

ExpoTime!

The global magazine for growing museum markets

Spring 2013

> 138,090 recipients

[Add me as reader](#)

[Contribute](#)

[Advertise](#)

64 pp.

News

**Stimulating
articles**

Videos

> 60 links

The spectacular
Kunstkammer Vienna
is re-opened!
Room XXIX with the
Saliera by Benvenuto
Cellini.
More on p. 8 and 21
© Kunsthistorisches
Museum Wien



Top Interview



- 5 Sustainable space, games and the increasing variety of museums. Barry Lord on the changes in the museum world. An interview with Anette Rein

Top Story

- 8 The Vienna Kunstkammer reopened



- 9 Christian Koeberl For Chelyabinsk and its predecessors: The New Meteorite Hall at the Natural History Museum, Vienna

- 16 *Shortcuts (News)*

New museum technology



- 21 Nikolaus Johansson The Vienna Kunstkammer illuminated by contemporary lighting art, designed by Olafur Eliasson

- 23 *Shortcuts (News) / Answers from colleagues*

New exhibitions



- 24 Noel McCauley; Tom Duncan In the light of Amarna. 100 Years of the Nefertiti Discovery

- 28 *Exposed (News)*

- 30 *New media*

- 32 *Get together*

- 35 *ad personam*

Top topic



- 37 Anette Rein Competences and responsibilities of ethnographic museums as global actors

Illicit trade, fakes and forgeries



- 47 Christian Müller-Straten At least three museums full of curious treasures – or: Benefactor or Moriarty ?

- 60 *Latest news*

- 61 *The Authors*

Imprint and contacts

Verlag Dr. Christian Mueller-Straten
Kunzweg 23, 81243 Munich, Germany
Phone +49-(0)89-839 690-43, Fax -44
<http://www.museum-aktuell.de>

Contribute

Editor-in-chief: Adelheid Straten, Ph. D.
(responsible, address see above)

Registration as reader

CEO and ads:
Christian Mueller-Straten, Ph. D.
(responsible, address see above)

Advertize

No liability for pictures and manuscripts. All information and data according to best knowledge, but without liability. Opinions of authors do not have to coincide with those of the editor in chief or the publication company. For manuscripts, we prefer British English. Pictures and PDFs: 96 dpi. The title of the magazine is protected by law. Copyright Munich 2013

Anette Rein

Competences and responsibilities of ethnographic museums as global actors¹



In the exhibition “Maori. Die ersten Bewohner Neuseelands” (“Maori, The first inhabitants of New Zealand”²; 1.4.-14.10.2012), the Linden-Museum in Stuttgart was exhibiting several historical cloaks in different display cases.

Maori cloaks (*kakahu*), made from the shiny New Zealand flax, were traditionally woven by women using a special technique called finger-weaving (*whatu*).³ During the weaving process the women had to comply with several taboos, such as not eating or drinking, or working when menstruating. The preparation of the flax fibres and the delicate weaving process required all their concentration if it was to be successful⁴. It was believed that the woven thread connects ances-

tors with their descendants.⁵ The production of a single cloak took about one year. Some of the weavers “signed” the cloaks on the back with their individual little pattern in red. These cloaks of different material, of different length and with different decoration, were extraordinary objects because they represented more than simply status and prestige for their owners. These items were not made to remain in the hands of one owner but had to circulate. While cloaks were regularly exchanged between chiefs, or important men and women, their temporary owners could accumulate the concentrated *mana* (spiritual power) connected with the cloaks. If a cloak – after the long journey from one hand to the next – returned to its first owner (which happened in only a few cases) this represented the



Two Maori cloaks. Left: *tukakumai* made and owned by Kohai Grace 2010, right: *kaitaka* with *taniko* border, 19th century. Linden-Museum Stuttgart. Photo: © Rein 2012⁶

greatest amount of mana or spiritual power, an owner could accumulate.

However, mana as spiritual power was not only allocated to a cloak as a valuable material object. The concept has to be understood as a complex system of elements that have to be in harmony so that mana can be present. A cloak alone was a very powerful item, but to activate mana for its owner, his/her cloak had to be worn and had to be connected, for example with the landscape, ancestors, the tribe, the language (te reo), the other taonga (ancestral treasures worn by the prestigious people of the tribe), the moko (tattoo), and the personality of the owner, who had to have a special attitude while wearing the cloak.

From a Maori perspective, through the special weaving technique these cloaks have their own voices. Consequently, any presentation in a museum requires a special approach and usually the request is for a display as close as possible to how the cloaks would look when worn. The result can be seen on Figure 1, on the cloak on the right, which is wrapped around a stand resembling the shape of a human body.⁷ The contemporary artist Kohai Grace, creator of the second cloak, seen in the centre, agreed to the flat hanging of her artefact.

Referring to the concept of *mana* and the belief in the spiritual power of any cloak woven with the finger technique, the decoration of the display case seems to be a very poor one that fails to communicate the vivid Maori spiritual traditions. The complex narrative is reduced to a fixed position and the objects are presented as “glass-cased ... to be gazed upon, admired, and understood only in relation to themselves”⁸ and in relation to the biography of the one who admires them. This follows the Western art concept and mediates the aesthetic quality of the objects. Neither the process of decoration together with the dialogues between the curators and the Maoris, nor the reduction or fragmentation into single, material or technical aspects of the displayed items is mentioned in the text (“*Sozialer Status*”) seen in the display case or in the catalogue. Although the curators corresponded with Maori representatives, the displayed cloaks underwent a process of “musealization”, which will be discussed in detail below.

Processes of musealization⁹

According to Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett¹⁰, all ethnographic objects are “an art of excision, of detachment, an art of excerpt. Where does the object begin and where does it end? ... Shall we exhibit the ‘collected’ cup with the saucer, the tea, the cream and sugar, the spoon, the napkin and placement, the table, the chair the rug? Where do we stop? Where do we make the cut?” She prefers not to talk about “ethnographic

objects” but about “ethnographic fragments”, created by ethnographers who made their personal choice in the field, segmented, detached, and carried the artefacts away to become part of a museum collection. The different steps are elaborated in the process of musealisation which, according to Anja Laukötter, consists of three steps.¹¹ Figuratively they correspond with the classic model of liminality in rituals that, following Arnold van Gennep¹², can be summarized colloquially as: **remove - recreate - re-integrate**.¹³

First: **removed** from their original context, the things are robbed of their function - they are taken out of time and space - in order to be exported in this still **unclean** condition for further processing.

Second: the semantic change of the objects takes place along a prescribed path through the various departments of the museum: in a process of gassing, inventory, conservation, restoration and declaration. They are integrated into the museum’s system of rules and regulations in the workrooms far from the public eye. Dislodged from their true symbolic context, the objects are sorted according to principles of materiality, authenticity, analogy, causality or functionality and then assigned to a culture - ergo, **recreated**. In this second step, the prerogative of interpretation is defined after physical appropriation has taken place. The objects become scientifically legitimized and are often declared exceptional. Specially chosen pieces are given this mark of quality by labelling them as “top exhibit” or “masterpiece” for the general public.¹⁴ An object that has been sanctified in this way comes to represent an entire culture, since ethnographic museums never show the people themselves, but only their forms of cultural expression.¹⁵

Third: the last step of musealization is its exhibition. The visitors’ individual perspectives give things their exclusive aura and thus turn them into museum objects.¹⁶ Their new status is now also perceived by the public and thus they are **reintegrated**.

“For the museum context, a single object was not sufficient. Instead, it needed ... an exhibited collection in order to fulfil the expectations that had been created.”¹⁷ Only with the help of the presented objects, a sheer vast mass of things, could e.g. ethnographical museums convincingly demonstrate to the public their expertise in the mastery of knowledge and the interpretation of the world in the midst of the ostensible chaos of cultural diversity. The final decision of what is shown in an exhibition, and in what way, resides with the curator - the established scientific expert.¹⁸ For a better understanding about changing paradigms in collecting and exhibiting ethnographic objects, let us have a brief look into the history of museums.

The beginnings of ethnographic museums

In Europe of the 16th and 17th centuries, collecting became an obsession of rulers, aristocrats, churches and, later, of academics. The natural sciences had not yet developed and people worldwide collected exciting and exotic things for their curio galleries.¹⁹ Such collections were intended to prove that the objects therein were examples of the varieties of the creational act. The criteria for collected pieces were the unusual and the rare. Ethnographic objects were seen as equal to European ones and all artefacts were presented according to their material conditions and functions. Neither the provenance nor the traditional context was of interest to the collectors. The owners of these galleries invited one another to private soirees where together they enjoyed the contemplation of items characterized by curiosity and marvel. The emotional reactions of the visitors can be described as ranging from defence to longing. The combination of the object's presentation was dictated by the personal inclinations of their owners. The collection of artefacts was regarded as a demonstration of the owner's power, wealth and knowledge, and simultaneously as a representation of the cosmos. A possible explanation for this passion for collecting and amassing artefacts is that Europeans slowly started to recognize that Europe had to be seen and understood in a wider context. As a consequence of the rise of worldwide travel, all the theories formally used to understand the world were put to the test.

By the end of the 17th century, the natural sciences were born and the politics of collecting changed. The great expeditions of James Cook to the South Seas in the 18th century brought for the first time masses of ethnographic objects to the European market. At this point, specialized collecting politics emerged with a new way of systematizing objects. The former universalism vanished and an ambiguity arose regarding the way in which ethnographic objects should be categorized. In the 19th century, the majority of large national museums and some of the ethnographic museums were founded. Step by step these collections were opened to the interested public: bourgeoisie, workers women, men, and children. Compared to the former practice of exclusive events for a selected public, the process of the democratization of knowledge began. After the closure of the curio cabinets and the handing over of collections to the new museums (such as natural history museums or historical museums), primitive people were regarded institutionally as being part of nature, comparable to flora and fauna. "The choice of the term ,ethnographic'²⁰ [object] was based on the assumption that mankind's differences were not only physical, as the anthropological collections demonstrated, but also cultural, and that physical and the cultural were closely linked."²¹

Ethnographic items were now organized according to a

system similar to a natural science system: according to their geographical provenience and similarity of their forms and classified according to an imagined stage of civilization. Questions arose as to how far these objects represented an original primitive world, the bottom of a pyramid of human evolution, which culminated in the white Anglo-Saxon male. In addition, the colonial exhibitions, which were the origins of many ethnographic museums, offered panoramas of power in which imperial hierarchies were on display."²²

Museum display labels foregrounded the predominance of the **white man** and his cultural and industrial achievements. Hence without any comprehensive concept, great numbers of objects entered museum collections. In the best cases, contextual knowledge about the artefact's origins, such as time, place and ethnic group was acquired and presented. As Nélia Dias has shown, ethnographic museums in France in the 19th century, conceived as democratic spaces at the service of the public, aimed to provide spaces for visualizing human difference, particularly racial and cultural differences. "Moreover, ethnographic museums attempted to display the progress of human civilization by linking race and progress."²³

According to Andrew Zimmermann, the "Berlin Museum was not merely a place in which anthropological objects, already defined as not-art, were stored; it was also an apparatus that rendered them as not-art and therefore as objects of natural science in the first place. This transformation was enacted largely by glass and iron cases designed specifically for the museum (known as the 'Berlin iron case')"²⁴ and which produced a new kind of museum display. The iron cases allowed daylight to fall onto masses of ethnographic objects and their arrangement in parallel rows in large halls which enabled the visitor to "view the contents of a number of cases simultaneously. From almost any position, the viewer's gaze passed through multiple cases thus creating what was referred to as a 'total impression' (*Total-Eindruck*) of the artefacts."²⁵

The attitude of collectors at this time, vis-à-vis those they took items from, can be exemplified by the way in which human remains were merchandised all over the world. The remains were not treated like human belongings, but rather as objects serving the scientific purpose of gaining knowledge about human races. Individual personality and respect for the Other were totally disregarded. Collectors gathered information about objects by interviewing only chiefs (or their translators) about specific issues. Their motto was: „One tribe – one chief – one voice“. Interviews with people of different generations or addressing gender issues were largely absent. The objects were displayed according to geographical and technological series that stressed their scientific rather than an aesthetic dimension.²⁶ Defining them as artefacts, specimens, and

documents (not as art) was a key strategy for securing the scientific status of anthropology as a scientific field studying the distinction between the so-called natural and cultural peoples.²⁷ In the “Berlin iron cases” the ethnographic items were presented as being artless, cultureless, and ahistorical.²⁸

Exhibiting the other(s) in the 20th century

Up until the 1930s, many exhibitions in Europe and the USA included people from overseas, especially imported for the shows, under the heading: “Wild people, wild animals”. They were primarily put on display in zoological gardens and world exhibitions. According to Kirshenblatt-Gimblett,²⁹ the museum institution took over the new role of offering events which could have been visited in theatres before. It “was particularly useful in England and the United States during the early nineteenth century because performances that would have been objectionable to conservative Protestants if staged in a theatre were acceptable when presented in a museum ... This reframing of performance in terms of nature, science, and education rendered it respectable” At the time, the museums world wanted to represent the power of the colonial states opposed to the colonized. A big step forward in changing discriminatory perspectives of the Other was the disentanglement of artefacts from the evolutionary system and the establishment of a new approach to evaluation based on cultural criteria. The height of the dioramas was reached after their introduction in the 19th cent. and museums began to reconstruct scenes that offered insight into cultural background, such as scenes of ordinary daily and religious life.

The shift from showing exhibitions about cultural differences (e.g. in the *Trocadéro* in Paris 1878) to cultural equality started in France with the newly designed *Musée de L'Homme* in 1937. According to Dias, the museum's focus on equal worth has to be considered from a double perspective: recognition of cultural diversity and its complexity in the spirit of relativism and the rejection of human hierarchy. Evolutionism as a theoretical framework was categorically rejected.³⁰ “By emphasizing racial and cultural equality, the *Musée de l'Homme* recognized the possibility of alternative social and cultural forms. This institution left aside the issue of artistic manifestation, a sensitive domain that would risk calling into question its relativist message as well as the status of French (and Western) art ... the acknowledgement of the diversity of cultures and of their equal worth did not necessarily imply the willingness to accept their artistic equality.”³¹

Since the 1970s, thanks to the demands of New Museology, the sole claim to expert status in dealing with the world has been broken by the active participation of those affected from the countries of origin in the interpretation of the world. This was the beginning of the

ongoing process of deconstructing expert knowledge and the role of the curator versus the knowledge of laymen. Since then, with new educational programmes and new political challenges, museums put more effort into working and engaging with public expectations. Visitors demanded to know more about people from other countries: how they lived, how they worked and their thoughts and opinions about life. New technical media, such as photography and video, were introduced into museum exhibitions. In the 80s, academic discussions started regarding the relationship between the aura of an object and the use of technical equipment.

Ethnographical exhibitions which tried to meet this need invited people from abroad (as seen from Germany) to share information about their way of life, for example, in the Museum of World Cultures in Frankfurt am Main in 2002³² the exhibition “*Indian Times. Nachrichten aus dem roten Amerika*” with the two guest curators Christian Feest from the Goethe University Frankfurt am Main and Foster Kalama from the Warm Springs Reservation in Oregon; or in 2006 “*Ma Lakota! Indianische Kindheit in Nordamerika*” together with the guest curator Arthur Amiotte from the Akta-Lakota-Museum, presented in the Intercultural Atelier (IKAT) of the Museum.³³

Despite these attempts to restage the cultural meanings of collection items, the reconstructed “native point of view” remained subordinated to the dominant Western, perspective. Up until the present day, the voices of the Other(s) have been excluded from the majority of museum presentations. Although there have been lengthy debates about this difficult issue, many museums are still missing key concepts of collecting and documentation for working with, at times vast, **unknown** collections. Museum artefacts have been presented under Eurocentric measures of value in three principle ways: exoticising (emphasizing difference = in situ with reconstructed habitats, assimilating (emphasizing similarities = art exhibitions) and encyclopaedic exhibitions, which follow mixed strategies.³⁴ A classic ethnographic exhibition mirrors the traditional Western scientific way of bringing systematic order into the world with objects, languages and with clear borders for the living areas of tribal societies. In those displays one will not find any interviews with people about their view on their cultural environment or their ways of organizing their life styles. Nothing will be mediated about what the source communities think about the use of their ancestral objects in a museum's exhibition.³⁵

Another way of presenting ethnographic artefacts still relies on a geographical background but chooses all-embracing categories like the “the world of women” or “the world of men”. In such a case typical items and their different use by both sexes are shown. Tribal

borders are of less interest. According to the chosen topics, suitable artefacts from different tribes are used to exemplify gender roles in society.³⁶ Following such a functionalistic approach, which became fashionable in museum practice since the 50s, objects are shown as being part of a holistic cultural concept. They are interpreted as tangible illustrations of abstract, non-material and cognitive correlations representing social organization and also used as an expression of religious rituals. In this approach the “indigenous point of view” is not simulated, but the cultural context of the objects is explained and interpreted e.g. in texts and displays.³⁷

The assimilative concept presents ethnographic artefacts as “pure” art objects following a formal, aesthetic viewpoint - now treating former “ethnographic objects” like Western “art objects”. I coined the term art-party

to describe an influential group of the curators. This group defends the high aesthetic and technical quality of the artefacts made by tribal societies. They reclassified these artefacts and display them in the same way as Western art is usually shown in Art Museums or Art Galleries. In these exhibitions, the object itself and its composition are the focus, together with the artist (the “culture” where it comes from became of less interest).³⁸ Those new defined art objects are presented isolated for aesthetic contemplation, completely removed from their cultural context or suggestion of an original use. In the absence of any given context, objects are interpreted by visitors on an individual basis, grounded in personal experience and knowledge. Within these different approaches the current concept of the Museum of World Cultures³⁹ in Frankfurt am Main uses a method which can be connected with artists working in the early 20th cent., such as Pablo Picasso and Emil Nolde. Ac-



Fig 2: Inter alia, the artist Simon Popper comments on his work in the museum: “Then again, a museum is like a supermarket. They move eggs and milk around, and there are objects from different part of the world that can have different ages and different prices. Some are luxurious, some are cheap. It’s the same as going to a shop. There are new products on display, and it is accessible to everyone... I also focused on ceramic pots from Peru, which have pairings on the shapes and images that you could find on them. Both these objects are gifts...The Moche pots from Peru are buried with the dead. Both (+Ibeji carvings)⁴³ have this unique quality of something that has to accompany an individual into their after-life.”⁴⁴. Foto: Museum of World Cultures © 2012

cording to Andrew Zimmerman “artists in Germany and France turned to the objects assembled in ethnographic museums as sources of inspiration for their own paintings.”⁴⁰ This use of ethnographic objects has generally been presented as an important step in the history of artistic modernism. In 2012 e.g. in Frankfurt am Main, seven directly invited contemporary artists⁴¹ choose from within the ethnographic museum’s collection of about 65 000 objects those which inspired them to create their own art object. The exhibition “Object Atlas. Fieldwork in the museum”⁴² presented their creations (as pictures, films, texts or objects) together with their ethnographic muses, as can be seen in the figure below.

This newest concept in Frankfurt am Main seems to be a mixture of an art exhibition together with the engagement of the museum with its own past⁴⁵ or its own collection. The artists used the concept of anthropological fieldwork to study the historical objects with their “new” eyes and interpreted them according to their own imaginations. Ethnographic information is largely absent, voices of social anthropologists or collectors are excluded, and the history of the artefacts remain hidden. According to Wolfgang Leuschner and Mathis Bromberger, the output of the contemporary artists are in their subjectivity comparable with the answers to the pictures used in a Rorschach test by psychologists.⁴⁶

Whereas most of the ethnographic museums show different types of exhibitions at the same time, the *Rautenstrauch-Joest Museum. Kulturen der Welt* in Co-

logne chose for its new building, which opened in October 2010, a single approach embracing the permanent display. As it says in the Museum leaflet, on 3,600 m² are presented “People in their worlds. Outstanding exhibits from Africa, Asia, Oceania and the Americas”.⁴⁷ In this display any geographical systematization is excluded by a thematic one, which shall be exchanged regularly with a new thematic focus. For the first period, they decided to concentrate on “themes which move people all over the world, but which they address differently depending on regional and cultural influences. The comparative cultural approach emphasizes the equality and validity of all cultures and provides impulses for thought and stimulating dialogue. The inclusion of our own culture in this comparative approach goes some way towards relativising our viewpoint ...The theme complex ‘Comprehending the World’ is devoted to four different kinds of encounters with other cultures from the **European point of view**. ‘Shaping the World’ which with five sub-themes provides a multitude of insights into different ways of life in different times and places.”⁴⁸ An impressive scenography⁴⁹ with manifold space images intensifies the experience of the different topics on display. In the space image “*Ansichtssachen?! Kunst!*” the museum shows objects as art objects as well as offering information about the ethnographic context on demand.

Special display cases were created for this part of the exhibition, where visitors can decide whether to see an object as a pure art piece or, when pressing a button, to learn more about the context of each piece. The



“Ansichtssachen?! Kunst!” (A matter of perception). Photos: © Atelier Brückner⁵⁰

information is projected behind the object on the back board of the display case (s. fig. 3, 4).

However, it remains unclear who identifies with the labels “us” or “European” mentioned in the museum’s leaflet. The big question: “Who is speaking?” is not a special theme of the whole exhibition. Taking the text seriously, it seems that the *Rautenstrauch-Joest Museum* speaks on behalf of all Europeans with one voice (Director? Curator? Conservator? Designer?) vis-à-vis the Other(s).⁵¹

Vision for ethnographical museums as global actors

Ethnographical museums have a special mission within the museum scene. Their collections are generally a mixture that includes archaeological items, high art objects (also from the perspective of their producers), items from daily life and religious objects. One principal duty of an ethnographical museum is to be a forum for the presentation of the concepts of different traditions, cultures and individual voices within different cultures/traditions and identities in different time periods. This means that, in addition to the study of objects, human beings themselves should be the focus of research and mediation.

Paul Goodwin highlights the fact “that in a global world, cultural identity is no longer limited to the singular categories of race, gender, sexuality, class or national identity. Instead, global technologies have inspired the non-stop flow of ideas and communication, whilst the social trends of exile, travel and migration have effected a wide-scale and constant movement of people across borders. Whereas the power relations of the modernist and post-colonial modes could be defined by the negotiation between two subjects: colonizer and colonized; oppressor and oppressed; museum and public; there is no such sense of centre and periphery in the culturally plural mode, where boundaries of nationhood, community and identity are called into question.” As Homi Bhabha points out, these notions of cultural fixity have been replaced by “a complex on-going negotiation - amongst minorities, against assimilation.”⁵² The conventional Enlightenment subjectivities (national, imperial, modern) are refracted in multiple identities (local, regional, transnational, global, sexual, urban and so forth) and the Other becomes OtherS⁵³ “(differentiated by ‘race’, class, gender, national origin, lifestyle and so forth). The earlier idea that representation of others must either be exoticising or assimilating ignores other options – such as recognizing differences without exoticising, others as counterparts in dialogue, or oneself as an other.”⁵⁴

Following Silaja Suntharalingam,⁵⁵ “museums are increasingly moving away from the ‘notion of the curator as the sole interpretator, handling down wisdom to a

passive public. Instead, a space is being created for dialogue, interaction and the complex on-going negotiation’⁵⁶ between museum, visitor and artist. In terms of ‘play’, museums in a globalised world are increasingly becoming ‘intermediaries’ and laboratories for experimenting with new cultural combinations and encounters’⁵⁷. The new approach focuses on the experiences of the individual.⁵⁸ We have reached a point within the museum sphere where we have to discover new voices in old collections. The museum as a social construct, a purveyor of ideologically charged notions of knowledge and historical truth must evolve into a reflective, exploratory cultural space where existing collections speak in new voices. According to Susan Pearce, this implies a major shift in museum management and attitudes.⁵⁹ One future challenge for museums will be to show cultural systematic and diversity knowledge.⁶⁰

Multiculturalism has brought the natives home and with the end of the grand narrative of modernity the other(s) became OtherS. This opens up a new field of cultural flux of “subjugated knowledges”, of nomadic knowledge and crosscultural translations.⁶¹

Ethnographic museums have to abandon the discourse of the other(s) in favour of opening their archives and displays to the social network around the collections to be worked on in a participative / inclusive relational way as the one method of accepting the equivalency of intellectual contemporaneity (*Zeitgenossenschaft*) worldwide. There should be no limitation of the acknowledgment of OtherS as intellectual contemporary counterparts with their own item centred view about the basic questions of humans living together in one world. As James Clifford formulated it: “Gone are the days when cultural anthropologists could without contradiction, present ‘the Native point of view,’... ,the anthropologist’ – broadly and sometimes stereotypically defined – has become a negative alter ego in contemporary indigenous discourse, invoked as the epitome of arrogant, intrusive colonial authority.”⁶²

Ethnographical museums seem to be in deep crisis. With regard to their collections, many of them are overwhelmed by an inability to speak. They have long since lost their authorised voices: those of the collectors, of colonialism and, furthermore, those of the scientists who do research on ethnographic artefacts. How long will ethnographic museums lick their wounds, cultivating the litany of trauma because of the loss of the ‘carte blanche’ for colonial and scientific authority? “Contemporary expectations are extremely high and no single museum could cover all aspects of centuries of colonization, adaptation, transformation, changing economic and governmental pressures, counterhistories of cultural ‘repatriation’ ... ongoing oral traditions and indigenous epistemologies.”⁶³

Ethnographic museums should see the obstacles and

take their opportunities. They should become aware of the great treasure of knowledge and artefacts they have accumulated over recent centuries. Positioned between indigenous “myth” and Western “science”,⁶⁴ they have to embrace their politically responsible role, presenting a platform for contemporary diverse and cross-cultural dialogues about different knowledge systems and life concepts.

Notes

- ¹ This is the revised form of my article first published in *Etnolog* 22/2012, pp. 193-213. You find a detailed bibliography under <http://www.etno-muzej.si/sl/etnolog>, pp. 189-191. Many thanks to my colleague mag. Ralf Čeplak Mencin who accompanies my work on museums since years.
- ² Translated by the author
- ³ Many thanks to Lisa Renard who gave an exciting workshop about the weaving process and the concept of *mana* in the Linden-Museum on 6 May 2012 and who did the proof reading of this text. As an expert on Maori traditions she inspired me to use the exhibited cloaks as a classical example for the situation in which curators are caught between the devil and the deep blue sea while displaying only fragments of ethnographic contexts.
- ⁴ I decided to use the past tense because I mainly rely on an old cloak. But as Lisa Renard has pointed out, even today the women have to respect several taboos during the weaving process.
- ⁵ Heermann & Veys 2012, p. 78
- ⁶ Thanks to Inès de Castro for approving the publication of my picture.
- ⁷ Ingrid Heermann e-mail: 10 May 2012. “While preparing items for a display case, the voice of the conservators is one of the strongest. If they decide that a hanging of the cloaks would damage the cloak, there is no other way than of a lying position for the textiles - although this contradicts the concepts of the Maori completely” (Renard 2012, oral comment)
- ⁸ Macdonald 1999, p. 2
- ⁹ Rein 2011b
- ¹⁰ Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1990, p. 388
- ¹¹ Laukötter 2010, p. 120
- ¹² In 1909, Van Gennep described the structure of rites of passage for the first time. In the exhibition *Reisen und Entdecken. Vom Sepik an den Main* (October 27, 2007-August 30, 2009) the various steps of musealization were staged and explained in a companion book to the exhibition (cf. Raabe 2008)
- ¹³ In German the terms are *raus - rüber - rein*.
- ¹⁴ See: *Being Object - Being Art. Meisterwerke aus den Sammlungen des Museums der Weltkulturen Frankfurt am Main*, <http://www.mdw-frankfurt.de/Deutsch/> (March 21, 2010).
- ¹⁵ Köstering 2003, p. 17
- ¹⁶ Laukötter 2010, p. 121
- ¹⁷ Id.
- ¹⁸ Laukötter 2010, p. 122
- ¹⁹ Cabinet of wonders or curiosity (Golding 2011:38)
- ²⁰ Instead of calling it an ,art object‘.
- ²¹ Dias 2006, p. 175
- ²² Nederveen Pietersee 2005, p. 164
- ²³ Dias 2006:175. See also Macdonald 1999, p.12

- ²⁴ Zimmermann 2006, p. 287
- ²⁵ Id.
- ²⁶ Dias 2006, p. 178
- ²⁷ Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 2006, p. 362
- ²⁸ Zimmermann 2006:296
- ²⁹ Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1990, p. 397ff
- ³⁰ Dias 2006, p. 181
- ³¹ Dias 2006, p. 179f
- ³² Rein 2009/10
- ³³ “Ma Lakota! Indian Childhood in North America” was on display from 13 February until 27 August 2006. <http://www.frankfurt-live.com> (visited 20.02.2006); booklet of the exhibition.
- ³⁴ Neverdeen Pieterse 2005:164f. Dias 2006, p. 182
- ³⁵ For a more detailed description of an exhibition in Dresden see Rein 2010
- ³⁶ See Rein 2009/10 and Raabe 2008
- ³⁷ Förster 1999, p. 40f
- ³⁸ Förster 1999, p. 41. For a more in-depth discussion, see Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 2006
- ³⁹ In 2001 the museum changed its name from *Museum für Völkerkunde* into *Museum der Weltkulturen / Museum of World Cultures*. Since then any suggested change to another name has been refused by the city councillors. (<http://www.stvv.frankfurt.de/parlis2/parlis.php>; visited 10.03.2012)
- ⁴⁰ Zimmermann 2006, p. 279
- ⁴¹ Helke und Thomas Byerle, Marc Camille Chaimovitz, Sunah Choi, Antje Majewski, Otobong Nkanga and Simon Popper. In addition to the invited artists, drawings and photographs by Alf Bayerle (1982) are also shown. From 25 January until 16 September 2012
- ⁴² Addition by the author
- ⁴³ Quote from the booklet p. 29
- ⁴⁴ Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 2006, p. 363
- ⁴⁵ Leuschner & Bromberger 2012, p. 27
- ⁴⁶ http://www.museenkoeln.de/rautenstrauch-joest-museum/download/Hausflyer_engl.pdf (visited 6. 5. 2012). Fig.: 3, 4: „Ansichtssachen?! Kunst!“ (A matter of perception)⁵⁰; © Atelier Brückner
- ⁴⁷ http://www.museenkoeln.de/rautenstrauch-joest-museum/download/Hausflyer_engl.pdf (visited 13. 5. 2012). Emphasis by the author
- ⁴⁸ Atelier Brückner Stuttgart http://www.atelier-brueckner.com/nc/projekte/museen/rautenstrauchjoest-museum-koeln.html?tx_photogals_elementid=238&tx_photogals_image=9 (visited 6.5.12)
- ⁴⁹ Thanks to Uwe Brückner, who provided these pictures.
- ⁵⁰ For further examples about alternative ways of thinking about ethnographic items see pp. 204-210 in *Etnolog*: <http://www.etno-muzej.si/sl/etnolog>
- ⁵¹ Goodwin 2009, interview with Silaja Suntharalingam; quoted in Suntharalingam 2009:2. Bhaba quoted in Suntharalingam 2009, p. 2. “The emergence of an accompanying rhetoric for global culture is reflected by the proliferation of new terms such as ,inter-cultural‘, ‘trans-cultural‘ and ‘ross-cultural‘. These terms are increasingly being used to displace the well-known politicized terms of ‘cultural diversity‘ and ‘multiculturalism‘.”
- ⁵² Referring to the concept from Jan Neverdeen Pieterse, I would like to introduce a special notation for OtherS. The fragmenting aspects of each individual’s identity becomes more obvious in a big ‘O’ and a big ‘S’ instead of writing e.g. ‘others’ /‘Others’
- ⁵³ Neverdeen Pieterse 2005, p. 165
- ⁵⁴

- ⁵⁵ Suntharalingam 2009, p. 2f
⁵⁶ Bhaba Beyond the pale: Art in the age of multicultural translation, p. 22. Quoted in Suntharalingam 2009, p. 3.
⁵⁷ Pietersee Multiculturalism..., p.178. Quoted in Suntharalingam 2009, p. 3
⁵⁸ Paine 2000, p. 157
⁵⁹ Pearce 2002
⁶⁰ Bush 2005, p. 17
⁶¹ Neverdeen Pietersee 2007, p. 130
⁶² Clifford 2004, p. 5
⁶³ Clifford 2004, p. 27
⁶⁴ Clifford 2004, p. 19

Literature

- Basu, Paul; ALIVIZATU Marilena: ARCLG64 Museum History & Theory. The Museum: Critical Perspectives. 2009, <http://moodle.ucl.ac/course/view.php?id=5817>, visited 15.5.2010
- Bush, Martin: Shifting sands: museum representations of science and indigenous knowledge traditions. In: Open Museum Journal 2005, Vol. 7, pp. 1-17
- Clifford, James: Looking several ways: anthropology and native heritage in Alaska. In: Current Anthropology 2004, Vol. 45:1, pp. 15-30
- Dias, Nélia: 'What's in a name?' Anthropology, museums and values: 1927-2006. In: Cordula Grewe (ed.): Die Schau des Fremden. Ausstellungskonzepte zwischen Kunst, Kommerz und Wissenschaft. Stuttgart 2006, pp. 361-376
- Stuttgart 2006, pp. 169-185
- Golding, Vivian: Learning at the museum frontiers: identity, race and power. Burlington 2009
- Förster, Larissa: Ethnographisches Objekt versus Kunstobjekt. In: Iwalewa Forum 3, 1999, pp. 39-59
- Heermann, Ingrid; VEYS, Fanny Wonu (eds.): Maori: die ersten Bewohner Neuseelands. Stuttgart 2012
- Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara: Objects of ethnography. In: Ivan Karpp; Steven D. Lavine (ed.): Exhibiting cultures: the poetics and politics of museum display. Washington 1990, pp. 386-443
- Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara: Reconfiguring museums: an afterword. In: Cordula Grewe... Stuttgart 2006, pp. 361-376
- Köstering, Susanne: Natur zum Anschauen: das Naturkundemuseum des Deutschen Kaiserreichs: 1871-1914. Köln 2003
- Laukötter, Anja: Kultur in Vitrinen: zur Bedeutung der Völkerkundemuseen im beginnenden 20. Jahrhundert. In: Ursel Berger (ed.): Wilde Welten: Aneignung des Fremden in der Moderne. Berlin 2010, pp. 109-126
- Leuschner, Wolfgang; Bromberger Mathis: Eine Reuse ist kein Rorschachtest: fremde Kulturen kolonialisiert: das neue Konzept des Weltkulturenmuseums in Frankfurt. In: Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, 30.5.2012, p. 27
- Macdonald, Sharon: Exhibitions of powers and powers of exhibition. In: Sharon Macdonald (ed.): The politics of display: museums, science, culture: an introduction to the politics of display. London 1999, pp. 1-24
- Museum der Weltkulturen: Ma Lakota!: Indian childhood in North America. Frankfurt 2006
- Nederveen Pieterse, Jan: Multiculturalism and museums: discourse about others in the age of globalisation. In: G. Corsane (ed.): Heritage, museums and galleries: an introductory reader. London 2007, pp. 163-183
- Nederveen Pieterse, Jan: Ethnicities and global multiculturalism: pants for an octopus. Lanham 2007
- Paine, Crispin (ed.): Godly things: museums, objects and religion. London 2000
- Pearce, Susan: A new way of looking at old things collections. 2002, http://portal.unesco.org/culture/es/ev.php-URL_ID=2284&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html#new, visited 18.6.2012
- Raabe, Eva (ed.): Reisen und Entdecken: vom Sepik an den Main: Hintergründe einer Ausstellung. Frankfurt am Main 2008
- Rein, Anette: One object — many voices: the museum is no 'neutral' place. In: MUSEUM AKTUELL No. 165, 2009/10, pp. 9-18
- Rein, Anette: What is a museum - a collection of objects or a network of social relationships? In: MUSEUM AKTUELL No. 174, 2010, pp. 46-52
- Rein, Anette: Sacred ritual or profane 'event' culture? How can ritual objects and performances in museums be shown with integrity? In: MUSEUM AKTUELL No. 181, 2011, pp. 22-27 (2011a)
- Rein, Anette: Flee(t)ing dances!: initiatives for the preservation and communication of intangible world heritage in museums. In: Gabriele Klein; Sandra Noeth (ed.): Emerging bodies: the performance of worldmaking in dance and choreography. Bielefeld 2011, pp. 93-106 (2011b)
- Steiner, Christoph B.: Rights of passage: on the luminal identity of art in the border zone. In: Fred R. Myres (ed.): The empire of things. Oxford 2001, pp. 207-232
- Suntharalingam, Silaja: Tate Triennale 2009: positioning global strategies at Tate Britain. In: Edition 5 Tate Encounters. <http://www2.tate.org.uk/tate-encounters/edition-5/Silaja-Suntharalingam-Tate-Triennial-2009.pdf>, visited 14.05.2012
- Van Gennep, Arnold: Les rites de passage. Paris 1909
- Weltkulturen Museum 2012. *Object atlas: fieldwork in the museum. Dialogues between art and anthropology with Lothar Baumgarten...* to accompany the Exhibition "Object Atlas — Fieldwork in the Museum" at the Weltkulturen-Museum, Frankfurt am Main, 25.1.-16.6.2012. Clémentine Deliss (ed.). Bielefeld
- Zimmerman, Andrew: From natural science to primitive art. In: Cordula Grewe... Stuttgart 2006, pp. 278-300



- | | |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| ○ measure climate data | Ing.-Büero Hans-G. Wolf |
| ○ monitor climate online | Climate and Computer |
| ○ collect measuring data | Goesselbarg 1a |
| ○ evaluate data if required | D-23847 Siebenbaumen |
| ○ record monitored data | Phone +49 (0)4501-822 601 |
| ○ provide them at your PC | Fax +49 (0)4501-822 603 |

Internet: www.ClimaControl.de / E-Mail: info@ClimaControl.de
 Data Transmission via Radio, LAN or Bus