Chapter 13

Decolonising Hinemihi and Conservation Practice

Dean Sully

Decolonising

The term 'decolonisation', originally referring to the process of handing over governance to the indigenous inhabitants of former colonies, is now recognised as an ongoing long-term process of divesting colonial power (Huygens 2006, p. 364). Linda Tuhiwai Smith uses the term to represent an indigenous language of critique in understanding the impact of colonialism on the living consciousness of indigenous communities (Smith 2005, p. 24). This represents the legacy of the fight against colonial rule and is in essence 'oppositional 'in nature: 'The reach of imperialism into "our heads" challenges those that belong to colonized communities … to decolonise our minds, to recover ourselves' (Smith 2005: 23).

The application of 'decolonising methodologies' involves a repositioning of worldviews that seeks to understand theory and practice from specific local perspectives and for specific local purposes (Smith 2005, p. 7). It seeks to enable peoples to speak for themselves and tell their own stories from their own perspectives in a manner they consider appropriate to them (Kreps 2003). The decolonising concept of 'de-centring' involves moving concepts from the margin to the centre, allowing a challenge to dominant narratives and providing an opportunity for 'writing back' in expressing values that lie hidden (Atalay 2006, p. 282, Smith 2005). This offers a means of addressing the asymmetrical interconnectivity that entwine the lives of the coloniser and the colonised. In cultural terms, reducing Eurocentrism involves revealing and questioning the cultural values of the dominant group, so they can learn to 'other' themselves

and their own culture. In structural terms, this involves 'depowering' themselves (Black 1997, Huygens 2006, Kirton 1997). This is a liberating process that allows the emergence of a new discourse, one that is not confined solely by Western reference points (Kreps 2003).

Decolonisation offers a critique of colonialism conducted in the perspective of an even more comprehensive, multifaceted critique of ourselves (Gopal 2007). It requires an examination of the past so as to provide some understanding the conditions by which certain accepted experiences of the world may have come into existence and how this might be used to shape ongoing relationships (Rowlands 1998). Gopal suggests that for Britain such a common project provides an opportunity to renegotiate a desire for multicultural cohesion that goes beyond decreeing a common set of values by which we are all judged—going, rather, to a truly participatory dialogue in which a shared present, past, and future can be held in common (Gopal 2007).

Decolonising Conservation

The impact of past collecting activities has resulted in the complex and intertwined histories of cultural artefacts and peoples that today raise issues of contested ownership and challenges over use, management, interpretation, and control of cultural heritage (Corey-Pearce 2005, Hooper-Greenhill 1998, 2000, Joyce 2002, p. 215). To descendants of the originating communities, the presence of their cultural material in centralised, national, and international heritage institutions may be seen as painful reminders of cultural loss and the injustice of past relationships that are maintained and presented as current (Muñoz-Vinas 2005, p. 66). Professional conservators contribute to this by ensuring that objects endure and by altering them to a condition that reflects their own specific cultural, institutional, and professional expectations. The physical

survival of cultural material may be viewed as a positive outcome of this process, however the use of objective scientific principles to curate and conserve such objects reflects an inherent assumption of power, which underpins the right to select and enhance certain meanings of objects and culture, whilst restricting others (McLaughlin 1993, p. 2). The emphasis of Western conservation on tangible evidence, legible within Western knowledge systems, tends to separate the notion of the object from the social networks that bind people to objects.

The beliefs of descendant communities, indigenous peoples, minority groups, local people, or the socially excluded that represent ways of understanding outside the prevailing universalising paradigm are less likely to enter into the central tenets of conservation. The suppression of 'alternative' views that were seen as resisting the mission of colonialism can similarly be seen in current heritage conservation philosophy that privileges certain approaches whilst resisting other approaches to caring for material culture (Theophile & Ranjitkar 2003, p. 58). The decolonisation of conservation provides an opportunity to create counter-discourse that challenges the power relations involved in existing approaches to managing the past. This approach resists the automatic imposition of a Western epistemology and worldview and the appropriation of the cultural and intellectual property of others (Atalay 2006, Clifford 2004, p. 5).

The pedagogical implication of affirming alternative histories is the access to alternative knowledges that form the basis for alternative ways of doing things. By accepting the validity of alternative stories over the past, we acknowledge the validity of alternative models of managing the past (Glover et al 2004, Smith 2005, p. 34). Repatriation claims often expose the internal contradictions of the heritage industry as they represent the potential loss of the raw materials for heritage scholarship and professional practice. Repatriation claims can be seen as

a form of resistance to colonial power and a mechanism for reclaiming traditions and challenging the culture of the occupier (Joyce 2002, p. 106)

Hakiwai and Tapsell remind us that developing partnerships, rather than opposition positions, have been effective in resolving issues of long-term management of Maori taonga (treasures) (Hakiwai 1995, Tapsell 2002, p. 284). The solution to some of the contradictions inherent within current conservation theory and practice lies with an engagement in the social network around the conservation process. In practice, all the elements of a decolonising conservation are required to be negotiated with the communities involved in the process. This goes beyond adding public outreach elements to existing frameworks of practice. It is engaged with reconceptualising conservation theory and transforming practice (George & Hollowell 2007, Kreps 2003).

A decolonising conservation offers the potential to investigate alternative ways of approaching the conservation process. A conservator's engagement with other peoples' objects provides an opportunity to reconsider the nature of past relationships with those who produced, owned, exchanged, collected, and used the objects, along with their descendants. The physical presence of objects that prevail through time creates a focus for considering and reconsidering relationships with 'our' past and the past of 'others'. Adopting a decolonising position offers an opportunity to critically review 'our' understanding of existing relationships and seeks to question 'our' relationships with 'our' colonial past.

Decolonising Conservation Practice

A key feature of a decolonising conservation practice is an agenda guided by local communities, engaged with the current aspirations of these communities, and focused on the

issues that are important to these communities now (Gosden 2001, pp. 245–249), Smith & Wobst 2005, p. 392). The aim of such a process is to enable communities to participate in the process of heritage production and management in a way that reflects their own expectations and allows them to determine what is conserved and how this is done (George & Hollowell 2007). Community-based conservation projects that are people-centred and bottom-up enable heritage processes to be decentralised and adapted to local needs (Kreps 2003). This calls for projects that are undertaken with the community, in a truly collaborative effort, in which conservation decisions come out of a genuine process of negotiation between those involved in the process (Smith 2005, Smith & Jackson 2006, Smith & Wobst 2005). This should involve conservators working within a framework of local community and indigenous control rather than solely within established Western professional guidelines (Smith & Jackson 2006). This work may require different processes of accountability in which heritage professionals are monitored by supervisors or mentors from the community groups involved (eg Huygens 2006, p. 367).

Community Conservation and the Conservation Community

Conservation not only provides an opportunity to renegotiate the meaning and function of the material past in relation to the values of the current community; it also has the potential to assist in building a community through the networks that connect people to the object undergoing conservation, as an object-centred social network (Kreps 2003). The perceived necessity of conservation action, which often arises from concerns about the condition and stability of the physical materials that make up cultural heritage, brings with it a specific dynamic to the decision-making process. A conservation intervention creates a clear reason for people to define their relationship to the material culture undergoing conservation. The conservation

project can offer a focus for establishing public dialogue, and, where it does not exist, assist in building a community framework through which decisions can be reached. Judgments about the values, associated with the material past, are necessarily specific to the time and context in which they are made.

The conservation process, therefore, provides a valuable opportunity to focus on the effect that material culture has on people at the 'moment' of conservation (Wharton 2004, p. 206). The relationships generated in the process have a direct impact on maintaining the relevance of cultural material to people's lives. As these relationships change over time, they may cause multiple transformations in the nature of the material culture. Although each of these transformations is constructed in the present, processes aimed at developing shared understanding around conservation decisions can supply a mechanism for the long-term care of material culture.

Therefore, what is required is a genuine inclusive participatory conservation process that develops long-term trust within communities and brings tangible benefits to the individuals and communities involved. In considering the conservation community, we must expect that the ways in which people perceive, value, care for, and transmit heritage will be as diverse as the communities that they represent (Kreps 2005, p. 7). The challenge of establishing an equitable balance between the seemingly incommensurable claims of different communities (such as the heritage professionals and a connected community) is significant (George & Hollowell 2007). This may entail striving towards achieving a consensus of view where possible, or if no consensus is possible or even desirable, then at least openly acknowledging the differences that are evident so that they are clearly expressed rather than played down (D Eastop 2007, pers. comm., Garton Smith 1997/8). A community's re-engagement with cultural heritage may

become a symbol of local unity and, at the same time, be a site of polarisation that reveals opposed factions within widely diverging community. These factions may wish to preserve the past but imagine the future in different ways (Rowlands & de Jong 2007). Community conservation presents a range of challenges for the conservation profession. There are difficult questions to address about who genuinely represents the 'community', how decisions are made, and who benefits from the process.

Who Is the 'Community'?

The term 'community' can be a difficult one to define; it can obscure a complex phenomenon of linked social systems that exist on many levels, often characterised by particular cultural behavior. Communities are likely to be elusive and constantly changing. It is often difficult to identify which particular cultural community, or which part of a community, has the greatest stake in any particular instance (DCMS 2006). The image of a coherent longstanding localised source of authority, tied to what are assumed to be intrinsically sustainable management regimes, may be an idealised view, even within a Maori cultural context where genealogical links tend to define clearly established responsibilities to taonga. Within New Zealand, for example, urban-based Maori groups have challenged the established authority of traditional iwi (tribal) structures (Meredith 2000).

When considering community involvement based on cultural links to the heritage undergoing conservation, the relative merits of specific communities to be represented in the process may need to be considered. It is a challenge to retain multivocality without accepting every voice without critique (George & Hollowell 2007). The claims of some groups such as cultural descendants, or members of a particular community, may need to be given more consideration

than others. In cross-cultural situations, it is likely to be the cultural groups themselves that define the right to be involved. Therefore, this requires a valid mechanism for evaluating competing claims (George & Hollowell 2007). The validity of specific communities is likely to relate to a connection that a community has with the geographic location, beliefs, customs, and language from which the heritage originates (DCMS 2006, p. 26). Systems such as the 'stakeholder paradigm' and 'interest group model' are mechanisms for community-based heritage resource management and ways of dealing with the associated conflicts that may arise.

McNiven and Russell, writing about indigenous archaeology, however, suggest that these mechanisms provide a mask of democracy and fair play to what is, in reality, further colonial appropriation that externalises communities from their own heritage. They propose the 'host/guest' model that is an effective scheme for cross-cultural interaction and represents genuine decolonising practice. In this model, members of the community, as 'hosts', have full control over the process and may invite 'guests' to participate on their terms. This is preferable to local communities being invited participants in somebody else's process (McNiven & Russell 2005, p. 236). The question of who is the guest and who the host is particularly problematic when considering the care of Maori meeting houses outside New Zealand.

How Are Decisions Made?

Is community conservation possible in which authority in the process is negotiated rather than assumed? The challenge here is to develop decision-making processes that do not privilege the 'insider' in the conservation process. The role of the conservation professional is to act as a facilitator, listener, and resource for the community (Butts 1990, p. 111); to provide

information about the process; to participate in an informed debate; and to provide tools that can be used to achieve the desired outcomes of the participants (Kahn 2000, Smith 2005).

When entering into a broader debate that surrounds the use, value, and meaning of conserved objects, conservators need to be prepared for the issues and interests that concern them as professionals but are not necessarily widely shared by other participants. Garton-Smith identifies the conflict between the imposition of professional conservation standards in local museums and the ability of local community groups to represent local views of the past (Garton Smith 1997/8, p. 9). Heritage professionals can endanger heritage by distancing its conservation from its traditional guardians (Johnston 1992, p. 5). Konare presents a call for the establishment of local conservation structures and practices based on each ethnic community's particular traditions. This does provide a role for the heritage professional to give training and expertise, however their views should not take precedence over local knowledge, experience, and wisdom (Kreps 2003, p. 42). This is reflected in Gamini Wijesuriya's assertion in chapter 3 that the beliefs of the 'connected' community should take precedence over that of other users such as heritage experts.

There is no one definitive solution for effective collaborative practice. How community-based projects are applied to conservation practice is situation and context dependent; each community project requires place-specific solutions rather than the application of general models. Cooper and Brooking suggest a devolutionary approach in which communities are trusted to get on with the job, to sort out their own priorities and goals, and to organise their own projects and operating methods (Cooper & Brooking 2002). The heritage institution and professionals can take a backseat in such a locally driven, self-motivated programme. Practical

resources can be focused on the objectives of the project, rather than on the procedural

mechanisms that can become a priority in their own right (Cooper & Brooking 2002).

The process of consultation that relies on specific mechanisms, such as the production of a

statement of significance and management plan within the Burra Charter framework, can be

seen as being designed to reflect the procedural requirements heritage institutions, rather than

as ensuring the genuine informed participation of community groups. The assessment of

community values may not easily be forced into preconceived categories of importance,

because places that hold significance to a particular community may not be significant to any

other group (Gordon 1991, p. 48). Care needs to be exercised with the assumption that heritage

professionals can objectively evaluate the relative benefits of conflicting cultural values held by

different community groups. Knowledge about local community values may not be available to

everybody and may only be accessible by particular individuals within the community, such as

kaumatua (elders) who hold knowledge about wähi tapu (sacred sites) (Nathan 1991, p. 11).

Rosof provides some background to the participatory mechanisms for American Indian peoples

at the National Museum of the American Indian (NMAI), Washington, DC (Rosof 2003). Their

collaboration processes have focused on producing individual statements, rather than pan-tribal

cultural solutions, to ensure that NMAI practices are adapted and updated to the specific needs

of individual native communities. Johnson and colleagues describe the way that systematic

consultations have resulted in a shift in the way that conservators work at NMAI (Johnson et al

2005). Guided by community representatives, conservators have attempted to balance the

institutional practice of conservation with the beliefs of the communities.

This is also evident in the iwi- and hapü- (sub-tribe-) based models presented by Hakiwai (chapter 2) and Schuster and Whiting (chapter 4) relating to the care of Maori taonga in New Zealand. In the projects described in chapter 4, Maori conservators act as facilitators to provide tools, knowledge, and resources to enable local communities to develop their own response to the needs of their historic marae buildings. The approach to marae conservation is an excellent example of community-based conservation and adaptation of Western conservation principles to local circumstances.

Wharton's role in the in the conservation of the Kamehameha I Monument in Hawai'i reveals how a shift of conservation focus away from the academy to the requirements of the community can result in a truly collaborative process that derives clear benefits to those involved (Wharton 2002, 2004). Kreps gives a useful example of the community-based conservation of a 19th-century adobe church in Arroyo Seco, New Mexico. Here, local cultural traditions and current conservation approaches were combined to restore both the building and a renewed sense of pride in the collective identity of the community (Kreps 2003, p. 141).

The restoration of Tutanekai (in chapter 4) powerfully illustrates the opportunity that destruction and restoration present for community building. Community participation in Tutanekai's restoration was a platform for the transfer of traditional knowledge—processing raw materials, dyes, weaving techniques, painted designs, carving, etc. Through the support of heritage professionals, the community was able to take control of the process and retain the responsibility for their meeting house. The positive benefits of community participation can be seen as having an effect beyond the limits of the conservation project. In chapter 2, Hakiwai uses the term 'cultural well-being' to describe the vitality that communities and individuals

enjoy through participation in cultural activities and the freedom to retain, interpret, and express their heritage and traditions.

Kaupapa Maori

'Kaupapa Maori' is one model that describes a specific Maori approach to research proposed by Linda Tuhiwai Smith (Smith 2005, p. 183). Kaupapa Maori recognises that Maori have a different epistemological tradition that frames the way that they see the world. Thus, it establishes Maori culture as the foundation of the research method. This connects to the concept of whanau (the family) as the prevailing social organization. The concept of the whanau as the focus for conflict resolution also been widely adopted outside New Zealand in social work practice as the 'Family Group Conference' (Morris & Tunnard 1996). Similarly, the extension of another key Maori concept, that of the marae as a meeting place, has been broadened at The Field Museum in Chicago. John Terrell and colleagues, in chapter 5, suggest that the Maori concept of the marae may be New Zealand's greatest gift to the world. The role of Ruatepupuke II as a focus for Maori cultural activities has expanded as a place for cross-cultural encounters, 'marae encounters', for a range of community groups such as Korean diaspora communities and Native American tribes from the Chicago area (Terrell 2005). The bicultural governance structures of the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongrewa (Te Papa) establish primary rights of indigenous peoples in the management care and interpretation of the cultural material held in museums.

In chapter 2, Hakiwai informs us of the principle *mana taonga* that recognises the spiritual and cultural connections of taonga with the people. These rights accord to iwi the mana (authority) to care for their taonga, to speak about and with them, and to determine the uses of them by the

museum. This is related to principles of 'partnership' and 'active participation'. This gives substance to the concept of curating 'other peoples' objects' and to the notion of 'object-centred social networks'. This has meant an institutionalisation of source community involvement in the museum's major conservation projects. The examples of the conservation of a Ngäti Pikiano 19th-century pataka (storehouse) (Kreps 2003, p. 73), and a Ngäti Tahu eel trap (Smith & Winkelbauer 2006, pp. 128–33) illustrate this process in action. In these projects, the collaboration between the iwi representatives and museum conservators ensured that both physical integrity and cultural integrity of the taonga undergoing treatment were enhanced.

To these examples, we can add other community engagement models such as the 'Iwi Caucus' model , a New Zealand bicultural partnership for councils and Maori community consultation (Tunks 2002, p. 334). The 'Carter Holt Harvey model' for consultation between Maori communities and large commercial companies (Roberts 2002, p. 248) prioritises the intangible or spiritual relationships between the tangata whenua (home people) and their taonga tūturu (ancestral taonga), rather than the narrower issues of physical evidence, to inform decisions (Roberts 2002, p. 222). The role of tangata whenua is a key concept within Maori cultural resource management. The customary authority of tangata whenua over the land upon which the museums stands (mana o te whenua) provides a role of kaitiakitanga (spiritual and customary guardianship) of the taonga that resides within the museum.

In addition, the source community connected to its taonga also has particular customary responsibilities for these objects. Guardianship, therefore, exists in interconnected obligation of both groups. Therefore, partnerships need to be formed through the museum's tangata whenua to other Maori groups connected to their taonga in the museum. The tangata whenua provide the appropriate customary space, which allow outside kin groups to interact with the museum

(Kawharu 2002, p. 294). Tapsell suggests that these partnership relations, under the customary authority of the home group, can be used by institutions worldwide to reconnect source communities with the objects in their museums. These long-term partnerships can be sustained through collaborative research conservation and exhibition projects that offer benefits for all parties (Tapsell 2002, p. 290).

Who Benefits?

In a self-reflective process, there are evident benefits that can accommodate different ways of working that arise from different ways of understanding the world around us. This requires the heritage professional to share rather than represent authority, working sensitively, flexibly, and respectfully to demystify conservation processes for local communities (Nicks 2003). To facilitate this process, resources are required to generate trust and sustain meaningful relationships that need to be incorporated into the budgets and deadlines of funding agencies. Thus, for a community to effectively participate, resources are required to compensate participants for time spent and expenses incurred. This may involve creating employment and providing training for community members (Nicks 2003). Other specialists, such as accountants, lawyers, architects, and the like, may be models for resourcing specialist knowledge from community groups.

Formal co-management and co-ownership arrangements may be effective in some situations; however, these have long-term implications for resources that heritage institutions and communities must be prepared to honour if they are to succeed (Nicks 2003). This reflects a current discussion between The National Trust and Ngäti Ranana about the levels of commitment possible from the UK-based Maori community to use Hinemihi as a focus for

Maori cultural activities that is associated with the potential redevelopment of Hinemihi at Clandon Park. The presence of a significant and active Maori community in the United Kingdom is fundamental to the success of a participatory approach for the care of Hinemihi. Karl Burrows (chapter 9) informs us about the difficulties that voluntary organisations have in making shared commitments to future projects. There are practical and social limitations for using Hinemihi as Ngäti Ranana's 'London marae'.

One of the benefits of building relationships around the conservation of Hinemihi has been a greater understanding on the part of the community about the limitations under which heritage institutions such as The National Trust operate. In addition, it provides some understanding for heritage professionals of how decisions about the use of heritage in their care has impact on the quality of people's lives.

There are potential adverse consequences to increased consultation in that there is a tendency to place large demands on the same group of people within communities whose views are valued (Cooper & Brooking 2002, p. 199). It may be asking too much of people to represent a community's views and to take some of the responsibility and criticism that belong to heritage professionals (Neich 1985). Issues about authority over cultural heritage may not be a current priority for a community. Communities that are tackling issues of social welfare list education, housing, health, employment, and access to resources as priorities for community action in preference to questions of ownership of material culture (Tapsell 2003, p. 246).

James Schuster (chapter 10) provides an insight into the feelings that Ngäti Hinemihi hold as Hinemihi's connected community. He reveals that although this relationship is significant, it is one of many relationships and many issues that face the community that may have greater priority in terms of the social well-being of the hapü. One momentous issue currently being

discussed is the long-awaited return of the Ngäti Hinemihi to Te Wairoa, the village left

devastated by the eruption of Mount Tarawera in 1886. Hinemihi at Clandon Park may have a

role to play in this process, but it is evidently one amongst many other pressing concerns for

Ngäti Hinemihi. It does, however, open up the opportunity at some stage in the future of uniting

the three Hinemihi's at Te Wairoa, in a symbolic return of the people, their ancestors, and their

taonga after over a century of exile.

The legal opinion provided by Kathryn Last in chapter 11 considers the ability of The National

Trust to return Hinemihi to Ngäti Hinemihi, should they wish to do so. Last shows the

complexity involved in dealing with the legal claims of return and restitution. In addition,

Arapata Hakiwai, in chapter 2, highlights the rights of indigenous peoples to 'self-

determination' and in exercising that right, there is recognition of indigenous peoples as 'the

exclusive owners of their cultural and intellectual property that is presented in The Mataatua

Declaration (1993) and The United Nations Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous

Peoples (1993).

The Maori past is not just a heritage resource; it is part of the living present that reaches back

through whakapapa (genealogy), tupuna (ancestors), and through time to the creator (Matunga

1994: 219). This view is summed up by O'Regan: 'The heritage of our ancestors, passing down

to us, passing down through us' (O'Regan 1990 hapü 98). When considering contrasting claims

about the ownership of cultural materials, few precedents suggest that litigation is an effective

way forward. The positive experiences, evident in cases of repatriation such as the Kelvingrove

ghost dance shirt, have occurred when both sides of the ownership claim have entered into a

partnership of mutual benefit (Simpson 2002). The most effective way to address questions of

contested ownership is for heritage institutions to develop partnerships with the source

communities of the cultural material that they hold. In doing so, they are able to encourage active participation and acknowledge their authority in decisions about the care and ownership of their objects. Communities may not wish to engage in such a process or may require the heritage professionals to position themselves within a community framework to a greater extent prior to taking part.

Consultation that Ticks the Box

When questions of ownership and control of contested material culture are evident, the involvement of the local or source communities could be seen as an attempt by heritage institutions to justify the status quo and to appropriate other cultural meanings to add value to their existing property. These actions conflict with the idea of consultation representing a genuine attempt by those involved in the process to share understanding and seek to consider the values of the other parties. For the consultation process to be valid there needs to be an attempt to share control over the decision-making amongst the people involved, along with a process of negotiation to enable for alternative outcomes to become acceptable. With institutionalised collaboration, there is a potential that the consultation process could become an empty category in a procedural tick box.

Cross-Cultural Approach

The discourse around the UNESCO Safeguarding of Intangible Heritage Act 2003 represents a shift concern from tangible heritage protection to the safeguarding of the knowledge, skills, and values as well as the people and social processes that sustain this heritage. This requires that local communities be able to sustain living heritage through the performance of their cultural

traditions (Rowlands & de Jong 2007). The knowledge and practices of indigenous conservation as an expression of cultural identity and continuity fit within this concept of intangible heritage and therefore need to be protected to ensure transmission through the generations (Kreps 2005, p. 5). Gamini Wijesuriya (chapter 3) provides historical details of the traditional practices that are a part of the maintenance of spiritual buildings in the Buddhist tradition. These practices, skills, and knowledge systems are integral parts of the cultural life of these religious places and safeguard the transmission of these buildings into the future. These methods rightly take precedence over a universalised idea of preserving heritage.

A collaborative approach that blends the strengths of Western scientific understanding with the knowledge of local communities or indigenous peoples has the potential to create a new set of theories and practices for an ethically informed study and management of the past. This opens up the possibility of a conservation that addresses the social issues of the present rather than merely seeks to fix the past and predict the future. The challenge, therefore, is to attempt to hybridise Western and local approaches through adaptive conservation techniques to respond to the specific needs of the communities involved (Flynn& Hull-Walski 2001). The balance between 'educating the local' and 'doing it like the local' may lie in a merged approach in which the philosophical underpinnings of conservation are stretched to incorporate the diversity of needs of local communities, thereby expanding the goals of conservation and working methods rather than limiting them, expressing the possibility of having a 'both/and' rather than an 'either/or' (Theophile & Ranjitkar 2003, p. 58, Clavir 2002, p. 233). In chapter 4, Schuster and Whiting consider the implications of hybridisation within the indigenous heritage professional. This has forced Maori trained in the principles of Western conservation to reconcile two sets of cultural ideas in their work and home lives, which is sometimes difficult to resolve.

Cross-cultural comparison allows us to identify the differences and acknowledge the similarities of how objects are valued and cared for in various cultural (Kreps 2003, p. 153). The difference between conserving buildings and conserving the skills that built them can be polemicised into a critique of conservation wherever local traditional practice survives (Menon 2003, p. 109). This might be seen as the difference between the act of making being memorialised in the physical material and the act of making being valued in the ability to make (i.e. the act of carving not the carving itself) (Kreps 2003, p. 44, Mead 1983, p. 101).

This is enacted in Schuster and Whiting's account of the restoration of Tutanekai in chapter 4. The removal of Tutanekai's fire-damaged carvings and their replacement with new carvings can be seen as consistent with a Western concept of conservation. However, the decision to bury the removed historic carvings, to enable them to decompose on the marae as a way of retaining the mauri (spiritual potency) of the carver, lies outside the framework of understanding for Western conservation. Therefore, rather than memorialising the carvings as a museum exhibit, their value is seen to be in the coming together of ancestral spiritual power and the integrity of the marae.

The approach taken with the Tutanekai's fire-damaged tukutuku (decorative internal wall panels) similarly focused on replacement rather than retention of original material. The damage and restoration of the tukutuku was seen as an opportunity to renew their beauty. The current generation has confidence that future generations will be able to supply carvings and woven panels for their meeting houses in the same way that their ancestors have done in the past and do now. Eva Garbutt, in chapter 6, describes the conservation of tukutuku for Te Wharepuni a Maui in Stuttgart's Linden Museum in 1993 by Emily Schuster. This is seen as a negotiation

between Maori and Western conservation approaches in which a Western conservation view of the retention of original material takes precedence over Maori approach of the reweaving and renewal. The degree to which this compromise is weighted in favour of the heritage institution/professional or the Maori participants can be viewed differently from either side of the divide.

In any partnership, of course, a degree of compromise and negotiation is required. The degree of compromise is clearly linked to the relative positions of power and authority in the process. Whether such a partnership represents merely the provision of a broader support for the conservation decisions or a true reconceptualisation of the process depends on access to power and authority. A redistribution of power is the key to the success of decolonisation strategies. This is likely to be a long-term process in heritage conservation processes in which the legal, intellectual, and practical limitations on progress will need to be negotiated on a case-by-case basis.

Conserving Maori Meeting Houses outside New Zealand

The value of contact between heritage institutions and source communities is evident in the care of Ruatepupuke II in Chicago, Hinemihi at Clandon Park, and Te Wharepuni a Maui in Stuttgart's Linden Museum. In these cases, the rights of Ngäti Hinemihi, Te Whanau-a-Ruataupare and Ngäti Porou to speak for their *taonga tipuna* (ancestral treasures) are established by whakapapa and customary practice. Therefore, The National Trust, The Field Museum, and the Linden Museum have clearly established lines of communication to a connected community in New Zealand. In each case, 1986 appears to be a pivotal point in the chronology of reconnecting the meeting houses with their Maori source communities in New

Zealand. This possibly reflects the international impact of the Te Maori exhibition and is associated with social and political changes occurring then within New Zealand and the Maori society.

Each of the four meeting houses received initial contact from representatives of the source community at this time. In the case of The Field Museum, a delegation was sent from Chicago to Tokomaru Bay to engage in an open dialogue with the community there. The partnership in decision-making that has developed around the curation and conservation of Ruatepupuke II is an inspirational model of genuine and effective participatory practice. The 1993 restoration of Ruatepupuke II was structured as a co-curated project between John Terrell and Arapata Hakiwai and conservation interns from Tokomaru Bay working alongside Field Museum conservation staff. This reflects a genuine bicultural project with shared control over principle, policy, and practice. Even fourteen years on, this project stands as an inspirational model for what could be achieved in the current conservation project for Hinemihi.

The care of Rauru at Museum für Völkerkunde in Hamburg represents a different story in which the process of reconnection with the source community does not appear to have developed significantly. Eva Garbutt considers the reasons behind this in chapter 6. It might be because Rauru has always been considered to be in good condition and has been permanently sited within the same museum gallery since he was installed at the museum in the early 20th century. It might also be a consequence of expectations of the institution in which Rauru is held. It is likely that the initial reconnection with Ngäti Hinemihi following Emily Schuster's visit in 1986 will be developed when future decisions about Rauru's care are being considered.

Deterioration in condition is a common catalyst for conservation action in the decision-making process of Western conservation. This has been apparent in discussions about Hinemihi at Clandon Park, where the consequences of her external location mean that relatively frequent maintenance and repair of her structure is required. These interventions have stimulated discussions about how this should take place. This does not, however, hold true for conservation interventions on Ruatepupuke II, where deteriorated condition has not been the major driving force in initiating conservation intervention at The Field Museum. The account of the debate about the restoration of Ruatepupuke II's painted designs in chapter 5 reveals that the proposals are driven by the desires of the community at Tokomaru Bay. This relates to Ruatepupuke II's appearance as a representation of tribal identify, rather than more conventional museum concerns of physical stability.

In chapter 2, Arapata Hakiwai informs us that Maori cultural treasures held in museums have a vital role to play in the resignification and inscription of Maori identity. They have a restorative dimension to the living descendants of their producers and users today. The lack of geographical proximity limits the ability of the source communities to play a day-to-day role in decisions about their meeting houses held outside New Zealand. Improvements in global communication, e-mail, video-conferencing, and transport mean closer participation in routine decisions are realistic possibilities in ways that may not have been technically possible thirty years ago.

Schuster and Whiting, in chapter 4, provide a potential model for the conservation of meeting houses outside New Zealand. There is, however, a significant difference between the approach to the conservation of meeting houses and marae that are outside heritage institutions and are intimately connected with the lives of their local community. Of the meeting houses outside

New Zealand proposed in conservation work currently being discussed, Hinemihi at Clandon Park provides a real opportunity to engage fully with the approach taken in the conservation of historic marae in New Zealand. This model focuses on assisting the local community with training knowledge and resources required to look after their meeting houses. The presence of an active Maori community in London creates a role for Hinemihi in expressions of Maori cultural identity and in developing relationships that facilitate cultural transmission of their values for a generation of Maori children growing up in Britain. Karl Burrows, in chapter 9, informs us that there are difficulties for Ngäti Ranana in accepting responsibility for an ancestral meeting house to which they are not genealogically connected. Therefore, their relationship with Hinemihi and their responsibility to Ngäti Hinemihi requires delicate and complex negotiation. Ngäti Ranana, in the absence of Ngäti Hinemihi in the United Kingdom, are seen as the 'home team' to represent and support the wishes of Ngäti Hinemihi as the connected community. Ngäti Ranana do, however, provide a local community for Hinemihi that are able to facilitate her spiritual conservation by 'keeping her warm'.

The conservation of Hinemihi has created a focus for relations between Ngäti Hinemihi and Ngäti Ranana that have implications for the role of Maori cultural transmission within the Maori diaspora of Britain. The participation of James Schuster, as Ngäti Hinemihi and Maori heritage professional to guide members of the London Maori community in the conservation of Hinemihi, offers an intriguing prospect of shifting the focus of Hinemihi's conservation from that of a conservation project within the heritage institution in the United Kingdom to a marae conservation project that takes place within a Maori community.

In engaging with the Maori community, Julie DeLong Lawlor and Katy Lithgow (in chapter 8) provide a progressive view of The National Trusts' view of conservation that is focused on

facilitating the Hinemihi's Maori cultural function. The success of their approach will be measured in terms of the resultant social benefits. The intellectual and legislative framework of The National Trust is evident in the provision of a formal process of information gathering and structured consultation. In facilitating the use of Hinemihi as a marae, however, The National Trust offers the possibility of a life for Hinemihi beyond the status as a garden folly and historical manifestation of the Onslow family's relationship with New Zealand in the 19th century. This explicitly acknowledges the contemporary role that Hinemihi has in the significant events of people lives today. How this is to be accommodated in the current proposals for Hinemihi's future reflect an important discussion about the emphasis on 'development' or the emphasis on 'conservation' in the project. This mirrors the tension between the 'cultural perspective' and the 'preservation perspective' that juxtaposes cultural sustainability and material authenticity within marae conservation in New Zealand outlined in chapter 4.

The limitations imposed by adopting a 'preservation perspective' on the innovation of communities is perceived as problematic for marae conservation in New Zealand. Similarly, this has the potential to create tension with the future development of Hinemihi.

The development of Hinemihi's conservation as a community project driven by the needs of the Maori community offers an opportunity for The National Trust and heritage professionals in Britain to work with Maori, on Maori cultural heritage, within a Maori worldview. This would need to be adapted within the patrimony of The National Trust and the prevailing Western conservation paradigm. In sharing authority, heritage professionals gain strength. For The National Trust, Hinemihi is an opportunity to work with Maori and to be guided by them, rather than seeking to impose guidelines on the process. This requires a degree of courage and

confidence on a part of The National Trust to fully open up to the benefits of incorporating other worldviews into their perspective on the care of Hinemihi.

Concluding Remarks

Rethinking the nature of this past beyond Eurocentric paradigms offers ways of widening the possibilities for cultural transmission in the present and future. By questioning authority over the past, decolonising processes are means of constructing a view of the past that is ethically, culturally, and politically appropriate to the present.

The process of cross-cultural working and merging of indigenous conservation with a Western conservation practice begs the question about how equitable this process can be in a situation in which the power relationships largely remain unaltered. This limits the potential to develop a conservation practice that emphasises the ethics of social justice for a wider more diverse constituency.

Whether it is indigenous conservation, public conservation, informed conservation, devolved conservation, decentred conservation, people-led conservation, community-based conservation, participatory conservation, or context-focused conservation, these concepts do not offer solutions but rather the prospect of different and possibly better ways of working. The benefits of this work need to be assessed in terms of their effect on people though general concepts of social welfare and human happiness. They may also be seen as providing new sets of questions about the role of conservation in developing a more humane heritage. The possibility of such a shared project may be our contribution towards a less terrifying, more hopeful collective future (Butler 2006, Gopal 2007).

If the goal of a decolonising conservation is to enable heritage institutions to relinquish control and allow communities to become actively involved in the care of their cultural heritage, then the care of historic meeting houses outside New Zealand can be considered to be successful. However, although active bicultural participation is a commendable goal, it is evident that in all the case studies of caring for meeting houses outside New Zealand, the involvement of communities has occurred because heritage institutions and their professionals have allowed it to take place. The Maori participants are clearly guests and are not hosting the process.

The role of Arapata Hakiwai in the care of Ruatepupuke II and James Schuster with Hinemihi present a degree of Maori supervisory control and mentorship that helps establish more equitable relationships. As yet, this has not gone as far as Western heritage professionals working within an intellectual framework governed by a Maori worldview. In this regard, it is right to question whether Hinemihi herself will need to be consulted about the proposed changes to her use and care. How this could be done is difficult to conceive within a Western worldview, as Hinemihi's needs are represented by discussions between her people. Whether Hinemihi herself has anything to say is likely to be expressed in terms of her effect on those people. In chapter 10, James Schuster, speaking for Ngäti Hinemihi, reflects on Hinemihi at Clandon: 'We owe her our lives. We would not exist had it not been for her. When she is ready to return, she will'. It may be right to leave that question to her.