

# Community consultation: Te Papa and New Zealand Indian communities – the other side of the coin

Dr Pushpa Wood

20 Rolleston Street, Mount Cook, Wellington, New Zealand (pushpa.wood@paradise.net.nz)

**ABSTRACT:** This response to a recent article by Stephanie Gibson in *Tubinga* (2003) aims to describe a process of community consultation that is accepted by most communities and institutions and that can be implemented in any surroundings and for any project. It may pose some challenges for bureaucracy, but it is necessary if corporate, governmental, and quasi-governmental organisations wish a continued and positive relationship with the communities in which they work.

**KEYWORDS:** Museum, New Zealand, Te Papa, Community Advisory Group, *AAINAA*, Indian, Hindu, Sikh, Muslim, community consultation.

## Introduction

The International Council of Museums (ICOM) *Code of Professional Ethics*<sup>1</sup> states that ‘Museums have an important duty to develop their educational role and attract wider audiences from the community, locality, or group they serve. Interaction with the constituent community and promotion of their heritage is an integral part of the educational role of the museum’. These notions have been incorporated within the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa Act 1992, the museum’s Concept, its Policies, and in the development of the overall museum experience.

Even though the governing bodies refer to the desirability of incorporating the wider community to support its aims and policies, the process of community consultation and utilising that consultative process as a distinguishable resource are relatively new among museums (Gibson 2003: 63).

The exhibition *AAINAA – Reflections through Indian weddings*, involving the New Zealand Indian community, was Te Papa’s third ethnic community-based project – the other two being focussed on the Chinese and Dutch

communities. These exhibitions fall within the parameters of many museums’ objectives, constitutions, and exhibition policies. Some exhibits can provide a base for a museum ‘to develop its role as an educational resource used by all sections of the population or specialised group that the museums intended to serve’ (ICOM 2001). By consulting with the ethnic community, the museum can develop community relationships to enable the use of expertise that might otherwise lie undeveloped. The expertise provided can be a ‘storehouse of treasures’ that would otherwise not be tapped and gradually lost with the passing of generations.

## The New Zealand Indian community

Historically the first Indians arrived in New Zealand in the 1800s following a period of indentured labour for the sugarcane industry in Fiji. The main geographic regional representation was from Gujarat, with a smaller number coming from Punjab.

As generations evolved, the Indian community grew in number, with most marriage partners coming from India (up until the last thirty years) – New Zealand residents (or sometimes their parents or specific members of the extended family) often selecting a partner from their own caste and region. Such social intercourse helped to reinforce through the generations the religious beliefs, social norms, and cultural heritage of the homeland and the region, regarded by New Zealand Indians as their roots.

Through extended family inter-relationships and occasional visits to India, Indian families have been able to retain much of their culture and social identity (e.g. sari wearing by Indian women, marriage ceremonies). The culture and social identity have been fostered by the growth and establishment of cultural centres and more recently gurdwaras, temples, and mosques (places of worship). These places play an important role in day-to-day life and especially on ceremonial occasions. The marriage ceremony is one of the most important social traditions that has been retained in its traditional form despite the various changes that the Indian community has undergone.

In the last twenty years, diversification of the New Zealand Indian community has occurred through the increased migration of Indians from other parts of the world. The migrants included a large number of Indians emigrating from Fiji owing to the 1987 military coup there and subsequent political uncertainties, and other Indians with aspirations of fulfilling trade and professional vacancies in New Zealand.

Hinduism has, and still is, the predominant religion of Indians living in New Zealand but, as a result of recent immigration, there is now a full range of religions, with Sikh and Muslim faiths forming distinct minorities. While there has been considerable changes in interactions within the Indian community, ceremonial occasions such as weddings, as conveyed in *AAINAA*, still serve as a basis of community gathering and a reinforcement of the community's cultural and religious roots.

## Community inclusion

It is a widely accepted fact that museums worldwide are dependent on the inclusion of community, not only for the number of visitors entering the museum, but also for the support provided by the wider community. This support varies from financial support (donations, bequests, and sponsorship) to informal marketing and the provision

of feedback through surveys and research carried out by museums.

Following the ICOM (2001) *Code of Professional Ethics*, consultation with the community has increasingly become a key process for most museums and Te Papa is no exception. Consultation in this context normally occurs at three levels.

- Use of the community for research and exhibit development
- Financial and marketing support
- Use of expertise within the community that is not available to a museum owing to limited resources in terms of both staff and finances.

## Community consultation – expectations

In terms of community consultation, museums increasingly depend on a community's ability to acquire the information (in various forms) needed to better serve the society and its ability to use that information properly and productively (Edson 1997: 90).

Owing to the limited financial resources of museums, particularly in recent times, the consultation with communities is a growing relationship. Most, if not all, projects undertaken by museums have two or more partners and a number of stakeholders involved. In community exhibition projects such as *AAINAA* there are two key partners with a number of stakeholders. Community in such instances becomes the second partner with the museum playing the role of the first partner.

Each of the two partners (museum through its staff and the community through various forums) can, if properly focussed, input resources to the various outputs of the museum. The community invariably is much larger in size and resource base than the museum staff, and consequently is more diverse and more complex in nature. Each person is bound by the law, morals, ethics, codes, and culture of her/his own community, peers, profession, and nation. Part of the complexity of a community, and therefore of its contribution to a museum, results from the fact that the individuals that make-up the community have different consciences, priorities, aspirations, and goals (Russell 1955).

The actions so generated may be that 'which we may not want to do, but which we do anyway as a means to an end ... The other set of actions are those which we do, not

because we want to, nor even because there is an end which we want to achieve, but because we feel ourselves under an obligation to do them' (Sommers 1986). Most community voluntary participation in the current environment is based on this 'sense of obligation' and, in few cases, on the desire to seize an opportunity for self-promotion.

Working with the New Zealand Indian community to develop a common goal, Te Papa needed to identify the different parameters under which the two parties were to operate. In consulting with the New Zealand Indian community, Te Papa needed to consider the constraints of time, personnel, and finances on its second partner that arose because community members invariably were holding another job or were self-employed while providing unpaid work to Te Papa (whereas the first partner was various paid full-time staff of Te Papa). Coupled with this disparity between partners is the power base that lies with the Te Papa staff as the decision makers for an exhibition. These staff members were perceived as professional people with expertise and knowledge about the policies and organisational culture of Te Papa; in contrast, community members perceived themselves as being 'outsiders' invited to comment and provide expert advice<sup>2</sup>.

Based on the above discussion and the expectations from the community consultation process, a fair consultation and shared partnership model for the execution of the *AAINAA* project needed to comprise six stages:

- 1 Identify key stakeholders
- 2 Identify and determine common goals for both partners
- 3 Develop agreed process to achieve those goals
- 4 Review the process at regular intervals
- 5 Review the process at completion and/or debrief the entire project team
- 6 Make/suggest any necessary changes for future consultation processes.

## *AAINAA* – the actual process

The Indian community's first formal contact with Te Papa was in late 1997 through the exhibition called *Passports*. Because of the relationship at the time, great interest was generated among Indian people, who were very keen to 'tell their stories' to Te Papa. When a decision to focus on Indian Community for the community exhibition was made, the initial consultation for this project began in March 2001. A formal approach was made by Te Papa to

the Wellington Indian Association 'to nominate six people to meet with Te Papa staff to discuss the exhibition project and issues affecting the lives of Indian people in New Zealand' (Gibson 2003: 64). In May 2001, people recommended from the community were contacted to participate in the project and in July the 'Blue Skies' meeting was held.

Feedback from a number of community participants indicated that the meeting was well attended, but that participants had been unclear about the process of informing people about the meeting. Participants at the meeting were asked to forward their names and short *curriculum vitae* if they were interested in being part of the small advisory group for the proposed project. The selection process and criteria used to form the Community Advisory Group (hereafter referred to as CAG) was also unclear. It is acknowledged that both the selection process and criteria may have been clear to Te Papa staff and to some community members, but they were not known widely, and definitely were not clear to the CAG membership. Individuals appointed to the CAG viewed it as a privilege and an honour to be part of this group. The composition of CAG has been described by Gibson (2003: 65).

From the very beginning it was made clear to CAG members that Te Papa as an institution values the skills, expertise, and views of the Indian community and would be willing to accept community participation to improve their decision-making process. The front-line exhibition staff that worked with the CAG had a strong belief that people should have an opportunity to express their views and every effort was made to elicit opinions. CAG was very conscious of the fact that this was the first and maybe the only opportunity to showcase Indian culture to rest of the country and overseas visitors through Te Papa. This in itself put a great burden on the group members' shoulders to ensure that the 'outcome' truly reflected Indian people in general and the Indian community in New Zealand in particular.

At the first meeting of the CAG, members were honest and open in presenting their own personal expectations, objectives, and reasons for participation. The gaps within community representation and survey replies (discussed below) were also identified and reiterated at other times. However time and resources seemed to be against filling these gaps and true community representation was not achieved. The CAG members had to bear the consequences of this from the community and this added extra stress and responsibility to the focus of supporting the exhibition.

All meetings were controlled and serviced by staff of Te Papa and at their premises. CAG members were invited to comment on proposals or, where there were barriers in development, provide solutions. While Te Papa kept control over the exhibition and the finances, the CAG members were solicited at every step of the process for input and they took control of the opening ceremony and the community education sessions held at Te Papa. A marriage survey was developed with the cooperation of CAG members and was utilised by Te Papa as the basis of documentation in the exhibit. Twenty-one respondents were selected from the survey replies by Te Papa and were interviewed on film. This film footage became an important part of the exhibition.

To acknowledge the main religious groups represented in New Zealand, the two-year exhibition cycle was divided into three timeframes:

First twelve months: Hindu focus (Hinduism remains the major religion of the New Zealand Indian community).

Months 13–18: Sikh focus.

Months 19–24: Muslim focus.

For the duration of *AAINAA* the main structure, including the material from the survey, remained the same. The area involving the bride and groom mannequins and the immediate surrounds were changed to meet the three religious requirements.

After the exhibition opened, Te Papa consulted with the CAG and other community members to establish an educational online website aimed at intermediate school-aged children.

At the time of writing, with the exhibition now concluded, the overall review process is still awaited. As far as the author is aware, to date, the only monitoring/review undertaken was an internal review and an initial impact report prepared by the Te Papa Visitor and Market Research team in November 2004 to report on the 'visitation trends and satisfaction since opening'. If any further review or survey has been carried out since then, the CAG members are not aware of it.

## The gaps – a CAG perspective

There were established channels of accessing information that had been used by Te Papa; however they were not clear to CAG or 'Blue Skies' meeting participants. At the 'Blue Skies' meeting all participants were asked to either

nominate someone they thought would contribute to the project or nominate themselves. Owing to lack of criteria for membership of the CAG, the CAG was not truly representative of the Indian community: it lacked youth, Sikh, and Muslim representation. In addition, out of five members, only one was male and three members were from one region, i.e. Gujarat.

It was appreciated and generally accepted that it was necessary to derive the CAG membership from the Wellington region owing to time and financial restraints. Some consultation with other New Zealand regions would have been useful. Similarly, some group consultation meetings could have been organised in the Wellington region with the Sikh and Muslim communities that would have helped to fill the gaps on the CAG.

Goals of the project were made clear at the onset of the project and a timeline with outcomes was agreed upon. The Concept document prepared was a great source of information for members. However, regular 'revisits' of interim goals and other monitoring processes would have helped the CAG to keep on track as members' participation on this project was one of many unpaid jobs these volunteers were carrying out in addition to their paid employment. As most CAG members had not had an experience in being involved with such a large-scale project, these regular 'revisit' sessions would have provided additional opportunities to voice their concerns if any and would have empowered them to feel a certain amount of ownership of the project.

The ICOM *Code* states, 'Members of the museum profession have an obligation, subject to due acknowledgement, to share their knowledge and experience with their colleagues and with scholars and students in relevant fields' (2001). With the specific expertise amongst the CAG membership, scholarly follow-up research was requested at the first CAG meeting. Subsequently, two key research outcomes were identified at the very early stages of planning for the project:

- a. Development of a Social Science Database exploring changing marriage and associated practice(s) within the community since World War I.
- b. Development of an oral archive possibly in association with the Oral History Archive unit at the National Library of New Zealand<sup>3</sup>.

The CAG meeting notes of 27 May 2002 further report that 'CAG had a special meeting on 24 May and had developed some ideas for research and ongoing post-

opening events'. It was further reported in these meeting notes that 'Pushpa suggested that CAG and Te Papa hold a meeting to discuss ideas for post-opening events, research and publication'. It was agreed at that meeting that 'research could drive seminars on related social issues'. It is evident from these meeting notes that research was very much on the agenda from the very beginning. Te Papa agreed to this. When research was to be implemented one year after the opening of the exhibition, an informal approach to Te Papa for access to the material collected was denied for two reasons:

- a. All the material collected by Te Papa belonged to Te Papa and therefore the researcher was not authorised to access this material<sup>4</sup>. It was understood and acknowledged by the CAG that cultural material belongs to community, but Te Papa claimed it has the responsibility to protect the trust placed in them by the people who agreed to participate in this project<sup>5</sup>. However the researcher was not interested in the ownership of the material, rather 'access' to it for research purposes only.
- b. Somehow asking participants' permission for future contact had been left off the original survey; so ethically no one other than Te Papa staff could access that material. The CAG members had understood from the very beginning of the project that a statement was to be included in the original survey form to request the permission of participants for CAG member(s) to have access to the material provided for further research in the future. Inclusion of this statement in the survey would have enabled participants who had expressed an interest in taking part in further research to be identified. However, this did not happen and consequently the researcher was unable to carry out further research at that stage<sup>6</sup>.

Te Papa's document 'Our Principles' states under the heading Output Statements, 'Te Papa works in partnership with heritage organisations, iwi/Māori research and education institutions, and extends access to the Te Papa experience' and explains under the Outcome Statement that 'Te Papa engages communities and iwi/Māori in its activities, and provides leadership and support to enhance services in the heritage sector'. However, that principle was not followed in this instance, with regard to research and publication. Although the reasons for this have been appreciated by the researcher, they did not seem justified, especially when the intention to carry out further research had been made clear by the CAG at the outset.

With the network for feedback left as informal, and Te Papa being limited in its funds, there were no formal updates or reviews once the exhibition was opened. Furthermore, except for one formal follow-up/debriefing meeting (requested by the CAG) with senior Te Papa management after the opening, no formal review of the entire project has taken place. Some community members were involved in developing an online resource, but this was not part of any formal process. Now that the exhibition has completed its two-year term, a complete review of the process and project would have provided useful and valuable information for similar future projects. The Te Papa team is very experienced at putting together such projects; however, every community has something to offer and a mechanism needs to be put in place to seek such advice formally. Such a mechanism would also enhance the relationship between partners and, consequently, the community would feel that its members' views and opinions are valued, which in turn would encourage future participation.

Wesson (1993: 18) states that 'for good communication to occur, there must be someone who listens, listening is the central theme of quality management and as such, is central to partnership and community consultation'. While the front-line exhibition staff was openly communicative, and willing to share, there was another level of activity underway that was not always obvious to the CAG and at times it was the perception of CAG members that they were not part of 'all activities' that were being planned.

The CAG members were very strong in their feedback to Te Papa management about a proposal put forward for a permanent position either within Te Papa, or for an independent person, as a 'community liaison' person in the future. In late 2003, Susan Superville was appointed as a Community Relations Manager. This position has definitely bridged the community–Te Papa gap and has strengthened the ongoing relationship between community and Te Papa. This also resulted in some valuable events being organised during the lifetime of *AAINAA*.

Te Papa has actively promoted and facilitated an ongoing relationship through educational evening forums organised and presented by the Indian community. In addition, a number of 'floor talks' were organised by Te Papa in which the CAG members and other community members contributed. Feedback from the community about these sessions has been very positive and has been viewed as a sign of ongoing relationship between Te Papa and the community.

Empowerment, shared participation, and acknowledgement are key elements to achieve a positive working relationship. However, Te Papa held rather than shared its power by having different levels of 'community consultation and engagement' processes in place. This essentially 'compartmentalised' the consultation process. For example, the facilitator for the 'Blue Skies' meeting was appointed by Te Papa; the survey interviewer was appointed by Te Papa (with no consultation with the CAG) and was paid for the work; the translator on the other hand was appointed in consultation with CAG (and was also paid for the work). Other community members were included from time to time as need arose for additional resources, expertise, and event management, usually without payment for work done. This compartmentalised approach had caused some concern for the CAG and created tension at times in the community–Te Papa relationship at various levels. It is interesting to note that the CAG was never formally introduced to the survey interviewer who was a community member as well. Although this omission may appear as a very small issue, it did create an unintentional 'hierarchy' within local community.

Selection criteria for which survey participants were to be interviewed had not been made clear or agreed upon with the CAG. Therefore, when the gaps in representation of region, age group, and religion were identified, Te Papa had already committed a considerable amount of resources (financial and staffing) to interview 21 survey participants. Unnecessary stress was placed on both the CAG and the Te Papa team to identify additional participants for interviews within Wellington region and to involve young people, at very short notice. Though last minute efforts were successful in 'plugging' these gaps, the process itself was less than satisfactory from the community's perspective. All this could have been avoided had the CAG been involved in the survey participant selection process. CAG members would have been able to identify the gaps in community representation before interviewing started; so, resources assigned to this part of the project would have been more equitably divided.

Another example of Te Papa 'holding on' to the power rather than sharing it (though unintentionally) was evident by the absence of formal acknowledgement of the CAG members and their voluntary contribution until well after the opening of the exhibition. This oversight had to be brought to the attention of Te Papa staff by the CAG when

the community asked questions about CAG involvement and contribution in the project.

The feedback from the public has been very positive and the CAG members and Te Papa can hold their heads high that a goal of producing a high-quality and important exhibition has been achieved. One of the most important objectives of the consultative process should always be to treat that process not as a 'requirement' that must be met but as an 'investment' for the best outcome (adopted from Schwartz & Deruyttere 1996: 4–7). Resource inputs by Te Papa and the CAG members can be viewed as an 'investment'.

## Learning from the experience

Community in any context is complex and presents its own challenges when it comes to consultation. Consulting the Indian community in this instance was no exception. Consequently, the preliminary stage of identifying and utilising the available communication channels within a diverse community is vital. If the right and/or correct channels are not identified and utilised, real and representative community consultation cannot occur. Such a situation will produce gaps within resources and rifts within the community being consulted.

At the initial community consultation process it is important that the community is made aware of: the types of decisions to be made that will involve community consultation; any matters in which the community will not be consulted and the reasons why not. It is also important that the consultation processes used are flexible, inclusive, and appropriate and finally that, where possible, the process facilitates mutual understanding between groups and individuals with differing views.

In other words, 'the key to success lies in the building of effective, inclusive relationships, across sectors, to mobilise all individuals [selected resources] in a way which maximises their contribution' (Wesson 1993: 24).

If Te Papa management is to continue using the community consultation process, as per its charter, the following points need to be taken into account if it is to build new relationships and strengthen its ongoing relationships with the communities it endeavours to serve:

- It is important to have some community consultation meetings in the community itself and to have various community leaders chair the community meetings, to convey power sharing. This will provide an opportunity for wider consultation and input.

- Focus groups in each of the main regions/cities should be planned for, budgeted for, and organised, to gain wider community input and 'buy in'.
  - True cross-representation (geographic, gender, age, and religion) is of prime importance both in consultation and representation regarding any material that may be exhibited. It is important that young people are involved from the onset of a project and are consulted through appropriate channels. Their input should be seen as an important and necessary part of the whole process.
  - One of the first roles of a consultative group should be to identify gaps in resources. Te Papa needs to be prepared to implement strategies to fill the gaps to reflect true consultation. Gap identification will facilitate appropriate risk management planning and will enhance the strategic distribution of resources and help to minimise the process being ruled by set time frames and limited finances.
  - Consultation with the community should involve the selection of an initial development group in partnership with Te Papa: (1) to overview the resources; (2) to ensure that true representation is achieved; (3) to negotiate the roles and expertise required for the consultative group; and (4) to finalise and agree upon an appropriate timeframe for the project being undertaken.
  - Understanding of cultural context of power in decision making is crucial. This will encourage power sharing with the community and will ensure that sharing is negotiated with the community and its representatives. The representatives and the community should not have to demand power sharing nor do they need to take over the roles of professional staff.
  - From the community's perspective, this type of project is a daunting task and members tend to feel deep sense of responsibility to ensure that they are representing their community as per expectations. Te Papa as a professional organisation has an added responsibility to provide appropriate tools to community members that will build their confidence and empower them to make positive contributions.
  - The organisational culture of Te Papa and its current compartmentalised practice of operating can be foreign to communities that are used to a more holistic process. Consequently, Te Papa should organise an orientation session for community representatives about its organisational structure and work environment/culture.
  - Te Papa should make clear at the outset to the community whether it intends to build a long-term relationship with the community.
  - Te Papa is just one of many institutions that regularly solicit ethnic minority groups for their support, contribution, and expertise. For an ongoing relationship, Te Papa should show to the community involved that it 'values' the community it serves and its relationship with it. This can be achieved by involving all elements of society or its representatives in planning and delivery where such involvement will make a defined and valued difference. A relationship of trust, open communication, and the appropriate form of acknowledgement (not necessarily on a formal basis) are all evidence that a community is valued.
  - The roles various community members will play need to be established early on in a project, as some community members will want to be involved in every aspect of an exhibition. A 'workshop' early in the process negotiating the roles of the two parties and the individuals within each party would be very useful and the definition of roles should be revisited if necessary at regular intervals. This will help to alleviate the conflict and power struggle between the experts, advisors, lay persons and professionals, and the paid subcontractors.
- Schwartz & Deruyttere (1996: 4) attributed three key functions to consultation, namely, to inform the other party, to elicit opinions from other, and finally be a prelude to or precondition for effective community participation. This last function of consultation 'can lead to participation in which the community shares authority and power throughout the development cycle, from policy decisions and project identification to *ex post facto* evaluation' (Schwartz & Deruyttere 1996: 5).
- The CAG members understood and had first-hand experience of Te Papa staff's commitment, during the development phase of *AAINAA*, to use all three functions of consultation as identified above, although some were more successfully used than others.

## The way forward

In conclusion, it can be stated that Te Papa made every effort to fulfil its obligation as a museum that is responsive to the community needs it serves and that involves the community at different levels of consultation. From the community perspective, implementation of the following

suggestions and recommendations will enhance future community consultations and will lend further credibility to Te Papa's function(s) in the community.

They are based on the Indian community's experience of involvement in putting together *AAINAA*. These suggestions are by no means a criticism of the excellent work carried out by Te Papa and its dedicated team of staff. Instead, they are an attempt of the 'second' partner involved in the consultation process to provide some constructive feedback, which will enhance the future relationship.

All areas of communication channels within the wider community need to be identified at the very beginning and appropriate channels for disseminating information and collecting views/opinions to be agreed upon.

A 'complete stock take' of community expertise needs to be carried out. This is a useful ongoing strategy for any corporate organisation in general and Te Papa in particular, and the resulting resource can serve as a useful bank for future projects. Each community has its own way of viewing and valuing its members' expertise. Therefore, early involvement will ensure their participation and commitment to the project(s).

A truly representative advisory group needs to be established for each project. Lack of time or financial resources should not dictate the formation of such group. Te Papa needs to be prepared to allocate extra resources if any gaps of community representation are identified at later stage.

An appropriate orientation programme and training need to be organised for the community members involved. These will generate a common understanding of roles and responsibilities for all parties involved.

Meeting venues and leadership roles at such meetings need to be shared between Te Papa and the community involved, i.e. some meetings can be organised outside Te Papa offices with rotating leadership for the meetings. This will convey a sense of 'power sharing' to the community members.

Wesson (1993: 20) states that to be successful 'a project should be designed and executed with significant participation of the beneficiaries at each step of the way. Beneficiaries participate when they understand and appreciate how a project may help them [and the community they represent]... understanding, communication, participation – these basic words of human intercourse are vital to any successful development activity'. In order to develop

continuous dialogue and personal contact, Te Papa can use the existing channels within the community for monitoring, evaluation, and review throughout the progress of such community projects. Ongoing dialogue will also encourage Te Papa to recognise and nurture the existing capabilities and resources that are needed within any group. In order for Te Papa to improve its understanding of community concerns and aspirations, it is vital that a process of consultation through constructive dialogue and regular exchange of ideas remain on its agenda for every project.

## Acknowledgements

This paper was written with great encouragement from Stephanie Gibson and lot of 'nagging' and support from my husband Jack Wood. Many people in my extended family, especially all the CAG members, have contributed in more than one way to this paper and I acknowledge their support and encouragement. They all know who they are. I accept the sole responsibility for any shortcomings.

## Endnotes

- 1 The International Council of Museums (ICOM) *Code of Professional Ethics*, Section 4. This *Code* was adopted unanimously by the 15th General Assembly of ICOM held in Buenos Aires (Argentina) on 4 November 1986. It was amended by the 20th General Assembly meeting in Barcelona (Spain) on 6 July 2001, and revised by the 21st General Assembly meeting in Seoul (Republic of Korea) on 8 October 2004.
- 2 For more details see Michael Fitzgerald's files held by Te Papa.
- 3 For more details see meeting notes of 12 September 2001 held by Te Papa.
- 4 Verbal request was made to Gerda Nana, Exhibition Manager. However it is noted that the researcher did not follow up this request after the initial rejection as it was felt that the decision to provide access would not change.
- 5 This was explained by Stephanie Gibson, a member of the Te Papa History team.
- 6 It is understood that the Te Papa Archives team has now established a community archive that researchers are able to access, as it has been done already. A subsequent permission form for archiving and research access was sent to all the original interviewees after the exhibition opened to remedy the shortfalls of the original survey form.

## References

- Edson, G. (1997). Ethics and the museum community. In Edson, G. (ed.) *Museum Ethics*. London: Routledge. 282 pp.
- Gibson, S. (2003). Te Papa and New Zealand's Indian communities – a case study about exhibition development. *Tubinga* 14: 61–75.
- (ICOM) International Council of Museums. (2001). *ICOM Code of Professional Ethics*. Paris, France. 17 pp.
- Russell, B. (1955). *Human Society in Ethics and Politics*. New York: Simon and Schuster. 227 pp.
- Schwartz, N.B. and Deruyttere, A. (1996). *Community Consultation, Sustainable Development and the Inter-American Development Bank: a concept paper*. Washington, D.C.: Social Programs and Sustainable Development Department, Inter-American Development Bank. 31 pp.
- Sommers, C.H. (1986). *Right and Wrong: basic readings in ethics*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. vi + 201 pp.
- Wesson, W. (1993). Creating cities that work: managing partnership. *Education and Training* 35 (6): 15–34.