MAORI ART IN AMERICA:
THE DISPLAY AND COLLECTION HISTORY OF MAORI ART IN THE UNITED STATES, 1802-2006

by

JENNIFER WAGELIE

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Art History
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York

2007

UMI Number: 3283178

Copyright 2007 by
Wagelie, Jennifer

All rights reserved.

UMI Microform 3283178
Copyright 2008 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

©2007

JENNIFER WAGELIE

All Rights Reserved

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Art History in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

4/27/07
Date

Professor George A. Corbin
Chair of Examining Committee

4/27/07
Date

Professor Kevin Murphy
Executive Officer

Professor Eloise Quiñones-Keber

Professor Sally Webster

Dr. Adrienne L. Kaeppler
Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Abstract

MAORI ART IN AMERICA:
THE DISPLAY AND COLLECTION HISTORY OF MAORI ART IN THE UNITED STATES, 1802-2006

by

Jennifer Wagelie

Advisor: Professor George A. Corbin

This dissertation provides the first comprehensive study of the collection, exhibition, installation, and reception of Maori art in the United States. It begins with the first accession in the early nineteenth-century and ends with twenty-first century permanent installations. While focusing on Maori art exclusively, this study more broadly reveals how the art of non-Western cultures has been collected and presented within American institutions, be it an ethnographic, natural history, university, or art museum. Methodologically, the approach to this study is both historiographic and comparative, relying heavily on primary source material including archival documents, museum guidebooks and annual reports, and object and installation photographs.

PREFACE

The research for this dissertation was begun in January 2002 and finished in May 2003. The information provided in this study was completely dependent on the levels of record keeping of each individual museum, as well as my abilities to navigate the varying archival and collection systems of ten institutions, as well as various special collections and libraries.

The reader will notice that the English name for each object is used primarily, with the Maori name in parenthesis and italicized. This choice was made for a number of reasons. The first is because the study is written for an American university with a panel of primarily English-speaking readers, many unfamiliar with Maori terminology. Additionally, the choice to italicize Maori names is based on the standard style manual (Kate Turabian) used for dissertations at the CUNY Graduate Center. The Maori names that are used are taken from the most recent exhibition catalogue of Maori art published in 1998 and edited by D.C. Starzecka.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

With a project of this magnitude, the list of thanks is long and heartfelt. Of utmost importance is in thanking my dissertation advisor, Professor George A. Corbin, who was the mastermind behind fusing my two loves of Maori art and institutional history into a sound dissertation that was a true labor of love. A human bibliography, Professor Corbin assisted me as all good dissertation advisors should, providing enormous amounts of support, understanding, and empathy, accompanied by the occasional and sometimes needed, tough love. He is not only an admirable scholar, but also a wonderful and dedicated teacher. I am deeply indebted.

I would also like to thank my second and third readers, Professors Eloise Quinones-Keber and Sally Webster, who both carefully read my dissertation, providing excellent feedback and food for thought. As readers outside the field of Pacific art, their comments were invaluable in making this project into something understandable by all specialists.

A note of special thanks goes to Dr. Adrienne L. Kaeppler. Always at the ready to answer any questions, provide articles and photographs, as well as countless meals at various Thai restaurants in the greater Washington, DC area, Adrienne is a scholar who as a young graduate student I admired greatly and now cannot believe my good fortune in counting her as both a mentor and a friend.

At the CUNY Graduate Center, I would like to thank former executive officer of the Ph.D. program in art history, Professor Patricia Mainardi for her guidance during her

tenure, as well as current executive officer Professor Kevin Murphy for displaying much compassion during the editing and depositing process of the final draft.

My time at the Graduate Center would not have been the same if I had never made the acquaintance of Lauren Frederick-Bowen, former program assistant extraordinaire whose support was unending and periodic *General Hospital* updates always welcome. Lauren is someone I will always call a friend and feel blessed to do so. I would also like to thank Sandylene Wakefield, an assistant in the program office, who was always willing to lend a hand and never complained when I asked her every semester for my banner ID number. I would also like to thank Linda Perrotta, Matthew Schoengood and Ellen Burns for employing me at the Graduate Center at various times throughout my coursework.

From my undergraduate institution the University of Arizona, I would like to thank my teachers Professors Pia Cunio and the late Jane Welch Williams, as well as my advisor Professor Sarah Moore who is one of my biggest fans and I am one of hers. Without Sarah's encouragement, I never would have had the nerve to go to graduate school in New York, and for that, I'm eternally grateful.

In 1997, when I moved from Tucson, Arizona to New York City for graduate school, I only knew one person. I'm now coming out of graduate school with wonderful colleagues and very good friends. I'd like to thank Rich Aste, Kelly Baker, Preston Bautista, Emily Caglayan, Celeste Donovan, Sarah Kate Gillespie, Jamie Johnson, Todd Magreta, Margaret Connors McQuade, Elizabeth Moran, and Ruth Anne Phillips for their collegiality and good cheer. To Melissa Bell, Angela Herren, Karen Lemmey, and Rachel Levy – you are my East Coast sisters and very best friends. How can I ever thank you?

To complete a dissertation concerning institutional history, one must rely heavily on the kindness of institutions, which I universally received. At the Peabody Essex Museum, I'd like to thank Christina Hellmich and Christine Michilini, for their assistance in understanding the amazing Maori collection in Salem, and to their neighbors at the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, I'd like to thank Susan Haskell, Patricia Kervick, and Tricia Capone. At the American Museum of Natural History, I am indebted to Paul Belitz and Kristin Mable in the department of anthropology, as well as the helpful staff of both the library and photographic archives. At the Metropolitan Museum of Art, I'd like to thank Eric Kjellgren for not only assisting me with the research regarding *Te Maori*, but also giving me the opportunity to work on the *Timeline of Art History* project. At the Goldwater Library, thanks go to the amazing Ross Day and lovely Joy Garnett. At the Brooklyn Museum of Art, I had the good fortune of meeting and for many years working with Bill Siegmann, who allowed me unprecedented access to curatorial files and photographs.

Outside of New York, I'd like to again thank Adrienne Kaeppler, for all of her assistance in understanding the collection at the National Museum of Natural History. Additionally, I'd like to thank Felicia Pickering at the Museum Support Center for spending days with me in the collections taking photographs, as well as the staffs at both the National Anthropological Archives and Smithsonian Archives. Michael at the SI photographic services deserves a special mention for the great compassion he showed towards a poor graduate student in need of photographs.

At Penn, I'd like to thank Alex Pezzati, who knows the archives in and out and was extraordinarily gracious and kind. I'd also like to thank Mike Gunn at the St. Louis

Art Museum for extending such courtesy in my quest to learn more about the collection there. The same thanks go to Roy Hamilton at the UCLA Fowler Museum.

Given the enormity of their collection, the Field Museum in Chicago exhibited what my mom would describe as real Midwestern hospitality. I was there for two straight weeks and their entire staff was indescribably helpful and kind. I would like to personally thank Chris Phillipps, Dorren Martin-Ross, Armand Esai, Jerice Barrios and Steve Nash for their willingness to help me with every request for anything Maori. I'd also like to thank John Terrell for our conversations; especially those regarding *Te Maori* helped me shape my understanding of that watershed exhibition. While in Chicago, I also visited the archives at the Art Institute of Chicago, where Bart Ryschoback was both gracious and helpful.

My last research stop was in Honolulu, Hawaii and at the Bishop Museum. So many thanks go to Betty Kam and her incredible staff who were such a delight to work with, as was the library staff and Charley Meyers in photographic archives, who made sure that even though there was an earthquake on the Big Island, I still received the photograph I needed.

In addition to the various staff members at institutions across the U.S., I'd also like to thank the staff at the Library of Congress, which became my home away from home – desk number 192 served me well.

While writing the bulk of this dissertation, I was also working full-time in the department of academic programs at the National Gallery of Art. What might seem like a dissertation death sentence to some was an absolute blessing for me, in no small part because of Dr. Faya Causey. A boss, a mentor, and a friend, Faya has been my biggest

champion, providing me with the most sage advice. Words cannot describe how enormously grateful I am to her, as well as to associate head Ana Maria Kozuch – they both deserve much of the credit in seeing this dissertation to the end. I'd also like to thank my former co-worker Allison Benedetti, for all of her love and support, as well as my new co-worker Ali Peil, for her general good cheer.

In addition to my co-workers in the department of academic programs, I have many other people to thank at the National Gallery of Art. Lynn Russell, the head of the division of education, deserves a note of thanks for supporting my studies. I'd also like to thank Caroline Weaver for her eagle-eyed editing, Rio DeNaro for her help with my gazillion illustrations, and Suzy Sarraf for all technical issues. I would also like to thank Lamia Doumato in reader services for providing me with my own spot in the library to study, as well as Ted Dalziel and Tom McGill in the inter-library loan department for their help in getting me books from far-flung places. I could not have been more fortunate than to work in the institution where the seminal 1979 *Art of the Pacific Islands* exhibition was held. Mark Leithauser and Rob Shelley in the department of design and installation were generous with their knowledge and time in assisting me to better understand the exhibition, as were Maygene Daniels and Michele Willens in Gallery Archives, who assisted me in retrieving key exhibition photographs.

I'd like to thank friends and colleagues in New Zealand who have been so supportive of my work. On my initial trip to the Pacific, I had the good fortune of meeting Megan Tamati-Quennell and Janet Davidson, the latter who gave me the sage advice that the dissertation was only the stepping stone, not my life's work. I'd also like to thank Deidre Brown, who was always so kind, helpful, as was Roger Neich, whose

work I have long admired and whom I had the good fortune of meeting at the PAA conference in Salem, MA. I'd also like to thank colleagues Jade Baker, Conal McCarthy, and Huhanna Smith who at different times offered different points of view I never would have been aware of working in the United States.

I'd like to end by thanking my family – my four sisters, four brothers-in-law, four nieces, and three nephews – Becky, Beth, Amy, Meredith, Scott, Pat, Paul, Erik, Audrey, Madelyn, Lola, Marlowe, Kye, Charlie, and Henry – respectively, for just being them – for always talking to me on the phone when I was so clearly procrastinating, or for offering alternating encouragement, congratulations, or a shoulder to cry on. I never would have been able to do this without my family.

This leads me to a new member of my family, my lovely fiancé Harvey Stark. We started dating in the midst of finishing my dissertation and strangely enough still wanted to marry me. He has been everything to me, providing all kinds of love, understanding, and comfort. I can't wait to marry him – I know we will have a lovely life together.

My final thanks are to my parents, Reuben and Sandi Wagelie - to whom this dissertation is dedicated. They have never said anything was impossible – majoring in art history, wanting to pursue a Ph.D., moving to New York, needing to go to New Zealand to see if that's what I wanted to study… Any successes I have are because of them. They are two truly remarkable people who have provided their five daughters with infinite supplies of love and compassion. The world is a far better place because they are in it.

CONTENTS

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

"Catalogue of Maori Artefacts in the Museums of Canada and the United States of America," *Bulletin of the Auckland Institute and Museum*, n. 12 (1982), pl. 217a.

Fig. 1.36: "William Oldman with some of his larger Maori, African, North-West Coast Indian, and Asian sculptures by the stairway in his home at Poynders Road, Clapham Park, London," n.d. in Roger Neich and Janet Davidson, " William O. Oldman: The Man and his Collection," in *The Oldman Collection of Maori Artifacts: New Edition of Polynesian Society Memoir 14 by W.O. Oldman*. Auckland: The Polynesian Society (2004), vi.

Fig. 1.37: Gatepost (P2244). Collection of the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology in David R. Simmons, "Catalogue of Maori Artefacts in the Museums of Canada and the United States of America," *Bulletin of the Auckland Institute and Museum*, n. 12 (1982), pl. 230b.

Fig. 1.38: Pendant, *hei-tiki* (P2317). Collection of the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology in David R. Simmons, "Catalogue of Maori Artefacts in the Museums of Canada and the United States of America," *Bulletin of the Auckland Institute and Museum*, n. 12 (1982), pl. 211a.

Fig. 2.01: Head (48301). Collection of the Field Museum. Photo by the author, 2002.

Fig. 2.02: Image (48297). Collection of the Field Museum. Photo by the author, 2002.

Fig. 2.03: Ward's Natural Science Establishment display at the World's Columbian Exposition, 1893. Collection of the American Museum of Natural History, photographic archives.

Fig. 2.04: Doorway and lintel, *pare* (29:58/59 a/b/c). Collection of University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology. Photo by the author, 2003.

Fig. 2.05a/b/c: Carved wooden picture frame (2003.1.2663). Collection of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University. Photo by the author, 2003. Copyright 2007: President and Fellows of Harvard College.

Fig. 2.06: Canoe stern (5,535). Collection of the M.H. De Young Memorial Museum in *Traditional Art of Africa Oceania and the Americas* by Jane Powell Dwyer and Edward Bridgman Dwyer. San Francisco: The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco (1973), 33.

Fig. 2.07: Figure, (5,523). Collection of the M.H. De Young Memorial Museum in *Traditional Art of Africa Oceania and the Americas* by Jane Powell Dwyer and Edward Bridgman Dwyer. San Francisco: The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco (1973), 37.

Fig. 2.08: Figure of Kotuwhaka Iriora, (5,522). Collection of the M.H. De Young Memorial Museum in *Traditional Art of Africa Oceania and the Americas* by Jane

Powell Dwyer and Edward Bridgman Dwyer. San Francisco: The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco (1973), 38.

Fig. 2.09: Maori manikin, ca. 1895. Collection of the National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution.

Fig. 2.10: Interior of New Zealand exhibition in the Department of Forestry and Game, Louisiana Purchase Exposition, 1904 from "New Zealand at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition, 1904," in *History of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition* edited by Mark Bennitt. St. Louis: Universal Exposition Publishing Company, (1905), np.

Fig. 2.11: Louis Steele and Charles Goldie, *The Arrival of the Maori in New Zealand*, 1898, oil on canvas, 53 x 126 ¾ inches, Auckland City Art Gallery, presented by George and Helen Boyd in Leonard Bell, "The Representation of the Maori by European Artists in New Zealand, ca. 1890-1914," *Art Journal*, vol. 42, no. 2, (Summer, 1990), 143.

Fig. 2.12: Cloak, *kaitaka* (88521), detail. Collection of the Field Museum. Photo by the author, 2002.

Fig. 2.13: *Young Woman in Feather Robe with Feathers in Hair on Woven Mat Near Carved Pou Pou (Ancestral Panels),* 1903. Collection of the National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution.

Fig. 2.14: *Two Young Women Showing Method of Cooking with Woven Mats In Steam Hole*, n.d. Collection of the National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution.

Fig. 2.15: Rafter Decoration Patterns 1 and 3, n.d. Photomechanical. Collection of the National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution.

Fig. 2.16: "*The twenty-nine kowhaiwhai designs published in Hamilton's book* Maori Art*, identified by their* Maori Art *number*," in Roger Neich, *Painted Histories*, (Auckland: University of Auckland Press, 2001 (reprinted)), 30.

Fig. 2.17: "Ceremonial entrance to the inner Pa, created by Neke Kapua and his sons at the Colonial Museum, Wellington, specifically for Te Araiteuru. Two cemetery Posts from Ruato stand in the foreground*,"* Photo by James McDonald, Collection of the Museum of New Zealand/Te Papa Tongarewa, C.001665. from Bernard Kernot's "Maoriland Metaphors and the Model Pa," in *Farewell Colonialism: The New Zealand International Exhibition Christchurch, 1906-07*. Palmerston North: The Dunmore Printing Company Ltd. (1998), 65.

Fig. 2.18: "Dominion of New Zealand Building," Panama-Pacific International Exposition, 1915. San Francisco Historical Photograph Collection, San Francisco Public Library.

Fig. 3.31a: Canoe prow, *pītau* style (80.0.2898), Collection of the American Museum of Natural History. Photo by the author, 2003.

Fig: 3.31b: Canoe prow side view in David R. Simmons, "Catalogue of Maori Artefacts in the Museums of Canada and the United States of America," *Bulletin of the Auckland Institute and Museum*, n. 12 (1982), pl. 183.

Fig. 3.32a/b/c: Treasure box, *papahou* (80.1-1638ab). Collection of the American Museum of Natural History. Photo by the author, 2003.

Fig. 3.33: Puppet, *karetao* (80.1-1652). Collection of the American Museum of Natural History. Photo by the author, 2003.

Fig. 3.34: Figure, (80.1-1642). Collection of the American Museum of Natural History. Photo by the author, 2003.

Fig. 3.35: Gable mask, (80.1-1647). Collection of the American Museum of Natural History. Photo by the author, 2003.

Fig. 3.36: South Sea Island Hall, 1911. American Museum of Natural History, Photographic Archives.

Fig. 3.37: Sketch of South Seas Hall by Margaret Mead, circa. 1928-1930. From Margaret Mead Papers, Box K18, Folder: South Sea Hall. Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.

Fig. 3.38: "Index plan for Fourth Floor of Museum," in Roy Waldo Miner, *Exhibition Halls of the American Museum of Natural History.* New York: American Museum of Natural History (1939), 19.

Fig. 3.39: "Maori –canoes" case. American Museum of Natural History, Division of Anthropology Archives.

Fig. 3.40: "Maori –canoes" case. American Museum of Natural History, Division of Anthropology Archives.

Fig. 3.41:"Maori-carvings" case. American Museum of Natural History. Photo by the author, 2003.

Fig. 3.42: "Prestige Items" case. American Museum of Natural History. Photo by the author, 2003.

Fig. 3.43: "Maori-textiles case. American Museum of Natural History. Photo by the author, 2003.

States of America," *Bulletin of the Auckland Institute and Museum*, n. 12 (1982), pl. 198b.

Fig. 5.21: Model canoe prow (60.63). Collection of The Metropolitan Museum of Art in David R. Simmons, "Catalogue of Maori Artefacts in the Museums of Canada and the United States of America," *Bulletin of the Auckland Institute and Museum*, n. 12 (1982), pl. 202a.

Fig. 5.22: Model canoe prow (56.98). Collection of The Metropolitan Museum of Art in David R. Simmons, "Catalogue of Maori Artefacts in the Museums of Canada and the United States of America," *Bulletin of the Auckland Institute and Museum*, n. 12 (1982), pl. 202b.

Fig. 5.23: Installation view, The Metropolitan Museum of Art. Photo by the author, 2003.

Fig. 5.24: Installation view, The Metropolitan Museum of Art. Photo by the author, 2003.

Fig. 5.25: Installation view, The Metropolitan Museum of Art. Photo by the author, 2003.

Fig. 5.26: Installation view, The Metropolitan Museum of Art. Photo by the author, 2003.

Fig. 5.27: "Distribution of Basic Trends in Oceanic Art," in Ralph Linton and Paul Wingert, *Arts of the South* Seas The Museum of Modern Art: New York, (1946), 9.

Fig. 5.28: Installation view of the exhibition, "Arts of the South Seas." The Museum of Modern Art, New York. January 29 through May 19, 1946. René d'Harnoncourt Papers, IX.A.40. The Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York. Digital Image © The Museum of Modern Art/Licensed by SCALA/Art Resource, NY

Fig. 5.29: Installation view of the exhibition, "Arts of the South Seas." The Museum of Modern Art, New York. January 29 through May 19, 1946. René d'Harnoncourt Papers, IX.A.40. The Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York. Digital Image © The Museum of Modern Art/Licensed by SCALA/Art Resource, NY

Fig. 5.30: Floor plan, *The Sculpture of Polynesia*, The Art Institute of Chicago, 1967 in John Vinci, "The Art of Installation," in *A. James Speyer Architect Curator Exhibition Designer*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, (1997), 90.

Fig. 5.31: Installation view, *The Sculpture of Polynesia*, The Art Institute of Chicago, 1967 in John Vinci, "The Art of Installation," in *A. James Speyer Architect Curator Exhibition Designer*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, (1997), 90.

Fig. 5.32: The Art of the Pacific Islands July 1, 1979-Feb. 17, 1980, Installation, National Gallery of Art, Washington D.C., Department of Design and Installation.

Fig. 5.33: The Art of the Pacific Islands July 1, 1979-Feb. 17, 1980, Installation, National Gallery of Art, Washington D.C., Gallery Archives.

Fig. 5.34: The Art of the Pacific Islands July 1, 1979-Feb. 17, 1980, Installation, National Gallery of Art, Washington D.C., Gallery Archives

Fig. 5.35: Museum Views, Special Exhibition, "Te Maori: Maori Art from New Zealand Collections", 1984 **The Metropolitan Museum of Art**. Image © **The Metropolitan Museum of Art.**

Fig. 5.36: Museum Views, Special Exhibition, "Te Maori: Maori Art from New Zealand Collections", 1984 **The Metropolitan Museum of Art**. Image © **The Metropolitan Museum of Art.**

Fig. 5.37: *Pukeora* being carried up the steps into The Metropolitan Museum of Art in Hirini Moko Mead, *Magnificent Te Maori: Te Maori Whakahirahira*, Auckland: Heinemann (1986), 8.

Fig. 5.38: Museum Views, Special Exhibition, "Te Maori: Maori Art from New Zealand Collections", 1984 **The Metropolitan Museum of Art**. Image © **The Metropolitan Museum of Art.**

Fig. 5.39: Museum Views, Special Exhibition, "Te Maori: Maori Art from New Zealand Collections", 1984 **The Metropolitan Museum of Art**. Image © **The Metropolitan Museum of Art.**

Fig. 5.40: Museum Views, Special Exhibition, "Te Maori: Maori Art from New Zealand Collections", 1984 **The Metropolitan Museum of Art**. Image © **The Metropolitan Museum of Art.**

Fig. 5.41: Museum Views, Special Exhibition, "Te Maori: Maori Art from New Zealand Collections", 1984 **The Metropolitan Museum of Art**. Image © **The Metropolitan Museum of Art.**

Fig. 5.42: Museum Views, Special Exhibition, "Te Maori: Maori Art from New Zealand Collections", 1984 **The Metropolitan Museum of Art**. Image © **The Metropolitan Museum of Art.**

Fig. 5.43: Dawn ceremony at the opening of *Te Maori* in Hirini Moko Mead, *Magnificent Te Maori: Te Maori Whakahirahira*, Auckland: Heinemann (1986), 14.

Fig. 5.44: Maori Arts and Crafts Institute, Rotorua, New Zealand. Photo by the author, 1999.

INTRODUCTION

This dissertation provides the first comprehensive study of the collection, exhibition installation, and reception of Maori art in the United States. It begins with the first accession in the early nineteenth-century to twenty-first century permanent installations. While focusing on Maori art exclusively, this study more broadly reveals how the art of non-Western cultures has been collected and presented within American institutions, be it an ethnographic, natural history, university, or art museum.

The genesis for this study was borne out of a long-standing interest in institutional history that was combined with a scholarly and aesthetic interest in Maori art. A seemingly strange combination of two disparate fields had been previously linked together by the landmark 1984 exhibition, *Te Maori: Maori Art from New Zealand Museums* at the Metropolitan Museum of Art - an exhibition that forever changed the landscape of the display and publication of work on Maori art and the future make-up of the museum profession in New Zealand. While *Te Maori* provided the initial inspiration for this study, upon further examination, a connection between Maori art and its institutional history in the United States was revealed dating 182 years before the landmark exhibition opened to the public.

The History of the Study of Maori Art

Unlike central or western Polynesia, where much of the art was destroyed by early nineteenth-century missionaries, Maori art survived much laterand continues to be made today, accounting for the high number of objects in collections in both the United States and abroad. This is also reflected in the fact that while the discipline of Oceanic art history is a relatively young field, more scholarly literature has been devoted to the field of Maori art than any other area in Polynesia. This assertion was documented in a 1990 publication by anthropologists Allan and Louise Hanson, "The Eye of the Beholder: A Short History of the Study of Maori Art," (based on a paper presented at the 1984 Pacific Arts Association International symposium. The article is an extension of a paper they presented at the 1984 Pacific Arts Association symposium, and based on research presented in their 1984 bibliography, *The Art of Oceania: a Bibliography*. Of the 6,650 entries in their bibliography, 816 deal with Maori art either, "exclusively or substantially."[1] The scholarship is divided into two categories; literature that focuses on the history of a single object and on specific museum collections and literature that discusses the history of Maori art, its style and iconography. The popularity of scholarship focusing on the Maori is the result.

---

[1] Allan Hanson and Louise Hanson, "The Eye of the Beholder: A Short History of the Study of Maori Art," in *Art and Identity in Oceania* eds. Allan Hanson and Louise Hanson, (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press), 1990: 184.

Review of the Literature/Sources

In terms of broader writings on Maori art, those publications include Augustus Hamilton's 1901 *Maori Art*; Terrence Barrow's 1964 *The Decorative Arts of the New Zealand Maori:* as well as in a more recent oceanic art survey such as Gathercole, Kaeppler, and Newton's *Oceanic Art;* and the catalogues to major Oceanic and Maori exhibitions such as; *Arts of the South Seas* in 1946, *The Sculpture of Polynesia* in 1967; *The Art of the Pacific Islands* in 1979, *Te Maori: Maori Art from New Zealand Collections* in 1984, and most recently the British Museum's *Maori Art* in 1998.

Additionally, many important compilations, lists, surveys, and catalogues regarding Oceanic and Maori art published in the last 35 years has facilitated the completion of this dissertation. Of the compilations and lists, both the 1982 publication of *Catalogue of Maori Artefacts in the Museums of Canada and the United States* by David Simmons and the 1985 *Pacific Island and Australian Aboriginal Artifacts in Public Collections in the United States of America and Canada* in 1985 were essential to this study. It was Simmons' catalogue that provided a road map for this dissertation, identifying what museums in the U.S. and Canada have Maori objects, listing them by state, city, and museum. Each entry includes a brief synopsis of the museum or the major donors, dealers, or collectors that contributed to the collection, as well as a select number of plates illustrating individual objects. Both of these publications are excellent sources that have established where the objects are and are an excellent first step to understanding the institutional history of Maori art in the United States.

In terms of museological studies, 1984, the year the Hansons' bibliography was published is an important date in the history for not only Maori art, but also non-Western art, in the United States. In 1984 museums in New York were accused of going, "tribal," as it was the year when *Te Maori* opened at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, as well as the *Primitivism in 20th-Century Art* exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art. The years afterward mark a period of scholarship when many scholars were thinking about exhibiting cultures and displaying non-Western art and in turn were publishing works that focused on those topics. Some publications of note include; *Objects and Others: Essays on Museums and Material Culture*, edited by George Stocking Jr. and published in 1985; Susan Vogel's groundbreaking exhibition and catalogue, *Art/Artifact: African Art in Anthropology Collections* in 1988; Ivan Karp and Steven D. Levine's 1991 publication, *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*; Michael Ames' *Cannibal Tours and Glass Boxes: The Anthropology of Museums* in 1992; Sally Price's 1989 *Primitive Art in Civilized Places;* Adrienne Kaeppler and Amy Henderson's *Exhibiting Dilemmas: Issues of Representation at the Smithsonian* in 1997; *The Politics of Display: Museums, Science, Culture* edited by Sharon Macdonald; Shelley Errington's *The Death of Authentic Primitive Art and Other Tales of Progress,* and Barbara Kirschenblatt-Gimblett's *Destination Culture: Tourism, Museums, and Heritage*, both published in 1998; and H. Glenn Penny's 2002 publication *Objects of Culture: Ethnology and Ethnographic Museums in Imperial Germany*, to name but a few.

All of these publications are important contributions to the dialogue regarding the display of non-Western objects, but none take the approach that has been carried out in this study – that is, to choose a culture and tell the history of its collection and display

based on archival documentation and photographs – which in turn narrates the story of American museums' display and collection of non-Western art. Much of this work pits the natural history museum against the art museum creating a scholarly atmosphere that privileges one mode of display over another, with the art museum seemingly lending more credibility to the objects by calling them art, and in turn, raising the makers of those objects to a higher status. This is the crux of this dissertation and one of the major issues to be addressed: by looking at the primary sources of the major US natural history museums, was it true that objects were treated differently than in their art institution counterparts? Extensive research has shown that this was obviously untrue.

There are two contemporary scholars, Conal McCarthy and Amiria Henare, both working on Maori topics that have tangential fields of study to the approach in this dissertation. McCarthy's recent dissertation completed in 2004, "From Curio to Taonga: A Genealogy of Display at New Zealand's National Museum, 1865 – 2001," (2004) and the topic of a forthcoming book deals with the history of the National Museum in Wellington, from its beginning as the Dominion Museum to it current incarnation, *Te Papa Tongarewa*. We share a mutual admiration for world's fairs and McCarthy has completed groundbreaking work in the history of fairs in New Zealand. Henare has recently published her first book entitled, *Museums, Anthropology, and Imperial Exchange* (2005) that looks at the collection history and exchanges between New Zealand and Scotland. This brings us to the present day and the current trend toward scholarship that has brought us to narratives rather than histories and returned to a close looking at and reading of the objects.

The Dissertation Project

The chapters of this dissertation are presented mostly in a chronological order, based on a system of cross-referencing the founding date of each institution or world's fair with when their first accession of Maori art took place. The first chapter, "Early Explorers, Expeditions, and Ethnography," provides the basic structure for the succeeding chapters. It begins with an overview of European exploration of the Pacific, leading into an explanation of how Americans came to the Pacific in the early nineteenth-century. While there, American whalers and merchants collected souvenirs of their travels and upon their return donated them to local museums. The Peabody Essex Museum in Salem, Massachusetts is the site of the first accession of Maori art in the United States, occurring in 1802. This early date makes the overall collection at the Peabody Essex Museum the most historically significant in the United States and its objects are unique not only in age, but also in the extensive provenance that is attached to them. The museum's mission was based in both maritime and ethnographic histories and their displays provide glimpses into late nineteenth-century installation practices.

The remainder of chapter one focuses on the emergence of an uniquely American form of anthropology that emerged in some of the United States' premiere universities, namely Harvard University in Cambridge, Massachusetts and the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia. The scholarly discipline manifested itself in the universities' museums, the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology at Harvard University and the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology. Each museum's collection and display histories are examined, noting

interesting instances of trading Native American objects from American museums for Maori objects from New Zealand museums and the carefully documented correspondence between museums and ethnographic dealers.

The second chapter, "West of France and North of Australia: Maoris at the Fair, 1893-1914," focuses on the inclusion of Maori art in American world's fairs. Objects were either acquired through vendors or exhibits during the fair or disseminated, be it through donation or acquisition, to American museums after the fair was over. The chapter delves into the reasons for a Maori presence at the fairs that reveals a surprising result – that the New Zealand government used the Maori as a means of promoting New Zealand tourism to a world-wide audience, as opposed to a commonly held belief of using the Maori as a cultural foil, championing one race over another. It also pieces together the biography of T.E. Donne, a major figure in the history of Maori art in America. Discussed are the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago, the 1894 California Mid-Winter Exposition in San Francisco, the 1895 Cotton States and International Exposition in Atlanta, the 1904 Louisiana Purchase Exposition in St. Louis, and the 1915 Panama-Pacific International Exposition in San Francisco and details how objects displayed at the fairs were subsequently acquired or donated to major United States institutions. Those institutions include Chicago's Field Museum, the Smithsonian Institution's National Museum of Natural History, the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology at Harvard University, and the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology. By looking collectively at the objects that were on display, it is possible to reconstruct what the average American farmer, clergymen, carpenter, or

anthropologist – all visitors to the fair - may have learned about the Maori from 1893-1915.

Chapters three and four collectively discuss the extensive collection and display histories at four American natural history museums with significant collections of Maori art. Those institutions include; the Smithsonian Institution, National Museum of Natural History in Washington, D.C. , the American Museum of Natural History in New York, the Bernice P. Bishop Museum in Honolulu, and the Field Museum in Chicago.

During the period in and around the foundation of the United States' largest natural history museums in the late nineteenth-century, a number of parallel events were taking place in New Zealand. Augustus Hamilton's seminal work, *Maori Art,* was published in 1901 the same year the Maori Antiquities Act was legislated into New Zealand law – ensuring that it would no longer be possible for a "Maori antiquity" to leave the country without permission of the object's owners—those owners presumably being the Maori. In the same year, Hamilton partnered with Donne to establish a National Maori Museum, later becoming the Dominion Museum, now known as *Te Papa Tongarewa*, the National Museum of New Zealand, in Wellington. The events beg the question--what was it about this time period in New Zealand that saw all of these ways to preserve the integrity of Maori objects while America was building it's largest monuments to the achievements of nature, science, and man? Could all of these events merely be a coincidence?

Through the lens of archival documentation, the third and fourth chapters, like the first chapter, look at the collection history of each institution, followed by the history of their displays. By nature of their missions as natural history museums, these are the

institutions that hold the largest collections of Maori objects, exposing long and complicated histories. Documentation reveals that relationships were fostered by American curators with their counterparts in New Zealand and topics of discussion included the exchange of objects and accuracy of display. The Smithsonian's National Museum of Natural History's collection is primarily composed of objects collected on the United States government-sponsored Wilkes Expedition that traveled around the Pacific from 1838-42 and their display history highlights the advent of the use of "manikins" in installation practices. The American Museum of Natural History is notable for many of the personalities it employed, namely Franz Boas and Margaret Mead. While Boas' career at AMNH was short-lived, Mead's spanned close to fifty years, seeing the fruition of her efforts in the mounting of her *Hall of the Pacific Peoples* in 1971 that after its opening was heavily criticized and then quickly renovated.

Chapter four focuses on the collections and display of Maori art in Honolulu and Chicago. In Hawaii, the Bernice P. Bishop Museum is somewhat of an anomaly in its inclusion in chapter four. It is not a large-scale natural history museum, like the others discussed in the chapter and furthermore straddles the line between being an American museum, as it also belongs to Polynesia, as do the Maori objects in its collection. Like AMNH, it too has had a history of employing important figures in the history of Oceanic art like Sir Peter Buck, Alexander Spoehr, Roland Force, and Adrienne Kaeppler.

Finally the Field Museum, whose initial collection was a result of the remnants of the 1893 world's fair that was hosted in Chicago, is perhaps most well-known for being the repository of the immense A.W. Fuller collection, as well as the only museum in the United States, and of only a handful in the world to have a complete Maori meetinghouse

in its collection and on display to the public. The museum's most current display provides a modern-day example of how non-Western installations can go wrong and the pressures large museums face in attracting visitors and revenue.

The fifth and final chapter examines the various ways in which Maori art was understood and publicly accepted as art. It begins with a brief examination of the genesis of the term 'primitive art,' followed by a discussion of the collection and display histories at two New York art institutions, the Brooklyn Museum of Art and the Metropolitan Museum of Art. In comparison, their collections are significantly smaller than those discussed in previous chapters (70 Maori objects at Brooklyn, 24 at the Met), as are their installation histories. The first documented display of Oceanic art at the Brooklyn Museum of Art was in 1957, while the Metropolitan Museum's first display opened in 1982 (although its predecessor the Museum of Primitive Arts began displaying non-Western art as early as 1957). This chapter also delves into a discussion of the roots of the term primitive art and how it may have influenced the focus of these collections and under what rubric they were presented.

The final chapter ends by discussing temporary exhibitions of Maori art at art museums. It weaves together the histories of four major exhibitions featuring Oceanic art that also include Maori art. It begins in 1946 with the Museum of Modern Art exhibition, *Arts of the South Seas* and the 1953 follow-up exhibition, *Arts of the South Pacific Islands: A Loan Exhibition* at the M.H. DeYoung Museum in San Francisco. Next was the1967 *Sculpture of Polynesia* exhibition organized by the Art Institute of Chicago (it also traveled to the Museum of Primitive Art), the 1979 *Art of the Pacific Islands* exhibition at the National Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C., and ends with the 1984

opening at the Metropolitan Museum of Art of *Te Maori: Maori Art from New Zealand Collections*.

Methodology

Methodologically, the approach to this study is both historiographic and comparative, relying heavily on primary source material including archival documents, museum guidebooks and annual reports, and object and installation photographs. The research for this study was completed over a two-year period from 2001-2003 and involved visiting institutions in the United States with substantial collections of Maori art. Once there and dependent on the availability of staff, I photographed the permanent installations of Maori art that were on display as well as objects in storage to provide documentation of what was in the collections, both on and off view to the public.[2]

Additionally, a significant amount of time was spent in the archives and libraries of each institution gathering documents pertaining to each museum's Maori collection. The documentation includes correspondence, memoranda, checklists, drafts of wall text and brochures, and accounts from annual reports and museum journals. After weaving together the written and photographic documentation, the result is this dissertation and a reconstruction of the history of Maori art in the United States.

---

[2] Focus was paid mostly to carved objects made of wood, bone, and greenstone, as well as cloaks and textiles. I did not, for example, photograph the hundreds of stone adzes and fishhooks in the collection at the Field Museum. I understood that an implicit value judgment was being placed on objects I considered art and those that I did not, but as an art historian, I was obligated to focus on art, rather than anything that would more frequently be considered material culture or an agricultural tool.

CHAPTER ONE:

EARLY EXPLORERS, EXPEDITIONS, AND ETHNOLOGY

On September 25, 1513 Spanish explorer Vasco Nuñez de Balboa became the first European explorer to sight the Pacific Ocean and coined the area's familiar title, the "South Seas." The Spanish were first in a long line of Europeans who, for centuries, had made the lengthy journey to the Pacific, subsequently exposing this little-known part of the world to the rest of Europe. Balboa was one of many Spanish explorers, including Ferdinand Magellan, who in the sixteenth century set out for the area in the hope of finding gold.[3] Although the first European to embark for the Pacific was a Spaniard, New Zealand was actually first sighted by a Dutch explorer, Abel Janszoon Tasman, one century later on December 13, 1642 (fig. 1.01).

Why were Westerners so interested in charting new territories and finding new land? The answer may have been increasing population densities that compelled them to trade, migrate, and travel; it may have also been a growth in capitalism and industry, or Christianity's influence on Europeans and Americans, which affected how they perceived the earth.[4] Whatever the reasons, successive centuries brought to the area increasing

---

[3] R. Gerard Ward, ed., *American Activities in the Central Pacific, 1790-1870; A History, Geography, and Ethnography Pertaining to American Involvement and Americans in the Pacific Taken from Contemporary Newspapers, Etc.*, with an introduction by Ernest S. Dodge (Ridgewood: Gregg Press, 1966), 1-26.

[4] Anne Salmond, *Two Worlds: First Meetings Between Maori and Europeans*, 1642-1722 (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1991), 48–52. These statements are all based on

numbers of seafarers, lured by the Pacific's expansiveness, promise of fortune, and increased possibilities for trade and commerce.

In the mid-seventeenth century, the Netherlands enjoyed considerable economic power resulting from the increased trade and industry that spurred the formation of the East India Company.[5] Tasman never went ashore on New Zealand; a Maori double canoe, perhaps resembling the canoe illustrated in fig. 1.01, was said to have attacked when the Dutch shipmen attempted to disembark.

Double canoes were widely used in New Zealand during the mid-17th century, although very few illustrations of them exist. A.C. Haddon and James Hornell explain that the absence of illustrations of Maori double canoes was due to their simple construction that allowed for their ubiquitous presence in central Polynesia. It seems that the double canoe was so familiar to members of Cook voyages that they did not warrant illustrative documentation.[6]

Tasman left New Zealand thinking he had discovered the fabled "Southern Continent" and headed northwest, where he accidentally encountered Tonga.[7] Tasman's journey also marked the end of Dutch exploration until 1721, when Jacob Roggeveen

---

suggestions Salmond makes in answering the question of why Westerners were so interested in the Pacific.

[5] Ward, 27-30.

[6] A.C. Haddon and James Hornell, eds., *Canoes of Oceania*, vol. 1, *The Canoes of Polynesia, Fiji, and Micronesia*, by James Hornell Bernice P. Bishop Museum Special Publication 27 (Honolulu: Bernice P. Bishop Museum, 1936-1938; reprint Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1997), 194-95 (page citations are to the reprint edition).

[7] Ward, 31–32.

discovered Easter Island.[8] As the Dutch stronghold on Pacific exploration waned, the English began their domination of expeditions to the area beginning in the eighteenth century.[9] The early English voyages of Byron, Wallis, and Carteret trained personnel for what would become the most historically significant expeditions to the Pacific: those of Captain James Cook.[10]

Captain Cook made three expeditions to the Pacific; his first voyage on the ship HMS Endeavour took place between the years of 1768 and 1771, with the stated purpose of observing the "Transit of Venus."[11] Spanning the years from 1772 to 1775, the second voyage's goal onboard the Resolution and Adventure was to explore (or eliminate) the possibility of the "Great Southern Continent," thought to be somewhere between South America and New Zealand.[12] The final voyage, which ended in Cook's death in Hawaii on February 1779, was originally organized to find and chart the Northwest Passage.[13] It was on Cook's first voyage, however, that he came upon what Abel Tasman had only sighted in 1642: the islands of New Zealand, where he returned many times on his subsequent voyages.

On October 7, 1769, Cook wrote in his journal, "Gentle breezes and settled weather. At 2 PM saw land from the mast head bearing WBN, which we stood directly

---

[8] Ibid., 32.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Ibid., 35.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Ibid., 37.

[13] Ibid., 38.

for, and could but just see it of the deck at sun set."[14] Unbeknown to the explorer, he had sighted the Bay of Islands area of the North Island of New Zealand. On the following day Cook's journal recorded his first sighting of the Maori: "We saw in the bay several Canoes, People upon shore and some houses in the Country."[15]

Cook stayed in New Zealand for close to six months and returned to the area on his next two voyages. Cook never fully realized the original intentions of his voyages—following the Transit of Venus, establishing the existence of the Great Southern Continent, or finding the Northwest Passage; however he, along with his crew and super-numeries, provided some of the earliest European accounts of the Maori as well as early illustrated examples of Maori life and culture—and, most importantly, objects with the earliest known provenance in European or American museums that were collected on each expedition. Described as "artificial curiosities" at the time, most of the Maori objects Cook collected now belong to European and New Zealand collections, with the exception of a single jade pendant (*hei-tiki)* from the A. W. Fuller collection now in the Field Museum, in Chicago (fig. 1.02).[16] The label accompanying the object reads, "Idol,

---

[14] James Cook, *The Journals of Captain Cook: Prepared from the Original Manuscripts by J. C. Beaglehole for the Hakluyt Society, 1955–67,* selected and edited by Philip Edwards (London: Penguin Books, 1999), 68–69.

[15] Ibid., 69.

[16] For further information regarding documents related to Captain James Cook, see Adrienne Kaeppler, *"Artificial Curiosities": Being an Exposition of Native Manufactures Collected on the Three Pacific Voyages of Captain James Cook, R. N., at the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum, January 18, 1978-August 31, 1978, on the Occasion of the Bicentennial of the European Discovery of the Hawaiian Islands by Captain Cook, January 18, 1778*, Bernice P. Bishop Museum Special Publication 65 (Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1978).

New Zealand, ----ly carved in Beautiful Nephrite Stone or jade. Worn around neck that was. This is the largest and finest ----the collection of the Leverian Museum".[17]

In addition to the men who collected these objects, the artists aboard Cook's ships provided the rest of the world with illustrations of the lives of these newly encountered "natives" at a time long before the advent of photography. Artists such as Sydney Parkinson, William Hodges, and John Webber produced images that have, in many ways, become canonical and the standard for how many peoples and cultures outside of the Pacific, came to view the peoples and cultures of the Pacific.

The images of New Zealand from the Cook voyages run the gamut, from pen and wash portraits to large landscapes presumably done in a studio once the artist returned to England. Perhaps the most famous of these images were those produced by Sydney Parkinson, including *New Zealand War Canoe bidding defiance to the ship* of 1769 (fig: 1.03) and *Portrait of a New Zealand Man*, c. 1769 (fig. 1.04), now in the library collection of the British Museum. Works by artists such as Parkinson presaged the longstanding European tradition of painting images of native culture and, specifically of Maori culture. By the mid-19th century, English-born artist George French Angas began publishing his watercolors of Maori objects and the landscape of New Zealand that were later turned into engravings.[18] The use of Angas reproductions in displays of Maori art as contextual illustrations is an almost ubiquitous trait shared by many American museums. By the late-19th to early-20th century, European artists Gottfried Lindauer and William

---

[17] Accession record #2616, Registrar's Office, The Field Museum, Chicago, IL,.

[18] See George French Angas, *The New Zealanders Illustrated* (London: Thomas McLean, 1847) and George French Angas, *Savage Life and Scenes in Australia and New Zealand, Being an Artist's Impressions of Countries and People at the Antipodes*, 2d ed. (London: Smith, Elder, and Co., 1847).

Goldie focused on depicting the Maori through portraiture, a common European artistic convention of the time.

Collectively, these illustrations serve several purposes; namely, they provide insight into how the objects may have looked at the time they were collected and what their original uses may have been. If viewed from the appropriate historical and critical perspectives, these images are invaluable for the clues they provide about the use and functions of Maori art. Scholars Leonard Bell and Bernard Smith are effusive in their writings on the topic of the European representation of the Maori. In the first edition of Smith's book, *European Vision and the South Pacific*, he provides the reasoning for European interest in depicting the Pacific, "But the image of the noble savage was never entirely eradicated from European thought, for the belief in the natural goodness of savages was, at bottom, a belief in the natural goodness of man."[19] Bell provides sobering statements, such as, "Ethnographical inaccuracy in the representation of Maori subjects was the norm among European artists."[20] Bell cites examples from the work of Gottfried Lindauer where Maori subjects were inappropriately dressed, donning ceremonial garments while performing agricultural tasks, or of artist Wilhelm Dittmer's portrayal of mythological goddess *Te Tohunga* as seductive and young, as opposed to how Maori myth portrays her as elderly with, "a mouth like a barracuda and seaweed hair."[21]

---

[19] Bernard Smith, *European Vision and the South Pacific, 1768-1850: A Study in the History of Art and Ideas* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960), 87.

[20] Leonard Bell, "The Representation of the Maori by European Artists in New Zealand, ca. 1890-1914," *Art Journal*, 49, no. 2 (Summer 1990): 145.

[21] Ibid.

While Europe was sending exploring expeditions to the Pacific in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, the United States was just beginning its history as a country. Exploring expeditions like those sponsored by the Europeans did not occur in the United States until well into the nineteenth century, beginning with the United States Exploring Expedition, 1838-1842 (Wilkes Expedition), followed by an 1875 voyage to observe the Transit of Venus.[22]

Instead of the European exploring expeditions designed to find the fabled "Southern Continent" or follow the Transit of Venus, the intentions and goals of most American seamen in the Pacific did not tend toward folkloric or anthropological interests; rather, their focus was on the many opportunities for trade and commerce that the Pacific offered. It is here that the cultures of the United States and the Maori first intersect, and where the story of Maori art in America begins.

At the turn of the nineteenth century, between 1801 and 1812, many American merchant seamen were trading with China and found themselves cruising the Pacific. While their impetus to go to the Pacific was trade-related, many seamen collected objects at various ports of call in the Pacific and which later became the first objects to form the early collections at American museums.

After China trading began to wane in 1812, American whaling in the Pacific boomed. The whales were harvested for their by-products—such as their oil, used for lamps; their baleen, for corset boning; and their teeth and bones, for the scrimshaw carvings that had become fashionable items in nineteenth-century New England society. Americans excelled at demanding and consuming items made using whale products.

---

[22] See chapter three for a discussion of these expeditions.

The Industrial Revolution was in full swing, and basic theories of supply and demand prevailed.

Between the years 1820 and 1840, young men from small New England towns like New Bedford, Nantucket, and Salem boarded whaling boats and traveled to the waters of New Zealand, Samoa, and Hawaii in hopes of finding fortune. Whaling ships were seen as somehow inferior to merchant ships, and whaling itself was viewed as an unpleasant vocation plagued by low pay, horrible working conditions, and interminable stays at sea. Nonetheless, American whalers differed from their European contemporaries; they were, quite simply, better at it, revolutionizing not only the process of killing whales but, more importantly, efficiently transporting the valuable whale oil back to the United States.

American domination of the whaling industry continued for a period of twenty years at ports in New Zealand, Samoa, and Hawaii. In New Zealand, the American port was based in the Bay of Islands on the North Island (fig. intro.01). This fact is significant because—even though whalers tended toward drunkenness and disorderly behavior—they did collect objects, many of which now reside in American museums. By 1840, the American whalers' tendency toward alcohol abuse and reckless conduct came to a head, and the British were forced to take over the Bay of Islands area to establish order. One direct effect of British control not only affected the long-term history of Maori self-governance, but also ended the American stronghold of whaling in the area, due to exorbitant British-imposed taxes and tariffs. American whalers were forced to leave the area and moved to Honolulu, where they continued to whale until the need for oil was supplanted by the invention of the gas lamp in 1859 and later by electricity in 1879.

During the twenty-year domination of American whalers in the Pacific, there were also a number of New England seamen who sought their fortune in Fiji, collecting sandalwood (*santaluma aloum)* and *beche-de-mer*, a type of snail or sea cucumber that was caught, boiled, dried, before being traded to the Chinese (as was sandalwood). Unlike with whaling, the profits from this industry were huge, and many an American sandalwood trader made his fortune. As had the China traders and whalers before them, along the way, these sea captains also collected ethnographic objects.

This chapter focuses on the earliest collections of Maori art in the United States and the institutions that house them: the Peabody Essex Museum (hereafter the PEM) in Salem, Massachusetts; the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, (hereafter PMAE) in Cambridge, Massachusetts; and the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology (hereafter Penn) in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Through a closer look at their objects and history of installations, this chapter weaves the histories of early American collecting habits together with a discussion of the emergence of a uniquely American form of anthropology and ethnology as a scholarly discipline in major American universities, and the visual manifestations of those subjects using museums and exhibitions as their vehicles.

Charting the history of European and American activities in the Pacific gives insight into the formation of early American collections of Maori art, which came from these New England sea captains, traders, merchants, and whalers. It may have been by accident or through the simple act of purchasing a souvenir that these objects remain in

the collections today and continue to be used as didactic tools to inform American audiences about the cultures of the Pacific.

Peabody Essex Museum, Salem, Massachusetts

Early American collections of Maori art are firmly rooted in the connections between the Pacific and New England. These two seemingly disparate places which on the surface have little in common, are in fact often linked in the scholarly literature. Perhaps the best example of these ties is given in former PEM curator Ernest Stanley Dodge's book, *New England and the South Seas* (1965):

> New England and the South Seas are half a world away from each other—the one a cramped continental corner, the other magnificently oceanic. Geographically they are far apart. But they share one great geographical feature. The sea, only feasible means of reaching distant places in a reasonable length of time available to mankind before the airplane shrunk the world, links them…Nor can one see much kinship between the New Englander, a breed physically and mentally toughened by his country, his beliefs, his inheritance, and his institutions; and the Polynesian, gaily obliging, irresponsible, agreeable and, at the same time, cruel, sometimes cannibalistic, and vengeful.[23]

The importance of the PEM to the history of Maori art in America cannot be overstated; institutionally, it provides scholars with reliable records of early Maori art and, in turn, those records facilitate comprehension of the history of Maori art in America and provide insight into early American collecting habits. The museum's maritime

[23] Ernest Stanley Dodge, *New England and the South Seas* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965), 1–2.

uniqueness separates it from the histories of other American institutions discussed in this study.

PEM existed in different incarnations. The first, called the Essex Institute, was originally a product of the East India Marine Society (EIMS). EIMS was founded in 1799, composed of the leading ship owners, captains, and supercargoes of the time,[24] with strict stipulations that required each member to have actually "navigated the seas beyond the Cape of Good Hope or Cape Horn."[25] The Society served as an organization for like-minded shipmen, offering social engagements and meetings as means of increasing their already booming businesses. Society members were under directives to keep charts and journals of their travels, in the hopes that the next generation might benefit from their experiences. In 1801 the Society published a document outlining their comprehensive directions that sound similar to directives given by eighteenth-century English collectors:

> Whatever is singular in the manners, customs, dress, ornaments, &c. of any people is deserving of notice…There should be collected for the Museum, specimens of various kinds of vegetable substances; earths, minerals,…There should also be preserved such parts of birds, insects, fish…Inquiry should be made for any remarkable books in use among any of the eastern nations…Articles of dress and ornaments of any nations with images and objects of religious devotion, should be procured.[26]

---

[24] Christina Hellmich Scarangello, "The Pacific Collection in the Peabody Essex Museum, Salem, Massachusetts," *Pacific Arts: The Journal of the Pacific Arts Association* (July 1996): 69.

[25] The East India Marine Society of Salem (Salem: Salem-Press-Palfray, Ives, Foote & Brown, 1821), 3.

[26] Scarangello, 70.

Coinciding with a decline in the shipping business in 1867, Londoner and industrialist George Peabody provided the funds to incorporate the museum of the East India Marine Society with the Essex Institute to form the Peabody Academy of Science.[27] In addition to the transfer of objects from EIMS and the Essex Institute to the Peabody Academy of Science, the staff also shifted and was primarily comprised of the classmates and colleagues of Harvard professor Louis Agassiz. By an act of legislature, the name was then changed again to the Peabody Museum of Salem, because the former name was deemed "misleading."[28] Today, the institution is called the Peabody Essex Museum, having its current title since 1992.

History of the Collection at the Peabody Essex Museum

The history of PEM's collection mirrors the history of New England seamen in the Pacific. In 1802, Daniel Ward, a trader in China who traveled to Tahiti, Tonga, Hawaii, and New Zealand, donated to the EIMS the first Maori objects in an American collection. Ward donated three objects: a greenstone pendant (*hei-tiki),* a fishhook, and a parrot ring.[29] In 1803, this donation was followed by a gift of a short club from another China trader, John Fitzpatrick Jeffrie.

In 1807, another China trader Captain William Richardson, donated one of the largest and most significant gifts of Maori art to the EIMS. Of the close to twenty objects

---

[27] *Guide to the Peabody Museum* (Salem: Newcomb & Gauss Co, 1937), 1.

[28] Ibid.

[29] Ernest Stanley Dodge, *The New Zealand Maori Collection in the Peabody Museum of Salem.* (Portland, Maine: The Southworth-Anthoensen Press, 1941), 15.

in the donation, several were the focus of close studies that were published in major Pacific journals or exhibited in major exhibitions. One of those objects, a scarifying knife, was a focus of a 1911 article by Augustus Hamilton in the *Dominion Museum Bulletin*. The knife (fig. 1.05) was described as, "one of the most beautiful specimens of scarifying knives that I have ever heard of."[30] Regarding the object's function, Hamilton references the Bible describing the knife as, "The delicate nature of the carving and the attachment of the shark-teeth forbid the supposition that these knives were for ordinary cutting purposes, but it is known that they were used at *tangis* for cutting and lacerating the flesh in token of grief. The custom is of great antiquity, and is forbidden in the regulations prescribed for the Jews in Leviticus and Job."[31] Hamilton's statement seems to downplay any suggestion that the knife might be used for cannibalistic purposes, legitimizing the "flesh cutting" object as having biblical roots.

Another object highlighted by a Pacific scholar was a treasure box (*waka-huia*) donated by Richardson. The box was discussed in the December 1927 issue of *The Journal of the Polynesian Society* (fig. 1.06). The former director of the Otago Museum in Dunedin, New Zealand, well-known Pacific scholar H.D. Skinner began the article by relating basic information regarding the object's provenance. Skinner explains that the undersides were generally more elaborately decorated because most treasure boxes (*waka-huia)* were hung from the rafters. Noting its appearance as looking brand new with

[30] Augustus Hamilton, "A Maripi or scarifying knife, and a pare, or carved door lintel in the Salem Museum, U.S.A." *Dominion Museum Bulletin*, 3 (1911): 106-107.

[31] Hamilton, 106.

the, "light yellowish tint of freshly-cut *kauri* timber,"[32] Skinner explains that most other treasure boxes are painted red and black, or discolored due to applications of oil or absorption of smoke. In describing the decoration adorning the underside of the treasure box, Skinner suggests a reading of the carver's mental state in relationship to the elaborate design, writing, "This variation in the employment of design elements, most clearly seen in the balancing of beaded lines against curves, throws interesting light on the mental attitude of the Maori carver."

Of the many objects in the Richardson acquisition, the most notable, however, was his gift of a lintel (*pare*) that is thought to have originated from the Bay of Islands on the North Island of New Zealand and is dated to before 1807 (fig. 1.07). In many ways, Richardson's lintel can be considered the canonical Maori object in an American collection. As recently as 2003, Deirdre Brown included the linel (*pare*) in her book discussing Northland carving, *Tai Tokerau Whakairo Rākau: Northland Māori Wood Carving.* Brown reveals that although its origin has often been linked to the Bay of Plenty, the lintel (*pare*) was most likely from the Northland (Auckland and areas north of Auckland) because it was collected in the Bay of Islands and is constructed with *kauri* wood that is found in the north fig. intro.01).[33] The lintel (*pare*) has also been exhibited repeatedly in noteworthy exhibitions through the years. It was first exhibited outside of PEM at the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago (fig. 1.08) in the Massachusetts's state building, although nearly hidden behind Polynesian ships models

---

[32] H.D. Skinner, "A Waka-Huia in the Peabody Museum, Salem," *The Journal of the Polynesian Society* 36, no. 4 (December 1927): 366.

[33] Deidre Brown, *Tai Tokerau Whakairo Rākau: Northland Māori Wood Carving*. (Auckland: Reed Books, 2003), 106.

and paddles.[34] Fifty years later, it was displayed in an entirely different arena—the Maori section of the Museum of Modern Art's 1946 exhibition, *Arts of the South Seas* in New York City.[35] The lintel (*pare)* is composed of a central *tiki* figure with its tongue protruding and three-fingered hands placed firmly on its stomach. The figure stands on feet with three toes. The entire right side of the lintel (*pare*) is an almost mirror image of the left side, compositely forming an intricate background of two outward facing *manaia* figures.

Richardson's donation was followed in 1812 by another gift from a distant relative: Captain William Putnam Richardson, who captained the ship *Active* at the tender age of twenty-five.[36] Putnam Richardson's gift of approximately 20 objects were collected in New Zealand while on a stopover in 1811.[37] Several of the objects are thought to have been collected in the Bay of Islands, which leads one to believe that these objects could be identified stylistically with objects from that area. Of the variety of objects donated to PEM, a flute that was donated by Putnam Richardson along with another flute and flageolet from the Richardson accession of 1807 were the focus of an extensive study published in 1945 (fig. 1.09). The study was co-written by Ernest S. Dodge, PEM's former curator and director, with Edwin T. Brewster, a physics teacher and amateur flutist from Andover, Massachusetts and published in *The Journal of the Polynesian Society*. Titled, "The Acoustics of Three Maori Flutes," the article was

---

[34] See chapter two for further discussion of the 1893 World's Fair in Chicago.

[35] See chapter five for further discussion of the *Arts of the South Seas* exhibition at New York's Museum of Modern Art in 1946.

[36] Brown, 73.

[37] Ibid.

written because, "Museum labels of primitive musical instruments and their catalogue descriptions are not always happily expressed"[38] The 22-page article provides a detailed overview of the acoustics of several types of instruments. Dodge and Brewster identify the flute donated by Putnam-Richardson in 1812 as a *kouau*,[39] and the flute and flageolet donated by Richardson in 1807 as an *nguru*[40] and *putorino*[41] respectively. One interesting aspect to this article is that it was researched and written to address a very specific problem in most museums – that many objects are mislabeled or given incorrect labels, which in many cases, as with the instruments identified by Dodge and Brewster, thwart the viewer from understanding what their original functions were.

In spite of the whalers' lengthy and somewhat ignoble history in the Bay of Islands, only two whalers made donations to the EIMS.[42] The first was a short club, given in 1821 by Josiah Gwinn,[43] captain of the *Ann* that made two voyages to New Zealand from New Bedford, Massachusetts, in 1803–1806 and in 1807–1809, and a third from London in 1811–1813.[44] The second donation was a canoe model collected at Mana

---

[38] Ernest Dodge and Edwin T. Brewster, "The Acoustics of Three Maori Flutes," *The Journal of the Polynesian Society* 54, no. 1 (March 1945): 39.

[39] Ibid., 56.

[40] Ibid., 49.

[41] Ibid., 43.

[42] There is some disagreement as to whether these men were whalers or merchants. While Rhys and Margaret Richards describe both Gwinn and Neil as whalers, in a recent personal conversation (July 2005) with PEM curator Christina Hellmich, she contends they were merchants and not whalers.

[43] Dodge, *The New Zealand Maori Collection*, 47.

Island in the Cook Strait (fig. 1.10) and given to the museum in 1838 by Captain James Neil.[45]

Sandalwood traders Captains Benjamin Vanderford and William Putnam Endicott, the wealthiest kind of American seamen in the Pacific, made donations of a cloak in 1823[46] and an adze in 1838,[47] respectively. Vanderford was later asked to serve as assistant captain on the United States Exploring Expedition, but would die before the expedition began. Endicott traveled to New Zealand, Tonga, and Fiji on the ship *Glide*.[48]

In 1897, Dr. George Weld donated a Maori adze (*toki)* to the Peabody Museum of Salem, whose associated documentation claims that it was found embedded in a human skull, indicating it was used as a weapon (fig. 1.11).[49] Weld was such a prominent donor that an entire hall of the museum that housed Japanese objects was named after him.

History of Display at the Peabody Essex Museum, Salem, Massachusetts

Documentation of the exhibition history at PEM begins in 1838, when the museum was still called the East India Marine Society and a newly appointed

---

[44] Rhys Richards and Margaret Richards, *Pacific artifacts brought home by American whalemen: Pacific Islands curiosities, objects, artifacts and art in museums in New England and Long Island.* Unpublished report (2000): 22-23.

[45] Dodge, *The New Zealand Maori Collection*, 27.

[46] Ibid., 13–14.

[47] Ibid., 34.

[48] Richards and Richards, 26.

[49] Dodge, *The New Zealand Maori Collection*, 33.

superintendent reinstalled the objects by object type such as utensil, weapon, or tool.[50] This installation remained static for close to twenty years, until the Institute was purchased by Peabody in 1867, after which time the installation shifted from groupings by object type to groupings by functional types: war, agriculture, navigation, or food-making.

In 1880, after Edward S. Morse's appointment as museum director, the objects were reinstalled once again—categorized this time by geography and culture, not by type or function.[51] Although its date is not documented, a photograph from the museum's photographic archives (fig. 1.12) conforms to Morse's system of categorization established in 1880, but was most likely photographed between 1897 and 1899, as it includes a *tiki* that was donated in 1897 and before the museum was expanded and the ethnological collections were moved in 1899. From these details it is possible to conclude that the installation was made during Morse's tenure as director in the late 1800s.

Morse's late nineteenth-century display case is remarkable in its inclusion of many types of Maori objects. At the top, and most prominent, is the Richardson lintel, flanked on each side by cloaks. On one side, propped against the cloaks, are three long staffs *(taiaha)*. Below the lintel are three sets of objects: on one side are three adzes, across from three flutes on the opposite side. In the middle of the case, directly below the lintel, is a photograph of seven Maori women standing in front of what appears to be a lintel in situ, hung above a doorway of a meetinghouse. Below the photograph are five pendants (*hei-tikis)*, four artfully arranged around the large one donated in 1897 by Miss

---

[50] Scarangello, 74.

[51] Ibid., 76.

Mary Putnam Ropes and Miss Eliza Orne Ropes and was thought of at the time as, "the largest and the most perfect specimen owned by any museum"[52]

Below the pendants (*hei-tikis)* is a painted portrait of a Maori chief (by an unknown artist), wearing one around his neck. On either side of the portrait are carved hand clubs and mounted below the portrait is the "sacrificial knife" donated to the museum in 1807 by the aforementioned Captain William Richardson. Ten nephrite and stone hand clubs dominate the lower half of the display; just below the clubs are three flax belts. Placed at the bottom of the case are six fishhooks of varying sizes and three paddles. The composite effect of the display is well balanced and ordered, with an equal number of objects on either side, providing a sense of symmetry similar to that in the lintel that dominates the case.[53]

By 1885, the museum collection had outgrown its current building and made plans to add to the existing building. Close to fifteen years later, in October 1899, the East Hall opened, housing the museum's ethnological collections. In the intervening years, the museum had participated in the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition. The PEM sent a collection of Pacific objects to be displayed in the fair's Massachusetts Building (fig. 1.08). Although documentation is incomplete, we assume that the museum sent many of its Pacific objects to the fair in an effort to promote it and its large collection. The display consisted of a case of objects, labeled "Polynesia," which included models of ships from all over Polynesia, long spears (including ones from New

---

[52] Hamilton, 106.

[53] See Allan Hanson, "Art and the Maori Construction of Reality." in *Art and Artists of Oceania*, ed. Sidney M. Mead and Bernie Kernot (New Zealand: Dunmore Press, 1983), for further information regarding the symmetry found in Maori lintels.

Zealand), and most noticeable, yet barely visible in the picture, the Maori lintel that Richardson had collected in 1807. [54]

Because photographic evidence of early installations is scarce at PEM, guidebooks can provide the best and most reliable evidence and description of how displays changed over time. In 1901, when the PEM was still called the Peabody Academy of Science, its guidebook states that the main reason for adding a building to house the museum's ethnological collections was "primarily for the purpose of placing the valuable ethnological collections in a place of greater safety."[55] The museum's actions indicate that, not only were its holdings substantial enough to warrant the construction of another building—but more importantly, that it took the security of its ethnographic collections seriously enough to house them separately from its natural history and maritime collections. The guide described the hall in general as "a collection of objects illustrating the everyday life, dress and religious customs, the implements of war and domestic use, and objects of art of the native races of…the Pacific islands…the arrangement of the Museum is intended to be educational, and not merely for the purpose of exhibiting curiosities."[56]

Although the museum's installation of objects from the Pacific was still organized by geography, as it had been post-1880, it was described in the 1901 guidebook thus:

> As now arranged, the collections of the museum may be summarized as follows…A collection, arranged by countries, of objects illustrating the every day life, dress and religious customs, the implements of war and of domestic use, and

---

[54] The entire fair, along with the Massachusetts State Building, is discussed in chapter two.

[55] *Peabody Museum of Science Guide*, 1901, 9.

[56] Ibid., 10.

> objects of art of the native races of Japan, Yezo, Korea, China, Malay Archipelago, Siam, India, Africa, the Pacific Islands, North and South America, etc., occupying the East Hall.[57]

Each case was labeled with its country name, and each object was clearly marked with the object's name and the location of where it was obtained.[58] In addition to objects from New Zealand, the floor was lined with cases of objects originating from India, Arabia, Africa, Arctic America, North America, NorthAmerica/Mexico, and South America, along with pictures of Salem ships and hull models. The center of the space is shared by case 72—marked "special"—and a central case of models of American and foreign vessels (fig. 1.13).

The guidebook describes Maori woodcarvings as being "of special interest as examples of native art," and specifies that a canoe model[59] can be found hanging from the center of the hall.[60] Further, the guidebook also states that Maori objects such as "stone clubs, wooden clubs and paddles, jade '*hei-tiki,*' smaller jade objects, flutes, a sacrificial knife (its carved handle edged with sharks' teeth), carved boxes, etc.",[61] were exhibited among objects originating from Australia, such as "clubs, shields, boomerangs, spears and spear throwers,"[62] located in case 64.

A notable alteration occurred in the guidebooks' text between 1901 and 1916, which remained through 1937: the featured Maori object was a canoe prow (fig. 1.14)

---

[57] Ibid.

[58] Ibid., 18.

[59] Donated to the Museum in 1838 by whaler Captain James Neil.

[60] Peabody, 1901, 18.

[61] Ibid., 20.

[62] Ibid.

donated in 1911 to the museum by Dr. Charles Goddard Weld, who bought it from the ethnographic dealer W. O. Oldman. The provenance described in Oldman's catalogue is cited in the 1937 guidebook, which describes a "[c]arved figurehead of a war canoe, named Komarurua, built at Mangatapu by the Whanau-a-Apanui tribe and sold to the Ngati-Tai tribe in 1830…"[63] Dodge adds that European paint was used to paint the prow—and that, when the last owner saw it in 1893 in Mercury Bay, it had been, "entirely rotten."[64]

Along with changes in the guidebooks, the 1900s also marked the beginning of what was to become the important legacy of two men—former curator of ethnology, Lawrence Jenkins, and a Salem lawyer, Stephen W. Phillips. Jenkins graduated from Harvard in 1900 graduate of Harvard who had a specific interest in Pacific ethnology. Phillips was born in Honolulu, was the son of the former attorney general for the kingdom of Hawaii under King Kamehameha V.[65] Both made significant contributions to strengthening the Pacific collection at the then Peabody Museum of Salem.

The latter half of the twentieth-century collections is dominated by the presence of the aforementioned Ernest Stanley Dodge, who began his career at the then Peabody Academy of Science in 1931 as a museum assistant. Within six years, he was promoted to the position of assistant curator of ethnology and at the same time became a special student in anthropology at Harvard University from 1937-38. During his career he received honorary degrees from Boston University, Salem State College, and Marlboro

---

[63] Dodge, *The New Zealand Maori Collection*, 28.

[64] Ibid.

[65] Scarangello, 77-78.

College in Vermont.[66] In 1943 Dodge was named the curator of ethnology and by 1946 he was named assistant director of the museum, taking the reigns of director in 1950, where he remained until his death in 1980.[67] With a tenure of almost 50 years, Ernest Stanley Dodge's influence on the history of PEM was considerable.

Much of Dodge's legacy resides in the eight books and close to 500 articles he published during his career. Germane to this dissertation are his books, *The New Zealand Maori Collection in the Peabody Museum of Salem* (1941) and *New England and the South Seas* (1965), as well the article titled, "The Acoustics of Three Maori Flutes," he co-wrote with Edwin Brewster in 1945. Dodge's publications are important because they brought attention to not only PEM's Maori collection, but to their collections of other areas of the Pacific such as the Hervey, Marquesan, and Hawaiian islands. In addition to his work on the Pacific collections at PEM, Dodge also published on Cook's voyages, including, "Following Captain Cook Around the World" (1966) and "The Cook Ethnographical Collections" (1970).

The Peabody Essex Museum continues to collect and in 2004 completed a multi-million dollar renovation making it not only a tourist destination in New England, but also a place for continued new scholarship. The museum's importance to this study lies in the historical significance of its earliest collections, currently featured as part of the museum's permanent display, (figs: 1.15 and 1.16) where the focus is on the early collections highlighting the 1807 Richardson lintel (*pare*) (fig. 1.15), flutes (*nguru and*

---

[66] Edgar J. Driscoll, "Ernest Stanley Dodge, 66, Author, Museum Director," *Boston Globe*, (Feb. 10, 1980), 1.

[67] Ibid.

putorino), and knife (*maripi*) (fig. 1.16). The objects collected in the early nineteenth-century provide evidence of early carving techniques and because their provenance is so well documented, they also afford the opportunity to pinpoint carving styles by region. For this study, the early collections offer documentation regarding American collecting habits, as well as the suggestion of possibilities as to why Americans were keen to collect objects or souvenirs from places far-from the world and donate them to museums.

Maori Art and the Ivy League

In the late nineteenth century, the museums of two Ivy League universities, Harvard University and the University of Pennsylvania, began to cultivate a different form of museology that coincided with their acquisitions of Maori art.

Coeval with the development of the university museum in the early twentieth-century, a handful of conceptual "-isms"—Darwinism, racism, imperialism, and nationalism—infiltrated the American consciousness, influencing the conditions under which institutions were being established. "Natural selection" and "survival of the fittest" were terms on the forefront of American cultural debates at the beginning of the twentieth century; ideas about the "vanishing race" and the fear that evidence of certain cultures would disappear if it was not collected and documented dominated the museum field at the time. Along with the "-isms," the academic discipline of anthropology began to develop in the United States. In essence, anthropological theories that were taught in the classrooms were manifesting themselves visually in the displays in museums of the institutions where the teaching was taking place.

Differing from scholarly approaches to anthropology in England or France, scholars in the United States strove to establish a self-reflective, self-critical "anthropology of anthropology."[68] Scholar Barry Alan Joyce states that this "national ethnology" was determined by "(1) the interplay and competition with science and religion, (2) the aspirations of an expanding nation, and (3) unique American images of American blacks and Indians."[69] While his statements are primarily meant to provide a context for understanding the motivations of the United States Exploring Expedition;[70] his comments resonate with this period and with the collecting and display practices at Harvard University and the University of Pennsylvania.

Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University

On October 6, 1866, one year before he bought the ailing East India Marine Society, George Peabody committed $150,000 to the trustees of the newly initiated Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology in Cambridge, Massachusetts. The large donation was earmarked for three purposes: 1. the establishment of a named professorship in honor of Peabody at Harvard; 2. the purchase of artifacts, and 3. the

---

[68] Barry Joyce, *The Shaping of American Ethnography: The Wilkes Exploring Expedition, 1838-1842,* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2001), 6.

[69] Ibid.

[70] Also known as the Wilkes Expedition. See chapter three for a discussion of the formation of the collection of Maori art at the National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C.

creation of a building fund, with land given by the President and Fellows of Harvard College.[71]

The first Maori object to enter into PMAE's collection was a greenstone hand club donated by Harvard College in the museum's first year 1867. That gift was followed by a large donation of 257 objects from the Massachusetts Historical Society, five of which were Maori. A fur trader named Captain James Magee collected at least one of those five objects— a fishhook made of wood and bone—in 1794. The documentation also verifies that it is one of the earliest collected Maori objects in any American collection.[72] In addition to this early fishhook, two stone clubs, a stone implement, a paddle, and a second fishhook made of shell were also included in the gift.

Between the years of 1860 and 1861, objects belonging to the Boston Marine Society deemed "natural and artificial curiosities" had been found "lying around. . . without order or method."[73] To remedy the situation, the society pared its collection, donating in 1869 a total of 178 objects to the museum—three of which were Maori, one being the prominently displayed model canoe in the museum's permanent installation of art from the Pacific Islands. An excerpted letter to Thos. P. Bowie, Esq. from the president of the Boston Marine Society describes the society's decision to donate objects

---

[71] Rubie S. Watson, Nynke J. Dorhout, and Juliette R. Rogers, "Pacific Collections at the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology at Harvard University: The Early Years," *Pacific Arts: The Journal of the Pacific Arts Association* (July 1996): 57.

[72] Accession file 67-10, "Captain James Magee (1750-1801)," Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.

[73] William Baker, *The History of the Boston Marine Society* (Boston: The Boston Marine Society, 1982), 198.

described as "implements of (art) and war" to "aid in the furtherance of so valuable a science as that of ethnology." [74]

The next major accession arrived in 1893, the same year as the World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago. Although the objects collected there are discussed in chapter two, it is important to note at this point that PMAE's former director, Frederic Ward Putnam, served first as the director of the Midway Plaisance and then the director of ethnology at the Chicago fair.

In 1899, the Boston Museum of Natural History donated a collection of objects whose primary historical significance lies in the fact that a portion of the collection once resided in what is considered to be the first American museum—the Peale Museum in Philadelphia.[75] That the objects have Peale provenance means they could potentially have been collected before 1800 or during the United States Exploring Expedition between 1838-41. [76]

---

[74] Accession file 69–20. Letter #170, Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.

[75] There are also two objects with Peale provenance in the collection of the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology discussed later in this chapter.

[76] American artist Charles Willson Peale opened the Peale Museum in 1785; it is commonly referred to as the first museum opened in the United States. It had a multipurpose mission—that of a library, ethnographic, natural history, and art museum all rolled into one. In 1827, Charles Willson Peale died and his sons transferred the collection to Philadelphia. Eleven years later, in 1838, the collection was transferred again to the brand new Philadelphia Museum. Shortly thereafter, the Peale family began to experience financial difficulties and in 1848 offered the collections for sale. In 1849, the ethnographic and natural history collections were bought by P.T. Barnum, of circus fame, and Moses Kimball. Barnum's portion of the collection was housed in his museum that burned down in 1865. Kimball placed his collection in the Boston Museum of Natural History, and presumably, any objects in the Peabody-Harvard's collection with Peale provenance are from Kimball's collection.

Of the many objects in the accession, two have definitive Peale provenance. The first is a chief's robe, (fig. 1.17) dating to circa 1825–1839. The second is a figure, dating to either 1841 or possibly even earlier, circa 1805–1825 (fig. 1.18). The figure is a beautifully carved piece with arms resting on the figure's stomach, its right hand (having three fingers, while the left has four) holds a hand club (*kotiate)*, and has full facial tattooing suggesting it was cut from a support pole of a meeting house. Written in black ink on the uncarved back section of the figure is the statement "New Zealand Idol Depos by J." The identity of "J" remains unknown, although it has been suggested that the initials refer to Thomas Jefferson or the ship captain who collected the figure.[77]

Another reason that this group of objects is significant is that there is an accompanying fictional account of a grandfather and grandson's visit to the museum that describes objects from the donation made by the Boston Museum of Natural History. Published in 1848, *Tom Pop's First Visit to the Boston Museum, With His Grandfather: Giving an Account of What He Saw, and What He Thought*, is a narrative account that provides some clues as to how objects from the Pacific were received by the public. The title "Heathen Idols," describes the book's illustrations of a Maori pendant (*hei-tiki)*, Rarotonga Fisherman's God, and Easter Island *moai* and lizard figures (fig. 1.19).

Three of the illustrated figures and notably those that are human representations, have their genitals covered, presumably out of mid-19th century modesty. The addition of clothing to three of the figures represented in the print alludes to the dialogue captured in the fictional account of the conversation between Tom Pop, his grandfather, and an

---

[77] Specimen label, Peabody Museum ID #99-12-70/53494, Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA. (Note that this figure was included in PMAE's exhibition, *Masterpieces of the Peabody Museum* in 1978. An entry by Carol Jopling was included in the exhibition catalog.)

audience of young children: the grandfather draws a distinction between "us" and "them" or, more pointedly, between Christians and "heathens," and provides a glimpse into the mindset of an average nineteenth-century New Englander, as portrayed in this fictional work. The ensuing dialogue, captures the children's reaction:

> "What are those awful creatures I see there?" "Well, my dear children, I will stop long enough for that; and right glad am I that you called my attention to them. You've heard about heathen idols, I dare say." "Yes, grandfather;" "Yes, sir;" "Yes, indeed," answered half a dozen at least, and all speaking together." "Well, my dears,"—taking off his hat,—"heathen idols, such as you see there, ugly, misshapen, and beastly, both in shape and character, are the gods of the poor benighted heathen. Instead of worshipping our Father above,—instead of worshipping all the Host and Heaven, as many of the ancient heathen did,—they worship sticks and stones, the creatures of their own hands—monkeys, and birds, and serpents, and cows, and all sorts of hideous, and filthy, and hateful things." "*Why*, grandfather! I shouldn't know your voice, I declare," said Tom; "and I never saw you look so, nor heard you talk so, in all of my life before!"[78]

All of the objects, with the exception of the Maori pendant (*hei-tiki*), had once belonged to the Boston Museum of Natural History. Records indicate that the pendant (*hei-tiki*) was collected in 1835 by a second mate named Bradford Maxwell, who served on the whaling ship the *Joseph Maxwell* under Captain Ellis before coming into the collection of a Miss Stearns, who sold it to the museum in 1889.[79]

The year 1921 marks the debut of European ethnographic dealers onto the PMAE acquisition scene. To supplement their object purchases from European ethnographic dealers, museums commonly exchanged objects from their own collections with those

---

[78] *Tom Pop's First Visit to the Boston Museum, with His Grandfather: Giving an Account of What He Saw, and What He Thought*. Boston: Printed for the publisher (1848), 23.

[79] Accession card, 89–41, Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.

from other museums. In fact, many of the large American natural history museums exchanged objects from their Native American collections for Maori objects from New Zealand museums—one native culture for another.[80] PMAE's first exchange of a Maori object with another museum occurred in 1905, when an unknown object was exchanged for a fishhook from the then-Peabody Academy of Science.[81]

Another exchange was made in 1920, this time with the Otago Museum in Dunedin, New Zealand, presumably under the direction of H. D. Skinner—famed New Zealand anthropology professor, curator, and later director of the Otago Museum. The museum acquired two meetinghouse panels[82] (*poupou*) dated 1870. The panels are quite large, extending from the floor to the ceiling of the exhibition space's wall. Each panel is composed of two ancestor figures, situated atop the heads of the others. All of the figures have the requisite inlaid *paua* shell eyes, with the panel on the right featuring additional smaller figures placed alongside the main ancestors also with *paua* shell eyes. In addition, the main figures have protruding tongues and spiraled tattooing carved on their bodies.

In 1947, the largest accession of Maori objects in PMAE's collection was acquired through an exchange with the Otago Museum. In the case of this accession, it was not pieces of Native American art in which the Otago Museum was interested, but rather a plaster reproduction of an Old Kingdom Egyptian slate statue in the collection of Boston's Museum of Fine Arts (hereafter the MFA).

---

[80] Discussed in further detail in chapter three.

[81] Accession card, 05-13, Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.

[82] It is not known what they were exchanged for.

On August 16, 1946, Dows Dunham, a curator in the department of Egyptian Art at the MFA, wrote a letter to Donald Scott, then the director at the Peabody-Harvard. The letter details Dunham's yearlong negotiations with H. D. Skinner, director of the Otago Museum, who wanted to purchase the painted plaster reproduction. The reproduction was fabricated by the Museum of Fine Arts during World War II when they had to evacuate the building; however, once the war had ended and the original objects were safe, the reproduction was no longer needed. Dunham details that the deal failed because of restrictions enforced by the New Zealand government, but that Skinner proposed that, in exchange for the Egyptian statue, he would send Maori material equal to the cost of the statue and its shipping charges.[83]

In response to Skinner's request, Donald Scott asked C. B. Humphreys, then the keeper of the Oceanic Collections at the University Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology in Cambridge, England, to assist him. Humphreys replied on August 23, 1946, writing:

> The Otago Museum has a superior collection of Maori material culture and storerooms rich in duplicate objects. It's [sic] Melanesian collection is not particularly rich nor are the objects from other parts of Polynesia outstanding. If the objects were entirely Maori, offered for a more reasonable amount, I should be strongly inclined to close with the offer. But, as you know, Skinner has the reputation of being a wily bargainer—to put it somewhat mildly—so I should have a pretty definite idea of what you are to receive if I were you.

[83] Dows Dunham, Unpublished Letter to Donald Scott, accession file 47-54, August 16, 1946, Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.

> As I have probably told you, I hope to be in the South Island of New Zealand in December–January next. If it will not hold up the matter too long I shall be glad to do what I can for you when I am in Christchurch and its vicinity.[84]

In subsequent correspondence, it is clear that both Scott and Humphreys were unhappy with Skinner's proposed list of objects[85]; what is unclear, based on the available documentation, is whether that issue was ever resolved and what, precisely, the MFA stood to gain from the transaction. It could have been an act of altruism—one Boston museum helping out another—but it seems likely that PMAE may have paid the MFA what the Maori collection was worth.

Eighty Maori objects acquired through the 1947 exchange with the Otago Museum currently reside in Harvard's collection, fifteen of which are on display with the permanent collection from the Pacific Islands. The majority of objects are agricultural and fishing tools or bone fragments of the *moa,* owing to the Museum's interest in ethnology and natural history, but there are also some fine pieces of Maori art. One of the highlights is a bone club (*wahaika*) (fig. 1.20) featuring a *tiki* figure carved on the interior curve above the handle.

The 1947 exchange seems counterproductive, occurring one year before the New Zealand government spent £44,000(GBP) to purchase W. O. Oldman's private collection of Maori and Polynesian art. In retrospect, the government's willingness to spend money

---

[84] C. B. Humphreys, Unpublished Letter to Donald Scott, accession file 47-54, August 23, 1946, Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.

[85] Donald Scott, Unpublished Letter to unknown recipient, accession file 47-54, November 3, 1947, Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.

on Oldman's collection while precluding the expenditure of a much smaller sum—an act that sent more than eighty objects out of New Zealand and into an American collection—seems shortsighted.

The following year, the Peabody acquired its second largest collection of Maori objects (36), through what was originally a loan and was later donated to the museum by the Pilgrim Society in 1965. The final accession of Maori art into PMAE's collection took place in 1974 donated by Mr. and Mrs. Donald Portenier, who bought the objects at an estate sale in Erie, Pennsylvania. The objects are thought to have been originally purchased during World War Two.[86] While the accession is mostly composed of adzes, there are a number of greenstone pieces, including a pendant (*hei tiki)*.

History of Display at PMAE

In the 1898 guide to the Peabody Museum at Harvard, the section where Maori objects were displayed was described as "a number of table cases and the adjoining wall case which contain the collections from Micronesia, Polynesia, Malaysia, and Australia."[87] In 1926, the first official installation of Pacific Island objects opened at PMAE and the way the objects were displayed and discussed the installation emphasized the aggressive and warrior-like nature of Pacific Island cultures. After a refurbishment in

[86] Accession card 974-21, Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.

[87] F. W. Putnam, *Guide to the Peabody Museum of Harvard University with a Statement Relating to Instruction in Anthropology* (Salem: Salem Press,1898), 24.

1989, the previous emphasis was readdressed to present the Pacific Islands as a, "spectrum of manufactures of the indigenous people of Oceania…"[88]

While the themes of the exhibition have changed, the "look" of the installation has remained the same (fig. 1.21). The display is reminiscent of a Pitt-Rivers style of installation (fig. 1.22) that uses large, flat, wooden cases filled with objects that are grouped together by geographic region, artifact, and type. Augustus Pitt-Rivers was one of the most influential figures in the nineteenth-century museum movement in England, based on his efforts to document and prove principles of material evolution.[89] Pitt-Rivers developed a system of display that focused on typological classification and is well-known for packing the cases of his displays with objects that were functionally related, much in the way the PMAE exhibition is organized.[90] The cases are divided by location and further subdivided by object type. For instance, in fig. 1.23, all types of Maori weapons are displayed, including clubs and spears. The addition of contextual illustrations was introduced to the display cases in 1989, an example being the inclusion of a Maori chief holding a club (fig. 1.24). The purpose of the contextual image was to aid the visitor in making a connection between the object laying in the case and how it functioned in the culture it came from.

---

[88] Introductory wall text of the permanent installation of the Pacific Islands, Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, April 2003.

[89] David K. Van Keuren, "Museums and Ideology: Augustus Pitt-Rivers, Anthropological Museums, and Social Change in Later Victorian Britain," *Victorian Studies* 28, no. 1 (Autumn 1984): 175.

[90] Ibid., 181-82.

University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology

The University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology (hereafter, Penn) was founded in 1887. Penn had an early ethnological interest in Polynesia because of a commonly held belief that Polynesians were "prime examples of uncivilized men living in a 'state of nature,' or what is more familiarly referred to as the 'Noble Savage.'"[91] George Byron Gordon, who in 1904 began working at the University of Pennsylvania Museum as an assistant curator (later becoming director in 1910), commented on having a museum within a university in 1911:

> Independent as their development has been, the fact that museums are sometimes found to-day in connection with universities is an indication that our educational habits are beginning to approach those of the ancient Greeks, and that at the same time the museum as a modern institution is taking on something of the character of its classical prototype.[92]

Elaborating further, Gordon speculated on the purpose of a modern museum and how the university museum as an institution fulfilled those functions:

> The principal function of the modern museum, then, is to promote the increase of knowledge and the cultivation of taste…The work at the University Museum, in common with other institutions of its kind, aims to accomplish in building up collections to illustrate the course of human history, must be done now or not at all…Many a clue to the history of our race will be lost with the passing of the native cultures of the more primitive populations of the world…To save these human documents for the uses of science and of posterity is a service which the

[91] William H. Davenport, "The Curators Write: A History of the Museum's Polynesian Collection," *Expedition* 24, no. 2 (Winter, 1982): 1

[92] Gordon, George Byron, "The Functions of the Modern Museum," *Museum Journal* 2, no.1 (March 1911): 2.

> present generation owes to the human race and the instrument by which this service must be done is the modern museum.[93]

His statements clearly reveal the intentions of American ethnographic museums in the early part of the twentieth century: the promotion of knowledge and racial self-discovery by studying the "primitive."

Former curator William H. Davenport echoes statements made by George Byron Gordon when Davenport writes, "the Museum was begun with a pair of complementary concerns: one in the origins of civilizations, the other in the so-called non-civilized cultures. These have come to be the Museum's 'great' tradition of archaeology and 'little' tradition of ethnology."[94]

The earliest documentation of Penn's display of Oceanic art is in 1921, although the installation most likely opened at least one year earlier. (figs. 1.25 and 1.26) Then-curator H. U. Hall remarked on the installation stating:

> The objects dealt with in this article form part of the exhibition lately arranged in the southeast room on the ground floor of the Museum and intended to illustrate the representative and decorative art of some of the primitive peoples of Africa and Oceania. As examples of art, remote in its results, as it probably is in conscious purpose, from realism, yet born of and still unmistakably affected by an interest in reality, the productions of Maori craftsmen are preeminent.[95]

---

[93] Ibid., 5.

[94] Davenport, 1.

[95] H. U. Hall, "Maori Wood Carving and Moko," *The Museum Journal*, 11, no. 4 (December 1920): 212.

Photographs illustrate Hall's remarks. The section marked "New Zealand" is just as described: nestled among Benin ancestral bronze heads and oliphants, Kongo power figures, and a Hawaiian feather cape. Maori canoe prows are prominently displayed; the ancestral figure on the outer edge—which normally would have been "leading" the canoe and facing the water—is situated in such a way that it confronts the viewer. Above the display are two lintels and, to the right, framing the doorway, are situated the lintel and houseposts carved by Maori artists and purchased by Stewart Culin in 1893 at the World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago.[96] In total, seventeen Maori objects were displayed in 1921 and (apart from the Hawaiian feather cape) the "New Zealand" section is the only representative of the Pacific.

In 1965 Penn published a guide to their collections, which may have coincided with an undated photograph from Penn's photographic archives. (fig. 1.27) The guide describes the installation of Pacific objects as, "…divided the Oceanic gallery into these three culture regions showing art and artifacts of the diverse peoples who made their way in frail boats from Asia and its off lying islands to the scattered islands of the Pacific."[97]

The focus on Maori art continued through the years and on January 29, 1982, Penn opened an Oceanic exhibition that continues to the present to serve as its permanent display of Pacific Island art. Focusing solely on their Polynesian collection, the exhibition prominently displays Maori art, making the objects a focal point of the entire installation. Davenport, in writing about the new exhibition, explained their Polynesian focus as representing a, "change of emphasis; we are focusing on only one cultural

---

[96] See chapter two for further discussion of objects collected at world's fairs.

[97] *Guide to the Collections of the University Museum*. (Philadelphia: The University Museum, University of Pennsylvania, 1965), 127.

region, but we are including a much wider range of material so that both the aesthetic and utilitarian aspects of Polynesian material culture are represented; and we are including a brief summary of the archaeology of Polynesia, one of the last regions of the world to be occupied by mankind."[98]

The current display begins with introductory material relating to the country of New Zealand and a map. (fig. 1.28) The display isolates certain objects and themes and then explains and explores them using other objects, text, and contextual illustrations. For example, one section is devoted to the Maori canoe and includes a large reproduction of John James Barralet's Maori war canoe illustration (fig. 1.29) along with a prow and stern from their collection (fig. 1.30a/b). Another section is devoted to cloaks to explain not only the object, but to illustrate the role of the Maori chief - the wearer of the cloak. Davenport included a drawing of a Maori chief to show how the cloak is worn and an actual cloak from Penn's collection, paired with a chief's staff (fig. 1.31). Another section focuses on Maori portraiture created by European artists like Gottfried Lindauer (1870's and 80') and William Goldie (early 20th-century) (fig. 1.32). Below the portraits is a case of objects like those illustrated in the drawings – hand clubs (*patu)* and pendants (*hei-tikis*) – a way of tying together objects and their constructed contextual use (fig. 1.33).

Penn's installation, now twenty-three years old, remains largely unchanged since it opened in 1982. It is evident that Davenport was working with a small budget, but still managed to isolate and explain important aspects of Maori art and culture. What is important about the installation is not necessarily how good it looks, or doesn't, but rather

---

[98] Davenport, 2.

that the emphasis of much of the hall is on the Maori, with a few displays of Melanesian art sharing the space. This instantly leads to questions about why – why the emphasis on the Maori over any other Polynesian culture. This question may, in part, be answered by looking at the collection history of the Museum, with special attention paid to their long relationship with English ethnographic dealer, William O. Oldman.

Although the majority of the objects in Penn's collection were purchases made from Oldman, there are two other significant accessions. One is a *kaitaka* cloak (fig. 1.34) that has Peale Museum provenance. Like the objects in PMAE's collection with Peale provenance, it could also date to the early nineteenth-century. The other significant collection, at least in terms of size, was purchased by the Museum in 1890, five years after they opened from Edward D. Cope for $5,500.[99] An example from the Cope collection is a canoe prow (fig. 1.35). Although the Cope collection surpasses the number of objects purchased from Oldman in numbers, the significance of the Oldman objects in Penn's collection cannot be overstated and is the focal point of the discussion regarding Penn's collection history.

"Yours obediently, sincerely, and faithfully":
William O. Oldman, Ethnographic Dealer and Collector

As previously mentioned, English ethnographic dealer and collector William O. Oldman's (fig. 1.36) personal collection of Maori artifacts was bought in 1948 by the New Zealand government for the sum of £44, 000 and then distributed among the

[99] E.D. Cope Unpublished Letter to Dr. William Pepper, December 29, 1890, Archives, University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, PA

nation's four major museums, as well as some of its smaller regional museums. While Oldman is most well known for his collection that went to New Zealand, he was also known in the United States, as he had been selling Maori and Pacific art to museums across the country for forty years. In fact, the 111 objects Penn purchased from him account for one-third of its entire Maori collection. One curious fact about many of the objects attributed to having been purchased from Oldman[100] is that they were published as part of the E.W. Clark Collection that was presented to the museum in 1910 by Clark's son Herbert, with no acknowledgement of Oldman's role in the transactions.[101] This seems to have been a frequent occurrence in the early history of many museums – that public acknowledgement of donor information trumped information regarding from whom the object was purchased.

Whatever was the case, because of the great number of purchases Penn made from Oldman, presumably with money provided by Clark [102] the correspondence detailing these transactions, written over a thirty-year period of negotiations over the acquisitions, is extensive. Sometimes Oldman would send catalogues of objects to Penn, or the museum would inquire if certain types of objects were available, such as a canoe prow or meetinghouse. Oldman frequently sent Penn objects he thought the museum would wish to purchase on consignment, giving the director and curator an opportunity to view the objects firsthand.

---

[100] Attributions include the Museum's own records and correspondence between Penn and Oldman.

[101] See: "Notes," *The Museum Journal* 1, no. 3 (December 1910): 2, and "The E.W. Clark Collection. New Zealand," *The Museum Journal* 2, no. 2 (June 1911): 30-42.

[102] Since the objects were clearly sold by Oldman, I will continue to refer to them as Oldman objects, as opposed to referring to them as part of the Clark collection.

Once a decision was made—a process that often took much longer than Oldman would have preferred—the remaining objects would be returned via ship. As one might imagine, given the time period in the early twentieth-century, this process of buying and selling objects often took months, if not years, to culminate in a final transaction. The letters provide insight into how deals were struck and objects were acquired, and reveal a mostly cordial (though sometimes subtly hostile) relationship between Oldman and his clients.

A letter dated August 17, 1908, from Oldman to Penn director George Byron Gordon, began the twenty-year relationship between W. O. Oldman and Penn. In this first documented correspondence, Oldman writes:

> In reply to your favour of the 7th: I have the pleasure in sending a copy of my general catalogue which is now however, a little out of date…I shall be very pleased to send further particulars of any or I would send selections on approval if carriage is paid both ways. – I guarantee all specimens sold to be genuine old pieces, and any will be willingly exchanged if found wanting in any respect….Hoping to hear from you at your convenience. I am Sir Yours obediently, W. O. Oldman[103]

In this initial letter, Oldman lists a number of objects he has on hand, including "[a] number of fine old New Zealand Specimens on hand. Feather boxes."[104] The dealer followed the initial letter by sending a number of objects for the museum to look over, including close to sixty Maori objects.

---

[103] William O. Oldman, Unpublished Letter to G.B. Gordon, August 17, 1908, Archives, University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, PA.

[104] Ibid.

By December 17, 1909, Penn had made its first purchase: a pair of objects Oldman described as "Gate Posts"[105] (fig. 1.37). The gateposts were on display as early as 1921, evident by the installation photograph in figs. 1.25 and 1.26. On January 9, 1910, the dealer wrote:

> I have taken the liberty of enclosing you a list of an interesting collection of wooden Food and Oil Bowls which I have formed. The New Zealand Feasting Bowl is, I believe, unique in size and is of very great age, almost black and highly polished. I hope you will receive the New Zealand Pa Gate posts very soon, There was some little delay with the Consular Invoice. I am holding the specimens awaiting the favour of your reply.[106]

The reference to the delay was followed up four months later by another letter from Oldman:

> I am sorry to say I have been unable to get the desired declaration from the American Consuls—I have been down several times. The main difficulty was that I did not know the Consular Invoice number and they did not seem inclined to assist me in the slightest by looking thro' the day invoices for the name, although I asked them to.—They were hardly satisfied that I could prove the Gate posts were over 100 years old.—and as a matter of fact I cannot say they are but they are undoubtedly very old specimen. The New Zealand Bowl is a very exceptional piece and I am sure you would not find it dear although an expensive piece. I shall be very greatly obliged if you could let me have the cheque which you promised in January last as I have a lot of expenses to meet.[107]

---

[105] William O. Oldman, Unpublished Letter to G.B. Gordon, December 17, 1908, Archives, University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, PA.

[106] William O. Oldman, Unpublished Letter to G.B. Gordon, January 19, 1910, Archives, University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, PA.

[107] William O. Oldman, Unpublished Letter to G.B. Gordon, May 4, 1910, Archives, University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, PA.

The letter dated May 4, 1910 is fascinating because it not only points out the difficulty in objects clearing through customs—as well as the importance of being able to reasonably date objects—but it also highlights the importance of the object's age and authenticity, its status as a "very old specimen." Another interesting note is the timeliness (or rather, lack thereof) of the transaction: although the initial purchase seems to have taken place on December 17, 1909, the museum did not receive the object itself until April 1911, a full sixteen months later, which occasioned Oldman to write, "I am in receipt of your favour of the 18th [?] I am glad to hear the specimens have reached you safely."[108] Oldman was glad the objects arrived, but by then he had already moved on to the next sale, writing:

> On the three collections of Club and Jade Meri I cannot possibly make any reduction but I will accept £400. for the collection as sent, for cash. Regarding my prices which you consider high. I would point out to you that the pieces sent are the rarest and finest. I could supply you with a good old New Zealand Paddle for instance, as old and large as the one sent you but with plain blade for £1.3.0, And a good old Jade Meri for £16.10.0 It is the specimens which are exceptional in size or carving which are so exceedingly scarce.[109]

Here again, price haggling between Oldman and his museum client is based on how old and rare the objects were thought to be.

---

[108] William O. Oldman, Unpublished Letter to G.B. Gordon, April 27, 1911, Archives, University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, PA.

[109] Ibid.

Letters between Oldman and Gordon from later that year reveal the pursuit of larger objects, namely houses and whole canoes. On June 19, 1911, Oldman wrote the following to Gordon:

> Re Maori House.—It is curious that I have been negotiating for a very fine specimen of one of these for some time, the owner is asking a very high price but I am hoping before long to be able to secure it at a lower figure. —I know of another but it is a late work, quite complete about 12 x 24 ft.—I will let you know as soon as I get anything settled re the first one—I also know of a complete New Zealand War Canoe with carved prow and stern. It is very large, would this interest you at all?[110]

By September 21, 1911, Oldman was soliciting interest in the "Burr Tiki"[111] (fig. 1.38) and was, on behalf of the museum, on the lookout for an Edge-Partington catalogue of the Pacific, which he considered "exceedingly difficult to get."[112] Oldman also makes reference to a consignment of "three Maori heads"[113] that he offered to the museum, but which was ultimately rejected.

---

[110] William O. Oldman, Unpublished Letter to G.B. Gordon, June 19, 1911, Archives, University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, PA.

[111] Eventually this *tiki* was purchased from Oldman by the museum as part of the E. W. Clark Collection. According to a June 1911 issue of the Penn's *Museum Journal* (p. 42), the *tiki* was "brought from New Zealand by Midshipman Burr, of the 'Discovery,' one of the two ships of Captain Cook's third voyage around the world." This is incorrect because Burr was a master's mate on Cook's second voyage aboard the *Resolution*. Regardless, the specimen remained in the Burr family until it was acquired by Penn. Although undocumented by the most current scholarship concerning Cook objects in the United States by Adrienne Kaeppler, if the statement was true, it would be only one of two (the other in the collection of the Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago) Cook collected objects in the United States.

[112] William O. Oldman, Unpublished Letter to G.B. Gordon, September 21, 1911, Archives, University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, PA.

The correspondence also reveals that, on at least one occasion, the museum commissioned Oldman to buy objects on its behalf:

> I thank you for your cablegram re. Sale received commissioning me to buy the good selected lots at reasonable prices. My com: to be 10% on Maximum Valuation plus Van hire, clearing and cost of packing specimens. I will do my best to buy as cheaply as possible for you.[114]

Oldman followed up three days later, writing, "I beg to report I was able to secure practically all the best pieces in the Sale of Maori Curios yesterday. I enclose account of the lots bought"[115] He also provides further details on some of the objects he procured:

> I purchased lot 60[a] (adze handle, p3207) although fairly late it is very good work – The only other desirable lot mentioned by you was Lot 49[a] , this had been broken in two and carefully restored. I bid up to £23 for same and considered this was quite enough for an imperfect specimen. With regard to Lot 48[a] (p3203 treasure box) this remarkable box I am told has been in a museum under a glass case for over 60 years this will account for the new appearance the carving has on the other side. I hope you will be pleased with the selection I have made.[116]

A few days later, Oldman confirms that the Maori objects, along with some from Benin were shipped to Penn.[117] He also mentions Thomas Edward (T. E.) Donne, who figures

---

[113] Ibid.

[114] William O. Oldman, Unpublished Letter to G.B. Gordon, April 14, 1912, Archives, University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, PA.

[115] William O. Oldman, Unpublished Letter to G.B. Gordon, April 17, 1912, Archives, University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, PA.

[116] Ibid.

prominently in the histories of world's fairs and development of American natural history museums. In this instance, Oldman is referring to Donne and the Maori house[118] that he wanted to sell:

> Mr. T. E. Donne whose collection will be sold tomorrow has asked me if I can disperse of his carved Maori house for him, it is of course not an old specimen but the carving on the whole is good and even this carving I am told it is now impossible to get.—It was carved about 30 years ago. It is here in London and is very complete.—The piece asked at the Exhibition was over £1000 but it may now be purchased for £765, I am sending you a book giving illustrations and description of house, which M Donne has lent to me and which I shall be obliged if you will return to me at your convenience. [119]

In response to objects that were sent to Penn in June of 1913, Gordon expressed his disappointment in not being offered carvings that were on a larger scale and criticized Oldmen for prices he considered to be, "Prohibitive." [120] Oldman's reply was only to contend that the prices were the same as they had always been, and that it was, "utterly

---

[117] William O. Oldman, Unpublished Letter to G.B. Gordon, April, 23, 1912, Archives, University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, PA.

[118] In his book *Carved Histories: Rotorua Ngati Tarawhai Woodcarving*, anthropologist Roger Neich explains that Donne's house was commissioned in 1905 by Maori artists Neke Kapua, Eramiha Kapua, and Tene Waitere from Rotorua. Donne loaned the house to the Christchurch International Exhibition in 1906, where it was given the name *Te Wharepuni-a-Maui*. After the exhibition closed, the house stood unoccupied in the Government Gardens in Rotorua before finally being sold, presumably after 1912. The house now belongs to the collection of the Stuttgart Linden-Museum in Germany.

[119] William O. Oldman, Unpublished Letter to G.B. Gordon, April 14, 1912, Archives, University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, PA.

[120] G.B. Gordon, Unpublished Letter to William O. Oldman, July 17, 1913, Archives, University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, PA.

impossible for me to quote you a price something like half my quoted prices for the pick of the collection…"[121]

This exchange reveals a slight rift between the client and the dealer—the client expressing wariness in paying over-inflated prices and the dealer, irritated, responds curtly. Although the available correspondence does not reveal what the end solution was, it is a fact that at least nine Maori objects were purchased from the list sent in June; these included a doorpost, two treasure boxes, a hand club, three *hei-tikis*, an ear pendant, and an adze blade.

It appears that the client-dealer rift was repaired, however, and by November of that year Oldman was offering new collections of African and New Ireland objects, while reminding Gordon to return the remaining portion of the Polynesian collection that sparked their disagreement. Also in this letter, Oldman asks, "Do you require a copy of Hamiltons' Maori Art? I have a new one bound I should be pleased to sell it for £5.5.0. I have also a fine large set of plates (fine early impression) to Cook Voyages. Thanking you I am Sir Yours obediently W. O. Oldman."[122] His questions reveal how Hamilton's *Maori Art*—published originally in the late nineteenth century and the main survey of Maori art until the publication of Terrence Barrow's work in 1978—was purchased, as well as indicating an expectation that the museum would be interested in both that text and in images related to the Cook voyages.

---

[121] William O. Oldman, Unpublished Letter to G.B. Gordon, July 30 1913, Archives, University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, PA.

[122] William O. Oldman, Unpublished Letter to G.B. Gordon, November, 4, 1913, Archives, University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, PA.

Oldman sent another set of objects to Gordon in May of 1919. These included three Maori objects: the first, described as a "New Zealand large Bowl and cover tiki figures on lid. Largest specimen known of its kind brought to England about 1845 by Admiral Faursett," and the second, "Feather Box with legs added. Very ancient specimen. G. Bennet. Kovel 1826" and "Overdoor. 3 figures. Fine pierced work."[123] What is unclear is if any of the objects were purchased by Penn. No records exist that document a transaction was ever made. Less than one year later, Oldman sent another set of objects, including flax mats, cloaks, belts, a tiki, and hand club.[124] At the end of that same month, he sent a list of Fijian and Maori objects to Gordon, and a list of objects packed and sent to Penn that included a collection of thirty-four Maori "specimens."[125] From a letter dated June 5, 1920, it appears that Penn bought two treasure boxes, which were listed in Oldman's letter dated March 3.

The correspondence between Oldman and Gordon continued; however, by July 13, 1925, Gordon wrote to Oldman indicating that the museum's collecting habits had changed: "We will always be interested in ethnographical specimens, especially in the excellent material that you are in the habit of assembling. Lately for two reasons we have

---

[123] Unpublished List, "Oceanian Section-Collections-Oldman," W. O.-Lists of Collections (1914–1923), May 17, 1919, Archives, University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, PA.

[124] William O. Oldman, Unpublished Letter to G.B. Gordon, March 3, 1920, Archives, University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, PA.

[125] Unpublished List, "Oceanian Section-Collections-Oldman," W. O.-Lists of Collections (1914–1923), March 31, 1920, Archives, University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, PA.

not done much in this direction because we have been obliged to use our resources for the time being in our Oriental collections."[126]

The museum was interested in finding out more about a canoe prow they had purchased from Oldman in 1912 (fig. 130b). In a letter written July 17, 1925, Gordon inquired about the prow that had a brass plate attached to it, reading, "Present to F. W. Trolove. Esq., J. P. as a souvenir of the classic shores of Queen Charlotte Sound by Captain Courtenay Kenny J.P.H.H. R. This figure head of a Maori canoe believed to have been the last relic possessed by the Ngatiawa of the invasion and conquest of Queen Charlotte Sound by their ancestors under Rauperaha." Gordon was curious if Oldman knew anything about the previous owner and if, in fact, the prow had been collected in British Columbia; if it had, it would indicate possible communication between Northwest Coast Indians and the Maori. The canoe prow's previous owner was T. E. Donne, and through Oldman he indicated to Penn the history of the object. Unfortunately, the archives do not have Donne's letter, but it is safe to assume that the Maori did not invade eastern Canada in the nineteenth century.

The last set of Oldman letters, dating between 1930 and 1939, reflect a dealer who was on the verge of entering into retirement. What is perhaps the most important letter of the many written to Penn by Oldman dates to December 3, 1930 and is marked "private and confidential." In it, Oldman offers Hall and Penn the first chance to buy his personal

[126] G.B. Gordon, Unpublished Letter to William O. Oldman, July 13, 1925, Archives, University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, PA.

collection of Maori artifacts—the same collection that, ultimately, was purchased by the New Zealand government:[127]

> I thank you for you for your letter of the 14th alt. Yes I told Mr. Heye who is my oldest American friend my life secret, about the private collection I have been gathering over the last thirty years.
>
> When I started my Ethnographical business in 1901 I had a few very choice Polynesian things which I determined to keep locked away and to add anything exceptionally rare that I came across when I could afford to do so, thus acting as my life insurance, gradually I have gathered a unique collection.
>
> I have kept this an absolute secret until I told Mr. Heye. I had to because my clients would naturally have been offended at not getting the offer of all I secured—
>
> I retired from the business some three years ago and now after long deliberation I decided I could part with the collections only as a whole and to give America the first chance to acquire it. My reason being that America helped me when my own country would or could not during the years I was trying to make a living. I talked the matter over with Mr. Heye and he very kindly said he would mention the matter to Mr. Jayne. I desire especially that this should be kept as quiet as possible as I realize that there will be many vigorous protests against it leaving this country, it would make quite a stir in the Ethnographical world and I do not want any publicity or bother until the collection is out of my possession.
> I am unable to convey much of an idea in writing of the quality of the collection but the following details given in absolute confidence may be of use.—
>
> There are over 1,000 objects, from New Zealand there are 30 Feather Boxes, 32 Tekies, 8 Heads, 6 Feeding Funnels, 16 Musical Instruments (Flutes, Whistles And Trumpet) 2 Unique Stone Sculptures, 25 large carvings (Canoe Sterns and Prows, Overdoors, Master, Bowl) 2 Toki with carved handles, The largest jade adze known, Mussell? Roki, Bailers 7[128]…Every piece in the Collection is Either

---

[127] Although the letter is not available in the Penn archives, it seems that George Heye—Oldman's lifelong friend and the man responsible for the Heye collection of Native American art that forms the basis for the National Museum of the American Indian's collection—had revealed to Hall the existence of Oldman's "secret" collection. Oldman's "private and confidential" letter of December 3, 1930 was in response to his inquiry.

[128] Oldman also describes the other objects that were also part of the collection he offered for £55,000. In addition to the 1,000 Maori objects, he also had objects from Hawaii, Rarotonga, Tahiti, Marquesas, Easter Island, Micronesia, and Melanesia, Benin, American Indian, and Eskimo.

> very rare or unique and contains specimens brought over by Vancouver, Cook, Wilson, Freycinet, Ellis, Williams, Bennett.
>
> Its true value as a collection could not be computed by anyone as it is unique.—I would be very pleased to show you or Mr. Jayne the collection at any time and to give every facility to approve it, if you consider its possible acquisition.—The definite price I have fixed is £55,000. (Fifty-five thousand pounds)
>
> I may mention that there is not a single piece in this collection which was in my stock which you saw when in England. I have the balance of this material stored here also and it is available to the purchaser of the collection at a very low price.—I am sorry to have inflicted such a long letter of Explanation on you but I felt that I should give full details of the Collection's history.
>
> Trusting you are well
> I am
> Yours faithfully
> W. O. Oldman[129]

Oldman's letter of December 3 provides a first glimpse into the immensity of his "secret" collection, while also revealing Oldman's fondness for both the United States and Penn. Unfortunately, the timing could not have been worse for any American museum. By 1930, the Great Depression was at its height and the museum simply could not expend such an extraordinary sum at such a financially desperate time. Then Penn director Horace Jayne reiterated this sentiment in his reply to Oldman:

> Mr. Hall had shown me your extremely interesting letter of December 3rd regarding your private collection of ethnographical material, and Mr. Heye has kindly spoken to us of its excellence and desirability. There is no question of course as to its great importance and value and your brief notes give a good indication of its scope and quality.

---

[129] William O. Oldman, Unpublished Letter to H.U. Hall, December 3, 1930, Archives, University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, PA.

> I feared, however, when I suggested that Mr. Hall write you, that its acquisition would be beyond our means, and your letter unfortunately seems to confirm this. We are experiencing financially very difficult times and we have not of any course any such sum accumulated, nor can I face or urge upon my Board an attempt to raise so large an amount with even the remotest chance of success. We are already much curtailed in our activities due to the financial depression.
>
> I am, however, reluctant to abandon hope entirely and should an improvement of conditions occur or other events come to pass, you may be sure we shall communicate with you. It is a collection which would be welcomed here perhaps more than at any other institution in this country, and I would be personally enormously pleased if, by some means or other, it could be consummated. We shall, of course, keep your letter and all its contents strictly confidential.
> Yours sincerely
> Horace H. F. Jayne
> DIRECTOR[130]

Oldman's response was sympathetic and replied:

> Dear Mr. Jayne,
>
> I thank you for your letter of the 17th alt. regarding my collection.—I am sorry you are unable at present to entertain its purchase.
>
> I quite understand that now is the worst possible moment to dispose of it owing to this world wide trade depression. Having an immediate financial need to sell I am quite willing to let the offer stand for a short time and will meanwhile lock the main collection away.
>
> I would like your Museum to have it. If any opportunity occurred the payment could be spread over a few years if it would assist you at all.
>
> I am Yours sincerely,
> W. O. Oldman[131]

---

[130] Horace H. F. Jayne, Unpublished Letter to William O. Oldman, December 17, 1930, Archives, University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, PA.

[131] William O. Oldman, Unpublished Letter to Horace H. F. Jayne, January 9, 1931, Archives, University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, PA.

Like Oldman, Penn also wished the collection could be its own. The institution's curator, Henry Hall, had even requested to visit it—perhaps owing more to curiosity, rather than actually being able to buy it.

By 1939, the Oldman letters had begun to taper off. Jayne offered his institution's assistance to Oldman: "You appreciate, I trust, that if we can be of any aid to you on this side of the water, you have only to call on us."[132] Oldman, in the last letter of his found in the archives at Penn, responded:

> Dear Mr. Jayne,
>
> I thank you for your letter of the 17th Jan.—I much appreciate your very kind offer of assistance.
>
> I wrote you to say the book "Maori Artifacts" had not, at the time of writing, been received.
>
> If it has not turned up will you kindly let me know and I will send you another copy at once.
>
> I am Yours faithfully,
> W. O. Oldman[133]

Nine years later, the Oldman Collection was, as previously mentioned, purchased by the New Zealand government for £44,000 and dispersed among its major museums first, remaining objects and duplicates then sent to the smaller regional museums.[134]

---

[132] Horace H. F. Jayne, Unpublished Letter to William O. Oldman, January 17, 1939, Archives, University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, PA.

[133] William O. Oldman, Unpublished Letter to Horace H. F. Jayne, March 3, 1939, Archives, University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, PA.

Important lessons can be learned from this collection of correspondence. It provides evidence documenting the relationship of a museum to an ethnographic dealer, it reveals the plight of the ethnographic dealer—from which sources he was obtaining objects, how they were being described, what characteristics were seen as valuable and what sort of object was most in demand. In the case of the Oldman letters, the reader comes to discover that, although he had collections from other parts of Oceania and Africa, it was on New Zealand that he—like Penn—focused most intently; however, the motivation behind this focus is not definitive. Was it because those objects were most aesthetically pleasing? Was it that the Maori really were considered the "least savage of the savages?" Certainly, there had been differing opinions over the years concerning the Maori. In 1920 Hall praised the Maori for their craftsmanship, but criticized their work for succumbing to the advent of technology by stating:

> With the primitive means at his command, the beautiful lines and perfect finish of the hard greenstone alone in the weapon here shown required a degree of skill and painstaking workmanship which seem almost incredible. And the oldest and the finest productions of these artists were accomplished before the white man brought them iron and steel to replace the bone and shell and stone of the tools of their own devising. Is it no more than a coincidence that the improvement of tools and the discovery of easier methods of dealing with refractory materials goes hand in hand with a decline of the workman to the task whose very difficulties were a spur?[135]

---

[134] See Roger Neich and Janet Davidson's revised edition of, *The Oldman Collection of Maori Artifacts*, 2004, for further information regarding the sale and distribution of Oldman's collection.

[135] Hall, 242.

Twenty-seven years later in a lengthy article titled, "The Oceanic Collections of the University Museum," published in 1947, D. Sutherland Davidson wrote disparagingly about the Maori as a whole, saying that they "took keen delight in crunching eyeballs like cocktail cherries."[136] Davidson, an archaeologist and ethnologist specializing in Australia, received his Ph.D. from the University of Pennsylvania in 1928. His background in archaeology is apparent in the article that focuses on the differences between Melanesia, Polynesia, and Micronesia as opposed to what the title of the article implies, that the focus is on the Oceanic collections at Penn. One of few statements made on New Zealand, Davidson reveals his mid-twentieth century ideas about the Maori and their perceived cannibalistic tendencies.

Another possibility is the idea of the "vanishing race" and of collecting as a means of preserving a culture most certainly heading towards extinction. As Davidson comments to that effect:

> The future of the Polynesians is not encouraging. The Hawaiians and Maori will disappear into the larger populations which are engulfing them, but at least they have contributed much to the local cultural patterns, and these influences apparently will remain long after the physical types have gone.[137]

Was it because those objects were easiest to purchase? This seems unlikely, in light of legislative acts like the New Zealand Maori Antiquities Act of 1901 that ensured that Maori objects would not leave the country, thus depleting it of its own cultural heritage, although in the case of Skinner's trade with PMAE, there seems to have been a loophole

---

[136] Davidson, D. Sutherland, "The Oceanic Collections of the University Museum," *University Museum Bulletin*, 12, no. 3–4 (June, 1947): 107.

[137] Ibid.

in the legislation. Maybe it was that the most available information addressed the Maori, if you take into consideration the turn-of-the-century publication of Hamilton's *Maori Art*—which, over the years, served as a sort of Sears Roebuck catalog of Maori objects. Whatever the reasons, the letters serve as both historical documentation of the building of a collection, as well as a time capsule revealing early twentieth-century sensibilities concerning ethnographic objects.

Conclusion

By focusing on three early collections and displays of Maori art in the United States, this chapter has begun to set the foundation for studying the whole history. It charts the early expedition history of Europe and provides explanations of why Westerners were in the Pacific, further illuminating why Americans, and specifically New Englanders, were there, resulting in the first accessions of Maori art into American collections. The Peabody Essex Museum in Salem, Massachusetts, provides a context for the early collections. Its objects possess detailed provenance, unparalleled by any other museum in the United States. Their display history runs the gamut of exhibiting objects by type, function, and country of origin.

The acquisition of Maori art by the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology at Harvard University, extends the stories of New Englanders collecting Maori objects into the late 19th-century. The fictional account of a 19th-century family's viewing of Polynesian art entitled: *Tom Pop's Visit to the Boston Museum,* illustrates mid 19th-century attitudes towards art from Polynesia. In terms of installation practices, PMAE's

display offers an example of an American museum replicating the typological style of the Pitt-Rivers Museum in England -- the exhibition remaining unchanged for almost 80 years. PMAE also offers an early example of an American museum exchanging Maori objects with museums in New Zealand, specifically in the 1947 exchange with the Otago Museum in Dunedin. That exchange provides an example of the ironic and somewhat contradictory terms H.D. Skinner, director of the Otago Museum, was dealing with in trying to increase his museum's collections. The irony of the situation lies in the fact that one year after the exchange, the same government that prevented Skinner from simply purchasing the Egyptian mummy from MFA Boston, spent £44,000 to purchase the Oldman collection of Maori and Polynesian objects in an effort to retain its cultural heritage -- the same cultural heritage that Skinner was forced to exchange because the New Zealand government prevented him from taking any other action.

Finally, the discussion of the Maori art purchased and exhibited at the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology in the early decades of the 20th-century documents the Museum's relationship with an ethnographic dealer – a common practice among American museums, but rarely so well documented. The three museums discussed provide the beginning of nearly a century of understanding American attitudes towards Maori art and histories of collecting and display.

CHAPTER TWO:

WEST OF FRANCE AND NORTH OF AUSTRALIA:

MAORI ART AT WORLD'S FAIRS, 1893-1915[138]

Christopher Columbus, the state of California, foreign trade, the Louisiana Purchase, and the Panama Canal are five seemingly disparate subjects that are historically connected to the presentation of Maori art and culture at United States world's fairs and expositions. Today it is a prevailing opinion that world's fairs were a way for a hosting country to advertise its modernity and progressiveness, using non-Western cultures as a foil to do so. World's fair historian Robert Rydell summarizes this sentiment in his book, *All the World's a Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876-1916*: "World's fairs performed a hegemonic function precisely because they propagated the ideas and values of the country's political, financial, corporate, and intellectual leaders and offered these ideas as the proper interpretation of social and political reality."[139]

---

[138] Frank Morton Todd, *The Story of the Exposition: Being the Official History of the International Celebration Held at San Francisco in 1915 to Commemorate the Discovery of the Pacific Ocean and the Construction of the Panama Canal*, vols. 1-5 (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, the Knickerbocker Press, 1921), 253. The title is a reference to where the New Zealand building was located on the fairgrounds in San Francisco.

[139] Robert Rydell, *All the World's a Fair : Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876-1916* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), 5.

During the height of the Victorian age and just afterward, Maori culture was on view at five great American fairs—the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago, the 1894 California Midwinter International Exposition in San Francisco, the 1895 Cotton States and International Exposition in Atlanta, the 1904 Louisiana Purchase Exposition in Saint Louis, and the 1915 Panama-Pacific International Exposition in San Francisco.[140]

At the outset of my research I agreed with Rydell and in the first formulation of my dissertation I attempted to show that the collecting and exhibiting of Maori art at the fairs was underpinned by European-American culture's perceived racial and religious superiority, and that racial classifications were critical elements in New Zealand's interest in presenting the Maori and their culture at American world's fairs and expositions. I reasoned that the New Zealanders who submitted their country's exhibits believed in the superiority of the Caucasian Christian European world, as did the Americans who accepted or arranged for the transport of Maori material.

Up to this point in the historical narrative examined in this dissertation, we have seen Maori art treated as curiosities, souvenirs, ethnographic, or anthropological subject matter in the collections of the Peabody Essex Museum, Salem, Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology at Harvard University, and University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology. Issues of race and classification were at the forefront of my own research on their presentation at American world's fairs. To support my arguments, I originally sought mention of the Maori in the anthropological indices of

---

[140] There is no solid evidence that Maori material was sent to or received from the 1876 Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia. The Smithsonian Institution did send and receive a number of objects, but research up to this point suggests that none was Maori.

the fairs' publications; this proved an ineffective tactic, for the Maori were never the main focus of the anthropological displays at any American fair. Instead, Maori art was found in places like departments of forestry and game or palaces of agriculture providing an amendment to Rydell's general thesis: while racism and classification may have affected aspects of the exhibition of the Maori, the ultimate goal was a latter day curiosity cabinet. The Maori, many of them Christianized by this point, still had "curious" traditions and objects deemed worthy of a sideshow. Different from other cultural groups, the Maori were seen as the least savage of the savages, with the ability to make beautiful crafts like feather cloaks, war clubs, meeting houses, and canoes.

These findings have led to a modified thesis concerning the presentation of Maori art and culture at American world's fairs. While race and classification are integral to the entire enterprise of the fairs, pragmatic and even ingenuous goals—such as scientific advancement and education of the masses, as well as expanded trade and tourism—were also behind their organization. Unlike many other indigenous peoples of colonized countries at the same fairs, like the "exhibits," of live "natives," from the Philippines at the World's Columbian Exposition in 1893, the Maori were presented more as key elements in the promotion of tourism to New Zealand—not as mere anthropological specimens.

The evidence for my revised thesis comes not only from official guidebooks, exhibition catalogues, fairground maps, installation photographs, and museum accession records, but also from newspaper and journal reviews and visitor observations. The documentation, found in archives, libraries, and museums, tells a rather straightforward story: how each fair came into being, how New Zealand became involved, what was the

scope of Maori art on display at the fair, and—more importantly for later developments—what happened to those objects once the fairs closed.

The influence of the five aforementioned American fairs on the history of Maori art in the United States cannot be overstated. The fact that tourism to New Zealand was a critical motivation for featuring Maori art at the fairs, and the resulting representations of the Maori help us to understand the choice of Maori objects that were displayed there. The millions of Americans that visited these fairs indicate the possibility for Maori art and culture to enter into the collective American picture of world cultures. These visitors included members of the "general public," as well as specialists, farmers, carpenters and joiners, churchmen and -women, scientists, and anthropologists.

The fairs were also one of the vehicles American museums used to substantially increase their collections of non-Western art, specifically of Maori objects. As was the case for most of these fairs, once they were over, many of the objects would find themselves in the collections of American museums, having been given to or bought by the institution rather than returning to their place of origin. For example, the collections of the Smithsonian Institution increased more after the 1904 Louisiana Purchase Exposition than at any other time in its history, excluding the period after the 1876 Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia.[141] The ways in which these objects were acquired are of particular interest to this study, as the cast of dealers, curators, and directors—as well as the fairs themselves—should be viewed as culture brokers. Their collective influence on the characterization of the Maori collections at American natural history museums, especially, is critical.

---

[141] www.si.edu/archives/archives/findingaids/faru0070series_16htm

This chapter is separated into sections on the five fairs and then subsections on museums with collections that have objects original displayed at those fairs. Those museums include the American Museum of Natural History, New York; the Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago; the Smithsonian Institution, National Museum of Natural History, Washington D.C.; the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University; the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia; and the M. H. de Young Memorial Museum, San Francisco.

World's Columbian Exposition, Chicago, 1893

Robert Rydell described the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago as having "introduced millions of fairgoers to evolutionary ideas about race—ideas that were presented in a utopian context and often conveyed by exhibits that were ostensibly amusing."[142] The fair in Chicago was a place where the "Other" was repeatedly displayed in the anthropological buildings and on the Midway Plaisance as a means of reinforcing popular late nineteenth-century ideas about race and class, presenting "scientific" evidence that supported those claims.

Examples of Maori art and culture were located within several different areas of the exposition. Their primary location was within the New South Wales exhibition located in the anthropological building's department of ethnology. In his 1893 publication *The Book of the Fair*, author Hubert Howe Bancroft describes the New South Wales and New Zealand displays, stating:

---

[142] Rydell, 40–41.

> In the western quarter of the Anthropological building a considerable space is devoted to the large and interesting government exhibit from New South Wales, and to the collections from New Zealand, New Caledonia, and other islands of the South Pacific. They are mainly composed of weapons, implements, ornaments, and costumes, arranged in striking designs upon the walls of the various sections, supplemented by hideous idols from the New Hebrides and Solomon groups, and by paintings of typical natives, some of them hardly less repulsive…The assortment of Polynesian curios is further enriched by contributions from the royal museum of Vienna, and by those of private individuals, among which is one from New Caledonia, while from New Zealand are implements, ornaments, and cloth of Maori manufacture.[143]

In addition to the description provided by Bancroft, the fair's official catalogue lists the exhibits within the New South Wales display. New Zealand is listed specifically by name, located in "Exhibit no. 18. Liversidge, Archibald, M.A.F.R.S., professor of chemistry in the University of Sydney. Loan collection of aboriginal stone weapons of New South Wales, Victoria, New Zealand, New Guinea, New Britain."[144] More Maori objects may have been included in exhibits with vague titles such as "ethnological specimens from the South Sea Islands"[145] or "Collection of articles of clothing,

---

[143] Hubert Howe Bancroft, *The Book of the Fair: An Historical and Descriptive Presentation of the World's Science, Art and Industry, as Viewed Through the Columbian Exposition at Chicago in 1893* (Chicago and San Francisco: The Bancroft Company, 1893) 639.

[144] *Official Catalogue of Exhibits World's Columbian Exposition, Department M. Anthropological Building, Midway Plaisance and Isolated Exhibits* (Chicago: W. B. Conkey Company, 1893) 33.

[145] *Official Catalogue*, 32.

implements of war, and the chase, and tools of industrial operations of the natives of the South Sea Islands."[146]

Maori objects were also located within such diverse locations as the Massachusetts State Building, the Wards Natural Science Establishment display, and Carl Hagenbeck's Ethnographic display. Maori carvers may have been on site, creating a doorway and lintel that is now in the collection of the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Anthropology and Archaeology.[147]

New Zealand participated in the Chicago fair under the aegis of New South Wales (as it was once under the authority of Philip the Governor of New South Wales) in the late 18th-century. The reasons for New Zealand's participation in the Chicago fair are explained in a letter to John Ballance (1839–1893), former liberal premier of New Zealand, written by Alexander Campbell, a member of the United States Consulate in New South Wales. Campbell wrote:

> My dear Sir,
>
> Press of business before my departure from Wellington prevented me from calling personally to offer you, and through you, the government of New Zealand, my warmest thanks for your enlightened sympathy and prompt action towards ensuring the adequate representation of the resources of your enterprising and interesting colony at Chicago in 1893.
>
> I can assure you I shall not fail to make known to the authorities in America how much I am indebted for the courtesy and attention with which my mission was received by you and other representative gentlemen whom I had the pleasure of meeting while in New Zealand.

---

[146] Ibid.

[147] Evidence of this is located in Penn's archives in material relating to the objects. As the notes are not footnoted or documented in anyway, it is difficult to ascertain the validity.

> I feel sure that any measures New Zealand may take to exhibit her wonderful resources at the World's Fair will not prove a cause for regret.
>
> With assurances of the highest consideration.
>
> I am, my dear Sir,
> Very faithfully yours,
> [signed] Alexander Campbell[148]

This letter of invitation gives no indication that New Zealand's objective for participating in the fair was in any way related to promoting anthropological research or commentating on racial issues—adding another caveat to Rydell's assertion that the overriding theme of the 1893 fair "introduced millions of fairgoers to evolutionary ideas about race…"[149] New Zealand's reason for participating is made clear in Campbell's statement that participation was an act of, "ensuring the adequate representation of the resources of your enterprising and interesting colony at Chicago in 1893." In other words, to promote the country's industrial and natural resources.

The three museums with collections of objects with World's Columbian Exposition provenance are the Field Museum, the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, and the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology. Of the three institutions, the Field Museum's collection is the largest and the majority of their collection is based on objects that were originally displayed at the 1893 fair. In fact, the current museum is housed in one of the extant

---

[148] Alexander Campbell, Unpublished Letter to John Balance, September 10, 1891, Reference # MS-Papers-0025-10, National Library, Wellington, New Zealand.

[149] Rydell, 40–41.

buildings from the 1893 fairgrounds. A total of fifty-two objects, diverse in type and material, compose the Field's collection of Maori objects with American world's fair provenance. The fifty-two objects came to the museum in four separate accessions: numbers 81, 94, 407, and 813.

The first, accession number 81 was a purchase of two clubs from Carl Hagenbeck, a German ethnographic dealer. Carl Hagenbeck's Zoological Arena and World's Museum was located in the Midway Plaisance section of the fair. Confirmation that the objects originated from that location is found in a letter from Hagenbeck to the Field Museum's director dated September 22, 1893:

> Dear Sir, Herewith I beg to have you my price list of Ethnographical Collections which are at present on exhibition in my Zoological Arena here. I am inclined to sell the collections after the close of the exposition, and should feel much obliged if you would kindly let me know if you purchase any of them. The prices are very reasonable. Hope that you will visit my place in time to view the collections yourself. I remain your very truly, signed Carl Hagenbeck."[150]

In addition to Hagenbeck's letter of invitation, a letter from the Field Museum's director to Captain S. R. Jacobsen dated March 21, 1895 confirms that the collection was sold to the museum.

Hagenbeck's collection was not the only one that the museum purchased directly from the fair; objects contained in accession number 94 were bought from The R.J. Gunning Co. as part of a collection of "idols." Instrumental in bargaining the price down

---

[150] Carl Hagenbeck, Unpublished Letter to the Director of the Field Columbian Museum, September, 22, 1893, Accession #81, 1893, Registrar's Office, Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago, IL.

to $1750 from an original figure of $7500 was Franz Boas, who wrote that the collection, "seems to me altogether too high."[151] The four Maori objects included two pendants (*hei-tikis*) as well as a small head made of wood (fig. 2.01) and a carved figure described as an, "image," in the museum's catalogue (fig. 2.02).

Objects forming the rest of accession number 407 were procured from the Wards Natural Science Establishment, noted for its display of mastodons in the anthropology building and rare gems in the mineral department (fig. 2.03).[152] From Wards, the Field Museum bought several Maori life masks, molds taken of deceased Maori men's faces, as well as craniums, two children's skulls, and a partial skeleton.[153] Although these objects do not fall into the category of *art*—art being the ultimate focus of this dissertation—they do speak to the museum's overriding goal of collecting not only what we today consider art, but also collecting objects of a more organic nature, in the form of human remains.

Accession number 813 is a gift to the Field Museum described as "53 ethnological objects-New Zealand."[154] There are several problematic aspects to this accession. First, the accession date is April 29, 1902—that is, nine years after the close of the fair. This time lapse makes one wonder for what reason the transaction was

---

[151] Franz Boas, Unpublished Letter to F.J.V. Skiff., March 2, 1894, Registrar's Office, Field Museum, Chicago, IL.

[152] Bancroft, 651.

[153] These objects are located in an area of the Field Museum nicknamed, "The Bone Room." Due to the fact that several of the objects found in the Ward accession are of human remains, photographs were not taken.

[154] Accession record #813, 1902, Registrar's Office, Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago, IL.

delayed, as the accession dates for both Hagenbeck and the Wards Natural Science Establishment occurred within 1893.

The second problem is stated on the accession record itself: "No data could be found indicating the identity of the collector so was assigned to WCE."[155] This statement causes immediate concern, indicating that the objects may never have been displayed at the fair. Furthermore, the current database at the Field Museum indicates that there are thirty-nine Maori objects associated with this accession number, not fifty-three. Where, then, are the fourteen missing objects?[156]

Another institution with a collection of Maori objects from the World's Columbian Exposition is the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Anthropology and Archaeology. On its own, the museum held an award-winning exhibit at the exposition, curated by Stewart Culin, then the director and curator of the Egyptian sections. In addition to curating the exhibition, Culin was also responsible for increasing the museum's limited collection, established in1887, six years before the fair.[157]

One of Culin's acquisitions at the fair was a Maori doorway and lintel then described as "[o]ne of the most impressive" [158] Polynesian objects Culin collected at the

---

[155] Accession record #81, 1902, Registrar's Office, Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago, IL.

[156] List of Maori Objects, September 2002, Office of the Collection Manager, Field Museum, Chicago, IL.

[157] Alex Pezzati, "World's Columbian Exposition, Chicago, 1893," [8/21/1991] Archives, University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, PA.

[158] William H. Davenport, "The Curators Write: A History of the Museum's Polynesian Collection," *Expedition* (Winter, 1982): 3. In his article, Davenport states, "…in 1893 Mr. Stewart Culin, then the Secretary of the Museum, purchased objects at the World's

fair. (fig. 2.04) According to William Davenport, a former Oceanic curator at the museum, the doorway and lintel were carved at the fair by Maori craftsmen.[159] Although evidence of this is not firm, it would be the single incident in the history of Maori inclusion in American world's fairs where the Maori artists themselves were part of the exhibit. A fairgoer could presumably not only view the art of the Maori, but also observe the artists in the act of creation.

The doorway and lintel (*pare*) are on permanent display at the museum (figure 2.04) and compose a significant portion of the Maori installation within its Polynesian section. The carvings are extremely intricate and complicated, incorporating multiple ancestor figures (*manaia*) with paua shell eyes into the design of the doorway, along with the standard spiral motif. The lintel (*pare*) is similar in composition to the lintel (*pare*) (fig. 1.07) donated by Richardson to the Peabody Essex Museum in 1802, with the central figure flanked by a symmetrical composition including *manaia* figures on either side.

The third institution that collected Maori art at the fair was the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology at Harvard University. The seven Maori objects in their collection are mostly small jade pieces—pendants and fragments as well as two clubs, that are included in the museum's current display. Except for the aforementioned

---

Columbian Exposition in Chicago. Among them were many fine objects from Polynesian New Zealand. One of the most impressive was a sculptured doorway that had been carved at the Exposition by expert New Zealand craftsmen who had been brought to Chicago to demonstrate the old, and justifiably famous, Polynesian skills." Davenport is making reference to multiple Maori objects aside from the doorway and lintel, but according the Museum's catalogue records, the only Maori objects with world's fair provenance were the doorway and lintel.

[159] Ibid.

statement that these pieces were purchased at the World's Columbian Exposition in 1893, there is no other information regarding the individual objects.[160]

One of the more unusual objects in PMAE and, moreover, any of the American world's fair collections, is a carved wooden picture frame (fig. 2.05a/b/c) composed of multiple three-dimensional portrait busts depicting Maori men and women and carved *manaia* figures. The accession records specify "Gift of Mrs. F. W. Putnam 1917. Probably given to F. W. Putnam while at the Chicago Exposition, 1892–93."[161]

The frame is an example of cross-cultural exchange between the Maori and New Settlers, whereby traditional Maori woodcarving techniques and subjects melded together with European conventions of decoration. The top is carved with leaves and ferns that converge onto a carved portrait bust in ¾ view of Maori man. The man, wearing a feather cloak, is portrayed with facial tattoos. Two similar portraits—possibly depicting the same man as the one portrayed in the top middle of the frame, but in a different view—adorn the right and left bottom corners on the frame. The top left corner is broken off, but the top right corner depicts a Maori woman carrying a child on her back. On both the right and left sides are carved depictions of *tiki* figures with tongues protruding. Their three fingered hands rest on their stomachs with one hand holding a club (*patu*). The figures are adorned with alternating line and dot patterns that resemble tattoo markings.

An unexpected display of Maori art was exhibited in the Massachusetts State Building. As discussed in chapter one, the Peabody Essex Museum in Salem sent a

---

[160] Accession file #93-32, Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.

[161] Specimen label Peabody Museum ID #2003.1.2663, Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.

display of Pacific objects to the fair in an effort to promote its collection. The case (fig. 1.08) consisted of a case of objects labeled "Polynesia" and included various model ships from throughout Polynesia, long spears (including ones from New Zealand), and most noticeable, the Maori lintel collected by Richardson.[162]

California Midwinter International Exposition, San Francisco, 1894

The California Midwinter International Exposition was the west coast's version of the World's Columbian Exposition and was the location where many of the exhibits displayed in Chicago were shipped.[163] M. H. de Young, publisher of the *San Francisco Chronicle,* Columbian commissioner from California, and vice-president of the National Commission, was responsible for bringing the fair to fruition; in a wave of enthusiasm, he had taken it upon himself to recreate a version of the fair in the west. According to the fair's official history, De Young's motivation arose from an idea that "if these exhibits were to be available elsewhere, why not secure them for California, and why not, at the same time, advertise California's climatic advantages by holding a great international exposition by the side of the Golden Gate, at a season of the year when dwellers in less-favored localities sit huddled around their fires?"[164]

---

[162] This case is discussed in detail in chapter one.

[163] Robert W. Rydell, John E. Findling, and Kimberly D. Pelle, *Fair America: World's Fairs in the United States* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2000), 41.

[164] *The Official History of the California Midwinter International Exposition: A Descriptive Record of the Origin, Development and Success of the Great Industrial Expositional Enterprise, Held in San Francisco from January to July, 1894, Compiled*

Although no photographs of the Maori display at the fair are known, there is a description that states, "To this collection of weapons of war and weapons of the chase are added specimens of South Sea Island spears, swords made of sharks' teeth, South Sea Island warriors clubs, the model of an Alaska boat, the ornamental prow of a New Zealand war canoe and a New Guinea shield…"[165] Seven Maori objects[166] on display at the CMIE served to "perpetuate in the Museum"[167] and now compose a portion of the De Young Museum's permanent collection. The objects include a canoe prow and stern, and ancestral figures. (figs. 2.06-2.08)

Cotton States and International Exposition, Atlanta, 1895

The Cotton States and International Exposition in Atlanta that opened in 1895 was the southern United State's version of the World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago. Business leaders noticed of the success of the 1893 fair and seized the opportunity to increase their region's visibility on the world's foreign trade scene – something they

---

from the Official Records of the Exposition and Published by Authority of the Executive Committee (San Francisco: Press of H. S. Crocker Company, 1894), 11.

[165] Ibid., 198.

[166] The M. H. deYoung Museum was closed for renovations until the fall of 2005. Although the collection could not be viewed, photographs of the objects were provided to the writer by the Museum in the publication, *Traditional Art of Africa, Oceania and the Americas* by Jane Powell Dwyer and Edward Bridgman Dwyer. It is unfortunate that the archival records could not be accessed during the course of my research.

[167] *The Official History of the California Midwinter International Exposition*, 11.

hoped would help the country out of the depression it was experiencing.[168] The Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C. sent a number of specimens to Atlanta culled from exhibits they had sent two years earlier to the World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago.[169] George Brown Goode, then the assistant secretary of the Smithsonian lists the goals of their exhibition stating:

> In making the arrangement referred to, an attempt was made—(1) To give as good an idea as possible of the character of the treasures which are preserved in the Museum, by presenting an epitome of its contents, with contributions from every department. (2) To illustrate the methods by which science controls, classifies, and studies great accumulations of material objects and uses these as a means for the discovery of the truth. (3) To exhibit the manner in which collections are arranged, labeled, and displayed in a great museum. (4) To afford as much instruction and pleasure as possible to those who visited the Atlanta Exposition, to impress them with the value of museums as agencies for public enlightenment, and thus to encourage the formation of public museums in the cities of the South.[170]

Interestingly, it was the goal of the Institution to not only highlight their collections, but to also teach a broader audience more about scientific methods and way of categorizing material, as well as encouraging individuals in the South to see the value in museums and to create their own.

---

[168] Rydell, Findling, and Pelle, 26-27.

[169] G. Brown Goode, "Report Upon the Exhibit of the Smithsonian Institution and the United States National Museum at he Cotton States and International Exposition, Atlanta, GA., 1895," *Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution Showing the Operations, Expenditures, and Condition of the Institution to July, 1896* (Washington: Government Printing Office,1898): 613.

[170] Goode, 614.

In addition to presenting objects as representations of other cultures, the use of "manikins"[171] is a practice that has been utilized by natural history museums for well over a century.[172] The earliest recorded display of a Maori "manikin," in the United States (fig. 2.09) was designed and made by the USNM for the Atlanta Exposition in 1895. The manikin was displayed in the exhibit, "Types of Mankind," organized by the four divisions of mankind established at that time—the "Black Types," "Brown-Red Types," "Yellow Types," and "White Types," with three figures representing each division. Goode describes the total of twelve figures collectively stating:

> Beyond the archway attention was first attracted by a series of costumed figures, which were arranged on the sides of the main hall at the entrance to the alcoves. These were intended to illustrate the physical characters and the ethnical costumes of twelve of the most characteristic types of the human species. The costumes, most of which were now exhibited for the first time, had been collected by the explorers and correspondents of the institution, and the figures, in sculptor's plaster, have been modeled either from life or from abundant material in the Museum, under the superintendence of Professor Mason and the immediate direction of Dr. Walter Hough…Although dispersed through the entire exhibition, their relation to each other is so intimate that they are here grouped together.[173]

Accompanied by the American Indian and a D[a]yak from Borneo, the Maori manikin was listed under the "Brown-Red Race," and placed just opposite the "Department of Fishes." The label that accompanied the figure explains:

---

[171] Although it might seem that the correct spelling is mannequin, the term "manikin" is presumably a nod to the idea that these figures are representing both man and kin – key terms in anthropology.

[172] They were also used by the American Museum of Natural History and the Field Museum. Their use in those institutions will be discussed later in chapters 3 and 4.

[173] Goode, 615.

> The Maori are of the Polynesian family and inhabit the islands of New Zealand. They are tall, very well formed, among the most perfect specimens of mankind. The Maori are at present upon the verge of extinction…Their clothing consists of robes of New Zealand flax (*Phormium tenax*) thrown over the shoulders or folded around the hips. Usually the chiefs wore a feather cape over the left shoulder. The face was tattooed in scrolls, deeply incised. The weapons were clubs and spears, the shield not being used.[174]

The idea put forth in the label that accompanied the figure--that the Maori were, "on the verge of extinction," in the late 1890's is untrue but one that was a ubiquitous statement about the Maori, as well as many other cultures such as Native Americans. According to the 1889 *New Zealand Yearbook*, the Maori actually comprised one-third of the entire population of New Zealand.

The inclusion of a Maori figure in the display assisted in supporting the Smithsonian's attempts to illustrate progress and culture. According to Robert Rydell, they supported much more, "Within the larger contents of the southern fairs, these hierarchical displays of race and culture furnished a scientific scaffolding for the emerging ideology of the New South. Seemingly backward "types" of humanity, including blacks, could legitimately be treated as wards of the factory and field until an indeterminate evolutionary period rendered them either civilized or extinct."[175] This function changed when Maori art and culture was represented in 1904 at the exposition in Saint Louis.

---

[174] Unpublished label, "Red-Brown Race.—Maori Man," Department of Anthropology Archives, National Anthropological Archives, Suitland, MD.

[175] Rydell, 101.

Louisiana Purchase Exposition, Saint Louis, 1904

The Louisiana Purchase Exposition of 1904 showcased not only grand prize–winning wool and grain displays from New Zealand, but also gold medal-winning paintings and photographs of the Maori, and their woodcarvings. Contemporary critics of the fair in Saint Louis considered the Maori as having "long since passed the savage state."[176]

The first clue in piecing together a comprehensive understanding of how the Maori were presented in Saint Louis is the sole interior photograph of the New Zealand exhibition that comes from Mark Bennitt's 1905 publication, *History of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition.* The photograph illustrates the New Zealand exhibit in the department of forestry and game (fig. 2.10) and appears a taxidermist's delight, with a multitude of stuffed fish and deer heads adorning the walls.[177]

Among the wildlife trophies are paintings of New Zealand scenery, Maori daily life, and portraits of Maori men, women, and chiefs. Many of the paintings were the work of European artist Gottfried Lindauer, loaned from the H.E. Partridge collection, which was eventually donated to the Auckland City Gallery, where many of the paintings now reside. Many of the photographs are credited to New Zealand photographer John Douglas Perrett who died in 1937. About the exhibition, Bennitt writes:

---

[176] Mark Bennitt, "New Zealand at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition, 1904," in *History of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition*, ed. Mark Bennitt (Saint Louis: Universal Exposition Publishing Company, 1905), np.

[177] This photograph provides the basis for a future article. Using the catalogue by Donne as a guide, it would be an important scholarly contribution to locate each painting or photograph listed in order to recreate the 1904 installation.

> In the Department of Forestry, Fish and Game, New Zealand had a unique and tastefully arranged display that attracted keenest interest and whole-hearted admiration…Pictures and paintings can but feebly attempt to portray Nature, yet those hanging around the walls were fascinating to a degree in that they served to indicate to visitors the character of a country which Nature has blessed probably more than any other – when judged from the point of view of the beautiful and the picturesque."[178]

In addition to the animal heads and fish bodies, the display also exhibited examples of Maori carvings including a wooden head, a *manaia* figure, a lintel, and jade or bone war clubs (*patu)*. In the center of the room are two cases. On the top of the right case is a Maori preserved head (*moko mokai*), as well as a wooden tattoo funnel, used as a feeding mechanism during the tattooing process. The cases below and to the left are difficult to see, but presumably contain examples of smaller pieces like *kauri* gum carvings (made of hardened tree sap), as well as jade *hei-tikis*. From the catalogue of the New Zealand exhibits at the fair produced by the New Zealand Department of Tourism and Trade, we know that there was also a copy of Augustus Hamilton's seminal turn-of-the-century publication, *Maori Art,* as well as a miniature tree made from human hair.

The catalogue produced by the New Zealand Department of Tourism and Trade was an additional important part in piecing together the New Zealand exhibitions at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition. It details every New Zealand object included in the Exposition, as well as a list of the medals they won, facts about New Zealand, and a detailed description of the many government services New Zealand provided to its citizens. The catalogue describes several New Zealand exhibits at the exposition, in

---

[178] Bennitt, np.

addition to the one captured in the photograph of the exhibit in the department of forestry and game. The exhibition in the Palace of Agriculture was much larger than the one featured in the department of forestry and game and unfortunately, no known photograph exists. What we do know about the display is listed in the catalogue of the New Zealand exhibits at the fair and included examples of wool, flax, and timber, for which New Zealand won grand prize medals; hundreds of enlarged photographs by Perrett detailing New Zealand scenery and Maori daily life; and watercolors and oil paintings. In fact, the well-known Charles Goldie and Louis Steele's 1899 painting, *The Arrival of the Maori in New Zealand*, is listed in the catalogue. (fig. 2.11) The painting was the focus of a 1990 article by Leonard Bell, "The Representation of the Maori by European Artists in New Zealand, ca. 1890-1914," where he describes the work, which he notes had been described as one of the most culturally significant paintings in New Zealand, but to him is nothing more than a, "hodgepodge, a rag bag for the collector of exotic curios."[179] In hindsight, it is interesting to think about how the painting is interpreted now as opposed to how it might have been perceived by the American fairgoer over a hundred years ago.

In addition to the displays in the departments of agriculture and forestry, there were also exhibits sponsored by private businesses and individuals, such as the display of agricultural tools sponsored by the Clapham Brothers of Ashurst, New Zealand[180], models of steamships and route maps sponsored by the Union Steamship Company of New Zealand, Ltd., and the Hancock & Co. Brewers of Auckland who displayed lager

---

[179] Leonard Bell, "The Representation of the Maori by European Artists in New Zealand, ca. 1890-1914," *Art Journal*, no. 2 (Summer 1990): 145.

[180] T. E. Donne, *Catalogue of Exhibits made by the New Zealand Government at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition*, (Saint Louis: Little and Becker Printing Co.,1904), 10.

beer and imperial ale brewed in New Zealand. and proudly made of New Zealand hops.[181]

The exhibition catalogue produced by the New Zealand Government was written by T. E. (Thomas Edward) Donne, a Caucasian New Zealander who served as the secretary of the New Zealand Tourism and Trade Commission and later as the head of the Government Tourist Department in Rotorua.[182] In addition to his positions within the tourism industry, Donne himself was a collector and dealer of Maori art and described as, "one of the most influential patrons of Rotorua Maori carving in the early twentieth century."[183]

As a central figure in the dissemination of Maori art to American museums through world's fairs beginning in Chicago in 1893, Donne was an historical figure who wore many hats—government official, collector, and dealer—and was, in effect, a culture broker. Donne and to a lesser extent both the New Zealand Board of Tourism and Trade and the fair in Saint Louis can be viewed as both collector and dealer of Maori objects.

In the introductory paragraph of the catalogue, Donne explains that the New Zealand exhibit was, "primarily intended to make known to the world the attractions New

---

[181] Ibid., 11.

[182] Donne's archives in the National Library in Wellington comprise a multitude of documents he wrote about the Maori, as well as correspondence he wrote to fellow Maori collectors and major curators and scholars—notably, well-known Maori scholar Sir Peter Buck regarding issues related to Maori art. In addition to the archival documents, Donne made scrapbooks that are teeming with anything relating to Maori culture including articles and cut-outs of photographs from newspapers.

[183] Roger Neich, *Carved Histories: Rotorua Ngati Tarawhai Woodcarving*, (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2001), 140.

Zealand offers tourists."[184] He also notes, "Incidentally a few of the leading products of the colony have been brought to the World's Fair, and to a slight extent they serve to indicate the country's productiveness."[185] As is the case with other "non-Western" cultures included in these fairs, issues of representation emerge. The tourism and trade commission primarily used the beautiful scenery and agricultural progressiveness of New Zealand to promote its country to an American audience. But it also used its natives, the Maori, as a way of saying that not only did they have the very best ways of processing grain, but also the least savage of the savages, a point that contradicts many scholars' readings of world's fairs.

The largest anthropological display at a fair to date was at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition and, curiously, the Maori were not included in that section. This fact is another interesting counterpoint to many of the popular ideas surrounding the inclusion of non-white or non-Western countries in world's fairs. In a similar fashion to previous American world's fairs, the New Zealand government was using the Maori as a tool to promote tourism—a marketing message that said, "Look, our mountains are beautiful, and so are our natives—they are what make us unique and set us apart from other colonized countries."

That the stated purpose of the New Zealand exhibitions was not of an anthropological nature reinforces this assertion. New Zealand did not want its "natives" to be viewed as savages by the United States (which is not to say that they wanted them to be viewed as equal, either). Their primary intent in Saint Louis was to promote New

---

[184] Donne, 2.

[185] Ibid.

Zealand as a country; inclusion of the Maori was of secondary concern. While the native country "curated" the displays, it was still non-Maori (or *pakehas*) who maintained control over how the Maori were portrayed—through objects, photographs, and paintings executed by European-trained artists.

As previously discussed, fairs provided a marketplace where American museums could "shop" for objects to enhance their collections, without ever having to leave their own country. Objects were either donated to museums or bought by staff members from Donne; in either case, Donne acted as a go-between. In previous paragraphs, I have attempted to reinforce Donne's influence not only on the character of the fairs, but also on the character of the collections of Maori art in the United States.

Based on those accession records, Donne had helped both the Field Museum and the Smithsonian Institution to acquire hundreds of Maori objects from the Louisiana Purchase Exposition in 1904.

Donne donated and sold a number of objects to the Field Museum after the fair was over. He gave a set of 16 photographs, providing varying images of the Maori ranging from a casual portrait of two Maori girls in traditional dress to a formal portrait of a tattooed Maori man wearing a feather cloak. Of the objects he sold to the museum, which included axes, a pendant (*hei-tiki*), clubs (*patu*), and paddles, the most valuable to the collection today are a set of six feathered cloaks (*kaitaka*). (fig. 2.12) One of many fine examples, this cloak is covered with a multitude of interconnected triangles composed of different colored feathers in white, orange, brown, lime green, and a turquoise that almost appears black. The border of the cloak is made of kiwi feathers.

Unlike the diversity of objects that the Field Museum received, the collection received by the Smithsonian Institution's National Museum of Natural History is much more homogeneous, consisting of an assortment of deer heads and stuffed birds and fish, many of which were displayed in the fair's department of forestry and game, in addition to a collection of photographs including New Zealand landscapes, portraits of Maori men and women, and scenes of Maori daily life. The accession was viewed as a disappointment to the institution, a fact that Donne addressed in a letter dated Dec. 17, 1904 to R. Rathbun, assistant secretary of the National Museum:

> From the statements of several acquaintances made to me, it would appear that Dr. Hough is somewhat annoyed because I did not hold certain ethnological specimens at this disposal…Early in the currency of the Exposition Dr. Hough saw me and made inquiries regarding certain feather robes, clubs, etc. I told him in reply to his inquiry that I had brought nothing for sale. He then asked whether I would be willing to make exchange; I said that I would. Nothing further was done in the matter; there was no proposition as to what form any such exchange should take, and no promise was either asked or given or implied that I should hold these articles for consideration for your Institution. The whole conversation was of a general character and indefinite…After I did not see Dr. Hough till after the close of the Exposition, when he called at my office and expressed surprise that I had promised the specimens in question to the Field Columbian Museum…on the 11th of May last I made offer to your Institution to exchange a red deer head for a moose, Wapiti or other animal head, but regret to say that my suggestion was "turned-down', vide your letter of the 23rd of May…I made this proposal thinking that your institution in its "World's Work" would like to have a specimen of a New Zealand red deer head, and not from any private instance…I regret exceedingly that any personal misunderstanding should have occurred with any member of your Institution, as my Country is under very great obligations to the Smithsonian Institution in connection with the present of Elk made by the President and in other ways.[186]

[186] T. E. Donne, Unpublished Letter to R. Rathbun, December 17, 1904, Record unit 70; series 16, box 68, folder 17, Smithsonian Institution Archives, Washington, D.C.

Despite the disappointment of not receiving the collection desired by Rathbun, the photographs the museum received are an interesting collection of images. The photographs are large-scale in size, with an average dimension of 17 x 23 inches, and were originally displayed in the Palace of Agriculture at the Saint Louis fair. Most strikingly, it is one of the photographs (fig. 2.13) of a Maori woman that is now in the collection of the National Anthropological Archives at the Smithsonian Institution that exemplifies an issue that is addressed in Roger Neich's book *Carved Histories*. Neich writes:

> Several photographs posed for Tourist Department publicity at Whakarewarewa about 1910 show Maori women watching carvers at work and even touching the carvings. As in these publicity photographs, European disregard and deliberate flouting of tapu prohibitions must have weakened them in Maori eyes. The activities of European collectors of Maori artifacts about Rotorua, such as Gilbert Mair, J.F. Robieson, T.E. Donne, Eric Craig and many others, must have been a strong influence in this direction. These men collected, bought, acquired or stole carvings considered highly tapu by their Maori owners, yet these same Europeans could handle, sell, display and re-use such carvings with impunity.[187]

The photograph (fig. 2.13) dated July 1, 1903, is of a Maori woman, presumably naked, with only a kiwi feather cloak covering her and a greenstone club placed firmly in her right hand. She lies on a mat in a meetinghouse, in a position of repose, with feet crossed at the ankles. The woman is surrounded by Maori art, in the form of a canoe prow that is placed behind her and wood house panels and woven mats that line the walls of the house. This photograph would seem to support Neich's statement that these photographs were the machinations of Europeans collectors who appropriated the people

---

[187] Neich, *Carved Histories*,154.

and the objects and thus, reducing their sacredness. This image is very different from another one in the collection (fig. 2.14) which shows two Maori women, in Western dress, cooking in a steam hole.

In addition to the black and white photographs, the National Anthropological Archives were given a collection of 29 rafter paintings from Donne. (fig. 2.14) The paintings, by Augustus Hamilton, were featured in his book, *Maori Art* (fig. 2.16) and exhibited in the Palace of Agriculture.[188]

Although it appears that New Zealand's main objective in Saint Louis was to promote tourism, and that the Maori were not in fact displayed as anthropological oddities, it is obvious that T. E. Donne was influenced by the anthropological displays at the Saint Louis fair. In 1906, New Zealand hosted its own fair, the Christchurch International Exhibition. The prominent feature of the fair was the Maori *pa*—a Maori village very much akin to that of the Filipino or Native American displays in Saint Louis. (fig. 2.17) It seems that Donne was quite taken with the displays and is described as "enthusiastic about the way the Americans had displayed their colonial peoples and persuaded the Government here to arrange a similar presentation."[189] In Bernard Kernot's words, "The evolutionary sequence, so evident at St. Louis, was subordinated in Christchurch to the presentation of Maori and Pacific Islands peoples according to

---

[188] See also chapter three, "Traditional Kowhaiwhai," in Roger Neich's *Painted Histories*, (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1993; reprint, Auckland: University of Auckland Press, 2001) 29-88 (page citations are to the reprint edition).

[189] Bernard Kernot, "Maoriland Metaphors and the Model Pa," in *Farewell Colonialism: The New Zealand International Exhibition Christchurch, 1906–07* (Palmerston North: The Dunmore Printing Company, Ltd. 1998), 64.

colonial images of a mythic Maoriland."[190] So while it seemed that New Zealand organizers were in many ways quite progressive in their approach to displaying the Maori, they in fact took lessons learned from the United States and implemented them using their own native peoples.

Panama-Pacific International Exposition, 1915, San Francisco

In 1915, San Francisco celebrated the completion of the Panama Canal and, fittingly, the "discovery of the Pacific Ocean" by hosting the Panama-Pacific International Exposition. It is from this fair that we find the inspiration for the title of this chapter, "North of Australia and west of France," whose apparent geographic mistake was really a description of the New Zealand building's location fair. (fig. 2.18) The New Zealand Pavilion was described as "a mingling of French and Italian renaissance, with a highly ornate façade."[191] Although there are no known supporting photographs, the exhibit inside the Pavilion was described as, "a fascinating composite picture of the products, scenery and sport facilities of the Dominion. Heads of game, deer, and mountain sheep decorated the walls, and with them were mounted specimens of great fish to make the angler envious."[192]

Unlike in other fairs discussed in this chapter, no Maori objects are found in American museum collections with Panama-Pacific provenance. We know for certain

---

[190] Ibid.

[191] Todd, 253.

[192] Ibid.

that there was a kinemacolor film that was shown in the pavilion—which, among other things, filmed "various interesting phases of aboriginal life among the Maoris, and scenes depicting agricultural and manufacturing pursuits."[193] What is most significant about this fair is that it is the first time of documented public reaction of fair visitors to the New Zealand exhibits.

In the archives of the Alexander Turnbull Library in Wellington, New Zealand, is the original guestbook from the New Zealand building at the Panama-Pacific Exposition. It lists dates, names, home addresses and most importantly, remarks. For instance, Martin Badong from the Filipino YMCA Manila, visited the pavilion on July 20, 1915 and remarked, "Excellent exhibit," while Virginia M. Pisetti of Sonoma stated, "The Robes are handsome."[194] Perhaps one of the most telling remarks came from Grace Denton, who on August 6, 1915 visited the building and remarked, "A wonderful exhibit of natural history," giving firm indication of at least one person's perception of the objects displayed, as examples of natural history, not art.

Conclusion

What do these objects tell us about what was being presented to a primarily American public from 1893 to 1915 about the Maori? That is perhaps one of the most difficult questions to answer. The easier answer is to define what the fairs say to us now about who the Maori were then. Collectively these objects might have suggested that the

---

[193] Todd, 254.

[194] This also confirms that objects, namely robes, were presented in the exhibition.

Maori were violent, as evidenced by their war clubs, or perhaps unusual in appearance, as evidenced by the *kauri* gum busts depicting tattooed faces. From the necklaces and hair combs, it is revealed that they prized beauty; from the greenstone *tikis* and elaborate woodcarvings, that they were expert craftsmen.

The historical evidence also gives an idea of how much influence dealers and collectors had in shaping the current state of American collections. If we take, for example, T.E. Donne and the Louisiana Purchase Exposition, and chart the journey of an object from New Zealand to its current home at the Field Museum in Chicago, it would start with the announcement of the fair. It would then move on to the New Zealand government, then the board of tourism and trade, who would turn it over the responsibility to T. E. Donne, who would solicit the Maori for objects and speculatively arrange the photo shoots of "Maori daily life." The objects go back to Donne, who arranges for them to be sent to Saint Louis, where they are placed on display in the palace of agriculture and department of forestry and game. At the end of the fair, the objects go back to Donne, who then donates or sells them to the National Museum of Natural History and Field Museum of National History, where the objects have permanently remained, to be seen by countless visitors, and aided in informing a primarily American audience about the Maori. It is another example from the historical past that illustrates how little the Maori were consulted in the process of displaying themselves. What complicates the matter is that the bigger issue relates to the objects' history. Even though the Maori objects have incomplete records, the fact of the matter is that if the objects had not come to the United States, they could never have afforded an audience outside of New Zealand the opportunity to learn about the Maori, both then and now. That is the

most interesting aspect of all of this: that these objects continue to teach a primarily American public about the Maori—which, strangely enough, was the intended goal of all the world's fairs: to educate. In the case of the Saint Louis fair, I imagine that the Board of Tourism and Trade had no idea how long their investment in the Louisiana Purchase Exposition would pay off. To this day thousands view the objects and photographs at American museums and, more often than not, probably remark, "New Zealand is so beautiful. . . I'd like to go there"—which was exactly my reaction the first time I viewed them.

CHAPTER THREE: MAORI ART AND AMERICAN NATURAL HISTORY MUSEUMS PART ONE: THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION, NATIONAL MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY AND AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY

In her book titled, *The Death of Primitive Art and Other Tales of Progress*, anthropologist Shelly Errington writes:

> And so, if you want nature, the Garden of Eden, and the Childhood of Man, untouched by industrial pollution or filthy lucre, you go to the natural history museum, where you will find no guards, permission to take photographs, reams of children, toys and games in the museum shop, hamburgers in the cafeteria. If, however, you want history—*art* history—currently and in every respect enmeshed with money unfolding through time, you go to the fine arts museum, where you will find plenty of guards, no flash or tripods allowed, respectful adults, silk scarves in the museum shop, quiche and radicchio salad in the restaurant. It is no accident that these two types of museums come in pairs: the Field Museum and the Art Institute; the California Academy of Sciences and the de Young; the Smithsonian and the National Gallery; the American Museum of Natural History and the Metropolitan Museum of Art. Together they divide the universe into nature and culture. [195]

Is it really so simple? Can the difference between natural history museums and art museums be described as paralleling the divide between nature and culture? Certainly one must take into consideration the interesting situation in which many non-Western

---

[195] Shelly Errington, *The Death of Authentic Primitive Art and Other Tales of Progress*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 28.

objects find themselves: that they are collected and displayed by both natural history museums and fine arts museums. Does that mean that the functions of the objects change—for example, is a canoe prow in one museum still a canoe prow in the other?

The previous two chapters of this study have dealt with the early history: how the objects first arrived in the United States and, more specifically, what was involved in the early intellectual curiosity surrounding those objects. Using the same research techniques—albeit on a much larger scale in terms of quantity of objects—I have sifted through archival material and photographs to reconstruct these objects' collection and display histories in the four major American natural history museums with substantial collections of Maori objects—the Smithsonian Institution's National Museum of Natural History in Washington, D.C., the American Museum of Natural History in New York City, the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum in Honolulu, and the Field Museum in Chicago.

In turning our attention to these types of museums, the question arises: Why do natural history museums in the United States possess the largest holdings of Maori art—larger than any of the ethnographic or anthropological museums discussed so far, and more than any art museum to be discussed in future chapters? The germ of an answer to this question lies in the late sixteenth-century writings of Francis Bacon, who declared the need for an advancement of secular knowledge through curiosity cabinets that displayed "exotica" from around the world. Bacon had, after all, written treatises in 1570 on the proper formation of collections, of "all things in heaven and earth."[196]

---

[196] Don D. Fowler, "A Natural History of Man: Reflections on Anthropology, Museums, and Science," *Fieldiana* Anthropology New Series, No 36: *Curators, Collections and Contexts: Anthropology at the Field Museum, 1893-2002*, Stephen E. Nash and Gary M. Feinman, eds. (September 30, 2003): 11.

Another part of the answer may lie in the characteristics that define a museum as an institution. For example, in 1706 the *New World of Words* defined a museum as "[a] study or library also a college: a Publick Place for the Resort of Learned Men" and, by 1750, the term "museum" was being used in the modern sense; for example, the British Museum building was used for the presentation and exhibition of objects illustrative of antiquities, natural history, and fine and industrial arts.[197] During this period, philosopher George Paley "urged the contemplation of nature… the lesson book of God's design of the world."[198]

The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines "state of nature" as "the condition of man before the formation of organized society."[199] Given that definition, understanding why the study of Maori art and culture is included in the mission of a natural history museum becomes easier to make. In the nineteenth-century, the Maori may have been viewed as "the least savage of the savages," but certainly a Western audience would not have viewed them as existing within "organized society." Moreover, the goals of anthropology—the true core of the discipline—are the search for "original human nature" and the "natural laws" governing human behavior. And because "savage" societies were perceived as "closer to nature" than "civilized" societies, they were considered to be part of the natural world; viewed through such a lens, the study of "savages" would fall easily within the realm of natural history.[200]

---

[197] Ibid., 13.

[198] Ibid., 14.

[199] Ibid., 15.

With that said, this chapter begins with a discussion of the National Museum of Natural History in Washington, D.C., established first among all the natural history museums in the United States, and the first among the four to accession Maori objects into its collection.

Smithsonian Institution, National Museum of Natural History, Washington, D.C.

The Smithsonian Institution was established in 1842 with money bequeathed to the United States government from Englishman James Smithson, who declared, "I then bequeath the whole of my property… to the United States of America, to found at Washington, under the name Smithsonian Institution, an Establishment for the increase & diffusion of knowledge among men."[201] Under the umbrella moniker of Smithsonian Institution, the United States National Museum (hereafter USNM) was formally created in 1858. [202] Until then the USNM's collection was temporarily housed in the United States Patent Office. [203] When the USNM building (now the Smithsonian Institution's

---

[200] All of these ideas are introduced in the previously cited Don Fowler's essay in the 2003 edition of Fieldiana.

[201] Philip Kopper, *The National Museum of Natural History*, (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1982),37.

[202] *Visitor's Guide to the Smithsonian Institution and National Museum Washington, D.C.,* (Washington: Judd & Detweiler, Printers and Publishers, 1880), 11.

[203] All objects from the Wilkes expedition have two catalogue numbers – their "Peale" number that was given to them when they were in the U.S. Patent Office and the number assigned to them when they were transferred to the National Museum (National Museum of Natural History. The "Peale" numbers provided by the Museum match up to those given in *A Popular Catalogue of the Extraordinary Curiosities in the National Institute Arranged in the Patent Office*. Washington: Alfred Hunter (1855).

Arts and Industries building) was completed in 1858, the collection was transferred from the Patent Office to the new building, where it remained until the USNM moved again in 1910 to the current National Museum of Natural History building. In 1957, the USNM split and the Museum of Natural History was created and subsequently renamed the National Museum of Natural History (hereafter NMNH) in 1969.

History of the Collection at NMNH

It is not surprising that the NMNH's collection of Maori art is composed primarily of objects obtained during the Wilkes Expedition.[204] The four-year journey to the Pacific was the United States' first large-scale scientific expedition. The expedition demonstrated to the Europeans, who for so long had dominated the realm of voyages to the Pacific, that the United States could "mount and sustain a major scientific expedition overseas."[205] As a result of British control of whaling grounds in the Pacific, a band of men hoping to find new whaling and sealing grounds began to encourage the government

[204] Note that a brass replica of a club (*patu*) that was originally collected on one of the Cook voyages was, until recently, an object in the collection of NMNH, making it the earliest Maori-related object not only in this collection, but in all of the collections of the United States. In 2005, Adrienne Kaeppler wrote an article on the object, "Two Polynesian Repatriation Enigmas at the Smithsonian Institution," that was published in the *Journal of Museum Ethnology,* vol. 17 (2005). She explains that the replica was part of a group of objects that was the focus of a repatriation claim made by a Northwest Coast tribe as the club was originally found with a group of objects from that region, before being sold to NMNH. In an update to Kaeppler's article, the club was repatriated to the Northwest Coast tribe that laid claim on it.

[205] Herman J. Viola, "The Story of the U.S. Exploring Expedition," in *Magnificent Voyagers: The U.S. Exploring Expedition, 1838-1842*. Herman J. Viola and Carolyn Margolis, eds. Smithsonian Institution Press: Washington DC (1985), 23.

to sponsor an expedition to the South Seas.[206] In 1828, with the backing of President John Quincy Adams, Congress passed a resolution authorizing the president to send an American ship to the Pacific to "examine coasts, islands, harbors, shoals and reefs…"[207] The expedition (sometimes referred to as the "Deplorable Expedition"[208] because of a string of misstarts before it set sail) was led by Lieutenant Charles Wilkes, who was accompanied by many of the brightest minds in nineteenth-century sciences, including philologist Horatio Hale, naturalists Titian Ramsey Peale and Charles Pickering, and artists Alfred T. Agate and Joseph Drayton.[209]

Although objects collected on the Wilkes Expedition would form the basis for the USNM's anthropological collection, expeditioners had some difficulty obtaining Maori objects—particularly preserved heads (*moko mokai*) which Wilkes believed to be much sought-after. In *The Shaping of American Ethnology*, author Barry Joyce remarked:

> Throughout their stay in New Zealand, the expedition found it difficult to obtain Maori artifacts for its collections. Particularly precious was that most prized Maori curiosity—tattooed shrunken heads—the sale of which had been prohibited by law since 1831. Wilkes discovered that even if the Maoris were no longer ready sources of cultural paraphernalia, others stood ready to supply their needs—for a price. Lying at Bay of Islands was a missionary brig that doubled as a floating curio shop of native artifacts. Hence it was from this rather unlikely source that the expedition rounded out their Maori collection, clandestinely securing two preserved heads—both dubiously identified by the proprietor of the vessel as "New Zealand Chiefs"—for £10 sterling.[210]

---

[206] Ibid., 9.

[207] Ibid.

[208] Ibid., 10.

[209] Ibid.

[210] Joyce, 82.

In addition to the *moko mokai*, Wilkes obtained an encyclopedic collection of Maori art including cloaks, mats, skirts, pendants (*hei-tiki*), a canoe prow, staffs (*taiaha*), and a treasure box. The pendants (*hei-tiki)* (figs. 3.01 and 3.02) are described in the 1855 Patent Office's catalogue as, "[a]mulets for preserving the wearer from evil spirits, worn around the neck."[211] Both are made of nephrite or greenstone; the object in fig. 3.01 tilts to its right, while that in fig. 3.02 tilts to its left. The left eye of the fig. 3.01 *hei-tiki* is composed of pearl shell and the right eye—as well as both eyes *s*hown in fig. 3.02—is formed of red sealing wax.

In describing the various religious missionaries in New Zealand and their attempts at conversion and ridding the "natives" of their non-Christian beliefs,[212] Wilkes described the difficulty in obtaining certain objects; attributing the problems he encountered to "taboo" law, paramount in Maori society. He gives as an example the difficulty he had in purchasing a canoe prow (fig. 3.03) that was considered "taboo":

> This prow, which was elaborately carved to represent some non-descript animal, with a human head, having the tongue protruded, was accidentally seen in an out-of-the-way storehouse, and was somewhat mutilated; it had belonged to the late chief Kiwikiwi, and was tabooed in the first degree. Overtures were made to the widow of Kiwikiwi for its purchase. It was evidently considered very sacred, for none of the natives would touch it, or even enter the storehouse in which it was kept. Not withstanding all its sacredness, it was sold, after a little chaffering, for six dollars. The first price was two pounds, but the widow could not resist the chance of its sale. After the bargain was concluded, no native could be found willing to incur the penalty of the taboo, by carrying it. When the transportation

---

[211] *A Popular Catalogue of the Extraordinary Curiosities in the National Institute Arranged in the Patent Office*, (Washington: Alfred Hunter, 1855), 20.

[212] See Wilkes, Charles, *U.S.N. Narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition. During the Years 1838, 1839, 1840, 1841, 1842*. v. II. Philadelphia: Lea & Blanchard (1845), 382-384, for further information.

> was accomplished, a new and unexpected difficulty arose: it could not be carried across the water in a canoe, as it was against taboo to do it. The threat of making them refund the money, and take back the *ihu* or nose, so worked upon the covetousness of the old Kawiti, the chief, that he consented to remove it, and also promised to come the next day and paint it red, after the native fashion. This he punctually performed, using a kind of red earth mixed with water.[213]

What Wilkes describes is the act of a Maori chief undoing the *tapu* of a powerful object, so it could be sold and taken away (or "pow wowed," as it was described in the Patent Office's catalogue): "Prow of a war canoe curiously carved, supposed to be very efficient after it has been pow wowed over by the priest."[214] He explains that the object was painted red to undo its sacredness and includes an illustration of the canoe prow and some Maori weapons. (fig. 3.04) The means by which Wilkes acquired the prow—that is, buying directly from the source, a Maori—differed from other collection methods, and the description shows the great lengths the seller would go through to ensure the a successful transaction.

Wilkes also collected a treasure box (fig. 3.05a/b), which the author of the Patent Office catalogue compares to a "dandies' shaving box."[215] Mislabeled as a "Dressing-Box (*waka o te pare),"* the rectangular treasure box is constructed of dark wood; its entire body is carved with chevrons whose horizontal orientation on each row alternates from left to right. Each row is interrupted by a straight line cleaved in the middle by a downward and alternately upwardly carved flip. Handles on either side (fig. 3.05b) are

---

[213] Ibid., 384.

[214] *A Popular Catalogue…*, 20.

[215] Ibid.

tiki heads with shells for eyes. Both sides are identical and incorporate two spirals on either side of the head, while the alternating rows that dominate the body of the box continue down the sides.

Of the many objects collected during the Wilkes Expedition, the majority falls under the category of fiber arts.[216] Most of the cloaks are *korowai* (fig. 3.06), meaning they are all ornamented with black cords.[217] The next prevalent type of cloak represented in the Wilkes collection is the *kaitaka*, a cloak that was "woven in spaced double-pair twining (a space is left between each weft)," where "decoration is sparse and sometimes absent."[218] All have a *taniko* border of varying widths, framing various sides. Three of the *kaitaka* cloaks have been identified as *paepaeroa*, meaning that the wefts are vertical[219] (fig. 3.07), while the other three cloaks (fig. 3.08) are identified as *pātea* with horizontal wefts.

There are four men's kilts in the collection. Each share a similar construction consisting of a thick braided waistband of either hair or flax, with long strands of flax flowing down from the waistband to form a skirt. In addition to the clothing, the only basket collected on the expedition, identified as a *kete whakairo* (fig. 3.09), is an extremely rare example of basketry. Measuring fifteen inches high by twenty-four inches

---

[216] The designations are based on the catalogue cards of the Museum, as well as the explanations found in Mick Pendergast's 1996 article, "The Fibre Arts."

[217] Mick Pendergrast, "The Fibre Arts," in *Maori Art and Culture*, ed. D.C. Starzecka, (London: British Museum Press, 1996), 140.

[218] Ibid., 137.

[219] Ibid., 139.

wide, its uniqueness lies in that it is a black-dyed geometric twill flax basket. and is one of only three in the United States, and the largest basket of its kind in the world.[220]

In addition to the Wilkes Expedition, another important late nineteenth-century journey to the South Seas sponsored by the American government was the United States "Transit of Venus" Expedition" (1874–75); this expedition, too, resulted in the acquisition of Maori objects. In 1871, Congress authorized a series of astronomical observations to study the astral phenomenon known as the "Transit of Venus," which scientists had predicted to occur on December 9, 1874, at different points around the world.[221] Launched from New York Harbor, the ship Swatara, led by Commander Ralph Chandler, set sail for four destinations: the Crozet and Kerguelen Islands in the sub-Antarctic, Tasmania, New Zealand, and the Chatham Islands.[222]

The scientists arrived in New Zealand on October 16, 1874; they disembarked at Bluff Harbor on the South Island and set up their observatory on Lake Wakatipu in Queenstown. (fig. intro.01) Objects from that site—now in the collection of NMNH—were collected by Israel Russell, an assistant photographer on the expedition, who also collected for the Smithsonian Institution flora and fauna native to New Zealand. The adzes that Russell collected on behalf of the Smithsonian were most likely found in a

---

[220] Adrienne L. Kaeppler, "Anthropology and the U.S. Exploring Expedition," in *Magnificent Voyagers: The U.S. Exploring Expedition, 1838-1842*," eds. Herman J. Viola and Carolyn Margolis. (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1985), 134.

[221] The phenomena recently occurred on June 8, 2004 and will again in 2012.

[222] Ian W. Keyes, "New Zealand Artifacts from the United States "Transit of Venus Expedition," 1874-1875," *Smithsonian Contributions to Anthropology*, vol. 2, no. 2 (1967): 21.

cache composed of locally derived rock types.[223] The object in figure 3.10a/b is described as a "[q]uadrangular tanged adz of hard, fine-grained, greenish metamorphosed mud stone." An inscription on the blunt side of the adze identifies it as "[catalogue number] 21228 Transit of Venus Exp. N. Zealand I. J Russel[l]"(fig. 3.10b). In an unpublished document found in the National Anthropological Archives, Ian Keyes suggests that the wooden haft has no relationship to the adze and that it was likely given to the expedition from a private source.[224]

In addition to a whalebone comb and flax purse collected in Riverton, outside of Queenstown, (fig. intro.01), the final object acquired through the Transit of Venus expedition is a club from the Chatham Islands, originally collected by the on-board surgeon for the Swatara, Dr. E. Kershner. The club (fig. 3.11) is composed of gray-green muscovite schist;[225] Keyes describes its outline as reminiscent of the bird form type of club unique to the Moriori, predecessors of the Maori.[226] The fact that all the items acquired through the Transit of Venus expedition were collected on the South Island of New Zealand affords scholars an opportunity to view styles that may differ from other

---

[223] Ibid., 22. Also note that the rock type is Paleozoic Maitia or Te Anau Series and described as "metamorphosed," as it is harder than other Paleozoic rocks because it took on characteristics of minerals it was found with.

[224] Ian W. Keyes, "Accession No. 3939 Polynesian artifacts collected by the Transit-of-Venus Expedition, 1874-1875, from New Zealand and the Chatham Islands" unpublished document. Acc. No. 3939, Department of Anthropology Archives, National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution, Suitland, MD.

[225] Keyes, 26.

[226] Ibid., 26.

objects in American museums that were collected primarily on the North Island and, more specifically, the Bay of Islands area.

In a letter dated October 4, 1921, the son of the late Rear Admiral Charles S. Sperry of the United States Navy asked if the Museum might be interested in the following objects:

> …a set of Maori blankets, about five or six of them, some wool, some grass, some feathers, all different, together with belts of beads and that sort of thing to go with them. The blankets and other apparel, if you can call them that, appear to be new, or nearly so, and are fortunately at present in very good condition….Please do not think our feelings will be hurt if articles of this kind are not wanted…"[227]

Rear Admiral Charles S. Sperry, the original owner of the objects in question, was a participant in President Theodore Roosevelt's Great White Fleet project. The fleet was a parade of the United States' finest navy ships that, as part of the president's plan to spread goodwill, sailed around the world from 1907 to 1909 while reinforcing the United States' naval and military strength to other countries. Although the Great White Fleet's goals differed from those of other government-sponsored trips to the Pacific, such as the Wilkes and Transit of Venus expeditions, all of these journeys resulted in the acquisition of Maori objects for NMNH.

Sperry led the fleet only after his predecessor, Rear Admiral Charles M. Thomas, died aboard ship. Sperry joined while the ships were in San Francisco, setting sail for the Pacific in July 1908. While in New Zealand from August 8 to 15, 1908, the group

---

[227] Charles Perry, Unpublished Letter to Mr. Burton E. Livingston, October 4, 1921, Department of Anthropology Archives, National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution, Suitland, MD.

traveled to Rotorua, where the newly installed ship's captain received a collection of Maori objects from a Maori chief who "carved a grinning mask of Theodore Roosevelt and at intervals shouted 'Bully' through its [sic] immense teeth" while Sperry "reciprocated by donning a native costume of feathers and grass."[228]

In response to Admiral Sperry's son's letter the then-Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the National Museum, W. de C. Ravenel, replied, "Your letter of October 4, addressed to Mr. Burton E. Livingston, has been submitted to the National Museum and in reply I beg to say that we should be very glad indeed to received for the national collections the Maori blankets and other specimens which you very kindly offer to present."[229] On November 18, 1921, NMNH formally integrated the collection containing "Maori robes, skirts and belts, and 2 Filipino mats," into its collection.

Misidentified as robes (they are actually *korowai*, or cloaks), the collection of six objects vary in materials and composition. Four of them are crafted of wool, with dangling strings of various colors (as seen in figs. 3.12 and 3.13). Each cloak is embellished with alternating colored borders and fringe hanging from one end. While the object depicted in figure 3.12 is composed of primary colors red, blue, and yellow, as well as black, yarn, the cloak shown in figure 3.13—using a palette of cream, dark red, pink, yellow, and black—provides a sharp contrast. The other two cloaks, similar to those

---

[228] Robert A. Hart, *The Great White Fleet: Its Voyage Around the World* 1907-1909, (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1965), 187.

[229] W. de C. Ravenel, Unpublished Letter to Mr. Charles S. Sperry, October 13, 1921, Department of Anthropology Archives, National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution, Suitland, MD.

seen in figure 3.14, also have dangling strings, and both incorporate feathers into their borders.

The Sperry accession also contains two skirts composed of lengths of string hanging from a waistband. Fig. 3.15 shows one example that uses a multitude of colors. In addition to the two skirts, four belts (fig. 3.16) were included in the acquisition; bold geometric patterns of varying colors dominate each skirt's design. In comparison to the cloaks collected during the Wilkes Expedition, the cloaks in the Sperry accession exemplify an obvious type of aesthetic difference – the use of much different colors. One wonders if the objects found in the Sperry collection were worn by the Maori in the early part of the twentieth-century or if they were made specifically for visitors.

Given the NMNH's prominent position as the United States' museum of natural history, it is not surprising that its significant acquisitions of Maori art were in some manner initiated or having been explicitly government-sponsored, as in the case of the Wilkes and Transit of Venus expeditions, or more tangentially, as in the case of Admiral Sperry and the Great White Fleet.

History of the Display at NMNH

After the Wilkes Expedition returned the United States in 1842, the objects collected on the voyage were housed in the U.S. Patent Office until 1858, when the collection was moved to what is now known as the Arts and Industries building. In 1855, the Patent Office published *A Popular Catalogue of the Extraordinary Curiosities in the National Institute, Arranged in the Building Belonging to the Patent Office.* Through

written documentation we understand that the Maori objects collected on the Wilkes Expedition were first displayed in the Patent Office. The numbers listed in the catalogue correspond with the Peale numbers provided by the NMNH and the Peale numbers are associated with each Wilkes Expedition object in addition to the catalogue number assigned to it when it was accessioned into USNM's collection in 1858. The catalogue begins by describing the space in which the objects were displayed:

> In entering, you will observe a large and magnificent hall. The only failure of architectural effect the visitor will readily observe, is the introduction of a colonnade, with an entablature across and under the end of the great arch which admits light north of the dome—it is useless on the score of stability or construction, and impedes the grand *coup d'oeil* of this chaste and classical interior. The architect (Mr. Mills) was compelled to change his plans for this room, which contemplated a finish like that in the East Wing. The blemish is often pointed out by the intelligent and courteous officer in charge. If you wish to go through in the regular order of the catalogue, turn to the right, and commence with…[230]

A nineteenth-century visitor would have began his visit to the exhibition by looking at a case of objects from the "Feejee Islands," proceeding next to cases of objects from other areas of Polynesia, including Samoa, Tonga, the Sandwich Islands, and the "Dangerous Archipelago" (Tahiti). Next came "Case 8," containing some thirty-eight objects from New Zealand including "[f]loor mats" and a "[c]urious [g]rotesque [i]dol," as described in the catalogue of the Patent Office. The case opposite held Egyptian objects and the adjacent case displayed objects from Australia.

---

[230] *A Popular Catalogue…*, 11.

Without photographs, it is difficult to ascertain how large the cases were; however, it seems safe to assume that a case holding thirty-eight objects—among them twelve mats and cloaks, three staffs, and a canoe prow—was either very large or very crowded. Given the time period—the mid-nineteenth century—it is very likely that the display would have been characteristically Victorian, cluttered with a multitude of objects crowded into a relatively small space. The variety of objects listed indicates that the case provided the viewer the opportunity to learn about all of the major types of Maori art: fiber, woodcarving, and greenstone.[231]

In 1858, after the collections were moved from the Patent Office to the Smithsonian Institution's Castle (formerly the Arts and Industries building), an exhibition called *Synoptic History of Invention* was on view, visually illustrating early-evolutionary ordering.[232] Although it is not known which objects are Maori, the case designated "Synoptic History of Invention: Hammer, An Adze, Planing Mile" (fig. 3.17) appears to have included at least a few examples of Maori adzes. This is also where the photographic evidence of Maori objects on display in the Arts and Industries building tapers off, so once again we must consult guidebooks for written documentation of the Maori art that was on display. The *Visitor's Guide to the Smithsonian Institution and National Museum, Washington, D.C.*, first published in 1880, a year after the Castle was built, provides evidence that Maori objects were included in the Anthropological Hall on

---

[231] Ibid., 19-20. Many of the descriptions listed in the Catalogue were included in this chapter's earlier discussion of Maori objects collected on the Wilkes Expedition.

[232] See also Walter Hough's *Synoptic Series of Objects in the United States National Museum Illustrating the History of Inventions* (1922).

the second story of the building.[233] In an introduction to the hall, William Rhees writes about the field of anthropology, stating:

> All those branches of study which relate in any manner to the natural history of man are embraced under the term ANTHROPLOGY… and *Ethnology*, which considers existing races in all their physical and moral aspects…While the Smithsonian collection is especially rich in North American articles, it also embraces a variety of relics from the drifts of France and England, a series of Swiss lacustrine antiquities, Neolithic weapons, and tools from Denmark, c. Still more numerous are weapons, utensils, textile and ceramic fabrics from Asia, Africa, Australia and the island groups of the Pacific.[234]

Rhees goes on to describe that the Anthropological Hall was arranged in 1880 as a progression in technology—that the exhibition was designed on a continuum, starting with chipped stone flakes, spearheads, and the like, and ending with more "sophisticated" objects, or objects of ground and polished stone. Maori objects were included in the latter group, and are found in two cases numbered 26 and 30. Case 26 contains "*New Zealand, Australia, Kingsmill, Sandwich, and Samoan Islands*.—Adzes; axes of shell and stone; war clubs."[235] Case 30 contained

> Large wooden vessels. Feather cape present to Commodore Bolton, U.S. navy by King Kamehmeha, Sandwich Islands…Carved prow of war canoe; large gourds; hammocks; mats; model of Samoan hut; bone breast plates; coils of rope and cord; stone adzes with carved wooden handles; tattooed head of New Zealand

---

[233] William J. Rhees, *The Visitor's Guide to the Smithsonian Institution and National Museum,* (Washington, D.C. Judd and Dettweiler Publishers, 1880), 63.

[234] Ibid.

[235] Ibid., 79.

> chief; carved wooden boxes; clubs for beating fibre for making tapa, a native cloth; head-dress of porcupine fish skin.[236]

Additionally, "human skulls from New Zealand" were placed somewhere on top of cases 17–30.[237]

Although the listing for the Maori section remains the same in the next edition of the visitor's guide in 1881, the Maori are not included in subsequent guides through 1889, the last known year that type of guide was published while the USNM's collection was still housed in the Arts and Industries building. The display history resumes in 1895, when Maori objects were sent to represent the Smithsonian Institution at the Atlanta Exposition in 1895.[238]

In 1911, the USNM moved to its own home across the Mall in what is presently the building of the National Museum of Natural History.[239] By 1925, the museum had published the first guidebook to be produced after the move to its present location.[240] While it does not specifically list the Maori in the Ethnographic section, photographic evidence documents that a Maori manikin, similar to the manikin that was first displayed at the Atlanta Exposition in 1895, (fig. 2.09) was included in the section designated,

---

[236] Ibid., 79-80.

[237] Ibid., 80.

[238] Refer to discussion of the Atlanta Exposition in chapter two.

[239] To reiterate the history, after moving in 1911, the USNM split and the Museum of Natural History was created in 1957. In 1969, it was renamed the National Museum of Natural History, the USNM having been dissolved a few years earlier.

[240] See *Guide to the Natural History Building*. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1925).

"Ethnology," (fig. 3.18). The manikin (fig. 3.19) is a taller and more robust version of his 1895 counterpart and is depicted with facial tattooing, wearing a cloak (*kaitaka-paepaeroa* style) with a *korowai* cloak peeking from the side. The figure's forceful stance is accentuated by the staff (*taiaha*) he holds firmly in both hands. A feather cloak hangs behind him, while two more staffs *(taiaha*) lay on the floor of the case alongside him. That the manikin was displayed in a case would have been considered an ideal presentation by Franz Boas. The encased figured would, "demonstrate the correct disposition of costumes, ornaments, and tools…"[241] The Maori figure is one of many in the hall and speaks to the growing use of this type of display in early twentieth-century natural history museums.

In 1920, five years before the museum published this first guide, Dr. Walter Hough, an ethnology curator, published an article in the 1920 edition of the Smithsonian Institution's Annual Report. Titled "Racial Groups and Figures in the Natural History Building of the United States National Museum," the article begins with a history of the early use of "lay-figure" groups as "a means of illustrating primitive peoples, single figures were constructed for the display of costumes and other belongings, and in time two or more of the figures were assembled in groups," but critically describes the early figures as "often rather rudely executed, but . . . much approved by the public of the period." The article described the different types of display: figures, groups and dwelling groups.[242]

---

[241] Ira Jacknis, "Franz Boas and Exhibits," in George W. Stocking, Jr., *Objects and Others: Essays on Museums and Material Culture*. *History of Anthropology Volume 3*, (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1985), 95.

Hough's article presents a list of all of the lay-figures and groups on display at the USNM in 1920 and, under the "Tribes of Polynesia" rubric, includes the previously discussed Maori manikin, as well as a dwelling and family group of Samoans and village group of the "early" Hawaiians.[243] Hough attributes the resurgence in the interest of these figure groups to the Museum's hiring of, "artist-turned-archaeologist,"[244] William Henry Holmes in 1898 and credits him by stating, "The family groups here illustrated are largely the produce of his genius, and the later examples are regarded as serving well the purposes of science and at the same time as fulfilling the requirements of art."[245]

Hough places emphasis on the figures being works of both science and art—which they were, because while Holmes and other curators at the Smithsonian were researching the racial groups, prominent American sculptors, like Henry Kirke Bush-Brown, sculpted the figures.[246] Here, Hough first describes the research or scientific process:

> In designing a lay-figure group the necessary studies of the peoples to be represented are made. Individuals are selected to illustrate the salient features of the people, their arts and industries, their costumes, and their physical characteristics; and such features of their environment as can be utilized within

---

[242] Dr. Walter Hough , "Racial Groups and Figures in the Natural History Building of the United States National Museum," in *Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution Showing the Operations, Expenditures, and Condition of the Institution for the Year Ending June 30*. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1921), 612.

[243] Ibid.

[244] Jacknis, 81.

[245] Hough, 612.

[246] Ibid., 612-613.

> the available space are added. The end sought is to assemble the figures as in a picture, which will tell the story forcibly and at once.[247]

In contrast, he describes the artistic process thus:

> The group when designed, together with drawings, photographs, and other necessary data are turned over to the sculptor and the living model is posed for him. The figure is modeled in clay and from this a cast is made in plaster of Paris. This cast is appropriately painted, costumes are added, and wigs are provided. The figures are then assembled under the eye of the artist and with necessary changes composed into the group.[248]

Hough emphasizes the figures' importance as tools for exhibiting ethnology, stating that "They are placed in company with the cases of specimens belonging to the arts and industries of different peoples, and thus furnish a unit striking interest and value for visual instruction in science."[249] Ultimately, the goal of the lay-figure groups and manikins is to provide the visitor with an impression of the individuals who belonged to these different races, and what their lives might have been like.[250]

By the 1940s, changes in the look of the exhibitions at NMNH were afoot, with curators asking for funds targeted at improving the exhibitions; by the 1950s, a major exhibitions program had been created. Even a new system for the writing of wall texts was initiated: "They would ask one of the painters to come down off his ladder and read

---

[247] Ibid., 613.

[248] Ibid.

[249] Ibid.

[250] Hough's theories are very similar to those espoused by Franz Boas. See section on life groups in Ira Jacknis' 1985 essay that details Boasian theory on the manikin groupings.

the label; if he did not understand it, the text was changed."[251] The mood was geared to the "average" visitor with no previous knowledge of ethnology or many of the cultures on display. Darkened, cramped spaces reliant on windows for light and fresh air for cooling could be transformed into spacious, comfortable exhibition halls with the help of fluorescent lighting and air conditioning.

Saul H. Reisenberg, a curator of the division of ethnology, worked in conjunction with the museum's exhibition designer to overhaul the Pacific Hall called *Cultures of the Pacific and Asia*. Reisenberg solicited other museums for objects needed to complete the displays. An excerpt from a reply he received from Dominion Museum curator Terence Barrow documents not only the objects the Dominion were able to donate, but also the difficulty of doing so owing to the Maori Antiquities Act (a law that had been passed at the turn of the twentieth-century in New Zealand to restrict the passage of Maori objects outside of the country) as well as the exchange of information regarding what is accurate or traditional Maori culture:

> Unfortunately, the items you request are, in this Museum, extremely limited. For example, we possess only two carved pigment containers. Can do no more than offer you casts. In the case of the tattooing implements, something in the way of replicas…To return to the question of supplying you with the items listed, we can let you have two ear pendants for figures (e) and (f), but these will be comparatively recent date and not covered by our Antiquities Act which makes the export of any Maori artifact a tedious business. I will attempt to find some cloak pins, but again will be late examples not covered by the Act. Arrangements can be made for casts of pigment container (which, by the way, is less than the size of a man's fist) and for tattooing chisel and mallet. If these items would help,

[251] Ellis L.Yochelson, *The National Museum of Natural History: 75 Years in the Natural History Building*, (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1985), 88.

> please let me know immediately. There is little chance of providing a belt, and the head fillet, as far as we are aware, is not a traditional thing.[252]

Reisenberg, in an act of collegiality and a desire for accuracy, wrote to Barrow for advice regarding the Maori section of the *Cultures of the Pacific and Asia* hall. In response, Barrow replied:

> I am impressed with your plans for a Maori life group exhibit for your new Pacific Hall and wish to help you in every way possible…The bowl of figure (e), as it appears in the sketch, is not a Polynesian form, and the adze, again as it appears in the sketch, is mounted incorrectly. The bevel should be up-turned. The tattoo of figure (b) appears to have been taken from an old plate and is quite inaccurate. The tattoo of figure (a) is good and probably from a drawing by John Robley who was in New Zealand during the Maori war. You will have a volume of Moko; Or Maori Tattooing by Robley, London, 1896, and I recommend reference is made to this standard work. The huia feathers thrust into the topknot are rather too symmetrically placed for my taste and the number is not necessarily set at three. Usually one or two huia feathers are worn. I do not know how far advanced your display is at the moment or whether my suggestions will be of any help.[253]

In his reply, Barrow pointed out a variety of mistakes, from the placement of the *huia* feathers to the tattoo patterns that adorn the figures' faces and legs.

Reisenberg's *Hall of the Pacific People* (Hall 8) officially opened to the public on June 28, 1962. Reisenberg seemed to have heeded several of Barrow's suggestions in the final "Maori Life Group" (fig. 3.20), specifically those he had made regarding the *huia*

---

[252] Terrance Barrow, Unpublished Letter to S.H. Riesenberg, October 18, 1961, USNM DOE Oceania: New Zealand MS and Printed, National Anthropological Archives, Suitland, MD.

[253] Ibid.

feathers; now including only two feathers within the topknots of each of the male figures. It is difficult to discern whether his suggestions for Fig. B, the tattooer, were implemented—although Barrow's reference to Robley's book on *moko* provides insight into what sources scholars and museum professionals in the mid-twentieth century were referring to regarding accuracy of design. The life group remained on display until 1997, when it was dismantled to make way for museum renovations. Given that, in the 1920s, the makers of these figures strove for them to be "historically correct" and "represent[ative of] the races in the aboriginal state, or in the period before changes due to contact with civilization had modified them,"[254] the use of the figures in modern times (or in this case, up until 1997) proves to be problematic for the cultures the figures represented.

In addition to the "Maori Life Group," Maori objects were placed in other displays in the hall. For example, a carved figure collected on the Wilkes Expedition was installed in the bottom right hand corner of the case titled "Peoples and Cultures of the Pacific Islands," and is the sole representative of Polynesia (fig. 3.21). In another case titled "Diversity of Pacific Cultures," a feather cape donated by Admiral Sperry (fig. 3.22) is included. In "Kings and Chieftains," (fig. 3.23) Reisenberg chose a *hei-tiki* to be displayed on the left hand side to the right of two Tongan fly whisks and directly below one of the museum's most prized possessions, a Hawaiian feather cape. The wall text describes Polynesians as being "descended from "god-ancestors" and "bound together in a web of kinship and social obligation."

[254] Hough, 613.

The case titled "Warfare" (fig. 3.24) originally contained the tattooed head (*moko mokai)* collected by Wilkes and was taken off view in the early 1980s. Maori objects figure prominently in the case, as a drawing of an archetypical fierce Maori warrior accompanies the text that describes warriorship in Polynesian culture as "the attainment of one's destiny as a man." Four clubs *(patu)* are placed on the left side of the case, below two clubs from the Chatham Islands. A long staff (*taiaha*) with a feathered collar on the right, amongst other spears from Samoa and Hawaii and a staff from the Marquesas Islands, was collected during the Wilkes Expedition.

The case titled "Woodworking and Art " illustrates the intersection between natural history and art; here, the Maori take center stage in a display that was intended to provide examples of Polynesian craftsmanship despite the "simple tools." (fig. 3.25a/b) The case uses a treasure box, a club, a carved figure, and a slab to illustrate the final products of tools, such as what a scraper might produce.

All of the cases in the Maori section, as well as the entire Pacific section of NMNH, began to undergo dismantling in 1997 ending in 2004. In subsequent years, the collection's current curator, Dr. Adrienne Kaeppler, is charged with the task of reinstalling the Pacific section when it is reopened, along with the rest of the museum's ethnological collection.

American Museum of Natural History, New York, New York

The American Museum of Natural History in New York City (hereafter AMNH) was founded in 1869 for the purpose of "establishing a Museum and Library of Natural

History; of encouraging and developing the study of Natural Science; of advancing the general knowledge of kindred subjects, and of furnishing popular instruction."[255] The institution's first eight years were spent in the Arsenal of Central Park, before its current home on Seventy-seventh Street and Central Park West was finished in 1877.

The anthropology department at AMNH has been host to some of the biggest names in the field: Frederic Putnam, one of the first curators of the anthropology department, was succeeded by Franz Boas, Clark Wissler, P. E Goddard, and Robert Lowie – all with an interest in North American Ethnology, as well as Herbert Spinden, whose interests were in Mexican and central American archaeology and perhaps the most well known of all, Margaret Mead. As part of the anthropology department, AMNH's collection of Maori art is, in my opinion, one of the most eclectic in the United States, with objects ranging from the rare (a wooden puppet or *keroteke*) to the sacred and controversial (Robley heads).[256]

History of the Collection at AMNH

The first accession of Maori art into the collection at AMNH included three adzes donated by Ward and Howell in 1881.[257] Ten years later, a collection of jade objects was

---

[255] Roy Waldo Miner, *Exhibition Halls of the American Museum of Natural History*, (New York: Published by the Museum, 1939), 13.

[256] A note about the collection of preserved heads (*moko mokai*): I was never allowed, nor did I ask, to view the Robley collection. My discussion of them within this chapter relates only to their historical significance within the collection of AMNH and will not include any kind of formal analysis or illustration.

[257] Very little is known about the accession – no documentation is available through the department of anthropology's archives.

donated by George F. Kunz.[258] Kunz was a gemologist who, interestingly enough, was the vice-president of the famous jewelry store Tiffany and Co. in New York City. It is unsubstantiated, although certainly possible, that the objects were donated directly from Tiffany and Co. with Kunz as the intercessor. The collection, given an acquisition date range of 1891–93, included several nephrite pendants (*hei-tiki)* such as the example illustrated in fig. 3.26.

Within that same time period, a significant collection of Maori objects entered the collection; the museum purchased the objects from New York businessman Appleton Sturgis.[259] Sturgis was born in Baltimore and served as a lieutenant in the Union army in the Civil War. He was the head of the cordage department of the National Cordage Company in New York,[260] later becoming the company's secretary, and was an active member of the New York civic and art scene, belonging to the New York Chamber of Commerce, the New York Historical Society, the National Academy of Design, and the Union Club.[261]

The methods by which Sturgis acquired these objects are unknown; in fact, it is unknown if Sturgis himself even collected the objects. The only document associated with the accession is a handwritten list of objects titled *Catalogue of South Sea Island*

---

[258] Perhaps Kunz is most well-known for a pre-Columbian axe, commonly known as the Kunz axe, which he also donated to the Museum. The object is a fixture among most major pre-Columbian survey books and has become an icon in the field.

[259] At approximately the same time, the Brooklyn Museum of Art also purchased a significant collection of objects from Sturgis, which formed beginnings of their non-Western collection in the late nineteenth-century.

[260] "Summonses were not served," *The New York Times*, (August 11, 1893).

[261] "Obituary Appleton Sturgis," *Brooklyn Daily Eagle* (New York), (July 25, 1900): 3.

Curiosities Weapons, EE. Sturgis.[262] "EE. Sturgis" may be a reference to Appleton's wife, Emily Elliott; therefore, she—not her husband—may have been responsible for amassing the collection. After disappearing mysteriously off a boat in New England, Emily's death in November 1892 was followed by another family crisis when, in January 1893, the Sturgis' son was jailed as an accessory to a forged check incident. [263] Moreover, the company Appleton Sturgis worked for was experiencing financial trouble, as reported in a May 5, 1893 article in the *New York Times*. Five months later the sale of Sturgis' collection to AMNH was completed. It would be interesting to know if the aforementioned series of events had any bearing on Sturgis' decision to sell his collection to both AMNH and the Brooklyn Museum of Art. If the collection was indeed Emily's, it is certainly possible that its sale by Appleton was a way of parting with his wife's memory, or as a way of ensuring his own financial stability while the company he worked for was faltering.

At the time of its purchase, the Sturgis collection comprised the majority of the Pacific collection at AMNH. The scope of the collection is exhaustive, in the sense that they represent all of the major types of Maori art. Among those is an unusually carved club (fig. 3.27) composed of wood with a bone or shell blade.[264] The handle is tapered at one end and mimics the shape of a nautilus shell. The museum also purchased several treasure boxes from Sturgis. The box illustrated in fig. 3.28 is unusual in this collection

---

[262] Accession folder 1891-93/27, Division of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY.

[263] "Nesbitt and Sturgis Held" *The New York Times*, (Jan. 29, 1893).

[264] Due to its unusual qualities, it is not entirely clear if this object is in fact a Maori object.

and of those found throughout the United States, in that the body is primarily uncarved (excluding the two figures on either end of the lid, as well as the two heads that serve as handles on each end of the box). Another unique object is a staff (*taiaha*) (fig. 3.29) that is carved throughout and has a thick bunch of red strings tied along the top.

Following the Sturgis acquisition, the museum purchased a mat and a basket from German ethnologist Otto Finsch in 1898. Two years prior to the final purchase, Finsch had written a letter to Franz Boas in which he communicated that he had finished building his South Seas collection and was offering it to the museum for $4,000.[265] Two years later, while Boas was in Europe, he wrote to the then-AMNH president, Morris K. Jesup, to update him on his progress while away from the museum.[266] The letter is noteworthy for a number of reasons, one being that it documents the exchanges Boas was cultivating with European museums:

> My endeavors to arrange exchanges are quite successful… From Dresden I expect to obtain a good series from Dutch New Guinea in exchange for duplicates from Alaska. This will be a very desirable addition to our South Sea Collections…These exchanges will relieve us of a good deal of the cumbersome duplicate material which is difficult to preserve and we shall have in place of storage material good exhibition material.[267]

---

[265] Otto Finsch, Unpublished Letter to Franz Boas, February 21, 1896, Accession folder 1898-49, Division of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY.

[266] It should be noted here that although Boas parted in 1905 from AMNH on relatively bad terms, for much of his tenure there, Jesup was his biggest champion and most generous patron, supporting Boas'plans for collecting, research, and exhibitions. See the 1985 Jacknis essay for more detailed information.

[267] Franz Boas, Unpublished Letter to Morris K. Jesup, July 24, 1898, Accession folder 1898-49. Division of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY.

In continuation of the discussion of museum exchanges begun in chapter one, Boas' letter reveals the level of contact and possibility for exchanges between American and European curators in the late nineteenth century.[268] What is more interesting about the excerpt, however, is Boas' admission that there was a surplus of Alaskan objects in AMNH's collection, which he was willing to relinquish in exchange for objects from the Pacific and Africa. The idea that it would relieve the museum of "cumbersome duplicate material" seems counterproductive to the collecting practices of the time, when the frenzy to collect objects from the Northwest Coast was on the verge of coming to an all time high.[269]

Another provocative aspect of the excerpt is his statement regarding "storage material and exhibition material." Boas makes a distinction between objects he believes are worthy of being put on display and objects that are not, which makes sense given his theory that the three purposes of museums are, "entertainment, instruction, and research," and 90% of museum visitors require nothing beyond what entertainment provides.[270]

---

[268] In terms of exchanges with foreign, non-New Zealand museums in AMNH's history, there are three. One with the Free Public Museums in Liverpool that resulted in the acquisition of a chisel and a pendant in 1905 in exchange for photos of busts of types of Native Americans and Filipinos. The second was in 1907 with the Gigliola Collection in Florence Italy for which AMNH received quartz flakes and other organic materials. The third and final was in 1921 when the Museum received a cloak from the Museum fur Tierkunde und Volkerkunde in Dresden. Whether any or all of these were a result of Boas's visit is unknown.

[269] See Douglas Cole's 1985 publication, "Captured Heritage: The Scramble for Northwest Coast Artifacts," for an interesting discussion of the time period between 1891 and the Depression when the collection of Northwest Coast objects by museums including AMNH was at a heightened frenzy. It also serves as an interesting parallel to what is happening regarding the collection of Maori art at the same time – not quite a frenzy, but could surely be categorized as one of the most sought after areas to collect in the Pacific in the late 19th century and deserves attention in future scholarship.

Boas evaluated Otto Finsch's collection while in Europe and responded to Jesup: "I cannot speak enough in praise of the collection which has been made with the greatest care and has been worked out so thoroughly that it gives a wonderful insight into the culture of the natives of these regions."[271] Aside from admiring the objects, Boas reasons with Jesup that purchasing the Finsch collection in conjunction with the Sturgis collection would make both more valuable to the public: "Owing to the great value of the specimens and to the fact that the acquisition of the collection would enable us to make a large portion of the Sturgis collection, at once, as useful to the public as we desire to see the whole Museum. I think it very desirable to purchase this collection."[272] The documents associated with the Finsch accession exemplify the difference between assumption and reality. For example, while the assumption was that Native Americans were a "vanishing race," the reality —as Boas revealed—was much different. The museums had so much material that they made distinctions between storage and exhibition collections, and (at least in the case of Boas), they were quite willing to part with those objects in the hopes of strengthening their collection of "exhibition-quality" works.

In 1909 T. E. Donne, the former secretary of the New Zealand Tourism and Trade Commission, former head of the New Zealand Government Tourist Department in Rotorua, and liaison between New Zealand and American world's fair organizers, resurfaced in the acquisition history at AMNH as an ethnographic dealer. Unlike objects

---

[270] Jacknis, 86.

[271] Franz Boas, Unpublished Letter to Morris K. Jesup, July 24, 1898. Accession folder 1898-49, Division of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY.

[272] Ibid.

in the collections of NMNH, or FMNH, which were donated to or purchased from the museums from the world's fairs with Donne's assistance, the objects in the collection of AMNH were purchased directly from his personal collection. Of the accession, it includes two objects that are on permanent display in the museum: a storehouse (*pataka*) (fig.3.30) and a canoe prow (fig. 3.31a/b). As Oldman had done with Penn, Donne sent, on consignment, a collection of objects for AMNH to inspect and hopefully to buy. In a letter that accompanied the objects, Donne informs Professor Bumpus (then the director of AMNH) that the canoe prow is "an old one, hewn out of a solid piece of timber" and gave the value as $250. The storehouse was newly carved, but Donne maintains that it is worth the $500 asking price (contending it was valued by Hamilton for $750) because "the men who can do such work can now be counted on the fingers of one hand, and they are well up in years and it is most difficult to get them to do carving."[273] Donne, like so many other dealers we have witnessed so far, used hyperbole as selling points; for example, in the case of the storehouse (which was recently constructed and could thus be considered less valuable than a much older or "antique" object), had set a high price not because of its age, but because the possibility for future work by the same artists was slim. Instead of the old age of the objects, it becomes the artist—or the rarity of that artist existence—that is valued.

In addition to his role as ethnographic dealer, Donne also acted on behalf of his longtime friend Augustus Hamilton, then the director of the Dominion Museum in Wellington. Donne suggested to Bumpus that he ask Hamilton to exchange objects in

---

[273] T.E. Donne, Unpublished Letter to Professor Bumpus, October 8, 1908, Division of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY

their collection for "plaster casts of New Zealand Natives" from the Dominion Museum so that he "might be able to build up a small Maori pa, in which case I should be very glad to send you drawings and designs for fencing, placing of houses, etc."[274] What is especially interesting about Donne's letter is that he cites two books, George French Angas' *The New Zealanders Illustrated*, 1847 and Augustus Hamilton's *Maori Art*, 1901 to use as references, "Should you want any suggestions relative to Maori matters…"[275] This is an important revelation, as it confirms the sources that AMNH was most likely consulting in building their Maori collection. Hamilton's work is often cited in the archival documents of other museums, to the extent that it was used as a catalogue for curators to look through and consider what they would like to add to their own collections. Reproductions of Angas' illustrations are often incorporated into the permanent displays of Maori objects in American museums as contextual resources showing how the objects on display functioned within Maori society.[276]

Donne ends his letter by bringing Bumpus' attention to "two Maori slabs" (*poupou*) that the Dominion Museum was interested in offering to AMNH in exchange for the original or a copy of a feeding funnel collected by Robley. Donne also lists items "which I should be willing to receive in exchange for Maori carvings. Mounted Heads.-

---

[274] Ibid.

[275] Ibid.

[276] Of course, one must look at these images with a critical eye. Refer to the work of Bernard Smith or Leonard Bell regarding European constructions of the Maori through illustrative work.

Moose, Wapiti, Caribou, Virginia, Black Tail, Rocky Mountain goat or Buffaloes [sic] Good skins with heads. Grisly [sic], Black or Brown bear."[277]

T. E. Donne's letter to Professor Bumpus is revelatory on several levels. While reconfirming that the qualities of age and rarity are important selling points for dealers, Donne's citation of both Angas and Hamilton's works as reference tools for building a Maori collection is important to understand while evaluating the philosophy that informed the building of AMNH's collection. Furthermore, Donne reveals that at the turn of the twentieth century, taxidermy animals were considered an even exchange for Maori objects.

The Dominion Museum did exchange objects with AMNH, but not until 1952. AMNH received Maori clubs (*patu*), a staff (*taiaha*),a fishhook, a cloak pin, drills, cutting stones, a cloak, two bags, and cooking containers, but for an unusual request in return. The former director of the Dominion Museum, R.A. Falla, sent a letter to Harry Shapiro, head of the anthropology department in the 1950's, regarding fabric that had been designed by Maori children and was originally on sale at New York City's famed department store, Macy's, in 1950:[278]

> I understand that neither the Corporation nor retailers are willing to supply small orders or short lengths; and it occurred to me that if any of the designs are still on the market and easily obtainable you might be able to get from 6 to 10 feet of each on our behalf and on and exchange basis. We have available for various

[277] Donne, 1908.

[278] H.L. Shapiro, Unpublished Letter to R.A. Falla, February 8, 1952, Division of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY

> fabrics, cloths, or other articles of Maori and Polynesian workmanship if you have any needs of that kind.[279]

Shapiro obliged and arranged for samples to be sent to the Dominion Museum in exchange for an assortment of Maori objects.[280]

One of the most well-known figures in the history of Maori art in America is General H. L. Robley. Robley's fame stems from his having published books on Maori tattooing, and more sensationally, from having amassed the largest group of preserved heads (*moko mokai*) outside of New Zealand. Robley became fascinated with the Maori and Maori tattooing while he was stationed in New Zealand with the British between 1858-1871. During that time, he made voluminous sketches of tattooing patterns; his book *Moko* serves as a reference tool for documenting early nineteenth century tattooing designs and patterns.[281]

Due to the constraints of the Sydney Act, passed in 1831, which effectively stopped the exportation of preserved heads,[282] Robley was unable to acquire his collection while in New Zealand. Instead, he amassed his collection after he returned to

---

[279] R.A. Falla, Unpublished Letter to Dr. H.L. Shapiro, February 1, 1952, Division of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY.

[280] Other exchanges with New Zealand museums were made with the Otago Museum, Dunedin. The first was in 1927 and the second occurred thirty years later. AMNH received an assortment of objects, the most interesting being a bird snare, the only one in an American collection that the Museum received in 1957.

[281] Major-General Robley, *Moko; or Maori Tattooing,* (Southern reprints, 1987).

[282] A notable exception being the head *(moko mokai)* that was collected by Wilkes in 1840, but he did note in his journal that it was nearly impossible to obtain.

Europe, where he waited for the much sought-after objects to become available through auction.[283] In the end, he had collected thirty-five heads and offered them for sale. The collection was purchased with money provided by former AMNH president Morris K. Jesup. Off of public display since the mid-1980s, the objects themselves are also unavailable to most researchers; however, a collection of the countless sketches Robley completed during his lifetime is available in the department of anthropology's archives.[284]

In 1926 a mat, three skirts, a poi ball, and three purses were donated to the museum by Channing Pollock of Shorham, Long Island, New York. Eighteen years after that initial donation, Mrs. Pollock contacted the museum again, this time to donate a belt. What is most interesting about these two accessions is the story of how they were acquired, given here in Mrs. Pollock's own words:

> Some years ago I gave to your Maori exhibit a number of articles presented to me by the Arawa tribe of Maoris at the conclusion of their season at the old Hippodrome… At the time of the appearance of the Maori Troupe at the Hippodrome I was head of the Publicity Bureau and helped to arrange for the making of plaster casts to be used in your figures.[285]

---

[283] L.W. Melvin, *Robley-Soldier with a Pencil*, (Tauranga: Tauranga Historical Society, 1957), 13.

[284] The Robley sketches in the archives of AMNH's department of anthropology are another avenue of research needing to be completed.

[285] Channing Warble Pollock, Unpublished Letter to Curator Maori Collection, June 26, 1944, Accession folder # 1944-25, Division of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY

Mrs. Pollock's letter documents another way for the American public to learn about Maori culture other than through museums: through dance troupes at the Hippodrome. The letter also reveals that she served as a consultant in the creation of Maori manikins used in AMNH's Pacific exhibition.[286]

Just as purchases from W. O. Oldman dominate the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology's Maori collection, so do objects purchased from Dutch ethnographic dealer M. L. J. Lemaire dominate the collection at the AMNH. In 1951, Lemaire began a relationship with AMNH that would last for nine years. As a sign of the times, Lemaire did not send the objects on consignment, as Oldman had; rather, he sent batches of photographs for the curators to peruse, asking only that the photographs of the objects they chose not to purchase be returned to him.[287]

AMNH bought most of Lemaire's objects within their first year of correspondence, 1951. Subsequent purchases of smaller numbers were made in 1952, 1953, 1954, and 1960, and collectively assist in making the entire collection at AMNH the most eclectic, in terms of variety of types of objects, in the United States. Its eclecticism could be attributed to the time of the objects' purchase —in the 1950s—and to the fact that the majority were most likely created in the early twentieth century and could be categorized as objects made for tourists.[288]

---

[286] Discussed more fully in upcoming section on the Museum's Maori manikin.

[287] M.L.J. Lemaire, Unpublished Letter to H.L. Shapiro, February 12, 1951, Accession folder #1951-29, Division of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY

[288] For more on non-western art made for tourists, see the work Shelly Errington (1998) and Barbara Kirschenbaum-Gimblett (1998).

AMNH purchased two treasure boxes from Lemaire. Of the two, that seen in fig. 3.32a/b/c is unusual in both shape and composition, leading one to wonder about its approximate date of creation. It is composed of a darker wood and is square in shape.[289] The top (fig. 3.32b) is composed of two abstracted *manaia* heads, connected by the space where one may expect their mouths should be (they are not). The eyes are accentuated by pieces of colored shell and the sides are composed of S-shaped figures. When viewed from the front, the abstracted faces on the handles appear unfinished (fig. 3.32c).

Other objects purchased through Lemaire include rarities such as a puppet (*karetao*), one of few that are known to exist in the world, including Europe and New Zealand (fig. 3.33).[290] The wooden puppet represents a man, with tattoo patterns carved on his legs. The ovular nose and ears accentuate his elongated face, while pursed lips, eyes filled with shells, and a head of black painted hair complete his facial features. His arms are attached by string and move by pulling the cords. The entire figure is mounted on a pole to be held while moving the arms, and compositely seems more European than Maori in appearance. A firm date for the puppet is unknown.

Another beautiful and unusual figure purchased from Lemaire in 1951 is seen in fig. 3.34. It is composed of three figures: one full figure and two heads. The main figure has its hands on its stomach and knees flexed, which from the side reveals one of the two heads that complete the carving. Under the feet of the main figure is a larger head that,

---

[289] It is also unclear what the Maori word for this type of treasure box should be. Because of its shape, I would guess that it would be a *wakahuia*, except that it is more of a square than a rectangle. Perhaps this is another indication that it was made for tourists owing to its unusual shape.

[290] The AMNH puppet is one of two in the United States, the other one is part of the Bishop Museum's collection in Honolulu.

viewed from the side, appears to have an enlarged forehead. All are treated with the same kind of intricate incised carving.

By 1960, the museum bought only one object, a large gable mask (fig. 3.35). The institution's inability to purchase more objects was due to prohibitively high prices that Shapiro blamed on "an increasing interest in primitive art."[291] Lemaire's responded:

> I think it is a great pity that most of my objects on which you are interested are to[sic] expensive. However this is not my fault, it is merely caused by your countrymen. They are responsible for this inflation of prices. Collecting of primitive art seems to be the newest hobby in the U.S. All the American dealers come regularly to Europe where they buy big quantities at very high prices. I hope that sooner or later most of these collections will go to your Museum…I hope you will succeed to obtain for the year 1960 a more important budget for acquisitions as most of the European museums got.[292]

Shapiro and Lemaire's correspondence reveals an important milestone in the history of collecting Maori art with Lemaire's reference to the rising costs of "primitive art" in the late 1950s[293] blamed on it being what he describes as, "the newest hobby in the U.S.".

While the museum continues in the present day to acquire Maori objects, major acquisitions ended in the 1950s with objects purchased from Lemaire. The collection

---

[291] H.L. Shapiro, Unpublished Letter to Mr. M.L.J. Lemaire, December 21, 1959, Division of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY.

[292] M.L.J. Shapiro, Unpublished Letter to Mr. H.L. Shapiro, December 28, 1959. Accession folder 1960-1, Division of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY.

[293] An avenue for further research is if there is a direct correlation between rising costs of Maori art and the inclusion of non-Western objects in American art museums. Note the work of Haidy Geismar on the Maori art market for further information.

history of AMNH provides an opportunity to learn about a variety of acquisition techniques, as well as view objects unique to the corpus of Maori art—oversized gable heads or a puppet (*keratao*), for example—as a whole. It is this very diversity of methods and objects that contributes to their convoluted history of displaying Maori objects, beginning in 1911.

History of the Display at AMNH

1911 was the year of the earliest recorded display of Maori art at AMNH. From the exhibition's accompanying catalogue titled *Collections from the South Sea Islands Placed on Exhibition in the American Museum of Natural History, January 25, 1911,* prepared by the then–assistant curator of anthropology, Dr. Robert H. Lowie, we understand that the display was met with much anticipation: "The Museum has waited many years for the proper exhibition of its magnificent collection from the South Seas."[294] Lowie makes a point of first noting from where the collections were taken and who was responsible for making them:

> The exhibits in this Hall are from the celebrated Sturgis Collection purchased by the Museum in 1891; the Robley Collection of tattooed heads donated by Mr. Morris K. Jesup; …Among the collectors whose work is represented here are Dr. O. Finsch, Professor A.C. Haddon, Mr. A. Sturgis, Professor Baldwin Spencer, and Lieutenant General Robley.[295]

---

[294] Dr. Robert H.Lowie, *Collections from the South Sea Islands Placed on Exhibition in the American Museum of Natural History, January 25, 1911*, (New York: American Museum of Natural History), 3.

[295] Ibid.

In describing the hall, its educational value, and Polynesians in general, Lowie remarks:

> The Hall now for the first time opened to the public contains ethnological collections from some of the most interesting races of mankind…the Polynesian, whose complex social institutions, artistic sense, and handsome physique have made a strong impression on all European visitors form the time of Captain Cook to that of Robert Louis Stevenson,--all are represented by typical specimens of their crafts and arts.[296]

The single known photograph (fig. 3.36) reveals what Lowie describes in depth, noting that it is divided geographically, like the Pacific Islands themselves:

> A wide central aisle running north and south separates the Polynesian and Micronesian section in the eastern half of the Hall, from the Melanesian section on the west side; two wall-cases in the extreme west are reserved for Australian, and the Tower for New Zealand, collections. Disregarding the Tower, and the two small western wall-cases, the visitor may consider the Hall as divided into four quarter sections.[297]

From both his description and the installation photograph, we know that while the first section the visitor encounters is the Polynesian section, the New Zealand section has been separated from its geographical neighbors of Fiji and Samoa. Instead, the Maori are found isolated from the rest of Polynesia in the museum's tower, which can only indicate both the importance of the Maori collection, as well as the pervasiveness of the objects within AMNH's entire Pacific collection. Lowie describes the Maori tower in detail,

---

[296] Ibid.

[297] Ibid., 3-4.

paying special attention to the tattooing found on the manikin (fig. 3.36) that greeted visitors to the section as well as their collection of preserved heads (*moko mokai*):

> The entrance to the Tower is guarded by the life-size figure of a tattooed Maori (New Zealand) warrior perched in an attitude of defiance on a bowlder [sic] of nephrite. Tattooing, prominent in many parts of the South Sea, is best exhibited in the Museum's collections from New Zealand. While the tattooing of the body is illustrated by the cast at the entrance, the facial decoration is best shown in the wonderful series of tattooed heads cased in the Tower itself,--probably the best collection in the world. Such heads were generally secured from enemies, more rarely from the corpse of friends, and after the removal of the soft parts were preserved by an elaborate process of mummification. The implements used in tattooing are exhibited in the same case. A model of a Maori storage house is shown in the center of the Tower. Its decoration is highly characteristic, but even finer work is seen in the specimens of native canoe prows, which indicate a very high degree of artistic sense on the part of their carvers, who must rank as one of the most remarkable of all primitive races.[298]

The Maori manikin that "guarded" the Maori tower in 1911 stood upon what was purported to be the largest block of jade (weighing three tons) in any museum in the world at the time. George F. Kunz,[299] who had donated a number of Maori jade pieces to the museum in 1893, had secured the boulder for American industrialist J. Pierpont Morgan, who later presented it to the museum. The Maori figure was heralded at the time for its realism , as it was cast from two Maori dancers named Chief Kiwi and Hautouterangi, who were in New York the year before the hall opened performing at the Hippodrome with a Maori dance troupe.[300] The warrior figure is posed defiantly, tongue

---

[298] Ibid., 6.

[299] Kunz writes in detail about New Zealand jade in his article, "New Zealand Jade," in *American Museum Journal*, v. 11, n. 2 (February 1911): 57-58.

protruding, wearing a skirt that exposes his tattooed thighs. His body weight is balanced entirely on his left foot, while his right foot and arm are raised and his right hand grips a club. The figure was met with the approval of the entire dance troupe and the sculptor, Sigurd Neandross, used his models, as well as Robley's book *Moko,* to accurately reproduce the tattooing patterns seen on the figures face and thighs.[301]

In addition to the Maori manikin at the entrance to the exhibition, the installation photograph (fig. 3.36) documents that on the sides of the entrance walls hang two Maori figures on either side of the "warrior." Just behind the figure is Donne's model storehouse (*pataka*) displayed out in the open, without any kind of glass protection. A-frame glass cases dot the exhibition space of the tower, with canoe prows to the left and right of the storehouse. This photograph is invaluable because it documents that the canoe prows and storehouse that are currently on display at the museum, have been there since at least 1911 – for almost 100 years!

At the end of his description of the Maori section, Lowie, in characterizing the Maori race, describes their "high degree of artistic sense" ranking them as, "the most remarkable of all primitive races." This is an historically significant point that, as early as 1911, anthropologists were making distinctions among races based on artistic skill, bringing to light early twentieth-century views about racial differences. Is it merely a coincidence that at the same time that Lowie's notes were published, modern artists were beginning to use so-called "primitive" art as inspiration in their own work?

---

[300] This was the same troupe that Channing Pollock received the skirt, belts and purses from that she later donated to the Museum in 1926 and 1944.

[301] Robert H. Lowie, "The New South Sea Exhibit," *American Museum Journal*, vol. 11, no. 2 (February 1911): 53-56.

Margaret Mead and the American Museum of Natural History

An epic period in the museum's history began on January 9, 1926, when a young anthropologist named Margaret Mead was hired as an assistant curator of ethnology with an annual salary of $2,000.[302] Mead was in the habit of documenting her activities at work with memoranda that, over the course of time, have proven to be an invaluable resource to scholars. The memos document the course of her long career at AMNH, while chronologically charting the growth of the anthropology department and the history of the display of art from the Pacific Islands in that museum.

A year after Mead arrived at the museum, H. D. Skinner from the Otago Museum and University in Dunedin, New Zealand was visiting the United States and spent time at various American museums, including AMNH and the Bishop in Honolulu. Mead remarked, "I took advantage of Dr. H. D. Skinner's presence in the country in the winter of 1927, to overhaul our Maori collection thoroughly, write a Guide Leaflet on 'The Maori and their Arts' and install a Maori collection in the fifth floor West Tower adjacent to the South Sea Hall."[303]

---

[302] George Sherwood, Unpublished letter to Margaret Mead, January 9, 1926, Papers of Margaret Mead, Box K14, Folder AMNH General, 1926-39, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.

[303] Margaret Mead, "Notes on Department History," unpublished document, Papers of Margaret Mead, K16 Folder: Margaret Mead Office Files, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

The book Mead mentioned in her note about Skinner's stay in New York was published in May of 1928.[304] Dividing Maori art into typological sections—greenstone, woodwork, weapons, textiles, and tattooing—*The Maoris and Their Arts* is a testament to the importance of the museum's Maori collection at the museum. As Mead had already identified the Maori collection as large enough to warrant its own exhibition in a special area, a published book on the subject only cemented its importance to the museum. The reasons may also lie in sentiments Mead expressed in the leaflet, which had been echoed seventeen years earlier by Robert Lowie when he wrote his own catalogue about AMNH's South Sea collections—statements that elevate certain races who demonstrate artistic skill. [305] In it, Mead writes:

> Even before he obtained European tools the Maori produced works of art which rank very high in the woodwork of the primitive peoples of the world. The high esteem in which the artist was held and the fact that work dignified rather than demeaned a chief probably had a great influence in producing such beautiful craftsmanship."[306]

---

[304] If Skinner assisted Mead with the leaflet, he is not credited. Skinner did go through AMNH's collection and writing notes and drawings on many of the Maori objects in their collection. The notes would be a helpful reference to a scholar interested in reconstructing the history of the Otago Museum or a biography on H.D. Skinner. They are located in the Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. Papers of Margaret Mead, Box K18, South Sea Hall Folder.

[305] See Franz Boas. *Primitive Art*. (Oslo: H. Aschehoug & Co. (W. Nygaard) 1927), 161-163 and 182, for his discussion of the Maori use of spiral designs and geometric patterns in their art. While the issue of primitive art is dealt with in-depth in chapter four of this study, it is important to note the publication of Franz Boas' book, *Primitive Art,* in 1927. While it is not confirmed, it can be assumed that his inclusion of the Maori in this publication could have influenced Mead's statements. Certainly the subsequent references to the Maori spiral designs in future exhibition catalogues is rooted in Boas' publication.

[306] Margaret Mead, *The Maoris and their Arts, Guide Leaflet no. 71*, (New York: The American Museum of Natural History, May 1928), 7.

At some point between 1911 and 1927, when the hall that Lowie installed in 1911 was dismantled, Mead described the status of the Maori material in 1927 as "scattered around the hall, and while it is now together at one end of the Philippine Hall, it has never regained the coherence which was part of the original planning, which included the mounted Maori warrior on the large greenstone pebble at the entrance to the tower."[307]

With Skinner's assistance, within the first years of her tenure at the museum Mead inspected the cases in the South Seas hall and corrected false attributions. In a rough sketch that dates to approximately when Skinner was at AMNH (fig. 3.37), Mead reveals her plan for what the hall should look like, with the Maori section in the upper left corner, inhabiting the tower.

In the beginning of 1930, Mead reported that the installation of the Maori cases in the tower had been completed. One year later the entire South Seas hall and Maori tower were being painted while labels were being printed. The process was halted for unknown reasons. Mead's South Sea Natives hall opened eight years later, in 1939, and its opening was documented by the publication *Exhibition Halls of the American Museum of Natural History* that same year. At this point in the chronology, the Maori objects were located on the fourth floor of the museum (one floor lower than they were in 1911), nestled between the "Philippine Natives" and "Minerals and Gems" exhibits, with the Robley heads being a highlighted feature on the floor plan (fig. 3.38).

The text of the 1939 exhibition guide reveals that the halls devoted to the Pacific Islands were divided into two sections—one that contained material from Polynesia and New Guinea and a second that contained objects from the Philippines. Maori material

---

[307] Mead,"Notes on Department History."

was displayed in the second hall. The preserved heads (*moko mokai*) were labeled as the most "conspicuous objects in these halls,"[308] along with the museum's large cast of an Easter Island *moai* figure and Hawaiian feather cape. The description of the Maori in Miner's catalogue makes a distinction between their aesthetic style and the style of Melanesia, noting that the Maoris' was "characterized by the dominant spiral motive."[309] Again, the author highlights the Robley collection of preserved heads, declaring it "one of the most remarkable exhibits in the Museum."[310]Additionally, the model storehouse (*pataka)* (fig. 3.30) that the museum purchased from T. E. Donne in 1908 was included in the exhibition in the tower, along with a canoe prow, bargeboards, and carved figures.[311]

Along with the opening of the South Sea Natives hall in 1939,[312] there was a musical program held in conjunction with the exhibition. The *Free Illustrative Musical Program from South Sea Islands and Philippine Islands Halls* took place from 3:00p.m. to 4:00 p.m. on December 4–8 and 11–15 in 1939. In notes found among Mead's papers

---

[308] Miner, 148.

[309] Ibid., 149.

[310] Ibid.

[311] Unpublished document, "Summary of Conditions in the South Sea Hall," April 25, 1930, Papers of Margaret Mead Papers, Box K18, Folder: South Sea Hall, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

[312] Also in 1939, a special exhibit called the *Primitive Art Show* opened at AMNH. Since the exhibition photographs are dark, it is not clear exactly which Maori objects were included, they do provide documentation of how the objects were displayed – in an a-frame cases set in a room full of marble busts. The exhibition also adds another dimension to ongoing questions regarding the treatment of art within a natural history museum—in effect, the Museum was having its own "art" exhibition, predating the opening of the Museum of Primitive Arts in New York by 16 years and MoMA's *Arts of the South Seas*, by six.

at the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C., we come to understand that the museum's education department, in consultation with Mead, arranged the program. Mead writes in her notes that the purpose of the program was to "supplement, through the sense of hearing, the visual impressions made by the exhibits," going on to describe the musical complexity of the Pacific Islands.[313] The program included a wide variety of music from the Pacific, including what were sure to be crowd pleasers like "Blue Hawaii" and "Aloha Oe." The playing of a "Maori Love Ditty" and the "Warriors' Departure " represented the Maori, and both were played for an American audience via an audio recording of the Rotorua Maori Choir of New Zealand.[314]

Within five years after the opening of the South Sea Natives hall, Mead was already planning an even larger installation and what was to arguably become the culmination of her life's work. This, the Hall of the Peoples of the Pacific, opened to the public in 1971, two years after Mead retired from her duties as curator of ethnology. The sheer volume of documentation pertaining to the first incarnation of the hall is unparalleled by any other American museum and serves as an invaluable testament to how an installation of that size and magnitude is developed and completed.

The first memo regarding the Hall of the Peoples of the Pacific was written in 1945, when Mead listed all of the objects that should be kept or replaced from the South Seas Natives hall, as well as areas that should be recognized, and points that needed to be

---

[313] Unpublished document, "The American Museum of Natural History Free Illustrative Musical Program for South Sea Islands and Philippine Islands Halls," Papers of Margaret Mead Papers Box Q20, Folder: Margaret Mead Office Files, Administrative Exhibits, 1911-48, nd, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

[314] Ibid.

made.[315] Mead noted that the "big emphases" should be on cultural diversification, stratification, diffusion, eth[n]ological differentiation, and different levels of civilization, along with the spread of Asia, late European contact, and the adaptation to the environment. She noted that for Polynesia, both Samoa and New Zealand were areas that should be displayed as "whole cultures."[316]

Ten years after that initial memo, Mead completed a comprehensive outline for the hall, declaring that it should replace the Philippine Hall that was currently being exhibited on the fourth floor of the Museum. In a memo under the heading "Basic Assumptions," Mead outlined a number of items. Since the hall would be combining two areas—the South Seas and the Philippines—into one, all of the main areas would have to be condensed; the display of large figures, like the Maori warrior, would be downsized and only the Tahitian and part of the Filipino life groups would be included; all of the cases were too old and needed to be replaced. The hall should give an impression of the islands; and finally, that if sound was to be used it should be of breaking waves.[317] Mead again emphasized, as she had in 1945, that the main themes would be the diversity fostered by the islands, the nature of diffusion, and the relationship to the resources of that area. She described the layout of the exhibition stating that the entrance should be

---

[315] Margaret Mead "Hall Plans AMNH Sept. 26, 1945," Unpublished Memorandum, People of the Pacific Hall Folder, Division of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY.

[316] Ibid.

[317] Margaret Mead, "Outline Plan for one Pacific Island Hall to be located in the present Philippine Hall, 4th Floor, Northwest, Prepared by Margared[sic] Mead-June 21, 1955," Unpublished Document, People of the Pacific Hall Folder Division of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY.

flanked by the Easter Island *moai* and large masks and figures and that a wall should be placed behind the figures to allow for special lighting—presumably to make a dramatic first impression on the visitor.

Mead described the center of the hall as being full of light, with all-glass cases to give the impression that the visitor was looking through "the island world." The center would display canoes, objects related to the uses of coconut and fishing, and a smaller exhibit called "Art of the Area." Mead called for a small Maori *Pa* to either supplement or replace the current display of the storehouse as a means of showing "rank, social organization, etc."[318] In another section Mead envisioned "a series of topical exhibits which are Pacific-wide in content." Mead described the Maori area as centered upon a small habitat group, presenting arts and crafts such as weaving and woodwork. She made special note that "[s]tress will be laid on the Maori adaptation to their environment, invention of weaving, special use of greenstone, loss of outrigger in river transportation, preservation of heads, etc."[319]

In 1961, Mead detailed in writing a meeting she attended with Preston McClanahan, the hall's designer, and Philip Gifford from the anthropology department. The memo documents that Preston McClanahan was put in charge of the Maori section and was directed to work out a detailed plan for how the Maori material should be handled, with special attention paid to the large objects like the canoe prows and

---

[318] It is interesting to note that the idea for a Maori pa on display was first introduced to Professor Bumpus, the director of AMNH by T.E. Donne in 1908. This was shortly after a "live" pa was displayed at the Christchurch International Exposition 1906-1907, due to Donne's influence.

[319] Mead, "Outline Plan for one Pacific Island Hall…".

storehouse. How to display the storehouse was believed to be a problem, as Mead did not want it to appear to be a model for a larger object; hence the smaller scale of the other objects.[320]

A few days later, McClanahan wrote a memo to Mead detailing the basic design concept of the hall, describing it thus: "The entire range of architectural elements must, in addition to utilitarian requirements, insure the viewer's understanding of the exhibition. The viewer must not be aware of these elements, only the objectives, obtained through total architectural organization."[321] McClanahan proposed a "modular" exhibit structure—a complicated case system that did not compete with the objects it held. He also stressed the importance of lighting and that a wide variety of lights could be installed to spotlight certain objects. A year later, in 1962, McClanahan calculated how long it would take to complete construction on the hall, and how much it would cost. Some of the more staggering figures are the 350 weeks he estimated it would take to install 3,500 objects (at a cost of $70,000), or the 75 weeks and $15,000 required to construct the diorama of the Balinese group. In total, McClanahan estimated that the process would take at least seven years to complete and that the project's expenses would total over $200,000.[322]

---

[320] M. Mead, Unpublished Memorandum to L.A. Williams, P. McClanahan, P. Gifford. October 6, 1961, People of the Pacific Hall Folder, Division of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY.

[321] P. McClanahan, Unpublished Memorandum to Dr. M. Mead & associates, October 18, 1961, People of the Pacific Hall Folder, Division of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY.

[322] Preston McClanahan, "Estimated Exhibit Costs for the Proposed Hall of the Peoples of the Pacific," Unpublished Document, October 10, 1962, People of the Pacific Hall

Early in 1969, Mead sent a series of letters to curators and directors of all of the major museums in New Zealand, soliciting them for Maori material she needed for the installation of the hall of the Pacific Peoples. In a form letter, Mead explained that AMNH was preparing a new exhibit and that a number of Maori objects were needed to complete the display. Among those were, "a woman's plain pack strap," "examples of the woven flax bracelets and anklets worn by women," and "a sample of pigment used for face moko made from the soot of the kahikatea tree and bird fat."[323] D. R. Simmons from the Auckland Museum replied that many of the objects she sought were old and difficult to obtain; [324] G. S. Park of the Otago Museum was similarly discouraging. Only Betty McFadgen from the Dominion Museum was able to assist, loaning AMNH a pack strap, as well as fulfilling Mead's request for a sample of raw flax. Additionally, McFadgen was helpful by correcting Mead's erroneous use of the term "sleeping house" to describe what was actually a meeting house, and subsequently recommended a cooperative that would be able to make a sleeping mat for her.[325]

Research for the wall text and labels commenced in 1969, with preparatory work on the Maori having been completed by Mead's assistant Elizabeth Nicholson a year earlier.[326] Mead had decided that establishing an educational direction for the visitor to

---

[323] People of the Pacific People Folder, Division of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY.

[324] Margaret Mead, Unpublished Letter to David Simons, January 9, 1969, People of the Pacific Hall Folder, Division of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY.

[325] Betty McFadgen, Unpublished Letter to Margaret Mead, January 23, 1969, People of the Pacific Hall Folder, Division of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY.

follow would help the installation team be more efficient in writing the labels and installing the objects. She believed that there should be an "established or reinforced," concept of the Pacific, which should be introduced first broadly and then more specifically. She proposed using anthropological concepts like trade, warfare, and sibling rivalry in the labels, as well as providing historic background and "how-to" information. Last, she added that the hall should be a place of both novelty and entertainment—an idea that seems both incongruous and savvy to us today. Was Mead diminishing the significance of the objects and her research to novelty and "infotainment," or was she simply ahead of her time in understanding that entertainment was a vital tool for increasing attendance figures?[327]

After a visit to the Peabody Essex Museum in Salem (or what she referred to as a "'curiosity cabinet'" that is the Salem Museum"), Mead wrote in the third of a series of "newsletters" on the hall that "[o]ne of the worst techniques in exhibition is pontification," and that "[i]t may often seem as though what is being transmitted is the Gospel According to A.M.N.H.—the GOOD NEWS about the Pacific." She recommended that labels be limited to what she describes as the "40-second reader" being careful to "connect the facts and the objects into clearly apprehend[s]ible bundles." Mead emphasized the importance of showing science at work while seizing the

---

[326] Nicholson wrote reports regarding Maori weapons, women, and clubs in 1968 and cites her sources as everyone from Best, Hamilton, Robley, Buck (Te Rangi Hiroa). The reports are available in the Division of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History.

[327] Margaret Mead, "Memo to E.N. Re: People's Hall label research." Unpublished Memorandum, July 14, 1969, People of the Pacific Hall Folder, Division of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY.

opportunity to "combine archaeology with linguistics, genetics and art styles."[328] Mead's objectives in presenting information to the public were to be accurate, engaging, precise, and unbiased.

Mead and Nicholson began to write first drafts of the labels in 1969, and material from New Zealand was placed in an alcove at the back of the installation, to the left of the Easter Island *moai*. A Maori axe was included among objects from all areas of the Pacific in the installation's "synoptic case," which was meant to show contact between the various cultures of the Pacific.

The Maori alcove was divided into topical cases: textiles, carvings, weapons, canoes, chiefly items, and tattooing, with the storehouse installed on its own in the center of the space. The case containing the canoes displays them so that the figures in each prow and stern face the viewers, without allowing them enough room to view each individual canoe from the side (fig. 3.39). The wall text in 1971 discussed the canoes as being the transportation that carried the Maori to New Zealand. The label described the large pines that grow in New Zealand, which made it possible to fashion canoes more than one hundred feet long, and stated that only men of high rank were allowed to carve war canoes, describing their hulls as being decorated with spiral designs. The label also referred to smaller fishing canoes that remain largely unadorned.

As the visitor rounded the corner into the Maori alcove, they were immediately confronted with case containing a set of four paddles, three of which are dated to pre-1881, displayed diagonally (fig. 3.40). An enlarged reproduction of Barralet's drawing

---

[328] Margaret, Mead "Newsletter Pph #3," August 8, 1968, Unpublished Document, People of the Pacific Hall Folder, Division of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY.

Maori Canoe is mounted behind the paddles, while a canoe bailer that was formerly in the collection of the Otago Museum in Dunedin, New Zealand, rests at the bottom of the case on the left. The label includes an excerpt from "The Song of the Aotea Canoe"—the canoe that is believed to have been the first to land on New Zealand:

> Behold my paddle, Te Roku-o-whiti!
> See how it flies and flashes,
> It quivers like a bird's wing,
> This paddle of mine.
> Ah, the outward lift and the dashing,
> The quick thrust in and the backward sweep,
> The swishing, the swirling eddies,
> The foaming white wake and the spray
> That flies from my paddle.[329]

An extension of the case with paddles is a case is containing weapons such as staffs (*taiaha*), axes (*tewhatea*), and clubs (*patu*). Described on the label as being valued as both instruments of war and symbols of authority, the latter point was reemphasized by McClanahan and Mead's decision to include another Angas lithograph, illustrating a Maori chief holding a staff (*taiaha*). The staffs and axes are positioned diagonally in the back of the case, with an array of clubs displayed in front of them, alongside the label and Angas lithograph. Adjacent to the weapons are a variety of objects were included: house panels, figures, and a lintel. (fig. 3.41) The carvings were complemented by contextual illustrations taken George French Angas' book, *New Zealanders Illustrated*, published in 1847. Angas' color lithographs of a funerary arrangement and meeting house assist the

---

[329] Peter H. Buck, *Vikings of the Pacific*, (Chicago: The University Press of Chicago, 1938), 277.

viewer in understanding how the objects were used; reference to Angas' work was a technique used throughout the Hall, and continues to be used today in the museum's current installation of Pacific art.

Across from the carvings is a display of "prestige items" (fig. 3.42), in other words, objects that are valuable to the Maori. The placement of the pendant (*hei-tiki*) and adze (*toki*) are interesting as they are hanging from the top of the case by fishing wire, dangling above carved bowl, a flute, and a belt. The case conveys to the visitor what objects were deemed important to the Maori, while the final case the center (fig. 3.43) contains textiles of various types (along with samples of the raw materials used to make them), flax, and the tools that are employed to produce cloaks, mats, and belts. The cloaks that are strapped to the round plastic "bodies," presumably to give the visitor a sense of how the object would have looked when worn and interspersed amongst the cloaks are Angas lithographs (fig. 3.44).[330]

The main draw of the exhibition in 1971 that was used to advertise the hall in press releases and posters that were hung throughout the museum[331] was the case that housed the preserved heads (*moko mokai*.) We know that the label text explained the tattooing process and patterns, as well as the accompanying ceremonies that occurred

---

[330] Please note that there is no indication that the Angas lithographs were included in the 1971 exhibition – this photograph is from the installation in 2006, which may seem odd, except that the choice and configuration of objects has not substantially changed since then.

[331] A proposed poster read, "…A Maori man preserved the tattooed head of a dead friend…The peoples of the Pacific have changed, as people do. But the artifacts they created and the ambiance of their past remains remain beautifully presented in the new Hall of the Peoples of the Pacific."(taken from an unpublished memo from Ann Breen to Elizabeth Nickerson, May 6, 1971 that gave proposed copy for posters to call attention to the Hall.

while tattooing (*moko*) was being performed. Tattooing was described as denoting both prestige and beauty and the process of preserving the heads was described in depth.[332]

In the Acoustiguide audio guide that accompanied the hall, the Robley collection was featured,[333] and it inspired an interesting dialogue regarding how the collection was to be discussed. In 1973, two years after the hall opened, excerpts from the Acoustiguide text were excerpted and used in a radio advertisement on New York City radio stations. Mead's approval was sought for the advertisement. Upon reading the portion that said, "And if you turn around, you'll see a case full of heads…One European explorer came ashore, and admired the tat[t]ooing on the face of a captive slave. The chief said, very well, killed the slave and had the head smoked for the visitor at once."[334] In a handwritten note, Mead withheld her approval, stating that the language was "too sensational offend Maoris Tchambuli relatives who have died relatives who have been killed"[335] Both Mead's response, as well as the poster copy that described the Maori head as being that of a dead friend offers evidence that sensitivities toward displaying and discussing human remains in the museum context were present as early as 1973. Critics may argue that

---

[332] A photograph of the case is available in the museum's photographic archives, but due to sensitivities toward the subject matter, I have chosen not to illustrate it here.

[333] The collection was taken off view on an unconfirmed date post-1984 due to sensitivities towards displaying human remains. Whether that was a decision in response to the influx of Maori during the run of *Te Maori* at the Met, is unclear.

[334] Unpublished document. "American Museum of Natural History, Acoustiguide Tour "Margaret Mead," People of the Pacific Hall Folder, Division of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY.

[335] Margaret Mead, Handwritten Note on Unpublished Memorandum from Ann Breen to Shari Segal, October 16, 1973, People of the Pacific Hall Folder, Division of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY.

displaying the Robley collection was culturally insensitive to begin with, but both of these archival documents offer proof that Mead made conscious attempts at a sensitive treatment of the objects.

The Peoples of the Pacific Hall officially opened on May 19, 1971. The press release prepared for the event summarized that the hall had been conceived in the 1920s and worked on by Mead since the 1940s. McClanahan's initial estimate that the hall would cost $200,000 to produce was dwarfed by the final total of $1,000,000. The press release described the hall as "washed by the sounds of the Pacific Ocean…Maori music plays in the New Zealand section," as well as describing the "seven severed and smoked heads" in the Maori case as the "darker side of life in the South Seas."[336] To Mead, the hall had to "reflect the islands—the blue of the sea, the bright sky, the far vistas and sunlit shore[.]"[337] Published as an accompaniment to the May 1971 issue of *Natural History*, AMNH's monthly magazine, was an extensive guidebook called *Peoples of the Pacific*, edited by Mead and McClanahan. The guidebook gives the reader an overview of the various regions of the Pacific, delving into a discussion of how Pacific Island objects in the collection were collected, as well as a brief explanation regarding how the hall had been constructed.

Mead's extended efforts and apparent triumph were dampened by the reception of the hall of the Peoples of the Pacific; in the case of the *New York Times*, for example, the

---

[336] Unpublished Press Release, "Beauty, Drama, History Combined in Hall of Peoples of Pacific Directed by Dr. Margaret Mead, at the American Museum of Natural History." People of the Pacific Hall Folder, Division of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY.

[337] Margaret Mead, "Our New "Hall of the Pacific": 45 Years in the Making." *Redbook*. (May, 1971).

exhibit received a chilly reception. In an article revealingly titled "I Could Cry, I Could Just Cry," *Times* reporter John Canaday began by writing, "Let's hope I'm wrong and that repeated visits will show that the American Museum of Natural History's new Hall of the Peoples of the Pacific is not the disaster that it seems on first acquaintance. Right now I feel that it has set the technique of art-anthropological installation back 50 years."[338]

Canaday elaborated by stating that natural history museums needed to realize—as Cubists had fifty years earlier—that ethnographic objects were also works of art, and that many of these museums had first-rate art collections as well as natural history artifacts . Because of what he perceived as AMNH's failure to take this into account, Canaday believed that the museum had done a complete disservice to the objects. Mead and McClanahan's attempts fell flat with the reviewer, who, while acknowledging the difficulty in the dual role the objects now played—both ethnographic and artistic—was highly critical of the end result:

> Attempts to reveal the expressive nature of artifacts by such means as their incorporation in life-size dioramas, by eccentric lighting, by startling juxtapositions, by sound tracks and other supporting devices, had to be checked this side of their theatrical capacity to deform objects that, after all, had to maintain their identity as factual records. When to include an object because it was a fine work of art if it was a redundant as an ethnological specimen, and when to include objects because of no esthetic value because they demonstrated a point, was a question of balancing one against another to combine truth and effectiveness in a given amount of space…The obligation to respect truth versus the temptation to yield to false effects was, in fact, the conflict that had to be resolved, but the first thing was to take what you could out of cases and, when you had to use cases, to make them as little like coffins as possible.[339]

---

[338] John Canaday, "I Could Cry, I Could Just Cry," *The New York Times*, (May 30, 1971): D19.

[339] Ibid.

Canaday's unfavorable review marks a paradigm shift in the display of Maori objects. He was outraged that AMNH seemed to ignore the inherent artistic value of the objects. However, after looking closely at the installation's related archival material, we know that Canaday's accusations are not entirely founded. For example, we know that as early as the 1890s, Boas used the term "art objects," and that AMNH had a history of discussing their collection as an art collection, Mead herself having written *The Maoris and Their Arts,* illustrating that she too considered these items as art objects. Perhaps it was the awareness that they were working in a natural history museum with a stated mission of "establishing a Museum and Library of Natural History; of encouraging and developing the study of Natural Science; of advancing the general knowledge of kindred subjects, and of furnishing popular instruction"[340] that fueled some of the perceived confusion. If an institution's stated mission is to teach the public about natural science, how much artistic license can it actually take with an installation in a natural history museum?

Many of Mead's colleagues at AMNH agreed with Canaday's criticisms, and plans to change the hall surfaced six and a half years after it opened.[341] In notes written by Mead on the occasion of the first conference concerning the new hall, on January 23, 1978, she documents that an outside designer named Rod Lopez-Fabrega was chosen to undertake the redesign hall. In noting her colleagues' overwhelming disapproval of the hall, Mead writes:

---

[340] Miner, 13.

[341] The installation history here is confused. While some state that the Hall came down completely, it appears that it was in fact still up, until the new Hall was unveiled in 1984.

> Nick[i]lson [It is spelled Nicholson above; please correct if nec.] thinks the hall is flat doesn[']t stand out, beautiful things [e]verything two [sic] uniform…Lopez, whish he could see more into houses, should have artifacts to tie to archaeological map, None of them grasp the point of the vast range in the hall…I stressed as much as I could how much any change would up set the mesh, but they all want to get their fingers in, don't like modules, don't like the fact you can see through, (as specially in Bali) essentially I think don't like the Hall…Only real hope of saving things will be to convince them its too expensive to change things."[342]

Two months later, Lopez-Fabrega recalled the antagonistic meeting in a letter to Mead, writing:

> I was acutely embarrassed to see the meeting take a turn toward bear-beating and to hear your life's work put down with a few flip phrases, as it seemingly was. Conversely, I was puzzled by your resistance toward doing anything of substance to improve the presentation of this magnificent collection in any significant way.[343]

He continued his letter by questioning why Mead was so unwilling to work with him, reiterating that it was her life's work on display, and relaying his hope that she would not let it become "a second rate rework."

Perhaps owing to his own admission of being "presumptuous" in writing to Mead, Lopez-Fabrega was dropped as the hall's designer. In his place a new designer, Eugene Bergmann, was installed. But Mead's attitude continued to be one of seeming disinterest. In a letter to her on March 23, 1978, Bergmann discusses a number of issues, including

---

[342] Margaret Margaret, "PPH Jan 23, 1978," Unpublished Document, People of the Pacific Hall Folder, Division of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY.

[343] Rod Lopez-Fabrega, Unpublished Letter to Margaret Mead, March 12, 1978, People of the Pacific Hall Folder, Division of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY.

how he would like to proceed with the mock-up for the exhibition, and mentions his having tried to contact her, but with little success.[344]

Whether or not her interest level increased is unclear, but it appears that Mead did have the final say on matters relating to the hall. After a discussion with Mead on May 22, 1978, Bergmann summarized the conversation, listing points they had on which they had agreed. One was that the schematic exhibits were to be moved to the entrance of the hall and, specific to this discussion, that New Zealand would be integrated with Polynesia "by the use of the same flooring and color."[345]

Bergmann had created an in-depth description of exactly how the hall would work. In an extensive document dated April 1978, he outlined each issue: case lighting, case structure, ceiling lighting and structure, flooring and walls, culture group identification–general ambiance–glass reflections, copy, and a summation of how he felt about the plans.

Bergmann created a paper trail of his dealings with Mead and on July 6, 1978, wrote, "It is my understanding that with this meeting we have agreed upon the position of all exhibit cases in the Hall except for some of the aisle cases, which will be placed near the east and west wall."[346]

---

[344] Eugene Bergmann, Unpublished Letter to Margaret Mead, March 23, 1978, People of the Pacific Hall Folder, Division of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY.

[345] Eugene Bergmann, Unpublished Letter to Margaret Mead, May 24, 1978, People of the Pacific Hall Folder, Division of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY.

[346] Eugene Bergmann, Unpublished Letter to Margaret Mead, July 6, 1978, People of the Pacific Hall Folder, Division of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY.

Margaret Mead died later that year. In hindsight, poor health or old age could have been contributing factors to her seeming reluctance regarding her beloved hall's renovations. It seems that her notes taken in that early meeting to discuss the renovation of the 1971 incarnation of her hall foreshadowed the inevitable future: that, after forty-five years of planning and execution, Mead's efforts were almost universally panned, and the summation of her life's work dismantled and redesigned.

In keeping with the slow installation pace that AMNH maintained over the years, the renovated Margaret Mead hall opened in December of 1984. Heralded in the press, the success of the new installation was due either to its correcting the perceived mistakes of the 1971 hall, or its unveiling during a different cultural climate—one where the inherent value of the objects as art may have been less important. The *New York Times*, which had been so critical in its review of the 1971 incarnation of the hall, was now effusive in its review of the 1984 reinstallation. The article by an unnamed author, titled *At New Mead Hall, a Bygone World,*[347] describes object after object, each more rare than the other. The reviewer poignantly describes Mead's hand in the 1984 reinstallation, writing, "Dr. Mead had always dreamed, she wrote later, of making the museum's Pacific islands collections into a new Hall of the Pacific. It was not until her 35th year at the museum that she was able to realize that dream. The hall took 10 years to complete—and only 5 years later, building reconstruction forced its closing."[348] From the primary source material, we understand a different version of the story.

---

[347] *The New York Times*, (December 21, 1984): C22.

[348] Ibid.

The Hall closed again in 1997 but was reopened in 2001 after having been slightly reconfigured by Professor George Corbin, who served as guest curator of the hall. The current incarnation is officially called the Margaret Mead Hall of the Pacific People. It was renovated after having been closed for four years and retains much from its 1971 and 1984 incarnations. Most of the cases have remained the same in appearance and object type, as have the lighting, music, and overall atmosphere. What has changed is the addition of some contextual images, an updated map of the Pacific, as well as a section on tattooing and canoe models that feature the Maori .

A case devoted to Mead now greets the visitor (fig. 3.45) and includes personal effects such as her walking stick, Medal of Honor, and magazine and book covers from her various publications. An adjacent television shows a loop of interviews of Mead's coworkers, friends, and family recounting stories of their experiences with the anthropologist. Nearing the hall's main entrance, the visitor can view color photographs of people from the Pacific, subtly making the point that the objects the visitor will soon view were created by contemporary people existing not in the past, but in present (fig. 3.46).

CHAPTER FOUR:

MAORI ART AND AMERICAN NATURAL HISTORY MUSEUMS PART TWO: THE BERNICE P. BISHOP MUSEUM AND FIELD MUSEUM

Bernice P. Bishop Museum, Honolulu, Hawaii (hereafter the Bishop)[349]

As a memorial to his late wife Princess Bernice Pauahi who was a descendent of the great King Kamehameha, Charles Bishop set out to create a museum that would be, "an ornament to the city, an attraction to visitors, and a conservatory of relics of ancient Hawaiian life, now disappearing fast."[350] Built on the original grounds of the Kamehameha School for Boys, the founding of the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum is

[349] The Bishop Museum is difficult to discuss within this chapter because in many ways it does not easily fit within the criteria established in my original thesis. Technically it is part of Polynesia and thus the thesis of discussing the history of displaying and collecting objects outside their country of origin is somewhat skewed. Additionally, for the first 60 years of its existence, the Bishop wasn't even part of the United States, having been granted statehood a little over 50 years ago. While it is now a part of the United States and can be considered an American museum, its "Americaness," if you will, is relatively new, thus creating a wrinkle in the examination. But how can it not be part of the discussion? Certainly one must keep their geographical and political history in mind, while understanding their display and collecting histories.

[350] *Daily Herald*, Honolulu, HI, Sept. 16, 1886, quoted in Roger Rose, *A Museum to Delight and Instruct: William T. Brigham and the Founding of Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum*, Bernice P. Bishop Museum Special Publication 68, (Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press , 1980), 17.

celebrated on December 19, 1889—what would have been Princess Pauahi's 58th birthday.[351]

Within ten years of the Museum's founding, its first curator (later its director), William T. Brigham was sent by the trustees in 1898 to visit American and European museums. His purpose was not only to examine other Pacific collections for his own scholarly development, but also to document other collections and measure how institutions outside of Hawaii were arranging and managing their Pacific collections. He was also sent to foster relationships with museum curators and directors worldwide, assuring the possibility for future exchanges to fill out the Bishop's collection.[352] Even though the Museum was, geographically, far, far away from major American and European museums, a concentrated effort was exerted to maintain ties with other museums, as well as remain current with the latest in collection management and arrangement. Brigham's trip exemplifies what former curator Roger Rose described as the original need of the Bishop was, "a functional museum of truly national character."[353]

History of the Collection at the Bishop Museum

[351] Rose notes in his 1980 publication that the founding date is an arbitrary one, named to coincide with the Princess' birthday and established after the Museum had already opened to the public.

[352] *Annual Report of the Director to the Trustees. Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum*, vol.1, no.1, (1898): 1.

[353] Rose, vii.

While the museum was being constructed, Charles Bishop began to quietly amass objects to increase the size and breadth of the collection of Hawaiian material his wife had bequeathed to him. In 1887 he purchased an exquisite and large collection from the dealer J.S. Emerson that featured *kapa* and *kapa* implements, followed by another purchase a year later from George Dole that was composed primarily of stone adzes. A coup for Bishop was the transfer of the Hawaiian National Museum's collection to the Bishop Museum in 1888. As far as their Maori collection was concerned, the Bishop's first accession was part of a large purchase made by the Museum from Auckland dealer, Eric Craig in 1888.

Accessions bought from Craig account for the majority of Maori objects in the Bishop's collection, as well as to objects acquired from another Auckland dealer, S. Danneford. According to D.R. Simmons,[354] Craig was from the *Whakatane* area on the North Island of New Zealand, where he began his career as a collector and dealer, later moving to Auckland. Simmons also maintains that the objects acquired through Craig were from the Bay of Plenty area on the North Island. As well as being an ethnographic dealer, Craig was also an expert on New Zealand ferns, having written several books from 1870 to 1900 on the subject that included samples. In addition to the objects the Museum purchased from Craig directly, a man named H.A Widdemann also bought Maori material from Craig for the Museum.

Through Craig, the Bishop acquired an encyclopedic variety of Maori objects for their permanent collection. One of the most prominent pieces in the entire collection, on and off view since 1903, is the storehouse (*pataka*) façade (fig. 4.01) the Museum

[354] Simmons, 79.

acquired from Craig in 1889. The façade is formed by eight vertically oriented pieces. The central panels are composed of a large gateway and entranceway. The large figure on the gateway stands atop the "doorway" with a club (*patu*) in its right hand and both hands resting on its stomach. The figure's face is carved with swirling tattoo patterns that are outlined in black paint. The eyes of all of the figures on the façade are made from *paua* shell. Similar figures compose the two panels on the right and left of the gateway panel. The panels to the immediate right and left of the main panel are bisected, with the bottom half containing carved figures and the top halves containing large *tiki* figures. *Tiki*-like figures also compose the far right and left panels of the façade. The entire architectural piece is painted with a reddish hue, accented, with the tattoo patterns adorning some of the figures.

After a series of rejections, Charles Bishop secured the collection of the America Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM) in 1895. One of the notable acquisitions was a pendant *hei-tiki*—illustrated in fig. 4.02. Like so many others, this *hei-tiki* is made of a dark greenstone, its eyes outlined in an unknown material that may have once been some kind of shell.

In 1910, the Museum acquired a cast of a tattooing funnel (fig. 4.03) from H.G. Beasley, a collector from England and contemporary of W.O. Oldman and A. W. Fuller. Although little is known about the object and where the original is, it is important because it highlights the use of copies to fill gaps in a collection. In fact, the Bishop is not alone in having casts in their collection, as most American museums do.

Similar to other American museums, Bishop also exchanged objects with New Zealand museums; the Dominion Museum in 1914 and the Otago Museum in 1931. They

received a replica of a frame from the Dominion Museum and two large house posts (*poupou*) from the Otago Museum, one of which is illustrated in fig. 4.04a/b. The post is composed of two figures, both appearing as mirror images of each other, with protruding tongue and inlaid shell eyes. The top figure (fig. 4.04a) has its right hand on its bottom lip and left hand on its stomach, while the bottom figure has the same hand configuration, switched (fig. 4.04b).

The final major accession received by the Museum was from Peter Buck and later his estate. Buck was a seminal figure in not only the history of the Bishop Museum, but in the history of Maori art as well. First a medical doctor, Buck wrote many medical treatises, before becoming curator and later director of the Museum. Of the many objects he donated to the Museum, two were beautiful examples of greenstone hand clubs (*mere*) (fig. 4.05). The Bishop Museum continued to receive accessions of Maori art through the end of the 20th-century, including examples of contemporary Maori art that are currently on display in the Polynesian Hall.

History of the Display of Maori Art at the Bishop Museum

The first documented display of Maori art in the Bishop Museum was located in the Museum's original Hawaiian vestibule. Fig. 4.06 is circa 1892 photograph taken by Brigham. In addition to taking the photograph, Brigham is also credited with curating the early installations. A Maori canoe prow (fig. 4.07) purchased from Eric Craig in 1888 is seen jutting from the right side of the picture and another prow is placed below it. The museum also had a picture gallery (fig. 4.08), with photographs that included

photographs of Maori, mostly by J. Martin and the Burton Brothers such as the photographs in figs 4.09 and 4.10.[355]

Future displays of Maori art were presumably placed in the Polynesian Hall, whose building was completed in 1894. The importance in separating the Hawaiian material from objects from other Polynesian areas was commented upon in the 1902 *Annual Report from the Director to the Trustees*:

> The Polynesian Hall made it possible to separate the general Pacific collection from the Hawaiian, and the Hawaiian Hall gives for the first time an opportunity to properly exhibit and scientifically classify the ethnological material of these islands and the products of nature as distinct from those of man's hands.[356]

Shortly after the collections were separated at the turn of the century, Brigham wrote and *A Handbook for Visitors to the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum of Polynesian Ethnology and Natural History* in 1903. The handbook's text, photographs, and charts allow us to reconstruct the display of Maori material as it was assembled in 1903. Brigham's handbook "escorts," the viewer as they make their way through the Museum. Upon entering the Entrance Hall (fig. 4.11) the storehouse (*pataka*) façade purchased from Eric Craig early in the Museum's history was prominently hung on the wall to the left of the staircase. In the handbook, Brigham is thorough in his description of the function of the storehouse and how the Maori used it. He describes incorrect comparisons made between Maori carving and that of the Haida from the Northwest Coast, "As the style of carving is

---

[355] Adrienne L. Kaeppler, "Taonga Maori and the Evolution of the Representation of the "Other,"" 17.

[356] *Annual Report of the Director to the Trustees. Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum*, v.II, no.1, (1902): n.p.

sometimes likened by uncritical visitors to the well known totem posts of the Haida Indians, a model of one of the latter is placed near by to show the great difference, even of form."[357] It is interesting that Brigham not only chides the "uncritical visitor,' for making the mistake of likening Maori art to that of the Haida, but also installs a model of a Haida memorial pole within the exhibition to reinforce the point.

While climbing the stairs towards the entrance to the Polynesian Hall, the visitor passed another example of Maori art, a case full of flax mats, although Brigham describes them as, "a number of capes of this [flax] material worn by both sexes."[358] Upon entering the Polynesian Hall, the first five cases to the visitors right, (as well as one (number 23) in the middle of the hall), were filled with Maori objects. (fig. 4.12) In introducing the Maori to the handbook reader, Brigham gives an overview of exploration in the Pacific, explaining that the Maori came from *Hawaiki* in the fifteenth-century and adhere to the "tapu," system. He declares that the Maori, more than any other Polynesian "tribe," "has given such determined resistance to the incoming whites."[359] Additionally, he compares the Marquesans to the Maori stating, "Cannibals of unchecked appetite, and warlike to an extent nearly equaling the Maori."[360]

After providing an historical account of the Maori, their belief systems, and describing their mentality as warlike, Brigham describes each display case—his narrative

---

[357] William T. Brigham, *A Handbook for Visitors to the Bernice Pauha Bishop Museum of Polynesian Ethnology and Natural History*, (Honolulu, 1903), 7.

[358] Ibid., 17.

[359] Ibid.

[360] Ibid., 23.

allowing us to reconstruct the display. The arrangement is mostly thematic. The first case (see fig. 4.12, case no. 1) contained house panels (*poupou*) and shared with case no. 2 a bird container (fig. 4.13). The bird container now is primarily composed of a woven basket that is lifted from the ground by three wooden legs, secured by a thin rope. The basket and the legs are decorated with gatherings of feathers. Except for the lintel, the war canoe, and weapons (such as a hand club (*patu*), and a long club (*tewhatewha*)) displayed in case no. 2 indicate its theme of warfare. Case no. 3 contained items of prestige – a pendant (*hei-tiki)*, a necklace, a staff (*taiaha)*, and tattooing tools, while case no. 4's theme must have been navigational, as it contains a number of canoe parts, such as the fishing canoe prow (fig. 4.14) purchased from Craig. The prow is small, containing only one carved spiral that is connected to the head of a *manaia* figure. The prow is carved in a manner that does not exude delicate craftsmanship, perhaps indicating its age and that it was carved with non-metal tools. Case no. 5 displays a "fire-stick," and a treasure box (*wakahuia*) (fig. 4.15), but its theme is unclear. The final case containing Maori material described by Brigham, case no. 23, contains cloaks that Brigham describes as having been, "worn by chiefs."[361]

The year following the publication of Brigham's 1903 handbook to the Museum was marked by a continuing expansion of the Polynesian department and by 1905 a proposal was made to construct a Papuan Hall to house the Papuan, Australian, Fijian and Micronesian collections. The reason for shifting the collection was to make room for a, "full sized carved Maori house, food house, and chief's tomb, and also a carved war

[361] Brigham, 17.

canoe of the type so beautifully shown in the Auckland Museum."[362] We know that the dream of having a full-size war canoe and house was never realized, but certainly the desire can be attributed to the director having traveled to New Zealand and seen the display at the Auckland War Memorial Museum.[363]

As he had done at AMNH, H.D. Skinner from the Otago Museum in Dunedin, spent time with the collection at the Bishop. A report from 1927 relates that he spent three months in Honolulu, "making a study of the ethnological specimens, especially adzes, from Pacific Islands."[364] As he had done with Margaret Mead, Skinner also, "furnished advice and assistance to the Curator of Collections [Edwin H. Bryan] in the arrangement of exhibits in Polynesian Hall."[365] Skinner's appearance, first in New York, then in Hawaii, affirms that collections and displays outside of New Zealand were not entirely cared for and exhibited in a vacuum. Skinner, while not Maori, was from the country of origin and had experience in working with the objects first hand. His influence, while immeasurable, surely cannot be ignored.

In 1938, while Sir Peter Buck was director of the Museum he, along with his staff, made great strides, not only in maintaining the appearance of displays in the Polynesian Hall, but also in the ongoing work associated with the ethnological collections. Buck

---

[362] *Annual Report of the Director to the Trustees. Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum*, vol. II, no.4, (1905): 257.

[363] The Museum holds a large collection of installation and object photographs of other museums collections in their "Ethnographic Photograph Collection," including photographs of the large war canoe currently displayed at the museum in Auckland.

[364] *Bulletin*, Bernice P. Bishop Museum, no. 57 (1927): 30.

[365] Ibid.

.

rearranged the Polynesian Hall so that, "the main Polynesian groups are now adequately represented."[366] The interior of the exhibition cases were repainted, Buck choosing a neutral cream color, "which greatly improves the appearance of the exhibits."[367] Additionally, a committee was formed to check the accuracy, completeness, and attractiveness of the labels, while Buck took time to complete scholarly work concerning the Museum's ethnological material.[368]

Further efforts to improve the display labels were undertaken in 1939[369] and by 1940, Buck had successfully achieved his goal of having clearer labels noting, "The use of a hand printing press considerably improved the labels in appearance and visibility."[370] Coinciding with the death of Peter Buck in 1951, changes in the display were underway. The Maori collection was shifted to the second floor, where it has remained to the present time. The hall was described as having taken a modernist approach[371] under the direction of Buck's successor, Alexander Spoehr.[372] (fig. 4.16) Large objects alternate with cases of smaller objects. In the far left side of the photography, is the small Maori section

---

[366] *Bulletin*, Bernice P. Bishop Museum, no, 164 (1938):5.

[367] Ibid., 21.

[368] Ibid., 5.

[369] *Bulletin*, Bernice P. Bishop Museum, no. 167 (1939): 27.

[370] *Bulletin*, Bernice P. Bishop Museum, no 171 (1940): 5.

[371] Personal conversation between the author and Adrienne Kaeppler, November 22, 2005, Washington, D.C.

[372] Note that Spoehr had previously been employed at the Field Museum in Chicago, who was followed by Roland Force, who had also been at the Field Museum prior to joining the staff at the Bishop in 1953, resigning in 1962.

composed of two prows and a lintel. The lintel is also included in the current installation (fig. 4.26a/b), but the fishing prow is not (fig. 4.17).

The current Maori display (as of May 2003) is located on the 2nd floor of the Polynesian Hall and was originally curated by former curator of ethnology, Adrienne Kaeppler. Some changes and additions were made by her successor, Roger Rose. Kaeppler removed the "modernist" additions to the Hall and on September 23, 1980, the permanent exhibition *Peoples of the Pacific: Chiefs, Bigmen, and Mariners* opened to the public. The installation is dominated by the same storehouse (*pataka*) façade that greeted visitors as they made their way up the first staircase of the Hall in 1903. (fig. 4.18) To the right of the façade is a canoe strake (fig. 4.19) that is accompanied by a reproduction of Parkinson's famous pen and wash image Maori men in a canoe (fig. 4.20). The labeling discusses canoes on the whole, focusing in on the captains who were considered, "founding ancestors emphasizing the male line." The label for the canoe strake is markedly short, stating that the sides of canoes were sometimes carved in relief and that the carvings were often associated with the symbolic status of the owner. One thing that is noticeably absent is any information relating to the provenance of the object – when it was collected, was it purchased or was it a gift, and what the name for the object is in Maori. That is a pattern that is repeated throughout the installation.

The cases in the exhibition appear to be architectural elements embedded into the walls, but were originally windows. With the addition of the cases framed with dark wood, the feel of the installation is much different from Spoehr's modernist approach. (fig. 4.16) Framed by a wooden border that arches at the top, the background is a bright gold color that contrasts sharply with pea green carpet on the floor (fig. 4.21). The use of

gold indicated that the objects in the cases were Polynesian. In the left case is an example of contemporary Maori art, a main house post (*putokomanawa*) that was completed in 1985 by Maori artist Paratene Matchitt and donated to the Museum in 1989. (fig. 4.22) According to the label, it represents a contemporary version of a traditional Maori house post and is one of several contemporary pieces that are in the installation. Matchitt's contemporary version of a *tiki* depicts the figure with a s-curve body, with one hand on the bottom of its body and the other, snake-like hand reaching behind and exiting through a wide-open gaping mouth as the tongue does in many Maori carvings. Like earlier carvings, the *paua* shells substitute for eyes and the arms and face of the figure are adorned with carved tattooing designs.

In the cases that are to the right of the main wall is a contemporary carving of a *tiki* by Maori artist Pakarike Harrison. Both carvings were added after Kaeppler left the Bishop in 1980. They are interesting choices on behalf of the museum, as contemporary non-Western art is rarely placed on display with pre-twentieth century examples. The accompanying label to the left of the case is titled "Carving," and explains the paternalistic aspects of Maori carving, as well as giving a brief formal analysis of the carving. The label is quick to point out that the motifs and styles vary from carving to carving and that stylistic differences exist from region to region. In that brief statement, the visitor learns that Maori art is highly varied and that there is an artist who creates the work – two important points that are not usually emphasized when discussing Polynesian (and Maori) art.

The adjoining case contains examples of weaving displaying a belt, a purse, a weaving peg, and a skirt (fig. 4.23). To the right of the case is a long explanatory label on

New Zealand with a map of the area. Underneath is a label titled, "Weaving," that differentiates the Maori from other areas of Polynesia for using flax instead of barkcloth. The skirt was made by Emily Schuster, Q.M.S. and is another example of contemporary art being displayed at the Bishop.

On the opposite wall is another pair of embedded vertical window cases containing Maori material (fig. 4.24). The case on the right contains a puppet (*keratao*), a gable mask, and a decorated gourd – an assortment of objects with no apparent common theme. The puppet is one of two (the other is in the collection at AMNH) in the United States, described in the wall text as another Polynesian example of entertainment. The large gable mask is rare among American examples because of the striking black lines that outline the carvings on the face. The mask's function is explained in the accompanying wall text as the symbolic head of a meetinghouse, while the bargeboards that meet at either side of its face on the A-frame façade of the house, are its symbolic arms. The gourd's function is not explained in the associated wall text – its label only states that it is a decorated gourd container.

The case to the left contains a long club (*tewehaweha)* and a long staff (*taiaha*). The associated label explains the function of the long clubs, in combat and ceremony. The label underneath is titled "Feathered Cloak." Since there is not one in the case itself, one wonders if it has simply been temporarily removed or if it is a reference to the drawing that is hung above all of the labels to the left of the case. The drawing titled, "*Te Heu Heu of Tokaanu*," illustrates a Maori man wrapped in a lush kiwi feather cloak with *huia* feathers in his hair and a large greenstone handclub (*patu*) in his hands (fig. 4.25).

Further down the wall, separated by a Baining mask from New Britain and cases of objects from other regions of the Pacific, is a wall labeled "Architecture" that includes an Abelam and Maori lintel, (fig. 4.26a/b), as well as a Palauan storyboard. The Maori lintel is like many others found in New Zealand, composed of three figures, each with tongues protruding and arms raised high above their shoulders (fig. 4.26a/b). All of the figures are standing on a platform and two large spirals are alternated with the figures and smaller spirals are carved on either end of the lintel. The entire object is painted red. Underneath the objects are three illustrations that show how the lintels function within their particular architectural structures (fig. 4.27). On the left are two photographs – one of a house in Palau and the other of an Abelam meeting house, both used for initiation rites. The function of the Maori lintel on display is illustrated by a photogravure taken by an unknown artist from the Museum's A.W. Fuller Collection. The photogravure shows a view of a Maori house and canoe, illustrating where a lintel would be placed on the house.

Lining the balcony side of the second floor is a series of flat cases. Directly across from the façade of the storehouse (*pataka*) are flat cases that contain Maori material. Beginning on the left side, the case is labeled, "Valuables," and contains a treasure box and a pendant (*hei-tiki)*. (fig. 4.28) This particular display of a treasure box is the only one in an American collection that actually contains treasures, to demonstrate how it might have been used. To the right of the valuables case is a drawing of a group of Maori women weaving a large basket and an object used in kit modeling (fig. 4.29). The adjoining case contains a sweet potato god (far left), as well as fishhooks and two flutes

(fig. 4.30). Further down, are two sets of poi balls used by women in Maori dances and the final case in the series contains hand clubs (*patu*) made of greenstone and whalebone.

The Field Museum, Chicago, Illinois

Known as the Chicago Columbian Museum at the time of its formation,[373] the Field Museum (hereafter FMNH) was formally incorporated on September 14, 1893 with monies provided by Marshall Field, a Chicago businessman and the namesake of the famous department store. Opened to the public on June 2, 1894, the Museum's original collections, including those of the department of anthropology,[374] were composed of objects and exhibits displayed at Chicago's World's Columbian Exposition of 1893. The Museum's first home was a building located in Jackson Park, (in what is now the Museum of Science and Industry) until 1921, when the Museum moved to its present home in Chicago's Grant Park.[375]

---

[373] The Field Museum has endured a number of name changes. Founded as the Chicago Columbian Museum, the name changed a year later to the Field Columbian Museum. It remained that way for eleven years, but in 1905 was renamed the Field Museum of Natural History. In 1943, the name was changed to the Chicago Natural History Museum, then in 1966 changed back to the Field Museum of Natural History. In 1997, it was given its present name, the Field Museum and it has remained the same ever since.

[374] As mentioned in chapter two, the director of the fair's department of ethnology and Midway Plaisance was PMAE's original director, Frederic Ward Putnam.

[375] Stephen E. Nash and Gary M. Feinman, "Introduction: A Glorious Foundation: 109 Years of Anthropology at the Field Museum of Natural History," *Fieldiana* "Curators, Collections, and Contexts: Anthropology at the Field Museum, 1893-2002," Anthropology, New Series, no. 36 eds. Stephen E. Nash and Gary M. Feinman. (September 30, 2003): 7.

As with many other American institutions, the Field Museum has been host to an impressive array of curators. Before he was appointed at the AMNH, Franz Boas was temporarily named the curator of the anthropology department in 1893, the first of three in the Museum's history, until the Museum lured William Henry Holmes away from NMNH and named him curator of anthropology in 1894 – a position he retained for two years. The last curator of anthropology was George Amos Dorsey, who remained at the Museum until 1914.

After Dorsey left, the Museum began appointing curators and assistant curators specific to the various subsections of anthropology. In fact, during the middle of Dorsey's term, the first curator of the Pacific and more specifically of Melanesia, A.B. Lewis (1908-1940) was named. During Lewis' term, Ralph Linton served as assistant curator of Oceanic and Malayan ethnology (1925-1928) and after Lewis left the Museum, Alexander Spoehr was named curator of Oceanic ethnology (1946-1952), later moving to the Bishop Museum. Roland Force was the Field Museum's first curator of Oceanic archaeology and ethnology. Force's tenure at the Field was 1956-1961, after which he followed Spoehr to the Bishop Museum. A year into his appointment, Phillip Lewis, now a curator emeritus, began his career at the Field Museum. Working up the ranks from assistant to associate, to curator, Philip Lewis was the first curator in a United States natural history museum to be named curator of primitive art.[376] The mid to late 1950s is an interesting, if not watershed time period for the Pacific collection at the Field

---

[376] Donald Collier, "My Life with Exhibits at the Field Museum, 1941-1976," *Fieldiana* "Curators, Collections, and Contexts: Anthropology at the Field Museum, 1893-2002," Anthropology, New Series, no. 36 eds. Stephen E. Nash and Gary M. Feinman. (September 30, 2003): 209.

Museum. Not only had they hired Roland Force as the first curator of Oceanic archaeology and ethnology in 1956, but also a year later the museum made a groundbreaking decision to hire Philip Lewis as assistant curator of primitive art. In a brief article that announced the decision in February 1957 issue of the museum's bulletin, the hire is described, as, "a logical step essential to its status among departments of anthropology of the great museums of the world."[377] Furthermore, the move to hire a curator of primitive art was seen as a, "means that this Museum has moved to claim for itself the position in anthropology and in art that it deserves as a major repository of objects representing man's creative efforts."[378]

It was during Lewis' term that Fred M. Reinman was appointed as an assistant curator of Oceanic archaeology and ethnology in 1961. Reinman and Lewis bring us to the present and current curator of Oceanic archaeology and ethnology, John Terrell, who began working at FMNH in 1971.[379]

History of the Collection at the Field Museum

Given the history of how and why the Field Museum was established, it should come as no surprise that the first accessions of Maori objects into their collection came

---

[377] "Museum to Branch Out in Primitive Art," *Chicago Natural History Museum Bulletin*, vol. 28, no. 2 (February, 1957): 3.

[378] Ibid.

[379] See "Appendix 1 The Field Museum's Anthropology Curators and Staff Members, 1893-2002," *Fieldiana* "Curators, Collections, and Contexts: Anthropology at the Field Museum, 1893-2002," Anthropology, New Series, no. 36 eds. Stephen E. Nash and Gary M. Feinman, (September 30, 2003): 259-261, for complete list.

directly from the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition. While those objects were dealt with extensively in chapter two, it is worth reiterating that they were purchased either by or from Franz Boas, Carl Hagenback, and the Ward's Natural Science Establishment.

The first accession to enter into the collection outside of the Fair's purview was a gift of jade pieces from George Kunz in 1893, the vice-president for Tiffany and Co. who, in the same year, had also donated pieces to AMNH. A total of twelve objects were donated, ranging from celts to clubs (*patu*) and to what is strangely referred to in the accession record as a, "tomahawk of jade."

In 1905, FMNH began a relationship with W.D. (William Downing) Webster, an English ethnographic dealer based in London and a contemporary of W.O. Oldman. The Museum made a substantial number of purchases from Webster between 1905 and 1907 not only of Maori art, but art from other areas of Polynesia and Africa. Webster is distinguished as a dealer, rather than a collector and the purchases made by FMNH in the early twentieth-century were transacted as he entered into retirement.[380] The first interaction in 1905 between FMNH and Webster began when the then curator of anthropology, George Dorsey, visited London. After declaring Webster, "the greatest English dealer in ethnological specimens,"[381] Dorsey recommended that the Museum purchase five wooden Maori clubs, along with a number of objects from Australia, Fiji, Samoa, Tonga, Mangaia, and New Caledonia. Initially, former director Frederic Skiff did not approve and it was only after receiving a seven-page letter from Dorsey did his

---

[380] Roger Neich and Janet Davidson. "William O. Oldman: The Man and His Collection," in W.O. Oldman's *The Oldman Collection of Maori Artifacts*. New Edition of Polynesian Society Memoir 14, Auckland: The Polynesian Society (2004), vii.

[381] George Dorsey, Unpublished Letter to Frederick Skiff, July 22, 1905, Accession file #963, Registrar's Office, The Field Museum, Chicago, IL.

opinion shift. One of the ways Dorsey justified the Webster purchase was by noting the, "steady but sure extinction," of the people of the Pacific. He also made his case by noting that opportunities, like AMNH's purchase of the Finsch collection, were fleeting, while museums at home and abroad were busy, "denuding the islands of every vestige of ethnological interest.[382] It is interesting to note that Dorsey's comments were made fifty years earlier than Lemaire's same pronouncement to AMNH that the future availability of ethnological specimens from the Pacific was in question.

The Museum's second purchase from Webster proved to be more difficult. While it ended in the acquisition of close to 30 Maori objects among countless others from other areas of the Pacific and Africa, the transaction was mired in bureaucracy. Reminiscent of exchanges between Oldman and Penn, Webster, the controversy began when, like Oldman had done so many times to Penn, Webster sent, unsolicited, a large collection of objects on consignment to FMNH.

Whether the unsolicited consignment technique of ethnographic dealers was the result of good business sense or as part of a conniving ploy used to force museums to make purchases is debatable. Whatever was the case, it worked, and Skiff acquiesced but only as a result of a hard fought battle between Webster, Dorsey, Skiff, and Edward Ayer, a trustee of the Museum. Upon Dorsey's initial request to purchase the collection, he was denied, several times by Skiff, owing to difficult financial times. Webster, claiming desperate financial hardship, which was likely given that he was selling his collection to prepare for retirement, wrote directly to Ayer, asking for his assistance. It

---

[382] George Dorsey, Unpublished Letter to Frederick Skiff, July 29, 1905, Accession file #963, Registrar's Office, The Field Museum, Chicago, IL.

was Ayer's involvement, along with Dorsey who again made the point that the quality of objects presented to the Museum today would surely never appear again.[383]

While objects were purchased from Webster, the Museum was making a number of other significant acquisitions. Upon Dorsey's recommendation, the Museum purchased a Maori meetinghouse. (fig. 4.34) To date, it is the only one in an American museum. The exterior of the house is unique in that the individual panels that comprise the façade have individual *tiki* figures with *paua* shell eyes. At a distance the overall aesthetic is almost eerie, as if 100 pairs of eyes were watching you. The house was purchased from German ethnographic dealer, J.F.G. Umlauff for $5,000. In the catalogue Umlauff published to advertise the house, he describes how excited he is to sell the house because it is a, "monument of a sinking culture which are half men and half beast."[384] He directs any reader who is unfamiliar with Maori carvings and their inherent value to Hamilton's *Maori Art*, and more specifically to page 136 where Hamilton describes the high costs associated with the construction of a building like this house.[385] Umlauff also describes how the house had been transported from its place of origin, on Tokomaru Bay on the east coast of the North Island to Dunedin on the South Island (fig. intro.01).

---

[383] George Dorsey, Unpublished Letter to Frederick Skiff, August 1, 1907, Accession file #1018, Registrar's Office, The Field Museum, Chicago, IL.

[384] Stephen R. Wanger, Unpublished translation of ""Whare Whakairo Hiteananui" *Rats und Versammlungshaus, Museum Umlauff, Hamburg,* Dec. 1902," December 1992. Archives, The Field Museum, Chicago, IL.

[385] Writing about a carved house at the Thames in Auckland, Hamilton relates that it was built in 1878, "…after a large number of men of four division of the Ngati-awa had been employed upon the preparation of the carvings for three years." He writes that the builders would not accept payment, "beyond the food and presents they had received from time to time during the building." In the end, the carvers were paid 1,000 pounds, "in single bank notes," and the builders, "went on their way rejoicing."

In addition to the house, the Field Museum also purchased a sizeable collection of objects from Australia, New Zealand, and New Guinea from Umlauff. Remarking on the entire lot, Dorsey was quick to point out to Skiff that "[r]egarding the collections as a whole, I wish to state that none of them, in any way, duplicate collections already in our possession from the islands of the Pacific." Furthermore, Dorsey also emphasized that through the purchase of this collection the museum could make its claim to having one of the greatest Pacific collections in all of the museums of the world.[386]

Dorsey's justification for purchasing the house from Umlauff in 1905 can be viewed as a precursor to the museum's later acquisition of the Fuller collection in 1958, which catapulted the Field Museum's Pacific collections, and specifically its Maori collection, to its status as one of the finest in the United States.

The acquisition of the Fuller Collection stands as the largest purchase of Pacific objects by an American museum to date, with objects representing every part of the region. Of the 6,500 objects that were purchased, approximately ten percent, or six hundred were Maori.[387] An English ethnographic dealer, Captain A.W. Fuller was a contemporary of other ethnographic dealers such as Beasley, Oldman, and Webster, who for over a period of sixty years amassed an enormous collection of Pacific artifacts. Fuller had been courted by a number of museums both in the United States and abroad, but settled on the Field Museum because its staff could not only comply with his wishes to keep the collection completely intact, but also because they were also a science

---

[386] Dorsey, July 22, 1905.

[387] See Roland W. Force and Maryanne Force, *The Fuller Collection of Pacific Artifacts*. New York and Washington: Praeger Publishers (1971). The book serves as a comprehensive guide to Fuller and his collection.

museum, which appealed to Fuller's collecting philosophy, whose central idea was that it was not an "art" collection. Instead, Fuller's collecting habits were practically philatelic in nature, guided by the "study of comparative technology and the evolution of design."[388]

As Roland Force describes it, "To Fuller, his collection represented a continuum of material culture. He especially sought old pieces because they were the product of a technology developed apart from and prior to contact with the Western world."[389] While it is difficult to select highlights from such an expansive collection, three that Force mentions in his book on the Fuller collection are a rare adze (fig. 4.32), gourd (fig. 4.33), and a pendant (*hei-tiki*) (fig. 1.02) that was collected on one of Cook's voyages to the Pacific.[390]

History of the Display at the Field Museum

Portions of the Field Museum's enormous Pacific collection have been displayed since the moment the museum opened in Jackson Park after the World's Columbian Exposition closed. In *An Historical and Descriptive Account of the Field Columbian Museum,* published in 1894, it confirms that objects from the Pacific were included in Hall 4 of the Department of Anthropology (fig. 4.34). Although unconfirmed, it is likely that Maori objects were included among the 48,000 the museum acquired through the

---

[388] Ibid., 9.

[389] Ibid., 12.

[390] Already discussed in chapter one.

fair's department of ethnology[391] and that the installation may have been similar to the Ayer Hall that displayed North American ethnological material with artifacts in horizontal and vertical glass display cases (fig. 4.35).

It was not until the museum moved into its present home in Grant Park that firm visual evidence of Maori art on display appears. Again, the chronology is unclear; many accounts contend that the Maori house, along with other Polynesian material, was on display by the time the Grant Park location opened in 1921. I would argue that this is unlikely, as it would have taken an unrealistically Herculean effort to move, unpack, and install an entire museum within the space of one year. A report published by the museum in January of 1925 confirms this suspicion in its description of the previous year's activities. Ralph Linton, then the assistant curator of Oceanic and Malayan ethnology, was mentioned as having installed a total of thirty-one cases during the year; fourteen of those were described as containing Polynesian ethnology. All were part of the hall of Polynesian and Micronesian Ethnology curated by Linton and set to open later in 1925, with material touted to have been displayed for the first time ever.[392] One of those objects was the meeting house *Ruatepupuke II* the museum had purchased from the German dealer Umlauff in 1905: "It is proposed that the western end of the new hall will be occupied by a remarkable Maori council-house, the only one of its kind in America…This part of the hall will also contain a number of cases picturing the life and

[391] "An Historical and Descriptive Account of the Field Columbian Museum," *Field Columbian Museum*, pub. I, v. I, no. I. (December 1894): 73.

[392] A guide written by Ralph Linton and published by the Museum in 1926 accompanied the exhibition.

culture of the Maori of New Zealand."[393] The annual report of the following year confirmed that the hall opened on November 1, 1925, on the ground floor of the museum in Hall F. The completed hall contained a total of forty cases. Of those, ten were situated alongside the house, and nine were devoted to Maori art: "nine of these cases illustrate the highly developed culture of the Maori with good examples of their feather robes, wood carvings, weapons, stone and jade implements."[394]

The exhibition that opened in 1925 was also part of a larger project whose goal was to educate Chicago-area schoolchildren. Documented in a 1928 publication titled *Field Museum and the Child…*, author Stephen Simms describes the various ways in which the museum used its collection and exhibits to educate local children. While also learning about botany, geology, and zoology, museum educators used the Micronesian and Polynesian collections to educate seventh graders about Oceanic geography.[395]

Certainly an attraction in the eyes of the seventh-graders who were learning about Polynesia, the Maori meeting house was noted as being the "chief attraction" of the hall, and that "its decorations show Maori art at its best." Furthermore, the skill of the Maori artist was lauded with statements such as, "The mechanical skill and artistic ability of the Maori were lavished on the construction of his great council houses," and the meeting houses' functions were described as "guest houses…dormitories…usually erected as

---

[393] *Annual Report of the Director to the Board of Trustees for the Year 1924*. Field Museum of Natural History Publication. v. VI, no. 4 (January 1925): 308-309.

[394] *Annual Report of the Director to the Board of Trustees for the Year 1925*. Field Museum of Natural History Publication. v. VI, no. 5 (January 1926): 438.

[395] Stephen Simms, *Field Museum and the Child: An Outline of the Work Carried on by Field Museum of Natural History among School Children of Chicago through The N.W. Harris Public School Extension and the James Nelson and Anna Louise Raymond Public School and Children's Lectures*, (Chicago: Field Museum of Natural History, 1928), 28.

memorials of some great event, such as the birth of an heir to the principal chief of the tribe."[396] These same sentiments are echoed in the house's original label (fig. 4.36).

It is possible to reconstruct what was on display in 1925 because the museum's archives have retained the original wall text and object labels. From the labels we know that, aside from the house, there was an exhaustive display of objects on view to the public. Maori art held a central position in the hall, just as it has with most of the institutions discussed thus far.

The labels are composed of plain, black, block-written letters on cream-colored card stock. Headings like "Wood Carvings" are printed in capital letters. In addition to the aforementioned wood carvings, other sections included designations such as "Feather Robes," "Tattooing," "Robes," "Wood-Carvings and Wood-Working Tools," "Weapons," "Jade Implements," "Stone Implements," and "Clothing." Many of the objects were among those purchased from T. E. Donne just a year before the hall opened—for example, the treasure boxes (*wakahuia*) in the "Wood Carvings" section, or the feather cloaks found in the "Feather Robes" section.

By and large, the exhibition did not change for thirty years—although there are reports of the house having fallen into disrepair and, at one point, there was a large plastic tarp covered the entire structure, obstructing it from public view. Beginning around the same time (1956), Roland Force was hired as a curator of Oceanic archaeology and ethnology, and a memo titled "Recommendations Regarding Rearrangement of Hall F (Polynesia and Micronesia)"[397] surfaced. The memo made specific recommendations

---

[396] *Annual Report of the Director to the Board of Trustees for the Year 1925*. Field Museum of Natural History Publication. vol. vi, no. 45 (January 1926): 438.

regarding the display of the Maori house: that it was to remain as it was presently installed, with plans to enclose the sides and use the enclosures as storage. Additionally, plans for a large square patio in front of the house were expanded to include a fountain atop a flagstone floor with potted plants and "comfortable backed benches" dotting the grounds.[398]

The period of the mid-to-late 1950s at the Field Museum saw an increased interest in the Pacific collection, culminating in the acquisition of the Fuller collection in 1958, which was the same year that Phillip Lewis curated a show called, *What is Primitive Art?* Although unconfirmed, it seems that Maori and, more broadly, Polynesian objects were *not* used to answer the question posed in the exhibition title. In an article published in the museum's bulletin, Lewis wrote that the exhibition's purpose was to "serve as an introduction to the increasingly popular field of primitive art" using "[t]he great collection from North and South America, the enormous and excellent Melanesian collections, the Malaysian collections, including that from Madagascar, and the Cameroon and Benin collections from Africa form an aggregation of primitive art unequaled in most museums in the world."[399]

Efforts to reinstall the Polynesian and Micronesian hall resumed in 1958, as evidenced by a memo headed with the subject line of "Hall Planning." Force wrote to the director, Colonel Clifford C. Gregg, his intentions for the "overall improvement of the

---

[397] "Recommendations Regarding Rearrangement of Hall F (Polynesia and Micronesia)," Unpublished Document, March 7, 1956, Archives, The Field Museum, Chicago, IL.

[398] Plans regarding a patio, fountain, and a flagstone floor never came to fruition.

[399] Lewis, Phillip H. ""What is Primitive Art?"—Answer Told in Exhibit." *Chicago Natural History Museum Bulletin*, vol. 29, no. 7 (July, 1958): 3.

Oceanic exhibit halls."[400] His plans were predicated on the then-"possible" acquisition of the Fuller collection, which was first put on display from May 8 to October 15, 1959.[401] (fig. 4.37) The exhibition, titled *Panorama of the Pacific: The Fuller Collection*, was on display in the main hall of the museum just in front of the Akeley elephant. Maori objects were sandwiched between objects from Easter Island and Hawaii. Set apart from the main display, Force highlighted an unusually large *hei-tiki* from Fuller's collection. Little is known about the object except that Fuller donated it to the museum in 1959. The reason for its isolation from the other Maori objects could be a practical one—that it was donated to the museum late and so was unable to be included with the original installation, for example—or the decision to isolate the *hei-tiki* may have been more deliberate: to highlight its high quality and large size, its lack of provenance notwithstanding. [402] During the early 1960s Force wrote a number of articles on the Pacific that were published in the museum's *Bulletin,* including a continuing series on the early explorers in the Pacific[403]—all as a precursor to the opening of the hall.

Force's plans for an overhaul of the Polynesian and Micronesian installation came to fruition, coincidentally, at around the same time that the new installation of Pacific exhibits curated by S. H. Riesenberg at the NMNH opened, and when an exhibits department was formed at the Field Museum. Under his direction, *Peoples of Polynesia and Micronesia* opened in February 1961. Upon entering, visitors were greeted by a large

---

[400] Roland Force, Unpublished Memorandum to Colonel Clifford C. Gregg, November 1, 1958, Archives, The Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago, IL.

[401] Force and Force, 17.

[402] Force and Force, 23.

[403] See the January-April, 1960 issues of the *Chicago Natural History Museum Bulletin*.

map titled "Culture Areas of the Pacific," informing them of the five areas of the Pacific—Polynesia, Melanesia, Micronesia, Australia, and Indonesia (fig. 4.38). Once inside the exhibition, the Maori section was easily discernable by the multiple signs reading "New Zealand," which labeled a series of thematically composed cases (fig. 4.39). The first case on the left that illustrates various types of Maori art, including Fuller's large *hei-tiki,* holding the central position, surrounded by smaller *hei-tiki*, a preserved head (*moko mokai*), a feeding funnel used during tattooing, and a late-style treasure box. The case beside it illustrates "sea-faring" (fig. 4.40) and includes fishhooks, a carved paddle, a canoe bailer, and war and fishing canoe prow models. A contextual illustration of a long war canoe, based on Sydney Parkinson's drawing, is also featured in the case. Next to it is a case (fig. 4.41) showing various types of Maori woodcarvings such as house parts, bird snares, and figural carvings that hover in midair against a backdrop consisting of an illustration of a large gable mask. Additional cases featured textiles such as cloaks, skirts, and belts (fig. 4.42), as well as a case devoted to warfare that included Maori staffs, clubs, and axes. (fig. 4.43)

Perhaps the most distinctive feature of the 1961 installation was the Maori life group prepared by the museum's artist and preparator Susan Schanck. It provides another interesting parallel between the permanent installations that both opened in the 1960's at FMNH and NMNH, in that both museums chose to reincorporate manikins into their installations.[404] The difference was in presentation. While NMNH displayed their life group within a display case, the life group at FMNH was "in situ," displayed within the

[404] Although I have never come across any documentation to support this, it would be interesting to know if Force and Riesenberg were consulting each other, and furthermore if Force was in contact with curators in New Zealand, as Riesenberg had been.

museum's Maori meeting house. Furthermore, the life group was not merely a group of individuals practicing tattooing rituals, as was the case at NMNH; rather, these manikins were grouped as a multigenerational family, and were featured in a January 1962 issue of the Chicago Natural History Museum *Bulletin* article titled "New Maori Family 'At Home' in Polynesian Hall." In fact, the cover of the bulletin features a playful photograph of the preparator, Susan Schanck, pretending to light the pipe held by a manikin depicting an older Maori woman (fig. 4.44). The article describes the Maori as "an exceptional people. Not only did they attain excellence in government, in navigation, and in the art of warfare, but—more importantly—their achievements in the decorative arts, in music, in poetry stand as enduring reminders of the sophisticated and artistically sensitive society they were able to develop in an isolated area of the world."[405]

The Maori family "playing house" is composed of two children playing cat's cradle, (with the preparator fixing one child's hair), the grandmother smoking a pipe (fig. 4.45), a grandfather taking a nap in the corner, and a mother and father standing, wearing multiple cloaks (fig. 4.46). The decision to form the Maori figures into a family is an interesting one, conjuring images of domestic bliss and, more importantly, something the American visitor would be able to relate to: a family setting (never mind that this family was draped in *taniko* and *kaitaka* cloaks). Certainly, it was a scene that the "average" visitor could relate to better than the performance of tattooing rituals.[406]

---

[405] Marilyn J. Jindrich, "New Maori Family "At Home" in Polynesian Hall," *Chicago Natural History Museum Bulletin*, vol. 33, no. 1 (January, 1962): 2.

[406] Although it would be interesting, I have found no evidence of any reviews of the reinstallation of 1961 in any of the local Chicago papers.

Within thirty years, the installation was changed again and the new permanent installations of Pacific material were met with both a flurry of controversy and praise: controversy surrounded the permanent installations of the museum's Pacific collection, and praise surrounded the renovation of the museum's Maori meeting house, *Ruatepupuke II*.[407] The reinstallation of the Field Museum's permanent collection of Pacific objects was completed in two parts; one of its objectives was to completely rethink how natural history museums should present culture. Unlike so many of the installations examined in this study, the Field Museum's new Pacific section was curated not by the curator of the Pacific, John Terrell, but by a team of exhibition "experts"—almost sixty in all—whose sole purpose was to increase attendance figures. The primary target of most critics' ire was the exhibition *Traveling the Pacific,* which opened in 1989.[408] (fig. 4.47) Part of the current installation, the exhibition is divided into sections labeled "Island Chains," "Atoll," "Canoe, "Huon Gulf" and "Tahiti Market." Exhibition materials express a friendly, almost childlike tone, as visitors encounter an interpretation of the Pacific as an easygoing, devil-may-care part of the world. This tone is reinforced by a large display that greets the visitor upon entering with the heading, "Plan your trip across the Pacific." The welcoming tone is later contradicted by oversized postcards of idyllic views of the Marshall Islands with a foreboding caption that reads, "Life on a

---

[407] During this time period, the museum was also host to two traveling exhibitions of Maori art; *Te Maori: Maori Art from New Zealand Collections* in 1985 and *Te Waka Toi*, an exhibition of contemporary Maori art. Both are discussed more fully in chapter five, which examines significant temporary Maori exhibitions in the U.S.

[408] For reviews and commentary surrounding the *Traveling the Pacific*, see William Honan's article, "Say Goodbye to the Stuffed Elephants" in the January 14, 1990 issue of the *New York Times,* as well as John Terrell's article in the March 1991 issue of *American Anthropologist.* For an insightful review of the exhibition itself, see Adrienne Kaeppler's review in the same issue.

picture-postcard beach is no vacation," while the reverse side reads, "Life here is no picture postcard! It's hot. Drinking water is scarce. And a typhoon blew my house down! I've got a newfound respect for the People—and plants and animals—that can 'make a living' here…"

Special features of the exhibit include a re-creation of a coral island and lava flow. Maori objects are featured as part of the section on canoes, where visitors can see a model canoe prow (fig. 4.48) and canoe model. The associated wall text for the prow asks the viewer to find ornaments that look like people, explaining that these ornaments enhance the spiritual power of canoes, and noting that the model canoes are based on the "real thing." One of the main criticisms of the exhibition is its seeming lack of an educational component, and its reinforcement of misleading Pacific stereotypes. Adrienne Kaeppler, in her 1991 review of the exhibition, succinctly summed up the exhibition's problematic aspects, writing:

> …but the "exhibit team of more than 60 people aided by 20 scientific consultants" under the direction of Phyllis Rabineau, has so far let us down on the learning component and has given us stereotypes revisited. Perhaps the team needs different scientific consultants, or they need to heed the advice of the ones they have, or to solicit more input from their own curators, to enhance the dramatic installation with scholarly knowledge. Then adults as well as ten-year-olds can come away better informed about this vast area of widely differing cultures—information desperately needed to inform the public about an area destined to become much more important in the 21st century.[409]

An interesting side note to Kaeppler's review is that it was published exactly twenty years after John Canaday's critique of Mead's 1971 installation at AMNH in the *New*

[409]Adrienne L. Kaeppler, "Review: *Traveling the Pacific*," *American Anthropologist*, New Series, vol. 93, no. 1 (Mar., 1991): 270.

York Times. In those twenty years, what changed? While Mead did not use lava flows, Canaday faulted her for doing a disservice to the objects by not treating them as art objects. Kaeppler here faults the Field Museum team for their unscholarly approach and reinforcement of negative Pacific stereotypes. Ultimately, while the rhetoric and arguments are different, the call for an overall respect for the objects and the people is the same.

The companion installation to *Traveling the Pacific,* called *Pacific Spirits: Life, Death & the Supernatural*, opened on November 10, 1990; it was the culmination of the museum's $4.3 million-dollar project supported by the Regenstein Foundation, the National Endowment of the Humanities, the National Science Foundation, and the National Endowment for the Arts. Collectively, the two exhibitions, plus *Ruatepupuke II*, comprise the Regenstein Halls of the Pacific.

In contrast to *Traveling the Pacific*, *Pacific Spirits* is described as "more traditional museum fare" meant to showcase the Field Museum's substantial Pacific collection—the largest in the continental North America with a total number of objects numbering at around 55,000, with ten percent of those being of Maori provenance. Due to this significant percentage, it is not surprising to see that the Maori inhabit a significant amount of the installation space, even though Polynesian objects occupy only one of the seven sections of the exhibition. What is surprising is that there is no mention of Captain Fuller or his contributions to the collection. The critical mind must wonder if this omission was intentional or, rather, a huge oversight?

The overall exhibition is divided into seven sections, arranged thematically with names like: "Spirit Houses," "Pigs and Prestige," "Honoring the Dead," and "Chiefs and

Gods." Of the seven themes, the Maori have a dominant presence in the "Chiefs and Gods" section (fig. 4.52), with familiar sub-themes such as: status exemplified by the inclusion of treasure boxes, *hei-tiki*, (fig. 4.53) clubs (*mere*), and a cloak (fig. 4.54); war (fig. 4.55), displaying staffs (*taiaha*) and more clubs (*mere*); and spiritual power (fig. 4.56), using Maori tattooing as one example. Other themes include music and dance, with Maori flutes while fishing is illustrated by fishhooks. Antithetical to the exhibits found in *Traveling the Pacific*, the objects found in the *Pacific Spirits* exhibit are enclosed in large, dark wood cases filled with objects presented either on the back wall of the case, or on slanted display boards. Another ubiquitous trait of the installation is its incorporation of photographs and drawings to contextualize the objects presented to the visitor.

Former Bishop Museum curator Roger Rose wrote an extensive review of the *Pacific Spirits* exhibition that was published in the July 1991 issue of *Pacific Arts*, the journal of the Pacific Arts Association. Describing parts of the exhibition as "static," with cases that often "mar the appreciation of objects,"[410] Rose's review examines each of the seven thematic sections, noting that the sections titled "The Mask," "Pigs and Prestige," "Magic for War," "Masked Dance," "Honoring the Dead," and "Spirit Houses" are reserved for Melanesian objects, while the remaining section is reserved for Polynesia. He regards the Polynesian section as "conceptually different from the Melanesian galleries, and far less successful.[411] He goes on to criticize the area for lumping all of Polynesia into "one vast *mélange,"* stating that "[o]bjects are so mixed that no ordinary

---

[410] Roger Rose, "Exhibiting the Pacific in American Museums: Review of "Pacific Spirits: Life, Death & the Supernatural," Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago." *Pacific Arts,* (July 1991): 1 & 4.

[411] Ibid., 5.

visitor would ever discern there are Hawaiians, Maori, or Tahitians with distinctive cultures and lives of their own."[412] Rose concedes that representing all of Oceania is a daunting and, in many ways, impossible task. Nevertheless, he writes, "What this is lacking of a holistic view of culture, any culture in this vision of Polynesia, is compensated only partly in the Melanesian section of 'Pacific Spirits,'" going on to say, "the sense of real people doing real things that anyone today could really care about never quite emerges from artifacts that seem caught in a time warp, the far away, exotic other."[413] Rose's message is clear: although it takes a more serious tone than its companion exhibition, *Pacific Spirits*' fault lies in its lack of comprehensiveness and the fact that objects are put on display as examples of themes, but not of specific different cultures. Twenty years later, it is interesting to note that permanent installations, be they in Chicago or New York, continue to be criticized for similar shortcomings—a perceived lack of respect for both the culture and their objects as well as a seeming lack of awareness that these cultures are living traditions making objects of high craftsmanship and skill. Does this mean that museums have not learned anything from past curatorial gaffes or that the perfect combination of cultural sensitivity, high scholarly standards, and audience accessibility is simply unattainable?

Certainly, the most valiant attempt to embody those three ideals was made when *Ruatepupuke II* was restored and reopened in 1993.[414] Plans for renovation of the house

---

[412] Ibid.

[413] Ibid.

[414] See Ron Dorfman, ed. *Ruatepupuke: A Maori Meeting House*. Chicago: The Field Museum of Chicago, (1994) for the history of the house and details regarding the renovation.

were born after the opening the *Te Maori* exhibition in 1986, when Maori elders for the first time were able to see and touch it since it left New Zealand early in the twentieth-century. In reference to an ongoing rift said to have been caused when the house was removed from its original home on Tokomaru Bay on the North Island of New Zealand, one elder is quoted as saying, "I don't feel so sad now…The ancestors feel good and all is well."[415]

At the same time that negotiations for renovating the house were in process, involving visits by delegations from the Field Museum to New Zealand and vice versa, a changing climate in New Zealand regarding the display of Maori objects outside their country of origin was afoot.[416] At the Taonga Maori conference (November 18–27, 1990) funded by the New Zealand government, tensions came to a head when a young Maori man asked, "You have asked what the Maori people want from the museums of the world. I will tell you what we, the Maori people, want. We want you to give us our *taonga* [treasures] back. That is what we want."[417] In an article that recounts the story of the confrontation, Terrell includes responses to the questions posed to panel members at the conference at the end of his paper on the Maori collection at the Field Museum by stating, "Do the Maori have anything to teach the world? . . . But if you have something

---

[415] "Maori Meeting House Reopens," *In the Field: The Bulletin of the Field Museum of Natural History,* (March/April 1993),:9.

[416] Several research trips were made between New Zealand and Chicago in the early 1990's, but work began early, when Sidney Moko Mead, as a graduate student, wrote a preliminary report about the house.

[417] John Terrell, "Taonga Maori: "We Want out Treasures Back,"" *From the Field*, (March/April 1991): 14.

to teach the world, please don't bring all your taonga home and leave us only with a video tape."[418]

The installation includes an introductory panel (fig. 4.54) that includes photographs of how the house appeared in the nineteenth century, when it stood on Tokomaru Bay, as well as text that describes the function of each part of the house, the floor symbolizing the Earth Mother, the ceiling and roof symbolizing the Sky Father, and the wall posts symbolizing the gods and ancestors. The museum also displays a large piece of greenstone (fig. 4.55) that was given to the museum by the people of Tokomaru Bay.

By partnering the museum with the people of Tokomaru Bay, the house was physically restored and renovated and, perhaps even more importantly, its cultural value and function were changed. It was no longer perceived as just an object in a museum, but instead was a living *marae* that happened to be located in the Midwest of the United States, instead of Polynesia (fig. 4.56).[419]

Conclusion

One of the central debates in the field of non-Western art history focuses on what the appropriate mode of display is for non-Western objects. Questions surface regarding whether non-Western objects should be in natural history museums or art museums—which usually involves a perceived devaluation of the objects' inherent value and

---

[418] Ibid., 15.

[419] Ibid., 14.

meaning. On a comprehensive level, the objects in natural history museums tend to be of higher quality than their counterparts in art museums, having longer, more documented provenances. In some cases their curators, though they may not be trained as art historians, discuss the objects as art, using the term interchangeably with object—as if, in their minds, there is no difference. Additionally, over the course of the years, there is documentation that a series of "art" exhibitions have been displayed in natural history museums.

Objects in art museums are called "art," while the very same objects, when displayed in natural history museums are not and the resulting sentiment is that objects displayed as art are more highly valued, and thus the people who make them are highly valued as well. This has created an atmosphere that privileges one mode of display over another and the debate rages on, and one can wonder at what point, if any, it will subside.

This question of art history versus natural history was the central question I set out to answer when embarking on this project, the answer quickly surfaced: there is no answer. There is no "right" answer because the problem is not two-sided; there is no simple dichotomy between good and bad or anthropology and art that exists in this age-old quandary. As with most things, the issue is much more complicated than that and, in many cases, much less fraught with malevolence than many scholars would have seemed to think. Of course there are instances of greed and unethical behavior—and even more examples of bad sense and bad taste—but in most cases, I would venture that each museum's objective, based purely on the archival documentation as presented in these chapters, is a genuine concern for the object and interest in representing it in the best possible light. Whether their efforts were met with success or failure is altogether another

topic. In cases where failure or offensiveness was the end result, the reasons were usually lack of funds or staff, as opposed to anything more insidious or mean-spirited. Through the reconstruction of the collection and display histories of natural history museums in the United States with significant collections of Maori objects, one can see that the differences between natural history and art museums are not as vast. The hope is that the research presented in these chapter and, more comprehensively, in this dissertation, will provide a springboard for a new approach to the discussion of displaying non-Western art in American institutions: one that at its foundation takes into consideration the long and complicated collection and display histories of individual institutions, based solely on archival documentation and photographs.

CHAPTER FIVE: COLLECTING AND DISPLAYING MAORI ART AS ART – THE PERMANENT AND THE TEMPORARY

The term "primitive art" was coined in Europe at the end of the nineteenth century to describe the non-Western art that modernists of the time were using as sources for their own work. Art historians are very familiar with Gauguin's South Pacific subject matter of the late nineteenth century, including work he did that was influenced by Maori art he saw at the Auckland Museum during a brief 10-day trip to New Zealand.[420] In 1907, modern artists Andre Derain and Pablo Picasso were lauded for having "discovered" African art, in the teens and twenties German Expressionist artists such as Nolde and Kirchner source African and Oceanic art, and by 1929, the Surrealist movement began to champion the art of Oceania and Native America, shying away, however, from the African art that was so admired by Picasso and his colleagues. In that same year, editor Christian Zervos devoted an entire issue of the French journal *Cahiers d'Art* to Oceanic art and, in the journal *Variétés*, the "Surrealist Map of the World" (fig. 5.01) was first published, depicting Oceania and Alaska larger that Africa.[421]

---

[420] See Bronwen Nicholsen, *Gauguin and Maori Art*, (Auckland: Godwit Publishing Ltd., 1995).

[421] Jack Flam with Miriam Deutch, eds. *Primitivism and Twentieth-Century Art: A Documentary History* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press, 2003), 12. Also see William Rubin's 1984 catalogue to the exhibition, *Primitivism in Twentieth Century Art*.

In terms of the institutional history of Maori art in the United States, we know that the term "primitive art" was used frequently in reference to objects in the collections of natural history museums. We know that the term is used in a 1904 article entitled, "Primitive Art" published by AMNH and again in 1913, when the article, "Art in a Natural History Museum," appeared in *The American Museum Journal*. By 1927, Franz Boas published *Primitive Art*[422] and in 1939, the AMNH presented its own exhibition called *Primitive Art*, although whether Maori art was included is not known at this time. In the 1950s, Philip Lewis was named associate curator of "Primitive Art" at the Field Museum of Chicago; and, by 1952, the increasing interest in primitive art was blamed for the difficulty dealers were having in acquiring quality pieces to sell to natural history museums, as was evident in correspondence between M. de Lemaire and the American Museum of Natural History.[423] In revisiting these facts, there is a definitive relationship between the rise in institutional and private collector interest in primitive art and how that affected the collecting and display of Maori art in natural history, and in turn, art museums.

The final chapter of this study focuses on the shift from the public viewing Maori objects within an anthropological or ethnographic framework, to viewing Maori art as art in art museums. The chapter will first look at the collections and permanent displays of Maori art at two New York institutions: the Brooklyn Museum of Art and the Metropolitan Museum of Art. The permanent turns to the temporary as the chapter ends

---

[422] Although, in this instance, the term decorative could be substituted for primitive with very little

[423] See chapter three for documentation of the correspondence between AMNH and LeMaire that discusses the increasing interest in primitive art in the 1950's.

with a discussion of major temporary exhibitions of Maori art in United States art museums in the later twentieth century.

Brooklyn Museum of Art, Brooklyn, New York (hereafter BMA)

The Brooklyn Museum of Art was founded in 1825 with three areas of collecting and exhibiting; natural history, ethnology, and fine arts. The museum records its first accession of Maori art in 1903, the same year that the institution (then called The Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences) hired Stewart Culin to head an ambitious collecting mission described by the *Brooklyn Daily Eagle* as "building up great ethnographical collections, sending out expeditions for acquiring antiquities, first over all America, then over the entire world."[424] Today their collection of Maori art numbers to 70 objects, with eight on permanent display to the public.

Two of the first accessions acquired in 1903 were gained through an unknown source. The first, a gable figure (*tekoteko)* (fig. 5.02) dating to the turn on the twentieth century,[425] is very small in size, measuring approximately twelve inches tall and two inches wide, and is thought to have once been part of a model house. The figure is currently on display in the museum (fig. 5.03); the associated label describes the figure as

---

[424] Diana Fane, "The Language of Things: Stewart Culin as Collector," in *Objects of Myth and Memory: American Indian Art at The Brooklyn Museum*. Diana Fane, Ira Jacknis, and Lise M. Breen, eds. (The Brooklyn Museum in association with University of Washington Press, 1991), 13 quoting from the *Brooklyn Daily Eagle.*

[425] Assessments of BMA's collection were made by New Zealand scholars, D.R. Simmons in 1979 and Terence Barrow in 1992. In this case, Barrow assessed that the gable figure was from the turn of the century.

being placed above a gable mask, the highest element of a meeting house facade. It was also included in the museum's exhibition *Architectural Elements of the Pacific* that was on display for a year beginning in August of 1987. The small figure is painted black and has inlaid shell eyes. It is elaborately carved with swirling and geometric tattoo patterns covering the surface.

Another object acquired at the same time in 1903 was a gable mask (*koruru*) (fig. 5.04). Identified by Terence Barrow as being from the *Arawa* tribe in the Bay of Plenty area (fig. intro.01) of the North Island, the mask measures approximately nineteen by eleven inches and is dated ca. 1870. Its pointed jaw line is punctuated by a large mouth covered in carved geometric designs and inlaid *paua* shells that are used for eyes. The mask is also currently on display with the museum's permanent exhibition (fig. 5.05, left side), and the associated label uses the mask to explain the facade structure of the meeting house. Having already explained how the gable figure (*tekoteko*) functions, the label describes the function of the mask as a depiction of the ancestor the meeting house is honoring. The mask has a history of being displayed in other cities, and was included in the 1953 M. H. De Young Museum's exhibition in San Francisco, *Art of the South Pacific Islands: A Loan Exhibition*, as well as in the *Dimensions of Polynesia* exhibition at the Fine Arts Gallery of San Diego in 1973. As with the gable figure, it was also part of BMA's *Architectural Elements* exhibition in 1987.

In 1935 four Maori objects were donated to the museum by New York businessman Appleton Sturgis—who, thirty-seven years earlier, had donated a number of objects to the American Museum of Natural History. The objects include a grass cutter, house post, paddle, and treasure box. Then, in 1953, a fishing canoe prow (fig. 5.06) was

donated to the museum by Princess Gourielle, also known as Mme. Helena Rubenstein, the well-known cosmetics queen. Described by Barrow as being of "exceptional quality," the prow is thought to have been taken from a rotting boat and affixed to a new one.

From funds provided by Frank L. Babbit and Carll [sic] H. de Silver, the museum purchased a lintel (*pare*) in 1961. Measuring thirty-five by fourteen inches, the lintel location and date were identified by Simmons to be from Gisborne on the North Island and from ca. 1860. The lintel (*pare*) (fig. 5.07) was included in the museum's 1967 handbook, where the oral ancestral histories of the Maori are likened to stories told about those who came to America on the Mayflower and describes the Maori carving style as having a "great technical virtuosity."[426] The lintel was displayed in the *Architectural Elements* exhibition in 1987 and is included in the current exhibition at BMA (fig. 5.08). The associated label text describes the "interplay between the positive and negative spaces," as well as the depiction of humanlike forms in the spiritual world.

The Brooklyn Museum of Art's display of Pacific objects was innovative for the times and, in many ways, picked up where MoMA's *Arts of the South Seas* of 1946 left off. The first photographs documenting the display of Pacific objects at the BMA date to 1957, when Flora Kaplan was acting curator.[427]

The photographs suggest that the display was small, ranging from an intimate grouping of smaller objects (fig. 5.09, left case) to that of a canoe prow jutting out from the wall (fig. 5.10), as if the rest of the canoe could be found on the other side. Minimal use of wall text leads one to wonder if that was because the objects were meant to stand

---

[426] *The Brooklyn Museum Handbook* (Brooklyn: The Brooklyn Museum, 1967), 253.

[427] William Siegmann, e-mail correspondence, November 18, 2003.

on their own as art objects—or, conversely, if they were displayed in a "vacuum," out of the contexts of time, space, and location.

The installation was accompanied by a catalogue called *Primitive Art of the Pacific Islands,* written by Jane Powell and Martin Friedman (Powell being the curator who predated Kaplan). The opening paragraph casts the Pacific with "[t]ales of exotic paradises"[428] and describes the visitor's experience with the objects: "The basis of our enjoyment of this art is largely through an emotional reaction to its exotic appearance, but our appreciation is deepened by understanding how it functioned and what it meant within its own culture."[429] Powell and Friedman reference Gauguin and the German Expressionists who assimilated Oceanic motifs in their art. The authors make a surprising point in the introduction, noting that much of the history, and in turn the art, of these cultures was destroyed by the effects of "modern civilizations": "The art of the Pacific islanders was very much a part of their daily life and therefore was a necessary factor in the physical and psychic well-being of their community."[430] The Maori are illustrated by a figure (fig. 5.11) whose countenance is used to explain portraiture in Pacific art. The figure, while not considered portraiture in the traditional sense, is described as being sculpted to relate to a specific individual based on the tattooing patterns that adorn the figure's face.

In 1961, the entire main hall of the Brooklyn Museum of Art was dominated by a

---

[428] Jane P. Powell and Martin L. Friedman, *Primitive Art of the Pacific Islands* (Brooklyn: The Brooklyn Museum, 1957), n.p.

[429] Ibid.

[430] Ibid.

dramatic display of at least five figures from the Americas (two), the Pacific (one), and Africa (two); each one was presented as an object of power and beauty (fig. 5.12 a/b). Each object was individually lit and placed on its own individual pedestal, displayed without any sort of protective case. Potted plants are interspersed among the pedestals. It is safe to assume, because the power figures were situated in the front lobby of the museum, that they would have been among the first objects greeting visitors as they entered the museum, thus reinforcing their standing as "art." It is notable, for the purposes of this discussion that a Maori figure from a meeting house was chosen as representative of all of Oceania. Was this done because the figure was similar to the size and shape of the others featured in the hall, or was it because Maori art was thought to represent chiefly power in the Pacific?

The visitor's experience at the Brooklyn Museum of Art in 1969 was significantly different. Upon arrival at the entrance to the Pacific Islands section of the BMA (fig. 5.13), visitors were presented with individually numbered, individually lit, vertically oriented floor-to-ceiling glass cases on both sides of the hall's entrance. The objects on the left of the entrance were of Native American provenance, and on the right, from the Pacific Islands. In each case was placed a textile and a weapon from individual locales or groups, ranging from the California, Navajo, and Zuni Indians on the left to Borneo, New Zealand, and Sumatra on the right. The informing philosophy of this curious uniform design is unknown, but it may have been an intentional juxtaposition of ideals: man versus woman, domesticity versus warfare, Native Americans versus Pacific Islanders. The net result is that the objects are used as decorative devices or as specimens, not as art.

Once visitors entered the Pacific Islands section, they were greeted by a large case of Maori objects (fig. 5.14). Here, the presentation recalls that found in modern art galleries. Maori art has retained a central position within the display and exhibits a typical overview of Maori art: objects range from small to large and include *hei-tiki,* a canoe model, figures, paddles, a gable mask, a skirt, and a lintel. Once again, it is difficult to discern from the photographs whether wall text or labels were included within the display (if they were, it is clear that they must have been quite understated). The exhibition display did not change significantly for the next several decades. The early 1980s brought only a few subtle changes, including the addition of a treasure box and the movement of some of the smaller *tiki* to the other side of the case. In 1987, the museum organized *Architectural Elements from the Pacific Islands.* Next to the introductory wall text, the museum displayed a photographic reproduction of the façade of a Maori meeting house, contextualizing many of the figures on display (fig. 5.15). As previously mentioned, the exhibition included several Maori objects including the museum's lintel, small figure, and gable mask (fig. 5.16).

The current exhibition occupies a small corner of the museum, but in a high-traffic area that visitors pass through to get to the elevators. A large sign reading "The Arts of the Pacific Islands" greets the visitor, along with didactic text on Polynesia and a map of the region (fig. 5.17). The Maori section is placed on one side of the room and comprises three cases, two of which display isolated objects including a large head and a lintel (fig. 5.05). The central case (fig. 5.18) displays six objects. The exhibition designers placed two carved figures on small pedestals, while a club (*patu*) is displayed at a 45 degree angle in front of the figures. On the left side of the case, a pendant (*hei-tiki*)

is pinned to the back of the case and two treasure boxes *(wakahuia*) are placed below, one at an angle, another laying flat on the bottom of the case. The museum has plans to renovate the entire area in the coming years.

The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York (hereafter MMA)

The roots of the Oceanic collection at the Metropolitan Museum of Art are planted in its mother collection, formed by Nelson Rockefeller, the former governor of New York and United States vice president. In 1954, Rockefeller founded the Museum of Primitive Art (first called the Museum of Indigenous Art)[431] to display his collections of art from the Pacific, Africa, and the Americas (hereafter MPA). The museum officially opened to the public in 1957 and was located behind the Museum of Modern Art in a townhouse owned by Rockefeller on West Fifty-fourth Street.

The MPA did not have enough space to exhibit its entire collection, so instead chose to install small thematic exhibitions. Over the course of the twelve years it was open to the public, exhibitions that included Maori art were *Figure Sculpture from Polynesia* in 1961, *Sculpture from the South Seas* in 1962, and *Masterpieces from the South Seas in the Collection of The Museum of Primitive Art* in 1965.

However, Rockefeller and his longtime friend René d'Harnoncourt, who also collected primitive art during their thirty years of friendship, had higher aspirations for the collection and set their sights on the MMA. In his own words, Rockefeller wrote that he and d'Harnoncourt decided that, if an exhibition of the MPA's collection was

[431] Flam, 450.

displayed at the MMA, the officials there might change their minds about primitive art.[432]

The exhibition *Art of Oceania, Africa, and the Americas from the Museum of Primitive Art* was designed by Douglas Newton, who had been d'Harnoncourt's assistant and, since his death, had assumed his curatorial responsibilities. The exhibition ran from May 10 to August 17, 1969 and, in the foreword of the catalogue, former MMA director Thomas P. F. Hoving writes, "But, even more important, *Art of Oceania, Africa, and the Americas* affords the public a splendid opportunity to see works of art of incomparable quality . . . And the name of the Metropolitan is, after all, quality."[433]

The catalogue establishes the sources of the term primitive art, but regards the "discovery" by modern artists and their view of African art as "subjective, highly partial, in a certain sense uninformed."[434] Maori art is described as "[t]he richest of all Polynesian art areas, both in decorative quality and surviving quantity."[435] Six Maori objects are listed in the catalogue, including a figure (figs. 5.19 and 5.20) that is also shown in an installation photograph of the exhibition. Hung on the wall, the figure is spot-lit from above, creating an ovular glow against the wall. Given that the Polynesian figure shown in the photograph is from Mangareva, that Fijian clubs are found in the

---

[432] Nelson A. Rockefeller, "The Michael C. Rockefeller Wing of the Met: A Father's Memorial," *Smihsonian Magazine*, v. 9, n. 7 (October 1978): 48.

[433] Thomas P.F. Hoving, foreword to *Art of Oceania, Africa, and the Americas from the Museum of Primitive Art* (Great Britain: The Curwen Press Ltd., 1969), n.p.

[434] Robert Goldwater, introduction to *Art of Oceania, Africa, and the Americas from the Museum of Primitive Art* (Great Britain: The Curwen Press Ltd., 1969), n.p.

[435] Douglas Newton, "Polynesia," in *Art of Oceania, Africa, and the Americas from the Museum of Primitive Art* (Great Britain: The Curwen Press Ltd., 1969), 6.

same room as an Aztec stone sculpture, and that in the photograph's background, a tall Baining (*hareiga*) figure from East New Britain looms in the background, it would seem that the exhibition did not have a central thematic or geographic organizing principle.

Nonetheless, Rockefeller and d'Harnoncourt's plan succeeded. In an article published in *Smithsonian Magazine,* Rockefeller recounted how he had been approached by well-known New York socialite and philanthropist Brooke Astor, who had told him she felt the collection should stay at the Met, and that she would contribute toward funding a special wing to house it there permanently. At the exhibition opening, Rockefeller announced that he would donate the collection to the Met to be housed in a wing dedicated to his son, Michael C. Rockefeller, who had died while collecting objects in the Asmat area of southwest New Guinea.[436]

The Met's collection of Maori objects totals twenty-four; nineteen were from the Rockefeller collection and were accessioned into the museum's collection in 1979, with the exception of a treasure box and cloak donated to the MPA's Michael C. Rockefeller Memorial Collection in 1960 and later accessioned into the Met's collection in 1978, before the bulk of the collection was incorporated into the Met. The objects that came from the MPA and Rockefeller collection were primarily bought at auction.

Some highlights of the collection include a house post figure (fig. 5.20) that came from the collection of Captain J. Lort Stokes, who obtained the figure while aboard the H. M. S. Beagle (the ship that Charles Darwin sailed on) while it was in New Zealand in

[436] Rockefeller, 52.

1835.[437] Composed of wood, the figure is typical in that it displays a tongue protruding from an open mouth. The figure has one hand with three fingers resting on its chest, while the other with four fingers is tucked underneath its chin. The knees are slightly bent, and spiral designs adorn the chest and knees.

Another interesting object is a model of a canoe prow that was formerly part of the collection of English ethnographic dealer Harry G. Beasley[438] (fig. 5.21). The small prow measures thirteen and one-quarter inches in height and is dominated by the protruding-tongued figurehead at the front of the prow. An interwoven spiral design bisects the back of the figure, with its arms supporting it. In comparison, another model canoe prow in the collection (fig. 5.22) appears to be unfinished (in the opinion of anthropologist David Simmons when he saw it in 1973).[439] Unlike the prow from the Beasley collection, this prow is dominated by dual spirals behind a diminutive figurehead. Another small figure rests against the opposite end.

The Michael C. Rockefeller Wing opened to the public on February 3, 1982 dubbed "The Met's New Treasure: A Showcase for Primitive Art" by the *New York Times Magazine,* and hailed as an "event of considerable significance."[440] The wing was built at an expense of close to $18.3 million and the total space encompassed close to an

---

[437] Catalogue entry, 1979.206.1508, Department of Art of Africa, Oceania, and the Americas, The Metropolitan Museum of Art.

[438] Catalogue entry, 1979.206.1577, Department of Art of Africa, Oceania, and the Americas, The Metropolitan Museum of Art.

[439] Catalogue entry, 1979.206.1435, Department of Art of Africa, Oceania, and the Americas, The Metropolitan Museum of Art.

[440] Hilton Kramer, "The High Art of Primitivism," *The New York Times Magazine*, 24 (January 1982): 18.

acre.[441] In the fall 1981 issue of the museum's *Bulletin*, director Philippe de Montebello noted that the opening of the Rockefeller wing "rounds out the presentation of all areas of its encyclopedic collection . . . The great strength of the Metropolitan Museum lies in its comprehensiveness; few museums can offer a complete cross section of art history in one architectural entity."[442] The interior of the wing was dominated by the Met's collections of African and Pre-Columbian art, while the Oceanic objects were displayed against a backdrop of a wall of windows that looked out onto East Eighty-first Street and Central Park. The exhibition was designed by the former curator of Oceanic art, Douglas Newton, and remained largely unchanged until renovations are completed in 2007.

The collection is dominated by Melanesian art, and more specifically art from Papua New Guinea and Asmat of Irian Jaya, but displays objects from all of Oceania including Australia and Indonesia. The Polynesian section was small, but contained a figure from Mangareva (one of only seven that exist today), as well as a model of a Fijian spirit house. The Maori section was situated next to the Easter Island section, with the objects in a wall case protected by plexiglass. (fig. 5.23) The handful of Maori objects, including a treasure box (fig. 5.24), a flute and weaving peg (fig. 5.25), and latrine handle (fig. 5.26) are set on a neutral, cream-colored fabric. Limited wall text is included, displaying only the name of the object, to which culture it belongs, the medium, dimensions, and credit line. Unlike displays of Maori art at natural history museums that

---

[441] Grace Glueck, "A Spectacular New Wing," *The New York Times Magazine*, 24 (January 1982): 20.

[442] Philippe De Montebello, "Director's Note," *Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin*, vol. xxxix, n. 2 (Fall 1981): 3.

include contextual photographs and some explanation as to how the object functioned, the display at the Met did not.

The collections of the Brooklyn Museum of Art and the Metropolitan Museum of Art pale in comparison to the collections at the American natural history museums like the National Museum of Natural History, the American Museum of Natural History, the Bernice P. Bishop Museum, and the Field Museum that have previously been discussed in both size and quality. The obvious reason lies in the fact that those art museums were late to begin collecting Maori objects. The critical element that figures into these museums' collections is the underlying statement that is being made—that Maori art had officially been recognized as "art," simply through its inclusion in the collections of two United States' art museums. The inclusion also sets the stage for a series of special exhibitions set in art museums, which further reinforced the dual definitions these objects possess.

Temporary Exhibitions of Maori Art in Art Museums

This study will end with a discussion of temporary exhibitions. Employed by all types of museums, temporary exhibitions function as a measure of trends in scholarship, or perhaps the importance of certain subjects meriting exclusive exhibitions that may fall outside the scope of a museum's permanent collection. The temporary exhibitions discussed in this chapter include or focus on Maori art, and were on display between 1946 and 1984—those dates referring to the openings of the Museum of Modern Art's 1946 exhibition *Arts of the South Seas* and the seminal exhibition *Te Maori: Maori Art*

from New Zealand Collections in 1984 at the Metropolitan Museum of Art (later traveling to St. Louis, Chicago, and San Francisco), a year that saw a spate of non-Western art exhibitions in major institutional arenas.

Arts of the South Seas, Museum of Modern Art, New York, New York 1946

The story of the display of non-Western art and later Maori art in United States art museums begins in 1933, when the Museum of Modern Art (hereafter MoMA) embarked upon a series of exhibitions devoted to non-Western, or "primitive" art. The first in 1933, *American Sources of Modern Art,* focused on Aztec, Mayan, and Inca art. It was followed two years later by *African Negro Sculpture* (1935). In 1941, MoMA opened *Indian Art of the United States,* curated and designed by Rene d'Harnoncourt, who would go on to design the first large-scale exhibition of Oceanic art in the United States, *Arts of the South Seas,* in 1946.[443]

Arts of the South Seas opened a mere six months after the end of World War II. The exhibition was organized by Rene d'Harnoncourt, exhibition designer, in collaboration with Columbia University professors Ralph Linton (an anthropologist) and Paul Wingert (an art historian), who coauthored the catalogue, and the Mexican muralist painter Miguel Covarrubias, who assisted with the installation of the objects and contributed a number of color drawings to the exhibition catalogue.

The catalogue and the installation of the exhibition both emphasize the

---

[443] Marianne Staniszewski, *The Power of Display: The History of Exhibition Installations at the Museum of Modern Art* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1988), 98–99.

organizers' categorization of "affinities and artistic trends"[444] unique to, and shared by, regions of Melanesia, Polynesia, Micronesia, and Australia. The diagram "Distribution of Basic Trends in Oceanic Art" (fig. 5.27), also found in the catalogue, describes the major characteristics which define the style of three of Oceania's major divisions: Micronesia (1) is described as having simplified forms, Polynesia (2) as having natural forms, geometrized; and Melanesia (3), for natural forms that are exaggerated and distorted with rhythmic organic curved surfaces, qualities it shares with Australia as well as New Zealand.[445]

New Zealand was one of twenty regions featured in *Arts of the South Seas*. Of the four hundred objects in the exhibition, Maori art was represented by twenty, with objects that ranged from small jade pendants (*hei-tiki)* to large wooden carved lintels, canoe prows, and sterns. All of the objects were on loan from North American museums. The few photographs found in the Museum of Modern Art archives documenting the Maori installation make it difficult to reconstruct the public display in the exhibition. The most prominent feature in fig. 5.28, a photograph taken from the central Polynesia section looking towards the Marquesas and New Zealand sections, is the re-creation of a nineteenth-century drawing of a tattooed Marquesan man. (Illustrations from G. H. von Langsdorff, *Bemerkungen über eine Reise um die Welt, 1803-7*, pl. 8 and 10, 1812)[446] Presumably, the drawing was included as a contextual source for the tattooed wooden

---

[444] Ralph Linton and Paul Wingert, *Arts of the South Seas* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1946), 2.

[445] Ibid.

[446] Adrienne Kaeppler, Christian Kaufmann, and Douglas Newton, *Oceanic Art* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1997), 343.

arm emerging from the adjacent wall. These tattoo-related items were accompanied by Marquesan objects like woven fans and headbands decorated with seashells. Behind the right of the fan, is a house post from the collection of the Royal Ontario Museum in Toronto.[447]

In a rather barren installation, with small object labels and walls bereft of text, four Maori objects dominate the space labeled "New Zealand," with only small labels indicating they are Maori (fig. 5.29). On the wall is the Richardson lintel from the collection of the Peabody Essex Museum. The placement of the lintel several feet high on the wall was meant to duplicate where it would be above the doorway of a carved meeting house, much as it is presently displayed at that museum (fig. 1.15).

Below the lintel is a "canoe" fashioned from a carved stern and prow on loan from the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, connected together by a long wooden board. The act of connecting them by this length of board, it would seem, is an attempt to contextualize the canoe into a more recognizable object for the viewer, much like the drawing of the tattooed Marquesan man. It is a vast departure from the way the prow was displayed individually at Penn in 1921 (fig. 1.26) or the stern in the 1960's. (fig. 1.27) The section also displayed a large carved head from the Field Museum in Chicago.

Many of the objects not included in the photographs, but in the catalogue are from the Peabody Essex Museum's collection such as the knife (*maripi*) (figs. 1.05) and pendant (*tiki*), both of which are included in PEM's current installation (fig. 1.16). Also illustrated in the catalogue is the treasure box collected on the Wilkes Expedition (fig.

---

[447] See *Arts of the South Seas* catalogue, p. 52, for illustration.

3.05) misidentified in the MoMA catalogue as #3786, when it is actually #3787.

Where the black and white photographic records of the exhibition might be lacking, published written descriptions of the exhibition, by contrast, provide many useful details. Vibrant colors and calibrated lighting were employed as sensory guides for the visitor. Wall colors were coordinated to reflect the different climatic zones of the Pacific; desert, tropical forests, temperate zones, and barren coral beaches all coordinate with the color used on the walls of the various sections.[448]

Perhaps the most distinctive new "display tool" was the "vista." Using a combination of waist-high and movable walls to emphasize one area's either distinct or shared qualities with the others, d'Harnoncourt used the "vistas" method to assert Linton and Wingert's theories of affinities among Pacific cultures. For example, a visitor looking at the Maori section was able to see artistic affinities shared by New Zealand, the Marquesas Islands, Hawai'i, and Easter Island, because the vistas guided their eyes between the sections and reinforced the likenesses.

Arts of the South Seas made headlines in the major art magazines such as *Art News* and *Art Bulletin*[449] and was featured in mainstream magazines like *Vogue* and *Life*,[450] as well as in newspapers from around the country and the world. The exhibition had its detractors, but the reception was primarily positive.

On one level, the mere fact that Pacific art was exhibited at the Museum of

---

[448] "Art of the South Seas," *Architectural Forum*, vol. 84, no. 5 (May 1946): 98.

[449] Gregory Bateson, "Arts of the South Seas," *Art Bulletin*, v. 28, no. 2 (June 1946): 119–123, and Harry Shapiro, "South Seas: Primitives for Sophisticates," *Art News* (March 1946): 36–37, 67–69.

[450] Miguel Covarrubius, "Art of the South Seas," *Vogue* (Feb. 1, 1946): 128–130, and "South Seas Art: It has Odd, Primitive Beauty," *Life* (Nov. 4, 1946): 77–84.

Modern Art was crucial to the perceived legitimization and mainstreaming of Pacific art as art and, in most cases, MoMA was praised for its efforts. Negative criticism about the exhibition was aimed primarily at the historical context within which *Arts of the South Seas* found itself: opening so soon after the end of the Second World War. Some members of the press accused MoMA of attempting to profit from the war, while other headlines read, "Art Exhibition Makes Pacific Vets Forget Hatred." Other members of the press were critical of the veterans themselves, describing them as traitors. One such critic, Robert Ruark—whose article ran in several U.S. newspapers—wrote, "Six months only is the war over and already there is a strong nostalgia for dear old Solomons and New Guinea . . . at the Museum of Modern Art they are running a display of native art from all over that awful area and who are the most interested gawkers? Soldiers, sailors, marines, ex-soldiers, ex-sailors, ex-Marines."[451]

Gregory Bateson, an anthropologist and, incidentally, third husband of Margaret Mead, wrote an anthropological review of the exhibition that appeared in the June 1946 issue of *Art Bulletin*. Overall, his review was positive: "The spectator is given a sense of the unity, not only of the South Seas, but also of this particular exhibit."[452] But while other reviewers referred to the Maori objects as "refined jade carvings of the New Zealand Maori whose works ranks with the world's art masterpieces,"[453] Bateson, by contrast, felt the objects were "a reversion to a more grotesque theme," and referred to the

---

[451] Robert C. Ruark, "Dear Old Isles," *New York World Telegram* (Feb. 19, 1946).

[452] Bateson, 121.

[453] "South Sea Moderns," *Newsweek* (February 11, 1946): 94.

hei-tikis from the Field Museum as a "google-eyed crooked headed jade figure."[454]

The most puzzling portion of Bateson's review is his argument that the exhibition's design was based on the human reproductive cycle: "It is in this unity which causes the spectator to say 'it makes sense.' In sum, what d'Harnoncourt has done is to set a series of human cultures in a certain order and that order is symbolically determined by the basic human reproductive cycle."[455] Bateson gave d'Harnoncourt the review to read as a draft; thus in the footnotes we find d'Harnoncourt's reaction paraphrased: "…he said at first that he did not feel competent to judge of the importance of the reproductive sequence. He agreed that it might well be there but 'perhaps it is not as important as you make out.'[456]

Another review written by a notable figure, modern artist Barnett Newman, first appeared in Spanish in the journal *Ambos Mundos* (June 1946). The article was subsequently translated into English and published in *Studio International* in February 1970. Newman's review is critical because it discusses the exhibition in terms of its relationship to modern art:

> The Museum of Modern Art in New York has brought this inter-relationship between modern art and the art of primitive peoples up to date with its recent exhibition of art objects from the Oceanic Islands of the South Pacific. With this exhibition, it is now clear that even Surrealism, which has always given the impression of being on the periphery if not outside the curve of the modern plastic revolutionary wave, is no exception to the romanticism of our time, that it had its

---

[454] Bateson, 120.

[455] Ibid., 121.

[456] Ibid., 122.

romance in the art of the South Seas.[457]

Newman characterizes Maori art styles as "ornate, rococo decorative," and all of Oceanic art as having a "sense of magic."[458] Newman believed that the installation's groupings showed "a fraternity with the several facets of our modern art movements . . . sharply exposed the fundamental cleavage between them which explains why the Surrealists failed to achieve this common purpose,"[459] and in the end chastises the Surrealists for not understanding the deeper meaning of the art: "It was almost as if the object lesson of this important exhibition was to demonstrate the failure of the Surrealists correctly to interpret the meaning of magic—that they comprehended only its superficial aspects."[460] In short, Newman's review explains that the exhibition clarified that the Surrealists' admiration of Oceanic art was negated by their failure to learn about it within its own cultural context.

Other reviewers had trouble with what they perceived as the imprecise focus of MoMA's mission. An unnamed *New Yorker* reviewer stated, "The trouble with the Museum of Modern Art is that once you think you've got its course clear in your mind, it goes and does something to confuse you. There was a time, a few years ago, when it went careening off after folk art, and anthropology . . . and I don't know what, as if determined

---

[457] Barnett Newman, "Art of the South Seas," *Primitivism and Twentieth-Century art: A Documentary History*, Jack Flam with Miriam Deutch, eds. (Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press, 2003), 277–278.

[458] Ibid., 278.

[459] Ibid., 279.

[460] Ibid.

to beat the Museum of Natural History on its own ground . . . To be brief about the matter, I'd like to see the Modern Museum stick to Modern art."[461] Interestingly, this reviewer's sentiment foreshadowed reviews the *Te Maori* exhibition at the Met in 1984—almost twenty years later.

The primary reason *Arts of the South Seas* is an important historical benchmark is that it championed the cause? of the European modernists by challenging the accepted notions about what "art" was. What is clear is its seminal influence on subsequent theories and on contemporary design techniques in museums around New York City and the United States.

A few years later, Wingert took up the cause again, with the 1953 exhibition, *Art of the South Pacific Islands: A Loan Exhibition* at San Francisco's M.H. De Young Memorial Museum.[462] Again using primarily American collections, Wingert's purpose in curating the exhibition was, "to represent as comprehensively as possible the aesthetic qualities that are to be found in the varied art of this enormous area," noting, "No attempt has been made to attain ethnological completeness, and, consequently, unembellished objects are not included."[463] The works in the exhibition were not meant to be encyclopedic, rather, Wingert was choosing "masterpieces." Of the nineteen Maori art objects listed in the catalogue, only the house post from the Royal Ontario Museum in Toronto was also featured in the MoMA exhibition of six years earlier. If the exhibition

---

[461] "The Art Galleries: The Modern Museum and Other Problems," *New Yorker* (Feb. 2, 1946): n.p.

[462] Note that the De Young was closed to researchers while research was being completed for this dissertation and only just reopened as of October, 2005.

[463] Paul S. Wingert, *Art of the South Pacific Islands: A Loan Exhibition* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1953), 11.

really was a collection of Oceanic masterpieces, then why was only one from MoMA exhibition also included in the 1953 De Young show? From a practical standpoint, it may have been difficult for Wingert to secure loans for objects that had been lent just six years before or that he simply wanted to expose visitors to different Maori objects than had been seen before. But, could it have been that this was the exhibition Wingert had wanted the MoMA exhibition to be? It is possible since the basic premise of the exhibition is the same and it was organized within such a short amount of time from the last exhibition, it is certainly a possibility.

The Sculpture of Polynesia, The Art Institute of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, 1967

The Sculpture of Polynesia was the first American exhibition to focus not only on a specific area of Oceanic art, but also on a specific medium: sculpture. Opened on November 18, 1967 at the Art Institute of Chicago, the exhibition closed on January 1, 1968 with a total attendance of 32,876 visitors.[464] The exhibition was curated by Allen Wardwell, who at the time was the Art Institute's curator of primitive art. After closing in Chicago, *The Sculpture of Polynesia* traveled to the Museum of Primitive Art in New York.

The name of the exhibition implies that sculpture from all of Polynesia is represented; however, the works on display were primarily of Maori provenance. In the opening paragraphs of the exhibition catalogue, Wardwell made reference to this

[464] B. A. Duffy, Head, Security Department, Unpublished Memorandum to Col. S. N. Black Comptroller, January 2, 1968, The Art Institute of Chicago Archives.

discrepancy. Any Polynesian sculpture was rare, he noted, due to its destruction by European explorers and missionaries attempting to rid the islands of idolatry, but more Maori objects had survived in comparison to their other Polynesian counterparts, hence the reason such a greater proportion of Maori objects were included in the exhibition.[465]

In his catalogue essay, Wardwell makes several points regarding the medium of Polynesian sculpture. He notes Polynesia's shared climate, heritage of excellent navigators, ubiquitous belief in *mana* and *tapu,* and the existence of a priestly class and chiefs as rulers. Of the art, he notes its items' smaller size, particularly in comparison to the monumental scale of Melanesian art; an undercurrent of naturalism; the predominance of wood as the favored medium; and the importance of the adze as a carving tool.[466] Wardwell describes his overall observations of Polynesian sculpture thusly: "Through all these divergent patterns and forms, however, there runs the unmistakable evidence of excellent esthetics which gives the sculpture of Polynesia its particular quality and places it with the highest achievements of primitive man."[467]

In focusing on the sculpture of New Zealand, Wardwell notes, "considerable contrast to certain stylistic, cultural and geographic homogeneity[.]"[468] He also writes about the country's rich natural resources and abundance of wood and stone, materials well suited for carving. Wardwell makes note of a shift in the scholarly paradigm when,

---

[465] Allen Wardwell, *The Sculpture of Polynesia* (Chicago: The Art Institute of Chicago, 1967), 7.

[466] Ibid., 7–8.

[467] Ibid., 10.

[468] Ibid., 7.

in his catalogue introduction to the Maori section, he footnotes J. M. McEwen's 1966 publication *Maori Art, in an Encyclopedia of New Zealand:* "Because of the large size of the islands and the Maori populations themselves, the art forms developed into a number of regional styles which have been recently analyzed, but which cannot all be shown here, due to the difficulty of borrowing representative examples, of each style."[469] Wardwell's inclusion of McEwen's text marks the point in time when Maori art began to be categorized by regional style, a development in the field that continues today.

The Sculpture of Polynesia exhibition included objects from Fiji, Tonga, Samoa, Central Polynesia and Cook Islands, Society Islands (Tahiti), Austral Islands, Mangareva, Marquesas, Easter Island, Hawaii, and New Zealand. Of the 151 objects in the exhibition, sixty-four of them (forty-two percent) are Maori. The objects were culled from national and international collections, both public and private. Almost half were lent by American institutions; fifteen were borrowed from museums in New Zealand, six from Europe, and three from Canada. In terms of private collections, seven objects were lent by American collectors, while two were lent by collectors living abroad. The figures in the catalogue are separated by type: lintels (*pare*), treasure boxes, figures, canoe prows, sterns and bailers, snares, musical instruments, weapons, and *hei-tiki*.

The exhibition was curated by Allen Wardwell, but its installation was designed by A. James Speyer, the museum's curator of contemporary art, whose duties also

[469] Ibid., 71.

included designing exhibitions.[470] Originally trained as an architect, Speyer was a student of the well-known architect Mies van der Rohe.[471]

In a letter to Wardwell dated September 26, 1967, sent from his sister Darthea's home in Paris, Speyer described his plans for the exhibition in four typewritten pages. He observed that, because the exhibition and the objects are both small, they might appear dwarfed if they were placed in a large space; Speyer worried that a series of vitrines built into walls would lose the small objects and have the appearance of merely a series of windows, inviting little investigation by the visitor. Speyer noted that a certain sense of mystery was necessary to support the presentation of the pieces, and suggests the need to create a "real environment." He goes on to describe his "scheme":

> Accordingly, my scheme is worked out as a series of square arches, through which one walks, and inside which one finds the cases of material without ever having too much presented at once. There are tempting glimpses of more objects to come, as one wanders along the allee[sic] of the inspection route, and at times the arches open to show a free standing item in the distance (equivocal distance if possible). The arches are arranged in three kinds of groups corresponding to the three geographical groups you decided for the show. The arrangement has been decided as unmechanically—as aesthetically—as possible. The courts which ensue as the space is penetrated at the location of free standing objects, all suspended in a space of nebulous outline, is carefully planned, exactly planned, and of course cannot be changed without my knowing it. The balance is not something arbitrary! (I only say this as it may look to you as though the relationships are more flexible than I think they are; in fact, once built and in place, they may be moved to advantage, but we must wait to see.)[472]

---

[470] John Vinci, "The Art of Installation," *A. James Speyer Architect Curator Exhibition Designer* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1997), 79.

[471] Ibid., 91.

[472] A. James Speyer to Allen Wardwell, Unpublished Letter, September 26, 1967, The Art Institute of Chicago Archives.

The exhibition was located on the first floor of the Morton wing, one of the three spaces in the Art Institute that was designated for temporary exhibitions. The rectangular space was 164 feet long and 45 feet wide, with high ceilings measuring over fifteen and a half feet tall.[473] Speyer arranged to use polygonal planes around the exhibition's perimeter, along with a division of space that gave visitors the impression that they were winding though a series of paths. By looking at a floor plan of the exhibition (fig. 5.30), one can see the windy path that was created, along with the multiple isolated vitrines that Speyer described in his original letter to Wardwell.

The Morton wing's entrance was also its exit—and, upon entering the exhibition, the visitor was greeted by a case of Maori objects. The only available installation photograph of the exhibition shows the far right corner of the display case closest to the entrance and, to the right of that, the right-hand corner of the exhibition area (fig. 5.31). The visitor encounters a series of Maori objects including a series of lintels (most visibly to the left a lintel that belongs to the University of Pennsylvania's Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, bought from Oldman). To the right is a large display of canoe prows and sterns that includes complete prows from the collections of the Denver Art Museum, American Museum of Natural History, Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh, and the Museum of Primitive Art. The tall stern is from the Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto. Additionally, Wardwell included stern and prow fragments from the Auckland Institute and Museum and Peabody Essex Museum. It seems that, in addition to Wardwell's having divided the exhibition by geographical area (as Speyer had indicated

[473] Vinci, 82.

in the aforementioned letter), he also divided the exhibition objects by type, as they had been organized in the exhibition catalogue. Speyer's design utilized the feature of winding paths, where one object would often be visible in the distance, to help guide visitors on their way through the exhibition; the technique recalls the use of vistas in *Arts of the South Seas.* The stark white walls, likewise, bear a strong resemblance to those seen in MoMA's exhibition twenty-three years earlier. Speyer originally wanted to use planks of wood, as he had done in an earlier exhibition of art from the Northwest Coast, but the idea was not implemented due to budget constraints.[474] Speyer and Wardwell's installation is very similar to the 1946 MoMA exhibition, (figs. 5.28 and 5.29) as well as the 1957 permanent installation in Brooklyn. (figs. 5.10 and 5.12) in their use of blank walls with little, if any labels, and objects that are widely spaced apart. Certainly one can deduce that the MoMA and BMA exhibitions had to have been a source for the inspiration for the 1967 exhibition in Chicago.

A few years after *Sculpture of Polynesia* closed, Wardwell published an article in *African Arts* titled "New Light on Polynesia." He notes a series of major exhibitions between 1967 and 1972 that focused on Polynesian art—his exhibition at the Art Institute of Chicago; *No Sort of Iron* in New Zealand, which celebrated the anniversary of the Cook Voyages; and the 1972 exhibition at Paris' Musée de l'Homme, *La Decouverte de la Polynésie*.[475] Most interesting are the ideas he suggests for future exhibitions of Oceanic art: a large-scale exhibition of Maori sculpture, an exhibition of Hawaiian figural sculpture, an examination of Polynesian two-dimensional design, and finally, an

---

[474] Ibid., 91.

[475] Allen Wardwell, "New Light on Polynesia," *African Arts* (1972): 49.

exhibition of lesser known objects in museums from eastern Europe and Russia—which spoke to the sentiment that holdings of American, western European, and Polynesian museums had already been exploited.[476] We know that many of these suggestions were realized, including *Te Maori* in 1984, the publication of extensive books on Hawaiian sculpture and Polynesian textiles, and barkcloth paintings. One suggestion Wardwell did not make—but which was clearly on the minds of Oceanic scholars Peter Gathercole, Adrienne Kaeppler, and Douglas Newton—was a comprehensive exhibition displaying the art of all of Oceania. This was realized at the National Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C., in the 1979 exhibition *The Art of the Pacific Islands*.

***The Art of the Pacific Islands*, National Gallery of Art, Washington D.C., 1979**

The day after the exhibition *The Art of the Pacific Islands* had its preview opening at the National Gallery of Art, an article appeared in *The Washington Post* detailing the evening's events. From the two one hundred–pound pigs that were roasted in a pit on the National Mall, to the crowd's amazement that both Paul Mellon and the Gallery's director J. Carter Brown were spotted wearing colorful floral leis (Brown going as far as to don sandals for the occasion), it was an event that the crowd of 250 was not used to seeing and perhaps foreshadowed their experience upon viewing the art displayed inside.[477]

---

[476] Ibid., 51.

[477] Daniel Radcliffe, "Luau at the Gallery," *The Washington Post* (June 29, 1979): A1.

As with the Museum of Modern Art, the National Gallery of Art does not have its own permanent collection of Oceanic or non-Western art to exhibit and instead brought together three guest curators Douglas Newton, Adrienne Kaeppler, and Peter Gathercole to curate the exhibition. In addition to the guest curators, the exhibition team included the Gallery's designers Gaillard Ravanal, Mark Leithauser, and Gordon Anson. Ravanal and chief curator Earl A. Powell III (now the Gallery's Director) coordinated the exhibition. The exhibition was the first since MoMA's 1946 show and the DeYoung's 1953 exhibition to display objects from Polynesia, Melanesia, and Micronesia together, with the prime difference being that the National Gallery's exhibition was on a much larger scale: the over four hundred objects that were loaned to the exhibition came from both national and international collections, including many objects that had never left their countries of origin. The installation was located in the Gallery's newly opened East Building, designed by well-known architect I. M. Pei and located on the concourse level in a space measuring 18,000² feet. On display from July 1, 1979 to February 17, 1980, the attendance figure for the run of the exhibition totaled 393,509.[478]

The catalogue for the exhibition includes four articles written by co-curators Newton, Kaeppler, and Gathercole. The first essay by Newton, "Continuities and Changes in Western Pacific Art," focuses on Melanesian art, while the remaining essays by Gathercole and Kaeppler focus on Polynesian and Micronesian art. Kaeppler's essay, "Aspects of Polynesian Aesthetic Traditions," defines the differences between art and aesthetics, calling for an understanding of the cultures of the makers of primitive art and criticizing that much of what has been viewed as primitive art has done little to make

[478] www.nga.gov/past/data/exh443.htm

understood the work as "manifestations of aesthetic traditions far different from our own."[479]

Peter Gathercole penned the other two essays. The first, titled "Polynesian Cultural History," discusses the origins and development of Polynesian culture. The second essay, "New Zealand Maori," is devoted to the art of the Maori. Gathercole points out that Maori art is not limited to woodcarving and weaving, and that their creative traditions extend to the literary arts, including poetry, proverbs, and songs. He notes the importance of the *haka* and the fact that songs are classified by function—love, dance, or lullaby. Gathercole explains the importance of the *marae* as an arena for performance of songs, dances, and poetry, as well as the significance of the meeting house as the physical embodiment of the tribe. To that end, he describes the carvers as the mediators between the material and immaterial world, and isolates the origin of the curvilinear style and its genesis to the northern part of the North Island. Many of Gathercole's theories relating to Maori styles are based on Sidney Mead's 1975 article in the journal *Oceania*, "The Origins of Maori Art: Polynesian or Chinese?" The article serves as a precursor to the periods in Maori art that Mead established in the catalogue for the Met's 1984 exhibition, *Te Maori: Maori Art from New Zealand Collections.*

The curators organized the National Gallery's large-scale exhibition by locality, taking the visitor on an imaginary tour of the Pacific, beginning with Hawaii and traveling westward. The entrance to the exhibition (fig. 5.32) was dominated by three Hawaiian feather cloaks, as well as an image of Kuka'ilimoku, the Hawaiian war god

---

[479] Adrienne Kaeppler, "Aspects of Polynesian Aesthetic Traditions," *The Art of the Pacific Islands* by Peter Gathercole, Adrienne L. Kaeppler, and Douglas Newton (Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1979), 77-96.

figure from the collection of the Peabody Essex Museum in Salem.[480] Once inside, the visitor encountered objects from Fiji, the Marquesas, Easter Island, the Society Islands, and the Austral Islands before entering the room featuring Maori objects, the last of the areas presented in Polynesia. On the right side of the room was a large case (fig. 5.33) that featured objects relating to canoes, including two sterns, two prows, and a bailer. The large case was bookmarked by two smaller cases, one containing an adze and a hand club, the other containing two clubs. A bargeboard and figure were affixed above the exit that headed toward a display of *Lapita* pottery on the right and a grouping of New Caledonian masks situated next to a large gable mask.

On the opposite wall (fig. 5.34) was a display of objects relating to the meeting house, including a lintel, treasure box, two figures, and an amulet. The smaller case to the right displayed small items like pendants and amulets, while the case on the left contained flutes and a very rare janiform godstick. On the back wall, above the entrance to the Maori section, was a large reproduction of an engraving after Barralet of a Maori canoe; beneath that, a photograph of a meeting house, alongside a case containing a staff. Presumably, the drawing and photograph serve to illustrate the functions of some of the objects, as the viewer will note that there is little wall text accompanying any of the figures (although there was an Acoustiguide available for rent to the exhibition visitors). In the far right corner is a meeting house panel from the Bishop Museum. The panel and the small figure displayed in the main case are the only Maori objects from American collections (the Bishop Museum and a private Honolulu collection, respectively) in the

[480] Note that this was only the second time that Kuka'ilimoku left Salem. The archives in the National Gallery of Art hold interesting correspondence relating to the loan, as well as diagrams detailing how he would travel from Salem to Washington, D.C.

exhibition. The other 30 Maori objects in the exhibition are from collections in Europe and New Zealand.

Critical reviews of the exhibition were overwhelmingly positive. All of the commentary surrounding the exhibition shared the ubiquitous sentiment, in one form or another, that these arts—from the Pacific Islands—were long overdue for recognition. Reviews commonly referred to the romantic allure of the South Seas, or that "this wasn't what you would see at Trader Vic's." In a review published in *Art in America*, freelance critic David Tannous described the exhibition as extraordinary in size, scope, and attention to detail, praising the organizers attempts to, "maintain a balance between the didactic and the spectacular."[481] In describing the Maori objects, he refers to the canoe prows as "reaching heights of invention in the swirling pierced fretwork."[482] In the end, Tannous raises the question presumably on everyone's minds: "Is this art?" Indeed it is, he believes, because the objects are so impressive: "in turn beautiful, imposing, fantastical, expressive, affecting . . . there is little problem in seeing them as art."[483]

Cumulatively, these statements attest to a growing sea change in the history of Maori art in the United States that began in 1946 at MoMA: that, upon leaving the confines of the natural history museum, the objects came to be viewed in a different manner than they had been previously, and finally received the credit and

---

[481] David Tannous, "Artifacts into Art: An Oceanic Extravaganza," *Art in America*, vol. 68 (January 1980): 93.

[482] Ibid., 95.

[483] Ibid., 97.

acknowledgment they for so long deserved.[484] The Pacific exhibition at the National Gallery of Art played a role in a growing trend in the presentation of Oceanic art—as art, in art museums, and interestingly enough, curated by anthropologists, two of whom were working in natural history museums at the time they were planning the exhibition.

Te Maori: Maori Art from New Zealand Collections,
Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, New York, 1984

On exhibit for sixteen weeks at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, *Te Maori: Maori Art from New Zealand Collections* ranks among the most important displays of Maori art and culture ever—not just in the United States, but globally. The exhibition closed in New York on Jan. 6, 1985, but has lived on, for a full generation—through its exhibition catalogue, its influence on future exhibitions of Oceanic art, its groundbreaking precedent of including Maori elders in the planning process, and the numerous reviews and pages of scholarly literature it has generated. In sum, *Te Maori* had an enormous impact in 1984 and has revealed its importance over and over again in the specialist literatures concerning the museological practices surrounding the Maori, Oceanic art and, more broadly, has functioned as an arbiter of change in display policies and museum management for non-Western art as a whole.[485]

---

[484] See more reviews of the National Gallery of Art exhibition in *The Washington Post*, June 30, 1979; *Washington Post Magazine*, July 1, 1979; and "Oceania" by Allen Wardwell in the February/March 1980 issue of *American Craft*.

[485] See also George Corbin's review of the exhibition in the newsletter, *Museum Studies: New York University* (Fall/Winter 1984): 4; Adrienne L. Kaeppler's paper from the 1990 *Taonga Maori* conference published in 1992; and Peter Gathercole's essay, *'Te Maori' in*

Te Maori boasted many innovative and ground-breaking "firsts." It was the first time a major exhibition of Maori art had ever been organized; it was the first time Maori elders had been included in the consulting and curatorial processes; it was the first time most of the objects had ever left New Zealand; and it was the first time an opening of an art exhibition had ever been on the front page of the *New York Times*.

Over 140 objects were displayed in the exhibition, and visitors entering for the first time were greeted by large reproduction of a work by George French Angas (fig. 5.35). The exhibition was on an open plan that, like MoMA's 1946 exhibition, allowed visitors to see other objects in proximity while they examined the one immediately in front of them. Large moveable walls with titles like the "The Fort" and "The Storehouse" (fig. 5.36) dotted the floor plan, introducing the various headings around which the objects were organized. To introduce the concept of the Maori fort, one of the largest objects to travel with the exhibition, the Gateway of *Pukeroa Pa*, (*Te Huringa* 1 period, 1800-present) measuring sixteen feet, five and a half inches, also functioned as the symbolic gateway to the exhibition. The male figure depicted in the gateway represents the figure *Tutenkai*. Restored for the exhibition, the figure's face is tattooed and is covered with various symbols and iconography. When preparators discovered that the piece was too large to fit through the museum's freight elevator, they decided the only way to get the gateway to the second floor of the Met was to carry it up the front steps. A spectacular photograph (fig. 5.37) shows seventeen men carrying the Pukeroa gateway up the steps (somewhat incongruously into an area labeled "Paintings"). The concept of the

---

the Longer View in *Pacific Art: Persistence, Change, and Meaning,* eds. Anita Herle, Nick Stanley, Karen Stevenson, and Robert L. Welsh, (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2002): 271-279.

Maori fort was also emphasized by a recreation of a fence (fig. 5.38) that bordered one edge of the exhibition, with alternating Maori figures—notably, *Pukaki,* (*Te Huringa* 1 period, 1800-present) whose later return to its tribe was documented in Paul Tapsell's book, *Pukaki : A Comet Returns* (fig. 5.39).

Just behind the Gateway of *Pukeroa Pa* is a section marked "The Storehouse," which re-creates a Maori storehouse by hanging together two bargeboards and a finial figure; just beyond is the re-creation of a Maori meeting house constructed in a similar fashion (fig. 5.40). The architectural pieces and a perceived fragmentation of the exhibition were discussed by John Russell in his review of the exhibition for the *New York Times*. He wrote,

> [W]e find that the exhibition is not large and that almost all the objects are fragmentary. Bargeboards and gable apex are shown in isolation. Paddles are shown, but not a complete canoe. There is a gateway to a fort, and very impressive, but the gateway leads nowhere. The meeting house, without which Maori societies would have found it hard to exist, is likewise in vestigial form. Looking at these things, a line of Eliot's 'Waste Land' comes to mind: "'These fragments I have shored against my ruins.'"[486]

Russell's comments may be valid; however, aesthetically speaking, it is worth noting that it would have been logistically impossible to display an entire meetinghouse, for example. On the other hand, it would have been impossible to neglect some mention of the meetinghouse, given its significance in Maori culture. Objects surrounding the pseudo-house included various types of architectural structures such as lintels and posts,

---

[486] John Russell, "Almost-Lost Art of Maoris at Met," *The New York Times* (September 14, 1984): C 1 & 22.

while a collection of twentieth century weapons are displayed in a case on the adjacent wall (on the lower left of the photograph). A case in the center of the photograph contains smaller objects like adzes and hair combs. (fig. 5.41).

In a final section of the exhibition, the talisman of the ancestor named *Uenukutuwhatu* (nicknamed *Uenuku)* was featured (fig. 5.42, on the left, *Te Tipunga*, 1200-1500). Carved from wood, the figure stands eight feet, nine inches tall and is a rainbow war god. His inclusion in the exhibition was an example of a Maori elder overriding the wishes of a New Zealand museum employee. Of the disagreement, Douglas Newton wrote,

> In at least one case, Maori overruled Pakeha curators who wished not to send works, in particular the great carving of the rainbow war god Uenuku. His tribal custodian Ariki Nui Dame te Ata I Rangi Kaahu said grandly that Uenuku had led the ancestors to New Zealand, and he should lead them to New York[487]

Carol O'Biso gives another account, one that relates Uenuku's perceived spiritual powers, with the recounting of an unusual freezing storm that hit New York the day the exhibition pieces were to travel to Saint Louis. O'Biso's plan, originally, was to take large pieces out first, down the steps of the museum, followed by the smaller pieces like Uenuku. Because of the storm, however, Uenuku would have to be taken out first. "It had been my plan always to have Uenuku with me," O'Biso writes. "...The queen had said that if the exhibition was to go it must be led by the spirit of Uenuku. Uenuku at that moment was leading the spirit of Te Maori to Saint Louis. It was a bit extreme of him, I thought, to freeze the entire Eastern Seaboard just so he could go first. There were subtler

---

[487] Newton, 1994, 284.

ways he could have reminded me."[488] Aside from *Uenuku*, the exhibition near him included a bowl (*kumete*) and canoe bow cover (*haumi*), also from the *Te Tipunga* period (1200-1500). On the wall are various illustrative reproductions of the Maori by European artists.

The publication for the exhibition was edited by Sidney (Hirini) Moko Mead, co-curator, and includes a catalogue written by D. R. Simmons, as well as eight essays written by Mead and Simmons and three former lecturers from Victoria University in Wellington—Agnes Sullivan, Anne Salmond, and Bernie Kernot. The sixth essayist, Piri Sciasa, was the assistant director to the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council. Titles of the essays are given in both Maori and English. It is in this publication that Mead establishes the following periods in the history of Maori art: *Nga Kakano*/The Seeds (900–1200); *Te Tipunga*/The Growth (1200–1500); *Te Puawaitanga*/The Flowering (1500–1800); and *Te Huringa*/The Turning (1800–present).[489] In his essay, Mead also establishes that *taonga whakairo* is the closest Maori term that can be used to describe a Maori object, declaring, "Every item in the present exhibition is a *taonga* of this sort because each is also very old, a few centuries old."[490]

The essay by Agnes Sullivan, "The Roots of Maori Culture," establishes the prehistory of the Polynesians and asserts that no other culture before the Maori inhabited New Zealand. Sullivan's essay is followed by another by Mead, "Becoming Maori Art,"

---

[488] Carol O'Biso, *First Light* (Auckland: Heinemann, 1987), 152.

[489] Sidney Moko Mead, "The Ebb and Flow of Mana Maori and the Changing Context of Maori Art," in *Te Maori: Maori Art from New Zealand Collections,* ed. Sidney Moko Mead (New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc, 1984), 34–35.

[490] Ibid., 22.

which looks at the development of Maori art through the ages up to the 1980s. "Tribal Art Styles," by D. R. Simmons (also the author of the catalogue entries) follows, identifying some previously unknown tribal styles. Following is Anne Salmond's essay, "Pathways in the Maori World," discusses the "conceptual pathways of the Maori world" and provides a glimpse into Maori life in 1769. Bernie Kernot then looks at specific carvers and training techniques in "Maori Artist of Time Before." The final essay, Piri Sciasa's cleverly titled "As the Old Net Piles Onshore, the New Net Goes Fishing," discusses the then-current state of Maori affairs, and what the current exhibition represented to him then.[491]

The long planning process for *Te Maori* began in 1973, when Douglas Newton was the curator of the Museum of Primitive Art in New York, and the Consul-General of New Zealand inquired if the museum might be interested in a show of Maori art from New Zealand museums. The idea piqued his interest, but Newton quickly realized that the show would feature many large, important objects—too many, and too big, to fit into the tiny Museum of Primitive Art. Consequently, he diverted the request to Wilder Green, head of the American Federation of Arts, who agreed, with Newton's help, to undertake the exhibition. The planning process went forward, and Newton's first step was sorting through a stack of seven hundred photographs of the most important objects housed in New Zealand museums, from which he composed a wish list—knowing, of course, that not all of the desired objects would be available for loan.[492]

---

[491] Mead summarizes the eight essays in his introductory essay, "The Ebb and Flow…," 34–36.

[492] Newton, 1984, 280–281.

Six years later, in 1979, representatives of the Art Galleries and Museums Associations of New Zealand (AGMANZ) and the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council came to New York to discuss and set guidelines for the exhibition. Remarking on the meeting, Newton wrote:

> The museums might nominally own the objects, but the Maori had never relinquished their spiritual ownership of them and their right of control, a position with which many of the museum's curators were in agreement. There would have to be full Maori participation in, and agreement to, anything that was to take place, and the New Zealanders themselves had already fully accepted this principle. Naturally, we also did, not only because we had no alternative, but because we believed the principle was just.[493]

New Zealand museums hold Maori objects in trust for the Maori but, due to the items' cultural and spiritual value, do not own them outright. Maori art had traveled to the United States for exhibitions in the past, such as for *Sculpture of Polynesia* in 1967 and *Art of the Pacific Islands* in 1979, but Maori elders had never been consulted, making their inclusion in the consulting and curatorial processes of *Te Maori* that much more significant.

Michael Ames, in an essay titled "Biculturalism in Exhibitions," points out that *Te Maori*'s inclusion of Maori elders in its planning may not have been an entirely altruistic concession. Ames writes:

> New Zealand museums may have been more progressive or virtuous, or they may simply have made a realistic judgment about the politics of the situation. Maori have more political influence in New Zealand, constituting ten percent of the population . . . so New Zealand museums probably realized they would have

[493] Ibid., 281.

> problems with the government as well as with local tribes if they didn't seek permission. Yet virtue is still virtue, however motivated, and it sets a precedent that henceforth will be impossible to ignore." [494]

This concession was also noted by James Clifford who remarked on the exhibition, stating, "*Te Maori,* a show visiting the Metropolitan, clearly establishes that the 'art' on display is still sacred, on loan not merely from certain New Zealand museums but also from the Maori people."[495] Altruistic or not, the collaboration between museum curators and Maori elders set a precedent—a museological principle, if you will—that "permission of originating peoples should be obtained before agreement to loan . . . to oversees museums."[496]

More technical points were established: the exhibition would show sculptural objects in wood, stone, bone, and ivory, but would eschew the display of preserved tattooed heads (*moko mokai)* and weavings and featherworks (these were too fragile and deemed too sacred, having been worn on the backs of ancestors). These omissions provoked criticism of Newton's curatorial approach and of the exhibition itself. One critic, Greg McManus, wrote:

> [Newton's] choices were based solely on aesthetic quality and artistic excellence as he perceived it, not on any significance they may have had in Maori terms. He chose only objects from the period before 1860 (an arbitrary date chosen presumably to predate any significant European influence in Maori

---

[494] Michael Ames, "Biculturalism in Museums," *Museum Anthropology*, vol. 15, no. 2 (May 1991): 12.

[495] James Clifford, *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988), 209.

[496] Ames, 12.

> art); and he chose only objects in wood, stone, and bone, thus effectively excluding the work of women who mostly work with [fiber] materials in the production of weaving and basket-work. In addition, no attempt was made to provide geographic or tribal coverage—some tribes were represented by a number of objects while others were completely unrepresented in the final selection."[497]

McManus' critique that the choices were based solely on aesthetic quality is partially valid—although one cannot overlook that such aesthetic choices are, in fact, the very job of an art curator; Newton's mission was to treat *Te Maori* as an art exhibition, not merely as an exhibition of artifacts.[498] McManus' second critique—that objects dated before 1860—is invalid for two reasons. First because it was actually 1880; second, at the time—sixteen years ago—authentic Maori art was perceived to have been made prior to European contact and, thus, influence. McManus' criticism that women's art was excluded was answered by Newton's statement that the featherwork was deemed too fragile and sacred to travel. McManus' final criticism, that there was not more of an attempt at even-handed coverage of each tribe, is moot because Newton worked necessarily within the confines handed to him by AGMANZ and the Queen's art council—specifically, that not all objects he wanted would have been available to loan. It was up to the tribal elders to decide that, not Newton. In some sense, it [what?] recalls his

---

[497] Greg McManus, "The 'Te Maori' exhibition and the Future of Museology in New Zealand," in *Museums and Europe 1992*, ed. Susan Pearce (London: The Athlone Press, 1992), 193.

[498] For further discussion regarding display techniques of non-Western art, see Susan Vogel's 1988 exhibition catalogue from the Center for African Arts, *Art/Artifact: African Art in Anthropology Collections*.

earlier critique of using only aesthetic criteria to pick objects, which could have perhaps been conceded if Newton had instead selected objects according to geographical location.

The next task was to meet with the Maori Elders and officials from New Zealand museums; of the experience, Newton recalls,, "...and willy-nilly I was launched into one of the most extraordinary experiences of my life."[499] He traveled throughout New Zealand, negotiating with tribal elders, and was shocked to learn that many with whom he spoke were unaccustomed to the idea of loaning objects to other museums. Their primary fear was that their objects would not be returned. Newton's job became one of educator, explaining how American museums functioned and why exhibitions like *Te Maori* were important.[500]

Having established which objects would travel, it was also decided that the exhibition, after opening at the Met, would travel to Saint Louis, San Francisco, and Chicago. After its run in the United States the show would do a "return home" tour, visiting Auckland, Wellington, Christchurch, and Dunedin. The attendance records are staggering. In the United States, a total of 621,000 visitors saw the exhibition. But in New Zealand, approximately 900,000 saw the show—a number comprising 28% of the entire New Zealand population.[501]

Another stipulation placed on the exhibition by the Maori elders takes us to the next phase of the exhibition. Keeping in mind that the Maori believe that their art holds the spirits of their ancestors, a dawn ceremony was to take place at the opening of each

---

[499] Newton, 1994, 282.

[500] Ibid.

[501] Ibid., 285. Note that the population figure for New Zealand was from 1994 and has increased since then.

venue, in order to welcome the ancestors to the United States and ask them to receive all visitors attending the exhibition in peace. Certainly it was like nothing New York, much less the Metropolitan Museum of Art, had seen in its then-114-year history. At 6:32 a.m. on September 10, 1984, a group of Maori and their elders, museum officials, and executives from Mobil Oil (the exhibition's sponsor) assembled on the steps of the museum (fig. 5.43). New York Times writer Douglas McGill recorded what then occurred:

> At sunrise yesterday, five elderly Maori women standing at the top of the Metropolitan's outdoor steps cried out in eerie voices, like loons, to beckon the Maoris up the steps. The group was led by two warriors who wore only loincloths and swirling facial tattoos and carried long wooden clubs. The warriors stayed about five feet ahead of the group, walking in a crouch, raising their eyebrows, sticking out their tongues and repeatedly jabbing the air ahead of them with their clubs to beat away invisible evil spirits. Inside the museum, the group walked slowly to the second-floor exhibition hall, where the artworks are displayed. In a monotone chant, the elders faced each large sculpture and spoke to the ancestor spirits within. After all of them were welcomed, the entire group sang songs of greeting before a crowd of museum employees and reporters. Just when the ceremony seemed over and the crowd began to mingle, the two warriors screamed and broke into a war dance of fierce grimacing and combat postures. [502]

McGill's account expresses the impressive manner in which these objects were presented to the New York audience. It was an event that took place at each venue throughout the exhibition's run.

Other reviews provide insight into the climate in which *Te Maori* was presented. John Russell of the *New York Times* accurately sums up the problem and the eventual

---

[502] Douglas McGill, "A Dawn Ritual Prepares Maori Sculpture for Opening at Met," *The New York Times* (September 11, 1984): c15.

triumph of these pieces—survival—from the ages and through years of Christian missionary attempts made by the British in the nineteenth century. Russell quotes Martin Heidegger—who, he felt, best summed up the poignancy of the exhibition when he wrote, "The works are on view, in exhibitions. But are they there, really there, in themselves? They are no longer what they once were. We see them, to be sure. But they themselves have moved on, and are elsewhere."[503] Another critic, Kim Levin from the *Village Voice,* remarked, "[T]he Maori objects looked to me like truly primitive primitive art."[504]

Besides her critique of *Te Maori*, Levin discusses what she has termed a "tribal revival" in New York City—a proliferation of "primitive" art events occurring around the same time. Besides the Met, the Museum of Modern Art was hosting *Primitivism in the Twentieth Century*; the American Museum of Natural History had *Asante: Kingdom of Gold*; the Center for African Art hosted *African Masterpieces from the Musée de l'Homme*; and the IBM Gallery of Science and Art held *Out of the Mists: Northwest Coast Art*.[505] From all of the concurrent exhibitions, Levin concluded, "Follow the MoMA show to its logical conclusions and you'll end up believing there was never any such thing as Modern Art. And as for tribal art, as the anthropologist said to the art collector who asked how he liked the collection of primitive art: that's not art, that's medicine."[506] Clearly Levin was not a fan of "primitive art," and believed that illusions

---

[503] Ibid.

[504] Kim Levin, "New York's Tribal Revival: Rethinking the Ideals of Modern Art," in *Village Voice* (October 30, 1984): 109.

[505] Ibid.

made between so-called primitive art and modern art threatened the legitimacy of the latter.

Levin was not the only critic of the *Te Maori* exhibition. Douglas McGill used the exhibition as an example of corporate gain through art funding, writing:

> Art exhibits are also used in straightforward corporate diplomacy. Mobil, for example, sponsored the recent Maori sculpture exhibition at the Metropolitan Museum in an effort to foster good relations with the New Zealand Government, with whom it is a partner in the building of a plant to convert natural gas to gasoline in that country.[507]

For the Maori themselves, the feeling was much different, and the effects of *Te Maori* on New Zealand museological practices have been long lasting. One of the exhibition's co-curators, Maori scholar Hirini Moko Mead, wrote:[508]

> It can be argued...that the great accomplishment of the MMA was that it dramatically changed the definition of Maori art from a predominantly ethnographic, tribal and relatively unknown tradition into an international one of the stature of the great art traditions of Egypt, Greece, Rome and China. This was done, not only by changing the context of our art from that of a museum of natural history to a museum of art, but also by displaying it, in the Metropolitan particularly, alongside examples of the great traditions just mentioned . . . At home Maori art has characteristically been kept in ethnographic museums or in museums of natural history. In this sort of institution the indigenous culture of the land is presented as an integral part of the natural environment . . . we were inclined to accept rather uncritically this contextual and not very flattering

---

[506] Ibid.

[507] Douglas McGill, "Art World Subtly Shifts to Corporate Patronage," *The New York Times* (February 5, 1985): section C, p. 14, c. 3–6.

[508] Hirini Moko Mead, *Magnificent Te Maori: Te Maori Whakahirahira* (Wellington: Heinemann, 1986), 23.

> definition of ourselves and our culture. With all the best intentions in the world, the anthropological and museum views of American Indians and Maori have not achieved much in uplifting the self esteem of native people, nor in changing the attitudes of the dominant population towards them.

A 1997 study conducted by the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa National Services—"Bicultural Developments in Museums of Aotearoa: What Is the Current Status?"—sought to develop strategies to achieve appropriate levels of participation in the management, care, interpretation, presentation, and preservation of *taonga* Maori by the year 2000. The study also suggests ways to increase Maori involvement within New Zealand museums. This quote taken from the study describes the importance of *Te Maori*:

> "[The exhibition was] perhaps the catalyst for the changing face of Maori within our museums. Many have made the observation that it was the public of the United States who alerted New Zealanders to the value of the *taonga* that had been on display in our larger museums for the greater part of the century . . . Since *Te Maori,* it has no longer been acceptable to embark on a presentation of things Maori within a New Zealand museum without the appropriate approval, support, and involvement of Maori people . . . Since *Te Maori,* a bicultural agenda has been adopted . . . active Maori participation, on staff and boards has come to be expected.[509]

The critical reviews are a strange division between, on one side, the Maori avidly embracing the idea of having their art displayed at a major art institution, while on the

---

[509] Gerard O'Regan, *Bicultural Developments in Museums of Aotearoa: What Is the Current Status? Ki te Whakamana I te Kaupapa Tikanga-a-rua ki roto I nga Whare Taonga o te Motu: kei hea e tu ana?* (Wellington: Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa National Services, 1997), 6–7.

other side, American critics seem to disdain the idea, believing that having non-Western objects in American art museums detracts from the art and culture of those same originating peoples.

All that I have outlined is now dépassé in the eyes of Maori specialists. What is not as well known, however, is the prehistory (or pre–*Te Maori* history) of Maori art and culture and its public display in the United States. This history had a direct impact on the subjects and presentation of the objects, the exhibition photographs, and the catalogues—even what one might call the "look and feel" of the 1984 exhibition; this is what I present here. However, I do not want to suggest that this 1946–1984 exhibition history in New York is isolated from other American or European presentations; it is not. The emphasis here, instead, is on how Maori art and culture was exhibited and published in the United States, and how that has greatly affected the consumption of Maori culture between 1946 and 1984. Whether or not *Te Maori* can truly be classified as a watershed event is certainly up for debate, but a photograph to end this chapter and this dissertation may aptly summarize my findings. In 1999, on a visit to the Maori Arts and Crafts Institute in Rotorua on the North Island of New Zealand, I came across one of the carver's studios. Lying among the wood and tools was a well-used copy of the *Te Maori* catalogue (fig. 5.44). The poignancy of the moment and the subsequent documentary photograph is an indication of the long-lasting effects of a single exhibition and a reminder of how these types of exhibitions live on in history—rendering the ephemeral qualities of the temporary exhibition somehow less transient.

CONCLUSION

Before this dissertation, no study had ever looked holistically at the history of the display and collection of Maori art in the United States. This is a surprising fact, as there are many American collections rich with Maori objects, in addition to the multitude of important, if not watershed, American exhibitions that have included Maori art. As mentioned in the introduction to this thesis, similar studies have been made regarding the institutional histories of Maori collections in Europe and New Zealand, such as the companion catalogue to the British Museum's 1998 exhibition *Maori Art* or the recent work of Conal McCarthy on the history of display at New Zealand's National Museum. This examination differs from the others because there are no early colonial or missionary connections between the United States and New Zealand. A relationship free from religious or political undertones is an ideal framework for examining what happens to non-Western art when it is collected and displayed outside its country of origin.

The beginning of the historical narrative confirmed that the collections at the Peabody Essex Museum in Salem, Massachusetts provide an unparalleled look at early collecting practices, as well as documented examples of Maori art made at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Additionally, it established why whalers and ship captains were in the Pacific in the early nineteenth-century and why they were collecting "curiosities" that later were donated to New England museums.

Significantly, the early history of American museums revealed a ubiquitous truth: that there was no systematic method to acquire Maori objects by American museums. The variety of acquisition techniques and accompanying stories of how certain objects came to light were important contributions to the field because they revealed the multitude of ways objects entered collections based solely on archival documentation.

The dissertation firmly established the relationship between American museums and American world's fairs, identifying where Maori objects were located at each of the featured fairs, what types of objects were on display, and where those objects now reside. Perhaps one of the most important revelations in looking at the presentation of Maori art and culture at American world's fairs was that unlike many of their non-Western counterparts, Maori art was rarely placed in anthropological displays or used as a foil to demonstrate the Western world's dominance over non-Western cultures. The inclusion of the Maori was most often a tool of promoting tourism, not of promoting racial superiority.

Another pivotal discovery made in this examination was the relationship between the natural history and art museums. The collection data confirms that natural history museums in the United States have far more of and a higher quality of objects than their art museum counterparts and that an assumed fissure between the two types of museums by scholars in the late 1990's simply does not exist. Archival documentation revealed countless examples of the term "art" being used to describe objects in natural history museums, as well as anthropologists who had an eye on both the didactic and aesthetic qualities of the objects displayed in their museums. Additionally, the historical accounts

of curators of primitive art working in natural history museums and of anthropologists working as curators in art museums blurs the line between the two factions even more.

Of the many threads that run through this study, one of the most important identifies the cast of characters involved and how their professional and personal histories intersect. This dissertation is one of the first studies to look at Margaret Mead's papers in the American Museum of Natural History and synthesize the volumes of memoranda and correspondence regarding her career culminating and, in some views career ending, *Peoples of the Pacific Hall* that opened in 1971. We are lucky that Margaret Mead maintained such extensive correspondence so that the process of undertaking an exhibition of that magnitude could be documented. Because of that documentation, one can fairly judge the outcome of the exhibition and the ensuing criticism of her intentions.

In terms of characters, none are as colorful as W.O. Oldman and T.E. Donne. Both were collectors and dealers of Maori art, but had decidedly different styles and approaches to the discipline. This study brings together their personal histories and uncovers the influence they had over the shape and characteristic of Maori art in American museums.

The question remains, where do we go from here? As for future research and study, there are many areas yet to be researched. One possible avenue of research would be to take the corpus of objects presented in this study and identify common stylistic traits and trends between similar types of objects and then cross-reference those commonalities with their collection histories. This would provide important information as to where the objects were originally made and collected, as well as identify possible common collecting traits among American museums. In turn, the research could then be

compared to similar objects collected in the same time period abroad, to see if there is a quintessentially American taste for certain types of Maori objects, or if what was being collected simply reflects what was available.

Another area that merits future study is the W.O. Oldman collection. While the collection that was sold to the New Zealand government is well documented, the objects that were sold by Oldman to Penn, as well as the related correspondence between him and the institution deserve a closer look. Focused study on the topic would further document the often-difficult relationship between dealer and institution, as well as provide the framework for a comparison between Oldman objects in American museums versus those now in New Zealand museums.

Also warranting further study is the photograph of the display in the New Zealand section of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition in 1904 (fig. 2.10). Little, if any examination has been completed towards tracking down each individual painting that was on display. It would be interesting to bring together all of the pieces that were once displayed at the fair for a re-examination of what was being presented to an American audience at the beginning of the twentieth century.

Finally, the 1946 MoMA exhibition merits further study into its influence on future display techniques of Oceanic and non-Western art. This would require looking at the archival records of Linton, Wingert, and d'Harnoncourt, as well as examining all of the available archival photographs of the entire exhibition. A more in-depth investigation of the material might also reveal what the outside influences of the exhibition were and what influence modernists like Alexander Dorner had on the exhibition.

As I finish this dissertation, major events in the field are taking place inside and

outside of the United States which will set set the tone for the next century and be the basis for a continuing postscript to this study. European collections of non-Western art are being merged into larger fine arts museums, as is the collection of the Museum of Mankind with the British Museum. French government officials are prescribing mandates for the permanent display of non-Western art in the Louvre, while the opening of Paris' newest museum devoted to non-Western art, the Musée de Quai Branly was greeted with a lukewarm reception by critics. During the summer of 2006, an Australian news agency reported that young Aboriginal people were going to be put on display in the lobbies of upscale Australian hotels, harkening back to the days of the 1904 fair in Saint Louis.

In the United States an important advance in the display and collection of non-Western art was made with the opening of the National Museum of the American Indian on the National Mall in Washington in 2004. The current renovations of the installations of Oceanic art at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Brooklyn Museum of Art, and the Smithsonian's National Museum of Natural History, will provide opportunities to study the future of Oceanic art in the United States. All of these events in combination will surely continue the work of this dissertation that has synthesized the divergent history of Maori art in the United States.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary sources

Unpublished accession records, Division of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY

Unpublished memoranda and correspondence. Hall of the Pacific People folders. Division of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY

Unpublished accession records, Registrar's Office, The Field Museum, Chicago, IL

Unpublished documents, Archives, The Field Museum.

Unpublished documents. Papers of Margaret Mead. Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Unpublished catalogue entries. Department of Art of Africa, Oceania, and the Americas, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, NY.

Unpublished accession records, Department of Anthropology Archives, National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution, Suitland, MD

Unpublished catalog cards, Department of Anthropology Archives, National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution, Suitland, MD

Unpublished correspondence, USNM DOE Oceania: New Zealand MS and Printed/ National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution, Suitland, MD

Unpublished correspondence, National Library of New Zealand, Wellington, New Zealand.

Unpublished correspondence, Smithsonian Institution Archives, Washington, D.C.

Unpublished accession cards, Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University.

Unpublished accession files, Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University.

Unpublished specimen labels, Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University.

Unpublished Cope Letters, Archives, University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology.

Unpublished Oldman letters, Archives, University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology.

Secondary sources

Ames, Michael. "Biculturalism in Museums." *Museum Anthropology*, v. 15, n. 2 (May 1991): 12.

----------*Cannibal Tours and Glass Boxes: The Anthropology of Museums*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 1992.

Angas, George F. *The New Zealanders Illustrated*. London: Thomas Mc Lean, 1847

----------*Savage Life and Scenes in Australia and New Zealand*. London: Smith, Elder, and Co., 1847.

Annual Report of the Director to the Board of Trustees for the Year 1924. Field Museum of Natural History Publication. v. VI, no. 4 (January 1925).

Annual Report of the Director to the Board of Trustees for the Year 1925. Field Museum of Natural History Publication. v. VI, no. 5 (January 1926).

Annual Report of the Director to the Trustees. Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum. 1898-

"Appendix 1 The Field Museum's Anthropology Curators and Staff Members, 1893-2002." In *Fieldiana "Curators, Collections, and Contexts: Anthropology at the Field Museum, 1893-2002"* Anthropology, New Series, no. 36 eds. Stephen E. Nash and Gary M. Feinman. (September 30, 2003), 259-261.

Art/Artifact: African Art In Anthropology Collections with essays by Arthur Danto et.al. New York: Center for African Art, 1988.

"The Art Galleries: The Modern Museum and Other Problems." *New Yorker* (Feb. 2, 1946):

"Art of the South Seas." *Architectural Forum*, v. 84, no. 5 (May 1946): 98.

Baker, William. *The History of the Boston Marine Society*. Boston: The Society, 1982.

Bancroft, Hubert Howe. *The Book of the Fair*. Chicago, San Francisco: The Bancroft Company, 1893, 639.

Barrow, Terence. *The Decorative Arts of New Zealand*. Wellington: A.H. and A.W Reed, 1964.

Bateson, Gregory. "Arts of the South Seas," *Art Bulletin*, v. 28, no. 2, (June 1946): 119-123.

Bell, Leonard. *Colonial Constructs: European Images of the Maori, 1840-1914.* Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1992.

----------"The Representation of the Maori by European Artists in New Zealand, ca. 1890-1914." *Art Journal*, no. 2 (Summer 1990): 142-148.

Bennitt, Mark, *History of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition*. Saint Louis: Universal Exposition Publishing Company, 1905.

Boas, Franz. Primitive Art. Oslo: H. Aschehoug & Co. (W. Nygaard), 1927.

Brigham, William T. *A Handbook for Visitors to the Bernice Pauha Bishop Museum of Polynesian Ethnology and Natural History*. Honolulu, 1903.

The Brooklyn Museum Handbook. Brooklyn: The Brooklyn Museum, 1967.

Brown, Deidre. *Tai Tokerau Whakairo Rākau: Northland Māori Wood Carving*. Auckland: Reed Books, 2003

Buck, Peter H. *Vikings of the Pacific*. Chicago: The University Press of Chicago, 1938.

Bulletin. Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum. 1927-

Canaday, John. "I Could Cry, I Could Just Cry." *The New York Times*. (May 30, 1971): p. D19.

Clifford, James. *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988.

Cole, Douglas. *Captured Heritage: The Scramble for Northwest Coast Artifacts.* Norman: The University of Oklahoma Press, 1985.

Collier, Donald. "My Life with Exhibits at the Field Museum, 1941-1976." *Fieldiana "Curators, Collections, and Contexts: Anthropology at the Field Museum, 1893-2002,"* New Series, no. 36 eds. Stephen E. Nash and Gary M. Feinman. (September 30, 2003): 199-220.

Cook, James. *The Journals of Captain Cook: Prepared from the Original Manuscripts by J. C. Beaglehole for the Hakluyt Society, 1955–67*. Selected and edited by Philip Edwards. London: Penguin Books, 1999.

Corbin, George A. Review of *Te Maori: Maori Art from New Zealand Collections*, Sidney Moko Mead, ed. *Museum Studies Newsletter* (New York University) (1984): 4.

Covarrubius, Miguel. "Art of the South Seas." *Vogue* (Feb. 1, 1946): 128-130.

Davenport, William H. "The Curators Write: A History of the Museum's Polynesian Collection." *Expedition*, 24, 2 (Winter, 1982): 1-2.

Davidson, D. Sutherland. "The Oceanic Collections of the University Museum," *University Museum Bulletin*, v. 12, n. 3–4 (June, 1947):

De Montebello, Philippe. "Director's Note," *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin, v.* xxxix, n. 2 (Fall 1981): 3-10.

Dodge, Ernest Stanley. *New England and the South Seas*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.

----------*The New Zealand Maori Collection in the Peabody Museum of Salem*. Portland, Maine: The Southworth-Anthoensen Press, 1941.

----------and Edwin T. Brewster. "The Acoustics of Three Maori Flutes," in *The Journal of the Polynesian Society*, vol. 54, no. 1 (March 1945): 56.

Donne, T. E. *Catalogue of Exhibits made by the New Zealand Government at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition*. Saint Louis: Little and Becker Printing Co., 1904.

Dorfman, Ron, ed. *Ruatepupuke: A Maori Meeting House*. Chicago: The Field Museum of Chicago, 1994.

Driscoll, Edgar J. "Ernest Stanley Dodge, 66, Author, Museum Director," *Boston Globe.* (Feb. 10, 1980): 1.

Dwyer, Jane Powell and Edward Bridgman Dwyer. *Traditional Art of Africa, Oceania, and the Americas.* San Francisco: Fine Arts Museums, 1973.

The East India Marine Society of Salem. Salem: Salem-Press-Palfray, Ives, Foote & Brown, 1821.

Errington, Shelly. *The Death of Authentic Primitive Art and Other Tales of Progress*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

Fane, Diana. "The Language of Things: Stewart Culin as Collector." In *Objects of Myth*

and Memory: American Indian Art at The Brooklyn Museum. Diana Fane, Ira Jacknis, and Lise M. Breen, eds. Brooklyn, NY: The Brooklyn Museum in association with University of Washington Press, 1991.

Flam, Jack with Miriam Deutch, eds. *Primitivism and Twentieth-Century art: A Documentary History*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press, 2003.

Force, Roland W. Force and Maryanne Force. *The Fuller Collection of Pacific Artifacts.* New York and Washington: Praeger Publishers, 1971.

Gathercole, Peter. "New Zealand Maori." In *The Art of the Pacific Islands*, Peter Gathercole, Adrienne L. Kaeppler, and Douglas Newton, 97-100. Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1979.

----------"Polynesian Cultural History." In *The Art of the Pacific Islands*, Peter Gathercole, Adrienne L. Kaeppler, and Douglas Newton, 67-76. Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1979.

----------"'Te Maori' in the Longer View." In *Pacific Art: Persistence, Change, and Meaning,* eds. Anita Herle, Nick Stanley, Karen Stevenson, and Robert L. Welsch, 271-290. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2002.

----------, Adrienne L. Kaeppler, and Douglas Newton. *The Art of the Pacific Islands.* Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1979.

Glueck, Grace. "A Spectacular New Wing," *The New York Times Magazine*. (January 24, 1982): sm20.

Goldwater, Robert. "Introduction," in *Art of Oceania, Africa, and the Americas from the Museum of Primitive Art*. Great Britain: The Curwen Press Ltd., 1969, n.p.

Goode, G. Browne. "Report Upon the Exhibit of the Smithsonian Institution and the United States National Museum at he Cotton States and International Exposition, Atlanta, GA., 1895." *Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution Showing the Operations, Expenditures, and Condition of the Institution to July, 1896* (Washington: Government Printing Office,1898): 613-635.

Gordon, George Byron. "The Functions of the Modern Museum," *The Museum Journal*. v. II, n.1 (March 1911): 2.

Guide to the Collections the University Museum. Philadelphia: The University Museum, University of Pennsylvania, 1965.

Guide to the Museum of the Peabody Academy of Science (East India Marine Building). Salem, 1901.

Guide to the Peabody Museum. Salem: Newcomb & Gauss Co, 1937.

Haddon, A.C. and James Hornell. *Canoes of Oceania*. Bernice P. Bishop Museum Special Publications 27, 28, and 29. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press,1936. Reprint, Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1997.

Hall, H. U., "Maori Wood Carving and Moko." *The Museum Journal*, v. XI, n. 4 (December 1920): 212-244.

Hamilton, Augustus. "A Maripi or scarifying knife, and a pare, or carved door lintel in the Salem Museum, U.S.A." *Dominion Museum Bulletin*, n. 3 (1911): 106-107.

Hanson, Allan. "Art and the Maori Construction of Reality." In *Art and Artists of Oceania,* ed. Sidney M. Mead and Bernie Kernot, 210-225. New Zealand: Dunmore Press, 1983.

----------and Louise Hanson. "The Eye of the Beholder: A Short History of the Study of Maori Art." In *Art and Identity in Oceania,* eds. Allan Hanson and Louise Hanson, 184-195. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1990.

Hart, Robert A. *The Great White Fleet: Its Voyage Around the World 1907-1909*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1965.

Henare, Amiria J. *Museums, Anthropology, and Imperial Exchange*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

"An Historical and Descriptive Account of the Field Columbian Museum," *Field Columbian Museum*, pub. I, v. I, no. I. (December 1894): 73.

Hough, Dr. Walter. , "Racial Groups and Figures in the Natural History Building of the United States National Museum." In *Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution Showing the Operations, Expenditures, and Condition of the Institution for the Year Ending June 30*. Washington: Government Printing Office,1921.

Hoving, Thomas P.F. "Foreward," in *Art of Oceania, Africa, and the Americas from the Museum of Primitive Art*. Great Britain: The Curwen Press Ltd. (1969), n.p.

Jacknis, Ira. "Franz Boas and Exhibits." In *Objects and Others: Essays on Museums and Material Culture*. *History of Anthropology Volume 3*, ed. George W. Stocking, Jr., 75-111. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1985.

Jindrich, Marilyn J. "New Maori Family "At Home" in Polynesian Hall." *Chicago Natural History Museum Bulletin*. v 33, no. 1 (January, 1962): 1-5.

Joppien, Rüdiger and Bernard Smith. *The Art of Captain Cook's Voyages.* New Haven: Published for the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art by Yale University Press, 1985-1988.

Joyce, Barry. *The Shaping of American Ethnography: The Wilkes Exploring Expedition, 1838-1842.* Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 2001.

Kaeppler, Adrienne L. "Anthropology and the U.S. Exploring Expedition." In *Magnificent Voyagers: The U.S. Exploring Expedition, 1838-1842*," eds. Herman J. Viola and Carolyn Margolis, 118-147. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1985.

----------*"Artificial Curiosities": Being an Exposition of Native Manufactures Collected on the Three Pacific Voyages of Captain James Cook, R.N.* Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1978.

---------- "Aspects of Polynesian Aesthetic Traditions." In *The Art of the Pacific Islands*, Peter Gathercole, Adrienne L. Kaeppler, and Douglas Newton, 77-96. Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1979.

----------"Review: Traveling the Pacific," *American Anthropologist*, New Series, vol. 93, no. 1 (Mar., 1991): 269-270.

---------- "Taonga Maori and the Evolution of the Representation of the "Other."" In *Taonga Maori Conference: New Zealand, 18-27 November 1990*. Cultural Conservation Advisory Council (New Zealand)11-18. Wellington: Cultural Conservation Advisory Council, Te Roopu Manaaki I nga Taonga Tuku Iho, Department of Internal Affairs, Te Tari Taiwhenua, 1992.

----------"Two Polynesian Repatriation Enigmas at the Smithsonian Institution." *Journal of Museum Ethnography*, no. 17 (2005): 152-162.

----------and Amy Henderson, eds. *Exhibiting Dilemmas: Issues of Representation at the Smithsonian*. Washington and London: Smithsonian Institution Press.

----------Christian Kaufmann, and Douglas Newton. *Oceanic Art*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1997.

Karp, Ivan and Stephen D. Lavine, eds. *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*. Washington and London: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991.

Kernot, Bernard. "Maoriland Metaphors and the Model Pa." In *Farewell Colonialism: The New Zealand International Exhibition Christchurch, 1906–07*, John Mansfield Thomson, ed., 61-78. Palmerston North: The Dunmore Printing Company, Ltd., 1998.

Keyes, Ian W. "New Zealand Artifacts from the United States "Transit of Venus Expedition," 1874-1875." *Smithsonian Contributions to Anthropology*, vol. 2, no. 2 (1967): 21-27.

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara. *Destination Culture: Tourism, Museums, and Heritage*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press, 1998.

Kopper, Philip. *The National Museum of Natural History*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1982.

Kramer, Hilton. "The High Art of Primitivism." *The New York Times Magazine*. (January 24, 1982): sm16.

Kunz George. "New Zealand Jade." *American Museum Journal*, v. 11, n. 2 (February 1911): 57-58.

Levin, Kim. "New York's Tribal Revival: Rethinking the Ideals of Modern Art." *Village Voice*, (October 30, 1984): 109.

Lewis, Phillip H. ""What is Primitive Art?"—Answer Told in Exhibit." *Chicago Natural History Museum Bulletin* vol. 29, no. 7 (July, 1958): 3-4.

Linton, Ralph. Ethnology of Polynesia and Micronesia: Hall F (ground floor). Chicago: Field Museum of Natural History, 1926.

----------and Paul Wingert. *Arts of the South Seas*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1946.

Lowie, Robert H. *Collections from the South Sea Islands placed on exhibition in the American Museum of Natural History. January 25, 1911.* New York: American Museum of Natural History, 1911.

---------- "The New South Sea Exhibit." *American Museum Journal* v. 11, n. 2 (February 1911): 53-56.

"Maori Meeting House Reopens." *Field: The Bulletin of the Field Museum of Natural History* (March/April 1993): 1 & 9.

Masterpieces of the Peabody Museum. Cambridge: The Museum, 1978.

McCarthy, Conal. "From Curio to Taonga: A Genealogy of Display at New Zealand's National Museum, 1865-2001." Ph.D. diss., Victoria University, 2004.

McGill, Douglas. "A Dawn Ritual Prepares Maori Sculpture for Opening at Met." *The New York Times*. (September 11, 1984): c15.

---------- Art World Subtly Shifts to Corporate Patronage." *The New York Times*. (February 5, 1985): c14.

McManus, Greg W. "The 'Te Maori' exhibition and the future of museology in New Zealand." In *Museums and Europe 1992*. ed. Susan Pearce, 192-199. London: The Athlone Press, 1992.

Mead, Hirini Moko. *Magnificent Te Maori: Te Maori Whakahirahira*. Wellington: Heinemann, 1986.

Mead, Sidney Moko, ed. *Te Maori: Maori Art from New Zealand Collections.* New York: Abrams in association with the American Federation of Arts, 1984.

Mead, Margaret. "Our New "Hall of the Pacific": 45 Years in the Making." *Redbook*. (May, 1971):

----------"The Maoris and their Arts," *Guide Leaflet no. 71*, New York: The American Museum of Natural History, May 1928.

Melvin, L.W. *Robley-Soldier with a Pencil*. Tauranga: Tauranga Historical Society, 1957.

Miner, Roy Waldo. *Exhibition Halls of the American Museum of Natural History*. New York: Published by the Museum, 1939.

"Museum to Branch Out in Primitive Art." *Chicago Natural History Museum Bulletin* vol. 28, no. 2, (February, 1957): 3 & 5.

Nash, Stephen E. and Gary M. Feinman, eds. *Fieldiana "Curators, Collections, and Contexts: Anthropology at the Field Museum, 1893-2002"* Anthropology, New Series, no. 36 (September 30, 2003).

Neich, Roger. *Carved Histories: Rotorua Ngati Tarawhai Woodcarving*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2001.

----------*Painted Histories: Early Maori Figurative Painting.* Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2003.

----------and Janet Davidson. *W.O. Oldman's The Oldman Collection of Maori Artifacts. New Edition of Polynesian Society Memoir 14*, Auckland: The Polynesian Society, 2004.

"Nesbitt and Sturgis Held." *The New York Times*. (Jan. 29, 1893): n.p.

Newman, Barnett. "Art of the South Seas." In *Primitivism and Twentieth-Century Art: A Documentary History*., eds. Jack Flam with Miriam Deutch, 277-181. Berkeley

and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press, 2003.

Newton, Douglas. *Art of Oceania, Africa, and the Americas from the Museum of Primitive Art*. Great Britain: The Curwen Press Ltd., 1969.

----------"Old Wine in New Bottles, and Reverse." In *Museums and the Making of "Ourselves": The Role of Objects in National Identity*. ed. Flora Kaplan, 269-290. London: Leicester University Press, 1994.

Nicholsen, Bronwen. *Gauguin and Maori Art*. Auckland: Godwit Publishing Ltd., 1995.

O'Biso, Carol. *First Light*. Auckland: Heinemann, 1987.

O'Regan, Gerard. *Bicultural Developments in Museums of Aotearoa: what is the current status? Ki te Whakamana I te Kaupapa Tikanga-a-rua ki roto I nga Whare Taonga o te Motu: kei hea e tu ana?* Wellington: Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa National Services, 1997.

"Obituary Appleton Sturgis." *Brooklyn Eagle*. (July 25, 1900): 3.

Official Catalogue of Exhibits World's Columbian Exposition, Department M. Anthropological Building, Midway Plaisance and Isolated Exhibits. Chicago: W. B. Conkey Company, 1893, 33.

The Official History of the California Midwinter International Exposition… San Francisco: Press of H. S. Crocker Company, 1894.

Pendergrast, Mick. "The Fibre Arts." In *Maori: Art and Culture*, ed. D.C. Starzecka, 114, 146. London: British Museum Press, 1996.

Penny, H. Glenn. *Objects of Culture: Ethnology and Ethnographic Museums in Imperial Germany*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002.

A Popular Catalogue of the Extraordinary Curiosities in the National Institute Arranged in the Patent Office. Washington: Alfred Hunter, 1855.

Powell, Jane P. and Martin L. Friedman. *Primitive Art of the Pacific Islands*. Brooklyn: The Brooklyn Museum, 1957.

Price, Sally. *Primitive Art in Civilized Places*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1989.

Putnam, F.W. *Guide to the Peabody Museum of Harvard University with a Statement Relating to Instruction in Anthropology*. Salem, Massachusetts: Salem Press (1898), 24.

Radcliffe, Daniel. "Luau at the Gallery," *The Washington Post.* (June 29, 1979): A1.

Rhees, William J. *The Visitor's Guide to the Smithsonian Institution and National Museum, Washington, D.C.* Judd and Dettweiler Publishers, 1880.

Richards, Richards and Margaret Richards. *Pacific artifacts brought home by American whalemen : Pacific Islands curiosities, objects, artifacts and art in museums in New England and Long Island : report* (2000).

Rockefeller, Nelson A. "The Michael C. Rockefeller Wing of the Met: A Father's Memorial." *Smithsonian Magazine*, v. 9, n. 7. (October 1978): 42-53.

Rose, Roger. *A Museum to Delight and Instruct: William T. Brigham and the Founding of Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum*. Bernice P. Bishop Museum Special Publication 68. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1980.

----------"Exhibiting the Pacific in American Museums: Review of "Pacific Spirits: Life, Death & the Supernatural," Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago." *Pacific Arts*: *Journal of the Pacific Arts Association*. (July 1991), 1-7.

Ruark, Robert C. "Dear Old Isles." *New York World Telegram* (Feb. 19, 1946).

Rubin, William, ed. *"Primitivism" in 20th Century Art: Affinity of the Tribal and the Modern*. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1984.

Russell, John. "Almost-Lost Art of Maoris at Met," *The New York Times*. (September 14, 1984): c 1 & 22.

Rydell, Robert. *All the World's a Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876–1916*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Rydell, Robert W., John E. Findling, and Kimberly D. Pelle. *Fair America: World's Fairs in the United States*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2000.

Salmond, Anne. *Two Worlds: First Meetings Between Maori and Europeans*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1991.

Scarangello, Christina Hellmich. "The Pacific Collection in the Peabody Essex Museum, Salem, Massachusetts." Pacific Arts: The Journal of the Pacific Arts Association, (July 1996) 69-84.

Shapiro, Harry. "South Seas: Primitives for Sophisticates." *Art News* (March 1946): 36-37, 67-69.

Skinner, H.D. "A Waka-Huia in the Peabody Museum, Salem." *The Journal of the*

Polynesian Society, vol. 36, no. 4 (December 1927): 366.

Simms, Stephen. *Field Museum and the Child: An Outline of the Work Carried on by Field Museum of Natural History among School Children of Chicago through The N.W. Harris Public School Extension and the James Nelson and Anna Louise Raymond Public School and Children's Lectures*. Chicago: Field Museum of Natural History, 1928.

Smith, Bernard. *European Vision and the South Pacific, 1768-1850: A Study in the History of Art and Ideas.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960.

----------*Imagining the Pacific: In the Wake of the Cook Voyages.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.

Starzecka, D.C. ed. *Maori: Art and Culture*. London: British Museum Press, 1998.

Staniszewski, Marianne. *The Power of Display: The History of Exhibition Installations at the Museum of Modern Art*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1988.

Stocking, George Jr., ed. *Objects and Others: Essays on Museums and Material Culture, History of Anthropology Volume 3*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1985.

"South Sea Moderns." *Newsweek* (February 11, 1946): 94.

"South Seas Art: It has Odd, Primitive Beauty." *Life* (Nov. 4, 1946): 77-84

"Summonses were not served," *The New York Times*, August 11, 1893.

Tapsell, Paul. *Pukaki: A Comet Returns.* Auckland: Reed Publishing, 2000.

Tannous, David. "Artifacts into Art: An Oceanic Extravaganza." *Art in America*. v. 68 (January 1980): 93-97.

Terrell, John. "Taonga Maori: "We Want out Treasures Back."" *From the Field*, (March/April 1991): 14-15.

Thayer, William Roscoe. "Legends and Pageants of Venice." *Lippincotts Magazine*, 74 (November 1904): 637-649.

Todd, Frank Morton. *The Story of the Exposition: Being the Official History of the International Celebration Held at San Francisco in 1915 to Commemorate the Discovery of the Pacific Ocean and the Panama Canal*. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, the Knickerbocker Press, 1921.

Tom Pop's First Visit to the Boston Museum, with His Grandfather: Giving an Account of What He Saw, and What He Thought. Boston: Printed for the publisher, 1848.

Van Keuren, David K. "Museums and Ideology: Augustus Pitt-Rivers, Anthropological Museums, and Social Change in Later Victorian Britain," *Victorian Studies*, vol. 28, no. 1 (Autumn 1984): 171-189.

Vinci, John. "The Art of Installation," in *A. James Speyer Architect Curator Exhibition Designer,* ed. John Vinci, 79-96. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1997.

Viola, Herman J. "The Story of the U.S. Exploring Expedition," in *Magnificent Voyagers: The U.S. Exploring Expedition, 1838-1842*. Herman J. Viola and Carolyn Margolis, eds. Smithsonian Institution Press: Washington D.C., 1985.

Visitor's Guide to the Smithsonian Institution and National Museum Washington, D.C. Washington: Judd & Detweiler, Printers and Publishers, 1880.

Ward, Gerard, ed. *American Activities in the Central Pacific,, 1790-1870: A History, Geography, and Ethnography Pertaining to American Involvement and Americans in the pacific Taken from Contemporary Newspapers etc.* Ridgewood, N.J.: Gregg Press, 1966.

Wardwell, Allen. "New Light on Polynesia." *African Arts*. (1972): 49-51.

----------*The Sculpture of Polynesia*. Chicago: The Art Institute of Chicago, 1967.

Watson, Rubie S., Dorhout, Nynke J., and Rogers, Juliette R. "Pacific Collections at the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology at Harvard University: The Early Years." *Pacific Arts: The Journal of the Pacific Arts Association*, (July 1996): 57-68.

Wilkes, Charles, U.S.N. *Narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition. During the Years 1838, 1839, 1840, 1841, 1842.* v. II. Philadelphia: Lea & Blanchard, 1845.

Wingert, Paul S. *Art of the South Pacific Islands: A Loan Exhibition*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1953.

Yochelson, Ellis L. *The National Museum of Natural History: 75 Years in the Natural History Building. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press*, 1985.

Web site cited

www.nga.gov/past/data/exh443.htm