Collectors and collecting for the Raffles Museum in Singapore : 1920 to 1940

Luyt, Brendan

2010

Luyt, B. (2010). Collectors and collecting for the Raffles Museum in Singapore : 1920 to 1940. Library and Information History, 26(3), 183-195.

https://hdl.handle.net/10356/91771

https://doi.org/10.1179/175834810X12731358995235

Collectors and collecting for the Raffles Museum in Singapore: 1920 to 1940
Dr. Brendan Luyt

Introduction

The study of museums as part of society has been underway for some time now and a number of pioneering and insightful works have been written on their changing nature and role [1]. I would like in this article to add to this body of literature through the example of one museum director's efforts at expanding the collection of his institution (the Raffles Museum in Singapore) in the 1920s and 1930s. In particular, I wish to show how the social relationships that make much collecting possible are structured around the exchange of tangible and non-tangible resources. Given that much of the literature on museums tends to reflect the experiences of the imperial or white settler societies (UK, USA, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand), my focus on the Raffles Museum has the added benefit of exploring an under-examined geographical area [2].

The Social Nature of Collecting

Susan Pearce defines collections as "sets of objects, and like all other sets of objects, they are an act of imagination, part corporate and part individual, a metaphor intended to create meanings which help to make individual identity and each individual's view of the world" [3]. Hence to collect is to participate in the creation of social meaning. But the actual process of collecting itself is also social in that it requires the development of social networks or relationships between a multitude of individuals. A number of scholars have documented this process in both time and space. Amiria Henare, following Marcel Mauss, writes that: "objects are bought and sold, stolen, gifted and traded by way of social relations, which at once are constituted by the very movement of things, such that the two are in many ways 'one and the same'" [4]. Henare in the rest of her book unravels and explicates some of the social relations that bound together objects, explorers, scientists, and the local Maori people and which made possible the acquisition of the voluminous collections that presently reside in the museums of Scotland.

Crossing the Atlantic and focusing on the world of natural history, Robert Kohler argues that much of the collecting zeal in the United States in the late nineteenth and early twentieth stemmed from a particular set of social and economic relations. This was a time when fast and efficient rail transport made it possible to travel virtually anywhere in the country while industrial and agricultural development had not yet inflicted itself wholeheartedly on the natural world. But equally important to sustaining interest in collecting was what Kohler describes as "the middle class vacation complex" through which individuals developed interest in "improving outdoor recreation rather than social display". He suggests that "the people who stepped up to pay for museum expeditions were probably the same ones who read nature essays and viewed dioramas … camped and walked in lake and mountain districts, hunted and fished, and enjoyed recreational bird-watching or collecting" [5].

Another writer who emphasizes the social process of collecting is Fiona Kerlogue. In her article she describes the "context of scholarly networks and museum connections" that contributed to the development of the UK's Horniman Museum. The network revolved around the advisory curator, Alfred Cart Haddon, a former lecturer in ethnology at Cambridge University. Haddon was able to enlist in the collecting enterprise certain of his students who had gone on to join the colonial civil service, including Charles Hose and Ivor Evans. Other links,

were forged between Haddon and C. Bryant, DG Fenton, and RC Petherbody. But the network Haddon put together did not just consist of the collectors themselves, but the notion of what should be collected. Kerlogue argues that the book *Pagan Tribes of the Malay Peninsula* provided the impetus for the collection of Semang material, the authors of which numbered among Haddon's anthropology colleagues at the university [6]. Kerlogue's account has the added interest from the point of view of this article of specifically focusing on British Malaya and Sarawak, to which places Singapore was closely tied. As we shall see some of the collectors for the Raffles Museum were also involved in the networks that sustained the Horniman's collection.

The network binding together collectors and museums did not magically appear nor did they survive over time without work on the part of those involved. Resources were required to bring these networks into existence and keep them functioning. Of course, some collecting relationships were purely commercial in nature. Money was exchanged for specimens. But others were more than this. As Alberti notes of collecting museum objects in general, many took the form of gifts exchanges so that as in "any process of gift exchange, donations constituted a reciprocal relationship between benefactor and recipient. An isolated practitioner, collector or manufacturer sent a specimen to a metropolitan museum with the hope of securing potentially useful useful patronage, or, even better, the minor fame of a label or catalogue mention" [7]. In such exchanges what was traded were specimens or artifacts for the social resources available to the museum curator to give: at the upper end of the scale, positions in institutions or letters of recommendation to influential others; and at the lower end forms of social recognition more localized to the museum itself. In line with this observation Kohler notes how Ruthven, curator of the University of Michigan Museum, "attached his circle of local naturalist friends to the museum by a continual exchange of little gifts and favours: exchange of specimens for expert identifications; honorific expeditions and honorary curatorships; and cash gifts" [8]. And Chantal Knowles writes of the professional relationships of anthropologist and sometime collector of Melanesian cultural artifacts, Beatrice Blackwood, as being "broached, stimulated and maintained through the collection and circulation of objects. Her engagement with the collections and use of certain objects seem to have been a tool through which she gained respect and consolidated her position in several different communities, the colonial community, the museum community, and the wider academic community" [9]. The aim of the rest of this article is to describe in a detailed way the various resources used by one of last pre-war curator of the Raffles Museum, Frederick Nutter Chasen, to put together a collecting network for his institution during the 1920s and 1930s.

The Raffles Museum and FN Chasen

The Raffles Museum started life as a collection of objects displayed at an exhibition of colonial products held at the Museum of Natural History in London in 1874. Attached to the museum was a public library that received much of the earliest attention and resources. It was only in 1887 with the construction of new and custom-built premises that the museum really came into its own with a number of collecting trips made to various parts of the Malay Peninsula by the staff as well as numerous purchases and donations by members of the public. The result was a flood of of material that threatened to overwhelm the small staff as they tried to comprehensively document it. By 1920 the museum consisted of 63 large wall cases, 102 table cases, 48 small

show-cases, among numerous other smaller storage boxes [10]. This was the institution that employed Frederick Chasen for the first time in 1921.

We know little about his life. Born in 1897 in Norfolk, United Kingdom, Chasen was apprenticed to Frank Leney of the Norwich Museum between 1912 and 1915. There he received a basic training in zoology and museum work [11]. His major scientific passion seems to have been ornithology and he used his time in the Norfolk Yeomanry during the First World War to observe the birds of Macedonia which was later the basis of his first scientific article, "Field Notes on the The Birds of Macedonia" [12]. From 1919 to 1921 Chasen worked full-time at the Norwich Museum. He was initially appointed assistant curator and taxidermist of the Raffles Museum in 1921, but was promoted to the position of curator in 1923. He became director of the museum on the retirement of C. Boden Kloss in 1932. During his time in Singapore he became a noted expert on the birds and mammals of the region. Among his notable achievements was the co-authorship of Volume 3 (Sporting birds; birds of the shore and estuaries) of the government-sponsored Birds of the Malay Peninsula series published in 1936 and the full authorship of the fourth volume (The birds of the low-country jungle and scrub). He also published *A Handlist of Malaysian Birds* in 1935 followed by *A Handlist of Malaysian Mammals* in 1940 [13]. At around the same time Chasen volunteered to help with the war effort using his knowledge of museum display to produce propaganda designed to bolster morale against the imminent threat of Japanese invasion. In the last days before the fall of Singapore in February 1942 he, along with other members of the Department of Information for which he was working, were assigned space on ships leaving the city to prevent their capture. Unfortunately, the Japanese at the time were targeting all forms of shipping entering or leaving Singapore. The ship on which he sailed was sunk as a result and Chasen drowned. He was only forty-five years old at the time [14].

Most of the pre-war correspondence of the museum has now been lost. The exception is a collection of Chasen's letters. While likely an incomplete set, they provide a snapshot of his museum related activities over the course of the 1920s and 1930s. It reveals the existence of a network of collectors that Chasen tried to hold together, sometimes successfully and at others not, through a variety of resources that he had access to as a result of his position as curator of the museum. The rest of the article will discuss a number of these resources in turn.

Institutional Authority

Chasen as the curator of the Raffles Museum possessed a certain level of institutional authority. He was the government's "man of science" on the spot and as a high-ranking member of the civil service itself, among the top echelon of Europeans in the colony. A number of objects came to Museum as a result of the co-operation he was able to achieve through this intangible yet powerful resource derived from his institutional position. A key example involved a request from the Berlin Museum in early 1935 for two specimens of the "golden bo'sun" bird of Christmas Island, a territory at the time administered from Singapore. Chasen was able to write to the District Officer to request that he obtain the bird, prepare it in alcohol (using the directions provided in the letter) and send it to the museum. And this the District Officer did. Chasen's recommendation: "the work these men are doing is very worthy and the best possible use is made of the material" [15] was enough to prompt the collecting initiative. At other times, the reputation of the museum among members of the public as well as the civil service was enough to attract objects. This appears to be the case for a clay brick from an old demolished mansion

that was sent one day to Chasen from H. Henley of the Public Works Department [16]. Similarly, R. Phillips of the Kenneth Estate in Kelantan, was aware that the Raffles Museum was the designated centre for prehistoric research in southeast Asia as he sent what he suspected where prehistoric stone tools to the Raffles Museum in Singapore rather than to one of the other museums in British Malaya [17]. Other examples could be given of the institutional authority of the museum, and its role in attracting specimens, but the point has been made. Being curator of a major regional museum put Chasen in a position to extract specimens from civil servants and locals alike. However, the relative ease and low cost of this approach had to be balanced with the likely short-term nature of the relationship. If Chasen had burdened the District Officer of Christmas Island with too many requests he would have been refused. In the case of Henley's brick he likely was refused. In a follow up letter, Chasen asks "if you found any indication that a local factory existed" [18]. Henley, it appears, never replied. To sustain the relationship other resources would have needed to be brought into play, resources valued by both parties so that a gift exchange as noted by Alberti could be established.

The Museum Budget

An alternative to gift exchange was commodity exchange. The exchange of money for specimens was a frequent occurrence in the letters. It was still possible at the time to buy natural history specimens from dealers. In one series of letters Chasen, for example, writes to Mr. A.E. Scott-Skovsko in Kedah, whom he has learned is in the business of selling skins and specimens of the local fauna, to inquire about the purchase of "legally obtained Malayan skins" [19]. A year previously he received a letter from a dealer in Florida offering molluscs for exchange or sale [20]. And he received at least one letter from one of the directors for Rowland Ward, a large firm specializing in natural history specimens, offering a range of mammals for sale [21]. Ethnographic and historical material was also purchased. While visiting Malacca, Chasen chanced upon some carved doors. Back at the museum he wrote to his friend to purchase them "for any fair and reasonable price" [22]. A model of a Kelantan loom was purchased from Mrs. Walker of the Malayan Arts and Crafts Society for forty Straits dollars in 1938 [23] while a year later he authorized the acquisition of a set of chairs used by Sir Stamford Raffles from the antique dealer C.B. Hadden. This particular transaction was not a completely commercial affair though. Chasen asked for a discount: "It now remains for you to name your rock-bottom price. If I mentioned a figure first, you would be shocked! We are so poor!" while hinting at the immortality on offer for the charitable donor: "The chairs look very well and would make a fine show in one of our long galleries" [24].

Specimen Exchange

One of the clearest examples of Alberti's notion of gift exchange as the key to a great deal of museum collecting [25] is the exchange of specimens that we occasionally find reference to in the correspondence. The objects already in the museum could sometimes be used as a resource to maintain a relationship with a collector, but only if they were seen as duplicates or otherwise not of great importance to the institution. We can find one example of this in Chasen's correspondence with Dr. W.F. Stutterheim of the Oudheidkundige Dienst (Archaeology Service) in the Netherlands East Indies. Initially Stutterheim asks for an exchange of old wayang puppets held by the Raffles Museum for new ones. This exchange is not for Stutterheim himself, but is rather made on behalf of a local Javanese ruler who is an avid collector. Hence when Chasen refuses "it would be easier to procure the crown jewels. They are all we have" and adds that "if

you can see any opportunity of getting for me a small collection of Hindu-Javanese antiquities I should be extremely grateful" [26] Stutterheim remains very obliging. He writes: "What would you think of sending the terra cotta tjandi on loan and receiving some stone figures … Perhaps you could use a Shiva, Ganesha, and Durga , or some bronzes?" [27]. Unfortunately, we don't know if the exchange was actually realized. The last letter on the subject was dated March 15, 1937 and in it Stutterheim asks Chasen to be patient: "I am still trying to get a Durga for you" [28].

Another example involves Dr. G.C.A Junge of the Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie in Leiden. Chasen wrote to Junge, a fellow ornithologist, asking if he "would care to exchange duplicates from this collection for subspecies from the Malaysian islands not represented in the Leyden Museum? I have duplicates from the Mentawi Islands, Natuna, Anambas, and many other places" [29]. Junge replied that he was "sure we can arrange an exchange" [30] and suggested that Chasen provide him with a list of duplicates available and what he wanted in return for them. This list was forthcoming in Chasen's next letter [31], but once again, we cannot be sure from the evidence we have if the exchange actually took place. Junge brings up the subject for the last time in May 1937 when he hopes "soon to have time to arrange our exchange" [32]. But Junge continues to write Chasen afterwards (and Chasen replies) without mentioning the exchange, so perhaps the letters recording it are merely missing from the archive.

Ornithological & Zoological Expertise

One resource that definitely cemented productive collecting relations was the expert knowledge Chasen had on the birds and mammals of Malaya. Chasen's status as an ornithological expert rested on the fieldwork he had done in various parts of British Malaya, British North Borneo and the Netherlands East Indies in the 1920s which resulted in a number of publications. His *Handlist of Malayan Birds* helped cement the reputation this body of work created. E. Banks of the Sarawak Museum wrote in a review that it was: "a veritable Dictionary and Grammar of Malaysian Birds, a sort of ornithological 'Seven Pillars of Wisdom,' and its accuracy and erudition must make it a standard work" [33]. Banks' prediction was true enough, at least in the case of Jean Delacour, a famous French ornithologist who carried on Chasen's legacy by using much of his work in his own post-war book on Malaysian birds [34]. Similarly his *Handlist of Malaysian Mammals* was seen as a standard reference for zoologists of the region as late as 1955 when the British Museum issued a supplement to the work [35]. Not surprisingly then, it could be noted that by the time of his death he was "the most reliable and accurate authority on far-eastern birds and mammals, and almost every collection made in the region … was sent to him as a matter of course to identify and describe" [36].

In his surviving correspondence there are a number of examples of how Chasen's status helped to initiate collecting relationships. One of these involved an employee on the Bandjarwangi Tea Estate in Java, a certain C.P.J. de Haas. De Haas first learned of Chasen through his friend Mr. Lieftinck of the Buitenzorg Zoo who recommended Chasen's handlist. De Haas was preparing to go on home leave and in his spare time wanted to study ornithology, a new hobby of his. Previously he had collected snakes and reptiles; when he returned the local birds would be his focus of attention. De Haas wrote to Chasen to ask for a copy of this book, but at the same time he made clear his willingness to collect snakes and reptiles for the Raffles Museum [37]. In his reply, Chasen was quick to indirectly accept. He enclosed a complimentary

copy of his book and wrote: “perhaps on your return to Java next year, you can spare a few duplicates from your collection of birds, bats and reptiles for the Singapore Museum” [38].

Our second example comes from the correspondence Chasen conducted with Miss E.D.H Cramer, a school teacher in Pahang and incidentally one of only two women collectors identified in the existing correspondence. Cramer initially wrote to Chasen to ask for his help in identifying bird shell fragments that she had collected. This initial query was also accompanied by the nest of a Wray’s yellow-naped woodpecker [39]. Chasen replied that he could not identify the fragments as “so little is known about … Malaya’s hill birds” but that he was happy to get the nest [40]. This response on the part of a local expert encouraged Cramer to offer more specimens. In her next letter she sends four nests and some eggs, all identified and with documentation as to where they were taken and when. She ends the letter by asking Chasen to “please let me know if they would be of any use to you” [41]. This exchange was most favourable for the Curator as he was able to use some of the nests for the fourth volume of the Birds of the Malay Peninsula [42].

In our third example, Chasen’s acknowledged zoological expertise helped to steer the collecting activities of E.O. Shebbeare, the newly appointed Chief Game Warden for the Federated Malay States, to areas were Chasen believed scientific discoveries could still be made in Malaya. In Chasen’s first letter, he replies to Shebbeare’s queries by noting that the birds and mammals “have been studied very extensively” but that “bats are still worth collecting” as well as the “smaller insectivores” -- “tiny shews may still hold surprises for us” he notes. He also identifies two squirrels that Shebbeare must have sent him previously [43]. In his reply Shebbeare writes that he has received from another member of the Museum staff a number of useful journal articles which he has bound together. He also agrees to get his staff to collect small mammals and notes his frustration of not having identified the squirrels himself: “it was stupid of me not to spot the ears” [44]. In another letter Chasen identifies eight more mammals, instructing Shebbeare that “some of the names given above vary slightly from those given in some previous published lists but this is ‘progress’” [45]. Still later he teaches Shebbeare the differences between the various gibbon species in the colony [46] to which the grateful game warden replies that “this was just what I wanted to know” [47].

Shebbeare “paid” for this information in three ways. First, he was apparently an expert in the freshwater fish of India with articles published in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* and the *Darjeeling Natural History Journal*. Copies of these articles were sent to the Raffles Museum [48]. Secondly, Shebbeare supported Chasen’s efforts to get the remaining wild areas of Singapore declared a wildlife preserve [49]. And finally, he directly or indirectly collected for the museum. As he put it in one letter, referring both to himself and one of his trusted assistants: “We shall both of us always do our best to help you … as you have helped us” [50]. From the letters we learn this help took the form of “another lot” of fishes towards the end of May in 1939 [51] while in 1940 a circular was dispatched to all game wardens in British Malaya specifically informing them that Chasen wanted to obtain a male elephant for the museum’s collection [52]. A gun license was granted to the museum by the Game Warden’s office for the purposes of collecting specimens in the same year [53]. And Shebbeare promised to keep an eye out for leaf monkey specimens for Chasen who was puzzled by accounts of a third species that he had recently received [54].

The relationship between Shebbeare and Chasen perhaps most clearly matches that described by Robert Kohler as being applicable for smaller museums in the United States: "patronage …. was more usually based on close personal relations between curators and a few individual patrons [which] depended on a mutual trust based on personal acquaintance and shared experience and scientific interest" [55]. The number of letters exchanged between the two men is among the greatest of any of Chasen's correspondents while Shebbeare's expertise on freshwater fish and his willingness to learn about Malayan mammals suggests that the two had similar interests.

Reference Library

One of the more tangible resources available to Chasen was the reference library that was attached to the museum. This library was likely one of the largest in southeast Asia at the time. At the same time it was a centre for the production of scientific literature itself. The Journal of the Straits Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society (JSBRAS) had been published in Singapore since 1878 and the Bulletin of the Raffles Museum since 1928. Chasen's access to this literature was another favour he could dispense for those collecting for the museum. We can see this on at least two occasions. The first involves a certain B.K. Malleson of the Sungei Kruit Rubber Estate. Malleson had alerted Chasen of the existence of a "slab grave" in the area. Chasen visited the site and decided to excavate the grave. He also must have learned of Malleson's interest in zoology for in a letter to him he encloses a copy of an article by C. Boden-Kloss, the former curator of the museum, on Malayan mammals. At the same time, he wrote: "It occurs to me that a group of your swifts would make a very nice 'life history' case in the Museum here" and "if he has no objection" Chasen's assistant could "detach one of the cluster's of nests" [56]. Not surprisingly, Malleson allows the removal of the nest [57].

Chasen did a similar kind of favour for another of his collectors, Ivor Evans. Evans had been involved in the collecting network of the Horniman Museum earlier in the century. At that time he was collecting as the student half of a teacher-student relationship with Alfred Haddon and was indebted to Haddon for a recommendation for the position as curator of the Perak Museum [58]. By the 1930s he was retired, with an established reputation as an ethnologist and archaeologist [59], but still travelling and studying the local peoples of British North Borneo. In late 1939 he offered to collect stone tools and Neolithic beads for the museum [60]. In return he asked for the cost of the objects and a favour. Could the directions to Santubong (a village in British North Borneo) be copied from an earlier issue of JMBRAS and sent to him at Jesselton? In a further letter he appends a list of reference questions about natural history [61]. Chasen provides both directions and answers to the questions but adds: "We could do with some Dusan, Bajan, and Illancun ethnographica if it were very cheap" [62]. Evans is rather noncommittal in response: "I will see what I can do about ethnographica for you a little latter" [63].The tone not only of this letter, but others as well suggests that Chasen didn't have much of interest to Evans, other than access to the scientific documents of the library. Two example should suffice to illustrate the nature of their relationship. In his initial letter he starts off: "It is rather cheeky of me, but I've appointed myself unofficial collector for the Raffles Museum" while at another point he writes "I should like you to take the second best selection" that is to be result of his collecting efforts. The first was apparently designated for Cambridge University [64]. The impression we get in these letters is that the relationship between himself and Chasen is one of independent equals. Chasen doesn't have the resources that really matter to Evans at this time

giving us an example of the limits on collecting that the lack of availability of appropriate resources can produce.

Museum Space

Perhaps the best resource available to the curator was simply the museum's physical space. Private collectors tend to have definite limits in terms of the physical space they can allot to their collection. There comes a time when a decision must be made: stop collecting or eliminate portions of the collection. But for many, the desire to collect can become something of an obsession not easily quelled. For these individuals "the sense of the identity of one's whole self with one's whole collection frequently creates that most characteristic urge among collectors: to keep the collection together and to prevent the sale or dispersal of it or any part of it" [65]. Hence a third choice: donate the collection to a museum. Of course, this involves an element of risk: "the museum may not judge the whole ensemble to be worthy of reception" [66]. But in many cases this is not the case and a deal can be struck. In the correspondence available to us we find two examples where collecting was at least partially done for the Museum as a means to ensure beforehand the space needed for a serious collection. In April 1936, Dr. Edward Jacobson of Bandoeng Java in the Nethersland East Indies wrote to Chasen requesting help with an article he wanted to have published in "the new ornithological periodical which has been got out by the Director of the Leyden Museum" [67]. In return he offered to collect snakes for the museum. At first sight this is another example of the exchange of expert knowledge for collecting work. However, we learn shortly after that this is not the first collection of snakes Jacobson has made. He tells Chasen that he collected 175 snakes last year and donated them to the Leiden Museum. For Jacobson collecting is a serious hobby as he reveals in his detailed description both of the costs involved in collecting (he has worked it out as a half guilder average per snake) and the means by which he kills the snakes: "[They] are injected my me with spirit and 10% formaline and then rolled round an appropriate bottle to make good show pieces. After soaking in 70% spirit they are soldered in a tin" [68]. He closes the letter in a very professional manner: "Please let me know how many specimens you require of each species. Each species will be represented as much as possible by specimens of different age and different colour varieties" [69]. It is clear that Jacobson greatly enjoys collecting snakes – at one point he writes that "it is a pity that there seems to exist no method to preserve the colours" [70] -- and that his motivation for collecting for the Raffles Museum is not merely to obtain Chasen's expert knowledge. A few choice snake specimens would likely have been enough for that.

Charles R.M. Kelly of the Netherlands East Indies civil service based in Borneo provides a second example of the collector's need for space as an impetus for museum collecting. Kelly wasn't interested in natural history. In the first letter we have from him he writes: "I think the museum already will have a collection of birds, mammals, etc., but perhaps is short of a collection of shields, spears, blow-guns, masks …" Just as with the case of Jacobson, Kelly is a seasoned collector. He tells Chasen that he has recently won first prize in an ethnographic competition in Pontianak entitling him to go to the Pan-Pacific Congress Exhibition in Batavia [71]. Kelly doesn't ask Chasen for any other favours and so, just as with Jacobson, the promise of physical space in the Raffles Museum was at least part of the appeal of this collecting exchange.

There is a second aspect to the museum as physical space – an aspect bound up with the Western notion of museums as sacred places guaranteeing immortality to the objects placed within and hence a measure of immortality to the donor of the objects. Pearce tells us that "museums offer individuals the hope of recognition and a kind of immortality: it is the individual's chance to join the great game" [72]. We can see Chasen use this resource in an attempt to secure Malleson in the collecting network for the museum. After the slab grave has been excavated and moved to the museum he writes Malleson with his request for bird eggs, noting at the end of the letter that the slab grave was assembled "and occupies a prominent place in the centre of our main enthnographical hall". He also promises to "send a photograph when the case is finished. It makes a wonderful show and attracts a lot of attention" [73]. Chasen wants to reassure Malleson that his generous donation has secured a good position among the other "immortal" objects of the museum.

As a final example, we can turn to the trail of correspondence left by E.C. Foenander of the Forestry Department in Perak. Chasen persuaded Foenander to loan to the Raffles Museum a number of "beautiful Seladang heads" [74] that caught his eye while visiting the Selangor Museum. These heads belonged to Foenander who was a big game hunter as well as a forester and he agreed to throw in six elephant tusks as well. Appealing to the sense of immortality and fame that museums convey to their donors through the objects they donate he adds that "your Seladang heads and elephant tusks will be very welcome here … and they will be exhibited in your name in the public galleries" [75]. Of course, as we are used to now, he appends a list of desiderata to this letter: "If ever you notice skins and skulls of tigers and leopards (the spotted variety) for sale anywhere in Malaysian I should be glad if you would remember this museum" [76]. He adds to the appeal further enticement. If Foenander can procure the leopard skin it would be a first: "As far as I know there is not, at the moment, a good skin of the Malayan spotted leopard in any museum in the world" [77]. Foenander's animal parts were popular enough for an article to appear about them in the local press in which Chasen declares that they are "one of the most important acquisitions that the museum has had for many years" which must have greatly pleased Foenander [78].

Conclusion

Scholars interested in the place of the museum in society have not neglected the collections that make up the rationale for that institution's existence. They have also begun to study the process of collecting itself. Both collections and collectors are now seen as an integrally bound together with curators, trustees and the wider public in social networks that created an encompassing framework for their work. This article has illustrated the social nature of the collecting process for a major regional colonial museum. Through the use of the fortunately preserved correspondence of one of its foremost directors it has shown how collecting relationships were created and maintained through the use of a number of resources: money, institutional authority, specimen exchange, expert knowledge, library facilities, and the space of the museum itself.

[1] Tony Bennett, The Birth of the Museum (London: Routledge, 1995); Carla Yanni, Nature's Museums: Victorian Science and the Architecture of Display (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2005); Julia Noordegraaf, Strategies of Display: Museum Presentation in Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Visual Culture (Rotterdam: NAi Publishers, 2004); Kenneth Hudson, A Social History of Museums: What the Visitors Thought (Atlantic Highlands, New

Jersey: Humanities Press, 1975); Susan Sheets-Pyenson, Cathedrals of Science: the Development of Colonial Natural History Museums during the late Nineteenth Century (Kingston & Montreal: McGill & Queen's University Press, 1988).

[2] One exception is: Mark Crinson, 'Nation-building, collecting and the politics of display: the National Museum, Ghana', Journal of the History of Collecting, 13 (2001), 231-250.

[3] Susan Pearce, On Collecting: An Investigation into Collecting in the European Tradition (London: Routledge, 1995), p. 27.

[4] Amiria Henare, Museums, anthropology and imperial exchange (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), p. 3.

[5] Robert Kohler, All Creatures: Naturalists, Collectors, and Biodiversity 1850-1950 (Princeton: Princeton University Press), p.116.

[6] Fiona Kerlogue, 'Theoretical Perspectives and Scholarly Networks': the Development of Collections from the Malay World at the Horniman Museum', Indonesia and the Malay World, 36 (2008), 395-415 (p. 396, 409-410).

[7] Samuel Alberti, 'Objects and the Museum', Isis, 96 (2005), 559-571 (p. 564).

[8] Kohler, p. 126.

[9] Chantal Knowles, 'Reverse Trajectories: Beatrice Blackwood as Collector and Anthropologist', in Hunting the Gatherers: Ethnographic Collectors, Agents and Agency in Melanesia, ed. Michael O'Hanlon and Robert Welsch (New York: Berghahn Books, 2000), pp. 251-272 (p.252).

[10] Khiam Keong Seet, A Place for the People (Singapore: Times Books, 1983).

[11] Michael Tweedie, 'Frederick Nutter Chasen', Ibis, 88 (1946), 527-530.

[12] Frederick Chasen, 'Field Notes on the Birds of Macedonia', Ibis, 3 (1921), 185-227.

[13] Tweedie, p. 530.

[14] Victor Purcell, Memoirs of a Malayan Official (London: Cassell, 1965), p. xxx.

[15] Letter from Chasen to District Officer, Christmas Island, 12 April 1935, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1139.

[16] Letter from H. Henley to Chasen, undated, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1139.

[17] Letter from R. Phillips to Chasen, May 3, 1941, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1140; ‘Singapore as Research Centre for whole of the Far East: Collections to be sent to the Raffles Museum’, Straits Times, 24 February 1935, p. 11.

[18] Letter from Chasen to Henley, 21 December 1931, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1139.

[19] Letter from Chasen to Scott-Skovsko, 20 November 1940, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1140.

[20] Letter from W.E. Lincoln to Chasen, 17 December 1939, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1140.

[21] Letter from M.T. Stephens to Chasen, 21 February 1940, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1140.

[22] Letter from Chasen to A.B. Cobden-Ramsay, 22 December 1931, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1139.

[23] Letter from Tweedie to Mrs. G.A.G. Walker, 18 July 1938, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1140.

[24] Letter from Chasen to C.B. Hadden, 9 March 1939, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1140.

[25] Alberti, p. 564.

[26] Letter from Chasen to W.F. Stutterheim, 4 August 1936, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1139.

[27] Letter from W.F. Stutterheim to Chasen, 22 September 1936, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1139.

[28] Letter from W.F. Stutterheim to Chasen, 15 March 1937, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1139.

[29] Letter from Chasen to G.C.A. Junge, 13 March 1936, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1140.

[30] Letter from G.C.A. Junge to Chasen, 23 April 1936, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1140.

[31] Letter from Chasen to G.C.A. Junge, 8 June 1936, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1140.

[32] Letter from G.C.A. Junge to Chasen, 11 May 1937, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1140.

[33] E. Banks, ‘The Birds of Malaysia: Immense Field Surveyed by FN Chasen’, Straits Times, 27 January 1936, p. 10.

[34] E.J. Woolfolk, ‘Practical Handbook (Book Review: Birds of Malaysia)’, Scientific Monthly, 66 (1948), p. 171-172.

[35] T.R. Ellerman and T.C.S. Morrison-Scott, Supplement to Chasen (1940) A Handlist of Malaysian Mammals (London: British Museum, 1955).

[36] Tweedie, p. 528.

[37] Letter from C.P.J. de Haas to Chasen, 13 April 1939, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1140.

[38] Letter from Chasen to C.P.J. de Haas, 20 April 1939, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1140.

[39] Letter from Miss E.D.H. Cramer to Chasen, 9 April 1941, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1140.

[40] Letter from Chasen to Miss E.D.H. Cramer, 16 April 1941, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1140.

[41] Letter from Miss E.D.H. Cramer to Chasen, 8 May 1941, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1140.

[42] Letter from Chasen to Miss E.D.H. Cramer, 22 May 1941, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1140.

[43] Letter from Chasen to E.O. Shebbeare, 17 January 1939, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1140.

[44] Letter from E.O. Shebbeare to Chasen, 7 February 1939, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1140.

[45] Letter from Chasen to E.O. Shebbeare, 15 March 1939, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1140.

[46] Letter from Chasen to E.O. Shebbeare, 20 April 1939, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1140.

[47] Letter from E.O Shebbeare to Chasen, 25 April 1939, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1140.

[48] Letter from E.O. Shebbeare to Chasen, 7 February 1939, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1140.

[49] Letter from E.O. Shebbeare to Chasen, 3 March 1939; Letter from E.O. Shebbeare to Chasen, 8 April 1939, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1140.

[50] Letter from E.O. Shebbeare to Chasen, 19 February 1940, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1140.

[51] Letter from E.O. Shebbeare to Chasen, 25 May 1939, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1140.

[52] Letter from E.O. Shebbeare to Chasen, 18 January 1940, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1140.

[53] Letter from E.O Shebbeare to Chasen, 13 March 1940; Letter from E.O. Shebbeare to Chasen, 16 March 1940, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1140.

[54] Letter from E.O. Shebbeare to Chasen, 19 February 1940, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1140.

[55] Kohler, p. 124.

[56] Letter from Chasen to B.K. Malleson, 29 May 1935, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1139.

[57] Letter from B.K. Malleson, 18 June 1935, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1139.

[58] Kerlogue, p. 407.

[59] Michael Tweedie, ‘The late Ivor Hugh Norman Evans’, Sarawak Museum Journal 8 (1958), xix-xx.

[60] Letter from I.H.N. Evans to Chasen, 1 October 1939, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1140.

[61] Letter from I.H.N. Evans to Chasen, 19 April 1939, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1140.

[62] Letter from Chasen to I.H.N. Evans, 2 May 1939, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1140.

[63] Letter from I.H.N. Evans to Chasen, 23 May 1939, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1140.

[64] Letter from I.H.N. Evans to Chasen,1 October 1939, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1140.

[65] Pearce, p. 250.

[66] Ibid., p. 250.

[67] Letter from Edward Jacobson to Chasen, 27 April 1939, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1139.

[68] Ibid.

[69] Ibid.

[70] Letter from Edward Jacobson to Chasen, 27 August 1936, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1139.

[71] Letter from R.M. Kelly to Chasen, 1 October 1928, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1139.

[72] Pearce, p. 390.

[73] Letter from Chasen to B.K. Malleson, 15 November 1935, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1139.

[74] Letter from Chasen to E.C. Foenander, 10 January 1940, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1140.

[75] Letter from Chasen to E.C. Foenander, 15 January 1940, National Archives of Singapore, MSA 1139.

[76] Ibid.

[77] Ibid.

[78] ‘Six Pairs of Elephants’ Tusks Loaned to Raffles Museum’, Straits Times, 17 March 1940, p. 11.