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Meeting in Paris at a time when major new initiatives are underway, we benefited from the immediacy of issues facing the network of Paris museums. The dissolution of some museums, creation of others, and reorganization of collections animated our comparative consideration of museum practice, both historical and contemporary, in several national contexts. Guided visits to the Musée des Arts et Traditions Populaires, the Musée des Arts Africaines et Océanique, and the Louvre installation of arts premiers that prefigures the Musée du Quai Branly added considerably to our reflections on how museums have materialized distinctions between European/non-European and art/artifact. Warm thanks to Michel Colardelle, Germain Viatte, and Maurice Godelier for their informative tours.

While many themes were planned by the conference organizers, others emerged from the synergy of the gathering. In reflecting on the conference as a whole, I will focus on the following ones:

- Alignments and synchronies
- Disciplinary objects
- Art/artifact
- Authenticity
- Disarticulations
- Rearticulations
- Museum theatre
- The expo model
- The paradigm of attraction
- From rehearsal to redress
- From an informing to a performing museology
- Museum as an art practice
- Agency of the museums
Alignments and Synchronies

A fundamental issue for the history of museums is the alignment and later disarticulation of knowledge formations, collections, and institutional arrangements. Many of the museums that we discussed were established at a time of when there was a close fit among these elements. Collections were established in relation to knowledge formations that were museum fields. As these fields migrated to the university and changed their relationship to collections, museums that once housed them became doubly and even triply museological.

- First, museums fulfilled their primary museological function, namely, to preserve collections of natural, cultural, and artistic materials related to active fields of research.

- Second, as the knowledge formations that had created these collections migrated into the university, museums came to preserve the outmoded fields that had materialized themselves in collections and museum arrangements.

- Third, some museums, particularly those without the will or resources to transform themselves, became museums of themselves and either criticized or valued on that account.

Taken as a whole, the conference tracked the widening gap between historically integrated components of the museum system and the various ways that museums are rearticulating themselves.

Disciplinary Objects

Critical to the coherence of public museums during the nineteenth century was their role in creating "disciplinary objects." Several papers explored how disciplines mobilized museums to produce disciplinary objects and how, once constituted, such objects served to consolidate and secure a discipline. The distinction between art and artifact, which is at the heart of this process, was posed as an historical problem. The distinction was analyzed from the dual perspectives of anthropology and art history and was situated within several national contexts.

Zimmerman raised a theme that would resonate throughout the conference, namely, objects as disciplinary artifacts. He argued that defining objects as artifacts, specimens, and documents--and not art--was a strategy for securing the scientific status of anthropology as a field in 19th century Germany.

First, Völkerkunde was based on the convergence of disciplinary subject, Naturvölker, and disciplinary object (artifact). Since the incapacity for art defined Naturvölker and distinguished them from Kulturvölker, "primitive art" was an oxymoron. The denial of
their capacity for art was thus fundamental to the constituting of Völkerkunde's disciplinary subject, Naturvölker.

Second, to secure its scientific authority, Völkerkunde had to establish the evidentiary status of its disciplinary objects. For Völkerkunde to be a science, it had to be built upon evidence--specimens, documents, artifacts--not art. Zimmerman focused on how the Berlin Museum used material practices such as iron and glass cases to secure the conceptual category of artifact. Their goal was to prevent objects caught in the artifact category from relinquishing their evidentiary status and activating an aesthetic response. As Schildkraut noted during the discussion, treating cultural objects as scientific specimens also shielded them from moral scrutiny. The preservation of objects was linked to the extinction of cultures precipitated by colonial rule and missionary programs. This is an important issue given the role of objects as proxies for persons, as will be discussed below.

**Art/Artifact**

The critical question is not only how the distinction between art and artifact gets made, but also what this distinction enables and what it constrains. As Sheehan noted, the ways that museums begin tends to shape what they become. Museums by their very nature are prone to path dependency. They have tended to be conserving and conservative institutions. Given how central the art/artifact distinction was to the formation of modern museums and the disciplines associated with them, it is not surprising that this distinction should continue to preoccupy them. How could it be otherwise considering how fully this distinction has materialized itself in collections, their distribution across institutions, and their arrangement within them. Dias provided rich evidence of path dependency in her insightful history of ethnographic museums in Paris across four periods, from the 1820s (the Louvre period) to the present (Musée du Quai Branly). Shifting her attention to the present, she observed the transformation of artifacts into art and asked, "Is the designation ethnographic museum obsolete" and the distinction between "art" and "ethnographic object" moot?

Art history and anthropology have historically used opposite strategies in creating their disciplinary objects although those strategies have tended to converge in the context of avant-garde and contemporary art, as can be seen in Documents.

- Art history could be said to be complicit with its objects--there is a relatively close fit between the art world, the art market, art history as a knowledge formation, art objects and their makers, and display conventions. The historical avant garde and contemporary art, by putting the category of art into question and revealing its institutional character, opened it up. In so doing, it created the possibility for staging a critique of contemporary society. Moreover, the avant-garde can be said to have produced its own path dependency, judging by the endurance of such categories art brut, outsider art, visionary art, "primitive" art, and other kinds of art that originate outside the
Anthropology works with the gap between objects and the contexts into which they are brought, be they the homes of collectors, museum galleries, or anthropological discourse. In that gap, we can see the mediations—artistic, as Derenthal's account of Max Ernst suggests, as well as curatorial, disciplinary, and institutional—that convert artifacts into art.

If there is a trend, based on recent exhibitions that we discussed and museums that we visited, it is to reclassify artifacts as art so that they might serve more effectively as proxies for people. First, new kinds of contemporary art, putting the art category itself into question, open it up to receive what were once considered artifacts. Second, stakeholders once left behind after their objects were brought to the metropole have mobilized themselves. They are pressuring museums to repatriate their patrimony. While some refuse the category of art, others insist that their "artifacts" be recognized as art on a par with even the most conservative definition of the category.

What then happens to the category of artifact? When art museums reclassify ethnographic artifacts as art, they do not collapse the two categories into one. Rather, they maintain the categories and reclassify the objects. To reject both terms would be a risky prospect for art museums, whose raison d'être is the category of art. Moreover, as Fischer argued, reclassifying artifacts as art is not enough. Those newly defined works of art must be accorded the same respect that art historians bestow on European art, including recognition of the creativity of individual artists and attention to aesthetic response in local contexts. Having designated objects as art, based on aesthetic criteria (quite apart from how the objects may have been understood by their makers), Fischer brings art history and ethnography together. He takes what I would call an ethnographic approach to art historical concerns.

As has been often noted, scholars increase the value of objects by classifying them as art and by sheer dint of the attention they pay them. So do museums. Indeed, scholars and museums are part of the art system, which includes the market, the subject of contributions by Schefold and Corbey. They explored how the integrity of the art category secures the value of everything within it. This is not true for artifact—or is it? Without an indigenous art category comparable to art history's disciplinary subject and without indigenous art genres comparable to painting and sculpture, art historians use distinction, in two senses of the word.

First, there is the distinction between what is and what is not art. Artifact becomes a byproduct of this process. Artifact is art's Other. It does not disappear when artifacts are reclassified as art. Even the rejection of the distinction between art and artifact affirms the distinction because the rejection continues to carry the history of the affirmation. This is in keeping with what Roland Barthes calls constitutive negativity.
• Second, distinction produces hierarchies of quality among objects that have been brought into the art category.

Artifact is also more that art's residual other, as Zimmerman's paper and the Willemette Meteorite, to be discussed below, demonstrate.

**Authenticity**

How did Schefold, an anthropologist, and Fischer, an art historian, constitute a category of art for the Indonesian and African objects they study? Based on an aesthetic sensibility rooted in modernist formalism, they argued for the universality of art as a category and the importance of maintaining the purity and integrity of that category.

Fischer advocated greater purity of the art category, criticized the mixing of fine and ordinary things, stressed the formal properties inherent in an art piece, and rejected the use a great work to illustrate a theme, which he characterized as ethnographic. His position raised two interesting issues. First, as the history of contemporary art attests, formal properties may be of little if any consequence in what counts as art. Conceptual, process, and some forms of performance art, the work of Allen Kaprow being a prime example, are cases in point. Second, Robert Plant Armstrong, in his work on African art, distinguishes between an aesthetic of virtuosity and an aesthetic of invocation.¹ The latter may or may not involve formal qualities. What defines an aesthetic of invocation is an affecting presence. That presence develops with the repeated appearance of an object in significant events. There are cases where an aesthetic of virtuosity might even be inimical to an aesthetics of invocation.

Reflecting on whether art historians can apply to Siberut objects techniques that they use to authenticate European art, Schefold asked: In what sense can we speak of "stylistic canon, imitation, distortion," not to say fakes and forgeries? This question requires consideration of several related issues. How are these concepts themselves artifacts of art history as a discipline and its relationship to the art market? How do art historical categories relate to local cultural understandings, a topic that Fischer's work began to address?

We might rethink discussions of authenticity in terms of the temporality that art history, as well as anthropology, has tended to assign to "primitive" art as something in the present, but not of the present, consistent with the eternal present of "peoples without history." The value placed on the purity of the work, especially those created before contact, is linked to the temporality assigned this work and the difficulty that museums have had in recognizing non-European modernity. The conference did not, for example, consider African or Indonesian contemporary art. By implication, so we assume that "their" modernity is less authentic than our own? Or, that "they" can only be authentically...

themselves outside modernity? As, Plato commented, how much authenticity does development allow? Curtis noted the assumption that authenticity seemed to require a sacred grove, a space outside the market, a condition that we do not demand of European art. Fischer argued that there are visible differences between works created in the sacred grove and those produced in the atelier.

Given the historical and global circulation of these objects, we might speak of authentication (true of claims) rather than of authenticity (purity). The stakes in safeguarding authenticity are very high. Much depends on the provenance--or, paternity of art. When Schefold spoke of inferior copies, one might have asked if graceful copies would be better? Or, we could have debated Clifford Geertz's dictum, "It is the copying that originates." Given the importance of copies in the history of European art, we might rethink our unease with copies elsewhere? Fakes without prototypes are more dangerous because there is no original that might de-authenticate the fake. As Schefold argued, the admission of fakes into a "canon of authentic works" will "deform and distort an artistic heritage close to extinction." Would reclassification of copies and fakes give such objects a proper place and new value in their own terms? Would it be possible or even worthwhile to recognize a fake for what it is, a particular kind of thing in an equivocal relationship with something it purports to be? A barrier to dealing with copies, forgeries, and fakes is the moral issue of deception and, as Fischer noted, the humiliation of being cheated by something you like.

**Disarticulations**

Art is a place of eternal rest for objects too valuable to be left to museums that have experienced the disarticulation of knowledge formations, collections, and institutional form. As disciplinary paradigms shifted, the way to establish the seriousness of a field such as anthropology was to move it into the university, emphasize theory, and address topics that had little if any bearing on material culture per se. Deleporte, documenting the shift of American anthropology from the museum to the university, showed how American museums of anthropology insisted that they are not only repositories for things but committed to "immaterial ideas." As she stated, "Ideas and objects remain the building blocks of museological activity today."

While this has always been true of museums that professed to be scientific, the relationship between ideas and objects has radically changed since the nineteenth century. George Brown Goode, director of the U.S. National Museum (Smithsonian Institution) during the nineteenth century viewed the museum as a library of objects, gave higher importance to the label than the object, and saw greater instructional value in copies than in original artifacts: "An efficient educational museum may be described as a collection of instructive labels, each illustrated by a well-selected specimen." Today, it is not uncommon to find museums without collections and exhibitions that do not feature objects to cite only the Museum of the Diaspora in Tel-Aviv and the many so-called

---

virtual museums that can be found online. They are a reminder that historically, well before the public museum as we know it from the nineteenth century, museum was a term that could be applied to a book, a cabinet, or a room.³

In time, material culture came to be seen as an albatross that kept Völkerkunde and Volkskunde in the museum and held them back intellectually. As disciplinary paradigms shifted to new topics and theory received greater emphasis, museums like the Musée des Arts et Traditions Populaires, as Colardelle would be the first to concede, became museums of outmoded knowledge formations sedimented in their collections and enshrined in their permanent exhibitions. As he explained, scholars are no longer interested in working with the collections at this museum. They are not interested in material culture.

At the American Museum of Natural History, anthropology suffers partly because the collections are no longer as central to the discipline as they once were and partly because the literary turn in American anthropology has helped to dematerialize the field and contribute to the view within the museum that anthropology is not really a science. Those fields that are considered sciences (astronomy, astrophysics, geology, meteorology) may very well have little if anything to exhibit by way of objects or specimens, if the new Rose Center for Earth and Space is any indication. There is a walkable timeline of the universe and a high tech space show in the Planetarium. The most dramatic object on view is the Willemette Meteorite, an object of controversy. For the museum it is a scientific specimen—an extraordinary artifact. For the Clackamas, it is Tomanowos, as they refer to the Willemette Meteorite. It is not an artifact. Neither is it art. It is a revered treasure of enormous religious, historical, and cultural significance. The museum had to sign an agreement with the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon before the Grand Ronde would drop their demand for the repatriation of the meteorite.

**Rearticulations**

Collections once kept apart are being brought together and "art" provides a framework for rethinking their relationship. While structured differently (and with different effects), museums of art—and museums of modern and contemporary art, in particular—as well as museums of ethnology are rearticulating older spatializations (and temporalities) of cultural difference. The temporal issue is expressed in the distinction between the contemporary (of the present) and the contemporaneous (in the present) that Johannes Fabian makes.⁴

Art museums seem to say that "they" are as artistic as "us." The recategorization of ethnographic artifacts as art is a normalizing strategy. When the Louvre integrates what

---

were formerly ethnographic objects into its art collections it elevates them and by implication the people identified with them. Note the statements made to the press and reported around the globe when les art premiers opened in the Louvre's Pavillon des Sessions in April 2000. Jacques Chirac said that visitors would "discover art works comparable to the Louvre's greatest treasures," while the collector Jacques Kerchache told reporters that "I got the idea to put primitive art in the Louvre when I realized that three-quarters of humanity were being ignored." Chirac added, "The museum will show that there's no hierarchy among the arts, and no hierarchy among peoples."

Objects become proxies for persons and museums do for objects what society has difficulty doing for the people associated with those objects. As Dias pointed out, posters for sale at the entrance to the arts premiers exhibition featured a carved figure from the show. The figure proclaimed, "Je suis au Louvre," in answer to the famous question, "Iront-ils au Louvre?" that Félix Fénéon had posed in his 1920 essay Enquête sur les arts lointains. The role of objects as proxies is one of several reasons that museums are political minefields.

Anthropological exhibitions such as Body Art seem to say that "we" are as strange as "them." Thus, Body Art unsettled assumptions about the familiar (us) and strange (them) by relativizing culture through the aesthetic framing of such cultural practices as tattooing and scarification, foot binding and corsets. This exhibition was an "anthropological" experience not because it placed the "Other" on display, but because it unsettled visitors' certainties about their own normalness.

The issue, then, is not representation per se, but how difference is structured, spatialized, and temporalized, inside, outside, and across disciplines, institutions, collections, exhibitions, and stakeholders. Like American anthropology, Völkerkunde and Volkskunde have extended their cultural scope beyond "primitive" peoples and peasants, respectively. New configurations and terms (cultural science, European ethnology, cultural anthropology) are attempts to address the vexed history of Völkerkunde and Volkskunde in the German context. Tietmeyer traced the history of how Berlin museums dedicated to these fields divided up the cultural territory, changed their names over time, and later consolidated and redistributed collections. She then showed how Fascination Picture, the inaugural exhibition of the Museum Europäischer Kulturen (MEK), spatialized new cultural understandings in ways that the institution as such could not do. Although MEK now combines German and European collections, it continues to be separate from the Berlin Ethnological Museum. Similarly, as Schildkraut explained, the anthropology department of the American Museum of Natural History does not collect "Western" material, but will borrow such material for an exhibition such as Body Art.

Given the impact of recent immigration and global population flows, the spatialization of collections (and to some degree exhibitions) along geographic lines is less and less in touch with the daily reality in which the museum is actually operating. How European is Europe? The world is already here.

---

5 The Times of India, 14 April 2000, printed an Associated Press account.
Museum Theatre

What is to be done with museums that are museological in the first, second, or third degree, as outlined above? No longer engines of research, now custodians of the materialization (and display) of outmoded knowledge formations, what are the doubly and triply museological museums to do? We might look to new museums being planned in Paris as part of a more general trend.

One way to capture the epochal shift in the nature of museums is to think of them as a theatrical form—and, for that matter, to think of performance as a museum for practices that cannot be detached from the bodies that do them. One need only note the long history of national types, costumes, rituals, music, and dance in theatre and opera. World's fairs exploited the museological capacities of performance, as Dübeck and Plato demonstrated in their respective analyses of the Samoan Völkershauen and folkloristic displays of provincial France. These performances and installations placed living persons, and not only things, on display using theatrical conventions. Moreover, as Plato notes, scholars such as Le Play, who had difficulty establishing their fields within the university, used the world's fair as their forum. They thereby aligned the temporary space of the world's fair with the role of the museum in showing (and advocating) for particular fields of knowledge not yet at home in the university. In this respect, both the museum and the world's fair could be seen as more progressive in nurturing new fields than the university, with it legacy of a classical curriculum.

We might distinguish between theatre and museum as follows. In the theatre, spectators are stationed in their seats and the display moves. In the museum, objects are stationed in their cases and viewers move. Museums have always been a theatrical form in the sense of mise-en-scène, the placement of things in space, which is as essential to the taxonomic display of systematic collections as it is to the theatrical realization of a story. It is in this sense that the Galeries d'Anatomie comparée et de Paléontologie is as much an example of museum theatre as such scenographic installations as the nearby Grande Galerie de l'Evolution at the Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle in Paris.

More than ever, exhibitions have become a theatrical medium in their own right and museums have become events more than places. Increasingly, exhibitions are organized around a theme, concept, or narrative and museums are drawing attention to themselves for their installations and not (or not only) for their collections. Indeed, with the rise of museums without collections and exhibitions without objects, the very identity of the museum is in question. Asked for a definition of the museum that would account for these relatively new developments, the late Jeshajahu Weinberg, curator of the permanent exhibition at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum and formerly a theatre director, told me that "a museum is a story in three-dimensional space," as it theatre. This approach is consistent with the approach of Te Papa Tongarewa, Museum of New Zealand. Stories come first. Objects follow. Te Papa proceeds from the premise that visitors want to find themselves in museums and to be emotionally engaged by what they encounter. The museum visit is designed to affective, before it is informative.
The Expo Model

The theatrical approach to exhibition is but one of several practices that link museums to world's fairs.

- First, museums organized exhibitions for international expositions, to cite only the Smithsonian Institution at world's fairs during the nineteenth century. They still do, to cite only the Deutsche Hygiene-Museum (Dresden), which was responsible for the thematic exhibition Mensch at Expo 2000 in Hanover.

- Second, some museums were actually created as a result of a world's fairs or occupy former world's fair buildings or used world's fairs to develop their collections, a standard practice of the Smithsonian. The Field Museum of Natural History was founded in 1893 to house the natural history and anthropological collections that had been brought together for the Chicago World's Fair. The Musée national des Arts d'Afrique et d'Océanie, formerly the Musée des Colonies, occupies a building created for the 1931 Colonial Exposition in Paris. Though established only in 1972, the Queens Museum of Art is housed in the New York City Building featured at the 1939/40 and 1964/65 New York World's Fairs.

- Third, several papers noted that world's fairs produced prototypes for exhibition techniques that museums would adapt to their own purposes. Some of those techniques can still be seen in museums today. They include pre-cinematic dioramas, still a star attraction at the American Museum of Natural History, and panoramas, a stunning example of which survives in the Biologiska museet in Stockholm. The Panorama of the City of New York, which is considered the largest architectural scale model in the world, was created for the New York World's Fair, 1964/65 and is preserved (and regularly updated) at the Queens Museum of Art.

Despite these linkages (and perhaps even because of them), museums have stood in an equivocal relationship to world's fairs. To establish their own seriousness, they have tried to distance themselves from commercialism and sensationalism associated with world's fairs. Yet, in an effort to attract a larger audience, museums have also competed with world's fairs. Most recently, we can see museums using an expo model to refashion themselves within an increasingly commercial cultural marketplace. Te Papa is a prime example.

As long as world's fairs took a retrospective approach to measuring how far civilization had progressed, they were more compatible with museums, which also arranged their collections to tell a story of progress or evolution. By World War I, world's fairs were shifting from a retrospective assessment of achievement to a prospective envisioning of the future. It is precisely this future orientation that so appealed to the planners of Te Papa. With the appointment of one Te Papa's prime movers to the Jewish Museum in Berlin, it is now a model for at least one new European museum.
The Paradigm of Attraction

Today, as museums focus on attracting and serving a wide public, they find in world's fairs a wealth of possibilities:

- Museums, like expos, have become a prime site for radical architectural experimentation and an economic engine for attracting tourists and revitalizing cities. Notable examples include the Guggenheim in Bilbao and New Zealand's new national museum on the Wellington waterfront. Like expos, many museums in the English-speaking world have become unabashedly commercial ventures.

- Like expos, museums are focusing on exhibitions rather than research. Instead of research giving rise to exhibitions, exhibitions are driving research and setting the museum's intellectual agenda. This is consistent with the priority of visitors over collections and accounts for the emphasis on visitor services and amenities. More space is devoted to exhibition, both permanent and temporary, as well as to revenue-producing restaurants and gift shops. Expanded public programs are transforming museums into performing arts venues.

- Consistent with these developments, museums have learned from expos to elevate installation from a minor design practice to a serious artistic enterprise. This has been the mission of premier exhibition designer Ralph Appelbaum. Celebrities such as architect Frank Gehry, theatre director Robert Wilson, and filmmaker Peter Greenaway have been invited to design installations at the Guggenheim in New York and in various European museums.

Lest we presume that such strategies are recent, Penny showed how ethnographic museums in Germany during the first decade of this century responded to the pressure to serve a general public. Highly professional ethnologists had to balance their scientific priorities with popular instruction. While German museums with scientific ambitions first distanced themselves from international expositions, Penny showed how they were already competing with them for visitors by the first decade of our century. In an effort to balance their scientific mission with popular appeal, Germany's ethnographic museums began taking a more aesthetic approach to display. They shifted away from the older scientific approach (permanent installation of taxonomic displays) to thematic exhibitions, temporary displays, and more spectacular installations. Appealing to a wide public was in keeping with the emerging role of museums in a new public sphere. Penny's paper (as well as his publications) offer an historiographic corrective to the argument that colonialism is the prime mover in the development of Germany's ethnographic museums. Penny shows how German cities used their museums to compete with one another and to increase their prestige on a world stage. Their motivations were
civic as well as economic and they used cosmopolitan strategies and not only colonial ones.

**From Rehearsal to Redress**

Even as they become customers for museum services, visitors have become citizens in ways that differ from nineteenth-century models. The museum's accountability to its publics has changed. In the past, according to Tony Bennett, the public museum (he focuses on the United Kingdom, United States, and Australia) attempted to create citizens through a program of pleasant instruction. 

Museum visitors were not the only target of such programs. Christian missionaries had already converted the Samoans in the *Völkerschauen* discussed by Dürbeck. Like the performers at the Polynesian Village in Hawaii today, they were engaged in what Steven Mullaney has called a rehearsal of culture. By rehearsal of culture, Mullaney means an exhibition or performance that forecloses what it shows. Such displays are designed to repudiate (if not eradicate) what they exhibit. In the case of the Polynesian Village, a Mormon operation on the campus of Brigham Young University, Polynesians who are Mormons performance their "native" culture, just like the missionized Samoans described by Dürbeck. In both cases, the performers enacted their conversion by performing what they no longer believe. If repudiation licenses the showing of questionable material in the first instance, extinction enables its aestheticization. As Sheehan noted with respect to the little shoes associated with footbinding that were shown in *Body Art*, "if they were still binding feet, you would not be able to aestheticize the shoes."

Turning this process on its head, performance artist Guillermo Gomez-Peña has created what he calls reverse anthropology and rehearsals of culture are giving way to rituals of redress. Visitors may demand that museums deal with a fraught colonial past, new immigration, social inequities, and cultural claims. These issues inform the papers of Deleporte, who considered the relationship of American museums to Native Americans, and Okoye, who compared several exhibitions of African art in the United Kingdom. In a postcolonial era and at the heart of the former empire, museums can no longer assume a relatively homogeneous audience. New audiences are making new kinds of claims to what museums show. They are holding museums accountable to their own histories as institutions and to those who once lived far away from the metropole but are now in their midst.

The Willemette Meteorite mentioned earlier exemplifies these issues. On June 22, 2000, The American Museum of Natural History signed an agreement that maintained this treasure's dual status as "a world famous scientific specimen" and object of "religious,
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8 See, for example, *Couple in the Cage*, http://www.artswire.org/cocofusco/couple.html, which he created with Coco Fusco.
historical, and cultural" importance to the Grand Ronde. The resolution of the competing claims of the Museum and the Grande Ronde took the following form:

The agreement recognizes the Museum's tradition of displaying and studying the Meteorite for almost a century, while also enabling the Grand Ronde to re-establish its relationship with the Meteorite with an annual ceremonial visit to the Meteorite.

The agreement reflects mutual recognition of and respect for the traditions of both the Tribe and the Museum. As part of the agreement, the Tribe agrees to drop its claim for repatriation of the Willamette Meteorite and not to contest the Museum's ownership of it. However, the agreement also stipulates the Meteorite would be conveyed to the Tribe if the Museum failed to publicly display it, except for temporary periods for preservation, safety, construction and reasons beyond the reasonable control of the Museum. Also in keeping with the agreement, the Museum will place a description of the Meteorite's significance to the Clackamas in the Hall of the Universe, alongside a description of the Meteorite's scientific importance. (New York Times, 22 June 2000)

It is not the transformation from artifact to art that this agreement requires, but the refusal of either category by those who invoke their own cultural understandings to make their claims.

**From an Informing to a Performing Museology**

The National Museum of the American Indian is a prime example of the shift from an informing to a performing museology, to adapt a distinction that Johannes Fabian has made with respect to ethnography. With this shift, the museum puts its authority as an information medium into question. It reflects on itself as a medium by bringing to the fore devices that it once hid. A performing museology at the National Museum of American Indian means, for example, that an object may have three labels. The author will sign the label and identify him or herself as art historian, anthropologist, or Native American curator and in the case of Native Americans by tribal affiliation. Or, in the case of an exhibition entitled *All Roads Are Good*, the museum, which is largely staffed by Native Americans, invited twenty-three indigenous people from North, Central, and South America to roam the collection and make their own selection of what to show. The entire process was carefully documented and that documentation was also in the exhibition.10

---


10 See *All Roads Are Good: Native Voices on Life and Culture* http://www.si.edu/harcourt/nmai/exhibit/exroad.htm.
**Museums as an Art Practice**

Treating artifacts as art and aestheticizing display have become critical strategies in negotiating the relationship of showmanship, science, art, and cultural citizenship. It could be said that all museums are art museums. It is in the very nature of the museum as a medium to aestheticize what it shows, even when the objects are not art. The poetics of the medium--whether natural history museum or history of technology museum or cultural history museum--have inspired artists to take the museum as their subject and/or medium, to cite only Mark Dion, David Wilson, Ilya Kabakov, and Christian Boltanksi among others. Moreover, as already suggested, the politics of cultural representation have required a systematic conversion from ethnographic object to art in order to fulfill the museum's role in a program of cultural parity and equity.

Several papers explored the history of this process by attending to the relationship of artists (and not only art historians) to ethnography, ethnographic collections, and museums. As Derenthal demonstrated in his discussion of Max Ernst and the Indians (and as James Clifford and others have also shown), the aesthetics of ethnography and the ethnographic interests of the avant-garde before World War II, as seen in *Documents*, brought scholars and artists together around a shared sensibility. A critical site for their interaction was the museum.

The repercussions of this kind of interaction were beautifully explored by Grossman in her paper on the role of photographic practices in establishing the modernism of African sculpture through images that were themselves "at the crossroads between 'document' and 'art.'" In the process, photography attempted to establish itself as an art practice. Taking her lead from Malraux's famous dictum that "Art history is a history of that which can be photographed," Grossman addressed the artifactual and ontological status of photographs of African art. Focussing on Carl Einstein's *Negerplastik*, she stressed the role of photography in bringing African art into art history, in transforming images into icons, and in constructing a canon.

Thanks to photographs of the museum's interior, Fleckner was able to illustrate Carl Einstein's approach to the installation of African art at the Berlin Museum of Ethnology, which was redesigned in 1926. Einstein organized the permanent installation geographically and combined a spare approach to display with a commitment to scholarship, which he believed would enliven objects that had been removed from their contexts.

As artists make curation their art practice and curators become exhibition auteurs, the museum itself continues to develop as an art practice in its own right and, increasingly, to become an intensely reflexive one. The current trend towards narrative--the story museum and the highly interpretive exhibition--scenographic installation, and "animation," is being critically reassessed in relation to the idea of the museum as an autopoetic system. I have in mind here the work of Michael Fehr, director of the Karl
Ernst Osthaus Museum in Hagen\textsuperscript{11} and experiments in reflexive museology by such artists as Fred Wilson, Coco Fusco, and Guillermo Gomez-Peña.

\textit{Agency of Museums}

Whether they like it or not, museums are key players in identity politics, a topic that requires us to rethink the basic terms of our conference, in particular "the Other" and "cultural representation." While these terms provided a useful point of departure, the conference itself encourages us to rethink them. What if museums were prohibited from "exhibiting the Other," but required to exhibit their collections? What would they do? This question bears on the agency of museums in the mobilization of citizens around rights claims. Museums are an arena for the performance and contestation of cultural citizenship, which has made them a lightening rod for controversy.

Representation refers not only to imaging, but also to inclusion. And, not only to inclusion, for it is the structuring of inclusions and not inclusion per se that is critical. It is therefore important to attend more closely to the implied narratives that exclusions produce, as, for example, when Europeans are excluded from ethnological collections or non-Europeans are excluded from art museums. Similarly, how are inclusions structured at the Cité de la Musique, where non-European music and musical instruments appear only twice: first, as the pre-history of European classical music; and second, in the context of world's fairs, where their role as inspiration for European composers is primary.

Inclusion within the collection or within the space of display is one thing. Inclusion within the very infrastructure of the institution is quite another. The former has been associated historically with subjection, the latter with authority and control. While these issues may be addressed more vocally in the United States and United Kingdom (as well as in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and elsewhere), they are relevant to Germany and France as well.

I know I speak on behalf of all the participants in thanking Thomas W. Gaehtgens and Cordula Grewa, their support staff, and the two sponsoring institutions, the German Historical Institute in Washington, D.C. and the Centre Allemand d'Histoire de l'Art in Paris, for all they did to organize this conference and receive us so graciously.

\textsuperscript{11} For articles by Michael Fehr, see http://www.museum-theory.de/. For the Karl Ernst Osthaus Museum, see http://www.keom.de/.