

## Quai Branly Museum and the Aesthetic of Otherness

Alexandra Martin

In the opening chapter of *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*, Ivan Karp states: “Exhibitions represent identity, either directly, through assertion, or indirectly, by implication. When cultural ‘others’ are implicated, exhibitions tell us who we are, and perhaps most significant, who we are not. Exhibitions are privileged arenas for presenting image of self and ‘other.’”<sup>1</sup> These considerations of culture and representation are examined through the study of a French institution dedicated to the arts and civilisations of Africa, Asia, Oceania and the Americas — the Quai Branly; a museum dedicated to preserving and promoting the cultural heritage of ‘Others’. ‘The Other’ is defined as such by a dominant culture, and is perceived as lying outside of mainstream society. The definition of ‘Other’ is ever-changing and dependent on individuals: one will always be ‘Other’ to someone else.

The opening of a museum in Paris at 37 Quai Branly has aroused considerable controversy in France and beyond, and anthropologists, art historians, museum professionals and journalists have discussed the project extensively. The concept of a new museum created for the purpose of collecting, housing and displaying cultural productions from outside of Europe was a presidential initiative launched in 1996. The idea was proposed by Jacques Chirac, then President of the Republic, and Jacques Kerchache, a gallery owner, art dealer and self-proclaimed specialist in non-Western art. These two men wanted to promote appreciation of ‘first art’ among the general public by displaying these cultural productions first at the Louvre in the Pavillon des Sessions, and then by giving them their own museum, because “the entire world’s masterpieces are born free and equal”<sup>2</sup> The new museum was intended to break with the museum models from which these non-Western collections originated; the Musée de l’Homme (Museum of Man) and the Musée des Arts d’Afrique et d’Océanie (Museum of African and Oceanian Art). These two French institutions are dormant today due to the fusion of their collections, which are now displayed at the Quai Branly.

This article addresses the modes of representation of Otherness used in the Quai Branly Museum and seeks to understand the cultural assumptions of the exhibition makers, in part through an evaluation of the various names considered for the museum and their underlying implications. I examine the concept of a ‘museum of Others’, a notion which influences Quai Branly’s intellectual, political, and aesthetic projects.

### Art and Anthropology: Issues of Categorisation

Although it is now known as the Quai Branly, the museum has had four official names, and “each of these names indicated the different orientations that were wanted for the future museum.”<sup>3</sup> A name is never neutral, and oftentimes indicates the direction the institution intends to go, so we will review each name attributed — even temporarily — to the Quai Branly, as an avenue for understanding the museum’s politics. The museum was first named Musée des Arts Premiers (Museum of First Arts), but this was quickly discarded. There was a problem with the usage of the term ‘first art’, an expression that seems to be but a watered-down version of ‘primitive art’. The expression has evolutionary and, by extension, hierarchical connotations. In relation to what were these arts placed first? And particularly, in relation to whom? When the notions of ‘first’ or ‘primitive’ art are involved, a different sense of time emerges; one that denies the contemporaneity and modernity of art and artists. Thus,

... certain art objects produced in the 1980s are systematically excluded from membership in the category of ‘modern art’, for *modern* here refers to the artist’s sociocultural identity, not to physical contemporaneity with the present moment. By contrasting Primitive and Modern art, we are in effect utilizing a temporal metaphor to distance people and cultures that are fully our contemporaries in historical terms.<sup>4</sup>

The anthropologist Sally Price discusses this issue during her scrutiny of Western representations of primitiveness in her famous work *Primitive Art in Civilised Places*. She points out that, in its concrete use, ‘primitive art’ is defined as:

Any art capable of evoking in Western viewers images of pagan rituals — particularly cannibalism, spirit possession, fertility rites, and forms of divinations based on superstition.

Any artistic tradition postdating the Middle Ages for which museum labels do not identify the artists of exhibited pieces. (Or its corollary: Any artistic tradition postdating the Middle Ages for which museum labels give the dates of displayed objects in century rather than years.)

Any artistic tradition for which the market value of an object automatically inflates by a factor of ten or more upon export out of its original culture.<sup>5</sup>

Despite the scientific community’s rejection of the notion of ‘first art’, the term quickly became part of everyday language, especially amongst the art market. President Chirac himself would use the term throughout the development the museum. Indeed, the institution remained attached to a specific concept of non-European cultural production which conceived of ‘first art’ as ‘primitive art’. With these connotations in mind, it is not surprising that those in charge prudently decided to opt for a different museum name.

The second choice of name, the Musée de l'Homme, des Arts et des Civilisations (Museum of Man, Art, and Civilisation), was quickly changed to the Musée des Arts et des Civilisations (Museum of Art and Civilisation). This shift was partly due to protests by some Musée de l'Homme officials against the new project, which they felt was 'usurping' their collections. On the other hand, the removal of the Musée de l'Homme component complemented the Quai Branly's leaders' desire to become ideologically separated from the former institution, a move which was essential to the Branly project. However, the name Musée des Arts et des Civilisations remained problematic. Combining the terms 'art' and 'civilisation', two main components of the museum, implied that art was not included in the notion of civilisation.<sup>6</sup>

According to the development strategy implemented by the Quai Branly Museum's executive director Germain Viatte, the idea of a 'museum of civilisation' was problematic. For Viatte, a museum is a place that reveals man's ability to contrive and create beauty. Museums fulfill human needs for emotion; they mould our conception of beauty, our intelligence of shapes and materials, and intrigue us with their mysteriousness.<sup>7</sup> Following the example of the museologist André Desvallées, writer of a critical essay on the Quai Branly, one can ask: since Viatte's definition of a museum seems to correspond to a fine art museum rather than an ethnology museum, what place is left in Viatte's vision for the new museum to fill the requirements of a 'museum of civilisation'?<sup>8</sup>

The geographic location of the museum ultimately determined its name. After many discussions and changes, the museum was built under the Branly quay, and was given the name 'Quai Branly Museum'. Finding a location for the new museum had been as arduous a task as deciding upon the museum's name. The concept of renovating the Musée de l'Homme to create a new museum was quickly abandoned. Establishing the new museum at the Musée des Arts d'Afrique et d'Océanie was not an option either. For President Chirac, the latter site entailed an excess of highly charged memories; it was formerly known as Palais des Colonies (Palace of the Colonies), and had been built to receive the Paris Colonial Exposition of 1931.<sup>9</sup> Therefore it was necessary to find a new building to accommodate the collections from the two museums, as well as a new name. By opting for 'Quai Branly Museum', the institution would not be attached to any particular field.<sup>10</sup> This appellation sounded neutral and contained fewer negative connotations than the others. However, since a museum's name is *not* neutral, the final designation demonstrated that the Quai Branly's orientations were still vague. Was the museum focused upon art, anthropology or another field of study? Following the example of museums dedicated to anthropological studies, the Quai Branly Museum's collections have sought to address the question "who are the Others?"<sup>11</sup>

## Quai Branly and the ‘Us’ and ‘Them’ Boundary

The Quai Branly Museum may contribute towards creating a boundary between Western ideas and perceptions of ‘Us’ and ‘Them’. The notion of a museum of Others seems to fit the Quai Branly Museum’s operating criteria, since a museum of Others,

... does not refer to Us, but to those who are defined as being different ... A museum of Others exhibits the ‘things of Others’, their main characteristic being that they are exotic, i.e. they originate from a foreign country, brought back to ‘Our land’ by those who travelled to visit the ‘Other’s land’.<sup>12</sup>

Indeed, the state of being different is probably the most common characteristic that links the non-European objects that can be found in the museum. Price states that,

As others have noted, what is in fact shared by the objects under discussion here is that they (or their makers) have been cast by both Western traditions of scholarship and Western ‘commonsense’ thinking as dramatically Other and, yes Primitive — whether on grounds of religion, technology, literacy, barefootness, or some other dimension of their lives.<sup>13</sup>

In the museum field, the cultures that are represented within collections and those that are underrepresented speak volumes about the politics and poetics of representation. In *The Art Museum as Ritual*, Carol Duncan states that “what we see and do not see in art museums — and on what terms and by whose authority we do not see it — is closely linked to larger questions about who constitutes the community and who defines its identity.”<sup>14</sup> By excluding any purely European object, the Quai Branly Museum implicitly defines the ‘Other community’, and by so doing, ‘Our community’ as well. Drawing this boundary indicates that in France, the Other is defined as the body of communities outside of Europe.<sup>15</sup> As a museum of Others, the Quai Branly draws a boundary between ‘Us’ and ‘Them.’ Indeed, the museum is “devoted to non-Western civilisations’ art and culture”, and as a result, “the museum is defined with a Western point of reference.”<sup>16</sup> Therefore, ‘Us’ is the Western community.<sup>17</sup>

In the manner of the majority of museums of Others, although the Quai Branly is meant to be responsible for the conservation of Others’ cultural productions, it focuses more on the past than on current native or growing cultures. For example, modern objects are not represented within the museum’s permanent collection. The decision to exclude contemporary art from the museum’s holdings of objects from these societies is not without consequence, as exhibitions mould our ideas about the cultures that they represent.<sup>18</sup> This absence, which often occurs in museums devoted to non-European societies, tends to deny the inventive and creative abilities of other cultures. As James Clifford says in *The Predicament of Culture*, “The concrete inventive existence of tribal cultures and artists is suppressed in the process of either constituting authentic, ‘traditional’ worlds or appreciating their products in

the timeless category of ‘art.’<sup>19</sup> Lastly, this type of representation essentially freezes the culture in question. By freezing a culture in time, the contemporary realities and nature of a group of people is erased. Nothing in the Quai Branly’s permanent collection represents the existence of current productions. In addition, the confusion between past and present sometimes makes the visitor wonder if the people whose art is presented in the museum’s displays live in communities cut off from the world, uninfluenced by globalisation. However, as a museum of Others and a new organisation in the cultural heritage sector, the Quai Branly is still in the process of discovering who they are. In this respect, the museum fails to distinguish itself from a large number of institutions that represent non-Western cultures.

### **Exoticism: Fuel for the Imagination**

At the Quai Branly visitors are introduced to some of the most common Western myths about First People arising from colonial time, through a group of clichéd representations involving primitive characters associated with magic, rituals, and proximity with nature. The way that first art is displayed inside the museum does not transport visitors through an interpretation motivated by history, but by imagination.<sup>20</sup> Exotic representation is found everywhere — from the ticket booth, to the entrance, to the exhibitions and architecture of the building.<sup>21</sup> The myths that are centred on First People are embodied in the Quai Branly’s museography; set design, lighting and architecture which promotes a ‘primitive’ interpretation of the collection. In this respect, the path taken by visitors can be quite enlightening.

Even before entering the museum, visitors are placed in a trade exhibition atmosphere.<sup>22</sup> Visitors cross grassy patches, bushes, and foliage, which look like a real forest at the heart of Paris. This garden is meant to “symbolise a ‘sacred forest’ with the purpose of creating a sacred journey for the visitor.”<sup>23</sup> Once inside the museum, the visitor must “climb a long, wide ‘initiation’ ramp, complete with blinding video projections as they approach the large stage where the collections finally emerge in a half-light.”<sup>24</sup> This architecture and presentation ushers visitors into what Françoise Choay, a historian of urban and architectural forms, calls “the heart of the fantasy.”<sup>25</sup>

The visitor’s experience takes place in an atmosphere that is sensitive and emotive rather than cognitive. To achieve the latter, interpretation material would be necessary, which would undermine the museum’s obviously aesthetic approach. Following the philosophy behind the establishment of the Quai Branly, didactic aid would be seen as taking away from the museum’s contemplative nature, where emotion trumps knowledge.<sup>26</sup> The Quai Branly encourages the visitor to ‘travel’ by offering them an opportunity to be completely uprooted from everyday life. As indicated by the pamphlet given to the first visitors during the June 2006 opening, the museum allowed people to discover the world in an hour.

The 75,000 square foot space which houses the permanent collection is divided into four cultural areas, taking visitors on a journey to Africa, Asia, Oceania, and the Americas. However, there is a lack of clarity in the transition between these different cultural zones. This has the effect of homogenising all non-Western cultures, despite the diversity of cultures and objects displayed in the museum. The museum's presentation of Others adheres to traditional Western representations of the rest of the world. In this method of representation, animist beliefs and the assumption that non-Western cultures are constantly in close proximity to nature are prevalent. This approach embodies the famous, but outdated, Nature/Culture opposition. In the end, the museum is staged as a "synthesis of ill-assorted elements borrowed from various populations to create a kind of 'original mythology.'"<sup>27</sup> Such sentiments may be a product of the building's unique architecture. As architect Jean Nouvel wrote in his letter of intent:

This is a museum built around a collection. Where everything serves to draw out the emotions at play within the primal object, where everything is done to shield it from light while capturing that rare sunbeam, so necessary for the vibrancy of a spiritual presence. It is a place marked by symbols of forest and river, and the obsessions of death and oblivion. It is a sanctuary for works conceived in Australia or in America that are scorned and censured today. It is a haunted place, wherein dwell and converse the ancestral spirits of those who discovered the human condition and invented gods and beliefs. It is a strange, unique place, poetic and disturbing.<sup>28</sup>

Is the Quai Branly Museum the latest embodiment of a 'cabinet of curiosities' that satisfies the Western visitor's interests and preconceived notions of what is exotic? Estoile says that this museographical project "shows how much the myth of first art is rooted in the myth of primitive populations."<sup>29</sup> Prehistoric and modern art pieces are mounted side by side in the museum displays which causes the past and present to merge; as a consequence, pre-Columbian objects end up being associated with a primitive connotation.<sup>30</sup> The design of the exhibitions and the way in which objects are displayed results in the "elimination of time, allowing for pieces from different millennia to come closer together," which according to Benoît de L'Estoile is "precisely one of the main magical effects of first art."<sup>31</sup> Yet, if the message of the architecture and presentation style adopted at Quai Branly is well received by the public, it is because it is already popularly recognised and responds to familiar representations, reinforcing views of First People which are widely shared in the contemporary Western world.

### **Quai Branly's Political Project**

Generally, when Others' objects are collected and displayed by museums, it is done so in order to service a certain ideology or principle held by that institution. In the

case of the Quai Branly Museum, objects are displayed to celebrate diversity.<sup>32</sup> By founding the Quai Branly, President Chirac wanted to institutionalise first art. In his own words, Chirac aimed to “break away from a long history of contempt, to offer a fair place to arts and civilisations that were ignored or undervalued for too long, to return all dignity to peoples too often rejected, put down, and sometimes ruined due to arrogance, ignorance, stupidity, blindness.”<sup>33</sup> Ultimately, the project was intended to acknowledge non-European populations through the institutionalisation and display of their art. The project is an ambitious one, and Quai Branly’s mission can be seen as noble. The museum aims to encourage the recognition and appreciation of long-marginalised cultures and populations that have been historically oppressed. However, the transition from equality in the arts and equality between cultures and peoples is problematic.

By displaying humanity’s masterpieces of art side-by-side, they are presented as equal —at least symbolically — and by extension, so are the societies that created them.<sup>34</sup> However, one can ask “how does a symbolic place lead to holding a real place in French society?”<sup>35</sup> The recognition gained by these cultures through the exposure of their art to the wider public is symbolic rather than real and practical. In the end, this type of recognition does not make significant changes for people who continue to live with the price of colonisation, particularly in terms of inequalities relating to material resources.<sup>36</sup> Instead of engaging in concrete action, politicians turn toward cultural gestures. Where politics fails, culture often takes over.

History has unfortunately shown that while appreciating art and valuing a community should ideally be linked, these actions often fall into two different areas. A positive attitude towards a community’s artistic creativity does not inevitably lead to a favourable attitude towards its people. And yet, aestheticism is the avenue through which cultural diversity is celebrated in France, through the establishing of the Quai Branly. The anthropologist Lorenzo Brutti has stated that:

... the creation of this museum indirectly produces an imaginary counterbalance for a party that is very firmly situated politically and that sees, by promoting the Other’s art, the chance to fill a gap in its political programme. It implicitly promotes a severe politic against undocumented immigrants, but at the same time they erect a temple to house the least disturbing expressions of their cultures.<sup>37</sup>

However, we need to be careful not to be tempted to make a direct connection between a state ideology and a museum programme, and the issue of symbolic recognition of one’s culture needs to be addressed.<sup>38</sup> In fact, “if France intends to repay past injustice with a tribute to non-European communities, it is less as a former colonial power, but more in accordance with their universal call to compassion towards history’s victims.”<sup>39</sup>

There is a “tendency [at the Quai Branly] to think about the connection with the Other without any conflictual viewpoint.”<sup>40</sup> Thus, the colonial past and its heritage disappear in favour of an aesthetic presentation.<sup>41</sup> The museum does not critique its practices of collecting and methods of display, as it would in postcolonial practices, because if it did so conditions and ethics of acquisition would probably be questioned more thoroughly. Furthermore, despite President Chirac’s poignant speeches on diversity, there was no explicit reference to “the nation’s current difficulties with communication among its own diverse populations.”<sup>42</sup> The Quai Branly project’s main protagonists celebrate cultural diversity, without referencing France’s internal problems linked to this issue. This is demonstrated by a speech given by Chirac in 2004 in which he stated, “in these times of violence, arrogance, intolerance and fanaticism, the Quai Branly Museum will express France’s faith in the virtues of diversity and the dialogue of cultures.”<sup>43</sup> How concretely does the Quai Branly engage in a ‘dialogue of cultures’ in a contemporary Paris still marked by its embattled inner suburbs? Does the museum plan to celebrate diversity or to manage it, as it increasingly becomes a feature of the globalised world?

The Quai Branly project is presented in the language of human rights, and Chirac’s museum makes respectful gestures towards African and Native American populations.<sup>44</sup> This can be interpreted as an act of ‘altruism’, which can lead one to consider France’s relations with the other societies it claims to converse with — principally its former colonies. Engaging in dialogue with cultural minorities attracts some form of prestige for the country involved. The mission of the Quai Branly then extends beyond the simple celebration of cultural diversity; it demonstrates the French Republic’s universal claim of tolerance towards marginalised groups.<sup>45</sup>

### Reassessing Intercultural Dialogue

The Quai Branly’s tagline is “*Là où dialoguent les cultures*” — “Where cultures converse with each other.”<sup>46</sup> However, Clifford has queried “how ‘cultures’ will be able to converse — speaking what language? Supposing what epistemologies? What political agendas? With what degree of authority? Representing whom?”<sup>47</sup> These questions remain without a definitive answer. Clifford also observes that “cultures don’t converse: people do.”<sup>48</sup> These exchanges between people “are conditioned by particular contact-histories, relation of power, individual reciprocities, mode of travel, access, and understanding.”<sup>49</sup> By definition, a dialogue is a discussion between two or more people — or two or more parties — ‘Us’ and ‘Others’. If the people must engage in conversation, then all players must be a part of the commitment. Material objects and art works cannot be the centre of attention, because “the power attributed to objects as substitutes for cultures and peoples” is problematic.<sup>50</sup> The absence of non-Western representatives on staff within the Quai Branly also creates an issue. As ethnologist Bernard Dupaigne mentions in his provocative book, *Le Scandale des arts*



*premiers (First Arts Scandal)*, “no representatives from ‘three quarters of humanity’ are associated with the museum project that is in production.”<sup>51</sup>

The Quai Branly Museum presents a “traditional approach of Art and Others,”<sup>52</sup> an approach in line with “the denial of the voice and values of societies from which the objects are from.”<sup>53</sup> Yet, as repeatedly highlighted by Michel Ames, an advocate of collaborative museology (which promotes partnership between museum practitioners and community members) and also the former director of the University of British Columbia Museum of Anthropology: “we must not hesitate to question the authority of the views expressed.”<sup>54</sup> In colonial times, exhibitions aimed on the one hand to glorify colonial empires by showing the extent of their power and the legitimacy of their civilising missions. On the other hand, they also tried to educate a public that would otherwise never be able to discover or experience these other cultures.<sup>55</sup> In the past, the museum visitor would experience a more or less mythical world, invented by and fantasised about by Europe, created by using collected objects, frequently pillaged from colonial territories. Yet one of the most important legacies of imperialism is a more globalised world where travelling is a common activity. Through the dramatic increase in world travel, people originating from lands thought to be ‘far and strange’ can more easily access their cultural representations, for instance while visiting a museum. With transnationalism, someone thought to be the West’s ‘Other’ can now have a first hand experience of their cultural depiction in the western world. We must ask how these communities wish to be represented, or if they wish to be represented at all. As Ames points out, many voices and many stories exist.<sup>56</sup> For example, in the Anglo-Saxon world, broadly consisting of the United Kingdom, Canada, the United States, Australia and New Zealand, indigenous communities have intervened in museum projects over the years and exerted pressure upon institutions, such as through exhibition boycotts. The challenge with such collaborative museology is the development of new working relationships between scholars and communities. Museology in postcolonial times — where postcolonialism is understood as the “attempt to shift the dominant ways in which the relations between Western and non-Western people and their worlds are viewed” — needs to consider the Other’s viewpoint, and thus share authority.<sup>57</sup> Even if we can still speak *about* Others, we can no longer speak *in place* of Others.<sup>58</sup>

- 1 I. Karp, 'Culture and Representation' in I. Karp and S. D. Lavine, eds., *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display* (Washington D. C.: Smithsonian Books, 1991) 15.
- 2 Kerchache's manifesto, 'Pour que les chefs-d'œuvre du monde entier naissent libres et égaux' in *Libération*, 15 March 1990.
- 3 K. Pomian, 'Un musée pour les arts exotiques: Entretien avec Germain Viatte', *Le Débat*, Vol. 108, 2000, 74. All quotations originally in French have been translated by the author.
- 4 S. Price, *Primitive Art in Civilized Places* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989) 63.
- 5 Price, *Primitive Art*, 2-3.
- 6 E. Dubuc, 'Le futur antérieur du Musée de l'Homme', *Gradhiva*, Paris 1995, No. 24; N. Dias, 'Ethnographie, art et arts premiers: la question des désignations', *Arquivos do Centro Cultural Calouste Gulbenkian*, Vol. XLV, 2003.
- 7 Viatte's 1999 speech in A. Desvallées, *Quai Branly: un miroir aux alouettes? À propos d'ethnographie et d'arts premiers* (Paris: L'Harmattan, 2007) 29.
- 8 Desvallées, *Miroir aux alouettes*, 30.
- 9 B. Dupaigne, *Le Scandale des arts premiers. La véritable histoire du musée du quai Branly* (Paris: Mille et une nuits, 2006).
- 10 Dias, 'Question des designations.'
- 11 Benoit de l'Estoile, *Le goût des autres: De l'Exposition coloniale aux Arts premiers* (Paris: Flammarion, 2007) 13.
- 12 Estoile, *Le goût des autres*, 13.
- 13 S. Price, *Paris Primitive. Jacques Chirac's Museum on the Quai Branly* (Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 2007) viii.
- 14 C. Duncan, 'The Art Museum as Ritual' in D. Preziosi, ed., *The Art of Art History: A Critical Anthology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009 new ed., 1998 first ed.) 425.
- 15 E. Dubuc, 'Entre l'Art et l'Autre, l'émergence du sujet' in M. O. Gonseth et al., eds., *Le musée cannibale* (Paris: Musée d'ethnographie de Neuchâtel, 2002) 39.
- 16 Estoile, *Le goût des autres*, 11.
- 17 Estoile, *Le goût des autres*.
- 18 T. Barringer and T. Flynn, eds., *Colonialism and the Object. Empire, Material Culture and the Museum* (London/New-York: Routledge, 1998).
- 19 J. Clifford, *The Predicament of Culture. Twentieth Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998) 200.
- 20 Estoile, *Le goût des autres*, 269.
- 21 Estoile, *Le goût des autres*.
- 22 F. Choay, 'Un nouveau Luna Park était-il nécessaire?' *Le Débat*, Vol. 147, 2007, 62.
- 23 Choay, 'Un nouveau Luna Park,' 60.
- 24 Ibid., 61.
- 25 Ibid., 60.
- 26 Viatte in Desvallées, *Miroir aux alouettes*, 29.
- 27 Estoile, *Le goût des autres*, 296.
- 28 J. Clifford, 'Quai Branly in Process', *October*, Vol. 120, 2007, 4.
- 29 Estoile, *Le goût des autres*, 293.
- 30 Price, *Primitive Art*.
- 31 Estoile, *Le goût des autres*, 268.

- 32 Ibid.
- 33 Choay, 'Un nouveau Luna Park,' 59.
- 34 Godelier (2000) in N. Dias, 'Une place au Louvre,' in M. O. Gonthier et al. eds., *Le musée cannibale* (Paris: Musée d'ethnographie de Neuchâtel, 2002) 18.
- 35 Dias, 'Une place au Louvre,' 18.
- 36 Clifford, 'Quai Branly en construction' in 'Quai Branly in Process,' *October*, Vol. 120, 2007, 34.
- 37 L. Brutti, 'L'ethnologie est-elle soluble dans l'art premier? Essai de lecture ethnographique du quai Branly par le regard d'un observateur participant' in Y. Escande and J.M. Schaeffer, eds., *L'esthétique: Europe, Chine et ailleurs* (Paris: Librairie You-Feng, 2003) 17.
- 38 Estoile, *Le goût des autres*.
- 39 B. Estoile, 'L'oubli de l'héritage colonial' *Le Débat*, Vol. 147, 2007b, 93.
- 40 L. Hurbon, 'Un imaginaire post-colonial?' *Le Débat*, Vol. 147, 2007, 170.
- 41 Estoile, 'L'oubli de l'héritage colonial.'
- 42 Clifford, 'Quai Branly in Process,' 18.
- 43 Estoile, *Le goût des autres*, 10.
- 44 Clifford, 'Quai Branly in Process.'
- 45 Estoile, 'L'oubli de l'héritage colonial.'
- 46 Musée du Quai Branly, [www.quaibranly.fr](http://www.quaibranly.fr)
- 47 Clifford, 'Quai Branly in Process,' 5.
- 48 Ibid., 16.
- 49 Ibid.
- 50 Dias, 'Une place au Louvre,' 17.
- 51 Dupaigne, *Le Scandale des arts premiers*, 57.
- 52 Dubuc, 'Entre l'Art et l'Autre,' 37.
- 53 Clifford (1988) in Dubuc, 'Entre l'Art et l'Autre,' 37.
- 54 Dubuc, 'Entre l'Art et l'Autre,' 35.
- 55 Barringer and Flynn, eds., *Colonialism and the Object*.
- 56 M. Ames, *Cannibal Tours and Glass Boxes. The Anthropology of Museum* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1992); M. Ames, 'The Politics of Difference: Other Voices In a Not Yet Post-Colonial World,' *Museum Anthropology*, Vol. 18, No 3, 1994.
- 57 R. Young, *Postcolonialism: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003) 2.
- 58 Ames, *Cannibal Tours*; Ames, 'The Politics of Difference.'