

# 10

## THE ART OF ANTHROPOLOGY

### Questioning Contemporary Art in Ethnographic Display

*Haidy Geismar*

This chapter explores the dynamic relationship between contemporary art and anthropology from multiple perspectives. In recent volumes specifically investigating the relationship of contemporary art and anthropology, the focus is primarily on the capacities of both art and anthropology to represent social worlds,<sup>1</sup> and there is surprisingly little discussion of the border zones and aesthetic frames that define contemporary art as a specific material genre and institutionalized practice.<sup>2</sup>

The term “contemporary art” refers, most broadly, to art of the present. However, in its actual usage the term encodes many assumptions about practices by specific people who make specific things in particular places and spaces. Unless such works were displayed in a contemporary art gallery or written about by leading art critics in mainstream art publications or websites, it is unlikely that the sketches of the Women’s Institute Saturday afternoon life drawing class, for example, or the finger paintings of nursery school children would be defined as contemporary art. However, alongside an “art world” understanding of contemporary art (Danto 1964; Becker 1984; Danto 1988) there is a healthy body of literature within the anthropology of art that insists on thinking through art in terms of particular kinds of formal qualities and effects (Forge 1973; Gell 1998; Layton 2003; Morphy 2007). Anthropologists of art insist on locating these aesthetic artifacts within their social context, emphasizing how particular forms resonate with techniques of display, modes of collecting, and institutional and political frames to define what art is (see, e.g., T. Bennett 1995; Marcus and Myers 1995; Myers 2002). Despite this contextual approach, there are surprisingly few explorations of the surprising homogeneities and hegemonies evident within the global frame of contemporary art in which particular aesthetics, styles, and discourses

are shared alike by the New Museum of Art in New York, the Museum für Gegenwartskunst in Basel, and the Museum of Contemporary Art in Shanghai.

The anthropology of “contemporary art” is further complicated by frequent analytic slippage between the categories of contemporary and modern art. This conflation demonstrates the dependency of current understandings of art on the visual and aesthetic practices institutionalized globally through museums, galleries, art schools, and artists’ movements in a twentieth-century art world dominated by Europe and North America. The legacy of Euro-American modernism in our understanding of the “contemporary” becomes especially clear in how contemporary art has been deployed in the ethnographic collection. It is evident that a modernist definition of “art,” which insists on a primacy of abstracted form, the supremacy of certain institutionalized spaces, and a confident universality, is still the primary interpretive paradigm for ethnographic collections even though, by definition, ethnographic collections and displays have generally been committed to the exploration of cultural diversity and difference. Much contemporary museology, even within ethnographic collections, has drawn on representational strategies, material forms, and concepts gleaned from a canonical body of work (modernism) that, in fact, negates cultural difference and overrides cultural relativism, cultural context, and the tradition of comparison.

This chapter responds to some of the polarizing terminologies and blurred practices that emerge when contemporary artists and their artwork enter the ethnographic museum. The definition of contemporary art I use here is one that refers (ethnographically) to a discourse institutionalized in the modernist art world and a set of material or aesthetic (predominantly visual) artifacts that such institutions celebrate, collect, and display. I am also referring to a set of material and ideological practices that contain ideas about art worlds, disciplinary boundaries, and the nature of both art and the artist. As we move into the twenty-first century, it remains the case that assumptions about what art is and what it can do for ethnographic collections still need to be critically unpacked. The legacies of modernism still continue to inflect the emergent practices of contemporary artists in ethnographic collections, who use art as a vehicle for overriding other categories and values surrounding the objects on display. Yet we are also witnessing a decolonization of the categories of art and artifact and a replacement of modernism with new kinds of museology, many of them indigenous to other parts of the world (Shelton 2013). I consider here a number of different ways in which “contemporary art” practices, aesthetics, and discourses enter into ethnographic museums. Moving from disparate contexts such as the aesthetics of museum architecture to the trope of institutional critique, I seek to unravel the assumptions about contemporary art that are built into the interventions of living artists into ethnographic displays, and I evaluate their implications for the future of ethnographic museums. I also explore some emergent museological theories and strategies that synthesize the modernist categories of art and artifact, creating new aesthetic frames for ethnographic collections.

The theoretical and methodological framework employed in this chapter draws on recent museology by indigenous scholars that emphasizes alternative kinds of museums, and explores the nature of museums as sites for artistic and curatorial collaboration (e.g., Kramer 2004; Mithlo 2004; Tapsell 2006; 2011; Isaac 2007). Like many scholars working in this area, I am excited about the new generations of indigenous artists and curators that are finding their voice in historic museum collections. I am also critical of the overtly celebratory way that art is considered a palliative to the political problems of collections with roots in nineteenth-century ethnology. I am concerned when there is a lack of connection between discourses from within the art world that argue that artists are ethnographers (Foster 1996), historians (Godfrey 2007), or even agents of social relationships (Bourriaud 2002; Bishop 2004), and the *actual* ways in which art emerges as a series of practices and aesthetics within ethnographic institutions and collections. I argue that contemporary art should be considered in the same terms as we have come to evaluate ethnographic display: as historically and culturally constituted, and as containing epistemologies and classifications that have important ramifications for the politics of representation.

## **The parallel epistemologies of contemporary art and ethnographic artifacts**

We may identify four streams of work within contemporary museum studies particularly concerned with the role of art in ethnographic museums. The first stream looks at the parallel museum histories of modernism and primitivism (Clifford 1988; Price 1989; Miller 1991; Errington 1998). The second stream is concerned with the ways in which artists work with historic collections to inculcate a form of institutional, and often indigenous, critique. It positions museums as potential “contact zones” which can be complicit in the creation of new genres of art that use historic collections in a form of cultural excavation, and even restitution (Clifford 1997; Thomas 1999; Kramer 2004; Phillips 2011). The third stream asks how arts practice may provide an alternative methodology for constituting knowledge in museums. This approach understands art and anthropology as parallel methods for understanding the world that both produce cultural knowledge through practices of cultural representation (Grimshaw and Ravetz 2005; Schneider and Wright 2010). The fourth stream draws on interventions into museum studies by actor network theory (Macdonald and Basu 2007; Latour and Weibel 2005; T. Bennett 2008), archaeology (Harrison 2013), and assemblage theory (J. Bennett 2010). This new museological focus on networks and assemblage incorporates art into a broader view of the ways in which objects and people constitute cultural knowledge together in museums.

All of these streams emphasize how art and ethnographic collections have emerged as “parallel epistemologies” (riffing on Pinney 1992) for museum

collections. The technology that produces these knowledge systems is, in every case, display: the arrangement of objects, labels, vitrines, and lighting. For example, the modernists' discovery of the primitives – in the cities of colonial powers – was a museological encounter, exemplified by Picasso's encounter with African art at the Louvre (Clifford 1988). William Rubin's famous exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art in 1984, *Primitivism: Affinities of the Tribal and the Modern*, developed a curatorial strategy that valorized form over context, one that had emerged from the postwar market in primitive art (and that culminated in the creation of Nelson Rockefeller's Museum of Primitive Art, which in turn became the Department of Arts of Africa, Oceania, and the Americas at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in 1979). The criticism that emerged around this exhibition continues to powerfully frame the ways in which art and ethnographic objects are categorized in museums (Rubin 1984; Danto 1988; Roberts, Vogel, and Müller 1994; Gell 1996). Rather than using "art" as a cipher for form, and "artifact" as a cipher for contextual information, it is important to remember that, to a large extent, the categories of art and ethnographic object have been *made together* through the representational practices and technologies that seem only to display them. It follows, then, that museum exhibitions do not only reflect systems of classification, but are themselves epistemological authorities that constitute systems of value and classification (Vogel 1988; Macdonald and Basu 2007, 2). In fact, recent projects to bring art into the ethnographic museum demonstrate the categorical decomposition that this activity effects.

In the rest of this chapter, I focus on three ways in which contemporary art has entered into some large ethnographic collections (historically defined) of Europe and North America.<sup>3</sup> These interventions challenge us to think differently about the effects of bringing contemporary art and ethnographic objects into dialogue and also showcase the emergence of new museologies for "ethnographic" material culture. It is, I argue, no coincidence that the late twentieth century has seen the emergence of new cultural institutions, such as the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa, the Musée du Quai Branly, and the National Museum of the American Indian, all of which have ethnographic collections at their core, yet none of which specifically titles itself as an ethnographic museum, developing instead new aesthetic lexicons for these collections (Message 2006).

## The aesthetics of new cultural museums

The Musée du Quai Branly, which opened in 2006 on the banks of the Seine in Paris, exemplifies a highly charged relationship between art and ethnography, embedded in the legacies of European modernism. Its history has been well chronicled (Clifford 2007; Price 2007; 2010). The museum, which consolidates the cultural collections of the Musée de l'Homme and the Musée des Arts de l'Afrique et de l'Océanie (formerly the Musée des Colonies), also emerged out of the close relationship



**FIGURE 10.1** Interior shot of the Musée du Quai Branly, showing Visite du Plateau des collections, zone Océanie, *Un artiste voyageur en Micronésie, Paul Jacoulet* (temporary exhibition), April 28, 2013.

Photo: Alexandra Lebon/Scala, Florence. © 2014 Musée du Quai Branly.

between Jacques Chirac, president of France, and Jacques Kerchache, a tribal art dealer. The museum was designed by star architect Jean Nouvel to reflect his vision of an Edenic paradise that looks away from Paris, turning its back on everyday metropolitan time and space. It was designed to exemplify a postmodern tribute to a contemporary primitivism, exploiting a sensuous, labyrinthine, dark aesthetic for a radically alternative “non-Western” material culture (Figure 10.1).

The curatorial strategies employed in the museum reflect struggles between the architect and curators, as well as between anthropology, the art market, and the nation-state. They also epitomize the colonial history and ambition of French

nationalism and the instantiation of imperialist and nationalist theories of culture (and this is well laid out in Sally Price's (2007) biography of the museum). The epistemological struggles to define the contents of the museum is evident in the attempts to name the institution which was variously referred to as the Museum of Indigenous Arts, the Museum of First Art (Arts Premiers), before finally becoming the Musée du Quai Branly. The final nomenclature privileges the dominance of architectural form in a Parisian landscape as a mode of museological interpretation. Indeed, within and around the building, the undulating floors and lines of sight, the darkness, the central leather corridor running through the permanent collection, and the dense foliage blocking out the city combine to construct an aestheticized vision of the primitive other that is often at odds with the research agenda of the curators who are committed to exploring and contextualizing histories of collection, interpretation, and display.

The Musée du Quai Branly does not collect contemporary art.<sup>4</sup> Despite this explicit edict, its temporary exhibitions provide a provocation to the conventional ways in which the collections have been interpreted in the permanent galleries. One of the first temporary exhibitions, *Jardin d'Amour* by Yinka Shonibare (April 2–July 8, 2007) utilized experiential strategies of strangeness and exoticism alongside the historical interpretation of museum pieces. Exploiting the iconography of Fragonard, of Dutch lost-wax commercial cloth, black mannequins, and middle-class pleasure gardens, and referencing the history of ethnographic displays, Shonibare provoked an intense aesthetic experience that was also a profound intellectual investigation into the ways in which images mediate imperialism, the complicity of display in the performance of race and colonialism, and the subjectivity of the museum collection and of the museum visitor. The pathways of Shonibare's garden mimicked the labyrinthine pathways and foliage of the museum itself. Despite these interventions, for the most part, such exhibitions are perceived as a supplemental aesthetic for the museum's overarching representational strategy which itself is to use display strategies drawn from a lexicon of postmodernism architectural theory (of visual juxtaposition, architectural encompassment, bright color, and labyrinthine directionalities) to contain, control, even overpower cultural difference.

Despite the national specificity of the Musée du Quai Branly, it may also be seen as exemplifying a changing global landscape for the ethnographic collections. This is borne out by comparison with a contemporaneous project in another national context, the Smithsonian Institution's National Museum of the American Indian (NMAI), in Washington, DC (Figure 10.2). NMAI was designed by an architect of indigenous heritage, Douglas Cardinal (Canadian Blackfoot), and its landscape design and construction were supervised by Donna E. House (Navajo and Oneida). Its exhibition spaces were curated collaboratively between indigenous curators and communities (Lonetree and Cobb 2008; Shannon 2014). NMAI overlays what has been conventionally understood as an ethnographic collection with an aestheticized architectural environment in order to evoke a nationalized discourse of indigeneity. Although it could not be more different than the Musée du Quai



**FIGURE 10.2** Exterior shot of the National Museum of the American Indian, Washington, DC, January 2012. Outside the main entrance of the Smithsonian’s National Museum of the American Indian stands a 12 foot tall bronze sculpture by George Rivera (Pueblo of Pojoaque) depicting a buffalo dancer performing during a celebration of thanksgiving. The foliage around the museum includes nearly 150 species of plants representing four landscapes indigenous to the region.

Photo: Molly Stephey. Permission to reproduce granted by the National Museum of the American Indian.

Branly in political intent, curatorial strategy, and content, NMAI has effected a similar encompassment of indigenous artifacts by a formal aesthetic code of recognizable indigeneity embodied by the building itself.

Criticism of the museum, published just after its opening in 2004 and written by prominent art and museum commentators, focused on the ways in which the museum’s curatorial strategy to create a visual depiction of American Indian “survance” (following the scholarship of Gerald Vizenor (2008)) was constituted at the expense of evidential “information,” “facts,” and “research” (Rothstein 2004). In fact, indigenous curators such as Paul Chaat Smith and Jolene Rickard had refused to divorce the formal aesthetic of display from the context of colonial history (without letting the latter overwhelm the primary meanings of the collection, which for them focused on native lifeworlds). They inverted the relationship of form to content instantiated at Musée du Quai Branly, insisting on an indigenous aesthetic as exhibition strategy as well as subject of the display. As a result of this approach, in the recently closed exhibition *Our Peoples: Giving Voice to Our Histories*, patterned displays of gold, guns, and stone flints evoke histories of



**FIGURE 10.3** Wall of gold objects in the exhibition *Our Peoples: Giving Voice to Our Histories* at the Smithsonian's National Museum of the American Indian. Photo: Leonda Levchuk. Permission to reproduce granted by the National Museum of the American Indian.

aesthetic encompassment, assert native aesthetic frames, and use artistic display to make a powerful commentary on appropriation and encompassment, instantiating the persistence of native cultural forms (Figure 10.3).

Regardless of differences in their political constitution and theoretical orientations, some similarities exist between the NMAI and the Musée du Quai Branly. Both museums present indigenous identity monumentally and aesthetically through a building form that is curvaceous, and linked to a nonlinear architectural aesthetic and a world of nature that is evoked by the lush vegetation that surrounds each museum. Despite their differences, both museums claim the representation of indigenous cultures as a national project. NMAI, as Paul Chaat Smith (2009) has observed, is by no means the idealistic forum for the assertion of American Indian rights that many had hoped it would be.<sup>5</sup> Despite its collaborative curatorial policies and cutting-edge indigenous collections management system, it is still part of a system of governance that continues to frustrate, and at times oppress, native sovereignties. The tensions between community and state engagement played out in the curatorial strategies of the museum. In addition, both museums demonstrate the emergence of a new aesthetic frame of monumental architecture and indigenous signification for their cultural collections. NMAI uses

the discursive interventions of fine art exhibitions to reframe and problematize mainstream historical narratives and exhibitionary conventions (and the history of collecting that underpins them). Quai Branly utilizes an aesthetic frame that celebrates the hegemonic, institutional vision of the French state as the overarching container for cultural diversity, within which art exhibitions are used to develop canons of intellectual exploration into the aesthetics of collections previously rendered simply artifactual.

It would be a misnomer to call either the Musée du Quai Branly or NMAI an “ethnographic” museum – and indeed neither has claimed this moniker in their official titles. Nor do they refer to themselves as art museums. They do, however, evidence the emergence of a new style of cultural institution that re-presents ethnographic collections through the lens of an overarching aesthetic embodied in the building itself. Unlike other large-scale museum projects, this new type of museology acts as a marker of cultural difference while simultaneously co-opting that difference into a broader nationalist project. The new visual strategy that accompanies this museological transformation overrides the dominant perception that ethnographic displays must choose between art and artifact as representational frames. Instead of functioning according to a polarized modality (whereby curators, visitors, and collaborators have to identify as either self *or* other), the affective experience of being within the building extends to provide an interpretive strategy for understanding the contents within. These museums thus endeavor to create themselves as a more syncretic whole. All museums are made of their buildings as much as their contents, and their physical form instantiates specific ideological positions for their visitors (see T. Bennett 1995). The architectural form of these two institutions instantiates a museology (or a theory of museum presentation and representation) that extends from the museum building and landscape into the display of the collection, constituting a cultural space for the visitor to apprehend indigenous peoples, their spirituality, through a formal aesthetic code that in both cases draws the visitor’s attention to the conditions of viewing established in the colonial metropolis. In each place the museum building itself draws attention, through absence in Quai Branly and presence in NMAI, to the body and voice of indigenous people.

The newest permanent galleries at the NMAI–New York exemplify an emergent display strategy that constitutes a specific visual mode of presenting ethnographic collections by uniting paradigms of modernist art museums with a symbolic infrastructure that also references particular historical narratives and individual identities. *Infinity of Nations* presents an insight into the museum’s hemispheric collections and develops a new aesthetic for museum display that marries a focus on artifactual veracity, history, and context with a modernist formal aesthetic. Objects are displayed in wide vitrines, where they are richly celebrated for their aesthetic beauty. The exhibits demand that visitors look intensely at their form and appreciate them as art. Key pieces are contextualized with touch screens and longer labels. The emphasis of the display is the same as the subject of the exhibition, and frames beauty and creativity within shared experiences of both cultural

tradition and colonization. The display emphasizes both the form of the collection material and the dynamic history of individual pieces. Art historical inflections that focus on individual authorship, and ethnographic frames that focus on cultural traditions, have been fused through an approach that has associated objects with collective identities in order to mediate the voices of key individuals, who are located in time as well as space, past and present. *Infinity of Nations* presents a syncretic display strategy that locates art as a formal mechanism for understanding the richness of cultural traditions, but which also contextualizes the aesthetics of museum display as a historically located way of understanding artifacts, generating value, and gaining recognition for both individual persons and cultural collectives.

### **Institutional critique within the ethnographic museum**

I have argued thus far that, while the displays in the Musée du Quai Branly and NMAI construct different political rationales for present-day understandings of ethnographic collections, they both use display strategies that present form (the look, feel, shape, color, and materials of the building and its display infrastructures) as a kind of museology that translates indigeneity into a specific kind of national project. In this section I examine the ways in which the contemporary art genre of institutional critique has been used tactically in ethnographic collections to specifically unsettle that museology.

The genre of institutional critique has significantly interfered with the representational and epistemological paradigms and colonial histories of mainstream collections in many different kinds of museums. For example, Andrea Fraser's piece *Museum Highlights* (1989), was a performance by the artist where she took on the role of a docent at the Philadelphia Museum of Art and provided visitors with an alternative history of the museum and its contents.<sup>6</sup> Another well-known artist, Mark Dion, has also contributed to this interventionist genre, his characteristic work (2000–) being the installation of tableaux of museum work framed as cabinets of curiosity, that present rooms within museums that make visible the practices of curators and other museum staff. He has extended this approach by conducting a number of archaeological digs including an excavation of the Museum of Modern Art, entitled "Mark Dion – Rescue Archaeology" (2004–2005), during its recent rebuild, submitting the wallpaper, moldings, and tiles of the old building to archaeological and exhibitionary scrutiny.

While artists working within the paradigm of institutional critique have predominantly focused on art museums and galleries, some have also extended their critical gaze to ethnographic and cultural collections. Influential work by Fred Wilson, for example, in his landmark installation *Mining the Museum* (1992–1993) unsettled the Maryland Historical Society in Baltimore by inserting slave whipping stocks into a display of "woodwork" and slave shackles into a display of "metalwork." Wilson's

later work challenged the viewer to see the invisible practices of museum security guards and cleaners by placing them on display. Similarly, James Luna's *Artifact Piece* (1987) placed the artist in a display case at the San Diego Museum of Man surrounded by labels that highlighted his own life history, in ironic and powerfully critical imitation of the history of the generic display of American Indian bodies. In 1992 Coco Fusco and Guillermo Gómez-Peña exhibited themselves as "two undiscovered Amerindians" in their performance *Couple in a Cage* (see Taylor 1998).

The work of these artists, and many others, has influenced institutions, as is evidenced by the growing number of invitations for artists to work within museums on the specific understanding that the resulting exhibitions will excavate (and even exonerate) troubled histories, literally exhibiting the museum's willingness to expose and critique difficult pasts. Such projects demonstrate the ways in which institutional critique may be appropriated by institutions as a legitimating tactic, and highlights the political tensions that remain underelicted within the incorporation of art into ethnographic museums.<sup>7</sup>

Several tensions arise in the ways in which artists are incorporated into ethnographic collections and institutions. Within many projects, artists are presented as able to transcend institutional constraints, and are free to subvert and use objects and styles of display in order to breathe life into old collections, make them relevant in the present, and surpass colonial legacies (e.g., Hiller and Einzig 1996). In other projects, artists are perceived as privileged bearers of culture, as holders of the specialist knowledge embedded within cultural collections. Artists here may be given responsibility that extends beyond interpretation to include a kind of spiritual safeguarding. In these cases, artists become what Kramer (2004) has termed "Artist-Warriors," using the formal codes of art practice to navigate difficult histories and negotiate the boundaries between cultural imperatives and artistic freedom.

## The freedom of the artist in the ethnographic museum?

*Kate said: "What I really want to do is I want to put a bird cage full of fresh lemons on top of one of the cases there." And the way that we discussed this with the curators is really to do with her autobiographical reaction or her personal perspective on the museum. She wanted to make a statement about freshness against all that oldness, about the brightest possible colour one could imagine in there, about the freshest possible thing. The lemons were kept fresh while the exhibition was on ... Only a couple of months ago someone phoned me up and said, "I've just had a very curious conversation with someone I met, who was a student in 1990 and was taken on a trip to the Pitt Rivers and was telling me in order to tell a story about the Pitt Rivers, that her, the group of students she was with, got drunk at lunch time and that one of her fellow students went to the shops and bought a bird cage*

*and some lemons and smuggled then into the Pitt Rivers and put them on top of a case. The point of the story was that they were there for months and the Pitt Rivers hadn't even noticed they were there.*"<sup>8</sup>

Many artists perceive themselves to be located outside the systems of classification, display, and research that guide ethnographic museums and often describe their sense of freedom to reinterpret and even reinvent collections. This is often apparent in work by artists who engage specifically with anthropology to focus on the history of the discipline and its relation to colonial power. Some artists imagine themselves to be outside these histories and others locate themselves inside them. For instance, Susan Hiller, an artist who rejected anthropology during her graduate studies, explicitly constitutes much of her work as an alternative form of cultural representation to academia, excavating the unconscious categories that suffuse the ethnographic collection. She presents herself as an artist insider and an anthropological outsider, assuming the capacity to resignify and reject anthropological frames of reference. Hiller's work resists the standardization of anthropological categories, focusing on the singular rather than the generalizable, presenting "strange" views of everyday objects.<sup>9</sup> Her approach is to subjugate ethnographic objects to an alternative lexicon, and alternative hegemony of institutional representation and display that draws uncritically on an art world understanding of objects as malleable, recodable, and subject to the interiority of an unique artistic genius (a construct as powerful, and as problematic, as that of a timeless cultural tradition).

Alternatively, other artists approach ethnographic collections as "insiders." Canonical work by James Luna, exemplified within his famous performance works including *Artifact Piece* (1987) and *Take a Picture with a Real Indian* (1995) present a commentary on the representational strategies of ethnographic museums by positioning the artist, an American Indian (Luiseño), as being explicitly within and therefore part of the troubling history of museums that have historically exhibited the bodies of his people. Luna's work can only be fully understood, however, if visitors know the difference between his performances and installations and the more traditional ethnographic display contexts from which they draw. Luna raises difficult questions about what can be learned about the nature of artistic freedom in the ethnographic museum and what kinds of knowledge visitors need in order to participate in his work. In this section, I further explore this problematic – of embodied and disciplinary knowledge and its relation to museum visitors through the work of artists and curators – by discussing two museums, the Weltkulturen Museum in Frankfurt and the Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology (MAA) in Cambridge, both of which have in recent years dedicated significant exhibition and research space to invited artists who have work with their historic ethnographic collections in order to explore the assumptions about what art is and can do in these environments. Comparing the ways in which the Weltkulturen and Cambridge museums have invited artists to work with collections raises a number of questions with which many ethnographic museums currently struggle. The comparison also highlights

the pivotal role that art can play within these struggles. Key questions raised include: What is the role of contemporary art and artists in the process of working with ethnographic collections, predominantly from the nineteenth century? What are the limitations of contemporary art in this context? What are the implications for the presentation of local knowledge? What kinds of knowledge are created? What kinds of knowledge/histories are erased? What kind of legitimacy must an artist have to be invited? Who can speak for objects? What responsibility does the museum have to narrate, contextualize, and interpret the objects on display and how much can the language of contemporary art substitute for that of the conventional subject positions of the anthropology museum? The basis for grappling with these questions is a continually changing understanding about what display strategies are now appropriate for ethnographic collections.

### ***Pasifika Styles***

Over the past 20 years the CMAA, currently under the directorship of Nicholas Thomas, has used collections-based research as a starting point to reconnect source communities to the collections in order to bring indigenous knowledge into the museum, share collections as resources, and develop collaborative exhibition projects. This approach is exemplified by the ways in which the collection of the Cambridge University 1898 Torres Strait Expedition (one of the museum's earliest collections) has been revived through a series of exhibitions, books, and research initiatives that have brought Torres Strait Islanders to the museum, taken curators to the Torres Strait, and expanded knowledge about the collection. As a result of these efforts, the collection is perceived as an important and living collection that continues to change and resonate in the present (Herle and Rouse 1998; Herle 2003). A similar approach was taken in 2006, when the museum initiated an exhibition and research project called *Pasifika Styles* which invited contemporary Maori and Pacific Island artists from New Zealand to work with the collections and to create artwork for an exhibition that opened in 2007. The project was developed collaboratively between New Zealand and the United Kingdom, and workshops, conferences and performances were built into the exhibition (Raymond and Salmond 2008).

The *Pasifika Styles* project was launched in 2005 in Auckland, New Zealand, by Rosanna Raymond, a London-based artist of Pacific Island descent, and Amiria Henare (now Salmond), then curator at the CMAA. Both curators worked closely with a community of artists from New Zealand, linked through Raymond, and the exhibition project was devised through collaborative workshops from the start. The frame of engagement and even the title were established in dialogue with the artists. The exhibition, which was displayed at the CMAA from 2006 through to 2008 (Raymond and Salmond 2008), resulted from many visits and exchanges between the United Kingdom and New Zealand. Several artists were invited and funded to be in residence, to work with collections and with the public, and to create new work. Many of the visiting artists chose to

explore themes of ownership, rights, and entitlement – using the process of research to assert their legitimacy as cultural owners of the collections. For example, Jason Hall created a *Do-It-Yourself Repatriation Kit*, in which a suitcase displays a cut-out hole waiting for a Maori treasure and a mallet to smash and grab. Lisa Reihana's work, *He Tautoko*, featured a carved wooden *tekoteko*, an ancestral figure that had been collected in the 1830s by Baron Charles von Hügel, father of the museum's founding curator, near the Bay of Islands, the tribal homeland of the artist's father (Figure 10.4). Reihana's piece placed the *tekoteko* in a nineteenth-century case,



**FIGURE 10.4** Lisa Reihana, *He Tautoko*, 2006, Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Cambridge. The installation features a carved wooden *tekoteko* (MAA 1939.70), an ancestral figure originally attached to a house gable. The figure is wearing headphones, plugged into a visitor's listening post, and positioned in front of a video screen.

Photo: Kerry Brown. Reproduced with permission and by request in support of Cancer Research UK.

where the figure wore large white headphones that were plugged into a visitor's listening post in front of a video display which references the Maori collections in the museum and alludes to the artist's journey between New Zealand and Cambridge (see Herle 2008).

Throughout the interviews that are part of the *Pasifika Styles* website and in associated publications, many of the artists developed a shared discourse around the process of working with the collections. Artists described a process of awakening the collections, reconnecting to the objects, and reanimating and caring for their ancestral treasures. They articulated a profound sense of awareness of the colonial relations that underscored the collection of the artifacts. Many felt that they were addressing past injustices and locating themselves within a critique of colonialism not only in their artwork but through their personal presence in the museum (Durand 2010a; 2010b).

The exhibition was opened by a special *waiata* (song) composed by Che Wilson, and formal ceremony and feasting, drawing on Maori protocols. The response to the exhibition by artists and public alike was overwhelmingly positive – the show was perceived to have fostered interpersonal dialogue and connection and created an aesthetic frame in which a critical framework and celebratory narrative could surround Pacific Islanders and their image in the United Kingdom. In many ways *Pasifika Styles* exemplifies recent trends to open up museums to artists and thereby redeem troubling colonial histories, and builds on the seminal interventions of artists such as Fred Wilson and James Luna who have long drawn on their own cultural inheritance to poignantly critique the complicity of museum collecting and collections with imperial politics.

## The Weltkulturen Museum

The Weltkulturen Museum in Frankfurt, originally founded in 1904, contains the collections of the scientific research expeditions funded by the city of Frankfurt, the Frobenius Institute, and the Jesuit missions and by private individuals. It also has a large collection of contemporary Pacific art, primarily from Papua New Guinea. In 2010 the directorship was taken over by Clémentine Deliss who initiated an ambitious reconceptualization of the museum. For the inaugural exhibition of the new space, *Object Atlas*, which opened in January 2012, Deliss invited eight artists to be in residence at the museum, to work intensively with collections of their choice and to create work for the exhibition.

The Weltkulturen Museum is spread between three neoclassical villas on Frankfurt's museum mile (Schaumainkai). Deliss reconceptualized the anthropology museum as an experimental art zone, in which one villa is configured as a "laboratory" for collections-based research, with separate villas for administration and exhibitions. The first exhibition in the newest villa, built to showcase the

permanent collections, *Object Atlas: Fieldwork in the Museum*, presented pieces from the permanent collection alongside the work of eight artists. Artists were chosen “for their sensibility to a situation of experiment” (Deliss 2012, 11), and were invited to freely choose objects to work with, based on personal interest, on their own knowledge, or on compelling formal qualities. Selected objects were taken into the laboratory to which the artists, who lived one floor above, had 24 hour access. In liaison with curators, archivists, and librarians, they were given access to photographic, archival, and bibliographic information. In the exhibition, the objects were displayed on specially designed mounts and vehicles, lit by movable spotlights evocative of a laboratory or design workshop.

In this case, institutional intervention came also from the experience and vision of the museum director, as well as from collaborating artists and curatorial staff. With a background in the contemporary art world (as director of the *Africa '95* project, and founder of the international research project “Future Academy” and journal *Metronome*), Deliss brought into the museum a conversation about the nature of art and ethnographic collections, the nature of art worlds in different places, and the role of the artist as interpreter of collections. This approach is implicit in her provocative description of the museum as “post-ethnographic.” “We can,” she argues, “no longer be content to exhibit other people’s material culture based on the organizing principle of an ethnos or tribe of which we are not a part” (Deliss 2012, 21).

Expanding on this idea, Deliss has explicitly drawn on the techniques and skills of visual artists to bring new perspectives to the collection, and has championed the idea that fieldwork can be undertaken in the museum collection itself rather than in other places. This different approach has contributed to the reconceptualization of the museum as a laboratory in which artists bring their visual skills and methods to experiment intensively with the collections.

One of the artists in residence for the *Object Atlas* project, Otobong Nkanga, a Nigerian artist based in Antwerp, chose to work with money, knives, and cloth from West Africa, primarily Congo. Her sense of familiarity with many of the objects was tempered by the lack of documentary information in the museum about the specific objects she was working with. During the course of her research, Nkanga felt starkly that the object’s stories started only when they were collected (interview, July 2011). The dates she was given for them were of their collection rather than their year of production. Nkanga perceived the museum to provide a point of rupture between objects and context, supplying a new interpretive context that eradicated the original, yet itself was extremely poor (many of the objects were almost completely undocumented). Nkanga’s artwork aimed to give back to the objects stories that had been drawn from her own research into the ethnographic texts accumulated around the collection. She created large posters and woven fancy-cloth in which the objects are displayed, held by white-gloved hands, with newly found “names” and stories. This open interpretive space is supported by a discourse of the freedom of the artist



**FIGURE 10.5** Installation view of Otobong Nkanga, *Facing the Opponent*, a specially commissioned artwork for the exhibition *Object Atlas* at the Weltkulturen Museum, Frankfurt, 2012.

Permission granted by Otobong Nkanga.

to appropriate and interpret, to creatively rework, to represent, to have the final “word” in images (Figure 10.5).

Deliss is insistent on bringing the Weltkulturen Museum’s collections into a new framework and articulating its significance according to the language of the global contemporary art world. Her approach is exemplified by the unadorned mounts specifically designed for the exhibition by Viennese designer Mathis Esterhazy, which reference a laboratory-like environment. Nkanga’s work also imitates this aesthetic of innovation and discovery by emphasizing the white gloves that are also used in museums to touch objects, to maintain their sterility. It is notable, however, that this pristine laboratory is not the workplace of the nineteenth-century ethnologist (Jenkins 1994), nor the scientific zone of hypothesis and experiment of the deconstructed cultural laboratory (Latour and Woolgar 1986; T. Bennett 2005; Alberti 2008). This laboratory presents a clinical aesthetic that defined experiments as freedom and detachment from context for the twenty-first-century artist. Deliss’s objective is to refresh and recenter these ethnographic

collections, in response to the particular nature of the German ethnographic museum and the history of anthropology in Germany (see Zimmerman 2001). However, the lab-like frame risks locating art practices out of time in an endless contemporary and the ethnographic objects out of time in a weaker traditional past that is infinitely recodable. In terms of interpretive epistemologies, anthropology too is located out of the contemporary, and its capacities to make sense of the present are supplanted by art theory.

There are profound differences between the kinds of museum projects embodied by *Pasifika Styles* at the Cambridge museum on the one hand, and by *Object Atlas* at the Weltkulturen Museum on the other. The differences mimic those that I discussed above in relation to the Musée du Quai Branly and the NMAI. In Cambridge, as at the NMAI, artists were invited into the museum as representatives or constituents of the collections. They used their practice to develop a relationship with the collection and they represented a conscious sense of obligation to the histories of collections, collectors, and “source communities.” Their projects generated new cultural forms, which are seen as continuous with the cultural practices that surrounded the objects before they entered the space of the ethnographic collection. Many of these artists used these projects to engage in both a critique of broad imperial histories and more intimate community histories, drawing on relations between indigenous people and museums that were often characterized by alienation, exploitation, and aversion. They challenged the authority of the museum from within, and extended the epistemological authority of anthropology to include their own voices. This approach means that these artists have, therefore, worked as both anthropological interlocutors and anthropological subjects and, through their work, they have also generated new objects for anthropological collections.

At the Weltkulturen Museum, as at the Musée du Quai Branly, artists were invited to disrupt the continuities of knowledge, challenge the objectivity of museum documentation, and celebrate the possibility of different forms of formal appreciation. Rather than being positioned as anthropologists, artists were allowed to be “mad scientists” who could create new contexts for objects without any responsibility to communities outside of the institution. This may be seen as a radical challenge to the security of anthropology as a knowledge-making discipline, but it may also be seen as perpetuating the power relations and representational imbalances long institutionalized within the European ethnographic museum. Indeed, the Weltkulturen Museum and the Musée du Quai Branly instantiate a Eurocentric attitude to global collections, without the insecurity and self-consciousness that is present within anglophone settler colonies such as the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. This may also explain why the sense of responsibility to communities exemplified by the kind of reflexive museum practice of the Cambridge museum is absent in *Object Atlas*.

These artistic practices have important implications not just for what kind of artist they create but for how art is defined. The gaze of the artist in contemporary

Frankfurt may not be too dissimilar from that of a nineteenth-century anthropologist in the sense that both see collections as mute and in need of framing and interpretation. Severin Fowles (2008), in his critique of material culture studies, describes the vogue for speaking for objects as a colonial process, rendering objects as “subaltern.” Ethnographic collections in the framework of contemporary art at the Weltkulturen museum are viewed as infinitely recodable, malleable, indeterminate, and subject to multiple interpretations. In Cambridge they are recognized as historic markers and members of important contemporary cultural communities of origin as well as of museum practice. This view of objects regards them not as passive subjects but as agents acting to define the terms of their own representation.

## Art and assemblage in ethnographic museums

The idea that objects or collections themselves have agency has inflected another kind of institutional practice and generated yet another aesthetic for contemporary art within ethnographic collections. In this final section, I explore the notion of assemblage as an emergent museological discourse that fuses art and anthropological perspectives. The concept of assemblage has been used in recent years as a frame through which to level the epistemological status of the many different kinds of objects within museum exhibition, including contemporary art. This perspective unravels distinctions between art and artifacts, tracing, in Tony Bennett’s words, “a ‘semiotic materiality’ that seeks to follow how human and non-human actants, things and signs, things as signs, signs as things are brought together in networks of varying lengths and duration” (2008, 5).

Within the fields of art practice, anthropology, and museum studies, it is by now widely recognized that both art and anthropology are forms of cultural representation that share methods and practices – of photography, filmmaking, and other immersive observational techniques – and approaches toward undertaking and analyzing research (Marcus and Myers 1995; Foster 1996). However, as I have argued thus far, the aesthetic and social practices of contemporary art are frequently naturalized in order to achieve other effects within the ethnographic museum – whether it be the nationalistic primitivism on the quai Branly to the museological critique of colonial collecting in Cambridge. I have contended that contemporary art practice is increasingly used in ethnographic exhibitions as a kind of epistemology itself, a totalizing framework with which to present complex ideas and subject positions from a vantage point perceived in some ways to be “outside” of the museum and collection.

Exhibitions such as Bruno Latour’s *Making Things Public* (ZKM, Germany, 2005) or *Assembling Bodies: Art Science and Imagination* at the CMAA (2009–2010) drew together historic collections, everyday artifacts, and the work of contemporary artists. The idea of assembly, drawn from Latour (Weibel and Latour 2007) emerges

in these projects as a key museological device: assemblies of collections constitute “parliaments of nature” that “make things public” (Weibel and Latour 2007, 99). In *Assembling Bodies*, for instance, the body was presented as a material assemblage and the process of assembly, of calling to order, was also extended to the process of exhibiting, of assembling diverse kinds of collections around key themes that these artifacts were in fact crucial in constituting (objects such as twenty-first-century identity cards and nineteenth-century large-scale sculptural projects as contributing to a kind of racial profiling, for example; see Herle 2013).

However, one must be careful that the notion of assemblage, like that of contemporary art, does not obliterate its own history and context. The emergence over a long period of assemblage theory within museology may be understood as reflecting a set of aesthetic practices already institutionalized within museums and galleries, in which all exhibitions may be understood through the lens of assemblage. The aesthetic of juxtaposition, displayed in modern art installations through the placement of found materials and everyday artifacts into the gallery space correlates with the ways, for example, in which actor network theory within the social sciences may be used to flatten out the unique specificity of individual artifacts or artworks, recognizing significance through their connection in the network. As Patkowski and Reiner (2013) note, modernism itself may be conceptualized as a kind of social network that “visualizes relationships between individual artists through a spatial network of vectors laid out in broadly geographical terms” even as the cultural frameworks that constitute artworks are themselves negated in the ways in which they are exhibited. Their discussion of the use of an artist network diagram in a recent exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art (riffing off Alfred Barr’s famous formulation of twentieth-century art history in terms of a network diagram) “effectively (and ahistorically) rereads artistic modernity through the precarious socio-economic conditions of our contemporary moment, as a free-flowing field of enterprising agents” (Patkowski and Reiner 2013). The function of assemblage and assembly in the ethnographic collection is, thus, to render equivalent the different forms of knowledge on display and to dissolve some of the categorical imperatives of the art/artifact divide, even as it reifies or naturalizes other epistemological systems and visual paradigms.

## Conclusion

Within these extremely diverse projects, I have highlighted two broad paradigms in which art functions to make meaning in the ethnographic collection. The first uses art as a form of cultural and historical critique to re-evaluate collections; the second uses art as a powerful aesthetic frame to replace and reorder collections in its own image. In the context of ethnographic collections, “art” (as category, practice, conceptual frame, and set of aesthetic forms) has become a privileged mode of exploration and knowledge practice. A central motivating question for this

chapter has been to ask why the deconstruction of the ethnographic frame has not necessitated a deconstruction of the frame of art itself in the context of ethnographic display. I believe that this is because of the extent to which art is both entangled and mutually implicated in indivisible ways with the technologies of display. Without a doubt, art has great power in its ability to instantiate anthropology's uncertainty about its own material legacies. Yet, the examples I have described in this chapter have highlighted in fact how ethnographic museums also naturalize particular roles for contemporary art and artists. I have explored this through a range of projects, in which the connection of aesthetic forms derived from the art world and the institutional complex of ethnographic museums has worked to create new forms of knowledge and ways of understanding collections that draw our attention to some classifications and values and hide away others.

The examples discussed here demonstrate that art aesthetics (from the canonical interventions of institutional critique to the aesthetic of juxtaposition encapsulated by the term assemblage) are rarely contextualized themselves. This perpetuates the timelessness and ahistorical qualities of prior modes of ethnographic presentation. The methods of installation, relations of production, assumptions about the effects of abstraction and conceptualism, the legacies of modernism and postmodernism, and the prior knowledge needed to understand art styles and even institutional critique are often rendered invisible as art moves into the anthropology museum, much as the original stories of ethnographic objects were once erased by eager museum collectors and curators.

Recent histories of museum anthropology have made explicit the museum history of mainstream anthropology (Stocking 1985; Jenkins 1994; Gosden 2007). By contrast, the avant-garde language of contemporary art, and the metropolitan audience it creates (and those it alienates), is usually presented as timeless and placeless in much the same way as "primitive art" was once presented to eager audiences in the colonial capitals. Aesthetic frameworks drawn from modernist art worlds, theories, and practices are used to generate awareness, and critique, of the nature of anthropology museums, but there is a surprising lack of reflection on the history and meaning of these aesthetic forms themselves. The often stark dichotomy between the contemporary art and other objects on display reifies dichotomies between art and artifact in a new visual language which retains many connotations of the exotifying gaze, and can also reconstitute the imperial nature of art *and* the museum as a collaborative aesthetic and epistemology that speak for objects and by extension others. Rasheed Areen made this point many years ago in his critique of the ways in which the famous exhibition *Magiciens de la terre* juxtaposed European and non-Western artists, maintaining a hierarchy or separation between the two:

The distinction between the modern and the traditional is now really false, because it is the result of a historical force that is dominant today. If we wish to challenge this distinction then it will have to be done within a context that challenges the dominance of Western culture. (Areen 2007, 161)

For the final word, I turn to Nancy Mithlo's (2004) conception of the "Red Man's Burden," which she develops in an article that dissects "the politics of inclusion in museum settings." Here, Mithlo argues against a certain kind of "inclusion." She criticizes the assumption of outsidership as a necessary basis for collaboration, arguing that it perpetuates structural inequalities and places the burden of interpreting, and somehow redeeming, the troubled histories of ethnographic collections onto native people without integrating them into the mainstream institutional culture of ethnographic museums. I suggest here that a similar politics of inclusion occurs when contemporary artists are brought into the ethnographic museum. Instead of paying critical attention to the social, political, and aesthetic context of contemporary art as subject or object, art may become an outside frame for redeeming the ethnographic collection, making it appropriately contemporary without necessarily addressing the social relations of ethnographic museums and collections, both past and present.

Alongside indigenous collaborators, many kinds of artists and their works have also been given significant responsibility to assume interpretive authority over ethnographic collections. As Mithlo notes in the context of indigenous cultural rights and responsibilities, the assumption of representational authority by artists raises similar questions regarding important questions about who can speak for museum collections and in what register. We are often frustrated when we look for "art" inside ethnographic museums. In the context of the *mélange* of artifacts in a collection such as the Pitt Rivers Museum in Oxford, or in the NMAI, it becomes clear that almost anything in the museum could be perceived as art, including the museum itself. In anthropological terms, rather than a limited definition of art, ethnographic collections present a cornucopia of cultural production, in which many different forms and activities may be appreciated for their formal qualities, their beauty or sensory appeal. How, then, do we make sense of objects that self-consciously describe themselves as "art," as distinct from the other kinds of objects on display?

The self-consciousness of anthropological definitions of art hinge on the recognition that the term "art" exists in relation to a pre-existing art world (Perkins 2006), yet the sophistication of art theory and institutional critique within the world of art museums and galleries belies the ways in which art has in fact been naturalized as both display and interpretive strategy within ethnographic museums. Museological strategies, from institutional critique to those drawing on theories of assemblage, emerge in fact from the cultural specificity of a specific modernist art world – which itself has emerged in the same historical, political, and cultural environment as the ethnographic collection and museum. In many contemporary ethnographic displays, we are still presented with an incomplete picture of art as an ahistorical (in that it is definitively contemporary) set of aesthetic practices and an external mode of critique, rather than as a form of historicized cultural production itself. However, the final word does not end with these practices. We now, in 2014, have

an unprecedented situation in which indigenous and alternative museologies have been institutionalized to the extent that, in many instances, they have supplanted the organizational logic of the nineteenth-century museum. From the Multiversity Galleries in Vancouver's Museum of Anthropology (part of the University of British Columbia), through to the bicultural mandate that underpins the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa from the ground up, we may see an emergent museology that has transcended the logics of modernity. Here the boundaries between art and artifact no longer make sense, nor are they relevant to contemporary concerns for cultural survival, indigenous sovereignty, communities of practice, and new and emergent indigenous nationalisms.

## Acknowledgments

Thanks to Jennifer Deger, Faye Ginsburg, Bruce Altshuler, Clémentine Deliss, Anita Herle, Kylie Message, Andrea Witcomb, and Sharon Macdonald for constructive commentary on earlier drafts.

## Notes

- 1 Westermann (2005); Schneider and Wright (2006; 2010; 2013); Belting, Buddensieg, and Weibel (2013).
- 2 While much attention has been paid to the nuances of regional, national, and subdisciplinary schools of anthropology (e.g., Stocking 1985; 1992), the framework of "contemporary art," a much larger field of practice, has been far less critically unpacked in ethnographic terms. However, for exemplary literature, see Marcus and Myers (1995); Bouquet (2001); Barth (2005); Crehan (2011).
- 3 This is, therefore, a partial account, dealing with the ways in which museums that were once centers for anthropology have now become interesting places for artists to work. Of course, there are many museums (such as tribal museums and museums in the global South) where artists enter museums in different kinds of ways.
- 4 With the exception of contemporary Aboriginal art from Australia which complements existing collections and which, of course, is sufficiently embedded within a global art regime to make it truly an exception to the enforcement of peculiar hierarchies between contemporary art and artifact that the museum perpetuates through the naturalization of contemporary art in the building but not in the subject and definition of its collections. Tellingly, several Aboriginal artists were commissioned to develop site-specific work to decorate hallways, meeting rooms, and other parts of the museum, away from the core galleries.
- 5 See also Chapter 22, "When You Were Mine: (Re)Telling History at the National Museum of the American Indian," by Paul Chaat Smith in *Museum Transformations*.

- 6 Similarly, *Little Frank and his Carp* (2001) responded, with pastiche, to the fetishizing language critics used to describe the Guggenheim Museum in Bilbao designed by Frank Gehry. In a later video work (*Untitled*, 2003) Fraser was shown having sex with a collector who had paid to create an artwork (the video of Fraser having sex with the collector). Hans Haake's famous piece, *Shapolsky et al. Manhattan Real Estate Holdings, A Real Time Social System, as of May 1, 1971*, was withdrawn from display at the Guggenheim Museum in New York after museum trustees became aware of the connections he was making between the museum and the infamous slumlord named in the title of the piece. There are many other artists whose work has been formative in the canon of institutional critique and which engage in particular with ethnographic display, and it is not the place of this chapter to provide an exhaustive account. I refer only to some, but not all, of the most canonical artists in this discussion.
- 7 As Andrea Fraser remarked, speaking of institutional critique more broadly: "Every time we speak of the 'institution' as other than 'us,' we disavow our role in the creation and perpetuation of its conditions. We avoid responsibility for, or action against, the everyday complicities, compromises, and censorship – above all, self-censorship – which are driven by our own interests in the field and the benefits we derive from it. It's not a question of inside or outside, or the number and scale of various organized sites for the production, presentation, and distribution of art. It's not a question of being against the institution: We are the institution. It's a question of what kind of institution we are, what kind of values we institutionalize, what forms of practice we reward, and what kinds of rewards we aspire to" (Fraser 2005, 280).
- 8 Chris Dorsett, describing the interventions of contemporary artists in the Pitt Rivers Museum, at the conference *Vision, Witness, Profession*, at Goldsmiths College, September 19, 1999. In the conference session "Practices of Representation among Artists: Chris Dorsett, Cornelia Parker, Richard Wentworth in conversation with Nick de Ville," the three artists discussed their own experiences of artists' interventions in ethnographic and other museum collections and their responses to issues of representation and "material culture."
- 9 Hiller comments on the entanglement of art and ethnography as exhibitionary subjects: "At this moment, when Western culture seems to be threatened by external forces and riddled with internal contradictions, it is not surprising to find a proliferation of ethnographic exhibitions alongside an abundant return of related references and motifs in the work of many Western artists. These forms of display are crucial to the construction of our personal selves as subjects in a production and maintenance of a cohesive cultural self-identity for Western society, one integrally connected to its historic need for imperialist domination" (Hiller and Einzig 1996, 35–36).

## References

- Alberti, S. J. M. M. 2008. "Constructing Nature behind Glass." *Museum and Society* 6(2): 73–97.
- Areen, R. 2007. "Our Bauhaus Others' Mudhouse." In *Contemporary Art and the Museum: A Global Perspective*, edited by P. Weibel and A. Buddensig, pp. 150–162. Karlsruhe, Germany: ZKM.

- Barth, F. 2005. *One Discipline, Four Ways: British, German, French, and American Anthropology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Becker, H. S. 1984. *Art Worlds*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Belting, H., A. Buddensieg, and P. Weibel, eds. 2013. *The Global Contemporary and the Rise of New Art Worlds*. Harvard, MA: MIT Press.
- Bennett, J. 2010. *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Bennett, T. 1995. *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics*. London: Routledge.
- Bennett, T. 2005. "Civic Laboratories." *Cultural Studies* 19(5): 521–547.
- Bennett, T. 2008. "Anthropological Assemblages: Producing Culture as a Surface of Government." CRESC Working Paper Series 52. Accessed October 15, 2014. <http://www.archive.cresc.ac.uk/publications/documents/wp52.pdf>.
- Bishop, C. 2004. "Antagonism and Relational Aesthetics." *October* 110: 51–79.
- Bouquet, M. 2001. *Academic Anthropology and the Museum: Back to the Future*. New York: Berghahn.
- Bourriaud, N. 2002. *Relational Aesthetics*. Paris: Réel.
- Clifford, J. 1988. *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Clifford, J. 1997. "Museums as Contact Zones." In *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*, pp. 188–220. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Clifford, J. 2007. "Quai Branly in Process." *October* 120: 3–23.
- Crehan, K. A. F. 2011. *Community Art: An Anthropological Perspective*. Oxford: Berg.
- Danto, A. C. 1964. "The Artworld." *Journal of Philosophy* 61(19): 571–584.
- Danto, A. C. 1988. *ART/Artifact: African Art in Anthropology Collections*. New York: Center for African Art; Munich: Prestel.
- Deliss, C., ed. 2012. *Object Atlas: Fieldwork in the Museum*. Bielefeld, Germany: Kerber.
- Durand, C. A. 2010a. "Artistic Practice and (Museum) Ethnography." *Curator: The Museum Journal* 53(4): 491–500.
- Durand, C. A. 2010b. "Indexing (In)authenticity: Art and Artefact in Ethnography Museums." *Alternative* 6(3): 248–260.
- Errington, S. 1998. *The Death of Authentic Primitive Art and Other Tales of Progress*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Forge, A. 1973. "Style and Meaning in Sepik Art." In *Primitive Art and Society*, pp. 169–192. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Foster, H. 1996. "The Artist as Ethnographer." In *The Return of the Real: Critical Models in Art and Theory since 1960*, pp. 171–204. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Fowles, S. 2008. "The Perfect Subject: Postcolonial Object Studies." Accessed October 15, 2014. [http://academia.edu/404148/The\\_Perfect\\_Subject\\_Postcolonial\\_Object\\_Studies](http://academia.edu/404148/The_Perfect_Subject_Postcolonial_Object_Studies).
- Fraser, A. 2005. "From the Critique of Institutions to an Institution of Critique." *Artforum* 44(1): 278–285.
- Gell, A. 1996. "Vogel's Net: Traps as Artworks and Artworks as Traps." *Journal of Material Culture* 1(1): 15–38.
- Gell, A. 1998. *Art and Agency: An Anthropological Theory*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Godfrey, M. 2007. "The Artist as Historian." *October* 120: 140–172.
- Gosden, C. 2007. *Knowing Things: Exploring the Collections at the Pitt Rivers Museum, 1884–1945*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Grimshaw, A., and A. Ravetz. 2005. *Visualizing Anthropology*. Bristol, UK: Intellect.
- Harrison, R. 2013. *Reassembling the Collection: Ethnographic Museums and Indigenous Agency*. Santa Fe, NM: SAR Press.
- Herle, A. 2003. "Objects, Agency and Museums: Continuing Dialogues between the Torres Straits and Cambridge." In *Museums and Source Communities: A Routledge Reader*, edited by A. Brown and L. Peers, pp. 194–207. London: Routledge.
- Herle, A. 2008. "Relational Objects: Connecting People and Things through *Pasifika Styles*." *International Journal of Cultural Property* 15(2): 159.
- Herle, A. 2013. "Exhibitions as Research: Displaying the Technologies That Make Bodies Visible." *Museum Worlds: Advances in Research* 1(1): 113–135.
- Herle, A., and S. Rouse. 1998. *Cambridge and the Torres Straits: Centenary Essays on the 1898 Anthropological Expedition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hiller, S., and B. Einzig. 1996. *Thinking about Art: Conversations with Susan Hiller*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Isaac, G. 2007. *Mediating Knowledges: Origins of a Zuni Tribal Museum*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Jenkins, D. 1994. "Object Lessons and Ethnographic Displays: Museum Exhibitions and the Making of American Anthropology." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 36(2): 242–270.
- Kramer, J. 2004. "Figurative Repatriation." *Journal of Material Culture* 9(2): 161–182.
- Latour, B., and P. Weibel. 2005. *Making Things Public: Atmospheres of Democracy*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press; Karlsruhe, Germany: ZKM.
- Latour, B., and S. Woolgar. 1986. *Laboratory Life: The Construction of Scientific Facts*. Edited by J. Salk. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Layton, R. 2003. "Art and Agency: A Reassessment." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute incorporating Man* 9(3): 447–464.
- Lonetree, A., and A. J. Cobb, eds. 2008. *The National Museum of the American Indian: Critical Conversations*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Macdonald, S., and P. Basu, eds. 2007. *Exhibition Experiments*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Marcus, G. E., and F. R. Myers. 1995. *The Traffic in Culture: Refiguring Art and Anthropology*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Message, K. 2006. *New Museums and the Making of Culture*. Oxford: Berg.
- Miller, D. 1991. "Primitive Art and the Necessity of Primitivism to Art." In *The Myth of Primitivism: Perspectives on Art*, edited by S. Hiller, pp. 35–52. London: Routledge.
- Mithlo, N. M. 2004. "Red Man's Burden: The Politics of Inclusion in Museum Settings." *American Indian Quarterly* 28 (3–4): 743–763.
- Morphy, H. 2007. *Becoming Art: Exploring Cross-Cultural Categories*. Oxford: Berg.
- Myers, F. R. 2002. *Painting Culture: The Making of an Aboriginal High Art*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Patkowski, J., and N. Reiner. 2013. "Inventing Abstraction, Reinventing Our Selves." Accessed October 15, 2015. <http://www.materialworldblog.com/2013/02/inventing-abstraction-reinventing-our-selves/>.
- Perkins, M. 2006. "Do We Still Have No Word for Art? A Contemporary Mohawk Question." In *Exploring World Art*, edited by E. Venbrux, P. S. Rosi, and R. L. Welsch, pp. 291–316. Long Grove, IL: Waveland.

- Phillips, R. B. 2011. *Museum Pieces: Toward the Indigenization of Canadian Museums*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Pinney, C. 1992. "The Parallel Histories of Anthropology and Photography." In *Anthropology and Photography, 1860–1920*, edited by E. Edwards, pp. 74–95. New Haven: Yale University Press with Royal Anthropological Institute.
- Price, S. 1989. *Primitive Art in Civilized Places*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Price, S. 2007. *Paris Primitive: Jacques Chirac's Museum on the Quai Branly*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Price, S. 2010. "Return to Quai Branly." *Museum Anthropology* 33(1): 11–21.
- Raymond, R., and A. Salmond, eds. 2008. *Pasifika Styles: Artists Inside the Museum*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology; Dunedin, New Zealand: Otago University Press.
- Roberts, M., S. Vogel, and C. Müller. 1994. *Exhibition-ism: Museums and African Art*. New York: Museum for African Art.
- Rothstein, E. 2004. "Museum with an American Indian Voice." *New York Times*, September 21. Accessed October 15, 2014. [http://www.nytimes.com/2004/09/21/arts/design/21muse.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2004/09/21/arts/design/21muse.html?_r=0).
- Rubin, W. 1984. "Primitivism" in 20th Century Art: Affinity of the Tribal and the Modern. New York: Museum of Modern Art.
- Schneider, A., and C. Wright, eds. 2006. *Contemporary Art and Anthropology*. Oxford: Berg.
- Schneider, A., and C. Wright. 2010. *Between Art and Anthropology: Contemporary Ethnographic Practice*. Oxford: Berg.
- Schneider, A., and C. Wright, eds. 2013. *Anthropology and Art Practice*. Oxford: Berg.
- Shannon, J. A. 2014. *Our Lives: Collaboration, Native Voice, and the Making of the National Museum of the American Indian*. Santa Fe, New Mexico: SAR Press.
- Shelton, A. 2013. "Critical Museology: A Manifesto." *Museum Worlds: Advances in Research* 1(1): 7–23.
- Smith, P. C. 2009. *Everything You Know about Indians Is Wrong*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Stocking, G. W. 1985. *Objects and Others: Essays on Museums and Material Culture*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Stocking, G. W. 1992. *The Ethnographer's Magic and Other Essays in the History of Anthropology*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Tapsell, P. 2006. "Taonga, Marae, Whenua – Negotiating Custodianship: A Maori Tribal Response to the Museum of New Zealand." In *Rethinking Settler Colonialism: History and Memory in Australia, Canada, Aotearoa New Zealand and South Africa*, edited by A. E. Coombes, pp. 86–99. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Tapsell, P. 2011. "Aroha Mai: Whose Museum?" In *The Routledge Companion to Museum Ethics: Redefining Ethics for the Twenty-First-Century Museum*, edited by J. Marstine, pp. 85–111. London: Routledge.
- Taylor, D. 1998. "A Savage Performance: Guillermo Gómez-Peña and Coco Fusco's 'Couple in the Cage.'" *The Drama Review* 42(2): 160–175.
- Thomas, N. 1999. *Possessions: Indigenous Art/Colonial Culture*. New York: Thames & Hudson.
- Vizenor, Gerald. 2008. *Survivance: Narratives of Native Presence*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

- Vogel, S. 1988. "Introduction." In *ART/Artifact: African Art in Anthropology Collections*, pp. 11–17. New York: Center for African Art.
- Weibel, P., and B. Latour. 2007. "Experimenting with Representation: Iconoclasm and Making Things Public." In *Exhibition Experiments*, edited by S. Macdonald and P. Basu, pp. 94–108. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Westermann, M., ed. 2005. *Anthropologies of Art*. Williamstown, MA: Clark Art Institute.
- Zimmerman, A. 2001. *Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany*. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press.

Haidy Geismar is Reader in Anthropology at University College London where her research focuses on critical museology, indigenous theories of value, intellectual and cultural property, and new digital objects. Her latest book is *Treasured Possessions: Indigenous Interventions into Cultural and Intellectual Property* (Duke University Press, 2013). She is founder and editor of [www.materialworldblog.com](http://www.materialworldblog.com).