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BEYOND PLAGIARISM: WHERE DOES SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT BEGIN?

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY, MISREPRESENTATIONS AND THE COOK/FORSTER COLLECTION

ABSTRACT

Cases of violation of academic integrity among high-ranking politicians and scientists in Germany have shocked the public when it became known that these had fabricated the results of their research or committed plagiarism in their dissertation. However, where does scientific misconduct begin? There seems to exist a grey area of breaches of good research practice. I will explore it and inquire particularly into the practice of misquoting, using quotes out of context and omitting data that do not fit the author’s argument. I will also examine the conditions and circumstances under which such practices seem to have increased over the past decades. The main example, which illustrates such practices, constitutes the research, publication and exhibition projects of the Göttingen Cook/Forster Collection and the way in which they became misrepresented.
INTRODUCTION: ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AND MISCONDUCT

Scandals about prominent senior German politicians, such as Karl-Theodor zu Guttenberg, former Federal Minister of Defence, or Annette Schavan, former Federal Minister for Education and Research, erupted when it was disclosed that their dissertations contained plagiarism. The deprivation of their doctorates by their home universities (in 2011 and 2014, respectively) consequently forced them to step down from their offices. Furthermore, scandals shocked the public when investigations showed that some scientists had fabricated the results of their research which had been heralded as trailblazing, for example, in medical knowledge and disease therapy.1 Such cases attract massive attention in the media and the public in general. The public’s trust in academic research presented in publications began to falter (Zöllner 2018) and is still at issue, such as in medical science (Bülow and Helgesson 2019) and beyond. The prestige of institutions and the mechanisms of professional self-regulation in science were at stake. Accordingly, universities and funding institutions became increasingly concerned with “Gute wissenschaftliche Praxis” and “Wissenschaftliche Redlichkeit” (both mostly translated into English as “academic” or “research integrity”). This concern is also shared by all academic professional associations. Over the past twenty years, all these institutions have produced guidelines and recommendations that are manifestos of academic integrity and its ethical implications. Moreover, all these institutions have their own bodies of “Selbstkontrolle in der Wissenschaft”. The bureau of the ombudspersons is usually the first body to be contacted when violations of academic integrity are suspected. Allegations may be passed to the corresponding investigative committee in a second step.

In this article, I will focus on “misrepresentation” and mention the other issues concerning scientific misconduct, subsumed under “ffp” (fabrication, falsification, plagiarism), as listed in the German Research Foundation’s (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft: DFG) “Rules of Procedure” (DFG 2019b) only in passing. The latter cases are more evident than the broad scope of what could be understood as “misrepresentation”. I will inquire particularly into the practice of misquoting, using quotes out of context and omitting data that do not fit the author’s argument and examine the conditions and circumstances under which such practices seem to have increased over the past decades. I will explore these issues by presenting several examples, among them a case — the exhibition “Life in the Pacific of

1 One of the first most serious cases of scientific misconduct in Germany, which the DFG took as a call for action to set up guidelines, concerned the cancer researchers “Hermann and Brach” who had published almost 100 articles with either faked or manipulated data between 1988 and 1996 (Finetti and Himmelrath 1999).
the 1700s. The Cook/Forster Collection of the Georg August University of Göttingen in Honolulu in 2006 — in which I was personally involved.

The DFG published a memorandum on “Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice” in 1998, which was revised and republished in 2013. In September 2019, the DFG issued a “Code of Conduct” with 19 guidelines. Its goal is to “further research integrity and establish it as an integral part of research and teaching” (2019a:3). This Codex highlights the importance of scientific integrity in its preamble:

“Scientific integrity forms the basis for trustworthy research. It is an example of academic voluntary commitment that encompasses a respectful attitude towards peers, research participants, animals, cultural assets, and the environment, and strengthens and promotes vital public trust in research. The constitutionally guaranteed freedom of research is inseparably linked to a corresponding responsibility” (2019a:7).

The overarching principles “include working lege artis, maintaining strict honesty in attributing one’s own contributions and those of others, rigorously questioning all findings, and permitting and promoting critical discourse within the research community” (2019a:9).

Another paper, “Rules of Procedure for Dealing with Scientific Misconduct” (DFG, 2019b), complements this code. The latter contains a list of categories of scientific misconduct: 1) misrepresentations, such as the fabricating or falsifying data and research findings, 2) unjustified appropriation of others’ research achievements, and 3) interference with others’ research. In cases of established scientific misconduct, the trespasser – depending on the degree of misconduct – has to face a number of sanctions, such as being reprimanded in writing, forced to reimburse funding, being excluded from submitting applications or acting as a reviewer or becoming a member of one of the DFG bodies. Such sanctions for scientific misconduct are conceived primarily as deterrence; they should prevent others from fraudulent behaviour (Bülow and Helgesson 2019:246). The DFG Code notes that “not every breach of good research practice constitutes misconduct. Only deliberate or grossly negligent infringements defined in a set of regulations are considered scientific misconduct. Particular examples of misconduct include fabrication of data, falsification of data and plagiarism” (2019a:22).

This phrasing points to bad or poor research practice, though this expression is not used. However, the German Council of Science and Humanities mentions that, apart from the “ffp”, other “forms of scientific misconduct – such as ‘poor scientific practice’ or questionable research practice – that often inhabit a grey area and receive less public attention” exist (Wissenschaftsrat 2015:6). Simple “breaches”, which are not considered as misconduct, are not followed by sanctions. As Bülow and Helgesson pointed out: “The criminalization of scientific misconduct [...] is at risk of giving the false impression that dubious practices that fall outside the legal regulation ‘do not count’” (2019:246). This raises the question of where misconduct – that is, a violation of academic integrity – starts and where “bad” or “poor scholarship” ends. This applies to all categories of “ffp”, since each category in itself covers a broad scope where a clear-cut delineation between serious cases of scientific misconduct and dubious practices is difficult to assess. The same authors give examples of cases that fall outside the legal regulations, such as “selective publication” or “exaggerating the relevance and importance of one’s scientific results” (2019:249). They also consider them morally wrongful, though they do not fall under “ffp” and are, therefore, not criminalized. Biagioli et al. speak of a proliferation of forms of “academic misrepresentation
that many academics would see as unethical but which have not as yet been [...] categorized as misconduct” (2019:401). The bureau of the German Research Ombudsman, which advises consultants throughout Germany, reports in the DFG annual report of 2017 that almost 50 per cent of the 106 queries addressed to it concerned the natural and life sciences. These figures seem to demonstrate that the latter are apparently more prone to “ffp” cases than other disciplines. The queries concerned, among others, questions of authorship (22), plagiarism (22), the handling (8) and the falsification/manipulation of data (4). The DFG has also established a Committee of Inquiry into Allegations of Scientific Misconduct (Ausschuss zur Untersuchung von Vorwürfen wissenschaftlichen Fehlverhaltens), independent of the Ombuds Office.

The Committee of Inquiry into Allegations of Scientific Misconduct is a subcommittee of the DFG’s Joint Committee (Hauptausschuss) to which it submits recommendations of how to deal with particular cases it has examined. This body consists of eight representatives of academic disciplines, among them the anthropologist Ursula Rao (succeeding Joanna Pfaff-Czarnecka). This Committee investigated several cases of allegations in 2018. Among them, it identified four cases of scientific misconduct. Consequently, the DFG Joint Committee opened procedures as outlined in the “Rules of Procedure” (DFG 2019b). The DFG has recently published a full-page text (including a portrait) in its magazine “Forschung” of a life science scholar who was found guilty of serious scientific misconduct (Forschung 2019: 26). Thus, the most important funding institution in Germany has set up, though not intended as such, a kind of pillory for academic wrongdoers. This is done in cases after the seriousness of the misconduct and public information interest had been balanced against personal rights.

In other, less serious cases, scholars’ academic misconduct is also published, though without revealing their names. Nevertheless, in all the cases of misconduct, the trespassers’ home university is informed, where further sanctions may follow. Thus, scientific misconduct is treated as a serious offense today by both the DFG and the German universities alike.

Queries concerning “good scientific practice” rose from 7 cases in 1999 to 106 cases in 2017 (DFG 2017:7). Out of 37 queries originating from the life sciences, 25 concerned medical science.
MISQUOTES AND ADULTERATION OF CONTEXTS

As briefly mentioned, the misquoting and adulteration of contexts are not explicitly listed in the DFG Codex and its corresponding “Rules of Procedure” (2019b). However, The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity developed by All European Academies (ALLEA) and the European Science Foundation (ESF) is rather explicit. Where it also considers the “ifp” as “particularly serious” forms of research misconduct, it lists “further violations of good research practice that damage the integrity of the research process or of researchers”. Among these “unacceptable practices”, it mentions “Manipulating authorship or denigrating the role of other researchers in publications”. Furthermore “citing selectively to enhance [one’s] own findings or to please editors, reviewers or colleagues” (ALLEA 2017:8). Citation guidelines of institutes and universities in Germany are exclusively addressed to students as part of their training. They focus, almost without an exception, only on the technological aspect of citing the work of others (direct and indirect quotes/paraphrasing and how to deal with them in writing) and on the different styles of quoting (e.g. the Harvard system) (see, for example, Marschner et al. 2018; Schleif 2015).

The University of Melbourne is one of the few universities that explicitly define what is to be understood as misrepresentation and misquoting; this is done – again – in a guideline on academic integrity addressed to students.

“Misrepresentation and misquoting is when the words or ideas of the original author have been misrepresented. This may happen inadvertently [inadvertently] if you have misunderstood what the original author meant. This is poor scholarship.

Misrepresentation and misquoting can also be deliberate when a student intentionally misuses the words of the original author to justify their own work. This is extremely poor scholarship and could constitute academic misconduct.”(https://academicintegrity.unimelb.edu.au/forms-of-plagiarism/misrepresenting-and-misquoting)

In fact, a grey area exists between “inadvertently” and “deliberate” misquoting or misrepresentation. No such case of deliberate misrepresentation has been brought to the attention of the DFG so far. Nor are such offenses explicitly listed in the rules of good scientific practice of individual universities, though they also seem to be implicitly included. The ombuds offices of two German universities with which I had contact confirmed that no such cases had yet been brought to their attention.

Even if in academia, misquoting, omitting of data that do not fit one’s argument and adulteration of contexts are not clearly identified as scientific misconduct, a recent court case showed that such practices have been assessed as an offence by the law. The former chancellor Helmut Kohl had given confidential information to his biographer, Heribert Schwan, in an interview under the condition of privacy. Schwan, nevertheless, published this information in a dubious way, namely, by misquotes and quotations out of context.
Kohl (and, after his death in 2017, his wife) sued Heribert Schwan for breach of trust and publishing statements pulled out of context that seriously harmed the chancellor’s reputation. The Landesgericht (District Court) Cologne dealt with this case on 11 December 2019. The District Court confirmed an earlier decree of the Oberlandesgericht (Higher Regional Court) Cologne that Heribert Schwan had committed “eine Fülle von Fehlzitaten und Kontextverfälschungen” (“an abundance of misquotations and adulterations of contexts”). The court decreed that Schwan is forbidden to further disseminate 116 passages of his book (Zeit Online 2019). This sentence provides evidence of the fact that these forms of misrepresentation have been criminalized. The future will show whether this case, which concerned the integrity of a former prominent and respected politician, will have implications on similar cases of misrepresentations in academia.

Earlier and recent cases in anthropology

The fabricating or unrighteous appropriation of data seems to have happened rarely in anthropology. There are only a few examples which, nevertheless, have become well-known, such as the “seeming fraud” (Borofsky 2019:58) of Castaneda’s (1968) “The Teachings of Don Juan” (Fröhlich 2001:267–269) or the contested case (“hoax”) of the allegedly isolated Stone Age people of Tasaday in Mindanao’s jungles (Headland 1992). However, since anthropological writing comprises many different genres, including literary accounts, even fictions (such as the Papalagi; Scheurmann 1920), the distinction between the fabrication of data and anthropological literary writing is sometimes difficult to make.

A recent restudy of the famous “Mead/Freeman controversy” showed the extent to which misquotes contribute to denigrating a scholar’s achievements and damaging his/her reputation. This “controversy”, or rather Freeman’s monologue (since Mead had already died when he started his heavy critique), concerned Mead’s study, “Coming of Age in Samoa” (1928), about the non-repressive sexual education of young people in Samoa. This book was ground-breaking in the puritan American society when it appeared and heralded Mead’s leading role in the American feminist movement and as the most famous female anthropologist in the mid-20th century. The results of her studies were challenged by Derek Freeman. Freeman asserted that Mead had been “grossly hoaxed by her Samoan informants” (quoted after Shankman 2013:52) and, therefore, her results were dubious. He claimed, as Shankman sums it up, that Mead had been “the victim of her limited experience in the field, her lack of knowledge of Samoan custom, and her prior beliefs about the role of culture in human behavior” (Ibid.:52). Thus, Freeman attested Mead with a lack of anthropological competence. Only ten years after Freeman, Paul Shankman revisited this issue and produced evidence of how Freeman had selectively chosen parts of interviews, provided them with his own interpretation and neglected comments by Samoans that did not support his arguments. As Shankman concluded: “Regrettably, Freeman’s flawed caricature of Mead and her Samoan fieldwork has become conventional wisdom in many circles and, as a result, her reputation has been deeply if not irreparably damaged. And this is no joking matter” (2013:62). In comments on Shankman’s paper in the journal Current Anthropology, the responding scholars raised the issues of “falsification of evidence”, “failure to follow the ethics of scientific investigation and reporting” and “shameful manipulation” (2013:62–67).

At the time when Freeman criticised Mead’s Samoa study (1983), this debate was understood as a discussion about facts and “truth” rather than about the (mis-)use of sources in order to achieve a particular goal: to undermine Mead’s competence and authority – and probably also the conclusions she presented from her study in Samoa to the Americans. Nevertheless, Freeman became well-known through this “debate” far beyond the circle of Oceanists. The current situation in Germany is much more complex, especially in museums, which try to comply with the political, post-colonial, agenda; they are also publicly pushed by activist pressure groups and their demand for the “restitution” of artefacts and whole collections.
Collecting during colonial times is often equated with colonial plundering and assumed to have taken place, almost without any exception, in contexts of injustice (*Unrechtskontext*), even before detailed studies have been carried out (see Hauser-Schäublin 2018). The search for colonial misdeeds and plunder, often mentioned in a single context with Nazi stolen art (see, for example, Sarr and Savoy 2018), has led to a particular way of reading sources in some cases. It is beyond any discussion that a critical examination of the period of colonialism with its scholars and their work (texts and photographs) as well as its collectors of ethnographic artefacts is an urgent task of anthropology today. However, it is the question of how this is carried out which is important. The endeavour of some “western” scholars to identify colonialism and racism in mostly earlier scholars’ work and to overcome it or to “decentre Europe” has produced an eager search for such cases. Accordingly, historians and anthropologists alike are trying to present the relationship between colonizers and colonized no longer from the perspective of Europe but from the “periphery”, the formerly colonized countries. This call, “writing back”, was originally voiced by Salman Rushdie. Ashcroft, Griffith and Tiffin in their seminal book on post-colonialism “The Empire Writes Back” (1989), demonstrate that this “writing back” to the colonizing power (or “the Empire”) implies the appropriation of the colonial languages (especially English) by the formerly colonized and their use of these languages as a counter-discursive tool. “Writing back” by the (formerly) colonized is a powerful means to decentre and challenge imperial hegemonies and ontologies, knowledge included.

Nevertheless, “western” scholars have also attempted to take up this position to heavily criticise and blame others, preferably scholars of earlier generations, of colonialism and racism. Ethnographic museums as colonial institutions were among the first in which cleansing activities declared as decolonization took place. Bernhard Streck’s demand that ethnologists of the 1930s in Germany also deserve the right “that they are not judged from the chronocentric pedestal of post-war elucidation but are translated from within the context of their time [...]” (2004:118, translation bhs) has sometimes been thrown to the wind also in post-colonial anthropology. Several of the founding fathers of ethnographic museums have been pilloried and even ridiculed by some recent or present-day directors. This has been done by selectively choosing parts of their predecessors’ work and assessing it from a present-day allegedly morally superior position; although, this position is rarely critically reflected. It happened to Bernhard Hagen, the founder and first director of the Frankfurt ethnographic museum in the exhibition “Ware & Wissen” in 2014 and to the founder of the ethnographic museum in Berlin, Adolf Bastian, in the experimental Humboldt Lab Dahlem with the performance “Der von einem Stern zum anderen springt” (2014). In Leipzig, the exhibition “Fremd” (2016) radically dismantled the work and collections of former curators and directors (see also Deimel 2016). In the ethnographic museum in Basel, the founding director of the Museum der Kulturen, Fritz Sarasin, (and other former museum anthropologists) was discredited in the exhibition “Expeditionen” (2012) as well as in the 2020 exhibition in the Foyer of the Theatre Basel. He particularly came under attack by the dissemination of a compromising picture which had been provided with a cynical caption. The information of the original context in which this picture was taken was withheld. These exhibitions drew – without ever going back to the texts written by Fritz Sarasin – on Bernhard Schär’s book, “Tropenliebe” (2015). Schär took the ambivalent notion of “Tropenliebe” (the efforts inspired by distancing from and, at the same time, also erotically desiring the tropics) as a goal-oriented lens to provide evidence of Fritz Sarasin and his great-cousin Paul Sarasin’s potentially violent, colonial-arrogant and racist attitude and actions allegedly in the service of the Dutch on their expeditions in Celebes (and beyond), on the one hand. All evidence of written testimony that would have contradicted Schär’s negative assessment was ignored. On the other hand, he voyeuristically denounced them as homosexuals and accused them even of pederasty or rather of their “homoerotic predilection for the bodies of young men and boys” (2015:276; translation bhs). All these examples were achieved by selectively pulling bits of information out of context and presenting them in other contexts without any attempt to treat their work with fairness (Hauser-Schäublin 2020).
AN EXAMPLE OF MISREPRESENTATION: THE COOK/FORSTER PROJECTS

Against this background only superficially touched upon, I will now proceed to the analysis of an also post-colonially inspired attempt to prove – and, consequently, to negatively assess – the allegedly still continuing presence of “colonial thought” and “ethnographic othering” (Schorch et al. 2016:62) in the research and exhibition projects of the Göttingen Cook/Forster collection. This was done in an article, “Globalizing Maori museology: reconceptualizing engagement, knowledge and virtuality through Mana Taonga” written by Philip Schorch, Conal McCarthy and Arapata Hakiwai (henceforth called “the authors”) and published in Museum Anthropology (an AAA journal) in 2016. Borrowing from Ashcroft et al.’s book on post-colonial literatures and the quest for “writing back to the Empire”, the authors claim of “speaking back” to the Cook/Forster collection from a Maori perspective (2016:58). In this article, these authors try to prove that the research project on the collection (between 1992 and 2012) and the pertinent exhibition in Honolulu (and other venues) in 2006 were characterised by a “European lens”, a (single)”Euro-American centric view” and the imposition of a corresponding “Deutungsmacht (power of interpretation)” (2016:49). Accordingly, the authors accuse the Honolulu/Göttingen team of having missed a serious “engagement with ‘source communities’” (Ibid.) and the application of “a Hawaiian lens” (2016:50) or “a Native Hawaiian perspective” (2016:49). They assess these projects as expressions of “anthropological myopia” (Ibid.) and “lopsided (re-)interpretations of indigenous cultures in exhibitionary projects” (Ibid.:48). In their article, the authors contrast this allegedly failed project with their own monocultural project on a small island of Aroatearoa/New Zealand which “allows us to overcome this

4 I became aware of this article only two years after it had appeared. A colleague had sent me a copy of it and asked whether “Göttingen has ever reacted” to this publication. I was appalled when I read it and, consequently, I submitted a complaint to Museum Anthropology (MA) in 2018. I criticised the misrepresentation of the research and exhibition project in this article and asked to be given the opportunity to respond. MA agreed and suggested a number of issues which the journal considered as the most serious and on which I should focus. In the course of 18 months, the editor of the journal commented twice on my replication and I revised my paper accordingly. The editor sent out the paper to the authors of the disputed article and invited them to write a reply. The authors did not react, not even when they were invited a second time. MA did not bother about this absence of response but sent out my paper for “peer review”. Peer reviews are usually commissioned before the author of a paper is asked to carry out specific revisions. The MA chose a reversed procedure and sent out my rectification allegedly for a “double-blind” peer review. After all, how can a rectification to a published article be anonymized? The reviews showed that they were well aware of who had written the text. One of them rejected its publication right away, the other asked for revisions. In fact, the reviewers criticised the structure of the paper, that is, what MA had predefined of what I should do. Finally, the journal declined its publication in October 2019.
deficit” (2016:50) [i.e. the shortcomings of the Honolulu/Göttingen project] and “avoid[s] perpetuating the Eurocentric projection of anthropological imaginations” (2016:61).³

The main strategy of the authors to prove all these “deficits” consisted of reducing plural voices and perspectives present in the exhibition and the research project to Eurocentric monovocality. This was done in order to be able to “speak back” with an allegedly unified Maori voice to the supposedly still colonialist-minded anthropologists in Göttingen. I will present four examples: the first illustrates how the authors withheld the information given by the Göttingen researchers in several publications on the controversial cultural-political situation in Hawai‘i in which the exhibition took place. The second example shows how all the information published on indigenous advisors and consultants was disregarded, and the third example demonstrates how the display of the most important artefact criticised by the authors as being an expression of Euro-American Deutungsmacht is based on ignoring the information that this display was suggested by a Hawaiian expert. The fourth example deals with the “techniques” of quoting: picking parts of quotes out of context and putting them together in a new way so that their meaning is changed.

A brief outline of the background of the projects is necessary to understand the context in which this critique is situated. In 2003, the director of the Honolulu Academy of Arts, Stephen Little, learned from a Hawai‘i-based German, Peter Ruthenberg, about the existence of a collection of 500 artefacts originating from the Cook Voyages (1768–1780). They had been assembled James Cook and his crew, including the German scientists Johann Reinhold and Georg Forster, and were housed at the Institute for Cultural and Social Anthropology at the University of Göttingen (Hauser-Schäublin and Krüger 1998). These artefacts originated from 15 to 20 different islands and societies in Polynesia, Melanesia and the Americas, including Tierra del Fuego and the Arctic. Little showed a keen interest in bringing the entire collection back to the Pacific for the first time since it had been assembled 230 years previously. The basic idea was to bring the artefacts back in the way (or more or less in the condition) they had been collected by James Cook and his crew, namely, as “naked” artefacts (i.e. without reconstructing idealized “contexts of origin”). They should speak for themselves as ancestral witnesses of pre-contact cultures and inspire Pacific islanders of the 21st century to experience them on their own. Thus, the goal of the exhibition was “to celebrate the brilliant cultural and spiritual lives of the indigenous people of the Pacific as they existed prior to the first contact with Westerners” (Little 2006a:VIII).⁴ This “return visit”, as it was called, was enthusiastically celebrated as “coming home” on the front-page of Honolulu Weekly. The success of the “must-see exhibit” (see Menter 2009a:302) in 2006 was overwhelming.

1) The cultural-political setting in Hawai‘i

The Honolulu/Göttingen co-operation project started in 2004 when a hot dispute about the legitimate place where sacred artefacts should be kept had exploded among Hawaiians. The Bishop Museum in Honolulu was in the midst of this furore. In 2000, the museum had “loaned” 83 artefacts that had been removed from a cave (Kawaihae Caves, also

³ At one point in their paper, the authors call the Göttingen research “substantial” (2016:51) but in the light of their heavy critique, this attribute sounds rather like mockery.

⁴ The project members were Stephen Little, Director of the Honolulu Academy of Arts (from 2003 to 2011), his staff, and cultural advisors, among them Adrienne Kaeppler, and Brigitta Hauser-Schäublin, Professor of Anthropology (since 2016 em.) and director of the Göttingen Institute for Institute for Cultural and Social Anthropology at that time. Other members included Gundolf Krüger, a Hawai‘i specialist and then curator of the Göttingen ethnographic collection; Gerry Barton, a New Zealand conservation expert who also supervised the mounting of the artefacts; and Elfriede Hermann, who organised the symposium (2011). She has been Professor of Anthropology at the Göttingen Institute for Cultural and Social Anthropology since 2012. Ulrich Menter, also a Hawai‘i specialist (Menter 2009a), acted as a courier and assisted Elfriede Hermann in organising the symposium. He is now curator of the Oceania Department at the Linden Museum Stuttgart.
called Forbes Cave after its “explorer”) in 1905 to a native Hawaiian organisation, Hui Malama. This organisation brought the artefacts back to the cave and sealed it with rebar and concrete (Johnson 2007), arguing that these artefacts were grave goods. There were other Hawaiian organisations that strongly opposed the self-determined actions by Hui Malama. They contended that these artefacts were not burial goods but instead precious objects that were hidden in the cave to prevent them from destruction (iconoclasms) that took place during Christianization at the beginning of the 19th century. These objects, they argued, should be kept in a museum (the Bishop Museum) and used for teaching Hawaiians about their own culture. In the same year two organisations filed a lawsuit against Hui Malama and the museum, seeking the return of the artefacts. Hawaiian mediation failed and, therefore, the court, as a state authority, had to resolve the matter. The judge decreed that the objects had to be removed from the cave and returned to the Bishop Museum (Jolly 2017:90–91). In the end, 13 Hawaiian organisations were involved in the case. The return happened in late 2006 when the exhibition “Life in the Pacific of the 1700s” had already come to an end and the collection had been moved to the next venue, the National Museum of Australia in Canberra (from 1 July to 10 September 2006).

This dramatic dispute showed that there is no unified Hawaiian voice regarding the material heritage of ancestral Hawaiian culture. Moreover, questions of social differentiation and the membership of aristocratic families flared up: Who is entitled to speak on behalf of the (aristocratic) ancestors and decide what should happen with such non-commoner artefacts?

Comment

In their article, Schorch et al. keep quiet on this dispute although it had been mentioned by Hauser-Schäublin (2011, 2012) and Menter (2009a:298-302). By eclipsing this inner-Hawaiian conflict, they suggest that Europeans and North Americans arbitrarily set up an exhibition in a harmonious cultural setting and by ignoring a supposedly unified “native Hawaiian perspective” that would have been ready to speak.

2) The alleged lack of indigenous perspectives

Thus, the exhibition took place in a minefield of “cultural politics with different camps and conflicting interests” in which we became involved (Hauser-Schäublin 2011:35; 2012:172). Stephen Little, who was responsible for the exhibition, had a number of indigenous cultural experts from Hawai‘i, Tonga and Aotearoa/New Zealand at his side to make sure whether and how sacred artefacts could or should be handled and displayed and what were the cultural protocols to be followed (Little 2006b:X–XI).7 This endeavour to treat the testimony of South Pacific ancestral cultures with respect had already begun during the preparation of the exhibition when Little sent a delegation of four Hawaiian experts to Göttingen so that they could establish contact between the material testimonies of early Hawaiian culture and the Hawaiian ancestral spirits. It was a moving ceremony (Hauser-Schäublin 2012:168–169). Among the delegation was Leonard Kelemoana Barrow, an anthropologist and expert on Pacific cultures and Little’s major consultant during the preparation of the exhibition; he has both Hawaiian and Maori ancestry. The cultural advisors had a great bearing on how the artefacts, especially the feather image of the Hawaiian war god Ku (see ill. 1 and below) and the Tahitian mourning costume, were presented in the exhibition.

7Ironically, one of the authors of the article under discussion, Arapata Hakiwai, was among the advisors.
Display of the feather image of the Hawaiian war god Ku in the exhibition in Honolulu. The feather image is presented on a pedestal, which is based on Hawaiian volcanic rock. Note the offerings at its base. The form of presentation was suggested by a Hawaiian advisor who has a special relationship to the war god.

Photo: Wolfgang Kempf (22/02/2006).
The multivocality was also represented in the three-volume exhibition catalogue (Little and Rutenberg 2006; Little et al. 2006). The first volume contains full-size photographs of all the artefacts of the Cook/Forster Collection with minimal specification, in order to leave the interpretation to the reader/onlooker. The second volume contains contributions (generally summaries) of the 1998 publication on the provenance, the acquisition history and the cultural background of the artefacts of the Göttingen collection (Hauser-Schäublin and Krüger 1998). These chapters were written by Hauser-Schäublin, Krüger and Kaeppler and the following catalogue with pictures and texts about each artefact and their indigenous names was written by a team of anthropologists. The third volume contains contributions by Pacific scholars and literati. Thus, each volume provided a particular perspective on the collection and its background.

Comment

Schorch et al. ignore the contents of these volumes and the published evidence on the participation of cultural advisors and consultants as explained by Little in the first volume. They also disregard the third volume of the exhibition catalogue. They even belittle the cultural experts, their advice regarding the cultural protocol and the sacred rituals performed by the Hawaiians. They write: "[...] it seems that the engagement with 'source communities' [...] remained mostly confined to the cultural domains of rituals blessings [...]" (Schorch et al. 2016:49). Again, the authors withheld information that would have contradicted their statement. Stephen Little had not been aware of this article with its many misrepresentations. He wrote a statement (see Appendix) and expressed his concerns that these authors did not acknowledge the depth of collaboration. Thus, the authors had also ignored the fact that didactic panels were installed in the exhibition galleries which dealt with Polynesian and especially native Hawaiian cultural practitioners’ beliefs, such as those written by Mary Kawena Pukui.

From a methodological point of view, this raises the question whether any of the authors had visited the exhibition. At least, it is certain that none of them ever contacted anyone from the Göttingen/Honolulu team.

3) The display of Ku as an expression of Euro-Americentric Deutungsmacht

The most attractive and, at the same time, most contested artefact of the exhibition was, as already briefly mentioned, the feather image of the Hawaiian war god Kuka'ilimoku (Ku). Many different claims developed around this iconic artefact and demonstrated that a broad range of values became associated with it. We became involved in a tournament of values (Appadurai 1986:21) consisting of insurance values, lending fees, values associated with the authenticity of the artefact, historical values, aesthetic values, different interpretations of Ku’s cultural meaning, and sacred and identity values (Hauser-Schäublin 2012:166–168). These values and interpretations and the inherent imaginations and claims raised concerning Ku existed simultaneously; they stood side by side and we had to deal with each of them. As a powerful actor, the feather image also stirred different

---

8 Little had offered to act as the co-author of the complaint I had submitted to MA, but the journal refused to accept a co-author (e-mail correspondence with MA, 13 September 2018).
9 Not even while one of the authors held a Fellowship at the Lichtenberg-Kolleg at Göttingen University in 2013.
10 Ku is often explained as a Hawaiian god of war. However, Hawaiians themselves attribute many more properties to Ku (Hauser-Schäublin 2012:167, n. 6).
11 The astonishingly still “new” looking feather image with its unique grimacing facial expression evoked not only admiration but also doubts about its authenticity among art historians and museum curators. Ku’s
emotions, interpretations and assessments even among the Hawaiians. In the exhibition, Ku was displayed on a high pedestal whose base was formed by volcanic rocks from Hawai‘i. This was the result of a Hawai‘an expert’s advice, La‘akea Suganuma, who has a special affinity to Ku as a war god. It had been Suganuma, accompanied by three further Hawaiian experts, who had come to Göttingen during the preparations of the exhibition, in order to meet the feather image for the first time, to bless it and to escort it back to Hawai‘i.

La‘akea Suganuma is president of the Royal Hawaiian Academy of Traditional Arts and instructor in *lua* or “bone-breaking”, a form of Hawaiian martial art, closely associated with Ku. Suganuma had a leading role in the Hawaiian cultural protocol regarding Ku from the beginning to the end of the exhibition.

Against the background of the continuing conflict among the Hawaiians about the legitimate place where sacred artefacts should be kept, it is no surprise that the comments by Hawaiians on the exhibition and especially on the display of Ku differed remarkably; they depended on the different camps to which the commentators belonged. Consequently, a great many Hawaiians (and other Pacific Islanders) highly appreciated the way in which Ku was presented on the high pedestal overlooking the exhibition; they even put offerings at the foot of the pedestal and some started chanting (Hauser-Schäublin 2012:172). Others criticised the display. Among them was Ivy Hali‘maile Andrade from the Center for Hawaiian Studies of the University of Hawai‘i, Manoa; she wrote: “I found the altar-like setting [the display of Ku] as perplexing and there was no explanation for it. It seemed overly dramatic […].” (2007:342; see also Hauser-Schäublin 2012:172). For this reason, she “felt the exhibition was cold” (Andrade 2007:342).

**Comment**

Schorch et al. do not mention La‘akea Suganuma and his decisive role regarding the cultural protocol and the handling and displaying of Ku in the exhibition, although his role had been extensively described (Hauser-Schäublin 2012:168-170, Menter 2009b:117–119). They suggest that the altar-like setting was a consequence of what they call “Euro-Americanic monopoly on interpretive and scientific authority” (Schorch et al. 2016:49). They take up Andrade’s negative statement, which they present as the “Native Hawaiian perspective” (2016:50) and combine it with their own assessment: “As a consequence, the exhibition failed to ‘offer an indigenous point of view’” (2016:49).

**4) Strategies of (mis)quoting**

Several other passages exist in which the authors consistently selected bits of information from the Göttingen research publications (especially of Hauser-Schäublin and Krüger 1998) and used them for their own purposes. I have chosen an example of a quotation to demonstrate the authors’ tactic of quoting that allowed them to present a different “evidence” which diverged substantially from the original context and intent.

authenticity became finally questioned by a student from Hawai‘i. Focusing on Ku’s materiality, s/he suggested that most, if not all of the feathers had been replaced sometime in the 20th century. This suspicion was taken up by an expert in Oceanic material culture; he even extended the suspicion to the teeth and the way in which the feathers were attached (Hauser-Schäublin 2012). In a meticulous process, we were finally able to “prove” the feather image’s material authenticity.

Menter had already emphasized in 2009 that this form of display did not comply with the use and display of such feather heads as evidenced by historical documents (2009b:117–119); see also Hauser-Schäublin (2012:171).

Suganuma had been one of the prominent proponents in the Forbes Cave case; he had filed the suit against Hui Malama (see above).
“As stated above, the documentation of the Cook/Forster Collection is mainly limited to one-sided European sources (Hauser-Schäublin 2006).

Moreover, since these artifacts were mostly treated as ‘artificial curiosities’ and recorded like natural history specimens, there exist virtually no records of individual owners (sellers), receivers (buyers), or transactions (Kaeppler 1978).”

Schorch et al. (2016:55–56)

[1] This statement refers to an earlier assessment of the authors in which they called Göttingen historical research on the Cook/Forster collection “lopsided” and the result of “methodological limitation” (Schorch et al. 2016:51). The source referred to here (“Hauser-Schäublin 2006”) contains, among many other issues, a critical discussion of the historical sources (logbooks, diaries of voyagers) and concludes “[...] we can only guess what the South Sea islanders thought of their faraway visitors – all we have are the written reflections of Cook’s men and occasional transcriptions of oral reports [of indigenous voices]. Contemporary reports written by natives do not exist” (Hauser-Schäublin 2006:21).

With the phrasing of this reference, the authors reinforce their earlier negative statement by indirectly suggesting that other – indigenous – sources would have been available.

[2] This statement refers to an earlier assertion that suggested the Göttingen Cook/Forster research publication (Hauser-Schäublin and Krüger 1989) “awarded [the artefacts] with Western categories such as curiosity, specimen, artifact [...] but rarely indigenous categories” (Schorch et al. 2016:48).

The authors do not mention that the 1998 publication contained an extensive catalogue of all artefacts with all basic information available regarding the local names/categories, their function and context, and the measurements. Here, this argument is reinforced: the authors omit the context in which the Göttingen researcher had used the expression “artificial curiosities”, namely, in a critical discussion of these terms in their historical context, the 18th century (Hauser-Schäublin and Krüger 2006:18–19; Hauser-Schäublin 2011:32 –35).

[3] By quoting the authoritative source “Kaeppler 1978”, the authors suggest that no provenance research on the Cook Voyages Collections has taken place since 1978. They do not mention that the Göttingen researchers had carried out the first systematic examination of the forms of transactions, gifting, exchange and trading of European and indigenous goods as well as of the actors involved (Hauser-Schäublin 1998). They also do not mention the meticulous investigation of the collection’s acquisition history, the actors and the ways and political circumstances under which the artefacts reached the Göttingen Academic Museum in the late 18th century after Cook’s ship had landed in England (Urban 1998).

It needs to be added that such misrepresentations as those outlined above and published in a prestigious journal fuel the current public debates on “colonial looted art” and “restitution” in an undifferentiated way. If even “colleagues” accuse us of colonialism – what can we expect from a general public? The authors’ lack of acknowledging the provenance research, which had already been carried out on the Cook/Forster collection at a time...
when no other museums were doing such studies, suggests either political intent or, at its best, a lack of understanding of the political explosiveness of such an omission. Perhaps it needs to be remembered that sweeping attacks on anthropology as a discipline by self-legitimizing activist groups such as “No Humboldt 21!” and “Berlin Postkolonial” led to a subsequent eclipsing of anthropological perspectives in the conception of the Humboldt Forum in Berlin (Kohl et al. 2019).

There are further methodological and theoretical issues which need to be discussed, such as the question of comparability, that is, whether two completely different exhibition projects – a large one comprising artefacts from almost 20 different societies and a small monocultural project can be compared with each other at all and why this has been done (see ill. 2 in the Appendix). But this would be another topic.
CONCLUSION: CONTEXTUALIZING BREACHES OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Instead of continuing the discussion of this single case – which, I admit, left me baffled – I will now return to the general issues of academic integrity and its violations. As has already been mentioned above, misquotations and adulterations of contexts are situated in a grey area of misrepresentations. In anthropology, and apart from instructions addressed to students of how to write theses, ethical guidelines deal almost exclusively with the responsibilities of researchers towards their research participants and the people with whom they work or live and how to deal with the data collected (research data management).

Nevertheless, the problem seems to be omnipresent among scholars probably of all disciplines, though only rarely developed into a subject to be seriously discussed in major journals. “It is becoming more common to hear colleagues claim that they have been misquoted or misrepresented, or that their work has been reported out of context in publications” write health scholars Cleary et al. (2016:2). The problem of “ffp”, and among them, misquoting and adulteration of contexts, of course, raises the question why these violations of academic or research practice take place. Two interrelated issues seem to exist: a structural one and an issue of how to successfully deal with this structural setting.

The lawyer Bargen writes about causes of the “apparently explicit increase” of violations of academic integrity (2013:716–717):

“[Die]... Ursachen hängen mit fundamentalen strukturellen Veränderungen des internationalen Wissenschaftssystems zusammen [...]. Auffällige Erscheinungsformen des Veränderungsprozesses sind der wachsende internationalisierte Wettbewerb zwischen Forschergruppen und die Beschleunigung des Forschungsprozesses, die einen erhöhten Veröffentlichungsdruck, Konkurrenzdenken, Profilierungszwänge und einen nie endenden Kampf um Stellen und Fördermittel bedingen.”


15 “Causes are related to fundamental structural changes in the international science system [...]. Conspicuous manifestations of the change process are the growing internationalized competition between research groups and the acceleration of the research process, which result in increased pressure to publish, competitive thinking, the need to distinguish oneself and a never-ending struggle for jobs and funding” (translation bhs).
Thus, these structural conditions create a situation where only the fittest – or rather those who manage to present themselves as the fittest – survive. The major driving force resulting from these structural conditions is “publish or perish” in peer-reviewed publications that propels a scholar into a competitive struggle for academic survival. The number of such publications is, as Borofsky noted, decisive for an academic career and forms the basis of how scholars are judged professionally (2019:36). Every scholar knows how difficult it is to place a contribution in one of the highest-ranking journals.

Several guidelines exist regarding how to write an article to reach this goal. Tom Boellstorff, the former editor of American Anthropologist, wrote two articles on this topic. In the first paper (2008), he dealt mostly with questions of professional academic writing and the structuring of papers. Among the five points he listed, he explains what he understands by the “effective use of citations”: “At times just mentioning names is needed, but what seems to be most effective are short citations that demonstrate the author in question actually believes what you claim she or he believes” (Boellstorff 2008:282). In the second paper, he added that the author needs “to show you are aware of relevant literatures” (Boellstorff 2010:353). He emphasises how important it is to show the novelty of a contribution: “It is a real challenge to draw attention to one’s own research. Given this reality, all journals to my knowledge seek manuscripts that clearly show some novel finding or theoretical intervention”. He continues:

“You need to show, clearly and from the outset, that your manuscript has an analytical ‘punchline’ that brings something new to the table conceptually, however interesting the substantive materials presented might be in their own right. The true challenge is to show that your research can be interesting or relevant to readers who do not share your regional and thematic foci.” (Boellstorff 2010:353).

While Boellstorff recommends strategies of how to present one’s own research in writing as being superior to others, he does not mention academic integrity. As Borofsky recently explained, the concern for originality and the push to publish often serve the chase for status advancement and a career in anthropology rather than the advancement of knowledge (2019:107–108,113–114,118): the number counts more than the qualitative assessment of publications. He sees the entanglement of publishing with careerism, among other things, as responsible for specific styles of writing: by citing authoritative references in a “bump and go” pattern in order to enhance the credibility of one’s own work and to prove one’s intellectual competence, on the one hand, and by pointing out “flaws” in the work of other scholars on the other (Borofsky 2019:26, 37, 78-79,113).

Dealing with sources and references play a crucial role in the “technique” of goal-oriented (mis)quoting. The “Kultur des Belegs” (“culture of evidence”) was originally introduced into academic work, first and foremost, to serve the verifiability of what is stated (Neugebauer 2015:97). What is quoted is assumed to be correct and the exhaustive listing of references suggests serious reading and honest quoting of sources. Nowadays, references and evidence seem to be rarely checked, even by peer-reviewers. Who is cited seems to be more important than what is cited. As Borofsky pointed out: “Cultural anthropologists often assess a manuscript’s credibility by whether the author is familiar with certain references.” (2019:109). One of the reasons why references today seem to be rarely checked also lies in the flood of publications with which reviewers also have to cope and, accordingly, in applying the technique of speed-reading. The evaluation of publications follows the criteria defined as prerequisite (such as novelty, originality, references of important publications). Borofsky speaks of “weak standards for a publication’s value” and comments this: “We see the triumph of style over substance, of quantity over quality” (2019:114). Peer-reviewed publications serve as a defining measure.

---

16The technique of speed-reading is also highly recommended in handbooks for students; see, for example, Koch (2015).
of academic accomplishment in the process of allocating research funding and positions at universities; publishing fits into the pursuit of status (see Borofsky 2019:38,114).

Blind trust in peer-reviewing, however, is out of place. The DFG points out that peer review, as one of the mechanisms of professional self-regulation, did not prove to be infallible in the cases of proven scientific misconduct: “Nearly all the publications called into question appeared in peer reviewed international journals” (DFG 2013:67). This is a finding that needs to be reconsidered and it raises the question of how “neutral” a reviewer is regarding the author and the topic of the article or proposal s/he has to assess, as well as how much time and commitment s/he is willing to invest in (unpaid) reviewing (see Zuckerman and Merton 1971:95–100).

In concluding, we can say that the structure of the international competitive scientific landscape, with its restricted resources and the way in which data have to be presented and articles written, constitute the breeding-ground for breaches of academic integrity – at least for those who cannot resist the temptation inherent in these situations.

The awareness of breaches of academic integrity has risen, as has the awareness of the “grey area” between bad research practices, which seemingly “do not count”, and scientific misconduct, which is followed by sanctions. Plagiarism – one of the severest forms of scientific misconduct – implies the unauthorized and unacknowledged appropriation of research achievements, i.e. the intellectual property of others. By contrast, the coherent misrepresentation of other scholars’ work, complemented by negative assessments, is a misuse of a scholar’s work and, at the same time, also an intellectual assault on the scholar as a person and his/her reputation. Misrepresentations are not simply a *Kavaliersdelikt* (‘a trivial offence’) in a “bump and go” manner but disclose a lack of academic fairness and are even an offence, as the court case about the Helmut Kohl biography has shown. It is time that the question of where poor scholarship ends and scientific misconduct begins is addressed by a larger academic audience. Bülow and Helgesson are right when they postulate “[i]t would indeed be valuable if universities could focus more on the minor misdemeanors, which […] may be as problematic for research integrity overall as the most serious forms of scientific fraud” (2019:251).
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Statement by Stephen Little

"It is unfortunate that the article by Schorch et al. is seriously misinformed in its critique of the actions of the staff of the Honolulu Academy of Arts in the preparations for the 2006 exhibition, Life in the Pacific of the 1700s: The Cook/Forster Collection of the Georg August University of Göttingen. The article states, for example, that 'Throughout this process [of the exhibition] ... it seems that the engagement with 'source communities' (Peers and Brown 2003) remained mostly confined to the cultural domains of ritual blessings with limited access to the scientific realm of curatorial interpretations,' and, 'As a consequence, the exhibition failed to 'offer an indigenous point of view...'

Contrary to what is alleged in the article, while serving as Director of the Honolulu Academy of Arts and during the planning stages for the exhibition, I sought out and held many discussions with Pacific Island cultural experts and practitioners, all of whom were specifically mentioned and thanked in the exhibition catalogue’s Acknowledgments. These included La'akea Suganuma, Guy Kaulukukui, Nathan Napoka, Momi Cazimero, Kaleihauanamau Johnson, Emil Wolfgramm, Haniteli Fa’anunu (who visited from Tonga during the exhibition’s preparations) and Arapata Hakiwai (who visited from Aotearoa/New Zealand during the exhibition’s preparations), representing traditional systems of knowledge and cultural practices of Hawai‘i, Tonga, and Aotearoa. These discussions included questions of whether it was appropriate to publicly exhibit the several sacred works in the exhibition (which it was), and specific questions on precisely how these works should be exhibited in conformity with indigenous cultural protocols. It was through these discussions, for example, that it was decided to honor the rare and extraordinarily well-preserved Hawaiian feathered image, *ki'i hulu manu*, believed to represent the god Kūka‘ilimoku, on its own stone pedestal, higher than any other work in the exhibition. A decision was also made to install a stone platform at the base of the same work, in front of which visitors were encouraged to gather and chant *mele*, and on which many visitors left offerings of leis during the entire course of the exhibition. The same degree of detailed research and cultural sensitivity was brought to bear on the choice of four Pacific Island dances represented in the welcoming dances performed at the exhibition opening, which

17 Head of the Chinese, Korean, and South & Southeast Asian Departments, Los Angeles County Museum of Art, Los Angeles, CA.

18 Hawaiian volcanic rocks.
was attended by many respected Pacific Island cultural practitioners, including Princess Salote Pilolevu Tuita of Tonga, representing His Royal Majesty King Taufa’ahau Tupou IV, King of Tonga. Didactic panels installed in the exhibition galleries furthermore specifically quoted native Hawaiian cultural practitioners’ beliefs (for example, quoted from the written works of Mary Kawena Pukui, coauthor with Samuel H. Elbert, of the authoritative Hawaiian Dictionary: Hawaiian-English; English-Hawaiian [1957, 1999], with regard to fundamentals of ancient Polynesian cosmology).

It is also ironic that the authors of the article belittle or marginalize the ritual blessings that were performed both in Germany and in Hawai‘i, at several stages leading up to the exhibition’s opening, since these ancient and authentic rituals were (and continue to be) among the most relevant embodiments and manifestations of traditional cultural protocols of the peoples and cultures represented by the nearly five hundred works in the exhibition.\(^{19}\)

Finally, both the exhibition’s didactic materials and catalogue made it unambiguously clear that every single work in the exhibition possessed (and possesses) a unique mana, that the exhibition’s organizers were always keenly aware and mindful of this mana and the responsibility for the correct handling of these works that their mana entailed and demanded, and that the celebration of this mana and the works’ collective relevance for the present day were the exhibition’s primary guiding principles." (03/09/2018)

---

\(^{19}\) It needs to be added that the entrance fees had been waived by the Academy to enable disadvantaged and marginalized members of indigenous people resident in Hawai‘i to visit the exhibition.