

geschaffen. Teilweise werden Fachbegriffe vorausgesetzt (*khatam-kar* [26], *mashrabiya* [27]), die zumindest in einem Glossar am Ende des Bandes hätten erklärt werden müssen. Die Nutzung und der kulturelle Kontext einiger Objekte werden, vielleicht auch durch die Kürze der Begleittexte bedingt, knapp und allgemein erläutert. Auf Besonderheiten der abgebildeten Exponate, etwa in ihrer Form, verwendeten Motiven oder Inschriften, die eigentlich entscheidend zur „kulturelle[n] Relevanz eines Objekts“ (11) beitragen, wird in den meisten Fällen nicht eingegangen.

Zusammenfassend lässt sich festhalten, dass die Sammlung und ihre Objekte in diesem Begleitband in den Hintergrund treten. Sie scheinen lediglich Anlass dieser Aufsatzsammlung zu sein und diese zu illustrieren. Die Exponate hätten es jedoch verdient, in den Mittelpunkt des Begleitbandes zur Dauerausstellung gestellt zu werden. Differenzierte Aussagen über muslimische Gesellschaften hätten auch durch eine auf das Objekt bezogene bzw. von ihm ausgehende Kontextualisierung getroffen und dem Publikum vermittelt werden können. So wären Forschung und Museum gelungen verschränkt worden und hätten besser voneinander profitieren können. Für den Sammlungsinteressierten wäre es zudem ein größerer Gewinn gewesen, die Sammlungsgeschichte und die Wege der Objekte in die Sammlung zu vertiefen; ein Thema, dem in aktuellen Forschungsprojekten vermehrt nachgegangen wird. Dies hätte auch Schwerpunkte und Lücken im Sammlungsbestand und Begleitband erklärt, etwa den Mangel an Exponaten vor dem 19. Jh. oder der zeitgenössischen muslimischen Kulturproduktion in Deutschland.

Abschließend noch eine Bemerkung zum Titel „Welten der Muslime“. Dieser verspricht anderes als Dauerausstellung und Begleitband leisten können, was jedoch nicht die kulturelle Bedeutung der Exponate und Leistung der Autoren schmälern soll. Das Museum hätte gut daran getan, ähnlich dem Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, das seine neuausgestellte Sammlung islamischer Kunst als „Galleries for the Art of the Arab Lands, Turkey, Iran, Central Asia, and Later South Asia“ zeigt, wenigstens im Untertitel zu präzisieren, was die Stärke dieser Sammlung ist und letztlich auch des Begleitbandes sein sollte: nämlich die materielle Kultur muslimischer Gesellschaften in Nordafrika, West- und Zentralasien des 19. bis Mitte des 20. Jh.s.

Miriam Kühn

Phillips, Ruth B.: *Museum Pieces. Toward the Indigenization of Canadian Museums*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2011. 392 pp. ISBN 978-0-7735-3906-8. Price \$ 39.95

As the title suggests, this is a collection of essays, written over a period of some twenty years, describing the growing influence of indigenous interest groups over Canadian museums with significant ethnographic collections. The author, an art historian and anthropologist who participated in the process of „indigenization“ as an influential member of the Canadian museological establishment, endorses this development but, thankfully, main-

tains enough scholarly distance to sound a few alarm bells as well.

The political scene is set in Part One of the book, under the rubric of „Confrontation and Contestation,“ where Phillips describes some key events that contributed to Canadian aboriginal groups challenging traditional museological conventions. Phillips begins this section with a detailed analysis of Expo 67 in Montreal as an early example of clashing views on the portrayal of the aboriginal peoples' position in Canadian history and society, and the ability of native artists and interest groups to shape it in unconventional and influential ways. It comes as no surprise, though, that she singles out the 1988 „The Spirit Sings“ exhibition at the Glenbow Museum in Calgary as the trigger that set in motion the radical redesign of the role of native people in Canadian museology. Intended as a showpiece of aboriginal arts and crafts on the occasion of the Calgary Olympics, the exhibition led to an international boycott organized by native groups and their supporters to protest the disenfranchisement of Canadian aboriginal people. The controversy led to the formation of a government-funded „Task Force on Museums and First Peoples“ which spent four years, 1988–1992, on formulating new principles for the involvement of aboriginal interest groups in decisions about the appropriate depiction of native people in Canadian museums.

Ruth Phillips was a member of this task force, and this may have been a factor in her becoming the director of the Museum of Anthropology at the University of British Columbia in 1997. Here she succeeded the doyen of Canada's „critical museologists,“ Michael Ames, who had advanced the partnership with local aboriginal groups well beyond the prevailing norm. In Part Two, called „Re-disciplining the Museum,“ Phillips offers some intriguing insights into the challenges posed to established museological practices by the growing influence of native stakeholders. She discusses the restrictions on the display or even possession of sacred or otherwise sensitive objects, such as Iroquois wampum belts and so-called „false face“ masks, and she concludes that such restrictions are justified as a gesture of resistance to „the axis of knowledge and power that was activated during the colonial period, through academic and popular projects of representation“ (129). On the other hand, she refuses to join the camp of hard-core advocates of universal repatriation of native artifacts, arguing instead in favor of a nuanced approach that takes into consideration how a given object ended up in a museum collection.

Part Three – „Working It out“ – reviews several exhibitions at major Canadian museums and galleries where the new partnership between museum professionals and representatives of aboriginal groups has been entrenched. Phillips sees this „collaborative paradigm of exhibition production“ as involving „a new form of power-sharing in which museum and community partners co-manage a broad range of the activities“ (188) in an effort to redress „past asymmetries of power in the treatment of intellectual property“ (190).

More examples of „inclusiveness“ and „dialogic partnerships“ follow in the concluding Part Four, called „The

Second Museum Age" in reference to the first, traditional, era of colonialism that gave birth to these institutions. Perhaps the most radical innovation described under this rubric is the ongoing digitalization of museum collections which has allowed people from the outside to view the contents of drawers and storage cabinets on their home computer screens. As a pioneer of this development during her tenure at the UBC Museum of Anthropology, Phillips provides an insider's perspective on a technique replicated around the globe. Here she makes the interesting observation that it offers a kind of "digital repatriation" that provides originating communities with virtual access to artifacts without requiring their physical removal from established museum collections.

This is an engaging and informative collection presented by a highly qualified and knowledgeable scholar and museum professional. The book is beautifully produced and enriched by many evocative photographs that add considerably to the topics under discussion. But it suffers from two drawbacks. First of all, it is too long and repetitive. Joining sixteen "pieces" written over some twenty odd years presents a formidable problem, especially when the theme under consideration is relatively narrow. Phillips writes well and that, in combination with introductory sections written specifically for this volume, somewhat eases the strain of repetition, though not entirely. My second, and more important, criticism stems from the author's refusal to venture beyond political correctness in her willingness to assess some of the likely consequences of "indigenization" discussed here in such detail. The process described here for Canadian museums is but a fragment of the larger global project of "repossession" initiated by subjugated peoples as part of their (attempted) decolonization in order to break the monopoly of outsiders, including anthropologists and museologists, on the depiction and interpretation of the non-Western "Other." While Phillips is clearly aware of this larger context and makes scattered references to it, she says preciously little about situations where the views and interpretations of the academic and the native clash.

In her positive review of a new Blackfoot gallery at the Glenbow Museum in Calgary, set up in accordance with the new "collaborative paradigm," Phillips reports that the aboriginal partners involved "saw this project as an opportunity to develop an educational place where future generations of Blackfoot youth can learn the fundamentals of their own culture" (190). But this begs the question of who decides what these "fundamentals" are? More than ten years ago, I presented documented examples of some Canadian aboriginal groups deliberately distorting the historical and ethnographic record in order to present an idealized image of their cultural "fundamentals" (Scheffel, *The Post-Anthropological Indian. Canada's New Images of Aboriginality in the Age of Repossession. Anthropologica* 42.2000: 175–187). A just released collection of anthropological case studies from South and North America calls attention to the systematic distortions in the public presentation – through books, films, and museum exhibits – of Amerindian cultural "fundamentals" pertaining to environmental degradation, warfare, and vi-

olence, and its authors interpret this as an issue cutting to the very core of the ethics of contemporary anthropological research (Chacon and Mendoza, *The Ethics of Anthropology and Amerindian Research. Reporting on Environmental Degradation and Warfare*. New York 2012). Phillips herself is clearly aware of the potential misuse of museums for propagandistic purposes when she reflects about "what we stand to gain or lose when, in the future, we are approached to lend our space, our intellectual and cultural prestige, and our skills to government or commercial projects" (89). This warning was triggered by the hijacking of the UBC Museum of Anthropology by the federal government during its hosting of the 1997 Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation summit, but is it so far-fetched to presume that aboriginal groups have their own political agendas as well, and that museums could become tools for their propagation?

The digital catalogue of the UBC Museum of Anthropology, laudably accessible by anyone, anywhere, with access to the internet, provides a fascinating view of its rich ethnographic collections. But here and there the user stumbles across darkened spaces where, instead of a vibrant image, the inscription "culturally sensitive" appears on the screen. A cursory exploration shows pipes, belts, masks, and even moccasins that cannot be depicted thanks to falling into the "culturally sensitive" category. The catalogue has no explanation for what this class of artifacts entails or how and why it came into being. Phillips alludes to "official agreements" between the museum and native band councils concerning "shared authority" over displays and, I assume, collections (74). But the reader searches in vain for a more detailed description of these agreements. The closest the author gets to it is in a footnote referring to the protocol of cooperation between the Museum of Anthropology and the Musqueam band which is acknowledged as the traditional owner of the land occupied by the University of British Columbia. Here we learn that "[t]he text of this protocol is not made public by request of the Musqueam First Nation" (p. 327, fn. 12). Let's hope that someone uses this ominous void for further exploration of this intriguing topic.

David Z. Scheffel

Pitschl, Johannes: Homosexualität im Schnittfeld. Differente Identitätskonstruktionen in den LGBT-Communities und -Bewegungen von Salvador da Bahia, Brasilien. Wien: LIT Verlag, 2011. 167 pp. ISBN 978-3-643-50314-5. (Investigaciones – Forschungen zu Lateinamerika, 15) Preis: € 19.90

Das vorliegende Buch wurde 2010 als Diplomarbeit an der Universität Wien eingereicht. Es ist die Frucht einer über den Zeitraum von zweieinhalb Jahren sich erstreckenden Feldforschung unter nichtheterosexuell veranlagten Menschen in Salvador da Bahia, Brasilien. Das hier negativ charakterisierte Forschungsobjekt ist nicht anders in einem Begriff zu erfassen, weil eine Unzahl von Terminen existiert, die je nach Veranlagung und Aktivität der Betreffenden festgelegt sind bzw. neu entstehen. Damit sind bereits der Kern und das Anliegen des Autors an-