ABSTRACT

The Australian Research Council (ARC) Laureate Project, The Collective Biography of Archaeology in the Pacific or ‘CBAP’ was funded between 2015-2020 and, due to COVID disruptions, associated events continued until the end of 2022. Some of the initial aims included: to create a sub-field of the history of Pacific archaeology; to re-define the development of Australian archaeology within its wider Oceanic context; to re-discover the contribution of both French and German scholars; to recover the considerable amount of archaeological excavation that took place in the Pacific from the 1870s until WWII; to re-conceptualise the perennial issue of trans-Oceanic cultural contacts; to redress the neglect of the role of Indigenous Pacific scholars and of women in archaeology; and to re-engage with descendant communities in the light of our research and its findings. The paper discusses the project’s results in light of these and other emerging aims during the last seven years. It also provides a comprehensive bibliography of publications by the Project’s main contributors.
INTRODUCTION

As was noted in the 2017 paper laying out the justification for, and background to, the Australian Research Council-funded Collective Biography of Archaeology in the Pacific Laureate Project (henceforth CBAP), that the Pacific and Island Southeast Asian regions had hitherto been almost completely absent from world histories of archaeology (Spriggs 2017a). CBAP had as an anticipated outcome to change this situation through examination and exposition of the forgotten networks of influence linking Pacific scholars to the metropoles of Europe and America, giving Pacific archaeology its proper place with the much more established histories of Pacific anthropology and of Australian archaeology. It also intended to highlight the particularly significant early Francophone and Germanophone contributions to Pacific archaeology while not ignoring other non-Anglophone traditions (Hawaiian, Japanese, Russian and so on), through recuperation of the very largely forgotten archaeological excavations of the Pre-World War II period, and through re-membering the neglected roles of Indigenous scholars, women and so-called ‘amateur’ archaeologists in the development of Pacific archaeology.

It can fairly be claimed, and the very extensive project bibliography at the end of this paper (including four completed PhD theses) clearly demonstrates, that over the past seven years CBAP has firmly established the history of Pacific archaeology as a new and fruitful sub-discipline within world archaeology, covering the period from the speculations of early explorers to the present. The project was timely in that Pacific archaeology has been in a serious conceptual crisis in recent years, with theories about the origins of Pacific peoples mired in often racialised assumptions that were largely unanalysed. At the same time, archaeological ideas about the Pacific past have become increasingly internalised among indigenous Pacific Islanders. There has been an urgent need for the understanding of this history to move theory forward to create a more inclusive, decolonised Pacific archaeology. Much, of course, remains to be done in this regard.

AIMS AND ACHIEVEMENTS

It is worth going back to the original detailed aims of CBAP to evaluate how far we have come. The first was, as mentioned above, to create a sub-field of the history of Pacific archaeology, drawing upon but greatly extending the rather parochial histories of Australian and New Zealand archaeology that already existed. The hiring of French and German-language specialists, Emilie Dotte-Sarout and Hilary Howes, as the two postdoctoral fellows for CBAP, as well as recruiting two major Pacific historians as our primary research associates, Bronwen Douglas and Elena Govor, the latter a native Russian speaker, helped to broaden CBAP’s perspectives. The recruitment of four PhD scholars, Michelle Richards, Andrea Ballesteros Danel, Eve Haddow and Victor Melander, from Australia, Mexico, Scotland, and Sweden, further broadened the team’s perspectives, as did a wider informal network of research associates across the world. Our research and administration team of Catherine Fitzgerald, Tristen Jones and Mirani Litster brought further perspectives to the Project.

Annual sessions on the history of regional archaeology were organised at the Australian Archaeological Association Conferences of 2015–2022 – the 2020 conference was cancelled – showcasing the work of the project (see listing below). Four of these so far have resulted in published collections in journals (Dotte-Sarout and Spriggs 2017, Howes and Spriggs 2019a, Dotte-Sarout and Richards 2020, and Howes and Spriggs 2021; see also the published AAA session on pXRF analyses by McAlister and Richards 2019). CBAP co-sponsored the Annual Humanities Research Centre Conference at ANU in January 2017 on the theme Oceanic Knowledges: Exchange and Collaborations across Land and Sea and Time. A 2016 conference was held in Marseilles, France jointly with CREDO and CNRS on the history of Francophone contributions to Pacific archaeology (published in French and English as Dotte-Sarout et al. 2020a and 2021a) and a workshop at the ANU for Francophone early career researchers in archaeology was held in 2017 (Dotte-Sarout et al. 2018). Annual CBAP Lectures invited key figures researching the history of archaeology worldwide to address and meet with CBAP personnel, associated with annual CBAP workshops/conferences at the ANU from 2015 to 2019. These culminated in an international conference on Histories of Archaeology held as an online event at the end of 2021 (delayed from March 2020), as well as history of Asia-Pacific archaeology sessions organised at several other conferences, including the Indo-Pacific
Prehistory Association Congresses in Hue, Vietnam (2018) and Chiang Mai, Thailand (2022) – anticipated by an initial history session organised by Spriggs and Anna Källén at the January 2014 Congress in Siem Reap, Cambodia. The final CBAP event was Pasifika Perspectives on the History of Archaeology, a workshop for Pacific museum and archives personnel to repatriate the regional and local history of archaeology and to discuss ways of incorporating the history of archaeology into future exhibitions and research. This workshop was delayed from March 2020 and finally held at ANU in October 2022. Between them, these public fora did much to bring the history of Pacific archaeology to global attention.

The second aim was to re-evaluate our current stalemated and inadequate theories about the settlement of the Pacific and to re-engage with and critique histories of socio-cultural anthropology that have excised much of its shared past with archaeology in the Pacific in the development of key concepts and schools of thought. The work of all CBAP participants, their publications and PhD theses helped to achieve this objective. The concentration of the project on the period up to the 1960s allowed us to critique earlier approaches and conclusions. The Uncovering Pacific Pasts devolved exhibition at some 36 institutions worldwide (listed at the end of this paper) and the resultant publication (Howes et al. 2022) were delivered very specifically to address the ‘hidden history’ of Pacific archaeology and its origins – as with sociocultural anthropology in the region – in ethnology. The impetus of the multi-site exhibition continues with subsequent and planned exhibitions at the Vanuatu National Museum on The History of Vanuatu Archaeology, presented on posters in English and French. Part one, covering from the early European explorers to the start of World War II was exhibited during 2020–22, and Part two, the post-War years is planned for 2024. The Fiji Museum is re-imagining its Fiji and Pacific archaeology exhibitions in 2022–24, incorporating insights from CBAP research. Other institutions, also listed, engaged with the preparation of the Uncovering Pacific Pasts publication, even though they were not able to participate directly by preparing exhibits.

The third aim was to re-define the development of Australian archaeology within its wider Oceanic context and its participation in world archaeological debates over diffusion and evolution that were precursors to the recognisably modern archaeology brought into being by John Mulvaney and others in the 1950s and 1960s. The project increasingly engaged with the historiography of Australian archaeology, not least as CBAP research showed that it has provided only very partial and misleading accounts of the discipline’s history (Spriggs 2020a). Other research concentrated on the forgotten role of Dermot Casey, the facilitator of much of Mulvaney’s early work in Australian archaeology from the 1950s onwards as well as being a pioneer of Lapita pottery studies in the 1930s (Spriggs 2021a, 2022d). Another paper with early career researcher Chris Urwin further critiqued the accepted history of Australian archaeology (Urwin and Spriggs 2021). This new research direction has led to an Australian Research Council Strategic Research Initiative (ARC SRI) Grant for the project Aboriginal Involvement in the Early Development of Australian Archaeology, led jointly by Spriggs and Lynette Russell of the Monash University Indigenous Studies Centre (Grant SR200200155 for 2021–4). Other CBAP members have also contributed to the history of early research on Indigenous Australia (Howes 2019c; Ward et al. 2016; Windle et al. 2016).

The fourth aim was to re-imagine the story of external understandings of Papua New Guinea and its people, through a detailed examination of the development of theories about the origins and spread of the peoples of Australia’s only significant former colonies -- the pre-Independence Territories of Papua and of New Guinea. No suitable PhD candidate could be found to concentrate on this project as intended. However, much of the research of Howes and Spriggs examined the history of archaeology in Papua New Guinea and so contributed to the objective (see Dotte-Sarout and Howes 2019; Howes 2015a & b, 2016, 2017a & b, 2018a & b, 2019 a & b, 2022a, b, d & e, 2023; Spriggs, 2022b & d, in press), as did the participation of project associates Govor with her work on Russian scholar and sometime New Guinea resident Miklouho-Maclay, and Douglas with her work on race, explorers and on the history of mapping the Pacific, including Torres Strait between New Guinea and Australia (see, for instance, Douglas 2018e, 2022b; Douglas and Govor 2019; Govor 2018a & b; Govor and Ballard 2021; Govor and Howes 2020a; Tutorsky et al. 2019).

The fifth aim was to re-discover the contribution of both French and German scholars to the early development of Pacific archaeology. Dotte-Sarout and Howes were recruited to pursue
this objective and published extensively on it, including the proceedings of the conference held on Francophone approaches in 2016 (Dotte-Sarout et al. 2020a, 2021b and papers therein) among other works (those cited in the previous paragraph by Howes, as well as Dotte-Sarout 2017, 2020a & b, 2021b & c; Howes 2020, 2021a, 2022c). Much of Douglas’ work also researched early French (and Spanish) explorers and their contributions, particularly the edited volume on Bruni D’Entrecasteaux’s collections and the papers therein (Douglas et al. 2018) as well as other contributions (Douglas 2017, 2018f, 2020, 2021, 2022a, 2023a). This aim was also pursued through collaborations with museums in France, Germany, Austria and in the French Pacific for the Uncovering Pacific Pasts exhibition and resultant publication (Howes et al. 2022). The many publications by Govor on early Russian studies of the Pacific, beyond those cited above in relation to New Guinea, are also notable for extending the reach of the project beyond Anglophone scholarship (Balakhonova and Govor 2018; Govor 2020, 2021; Govor and Balakhonova 2022; Govor and Howes 2020b, 2022; Govor and Manickam 2017; Govor and Thomas 2019 and papers therein).

The sixth aim was to recover the considerable amount of archaeological excavation that took place in the Pacific from the 1870s until WWII, to demonstrate that the post-war professionalisation of archaeology in the region was built upon an ever-growing accumulation of knowledge and theories that had developed over a much longer time span. Our results contradict the idea that ‘modern’ archaeology began only in the post-war period (Richards et al. 2019; cf. Spriggs 2020a for a similar argument about Australian archaeology). This objective was extensively covered in publications by the team and particularly in the Uncovering Pacific Pasts devolved exhibition (see papers in Howes et al. 2022) which concentrated centrally on the period from the 1870s to just after WWII.

Pre-1918 excavations were documented by CBAP for Hawaii, Mariana Islands, New Caledonia, New Zealand, what is now Papua New Guinea, Pohnpei, Rapa Nui and Vanuatu (Spriggs 2022b) and the interwar years added the Autonomous Region of Bougainville, French Polynesia, Solomon Islands and Tonga to the list (Spriggs 2022c). Further accounts by Project members of these early excavations can be found in Dotte-Sarout (2017, 2020a, 2021c), Dotte-Sarout and Howes (2019), Haddow et al. (2021), Howes (2017a, 2019a, 2021a, 2022a & e), Richards (2017) and Spriggs and Bedford (2020, 2021).

Key 1920s figures investigated such as Dermot Casey of what is now Museum Victoria (Australia), Kenneth Emory of the Bishop Museum (Hawaii), E.W. Gifford of UC Berkeley (USA) and H.D. Skinner of Otago University (New Zealand) bridged both the pre- and post-World War II periods. They were found to be critical in linking the two and in the increasing professionalisation of the discipline (see papers in Howes et al. 2022).

The seventh aim was to re-write the forgotten history of Pacific archaeological practice by re-uniting artefacts and field notes from a series of earlier scholars, particularly those involved in archaeological excavation, and attempting to re-interpret or in some cases interpret for the first time their findings, within our current methods and knowledge. This was a particular focus of PhD scholars Haddow and Richards, both of whose theses link collections and field notes (Haddow 2020; Richards 2021). This objective was also pursued in the collaborative context of the Uncovering Pacific Pasts exhibition. Richards’ thesis research and additional publications are particularly important in this respect, using cutting-edge chemical analytical technology through the application of portable X-Ray Fluorescence (pXRF) to study Polynesian adzes and pounders in museum collections to source them to particular islands and quarries (see also Hayes et al. 2023; Richards 2019a & b, in press; Richards and Gunther 2019). Other CBAP papers examining earlier collections and reinterpreting them in light of current evidence include those by Balakhonova and Govor (2018), Haddow (2015, 2019b), Haddow et al. (2018) and several of the chapters in the edited volumes by Douglas et al. (2018) and Govor and Nicholas Thomas (2019). Several collections that are discussed for their place within earlier theories of Pacific archaeology and ethnology resulted from seizures of artefacts during ‘punitive’ expeditions mounted by European powers against Indigenous populations and discussions of the contexts for these occur in the themed issue by Douglas and Chris Ballard in Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History (2017a).

The eighth aim was to re-conceptualise the perennial issue of trans-Oceanic cultural contacts, a theme coming back into vogue in the second decade of the 21st century (see for example
Jones et al. 2011) and situated within a long history of discourse that extends back to the start of the 19th century and was particularly influential through the work of Thor Heyerdahl of Kon-Tiki fame who saw the contacts as particularly one-way, from the Americas into Polynesia. PhD scholars Ballesteros Danel (2020a & b) and Melander (2020) produced theses and additional publications which directly addressed this objective. Ballesteros Danel wrote on Spanish-language sources concerning ideas of contacts between Polynesia and the Americas from the 16th century on (Ballesteros Danel 2018, 2021; Ballesteros Danel and Arango Jaramillo 2023). Melander’s thesis (see also Melander 2017, 2019a & b) covered the genesis and early development of Thor Heyerdahl’s views on the putative settlement of Polynesia from the Americas up to Heyerdahl’s massive tome American Indians in the Pacific (Heyerdahl 1952). Ricardo Ventura Santos and Douglas (2020) examined the recent claim for a supposed Polynesian genomic input into Botocudo Indian populations in Brazil, tracing the idea’s long and tangled history.

The ninth aim was to redress the neglect of the role of women archaeologists working in the region, not only those professionally engaged but also the often-invisible archaeological wives who accompanied their partners into the field and who provided significant intellectual as well as physical labour towards the success of projects. CBAP participants and associates revealed much about the lives of early female pioneer archaeologists with Pacific interests: see contributions in the themed journal issues of Journal of Pacific Archaeology edited by Dotte-Sarout and Spriggs (2017), Journal of Pacific History edited by Howes and Spriggs (2019a), and Historical Records of Australian Science again edited by Howes and Spriggs (2021), as well as the edited volumes by Dotte-Sarout et al. (2020a, 2021a) and Howes et al. (2022) and papers by Dotte-Sarout (2021b) and Howes (2023). In addition, PhD scholar Richards’ thesis addressed the contribution of English pioneer Katherine Routledge on Rapa Nui (see also Richards 2017). The topic clearly deserved a project of its own – a clear mark of its previous neglect – and in 2019 Dotte-Sarout was awarded an ARC DECRA Fellowship for the project Pacific Matildas: Finding the women in the history of archaeology focusing on the role of Pacific women archaeologists (Grant DE200100597 for 2020–3), thus extending the ‘life’ of the Laureate project with a further three years of research (Dotte-Sarout 2021a).

The tenth aim was to re-engage with descendant communities in the present in the light of our research and its findings and to restore knowledge of the now largely forgotten agency and contribution of indigenous scholars and interlocutors to the creation of a Pacific past. Such involvement can probably be traced back as far as the Tahitian navigator and priest, Tupaia, on Cook’s First Voyage (see Douglas 2019). Many of the exhibits in the Uncovering Pacific Posts devolved exhibition included telling the stories of such scholars and interlocutors, such as those of Aurora Natua in Tahiti and Juan Tepano on Rapa Nui, and the final CBAP workshop for Pacific museum and archive professionals in October 2022 continues the dialogue and possibilities for future collaborations. Spriggs’ research brought out the importance of the autonomous Fijian Administration under the leadership of Rata Sir Lala Sukuna and particularly the key role of Ratu Rabici Logavatu in the research strategy and successful operation of UC Berkeley archaeologist Edward Gifford’s 1947 archaeological expedition (Spriggs 2019a, 2022e & f). Spriggs also managed to trace some of Ratu Rabici’s children in Fiji and share with them the results of his findings. Biographies of several prominent Indigenous Vanuatu filwokas/fieldworkers attached to the Vanuatu Kaljoral Senta/Cultural Centre who died in 2020–2021 were published (Bedford et al. 2022). These Indigenous cultural experts had worked with many archaeologists over a period of 50 years and made major contributions to their studies.

The importance of the Indigenous Pacific contribution to the history of archaeology was brought out in many other CBAP team publications and continues to be a significant area of engagement for team members. As noted earlier, building on the perspectives brought out in CBAP led Spriggs and Russell to develop a successful ARC grant on Aboriginal Involvement in the Early Development of Australian Archaeology which is ongoing. The involvement of Kepas Paon and the community of Rakival on Watom Island, East New Britain, PNG in discussions about the Lapita pottery found there by Father Otto Meyer in 1909 will hopefully lead to a suitable memorial to Father Meyer in the form of a local museum and further collaboration with PNG and international archaeologists (see ‘Statement by Rakival People’ in Howes et al. 2022: 557–562).
Additional themes and issues came up as the project progressed. These included: the need to take account of other marginalised groups important for the history of Pacific archaeology, such as the broad category of avocational archaeologists or ‘amateurs’; issues of repatriation of artefacts and human skeletal remains; the need to preserve the personal archives of archaeologists working in the Pacific today; and the necessity for obituaries of archaeologists, Indigenous specialists, and those in related disciplines to address their role in the history of Pacific archaeology as older generations pass on. Although it is always tricky dealing with the most recent parts of the history of the discipline while those involved in particular debates and controversies are still alive, much reflection on the last few decades of Pacific archaeology has also taken place.

Before World War I almost all Pacific archaeologists were ‘amateurs’ as no professional career was available in the discipline beyond positions in some museums that would have included the possibility of carrying out archaeological research; in the Pacific itself, only John F.G. Stokes at the Bishop Museum in Honolulu held such a position prior to 1914 (Spriggs 2017b). Avocational archaeologist is perhaps a less pejorative term than ‘amateur’ for people who engaged in archaeology while employed doing other things.

One of the aspects of Pacific archaeology that CBAP has brought out is the extremely important role of early missionaries, both Catholic and Protestant, in archaeological pursuits, from the early nineteenth century through into the twentieth. This was the theme of Haddow’s PhD thesis (2020) which concentrated on the careers of Presbyterian missionary Frederick Gatherer Bowie (1869–1933) and Anglican missionary teacher Charles Elliot Fox (1878–1977). Both were enmeshed in the developing networks of scientific scholars interested in Pacific origins and migrations. Bowie was a regular correspondent of Cambridge anthropologist W.H.R. Rivers, while Fox was in contact with Rivers and Alfred Cort Haddon in Cambridge and Grafton Elliott Smith in London (Haddow 2019a, 2020). Many other missionaries had archaeological interests, starting with William Ellis in Hawaii from the 1820s onwards (Haddow 2017), through George Turner on Anetan in the mid-nineteenth century (Haddow and Mills 2022) and Père Jean-Baptiste Suas on Ambrym in the early twentieth century (Dotte-Sarout 2017:29–30), both in Vanuatu, and on to Arthur Henry Voyce and Père Patrick O’Reilly who bridge the pre- and post-World War II era (Haddow et al. 2021), as does the contribution of French protestant missionary Maurice Leenhardt, and his wife Jeanne, in New Caledonia (Dotte-Sarout 2021b). The contribution of other avocational archaeologists is addressed in various papers in Howes et al. (2022) and other publications, including the role of Aubrey Parke in Fiji; employed as a Government Officer but probably upon his arrival in Fiji in 1951 the most highly trained archaeologist present in the Western Pacific (Spriggs 2020b, 2021b, 2022f; cf. Spriggs 2014).

Repatriation issues have very much come to the fore in recent years over museum collections either containing human remains of Indigenous peoples from the Australian and Pacific regions or artefacts deemed to have been obtained by deceit or force (for the latter see the themed issue of Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History edited by Douglas and Ballard 2017a, particularly Douglas and Ballard 2017b). In addition, some European museums are seeking to repatriate collections that no longer constitute the core of their interests or whose colonial associations are thought to be objectionable. This is indeed a fast-moving scene in current metropolitan museums!

CBAP Fellow Hilary Howes has had a long involvement with issues to do with the repatriation of ancestral remains from European museums and this continued and was informed by collaborations formed during the CBAP Project (see Govor and Howes 2020b; Howes 2020). She has further developed her interest in repatriation with a successful ARC DECRA grant called Skulls for the Tsar: Indigenous Human Remains in Russian Collections. This involves the study of Pacific and Australian human remains in Russian collections, collected as part of early interest in the origins of Pacific peoples (Grant DE210101721, for 2021–4).

Through their research, CBAP members provided informal advice to museums on repatriation issues as well as to groups and individuals seeking repatriation of collections, such as the Benin bronzes. Two rare Naamboi clay pots from Malakula, Vanuatu, collected by the archaeologist Richard Shutler Jr. in the 1960s were repatriated in 2017 to the Vanuatu National Museum from the Simon Fraser University Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology in Canada, after interest from the CBAP team and associates (museu.ms/collection/details/572/dr-richard-shutler-
The Royal Cornwall Museum, UK, has been placed in contact with the Vanuatu National Museum concerning the repatriation of a skull from the Maskelyne Islands in Vanuatu, collected in the 1880s. Dialogue has also been established in 2022 between the National Gallery of Australia and the Vanuatu National Museum over NGA holdings of traditional sculptures involving over-modelled skulls of ancestors. Archaeologist Aubrey Parke’s collections from Rotuma and Fiji were repatriated by Spriggs to the Fiji Museum from The Australian National University storerooms in September 2022 as a direct result of CBAP research and ongoing collaborations with the Fiji Museum and with the cooperation of Parke’s family. These are but a few examples of the facilitation of repatriation of objects and human remains that took place during the CBAP Project.

Archival materials are constantly under threat of being discarded because their value for Pacific archaeology has not been realised. One of the inspirations for CBAP was the loss of much of the archives of archaeologist Aubrey Parke (1925–2007) after his death owing to a misunderstanding between university administrators and his family. CBAP managed to ‘save’ several important archaeological archives such as the remaining papers of Aubrey Parke, those of New Zealand archaeologist Les Graube (1938–2018) and of American archaeologist Richard Shutler, Jr (1921–2007); the latter collection has been split between the Pacific Archives at ANU and the Vanuatu National Archives. Other prominent senior archaeologists have been encouraged to donate their collections to suitable archives, such as the Pacific Archives at The Australian National University, which has seen a recent influx of Pacific archaeological archives that they are working through. CBAP initiated a project to identify the archives of Australian archaeological scholars which once complete will lead to the creation of a database to be hosted online by the Australian Archaeological Association.


While the focus of CBAP has largely been on earlier periods in the history of Pacific archaeology, particularly before the 1970s as this has been a neglected area of research, there has been an opportunity to review more recent themes and issues and to look at the state of theory in historiographic studies of archaeology more generally, informed by some recent autobiographies and interviews of key players such as Patrick Kirch (2015) and Yosihiko Sinoto (2016). This is seen most prominently in the later papers in Howes et al. (2022; see Spriggs and Howes 2022). It has been done with a view to reflect on past practices and suggest future directions. Biographical and autobiographical reflections have included Bedford et al. (2016), Dotte-Sarout et al. (2018), Spriggs (2017c, 2019c), and Spriggs and Reich (2020). Archaeological technologies and what they make possible in terms of new analyses and, importantly, when they make them possible are another such topic (Hayes et al. 2023; Spriggs 2019b; Ward et al. 2016). Wider theoretical developments in archaeology and in the historiography of archaeology have also been considered (Dotte-Sarout et al. 2020b, 2021b; Douglas 2023b; papers in the themed issue of History and Anthropology edited by Douglas and Ballard 2022a, persuasively situated in its introduction by Douglas and Ballard 2022b; Douglas and Di Rosa 2020; Howes 2021b; Howes and Spriggs 2019b; papers in the themed issue of World Archaeology edited by Tim Murray and Spriggs 2017a and their introduction, Murray and Spriggs 2017b; Spriggs 2018, 2021c).

CONCLUSION

The field of the history of world archaeology had very largely ignored the Pacific region until this project; it is now firmly on the map on a world scale, and a new sub-discipline relating to the Pacific has become established and recognised. It also feeds back into discussions of the history of archaeology in adjacent regions such as Australia and Southeast and East Asia. This success has been achieved through publications, organising conferences, workshops, and conference sessions, presenting seminars/lectures internationally, and involvement with
museums worldwide and especially within the Pacific region in helping to provide additional context and framing for their collections. Four PhD scholars and two ECR postdoctoral fellows were trained and mentored.

Archival sources to construct a history of Pacific archaeology are vastly more extensive than had been imagined prior to the commencement of CBAP and much remains to be researched. Some important archaeological archives were saved from destruction. The research of the Project established how vital it is to consider non-Anglophone sources when considering the history of Pacific archaeology, concentrating on those of Francophone, German, Russian and Spanish-speaking nations as well as Pacific languages (Bislama of Vanuatu, Fijian, Hawaiian and Tahitian among them). The Project’s research aims will be directly carried on in ARC DECRAS projects by the two CBAP postdoctoral fellows: Emilie Dotte-Sarout with her project Pacific Matildas: Finding the Women in the History of Archaeology and Hilary Howes with Skulls for the Tsar: Indigenous Human Remains in Russian collections.

One of the major products of the Laureate Project was a devolved exhibition, Uncovering Pacific Pasts, which took place from the beginning of March 2020 at some 36 museums and other cultural institutions in 19 countries and territories; further spin-off exhibitions will be taking place at some of these institutions such as the Vanuatu National Museum and the Fiji Museum. These collaborations have benefitted both Pacific Island and metropolitan partner organisations involved through creating new forms of outreach to Indigenous communities. Some metropolitan museums have not had much contact in the past with Pacific communities, and the research of members of the CBAP team has also value-added to the knowledge of each museum’s collections. Significant early archaeological collections exist in museums and archives around the world which have not previously contributed to our knowledge of the deep past of the Pacific, but which have great potential to do so. Often these collections were unknown to descendant communities including to the national museums of their respective countries; new avenues of research and collaboration have thus been created for Pacific Island institutions. Although there is much left to learn, assimilate and inform our practice concerning the history of Pacific archaeology, we certainly know a lot more today than we did in 2015 when CBAP commenced.

The role of archaeological theories, usually generated in the metropolitan centres and sometimes imposed on a resisting archaeological record in the Pacific is another key theme, and also the reflexive impact of Pacific ethnographic and material culture studies back on European archaeology in particular. Polynesian chiefdom analogies for the Bronze Age of Europe enjoyed a vogue at one stage, and the dominance of (Malinowski’s understanding of) the Kula Ring exchange network of Papua New Guinea to explain Neolithic axe distributions in the United Kingdom persists today. Such tropes are also in need of explanation and deconstruction. Overtly decolonial approaches have also begun to be explored recently (Fricke and Hoerman 2023), albeit seemingly in ignorance of the many ongoing efforts in that direction happening across the Pacific. Such approaches, prefigured in McNiven and Russell (2005), might be seen to be long overdue, but can only be persuasive when they address the actual history of the practice of regional archaeology and its contexts.

We need to know more on Indigenous involvement in the development of Pacific archaeology, including through oral histories from interlocutors and descendants. The ongoing research into Ratu Rabici Logavatu’s role in Gifford’s 1947 expedition shows what can be discovered when the frame is shifted from the expatriate investigator to local knowledge-holders (Spriggs 2019a, 2022f). Local knowledge-holders would also include non-Indigenous residents with an interest in archaeology such as Dr Lindsay Verrier in Fiji, critical in the first discovery of Lapita pottery there in 1948 (Spriggs 2022e). The encouragement of Indigenous skills in archaeological research was generally slow to develop in the Pacific but has grown tremendously in recent decades and has the potential to transform the practice of archaeology. That is another story worthy of further research. Much more could be investigated on the role of institutions such as the Bishop Museum in Honolulu and the Otago Museum in Dunedin, organisations such as the Hawaiian Historical Society and the Polynesian Society, and in the post-WWII period in particular the nascent university departments in places such as Auckland, Canberra, Dunedin, Honolulu, Sydney and Melbourne. Further biographical studies on key museum and academic figures such as Peter Buck (Te Rangi Hiroa), Sue Bulmer, Kenneth Emory, E.W. Gifford, Jack Golson, Roger Green, Aurora Natua, Rudolf Pöch, Katherine Routledge, Margarete Schurig, Yosi
Sinoto, Richard Shutler and H.D. Skinner, to name but a few pioneers, would also yield much more about the sometimes-serendipitous ways in which archaeology developed in the Pacific, and the interactions between different scholars. There are only a few women archaeologists listed here and the often-hidden roles of women need much further work, including an Indigenous women scholars in related fields such as folklore and oral history who had a major impact on early archaeological practice. There is indeed much left to learn.
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