A Century of Collecting: Colonial Collectors in Southwest New Britain
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ABSTRACT. The study of material culture has waxed and waned in importance in anthropology, unlike archaeology where it has always been central. However, much of the anthropology carried out on the south coast of New Britain has concerned the collection of material culture. We survey a century of collecting on the coast ranging from the large, well-organized expeditions of the German period, through a number of individual collectors both amateur and professional from the German period to the Second World War, and we finish with the more minor forms of collecting taking place in the quite different political climate after the War. We show that the study of past collections can throw light on a number of histories: the biographies of individuals, both local and colonial, the histories of institutions and disciplines, and the history of change along the south coast of New Britain itself.


The first archaeologist to carry out systematic research on the south coast of New Britain was Jim Specht, but, as he was aware, he was part of a longer tradition of research and collecting. We review collection practices in this region by looking at collectors who visited between the 1880s and 1990s (Table 1). This is one area of Papua New Guinea where material culture has always been the focal point of study, linking anthropological and archaeological work. We focus on the south coast of West New Britain, between the Arawe Islands and Kandrian—often known as the Arawe region.

Objects in common use on Arawe today include women’s ornaments (turtle-shell armbands and earrings, hair ornaments, necklaces, and grass skirts); men’s ornaments (earrings, pig’s-tusk, cassowary-quill belts and barkcloth belts), and bags once common attire but recently only used in ceremonies (Fig. 1). Spears and shields are now only used for ceremonies, and stone axes, adzes and obsidian all went out of use early in the twentieth century. Wooden items range from out-rigger canoes to bowls exchanged in bride-price which are used for making sago pudding (sapela); these are made or bought from Siassi Islanders at the western tip of New Britain. Other containers include coiled-cane baskets also from the western end of New Britain, clay pots from the north coast of New Guinea and local coconut-leaf baskets. Nets of various shapes are used for catching fish, birds or pigs and some people still make looped vine-string bags. Exchange items include shell money, mokmok
for visitors and traders. In the early colonial period, proved a favourite port of call in the Arawe Islands, also with a plantation (Arawe) founded allowed good access to yachts and steamships. To the west, (Aliwa) was situated. In addition, the bay of Kandrian and the nearby islands, where one of the first plantations (from 1875 to 1880), must have had an impact as such as the Reverend George Brown on the Duke of York Islands (1844–1909) employee of Forsayth & Co. and amateur ethnographer 1897 38 Museum für Völkerkunde, Dresden Ferdinand Hefele Ship’s 1st Officer Peiho HSF 1908–1909 40 Linden-Museum, Stuttgart Hermann Schoede Government Officer German New Guinea 1909 8 Linden-Museum, Stuttgart Albert Buell Lewis Curator and Anthropologist 1910 330 Field Museum of Nat. Hist., Chicago Felix Speiser Anthropologist 1930 110 Museum der Kulturen, Basel John Alexander Todd (1863–1944) 1 Pitt Rivers Museum, Oxford W.E. Guinness, Baron of Moyne Traveller and Curio Collector 1935 8 British Museum, London Beatrice Blackwood Curator and Archaeologist 1937 275 Pitt Rivers Museum, Oxford Jim Specht (1940– … ) 11 Australian Museum, Sydney

(pierced stone discs) and the all-important gold-lip shells. Pandanus mats and capes are made and exchanged locally. These objects are created by and help create social relations, local and long-distance. Both objects and relations have changed considerably over the last century.

Although our focus begins with the inception of the formal colonial period, we are aware that objects were collected from New Britain and the Arawe region before this date, but none have come to our attention. Residents, such as the Reverend George Brown on the Duke of York Islands (1875 to 1880), must have had an impact as they participated in the trade of items from the region (Gardner, 2000).

The following chronological survey is divided into three sections: collections made during the German colonial period before World War I; those made after World War I; and those made in the inter-war years. Much of the detail of these collections has been discussed in earlier publications (Buschmann, 2000; Gosden & Knowles, 2001; Knowles et al., 2000; O’Hanlon & Welsch, 2000; Specht, 2000). The purpose of such an overview in this context is to document the culture and people around him by photographing them, collecting objects and writing notes on various aspects of the culture. He gave objects and photographs to overseas institutions to create and maintain links with leading anthropologists and curators (Forward to Parkinson, 1907). At his home in Kuradai, Parkinson also amassed his own personal collection, which he eventually

### German colonial period

The German Colonial period (1884–1914) was characterized by three types of collector: the long-term resident, the government resident, and the visitor, whether amateur or academic, who came to do research and make an ethnographic collection. We examine the collecting activities of thirteen individuals and show that this was truly a “golden age” of collecting.

**The long-term residents.** The first group to make collections included Richard and Phebe Parkinson, and Isokichi Komine. Only Richard Parkinson was of German nationality. Phebe was Samoan-American and Komine Japanese. They were in the colony because of commercial opportunities and not through any formal link with the German colonial government. They were “frontier” collectors and settled on the mainland of New Britain in 1884, prior to the German colony being well established.

Richard Parkinson became famous as an amateur ethnologist and collector through his authorship of *Dreizig Jahre in der Südsee* (1907) and other works (Meyer & Parkinson, 1894, 1900; Parkinson, 1887, 1889, 1895). With his wife Phebe, he had a major impact on the Arawe region (Specht, 1999, 2000). Richard Parkinson’s initial collecting was linked to his commercial interests, but profit-making was secondary to his intellectual pursuits. He had intellectual aspirations and wished to become more than a supplier of items to institutions. As a keen amateur ethnographer, he documented the culture and people around him by photographing them, collecting objects and writing notes on various aspects of the culture. He gave objects and photographs to overseas institutions to create and maintain links with leading anthropologists and curators (Forward to Parkinson, 1907). At his home in Kuradai, Parkinson also amassed his own personal collection, which he eventually

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>collector</th>
<th>post</th>
<th>collection dates</th>
<th>number of objects</th>
<th>museum(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard Parkinson (1844–1909)</td>
<td>German New Guinea Resident, employee of Forsayth &amp; Co. and amateur ethnographer</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Museum für Völkerkunde, Dresden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruno Mencke (1876–1901)</td>
<td>Leader and financier of “Erste Deutsche Südsee Expedition”</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>?&lt;100</td>
<td>Niedersächsisches Landesmuseum, Hannover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburger Südsee Expedition (1908–1910)</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary expedition initiated by Hamburg Museum</td>
<td>1908–1909</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>Hamburg Museum für Völkerkunde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferdinand Hefele</td>
<td>Ship’s 1st Officer Peiho HSF</td>
<td>1908–1909</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Linden-Museum, Stuttgart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilhelm Wostrack</td>
<td>Government Officer German</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Linden-Museum, Stuttgart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermann Schoede</td>
<td>German Curio Collector</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Berlin Museum für Völkerkunde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Buell Lewis (1867–1940)</td>
<td>Curator and Anthropologist</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>Field Museum of Nat. Hist., Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felix Speiser (1880–1949)</td>
<td>Curator and Anthropologist</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Museum der Kulturen, Basel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 1. “Big man” (Luluai Arulo of Kaleken village) wearing his wealth. Around his neck hangs a pig’s-tusk ornament, the tusks are of high quality each forming a near complete circle. Around his waist, over the barkcloth belt, are many strands of dogs’-teeth belts and strings of cassowary quill and nassa-shell beads. Nestled amongst these strings are two mokmok. The man also wears turtle-shell earrings and armbands and several woven arm and wrist bands. Scarification on his face has been highlighted in white, a common device used when photographing a subject with scarification. Taken by H.L. Downing at Gasmata, sometime during his career as a patrol officer between 1922 and 1937. Photo PRM BB.P.14.13, courtesy of Pitt Rivers Museum, University of Oxford.

sold to the Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago, in 1909. Specht (1999) estimates that Parkinson must have sold or donated more than 10,000 artefacts. Only a few were from southwest New Britain, including 38 sold to the Museum für Völkerkunde, Dresden, in 1897, and 56 items in the Field Museum, Chicago.

Phebe Parkinson’s role in her husband’s collecting exploits is rarely acknowledged. However, two women, Lillian Overell (1923) and Margaret Mead (1960), afford us a glimpse. We know that Phebe was fluent in tok pisin, the lingua franca, and Tolai, and acted as both translator and secretary to Richard (Overell, 1923: 178). She took over much of the commercial work to give her husband the time to pursue his research. Phebe understood the wishes, desires and criteria of those requesting collections. After her husband’s death in 1909, visitors and institutions continued to draw on her expertise. However, Phebe’s assets were gradually depleted and her plantation was expropriated in 1922. During this period, Phebe sold 19 objects from southwest New Britain to Karl Safert at the Museum für Völkerkunde, Leipzig.
Isikoichi Komine, a Japanese merchant, also spent most of his life in the colony. He lived in the Pacific from 1890 and in the Bismarck Archipelago from 1902. Komine collected approximately 3000 ethnographic artefacts including about 40 items from southwest New Britain. In 1911 A.B. Lewis (see below) negotiated the purchase of the collection and it was subsequently registered as part of the Lewis collection at the Field Museum. The collection contained many “duplicates” and Lewis set aside 402 objects for exchange with the Australian Museum, Sydney (Welsch, 1998, vol. 1: 425). It was said at the time that the collection held few fine pieces, but Komine obviously took pride in his personal collection on display around his home at Ponan, making it look like “a small ethnological museum” (Berghausen, 1910: 36 quoted and translated in Welsch, 1998, vol. 1: 425).

The government officials. Various colonial officials left collections to German museums documenting their own relations with the Territory. From 1889 to 1914 an imperial law required that all collections made by Germans in the colony on State business be offered to the Berlin Museum für Völkerkunde. Enraged by this draconian law, museum curators in other German cities tried to independently secure collections. A system of rewards was set up to attract individuals to collect for their museum, and it relied on patronage, medals and personal contacts (Penny, 1998).

The largest collection of Arawe items from a colonial officer was made by Wilhelm Wostrack. Born in Stuttgart, Wostrack arrived in the early 1900s and worked first in the Admiralties before being appointed District Officer at Namatanai Bay in New Ireland (Hahl, 1980 [1937]: 111–112). In 1904 Graf von Linden (later founder of the Linden-Museum, Stuttgart) asked Wostrack to support his home town by collecting objects from New Ireland, particularly “everyday” objects such as weapons, fishing gear, and musical instruments. In 1906 Wostrack’s collections started arriving in Stuttgart. A collection of New Ireland material arrived in February 1908, and a second collection was received in February 1909 containing eight “valuables” (gold-lip shell, a cassowary quill belt, and pig’s tusk ornaments) from the southwest coast of New Britain. Unlike the New Ireland material, the collection lacks “everyday” objects. One item gifted to the Linden-Museum by Albert Hahl, Governor of the Territory from 1901 to 1914—a goldlip shell from the Arawe—we consider wrongly provenanced as Admiralty Islands.

These two small collections exemplify the colonial officers’ relationship with the local people, which was quite different from that formed between individuals who merely passed through the Territory. The fact that both Hahl and Wostrack were able to acquire valuables that other visitors had no access to indicates their relationship with the locals was based on their recognition of the power and authority of government officials and a desire on the part of local people to engage in long-term relationships through gift exchange (see Gosden & Knowles, 2001: 93–95 for a more detailed analysis).

The visitors: researchers and collectors. Once the colony of German New Guinea was well established and after the laws favoured the Berlin Museum, alternative means of obtaining large collections were sought and wealthy backers were encouraged to contribute. There was much public interest in the colonies, and visitors flocked to museums to see evidence of the people and the place. Newspapers wrote up activities in the colonies for a very interested audience. All the following collectors, with the exception of A.B. Lewis, were German and very much caught up in the process of providing collections for provincial museums.

The motivations of these visitors were similar. As well as promoting their own museum or city, they were all practising “salvage ethnography”—saving the material evidence of vanishing peoples. They were also promoting their own academic reputations. Bruno Mencke (1876–1901) was an independent collector keen to have a part in the colonies that were a focus of his Berlin social life (Buschmann, 1999: 157–160). Mencke arrived in 1900 as the head and financier of his self-styled Erste Südsee Expedition (First South Seas Expedition). He travelled with a research team aboard the Eberhard, named after his late father, and his inheritance financed the trip. Mencke hoped to make his own mark in life through the acquisition and donation of ethnographic objects to German museums. Three places were to become beneficiaries, his birth-town of Hanover, his hometown of Berlin, and Stuttgart (once again through the persuasive negotiations of Graf von Linden). Mencke recruited three researchers to study Natural History and chose to cover the ethnographic research himself.

The aims of the expedition were grand: it would last three years and would research the Bismarck Archipelago, including a proposed coast-to-coast crossing of New Britain. However, Mencke was young and inexperienced. He stayed at Ralum with the Parkinsons (famous for their hospitality), and bought the Arawe collection we discuss here. The collection could be better known as the Forsayth & Co. collection as it was made by the crew of their ship the Mayflower while on the south coast of New Britain prior to 1901. Having carried out no primary research, Mencke soon got a reputation for having a keener interest in pleasure than scientific achievement (Buschmann, 1999: 158; Parkinson, 1999: 139). The Erste Südsee Expedition ended sadly and suddenly when Mencke was fatally wounded on St Mathias Island. Mencke’s Arawe collection was a commercial collection—it conforms to ideas of what objects were marketable, and contains several fine objects and many weapons. Although this collection of almost 300 objects is poorly documented, it is the earliest large collection from the Arawe so far identified.

After Mencke’s death a new expedition, the Hamburger Südsee Expedition (HSE) (1908–1910), reached the Territory, with its own ship, the Peiho, and a team of researchers. The HSE was born out of civic and academic rivalry. Both Georg Thilenius, Director of the Hamburg Museum für Völkerkunde, and Felix von Luschan in Berlin (possibly inspired by Mencke) proposed expeditions to the national government. Much of the Godffroy collection had gone to Leipzig, and Thilenius persuaded wealthy citizens of Hamburg to back an expedition, using the promise of a collection that would rival Berlin’s, and restore Hamburg’s reputation (Thilenius, 1927 quoted in Buschmann, 1996: 322). Thilenius recruited Professor Dr Friedrich Füllborn, a specialist in tropical medicine, to lead the expedition. Dr Otto Reche was chosen as physical anthropologist but was also familiar with ethnography, geology and geography. Dr Wilhelm Müller was elected as the ethnologist and linguist, Herr Dr G. Duncker as zoologist, and Hans Vogel as official artist and photographer. Franz Hellwig, although not an academic, was principal purchaser of artefacts and responsible for the administration of collections. He was
Both trader and collector, with experience in Melanesia. The ship’s crew included Captain Vahsel, who became a regular columnist in a Hamburg newspaper, and Hefele, the first officer, whom we discuss below (Fischer, 1981: 64–77; Reche, 1954: 44). The expedition’s aim was to survey the whole region (Reche, 1954; Thilenius, 1927; Vogel, 1911). The expedition reached southwest New Britain in December 1908 and spent several weeks moving along the coast. They returned in January and again in February when the group split up with Hellwig and Müller in residence on one of the Arawe islands specifically to collect ethnographical data and specimens while the others explored the Pulie River.

The collections of Hellwig (190), Müller (160), Reche (40) and Fülleborn (40) total 430 items. Fülleborn and Reche were incidental collectors, who delegated much of the work to Hellwig. Hellwig drew on his knowledge of tok pisin, and was the ideal acquirer. Müller, the anthropologist, compiled exemplary fieldnotes and detailed information on the objects.

Hefele was born in Stuttgart and was pressured by von Linden to collect for his museum. Hefele features in the expedition records due to his knowledge of meteorology and mapping (Thilenius, 1927). He collected around 550 objects in the first year, including about 40 items from southwest New Britain, but his collecting was in direct competition with the expedition, and he was transferred to another ship (Fischer, 1981). The range of objects that Hefele collected—including valuables, the everyday, and the “old” (stone tools)—suggests he was following the example of the professional collectors. The difference between his collection and that of the expedition is the level of documentation: Hefele’s contains the bare minimum of detail.

Hermann Schoede, the next major collector was a wealthy German who travelled around German New Guinea from mid-1909 to 1910 (Welsch, 1998, vol. 2: 148). For six months he sailed the leased schooner Harriet and Alice, and spent several days visiting the south coast of New Britain. A.B. Lewis, spent Christmas 1909 at Arawe Plantation with Schoede, and Lewis’s diary documents how Schoede worked (Welsch, 1998, vol. 1: 167–168). Schoede collected about 200 objects from the south coast, and approximately 180 are in the Berlin Museum (gifted in 1909). Part of his collection originally given to the Duke of Saxe-Meiningen is now in Leipzig, Museum für Völkerkunde, and four objects attributed to Schoede are in the Linden-Museum, Stuttgart. Although Schoede was an amateur, his documentation is impeccable. His collection was broad ranging like those of his professional contemporaries and for each item he recorded the provenance, drew the item and pasted all this information on the Berlin museum’s catalogue cards. Schoede provided a much greater depth of information than his contemporaries, he was on foot. He used local transport which though unreliable meant he was unhindered with the overheads and restrictions associated with travel by yacht and was able to spend longer in the field and penetrate different areas (see Welsch, 1998, vol. 1: 175 for Lewis’s “discovery” of the blowgun inland from Kandrian).

These visitors of the German colonial period share commonalities. All were propelled to the field, and were influenced by concerns at home. As individuals, collection was of paramount importance, and was the basis on which the wider public judged their efforts. Although many were researchers, it was the acquisition of objects that got them to the field. Müller’s collecting and hence funding was restricted by the HSE research (Fischer, 1981) and Lewis’s research was hampered by the museum questioning his judgement and requesting larger “showy” pieces (Welsch, 1998, vol. 1: 351). For the financiers back home publications and research were secondary concerns.

The German colonial period collections—overview. With the onset of war in 1914, the great “expedition period” of collecting (Welsch, 1998, vol. 1: 5) ended along with German Colonial rule. Civic rivalry in Germany and the USA turned to nationalism, and war put an end to publicly-funded research expeditions.

The number of items collected in this period is significant. In total, nearly 1300 objects were collected (1000 in just one year), a staggering 69% of all the collections we have researched. Partly this was due to the establishment of new or fledgling museums: and partly it was a result of the colonial expansion and coherent exploration of new territories and cultures. Finally, it reflected the academic approach at the time: foregrounding salvage ethnography and the paramount place of museums and objects in anthropology. “Salvage ethnography” and making “representative” collections were paramount in deciding what to collect. The earliest collection (by Richard Parkinson, now in Dresden) includes the oldest blowgun from the region. Blowguns from the southwest coast of New Britain are important because they are the only record of their occurrence east of Indonesia. Moreover, these items are fragile and frequently damaged, and the Parkinson example survives intact, complete with several darts.

Collecting was driven by academic concerns and civic rivalry at work in Germany and, to a lesser extent, the USA. Individual cities supported the academic research of artefacts but built up their ethnographic museum collections to enhance the status of their cities through the ownership and display of the material (Penny, 1998). For academics and privately funded individuals, it was an opportunity to immortalize their role in the colonies, perhaps even their role in “taming” the colonies, through providing object taxonomies and a material representation of the people to be brought under control.
The inter-war years 1914–1939

The second phase of collectors came in the inter-war period of Australian Administration, first under a military regime and then under the League of Nations from 1921 when New Guinea became a Territory Mandated to Australia. For local people, this was a period of massive change in settlement, subsistence, trade and ritual. Collectors of this period include museum curators with university links, an anthropologist and a tourist. We look first at the curators whose primary field objective was simply to collect objects.

Felix Speiser (1880–1949) was 49 years old when he arrived to carry out his second regional study of Melanesia. He had already spent time in Vanuatu from 1910 to 1912 and worked at the Basel Museum für Völkerkunde and in the anthropology department of the local university (Speiser, 1923). In 1929 he embarked on a regional survey of the Northern Solomons, south New Britain, northeast New Ireland and the Sepik region. His efforts сwweled the collections of the museum, resulted in several publications (Speiser, 1936, 1938, 1941, 1945, 1945–1946, 1946), and an exhibition, but no major monograph.

In early 1930 Speiser was centred at three base camps: Gasmata government station, Kandrian, and the Arawe Islands. Speiser made short trips inland and along the coast, building up relations with local people. He interviewed both the whites and local people. At the end of his sojourn on the coast Speiser reported that he had collected approximately 350 artefacts of which 110 from the Arawe region remain in the collection. A significant number were from Umboi and Siassi, which suggests up to 100 further items may now be dispersed. These were classed as duplicates by Speiser who hoped to recoup costs through their sale and exchange with other museums. Speiser’s research focussed on cultural traits and he wanted to delineate the cultural area and the external influences. He used material culture and ceremonial and ritual practices to define the Arawe region. In particular he concentrated on blowguns, head-binding, pig’s tusk ornaments, art styles on shields, barkcloth and paddles, masking ceremonies and circumcision. He recorded a style of mask—kutianke—that has never been recorded before or since.

The only other museum funded fieldwork during the inter-war period was carried out by Beatrice Blackwood (1889–1975) of the Pitt Rivers Museum, University of Oxford. Blackwood had met Speiser in Buka in 1929, and had acquired a blowgun from his “duplicates” collection for her museum. Speiser never recorded the field notes for his trip. He sailed around the Pacific islands with his guests aboard the Guernsey, a steam yacht. Speiser bought nine items, including barkcloth, shields and blowguns.

Speiser continued to gather material from the south coast of New Britain. Between Speiser and Blackwood’s visits two others collected in the region. John Alexander Todd (1911–1971) was the first and stayed longest. Todd, only 22 years old, accepted an Australian National Research Council grant to carry out fieldwork on the south coast of New Britain, which he hoped would lead to a doctorate at the University of Sydney. Affiliated to a university and not a museum, Todd was required to collect for the university, and was given £30 to purchase specimens. During his twelve month trip from March 1933 to April 34 he collected 245 artefacts and took over 1000 photographs (Gosden, 2000; Gosden & Knowles, 2001). However, material culture was not what took him into the field and encouraged him to return in July 1935. He obviously saw himself as a social anthropologist, as his publications show (Todd, 1934a,b, 1935a,b, 1936).

Todd was based at Kandrian and his collection includes distinctive Arawe items (shields, blowguns and barkcloth), but it also has examples of coiled cane baskets, “Tami” bowls, drums, nets, cassowary-quill bells, vine-string bags, panpipes and skirts. Unique for this period, Todd also acquired valuable dogs’-teeth ornaments (four belts and one forehead ornament). Despite his lack of interest in material culture, Todd produced a 16–page catalogue indicating a good sense of how valuables were used, and an idea of their relative value. None of Todd’s fieldnotes survive, but his collection shows that he had excellent local relations, linking into the activities of women who formed the basis of communities when men left the villages to work. The fact that Todd’s collection exhibits so much women’s material (bags, baskets and skirts) confounds any straightforward notion that collector’s gender influenced collection practice—our only female collectors (Phebe Parkinson and Beatrice Blackwood) collected comparatively fewer items of female material culture.

Our final collector from the inter-war period was a tourist. Following the traditions of wealthy collectors such as Mencke and Schoede, Walter Edward Guinness, 1st Baron of Moyne (1880–1944) arrived in the region under his own sail. Moyne was head of the Guinness family and part of the wealthy aristocratic set that epitomized the swinging 1920s and 1930s. From November 1935 to February 1936, he sailed around the Pacific islands with his guests aboard the Rosaura. Moyne had an interest in anthropology, and while essentially on a pleasure cruise, he made collections that were divided between the British Museum in London, the Cambridge University Museum of Anthropology and Archaeology, and the Pitt Rivers Museum in Oxford. At the museum in Rabaul, he saw deformed skulls from the Arawe. To obtain similar specimens, he passed along the south coast of New Britain and stopped at Kandrian where he bought nine items, including barkcloth, shields and blowguns, but no skulls. Eight of these items were gifted to the British Museum, and one barkcloth went to the Pitt Rivers Museum. The Cambridge Museum did not profit.
from this part of the voyage. Back in Britain, Moyne wrote a popular account of his travels with a full chapter on the Arawe (Guinness, 1936: 78–84), and a barkcloth design as the decorative cover of his book.

The inter-war collections—overview. The four collectors and their collections span nine years (1929–1937). We know other individuals certainly acquired items in this period—Koch, a plantation manager, and Chinnery (1927), the Government Anthropologist, but we have not discovered any of their collections. The colonial and collecting landscape changed, as anthropology moved towards intensive, localized social study in Malinowski’s wake (e.g., Todd). Collecting was not completely dismissed but it had become a by-product of research (Young, 2000). However, when straightforward links to a museum existed (as with Blackwood and Speiser), objects remained as central as before. A major change was that the naivety of “salvage ethnography” in its nineteenth century sense had dwindled.

The colonial landscape of the Arawe region changed radically in this period; by Speiser’s arrival in 1929 the Gasmata District Office had been established for twelve years and could put a boat, police boys and carriers at his disposal. When Blackwood arrived in 1936 a kiap made regular patrols along the coast. In addition to the changing style of colonial rule, an important new element on the south coast of New Britain was the arrival of missions. There had been a mission station at the Arawe Islands for some years, but it was only in the mid-1930s, after accusations of neglect, that the missions established around Kandrian. Mission and government tried to ban practices like head-binding, the keeping of skulls and sorcery. This policy resulted in
temporary devaluation of particular artefacts (skulls and mokmok stones) that became readily available to collectors (Gosden & Knowles, 2001: 151–153).

This period of colonial rule and collecting was driven by a desire to understand people with the long-term aim of control through education, the institution of colonial law and participation in the colonial economy (including taxation). While collectors may not have understood their work in these frames, they were certainly conforming to them, reinforcing them and benefiting from them. At this time, anthropology was taught to colonial officer cadets and Blackwood was teaching one of these courses at Oxford. Moyne as a British establishment figure and essentially on a pleasure cruise, was also gathering first hand experience of colonial rule (he became Secretary of State for the Colonies in 1941). Todd (1935b) even wrote an article on how European law could be better implemented in southwest New Britain. All the collectors, as they donned colonial whites and were facilitated by colonial officers, were framed by their dress code and contacts. They practised “salvage” ethnography only where legislation and missionary work were suppressing certain practices.

All but one of these collectors were in the field for months, time enough to develop local relationships quite distinct from the fleeting visits of earlier researchers. Again, we get a glut of visitors over eighteen months. Between them they removed over 500 items, and amongst them we can see items that were clearly made for sale, and the carefully negotiated acquisition of older items or valuables. Speiser and Blackwood even document the same informants—both refer to Lulua A. Rulo and Magnin in their notes. Speiser also engaged Aliwa, who worked with Müller, and by 1929 had become a Paramount Lulua, suggesting that an ability to broker trade and work with the whites did pay off.

Post World War II

After 1945 large-scale collecting was rare, but a steady trickle of researchers, tourists and dealers removed small collections from the region. Several researchers spent time in the region documenting contemporary material culture. From 1962 to 1974 Anne Chowning and Jane Goodale worked inland from Kandrian among the Sengseng and Kaulong groups respectively (Chowning, 1974, 1978, 1980; Goodale, 1966, 1995; Goodale with Chowning, 1996). They were the first major researchers in the interior and were part-financed by National Geographic, which published their first article. The article, although using a “typical” Arawe object in the title (Blowgun hunters of the South Pacific), did not concentrate on material culture but gave an overview of social life. However, it refers to a collection of 300 stone tools and discussions with Australian National University archaeologists in Canberra. Goodale collected some representative objects that are now housed in the University of Pennsylvania’s Museum. These items include a goldlip shell—the exchange of which became a focus of her research (Goodale, 1995: 87–108).

After Chowning and Goodale, Jim Specht visited the Arawe region in 1979 to carry out archaeological fieldwork. This work resulted in several subsequent visits and Specht was joined in the mid-1980s by Jim Allen and Chris Gosden, all participating in the Lapita Homeland Project.

In 1979, Specht collected 11 items of contemporary material culture which were deposited at the Australian Museum, Sydney. These items (collected only four years after Papua New Guinea independence) reflect a small range of well-known Arawe objects (e.g., vine string bags, blowpipe dart, barkcloth belts). There are no valuables, as Specht was reluctant to collect such items (pers. comm.). Those items he did acquire come from a disparate set of villages, and, as he was in the region to conduct archaeological research, he collected as a by-product of his main work in the region. In contrast to those collectors who had gone before him Specht deposited items in the National Museum in Port Moresby, which was often in response to a specific request made by the vendor (Specht, pers. comm.) Of course, if one extends the notion of collection to include archaeological excavation then Specht’s collections (to be deposited in the PNG National Museum) number many thousands of objects ranging up to 12,000 years old.

From 1985 to 1992, Gosden and Pavlides carried out archaeological fieldwork in the Arawe Islands. They did not make a collection, stepping away from the traditional by-product of any material culture study. Instead, Pavlides (1988) collected information on Pililo and Kumbun Islands, her main interest being to document an extant trading system and outline links between the Arawe Islands, Siassi and Kandrian through objects, kinship and a network of trade friendships. Pavlides concentrated on household contents and noted two things: the absence of shields and blowguns (stored elsewhere); and the replacement of some items (e.g., stone tools, obsidian flakes and pottery vessels) with European equivalents. However, some items had survived in use because they functioned better than the European equivalent. For example, metal blades discoulour taro, and therefore shell knives are still used.

Post World War II—overview. Although many tourists, dealers and other researchers, who passed through the region with different motivations, came away with objects or “souvenirs” from the region, very few collections from this most recent period have ended up in museums. Specht, our sole example of a museum curator in the region, is the only researcher who brought back a collection of objects for a museum. All the researchers probably acquired artefacts as mementoes of their work in the region, either through gift or trade. These items, like Hahl’s goldlip shell, may yet end up in museums.

This period is characterized by the end of colonial rule and Papua New Guinea independence. Amongst researchers there is the recognition that salvage ethnography has been disproved as an agenda, and that to remove objects that are no longer made may be the actual cause of change. While all cultures do change there is no longer a “before” and “after” distinction, or pre-contact culture to be preserved through collections. Instead fieldworkers wish to understand cultures and work with communities, pursuing aims of interest to the communities as much as their own research agendas. In addition, the ethics of acquiring objects was questioned, new legislation passed, and new institutions such as the National Museum and Provincial Cultural Centres are now managing cultural preservation in Papua New Guinea.

Most collecting focussed on the “disappearing” archaeological heritage of the region, which is being preserved in Papua New Guinea (rather than elsewhere).
The lack of coherent collection exemplifies changes in collecting objectives, regional politics and the agency of Papua New Guineans (both nationally and along the south coast of New Britain).

Conclusions

Researchers and collectors were attracted to the Aravai region of New Britain as it was accessible and had interesting anthropological characteristics, such as the head-binding of infants to create the aesthetically pleasing “longhead”, and the use of blowguns. All of the collectors had rather specific interests. Commercial traders concentrated on weapons, the curio collectors sought the obscure or the decorative, and the anthropologists looked for a representative selection of objects, including ordinary items in daily use.

None of the collectors felt that they were documenting themselves and their position in a colonial world. We are now using their collections as historical sources to throw light on them and the people they went to study. Only by comparing all the collectors can we gain a full picture of colonial culture and its changes. However, the collectors’ interests were not the only factors affecting collection composition. The locals developed an awareness of the structures and beliefs of a colonial culture in which the collectors played a key part. Blackwood’s arrival hot on the heels of Todd and Moyne meant that her informant Magnin knew exactly what she wanted, how to offer himself as broker and how to use the transactions to his own advantage.

Changes such as “pacification” were seen as vital parts of the colonial process that led to changes in the nature of material culture. Shields, once made for warfare but now almost exclusively for dance, were simplified so that later examples no longer had a protruding boss. The design on the inner face was less complex, no longer fully echoing barkcloth design. Wider intercommunity trade meant goldlip shells became more readily obtainable (though still expensive) and each collector gained at least one.

The south coast of New Britain has never been renowned as a great centre of anthropological research within Papua New Guinea as a whole. As can be seen from the amount of work and collecting in the last 100 years, such a reputation is not deserved, but is explicable in the lack of publication, and the diverse research traditions of Germany, Australia, Britain and the USA, which have inspired differing forms of colonial culture and its changes. However, the collectors’ interests were not the only factors affecting collection composition. The locals developed an awareness of the structures and beliefs of a colonial culture in which the collectors played a key part. Blackwood’s arrival hot on the heels of Todd and Moyne meant that her informant Magnin knew exactly what she wanted, how to offer himself as broker and how to use the transactions to his own advantage.

Acknowledgments

This research has taken the authors to all of the museums mentioned. We wish to thank everyone at these institutions who made our research visits so productive and enjoyable, in particular Liz Bonshak, Ingrid Heereman, Anne Heimhold, Christian Kaufmann, Antje Kelm, Marion Melk-Koch, Markus Schindlbeck, Jim Specht, John Terrell and Rob Welsch. We are indebted to Heide Leinert for making her research on the life of Mencke available to us. Particular thanks are due to Jim Specht for introducing us to the region, commenting on our work as it has progressed and sharing his thoughts on the Parkinson collections and first hand experience of collecting in New Britain. We are very grateful to the Leverhulme Trust, the British Academy and to the Economic and Social Research Council for funding our research. We are very grateful to Richard Fullagar and Val Attenbrow for the editorial time and care they expended on this paper which improved it considerably.

References


Full-text PDF of each one of the works in this volume are available at the following links:

http://dx.doi.org/10.3853/j.0812-7387.29.2004.1483

http://dx.doi.org/10.3853/j.0812-7387.29.2004.1396

http://dx.doi.org/10.3853/j.0812-7387.29.2004.1397

http://dx.doi.org/10.3853/j.0812-7387.29.2004.1398

http://dx.doi.org/10.3853/j.0812-7387.29.2004.1399

http://dx.doi.org/10.3853/j.0812-7387.29.2004.1400

http://dx.doi.org/10.3853/j.0812-7387.29.2004.1401

http://dx.doi.org/10.3853/j.0812-7387.29.2004.1402

http://dx.doi.org/10.3853/j.0812-7387.29.2004.1403

http://dx.doi.org/10.3853/j.0812-7387.29.2004.1404

http://dx.doi.org/10.3853/j.0812-7387.29.2004.1405

http://dx.doi.org/10.3853/j.0812-7387.29.2004.1406

http://dx.doi.org/10.3853/j.0812-7387.29.2004.1407

http://dx.doi.org/10.3853/j.0812-7387.29.2004.1408

http://dx.doi.org/10.3853/j.0812-7387.29.2004.1409

http://dx.doi.org/10.3853/j.0812-7387.29.2004.1410

http://dx.doi.org/10.3853/j.0812-7387.29.2004.1411

http://dx.doi.org/10.3853/j.0812-7387.29.2004.1412

http://dx.doi.org/10.3853/j.0812-7387.29.2004.1413

http://dx.doi.org/10.3853/j.0812-7387.29.2004.1414