876, under the Native Affairs Ordinance, he set up councils in the districts and provinces of Fiji, with the Great Council of Chiefs representing Fiji nationally. Gordon laid the foundation for the system of indigenous administration, which lasted until 1970. Many of the outstanding objects in the MAA’s collections were gifts to the Governor or Lady Gordon (Donnelly et al., 1994, pp. 40–41).

Gordon was also known to be an experienced and shrewd Governor. On the first few weeks of his arrival in Fiji, he met with various leading figures, including members of the interim government, chiefs and local settlers, before determining what his administration was going to look like and their course of action. He also mobilised doctors to assist in areas where the measles epidemic was at its worst (Herle, 2013, p. 79). As described in Gordon (1897, p. 121), “he sent the Barracouta to the most infected area with two medical officers and medical stores.”
8.7 Survey of Fijian Collections at MAA – Cambridge

The MAA at the University of Cambridge houses some of the most important Fijian collections in the world outside the Fiji Museum. These artifacts indeed provide insights into the early history of archaeology and anthropology. With over 2,500 objects, 2,500 photographs, diaries, field notes and drawings, they include items from all periods of Fijian history from the late eighteenth century to extensive material from the early colonial period (1870s–1890s).

The collections include over a thousand objects acquired in the 1870s by Sir Arthur Gordon, the first Governor of Fiji, his private secretary Alfred Maudslay and Baron Anatole von Hügel, founding curator of the museum. Another significant contributor
in the twentieth century was George Kingsley Roth, a colonial officer in Fiji between 1928 and 1957. The photographic collection comprises over 2,500 negatives, prints, cartes-de-visite, slides and postcards relating to Fiji, as well as Constance Frederika Gordon Cumming’s album of water-colours and photographs (MAA website, 2013).

The total number of Fijian objects at the MAA is 2,794 and this may include some Tongan artefacts as well. Because of their close connections it is not an easy task to differentiate between Fijian and Tongan items. The MAA records cannot be modified, therefore the records will continually come up as Fijian. The numbers above are thus more likely to be considered as being larger than reality. For example, some of the spears are not Fijian but they still come up as Fijian because of the way MAA records information and this cannot be omitted from the list because of the museum’s practical issues with the database (Carreau, pers. comm., 2014). A century ago, a similar situation arose when Skinner (1917, p. 32) included Fiji in the Polynesian group, although according to him the people are mostly Papuan. The important point though is that the influence of Tongan culture on Fiji’s decorative art has been so strong that it is sometimes impossible with any exactitude to identify certain specimens as of either Tongan or Fijian origin (ibid).

**List of Key Fijian Artifacts at the MAA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fijian Artifact Type</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carvings</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burekalou</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headrests</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spears</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wooden bowls &amp; dishes</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wooden hooks</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ivory</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabua</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornaments</td>
<td>93 [including 10 breastplates]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Textiles</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bark-cloths</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baskets</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mats</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skirts</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MAA, Cambridge. Data provided by Curator Dr. Lucie Carreau.

Figure 8.12. Display at MAA, Cambridge. Source: Tarisi Vunidilo, 2013.

8.8 **Fijian Collections at the Trinity Collection in Ireland and the British Museum, London**

Apart from the MAA, it is important to investigate other collections that have links to Fiji. The Trinity Collection in Ireland and the Fijian collection at the British Museum are two great examples.
8.8.1 Fijian Artifacts at Trinity College, Ireland

In 1894 the Provost and Senior Fellows of Trinity College deposited in the National Museum a number of specimens from Fiji (52 pieces), New Caledonia (3 pieces), Vanuatu (25 pieces), the Solomon Islands (12 pieces), and New Guinea (49 pieces). The Fijian collection is of particular interest for it is known to have been put together by Professor William Henry Harvey, of Trinity College, during a visit to the Fiji Islands in about the year 1855 (Freeman, 1949, p. 12).

The collection consisted for the most part of clubs and spears. The specimens arrived in Dublin in July, 1856, and in November of the same year (about two months after his return) Dr. Harvey delivered an address to the members of the Dublin University Zoological and Botanical Association on the Fiji Islands. The Chairman, Dr. Robert Ball, opened the meeting with these words:

Tonight Professor Harvey favors us with some remarks on the inhabitants of the Fiji Islands, whose arms, etc., you see hung around the room. Collections of this kind have been sneered at but very improperly as a right knowledge of them is of great importance in the very difficult and very high study of ethnology; a study in which the utmost penetration of the zoologist should join with the most profound knowledge of the philologist as the races of men are not less distinguished by their physical form and language than by their arms and ornaments: these things have come to have a scientific use. It is note-worthy
that a set of nine spears was given to Professor Harvey by the Rev. J. Calvert, who had himself received them from Cakobau. (Freeman, 1949, p. 16)

8.8.2 Fijian Collections at the British Museum

The British Museum has a very rich Pacific collection. The Museum also has dedicated staff that manage the Pacific collection on a full-time basis. This alone reflects the attitude of the museum towards the management of Pacific artifacts.

![Figure 8.14. British Museum. Source: British Museum website.](image)

The total number of artifacts under Fiji’s provenance comes to 2,500. This is an online total and is probably near accurate. It includes photographs, illustrations, banknotes and coins that are in the Pictorial Collection. The total number of artifacts under the care of the Collection Manager before June 2012 was approximately 1,500 anthropological artifacts. This would include weapons, masks, canoes, fishing gear, sacred and household objects and carvings. The Fijian collection at the MAA in Cambridge is much larger than the Fijian collection at the British Museum (Hasell, personal communication, 2013).

Below are the names of people/organisations the Fijian collection was acquired from. This list includes the major donations/purchases and they are listed in alphabetical order by surname. The names highlighted in yellow provided the largest collections.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF COLLECTOR</th>
<th>INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allardyce, William Lamond (Sir)</td>
<td>Small donation in 1893. His widow presented a larger collection to the museum in 1931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baxendale, Francis Richard Salisbury</td>
<td>Presented in 1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beasley, Harry Geoffrey</td>
<td>His collection bequeathed to the museum and received in 1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belcher, Edward (Sir)</td>
<td>Items collected on the voyage of HMS Sulphur donated in 1842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenchley, Julius</td>
<td>Items collected on the voyage of HMS Curaçoa. Presented in 1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christy, Henry</td>
<td>Bequest received after his death in 1865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon, Arthur (Sir)</td>
<td>Presented in 1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson, William H. (Captain, R.N.)</td>
<td>Presented in 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMS Herald – officers of</td>
<td>Presented by the Lords of the Admiralty in 1856 and 1857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im Thurm, Everard (Sir)</td>
<td>Presented in 1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay, R Gillian (Mrs.)</td>
<td>Presented in 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lister, D C E (Mrs.)</td>
<td>Presented artefacts collected by her husband Joseph Jackson Lister in 1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meinertzhagen, Frederick Huth.</td>
<td>(1845–1895). His collection was purchased from his daughter in 1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodwell, Cecil (Sir)</td>
<td>Presented in 1922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Botanic Gardens Kew</td>
<td>Transferred a few artifacts in 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starzecka, Dorota Czarkowska</td>
<td>Collections made in 1993 and 1994 when Assistant Keeper (Curator) of the Oceanic collections of the British Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel, J. (in register – possibly T for Thomas)</td>
<td>Fellow of the Linnaean Society, Colonial Sugar Refinery Company, Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swayne, Charles Richard</td>
<td>Presented by his wife in 1922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomson, Basil (Sir)</td>
<td>A few artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udal, John Symonds</td>
<td>A few artifacts were purchased from him in 1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellcome Historical Medical Museum</td>
<td>Presented in 1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood, Matthew (Sir)</td>
<td>Presented by his widow Lady Maud Wood. Comment in registration for this collection: 'Collected by donor's husband about 1875, given to him by King Thakombau'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, Robert (Rev.)</td>
<td>A few pieces formerly in the Royal Cornwall Museum, Truro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: British Museum, provided by Curator Jill Hasell.

### 8.9 Repatriation Projects

CHAPTER SIX highlighted a number of successful repatriations that have taken place between the Fiji Museum and England in the 1980s under the directorship of Fergus
Clunie. It is important to note here that there has not been any repatriation between the MAA and the Fiji Museum. As far as repatriation is concerned in England, there was a global event that caused changes in the way museums look at their collections. The first World Archaeology Congress (WAC) held in Southampton, United Kingdom in 1986, instigated a world movement focused on critical awareness of the treatment of the past in the present. Included in this movement was stakeholder empowerment and social justice (Silverman, 2011, p. 3). Four years later, the second WAC meeting in Venezuela encouraged archaeologists to further their resolve when they took on the issues of power inherent in professional archaeological practice. The same year, in the United States, the NAGPRA (Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act) was passed. Furthermore, indigenous peoples of Canada, Australia and other parts of the world ‘were now insisting on physical and ideological control of – or at least participation in decision-making about – their cultural heritage from human remains to sites of exhibited artifacts,’ (Silverman, 2011, p. 4). Dr. Kwame-Opoku (2008) argued,

How do a people remember their history when records have been stolen by another State? The human rights of the African peoples, are being violated by this persistent and defiant refusal to return cultural objects that were not produced by the Europeans and Americans and were not meant for their use….Most of these objects should have been returned when the African countries gained independence in the 1960s.

Over time, it was not only individual people that were interested in the return of their own cultural heritage. Countries were now involved therefore this became national issues, where countries wanted to exercise their right to those cultural properties that form an integral part of their cultural heritage and identity. For example, Egypt wanted the return of the Rosetta Stone from the British Museum, and Nigeria wanted the return of the Benin bronzes from the British Museum as well (Greenfield 2007, p. 124–128). As for Australia, the remains of a ‘long-ago decapitated Aboriginal person deposited at the Liverpool City Museum was given back in 1977’ (Innoncenti, 2014, p. 201). As a result, the Blair government set up a working group in 2001 to further study the question of human remains of less than 1,000 years’ old, the setting up of the Human Tissue
Authority and the adoption of a Best Practices Guide for the treatment of human remains in museums (ibid.).

In an interview with Clunie (2013), he expressed his vision on the future of repatriation between Britain and Fiji. Firstly, he mentioned that international museums are quite happy and confident to return artifacts to Fiji, however the Fiji Museum needs to build excellent relationships with overseas museums first before any new repatriation is carried out. Relationship is key, and it is important to identify museums and individuals who have keen interests in Fiji. Once this relationship is developed and further enhanced, this will open doors to future repatriation negotiations. In the case of Fiji, the Fiji Museum must develop a good reputation, building an excellent track record before any repatriation assistance can be received. The Fiji Museum must also work closely with the government of the day. The Board of Trustees of the Fiji Museum must keep the government informed through Board meeting reports and cabinet papers. Clunie (2013) also raised the importance of funding to pay for artifacts that are auctioned at international auction houses or online. For example, in the case of the Hooper Collection that was repatriated in 1980, a sponsor was needed to transport the collection from England to Fiji. British Petroleum came forward to fund freight costs between the two countries. If the Fiji government is fully informed of potential repatriations, they can assist with negotiations and meeting potential costs through its Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Fiji High Commission in London. It is also reassuring to see some donors gifting artifacts directly to museums. The Fiji Museum should be open to such gifts, and build on these opportunities and build stronger relationships with such donors. With technology currently taking over museum collection management, staff of the Fiji Museum should be alert when seeing Fijian artifacts on online catalogues. This could open doors to future repatriation and associated discussions and negotiations (Clunie, personal communication, 2013).

The interview with Ms. Lucie Carreau, Assistant Curator at the MAA, shed more light on this topic of repatriation. To her, repatriation in general provided conflicting views. As a French person, repatriation to her continues to perpetrate colonial legacies. For instance, French laws disallow France to repatriate artifacts to New Caledonia and
Tahiti. Both of these countries are French colonial territories of the Pacific. The MAA, as a British institution however, thinks differently about repatriation. As a curator, she can see that other museums do take repatriation seriously. To her, repatriation can be done in a variety of ways. On a personal level, if all collections were returned, it would be very sad. She understood museums as places where cultures from other ‘colonies’ are displayed. To her, collections must be displayed and enjoyed by museum visitors.

There is only one aspect of museum collections that changes her stand on repatriation, and that is regarding human remains. To her, such remains qualify highly for repatriation. For example, the return of the Toi Moko (Maori tattooed heads), which were returned from France to New Zealand, is a good thing to be done. She believes in historical entanglement between Fiji and Britain. She proposes that Fijian artifacts must go from Britain to Fiji and vice versa. That way, it adds life to the object. There are many proper ways of sharing cultural knowledge. To her, museums don’t belong to the curators but they legally belong to the Cambridge of the Museum.

However, she acknowledged that there is knowledge attached to the objects. There should be a link to prior knowledge of these artifacts. A proposed ‘politics of movement’ sees objects travel back to Fiji from Britain and vice versa. It is also paramount that Fiji sends new things, such as contemporary works, where British museum visitors can learn more about modern-day Fiji. The MAA lacks contemporary collections. In order to make things move so everyone can gain something from this process, there are two areas that need to be kept in mind. One is the practical problem (on-the-ground issues) associated with repatriation, and the other is the need for money to make this happen. A direct result of repatriation is that objects keep getting discovered. Some artists feel that artifacts become ‘ambassadors’ of the nation they represent, however according to Carreau (2013), this term is too official and formal. To her, objects connect everyone at all levels and they bring people together.

These two interviews capture the reality of what repatriation means from the standpoint of the Fiji Museum and the MAA. Since there has not been any repatriation that has taken place between these institutions, some of the points highlighted by Clunie (2013)
and Carreau (2013) will be useful in the planning of future repatriation projects. Apart from these two interviews, I also interviewed iTaukei who openly shared their views on repatriation. One informant who understood the importance of returning artifacts to their rightful countries of origin, said the following:

As a military family in terms of the loss of the life of a serving soldier whilst on a tour of duty, it is very important and something that should be done to honor the life of the soldier. Along the same lines, it would be only right to return to its place of origin something or anything, which has been misplaced or historically belongs somewhere else. It is morally the right thing to do!

As for the readiness of the Fiji Museum to receive artifacts, most concerns were associated with the physical infrastructure of the Fiji Museum. Others brought up the issue of costs related to the up-keep of artifacts, as well as conservation and security. In terms of understanding the ownership rights between museums and indigenous owners of such artifacts, MAA staff referred to museum guidelines and policies to reaffirm the important role museums play with reference to ownership. One of my informants responded:

The Fijian people are the owners of the artifacts, especially where the artifact originates from, but the museum should be the custodian of the artifact since they have the resources, and knowledge to best preserve it and protect it from decay and rot. Fijians in general would not be able to do this due to lack of knowledge, resources and lack of interest, dedication and commitment. Only if it is kept in the care of the Fiji Museum under the care of experts then should it be kept at the Fiji Museum.

Some of the informants commented that reconnecting repatriated artifacts to local people including artists and youths is paramount. The “Chiefs and Governors” exhibition was referred to a lot when the question was asked. Photos from the exhibition opening and subsequent activities showed the importance of young people connecting
to their heritage through museum artifacts and associated programmes. Diaspora was again highlighted due to the high number of Fijian families living in the UK. Many young Fijians are now born outside of Fiji, which has increased the level of importance of such artifacts for their cultural education. One informant responded:

*I feel that to an extent repatriation is appropriate as returning items to its county of origin would benefit the country in many ways, but foremost giving it its original historical context where it is appreciated more by the people it belongs to ... but then again it would be a good thing not to repatriate an item(s) since this could be beneficial for the museum holding the item in that it could be an opportunity for those visiting the museum to learn/see/appreciate the history of the item.*

8.10 Virtual Repatriation

Most libraries, archives and museums are now confronting the challenges of providing digital access to their collections. Different institutions have varied motives as to the reason behind their move to digitising collections. The common denominator however is access. Heritage institutions such as museums feel they are responsible to show museum visitors what they have in their storerooms. The limited physical space in museum galleries prevents the exhibition of all artifacts. This has moved a lot of institutions to photograph and load up the museum databases for online visitors to view and learn from. However, from an indigenous perspective, many source communities are often not informed of such decisions, therefore many would stumble on online pictures of cultural materials from their tribe or society. This digitisation movement has seen divisions in its reception as it relates to how much information should be loaded online and who the audience should be. My question, though, is whether digitisation of collections is the best way of repatriating collections to source communities, and what the rules and guidelines are associated with accessing these collections.
8.10.1 Virtual Repatriation and British Museum

Recently, the British Museum has put their Pacific Collections online, a move which was welcomed by many. Critics highlighted the issue of consultation as they feel that Pacific artifacts can be used by others for their gain, and no benefit goes to the source community in the Pacific. During the Casting the Net Workshop at the Australia Museum in 2012, the issue of consultation was raised by museum curators. Many were not sure how source communities that are geographically located across the Pacific can be effectively consulted for approval for research or virtual collections to be put online. One solution was for PIMA to be the conduit between Pacific source communities and international museums. See below the online news captured on Australian News in Figure 8.15.

![British Museum puts its Pacific artefacts online](image)

Figure 8.15. Screen capture of the Australian News, January 20, 2014. Source: Tarisi Vunidilo, 2014.

Virtual repatriation in this case has not been challenged by any Pacific museum as it is quite a new phenomena. The Fiji Museum’s virtual repatriation with the Museum of Victoria in Melbourne was the first of its kind, and the online collection by the British Museum is a fairly recent project to be done in England.
8.10.2  Collection Visit at the British Museum

During my fieldwork in June 2013, pictures were taken of Fijian artifacts kept at the British Museum’s off-site storage building. The clay pots were given to Sir Arthur Gordon who was Fiji’s Governor after Fiji was ceded to Britain in 1874.

Figure 8.16. Kuro ni Viti: Fijian pottery, originally from Nadroga Province, and close up of collector and new owner.

This clay pot originated from Sigatoka, west of Fiji, and was collected by Sir Arthur Gordon. Note the year on the second picture. 1878 was the year that Gordon completed his term as Governor of Fiji.

It is also interesting to view artifacts that signified the close relationship between the self-proclaimed King of Fiji (Tui Viti), Ratu Seru Cakobau and the King of Tonga (Tui Tonga) in the 1880s. This provided a dual provenance within the British Museum collection management system. These artifacts have both countries of Fiji and Tonga as places of provenance. These two powerful chiefs are related through royal inter-marriage over many generations, thus making their relationship a very close one.
The *tabua* (whales-tooth) on the left was given to King Cakobau by the King of Tonga as a gift in the 1850s after his acceptance of Christianity. The *tabua* was placed within the basket to the right during gifting. Tongan baskets such as the one in this picture are no longer woven today (Hasell, pers comm, 2013). PIMA has contacted the Tonga National Museum and the Ministry of Education and Culture in Tonga for a workshop on the revival of Tongan basket weaving at the end of 2015.

### 8.11 The MAA and UK Museums Today

It is clear that collecting archaeological and other cultural materials entails a lot of risk. Pressure to repatriate artifacts has been placed on museums from archaeologists, source communities and the media. Most museums know that they must return objects that do not belong to them. It is therefore urgent that all museums ensure that policies and practices are in line with current legal requirements and ethical expectations. Through time, the method of collecting in the past becomes no longer acceptable. Collaborations among numerous institutions are required to address complicated issues associated with taking looted artifacts and stolen antiquities (Taberner, 2011, p. 15). The benefits of adhering to these laws contribute to the knowledge-base of museum staff to craft customised policies for their institution. Formulating such customised policies will lead
to meeting the needs of the organisation (Taberner, 2011, p. 18).

In the United Kingdom, there are numerous laws that exist to provide guidance and protection to museums. The Public Libraries and Museums Act 1964 gives local authorities the duty to provide services and gives the Culture Secretary the duty to oversee the services they provide (UKPGA website, 2013). The Public Lending Right Act 1979 gives authors the right to payment from a central fund when their books are borrowed from public libraries (ibid). The Legal Deposit Libraries Act 2003 confirmed publishers’ legal duty to give one copy of every printed publication that is published in the UK to the British Library and, on request, to each of the five other legal deposit libraries (ibid). The Legal Deposit Libraries (Non Print Works) Regulations 2013 extends the legal deposit system to non-print works, like websites, e-books and CD Roms (UK Government website, 2013).

The themes of the possession and repatriation of historical human remains in British museums took centre stage in public debate in 2003 (Roque, 2010). As far as human remains are concerned, museums and other institutions in the UK that hold human remains are encouraged to ensure that any activities that they undertake in relation to human remains are lawful. Between the 1870s and the 1930s, colonial wars were aimed at the collection of heads for European museums. Headhunting was a norm in many indigenous communities around the world, and in the case of East Timor, Portuguese colonialism revealed this practice to be widespread. It is interesting to see how indigenous people and colonial powers interacted in a mutually dependent way and how collecting human remains became objects of political, symbolic and scientific significance (Roque, 2010). The law in relation to human tissue has recently changed following the Human Tissue Act 2004, the primary purpose of which is to regulate the removal, storage and use of human tissue for listed activities, which include research and public display. The Human Tissue Act came into force in April 2006 (UK Government website, 2013).

The Human Tissue Act requires that regulated activities are undertaken only with the prior consent of the individual from whom the tissues are taken. Significantly, existing holdings, imported remains and human remains that are older than 100 years fall within
exemptions to the requirement for consent. In practical terms, this means that the activities of museums and other institutions with collections of older human remains will fall largely outside the consent regime of the Act because of the age or origin of the majority of the remains in their collections. It is essential that all museums draft specific policy to guide staff and museum boards in caring for human remains (Taberner, 2011, p. 1).

8.12 Interview Analysis

A cross section of people was initially identified so that I could acquire a good representation of feedback on this research topic. The categories are museum staff, researchers, iTaukei community members and artists.

Museum staff: During the course of my fieldwork, I spent some time at the MAA and at the Sainsbury Research Centre in Norwich. At the MAA, I participated at the symposium that was organised by the Fijian Arts Project, and also attended the exhibition opening of “Chiefs and Governors: Art and Power in Fiji”. I interviewed the exhibition curators, Dr. Anita Herle and Lucie Carreau who are key staff members of the MAA. The Director Dr. Nicholas Thomas said the following words that marked the importance of the Fijian collection to the early formative years of the MAA:

No exhibitions could more appropriately mark MAA’s centenary on Downing Street than “Chiefs and Governors: Art and Power in Fiji”. The collections that it showcases were made by Anatole von Hügel himself, by Sir Arthur Hamilton-Gordon, Fiji’s inaugural Governor, his private secretary, Alfred Maudslay, and by other members of the Governor’s household and staff, in the years immediately following Fiji’s cession to the British Crown in 1874. The making of these collections, and their gift to the University in the early 1880s prompted the establishment of the museum, initially known as the Museum of Local and General Archaeology and Ethnology in 1883. (Herle, 2013).
iTaukei Community members: Attending the exhibition opening at the “Chiefs and Governors: Art and Power in Fiji” in Cambridge enabled me to meet Fijian community members who are residents of the UK. Some worked at the Fiji High Commission in London, while the rest are part of the British Army family spread throughout England. It was great to meet many Fijians outside of Fiji. It was also breathtaking to see young ones participate in museum activities during and after the exhibition opening. Parents who continue to take their children during the course of the exhibition in Cambridge must be commended. The exhibition later moved to Scotland, and is scheduled to tour Germany and Switzerland. No doubt, Fijians in these communities will come in numbers to be part of the exhibition.
Researchers: I am so indebted to the visionaries of the Fijian Art Project who provided the opportunity for me to interview numerous individuals in my quest to understand what their thoughts are in relation to the “Chiefs and Governors” exhibition and also to the topic of repatriation. Their feedback and comments has given me the drive to continue this research to find out whether Fijian artifacts can be repatriated to Fiji in the future.

Artists: Fijian artists who are based in England have invaluable insight on this subject, in particular those who view Fijian artifacts as sources of inspiration to their artforms such as dance, pottery, language and fashion. Inspiration for the development of their contemporary artforms comes from the Fijian collections kept in museums. One particular artist, whose interests began at the Fiji Museum at a very young age and
continued on after moving to England, where she now resides, said that ‘she felt the museum as her second home. Museums to her are “places where new ideas are formed, and a connection to her vanua is solidified.’

Figure 8.21. Mr. Solo Mara.

**Government officials:** The presence of the Fiji High Commission in London is strategic in so many ways. Their involvement as well with the Fijian Arts Project was a positive move towards the preservation and promotion of Fijian artifacts. It was pleasing to see the current Fiji High Commissioner, Mr. Solo Mara (pictured) writing the foreword for the catalogue of the “Chiefs and Governors: Art and Power in Fiji” exhibition. He acknowledged the role of prominent chiefs in Fiji who worked alongside British governors in facilitating Fiji’s colonial alliance to Great Britain leading up to 1874. He remarked:

*I can just imagine Chief Cakobau’s tanoa (wooden kava bowl) being used by Fijian chiefs during the discussions on the benefit of ceding Fiji to the British Crown in the 1870s, (Herle, 2013)*

To have the staff of the Fiji High Commission support the exhibition of Fijian artifacts in the UK was a positive step forward in promoting the presence of Fijian collections in UK museums. Another comment that was made by the High Commissioner rings true to many Fijians all over the world, that:
many Fijians...have learned about the artifacts on display from school text books; some may also have seen sketches done by early European visitors to Fiji. This exhibition is therefore a valuable source of knowledge for anyone seeking to understand the historical evolution of modern day Fiji and I strongly recommend it to everyone here in the UK. (Herle, 2013)

The opportunities for the future is bright for future students and researchers, as the High Commissioner goes on to say that the life stories contained in each and every artifact reflects the life skills our ancestors possess during their lifetime. The intricate carvings on the war-clubs, the spears for boar-hunting, and the hooks and netting for fishing shows stories that were real to our people.

*There is so much to be learnt from the region specific designs on the mats, the masi cloth, and the ivory ear-rings and necklaces. (Herle, 2013)*

### 8.13 Analysis Factors

#### 8.13.1 Knowledge of Museum Repatriation

Research consent forms used contained a section that explained the mission and vision of my research. Without a doubt, responses from museum staff had more details and examples when compared to Fijian community members. Differences in the level of
responses were expected and also beneficial for the research. For example, museum staff were able to give names of artifacts and where they were originally collected and by whom. On the other hand, iTaukei community members who may not be aware of certain artifacts, even though they did not know the name and where they originated from, responded by saying that some artifacts must remain in the UK for use by the Fijian communities living there, as they will benefit youths and the younger generation growing up in the UK. Some researchers I interviewed implied that there need to be more research done on Fijian artifacts in the UK.

8.13.2 Knowledge of museum collections in overseas museums

Museum staff of the MAA were well informed of all the Fijian collections all over the world. Another advantage was their involvement with the Fijian Art Project. I was informed that other museums in Scotland, Ireland and other parts of the UK possess Fijian artifacts. Responses from museum staff were in total contrast with the responses of iTaukei community members. Those community members that I interviewed generally did not know that Fijian objects are located in museums near where they live. Others were not aware of Fijian artifacts kept at the British Museum. Some of those I interviewed and who attended the exhibition opening as well as the subsequent family programmes did not know of the existence of such rich Fijian collections. On a personal level, my own family members who live in Britain were not aware of the existence of Fijian artifacts in museums. The combination of workshops, the exhibition opening and my presence in the UK raised the profile of museums amongst my family, which then
informed them of the exhibition at the MAA. Apart from the exhibition and the museum workshops at MAA, I co-organised a Fijian Language workshop for Fijian children. The use of social media also promoted the MAA and the workshops. The responses from Fijians around the world was overwhelming as families saw their own nieces and nephews take part in the cultural programmes.

8.13.3 Knowledge of Repatriation Laws

Museum staff of MAA were very knowledgeable about repatriation laws. In our discussions, they understood such laws in a national and international context. As a result, I was able to learn from examples in Australia and New Zealand in relation to their repatriation bids. Such repatriation laws are non-existent in the Pacific. This research will encourage further research in this area. Law reforms will be the way forward and Pacific island nations can discuss and develop similar laws for the future. The knowledge of such laws was not known among the Fijian community. This is all new territory for many of them.
8.13.4 Knowledge of Museum Collections Ownership

To MAA staff, they know that the MAA owns all the Fijian collections. From the Museum’s legal perspective, all collections under their care are managed by the Museum. Some artifacts are on loan, meaning that they are housed or exhibited within the museum building but belong to the lender. When it comes to the ownership of museum artifacts, legally, they all belong to the Museum. In contrast to the Museum’s perspective, the feedback from the Fijian community showed that most still feel that even though it has been with the museum for so long, they are still ‘traditionally owned’ and connected to their creator communities. This was not an easy topic to discuss for all parties. There are gray areas that need to be cleared and re-defined.
8.13.5 Knowledge of Repatriation Opportunities and Issues

Figure 8.25. iTaube (ivory necklaces).

The MAA staff were keen to explore further collaboration opportunities, however when the repatriation topic was discussed, there was no outright agreement although there were suggestions of collaborations between the MAA and the Fiji Museum. One point that was highlighted by one academic who was interviewed was that the only grounds of repatriation was to identify any ‘at risk artifact’ or any high profile Fijian artifacts that were taken out of Fiji illegally, that can be tracked and returned to Fiji. To him, these are the artifacts that will automatically be included in any repatriation plan (Hooper, personal communication, 2013). One example that was discussed was the Radini Waimaro. This is an ivory goddess, the only one of its kind to exist in Fiji (similar to the one pictured). This goddess was in the safe keeping of the Waimaro priests in the village of Nabukaluka, Naitasiri Province. Subsequent visits by Fiji Museum staff found that the goddess was bought by an art dealer and taken out of the country before the Fiji Museum and the Fiji Police was notified. Tracking of this goddess first went to Auckland, New Zealand, and later to Sydney Australia. After a continuous search and working in collaboration with Police departments in Fiji, New Zealand and Australia, the ivory goddess was declared missing. The Fiji Museum is hoping that it will appear through the auction houses in Europe. As the lead researcher
in this project, I do hope that it will re-appear during the course of my study. As for the Fijian community members, most hope that all Fijian artifacts will be returned to Fiji while others feel that if some artifacts remain in the UK, their families, in particular children will have the opportunity to learn from such artifacts. This will benefit them in re-learning their history and language as well. One of the activities that was used at the Fijian language classes in Aldershot was the use of artifacts for children to hold, hear stories of and learn from them.

8.13.6 Knowledge of Repatriation and Link to Cultural Identity

Figure 8.26. “Chiefs and Governors” exhibition signage.

Cultural identity was a subject that was constantly discussed. The MAA staff were aware that artifacts can be repatriated or returned to Fiji in the form of exhibitions, loans or through being virtually available online as forms of teaching. Those that learn from such teachings can improve in the way they look at themselves using their “cultural lenses” to look at themselves on how well, or otherwise, they feel as a Fijian. The Fiji Arts Project, through the “Chiefs and Governors” exhibition, was one tool that brought Fijians together, and provided a forum for sharing and learning from one another, and most importantly, from the artifacts that were displayed. The Fijian community
wholeheartedly supports such initiatives, and many felt that many more such programmes can be organised across the UK. The community in Scotland also enjoyed the same exhibition, which was opened on January 26, 2014. The exhibition was complemented by Fijian artifacts that were kept at their museums in Aberdeen.

8.14 Concluding Remarks

Fiji’s cession to Great Britain sealed the political relationship between these two nations after 1874. Over a century of research and social change has given rise to real differences in intellectual, moral and practical attitudes when it comes to museum artifacts and repatriation. Even though there were some repatriations that took place in 1980 between the Fiji Museum and some lenders and collectors, there has not been any repatriation between the Fiji Museum and the MAA.

The Fijian Art Project has surely encouraged discussions among museum staff at the MAA, Sainsbury Research Centre and the British Museum, as well as the Fiji High Commission in London and Fijian community members living in England. Being part of the “Chiefs and Governors” exhibition opening at the MAA allowed me to capture firsthand feedback from those present about the benefit of such programmes. Exhibitions are indeed successful tools used by museums to tell stories of artifacts in their collections for museum visitors to see and learn from. The interesting aspect of the “Chiefs and Governors” exhibition was that most of the Fijian visitors had not seen such artifacts before nor were they aware of their existence. This has contributed to numerous feedback from all over the world, with pictures being uploaded on social network sites.

During the interview process, repatriation was an interesting topic of discussion. Even though museum staff and Fijian community members feel that it is the moral thing to do, practical issues such as the readiness of the Fiji Museum, costs, conservation and security were issues that were highlighted. However, it has been suggested that a more strategic approach is needed when it involves “selective repatriation”. This involves highlighting key artifacts, in particular those that were known to be stolen or smuggled out of Fiji. This applies to the case of the Ivory Goddess, the Radini Waimaro. For the Fijian community, there were a lot of emotions involved in the repatriation discussion,
in particular after the Fijian language workshops and the “Chiefs and Governors” exhibition. Overall, more discussions on education and cultural revival workshops are encouraged that involve youths and younger Fijians, in particular those who are born overseas.
9 CHAPTER NINE

Case Study 3: iYAU VAKAVITI E KENADA

Fijian Collection at the Museum of Anthropology,
Vancouver, Canada: Cultural Rights and Repatriation

9.1 Introduction

Europeans referred to the Americas as the “New World”. The Indigenous Americans referred to themselves by their tribal names such as Aztecs, Apache, Cherokee, Mayan and Inca, for example. This is also true for Canada. The Indigenous peoples of North America are often referred to as the First Nations, however there are many tribes that are represented under this broad label. Over thousands of years, each of these tribes developed their own means of cultural expressions. During religious and ceremonial occasions, items such as masks, shaman rattles and sculptures were made for the sole purpose of a strictly defined use by shamans (religious elders). Most of these items were imbued with magical qualities. During significant political events, special garments and official regalia are used by local politicians and community leaders. For secular events and private interaction among people, toys, smoking pipes and fashionable paraphernalia are used (Miller, 2006, p. 142).

Canada has, for a long time, struggled to define its own image. This included issues associated with identity, diversity and public representation (Huneault, 200, p. 4). Since the 1980s, the development of new ways to work with Indigenous and diasporic originating communities from whom museums acquired their collections were positive, despite the volatile atmosphere in which Canadian museums have been operating. There has been a history of contestation, innovation and change, as well as structural relationships that link processes of decolonisation, inclusivity and reform at the micro-level of the museum with those that have been unfolding at the macro-level of Canadian society and politics (ibid).
Changes in Canadian museums took place in the mid 1960s and had close connections with the activist and civil rights movements in the United States. Indigenous resistance to colonial policies and territorial infringements intensified after World War II and into the 1960s (Huneault, 200, p. 5).

9.2 Background

Modern-day Canada can be described as a settler nation rooted in French and British colonial histories with effective Aboriginal activism with a growth of diasporic communities providing a backdrop in the history of museum change (Miller, 2011, p. 5).

The users of Indigenous arts in the Americas are the Indigenous people themselves. Each tribe is distinguished by unique carvings, designs and styles of art prescribed by their ancestors. Ritual and secular functions required objects to be used for a particular purpose. Colours and source materials determine the status of participants and the event. Traditionally, ceremonial clothing, jewellery and body adornments were made for high-ranking individuals, which reinforced power and status. This is similar in Africa, where stools were important symbols of authority, flywhisks were a symbol of status in Polynesia, and in the Southwest of the United States, woven woollen blankets were for people of high rank (Miller, 2006, p. 11).

Changes began to take place when Europeans arrived in the 1500s. Native American cultures were subjected to new ways of doing things, the creation of artistic objects changed and the old ways slowly died. The Navajo blankets that were previously worn as garments changed into rugs for non-American homes. Clay pots that were once used for storing grains or carrying water became curios for the tourist trade. Baskets that once held foodstuffs were now displayed as wall decorations. These shifts however did not end the manufacturing of Indigenous artforms, but rather this led to a flourishing collector-based patronage, which created new designs and styles in response to non-traditional tastes. This new demand also saw the preservation of skills and art that would have disappeared (Miller, 2006, p. 142).
Canada is a member of the Commonwealth and is home to Indigenous groups that have lost artifacts during colonialism. Others were destroyed, while some made their way to private and public collectors. First Nations view repatriation differently from other groups in Canadian societies, in particular those that include ancestral remains, sacred ceremonial or secret objects such as ceremonial pipes and totem poles (Tuesday, 2014, p. 184).

Many former colonies have pushed for the return of part of the material culture they lost during the period of colonialism. They claim to be entitled to the return of their cultural artifacts and are ready for their safe return. However, some former colonial powers have avoided this discussion on the grounds that colonial acquisitions are considered to have taken place in the past and have become the colonisers’ own history. Often brokering such relationships is not easy (Van Beurden, 2014).

Museums in Canada mostly get involved in protests and demonstrations that attract the media’s attention. As a result, local Canadians mostly hear more about their museums through media write-ups and exhibitions abroad. On the local scene, there is often demand on museums to remove familiar pieces of colonial contents that have become offensive or to take down an exhibition that has been accused of misrepresenting a particular constituency. Other museums can be accused of using public funding for a work of art that does not adequately serve the nation as a whole (Huneault, 2011, p. 3).

### 9.3 Indigenous Peoples in Canada

The First Nations groups in Canada largely consist of the Inuit and Metis. There are other tribal groups known as the Mohawk, Cree and Innu. These Indigenous peoples still exist today and many of them are reviving their culture and traditions today. Most of the older generation feel that they will never settle for a place in museums, reservations or history books as some of these mediums presume that they do not exist anymore. This reality still provokes misunderstandings, fear, mistrust and anger among these tribal groups (Leger, 1994).
All the Indigenous people wanted was protection for the territories on which they depend on and respect for their way of life. They affirm that human diversity is a source of wealth and that political institutions should consider and preserve it. For years, the First Nations of Canada have been seeking constitutional recognition. Some tribes have autonomous status and govern in their own right, and this makes it difficult for the mainstream government who often does not tolerate the way they do things. Also, mainstream governments see Indigenous groups as small groups of people claiming to be the legitimate owners of the forests that have to be exploited for revenue making purposes and who talk about sovereignty all the time (Tuensmeyer, 2014, p. 184).

Canadian law however played a key role in the suppression of the Indigenous culture. This was through the implementation of the anti-potlatch laws and the prohibition of the Sundance rituals. A direct result of these actions was the threat to the survival of Indigenous languages. In a society that rests on the oral recitation of legends, religious practice and laws, any threat to the language also affects the traditional way of life necessary for community survival (ibid).

Individual museums in Canada have been strengthening their relationships with First Nations communities for many years. However, issues have only recently become formalised within a national framework (Herle, 1994). Following an initial working session between museums and Aboriginal peoples, it was decided that the Canadian Museums Association’s (CMA) representatives should organise a national conference in Ottawa. In November 1988, a conference titled, "Preserving Our Heritage: A Working Conference Between Museums and First Peoples" was held at Carleton University. A consensus was reached at the conference about the need to establish a taskforce. The taskforce's mission statement was “to develop an ethical framework and strateg[y] for nations and culture representing Aboriginal history in cultural institutions” (Herle, 1994).

The report by the taskforce recognised that First Peoples and museums have a mutual interest in cultural materials and related knowledge concerning the past, present and future. Partnerships with museums included museum activity concerned with Native heritage including the collections, documentation, interpretation and exhibition of
Native artifacts. First Peoples were not satisfied with merely assisting with museums and public programming. They were also not satisfied in just assisting in ongoing museum projects. They wanted to be included in the development of policies and funding programmes (ibid).

There were recommendations to focus on specific partnerships in three areas: access, interpretation and repatriation. Also included was the involvement of First Peoples in the processes of planning and maintenance of all exhibitions and research, representation and projects that include Indigenous cultures. The inclusion of Aboriginal languages in documentation and display was recommended (Herle, 1994).

9.4 Birth of the Museum of Anthropology (MOA)

Vancouver's Museum of Anthropology (MOA) was founded in 1949 in the basement of the Main Library at the University of British Columbia. Today, Canada's largest teaching museum is located in a spectacular building overlooking mountains and sea – its collections, exhibitions and programmes are renowned for giving access and insight into the cultures of indigenous peoples around the world. The Pacific collection component was collected between 1895 and 1923. Frank Burnett, a Canadian writer and traveller of Scottish descent, was the founding collector, and his deep interest in the Pacific brought over 200 Fijian artifacts to MOA. Burnett, the son of a sea captain
(whaler), moved to Liverpool at an early age to attend the Merchant Tailor's Grammar
School, planning for a career in business, but at age 14 he chose to apprentice on a
sailing vessel. During his time as a sailor he travelled as far as Egypt and South Africa.
He immigrated to Montreal, Canada in 1870 or 1871 and tried his hand at various
enterprises, married his first wife, Henrietta Cooke in 1878, and moved across the
country to Manitoba in 1880, and then to Vancouver in 1895. He began making trips to
the South Pacific in 1895. He was able to retire in 1901, at which time he outfitted a
schooner, the Laurel, which he used to take another trip to the Pacific, collecting
artifacts along the way (MOA website, RRN, downloaded July 2015). He not only
collected artifacts from the Pacific, but also from indigenous communities within
Canada, including two most important Musqueam house posts, which were acquired
and donated by the UBC class of 1927 (Shelton, 2011).

The Museum houses over 38,000 ethnographic objects and 535,000 archaeological
objects, many of which originate on the Northwest Coast of British Columbia. Massive
totem poles, carved boxes, bowls, and feast dishes are featured in the Museum's Great
Hall, while smaller (but no less magnificent) pieces in gold, silver, argillite, wood,
ceramic, and other materials are exhibited elsewhere in the gallery spaces. MOA's
Multiversity Galleries provide public access to almost 10,000 objects from around the
world, and The Audain Gallery, MOA's new 5,800 square ft temporary exhibition hall,
showcases world-class travelling exhibits as well as those developed in-house (MOA
website, 2014).

9.5 Museum of Anthropology (MOA) Today

The Museum of Anthropology (MOA) is committed to working respectfully with the
originating communities from whom the Museum's collections have originated.
Discussions regarding repatriation are governed by this principle. MOA considers all
requests for repatriation seriously and on a case-by-case basis.

The Museum's mandate is to maintain objects purchased or donated by the public in a
facility accessible to the public, to further research and education, and to offer
assistance to originating communities regarding the preservation and display of
collections in their possession. The Museum's work is guided by the recommendations
of the Task Force report of the Assembly of First Nations and the Canadian Museums Association, "Forging New Partnerships Between Museums and First Peoples" (1992). The University of British Columbia governs the Museum. Policy #128 is the official University policy on repatriation. Note also that the Museum is not part of the BC Treaty process.

The Museum acknowledges that all First Nations material is part of the intellectual and cultural heritage of the respective First Nation. Policy #128 outlines in more detail considerations for the return of cultural objects. In the repatriation process complex issues may arise. In many cases, for example, there may be no clear evidence, either oral or written, on the pathway that led the object to become housed in the Museum. The Museum therefore may involve the community and/or individuals in the process of responding to a claim. They consider a variety of options to meet the spirit and intent of a request, including special access to holdings, loans, exhibits, stewardship arrangements, sharing authority and responsibility for care and interpretation, replication or new creation of objects, and respectful storage and/or display of collections in accordance with the advice of the originating peoples. The Museum will hold repatriation discussions in confidence until a joint resolution and public announcement are agreed upon (MOA website, 2014).

The Museum of Anthropology is committed to respecting the values and spiritual beliefs of the cultures represented in its collections. The collections contain items that are important to the originating communities, and whose placement and care within the Museum continue to affect the values and beliefs of those communities. The Museum recognises that these objects may have a non-material side embodying cultural rights, values, knowledge, and ideas which are not owned or possessed by MOA, but are retained by the originating communities (ibid).

### 9.5.1 Survey of Collection – Museum of Anthropology (Vancouver)

MOA houses over 40,000 ethnographic objects from almost every part of the world, including the South Pacific, Asia, Africa, Europe and the Americas. (The MOA
building also holds 535,000 archaeological objects under the care of UBC's Laboratory of Archaeology.) The ethnological collections are comprised of over 15,000 objects from Asia, almost 12,000 from North America (including over 7,100 from B.C. First Nations), approximately 4,300 from South and Central America, 4,000 from the Pacific islands and over 2,300 are from Africa. Over 6,000 pieces in the collection are textiles from all around the world. More than 38,000 object records are available online (33,000 with images) via the museum’s online collections catalogue (MOA CAT), as well as through the Reciprocal Research Network (RRN) (MOA website, 2013).

9.5.2 Survey of Fijian Collection – Museum of Anthropology (Vancouver)

The question of how Fijian artifacts came to be in MOA is an interesting one to ask. Numerous changes have taken place in Canada since the critical museum period of museum-building in the 1840s. Visiting the Canadian Museum of Civilization, MOA or the Royal Ontario Museum today shows they differ greatly from their foundation years. Today, many can find local histories as well as artifacts from other nations, including Fiji. During the course of Dr. Harry Hawthorn taking up the anthropologist position at MOA in 1947, the stage was set for courses to be taught in the practical aspects of cataloguing, conservation and display. Audrey Hawthorn, who was the curator, initiated the museum courses in which students utilised the collection, including Burnett’s. The setting up of the department of anthropology encouraged Oceanic scholars such as Cyril S. Belshaw, William McKellin and John Barker to develop their intensive fieldwork in the Pacific. Apart from the Burnett collection, the Pacific collections continue to grow with donations, bequests and some purchases. The museum at that time did not actively collect objects from the Pacific, however with the hosting of the Expo 86 in Vancouver this changed altogether. The museum assumed the role of designing the South Pacific pavilion, and had to send two staff members on a collecting trip to the Pacific. These well-crafted contemporary works came to the museum when the Expo closed (Mayer, in Shelton, 1999).

On January 14, 1918, Mr. Colman C. Wall proposed Mr. Frank Burnett, of Vancouver, as a member of the Fijian Society, and he was unanimously elected. Mr. A.J. Small was
President at that time (Transactions of the Fijian Society for the Year 31st December, 1910 [Fiji Times and Herald, 1917]).

Figure 9.2. Frank Burnett, MOA Collector of Fijian artifacts. Source: Museum of Anthropology, Vancouver, Canada.

9.5.2.1 **Burnett Collection**

MOA celebrated its fiftieth anniversary in 1997, and the decision was made to research and exhibit the Frank Burnett Collection from the Pacific Islands. Burnett collected between 1890 and 1920 and his meticulous recordings of his collecting are admirable, especially as he was not an academic. This process of documentation also changed the museum practice to one that is based on negotiations and collaborations with originating communities. The exhibition attracted Pacific people from their home communities and those living in British Columbia. The Pacific Island Museums Association (PIMA) agreed to partner with MOA for subsequent staff exchanges, internships and workshops that were born out of this event (Mayer, in Shelton, 2009, p. 199).

A total of 297 objects are found on the museum online database. A selection of these can be viewed in Table 4. 189 in total were collected by Frank Burnett and Figure 9.3 is a selection of artifacts from the Burnett Collection.
The MOA database has a comprehensive list of Fijian artifacts kept by the museum. Table 4 outlines the types of artifact, the Fijian name and the number in the collection.

Table 4. List of Fijian objects on MOA database.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPOLOGY</th>
<th>FIJIAN NAME</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adze</td>
<td>Matau</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrow</td>
<td>Mata-ni-moto</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apron</td>
<td>Liku (Rotuma)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axe-head</td>
<td>Matau Vatu</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bark</td>
<td>Kuli ni Kau (Vau)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>Toqi</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basket</td>
<td>Basikete</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beater</td>
<td>Ike</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blade</td>
<td>Yame ni Matau</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block</td>
<td>Dudua</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>Dari, Tanoa</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dish</td>
<td>Veleti raraba</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td>Droini</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drum</td>
<td>Lali</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan</td>
<td>Iri</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>Ceuceu</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire-stick</td>
<td>Nita</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fork</td>
<td>I Cula ni Bokola</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gong</td>
<td>Lali</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guard (Rat)</td>
<td>I lilili ni Kakana</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head-rest</td>
<td>Kali</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hook</td>
<td>I Ruberube ni Bulagi</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>Vale</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jar</td>
<td>Kitu</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knife</td>
<td>I Sele</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necklace</td>
<td>Taube</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Local Name</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net</td>
<td>Taga ni Balolo</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornament</td>
<td>Ukuuku</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddle</td>
<td>I Voce</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>Buburau</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point</td>
<td>Mata ni Moto</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pot</td>
<td>Kuro</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller</td>
<td>Bitu ni Kesakesa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root</td>
<td>Waka</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rope</td>
<td>Dali</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoop</td>
<td>iTaki Balavu</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scraper</td>
<td>I Yaca</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>Qa ni Vivili</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sling</td>
<td>I Rabo</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatula</td>
<td>I Kari</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spear</td>
<td>Moto</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoon</td>
<td>Sevuni</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>I Wau</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stencil</td>
<td>Mata ni Kesakesa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>Vatu</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopper</td>
<td>Sogo ni Kuro</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strainer</td>
<td>I Bo</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whales-tooth</td>
<td>Tabua</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapa Cloth</td>
<td>Masi</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool</td>
<td>Yaya ni Cakacaka</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trap</td>
<td>Uwea</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whisk</td>
<td>Fue</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Apart from Frank Burnett, there were other collectors of Fijian artifacts. For example, Rev. John Williams also donated Fijian artifacts to the collection and the MOA purchased certain artifacts that were part of the Expo 86, hosted by Vancouver in 1986. The two artifacts in Figure 9.4 were part of the Expo purchase.

![Masi Kesa (Printed Bark-Cloth) 1188/52](image1)  
Photographer: Kyla Bailey.
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Figure 9.4. Selected images of Fijian artifacts at MOA. Courtesy of UBC Museum of Anthropology, Vancouver, Canada.

### 9.6 MOA, Cultural Rights and the History of Artifact Appropriation in Canada

It is interesting to note that in Canada, some of the collections of artifacts were carried out under the guise of scientific reasons. For example, some artifacts were collected on the basis that cultures were about to disappear and there was an urgent need to salvage what was left as soon as possible. Between 1880 and 1930 there were repressive programmes against the Indigenous people implemented in Canada. In the 1950s Canada’s participatory democracy paved the way for local cultural centres and Indigenous museums and in the 1970s the repatriation of artifacts in Canada mirrored what was taking place in the USA.
To collectors, the material cultures should be preserved to record the past. Some other collecting purposes were part of the government’s suppression of what was considered to be harmful practices (Bouquet, 2012, p. 162). Some other artifacts were given away for safe-keeping by Indigenous individuals, others were sold under economic duress, while others were taken through assimilation policies, or simply stolen (Tuensmeyer, 2014, p. 184). It is then critical to identify as to how artifacts were appropriated in the first place, either as a scientific collection or by confiscation (ibid).

The flow of materials from Canada into metropolitan museums began in the early 1800s when colonialism began. The impact of such a process began at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century (Bouquet, 2012, p. 162). The collection of sacred objects as well as objects of daily use partly overlaps with the collection of human remains. Most ethnographic artifacts also contain human remains, for example the Whalers’ Shrine from British Columbia, which is now kept at the American Museum of Natural History in New York, combined human skulls and carved ancestral figures for secret and sacred whaling rituals (ibid).

European museums began a competitive process of acquisition, particularly for totem poles. Such memorial poles were made for specific tribes, endowed with a lot of history and meanings. However, collectors at that time were of the mindset that such poles belonged to a dying or dead culture. Some poles were donated to European museums by European dignitaries who acquired them under different circumstances from local tribes (Bouquet, 2012, p. 162).

### 9.7 Aboriginal Rights

The protection of Aboriginal rights was embedded within the federal set of legislations in Canada. One example is the Constitution Act 1982. Under Section 35 (1) of this Act, is a provision on the ‘The Protection of Aboriginal Rights’. The scope of these rights tends to be limited in reality. For example, for a repatriation to take place, a First Nation person has to firstly establish the exercise of their religious ceremonies as an aboriginal right or the possession of their cultural objects as their right. Secondly, they must prove
that the objects requested for repatriation are integral to such ceremonies. The third step is the justification test where it balances the broader public interest and the predicted economic outcomes of each solution (Tuensmeyer, 2014, p. 189).

The Six Nations Indians were known by the Canadian Government as British residents in Canada. The government promulgated the Indian Act, which provided for a process of emancipation, allowing them to acquire the status of Canadian citizens (Leger, 1994, p. 5). The creation of the League of Nations in 1919 provided some hope for repatriation of artifacts. Tribes met to discuss sovereignty issues, which somehow linked to cultural artifacts that many First Nations felt were taken away by force, or without the knowledge of Indigenous tribes. Some tribal leaders travelled to England and Washington to voice their concerns (Leger, 1994, p. 4).

9.8 Repatriation Case Studies in Canada

In the past decades, there were numerous returns of cultural objects between other museums in Europe with Canadian museums that manage First Nations collections. Most of the objects had been stolen, smuggled or looted (Van Beaurden, 2014). Museums that refuse to repatriate artifacts send a message to indigenous people that colonial power relations are still intact and have not ceased (Tuensmeyer, 2014, p. 184). It is also seen that there is a direct relationship between repatriation and reconciliation. In the 1990s, the Royal Commission of Aboriginal People was established to create a report in order to restore justice to the relationship between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people to propose solutions to stubborn problems (Tuensmeyer, 2014, p. 194).

With the adoption of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People, there are still issues surrounding whether and if so, how, to repatriate objects to indigenous communities they have been taken from centuries ago. Some issues are to do with ownership and conservation as well as human rights concerns. Artifacts that are involved here range from household items and religious artifacts to ancestral remains (ibid). It is important to note here that there has not been any repatriation
undertaken between the Fiji Museum and MOA yet, even though the current curator is happy to facilitate discussions for future repatriations:

MOA has repatriated a number of objects and are always willing to share the process with others (given we have permission from the parties involved in the repatriation). Given our experience we are also willing to discuss the process with institutions or applicants. (Mayer, personal communication, 2013)

One example was of a Hopi tribe in the United States that traced ceremonial sticks back to MOA. The tribe wrote a letter discussing repatriation to MOA staff and they found a trail of paperwork that revealed how they had ended up at the museum. Even though repatriations can be contentious, how MOA facilitated this repatriation made it so much easier for both parties. The Hopi Sharman conducted prayers in the room where the sticks were located and arrangements were made for a proper cultural couriering of the sticks back to the USA, with the support from an airline and the customs department (Mayer, personal communication, 2014).

MOA has repatriated human remains to New Zealand via the staff of the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa. This involved a series of cultural ceremonies at MOA. To MOA, human remains are always the first one to be repatriated and the museum believes that they must go back to their country of origin. MOA has also repatriated artifacts back to the First Nations. One example was the Mabel Stanley regalia. These regalia were with MOA for a number of years. They were displayed in the museum. The family requested that the regalia be taken down. The remaining events were interesting to the staff of the museum as the family performed a dance and later took them away. Later on, they contacted MOA saying that they were interested to return it to MOA for safekeeping purposes (Mayer, personal communication, 2014).

Sacred, ancestral and ceremonial artifacts, some of which may include human remains are the subject of repatriation claims. For example, in the Canadian Northwest Coast, some of their artifacts that were dated from the late nineteenth and early twentieth
century were removed between 1904 and 1927. Repatriation processes took place in the late 1950s and was completed in the late 1970s (Bouquet, 2012, p. 162). The potlatch regalia was returned in 1970s and the G’psgolox Pole in 2006. The repatriation process of the Whalers’ Shrine is still under negotiation (ibid).

An interesting point to add here is that the following case studies of sacred objects revealed what the thinking about indigenous culture was like at that time. In the early twentieth century, dominant thinking was that native culture was dying (in the case of the shrine) and needed saving. Or that indigenous cultures needed to be stamped out (in the case of the potlatch regalia as part of potlaching) because of their irrelevance. One artifact was bought and the other was confiscated. Repatriating these two artifacts will depend on negotiations by all parties concerned.

### 9.9 Classification of Repatriated Artifacts

Let us look at three separate case studies of sacred objects in Canada that involved a shrine, Potlatch regalia and totem poles. These case studies will provide a clear picture of and provide example to what was taking place in Canada in the 1800s and the early 1900s.

#### 9.9.1 Sacred Object

Figure 9.5. ‘Yuquot Whalers’ Shrine’ purchased by George Hunt in 1904 (Inglis, 1999)
This is the case study that is very important for indigenous people of Canada, in particular the Mowachaht community located on the southern part of Vancouver Island, British Columbia. The ‘Yuquot Whalers’ Shrine’, comprising of an original shed-like building with 88 carved human figures, four carved whales and 16 human skulls, had been built over generations by the Muchalaht tribe as a place of purification for the community’s chief whaler. It is also known as the Yuquot Whalers’ Washing House and it is still regarded by the Muchalaht as having enormous power even though Nuu-chah-nulth whaling days are long gone. The shrine was purchased in 1904 by George Hunt. Hunt was an indigenous assistant to the anthropologist Franz Boas of the American Museum of Natural History (AMNH). Since 1978, there has been plans and discussions between the museum and the Mowachaht community for its repatriation. The shrine has not been exhibited in its entirety and has been kept in storage for a long period of time. The process of repatriation is indeed a long road and a difficult one to comprehend (Lee, 2013).

9.9.2 Ceremonial objects: Kwakwaka’wakw Potlatch Regalia

This regalia was confiscated under the 1884 Anti Potlatch Law, which was aimed to reduce the number of ceremonies (Bouquet, 2012, p. 167). The ceremonies continued until 1921 when a Dan Cranmer’s potlatch ended in an intervention by the Royal Canadian Mounted police and the local Indian agent. To avoid imprisonment and persecution many potlatch regalia were surrendered by their owners or confiscated. Some were paid compensation to the amount of $1495 for a total of 750 objects, although these had an estimated value of $35,000. The Potlatch collection were crated and taken to the Ottawa Victoria Museum (later became the National Museum of Man). Even though the crate was not unpacked, the people of Kwakwaka’wak never forgot their treasures (Lee, 2013).

In 1951, when the Anti Potlatch Law was dropped, potlatching ceremonies resumed. In 1957, the first attempt to retrieve the collection began. In the 1960s, Canada was going through a renaissance of native arts and there was widespread recognition of the
aesthetic value of the regalia. A new museum Act made de-accessioning possible and it was agreed that the regalia would be returned, but to a museum and not individual owners. There was a misunderstanding about where the collection should go, to an existing museum or to a new one to be built (ibid).

### 9.9.3 The Totem Poles

In 1872, a Haisla Chief G’psgolox built a totem pole to commemorate the death of his children through epidemic. The pole was cut down by the Indian agent and removed from the Kitlope Valley in 1929. The Swedish Consul, who had purchased it, later transported the pole to Stockholm and donated it to the National Museum of Ethnography. In 1990, the descendants of the chief found out that the pole was the centrepiece of the museum in Sweden. In 1991, they went several times to claim it back. Negotiations began with the Swedish Government and one outcome was for a pole replica to be made to replace the original pole. This pole was shipped back to Canada in 2006 and was kept temporarily at the UBC before a ceremonial return on June 13, 2006 to the Haisla Village of Kitmaat (Lee, 2013).

### 9.10 Discussion on Repatriation

There are a number of issues that arise from this repatriation discussion for Canada. Generally speaking, there is tension between individuals and museums and also groups and museums. As for indigenous communities, repatriation claims are often conducted in a group arrangement, where a spokesperson is chosen to be the voice of the community to negotiate with the museum. Individual claims tend to involve artists whose artworks with indigenous themes are found in museums and are claimed on the basis of their indigenous content and relevance to local artists and their people.

It is also important to note that reasons for repatriation differ between communities. Some reasons were based on ceremonial rites and beliefs. Some beliefs ensure that some cultural artifacts must not be on display due to cultural sensitivity. In the case of the Umista Cultural Centre (Alert Bay) in Canada, they felt that the regalia were wrongfully placed in museums. They believed that the Shrine, which was shrouded in
secrecy, was not intended for public display, as with the potlatch regalia also (Bouqet, 2012, p. 168). The contribution of local artists and chiefs in exhibitions can assist correct methods of displaying artifacts that may have been displayed based on shape and form and not based on function and cultural meaning.

One benefit of repatriation is in the establishment of indigenous museums and cultural centres. Such centres can be places of cultural revival programs where local artisans continue to make masks and other cultural items. Additionally, indigenous museums and cultural centres play a key mediating role between collectors and local communities, or between larger mainstream museums and local tribes.

9.10.1 Virtual Repatriation

Virtual repatriation is accessing artifacts online that are not physically present to be seen and touched in real life. Some museums, such as MOA, are taking this further to provide a museum visitor the ability to be able to look up a subject online, through the museum database. All of MOA’s museum collections are online. When the topic of virtual repatriation was discussed with MOA curator Dr. Carol Mayer, she mentioned that this is not a solution but is part of thinking of possibilities to enable indigenous people (including Fijians) to access their collection. Some First Nations elders remarked,

\[\text{We just want to see objects, and sing to them [First Nations = singing].}\]

(Mayer, personal communication, 2014)

Dr. Mayer (2014) went on to say that there are various ways of how indigenous groups in Canada wanted to connect with their treasures. As part of reconnection and reconciliation, singing is part of this process. In terms of virtual repatriation, Mayer says that:
virtual repatriation is a practical way of either starting the process of physical repatriation and/or recognizing this is useful when the objects cannot be physically reconnected. I do not think Virtual Repatriation is a current trend – I believe it is an important step on the road towards universal accessibility.

Nemani (2014) supported Mayer’s comments when he said that since the Fiji Museum (and other Pacific museums) lack the proper physical space and structure to keep the repatriated artifacts safe and secure, virtual repatriation is the option in the short run. He feels that this is not the answer but a stepping-stone to the Fiji Museum realising a dream to have Fijian artifacts repatriated back to Fiji. Degei (2014) similarly shared his thoughts and supported what Mayer (2014) and Nemani (2014) outlined earlier. He said that:

> There may be artifacts that can be repatriated in this way (virtual way) for Pacific Museums and there may be some that we have to see the real item for our research. (Degei, 2014)

Angela Steiner, curator at the Wanapum Heritage Centre mentioned that it is always good to have information on objects, where they are located, the information that is associated with them, and what they look like. She also added that:

> Virtual repatriation is better than nothing at all. Building relationships with those museums will also lead to collaboration and may end up leading to a physical repatriation in the future. (Steiner, personal communication, 2014)

### 9.10.2 Illicit Trafficking of Cultural Objects

Illicit trafficking is part of repatriation considerations, and this is a very contentious issue facing many museums around the world. Even in the Pacific, evidence of illicit trafficking has been found over the years. Artifacts were stolen out of the Papua New Guinea Museum, Solomon Islands National Museum and the Fiji Museum. In terms of
artifacts stolen from custodians in villages, there are no regulations in place in the Pacific. It is our endeavour that the stolen Fijian goddess – the Radini Waimaro – is found during the course of this research, if not in the near future. This goddess was known to be the last remaining one in Fiji. An art-dealer, posing as a tourist, befriended the bête (indigenous priest) from the province of Naitasiri over a number of years, until such time that he was able to gain enough trust to view and eventually confiscate the idol (Clunie, personal communication, 2013).

In the case of Canada, some artifacts from West Papua (also known as Iriyan Jaya), specifically from the Asmat Tribe, were illegally trafficked to Canada. Once they arrived in Vancouver, they were impounded. Unfortunately, there were no proper records as to where they originated. Police as well as museum officers were not sure where to send them once they were confiscated. It becomes more difficult when the artifacts are older. Materials that have an older provenance make it difficult to identify sources and owners (Mayer, personal communication, 2014).

Canada has a Cultural Property Review Board that is managed by the government through its department of Canadian Heritage. Such boards play a pivotal role in ensuring that the museum market is regulated. In the case of Fiji, the Department of Culture and Heritage is working towards the development of sound policy that is internationally recognised, so that when the need to assist the Fiji Museum with repatriation matters arises, there are treaties and policies that supports the process. The department informant said the following:

My work is focused on the development and implementation of policies and protocols relevant to the culture sector including the ratification of appropriate UNESCO and UN Conventions and international treaties that will enhance work in the sector. The implementation of any repatriation requires sound policy in place, and although not obligatory, the ratification of certain UN treaties and UNESCO Conventions to facilitate ease in the repatriation of Fijian artifacts. So the protocols and standards assists in the transition process,
maintenance of the repatriated items/piece remains....once it is in its original place. (Nemani, personal communication, 2014)

On a local level, the Simon Fraser University (SFU) has a programme called IPINCH (Intellectual Property Issues in Cultural Heritage). Le Banc (2014), of SFU, mentions that:

*I believe my institution has many concerns towards justice and protection for intellectual property rights. IPINCH was founded in part by a Professor in our department (Dr. George Nicholas) in hopes to address such concerns.*

Globally, the International Council of Museums (ICOM) has a Red List that alerts museums and collectors of any stolen artifact from any country in the world. It is also wise to visit online auction houses to view what collectors and museums are purchasing for their collections. Apart from the purchasing of artifacts, Indigenous Fijians have shown their concern about the selling of Fijian artifacts online. The issues of ownership and integrity are brought to light here when:

*The rights of communities and original custodians are deprived and they often have less access. Often they do no have the powers over museums on how objects are meant to be used. For example, between 2003–4, we received a concerned email regarding the sale of Fijian war clubs online. The manner in which the clubs were exhibited was provocative. Half-naked women were used to sell the war-clubs online. This is a grave concern. (Nemani, personal communication, 2014)*

9.10.3 Future Repatriation Plans for MOA

MOA have not been approached by any Pacific museum yet to discuss repatriation. However, over the recent years, visiting artists have commented on certain artifacts that should not be exhibited. One of these circumstances was the decorated heads from the
Solomon Islands. The visiting artist felt that they should not be displayed. There were other artifacts that were not meant to be viewed by women and others. A solution that MOA has undertaken is the manufacturing of conservation boxes where such culturally sensitive objects are placed and a label that says: “Please contact the conservator for more information” is placed outside the box. The same rule applies to the computer database. No pictures of such sensitive materials are loaded into the system (Mayer, personal communication, 2014).

Another method of repatriation that has worked in the past, in particular with anthropologists, is the returning of pictures to villages where they previously worked. Such processes invoke memories among the source communities and may encourage the reviving of past traditions. One example is the revival of the building of long-house in the Purari Deltas in Papua New Guinea. Some pictures that were returned convinced those that were still alive of the importance of such long houses in their communities. In addition to photographs, there are other methods of recording that was done in Fiji that needs to be taken into consideration. Degei (2014), who works in a regional academic institution, also suggested that:

There are books and journals on and about Fiji written by early explorers that can be returned to our library.

Steiner (2014) supported Degei (above) when she mentioned that her centre in Washington State not only pursues the repatriation of artifacts but also related information kept in archives including journals and photographs:

The Wanapum Heritage Center is always looking to see where collections and information about the Wanapum are located including museums that would be overseas. Ideally objects would be brought home but the knowledge of where these objects are is acceptable with access to them if need be. We have been active in pursuing information stored in other places such as archives and
Another method that has worked in Canada and Papua New Guinea is through acquiring artifacts in an honest way. An artist, based in Canada, pays the local people more money to encourage them to make high quality art. She fundraise within the community and purchases modern equipment to take to PNG to encourage carvers to improve their carving skills, as it improves the prices of their carving when they are carved according to what art dealers prefer. She proactively promotes the use of ‘better tools to sell art today, for more money’ (Mayer, personal communication, 2014).

The Fiji Museum should have the right facilities built to receive returned artifacts. The current Fiji Museum building is not secured and there is no guarantee of the object being taken away. When repatriation is planned for the future, the objects need to come back to a better venue. Fijian artist Soro (2014) shared her view on this matter:

*I think that objects should only be repatriated to the Fiji Museum if and when we have the right facilities to maintain and take care of them. There is no use in repatriating objects if they are then going to disintegrate due to be in kept in the wrong temperatures or left dusty in the back of a cupboard somewhere.*

Koya-Vakauta (2014) also supports Soro’s (2014) comment above when she remarked:

*I am really torn when it comes to repatriation because on the one hand, it would be wonderful and on the other, we simply do not have the facilities to ensure their upkeep to the same standards as they have internationally. To be honest, much of the artifacts would deteriorate in no time if handed over in 2014 simply because we do not have the capacity, the facility, the funding and the political will to manage and house, maintain and safeguard these artifacts. (Koya- Vakauta, personal communication, 2014)*
The support is there in Fiji to build a better museum, and if the government is informed, politicians no doubt will jump to the opportunity as this makes them look good. It should be made sure that there is a thorough assessment on the needs of the museum such as the practical process of getting proper lighting and storage facilities. It is important that such assessments are practical. Collaboration is a great process to go forward. The involvement of other Indigenous departments in Fiji is crucial, as the more departments that work together, with combined voices, the more that this can alert the government that repatriation is important and the right attention should be given to the building of a new museum. Tamata (2014) mentioned that the iTaukei Trust Fund, a statutory body within the iTaukei Ministry said that her department has:

> Provided funding for fieldworkers, equipment (such as camera), ascertaining financial value of Intellectual Property (IP), and identifying communal owners of IP. We also wrote opposing the misappropriation of tapa design by commercial enterprises. (Tamata, personal communication, 2014)

Museums around the world must recognise responsibilities between institutions. In the case of Pacific museums, they can develop Memorandums of Understanding with museums that hold their artifacts, and possibly can charge overseas museums to manage the Pacific collections on their behalf. As space is a real issue with Pacific museums, this can be a realistic way of developing professional relationships now and for the future.

MOA has a good reputation with repatriation, which other museums can learn from.

It is always true that when repatriation processes begin, they are often adversarial. The suggestion is made that all parties must be encouraged to move in the same direction. Museum staff should be encouraged to follow paper trails, just as the requesting party should.
9.11 Interview Analysis

A cross section of people that provided a good representation of the community was identified. This group is similar to the ones chosen for Fiji. Their group, institutional and individual contributions are valuable to the research.

9.11.1 Museum staff

Due to the significant number of museums in Canada, I focus my research on the Fijian collections at the Museum of Anthropology (MOA). I interviewed the key personnel of the Curatorial team, who manage the Pacific Collection at MOA. It was through Dr. Mayer’s invitation that I was able to visit Vancouver and conduct my fieldwork there. The other curator, Angela Steiner, whom I met at the Pacific Arts Association (PAA) International Symposium, provided an in-depth discussion on repatriation regarding her work in repatriating First Nation’s artifacts from US-based museums, under the NAGPRA arrangement.

Angela Steiner is a Curator at the Wanapum Heritage Center. Having her participate in my research provided a unique opportunity to hear from someone that works from a museum in the USA and who assists in the returning of artifacts and human remains to Canada. This is her story:

*I work with the Wanapum Band to repatriate human remains and funerary objects under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act³, Washington State’s Human Remains Law⁴, and the National Museum of the American Indian Act⁵. The Wanapum have participated in the repatriation of a minimum of 748 individuals and 47,797 funerary objects during the time that I

---


⁴ Chapter 68.50 RCW; http://apps.leg.wa.gov/rcw/default.aspx?cite=68.50

⁵ United States Public Law 101-185; http://anthropology.si.edu/repatriation/pdf/nmai_act.pdf
She believes that indigenous cultural objects are important for indigenous communities to connect to their past, history and ancestors. In her view, museums are important places to care for these objects and make them accessible to communities. Ideally they will be in museums that are within the communities where they come from. Repatriation is good for communities, especially when they benefit all members.

9.11.2 Researchers

Apart from national and private museums, universities also manage Fijian collections, in this case mostly anthropological and archaeological materials. During my fieldwork in Vancouver, I visited MOA, which is part of the University of British Columbia (UBC) and the Simon Fraser University (SFU). Dr. David Burley and PhD student Kathleen Le Blanc, both from SFU, were interviewed and their time and views are greatly valued. This increased my understanding as to how Fijian collections came to be in their university collections. The Simon Fraser University introduced me to the IPINCH department that is doing wonderful work and research into the field of Intellectual Property rights and heritage ownership. They also focus their work on indigenous issues, and support many archaeological projects for First Nations. Le Blanc (2014) shared this with me:

*IPINCH has been very active in regards to resolving IPR issues. One case study that IPINCH is involved in is the repatriation of ancestral remains from the University of BC Lab of Archaeology to the Stó:lō of southwestern BC. More information on this as well as other case studies can be found on the IPINCH website. (Le Blanc, personal communication, 2014)*

She went to say that her institution (SFU) could assist in repatriation by first engaging in respectful dialogue with groups who wish for the return of their intellectual property.
IPINCH is working towards successful and respectful repatriation, which is likely to continue into the future (Le Blanc, personal communication, 2014).

Dr. David Burley, archaeologist and professor at SFU believes strongly that indigenous people have an undeniable right to their heritage. He is in favour of repatriation where there is a clear indication of impropriety in the manner in which the artifacts were collected. It is great to see academic institutions supporting the process of repatriation provided there is mutual support from home countries with the appropriate facilities and manpower to manage the new collections. He said the following:

*We have a clearly defined repatriation policy for human remains. If the conditions of that policy are met, repatriation is automatic. In several cases where repatriation has occurred, we have been active participants in the ceremonial/spiritual activities associated with the return. In the case of archaeological collections, we actively encourage and seek out institutions to which these collections may be returned. We are currently in the process of returning collections to the Vanuatu Cultural Centre that were excavated by Richard Shutler Jr in the 1960s. (Burley, personal communication, 2014)*

In terms of collaboration within his institution, the Archaeology Division at SFU have a very close working relationship with First Nations Studies (FNS) where two FNS faculty members are jointly appointed. FNS offers a course in First Nations Traditional Knowledge and they recommend all archaeology students take FNS courses. The Archaeology Division also has a Cultural Resource Management Certificate Program that requires coursework in indigenous knowledge (Burley, personal communication, 2014).

### 9.11.3 iTaukei Community Leaders

Fortunately, a number of iTaukei living in Vancouver shared their personal views regarding the Fijian collection at the MOA. Two particular interviews were conducted in the iTaukei language, as this was the language preferred by the informants. They
were able to express themselves better in their mother tongue, followed by written questionnaires, also written in the iTaukei language. Another reason for choosing these informants was the age group they represented, and I believe that this was a factor in the opposing responses they gave in relation to repatriation.

Maciu Macanawai admitted that he rarely visits museums. When asked how Fijian artifacts ended up Canadian museums, he answered that they were gifted. When asked about repatriation, he understood the meaning but he appreciates how much Fijians can learn from these artifacts if they were not to be returned Fiji. To him, Fijians based in Canada can learn more about their own past from artifacts in museums. He believed that this is one effective way of teaching Fijian culture and heritage to current and future generations. He believed that keeping Fijian artifacts in Canada is an effective way of promoting and marketing Fiji internationally. Learning from Fijian artifacts in Canada can spurn more research to take place in Fiji by Canada-based academics, curators and younger researchers. He has heard of a special repatriation project between England and Fiji where ‘a decorated club was returned to Fiji by the Queen of England’. The name of this club is *Tutuvi Kuta ni Radini Bau*. This club is the mace of honor that is used in Parliament settings in Fiji. This mace has significant meanings, one of which is to signify the end of cannibalism and war, and to celebrate Fiji’s acceptance of a new religion and modernity (Macanawai, personal communication, 2014).

Nanise Vulaca, a pastor’s wife who has been living in Vancouver for a number of years, has been associated with MOA for a long time. As a couple, both have represented the Fijian community in MOA’s community and museum events. Compared to Macanawai, she was more familiar with the museum and she would rather see all Fijian artifacts at the MOA returned to Fiji. In her view, many of today’s generation are not familiar with the history of Fiji, and returning Fijian artifacts is one way of reminding parents and teaching younger generations of the rich cultural heritage of Fiji. She supports any project that promotes the culture and heritage of Fiji and she would be happy to see the completion of this research and the compilation of a book that discusses Fijian artifacts currently managed by MOA (Vulaca, personal communication, 2014).
9.11.4 Museum Visitors

Based on conversations with a few members of the Fijian diaspora living in Vancouver, some were familiar with the presence of Fijian artifacts in MOA while others were not. Some had not visited MOA until the invitation to be part of the PAA cultural opening ceremony. One family visited the MOA only when they had visitors, or when there was an event where the husband had to perform the Fijian kava ceremony.

While in Vancouver, I was fortunate to accompany two New Zealand-based Fijian artists Ema Tavola and Margaret Aull on a special guided tour of MOA by Curator Dr. Carol Mayer. One of the observations we all made was our gratefulness to see Fijian artifacts being displayed in the gallery. Some were in glass cases while others were neatly displayed in Perspex drawers. These alone generated a lot of discussion among us as we moved around within the gallery space. Discussions would have been different if the Fijian artifacts were in the storeroom and access was limited. We all concluded that the work done by MOA to have all the artifacts shown in physical form in addition to the online database is the best way forward to acknowledge Frank Burnett’s collecting work undertaken more than a century ago (Aull & Tavola, personal communication, 2014).

9.12 Concluding Remarks

Museums in Canada no doubt revolve their activities around the issues of identity, diversity and public representation. Canada’s political history can be interpreted through many museum exhibitions, in the presentations of canoes (representing Indigenous people) and snow-mobiles (representing later migrants). Locals in Canada have used museum development, exhibitions and artifacts to voice their concerns regarding matters that affect communities in general. For example, the boycotting of an exhibition sponsored by a company that is drilling for oil on land claimed by a First Nation in 1988 is evidence of community power and solidarity.

Canadian curators, writers, consultants, lecturers, collectors and anthropologists have in the recent decade promoted the country abroad through innovative practices and professional know-how. One such collector was Frank Burnett, whose interest in Fijian
history brought over two hundred artifacts to be currently housed in MOA. Fijian diaspora, in particular those that live in Vancouver, now have the opportunity to visit and view these collections.

It is also great to see that museums and public monuments have become primary barometers of the manner in which public institutions interpret laws and policies related to cultural diversity. Since the 1980s, there has been development of new ways to work with both indigenous and diasporic-originating communities from whom museums have acquired their collections. There have been positive results, a huge change from the volatile atmosphere in which Canadian museums have been operating.

In order to reassure Indigenous Fijians that their artifacts are well-looked-after in MOA is for museums to introduce their exhibition space better. Since curators view the exhibition space every day, sometimes they do not view it from an outsider perspective. As a result, they do not normally ‘see’ the areas they work in every day. They need to be creative and find other ways of exhibiting artifacts creatively so that Fijians feel that their artifacts and their nation is well cared for and given the attention they deserve.
10 CHAPTER TEN

MACALA NI VAKADIDIKE: Fieldwork Data Analysis

10.1 Introduction

Ratu Deve Toganivalu, a renowned iTaukei chief from Bau who became a member of the Fijian Society (now known as the Fiji Museum) in 1917 shared his sentiments on the great importance of Fijian cultural property to Fijians (Transactions of the Fijian Society for the Year 31st December, 1910). Cultural property can be defined in many ways for Fijians; they can be materials that are used as everyday items, or made specifically for ceremonial purposes. These properties also reveal more information about the creator and speak volumes about those who own them. With the introduction of European materials, there have been changes in perceptions of indigenous cultural property. This chapter presents fieldwork results of repatriation in Fiji, England and Canada. Apart from the actual fieldwork in these three countries, “e-talanoa” also took place with participants living in other countries such as the USA, Australia and New Zealand. It is envisaged that this chapter will provide an overview of participants’ cultural memory and perspectives of museums and repatriation with greater focus on Fijian museum collections.

10.2 Method of Analysis

In this chapter, I have categorised the responses under the three countries where I undertook my fieldwork: Fiji, England and Canada. Apart from these three countries, I have added another category called ‘diaspora’, which included museum curators, researchers and iTaukei living in USA, Australia and New Zealand. The decision to

---

6 Transactions of the Fijian Society for the Year 31st December, 1910 (Suva: Office of the Fiji Times and Herald, 1917).

7 This refers to online discussion with fellow interview participants, a term that I have developed that encapsulate online discussion through email, electronic questionnaire and social networking through Facebook, Skype and Viber.
include these other three countries was made purely on the basis of linking responses
to actual projects that directly linked these countries to the Fiji Museum. For instance,
for Australia, those who were interviewed from Australia made links to the Virtual
Repatriation project that took place between the Fiji Museum and the Museum of
Victoria, in Melbourne. This is the only repatriation project that has taken place
between the Fiji Museum and any other overseas institution. Stephanie Caffarel (2014)
is working on a similar project template to be organised between the Fiji Museum and
the Quai Branly Museum in France. If this takes place, this will be the second project
of its kind for the Fiji Museum (see Appendix 1).

Each country has two sub-categories of organisations and community. Organisations
will include researchers, government departments and those who work in regional
institutions. Community members include artists, chiefs and Fijians living in Fiji and
abroad. As far as language used is concerned, the English language was the main
language of instruction, however, the Fijian vernacular Bauan language was used for
iTaukei artists and community leaders only. Most requested to speak in vernacular to
ensure that the topic was understood and conversation flowed better in the iTaukei
language.

10.3 Key Questions

The key questions in the interviews were related to Questions b) and c) of the main
research questions in Section 1.3. The main research question one on appropriation was
addressed in CHAPTER 4. Overall, this chapter focus on repatriation, ownership and
cultural rights.

Interviewees were asked the following questions: define repatriation, their views on
IPR, meaning of ownership, their understanding of PIMA, and the way forward. The
way forward meant that if repatriation was to take place, how would they view this
process as best taking place (see Figure 10.1). The categories of my participants
consisted of museum staff, academics, researchers and iTaukei community members.

---

8 Bauan language is the commonly used language devised by missionaries to assist communication across Fiji.
A total of 35 were selected in my final analysis to represent these categories. Responses from informants have helped establish a broad and well-informed analysis of repatriation in Fiji and may assist future applications of repatriation systems for indigenous communities in the Pacific.

Apart from finding out how Fijian artifacts were appropriated to international museums, the study also examined whether international museums have guidelines that facilitate repatriation of these artifacts to Fiji. Part of my research is to look at museum policies that relate to repatriation at the Fiji Museum, MAA (Cambridge) and MOA (Canada), as well as looking at federal and national legislations that support such processes. Apart from policy analysis, I will be analysing general opinions and experiences of key stakeholders in repatriation and how this has impacted their attitude towards repatriation in general.

As discussed in CHAPTERS 2 and 6, this is a qualitative study in which perceptions of selected repatriation stakeholders will be included in case studies to showcase a general feeling about repatriation of Fijian artifacts from overseas museums to Fiji. Museum participants were selected based on their experiences in managing Fijian
collections in their respective museums. The qualification of such participants included past work on repatriation cases, exhibition of Fijian artifacts and direct work with Fijian materials, in a museum setting. The category of researchers spanned across regional organisations in the Pacific, as well as tertiary institutions in Fiji, England and Canada. Criteria for the iTaukei community members included community members active in Fijian community events in England and Vancouver, as well as others in Australia and the USA. In terms of language used, simplified English was used in the questionnaire, and a translated version was developed using Bauan Fijian language. Even though I had a sample for each case study, I included other nations outside my case study areas of England and Canada to replace those who could not respond to my questionnaire and those I could not meet when I was conducting my fieldwork. The benefit of also including others outside my case study jurisdiction was that I was able to ascertain their views on repatriation and how much they value Fijian artifacts in museums in their adopted nation. As for community members in Fiji, this included artists and chiefs, whose views I truly valued, as they shared their experiences respectively based on their particular areas of artistic expertise and their views on repatriation that will affect their people in the future. The responses from the two Chiefs of Bau and Namosi were indeed valuable as many Fijian artifacts at the MAA (Cambridge) were from these Provinces. These modern-day chiefs are direct descendants of their forefathers who gifted or exchanged artifacts with Governors and collectors in the 1800s.

10.4 Interview Analysis

On the questionnaire, themes were identified under the following headings: repatriation, intellectual property rights (IPR), ownership, PIMA and the way forward. The last part was to encourage informants to share practical solutions and recommendations on how repatriation should be undertaken in the future. If they had identified issues in their earlier responses, they were then encouraged to provide positive steps forward.

The analysis of the dialogue provided an opportunity to highlight the differences and similarities between the stakeholders that I interviewed. Perceptions and opinions of
repatriation were purely based on their personal experiences. Although those who work in museums were more familiar with repatriation, every informant highlighted different issues relating to repatriation. One that continued to appear was the readiness of the Fiji Museum to receive repatriated artifacts. The main concern was the current space availability, as well as security and conservation issues that such artifacts would demand.

In terms of IPR, due to the difficult legal issues affecting collections in other parts of the world (not necessarily Pacific), the topic became much larger and difficult to include in this research. After analysing interview responses, it was decided that the topic of cultural rights be included in this thesis rather than IPR. Cultural rights were more appropriate given the indigenous stance I was taking in my research argument. Even though the topic of repatriation can be deceivingly simple, in actuality there were many variables in repatriation to analyse, such as legislations and policy. The analysis of these interview responses shed more light into how Fijian collections can be managed in the future.

10.5 Introduction to Participants

The three main categories were museum staff, researchers and iTaukei community members. Some of the participants in the first two categories also aligned themselves as iTaukei. This applied mostly to Fiji-based informants. However, when interviewed, they were informed as to which category they belonged to. Provided they wanted to speak on behalf of their tribe or indigenous affiliation, I then encouraged them to speak when answering the last question, which was classified as ‘the way forward’.

Due to the fact that these participant categories were repeated for Fiji, England and Canada, this allowed me to draw up some visual representation of what my participants were feeling in terms of repatriation. For example, most of my Fiji-based participants wanted repatriation to take place. Some, however, were concerned with the current physical condition of the Fiji Museum. On the other hand, the iTaukei participants in England and Canada (as well as New Zealand and Australia) were double minded.
Some were open to the idea of repatriation, but when it came to devising a way forward, there was hesitation and there was a sudden concern in keeping Fijian artifacts in overseas museums for the benefit of future generations of Fijians born overseas.

In analysing the responses received, I will be presenting the arguments, opinions, experiences and recommendations provided by each stakeholder. The discussions will include what repatriation meant to the informants, and IPR, ownership, role of PIMA and recommendations. I will begin with responses from Fiji, England and Canada and will later add responses from Australia, New Zealand and the USA.

10.6 Interview Results

10.6.1 Case Study 1: Fiji

Six Fiji Museum staff members were interviewed during my December 2012 – January 2013 fieldwork. I was pleased by their willingness to speak with me and share their thoughts with me in relation to where they think the museum should be heading in terms of repatriation. Some topics unrelated to repatriation were raised, for instance, the issues of exhibition space, quality of the present building, lack of storage space and number of visitors to the museum. One staff member even discussed the potential improvement of the current public toilet facilities as his concern was focused on carrying capacity and the appropriate facilities to take care of the influx of visitors at any one time. I recorded all their concerns in the hope that this research will provide better infrastructure for the current museum in preparation for the future.

The technical museum questionnaire was emailed to the Fiji Museum Director, Sagale Buadromo (2012) to gather background information of the Fiji Museum collections pertaining to policies, number of artifacts in the collection and whether any repatriation had taken place in the past. I found this method of information-gathering effective, as it lessens the load down the line to gain information from other staff members. The major concern shared by Buadromo (2012) is the physical space of the current Fiji Museum. She felt, as a result of the lack of ample space:
repatriation is not relevant for the Fiji Museum as yet due to the issue of space at the current museum facility. It is hoped when the current museum building is extended or a storage space is specifically built for new collections, then the museum will be ready for receiving artifacts from overseas. (Buadromo, personal communication, 2012)

Apart from the staff of the Fiji Museum, researchers and iTaukei participants were also identified and this consisted of those that work for government departments, regional institutions, contemporary artists and iTaukei craftspeople.

10.6.1.1 Meaning of Repatriation

Almost all Fiji-based participants defined repatriation correctly. All museum staff and researchers further provided examples to the definition. Some researchers were of iTaukei descent but they were responding based on the professional roles they hold. As for the iTaukei participants (mostly artists), I had to simplify the definition and literally give the meaning in Fijian so they were able to share their views confidently. For English speakers, the definition of repatriation was asked as question one, whereas for iTaukei speakers, it was question 10 (see Appendix), as I had to ask museum-related questions first, before the topic of repatriation was introduced. Then, I added other related repatriation questions to question 10, as seen here below:

‘Na cava na nomuni nanuma me baleta na vosa na ‘Repatriation’, Se na kau lesu tale ki Viti na nodai yau mai na vale ni yau maroroi mai na veiyasaki vuravura?

This is translated as:

‘What is your view regarding the word ‘repatriation’, or the returning of Fijian treasures from international museums?’
In this example, I have already defined the word ‘repatriation’ for the iTaukei participant, however my main aim here is to get their views on getting Fijian artifacts returned to Fiji from international museums. The questions preceding this asked how often they visit a museum and whether they know that Fijian artifacts are located in overseas museums. This method was to initially warm them to the idea that Fijian artifacts do exist overseas and lead into what their thoughts are on having these returned. Question 10 was when I saw these participants getting animated, and their suggestions of returning them were often sentimental, usually containing their innermost feelings that these artifacts ‘need to go back to their home.’

10.6.1.2 Intellectual Property Right (IPR)

Nearly all participants felt that the IPR belonged to indigenous makers and owners of Fijian artifacts, however, how one devises a method of identifying rightful owners remained unclear. Staff of the Fiji Museum who were of iTaukei background found it difficult to separate their feelings from the fact that Fijian artifacts that are kept in museums by right belong to the institution and are covered under the museum policy. The Fiji Museum Director, Sagale Buadromo mentioned that the Fiji Museum had recently reduced the gap between the community and the museum. Their role as custodians is clearly made to members of the community through their weekly radio segments. Some villagers have approached the museum to use a certain artifact for ceremonial use, and have then returned it for safekeeping. Even though this is not encouraged, she sees this to be a common occurrence in the future that could establish trust between local communities and the museum.

The researchers’ responses tended to highlight their lack of understanding of the legal definition of this term. Participants from the University of the South Pacific, iTaukei Trust and the Department of Culture and Heritage highlighted the importance of training for staff in particular with issues surrounding indigenous knowledge. For example, the Fijian Language Course at the University of the South Pacific highlighted that it is important to:
Market courses that deals with this important issues to govt. offices that deals with indigenous knowledge. USP is currently teaching the staff of the iTaukei Affairs Ministry for their diploma program sponsored by the iTaukei Trust Fund Board. Courses in this program deals mainly with indigenous knowledge. (Degei, personal communication, 2012)

Another Faculty member of USP mentioned the following, which supports what Degei (2012) mentioned above:

There is so much that can be done but it is quite challenging when the mainstream marginalizes indigenous knowledge and what it considers “cultural knowledge”. Currently at the school of education, we include IKS in our Undergrad and Postgrad courses, as is also done in Pacific Studies. I don’t think this is enough though. (Koya-Vakauta, personal communication, 2012)

It is great to see that regional institutions are taking the issues of IPR on board by ensuring that training is critical not only for Indigenous Fijians but for other cultural groups in the Pacific. The issues of IPR are present but the methods of how to counter the illicit use of indigenous knowledge are difficult to manage.

In the case of Vanuatu:

‘The VKS is actively involved in trying to protect the misuse of traditional IPR within Vanuatu – at the moment there is a possible looming confrontation between the VKS and a number of Vanuatu-resident Chinese traders in the capital over the misuse of some of the traditional designs from the island of Erromango on Chinese-produced clothing items,’ Huffman (2013).
It was interesting to see the various responses to this question, and that even though my concern was for artifacts kept in museum collections, when responses were made, they also included issues associated with the illegal use of designs on clothing (as seen above), as well as reactions to international designers using indigenous Pacific designs, and calling it ‘Aztec’ and ‘African’. I am glad that this research has opened dialogue among researchers to find practical ways of countering this issue, particularly at this time, when technology and social networking sites are placing indigenous knowledge on a global platform, which can be open to exploitation.

10.6.1.3 Ownership

This segment has a lot of connection with the IPR question, hence questions on the subject were grouped with the IPR questions. The exact question in the questionnaire (see Appendix) was a multiple-choice option (see below):

> From the list below, which category of museum stake-holders do you think legally own most artifacts in museums worldwide, and explain your answer?
>
> a. Artists    b. Museum    c. Collector    d. Community or e. Combination of a,b,c &d

Most of the respondents chose ‘e’ as the answer. There was no direct answer to the other options of artists, museum, collector and community. Huffman (2014) summed it up well when he commented that:

> Ideally it should be a fluid combination, varying from institution to institution, of a, b, c and d, but many institutions overseas may have legal peculiarities that can make things a little bit complicated, to put it mildly. A member of the Board of Trustees of the British Museum once told me years ago (when I had asked him about the possibilities of repatriation from the BM) that he thought that legally, because of the way that the BM had been set up so long ago (in 1753 – the oldest public natural history museum in the world), the collections, according to an early law, actually 'belong to the British Royal Family on behalf
of the British people’ – and that, therefore, to enable the possibility of repatriations to take place, it would necessitate an Act of the British Parliament to change that early law (Huffman, 2014).

Ratu Joni Madraiwiwi (2014), a Chief in his own right and direct descendant of Ratu Seru Cakobau, one of the high chiefs who ceded Fiji to Britain in 1874, responded by saying that:

*The Fiji Museum owns the artifacts and cultural items it has in its possession (apart from those which are on permanent or temporary loan to it from third parties) as a trustee for all Fijians (Taukei and non Taukei alike).*

As a lawyer, he does acknowledge what the modern law depicts. Then he added that:

*Many of these institutions are ambivalent about the idea i.e. they agree with it in principle but have very grave doubts about our capacity to properly house and care for these objects. Some also believe that the items are better looked after where they are now kept.*

10.6.1.4 Pacific Islands Museums Association (PIMA)

As a regional body, PIMA plays a key role in advocating issues relating to museums and collection care. I was glad to include this question in the questionnaire so that feedback can be filtered back to the organisation, and assist museums on the ground on issues relating to repatriation in the future. I also see the influential role PIMA takes in negotiating with local Pacific governments to support local island museums to improve their current museum building and to ensure that Pacific collections are well managed, and historical information is managed well for the benefit of our communities and our future generations.
Koya-Vakauta (2013) of the University of the South Pacific mentioned this, which reflected what others felt about the question.

*PIMA has the potential to be ‘the’ voice for the region in international dialogue. It would need more specifically commitment from member countries and their museums to ensure that their staff are well trained, that they have the space and financial commitment (sustainable financial commitment) to maintain these artifacts.* (Koya-Vakauta, personal communication, 2013)

### 10.6.1.5 The Way Forward

Overall, responses to this segment were heartwarming as all participants were positive for the future. Everyone acknowledged that repatriation is a difficult topic to deal with, however the suggestions for training, advocacy and collaborations were a few of the suggested solutions put forward.

The regional institutions such as the University of the South Pacific have suggested that awareness and advocacy be key actions to be done and for the School of Education and Pacific Studies in particular to help raise awareness on repatriation and IPR issues (Degei, 2013; Koya-Vakauta, 2013).

Researchers such as Dr. Apolonia Tamata (2013) suggested that ‘physical space is put aside’ for the current Indigenous Museum currently planned to be built in Nasova, adjacent to the current Vale ni Bose, or the Great Council of Chiefs building. This newly planned museum is a five-year project supported by the current government and there will be exhibition spaces that will focus on Indigenous stories from around Fiji.
10.6.2 Case Study 2: MAA, England

Interviews in England comprised of the three categories of museum staff, researchers and iTaukei participants. The English fieldwork was well timed as it coincided with the Fijian Art Project Workshop took place at the MAA (Cambridge) and at the University of East Anglia (Norwich). These two events enabled me to find participants, which was a huge blessing as I was able to conduct interviews after the workshops concluded. I analysed their responses based on the five main themes highlighted in the questionnaire: definition of repatriation, IPR, ownership, PIMA and the way forward.

10.6.2.1 Meaning of Repatriation

Similar to the responses from my Fijian participants, museum staff and researchers in England were very familiar with the definition and processes of repatriation. I did not have to probe into their responses as they were able to answer my questions directly with relevant examples. In my discussions with Dr. Anita Herle, she raised the important points associated with access and representations. To her,

Repatriation is bigger, it is more to do with relationships. I see repatriation as part of bigger issues that has to do with ‘access’ and interpretation…it is part of much bigger questions, what relationships do museums have with the people that the museum have to represent, what kind of projects does the museum have, what kind of say do people have for their collections, what kind of input can the people have towards exhibitions and collections that the MAA look after, what does it mean when we (curators & communities) represent that past….Curators do not have the exclusive rights and care for the collection but do manage them for the future. (Herle, personal communication, 2013)

Dr. Herle (2013) acknowledged that there have been a lot of changes in the UK, influenced by NZ, Australia and Canada. She has been in her role as MAA curator for over 20 years, and she recalled that during her tertiary study, many curators were trained with indigenous collections in mind and many now are working with source
communities to share their stories rather than just focus on curators as the experts. This has become the new method of working for the MAA and collaboration is a key part of their exhibition processes.

Lucie Carreau (2013), the MAA co-Curator of the “Chiefs and Governors” exhibition highlighted some key points regarding repatriation; her views are conflicted due to her French roots, as France disallows the return of artifacts to countries of origin. The two Pacific nations of New Caledonia and Tahiti are part of France. In her view, it will be sad to see collections go back to where they are from, however learning of other cultures is of prime importance for museum visitors to the MAA. What she found missing is the proper way of ‘sharing’. Repatriation, to her, is acceptable and more so, when objects are culturally significant, they can be returned and do not have to come back to UK museums. The best example was the return of the Maori Toi Moko (tattooed heads) from England to NZ. Even France agreed to have them sent back to NZ. Everyone agreed for this to happen. Every culture must work together to make a case, in particular for human remains.

10.6.2.2 IPR

Carreau (2013) responded by saying that UK museums are custodians only and that legally speaking, artifacts in overseas museums belong to these international museums and curators, and the artifacts at the MAA therefore belong to the University of Cambridge. She knows that they are now owners, but they have limited knowledge of the past that links the present generation to these artifacts collected centuries ago.

10.6.2.3 Ownership

As shared by Huffman (2014), a member of the Board of Trustees of the British Museum once told him years ago (when he asked him about the possibilities of repatriation from the British Museum) that he thought that legally, because of the way that the BM had been set up so long ago, according to an early law, actually 'belong to the British Royal Family on behalf of the British people’ – and that, therefore, to enable
the possibility of repatriations to take place, it would necessitate an Act of the British Parliament to change that early law.

Carreau (2014) is optimistic that the influences from Australia, New Zealand, Canada and the USA have impacted England as far as repatriation is concerned. There seemed to be a moral commitment to return artifacts, in particular human remains to where they originated. She has even suggested an exchange programme called ‘Politics of Movements’ that can allow artifacts to move from place to place; for example, Fiji can send new contemporary artifacts to the UK in exchange for some of the older ones. According to her, there is not much contemporary work in the collection to help engage with the Fiji of today. This exchange programme could reduce the gap between the Fiji Museum and the MAA since they only have historical collections of the past.

10.6.2.4 PIMA

Ana Qumivutia-Derenalagi, one of my iTaukei informants in England reiterates the important role PIMA must play in the discussion of repatriation:

*PIMA should play a pivotal role. They should be the ones to spearhead discussions and be at the forefront pushing for it since they are the association that deals with Pacific Islands Museums. As a group they are strong rather than having individual museums doing their own negotiations.* (Qumivutia-Derenalagi, personal communication, 2013)

Kirk Huffman of the Australian Museum highlighted some key points for PIMA to do, as far as repatriation is concerned:

*PIMA could play a very important role in attempting to create a coordinated Pacific approach to repatriation from both Pacific institutions willing to participate and with overseas institutions willing to listen sympathetically. At
the same time, and as part of the same process, PIMA could help coordinate the sometimes necessary 'Pacific side' of this process, whereby it could strongly lobby Pacific governments to increase their financial and structural support for Pacific museums and cultural institutions that hope to eventually receive and look after a number of possible repatriated objects. Repatriation is a two-way process, and both sides must be considered. (Huffman, personal communication, 2013)

10.6.2.5 The way forward

As suggested by Carreau (2014), money is important to enable the ‘culture of movement’ and to enable sharing of cultures between Fiji and those in MAA. Some artifacts come with very amazing stories, which gave a different meaning to how we view a particular artifact. Some were made using various techniques that are so hard to understand; for instance, Fijian basketry. Some of the ones at MAA are thick on the inside and the outsides are thin. This makes present day artists amazed with these creative techniques.

When working in the MAA collection store, it is evident that stories connect people and cultures. Artifacts in the collections connect Fijians with the British people, as well as with Tonga and Samoa, and this makes Fiji quite central in the movement of artefacts. The Pacific at one point did not have political boundaries like we have today. Such boundaries were non-existent and as a result, origin of museum objects can become vague as artifacts from Tonga can be similar to Samoa as well as Fiji (Carreau, 2013).

10.6.3 Case Study 3 – Canada

Similar to Fiji and England, I was able to interview museum staff, researchers and iTaukei participants. Dr. Carol Mayer, the Curator for MOA was my key MOA informant for this segment. I interviewed her in three different ways: first of all, by a questionnaire that I emailed her in the beginning of my research. I initially put together this questionnaire for museum directors and curators only. This questionnaire was quite
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technical and the aim was to gain background information, repatriation policies and numbers of Fijian artifacts in the museum collections. It was through this questionnaire that she referred me to the MOA online database. The second interview was in MOA where she took a group of us from Fiji through the collection, in August 2013. The other two participants were New Zealand-based visual artists Ema Tavola and Margaret Aull. It was great to be in the audience and listening to Dr. Mayer sharing her experiences in managing Fijian collections in MOA, and how she works closely with the Fijian community in Vancouver. The third interview was conducted at the Auckland Museum, when she was en route to Fiji via New Zealand. I took the opportunity to record our conversation and it was through this interview that she was able to fill in the blanks from the questionnaire I had sent her earlier and from the guided tour of the MOA galleries in Vancouver, after the PAA International Symposium.

10.6.3.1 Definition of Repatriation

Similar to Fiji and England, museum staff in Canada were very familiar with the definition. Mayer (2013) was able to share with me repatriation projects that MOA has taken part in. Even though MOA has not undertaken any repatriation with the Fiji Museum, learning from its past experiences in repatriating artifacts to indigenous communities within Canada and the United States is reassuring.

10.6.3.2 IPR

There was an acknowledgement that there are many ‘indigenous’ nations out there that do not have any laws relating to IPR. As for MOA, they work with artists on Copyright agreements when acquiring their works. It is acknowledged that sometimes, copyright agreements are useful but sometimes such agreements are not even recognised in their own countries. There is a suggestion that workshops (when funding is available) must be held to promote the recognition of IPR when working with Pacific Islands museums, artists etc. It is also critical that all museums must take into consideration strict compliance with any existing laws (Mayer, 2013).
It is reassuring to see the IPINCH Project, managed by the Simon Fraser University taking the lead in returning archaeological materials, especially human remains, back to their source community. As LeBlanc (2014) highlighted, IPINCH has been very active in regards to resolving IPR issues. One case study that IPINCH is involved in is the repatriation of ancestral remains from the University of BC Lab of Archaeology to the Stó:lo of southwestern BC.

10.6.3.3 Ownership

When asked the question (see Appendix A) ‘From the list below, which category of museum stake-holders do you think legally own most artifacts in museums worldwide, and explain your answer?’ with the options of: a. Artists; b. Museum; c. Collector; d. Community or e. Combination of a,b,c,d’ the response was that the word ‘own’ is a relative term and does not translate across cultures. The ‘actors’ in each option listed above (as ‘abcd’) may perceive themselves as ‘owning’ but it is important to understand that they have different interpretations of and meanings for the word.

10.6.3.4 PIMA

PIMA should serve as an advocate for the repatriation process and, because there is no consistency across the Pacific, PIMA should be cognisant of the internationally recognised procedures and could play an important role as a facilitator in repatriation negotiations (Mayer, personal communication, 2013).

10.6.3.5 The Way Forward

There is a general reassurance from MOA that they have repatriated a number of objects and are always willing to share the process with others (given they have permission from the parties involved in the repatriation). Given MOA’s repatriation experience, MOA is also willing to discuss the process with institutions or applicants.
10.7 Key Interview Responses & Findings

Responses made by all interview participants can be categorised into these sections under the five key themes of the questionnaire (see Figure 10.2 below).

**Figure 10.2. Five (5) main themes.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meaning of repatriation</strong></td>
<td>• Varied levels of understanding the meaning of repatriation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intellectual Property Right</strong></td>
<td>• Researchers were mostly aware of the conventions and associated legal implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ownership of Collections</strong></td>
<td>• Wide spectrum of understanding of ownership rights. Museum ownership versus collective ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PIMA and Pacific Museums</strong></td>
<td>• Role of PIMA clearly articulated and concern for readiness of Fiji Museum to receive artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Way Forward</strong></td>
<td>• Reconnecting repatriated artifacts to communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Keeping the link with Fijian diaspora</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.7.1 Theme 1: Meaning of Repatriation

10.7.1.1 Sub-theme: Understanding the Meaning of Repatriation

It was clear that the level of understanding of repatriation between museum staff, research and iTaukei participants varies. Not all museum staff understood the term and for some museum staff in Fiji, the term had to be redefined and simplified to ensure that they understood what I was researching. After redefining the term, then there was a clear discussion afterwards. This is clearly attributed to the fact that repatriation is a new process being discussed openly among museum staff. I am inclined to suggest that appropriation should also be discussed so that museum staff are able to appreciate the journey artifacts go through over a number of years, between collectors and even museums. Repatriation and appropriation must be equally valued and discussed among museum staff, government officials, artists and Fijians in general.
10.7.2  **Theme 2: Intellectual Property Right**

10.7.2.1  **Sub-theme: Legal Implications of Repatriation**

There was emotion about the return of artifacts but little discussion on the legal and financial implication this would bring to museums, and also between countries. However, I am reassured by the wonderful example already set by Fiji’s neighbours Australia and New Zealand on how to go about negotiating the return of artifacts. WIPO and other organisations have developed necessary guidelines to assist museums. Fiji has many examples to learn from, therefore this process should not be difficult after all.

10.7.3  **Theme 3: Ownership of Museum Collections**

10.7.3.1  **Sub-theme: Understanding the Ownership Rights Between Museums and Traditional Owners of Such Artifacts**

For the iTaukei participants, there is still an emotional attachment seen to exist between Indigenous Fijian people and artifacts, even when they are located overseas. From the museum perspective, objects that have been inherited, donated or purchased technically belong to the museum. I believe however that international museums have a moral obligation to indigenous communities in general. In the case of Fiji, international museums should evaluate their stand in relation to artifacts that are tribally owned. Even though it is not an easy task to evaluate each and every artifact collected in the 1800s, despite the “legality” of its ownership, traditionally speaking, if they are still of use in the creator communities, then there is an obligation to return such artifacts. This alone will add more cultural value to artifacts that still serve their purpose to their community.

10.7.4  **Theme 4: Role of PIMA and Pacific Museums**

10.7.4.1  **Sub-theme: Readiness of the Fiji Museum to Receive Artifacts**
The majority of the participants raised this point, including key members of the Fiji Museum. The readiness of the Fiji Museum is critical for decision-making to be done by international museums. The physical space was the biggest issue, and having enough space to house repatriated artifacts. Currently, the Fiji Museum is struggling to manage the current artifacts, let alone having the exhibition space to show them. I am proposing that the Fiji Government, through the support of the Department of Culture and Heritage and the Ministry of Education, to seriously consider extending the current museum building. If the Fiji Government is ready to negotiate the return of artifacts from overseas museums, then one action is to initiate and provide support for a larger museum with space for storage and exhibitions. Apart from the issue of physical space, other issues to consider are security, environmental conditions and conservation materials. They all have financial implications, and it is therefore important for the Fiji Museum Board to consider these financial undertakings seriously, as these are critical for the safe and proper management of repatriated artifacts.

10.7.5 Theme 5: The Way Forward

10.7.5.1 Sub-theme 1: Reconnecting repatriated artifacts to local people including artists and youths

Current practising artists, including artists both living in Fiji and abroad, highlighted reconnection as an important by-product of repatriation. All felt strongly about the endless possibilities and positive developments that would arise from repatriation. One practicing iTaukei artist mentioned the phrase “creative movement” as a positive outcome of bringing back artifacts that have left our shore for so long. He gave examples of being “reawakened to create new work” from such artifacts. One practicing musician also envisions himself viewing these “tangible art-forms” such as davui (conch), lali (drums) and derua (bamboo percussions) to invoke new sounds of music that will add to the current work he produces. It is indeed wonderful to hear such personal sentiments shared by these artists. In terms of working with the youths in our communities, the aforementioned musician highlighted the incorporation of modern music and genres such as rap, to include the Indigenous music and language to entice youths to museums and collections. Another area is poetry, which is beginning to attract a number of young Fijian diaspora as a way of expressing their cultural identity in a
new country. If such ways of working with youths are adopted, the repatriation of Fijian artifacts will have a wider far-reaching effect across the Fijian society and communities. As Sachiko Soro, Director of Vou Dance Group, said:

*the museum is a place of magic and mystery! There are huge opportunities for performance there within the different spaces offered there. And opportunities to be inspired by the artifacts and stories of our collective histories.*

Not only that Soro (2014) is proposing this idea, her company has done some work based on inspiration stories from the Fiji Museum, and is encouraging other artists to take up such opportunities for the future.

*We have made a few pieces inspired by ‘objects’ within Fijian society. For example the piece ‘Na Ibe’ which premiered at the Maidment Theatre in Auckland. The VOU dancers investigated the cultural and societal significance of the mats within Fijian society. We reference its use in all aspects of our lives, from birth to death, for weddings, funerals, family gatherings and soqo’s to make the sails of our Drua that sailed Fijians across our Pacific oceans. The sound track was a woman telling stories in Fijian of the mat that she used to remember as a child falling asleep on the mat or using it as a blanket; then there was the sound of an elder lady teaching a younger lady how to weave the Ibe.*

*Oqo me tiko I cake,*

*Oqo me tiko I ra,*

*Dreta vaka malua,*

*Talia vaka malua na ibe.*

*It symbolically weaves and holds together the various threads of Fijian society.*

(Soro, personal communication, 2014)
10.7.5.2 Sub-theme 2: Keeping the link of artifacts with the Fijian diaspora

Speaking of Fijian diaspora, I have had the honour of working alongside both young people and families in New Zealand, the United Kingdom and Europe in the field of language. Out of these language initiatives are the links to museum programmes, exhibitions and collections. I could feel the overwhelming nostalgia of reconnecting to Fiji at the “Chiefs and Governors” exhibition in Cambridge, England. There was an amazing feeling of patriotism and national pride as Fijians living in England visited the exhibition spaces and felt the presence of Fiji overseas. The general comments reflected this, and one that particularly stood out from those I interviewed, were:

I am so glad I came to see the exhibition, and thank goodness for the museum here in Cambridge to look after these artifacts for me and my children to see and enjoy. I am so happy! (Liganimeke, 2013)

10.8 Other Key Areas of Interest – Findings

One key finding of my research was the development of a new research framework that I created called the Veiwekani Research Framework. Veiwekani means ‘relationship’ in Fijian. I observed through the course of my research that the success of the fieldwork method that I applied was based on this new framework: both on the traditional meaning and professional meeting. Traditional means the use of indigenous relationship links such as their tribal (yavusa) and/or provincial (yasana) used by researchers that they belong to. Professional meaning the use of links based on their work relationships that enabled fieldwork to be undertaken successfully, through the people they know in the field.

10.8.1 Veiwekani Methodology Framework

10.8.1.1 Respect (Vakarokoroko)

These 3R Framework was critical in my research planning as I was undertaking my research and writing from an indigenous perspective. As an indigenous person, I believe
that knowledge is not an individual entity, it is relational (Wilson, 2014, p. 3). This therefore guides my way of building relationships with those around me, and those I will talk to. Even in the way I approached people, whether face-to-face, by phone or by email, the way I spoke was modelled on respect, which was paramount in the initial stages of research. As Nabobo-Baba (2008, p. 144) highlighted, researchers need to acknowledge and affirm existing elders and Vanua structures and protocols. In the case of Kaupapa Maori, Maori researchers similarly apply this methodology which is based on cultural expectations of relating to participants ethically and respectfully (Gobo, 2011).

10.8.1.2 Reciprocity (Veisolisoli)

In terms of reciprocity, researchers must ensure that there is sufficient means to show appreciation to people so that people’s love, support, time, resources and knowledge given freely are duly reciprocated. It is also important to note that talanoa is guided by the roles of relationship and kinship. In most cases, some of your research participants maintain a collegial relationship even after the research is completed. There may even be requests to assist the village or family post-research.

10.8.1.3 Relationship (Veiwekani)

As indigenous people, our search for knowledge is not an individual journey. One major difference between dominant paradigms and indigenous paradigms is that the dominant one is based on the belief that knowledge is an individual entity. Indigenous paradigms come from the belief that our knowledge is relational and is connected with the cosmos, animals, plants and the earth (Wilson, 2014, p. 4). As a researcher, there was a relational accountability that I had to fulfill, not only for myself but for the people I represented. This would include my family, my vanua, iTaukei people and the Pacific as a whole. When undertaking interviews and writing about it, I was not gaining knowledge for an individual pursuit but to fulfill my end of the research relationship. Relationship then became embedded in my methodology because I was being accountable to everyone around me.
Reflecting on the 3R framework above brings me to the relational nature of indigenous epistemology where it acknowledges the interconnectedness of the physical, mental, emotional and spiritual aspects of individuals between all living things (Lavalee, 2009, p. 23). In this case, individuals conducting the research are necessarily connected to the individuals being researched. Even though it is widely understood that qualitative research is not free from bias, indigenous researchers do acknowledge the interconnectedness of people and knowledge.

Before moving into the final discussions and analysis of the interviews, there are four other key areas of interests that I wanted to highlight. These topics have been mentioned briefly in my earlier chapters but not in detail. The main reason being that repatriation is the focus of this thesis. These key areas of interest will be dealt with in future papers and research. They are listed here below:

**Virtual Repatriation** – this was also a question posed during interviews and it received a unanimous response that this should not be viewed as a replacement for the real repatriation in the future. This can be a temporary measure for artifacts to be shared online through museum databases (as in the case of the Museum of Victoria and the Fiji Museum), however real repatriation of artifacts must be pursued by international museums if the Fiji Museum approaches them. There is always a word of caution in relation to sharing of sensitive artifacts with those who must have access to them. As Sana Balai, Assistant Curator at the National Gallery of Victoria, said:

> repatriation through digital photographs and sharing of online databases may be the way to go. This can only be done with proper consultation between museums/galleries and communities which artifacts originates from. The biggest issue must be taken into consideration is the sensitivity of these works, policing of what’s put on line to safeguard ownership and respect of these materials. (Balai, personal communication, 2014)
Apart from the cultural sensitivity aspect of this option, Ana Qumivutia-Deneralagi (2013) sums it well when she said that virtual repatriation could be relevant for this day and age but then having to see it in its original physical form is better as it brings to life the history of the object.

Illicit Trafficking of Cultural Property – Through this research, I found that the illicit trafficking of cultural property between countries around the world is rife. The Pacific is also included in such illegal trade of artifacts that are taken out of their country of origin. The result is the formation of a new form of ‘reverse repatriation’. Given the questionable method of having these artifacts returned, ICOM and other organisations such as UNESCO rule against it. I am glad that during the course of my research, I was able to organise and deliver the Fight Against Illicit Trafficking of Cultural Property – Melanesia, and am about to also embark on a regional workshop to be held in Vanuatu from August 1–3, 2015. One of the outcomes of my research is to raise awareness against the illicit trafficking of cultural property and to encourage proper dialogues between countries if cultural materials are to be returned. The case of the Radini Waimaro (discussed in CHAPTER SIX) is a great example. This ivory figurine is still listed under the Red List of ICOM, and it is my hope that one day it will be recovered and returned to the people of Waimaro, Naitasiri Province, where it truly belongs. Professor Steven Hooper (2013) highlighted this particular example in his interview:

*If Fiji was to be engaged in repatriation, perhaps the best way to go about it is to identify highly significant artifacts such as the Radini Waimaro, as this alone, warrants direct repatriation back to Fiji. The Radini Waimaro is one of those artifacts that will never be questioned and will be treated with utmost respect and serious support by researchers and museums worldwide. (Hooper, personal communication, 2013)*

Human Remains – As much as I tried to avoid the discussions of human remains in this research, there were a few references to this topic, in particular when discussing
the examples of other nations such as New Zealand and Australia. The discussion of Ro Veidovi (discussed in CHAPTER EIGHT) will be dealt with separately in a future paper that I will co-write with current Smithsonian Ethnology Curator, Dr. Adrienne Kaeppler. The NAGPRA was also referred to when discussing the return of human remains from the United States of America to First Nations tribes in Canada. I was fortunate to include Angela Steiner’s interview in my research given her role in negotiating with tribes in Washington State (USA) and tribes in Canada. Her perspective provided a fresh outlook on the discussions of human remains. A point mentioned by MAA Curator, Lucy Carreau, is worth highlighting:

> Even though there has not been repatriation between the MAA and the Fiji Museum. Perhaps significant artifacts that are important to Fiji, if identified must be returned, in particular human remains. Many museums, in the UK, including the MAA have a moral responsibility to return human remains, as this is the most dignified thing to do. (Carreau, personal communication, 2013)

**Diaspora (including contemporary Fijians and other races)** – this group of Fijian people that I met overseas during my fieldwork and travels has given me a different outlook on repatriation. As much as I wanted to propose the return of Fijian artifacts back to Fiji, the nature of diasporic movements of Fijians have turned this research into a ‘selective mode’ of repatriation, and to encourage the majority of Fijian collections to remain overseas for the benefit of Fijians born overseas. Responses from participants in England and Canada, and some from Fiji, have proposed that collaborations be encouraged between the Fiji Museum and international museums. Some have felt that if repatriation were to take place, they would not share part of Fiji’s heritage that are located overseas.

**10.8.2 Comparative Analysis of Repatriation in the Pacific and the Caribbean**

From October to November 2012, I was selected to represent the Pacific through PIMA to undertake research at the University of West Indies, in Trinidad & Tobago. The
A seven-week stay on the island enabled me to travel and visit museums on Trinidad & Tobago, Barbados and Dominica. Due to the similar colonial history and background of these islands with the Pacific, I was able to draw similar conclusions as to the need of international museums to dialogue with local communities in terms of repatriation discussions and negotiations. Meeting the last remaining Caribbean Queen during their Carib Week Celebration of 2012 opened discussions of working museums in Florida (USA) and to encourage the repatriating of selected Carib artifacts that were taken out of Trinidad by force in the late 1700s and early 1800s. The Carib community has opened a new museum in Arima, and it is hoped that this will encourage overseas museums to assist in sending artifacts, pictures and videos to support the current display. This research opportunity has opened doors for further exchange programmes to take place between Caribbean and Pacific museums, sponsored by the European Union and managed by the Secretariat of the Pacific Community, in Suva, Fiji.

10.9 Conclusion: The Way Forward for the Fiji Museum and Repatriation

As this PhD journey ends, I believe that this research will open many doors for future research to be undertaken in this field of museology, repatriation and cultural rights. I firmly believe that Fijian artifacts kept in international museum collections can and will be used to instigate fruitful collaborations between communities in Fiji and those in the diaspora. I have come to the realisation and affirmation of how rich the iTaukei cultural heritage is and it is vitally important for museums to use such cultural knowledge, not to divide people but unite *itokatoka* (family units), *matagali* (clans) and *yavusa* (tribes) in Fiji and those living overseas.

Interview participants that I spoke to have truly enriched my knowledge in this field of museums and repatriation. I started this journey with a different premise and after a series of debates, discussions and more dialogues, I have come to the realisation that many creative ways of repatriation can be far more enriching than bringing all Fijian artifacts back to Fiji. For example, there are many opportunities for creating new works for artists, such as dancers and musicians, based on stories associated with museum artifacts. You Director, Sachiko Soro (2014) summed it up well when she said:
repatriated artifacts can be invaluable to producing arts in Fiji they can be the
genesis and inspiration for what could potentially be Fiji’s greatest works of
performance arts.

I feel confident that the future of the Fiji Museum is positive if there are the right people
at the helm with the vision of working with any government to build a bigger and better
museum that can house future repatriated artifacts. Having a world-class building will
give ample trust for international museums to agree to repatriation proposals. Rather
than re-inventing the wheel, Fiji needs to learn from neighbouring countries such as
New Zealand and Australia, and also from indigenous examples in Canada and the
United States on who to manage repatriation. Staff trained in the field of law and
museology must be encouraged to facilitate future repatriations. With the combined
know-how of people along with new and better museum building, the future of
repatriation for Fiji is bright. Fijian treasures in international museums will one day
find their way back home to Fiji.
11  CHAPTER ELEVEN

ICAVACAVA – MACALA NI VAKADIDIKE

Conclusion and Research Summary

*We need to embrace a more complex model – one in which conflicting ways of understanding our world are interwoven – Lonetree*

11.1  Introduction

This research has taken me on a journey of discovery, one that enabled me to learn more, not only about myself, but learning so much about my own people, the iTaukei of Fiji. My choice of a museum career is indeed a calling so I can be a voice of our people, whose treasures-iYau, were taken from them in the early and mid-nineteenth century. During this contact period, there were period of peace, yet there were many volatile times of war and political instabilities between yavusa (tribes), vanua (land & people) and matanitu (confederacies). This research has become a tool to understand events that shaped Fiji, to be what it is today.

11.2  Why should Repatriation be Studied in Fiji?

Repatriation is a complex topic and the outcomes vary from country to country. Examining case studies from other parts of the world offers essential information on how repatriation works. The study of Fijian collections in museums in the United Kingdom (UK), Canada and Australia provided a better understanding of how repatriation has taken place in the past in these countries and provides a better approach on how to handle future repatriations. This study has enabled me to appreciate how Fijian artifacts were appropriated in the 1800s. Interviews with participants in Fiji and selected museums in England and Canada has empowered me to undertake this research
with all sincerity, knowing that this research will pave the way for similar research in other parts of the Pacific.

The purpose of this study is to analyse how Fijian artifacts were appropriated to international museums, and to identify practical ways of how these museums can repatriate Fijian artifacts to Fiji. The journey taken as part of my research methodology has opened my eyes to see the circumstances to understand how Fijian collections came to be in existence at the MAA Cambridge, British Museum, the Museum of Victoria (Melbourne) and MOA (Vancouver). My research also opened dialogues with academics and curators at the Smithsonian Museum (Washington) and Simon Fraser University (Canada). Fijian diaspora in these countries have shaped the way I looked at repatriation and I am pleased to include these talanoa and anecdotes in the case study chapters of Chapter 7, 8 and 9.

11.3 Significance of the Research

Koya-Vakauta (2013, p. 252) mentioned in her thesis that “the Pacific heritage art is another area that is in dire need of research. Currently, there is a very little theorisation or evidence based writing on the arts from a Pacific Islander standpoint. A particularly important area is the understanding of Pacific island aesthetics and what we can learn about indigenous epistemologies from there.” This comment rings true for the museum sector where more research is needed, and to be undertaken and written by indigenous Pacific people. As a iTaukei, I stand by this and this research is testament to my interest in this subject of repatriation and learning more about how this process can benefit our Pacific communities and museums.

This research has never been done in Fiji nor the Pacific, therefore, this work is a ground-breaking piece of research that can feed into more similar work to be undertaken in the future. As a Fijian, it is realistic to begin this research in my country, yet at the same time, proposing new ways of doing things that will benefit other indigenous communities in the Pacific region and around the world.
My research has greatly benefited from Fiji’s closest neighbours Australia and New Zealand. Case studies involving Aborigine and Maori communities respectively have greatly assisted my research in identifying practical solutions that will be beneficial for Fiji. More importantly, my fieldwork at the MAA in Cambridge and the MOA in Vancouver has sown some seeds for future research and exhibitions collaborations.

11.4 Repatriation Literature

Since there has not been any repatriation study undertaken for the Pacific, this research encountered difficulties in finding resources on the topic of repatriation for the Pacific, and specifically for Fiji. However, literary sources on repatriation for the UK and Canada, as well as New Zealand and Australia, were plentiful. Most of these resources included discussions on repatriation of artifacts for First Nations, Australian Aborigines and New Zealand Maori. I wanted to examine repatriation on a national level and specifically looking at possible differences in opinion between museum staff, researchers and iTaukei in each case study. Reading past repatriation experiences from these nations strengthened my resolve that my research is contributing to a much-needed discussion that has not taken place before on a national level in Fiji, nor regionally in the Pacific.

11.5 Research Questions, Aims and Objectives

The four primary research questions that guided this study were:

a) **What were some of the motives for the appropriation of the Fijian cultural objects?** The main motive was to collect ‘remaining’ tangible culture of indigenous societies due to cultural changes in Fiji (in the early 1900s)

b) **How important is the notion of cultural ownership in the study of museums, in particular the issues of appropriation and repatriation of indigenous cultural artifacts?** The indigenous and western views of ownership were discussed. The first one is more communal in nature and the other individual and legalistic. Curators that were interviewed
understood these 2 definitions and are open to further discussing ‘repatriation’ for Fiji, should the Fiji Museum is ready to embark on this process in the future.

c) **What are the social, political and cultural challenges associated with repatriation of cultural objects?** Social-defining ‘ownership’, political - legal processes between Fiji and Great Britain & Canada, Cultural-clear provenances for return to tribes and provinces and linking cultural objects to ‘extinct’ ceremonies (reference only & revival)

d) **How are b) and c) applicable to Fiji?** Opportunity for continuous dialogue between Fiji Museum and respective museums and opportunity for revival projects in Fiji with local tribes and villages, for example the Veiqia (Fijian Women Tattooing) Project Exhibition and associated programs such as the Liku Making workshop.

This research has answered the above questions by way of a combination of interviews and archival research. With regards to the motives of appropriations, it varies from person to person. However, the main reason, as highlighted by the work of Governor Allardyce, was to collect the remaining tangible culture of indigenous societies that were quickly changing under a lot of economical, social and political pressures from outside powers. The notion of ownership was interesting as the discussion of who owns these artifacts was discussed among museum professionals as well as iTaukei participants. That there are two clear views on the definition of ownership came to light: the indigenous and western view. The indigenous view alludes to communal and shared ownership and the role passed through generations of managing resources for future generations. The western view, on the other hand, focuses more on individual ownership with supporting legal mechanisms that often outweigh the shared notion of ownership. Museums know that iTaukei artifacts in their collection legally belong to the museum (since it has gone through the museum acquisition system), however most of the curators I spoke to recently are aware that these artifacts were once owned by iTaukei people. They are more inclined to discuss the future of repatriation and develop institutional relationships should the Fiji Museum intend to go that way.
In terms of the social, political and cultural challenges that are associated with repatriation, this research confirms that they do exist in various forms. These challenges are also intertwined. The social challenge is defining ownership and finding a platform for international museums to view Fijian collections in their museums as rightfully belonging to Fiji. This is easier said than done. All international museums have policies that govern how collections are managed, and how they should be repatriated. This can cross political boundaries of countries and, if not handled with care, can lead to negative consequences. This can be seen in the case of the British Museum fighting legal cases with Egypt and Greece. The cultural challenge will be evident when Fijian collections eventually get repatriated, and it must be decided which tribe they have to be returned to, and if cultural ceremonies associated with these artifacts are extinct, then uses and functions of such artifacts become useless. These artifacts can then only be used as references but not actively used again in villages and provinces.

### 11.6 Research Aims and Objectives

This research aimed to:

a) Critically examine the process of dispossession of the Pacific communities of their cultural objects by Europeans and the cultural, political, artistic or religious basis for this using the postcolonial discourse.

b) Explore the notion of cultural ownership and how this can be used to explain the process of repatriation of cultural objects and the implications of these in Fiji.

c) Explore the process of repatriation of appropriated cultural objects and some of the social and cultural implications on Fijian world-view.

I can confidently say that this research, through the support of the Postcolonial Theory and the Fijian Vanua Research Framework, has met these aims and objectives outlined
above. Before discussing repatriation, it is advisable to learn, understand and document the political and colonial history of any nation. I also appreciated finding out through this research that museum collections can be used as tools to study the political and historical history of a nation. Artifacts are not mere objects of admiration but research tools for understanding the world around you.

The study of repatriation forces a researcher to take a couple of steps back in order to understand how artifacts came to be in international museums. There are evidences of dispossessions of these artifacts from Pacific societies. Artifacts were taken away from the Pacific region firstly out of mere curiosity. As time passed, the economic value of these artifacts began to develop. In no time, business ventures began to grow which encouraged collectors and curators to begin collecting in large scales and volumes across the Pacific. In the case of Fiji, colonial administrators, missionaries and voyagers formed the largest group in appropriating artifacts out of Fiji.

11.7 Postcolonial Theory to Understand Repatriation and Appropriation

As the study of museums is a western pursuit, postcolonial theory is the most relevant theory to use for this research since it is a theory that can analyse, explain and respond to the cultural legacies of colonialism and imperialism. It is also a theory that explains the human consequences of controlling a country and exploiting indigenous people and their land. It also highlights the colonial legacy metropolitan nations leave behind after they arrive and conquer indigenous communities. This theory highlights that museums are still colonial constructs that continue to perpetuate colonial discourses in the guise of having indigenous people participate in museum curatorship and collection management. From an anthropological perspective, this theory records human relations among colonial nations and those that are exploited by colonial rule. For instance, Fiji and parts of Canada were colonised by England. This theory highlights these past relationships and the results of these political relationships. Indigenous people who own land and associated resources are often the ones that suffer the most. This theory brings out such mismatched relationships and highlights where colonial powers went wrong in their dealings with indigenous communities.
11.8 Summary of Findings

This research has opened my eyes to see the importance of artifacts to Indigenous Fijians or the iTaukei. As an iTaukei myself, I feel honoured and privileged to undertake this ground-breaking work that has not been done in Fiji before, let alone the Pacific region. I sincerely hope that my research will encourage future researchers and writers from the Pacific region to investigate where their artifacts are and to find creative ways to forge new relationships with international museums that are currently managing them. Some of the key findings and conclusions are discussed below that reaffirm the importance of continuing dialogues and to repatriate selected artifacts that will benefit museum audiences at the Fiji Museum.

One of the key findings suggests that participants are of the view that Fijian artifacts should remain overseas and that they become cultural reference points, in particular for Fijians living abroad. Viewing such artifacts in international museums creates a sense of belonging and ignites Fijian patriotism and nationalism. There is a general consensus that Fijian artifacts are still important to Fijians today and act as a reminder of Fijian connection to the cosmos, history, cultural roles and duties.

To summarise these findings, I will apply the notion of the Kato ni Vuku Framework or Baskets of Knowledge ethos, based on a Maori creation myth in which the gods gave humans three baskets containing the knowledge they needed to live on Earth. They hold the knowledge of the natural world (Kete Aronui), the spiritual world (Kete Tuataea) and our rational world (Kete Tuauri). Instead of three baskets, I will include an additional four baskets to make it seven. These seven baskets are derived from the key themes based on the questionnaire given out to participants.

11.8.1 Kato ni Vuku 1

Knowledge of museum repatriation
Those in the museum field understood the meaning of repatriation. To the vernacular-speaking individuals, I translated my line of questioning to the Fijian vernacular so as to make it clearer, ensuring that they understood what the term meant. Once the Fijian translation was done, the response came back more quickly than anticipated. The response in Fijian was personal and moving, as it finally dawned on the respondents the opportunity that exists for Fijian artifacts to be returned home. It is important to point out here that participants in Fiji preferred to have Fijian artifacts returned, however there was some hesitation on the part of the Fijian diaspora where they felt that artifacts are better-off overseas, however overseas museums must reach out to Fijian communities that live there to view and learn from these cultural artifacts.

11.8.2 Kato ni Vuku 2

Knowledge of repatriation laws and conventions

The understanding of the laws was clearer to those that work in the field of culture, arts and museums. Community members that I contacted were not aware of the laws as much as those that work in the field, in particular for those that work in the regional organisations such as UNESCO, the Secretariat of the Pacific Community and the Melanesian Spearhead Group (MSG). As a result of this discussion, I facilitated a three-day workshop titled ‘Fight Against Illicit Trafficking of Cultural Property’ in Papua New Guinea from July 7–9, 2014. The workshop was jointly organised and supported by these organisations: PIMA, UNESCO (Samoa) and ICOM (Paris). Topics of the workshop included the 1970 UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Cultural Property. This is a breakthrough in this research as I anticipate it will raise awareness of this issue in the Pacific region. Through regional collaborations, such awareness can be done effectively, most importantly using regional events such as the Melanesian Arts Festival platform.

11.8.3 Kato ni Vuku 3

Knowledge of museum collections in overseas museums
The ability for me to interview fellow Fijians living overseas was very rewarding in a lot of ways. Through the interviews and questionnaires, I found that some had been to museums in their neighbourhood, however others were not aware of Fijian collections even in their local museums. Our contacts in England and Canada were aware of such collections when the Pacific Arts Association meeting took place in Canada, and when I was present representing PIMA. Similar to the UK experience, most of the Fijian families who took part in the Fiji Art Project, as well those invited to the opening of the “Chiefs and Governors” exhibition, became more aware of the vast quantity of artifacts in the Museum of Anthropology and Archaeology in Cambridge during the exhibition events.

11.8.4 Kato ni Vuku 4

Knowledge of museum collections ownership

To those who were more familiar with the nature of museum processes, they were aware that that museums own such artifacts, however they also know and feel the importance of re-connecting such artifacts back to the homeland. Even though there was so much emotion given to the thought of “traditionally” owning these artifacts, the fact that it has changed hands over many years has made tracking of ownership murky. Some of my participants still feel that even though Fijian artifacts have been in the museum vaults for a long time, traditionally they still belong to the people that made them.

11.8.5 Kato ni Vuku 5

Knowledge of repatriation opportunities

In comparison to the Fiji-based participants, participants in Canada declared that there had not been any repatriation that has taken place between MOA and the Fiji Museum, however they were interested to see that some artifacts be returned to Fiji in the future. There were also some thoughts of keeping some artifacts to be present in Canada for education of and cultural appreciation for fellow Fijians living there. Participants in
England shared the same sentiments. Many felt that keeping some Fijian artifacts in England would benefit Fijians who are long-term residents of the United Kingdom and Canada, respectively. For Fijians in Fiji, some were interested to organise the current artifacts in the collections before new ones arrive. Within the museum itself, this will begin a good and positive move towards better house-keeping processes of identifying gaps in the collection. This can also be the time to identify artifacts that need repair, cleaning and conservation.

11.8.6 **Kato ni Vuku 6**

**Knowledge of repatriation and link to cultural identity**

All respondents could see the link between repatriation and cultural identity. Even those living in Fiji felt that bringing artifacts back to Fiji can reignite pride and appreciation of the iTaukei culture, which has not been taken seriously for sometime. The ability for young people to be proud of their culture and the increases usage of the iTaukei language were some of the benefits listed by some respondents. Those that work for the government, as well as academics, immediately responded by saying that repatriation is “vital” for the increased appreciation of cultural identity. One musician who lives in New Zealand expressed his feelings by saying that by getting artifacts back to Fiji (in particular musical instruments such as lali [drums], davui [conch shell] and derua [bamboo percussions]) can re-ignite patriotic feelings of Fijian identity for Fijians in general, but mostly to young Fijians living overseas. When these young people return home and reconnect with artifacts that had left Fiji’s shores so many years ago, this can be a positive character-building opportunity. As well-known Fijian singer, song-writer and artist Sailasa Tora puts it:

> ‘E veivakatoroiaketai vai keda nai yan,’

And this is translates as:

> ‘Our cultural treasures can develop us as a people’ (Tora, personal communication, 2014)
11.8.7 Kato ni Vuku 7

Knowledge of Cultural Revival and Reawakening

Some of the feedback gathered from this research, proposed and supported across the list of participants – from museum staff, researchers and iTaukei participants – is the revival of Fijian artforms that have gone extinct over the years. Some participants believe that repatriation can be a tool for this new movement. The abolishment of cultural practices such as tattooing (veiqia) by missionaries has resulted in the Fijian way of dress for girls and women changing as well, therefore the process of making woven garments such as liku (skirt) stopped. The arrival of modern goods, such as polyester bags, has now replaced the use of woven bags that use natural fibers such as drau ni niu (coconut leaves) and voivoi (pandanus).

As of April this year (2015), I have been co-curating an exhibition put together by a group of Fijian women living in New Zealand, Australia and Fiji on the topic of Veiqia (The Art of Fijian tattooing). This exhibition will be launched in Auckland in March 2016, as part of the PAA International Symposium Program. Selected Fijian women artists will be making new works inspired by this long-lost tradition and putting a contemporary angle to it to inform our young Fijian audience of the richness of our Fijian culture. As a team, we have been using artifacts that are kept at the Auckland Museum, Australian Museum and the Fiji Museum to showcase stories of Fijian tattooing specifically conducted by women, but that has been lost over the last century. There will also be contemporary dances, plays and poetry to add into the visual arts aspect of the show. I am excited to be part of this project and this links in well with my PhD research.

Apart from my role as co-Curator, I am also interested to organise revival weaving programs for Fijian women in Fiji. I am particularly interested to re-visit places where likus (skirts) were mostly collected from (and where they are now in large numbers in international museums). Since the abolishment of veiqia (tattooing), the art of liku (skirt-making) has become extinct. My mission is to take selected likus from the Fiji
Museum collection (similar to the one below) and take them to Namosi Village, for instance, and encourage our weavers to re-learn the art again, and begin to appreciate the art of veiqia, as Namosi and Fiji were well known for once.

Figure 11.1. Liku, skirt, MAA Cambridge Collection.

Figure 11.2. ‘Kato ni Vuku’ or ‘Baskets of Knowledge’ Fieldwork Summary
11.8.8 International Responses to Repatriation

This research has linked Fiji to other parts of the world. Apart from England and Canada, during the course of my research I was able to participate in events and programmes that have generated discussions on the subject of repatriation. The topic of illicit trafficking was also raised, as well as the discussions on the treatment and careful handling of human remains. Listed below are some countries and associated events that I participated in with the aim of promoting discussions and debates concerning repatriation.

Table 11.1 List of international projects linked to this research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY &amp; Year</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>CONTENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geneva, Switzerland</td>
<td>WIPO meetings, representing PIMA</td>
<td>IPR &amp; Traditional Cultural Expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Islands (2012)</td>
<td>11th Festival of Pacific Arts</td>
<td>Cultural Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad &amp; Tobago (2012)</td>
<td>SPC-EU Researcher Exchange Program</td>
<td>Repatriation in the Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich and Cambridge (England, 2013)</td>
<td>“Chiefs and Governor’s Exhibition”, Norwich Workshop on Missionary Collections</td>
<td>Fijian collections in UK Museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver, Canada (2013)</td>
<td>Pacific Arts Association International Symposium</td>
<td>Discussed repatriation research in a museum session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea (2014)</td>
<td>Fight Against Illicit Trafficking workshop</td>
<td>Illicit Trafficking and Repatriation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These events are testimony to the need to share, teach and empower others about repatriation. Indigenous communities have the right to know about this museum process. They need to know that they have every right to enquire to international museums whether they have artifacts from their countries kept in their collections.

The Fijian diaspora in England and Canada provided another perspective to the interviews and discussions. Even though repatriation meant the return of artifacts back to the country of origin, iTaukei people living abroad are in two minds. Firstly, they would support the move to have Fijian artifacts returned to Fiji, yet on the other hand, they think of their children and their families who call England and Canada their home. Their being overseas does not discount their traditional ties to Fiji. They are just as Fijian as the ones living in Fiji, however there is a call to make if certain artifacts can remain as educational resources or flag-posts for those who want to learn more about themselves.

Revival workshops have been suggested to take place in Fiji in order to bring back the knowledge of iTaukei traditions that has been lost over the years. For instance, a Fijian tattooing project known as the Veiqia Project has recently started, where a group of Fijian women living in New Zealand and Australia are undertaking research into the art of tattooing, a work of art that was abolished by missionaries in the 1830s.

11.8.9 National Responses to Repatriation

The feedback from interview participants in Fiji has been overwhelmingly positive. I am pleased to be able to return to the Fiji Museum, where I was employed in 1994. I feel my research has made a full circle, where I am able to view the collection as an
outsider, and at the same time, have the liberty to travel overseas and view Fijian artifacts as an outsider and to feed back the experience and knowledge gained through this research.

The staff members of the Fiji Museum have been very supportive of my interest to undertake this research from day one. The opportunity given to me to visit the collection store, undertake interviews and make observations has been an empowering exercise. I know full well that the onus is on me to use my thesis to move mountains, so to speak: to be able to encourage those who manage the budgets of the governments to build a better national museum, and also to encourage regional museums to be built around the country.

I am so privileged to access the knowledge and sentiments shared by two powerful chiefs of two provinces – the provinces of Tailevu, na Turaga na Roko Tui Bau, Ratu Joni Madraiwivi and Na Turaga na Tui Namosi, Ratu Suliano Romatanitobua of Namosi Province. As mentioned in Chapters 7 and 9, these are the two provinces that are well represented in museum collections abroad. Both are keen to see Fijian artifacts returned to Fiji in the future in order to benefit local Fijians re-learning and appreciating their culture. As the Tui Namosi, Ratu Suliano Matanitobua (2014) mentioned in his interview:

\[Na noqu nanuma nai yau makawa oqo e dodonu me kau mai I Viti baleta ni yau makawa qo ei tukutuku dina baleta ni ka e a vakayacori ena dela ni vanua e Viti.\]

which is translated as

In my view, those [Fijian] artifacts should be returned to Fiji because they represent what truly happened in Fiji. (personal communication, 2014)
In contrast, responses from three iTaukei artists, Paula Liga (master carver), the late Finau Mara (master weaver) and Selai Buasala (master Masi maker) showed that they were interested to have Fijian artifacts kept in overseas museums so that museum visitors can learn more about Fiji and may be compelled to visit the country. Finau Mara said the following:

_Noqu nanuma me sa biu tu ga yani e vei yasai vuravura me rawa ni kilai kina na noda iyau vakaviti se iyau maroroi vei ira na vulagi kei ira na itaukei ka rawa ni vakauqeti ira me ra lako mai kina noda vanua ko Viti._

Translated as:

_My thoughts is that they should leave these Fijian treasures in overseas museums as these artifacts may encourage visitors and Fijians alike to visit our country, Fiji. (Mara, personal communication, 2014)_

Researchers including academics were concerned with the physical readiness of the current Fiji Museum. The proposal has been put forward for the government of the day to be approached, with support from outside funding for a new and better museum to be built.

11.9 Limitations and Challenges of the Research

Below is the summary of the ‘5C’ challenges that I faced during the course of undertaking this research (see CHAPTER SEVEN).
Since there has not been any research undertaken before in Fiji on this topic, it was quite difficult to match and cross-check the gathered information to other projects in order to gauge the level of understanding of the Fijian community in relation to repatriation. I am pleased that this research can set a benchmark for future work to be done in Fiji. As a result of this lack of written work on the subject, I was forced to read up on the subject through case studies outside of the Pacific.

Another limitation was the constant editing of the questionnaire to suit my English and iTaukei-speaking participants. As mentioned in CHAPTER NINE, due to the technical aspect of this topic, I had to continuously simplify the questions in order to acquire the answers I was after. For example, the English questionnaire I sent to museum professionals differs from the one I sent to artists who may not be familiar with the museum jargon, such as ‘accession’ and ‘acquisition’. As for the Vosa Vakaviti (Fijian Language), I had to refine the questions for the community members I interviewed in comparison to the ones I used for iTaukei participants who work for the government. An anomaly that I found from one of my iTaukei participants, who was a Chief and a lawyer by profession, was that he wanted to answer the questionnaire in both languages. After analysing the responses, I noticed that the responses in the iTaukei language had
a great deal of feeling and emotions attached to it, while the English responses were very technical and politically correct.

The experience mentioned above then encouraged me to highlight the importance of creating research frameworks that are robust and most applicable to our people, in particular with the use of the iTaukei language. I feel that the Talanoa Framework developed by Pacific researchers may not fit in the Fiji context, therefore it is critical that Fijian research methodologies and frameworks should be developed by Fijian researchers that will suit Fiji-based research projects and contexts. This is critical to research that are undertaken from an Indigenous perspective, and also undertaken by iTaukei/Indigenous researchers (see Figure 11.4).

![Figure 11.4. ‘iTaukei Vei-Vosaki Research Framework’ (Source: Vunidilo, 2015).](image)

### 11.10 The Way Forward - Repatriation Planning

#### 11.10.1 Repatriation Planning at the Fiji Museum

The responses from the museum staff revealed that their concern is not so much in repatriating artifacts back to Fiji but the improvement in the infrastructure of the current museum building. Current Fiji Museum Director, Sagale Buadromo (2012) boldly responded during our interview that the current museum is even struggling with the
current collections. Staff members are trying their best to catalogue artifacts that have been recently gifted and donated by museum friends and colleagues. They also have pressing issues such as the improvement to the current gallery spaces and public toilet amenities. To them, once the building is upgraded, then they will be ready to receive new artifacts to be exhibited and for research purposes too.

The interview with Fergus Clunie (2013) offered some practical methods for the Fiji Museum to undertake in the near future. First of all, the current collections should be fully catalogued and gaps identified. Once they know of the ‘gaps’ in the collection, they can then approach an overseas museum that has a variant of the same artifact. Negotiations can then follow through a long-term loan, gift or de-accession.

Professor Steven Hooper (2013) shared an important point, that the Fiji Museum should target ‘high-risk’ artifacts such as the Radini Waimaro (ivory goddess), as these would automatically warrant repatriation, given its known history of being stolen from the tribe in Waimaro, Naitasiri Province. Included in this category as well would be the remains of Ro Veidovi, the late Chief of Rewa Province. Dr. Adrienne Kaeppler (2012) of the Smithsonian Museum shared how the family of the Roko Tui Dreketi recently approached the Smithsonian Museum for the return of the skull of Ro Veidovi.

11.10.2 Repatriation Planning by PIMA

The organisation supports the return of artifacts to their rightful owners and tribes. In its reports over the years, it has documented the presence of Pacific artifacts in overseas museums. Responses from the interviews signified how PIMA can facilitate repatriation discussions between museums in the Pacific and those abroad.

PIMA was informed that there were repatriation programmes facilitated between the Bishop Museum in Hawaii and the Kingdom of Tonga and Vanuatu. These are mostly human remains that were part of an archaeological excavation in the early 1900s and the museum staff felt that it was right for these remains to be returned.
During the course of my research, PIMA facilitated two repatriations. One was a Te Vau (Red Feather money) of the Solomon Islands (see Appendix # for the Press Release and the associated pictures of the repatriation ceremony. This repatriation took place as a result of my presentation at the Cultural Rights Workshop, organised by the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC). My topic was discussing the role of PIMA in the Pacific and the questions posed to me by members of the audience were on the repatriation. One of the SPC staff, Ron Benyon, who was translating the presentations, heard my comments and approached me during the workshop break. He mentioned that he bought a Te Vau in Honiara in 1988, and he took it with him to Noumea, New Caledonia. He loaned the Te Vau to the Museum of New Caledonia. After hearing my comments at the workshop, he felt that it is the right thing to return the Te Vau to the Solomon Islands National Museum. With the support of SPC and the Solomon Islands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the handing over ceremony took place, as part of the International Museum Day in 2013.

Another repatriation recently took place between a private collector in San Francisco and the Museum of Samoa. PIMA was informed that a nifo oti (wooden knife) was to be sold, but the collector was willing for this nifo oti to be returned to where it originated. This collector acquired this artifact through family inheritance, as his family traveled widely in the Pacific in the early 1900s. The Museum of Samoa and the Ministry of Culture and Education worked together to acquire this nifo oti from the USA.

PIMA was the leading organisation that organised and facilitated the ‘Fight Against the Illicit Trafficking of Cultural Property’ in Port Moresby in July 2014. This workshop was delivered during the Melanesian Arts Festival and had a focus on the Melanesian countries of Fiji, Papua New Guinea, Vanuatu and the Solomon Islands. There is a concerted effort to also organise similar workshops in New Zealand in March 2016, to include the Polynesian islands of Tonga, Samoa, Cook Islands, Tuvalu, Tokelau, Tahiti and Rapa Nui. In May of 2016, this workshop will take place in Guam, to include
museums in the Micronesia region including the Federated States of Micronesia, the Marianas, Republic of Belau, Guam, Nauru and Kiribati.

PIMA is indeed the right organisation to facilitate future repatriation projects and be an advocacy for heritage management and the fight against illicit trafficking of cultural property.

11.11 Further Research

There were many other avenues that I would have liked to explore in this PhD journey. I am keen to develop this research further and explore other effective methods of repatriation that are applicable to and beneficial for Fiji. Some plans of action are summarised in this ABC Chart:
Some of the topics I am keen to develop further are:

**Intellectual Property Right (IPR)** – To research further into the field and develop new research frameworks dealing with copyright and misappropriation of designs

**Virtual Repatriation** – Consider working with more international museums to develop more online portals

**Human remains** – Develop museum policies for dealing with human remains and associated artifacts

**Revival workshops** – Conduct weaving and tattooing revival workshops in Fiji, in association with the Fiji Museum and PIMA
**Provincial exhibitions** – Develop community stories and work with young people to develop exhibitions using artifacts and photographs about their provinces. I will begin with Namosi Province in 2016

**Museum studies in Curriculums** – Develop ways of working with the Ministry of Education to gradually introduce museum studies at secondary school level (under the History Curriculum) and encourage it to be taught at tertiary level.

### 11.12 Concluding Remarks

This research journey grew from a small seed of searching through and wanting to know where all the beautiful Fijian artifacts came from within the storeroom of the Fiji Museum, and the collections I worked in at the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa, Waikato Museum and the Auckland Museum. My journey from archaeology to cultural anthropology has been an enjoyable one. Excavating archaeological sites yields bones, charcoals, shells and pottery. Somehow I knew that these archaeological finds would be kept in a storage room somewhere in Fiji or in another part of the world. These were the ones I excavated, but what about the other collections that were there before me? What about the ones that were kept in England and Canada? Writing this thesis has enabled me to answer these questions and make me understand and appreciate the various methods through which these Fijian artifacts have been collected, transported, transferred and kept abroad.

I feel that I have given voice to these artifacts. I have tried to trace the movement of some of them and it was an exhilarating journey to see how a *tabua* and a woven basket from Tonga were given to King Cakobau, then eventually given to Sir Arthur Gordon, who then donated them to the British Museum. This *tabua* and basket are not just beautiful handcrafted items to view, hold and admire. They have stories that they carry with them, and this thesis has allowed me to venture into collection storerooms in Fiji, England and Canada, looking and holding some priceless artifacts I would not have touched or seen if it was not for this research.
I challenge future iTaukei researchers to write more about these treasures that have taken the name of Fiji across the Pacific Ocean, to the other side of the globe. There are so many rich stories and lessons to gain from these types of research. It will be great to use multi-media in recording these stories in the forms of videos and digital games, to interest young people in learning about their history, language and culture.

I would like to encourage museum studies to be taught at the University of the South Pacific in order to create a new cohort of iTaukei, Fijian, Rotuman and other Pacific researchers that are trained to undertake similar research to benefit their people and their communities. In order to start young, it would be great to make museum visits compulsory for schools on the island of Viti Levu. More so, this research aims to encourage the building of regional museums across Fiji. For instance, the provinces of Cakaudrove, Bua and Macuata can have their regional museums located in their provincial building in Labasa. As the province raises more funds, the government can provide additional funding with external partners to build regional museums that showcase their history, artifacts and promote the unique aspects of their provinces that are different from other provinces. For instance, the weaving of kuta (marsh grasses) is common in the provinces of Macuata. With the support of the Fiji Museum, PIMA and the Macuata Provincial Council, a new museum/cultural centre can be built to showcase the province and also benefit local schools. Additionally, tourists and local visitors can visit these museums, and this can be a revenue earner for the province. This can also lead to capacity building where young people are trained to manage and work in these museums.

To conclude, I would like to highlight a statement made by the late Professor Asesela Ravuvu when he stated that:

*Life, peace and prosperity are defined in a uniquely Fijian way which make the people see themselves as different from that of any other ethnic communities living in Fiji, or elsewhere in the world. (1985, p. 4)*
In this context, Ravuvu was discussing the ethos associated with Fijian ceremonies where I Yau (valued property) are presented and exchanged. My research has made me look at I Yau in museums in a different light, where I now think deeply on who made them, for what purpose, why they were collected, by whom and so forth. I now want to celebrate the story of how an artifact was made, used and celebrated before it was collected. Provided repatriation projects take place in the near future, I would like to ensure that the stories of these treasures are celebrated, recorded and shared for everyone to know. Our future generation will be in good hands if Fijian treasures are well-cared-for and associated stories are celebrated by everyone, young and old.
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Glossary

Civa – pearl-shell
Civavonovono – breastplate
Bati – warrior
Bose – meeting
Burenisa – men’s house
Dari – clay kava bowl
Davui – bursa shell trumpet or conch
Derua - bamboo percussion
Drua – double hull canoe
Gatu Vakatoga – tapa or bar-cloth in Tongan style
Gauna mai muri – future
Gauna e liu – past
Ibe – woven mat
Ie Toga – Samoan fine mat
iMilamila – head scratcher
Iribuli – coconut leaf-fan
iSevusevu – traditional kava ceremony
iTagaga - canoe masthead
iTaube - necklace
iTaukei – word referring to indigenous Fijians
iTiki ni Uto – breadfruit splitter
iTokatoka – family unit
iYau – with reference to highly valued
iWau – wooden clubs
Kailoma - people of Fijian and European descent
Kakala – Tongan fragrant flower
Kava – generic word for yaqona
Kali – wooden headrest
Kalou - God
Kaitiaki – traditional caretaker of indigenous knowledge
Kesakesa – Bark-cloth (tapa printing)
Kumi - large masi (dark brown in colour)
Kitu - water container made of coconut shell
Koro – village
Kuta - marsh grasses
Kuveji - tapa design stencils used in Lau Province
Lali - carved wooden drum
Lemaki – tribe of carvers that links to Samoa
Lovo - underground earth-oven
Luva – Tongan word for giving away the complete garland
Marae – Polynesian word for raised platform
Matakau – wooden idol
Matakau yalewa – female idol
Matanitu – confederacy
Matanivanua – Chief’s spokesman
Mataqali – tribal unit
Masi – stenciled bark-cloth
Nifo Oti - a type of Samoan wooden club
Papatuanuku – God of the earth
Punake – Tongan word for choreographer
Radini Waimaro - carved ivory Goddess of Waimaro District
Rara – village green
Roko – provincial envoy
Saisaitavevu – a type of spear
Saqa – clay water container
Saunidaliga – ear-rings
Sivisivi – Carving
Solevu – gathering
Tabekasere – a type of basket
Tabua – whales-tooth
Talitali – weaving
Talanoa – to tell stories
Tama – traditional greeting
Tangata Whenua – Maori name for indigenous people or people of the land
Tanoa – kava bowl
Tapa – bark-cloth
Teiteivaki – to plant
Tevau – Solomon Island feather money
Tiki - Maori greenstone pendant
Toli – Tongan word for gathering flowers
Toi Iho - New Zealand Trademark for Maori artists
Tokatoka – family unit
Tui – Tongan word for stringing flowers
Tufunga – Samoan word for choreographer
Tulituli – pottery making
Tukuni – oral history passed down through generations
Ulutoa – dart-head
Vasu – maternal family links
Vanua – literally means land or can mean people of the land
Vesi – iron-wood
Veisa – traditional exchange of goods between people
Veikerekerei - to borrow from others
Veisolisoli – the act of giving
Veitalanoa -telling stories
Veiwasei - sharing information and experiences
Veivakaturagataki - in a chiefly manner
Veiwekani – relationships between people
Vaka-i-Taukei – the Fijian way
Vula Vakaviti – Fijian traditional calendar
Whakatauki – Maori word for proverb
Waiata – Maori word for song
Wayaka – twine
Yalo I Viti - Fiji Museum publication
Yasana - province
Yaqona – kava root
Appendix A: Questionnaire for Researchers (English)

PHD QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ACADEMICS (FIJI)

PREPARED BY TARISI VUNIDilo

Project title: I YAU VAKAVITI – FIJIAN TREASURES IN MUSEUMS: A study of Museums and Repatriation

Name (optional): ______________________________________________
Name of institution: _____________________________________________
Position in the institution: _______________________________________

REPATRIATION

What is your definition of repatriation?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

How relevant is repatriation to your institution?
________________________________________________________________________
What is your personal view on this topic regarding museums and repatriation?

How familiar are you with Pacific artifacts kept in overseas museums?

What is your institution’s view on the idea of artifacts in overseas museums being returned to their home countries?

Provided your institution supports the repatriating of artifacts to their home countries, what practical ways of repatriation do you think can be undertaken?

What concerns does your institution have towards museums preferring to take part in any repatriation process?

Virtual repatriation is a current trend where artifacts are repatriated through digital photographs and sharing of online databases. Do you think virtual repatriation is relevant and practical for Pacific museums?
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHT (IPR)

What concerns does your institution have toward intellectual property rights?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

What has your institution done to date regarding issues relating to IPR and indigenous communities? Any case studies you want to share?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

What current opportunities can your organisation do to recognise indigenous knowledge?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

OWNERSHIP

From the list below, which category of museum stake-holders do you think legally own most artifacts in museums worldwide, and explain your answer?

a. Artists b. Museum c. Collector d. Community e. Combination of a,b,c,d
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

What concerns does your institution have toward the ownership of museum artifacts?
________________________________________________________________________
PIMA (PACIFIC ISLANDS MUSEUMS ASSOCIATION)

What role do you think PIMA should play in the process of repatriation and negotiations in the Pacific?

__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________

What challenges do you anticipate with the efforts of Pacific museums & PIMA in working towards bringing artifacts back to the Pacific?

__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________

What opportunities do you anticipate with the effort of Pacific museums & PIMA in working towards bringing artifacts back to the Pacific?

__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________

THE WAY FORWARD

What are some practical ways your institution can assist in the process of repatriation in the future?

__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________

Any other comments?

__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________
VINAKA VAKALEVU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION

Vinaka vakalevu

Tarisi Vunidilo

**Primary Supervisor:** Dr. Steven Ratuva  
Email Address: s.ratuva@auckland.ac.nz  
Phone Number: +64 9 373 7599 extn. 88618
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Phone Number: +64 9 373 7599 extn. 88983
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APPENDIX B

NA VAKATATARO VEI IRA NA WEKADA E VITI
E VAKARAUTAKA KO TARISI VUNIDilo

ULUTAGA: I YAU VAKAVITI – FIJIAN TREASURES IN MUSEUMS: A study of Museums and Repatriation

Yaca:

____________________________

I tikotiko:

____________________________

Koro (Village), Tikina (District), Yasana (Province)

____________________________

____________________________

VALE NI YAU MAROROI (MUSEUMS)

O NI DAU GADE I NA VALE NI YAU MAROROI E SUVA (Wirica nai sau ni taro donu)

IO
SEGA
VAKAVUDUA

O A BAU KILA NI TIKO EDUA NA VALE NI YAU MAROROI ENA NODA VANUA E VITI? (Wirica nai sau ni taro donu)
   IO
   SEGA

O BAU KILA NI RA TU ENA VALE NI YAU MAROROI E SUVA NAI YAU VAKAMAREQETI MAI NA NOMUNI YASANA? (Wirica nai sau ni taro donu)
   IO
   SEGA

O BAU KILA SE RA KAU YANI VAKACAVA I NA VALE NI YAU MARORORI E SUVA NAI YAU VAKAMAREQETI MAI NA VEIYASANA E VITI? (Wirica nai sau ni taro donu)
   VOLI
   SOLI VAKAILOLOMA
   KUMUNI
   BUTAKOCI
   SEGA NI KILA

TAUKENI NI I YAU VAKAVITI

NA CAVA NA NOMUNI VAKASAMA BALETA NA KENA TAQOMAKI NA NODA I YAU VAKAVANUA?
NA CAVA E DODONU ME CAKA ME TAQOMAKI KINA?

NA CAVA E DODONU ME CAKAVA NA TABANA NI IYAU MAROROI (MUSEUM) ENA TABANA QO?

NA KENA KAU LESU NAI YAU/REPATRIATION

NA CAVA NA NOMUNI NANUMA ME BALETA NA VOSA NA “REPATRIATION”, SE NA KAU LESU TALE KI VITI NA NODAI YAU MAI NA VALE NI YAU MAROROI MI NA VEIYASAI VURAVURA?

O NI KILA BEKA NI BIBI NA KENA KAU TALE YANI KI VITI NA NODAI YAU MAKAWA KA RA SA TU E VANUA TANI, SE E VINAKA CAKE ME RA MAROROI TU GA MAI VAVALAGI? Solia mai na nomuni nanuma…

O NI SA BAU ROGOCA BEKA ENA DUA NA GAUNA NA KENA KAU LESU KI VITI ESO NAI YAU MAKAWA MAI VALAGI?
NA CAVA NA NOMUNI NANUMA ENA VAKADIDIKE AU CAKAVA TIKO OQO, ENA YAGA BEKA VEI KEMUNI NAI TAUKEI E VITI ENA KENA KILAI NA VANUA ERA TU KINA NAI YAU VAKAVITI ENA VEIYASAI VURAVURA?

E DUA TALE NA KA O VIA VAKAMACALATAKA ME BALETA NA VAKADIDIKE OQO?

VINAKA VAKALEVU NA NOMUNI VAKAITAVI ENA VAKADIDIKE OQO

Vinaka vakalevu
Tarisi Vunidilo

**Primary Supervisor:** Dr. Steven Ratuva  
Email Address: [s.ratuva@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:s.ratuva@auckland.ac.nz)  
Phone Number: 373 7599 extn. 88618

**Co-Supervisor:** Dr. Hugh Leracy  
Email Address: [h.leracy@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:h.leracy@auckland.ac.nz)  
Phone Number: 373 7599 ext. 86992

**Head of Department:** Walter Fraser  
Email Address: [w.fraser@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:w.fraser@auckland.ac.nz)  
Phone Number: 373 7599 extn. 88983

For Ethical concerns contact: The Chair, The University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee, The University of Auckland, Level 3, 76 Symonds Street, Private Bag 92019, Auckland. Tel: 373 7599 extn. 83711
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CONSENT FORM FOR ACADEMICS-FIJI
THIS FORM WILL BE HELD FOR A PERIOD OF 6 YEARS

Project title: I YAU VAKAVITI-FIJIAN TREASURES IN MUSEUMS: A study of Museums and Repatriation

Name of Researcher: Tarisi Vunidilo

I have read the Participant Information Sheet, have understood the nature of the research and why I have been selected. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered to my satisfaction.

- I agree to take part in this research
- I understand that participation in filling in the questionnaire will take at least an hour
- I understand that I am free to stop filling in the questionnaire at any time, and do not have to answer any question that I do not want to respond to.
- I agree to any interview be audio taped.
- I wish/do not wish to receive the summary of the findings.
- I agree to not disclose anything discussed in the questionnaire.
- I understand that while every effort will be made to protect my identity in the research findings, there is a chance that I could be identified.
- I agree to respect the confidentiality of the questionnaire and/or any subsequent interviews and to not talk about any discussion to others.
• I understand that only the researcher will transcribe the questionnaire or any taped interviews.

• I understand that data will be kept for 6 years after which if I agree the audio tapes will be kept in the National Archives of Fiji and the University of Auckland.

Name: __________________________

Signature: _______________________  Date: ______________________

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE ON MAY 31, 2013 FOR (3) YEARS REFERENCE NUMBER 9608/2013

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

Project Title:
I YAU VAKAVITI-FIJIAN TREASURES IN MUSEUMS: A study of Museums and Repatriation

Name of the Researcher: Tarisi Vunidilo
My name Tarisi Vunidilo and I am currently enrolled as a PhD student in the Pacific Studies Department at the University of Auckland. I am also teaching part-time at the Pacific Studies Department since 2012.

About the project and an invitation
The purpose of this study is to find out more about the issue of appropriation and repatriation of Pacific cultural artifacts. Fiji collections are the focus of my study. Many Fijian artifacts are kept in overseas museums for many years and in this research, I am interested to study how these artifacts were appropriated, how they are currently managed and how they can be repatriated.

Should you accept this invitation you will become part of my research on the topic of museum collections and repatriation. The time estimate of filling in the questionnaire will take at least one hour (or less). This questionnaire will explore reasons as to how artifacts were taken out of Fiji, and how can they be returned if an opportunity arises.

How your stories will be used
Your participation is entirely voluntary. Your stories in this form will then become part of the data of this project. I would prefer to audio tape the stories/conversations but this would only be done with your consent. If you do take part you will be offered the opportunity to edit the transcripts of the recordings if you desire.

All questionnaires, audio and transcripts of all the sessions will be stored at the University premises for a period of 6 years in a locked cabinet. After that participants will be contacted to see if they agree to the tapes being held by the National Archives of Fiji and at the University of Auckland. The tapes and talanoa materials will be treated as confidential. Only my supervisor and I will have access to this material.

Right to Withdraw from Participation
You are free to withdraw from participation in this project at any time and you can request that any data that is related to you be withdrawn up to June 30, 2014 after which the final report will be written.

Anonymity and Confidentiality
All the information you provide in the questionnaire is strictly confidential and you will not be named in the thesis unless you expressly indicate to the contrary. However, due to your social position in society and social relationships, some may be able to identify you. All this will be explained to you prior to signing the consent form so that you are fully informed of any consequences if you do sign.

Vinaka vakalevu
Primary Supervisor: Dr Steven Ratuva
Email Address: s.ratuva@auckland.ac.nz
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Co-Supervisor: Dr Dr Hugh Leracy
Email Address: h.leracy@auckland.ac.nz
Phone Number: +64 9 373 7599 ext. 86992

Head of Department: Walter Fraser
Email Address: w.fraser@auckland.ac.nz
Phone Number: +64 9 373 7599 extn. 88983

For Ethical concerns contact: The Chair, The University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee, The University of Auckland, Level 3, 76 Symonds Street, Private Bag 92019, Auckland. Tel 373 7599 extn. 83711

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE ON May 31, 2013 for 3 years on May 31, 2016. Reference Number 9608/2013
### APPENDIX D: List of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sagale Buadromo</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Museum staff</td>
<td>Dec 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratu Sela Rayawa</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Museum staff</td>
<td>Dec 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sepeti Matararaba</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Museum staff</td>
<td>Dec 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adi Niqa Tuvuki</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Museum staff</td>
<td>Dec 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mereia Lesi</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Museum staff</td>
<td>Dec 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuliana Druava</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Museum staff</td>
<td>Dec 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apolonia Tamata</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Government dept</td>
<td>Dec 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sipiriano Nemani</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Government dept</td>
<td>Dec 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adi Meretui Ratunabuabua</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Regional Organisation</td>
<td>Nov 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Paul Geraghty</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Regional Organisation</td>
<td>Mar 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sekove Bigitibau</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Regional Organisation</td>
<td>Feb 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Frances Vakauta</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Regional Organisation</td>
<td>Jan 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Vusoniwailala</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Fijian community</td>
<td>Mar 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratu Joni Madraiwiwi</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Fijian community</td>
<td>Mar 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratu Suliano Matanitobua</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Fijian community</td>
<td>Apr 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sachiko Soro</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Fijian community</td>
<td>Apr 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambert Ho</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Fijian community</td>
<td>Apr 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selai Buasala</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Fijian community</td>
<td>Apr 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finau Mara</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Fijian community</td>
<td>Apr 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Liga</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Fijian community</td>
<td>Apr 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Steven Hooper</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Museum staff</td>
<td>June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fergus Clunie</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Museum staff</td>
<td>June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Anita Herle</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Museum staff</td>
<td>June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucie Carreau</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Museum staff</td>
<td>June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Carteral</td>
<td>United Kingdom/France</td>
<td>Museum staff</td>
<td>June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana Lavekau</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Fijian Community</td>
<td>Mar 16 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asena Liganimeke</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Fijian Community</td>
<td>Apr 15 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laisa Ratubalavu</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Fijian Community</td>
<td>Mar 28 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miriama Kaci</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Fijian Community</td>
<td>Mar 27 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Carol Mayer</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Museum staff</td>
<td>Feb 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April Ingram</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Mar 9 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Le Blanc</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Simon Fraser University</td>
<td>Dec 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. David Burley</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Simon Fraser University</td>
<td>Dec 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Steiner</td>
<td>Canada/USA</td>
<td>Museum staff</td>
<td>Dec 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanise Vulaca</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Fijian Community</td>
<td>Jan 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maciu Macanawai</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Fijian Community</td>
<td>Jan 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk Huffman</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Museum staff</td>
<td>Apr 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dion Peita</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Museum staff</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sana Balai</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Museum staff</td>
<td>Apr 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelma Vuki</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Fijian community</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod Ewin</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailasa Tora</td>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>Fijian community</td>
<td>Jan 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levani Vosasi</td>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>Fijian community</td>
<td>Jan 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joana Monolagi</td>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>Fijian community</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulaya Vukicea</td>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>Fijian community</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Akatsuki Takahashi</td>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>Regional organisation</td>
<td>Nov 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Allison Ramsay</td>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>University of West Indies</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Taulapapa</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Contemporary Artist</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Tahinao</td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>Government dept (culture)</td>
<td>Nov 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulupaki Ika</td>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>Government dept (culture)</td>
<td>Nov 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natan Itonga</td>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>Government dept (culture)</td>
<td>Nov 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alamai Sioni</td>
<td>Tuvalu</td>
<td>Government dept (culture)</td>
<td>Nov 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL : 51**