It is an indication of the current high level of interest in museums and representation that a book about an exhibition should be issued in a second edition. But Shelley Ruth Butler’s *Contested Representations* is more than simply a review of *Into the Heart of Africa*—both because the exhibition was a watershed event, and because the writer considers its broader implications. As Anthony Shelton writes in the foreword, this “cogently argued work has quickly become a classic case study in critical museology” (p. 1).

To sketch the background for any who may be unfamiliar with the notorious exhibition, *Into the Heart of Africa* was held at the Royal Ontario Museum (ROM) in Toronto, Canada, from November 1989 to August 1990. It was the first exhibition of African art at the ROM, drawn from the museum’s own ethnographic collections. As there was no specialist on the staff, the ROM hired a guest curator, anthropologist Jeanne Cannizzo. That Cannizzo was an academic with a theoretical interest in the discourses of the “new museology”, but inexperienced in the practical realities of museums, goes some way towards explaining the problems that emerged. But, as Butler quotes from Enid Schildkrout, more than one ethnographic curator has felt “there but for the grace of God go I” (p. 93). An analysis of the exhibition thus has relevance for readers from many disciplines who share an interest in the presentation of indigenous cultures in a post-colonial world.

Believing that museums need to be self-reflexive, Cannizzo decided to focus on the origins of the ROM collection, which owed its existence largely to military and missionary involvement in Africa. While the final room of the exhibition was devoted to the museum’s African artefacts, the initial galleries were “The Imperial Connection”, “Military Hall” and “Missionary Room”. It was not Cannizzo’s intention to commend these interactions with Africa, but on the contrary to critique Canada’s role in the imperial colonial project. Her expectation that others would share or readily sympathise with her critical view meant that she signalled it only in subtle ways: for example, a pith helmet—that ubiquitous signifier of the white man under the African sun—was displayed in a glass case as though a precious artefact; a display of African weapons was presented in the refined context of a Victorian drawing room; maps, photographs and press images were enlarged for exhibition to expose their claims of a heroic role for Europeans in Africa; and quotation marks were used to signal problematic words in wall texts that signalled a Eurocentric bias, such as “barbarous customs” and “unknown continent”. But, as Butler recounts, there was no “strong, explicit statement regarding the political and psychological costs of colonialism” (p. 9).
Those who did not pick up Cannizzo’s irony—and there were many—assumed that the exhibition was a celebration, not a condemnation, of military and missionary interventions and therefore understood Into the Heart of Africa as demeaning to Africans and African culture. As a result, many black Canadians were alienated. The Coalition for the Truth about Africa was founded in Toronto to protest about the exhibition and present a positive counter-view of African culture; highly contentious media coverage, confrontations and picketing of the ROM ensued, even involving police intervention; the travelling programme for the exhibition was cancelled by other venues in Canada and the USA; and ultimately Cannizzo, harassed and labelled a racist, resigned from the University of Toronto.

This scant outline of events is explored in depth in Butler’s book, based on her thorough investigation of the records and on interviews with many participants, as well as the many published responses to Into the Heart of Africa. Butler recounts the events surrounding the conception and reception of the exhibition with admirable even-handedness. She examines the problems inherent in the exhibition itself and its attempt to create a postmodern reading of the collection. She also discusses issues around the ROM and its relationship to Toronto’s communities, and shortcomings in the museum’s handling of the situation once it became clear that Cannizzo’s intentions had been misunderstood. In addition, while recognising the rights of protestors, she also acknowledges the difficulties surrounding their claims. Butler’s intention was to try to understand why the exhibition did not succeed, rather than to assign blame. Nor does she oversimplify the confrontation, but demonstrates that “the exhibit cannot be characterized as a debate between two monolithic sides—it was not entirely a debate between blacks and whites, nor between the left and the right” (p. 9).

Butler’s study reveals the pitfalls of postmodernism which aims to undermine the hierarchies of past scholarship and empower those misrepresented or neglected, but does so in ways that may be perceived as elitist—or even completely misunderstood—by the very groups it aims to champion. As Butler points out, there was a “key contradiction” in “the fact that Cannizzo’s theoretical understanding of multi-vocality had no impact upon her curatorial voice” (p. 105). The ultimate irony was that the curator’s “commitment to dispelling negative stereotypes of Africa, to confronting colonialism, and to fighting racism” (p. 16) would have been shared by the protestors, but they could not read her intentions in her complex ironic strategies. Paradoxically, many of the protestors would have preferred just the kind of essentialising exhibition that Cannizzo was trying to counteract.

What gives added interest to the new edition of Butler’s book is that she extends the range of the debate to include more recent exhibitions, both by Cannizzo herself and the ROM. New extensions for the museum include a dedicated African gallery with exhibitions developed with community consultation, which advised “Don’t over-interpret it, don’t laden it with discussion of colonialism or tribes…. Just present the objects” (p. 117). It is clear that the ROM learned from experience, even if this may seem in some ways a rather tame outcome. Butler acknowledges this and concludes: “If the ROM can generate debate about the legacies of empire and contemporary identities, museum visitors will be encouraged to understand their own history and identity in relation to others. In this way, the museum is not only a site of
affirmation, but also a place where complex histories can be continually produced, contested, and negotiated” (p. 123). It is a conclusion that both sides of the ROM confrontation—and indeed museologists everywhere—would support. Butler’s astute analysis alerts us to issues that must be addressed to achieve exhibitions which meet such desirable goals.


HAZEL PETRIE
University of Auckland

When Doug Munro and Brij V. Lal published Texts and Contexts: Reflections in Pacific Islands Historiography in 2006, they pointed out that the texts featured were “foundational”. They had served as building blocks and stepping stones for the development of Pacific islands historiography as a specialised sub-discipline and to read them, together with details about their authors, “is to appreciate their abilities, admire their commitment to their craft, and wonder if we could have done as well” without photocopying, word processors, the Internet and accessible primary sources.

Munro’s new work The Ivory Tower and Beyond was surely in his mind then. It is not hagiography, but a sympathetic exploration of the personalities, personal lives and career paths of his erstwhile co-author and four other groundbreaking Pacific scholars. Something of their essential natures or contributions is encapsulated in his chapter titles. The first, “J.C. Beaglehole—Public Intellectual, Critical Conscience”, pays particular attention to Beaglehole’s altruism, campaigns for civil liberties, and commitment to making New Zealand a better place. “The Prehistory of J.W. Davidson” reveals how elements that determined the academic focus of this foundation Professor of Pacific History were set in place during his earlier career as a decoloniser of the Pacific. Richard Gilson’s subtitle, “The Perfectionist”, sums up a character trait that delayed publication of his master work Samoa 1830 to 1900 until after his tragically early death. The first part of the title of the chapter on Harry Maude, characterising him as a “Loyal Lieutenant”, reflects attitudes ingrained from his childhood and 27 years spent in the British Colonial Service, but the second part, “Incurable Romantic”, would seem to better suit Davidson whose perception of the Pacific, especially Samoa, is revealed as Gauginesque. The subtitle of the final biography adopts Lal’s own term for the phases of life that inform or define a person’s work: “Brij V. Lal—Journeys and Transformations”. A scholarship boy from the cane fields of Fiji, Lal has played significant roles as a member of the Fiji Constitution Review Commission, set up in the wake of the 1987 coup. But he has also made a name for himself as an author of “faction” (fiction + non-fiction) since establishing himself first as a historian of indentured labour and then of contemporary Fiji.

These men—and they are all men (Dorothy Shineberg and another unnamed woman declined to join the ensemble)—did not confine themselves to the ivory towers of
academia but were active players in the geographical areas and political arenas that were the focus of their research and writings. Davidson and Lal in particular made history through constitutional advising, but, using Davidson’s terminology and preferred modus operandum, Munro refers to his subjects as “participant historians”, people who lived and worked (and, in the case of Lal, still work) “at the interface of scholarship and practical engagement”. His five biographies include fascinating glimpses into the lives of these well-known Pacific historians, revealing how national and academic politics, personal experiences and relationships set the trajectories for their academic endeavours. Was Munro underscoring this, perhaps, by inserting several musical analogies and indicating section breaks with a trio of double quavers? These often unexpected inclusions have surely sprung from his own interest in the history of the New Zealand Opera Company, which his father founded.

Historians are not neutral observers as Munro admits, so the inevitable emotional involvement that accompanies personal participation may mean that their work is sometimes suspect. But there is no denying that the establishment of the Department of Pacific History at the Australian National University in 1950 marked an important shift from imperial history to a new mode more solidly based on archival research and innovative approaches aimed at overcoming the ethnocentricity of the documentary evidence. Maude, for example, took oral traditions seriously even if Davidson had misgivings.

Factors that aided or hindered the pursuit of particular interests attest to the serendipity that may produce seminal work or chop it off at the knees. Learning that Caroline Ralston, author of Grass Huts and Warehouses, was nearly denied the opportunity of doing fieldwork in Tahiti, on the premise that the French Foreign Legion stationed there posed a sexual danger, should remind a younger generation of historians that the proverbial glass ceiling was not the only constraint on women’s careers.

The Ivory Tower and Beyond is unillustrated, which is a pity. If nothing more, the inclusion of portraits of the five historians featured would have been welcome, especially given the high cost of the book, which does not appear to be currently available in New Zealand. Disappointingly, too, especially given the disclosure that Beaglehole “would agonise over an ampersand” and Gilson spent “hours getting a single sentence right”, there are a regrettable high number of typographical errors—often three on a single page. Hugh Laracy noted in his Foreword that Munro’s chapters read like “stylish literary essays”. It would have been so had this otherwise elegant collection of writings with some clever turns of phrase not been marred by an apparently indecent haste in getting them to print. The repetition of phrases, ideas and quotations has also evaded editorial correction. A whole paragraph from a letter to Ida Leeson appears twice within the Maude chapter. Less hasty editing might also have noted the discordance (to use my own musical metaphor) in the chapter on Brij Lal. It veers away from explaining how Lal’s work for the Fiji Constitution Review Commission effected his transition from contemporary historian to participant historian by embarking on a strident condemnation of the Joint Parliamentary Select Committee’s reversal of some of the commissioners’ recommendations and the current political situation in Fiji. Another example of the author’s emotional involvement, perhaps?
Despite these shortcomings, *The Ivory Tower and Beyond* is a fine assemblage of academic biographies that serves not only to remind us that historiography is produced by human beings whose work has been shaped by forces within and beyond the academy, but also of the difficult conditions under which these pioneering historians worked. Their stalwart efforts in locating diverse and geographically dispersed archival sources, many of which have been copied by the Pacific Manuscripts Bureau, represent a rich legacy from which today’s Pacific historians may draw.


STEVEN RATUVA
*University of Auckland*

The discourse on Fiji’s embattled political history has often been the preserve of historians, political scientists and economists, and every now and then, the intellectual monotony is broken by streaks of intellectual freshness, which provide new prisms through which we can visualise new dimensions of Fiji’s complex situation. The book, *State of Suffering: Political Violence and Community Survival in Fiji* by Susanna Trnka, an anthropologist at the University of Auckland, does just that. The ethnographic approach shifts analysis away from the state-centred and broad-sweeping political narrative that political scientists and historians tend to thrive on, to capturing in a meticulous ethnographic fashion, the living experiences and consciousness of individuals and communities, embroiled in a survival game amidst the political chaos of the 2000 coup.

The book is based on Trnka’s fieldwork in Fiji during the 2000 coup, Fiji’s third since independence from Britain in 1970. The 2000 coup, like the first two coups in 1987, was inspired by indigenous ethno-nationalists who feared that their claim to primordial indigenous rights and perpetuation of the doctrine of “paramountcy of Fijian interest” were going to be undermined by Indo-Fijian political hegemony after the first Indo-Fijian Prime Minister, Mahendra Chaudhry, was elected in 1999. The shift in the political gravity away from indigenous dominance provided the fertile ground for “ethnic entrepreneurs”, as sociologists would say, who used the ethnic card to agitate against Chaudhry. Not all of them were committed ethno-nationalists. George Speight, the self-styled leader of the 2000 coup, was never an indigenous rights activist but an ambitious businessman whose attempt to build a fortune from the lucrative forestry industry was thwarted by his removal as chair of the Fiji Hardwood Corporation and Fiji Pine Limited by Chaudhry. There were also business people who feared that Chaudhry, a unionist, would have an anti-business stance and would make them accountable for their tax evasion schemes. Chaudhry’s authoritarian, uncompromising style of leadership won him many political enemies and simply reinforced negative stereotypes of “arrogance” and “selfishness” about
Indo-Fijians in general in the minds of many indigenous Fijians. These played well into the ethno-nationalist undercurrents, as in 1987, spawned by fear of Indo-Fijian political control.

The book captures some of the deeper psychological, socio-cultural and spiritual dilemmas faced by the Indo-Fijian community in Fiji as they struggled to maintain a sense of collective security, sanity, self-preservation, and perpetuity in the face of predatory ethno-nationalism. The coup, as the book portrays, spawned a number of inter-related paradoxical dualities that were to shape the subsequent trajectory of political development in Fiji in a fundamental way: the relationship between yearning for “normality” and individual pain; multi-culturalism and ethnic fragmentation; and stereotypes of Fijian “savagery” and indigenous Fijian sense of accommodation, among others.

The author weaves her narrative through the complex conflict situation littered with minefields of violence, pain, identity crisis, rumours, crisis of legitimacy and regime change spawned by the 2000 coup. She is able to bring together strands of individual experiences of pain and suffering of the victims of violence and collective communal fear of the Indo-Fijian community in an ethnographically meticulous manner. The notion of pain is central to the book: how it is inflicted, experienced, responded to at the individual, community and national levels, and the role of fear in shaping the political and ethnic consciousness of a community as it struggles to come to terms with its survival in a politically hostile environment.

One of the significant aspects of the book is how it lays bare some deep common ethnic stereotypes of indigenous Fijians by Indo-Fijians. In everyday discourse indigenous Fijians are cast in degrading images, such as “savages”, “animals” and “jungali” (bushman), by many Indo-Fijians. While these stereotypic categorisations are more intense and direct in the private domain, they are less explicit at the public and political sphere where politicians rhetorically espouse multi-culturalism, and at the same time try at all cost, sometimes rather clumsily, to conceal their deeper prejudices. These stereotypes are often subtle but still resonate in scholarly works by some Indo-Fijian scholars who picture indigenous Fijians as breeders of political instability and barriers to Fiji’s economic development because of their “outdated” culture and “regressive” landowning system. Some books on the experiences of Indo-Fijians in Fiji portray indigenous people only as insignificant “jungali” (bushmen) who pose a barrier to the march of progress and enlightenment of Indo-Fijians as bearers of the grand ancient Indus civilisation that is far superior in morality to the Oceanic “Kaiviti” (indigenous Fijians).

On the other hand, however, indigenous Fijians stereotype Indo-Fijians in equally degrading terms, often as selfish, untrustworthy, cunning and scheming. Their moral character as non-Christian “heathens” is a national scourge to be eradicated. This perception extends to politics where it is believed that the “Kaidia” (Indian) is not to be trusted to run the government because they will use it to deprive Fijians of their land and indigenous rights. A common assumption is that if you give Indians an inch they will take a mile. An indigenous Fijian parliamentarian once said in parliament a few years ago: “Indians are like weeds… they grow everywhere.” These stereotypes have been used by ethnic entrepreneurs as convenient mobilisation tools for ethno-nationalism.
When stereotypes are repeated over and over again, the constructed images become real in people’s cultural sub-consciousness and the target group even end up assimilating, believing and playing out these images, thus further reinforcing the constructed behavioural characteristics. It is quite common for indigenous Fijians to lament their lack of business acumen and the need to emulate Indo-Fijians, yet they proudly articulate their physical prowess in rugby and in wars as part of their identity.

However, by focusing only on the Indo-Fijian victims of the coup, the book fails to recognise that there were also indigenous Fijian victims whose suffering was not fully highlighted. Some were physically assaulted by Speight’s thugs and some had their properties violated. Later when the tide turned against the rebels following the assumption of power by the military, hundreds of indigenous coup supporters were arrested and beaten up in public, and some sustained very serious injuries. The pain inflicted on the indigenous Fijian community by the military was unprecedented. In a situation of conflict, the need to understand competing discourses is important to avoid perception of partiality. While this is of course not intended, the latent and perceived political message can be dangerously simplistic: innocent and helpless Indo-Fijians being clobbered mercilessly by naturally ferocious and vicious indigenous Fijians. Herein lies a major dilemma as ethnographic researchers try to negotiate their way through the minefields of political conflict.

Perhaps to avoid some of these perceptions, the book could have also provided an analysis from the point of view of indigenous Fijians. How did they conceptualise Indo-Fijians in relation to their own identity? What types of stereotypes did they hold? What were the underlying assumptions of these stereotypes? Often stereotypes between two groups can be symbiotic in a sense that a group’s perception of another group is shaped by the other group’s perception.

There is also no mention of the symbolic and functional role of the military in relation to ethno-nationalism. Did the military symbolise “painkilling” intervention as they flushed out the perpetrators of pain and suffering and made the situation safer for Indo-Fijians? Many of the perpetrators of violence were not the “average” Fijian or even die-hard anti-Indian ethno-nationalists but were unemployed youths, some with criminal records, who took advantage of the situation to express their socio-economic frustrations by scapegoating Indo-Fijians. Many of these had gathered at the parliament complex where they were organised to carry out acts of violence by Speight and his coup conspirators. Many were later arrested and some were even brutalised by the military. The book does not mention this but instead briefly mentions the role of the military and police in conspiring with and helping the coup-makers. While it is true that some individual policemen and military officers had openly helped the coup-makers, the two security institutions were still steadfast in their state security roles, and later responded in a rather heavy-handed way to flush out the coup-makers.

An area which is left unexplored is the historical and socio-cultural origins of the prejudices so powerfully portrayed in the book. It is important to understand the diverse contexts which help construct and legitimise prejudices, which are often intensified in times of crisis. In a conflict situation, racial prejudices can be used in diverse ways: as a retributive mechanism of anger to get back at the perpetrators of violence; as a means of self-preservation to put the blame on someone else; as
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a way of re-defining the moral order by casting oneself as the innocent victim as opposed to the predatory nature of the “Other”, and a convenient political tool of ethno-political mobilisation. While the colonial state helped to nurture ethnic tension through separate political representation and separate socio-economic development of Indo-Fijians and indigenous Fijians, over the years indigenous Fijians and Indo-Fijians had developed socio-cultural mechanisms with which they articulated and negotiated their differences. The process of ethno-cultural negotiation continues in various forms, either violent or peaceful.

Nevertheless, despite this, the book is a valuable contribution to the endless debates on ethnic relations and political conflict in Fiji. By unearthing the experiences and sentiments of ordinary people in a confusing and psychologically oppressive situation, the book fills a major void in contemporary Fijian socio-political discourse. It captures in a succinct way the dilemma of a diaspora, caught up in colonially created circumstances, of which they become victims. Despite the pain and suffering portrayed in the book, it also provides a ray of hope for inter-ethnic engagement by documenting instances of indigenous Fijian villagers providing refuge for some Indo-Fijians and saving them from marauding thugs. These actions show the vast reserve of goodwill and potential for inter-ethnic engagement in a conflict-prone nation. Herein lies Fiji’s future.


ROBERT JAHNKE
Massey University

It is a truism that a good book is one that you cannot put down once you begin reading. This was the case with this biography. I found myself retracing personal associations with Paki Harrison during his journey towards master carver status, first with Whaiora meeting house at Otara in 1977, then Otawhao at Te Awamutu in the early 1980s and at Auckland University when Harrison was carving Tanenuiarangi. We later came together as members of the National Qualifications Authority Whakaruruahau Whakairo and the committee established by Te Waka Toi to develop the Toi Iho mark of Māori Authenticity and Quality. I was also fortunate to spend time with Harrison at his home in Kennedy’s Bay imbibing the odd glass of wine and drinking from the cup of wisdom full to the brim with a lifetime of maturing.

This biography evolves through a number of cyclical rhythms where beginnings converge in new threads of trial and tribulation. As the biography plainly recounts, no journey is without its moments of tension, and a carver’s journey is fraught with these. There is the thread of Uncle Matt Te Hau, who was Harrison’s life line during his escapades at Teacher’s College and an initiator of the Auckland University Marae, which would crown Harrison’s journey as master carver, author and doctor. Ranginui Walker and Harrison’s conjoined paths, first at Teachers Training College and then at
Auckland University, are recounted; and there is the account of a return to Harataunga to fulfil a promise to his mother, Ngāwiki, to rebuild a house destroyed by Harrison in his youth. From Harataunga, there is a return to carve houses at Manurewa, where Harrison lived and taught, and Manukau Technical Institute in Otara. There is also Harrison’s association with Rongo Wetere, initially with the carving of Orakau and subsequently through to the establishment of Te Wananga o Awanuirangi in association with Rongo and Buck Nin, and his conceptualisation of the Bachelor of Arts programme with Kereti Rautangata. Further cyclical rhythms can be found in Paki’s association with Laurie Nicholas and Kereti Rautangata among others. There is also his courtship of Hinemoa, his marriage and the developing engagement of his family in Māori art. Essentially, this is a biography of a carver whose experiences in youth under the tutelage of Materoa Reedy, and her desire to instil in him standards of excellence in his quest for proficiency in the English language, would ignite his quest for knowledge and his passion for reading and writing. Ultimately, his interaction with his uncles Pine and John Taiapa would also enrich his vision as a carver and academic.

Like any good Māori biography, whakapapa ‘genealogy’ forms a core principle for navigating Harrison’s life. At the heart of the genealogy are ancestors from Ngāti Porou who constitute a critical essence of his being. In the process, the genealogical sequence navigates the boundaries of the Tairawhiti region while acknowledging Maui’s canoe, Nukutaimemeha, atop Hikurangi Mountain. There is a pantheon of ancestors including Toi, Paikea, Porourangi, Hau, Ueroa, Poroumata and Tuwhakairiora, Materoa and Hingagaroa together with the canoes Horouta and Nukutere, and Ngāti Ruanuku as a tribal force in the vicinity of Whareponga, who were eventually displaced as tangata whenua ‘people of the land’.

In negotiating Harrison’s connection to Ngāti Porou ki Harataunga, Walker outlines Paikea’s gene pool in the region and the disembarking of Hikitapua (Nāwäia) from the Horouta at Ahuahu and the inevitable interconnection of his descendants with Ngāti Tamaterā. Walker argues that Ngāti Porou at Harataunga identify with Paikea as their founding ancestor as opposed to Porourangi for Ngāti Porou ki Te Tairāwhiti. The narrative of the Harataunga connection switches to the 19th century musket raids as Hongi Hika’s invasion resulted in devastation and mass migration of Ngāti Maru to Tainui, while Pāora Te Putu maintained his ahi ka roa ‘right to land through occupation’. At this point Ngāti Porou enters the picture through Te Rakahurumai of Te Aitanga-a-Mate, Te Aowera and Te Whänau-a-Rākairoa, with Ngāti Porou’s fleet of coastal vessels offering a haven of security and tranquillity for Pāora Te Putu. The relationship between Te Putu and Te Rakahurumai resulted in the gifting of a parcel of land in 1854. In 1878, 4339 acres were partitioned for Ngāti Porou. It is on this land that Harrison chose to build his home.

This biography steps beyond the standard biography with the inclusion of Harrison’s views on Māori carving and pattern in the final chapter where the significance of the manaia ‘spiritual entity’, in particular, is reviewed relative to interpretations of previous writers. In some respects Harrison’s views are a logical synthesis of previous writers. For example, Gilbert Archey’s contention that the manaia is essentially a profile view of the tiki ‘human form’ finds support in Harrison’s view. However, one becomes aware of the Walker’s unfamiliarity with art language when he suggests, “One
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of the ubiquitous decorative motifs in surface decoration of carving is the *manaia*, the head of a bird-like beaked figure" (p. 217). The *manaia* is predominantly carved as form not pattern. Surface pattern is added to enhance the rhythms of head, torso and limbs. I concur with Harrison that there are instances when *manaia* exist as profile forms of *tiki* as is evident in Taranaki and North Auckland carving. However, the *manaia* also exists as an especial entity as the Kaitaia lintel demonstrates, and in the Doubtless Bay prow and the *pakake* ‘whale’ motif endemic on storehouse bargeboards from the East Cape and Bay of Plenty.

While it is acknowledged that Walker’s role as a biographer is to record Harrison’s discoveries and insights in relation to carving, painting and lattice work, the previous quote, with its emphasis on decorative motif, and descriptions of Māori art as decoration throughout the biography is the only flaw in an otherwise superbly crafted biography. The word “decoration” implies that Māori art is insignificant and meaningless. Harrison’s work as a carver and an intellectual refutes this description. However, Walker is not alone in his undiscriminating recourse to decoration. David Simmons, Hirini Moko Mead, Roger Neich, and recently Deidre Brown have described Māori art as decoration. Despite this consensus, I would contend that it is important that any description of Māori art defines it appropriately and accords it the *mana* (status) it deserves.

Harrison’s humble acknowledgement that there were better carvers than he in terms of aesthetic sensibility and design sensitivity needs to be qualified with an acknowledgement that he, more than any other carver of the 20th century, reinstated the critical importance of a grounded and relevant Māori *kaupapa* ‘rationale’ for the meeting house. His undeviating mission in making houses historically and cosmologically significant was aimed at investing the house with cultural integrity and relevance. Indeed, the houses he created have been transformed into narratives of cosmo-genealogy where the past is woven with the historical present as a manifestation of *whare wananga* ‘house of learning’. This is Harrison’s legacy to the nation. It is a Māori worldview.