Tuesday 24th March
Lotus Hall, Auditorium, Australian Centre on China in the World

Session 1 – History of archaeology, archaeological theory and method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.30am</td>
<td>Keynote 1: Nathan Schlanger (École nationale des chartes, France): André Leroi-Gourhan in the Pacific: disciplinary tensions between ethnology, archaeology and museology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.15am</td>
<td>Catherine Frieman (Australian National University): A history of new ideas: innovation, tradition, and the way archaeologists make meaning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30am</td>
<td>Michelle S. Eusebio (University of the Philippines): Consuming archaeological theory in Indo-Pacific archaeology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.45am</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.05am</td>
<td>Christian Joy B. Rodil (University of the Philippines): In a postcolonial lens: analysis of Philippine archaeology’s history and direction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.20am</td>
<td>Grant McCall (University of Sydney): Hoahakananaia and how it came to be a treasure of the British Museum and an inspiration to Rapanui carvers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.35am</td>
<td>Discussion (Questions and Answers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Keynote 1— André Leroi-Gourhan in the Pacific: disciplinary tensions between ethnology, archaeology and museology

Nathan Schlanger (École nationale des chartes, France)

The two years spent by French ethnologist and technologist André Leroi-Gourhan (1911–1986) in Japan just before the Second World War were of decisive influence for the rest of his career, providing much material for his books on technological classification (1943, 1945) as well as his doctoral thesis on ‘Archéologie du pacifique Nord’ (1946). This case study, illustrated with rich archival textual and iconographic sources, will serve to address a key issue in the history of archaeology—that of the benefits, consequences and even pitfalls of interdisciplinarity. With museum practices of the 1930s looming in the background, the idea that ‘archaeology is but the ethnology of the past’, springing as it did from humanist theoretical concerns, proved nonetheless to have also less welcome repercussions—on which there are lessons for us to learn to draw.
A history of new ideas: innovation, tradition, and the way archaeologists make meaning
Catherine Frieman (Australian National University)

In this paper I will explore the way assumptions about innovation and change have shaped archaeological inquiry. In archaeology, we work from fragments, each in itself representing no more than a moment or collection of short moments in the past and extrapolate outwards to build coherent narratives of human action. Our focus on change over time—particularly technological change—within archaeology is almost inescapable. Despite an ever-increasing number of scientific dating techniques, the foundations of archaeological chronologies are the very low-tech close study of artefacts and archaeological sites, with a major focus on the emergence of new technologies. Moreover, having developed alongside and out of the 19th century intellectual traditions, positivist and evolutionary frameworks often underlie our discussions of social and technological (and, hence, chronological) change. I suggest that pulling apart the idea of innovation, building on social models originally developed elsewhere in the human sciences, and questioning our reliance on evolutionary metaphors gives us a rich body of thought from which to reimagine a narrative of the past, challenge old assumptions, and tell new stories with old data.

Consuming archaeological theory in Indo-Pacific archaeology
Michelle S. Eusebio (University of the Philippines)

Social theoretical approaches are mainly produced in the West (Europe and North America), where many of these approaches are consumed under the umbrella of ‘archaeological theory’ by Anglo-American archaeologists. This paper explores how these approaches are consumed by application into the research design, interpretation of finds, and creation of narratives in Indo-Pacific archaeology. It also surveys the consumption of archaeological theories by archaeologists from Europe and North America as well as by local archaeologists in Indo-Pacific areas. The outcomes have implications in imparting the ‘history of archaeology’ as ‘history of archaeological thought’ in the local contexts of Indo-Pacific areas.

In a postcolonial lens: analysis of Philippine archaeology’s history and direction
Christian Joy B. Rodil (University of the Philippines)

The historical context of archaeology in the Philippines was shaped by colonial influences and it can be seen through various foreign archaeologists who initially worked and contributed in the region. The study argues that Postcolonial Theory is viable in the study and practice of Philippine archaeology by integrating an indigenous-based methodology in analysing the archaeological record. The author uses Edward Said’s Orientalism framework to carefully extract the colonial features of Philippine archaeology through an overview of the discipline from the late 19th century up to the present. The study believes that Post-colonial theory can reveal the discipline’s direction through extraction of various features such as language, methods, techniques and theoretical background. With this, the study’s objective is to know the changes in archaeological thinking in the local landscape and how it is growing and developing in the twenty-first century.
Rapanui (Easter Island): *Hoahakananaia* and how it came to be a treasure of the British Museum and an inspiration to Rapanui carvers

*Grant McCall (University of Sydney)*

*Hoahakananaia* (hereafter “Hoa”) is the most famous *moai* of Rapanui, as the people of Easter Island call themselves, their language and their home. Removed from the island in 1868, in exchange for carrying a letter, Hoa (and companion *moai hava*) have been part of the British Museum collections since, seen by millions and held to be a singular treasure of that institution, feted in brochures and on British postage stamps. This paper explains Hoa’s biography as it intersects with the development of archaeology on Rapanui and explores Islander efforts to retrieve their most often copied *moai* that some on the island see as being a symbol of their island’s power (*mana*), the return of which shall herald a new era for the world’s most remote inhabited place. The paper takes up debates about long and short chronologies, the transportation of the megalithic ancestor monuments and current integration of archaeological research into the life of the island’s community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 1 – History of archaeology, archaeological theory and method (continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.45pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.40pm</td>
</tr>
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</table>

**Keynote 2 — The whole and the parts: the need for new syntheses in the history of archaeology**

*Oscar Moro Abadía (Memorial University, Canada)*

Since the publication of the second edition of Bruce Trigger’s *A History of Archaeological Thought* in 2006, historians of archaeology have produced a negligible number of syntheses on the history of their discipline. This scarcity contrasts with the increasing number of scholarly works on more regionally and temporally restricted contexts. In this keynote, I argue for a critical historiography that incorporates recent theoretical developments in archaeology within broader historical syntheses. This requirement is particularly pressing in the case of archaeology, a science that has profoundly changed in the last two decades. Rather than presenting the parameters of a new synthesis, I show problems in recent developments in archaeological research, including the impacts of Indigenous knowledges in archaeological research, the ethical turn in archaeology, and the increasing theoretical and methodological fragmentation. I argue that these developments need to be incorporated into new disciplinary syntheses and, more importantly, they need to reorient how we write the histories of archaeology.
Woollahra Point, Sydney 1911: the emergence of archaeological excavation in Australia
Denis Gojak (University of Sydney)

This paper examines an early archaeological excavation carried out by the Australian Museum in Woollahra, Sydney. Its aims were modest—digging a shell midden, exposing engravings on a rock platform and, surprisingly, finding evidence of Spanish explorers shipwrecked in Sydney Harbour in 1595. This bizarre latter goal was negotiated with a prominent pseudoarchaeologist, Lawrence Hargrave to prove his pet theory. The dig demonstrates the methodological evolution of archaeological technique in one of the first scientific excavations in Australia and how it was used to gather research information, but also the social and political context within which institutional archaeologists had to operate.

The designed and the discovered: Chinese sacrificial jade cong in records and in archaeology
Qin Yang (Australian National University)

Since the 1970s, exhibitions of Chinese jades have been presenting prehistoric jades in the shape of square-surfaced cylinders as the classical ritual jade cong. This widely accepted image of cong, however, diverges significantly from those in various historical records. This paper examines issues of using classical literature in Chinese archaeology. It argues that the myth of cong jade originated from two divergent prototypes in the traditions of lexicography and ritual exegesis. And the late 19th-century identification of cong was the result of an antiquarian examination of unearthed objects under the canonical nomenclature of sacrificial jades.
Keynote 3 — A special kind of alchemy: archaeology, museums and reception

Stephanie Moser (University of Southampton, England)

The acquisition of major collections of antiquities in the nineteenth century by museums around the world had a profound effect on the development of archaeology as a discipline. A significant impact of this phase of imperial collecting was the promotion of research on substantive bodies of ancient material culture by an emerging community of specialists. Less recognised in histories of archaeology, but of critical importance in the formation of the discipline, was the extent to which the presentation and reception of such collections of antiquities contributed to defining the aims and aspirations of archaeology. In this talk I will discuss how the display of major collections of antiquities and audience engagement with these installations informed ideas about ancient cultures and archaeology as a subject. Specifically, I will present the results of research on the exhibition and reception of ancient Egyptian artefacts in the British Museum in the second half of the nineteenth century, demonstrating how both were intimately connected to the development of archaeology and Egyptology in Britain. I will conclude with a case study from my current project on archaeology and museum reception, which examines the extraordinary impact of museum objects in realms beyond the museum. Here I will discuss how the history of archaeology was entwined with key developments in the creative arts in Victorian Britain, particularly design.
Uncovering new histories of Marquesan art: reconstructing the Krusenstern expedition collection

*Elena Govor (Australian National University)*

Although Marquesan art is among the most recognisable and best represented in Oceanian museum collections, it is paradoxically among the most understudied Pacific art forms, with the spatial and temporal provenance of many objects remaining unknown. The collection of Adam von Krusenstern’s 1804 Russian expedition to Nuku Hiva Island in the Marquesas presents Islanders, historians, and curators with a unique opportunity to re-locate early Marquesan art within the contexts of its creation, collection, and subsequent museum dissemination. The savants and naturalists of this expedition, hailing from Switzerland, Germany, modern day Estonia, and Russia, collected hundreds of unique artworks and objects, supplemented by scores of illustrative materials and textual accounts. Approximately 250 of these items have now been identified in over a dozen European museums.

This paper will argue that while the painstaking reconstruction of this ‘virtual museum’ opens a new page in the historicization of Marquesan art and material culture, it is of equally great importance to Marquesan Islanders and the wider Pacific community, as many of these objects have been inaccessible, undocumented, or forgotten. The return of this material and cultural heritage provides Islanders with new perspectives on their histories and new avenues for artistic and cultural engagement.

The history of Australian archaeological engagement with Cyprus

*Craig Barker (Chau Chak Wing Museum, The University of Sydney)*

The archaeology of Cyprus has long held a fascination for Australian researchers. Antipodean museum collections began acquiring Cypriot material from the late 19th century, and Australian-led field projects have taken place since the 1930s.

It was in post-war Cyprus, under the supervision of JRB Stewart, that the first academic Australian archaeological excavation took place in the Mediterranean region. It is also through Stewart’s auspices that many Australian museum collections, especially the Nicholson collection at The University of Sydney, now have significant holdings of Cypriot antiquities. This paper explores the archaeological relationship between the two island nations and the significant role played by Australians within the history of Cypriot archaeology.

Patterns of connection: the Wanigela shells revisited

*Elizabeth Bonshek (British Museum)*

Thirteen engraved *Conus* shells were unearthed in 1905 while building the Anglican Mission’s new site at Wanigela, Collingwood Bay in Papua. Over sixty years later, more examples were found up to 500 km away in the northern Massim islands. Four shells were dated (Ambrose et al. 2012) to AD 1101–1495 and analysis of their designs suggested they represented the earliest evidence of the contemporary Massim design tradition on the New Guinea mainland. But what more can be said about these designs in reference to material culture in Collingwood Bay, and what light can be shed on the patterns of connection in the region.
A ‘provenience’ postulate?
Michelle Richards (Australian National University)

Archaeology is often identified as a multidisciplinary subject. But how true is this when archaeologists come to study museum collections? Frequently, ‘hard’ scientific techniques are used to analyse museum objects providing a date or geological provenance. Yet many words, such as ‘provenance’ and ‘provenience’ have multiple and different meanings in the more closely related fields of archaeology, anthropology, art history and museum studies. This paper explores the conflict in shared terminology and the related theoretical problems and shortcomings this causes for our interpretations. I discuss with examples from my PhD research in the Pacific how we may overcome the narrowness of singular disciplinary methodologies by approaching museum collections with greater continuity.

The hybrid archaeology of the Mildura and District Anthropological Group: from artefact collection to stratigraphic excavation in the 1960s
Chris Urwin (Museums Victoria)

The Mildura and District Anthropological Group goes almost unmentioned in histories of archaeology in Australia. Yet the group’s stone artefact collecting—conducted within a c. 125 km radius of Mildura—was extensive and well documented. In November 1964, the amateur group commenced stratigraphic excavation of an Aboriginal freshwater bivalve midden at Red Cliffs. In this paper I unpack the group’s methods and activities from 1960 to 1970 and examine their role in the history of Australian archaeology. I trace their relationship with the National Museum of Victoria and with Edmund D. Gill, a pioneer of radiocarbon dating.

Archaeological adventures across Arnhem Land: the 1948 American-Australian Scientific Expedition to Arnhem Land archaeology program
Sally K. May (Griffith University), Anne Clarke (University of Sydney), Ursula Frederick (Australian National University) and Iain Johnston (AIATSIS)

This paper will delve into the history of one of Australia’s largest ‘scientific’ expeditions—the 1948 American-Australian Scientific Expedition to Arnhem Land. The expedition included two experienced archaeologists—Fred McCarthy (Australian Museum) and Frank Setzler (Smithsonian Institution). Despite their widely acclaimed work in other parts of Australia and the world, their fieldwork during this expedition blurred the boundary between ‘scientific’ archaeology and treasure-hunting. This paper will include a brief history of the archaeological work of expedition members and will reflect on the ongoing legacy of this work and the collections for archaeologists and local Aboriginal communities.
**Wednesday 25th March**  
**Lotus Hall, Auditorium, Australian Centre on China in the World**

### Session 3 — Women in archaeology and the archaeology of gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker(s)/Topic/Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.00am</td>
<td><strong>Keynote 4:</strong> Margarita Díaz-Andreu (ICREA, University of Barcelona, Spain): Re-engendering archaeology: past, present and future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.45am</td>
<td>Lia Genovese: Madeleine Colani and Katherine Routledge: two trowel blazers born in 1866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>Emilie Dotte-Sarout (Australian National University), Guillaume Molle (Australian National University) and Veronique Lacarde (Université de la Polynésie Française): Two women in the land of men: re-examining Adèle de Dombasle and Willowdean Chatterson Handy’s legacies to Marquesan archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.15am</td>
<td>Claire Smith (Flinders University): Female Professors: the quiet revolution in Australian Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30am</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.50am</td>
<td>Sofia C. Samper Carro (Australian National University and Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona), Paloma Gonzalez Marcen (Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona): The (in)visible role of women in Pleistocene palaeoanthropology and archaeology: from Lucy to Raffaella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.05am</td>
<td>Tristen Jones (Australian National University), Martin Porr (University of Western Australia), Richard Kuba (Frobenius Institute), Alfred Nayinguul and the Njanjma Aboriginal Corporation (Njanjma Aboriginal Corporation): Indigenous agency, ‘the other’ and reciprocity: Agnes S. Schulz and the Frobenius Expedition to Arnhem Land 1954–55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.20am</td>
<td>Hilary Howes (Australian National University): Hidden Figures: women’s contributions to German-language archaeology in the Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.35am</td>
<td>Discussion (Questions and Answers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Keynote 4 — Re-engendering archaeology: past, present and future**  
**Margarita Díaz-Andreu (ICREA and University of Barcelona, Spain)**

The introduction of gender in archaeology forty years ago has led to some significant changes over the years. These changes refer to the way researchers think about the past, how they construct their own disciplinary history and how they perceive archaeological practice should take place. Despite these transformations, many challenges lie ahead. In this keynote lecture the main steps towards the situation we have today and the challenges for the future will be traced contextualizing it in two major frameworks. The first will be the socio-political context of the archaeological profession and the second will refer to the debates on the theoretical agenda within the discipline. Examples of good practice from different parts of the world will be highlighted.
Madeleine Colani and Katherine Routledge: two trowel blazers born in 1866
Lia Genovese

Katherine Routledge was born in England on 11 August 1866, into a family of wealthy Quaker industrialists. Two days later, on 13 August, Madeleine Colani was born in Strasbourg, northeast France, to an impoverished biblical scholar. Colani and Rutledge became pioneering archaeologists in the autumn of their lives, the former for the first large-scale survey of the Plain of Jars of Laos and the latter for the first scientific exploration of the *moai* of Easter Island. This presentation traces their respective contribution to the field of archaeology and their legacy in our knowledge of these two World Heritage sites.

Two women in the land of men: re-examining Adèle de Dombasle and Willowdean Chatterson Handy's legacies to Marquesan archaeology
Emilie Dotte-Sarout (Australian National University) Guillaume Molle (Australian National University) and Veronique Larcade (Université de la Polynésie Française)

Ralph Linton and Edward S.C. Handy are respectively remembered as the official archaeologist and anthropologist leading the 1920–21 Bayard Dominick Expedition to the Marquesas. Yet, it was ‘volunteer associate’ Willowdean Chatterson Handy who authored the first monograph on the project’s results (1922). The relations between her gender, her status on the expedition and the skills that justified her enrolment, as well as her own agenda during the trip, echo those of an earlier female traveller to the ‘Land of Men’ (*Te Fenua ‘Enata*), Frenchwoman Adèle de Dombasle. The comparative analysis of their scientific biographies demonstrates typical trends that have limited our appreciation of the role played by women in the history of archaeology – and ways to overcome this.

Female Professors: the quiet revolution in Australian Archaeology
Claire Smith (Flinders University)

In 2006 there were four female professors in Australian archaeology or a closely related discipline, a ratio of one to every three men. In 2020 there are twelve female professors in Australian archaeology, a ratio of one to every two men. This presentation will discuss this change in gender balance in academic archaeology in Australia over the 15 years or so.

The (in)visible role of women in Pleistocene palaeoanthropology and archaeology: from Lucy to Raffaella
Sofia C. Samper Carro (Australian National University and Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona) and Paloma Gonzalez Marcen (Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona)

From its beginnings, the archaeology of gender has favoured the disruption of traditional gender-defined narratives, such as those portraying prehistoric communities with males as the central figure in graphic and audio-visual representations. Although some relevant work has been done, these efforts have been disregarded by many scholars researching early hominins and Palaeolithic communities. Consequently, the general assumption of women playing a passive role in Pleistocene communities, limited to caring and nursing or low-risk subsistence practices, such as gathering, dominates prehistoric research. This presentation aims to provide a review of the persistence of inaccurate biological
sex estimations in early hominins, and to discuss the scarce representation of women in Palaeolithic archaeology scientific research, audio-visual reconstructions of the past and general dissemination outputs.

**Indigenous agency, ‘the other’ and reciprocity: Agnes S. Schulz and the Frobenius Expedition to Arnhem Land 1954–55.**

*Tristen Jones (Australian National University), Martin Porr (University of Western Australia), Richard Kuba (Frobenius Institute), Alfred Nayinguul and the Njanjma Aboriginal Corporation (Njanjma Aboriginal Corporation)*

Until now the research and outreach activities relating to the ethnological and archival museum collections assembled by the Frobenius Expeditions and their members in Australia have focussed solely on the Kimberley region. In this paper, we outline our preliminary research into the activities of the Frobenius Expedition to Arnhem Land in 1954/55, which was conducted by Agnes S. Schulz. Over 1400 black and white photographs, as well as original archival materials and bark paintings from her time in the Northern Territory have been identified in the collections. Based on a preliminary analysis of the photographic collection and the rock art sites featured in the only publication from the expedition (Schulz 1971) unrestricted and ongoing access to remote rock art sites was given to Schulz. Combined with the personal photographs of Traditional Owners on country, this evidence seems to indicate a reciprocated trust and personal relationship with her guides and the selective choice of her guides to impart traditional knowledge about place, art and *djang*. In this paper we discuss the significance of these observations and outline a future joint research project.

**Hidden figures: women’s contributions to German-language archaeology in the Pacific**

*Hilary Howes (Australian National University)*

German-speakers contributed significantly to the development of archaeology in the Pacific during the 19th and 20th centuries. Very few of those active in the field were women. However, women played an important, albeit under-recognised, role in facilitating Pacific archaeology in the German-speaking lands. Some were artistically talented and illustrated the catalogues and other publications compiled by their husbands. Others drew on their skills as early women graduates in ethnography to author comprehensive literature studies or edit and publish the field observations of their male peers. This paper profiles several of these contributions and considers why they have received so little acknowledgement to date.
## Session 4 — History of archaeology in Australia and the Pacific

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Presentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00pm</td>
<td><strong>Keynote 5:</strong> Tim Murray (La Trobe University, Australia): Archaeological theory and the history of Australian archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.45pm</td>
<td>Bronwen Douglas (Australian National University): Archaeology, paleogenomics and echoes of race in Oceania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00pm</td>
<td>Guillaume Molle (Australian National University) and Isabella Shaw (Australian National University): ‘One sacred stone at a time’: Marae studies in the building of Polynesian archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15pm</td>
<td>Duncan Wright (Australian National University) and Anita Herle (Cambridge University): Alfred Haddon: a ‘palaeontologist’ of Torres Strait Islander stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30pm</td>
<td>Andrea Ballesteros Danel (Australian National University): The Mocachi monolith: how visions of ‘bearded men’ influenced theories of trans-Pacific voyages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.45pm</td>
<td>Eirik Stokke (University of Oslo) and Reidar Solsvik (The Kon-Tiki Museum): A Norwegian viking in the Pacific: Thor Heyerdahl’s attempt at solving the Polynesian problem from the margin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00pm</td>
<td>Emilie Dotte-Sarout (Australian National University): Paul Rivet and the Oceanians: a new founding father for ‘archéologie océaniste’?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15pm</td>
<td>Discussion (Questions and Answers)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Keynote 5 — Archaeological theory and the history of Australian archaeology

*Tim Murray (La Trobe University, Melbourne)*

This keynote focuses on exploring intersections between an inquiry into the history of archaeology in Australia, and a more general exploration of the nature and purpose of archaeological theory. My ultimate purpose is to discuss the role of archaeological theory in the evolving practice of archaeology in Australia and elsewhere over the past 200 years. The goal of such discussions is to begin to sketch the broad outlines of a philosophy of archaeology and the nature of its contributions to society.

### Archaeology, paleogenomics and echoes of race in Oceania

*Bronwen Douglas (Australian National University)*

Advanced techniques and spiralling productivity in genomic sequencing of ancient DNA extracted from human archaeological remains is enabling much deeper, if intensely disputed histories of human ancestry, movements, and interactions. This collaboration between archaeology and highly specialized science is attracting unprecedented public interest. However, many archaeologists are sceptical of conclusions drawn from genomic analysis of aDNA, particularly premature generalization from limited samples and hints of racial essentialism. This paper locates the uneasy alliance of archaeology and paleogenomics within the regional context of Oceania, with critical reference to the largely ignored history of nomenclatures since 1750—shifting collective nouns and racially inflected terminology.
‘One sacred stone at a time’: Marae studies in the building of Polynesian archaeology
Guillaume Molle and Isabella Shaw (Australian National University)

Marae sites constitute one of the most prominent categories of archaeological remains in Eastern Pacific. As a pan-Polynesian concept embodying both religious and social modes of organisation, anthropology has long focused on its critical role in indigenous histories. This paper offers to re-evaluate the place and importance of ‘marae studies’ in the history of Polynesian archaeology. From the earliest mixture of fascination-repulsion experienced by westerners, marae had become a critical object of enquiries for archaeologists in the 20th Century. They have been successively investigated through various typological lenses: a proxy for migration patterns within a culture-historical framework; a cornerstone of settlement patterns analyses; and a key to understand chiefdoms’ socio-political dynamics in a more structuralist approach. Interestingly though, the primary ritual function of the sites seems to have been overlooked in these studies, probably due to theoretical and methodological issues. Nowadays, marae sites tend to crystallize identity challenges for the Polynesians themselves as reflected in the recent inscription of the Taputapuatea site on the UNESCO World Heritage list. As such, it is now more than ever necessary to reconcile both etic and emic perspectives on this cultural feature, past and present.

Alfred Haddon: A ‘palaeontologist’ of Torres Strait Islander stories
Duncan Wright (Australian National University) and Anita Herle (Cambridge University)

In 1898, Alfred Haddon wrote a letter to his daughter and son, gloriously adorned with drawings. Descriptions span ‘a beautiful Starfish with a large number of arms’, ritual paraphernalia and the components of Torres Strait Islander canoes and spinning tops! This letter echoes Haddon’s diverse research interests, including a fascination for the deep human history of Torres Strait. This focus plays out in a detailed assessment of the (pre)history of stone axes, clubs and outrigger canoes, also interrogation of a variety of temporal and spatial issues relating to emergence and development of Torres Strait Islander trade, exchange, ritual and religion. In this paper we discuss Haddon’s role and impact in the field of archaeology and assess the impact of his research for archaeologists working in this region today.

The Mocachi monolith: how visions of ‘bearded men’ influenced theories of trans-Pacific voyages
Andrea Ballesteros Danel (Australian National University)

In 1934, anthropologist W.C. Bennett described a series of pre-Columbian monoliths from Tiahuanaco as ‘bearded’ figures, particularly one known as Mocachi. This well-intended yet rushed and incorrect report had a contentious result, as the famed Norwegian voyager Thor Heyerdahl intentionally used these representations to support his well-known theory about ‘white bearded men’ having settled the Americas, followed by Polynesia. This paper addresses the construction of one of Heyerdahl’s principal theses. It contrasts Heyerdahl’s description with José Imbelloni’s fierce critique, an Argentine authority in Andean anthropology, trans-Pacific contact research and settlement theories of the Americas largely influenced by German diffusionist trends.
A Norwegian Viking in the Pacific: Thor Heyerdahl’s attempt at solving the Polynesian problem from the margin

Eirik Stokke (University of Oslo) and Reidar Solsvik (The Kon-Tiki Museum)

Recent research at ANU, on Thor Heyerdahl’s ‘Kon-Tiki theory’, has reframed the significance of the Norwegian explorer. This paper will present new insights on the beginnings of Heyerdahl’s theories, from the family archive. Prior to Fatuhiva, Heyerdahl hypothesised that Caucasian elements in Polynesian fysiognomy resulted from Vikings’ coming to these islands. This theory was abandoned, when Heyerdahl discovered carvings, on a statue in Puamau, Hivaoa, which he believed to be Mayan. The paper presents research-historical contexts of these short-lived theories, following the development of Heyerdahl’s theory from 1936 to 1941, emphasising his unique approach to ethnological research.

Paul Rivet and the Oceanians: a new founding father for ‘archéologie océaniste’?

Emilie Dotte-Sarout (Australian National University)

Not as well-recognised in the history of social sciences as his contemporary Marcel Mauss, Paul Rivet is nevertheless celebrated as the founder of the Musée de l’Homme (1937) and an eminent Americanist. Much more overlooked is his strong interest in Oceania, especially the role of ‘Oceanians’ in the peopling of the world and the origins of ‘civilization’. He developed these ideas early in his career, and later built on them to support, and basically establish, a French tradition of archaeology in the Pacific.
Thursday 26th March
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Session 4 — History of archaeology in Australia and the Pacific
(continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session 6: Dave Johnston: Australia’s Indigenous archaeologists — a history of our journey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.00am</td>
<td>Keynote 6: Dave Johnston: Australia’s Indigenous archaeologists — a history of our journey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.45am</td>
<td>Richard Shing (Vanuatu Cultural Centre / Kaljoral Senta): The development of Indigenous ni-Vanuatu Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>Chris Wilson (Flinders University): Australian Archaeologies and Makarrata (Truth Telling): A Collaborative Research Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.15am</td>
<td>Eve Haddow (Australian National University): Teachers, chiefs, and missionaries: Indigenous knowledge networks and early 20th century theories of Pacific prehistory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30am</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.50am</td>
<td>Tamara Maric (Musée de Tahiti et des Îles), Emilie Dotte-Sarout (Australian National University) and Guillaume Molle (Australian National University): Aurora Natua and the motu Paeao site: unlocking French Polynesia’s islands for Pacific archaeologists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.05am</td>
<td>James Flexner (University of Sydney), Stuart Bedford (Australian National University), Frederique Valentin (French National Centre for Scientific Research): Anglophonie, Francophonie and archaeology in Vanuatu: multilingual cooperation or parallel traditions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.20pm</td>
<td>Discussion (Questions and Answers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Keynote 6: Australia’s Indigenous archaeologists — a history of our journey
Dave Johnston (Founding Chair, Australian Indigenous Archaeologists Association; Director Aboriginal Archaeologists Australia; Director Boonwurrung Foundation (Melbourne) and Coordinator-Indigenous Engagement and PhD Candidate Australian National University, Canberra)

Australia’s Indigenous Archaeologists have been academically qualified and growing in number since the late 1980s. While the majority of us are not represented as employees in Australian University Archaeology Departments, we have been busy working on Indigenous Community heritage projects and engaged in the consultancy industry. We have also actively been listening and consulting with our communities and addressing important heritage-based themes that they have raised. The older members of our Australian Indigenous Archaeologists’ Association have also long lobbied and promoted what we felt was important to contribute to a more ethical Australian Archaeological discipline. This paper presents a history by Dave Johnston, Founding Chair of the Australian Indigenous Archaeologists Association (AIIA) of Australia’s Indigenous archaeologists, highlighting some of our journeys and our work over the last three decades.
The development of Indigenous ni-Vanuatu archaeology
Richard Shing (Vanuatu Cultural Centre / Kaljoral Senta)

The earliest archaeological visitors to Vanuatu, be they missionaries, explorers or scientists, would have had Indigenous guides leading them to sites. The two major archaeologists excavating in Vanuatu in the 1960s, José Garanger and Richard Shutler Jr, certainly employed local crews and interlocutors in their research. For Garanger oral traditions had an essential role in both the finding and interpretation of sites. Later archaeological researchers also worked closely with local communities in the 1970s and 1980s. It was not until the late 1980s, however, when the Vanuatu Cultural and Historic Sites Survey (VCHSS) was established, funded by the European Union and led by Jean-Christophe Galipaud and David Roe, that more formal training of Indigenous ni-Vanuatu in archaeological survey and recording techniques began. This was extended in the mid-1990s as part of a joint ANU-VKS project, when field schools for VKS filwokas and staff began, funded initially by the Sasakawa Foundation. The filwokas are the volunteers, men and women, based on many of Vanuatu’s 80 inhabited islands who support VKS activities and help liaise between local communities and foreign researchers. Field Schools and other training workshops continued into the new millennium. In addition, a dedicated Archaeology Unit within the VKS’s National Museum was established, initially funded by external grants but now part of the VKS budget, overseen in its early stages by Stuart Bedford and Matthew Spriggs as the Honorary Curators of Archaeology. The Unit is now at the stage where it regularly carries out independent surveys and even small excavation programs in collaboration with externally led research programs. Outreach in the form of comic books, posters, school visits, radio and TV shows, museum exhibitions and public presentations are important parts of the work of the Archaeology Unit. One staff member has a degree specialising in archaeology from University of Papua New Guinea and will next year start a Masters Program in Australia, and we hope to continue the training and professionalisation of archaeology in Vanuatu over the next several year.

Australian archaeologies and Makarrata (truth telling): a collaborative research agenda
Christopher J. Wilson (Flinders University)

This paper will present a historiography of Indigenous engagement in Australian archaeology since Langford (1983) ‘Our Heritage Your Playground’ and will also present a proposal for a new collaborative research framework in Australian archaeology. It is argued that a collaborative research agenda can be integrated across all fields of archaeology through a socio-cultural and political framework of Indigenous archaeologies which are motivated by reconciliation, adopting the Markatarta principles and examine matters of Indigenous sovereignty and ontologies.

Teachers, Chiefs, and Missionaries: Indigenous knowledge networks and early 20th century theories of Pacific prehistory
Eve Haddow (Australian National University)

Drawing on research investigating missionary engagement with Pacific archaeology, this paper considers Indigenous knowledge networks integral to emergent early 20th-century theories of the Pacific past. The discussion focuses on a case study from
Makira, Solomon Islands, exploring individuals connected to Charles E. Fox of the Melanesian Mission. Particularly prominent were young men involved in the mission and influential chiefs with whom Fox sought to connect. Data from museum collections, archives, missionary publications, and scholarly texts reveals the contribution of those interlocutors to international narratives of prehistory. This locally specific case study has relevance to broader histories of archaeology, as well as anthropology, particularly in the Pacific where the two disciplines remained heavily intertwined in the period discussed.

**Aurora Natua and the motu Paeao site: Unlocking French Polynesia's islands for Pacific archaeologists.**

*Tamara Maric (Musée de Tahiti et des Iles), Emilie Dotte-Sarout (Australian National University), Guillaume Molle (Australian National University)*

In the history of archaeology globally, the essential role of Indigenous collaborators has long gone unnoticed. In French Polynesia, some of the most significant archaeological collections held by the Musée de Tahiti et des Iles contain items of material culture which particular histories can serve to illustrate the role of one such overlooked key figure. Aurora Germaine Tetunui Natua, whose life spanned most of the 20th century, became known as a ‘Tahitian scholar’ and her professional life was intertwined with the history of Polynesian archaeology and its extended web of connections, from Maupiti to Pape’ete, Paris and Honolulu. Specific items exhibited at the MTI are representative of a significant site in the history of Polynesian archaeology: Motu Paeao in Maupiti. By examining the contextual information available for the excavation of the site and the analysis of the finds, we offer to reconsider the essential role played by Aurora Natua. This gives us an opportunity to move from the objects to the making of history, highlighting the professional story of the Polynesian woman who stands behind these remarkable artefacts and more generally her contributions to the dynamics at play in the mid-20th century, a period of exponential growth in the archaeology of French Polynesia.

**Anglophonie, Francophonie, and archaeology in Vanuatu: multilingual cooperation or parallel traditions?**

*James L. Flexner (University of Sydney), Stuart Bedford (Australian National University) and Frederique Valentin (French National Centre for Scientific Research)*

The colonial history of Vanuatu (formerly the New Hebrides/Nouvelle Hébrides) is somewhat unusual in the Pacific region, consisting of a joint Anglo-French ‘Condiminium’, which served semi-functionally to rule over the archipelago of 85 or so islands for a period of roughly 75 years before independence in 1980. The ‘discovery’ of Vanuatu’s pre-colonial history is entangled to some degree with this colonial history. Francophone and Anglophone archaeologists have been studying Vanuatu’s past since at least the 1960s, sometimes jointly, more often working semi-independently or in parallel. The history and present research setting of archaeology in Vanuatu stems from the pioneering work of French and American archaeologists in the 1960s, through a strong Australian presence beginning in the late 1970s, to the present environment of indigenous-led archaeology through the Vanuatu Cultural Centre. We speculate that some of the divergences in archaeological practice relate to broader variations in archaeological tradition, for example a ‘processual’ orientation of the American-led research versus a more ethnographic approach for the Francophone archaeologists.