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Editorial

Nau mai, haere mai.

Welcome to the second issue of Tauhere | Connections. As we head towards the end of the year, the theme of this issue – Whaiwhakaaro | Reflections – is particularly timely.

Our sector has many exciting moments to look back on this year. That includes, of course, the inaugural Museums Australasia conference held in Auckland in May, at which the Emerging Museum Professionals (EMP) group played a key role.

During the conference, we were pleased to launch this journal, inviting early and mid-career GLAM sector professionals to share their thoughts, insights, research and practical experiences. The quality of writing we have received is commendably high, and reflects the passion and solid knowledge base of EMPs around Aotearoa New Zealand and beyond.

In response to your feedback, the second issue of Tauhere | Connections features an increased quota of research-based articles, balancing those rooted in practice.

This issue includes reflections on the following: museums’ relationships with the principle of sustainability; the impact of institutional behaviour on visitors; the blurred line between museumgoer and non-museumgoer; representation of migrant and refugee communities in museums; photographic curation at home and away; effective and humanising storytelling; community co-creation in a museum setting; and the ethics, successes and challenges of a significant and long-term digitisation project.

We would like to thank our readers, those who provided useful feedback following the release of our first issue and all those who have taken the time to submit a piece for consideration. We hope you will all find something in this issue that gives you cause for reflection.

Ngā mihi nui,
Rebecca and Tamara
Lotte Kellaway
*Masters in Museum and Heritage Studies student at Massey University*

Lotte Kellaway is a crafty type who has spent the last seven years pootling about the house and mothering. She has a BA in Architecture Studies and is currently working towards a Masters in Museum and Heritage Studies at Massey University.

Earlier this year, my friend Charlotte was invited to share her obsession about conservation. She took part in the What We Talk About podcast recorded at BATS Theatre.¹ To most people, participating in the podcast was an opportunity to talk about something they loved, but Charlotte is not like most people. She has Asperger’s and her way of thinking about the environment and sustainability is typical of the condition. For a person with Asperger’s Syndrome, an obsession is a cause of deep distress.

Charlotte’s talk prompted me to look more deeply into the sustainability of museums. There are two definitions of ‘sustainable’ in the dictionary on my computer: one, the idea that something can be maintained at a certain rate or level; two, the conservation of an ecological balance by avoiding depletion of natural resources. Charlotte’s obsessions lie with the latter definition of sustainability, and her thinking spirals as she considers all the resources upon which her behaviour can impact. A bicycle is the most efficient way of getting around the city until you factor in the extra water and electricity consumed with the increase in showering and laundry. As soon as you step onto public transport you make it heavier thus causing the bus to use more fuel. Walking, however, is a less efficient use of time, and time is also a finite resource. Charlotte jokingly concludes that in this “over-analysis to the point
of being crippled by it and unable to make decisions”, the most efficient way to work is in bed, in the dark.

“In collections management, a ‘good’ product conforms to a very different set of rules. Synthetic is king and organic materials are to be avoided.”

When various industries market their approach to sustainability, different interpretations of what sustainability might mean become apparent. With each interpretation comes a different set of values. Good Magazine would like us to believe that our lifestyle choices can make a difference. The types of products the magazine champions, however, are very different to the types of products used in collections management. In Good Magazine, for something to be ‘good’ it should ideally be some combination of organic, free-range, fair trade, biodegradable, secondhand or recycled, and if new, manufactured from a renewable source. There is a second layer to this set of values, examining the company making the product; supporting local industry, particularly a company with a social focus, appears to be the ideal.

In collections management, a ‘good’ product conforms to a very different set of rules. Synthetic is king and organic materials are to be avoided. Stable compounds such as polyester, polyethylene and polypropylene, along with acid-free card and paper, unbleached cotton and flame-retardant Tyvek, are the primary products used to store and protect collections. The only biodegradable material is cardboard; other natural materials such as wood are too acidic or volatile. All ‘good’ materials give the impression that they will be here until the end of time, in line with the idea that collections will be maintained in perpetuity. These products conform to the first definition of sustainability, in maintaining the collection at a certain rate or level, but at what cost to the second definition and the depletion of natural resources?

In championing biodegradable, environmentally-friendly and renewable products, Good Magazine reconciles the two definitions of sustainability. People can maintain their shopping habits while avoiding depletion of resources. Museums, on the other hand, maintain their collections using a very different set of values, values that are seemingly at odds with a reduced reliance on natural resources. Does it matter if the materials used stay in the collection store and out of landfill? After all, museums are “organisms that ingest, but do not excrete.”

Use of a certain material, such as closed cell foam or Tyvek, isn’t just about what happens to it when it enters the museum. By applying Charlotte’s thought patterns, we have to think about the fuel to ship it to the museum and the fuel consumed in shipping it to the supplier before that. We must also consider the process of extracting the material in its natural form.

What impact does that have on the environment? How much of that source material is left in the world? Is it derived from fossil fuels? Does the process of
extracting it create by-products that are sent to landfill? Who is extracting or manufacturing the product? Are they paid well? Does the process damage their health? Where do the factory offcuts and seconds end up? Do I want to look this up? Will I want to work as a collections technician if I know these things? These plastics, they're not going to end up in landfill... they are going into the collection store. Forever. But does that contribute to sustainability?

Another environmental impact of museum collections is the number of useful items in storage. Collections tours are, to me, like stepping into my dream op-shop. Wonderful old things line the shelves, but we can’t use them, can’t touch them. As soon as an object is accessioned its useful life is over and a different set of rules apply in order to maintain its condition. Under no circumstances can clothing be worn, you can’t sit on the furniture, you don’t drink from the china. Museums interrupt the cycle of reuse that reduces the demand for new things to be made.

There’s a fabulous mid-century lounge suite in a museum at which I volunteer that ended up there when a prominent family sold their house. The museum saved it from an uncertain future. Rather than aligning myself with the view that museums spoil the fun for private collectors, who often don’t use objects either, I found myself thinking: “Imagine finding that in the op-shop when you needed a sofa.” And then I thought of the people who didn’t find what they needed, and went next door to the furniture sale to buy something cheap, new and probably made in China.

Purchasing secondhand items stems the demand for new ones to be made, thus reducing the impact of extracting finite resources. Ultimately, this is what Good Magazine is getting at, the remainder of its values addressing the scenario of “well, if it has to be new...” Museums store objects with the intention of “maintaining cultural identity and in helping people be aware of their history and roots”. An unintended consequence is the impossibility of resource recycling or of reducing the environmental impact of human need. Furthermore, the guidelines for collection management predominantly draw on the use of plastics to protect these objects in storage, and there are additional costs in terms of collection space and energy consumption.

This feeling that I have, that collections remove usable items from the outside world and create a need to produce more stuff is perhaps, unintentionally, linked to the argument that museums teach materialism and that the collecting habits of museums remove objects from private possession, “where they can best be enjoyed.” Presumably, this idea of enjoyment is to interact with an object in its intended form of use: to

“As soon as an object is accessioned its useful life is over and a different set of rules apply in order to maintain its condition.”
sit on a piece of furniture, to drink from the tea set or to explore the texture of a piece of embroidery without the barrier of cotton gloves.

Returning to the word ‘obsession’, I saw Museum Studies as a means of engaging with something I love: old stuff. But while my enthusiasm for op-shops was born partly from the aesthetic joys of vintage things and partly for its environmental benefit, I’m now finding it hard to reconcile my enjoyment of a museum’s collection with its dependence on plastics. In seeking to preserve cultural heritage material, museums are a part of the problem. Their reliance on plastic contributes to the depletion of natural resources, which will in turn affect the ability of future generations to enjoy the items we preserve for them. As Jerry Podany writes, “we will no longer have the luxury of ignoring whether conservation practices not only fail to contribute to sustainability but may work against larger preservation needs by contributing to excessive costs and unregulated, wasteful use of natural resources.”

An article by Robert Janes, *The Mindful Museum*, has influenced me most over the course of my studies and is something that I keep coming back to. Janes highlights the vulnerability of museums in their reliance on external funds to sustain them, arguing that this has “predicated their survival on being both dependent (for all forms of support) and independent...give us the money, we know what to do.” He argues that museums should consider the cost of maintaining their collections over time and factor this into a rationalisation of their collecting habits. I am inclined to agree with his view that “the convergence of global issues – ranging from climate change to the erosion of cultural diversity – has created a watershed of opportunity or an unprecedented crisis for museums.” As emerging museum professionals, we have a responsibility to ensure that this is an opportunity and work to align the ‘good’ intentions of the museum with a broader definition of sustainability.

**Endnotes**

1 You can find this podcast and other episodes in the series at: http://whatwetalkabout.co.nz/post/145179881913/30-charlotte-simmonds-on-conservation


Choosing a Uniform: Institutional Behaviour and Community Perception

Sasha Greig  
*Front of House Team Leader and Shop Manager at The Dowse Art Museum, Lower Hutt*

Sasha has a BA in Psychology and a Master’s Degree in Management, and enjoys being able to bring a different perspective to museums. She previously worked as a museum host, and is particularly interested in visitor behaviour, engagement and using research and strategy to help museums understand and cater to different audiences.

In the newly created role of Front of House Team Leader at The Dowse, one of my first major decisions was on the issue of uniforms. Previously, The Dowse had an informal uniform and dress code, a t-shirt that was worn for certain big events and the general expectation that front of house staff would look tidy at work. It worked, but it also meant that on a normal day in the gallery, there was no obvious signifier of who was a staff member. There was no indication as to who could answer questions, provide information about artworks or, importantly, let someone know where the toilets were. This article, however, is not about uniforms. It is about behaviour. More specifically, this article is about the institutional behaviour that determines how people, and communities as a whole, view a museum.

We decided to go with a simple black cardigan or vest that could be worn over a staff member’s regular clothes. Uniforms, particularly in the museum environment, can often be seen as a way of asserting authority, or creating the impression of security guards whose purpose is to monitor a visit rather than enhance it.¹ However, uniforms also tell a visitor who is staff, who they can approach when they need to find out something or have feedback to give, and this accessibility and accountability to our visitors is something we try hard to achieve.

Uniforms (or a lack thereof) are just one element of institutional
behaviour, and they play a small role in determining the conclusions that people will draw about a museum. Other institutional behaviours include the voice with which interpretation and object labels are written, who marketing is targeted at, venue hire pricing, how front of house staff interact with visitors, what exhibitions and events are programmed... the list goes on. In basic terms, the institutional behaviour of museums includes everything a museum does that visitors and non-visitors alike can observe and are affected by.

People often talk about actions speaking louder than words, or walking the talk. I think most institutions are aware that they need to do what they say they do. But how do you decide how to behave, and how do you ensure that everything the museum does – from exhibition programming, to collection policies, to events planning, to education, to front of house engagement – is sending out a cohesive and consistent message? A key element of this is first establishing a vision for the museum: defining the purpose of the museum’s existence, describing who the museum exists to serve, how it intends to serve them and why this service is important.

In the wider business world, vision is one of the core principles that form the foundation of a business’s existence. These principles should not change, and should be ‘embodied and lived' rather than be things that are done. In essence, the vision should dictate when a museum should act, how and why it should act, and who it is acting for. This is particularly the case for publicly-funded museums, of which there are many here in New Zealand, because the number of stakeholders in the museum tends to be much higher. The need to be accountable to those stakeholders also tends to be greater.

Aside from guiding the purpose of a museum’s existence, a vision also guides a museum’s behaviour. And that is the important part, because behaviour is the part that our stakeholders see. Whether a museum only needs to be accountable to a single wealthy benefactor, a small governance board or an entire city of ratepayers, it is the behaviour of the institution that will dictate how they are viewed.

Much has been made of the changing environments in which museums have to operate. In 1988 George MacDonald was already discussing the challenges that many in museums now spend a great deal of time facing: how to retain audiences in a world with an abundance of cultural and entertainment alternatives, how to encourage repeat visitation when museums may not
change often and how to encourage a new cohort of visitors when many do not feel welcome within the walls of traditional museums and galleries. As funding for museums, particularly from private donors and members, becomes more difficult to obtain, an awareness of institutional behaviour is more important than ever.

For example, if you say that you (as an institution) are inclusive, but your exhibitions and events are all targeted to a certain group of people, and your staff all come from the same background, it is unlikely that people will really see you as inclusive. If you say you are a place for families, but you demand silence in your galleries and don’t acknowledge or cater to the different requirements that adults and children have when viewing exhibitions, it is unlikely that people will believe you. If you say that you work with and for your communities, but provide no channels for them to tell you what they want and need, and if you do not consult with them on decisions that will affect them, are you really doing what you say? Obviously, this list goes on, and when it comes down to it, all museums need supporters in the same way any organisation does. We need people to visit us, to attend our events, to use our spaces, to enjoy our exhibitions, to fund us and to value us in their communities. Therefore, museums need to adopt some of the concepts and philosophies of other organisations. The vision needs to reflect the needs of key stakeholders and communities, and institutional behaviour needs to reflect the vision.

For many museums, this is easier said than done. Museums are often under pressure to cater to a number of different groups who may sometimes have conflicting needs. Many museums are also subject to the direction of a local council or other body that has influence over how they operate. But a clear and coherent vision should actually make this easier. A vision describes what is important to the museum, reflects how the museum caters to those who need it and describes how and why the museum is of value. If a vision is effective, and a museum is aware of its institutional behaviour, it should also dictate how a museum behaves when there are conflicting needs from stakeholders, or in a situation that has not been experienced before. Andrea Fox Jensen and Jeanne Vergeront have talked about turning the museum’s vision out towards its community, rather than onto itself. By doing so, the vision can accurately reflect the needs and wants of its surrounding communities. These outward-focused vision statements position the museum in terms of the value it has for others, rather than a self-imposed importance. They guide a museum’s behaviour so that it reflects both the vision, and the expectations of its interested communities.

Being firmly positioned in the customer-facing part of the museum, I often see the large effects of small behaviours. Because people see us as a museum for families, I have seen visitors become confused or even upset when we do not have interactive children’s activities available. I have seen...

“It is the behaviour of the institution that will dictate how they are viewed.”
first-time visitors feel immediately connected to an exhibition when it has featured local artists whom many of them have known personally. Going back to uniforms, I have seen visitors become much more comfortable approaching our staff to ask questions, give feedback and personal responses to exhibitions and generally engage in conversation because they can now see who we are.

Small behaviours can make an extremely large difference, not just to the people who visit the museum, but also to those who might, and those who think they never will. Behaviour is how reputation builds – people talk about behaviours, they talk about what they have heard a museum is doing or what they experienced last time they visited. It is largely behaviour that dictates whether someone will give the museum a try, having never been there before, and it is behaviour that dictates whether they will enjoy it once they are there.

In the same blog post that I cited previously, Jeanne Vergeront reminds us that museums are a means to an end, a place to access contemporary art, a place to learn about social history and a place to understand our place in the wider world, rather than an end in themselves. Behaviour that reflects a museum’s vision, and a vision that reflects the needs of a museum’s community, allows a museum to more effectively become the place that people need it to be, and ultimately, to be more valuable in people’s lives.

Endnotes:

Personal Memories to Community Records: The Swainson/Woods Digitisation Project

Chanelle Carrick
Curator Pictorial Collection at Puke Ariki

Chanelle Carrick completed a BA (Hons) in Art History and Theory/Archaeology followed by an MA at Otago University. Her MA examined the contemporary use of antique photographic technologies. She was Exhibitions Curator at Aigantighe Art Gallery in Timaru before starting as Curator Pictorial Collections at Puke Ariki, New Plymouth in 2013.

In 2005 Puke Ariki was offered around 255,000 photographic negatives for the museum’s collection. The negatives comprised the work of Swainson’s Studios and Bernard Woods Studio, and had been sitting in a garden shed for several years. Puke Ariki had only five days to consider whether to accept this local material of unknown scope and condition, but it was thought that the negatives had considerable social and historic value. So the damp and dusty boxes were transferred to Puke Ariki, essentially doubling the size of the pictorial collection.

The museum faced a major challenge to preserve such a vast collection. But with generous support from the Lottery Grants Board and the Taranaki Electrical Trust, Puke Ariki was able to appraise, clean, rehouse and catalogue the collection, with around 111,000 negatives being retained. Digitisation of the negatives began in 2013, with further support from the Electrical Trust, along with the TSB Community Trust, the Puke Ariki Trust and New Plymouth District Council.

The completion of digitisation in August 2016 marked the end of this significant project. The negatives have been transformed from private images into a collective public record, and the collection has been shared and explored through a number of community-focused initiatives. As we adjust to life post-Swainson/Woods we can now reflect on the value and outcome of digitising this collection, while considering some of
the challenges digital access brings, and begin looking forward to the collection’s future.

The collection

Swainson’s Studios was established in New Plymouth in 1923 by Joseph Swainson and sold to Bernard Woods in the early 1960s. In the 1980s the studio was taken over by Bernard’s daughter, who continued to operate it until 1997 and then donated the negatives in 2005. So the collection spans eight decades, giving an overview of photographic technologies during that time. From glass plate negatives to a wide range of black and white film formats, followed by vibrant colour film formats, the collection is a rich resource for anyone interested in the development of studio photography in regional New Zealand.

Swainson and Woods were commercial photographers, and the collection is primarily made up of studio portraiture. Weddings, family portraits, school photographs and sports teams, local businesses, and some candid photographs provide us with a remarkable record of Taranaki’s people, places and events over most of the 20th century. However, the collection is also quite unremarkable. These are, for the most part, ordinary studio images employing traditional portrait conventions. When seen in this way, the collection is dominated by visual repetition. But the role of the collection shifts depending on how, and by whom, it is framed. As a whole, any number of interpretations are possible in the wider context of Puke Ariki’s heritage collections, and the scope lends itself to the examination of changing traditions, fashions and social structures over time. It is not until individual images are removed from the crowd that we are reminded that to someone, these images are all intensely personal.

“Puke Ariki had only five days to consider whether to accept this local material of unknown scope and condition, but it was thought that the negatives had considerable social and historic value.”

‘Can you help us?’

A major focus since digitisation began has been sharing the collection with the people to whom it matters the most. This has been driven, in part, by the huge gaps in our knowledge about the collection that we rely on the community to help us fill. Most of the subjects in the negatives are identified by last name only. So Puke Ariki set about getting the collection into the community with the hope of crowd-sourcing identifications to develop a more useful resource over time.

In 2010 digital exhibitions were established at five regional locations with slideshows and response booklets containing images from
those locations as a way of targeting specific communities. Swainson/Woods also became a regular feature in the Taranaki Daily News through our ‘Can You Help Us?’ segment, where a new photograph is featured each week. Also, in 2013 the major temporary exhibition Photographic Memory, co-curated by then pictorial curator Ruth Harvey and pictorial technician Charlotte Stace, showcased the collection on a large scale for the first time and highlighted the digitisation of the collection as a major project for the coming years.

These initiatives proved really successful in gaining the support of the local community and raising the profile of the collection. But by far the most significant impact of the digitisation project has been the ability to interact with the Swainson/Woods Collection online. A comment function enabled on the Puke Ariki website enables visitors to share the names of their loved ones directly from the comfort of their living rooms. So far, this forum for sourcing collection information has resulted in over 8,000 identifications. The information we continue to receive ranges from simple names to detailed and often entertaining family histories.

Through sharing the collection widely, we have found that people have real connections to many of the images, and those people have been incredibly generous in sharing their stories. As such, a collection that on the surface...
can be seen as quite ordinary has been brought to life through both individual and collective memory.

One example of the value community engagement has brought to the collection is the story of Myrtle and Edward (known as Ted), who were identified when their photograph was published in the *Taranaki Daily News*. Through six community responses, we learnt that Myrtle and Ted are pictured about to fly off on their honeymoon in 1931. According to newspaper reports, they were the first couple in New Zealand to do so. Ted had a distinguished flying career, and their daughter recalled a family tale that he was once responsible for flying Lawrence of Arabia (T.E. Lawrence) out of India in a hurry. Through community responses we have been able to establish a rich narrative of an adventurous Taranaki couple that, along with the many other stories we have received, reminds us of the unknown potential hidden within Swainson/Woods and other local studio collections.

**Personal images made public**

Sharing the Swainson/Woods Collection has proved to be incredibly rewarding. But there are also risks involved in releasing an entire collection of private photographs for public display.

By placing the collection online, even at low-resolution, we have relinquished control over how those images are used and shared, particularly on social media. On one hand, seeing the public regularly share links to the collection on Facebook and family history sites is a big win for community engagement and promotion. On the other hand, at times the over-zealous sharing of images has caused concern for family members who might not want their photograph, or that of their loved ones, online at all. The collection also includes many images of Māori that, in an effort to make the collection as accessible as possible, have not been restricted from online display. As such, Puke Ariki has had to respond to a small number of concerns about the availability of images from the Swainson/Woods Collection, resulting in individual images being removed from the website.

While the aim of digitising the collection was to put it all online, as a family-friendly public institution, some common sense was also necessary when making decisions on which images were appropriate for public display. The digitisation team were our first line of defence, acting as censors for any material that might cause obvious offence or distress. They filtered out images of injuries and open wounds that were taken for insurance purposes, images of the deceased, and the occasional 1980s glamour shot that could be considered a little too personal.

However, we cannot always predict what kinds of images might evoke public concerns. We learnt early on, for example, that for publication in

“Through sharing the collection widely, we have found that people have real connections to many of the images.”
the *Taranaki Daily News* it is best to exclude recent wedding photographs to avoid any potential distress to those who have since divorced and their new families. Another case involved a group portrait that a family wanted removed from the website as one of the sons, seen in the image as a young teen, had gone on to commit serious crimes and the family did not want to be associated with him. We have been reminded over the course of the project that we simply do not know what circumstances or memories might be linked to a seemingly ordinary photograph. To some these images can be painful, and in placing them online we have been prepared to address any concerns openly and respectfully.

**Digitisation and access**

Facing these often very personal responses has raised important questions around the role of digitisation in facilitating access to collections, and what responsibilities Puke Ariki and other institutions have in determining what is appropriate for public display. Joanna Sassoon, writing on photographic materiality in the age of digital reproduction, argues that while digitisation is often driven by a demand for collection access, it can also enable “institutional control over what is made accessible, with criteria as to what is appropriate to be made public...rarely being discussed”.

Those internal selection processes can restrict access to some parts of collections, as the museum determines what material to exclude from digitisation projects while prioritising other areas for enhanced access. Institutions with large vernacular collections like the Swainson/Woods Collection have to carefully consider how much, or how little, is released online while remaining transparent about those decisions. Sassoon goes further to question just what digitisation actually provides access to.

Much has been written about the importance of materiality and the photograph as object, and it seems obvious that something is lost when translating physical things into digital formats.

Digitisation, and the selection of images to be digitised, privileges image content over materiality, and once digitised, photographic images in museum collections especially are transformed into commodities that are easily reproduced and sold or re-contextualised.

What also needs to be acknowledged is that the integrity of Puke Ariki’s digital files has been influenced by the decisions and tools of the technicians. They worked to produce the best product while remaining as true to the original negative as possible, but not necessarily true to the original photographer’s intent. Building a quality assurance process into digitisation workflows and establishing archival standards that governed how much – or in Puke Ariki’s case, how little – is done to repair images from damaged negatives, went some way to retaining a degree of accuracy. But translating physical negatives into digital positives will always be a largely subjective process.

While the original negatives are crucial to retain, the practical reality for Puke Ariki and many other institutions with photographic collections is that the
image content of those negatives, rather than their physical properties, is our primary asset. The unfamiliarity of images in a negative format makes them inaccessible to many of our visitors, and while they are used occasionally as teaching tools, it is not until they are digitised that they become available for widespread, non-specialist use.

A question of balance

Of course, when discussing digital access, the big legal elephant in the room is copyright. Who owns copyright to the Swainson/Woods Collection, and what right, if any, did we have to share these personal images so publicly?

The answer is unhelpful. While copyright of the Swainson/Woods Collection was transferred to Puke Ariki with the Deed of Gift, it is unknown what use agreements existed between customers and the studios. With this in mind, and in accordance with law, copyright is likely to sit with the person who commissioned each set of photographs until fifty years after their death. Given that the Swainson/Woods Collection spans up until 1997, there is without a doubt material that is still under copyright.

Because the large majority of images from the collection are identified by surname only, Puke Ariki has been faced with a copyright dilemma. To discover the copyright holders we needed to reproduce the negatives, making them available to the public and increasing the chance of identifying those who commissioned the photographs – but technically breaching the law in the process. In deciding to share the collection we struck a balance between legality and access, and with advice from Victoria Leachman, Rights Advisor at Te Papa, it seemed that the overall benefits of making the collection available online
outweighed the potential risks.

It is clear that, for the Swainson/Woods Collection at least, digitisation and public access to vernacular collections is anything but straightforward. Puke Ariki has attempted to share the collection with as much sensitivity as we could without censoring it to the point of misrepresentation. We have also ensured we have a process in place to resolve any concerns about public display, and those who have raised concerns have been understanding and supportive of the collection as a whole. Overall, the conversations and relationships that have formed out of community engagement with the collection – both positive and negative – have helped us gain a deeper understanding of our responsibilities to the collection and to the community.

**Where to from here?**

As more museums undertake large-scale photographic digitisation projects, discussions around the implications and limits of digital access will, I hope, continue.

But Puke Ariki is now starting to consider the future of the Swainson/Woods Collection. We have an incredibly valuable resource at our fingertips, and the scope of the collection naturally lends itself to thematic storytelling in a social context. Selective use of the collection can be highly effective in engaging the public, as we have already seen in an exhibition co-curated by previous Swainson/Woods Coordinator Milly Mitchell-Anyon and previous Social History Curator Elspeth Hocking. *Best in Show* brought together images of dogs and their families from the collection with social history items to form an exhibition that had little need for interpretation but a huge impact as a conversation starter. As a whole, the ability of the collection to speak to shared experiences will help Puke Ariki with our commitment to fostering a sense of collective identity in Taranaki.

I am sure that many of us, for example, have our own stories of being forced to wear beautifully co-ordinated woollen jumpers knitted by our mums like the Woods kids! We hope to further draw on the ability of this collection to evoke memories and spark conversation, through its continued use in our exhibition spaces.

One challenge we now face is keeping the Swainson/Woods Collection active while responding to the growing public expectation that our other collections
will become digitally accessible. We are also starting to see what impact this project might have on future acquisitions. I recently met with a potential donor of a large photographic collection and the question of whether we might be able to digitise the material was raised as a key issue. It seems that digitisation could become a criteria of acquisition, which may in turn impact on our ability to accept future donations.

But overall, digitising and sharing the Swainson/Woods negatives has enabled us to explore the potential of the collection on both a personal and social level, while giving us a deeper appreciation for the role digitisation can play in building strong relationships. Although our focus for the past few years has been on sharing the photographs with the local community, Puke Ariki encourages other curators, researchers, artists and historians to engage with the collection. While based in Taranaki, the Swainson/Woods Collection is also a New Zealand collection, and we look forwarding to seeing its stories revealed in new and perhaps unexpected ways in the future.

“A version of this paper was presented at the Practices in Contemporary Photography symposium hosted by the Govett-Brewster Art Gallery/Len Lye Centre in New Plymouth, 8 July 2016.

Endnotes


2 Sassoon, 193.

To Exhibit or Not
An Exploration of Photographic Exhibitions in the Museum

Loren Baxter
Masters in Museum and Heritage Practice student at Victoria University of Wellington

Loren is an emerging museum professional from Invercargill, New Zealand. She moved to Wellington this year to gain her Masters in Museum and Heritage Practice. Loren enjoys baking, yoga and hockey, and has developed a taste for travel. Next year she will participate in the Open Palace Programme in London. This is her first piece of published academic writing.

Photography forms a sizeable part of all recorded human history. Since its conception it has fulfilled numerous roles, moving from the scientific capture of truth through to the disposable digital snapshot. While photography theory is plentiful it has not yet successfully transitioned into the museum environment. Only modest amounts of literature exist concerning the exhibition of photography in museums, and what is available is limited and discipline specific. This article examines the development of theoretical thinking as it applies to photographic images in museums today. Recent photographic exhibitions will be discussed to illustrate these concepts and illuminate some of the challenges in this area of museum practice.

‘What is a photograph?’ and ‘What is photography?’ seem like simple enough questions. Considering the ubiquity of photography, answers should be straightforward. Yet no particular theory, or theorist, can provide complete clarity.1 Why is this? In the words of Sabine Kriebel, “To respond to the query “What is a photograph?” is not merely to describe a familiar, omnipresent item... It is to describe a series of historically contingent processes that, at one time or another, comprised a photograph and the practice of photography.” 2

2 Kriebel, “Theories of Photography.” 3.
In short, it is not as simple as it may look. From the slow and extremely delicate processes involved in daguerreotype production to the instant digital images we take on our phones, the changes in photography over time are vast. Any attempt to impose a clear definition on such a changeable process would immediately be hampered by its dependency on technological change and societal development. Despite this, photography theory is prominent and ongoing.

From its beginnings photography was topical and dividing. To some it was the most important triumph of modern science, while to others it was an object of lunacy, one that highlighted the stupidity of the masses. This stark divide resulted from differing assessments of the social function of the daguerreotype. Edgar Allan Poe described it as a near divine representation of absolute truth, “infinitely more accurate than any painting by human hands.” Science was seen as an unforeseen, yet-to-be-known power, with great promise and allure. Some fifteen years later, Charles Baudelaire took a much more apprehensive stance. He viewed photography, and its mechanical replication, as encroaching on the art sphere. It was impoverishing artistic imagination by fuelling “the notion that art and truth lie in the exact replication of the visual world rather than the world of the imagination, dream and fantasy.”

He did not align art and photography; at best, photography was a record keeper and a memory tool. These views remained bifurcated until the technological advances of the early 20th century when mass reproduction took centre stage, shifting the prevalent discourse away from the aesthetics, merits and demerits of photography.

It was not until the 1960s, however, that the photograph edged its way into the world of museums and art galleries. At this time, there was a “cultural repackaging of photography” when the focus shifted from its mass medium status to its cult value. John Szarkowski, Curator of Photography at the Museum of Modern art (MOMA) from 1962 to 1991, sought to embrace the change by completely disregarding, political, cultural and social context in his search for true photographic meaning. His work, The Photographer’s Eye, sought to investigate how photographs look and why. He concluded that photographs have five interdependent qualities intrinsic to the medium: “The Thing Itself”, because photography deals with what is real and actual; “The Detail”; “The Frame,” as what one sees in an image is carefully selected, not conceived; “Time”, as no photograph is instantaneous; and finally, “Vantage Point”, as photography teaches us to see and accept the unexpected perspective.
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Szarkowski does not stress the material nature as crucial to its understanding. Instead, he described the history of photography as centrifugal; as an organism born whole which we progressively discover. As Kriebel identified, Szarkowski was reconnecting with initial theories and critiques of the transparency of the photographic image. Although his dialogue was short, Szarkowski’s work, and that of others before him, clearly demonstrated the cyclical nature of photography theory. While it has changed significantly over time, photography theory continues to draw on past insight and direction.

One thread, which has remained relatively constant throughout the changes in theory, is the analysis of photography based on its social understanding and function. Scholar Elizabeth Edwards, who is very active in this field today, focuses on anthropological photography. Her work highlights the overall social importance of the photographic image and its connection with people.

In the last two decades, the material culture studies field has highlighted two dominant frameworks, social biography and visual economy, which attempt to connect the status and meaning of images to concepts like consumption, production, institutionalisation, use and content. Drawing from these models and from network theory, the more recent photography complex model suggests that the social saliency and efficacy of photographs is activated by networks of people and things. While taking the structures and technologies that bring meaning to photographs into greater consideration, this new model accounts for the flow of the photograph as a material object. Most importantly, the photography complex assigns a form of agency to the medium by acknowledging that the complex relationships and practices surrounding it have the ability to generate new material realities. Today, photographs are active beings forming living networks, a concept that is key to Edwards’ work.

To further this, Edwards considers the difference in mattering and meaning. “Why do photographs as “things” matter to people?” There is the suggestion that when one asks this question, people’s responses draw on practice and experience. Shifts from meaning to mattering, and from content to social

---

12 Kriebel, “Theories of Photography,” 17.
16 Ibid.
processes, are now essential within any material approach to this medium. The photographic image demands to be understood as a “plurality of modes of experience”\(^\text{17}\), as well as a tactile and sensory object that is shaped and constituted by time and place, just as the people who captured it were.\(^\text{18}\)

Despite this continuously developing theory, the role of the generic photograph in museums is, even to this day, vastly under-analysed. In their chapter “Museums and the Work of Photographs”,\(^\text{19}\) Elizabeth Edwards and Sigrid Lien identified photographs within museums as an ecosystem: a “finely balanced yet vital set of interconnections, dependencies, benefits and threats...expressed through practices, materialities, hierarchies and values.”\(^\text{20}\) Yet, in conversations with a social history curator, Edwards and Lien discovered that photographs were hardly considered, they were just there. This concept of “just thereness”\(^\text{21}\) epitomises how naturalised the photographic image has become for society, especially within the museum context. There are some very convincing arguments for the power and persuasive nature of items in our surroundings to which we do not give a second thought. Danny Miller, in his material culture theory, argues that the less aware we are of an item, the more ability it has to determine our behaviour and expectations, and to set scene.\(^\text{22}\) However, if photographs are “just there” and are most powerful when not noticed, what is the power of a solely photographic exhibition?

Consideration of the low rank of photographs in the museum hierarchy and their lack of object status further complicates this subject. Outside the art world, where photography found early purchase, this medium’s status is extremely uncertain. Are they objects? What is their value? This tension roots from the innate reproducibility of the medium. As museums value originality, the innate reproducibility of photographs immediately forces photographs outside of the institutions’ systems of value, excluding them from obtaining object status and placing them low in the hierarchy.\(^\text{23}\) Only photographs are allowed to be distorted, altered and cropped, without any controversy, before being put on display.\(^\text{24}\) Photographic images are frequently used as wall décor within museums and proffered little more than a passing glance. Is this something we should support? Are we being conditioned to understand photographs as different and outside the norm? Even in museums today, photographs can be separated out from the collections and labelled as archival material. This marginalisation means they have been largely undervalued in museum practice.\(^\text{25}\)

\(^{17}\) Edwards, “Objects of Affect,” 228.
\(^{18}\) Ibid.
\(^{21}\) Ibid.

\(^{22}\) Ibid.
\(^{23}\) Edwards and Lien, “Museums and the Work of Photographs,” 4-5
However, the continual improvement and incorporation of technology into the museum environment is causing dramatic shifts to occur in this area. Photographic collections have become more accessible and visible due to digital proliferation. This has generated two notable flow on effects of mixed benefit. For one, a sense of the materiality and historicity of photographs is increasing in museum practice, enhancing appreciation for the medium and raising its chances of object status and of being exhibited. This appreciation and awareness of the materiality of the medium only emerged when it was placed under threat by the digital environment. In contradiction, the second flow on effect achieves the exact opposite. The digital can also work to reinforce traditional object, photograph and context relationships through its relocation of the photographic image to the virtual space, accessible through touch screens, as optional, supporting information. It has been suggested that this is done to ensure the physical object remains undisturbed by the contextual photographic data. These effects show that despite the promise embedded in the digital medium to advance and better the status of photography in the museum environment, it is only beginning to alter the “just thereness” of the photographic image.

Positive change was recognised, however, when issues raised by Gaby Porter in 1989 were compared with emerging curatorial practice. Porter’s seminal essay “The Economy of Truth in the Museum” was the first work to critically analyse the role of photographs in this context. Porter felt photographs were not allowed their own history; instead, their immediacy and directness was used to support the truth value of other objects. Their value only derived from their ability to assist, intensify and transform other items. This took two forms: provision of context or the provision of authenticity. However, museums are beginning to rely on photographs to portray their narratives. Photographic images now complicate histories, shifting from mere illustration to tools working to introduce “a saturating directness into the museum’s representation of difficult and contested past.” Furthermore, the social and cultural practices of photography, as well as its representational issues, are becoming exhibition topics in their own right.

Recently, two national museums, National Museums of Scotland in
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Edinburgh and the Ulster Museum in Belfast, created exhibitions exploring the social history of photography. *Photography: A Victorian Sensation* at the National Museums Scotland was a large summer blockbuster exhibition with a 19th century focus. This exhibition provided a more generic account of the social history of photography than the Ireland-focused *Framed: People and Place in Irish Photography* at the Ulster Museum. Despite differences in institutional focus, size and scope, Edwards stressed that both institutions produced effective exhibitions that successfully switched focus away from the photograph as a document or an item of solely aesthetic value, and delved deeply into what these images do socially and culturally instead.³²

In her brief review, Edwards noted that in the Edinburgh exhibition she was confronted with the social and technological explosion of photography. By beginning with the daguerreotype’s mass adoption, this exhibition created an inclusive narrative surrounding the history of photographic use and desire. Similarly, the much smaller Ulster exhibition mastered the art of visitor immersion. By cramming the small exhibition space with cameras, albums, photographically illustrated books and postcards, the Ulster visitors could not help but be immediately immersed in the world of photography.³³ Working to portray a set degree of immersion is highly important as it influences individual visitor imagination and receptiveness, as well as the overall intensity of the experience.³⁴ Edwards applauded the highly immersive environment both exhibitions created. From the moment of entrance, they presented photographs as social rather than art objects, as well as demolishing the critique that the smallness of the medium can cause a lack of visual or material intrigue.³⁵

Both exhibitions communicated the value of photography by creating a sheer mass of objects within their given spaces. They presented photography as a site of translation, transformation and social engagement, instead of as a pure form.³⁶ This is why exhibitions are often referred to as narrative spaces. The memorability of a narrative usually increases the more people can identify with what is before them. In the text “Narrative Spaces”, Herman Kossmann suggested that these simple elements of narrative communication are often overlooked in the museum environment, stating that “reflecting on narrative perspectives, narrative strands, and narrative structures – is virtually alien to museums and exhibitions.”³⁷ Usually, audiences only hear the anonymous curator’s point of view. Perhaps photography is different due to its innate reflection and reproduction of human life, perspectives and processes. Perhaps it presents too many narrative voices. Edwards was tacit on this point, yet it seems that in these exhibitions the curator’s voice still reigned supreme.

³⁷ Kossmann, “Narrative Spaces,” 106.
The vast differences in the resourcing and design of these two examples demonstrates that the effectiveness of an exhibition does not rely solely on the strength of its artefacts. The approach taken to an item's exhibition requires serious consideration. Both these national institutions drew on their own in-house photography collections to generate these shows, yet took vastly different presentation strategies. *Victorian Sensation* embraced the full array of 21st century exhibition design elements such as large photographic murals, banners and a variety of touchscreen interactives. *Framed: People and Place in Irish Photography* followed a more minimalist and subdued social history approach, implementing large glass cases, wall-mounted vitrines and some framed material. Both perspectives are equally effective and demonstrate that there is no right or wrong way to exhibit photography.  

Delving slightly deeper, Edwards applauded the use of extensive labelling in *Framed: People and Place in Irish Photography*. The labels explained all relevant details of each image, including the medium and why it was shown in the said format. That is seldom done in this industry, especially in relation to photographs. 

Further to this, Professor Geoffrey Batchen, at the recent Collecting and Exhibiting Photography Symposium held at the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa, criticised the New Zealand photographic exhibition *New Zealand Photography Collected* for a reported lack of clear labelling. It was thought that visitors might assume all the items on display were original collection items and feel misled upon realisation otherwise. This connects us to the ongoing debate of what constitutes an authentic and original object. Museums, in principle, seek original items for their collections, but what is an original? Should we only display originals? 
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Before the invention of photography, this was a rather simple problem. Now the definition of an original photograph is almost impossible to consolidate. On the one hand an original image is the first printed image, yet to some people every single image is an original in its own right. This is only further problematised by the introduction of the digital image.

Should museums display digital inkjet prints of the negatives they own? Is this deceptive or misleading? Quite simply, if museums did not display inkjet prints there would be almost no photographic exhibitions. Any photographic exhibition produced under such constraints would consist of tiny, hard to see images hidden behind thick glass. Why is this? Because in many museums today, a photographic collection consists largely of negatives, not physical printed images. This is done for a number of key reasons. Negatives are easier to preserve; they require minimal storage room and allow the museum to reproduce the image for display to the desired size and quality. Furthermore, displaying digital reproductions is not deceptive if the accompanying labels are as extensive as those in the Ulster example. If a visitor is interested enough in the practice to hold concerns regarding the authenticity of the image, a detailed label will resolve any problems before they arise.

While it could be argued that stressing image difference, with bold categorising labelling, may make the non-originals seem fake and lacklustre or inhibit both the flow of the space and the conversations forming between the images, this is highly unlikely. In fact, the exhibition of large, eye-catching reproductions, which are robust and display suitable, creates a more visitor-friendly exhibition than a light controlled, hard to view alternative.

Why force viewers to crowd around a miniscule negative or an unclear image when the opposite can be achieved? In reality, the application of reproductions and digital printing highlights smart photographic curation practice by understanding and harnessing the innate reproducibility of the medium today. Good curators always consider their audience and understand that larger prints and negative reproductions only enhance visual satisfaction. As the earlier outline of photography theory demonstrated, photography is a changeable discipline. It is not made to remain static, so approaches which harness its adaptability, assert object status and allow the images to speak for themselves are a logical progression.

Edwards’ review of these two exhibitions raises numerous considerations for any largely photographic exhibition. To Edwards the exhibitions were successful in identical ways; they celebrated the ubiquity and mass of photography, as well as its ordinariness. They highlighted how entangled it is with other material forms, yet left visitors with a clear picture of what photographs do and why they matter. They treated the medium with a newfound seriousness and applied a refreshing mix of social history and scientific curatorial ideas.
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47 Collecting and Exhibiting Photography Symposium, National Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa.
to its presentation. Most importantly, they wrestled the medium away from a strict historical confinement to rows of framed prints or cropped background obsolescence.\(^\text{48}\)

The advances that these two exhibitions present in the exhibition of photography stem from a global trend for museums to embrace both society and the intrinsic sociality of the medium. In a recent demonstration of this trend, the Museum of London embraced Malraux’s conception of the museum without walls and developed the digital application Street Museum, taking their digitised photography collection to the people.\(^\text{49}\) By simply selecting a location, viewers can see an image of that area with explanatory notes. If they are in the exact location, viewers can switch to three-dimensional view and experience augmented reality overlaying the image onto a real-life city street. By taking the content to the people, this simple, low budget app tripled their visitor numbers.\(^\text{50}\)

With the current drive for museums to improve society and to be more community focused, perhaps photography is a key medium with which to support and further such outreach. Perhaps our emphasis should not be on improving solely photographic exhibitions, but on its digital applications and benefits beyond the museum walls.

While photographs have been present in museums for generations, only now are they obtaining object status, and consequently, the credibility to warrant their own exhibitions. The contradiction between the innate reproducibility of photography and the fundamental museum value of authenticity, together with a lack of theorisation in this area, has resulted in an unregulated, dynamic environment for museum practitioners. The relationship of photography and museums is far from settled, with the best use of this medium in the museum space provoking ongoing debate. However, a developing understanding of the social work of photography seems to be driving this debate in a positive direction. Photographs are increasing in social saliency and importance. Exhibiting photography, both inside and outside museum walls, will be an ongoing challenge for museum professionals and academics alike.

---


\(^{50}\) “Streetmuseum”, YouTube Video.
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Photographs in museums have a distinct history. Ambiguously and variously object, information, science and art, their presence sprawls across museum collecting and curatorial practice.¹

Attending the Collecting and Exhibiting Photography Symposium at Te Papa earlier this year opened my eyes to the complexity of photography as a medium and the difficulty of curatorial decision-making around selection, framing and interpretation. Using the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa (Te Papa) as a case study, I was interested in comparing and contrasting the New Zealand Photography Collected exhibition with the use of photography in the social history sections of the museum. In exploring how curators and communities appropriate images to tell stories, I aim to tease out how the meanings of photographs change over time and in different settings. To explore the role of photography in storytelling and identity affirmation, I will delve into the history of Te Papa’s photography collection, the implications of changing curatorial practice and the ethical and moral dilemmas of collecting, displaying and making accessible photographs of Māori.

Te Papa’s photography collections act both as documents of the past and as catalysts for present narratives. Representations of New Zealand’s history and culture are littered with photographic images framed as explicit and ‘authentic’ views of our past. The ability of photographs to capture detail instantaneously is a marvel that often overshadows the selectivity and cultural context leading to their production. Elizabeth Edwards describes capturing images as ‘culturally circumscribed by ideas of what is significant or relevant at the time, in any given context. Hence, as in any historical document, the inscription itself becomes the first act of interpretation’.  


Yet it is the realism of photographs that leads to our expectation that the medium will convey truth. Photographs are often unquestioned in this regard and are used as examples of an authentic and unmediated history. It is the responsibility of museums to offer a multivocal approach to interpreting photographic images, to question their scientific authority and to explore the context and motivations of the photographer.

Athol McCredie, Curator Photography at Te Papa, has extensive knowledge both of New Zealand photographic history and Te Papa’s collecting practices. His recent book, New Zealand Photography Collected, and the accompanying exhibition in Te Papa’s Ngā Toi gallery space, aimed to survey New Zealand photography using images

Queenstown, Wakatipu, from the park, 1876-1883, Queenstown, by William Hart, Hart, Campbell & Co. Purchased 1943. Te Papa (C.0014264)
Photographs are often unquestioned in this regard and are used as examples of an authentic and unmediated history."

collected by the national museum. This was a mammoth task with many areas of complexity and compromise. Collection subject areas are broad, ranging from historical landscapes, commercial tourism photos and colonial documentation of Māori through to amateur snapshot photography, portraits, documentary series and art photographs. These subject areas have been shaped by the organisation from its origins as the Colonial Museum to its current iteration and include areas of science, art and visual culture, history and Māori and Pacific cultures. Although photographs have been made and collected by the museum since its inception, the classification of these objects has remained ambiguous for much of this time. Photographs were often seen more as archives than collection items and it is only recently that a dedicated photography curator position has been put in place.

The creation of a single defined photography collection was the result of the merger, in 1992, of the National Museum with the National Art Gallery. This newly formed collection included negatives, transparencies and vintage prints from the museum’s history department and contemporary art photography from the gallery’s collection. Due to the cross-disciplinary museological philosophy dominant at the time, there was little curatorial specialisation, with the curators grouped according to the museum’s subject areas only. McCredie comments, “Photography was not seen as equivalent to the disciplinary four areas [...] but neither did it occupy a defined position within any of them.” The lack of a photography curator meant that the newly formed collection area was still without a definite identity.

Given the complexities of the photographic image and the diversity across subject areas, it is understandable that compromises were made in drawing such a disparate collection into a cohesive book and exhibition. During the photography symposium, McCredie explained some of these choices and trade-offs. His intention in creating the book was to deal with photography as a medium across many disciplines rather than laying out only an art historical canon. McCredie chose to illustrate changes in how photographs operate as objects within society, what they represent, why they were made and what they can tell us about our national identity. As the national collection, the scope could have been enormous, making the selection criteria vitally important. Te Papa’s focus has been on extending already existing collection areas by selecting representative examples of photographs that can stand for larger ideas. Rather than collecting medical or council photographs where meaning and use are unlikely to change, the museum has collected examples of a type that can tell many stories.

For example, snapshot photography can be used to tell us about the dress and look of people from a past era. However, it can also tell wider stories: the rise of amateur photography, technological advancement, consumer status symbols and information about what people considered important enough to capture for posterity. The meanings of these photographs change over time, from private photographs of family and friends to public images housed in the national collection. When a photograph’s value to its original maker or owner becomes obsolete – such as when the people depicted in the images pass out of living memory – these items then take on wider social and historical meanings. Even images created by the museum itself change meaning over time. From the early days of the Colonial Museum, scientists and curators used photography to document studies in natural history or ethnography. These objects are now treasured for their aesthetic and cultural value.

Te Papa’s history of making and collecting photographs of Māori is tied up with changing perceptions of indigenous people within New Zealand society. This began with the largely ethnographic documentation of Māori as ‘other’. In 1894 the New Zealand Institute, the governing body responsible for the national museum, granted amateur scholar and collector Augustus Hamilton financial assistance to photograph ‘a selection of pure Maoris, each individual to be taken in profile and full face’, which he developed into his self-described
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‘Record Collection of the Ethnology of the Maori Race’. After being appointed Director of the Colonial Museum in 1903, Hamilton deposited his entire collection with the museum and continued to add to it throughout his career. Photographs acquired by Hamilton from Whanganui photographer W.H.T. Partington mainly aimed to “represent Māori from an imagined past era but were mostly studio constructions designed to appeal to a market (including, arguably, Māori subjects themselves).”

A more disturbing reason for the collection of these images was the prevailing notion, among scholars of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, that Māori were a dying race. Dwindling population and disappearing customary practices resulted in a wave of salvage ethnography, recording ‘the Māori as he was’. However, this false notion was subverted by Māori who began to use the “colonising culture’s institutions for their own purposes... Some were gifting material to museums and allowing themselves to be photographed, not to be memorialised, but to demonstrate the strength of their culture and preserve it for the future”. These images are now used by descendants to preserve, reclaim and revive customary knowledge and practices as well as to identify and connect with their ancestors.

A shift in the status of Māori in New Zealand occurred after World War II, following the 100th anniversary of British settlement of New Zealand in 1940. There was celebration of, and new interest in, New Zealand history as distinct from Britain, and the important role Māori played in the development of the country. Illustrated histories and magazines raised the profile of photographic images as a means to understanding the past. Scholarly writing helped open the field of history to understanding “Māori in a historical context, as players in the development of New Zealand rather than as ethnographic subjects located in some timeless world of pure Māori culture”.

More recently, calls for decolonisation and biculturalism have led to changes in the ways Te Papa manages items in the collection.

“When a photograph’s value to its original maker or owner becomes obsolete – such as when the people depicted in the images pass out of living memory – these items then take on wider social and historical meanings.”
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Māori staff have been appointed as guardians and collection managers for taonga, administering access and outreach to iwi and facilitating relationships between descendants and their photographed ancestors. The 1984–87 touring exhibition Te Māori is described as a watershed moment for museums in the progression towards a bicultural approach, especially in the way photographs of Māori are treated. Repositioning those images from ethnography to art not only changed Pākehā views of Māori and expectations for their presentation, but elevated those objects for Māori themselves, restoring their mana and mauri. The strong presence of Māori in Te Māori’s organisation and management pointed towards the importance of taonga receiving appropriate care from knowledgeable people. As a matter of course, McCredie explains, “iwi are consulted on many matters to do with their taonga held by Te Papa in line with the Mana Taonga policy that proposes that regardless of legal ownership, Te Papa’s role is simply one of guardian, caring for taonga on behalf of iwi, the cultural and spiritual owners”.

Māori control and consultation over use and display of photographs reflects the changing relationship between Māori and Pākehā in the now bicultural organisation of Te Papa, as well as in New Zealand society at large. Some of the most significant changes in the treatment of photographs came about following the Waitangi Tribunal Report Ko Aotearoa Tenei (2011) concerning Māori intellectual property rights. The report’s recommendations are based on the moral right of Māori to control images of themselves and their ancestors, beyond those laws protecting the interests of authors and commissioners. To achieve this, the Waitangi Tribunal sought to set up a body that would allow Māori to register their taonga to “both control commercial exploitation and have a mechanism for objection to undesirable uses.” McCredie describes the report as having an authoritative moral influence which encouraged institutions like Te Papa to “move to a system of open access for photographs of Māori that is combined with provisions for iwi to control use of individual images”.

11 McCredie, ‘From Them to Us: Changing Meanings of Photographs of Maori at Te Papa’, 205.


Te Papa initially took a cautious stance, restricting all images of Māori from publication, use in exhibitions or online without the prior consent of the related iwi. However, this restriction was relaxed in 2009 for images of unidentified Māori, since it was not possible to gain permission from a related community.¹⁵

The institution still has a responsibility to protect those images from “commercial exploitation and derogatory or offensive use”¹⁶ in line with the report’s findings.

As images can be sent and received in an instant, making the collection digitally accessible is an ongoing concern, though the use of images to connect with whakapapa is increasingly important in a globalised world. The inclusion in collection records of the names and tribal affiliations of those photographed has made it possible for iwi to search more easily for images of their ancestors. Even the ethnographic images of a supposedly dying race, created by staff of the Colonial Museum at the turn of the century, are repurposed in our modern context by descendants who were once considered impossible. Collections can have a life of their own, changing through time and cultural transaction to take on new meanings for different people. With photography especially, categories are imposed only to be transcended.

Within the New Zealand context, we can see global trends in the representation of indigenous people reflected in photography, from colonial documentation of ‘other’, to more recent trends in renegotiating meaning and indigenous reclaiming of ancestral images. The use of photography in anthropology and ethnography to record the people and practices of indigenous cultures is inevitably caught up in the colonial power dynamic. The rush to document indigenous peoples during the late 19th and early 20th centuries was, in part, a result of the idea that interaction with colonisers would dilute traditional practices, rendering them inauthentic. The inherent nostalgia of these images, capturing a disappearing world, reinforced the idea that indigenous cultures were pure only in a past setting. Luckily those ideas have been outlived and later generations of indigenous people are increasingly re-engaging with colonial images. Elizabeth Edwards argues that “there is loss, a cultural dispossession, [but] increasingly archives and museums have become not places of exclusion and disappearance, temples of cultural loss, but spaces of contested histories and contesting practices, negotiation, restatement and repossession.”¹⁷

Janet Lydon argues that images of Aboriginal Australians have been used in two major and opposing ways throughout their history. She describes being profoundly impacted by viewing a
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photograph of Aboriginal men chained by the neck. Reflecting on this, she discovered that when these images were first circulated their impact and intention was quite opposite – as dehumanising images made for the “mainstream settler society as evidence for safeguarding progress and for a threat contained”. The photograph shocked Lydon because in recent decades, and in the only context to which she had been exposed, the image and others like it were seen as symbols of “colonial injustice, used by white and Indigenous people as shorthand for a larger history of oppression”. Interrogating images and using them to tell multiple stories can lead to social transformation, not only for indigenous people seeking to unleash themselves from colonial authority, but also for colonising societies in recognising the humanity and shared qualities of those oppressed. As spaces for ‘indigenous counter narratives’ open up, a rich, multivocal approach can encourage meaningful cross-cultural dialogue.

The use of photographs in illustrating injustice, racism and inequality can be a powerful tool in framing past and present values and behaviours for museum visitors. The ways in which photographs assume new meanings in the post-colonial context, Lydon says, reveal technologies of indigenous memory. These constitute a “range of practices that construct the past in the present, including by revealing unknown ancestors lost during the displacements of colonialism, and substantiating
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Indigenous stories and experiences formerly hidden from view."21 In a similar way to New Zealand, Australian cultural institutions have adopted moral practices that go beyond the law. These include consultation with indigenous communities over the use of images of identifiable people and the treatment of all indigenous peoples and their culture as living. The former also includes a restriction on access to images of deceased people according to Aboriginal protocol.22

These changes came about through the worldwide indigenous political activism of the 1970s, which focused on human rights, intellectual property rights and the repatriation of human remains and cultural objects to source communities. Then during the 1980s, as Lydon explains, “Australian museums became the target of vocal protests from Indigenous people demanding community access to collections, the appropriate display of cultural objects, and training and employment within the museum sector.”23 She quotes Tasmanian Aboriginal woman, Ros Langford, who argued that the issue was about control. “We say that it is our past, our culture and heritage, and forms part of our present life. As such it is ours to share on our terms.”24

It is important to note the emphasis Lydon places on the present use of cultural artefacts by modern Aboriginals, given the common misconception that Aboriginals are either confined to the past or ‘inauthentic’. Geographically remote Aboriginal communities have come to symbolise ‘authenticity’, leading to their exoticisation and ‘othering’, while the loss of culture suffered by communities from places such as south-eastern Australia, “who suffered invasion and dispossession first and most profoundly”,25 is dismissed. It is important to see the images of Aboriginal people taken by white colonisers as cross-cultural dialogue, acknowledging that both cultures were altered by the interaction and that all communities are dynamic, changing entities.

“As a form of Indigenous memory,” Lydon argues, “the photographic archive may address the exclusions and dislocations of the recent past, recovering missing relatives and stories, and revealing a history of photographic engagement between colonial photographers and Indigenous subjects.”26

The treatment of historical ethnographic images within a museum exhibition context can have a huge effect on the way those images are read by visitors. Edwards and Sigrid Lien warn that the tendency for photographs in museums to be unquestioned and lacking in interpretation means that “the less that we are aware of them [things/photographs], the more powerfully they can determine our expectations by setting the scene and ensuring normative behaviours, without being

24 Ibid.
25 Ibid.
open to challenge.”27 When colonial narratives and power inequalities go unquestioned by museum staff, this understanding is transferred to the visitor. When photographs are presented as mere supporting documents to an exhibition’s subject, their very nature as subjective and interpretive objects is lost. It is only when those images are interrogated or juxtaposed with counter-narratives that their value can be truly explored. Edwards and Lien give the example of an interpretive panel on infrastructure and railways where opposing images were displayed “side by side, photographs of the elaborate opening festivities, but also a stark indication of the conditions of African labour in the building of colonial infrastructure”.28

The story told by each individual image is complicated by their interaction with each other in a shared space. Photographs are key to knowledge systems within museums. They act as pointers, signs and symbols of larger social and cultural stories and shorthand for themes and ideas. This technique can be used by curators to illustrate exhibitions using a multivocal approach, disrupting photography’s traditional use as conveyor of ultimate, undeniable and scientific truth, to show the subjectivity of images. Te Papa’s

straightforward supportive evidence to the larger stories being told – those of history, culture and progress.

The photographs in *New Zealand Photography Collected*, on the other hand, are lifted out of their social and cultural context and elevated to telling the history of photography as a medium in our country. Their treatment is influenced by their location in the museum’s art exhibition space. There is much less interpretation and the audience’s attention is drawn to the beauty of the objects themselves and the skill of the photographer. In placing commercial landscape photographs alongside amateur snapshot photographs, McCredie illustrates our national appreciation of wilderness and landscape. However, by treating photographs as art, *New Zealand Photography Collected* offers a counterpoint to the exhibition techniques prevalent in the rest of the museum. The understanding of images is left open to individual interpretation and visitors can draw their own connections between, and with, the photographs, allowing for a more creative process of constructing or deconstructing national identity.

It is possible for museums to open up space for individual meaning making and counter-narratives by encouraging audience driven interpretation. Every individual brings a unique perspective to their viewing experience along with the very human tendency to tell stories to make sense of the world. Edwards describes a surprising reaction to an image of two young African women that, in her view, showed the colonial photographer’s desire through exotic voyeurism.
photographer’s focus on, and emphasis of, the star-like cicatrices covering the women’s bodies made Edwards feel uncomfortable. Noticing her African visitor’s eyes stray to the image she asked what they thought of it, to which the reply was “It’s wonderful... my grandmother had cicatrices like that, so beautiful – seeing that I remember the smell of her.” Just like that, sovereignty over that image and its meaning was returned from a sullied colonial perspective to that of pure remembrance and natural familiarity.

In reclaiming images of ancestors, Māori descendants forge new meanings and connections. The human experience can be salvaged from images made for another purpose and it is possible that, if we dig deeper into the context of an image’s creation, we will be able to more fully understand both the photographer and the sitters. Instead of placing museum audiences outside of the image, making the shift to empathetic interpretation will allow for a deeper engagement.

As Edwards very eloquently describes, “The rawness of photographs, their infinite recodability, their inclusiveness and randomness of inscription, hold the secrets of recognition. The increasing sense of visual sovereignty empowers one not only to make images, as contemporary practitioners are doing, but to re-engage with and re-interpret historical images from radically different perspectives, to give ‘voice’ to images and through them to insert the human voice, breaking through the containing context of photographs, to articulate the submerged. This is the site of their historical potential.”

The fluidity of meaning and interpretation of photographs offers an exciting and rich source of study, curatorial discourse and cross-cultural communication, requiring flexibility and reflexivity on the part of museum practitioners to inspire audiences to look deeper into photographs.

Photographic images can mean different things to different people. As physical records of the past mediated through cultural context, production techniques, social history and personal narratives, museums have a duty to make explicit their subjectivity. The idea that photographs are truthful and authentic documents must be questioned. The beguiling characteristic of photography to capture intended and unintended detail allows photographs to simultaneously contain scientific certainty and subjective experience. Exhibiting photographs requires reflexivity and an openness to audience interpretation that is free and unrestricted by prescriptive exhibition design. Counter-narratives will enter the museum within the audience’s minds, regardless of curatorial intention. However, museums can act as important catalysts for change if they embrace and explore the multiple narratives and voices that can be experienced and exposed through their photographic collections.

---
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Museums Within
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Meryl Richards is a writer living on the Kapiti Coast. In 2015 she completed a Masters in Creative Writing at Victoria University and is currently working on her first novel. From time to time, however, she likes to take a break from this to write about museums, exhibitions, community, books and life as she knows it. She has a Postgraduate Diploma in Museum Studies from Massey University.

At a Museums Aotearoa conference in Gisborne a few years ago, I presented a student paper from a research project on who went to museums and why. The project was part of my coursework in Museum Studies at Massey University, in which we’d been asked to interview two anonymous subjects: someone who identified as a habitual museumgoer, and someone who did not. Recently I read my presentation again and realised that I’d got it wrong. Well, not wrong perhaps, but there were important things that had escaped my attention.

The town I live in, Paekakariki, is full of university educated people, and the majority are Pākehā. It was easy to find someone for the first part of this assignment. The second part was harder, especially as I presumed that people wouldn’t want to talk about something they didn’t do.

But then I met Tanya.* We met by the Playcentre swings where Tanya was pushing the youngest of her children, and I talked to her about my project. Someone had said she might be interested. “Yes,” she said, “no worries, come over one night and we can chat.” Tanya is Māori, middle-aged, university educated; she was studying to be a teacher when I met her. You wouldn’t think she’d have much free time, but she barely paused to consider that fact before volunteering to give some of it to me.

I sat with Tanya in her warm kitchen as she baked bread, as she did every night, for her family to eat the next

* This is a pseudonym
day. “I'll give you the recipe, it's much better than that store-bought rubbish.” It was in the quiet of Tanya’s house after her children had all gone to bed and her husband worked in his study, that I found out she had a unique set of internalised museum values. Whether she physically set foot in a museum or not, it didn’t matter, she knew what museums needed to do for her and her whānau.

“We need to respect things from the past, and that is the job of museums, to look after and treasure our taonga,” she said. When asked if she believed museums matter to the majority of New Zealanders, Tanya replied, “I think they do. If we all thought about it, these things from days gone by are really important... we are looking for what is hidden in our history. We all try and find it.”

Actually, Tanya did go to museums, just not very often. Time and money were limited and given a choice, she said she’d “rather take the kids to the beach to look for pipis”. For some exhibitions, though, she would make an effort. “If you put a Māori spin on it, we’ll be there, if it’s about our taonga.” She told me about going to a Matariki exhibition at Te Papa where the experience was made accessible because of the museum kaitiaki who presented it.

“This Māori woman who was there was a native speaker. I speak Māori but I'm book learnt, so you can tell the difference, she left me for dust. She was really great at how she explained (the taonga) and she was also very Māori in the way she came across... I was so comfortable with it... So that’s the face I saw when I went to Te Papa. From what I could see there was nothing but respect and love for this taonga.”

As an occasional museum visitor, Tanya will visit mainstream institutions, but only when the rewards outweigh the obstacles. Research has been carried out in this area for decades; in the early 1980s American researcher Marilyn G. Hood noted that all too often museums offered “programmes that align with the values of their most frequent visitors, which conversely, are least appealing to occasional and non-visitors.”

Things have changed in this respect, but perhaps not as much as we would like to think. If modern museums and galleries want to widen their visitor demographics, they need to remind themselves that this conundrum still exists and continue to explore ways of addressing it.

Tanya also told me about going to a museum where she hadn’t felt so welcome. “I was given that look, you know what I mean.” Being Pākehā, I didn’t really know, but I had an idea. She’d felt pressured to buy a coffee and didn’t feel comfortable to continue exploring the collections. But it was at this point in our conversation that she stopped to bring out a tokotoko, a carved walking stick, that had been gifted to her husband.
“This is a real taonga,” she said. “They don’t just keep these things in museums. This is a taonga which we treasure – and all of our children know that when (my husband) dies this will go back to the family (that had it originally). We don’t own this in any sense of the word, we’re just using it. And I like how that’s what museums do, they look after, and they treasure.”

I was beginning to realise, talking to Tanya, that the binary model I’d begun with was irrelevant to the reality that I’d found. People cannot be so easily pigeonholed as museumgoers or non-museumgoers; nor should we make assumptions about cultural capital based on this factor. Tanya is rich in cultural capital. She comes from the predominantly Māori suburb of Flaxmere in Hawke’s Bay, has always had close ties to her marae, and the house she grew up in had photos of whānau and tipuna on the walls, giving her a strong grounding in her whakapapa and identity.

As an adult, Tanya sees similarities between museums and her marae. “My marae back home has the essence of what a museum is to me... it has the treasures, it has what we think of as te wairua, and I just know that feeling of walking in, it’s like walking into a womb with taonga, and even now I can just picture it, that is a museum to me in the true sense of the word. I don’t own it, but I can love it and have a piece of it and that’s great.”

It was about then that I thought I should discard the term museumgoer altogether. For it seemed to me Tanya was telling me she carried her marae – the essence of a museum – within her.

Tina Makereti, Curator Māori at Museums Wellington, wrote an essay on this topic recently, titled By Your Place in the World, I Will Know Who You Are. She described wrangling with the Māori and Pākehā sides of her parentage and struggling to place herself between cultures. When asked ‘Where are you from?’ her reply is “at least a paragraph, if not a page. Never a sentence. Each time I encounter this question I feel like I fail a small test, no matter how hard I work to come to terms with the lack of precision and definition in my answer.”

I too, have a sense of inadequacy when asked where I am from, and I flounder as I try to cobble together a reply.
My parents were both born in New Zealand but just escape being of the generation likely to refer to England as 'home'. We lived in Tolaga Bay when I was born and it holds a special place in our family narrative, despite many years living in other places and even in other countries.

I was taken to museums and art galleries when I was a child and I feel comfortable walking in to large, traditionally Pākehā cultural institutions, but I’m less comfortable walking onto a marae. I’m afraid I will make a fool of myself or offend someone. I don’t know exactly what I should be doing and when to do it. I bluff my way through my visit, affecting a degree of familiarity which, if anyone could be bothered to observe me, would know is false.

So this is what I mean when I said I’d got my presentation wrong. I spoke only of Tanya and her experiences of identity, culture and cultural institutions, which in retrospect, seems reductive and one-sided. Yes, it was a research project and she was the interviewee, but not to acknowledge my own lack of cultural capital, when it comes to stepping outside of my comfort zone, skews the picture.

I had to consider myself as someone with a ‘museum within’ and then also to ask myself some questions. How strong are the foundations of my museum? What do I value? What are in its collections? What do I want to learn? What do I want to add to my museum? What can conversations with people like Tanya do to enrich my museum?

Tanya no longer lives here in Paekakariki. Members of her whānau became ill and she moved back to her Hawke’s Bay papakāinga to be with them and to look after them. She told me of her plan to start up a kura kaupapa and to restore her hapū wharenui. This interested me and I asked if I could be involved in some way in documenting it. As always, Tanya was immediately generous and inclusive – “Yes,” she said, “you can come up and talk to the elders and members of the whānau.”

I haven’t visited Tanya and her whānau yet. I tell myself it’s because life has got in the way, but perhaps it’s because I’m still hesitant to step out of my cultural comfort zone. I’d like to think not though, because Tanya’s openness and generosity of spirit deserves to be returned in kind. Who knows? Perhaps some of her clarity will rub off on me.

Endnotes


Curatorial Practice and the Representation of Migrant and Refugee Communities at the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa

Louisa Hormann
MA in History and Museum and Heritage Studies student at Victoria University of Wellington.

Volunteering at the Holocaust Centre of New Zealand (HCNZ) led to Louisa’s thesis research on German-Jewish refugee objects, and her ongoing interest in the representation of migrants in the heritage sector. Louisa is the web curator of the Victoria University Creative Legacy heritage project, and a former HCNZ board member.

As societies become more diverse, museums are expected to deliver exhibitions and programmes that equitably represent the culturally pluralist societies in which they operate. Many museums today justify their civic value by positioning themselves as institutions that promote social inclusion, recognising and reflecting political acknowledgement of social exclusion and government attempts to reduce its effects. Such museums seek to engage with difference (gender, race, ethnicity, class, religion, disability, sexuality, etc.) and attempt to counter existing discriminatory narratives. This article examines engagement with minority communities at the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa (Te Papa). As there is already much literature on the national museum’s engagement with Māori, I focus on its collaboration with migrant and refugee communities, and how these groups are represented in the museum’s collections and exhibitions.¹ My analysis stems from the question: how is customary curatorial practice affected by this new

Te Papa’s positioning as an inclusive focal point of national identity for all New Zealanders requires its curators to engage collaboratively with New Zealand’s diverse communities and their histories. However, in the same way that curators propose objects for acquisition, these groups are selected by the museum, having been identified as communities of interest. This article will argue that the nature of this engagement is still largely directed by the museum itself.

Literature review

The institutional push towards collaborative work between museums and the communities they serve began in the 1980s, as the museum’s purpose shifted from preservation and research into material culture to also serving the community’s needs and aspirations. Under the influence of the ‘New Museology’, which developed in the same period, museums are considered to have a social responsibility towards the audiences they serve.

Under this new framework, the continuing relevance of museums becomes increasingly reliant on their ability to “respond to contemporary social challenges and to position themselves to deliver benefits in response to social change.” This point goes to the fundamental question introduced in Peter Vergo’s formative 1989 collection of essays titled The New Museology: what is the purpose of the museum?

Vergo’s critique begins from the standpoint that museums are social institutions and their work is inherently political. He argues, “The very act of collecting has a political or ideological or aesthetic dimension.” Furthermore, as repositories for valuable objects and authoritative sources of knowledge, museums are “key institutions in the production of social ideas in many nations.” The museum is seen as both shaped by society (more specifically, by society’s elites at the helm) and as an influential force in shaping the beliefs of wider society itself.

As ‘products of the establishment’, museums ‘authenticate the established or official values and image of a society’ directly and indirectly. They promote and affirm dominant
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societal values and narratives, while subordinating or denying alternative identities and perspectives, so that the political, social and economic dimensions of exclusion in society manifest in the museum.\(^6\) As Richard Sandell explains, museums that leave out the stories of minority groups both deny those groups access to museum services and aggravate their marginalised position “by broadcasting an exclusive image reinforcing the prejudices and discriminatory practices of museum users and the wider society.”\(^7\)

Based on this observation, Sandell has explored the potential for museums to “help retrieve and re-integrate those excluded” – and to act as “agents of social inclusion”.\(^8\) Sandell argues that museums “can counter prejudice through their capacity to frame (and reframe), to inform and enable the conversations which visitors, and society more broadly, have about difference.”\(^9\)

However, at the time of publication in 2007, he notes that despite “widespread concern to represent different communities in more equitable and respectful ways”, comparatively few institutions had deliberately set out to develop exhibitions that “purposively offer these alternative ways of seeing”.\(^10\) Equally, there were few studies examining the social and cultural effects of new representational forms and how audiences engage with them.\(^11\)
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Collaboration with communities is evidently a ubiquitous trend in museums, but the actual impact of these community engagement and representation strategies and the impact these changes have had on curatorial practice is little explored. This article seeks to address that point, by drawing on the reflections of Te Papa's curatorial staff on their experiences working with marginalised communities.

Recently, debate has centred on the “appropriateness of social change as a goal for museums”, as some conservative cultural sector professionals believe this objective conflicts with other museum agendas. Sandell explains that in the United Kingdom the concept of social inclusion is entrenched in government policy, and “critics have argued that the assignment of social goals to cultural organisations is tying them too closely to the state and eroding their autonomy.”

For Sandell, museums and galleries have both the potential and the responsibility to contribute towards reducing social inequality, and this, he argues, goes beyond party political objectives to what is considered more broadly as being in the best interests of society. He believes museums should seek to instigate social change as “…all museums have an obligation to develop reflexive and self-conscious approaches to collection and exhibition and an awareness and understanding of their potential to construct more inclusive, equitable and respectful societies.”

Sandell, who has written extensively on the subject, identifies two main methods used by museums “to reposition themselves so as to act directly to address the social problems associated with exclusion.” The first is museums working as “agents of social regeneration to deliver positive social outcomes to defined audiences”, involving “direct contact and ongoing project work with small groups of people who are considered to be disadvantaged, socially excluded, or living in poverty.” The second approach is museums acting as “vehicles for broad social change by exploiting their potential to communicate, educate and influence public opinion.” Te Papa itself combines both methodologies in its approach, as evidenced in the community work of its curators and in the strategic vision and purpose of the museum.

The initial literature on museum community engagement initiatives was mostly limited to work with ethnic communities and to front-of-house procedures. However, Sheila Watson’s edited volume Museums and their Communities shows there has been a significant shift in scope, expanding to include projects with broader communities (such as LGBTI groups and the disabled), and analysis of back-of-house processes (such as collecting and co-curating); both these aspects of Te
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Papa’s curatorial practice are examined in this article. Still, scholars debate whether community engagement is at the margins or the core of museum and heritage work today.20

Although Sandell argues that potential solutions for social inclusion could lie with museums, he concludes that museums have many limitations and that “their role in directly tackling the social problems associated with exclusion is likely to be marginal.”21 Golding and Modest warn of “tokenistic claims of inclusion by museums.”22

Graham Black’s chapter on the museum’s challenge to remain relevant to 21st century audiences identifies an enhanced, participatory museum experience, supported by better marketing as key to improving general visitation, but concludes that a strategic response is needed in order to achieve increased museum visitation from lower socioeconomic groups or from marginalised communities.23

According to Black, communities will only feel that the museum relates to them “when those communities are not only welcomed into the museum but also become an inclusive part of it – in the collections; in the histories presented; in the programming; in the development of multiple perspectives within exhibitions; and in the staff.”24

This representation, Black argues, must extend to include “a public recognition of the contributions communities have made to society at large”, not only the presence of relevant objects in the museum.25 Citing Donald Garfield, Deirdre has similarly suggested that social betterment can only be achieved when ‘disadvantaged’ groups “share in the power and authority of those who make decisions about cultural and other institutions.”26

24 Ibid.
However, the reality for most museums engaging in community projects is that the institution dominates proceedings. Sheila Watson’s edited volume Museums and their Communities, which examines the relationship between museums and the societies they serve, argues that this relationship “must be based on the recognition that this [relationship] is an unequal one, with the balance of power heavily tipped in favour of the institution.” The following discussion and case studies will show that Te Papa’s strategic direction gives the museum precisely this mandate, and this directs its work with migrant and refugee communities.

Community engagement at Te Papa: working with migrant communities

First established by an Act of Parliament in 1992 and officially opened in February 1998, New Zealand’s national museum was formed in the wake of the New Museology and self-consciously works with and for a variety of communities across its various departments and operations. According to Te Papa’s 2014–2018 Statement of Intent, the museum works “in partnership with iwi, communities, and organisations to create exhibitions, events, education, and public programming”, which ensures the museum “provides meaningful experiences for diverse audiences – including youth and non-traditional audiences...” Accordingly, curatorial practice, while central to the museum’s operations around collection care, has expanded beyond the traditional emphasis on the collection, preservation and use of objects, to include working with the various communities connected to Te Papa and its collections.

While not explicitly using the words ‘prejudice’ or ‘social inclusion’ in official documentation, Te Papa’s current strategic vision Changing Hearts, Changing Minds, Changing Lives speaks to the affective and provocative power of museums and their potential for positive impact on museum audiences. According to Te Papa’s former chief executive, Mike Houlihan (2010–14), the museum’s vision is to provide experiences that are “relevant...and evoke a response...that provoke thought, reflection and debate, and facilitate social interaction...that improve the quality of life of individuals and communities, and extend the impact of a visit beyond the museum’s doors.” Houlihan assures us that the
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objective is about ‘public value’, where “the museum actively plans to enable people to form ideas about their world, so that they can make decisions from an informed position.”\textsuperscript{31} Te Papa’s strategic vision is significant as it underpins all of the museum’s activities and provides a framework for all activities and decision-making.

As an autonomous Crown entity that must have regard for government policy, the museum’s strategic intentions and outputs are also aligned with Government goals and cultural sector outcomes (as set out in the Ministry for Culture and Heritage’s 2014–18 Strategic Intentions).\textsuperscript{32} One such cultural sector priority is ‘Fostering inclusive New Zealand identity’. Social inclusion is loosely expressed in terms of ‘New Zealand identity’ and is incorporated into Te Papa’s Performance Framework.\textsuperscript{33} The museum’s strategic intentions are more explicitly community-oriented, and include: ‘Accessing all Areas’, ‘Connecting with People’, ‘Sharing Authority’ and ‘Being a Forum for the Future’.\textsuperscript{34} Te Papa has an ongoing, statutory requirement to pay “regard to the ethnic and cultural diversity of the people of New Zealand, and [their] contributions...to New Zealand’s cultural life and fabric of New Zealand society” and to ensure it “provides the means for every such culture to contribute effectively to the Museum as a statement of New Zealand’s identity.”\textsuperscript{35} It does this predominantly through the community gallery on Level 4 of the museum, a dedicated segment of the Passports exhibition where migrant communities work in collaboration with Te Papa staff to tell their own stories. Passports, which provides an overview of the history of non-Māori migration to New Zealand since 1800, was always intended as a long-term exhibition, but curator Stephanie Gibson explains the intention was to change the community gallery modules every two years, so that “you could radically change it to profile a specific community...and give that community a chance to really express themselves on the national stage.”\textsuperscript{36}

Curated by Te Papa in consultation with external community advisors, these “community-generated exhibitions and associated events are considered by migrant groups to be important markers of their visibility within the nation.”\textsuperscript{37} Te Papa deliberately promotes these exhibitions as ‘community’ rather than ‘migrant’ exhibitions, highlighting the community consultation process that underpins individual exhibitions.\textsuperscript{38} Te Papa's curatorial team publishes regularly in the institution’s journal Tuhinga on issues of museum theory and practice encountered in their community engagement work. Stephanie Gibson and Sean Mallon's
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2010 article focuses specifically on the consultation between the exhibition team and community regarding the marketing of the community gallery exhibitions. Consultation, according to Gibson and Mallon, is never a straightforward process, and “managing the complex relationships and levels of consultation to which Te Papa’s exhibition teams commit is extremely difficult, time-consuming and expensive.” This is because, as Watson argues, meaningful relationships take time and patience, and communities are constantly changing over time. They are multifarious entities and therefore highly complex, and as Gibson and Mallon acknowledge, communities “can be fractured by their multiple identities, hierarchies and politics.”

In response, Te Papa curators undertake consultation with community advisory groups (CAGs), working alongside large internal exhibition teams. There is a degree of self-selection in the approach used to form CAGs, which usually consist of five to eight volunteers “sourced either from workshops held at Te Papa or ‘shoulder-tapped’ as suitable and respected people from their communities.” Due to funding limitations, members are often middle-aged or older and resident in the Wellington region, and so are not fully representative of their communities. Formal meetings are usually one-day events, but between meetings CAG members are still asked to advise on issues of representation, cultural authenticity and appropriateness of design proposals, signing off on exhibition texts and acting as “Te Papa’s ‘live links’ to the communities they represent.”

The selection of communities as potential subjects for exhibitions is also heavily directed by the museum. Te Papa initiates the process using a checklist of criteria by which to determine a community’s suitability. This checklist includes the following criteria: whether the community has a mandated representative body to help with the exhibition development process, the community’s research capability and availability of its resources to assist in effective communication, whether the community has already approached Te Papa for presence in the gallery, the nature of its current relationship with the museum and the quantity and quality of material culture relating to that community held in public collections. With “the realities of budgets, timeframes, attitudes of ‘best practice’ and demanding production standards” directly impacting on the exhibition development process, exhibition teams end up controlling the final decisions. The unequal nature of the relationship between museum and community is anticipated in the ‘Terms of Reference’ document produced by Te Papa for CAGs, which states that while “community recommendations are
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sought, respected, and adopted where feasible, final responsibility resides with the museum."\textsuperscript{48}

\textbf{Representing refugees: collection development and The Mixing Room exhibition project}

Six community exhibitions have been presented at Te Papa since the museum opened in 1998, but the current exhibition \textit{The Mixing Room: Stories from Young Refugees in New Zealand} (opened 2010) marks a shift in approach. Not only distinctive for its focus on a community based on situation (and an emphasis on migration due to forced displacement), the exhibition was created without material culture objects. It was also significant for the increased level of community engagement in its conception and development.

The history of 'regular' (as opposed to irregular) migration to New Zealand is a dominant theme within its national collecting institutions, but refugee objects and experiences have only recently appeared in the public heritage

discourse. Progression in this area aligns with international trends, as all heritage professionals are increasingly expected to ensure “their collections more fully represent all in society, including those from the periphery and the margins and those with alternative or unorthodox opinions...” 49 However, there are several challenges associated with the collection of the material culture objects of refugee experience.

Refugee objects are usually domestic in nature, and as everyday objects taken for mnemonic or practical reasons (or both), do not tend to speak for themselves. “If you didn't know their provenance you probably wouldn't collect them,” Gibson explains, “their survival is actually quite tenuous.” 50 Therefore, the ability of refugee objects to speak to the displacement experience depends greatly on how curators choose to record and use the artefacts. Such objects often come as part of complex acquisitions, and if accessioned incompletely could be misrepresented in the institutional record. This is especially problematic when dealing with collections consisting of objects both made in New Zealand, and originating from an ancestral homeland, such as the textiles collection donated by the Hager family to Te Papa in 2007.

While most of the Hager acquisition represented Kurt Hager’s New Zealand clothing manufacturing business, it also included a drawstring purse of knitted beads from Vienna, which was brought out to New Zealand when his family fled Austria in 1938 and 1939. 51 According to Gibson, the collection was accepted “as the Hager family, in terms of manufacturing, but also because they had a migrant – a refugee migrant history. But that doesn't really surface in the cataloguing very well, so I’ve tried to improve that.” 52 Gibson has since added the ‘refugee’ association to the Hager Purse object record. Now the object will appear in collection search results for ‘refugee’.

Regarding its potential display, there is a risk of the Hager purse being displayed as a ‘pretty purse’. 53 As Gibson explains, an aesthetic object “might be used for a different purpose, and its refugee storyline will get suppressed...So there is a danger around how we use objects.” 54 To counter this risk, Te Papa ensures their collection objects are as ‘useful’ as possible; that they have multiple significances and can tell many stories. 55

“ The reality for most museums engaging in community projects is that the institution dominates proceedings.”
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For instance, Helmut Herbert Hermann Rex’s minister’s gown, brought out of Germany when Rex and his wife fled as religious refugees, was displayed in an exhibition on uniformity, as an example of religious dress. Even though the exhibition concept did not require it, the curators decided to include Rex’s refugee story as part of the exhibition label accompanying the gown, “because the story’s so great and it’s respectful, we did two jobs – we used it as a religious dress and as a refugee story.” But this approach is only effective if all those historical significances are noted in the object record. Issues of representation – such as exhibition concept development, acquisition cataloguing and exhibition labels – have a direct impact on the ‘refugee presence’ in institutional memory.

Te Papa’s first recorded refugee acquisitions were the mainly textile objects of Augusta Bohmer, a Jewish refugee from Moravia who arrived in New Zealand in 1939. The Bohmer objects were actively sought out and acquired by Te Papa’s curatorial team for the Passports exhibition in the mid-1990s. Since then, Te Papa has been offered relatively few artefacts from refugee donors. Acquisitions include the minister’s gown (gifted on behalf of the Presbyterian Church in New Zealand in 2006), the Hager purse (2007), Estonian objects donated by the Reissar family, who came to New Zealand as displaced postwar migrants (2008), the cheongsam garments of Mayme Chanwai, a WWII refugee from Hong Kong, and a collection of Somalian artefacts donated by Mohamed Abdulaziz Mohamed (2014).

Contemporary refugees often arrive with very few objects and these are so personally significant that they do not wish to part with them; it is usually later generations who consider gifting to museums. 

When developing The Mixing Room exhibition, Gibson and her team decided to take an artefact-free approach. The exhibit instead uses oral testimony, so that youth with a refugee background shared their stories “almost as if that’s an object, and their images, and their creative works, which are all digital.” Dialogue, storytelling and collective action were the focus of the participatory methods used at the youth forum that determined the exhibition’s overarching concept and themes. Furthermore, all work created by the young participants was accepted for the exhibition, reflecting the project’s guiding principle to “deal with the dreams of the people with the utmost generosity that is within your power to manage”.

“Contemporary refugees often arrive with very few objects and these are so personally significant that they do not wish to part with them...”

55 Ibid. 56 Ibid. 57 Ibid. 58 Ibid. 59 Gibson and Kindon, 73. 60 Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa, The Mixing Room 90% developed design, 2010. 4. File EP-EX-011-01-05#e01 (ref. 406338), Te Papa Archives, Wellington, quoted in Gibson and Kindon, 77–78.
As a collaborative project and exhibition, *The Mixing Room* has co-created content. In contrast to solely collaborative projects, co-creation “requires community members and staff members to work together from the beginning to define the project’s goals and generate the content and programming.”\(^\text{61}\) This participatory approach utilised a delegated power model, and museum staff took guidance from Wellington-based non-governmental agency Change Makers Refugee Forum and from youth development practice, as well as consulting with community leaders and refugee agencies.\(^\text{62}\) The essential theme of settlement of refugee background youth in New Zealand for the gallery as a whole was chosen by Te Papa staff (curators, interpreter and concept developer), as it fitted the brief of the Community Gallery and avoided the risk of reawakening associated trauma by focusing on refuge in New Zealand rather than the refugee journey.\(^\text{63}\)

Most recently, Te Papa installed a new glass step in The Mixing Room’s floor timeline to acknowledge the ongoing Syrian refugee crisis, and first major arrival of Syrian refugees in New Zealand. The step was unveiled on 14 April 2016 and is the result of collaboration between Te Papa and the New Zealand Red Cross.\(^\text{64}\) Links to the Red Cross website have since been integrated into the exhibition itself, providing visitors with information on how New Zealand settles refugees, like those recently arrived from Syria. In her blog post marking the unveiling, Gibson also refers to the ‘Double the Quota’ campaign for increasing New Zealand’s refugee quota.\(^\text{65}\) Gibson’s earlier blog post reflecting on the 2015 Federation of International Human Rights Museums (FIHRM) conference hosted by Te Papa also refers to the Syrian refugee crisis, stating that despite the exhibition being five years old, it is now “more important than ever with recent events in Europe.”\(^\text{66}\)

Making such a link between the exhibition and the current Syrian refugee crisis raises awareness among visitors and online audiences of the crisis, but also prompts the audience to see the connection between the lived testimony of the exhibition’s co-creators and the plight of those still yet to find refuge. Reiterating these present-day connections, especially to political calls for doubling the refugee quota, speaks to one of the primary communication goals of *The Mixing Room* project, which intended to cause visitors to “be challenged to consider their own views on refugee resettlement.”\(^\text{67}\)

It also highlights the potential for museums, as identified by Viv Golding, to “forge a contemporary connection with the lived experiences of present-day audiences, most importantly to progress critical thinking and point to collaborative action that we can take as responsible communities on matters

---


\(^{62}\) Gibson and Kindon, 70, 74.


\(^{65}\) Ibid.


\(^{67}\) Gibson and Kindon, 69.
of contemporary concern...” While neither didactic or overtly political, Gibson utilises the full potential of the exhibition in relation to world events affecting New Zealand, encouraging audiences to respond critically and empathetically to social concerns surrounding refugees and ethnic difference.

**Conclusion**

Community engagement and the social responsibility of museums are important and contested topics of interest among scholars and practitioners of the museum and heritage sector. To ensure that museums themselves remain relevant to today’s diverse societies, it has become increasingly crucial for museums to deliver audience content that more fairly represents its various and varied constituents. This requires museum staff to engage with forms of difference in a way that serves to counter existing narratives of discrimination. In doing so, museums position themselves as institutions vital for the promotion of social inclusion.

This article considered how the strategic repositioning of museums has affected and changed curatorial practice at Te Papa in relation to minority communities – specifically regarding migrants and refugees – and the ways in which these groups have been represented in the museum’s collections, through collection development, research and exhibitions. Te Papa combines two methodologies to address the social problems associated with exclusion in New Zealand society: by working closely on community projects with representatives of relevant communities considered to be socially excluded or marginalised in some way, and by utilising its potential as a prominent, authoritative institution to communicate, educate and influence public opinion. The methods are embodied in the curatorial practice undertaken by Te Papa staff and in its strategic direction.

Te Papa’s curators, while still the subject experts leading collection operations and scholarship, now produce outcomes using collaborative and participatory approaches with its communities of interest and community advisory groups (CAGs). It is through the collaborative research undertaken by curators with specific community representatives that the museum’s collections and exhibitions are better able to reflect cultural practices, changes in society and important issues in contemporary New Zealand, as well as throughout the nation’s history. However, the nature of community engagement at Te Papa, as at similarly large institutions, is directed and controlled in large part by the museum itself. This is because the relationship between museums and their communities is fundamentally unequal; the institution is dominant because the authority ultimately lies with the museum. Any analysis of community engagement and diversity in New Zealand museums must first acknowledge this reality if we are to continue encouraging the development of social inclusion in our institutions.

---
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Abstract

This paper examines the process of community co-created museum exhibitions, describing the recent development of two such projects in which author Alexandra Rogers served as a ‘museum co-creator’. The work demonstrates both the positive outcomes as well as some challenges of co-creation in a museum space. For example, we show its potential for supporting critical thinking and empowerment in community co-creators, while our case studies also reveal persisting challenges in defining co-creation and our expectations of it. We suggest that existing criteria for co-creation within museums will serve future work in this area well, and enable dynamic and meaningful public engagement.

Introduction

The concept of co-creation and its potential to engage and harness the power of communities is growing in popularity across multiple disciplines. However, as with any emerging methodology, significant challenges remain in its definition and implementation, as well as in our understanding of its effects. With its roots in the diverse fields of marketing, education and design, co-creation (and its analogues, such as ‘participatory pedagogy’ and ‘participatory design’) is associated with a range of definitions, entailing varying degrees of participation.
Within the discipline of museology, co-creation has been discussed at least since Simon’s seminal work (2010), which defines co-creation as a partnership between the public and the museum in which both parties define their needs and goals at a given project’s inception, then work together towards fulfilling them. Simon’s work is widely cited and considered a coherent analysis of both participation and co-creation within museology (Gibson & Kindon, 2013; Govier, 2010; Holdgaard & Klastrup, 2014; Oomen & Aroyo, 2011).

Critically, Simon differentiates co-creation from participation by several criteria. These include that in co-creation:

- Communities have more power than they would in a participatory project
- Both the community and museum’s goals are achieved
- Communities are involved from the project’s inception and have the power to shape any aspect of its progression
- The finished project will be ‘co-owned’ by the community and museum.

Despite these criteria, significant disparity remains in the definition and enactment of co-creation in contemporary museology. Some studies have equated co-creation with ‘user-generated content’, which generally refers to public contribution in the form of social media and other online content, such as blogs and wiki pages (Sandvik, 2012; Stuedahl, 2011). Under this definition of co-creation, less interaction is expected between the museum staff and a public community (Holdgaard & Klastrup, 2014).

Other forms of public-museum interaction often labelled co-creation entail the donation or loan of an object,1 or the excerption of quotes or collage of submitted images on a digital screen. The community in such situations would have rarely been involved from the beginning of the exhibition, or had power over goal-setting and exhibition design and creation. Indeed, the term co-creation in modern museology appears to vary greatly in definition and practice, and a level of involvement that could more accurately be understood as participation is frequently considered co-creation. The lack of coherence in the museum literature is a potential stumbling block in the evolution of co-creation within the discipline.

This study aims to examine what co-creation according to Simon’s (2010) standards might look like in a museum setting by co-creating two exhibitions as separate case studies. We describe the experimental orchestration and evaluation of two co-created museum

---

1 This interpretation of co-creation was indeed observed in the museum hosting the second exhibition, where loaned or donated items were put on display as part of exhibits and referred to as examples of co-creation (AR and JR, pers. ob.).
exhibitions, including the co-creation processes, successful elements, areas for improvement, and general implications in the field of museology.

**Methods**

**The co-creating parties**

In both of the co-created exhibitions described here, author Alexandra Rogers served as a ‘museum co-creator’: linking access to a museum space, instigating and facilitating the co-creation process, and acting as a participant co-creator. Rogers’ goal in both cases was to co-create an exhibition that could act as an exemplar for future co-created exhibitions. Working with well-organised community groups provided a good test environment for trialling co-creation in a museum space as it offered the best chances for efficiency and success within a fairly short timeframe of a few months.

In the first exhibition the other co-creating party was the director of a citizen science project called Marine Metre Squared (Mm2, www.mm2.net.nz), in which members of the public help to monitor the New Zealand shoreline. The aim of Mm2 is to stimulate and facilitate care for people’s local marine environments, while building a database of information that scientists can use for their study of environmental change. One of the main ideas of Mm2 is that anyone can take part because it is easy and free. The project is set up for participation by families, schools and community groups, as well as individual adults, with many of the resources (both printed and digital) designed to be accessible for children.

The second exhibition was primarily co-created with a group called Healthy Harbour Watchers (HHW), which includes teachers and both current and past students from several different secondary schools who volunteer to monitor the water quality of Otago Harbour. HHW members test the water at various times throughout the year and compile their findings into an annual report. The HHW group with whom co-creation was carried out consisted of two chemistry teachers from different schools in Dunedin, along with four current, or recently graduated, secondary school students.

This exhibition also involved a group comprised of several primary school classes submitting to the South-East Marine Protection Forum (SEMPF) to have a marine protected area designated within the Otago Harbour. Each of the three primary school classes had become aware of a province-wide consultation process currently informing the decision of where in Otago a new marine protected area should be placed. The classes had gained an appreciation of the shoreline of the Otago Harbour through participation in Mm2 and thought that the area should be considered as a
candidate site for protection. Instead of contributing via the main online submission process, the classes all chose a more creative route, which was not only suitable for exhibition but was also deemed a valid submission mode by the SEMPF.

Evaluation of the process of co-creation

We used several methods to evaluate the co-creation process and its alignment with Simon’s (2010) criteria. Self-reflection was used to assess the experience of the museum co-creator, as well as to document the exhibition creation process. Self-reflection is an important and widely used tool in qualitative studies (Anfara, Brown, & Mangione, 2002; Finlay, 2002; Mays & Pope, 2000; Watt, 2007), yielding introspection that can reveal to the researcher the biases, emotions and thoughts that they are experiencing during the study and that may affect the results (Watt, 2007). In this instance, self-reflection was journaled weekly and then coded to identify emergent themes at the end of each of the two co-creation case studies.

To explore the experiences of the other co-creators, either a written questionnaire or in-person interviews were employed. A short questionnaire with eight open-ended questions was designed to provoke reflection on the process of co-creation and used to assess the Mm2 co-creator’s perspectives (for questions see Appendix A). This method was deemed appropriate for accessing quality feedback from an individual with professional experience in collaborative work, who we felt would provide unrestricted comments and appreciate responding on their own time frame.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with the adult co-creators from the HHW. This method was used in an effort to extract more in-depth reflection on their potentially divergent perceptions of the process.

“This method was used in an effort to extract more in-depth reflection on their potentially divergent perceptions of the process.”

Results and Discussion

Both exhibitions were successfully completed for their scheduled exhibition times. The first exhibition was titled ‘Look Beneath the Surface’ and was on display from 4 April to 18 May 2015 at the Otago Museum. The second exhibition was titled ‘Otago Harbour Community Caretakers’ and ran from 5 - 29 October 2015 at Toitū in
association with a major exhibition on the history of the Otago Harbour. Both were well received by their host museums, which are nationally recognised institutions with 270,000 to 300,000 thousand visitors annually. These museums present professionally constructed, high-budget exhibitions, but despite the co-created exhibitions being neither, feedback was positive (described further in Rogers and Rock, submitted ms).

The two exhibitions were also both legitimately co-created, as illustrated in the breakdown of tasks and the creation of the exhibition components. In ‘Look Beneath the Surface’, of the 13 exhibit components comprising the exhibition, the content for three was generated by the museum co-creator (Rogers), six by Mm2, and four by both co-creators together. Rogers was tasked with the display of items, including arranging the content and creating signage for all components. (The nature of these tasks and descriptions of the components are discussed elsewhere; Rogers and Rock, submitted ms).

For ‘Otago Harbour Community Caretakers’, five out of seven components were made by HHW co-creators in their section of the exhibition, while Rogers constructed two, and also arranged content and made signage for display (with some guidance from HHW co-creators). The SEMPF group made all the components of their section, with Rogers making signage and arranging the displays. Rogers also visited schools involved in the SEMPF submission twice, once to propose the idea of co-creating a museum exhibition, and then to collect the work.

As Rogers was the lead instigator for both case studies, our assessment of the process begins with their self-reflection documentation. To identify the generic themes that emerged from their journal, the researcher retrospectively classified and grouped each journal entry at the completion of each exhibition. This two-phase analysis allowed for their experiences in co-creating the first exhibition to inform the process of the second. Perceptions of both the museum and public co-creators are described separately below for each exhibition, with results aligned under their respective criteria. The four criteria as originally presented (after Simons, 2010) are merged into two central criteria including (1) power and involvement and (2) goals and co-ownership.

**Exhibition 1: Look Beneath the Surface**

The emergent theme that accounted for the most journal entries was that of the museum co-creator’s relationship with their public co-creator. Generally these entries centred on the challenges of relying on someone else to get things done and provide content and feedback on ideas. Some of these entries were also centred on the working relationship, addressing the issues of trust and a shifting leadership hierarchy within the co-creative work. Another theme that emerged involved the process of problem solving during the final exhibition presentation.

(1) Communities have more power than they would in a participatory project, and are involved from the project’s inception with the power to shape any aspect of its progression
This criteria appears to have been the case in ‘Look Beneath the Surface’, where co-creators met frequently throughout exhibition conceptualisation and construction, with meetings purposefully providing a time to share ideas and outline progress. The Mm2 director was able to contribute as much as they wanted to, and was aware of the direction the exhibition was taking such that they could redirect it where desired.

In initial meetings both co-creators decided what the exhibition would be about and how large it would be.

Compromise and redirection throughout the process is evidenced by the fact that three of the four exhibit components that the Mm2 director particularly wanted in the exhibition were exhibits that Rogers noted they would not have included. In the final arrangement of exhibition layout the Mm2 director maintained power, suggesting that a central display unit be rotated such that an entirely different initial component was seen from the main entry point to the exhibition. Rogers noted that initially they did not agree with this choice, although later realised it was for the better once the change was made.

The Mm2 director also noted challenges within the co-creation process, including that goals that were not always clear to both parties, while the lack of an agreed leader “led to confusion and a less co-ordinated approach.” As it turned out, Rogers did most of the creative work under the direction of the Mm2 director, not only putting the exhibition together but creating content and accompanying interpretive writing.

A limitation on both parties’ power to shape the progression of the exhibition was the repeated change of the allocated exhibition space within the museum, due to the museum’s many other commitments and schedules to work around. It shifted from an enclosed room with one entrance, to an open atrium with the possibility of the visitor entering the exhibition from two points and with no walls to attach things to. As the Mm2 director pointed out, such changes meant they were unsure of “who the main audience would be and how much we would need to attract them.”

Indeed it was a significant challenge for the co-creation process to have the exhibition hosted within a large and nationally recognised museum. The exhibition had to be added into the museum’s schedule approximately a year in advance, a process that took multiple meetings with museum staff to achieve. This significant amount of time and fore-planning required to secure a major museum venue may be outside the capacity for many community groups. Ultimately, the Mm2 director also wished there had been an opportunity to view the fully assembled exhibition in place before it was opened to the public to allow for a final internal review.

“Communities have more power than they would in a participatory project”
(2) Both the community and museum’s goals are achieved, and the finished project will be ‘co-owned’ by the community and museum.

The Mm2 co-creator’s goals for the exhibition were to not only tell the story of their project, but also to encourage participation. These had implications for the design of the exhibition from the very start. Mm2 puts an emphasis on caring for the marine environment, such that the exhibition needed to align with the group’s underlying marine-conservation ideals. It also needed to be appealing to family groups with children in order to reach one of the target audiences of Mm2, and in a way that invited their participation. To target this audience, the exhibition was organised to be displayed at the Otago Museum for seven weeks encompassing a school holiday period.

Throughout the subsequent stages of exhibition creation, the Mm2 exhibition goals were frequently referred back to, ensuring that the exhibition stayed beneficial to the larger Mm2 project. Rogers noted that progressive iterations of the exhibition descriptions included a breakdown of exhibit components, each detailing how they fit in with Mm2 goals. Ultimately, the story of the project was successfully told and participation was indeed encouraged, but no formal data exists on the recruitment of Mm2 citizen scientists as a direct result of the exhibition.

The museum co-creator’s goal was to present an exhibition that could act as an exemplar for future exhibitions developed with the public in a similar manner. The achievement of this goal was assessed more informally, with Rogers checking that the material included was feasible for a community.
to make (i.e. was not particularly costly or technically complicated) and thus could serve as effective exemplars for future work.

The ‘co-ownership’ criterion appears to have been met in this exhibition, as Rogers noted, “neither one of us took charge and tried to control the creative process, we both shared ideas and themes and decided together on what to and not to include in the exhibition.” In the end most of the exhibited material, including content made new for the exhibition, went back to the Mm2 project for its future use.

**Transfer of knowledge between first exhibition and second**

Challenges involving time management and unclear definitions of roles in the development of the first exhibition were identified as issues to be addressed in the second, primarily through the creation of a detailed timeline, enabling contributors to see what they needed to do by when.

Meanwhile, early allocation of the display space was inherently more achievable because the second exhibition was associated with another major exhibition that had a fixed place and schedule. There were only two options for the display space in order to maintain proximity to the main exhibition, and the final space was indeed fixed early on, allowing co-creators to visit and visualise the area they were using.

**Exhibition 2: Otago Harbour Community Caretakers**

It was recognised early on that co-creation as defined by Simons (2010) was not possible with the South-East Marine Protection Forum (SEMPF) group as the three school classes were constrained by time and budget, requiring them to work independently of one another, and towards a previously defined goal. Consequently, the schools did not have a chance to shape their half of the exhibition from its inception, and while each school had complete control over what they produced for their own section, they did not interact with or have influence over any other material in the exhibition.

Thus the main process of co-creation in this study was carried out with the Healthy Harbour Watchers (HHW) in their half of the exhibition, as with this group the essential criteria for co-creation could be fully met. Three main themes emerged from evaluation of Rogers’ journal entries, including a focused attention on learning from and improving on the first process; their relationship with the public co-creators; and developing processes to try and meet the criteria of co-creation.

The challenges in the working relationship with the second museum were very different from those faced

“Despite it being made clear that this was to be a community co-created exhibition, they wanted to ensure that they ultimately had the power to change anything about the exhibition that they wanted to at the end.”
with the first. Scheduling took less time, ir acceptance of the exhibition was conditional. As described in the Roger’s self-reflection, this museum “wanted to ensure they had the final say with the exhibition in how it looked and what it said. Despite it being made clear that this was to be a community co-created exhibition, they wanted to ensure that they ultimately had the power to change anything about the exhibition that they wanted to at the end.”

These changes included anything from structural and aesthetic elements of the display, to wording and design of the signage. The museum’s desire to be able to alter aspects of the exhibition presented a potential challenge for co-creation that was intended to be solely between an independent facilitator and a community group. However, ultimately the museum was happy with the exhibition content and presentation, and did not make any major changes.

(1) Communities have more power than they would in a participatory project, and are involved from the project’s inception with the power to shape any aspect of its progression.

As the SEMPF group of schools were not involved from the beginning, did not have influence on material the other schools generated and thus did not have power throughout the entire exhibition development process, their contribution was more comparable to participation. It is of note, however, that the process undertaken with the SEMPF group is typical of that often considered co-creation by museums and other public institutions.

To ensure that the HHW participants held equal power in the creation process, Rogers attempted to make their role as a facilitator as passive as possible. For instance, during the first meetings with the HHW group, Rogers refrained from giving overt suggestions for exhibition themes, and instead focussed on asking the group what they wanted to say. This resulted in the group coming up with the four sections of the exhibition (the history of HHW, their results, trends in their data and a harbour report card).

To ensure that the group continued to have the power and opportunity to shape the exhibition, co-creators met regularly to discuss the progressing work. All members of the group ended up contributing to at least one exhibition component, and while each component was the responsibility of one or two individuals, the group used
their regular meetings as opportunities to make suggestions on how the others could improve what they were creating. In this way, everyone was involved not only in what they were specifically working on, but were also able to contribute conceptually in what others were working on as well.

Thus it was clear that the criterion of power distribution was met, as the HHW group had significant control over designing and creating the exhibition, with the entire group contributing to all parts of the exhibition either conceptually or in creative practice (construction). The founder of the HHW group also felt that by being involved in the exhibition creation, the students became simultaneously more invested in, and critical of, HHW as a whole. They began “questioning some of the decisions” being made rather than passively accepting them, and the founder felt that this was a great advantage for the project as it had the potential to stimulate overall improvement of their work.

It is also clear that the HHW group maintained power over the direction of the exhibition from start to finish, with the goals of the exhibition decided by the group as a whole, and altered by members of the group during the process (e.g. when a student suggested midway through the planning phase that the additional goal of helping people get involved in HHW was important, it was subsequently added as a component of the exhibition).

As Rogers noted: “I came into the process with no expectations or preformed ideas for what the exhibition content would look like, and made a conscious effort to encourage the group to make the major decisions about the exhibition. Occasionally I stepped in and guided the group in a direction, based on my knowledge from the previous exhibition, but ultimately the HHW group had the final say.”

An important part of Rogers’ role as a facilitator, identified during the first exhibition process, was time management. A shared timeline allowed the group to see what was expected of them, while regular emails with updates on progress were also helpful in keeping everyone on track. This organisation was highly beneficial, with the result that HHW had all of their content finished and ready for display two weeks before the installation date, allowing time for a final review before the exhibition opened to the public.

(2) Both the community and museum’s goals are achieved, and the finished project will be ‘co-owned’ by the community and museum

In response to feedback from the first exhibition, the museum co-creator was anxious that everyone’s goals were clearly shared from the start. Thus, in the first meeting a point was made to expressly discuss each party’s goals. The HHW group expressed five goals that they wanted to achieve in their exhibition, namely to:

- Give visitors a history of HHW
- Share some results
- Illustrate long term trends in the data
- Introduce the concept of a report card rating the harbour’s health,
- Encourage the general public to get involved.
The goal of the SEMPF group was to showcase their creative submissions alongside the HHW displays, as both groups were working to protect the Otago Harbour.

Rogers’ goal of co-creating an exhibition according to the working criteria within museology was also declared, along with a secondary goal of investigating best practice for facilitating co-creation. Rogers then continued to bring these goals up in subsequent meetings to ensure that everyone worked to achieve them.

The exhibition was organised for display in Toitū (The Early Settler’s Museum, Dunedin, New Zealand) to coincide with their large temporary exhibition called Life on the Edge, which explored the cultural history of the harbour and how people have used it in the past. The co-created exhibition could be seen as building on this story, highlighting how contemporary communities, particularly youth, are currently caring for the harbour.

Initially, it seemed that the HHW were somewhat overwhelmed by the idea of creating an exhibition. This was likely in part a result of the traditional idea that an exhibition is not only driven by but also owned by a museum. However, once the co-creators were actively generating and enacting their own goals it became clear that not only were these going to be shared widely, the end product was also going to stay with them for future use.

The group’s founder noted that the HHW project’s story and general findings had never been properly shared, and that it was good to be able to do so in a cohesive, concise form via the exhibition. Through regular meetings, maximum group input and lots of opportunities for adjustments and additions, the group was able to take co-ownership of the exhibition they were creating. Indeed, more than the material items from the exhibition were retained by the HHW group. The founder also observed that, as a result of the reflective group work, one of the most powerful effects of the co-creation process was making them think a bit harder about their data, as well as more fully recognise “the community service part” of their work.

Conclusions for a facilitator role and co-creation within a museum context

In the first exhibition development process, the museum co-creator ended up doing most of the creative work under the direction of the public co-creator, while the second exhibition offered Rogers a more hands-off, facilitating role: showing different ends of the spectrum of co-creation. It is likely that more co-creation efforts

“The group’s founder noted that the HHW project’s story and general findings had never been properly shared, and that it was good to be able to do so in a cohesive, concise form via the exhibition.”
could fall effectively in the middle, with both community and museum contributing to exhibition components to address respective goals, but also collectively deciding on its presentation.

This process will still present challenges in achieving a cohesive exhibition design, and thus necessitate frequent feedback sessions where facilitation is organised and pragmatic but not dictatorial, and always deferring to the goals of the collective. This can be expected to be one of the most challenging steps for a museum unwilling to relinquish what may be felt as necessary professional control to an unexperienced community (Govier, 2010).

Both museum and community must be motivated and organised, preferably with a facilitator who can be flexible and able to respond to the differing levels of creativity and confidence within the community group. Theoretically either a museum or public co-creator could fill this role.

One of the many positive outcomes of the non-hierarchical work involved in co-creation is collaborative learning. This is often considered an analogue of co-creation, and in education theory it is understood as an effective means for encouraging students to think critically about the subject (Sung & Hwang, 2013). Evidence of this could be seen in the HHW co-creation work, particularly among the students involved. Through the co-creation process, the students gained equal power with the founder, which granted them the confidence to question some of the decisions being made on their behalf.

Education theory suggests we can anticipate beneficial effects of such power shifts when social boundaries between students and teachers are broken down and students start to ask questions which might not ordinarily be acceptable (Jun & Lee, 2014). The students’ increased involvement in HHW may also be linked to the positive influence of participatory investment, an effect now well described for citizen science projects, in which involved public participants show greater support for a wider cause, due to the time and energy they have invested in a specific project (Conrad & Hilchey, 2011; Ryan et al., 2001; Wiggins & Crowston, 2011).

The potential for such wide-reaching and positive effect on civic engagement is in line with the aspirational goals of many museums, and supports community co-creative practice as an effective means for achieving an active contemporary role for museums within society.
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Appendix A

Eight questions posed to the public co-creators through a questionnaire or during semi-structured interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Question Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>What do you think the benefits of co-creation were?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2</td>
<td>What challenges did you experience in the co-creative process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3</td>
<td>Which aspects of the co-creative process do you think were most effective?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4</td>
<td>Was it useful to have The Sandpit exhibition space to work within?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5</td>
<td>Would you consider co-creating another exhibition? Why/why not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 6</td>
<td>What do you think would have made the process easier or more effective?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7</td>
<td>What were some of the problems you faced during the co-creation of this exhibition?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 8</td>
<td>Do you feel you gained anything from this co-creation experience?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ötzi : Ice Man, Rock Star!
South Tyrol Museum of Archeology (Bolzano, Italy)

Please note: this piece includes an image of human remains on page 76.

Zoe Roland worked for Heritage New Zealand for seven years, developing award-winning public programmes comprising films, websites and travelling archival film shows. She currently lives in the Czech Republic with her family where she is completing her Masters of Museum Studies (Massey University) on the value of socio-historical personal narratives.

Walter Benjamin (1936) wrote that stories, unlike information void of narrative thread, have a germinative power like entombed grains of wheat. Their power is transferred from generation to generation, passing on counsel, tradition, memory and the nuances of life lost to the vagaries of time. This is the challenge of museums: to convey these attributes of humanity and history through the millennia. Effective storytelling can render objects and events explosive with immediacy and recognition.

The South Tyrol Museum of Archeology in Bolzano, Italy, home to Ötzi the ‘Tyrolean Ice Man,’ is testament to the power of storytelling and its ability to capture the past and resonate with the present.

My family and I wrongly assumed that arriving at the Museum early would allow us to ‘experience’ Ötzi unimpeded by fellow visitors. Instead we encountered a 150m-long queue snaking from the entrance, around the corner into the drizzly main street beyond. It appears that this small regional museum in the Austro-Italian Alps town of Bolzano (population 100,000) has transformed the ‘ice man’ into something of a celebrity.

Roughly 5,300 years ago, near a 10,500-foot-high pass at the top of the Ötztal valley in Italy and 300 feet from what is now the Austrian border, a 45-year-old man of stocky build with...
multiple ailments (including coronary disease, lactose intolerance, fleas and intestinal worms) travelled solo across the mountains with his tools and a birch container of embers. He was shot in the back by an enemy arrow and died soon after.

In 1991 he was found by German hikers after the glacier had retreated sufficiently to reveal his body, cocooned and preserved by ice and snow. Ötzi has been called one of the most spectacular archaeological discoveries of the 20th century: the oldest human remains ever found. Ötzi was preserved in such complete genetic and physical condition that scientists from many disciplines could determine a multitude of details, not only about Ötzi, but also his environment and the Chalcolithic period (between the Neolithic period and the Bronze Age) in which he lived. The germinative power of this story, literally preserved in ice, was brought to life by journalists, scientists and the skillful work of The South Tyrol Archaeology Museum.

The complexity of the find from both a scientific and historical perspective could easily have been presented as an alienating mash of dates accompanied by anatomical and medical terms, yet the Museum succeeds in bridging the gap between the past and the present, and, most unusually, between science and emotional engagement.

The Ötzi narrative is created in such a way that this “pitiful bundle of humanity” (as Spindler, one of the scientists, called him) becomes “humanised and dignified” with all the “visible components of self,” (Lambert and McDonald, 2013) and with this we experience him as a fellow human being. Any possible repulsion or disgust – for he is a desiccated corpse after all – is eroded through knowledge of

“Ötzi has been called one of the most spectacular archaeological discoveries of the 20th century: the oldest human remains ever found.”
his hardships, ailments, dietary choices and eventual demise at the hands of enemies. This knowledge is both arresting and affecting. As a result, not only is he immediately relatable as a fellow human, but we also feel compassion for him. This allows us to reflect upon ourselves in relation to his life, creating a boomerang effect of questions and answers about evolution and about ourselves.

By convincingly presenting Ötzi with a narrative that speaks of his challenges and mortality, the South Tyrol Museum of Archaeology has bridged over 5,000 years between the visitor and the ‘Ice Man’ to create a sort of human kinship. Coupled with our natural desire to make connections and find commonalities, and our neurological disposition (mirror neurons) for empathic responses to narrative (Eagle, Gallese and Magione, 2007), the Museum succeeds in presenting an incredibly engaging exhibition.

Getting to this point, however, has proved controversial, with criticisms of unresolved or neglected research avenues in favor of public interests. The research and exhibition are focused on answering the public’s questions about Ötzi: who was he, what did he eat, where was he born, what was he wearing and most importantly,
what were the details of his intriguing death? Helen Lambert, Reader in Medical Anthropology at Bristol University, and Social Anthropologist Maryon McDonald have criticised this forensics approach, writing that Ötzi joined a “select company of prehistoric media celebrities” (Lambert and McDonald, 2013) due to the lack of focus on the usual standard research agendas in favour of presenting Ötzi as a “person with a story” (Fowler, cited by Lambert and McDonald, 2013).

In an intentional appeal to public imagination, an Austrian journalist coined the name ‘Ötzi’: a cutesy nickname derived from the valley ‘Ötztal’ where he was found. In fact, public imagination went into overdrive, with songs written about him, a Time magazine cover dedicated to him, numerous offers to carry Ötzi’s Chalcolithic child from his frozen sperm, and a genealogy site claiming to be able to determine if you were related to Ötzi.

The Museum wrote in 2006 that the story is “deprived of anonymity” due to the exhibition featuring the ‘fate’ of an individual human being who was so alive in the public imagination. This is true, but it was a choice to make him so appealing; the name, the carefully selected display information, the trajectory of the narrative, the type of humanising phrases used to ‘narrate’ his life and the general focus of the interpretative text. By personalising what are essentially mummified human remains – complete with an ensemble of trace elements, isotopes, pollen and biological clues to human evolution – public appeal could be leveraged.

It is clear, whether from ancient scriptures or modern marketing and successful museums, that storytelling is the bait that hooks the public. Whereas information is “used to gratify immediate needs,” “narrative can remain timeless” (Benjamin, 1936). Fiction or nonfiction, it appears that implicit experiences or views are more effective in producing emotional responses than explicit arguments. The Museum therefore chose to tell a human story rather than simply provide scientific information.

Laurajane Smith (2006) wrote that it is not the object itself which has the inherent heritage value, but the values imbued within it from use and the passing on and receiving of memories. In the case of Ötzi, the scientific material fleshes out his story, but
as fellow humans we connect to him primarily through our own experiences, bodies and memories. To this I would add that learning about others and their lives, as Narrative Theorists have long since known, develops empathy and humility and can lead to pro-social benefits.

The concept of 5,300 years can be difficult to grasp, particularly for children. Jozsef (aged 7) told us after our visit that in the exhibition he had seen a video of Ötzi as a child playing in the mountains, “just like I did.” I realised that Jozsef’s understanding of the timeframe didn’t necessarily matter. The display is educational in other ways but, more importantly, it’s an exercise in humility, connecting to other human beings and value-making.

Ötzi and Jozsef both ate porridge for breakfast, messily mend their own clothes by hand, both are territorial, like to hit things with sticks, whittle wood, fix things, and both have had tummy cramps and nits. Rosa (aged 11) and Ötzi were exactly the same height and shoe size; she liked his ‘boho’ goatskin coat. Ötzi was the same age as their Dad and both of their grandfathers had suffered strokes like Ötzi, so they were aware that his life would have been all the more confusing and difficult as a result. It was almost impossible not to feel an engaged self-reflection in light of these commonalities. He was a human ‘just like us.’ Once we are hooked, we use these human connections – made through storytelling – as a launchpad for learning about the scientific implications of the find.

Jozsef’s fascination and sense of ‘kinship’ toward the porridge-eating Ötzi is not surprising, as research conducted by Princeton University Professor of Psychology Susan Fiske, who specialises in prejudice and stereotypes, found that we have an overriding preference for members of our ‘in-group.’ However, asking participants to consider whether a person in a picture, who is not part of their ‘in-group, would like a certain type of vegetable – and therefore asking them to step into the pictured person’s mind – “erases the disparity in medial prefrontal cortex activation in fMRI readings” (cited by Cohen 2013, 157). Although in this case the story is limited, it shows that once we are privy to the personal subjective preferences of others (even if it is as simple as learning that ‘Ötzi ate porridge for breakfast before he died’), our empathy and feelings of closeness generally
Between the ticket office and exiting through the gift shop, how can the experience of culture become affecting and enduring?

Increase. Ötzi became one of Jozsef’s ‘in-group.’

The Museum’s 300-person capacity ensures we are exempt from cheek-by-jowl jostling. The Sistine Chapel, the Mona Lisa, entire towns like Dubrovnik in Croatia – even the mythical balcony of Juliet in Verona – are continually surrounded by people, noise and memorabilia: distractions that often dilute and undermine the power of the place or object. Ethically and practically, it was prudent to display the mummified Ötzi in a private ‘Ice Man Box’; sombre, tomb-like and cold. One by one, visitors step up to view Ötzi in his temperature-gauged, highly-monitored and secure resting place. The experience is personal and a little bit creepy. What makes it different from viewing other cultural treasures, aside from the fact that these are actual human remains, is the simple fact that we have space, our own viewing platform. At that moment there is only the two of us.

As the world’s cultural treasures becomes increasingly commodified, there is something powerful about having space and time to experience stories like these in ways which allow for reflection. Between the ticket office and exiting through the gift shop, how can the experience of culture become affecting and enduring? The Museum achieved this through anticipating public desire, careful storytelling and providing space for reflection.

Since its opening on 28 March 1998, the Museum has been visited by over 5 million people and in 2015 alone, a quarter of a million people from all over the world visited. I wonder, if the Museum did not interpret Ötzi as a fellow human being ‘just like us,’ would there be queues of eager customers weaving their way around the corner in the rain? Or would the potentially more seriously named ’Tyrolean Ice Man’ have been overlooked by culture seekers?

We walked out feeling richer, elated by our experience, having made a new friend, understanding more about the world. We had a sense of global citizenship which surpassed time and space. The world, its past and ours had conflated; humanity had been shrunk into that small museum.

That night, camping high in the Dolomites and not far from where Ötzi made his last journey, I lay awake, taken by the story; wondering who had meticulously stitched his coat, if he had children, if he was lonely when he died. These thoughts and the surrounding landscape made me feel simultaneously insignificant and awestruck, both by science and the ‘germinative’ capacity of this perfectly preserved story.
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