CHAPTER 19

CRITICAL ANTHROPOLOGIES AND THE RESURGENCE OF CULTURE MUSEUMS

ALTERNATIVE HISTORIES

Anthony Alan Shelton

In 1949 extolling its radical potential, Clyde Kluckhohn famously wrote, "Anthropology holds up a great mirror to man, and lets him look at himself in his infinite variety." Kluckhohn's use of the mirror metaphor affirmed anthropology's ability to invoke and sustain a self-critical and reflexive attitude able to upset everyday dogmas and presuppositions and inform a critical sensibility with which to distinguish truth from falsity and better understand the world from multiple perspectives. His early work promoted an applied anthropology that in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries has increased awareness of the relativism of ethics and values; the positional status of knowledges; and the ideal of an open society. These perspectives, taken together, have contributed to the rethinking and democratization of museums; they have also increased their receptivity to organizational restructuring, governance, the adoption of new curatorial models, and their re-engagement with diverse audiences and indigenous and minority communities.

Kluckhohn's mirror, like the better-known works of his colleagues Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict, marked one of the mid-century turning points in the

development of anthropology as a critical discipline. Kluckhohn contrasted five aspects of society across different cultures: morality, ecology, action (being, becoming, materialist, spiritual, goal orientation), social relations, and time, in what he described as the "value orientations" method. Whether intentional or not, his conclusions contested the competitive, acquisitive individualism of American society and thereby denied the assumed naturalism and unquestionable virtue of capitalist values.

TWO PARALLEL GENEALOGIES

American anthropology was not alone in realizing the critical potential of anthropology in promoting social critique and re-evaluation of the way the world is seen and understood. In France, Marcel Mauss and his circle, Henri Hubert, Maurice Halbwachs, Robert Hertz, Henri Beuchat, and others, synthesized the ethnographic knowledge accumulated through the intensive fieldwork of their American and British colleagues to construct a comparative analytical approach to the understanding of Western-defined categories such as space; the body and law; ritualized actions like gift exchange and sacrifice; and the mechanisms of recording, transmitting, and structuring the past through social memory and embodied forms of knowledge. Whether demonstrating the limitations of established Western categories, actions, and technique, mapping their unsuspected diversity, or deepening awareness of their significance, Mauss, like his American colleagues, developed perspectives that effectively de-privileged and challenged the authority of any singular way of seeing the world. Kluckhohn and Mauss's positions encouraged the later development of a skeptical anthropology which systematically interrogated the basis of fundamental Western assumptions on rationality, ethics, belief, and social organization.

The period 1840–90 has been termed anthropology's museum age, when exhibitions were dominated by mechanistic theories of cultural evolution, espoused in Britain by Alfred Cort Haddon and in the United States by Otis Mason and John Wesley Powell. In contrast, during 1890–1920, the museum university period, museum exhibitions adopted the culture area approach, championed by Franz Boas. In Britain the codification of ethnographic collecting and the elaboration of classificatory systems during both periods were guided by institutional handbooks like the successive editions between 1874–1951 of *Notes and Queries*, compiled and published by the Royal Anthropological Institute, and Brian Cranstone's Section Four entry on Ethnography, for the 1958 edition of the *Handbook for Curators*. Other systems of classification included those by Augustus Pitt Rivers, Haddon, and Beatrice Blackwood, and in the United

States by George Peter Murdock. More surprising, given his more radical approach, Marcel Mauss in his 1926 *Manuel d' ethnographie*, also contributed to this intellectual appropriation of indigenous cultural meaning by proposing a classificatory system of his own. In all cases, indigenous knowledge or the agency of objects was ignored in favor of a focus on the accumulation, classification, and sometimes exhibition of objects within pre-established Western theoretical frameworks.

So irrelevant and anomalous had many ethnographic museums in the United States become that in a landmark article published in 1954, Tschopik and Collier insisted that museums needed to reassess their means of communicating knowledge and use new technologies to refocus displays on contemporary issues like cultural assimilation. Skepticism on the relevance of ethnographic museums, within the profession, was echoed in William Sturtevant's much–quoted 1969 article "Does Anthropology Need Museums?" and in the Netherlands by H. Frese's erudite but less well-known 1960 monograph on *Anthropology and the Public*. For more than a century, between the 1870s and the 1970s, museums, far from embracing anthropology's more radical interpretive implications, relinquished its critical potential in support of the constraining influences of Western prescriptive classifications. In the process museums ignored indigenous knowledge systems, stripped objects of their ascribed agencies, and imposed a scientific conservatism that blunted the discipline's radical potential.

THE CRITICAL GAZE

By the 1970s anthropology museums, like the discipline itself, faced wide and multiple criticisms. While anthropology feared the extinction of its subject and was assaulted by accusations of its colonial origins and unsettled by epistemological doubt, anthropology museums had to face the anger of the indigenous people they claimed to represent, a multicultural society whose existence they ignored, and critical theory they ill understood. In the United Kingdom, *The Hidden Peoples of the Amazon* exhibition at the Museum of Mankind, London (1985), met protests from indigenous peoples, derision from public media and human-rights organizations, and public outrage for failing to include indigenous voices and idealizing the social and political conditions under which indigenous communities suffered. In Canada, the Lubicon Cree, who were to be celebrated in Calgary's Glenbow Museum's exhibition *The Spirit Sings: Artistic Traditions of Canada's First Peoples* (1988), condemned the petroleum company funding the exhibition for exploiting their land and asked museums to boycott

loan requests. At the Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto, the exhibition *Into the Heart of Africa* (1989) was condemned by African Canadian protestors as insensitive and supportive of former colonial regimes. While all three museums at the time defied the demands made on them, the public recognition of their global and ethical responsibilities and the need for respectful and meaningful consultation later exerted a significant impact in changing exhibition methodologies. The Museum of Mankind's successive exhibitions, including *Madagascar: Island of the Ancestors* (1986) and *The Living Arctic: Hunters of the Canadian North* (1987), collaborated with local peoples and institutions, acknowledged the Western economic impact on those societies, and incorporated first-person voices into exhibition texts.

In Canada, in 1989, the Assembly of First Nations and the Canadian Museums Association responded to their own crises by instigating a task force to examine and recommend reforms on the relations between museums and indigenous peoples. Its report, which appeared in 1992, had a deep and enduring impact on the adoption of collaborative methods in curating First Nations exhibitions. While it was successful in returning the right of self-representation to communities, it failed to restore management over cultural property or to appreciably increase the number of First Nations curators and senior managers in permanent positions in Canadian museums. Demands for control, interpretation, and management of cultural property were again reasserted in 2015, in the influential Report of the Canadian Truth and Reconciliation Commission. This resulted in a second task force (Indigenous Council) being established by the Canadian Museums Association in 2017 to assess the progress of the first task force and to propose criteria and means to instigate intellectual decolonization and the establishment of effective mechanisms for power sharing between museums and communities. During this same period, twenty-eight years after the exhibition opened, in 2016 the ROM finally issued a formal apology to African Canadians for the hurt caused by their *Into the Heart of Africa* exhibition.

CONTEMPORARY RESPONSES

Because the growth of ethnographic museums has differed at distinct times in their history and in discrete parts of the globe, this section will examine three recent practices through which some museums have sought to reinvent themselves and regain contemporary relevance, ethical propriety, and intellectual integrity. The first practice focuses on the application of collaborative methodologies; second, the reconfiguration of ethnographic into world culture museums focused on glocalization; third, the development and museum application of critical museology.

Anthropology is by its nature a collaborative discipline, and it is more instructive to examine the power relations between museums and communities than it is to identify changes in methodology, to assess their degree of decolonization. This has provided a useful measure at the Museum of Anthropology at the University of British Columbia, where curators acknowledge at least three types of collaborative methodology, participant action research, when the museum fully relinquishes responsibility for an exhibition to an originating community, leaving the in-house curator as facilitator; dialectical collaboration, when a curator engages with community artists or knowledge keepers and the dialogue itself, in all its heterogeneity, structures the exhibition; and the consultation model involving community meetings and advisory panels. All three variants are collaborative, but involve the mobilization of very different types of relationship and result in different levels of empowerment. These current approaches, particularly participant action research, were instigated by Michael Ames, who, influenced by Dell Hymes and Paulo Freire's radical pedagogy, distanced the museum's methods and interests from mainstream disciplinary anthropology to embrace open, politically committed relationships that still guide many of its exhibitions.

The democratization of museums and knowledge mobilization with indigenous communities has further been accelerated by some nation-states assuming multicultural or plurinational identities and adopting the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2007). Canada implemented policies to protect and enhance its multicultural and bilingual heritage as early as 1971, before enshrining them in the 1982 Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the 1988 Canadian Multiculturalism Act. Ecuador and Bolivia adopted new constitutions in 2008 and 2009, respectively, which recognized their plurinational composition, not only protecting their multicultural and multilingual legacies, but agreeing to a level of indigenous self-government within the wider state polity. The adoption of the UN Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous People, signed by Canada in 2016, is expected to bring substantial organizational and curatorial changes to heritage management. Social and political changes like these will not necessarily threaten the museum's commitment to anthropology, but they do give renewed support to the adoption of the discipline's more radical strands discussed earlier.

The collaborative turn in museum anthropology has received especially strong intellectual leadership from Mexico, despite its government's disregard of the 1996 San Andrés Accords with the Zapatista Army of National Liberation (EZLN) on constitutional reform, and despite its backtracking on the adoption of a plurinational state model. Regardless of governmental cynicism, Mexican anthropologists have long been major international advocates of indigenous rights and reform over control of museum collections. Guillermo Bonfil Batalla,

director of the Instituto Nacional de Antropologia e Historia, INAH (1972–76), edited many of the most important documents from Latin America on indigenous political thought (for example, *Utopía y Revolución*, 1981). Six years later, he published *México Profundo: Una Civilización Negada*, where he argued that, despite more than five hundred years of repression and marginalization, an indigenous civilization with roots in the pre-Columbian past continued to exist side by side with Euro-American civilization in a common national territory. Bonfil's museology was devoted to returning voice to Mexico's indigenous, minority, and working–class populations, which, if impossible to execute through the INAH's vast network of national repositories of the country's official history, might, he suggested, be achieved through the establishment of a new organization, the Museo de Culturas Populares, which he founded in 1982. The collaborative methodology he developed was clearly embodied in the museum's first exhibition, *El Maíz: Fundamento de la Cultura Popular Mexicana*, which sought not to abstract maize from its historical and cultural contexts and reduce it to a scientific category or commodity, but to understand it as shaping culture just as culture shaped the plant's domestication and cultivation. The project team worked with communities throughout Mexico recording history and myths, techniques of cultivation, harvesting and storage, its religious and social significance, rituals, preparation and recipes, linguistic designations, and metaphorical associations. This compendium of indigenous knowledges was published as *Nuestra Maíz: Treinta monografías populares* (1982). The books were distributed among the participating communities along with poster-board exhibitions based on the museum's displays. Bonfil did not envision the Museo de Culturas Populares as developing a collection of its own, but as committed to political action and indigenous empowerment, which through community-based research undertaken for temporary exhibitions, might reverse the usual one-way flow of knowledge from local rural communities to metropolitan institutions. The museum also worked closely with existing institutions and community museums to build capacity and promote collaborations. Through his museum practice, written works, and the journal *Civilización: configuraciones de la diversidad*, Bonfil closely interwove museums, anthropology, and political activism, bringing to fruition one of the radical potentialities always endemic to anthropology.

The development of world culture museums began in the late 1990s as some major northern European ethnography museums began to redirect their primary associations away from the nations in which they were situated toward international intergovernmental organizations like ASEMUS (Asia-Europe Museum Network), and geopolitical blocs such as the European Union through which new regional identities were coming to supplant or coexist with national identities.

Between 2009 and 2013 the European Commission launched a research project, Ethnography Museums and World Cultures (RIME). Divided into two sections, First Contacts and Modernities, the project reiterated some of themes first discussed by Tschopik and Collier in 1954, albeit in a markedly different geopolitical and intellectual context. The themes covered: the relationship between anthropology and ethnography museums; collecting foci and methods; the uses to which colonial collections could be put, as well as new questions on how to incorporate indigenous perspectives into exhibitions, and the relationship between ethnography and contemporary art. These were all issues central to the ongoing emergence and development of world culture museums as well as others which had provoked areas of dispute with more traditional ethnographic museums. The project incorporated ten of Europe's largest and oldest ethnography museums, some of which had already reinvented themselves as world culture museums, and others which were in the process of doing so.

The rise of world culture museums coincides with our second practice intimately connected to changing definitions and significances of ethnographic collections. What was classified as "primitive art" before the 1970s was redesignated world art in the 1980s and global art in the 1990s. These redesignations coincided with different interpretive frameworks and the incorporation of certain categories of ethnographic materials into different art worlds. Ethnographic or "primitive art" had been clearly distinguished from Western art and attributed its own qualities. World art, although then accepted as comparable to Western art, both in its expressive power and through its accelerating commodification, was still separated from Western art. Global art, however, incorporated Western and non-Western artists as equals. The changing significance of ethnographic collections was mirrored in differences in its institutionalization and expressed in defining exhibitions. *Sacred Circles. 2000 Years of North American Indian Art* at London's Hayward Gallery, in 1976–77, exemplified the essence of "primitive art" objects by grafting a cultural area approach to the presentation of what its curators deemed to be highly refined art works. The New York Museum of Modern Art's *'Primitivism' in 20th Century Art: Affinity of the Tribal and the Modern* exhibition in 1984 juxtaposed anonymous non-Western art objects with named European avant-garde artists to demonstrate the supposed affinities that connected them. Finally, the exhibition *Magiciens de la Terre* (1989) at the Centre Georges Pompidou and La Villette, Paris, dissolved the categories of artist, artisan, and aesthetics to affirm the works, regardless of their place of origin, as specially endowed objects made by a common class of fabricators, or "sorcerers"—a move that many have criticized as a new form of appropriation of non-Western cultural expressions. The world of global art created a division between historical ethnographic collections which have remained in ethnography museums, or, in a few cases, have been subsumed by art museums, and

contemporary ethnographic objects, which when redefined as global art, with named artists, became increasingly commodified and distributed through galleries and art shows. Global art avoids institutionalization through the mobilization of new forms of exhibition such as biennales and art shows to escape the prescriptions of ethnographic classification.

Some world culture museums, such as the once-controversial Musée d' quai Branly, are a complex mixture of objects which fall into this historically disjointed net of categories and others which freely mobilize multiple exhibition genres regardless of their disciplinary affiliation. The quai Branly represented a radical break from its parent, the Musée de l'Homme, an ethnographic museum dependent on the National Museum of Natural History. In contrast other world culture museums have maintained a contemporary anthropological affiliation. However, one of the things that distinguish them from "unreformed" museums is their reconfiguration and sometimes reinstitutionalization of previously established collections. Sweden's Världskultur Museerna, the National Museum of World Culture in Stockholm and Gothenburg, established in 1999, combines the former independent museums of Middle Eastern and Asian art and archaeology with the country's two ethnographic museums to establish a new consortium whose wide collections encourage more interdisciplinary presentations. Liverpool Museum, redesignated a world museum in 2005, combined ethnographic, archaeological, historical and Western science collections but avoided any new synthesis, while the former Antwerp Museum of Ethnography was amalgamated with the city's European ethnography museum and maritime museum in the new Museum aan de Stroom (MAS). Frankfurt am Main's Museum für Völkerkunde, renamed Museum der Weltkulturen in 2001, attempted to reconfigure its collections through acquisitions of contemporary art, provoking a crisis in its identity and purpose which will be slow to heal. Nevertheless, the majority of these museums, including Rotterdam's Wereldmuseum (renamed 2000) and Vienna's Weltmuseum (renamed 2013), although mainly depositaries of ethnographic collections, depend on loans and new acquisitions to shift their exhibition focus and drive an agenda that concentrates on global and glocal themes. This new focus enables them to move away from the old dichotomy between tradition and modernity and employ different disciplinary lenses to substantially reshape their identity and profile.

Ethnographic institutions, collections, and exhibitions have become much more complex and heterodoxical than in the 1970s and can no longer be understood independent of the larger art world and the mixed institutions that comprise it. Many have also revived their popularity. World cultures are seen as dynamic, connected, and open-ended, and exhibitions like *Secret Love* (2012–13, Världkultur Museerna), *Fetish Modernity* (2011, Royal Museum for Central

Africa, Tervuren), *Dazzling Desire* (2017–18, Museum aan de Stroom) mark this new shift to global themes. These museums have also shed their close relations to museum ethnography, with its emphasis on older concepts of history, functionality, material culture, and provenance, to re-engage with more wide-ranging anthropological themes and related issues.

The third practice I want to discuss is that which stems from critical museology. Critical museology espouses its radical and essential break from operational or practical museology. Together with its means of reproduction embedded in wider heritage regimes, university courses and professional organizations, operational museology constitutes critical museology's subject of study. Critical museology grew out of the multiple social, political, and intellectual critiques, disquietudes, and experimental exhibitions and installations that have been aimed against museum operations since the 1970s. Its codification and methodological precepts have been heavily influenced by practices stemming from the application of the more radical anthropological perspectives applied by practitioners Charles Hunt, Jacques Hainard, Marc-Olivier Gonseth, Fernando Estévez, Nuno Porto, Klaus Schneider; and by various exhibitions curated in different institutions by Mary Bouquet, Nicola Levell, Anthony Shelton, Boris Wastiau, and others.

Between 1981 and 2004 Hainard curated or co-curated twenty-two exhibitions that applied anthropological insights to the examination of a wide variety of cultural subjects which formed the basis of what he called a museology of rupture. The exhibitions curated during this period have been divided into three categories: (1) those thematic exhibitions that focused on the deconstruction of cultural and social categories and classifications, (2) experimental exhibitions that sought to deconstruct the sociocultural dynamics that condition everyday life, and (3) reflections on the passions and politics involved in collecting objects, their exhibition, and their institutionalization. Hainard's museology envisaged the museum as a laboratory to examine the translation and revelatory power of visual languages to express the contradictions and unexamined values and assumptions underlying the performance of everyday life. Hainard and Gonseth at the Musée d' etnographie Neuchâtel, created a dynamic and restless, reflexive museology that ensured the museum remains critical of its own position and mindful of the limitations and contradictions within its own processes of collecting, cataloging, and displaying. For Hainard the world and the laws, rules, and norms surrounding its perception are always culturally constructed and should never be assumed to be natural, universally applicable, or transcendentally guaranteed. Through his museology of rupture, the political strategies and purposes which mobilize them can be decloaked and the simulacrum of the everyday revealed.

The potential of anthropology to provide methodologies and themes for museum exhibitions is recognized by a number of other critical museologists. Bouquet in her 1992 exhibition, *Man ape—Ape man* at the Pesthuis, Leiden, explored the context of Eugene Dubois's discovery of the missing link, Pithecanthropus, in human evolution. Instead of focusing on the fossils themselves, however, Bouquet constructed a cultural history of the period, concentrating on their depiction in cartoons and illustrations, advertising media, even re-creating Dubois's library to provide the social and intellectual context of his interpretation. Another room compared the West's fascination with evolutionary or genealogical classificatory systems with the systems of other societies where contemporaneous kinship terms are more important. Another of her exhibitions re-presented the history of the University of Oslo's ethnographic collections, while yet another focused on the significance of two sets of labels attached to a collection of Melanesian objects at the University of Porto. The collection had been acquired from German museums at the outbreak of World War II and the two sets of labels clearly expressed divergent German and Portuguese translations and variant understandings of the objects once they entered European collections.

For Estévez, memory, forgetting, and the personal and state objects and instruments through which it is modulated, provide a re-occurring theme of the installations he curated at the Museo de Antropología y Historia, Tenerife. Shelton's 1995 *Fetishism: Visualising Power and Desire* used Congo minkisi figures and modern and contemporary art to deconstruct the different historical uses to which the term *fetishism* had been used. The exhibition began with the term's nineteenth-century use to describe the earliest phase in the evolution of religion, before examining its incorporation into psychiatry and psychoanalysis and then finishing with its Marxist conception in the theory of commodity fetishism and alienation. Wastiau's 2000 *ExitCongoMuseum* sought to similarly deconstruct the aesthetic works in the Museum of Central Africa, Tervuren, to reveal their individual histories and the colonial history of their accumulation. This deconstructive turn was further adopted by Nicola Levell in the Centennial Gallery at the Horniman Museum (2001–16), where she laid bare the history of different visual languages through which the museum's collections had been mediated. In a later exhibition, *The Marvellous Real: Art from Mexico 1926–2011* (2013–14), Museum of Anthropology, University of British Columbia), Levell deconstructed and replaced a French surrealist view of Mexican art with a classification devised by the Cuban ethnomusicologist, critic, and novelist Alejo Carpentier to examine the significant differences in perspective generated by the adoption of a Latin American interpretive framework.

Other experimental exhibitions, usually eluded from the history of ethno-

graphic displays, were also curated in the United Kingdom in the 1980s–90s. My own redisplay of the ethnographic and archaeological galleries of Brighton Museum and Art Gallery in 1993 attempted to promote a dialogue between the ideas and values of different cultures with those of Western collectors. The Cultures Gallery assembled complexes of objects under the heading of action words—worship, exchange, conflict, the exercise of power and authority, and gender ascription—to present part of the multitudinous ways different cultures conceptualized and visualized them. A second gallery presented parts of the museum's larger ethnographic collections classified according to the assumptions and narratives recorded by their nineteenth- and twentieth-century collectors: a yachtsman who sailed the Pacific, a reporter and graphic artist for the *London Illustrated News* stationed in South Africa; a collector fascinated by the use of natural materials by indigenous societies; and a female anthropologist who had made extensive collections from Papua New Guinea. A smaller third gallery in this exhibition complex intended for temporary displays focused on issues that emerged from the juxtaposition of Western and non-Western worldviews, questions of hybridity, the politics of collecting, and the impact of anthropological views on contemporary art. Artists' intervention, though unpopular with some curators, were also encouraged in these galleries. In one intervention in the Cultures Gallery, *Peep*, the artist Sonia Boyce covered the vitrines with cut-outs of the tracings of the shadows cast by the objects, creating oblique peepholes on to the exhibits which forced viewers to bend their heads and bodies to see what lay obscured by the opaque paper coverings. In so doing she transferred the subject of the visitor's voyeuristic gaze away from the exoticized objects on display to the actions of the Western visitors in their attempt to penetrate and see beyond the paper screens.

A more ambitious project, which followed similar premises, informed my 1999–2002 redisplay of the ethnographic collections at the Horniman Museum, London. The museum's large central South Hall, surrounded by a high balcony, was transformed into Britain's first permanent exhibition of African art. This time a committee of curators (ACP) brought from Africa and Trinidad, together with two African curators based in the United Kingdom provided the criteria for the exhibition and advised on how best we could enlarge collections to include objects from French-speaking Africa, a region usually missing from United Kingdom collections. Display criteria included categories like patronage, different natures, men/women, ancestors and morality, royalty and power, text, image history, cycles of life, parody and humor, and creation and recreation. Although not based on the action-word approach, the ACP chose these themes to upset established anthropological categories. *Different Natures* was intended to present masquerade as part of wider African concepts of nature;

patronage was incorporated to historicize the changing relations of production and consumption that resulted from colonialism; and text, image, history were meant to undermine the dichotomy between literate and oral cultures. Objects were described using different sets of categories contained within this list. A second level of interpretation was provided by the Voices Project, which reached out to London's and Brussels's diverse African communities to request they share their memories of similar objects to those exhibited. This strategy was intended to de-exoticize the works in the gallery even more by locating them through diasporic memories to real Africans living among us. A third level of interpretation was provided by British, French, Belgian, Nigerian, Malian, Benin, Brazilian, and Trinidadian anthropologists, traditional knowledge holders and collectors whom the ACP contracted to enlarge the collections and increase their inclusiveness. Third-level interpretations were provided as texts or in video form. The importance given to narrative authenticity expressed in the several levels of voices, narratives, and audiovisual presentations contrasted starkly with the alienation we wanted to create in the design of the gallery itself. A postmodern pastiche of aluminum and glass cases enclosed in soaring ochre- and sand-colored structures rejected any feat of imagination that the gallery intended to transport visitors to an imaginary Africa. This was a London Gallery and without recognizing its distance and removal from Africa, it would have been impossible to acknowledge the colonial and neocolonial histories that had helped move these collections (and the voices and narratives of the people quoted in the exhibition) from their places of origin to where they are today. The intimacy of memories and words contrasting with the spatial alienation of the design conjured objects as transnational envoys, problematically located with disjunctured meanings, agencies, and purposes. If once they were part of more elaborate ceremonial, religious, or political assemblages, now they were abstracted. Instead of once possessing religious-legal life cycle functions or transforming and modulating supernatural powers, the works took on a didactic functioning which in the eighteen years since it was opened, dramatically increased the number of African British visitors to the museum, many of whom were anxious to share these powerful icons of their identity with their children and families.

As in the Brighton experiment, a second gallery in the Horniman Museum, curated by Levell, was devoted to the history of the larger collections from which the works in *African Worlds* had been drawn. However, instead of focusing on private collectors, the gallery drew attention to the museum's founder and subsequent curators to understand the growth of the collections and the motivations behind different historical genres of exhibiting it. This was much more complex than the Brighton version and adopted a Mondrian-like grid at-

tached to the gallery's ceiling to help suspend four large internally sculptured exhibition cases. The ceiling grid acted as a physical device that descended to partition the cases in increasingly complex compartments. In this way, the grid was intended to denote the various narrative uses and increasingly specialized classifications used by the museum to legitimate the growth of the collections and their deployment in changing genres of exhibition. The first case, *Scholars, Travellers and Traders*, gave an unrestricted view of the diversity of the ethnographic collections, idealized as prior to their classification and mobilization within the museum. The second case, on John Horniman's original collection and exhibitions, *The Gift*, cut deep furrows and acutely angled spaces and platforms into the case, so different aspects of the original collection, including police batons, meerschaum pipes, metal helmets and chain mail, cascading cases of butterflies and insects, plains Indian headdresses, Benin ivories, Sri Lankan masks, Hindu and Buddhist deities and a life-sized papier-mâché statue of Kali were ascribed discrete positions. The grid held the case but hardly penetrated it, consistent with the idea of a cabinet of curiosities in which the spectacle of wonder dominated all else. The third cabinet, *The New Museum*, a long wall case, was dedicated to the period 1901–46, when Haddon had been the museum's external adviser and rearranged the displays to represent a didactic exposition of the laws of cultural evolution. Mainly focused on the museum's Oceanic collection, here the grid descended to determinedly dissect space and make ever-increasing prescriptions on the arrangement and display of the collections by tracing similarities and differences in decoration and arranging objects according to the evolution of artistic decoration from abstract to naturalistic motifs. The fourth cabinet, the Material Culture Archive, conjured the period from 1946 onward, when anthropological functionalism was adopted and collections assembled through fieldwork. During this period, first under the curatorship of Otto Sampson and later Keith Nicklin and Ken Teague, collections representing aspects of distinct cultural and social practices were assembled to illustrate ethnographic strategies: Naga tattooing instruments; masks from Ibibio, Ekoi, and Anyang secret societies; models of the markings on Indian caste heads; and London tradespeople. Here the grid dissected the case into sections which isolated each set of objects, while large text reduced the importance of the objects to illustrations of set textual exegesis. The parody was completed by a system of drawers arranged alphabetically, each of which contained the fragments of a specific culture. As with the Brighton experiment, the two galleries were mobilized through a series of provocations engineered through a program of African artist residencies who critically responded to both displays.

These exhibitions share a common set of interests and perspectives neatly

described by Gonseth's threefold classification of Neuchâtel's own exhibitions. However, critical museology has wider interests. Nuno Porto's *Offshore* (2006, Museu de Antropologia, University of Coimbra) was a visually hard-hitting comparison of the free, unencumbered circulation of objects as icons of ethnic identities throughout the world to the legal impediments that restrict the movement of peoples between Africa and Europe. Wastiau's *Amazonie: Le chamane et la pensée de la forêt* (2016–17, Musée de Ethnographie, Geneva) used an elaborate scenography and employed multiple indigenous voices which, along with Brazilian artists, attempted to explain indigenous concepts of the forest, humans, and animals and their parallel "reality." Wastiau's exhibition ended with recordings made by a number of the Amazon's indigenous people's delivering messages to museum visitors about the challenges that threatened them. Like Porto, Wastiau told a brutal story about the history of the destruction of culture and habitat and implicitly adopted Ames's precept that knowledge is never neutral.

The importance of structuring exhibitions using indigenous categories is crucial to the development of critical museology and essential in moving the power of interpretation from monographic to dialogical presentations, and from curators to traditional knowledge holders and indigenous artists and intellectuals. Wastiau's Amazonie marks an important intersection between collaborative and critical museology, and it makes equally important points about the form of a future postcollaborative museology, when the binary opposition between Western and Amerindian institutionalized museums and community centers and their different visual systems might be superseded. The work of indigenous curators and thinkers like Jisgang Nika Collison, Claudio Alvares, and Paul Wangoola is, against enormous odds, beginning to map some of the strategies and practices to ensure these alternative museologies continue to move forward. The UBC Museum of Anthropology, after a visit by Wangoola, attempted in 2010 to adopt the idea of multiversity to a new eighteen-thousand-square-feet gallery, which, with mixed success, aimed to redisplay large parts of its worldwide collections following the classifications and themes proposed by different indigenous communities.

INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES AND INTELLECTUAL DIVERSITY

This essay seeks to demonstrate the coexistence of a potential radical anthropology which has subsisted alongside its various scientific articulations from earliest times. Scientific anthropologies dominated museum displays from the 1880s to the 1920s. Anthropology museums in Britain sluggishly adopted func-

tionalist and monographic displays after the 1920s, but increasingly lost popular appeal, eventually falling into crisis in the 1960s–70s. Only then after a period of intense criticism did some museums again find relevance through rediscovering and applying the radical potential of anthropology and new, related disciplines to rethink and produce critical and contemporary displays.

Outside of the Anglo-centric world, as in Mexico, anthropology and museums have long enjoyed a closer relationship. In Europe it is no accident that all those museums which have adopted critical museology are closely associated with universities. Museums outside the English-speaking world have incorporated radical and conservative streams of anthropology and consequently established both museums that supported national identity and museums of resistance. It is this latter type of museum I have sought to give prominence to here.

The change that has transformed so many ethnography museums into world culture museums in northern Europe has coincided with a move from a focus on national to European and multicultural identities and global vistas. This transformation also rests on reconfiguring collections, exhibitions, and disciplinary affiliations to adequately describe new global relations which in many cases have been prefigured in anthropology's particularly radical nature. Nevertheless, it has also been the move from a disciplinary anthropology to a broader anthropological imagination composed of a raft of cultural sciences including the new art history, cultural geography, cultural history, cultural studies, Indigenous Studies, critical theory, and the history of ideas that has recharged and redirected ethnography museums to again become vital social institutions. What has changed most is that many museums have expunged scientific anthropology and museum ethnography for a humanistic anthropology and in so doing have constructed a potential bridge between themselves and local, indigenous, and world communities.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

Ames, M. 1992. *Cannibal Tours and Glass Cases: The Anthropology of Museums*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Augé, M. 1999, *An Anthropology for Contemporary Worlds*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Belting, H., A. Buddensieg, and P. Weibel, eds. 2013. *The Global Contemporary and the Rise of New Art Worlds*. Karlsruhe: ZKM. Center for Art and Media.

Bouquet, M. 1993. *Man-ape Ape-man: Pithecanthropus in Het*. Pesthuis, Leiden: Nationaal Naturhistorisch Museum.

Bouquet, M., and J. Freitas Branco. 1988. *Melanesian Artefacts, Postmodernist Reflections / Artefactos melanésios, reflexões pós-modernistas*. Lisbon: Instituto de Investigação Científica Tropical / Museu de Etnologia.

Bouttiaux, A-M, and A. Seiderer, eds. 2011. *Fetish Modernity*. Turvuren: Royal Museum for Central Africa.

———. 2012. *Museo Nacional de Culturas Populares*. Mexico D.F.: Universidad Autonoma de México.

Bonfil Batalla, G., ed. 1981. *Utopía y Revolución: El pensamiento politico contemporáneo de los indios en América Latina*. Mexico D.F.: Editorial Nueva Imagen.

Boyce, S. 1995. *Peep*. London: Institute of International Visual Arts.

Burrow, J. W. 1966. *Evolution and Society: A Study in Victorian Social Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clifford, J. 2013. *Returns: Becoming Indigenous in the Twenty-first Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Colombres, A. 1982. *La hora del 'bárbaro': Bases para una antropologia social de apoyo*. Tlahuapan: Premiá Editora.

Cranstone, B. A. L. 1958. *Ethnography: Handbook for Museum Curators*. London: The Museums Association.

Estévez Gonzãlez. F., and M. de Santa Ana, eds. 2010. *Memorias y Olvidos del Archivo*. La Lagunilla: Museo de Historia y Antropologiaa de Tenerife.

Estévez Gonzães, F., ed. 2004. *El Pasado en el Presente*. Tenerife: Museo de Antropología de Tenerife.

Frese, H. H. 1960. *Anthropology and the Public: The Role of Museums*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

-Gonseth, M-O. 2005. "Un atelier expographique." In M-O Gonseth, J. Hainard, and R, Kaehr, eds., *Cent ans d' ethnographie sur la colline de Saint Nicolas 1904–2004*. Neuchâtel: Musée d'ethnographie, pp. 375–96.

Gonseth, M-O, J, Hainard, and R. Kaehr. 2002. *Le musée cannibal*. Neuchâtel: Musée d'ethnographie.

Harrison, R. 2013. "Reassembling Ethnographic Museum Collections." In R. Harrison, Sarah Byrne and Anne Clarke, eds., *Reassembling the Collection: Ethnographic Museums and Indigenous Agency*. Santa Fe: School for Advanced Research Press, pp. 3–35.

Isaac, G. 2007. *Mediating Knowledges. Origins of a Zuni Tribal Museum*. Tucson: Arizona University Press.

Kluckhohn, C. 1949. *Mirror for Man. The Relation of Anthropology to Modern Life*. New York and Toronto: Whittlesey House, McGraw Hill.

Kovach, M. 2009. *Indigenous Methodologies: Characteristics, Conversations, and Contexts*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

LaRocque, E. 2010. *When the Other Is Me: Native Resistance Discourse 1850–1990*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.

Levell, N. 2001. "The Poetics and Prosaics of Making Exhibitions: A Personal Reflection on the Centenial Gallery." *Antropologia Portuguesa* 18:151–94.

Mauss, M. 1967. *Manuel D'Ethnographie*. Paris: Editions Payot.

Morales Moreno, L. G. 1995. *Orígenes de la museología Mexicana: Fuentes para el studio histórico del Museo Nacional, 1780–1940*. Mexico D.F.: Universidad Iberoamericana.

Penny, H. G. 2002. *Objects of Culture. Ethnology and Ethnographic Museums in Imperial Germany*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Phillips, R. 2011. *Museum Pieces: Towards the Indigenization of Canadian Museums*. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.

Porto, N. 2009. *Modos de Objectificação da Dominação Colonial: O Caso do Museu do Dundo, 1940–1970*. Lisbon: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian.

———. 1999. *Angola a Preto e Branco. Fotografia e Ciência no Museu do Dundo 1940–1970*. Coimbra: Museu Antropólogico da Universidade de Coimbra.

———. 2002. *Museums and Modernity: Art Galleries and the Making of Modern Culture*. Oxford: Berg.

Shelton, A. A. 1992. "The Recontextualisation of Culture in UK Museums." *Anthropology Today* 8 (5): 11–16.

———. 1997. "The Future of Museum Ethnography." *Journal of Museum Ethnography* 9:33–48.

———. 2013. "Critical Museology. A Manifesto: Museum Worlds." *Advances in Research* 1:7–23.

———. 2016. "European Ethnography and World Culture Museums." Museumskunde. *Herausgegeben vom Deutschen Museumsbund* 81 (1/16): 20–27.

Shelton, A. A., ed. 1995. *Fetishism: Visualising Power and Desire*. London: Lund Humphries.

Stocking, G., ed. 1985. *Objects and Others: Essays on Museums and Material Culture*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Sturtevant, W. 1969. "Does Anthropology Need Museums?" *Proceedings of the Biological Society, Washington* 82:619–50.

Tschopik, H., and D, Collier. 1954. "The Role of Museums in American Anthropology." *American Anthropologist* 56 (5, part 1): 768–79.

Wastiau, B. 2000. *ExitCongoMuseum: An Essay on the Social Life of the Masterpieces of the Tervuren Museum*. Tervuren: Royal Museum for Central Africa.

———. 2016. *Amazonie: Le chamane et la pensée de la forêt*. Paris: Somogy éditions d'art.