SUSANNAH ECKERSLEY

ENCOUNTERING AUTHENTICITY IN THE CONTACT ZONE? MUSEUMS, REFUGEES AND PARTICIPATION

When multiple forms of »authenticity« are simultaneously at play within the context of museum activities for »refugees«, how are these challenged and negotiated as part of a meaningful »integration« process of situating the self? The museum context arguably offers a unique opportunity for affective experiences influencing people's sense of belonging that can emerge from scenarios recognising the value of »more than« material authenticity. Such scenarios enable people to respond to the combination of encounters with authentic material objects, authorised museum histories, personal memories and with one another within the setting of the museum as a means to situate themselves within changing circumstances, including displacement and migration.

INTRODUCTION

This chapter analyses »holistic« approaches to authenticity in the heritage field[1] alongside the use of the contact zone theory in museums[2]. The »contact zone« is a term coined by Mary Louise Pratt and developed in relation to museums by James Clifford[3]. It uses the specific case study of a museum responding to contemporary migration and a funding opportunity based on political ideas of integration to draw out contradictions, challenges and opportunities within the theories as well as within participatory museum and heritage practice. The research methodology is based on three strands of research. Firstly, an interdisciplinary literature review, in conjunction with a broad review of museums in Germany responding to migration. Secondly, analysis of specific museums, activities within museums, and peer observation of groups of museum visitors. Selected material from semi-structured interviews with significant figures associated with the project *Multaka: Treffpunkt Museum* in Berlin – a museum director, a cultural professional and two project managers – forms a third strand of data from the key case study. The *Multaka* project came about as the result of a response by several Berlin museums to a call for projects addressing the issue of refugee integration in Germany (through the federal programme »*Demokratie leben!*« [Live Democracy!] funded by the Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend) and was designed to offer Arabic-language tours of the museums for refugees, guided by refugees. In the midst of countless refugee- and migration-related projects in German museums at this time, *Multaka* stood out as different. Instead of thematising the issue in exhibitions, or at special events which refugees might be invited to attend, the premise of *Multaka* was to offer refugees an opportunity to shape museum activities, to lead and participate as active agents. Within this broader analysis, this chapter takes forward and focuses on the much-used theoretical concept of the museum as a »contact zone«[4], properly attending to its antagonistic potentials, while responding to the notion of »authenticity« in relation to museums, objects and memories.

MUSEUMS AS MIGRATION CONTACT ZONES

Museums – institutions at the intersection between society, politics and culture – offer an insight into the past and its continuing impact on the present. Museums reveal much more about the past, the present and potentially also the future than is often assumed – beyond the objects and their historical or art-historical significance for cultural history, they can offer an insight into the society which has developed and which maintains the museum. The institutional histories, structures, public roles and missions of museums may be considered partial reflections of society, revealing and constructing the politics, cultures and social attitudes and expectations of the nation, region or city within which they sit.

Migration – as an ever-present part of human history[5] – can be considered a part of every museum, whether individual museums, or societies, recognise and respond to this or not[6]. Migration stories, influences and impacts can be found within any history, and any museum, if the objects, displays and collections are read through a »migration lens«. Both objects and memories – arguably the crux of all culture-focused (rather than nature-focused) museum work – are crucial to the telling, sharing and remembering of human migration stories. Arjun Appadurai suggests that within migration stories the memory of *loss* is particularly strong – the memory of the *what*, *who* and *where* that have been left behind[7]. When powerful memories of loss, trauma, attachment and change are articulated, objects often take on a heightened symbolic significance and affective power for individuals.

James Clifford coined the phrase »museums as contact zones«[8], borrowing the notion of the contact zone from Mary Louise Pratt[9]. It has been frequently used, both in museums and in museum studies analyses of museum work, but perhaps not always understood in its original meaning, which includes not only connections but also conflicts arising from the ways in which objects may be used as *aides-memoires.* Museums have used the idea of the museum as a contact zone to make changes to collecting policies, exhibitions, and permanent displays, to include specific communities in consultation and co-curation of individual projects. However, Clifford points out the potential antagonism of the museum as contact zone due to the asymmetric power relationships that exist between the museum – both as an institution and as a group of professionals – and the diverse communities who may or may not form their audiences. This also forms the basis of Robin Boast's critique of museum and museum studies readings of the idea[10].

Clifford highlights that »when museums are seen as contact zones, their organising structure as a *collection* becomes an ongoing historical, political, moral *relationship* – a power-charged set of exchanges, of push and pull«[11], suggesting that there should be more than controlled consultations or structured collaborations. These, as Boast points out, may in fact reassert the neocolonial power of the museum rather than empower communities. The delicate balances of experience and authority as well as of encounter and recognition are also negotiations: »Neither community ›experience‹ nor curatorial ›authority‹ has an automatic right to the contextualisation of collections or to the narration of contact histories. The solution is inevitably contingent and political: a matter of mobilised power, of negotiation, of representation constrained by specific audiences«[12].

Schorch's work analysing museums as contact zones[13] has done so in relation to Bhabha's idea of the »Third Space«[14] and of meanings made by museum visitors, whereas I examine ways in which individuals respond to encounters with museum objects, relating these responses to different, yet connected, notions of object, historical, personal, mnemonic or affective authenticity, and highlighting the potential power of sociability within such encounters and responses.

MULTIPLE AUTHENTICITIES

Authenticity here is used in multiple senses of the term, taking into consideration both materialist and constructivist approaches to understanding what authenticity might be (as outlined by Sian Jones and Cornelius Holtorf[15]), in other words, »the negotiation of parallel authenticities in tension«[16]. Holtorf suggests that more recent »interest in what is authentic, unique and original is not surprising in a global age of virtual realities and perfect copies, uncertain belonging and increasing »sameness«[17], and this article will take forward the issue of uncertain belonging in relation to simultaneously different notions of authenticity. To this end, I will analyse a contemporary example of museum engagement practice which involves refugees and immigrants (*Multaka*: *Treffpunkt Museum*) in relation to the particular role of the museum – as both a site holding collections of »authentic« objects and a site where potentially affective encounters between people, objects and memories may take place.

As is the case in Jones' examination of multiple authenticities[18], it is the relationships – the encounters – that are crucial to understanding authenticities that are not only »in tension«[19] but also integral parts of a single phenomenon. The potential significance of this to an analysis of encounters between people, objects, memories, history, emotions and power dynamics within a participatory museum project for refugees is indicated by Jones: »The experience and negotiation of authenticity also relate to networks of relationships between objects, people and places [and to] the ways in which these dual processes operate in practice and how people use authenticity to negotiate their own place in a world characterised by displacement«[20].

Jones' analysis of authenticity provides helpful reflections on the relationship between the materialist and constructivist stances on authenticity. Given that museums are places where people encounter objects (considered to be authentic objects in the materialist sense), and where their own constructions of meaning may be reflected, contested or developed in light of perceived authenticity or inauthenticity, her argument is particularly apposite for this paper. In my short study I will draw out various forms of authenticity in relation to the *Multaka* case study analysis and the contact zone theory. In this one case, materialist notions of authenticity focusing on objects and the transmission of history in the museum become intermingled with constructivist notions of authenticity through the exploration of power dynamics between communities at work within the museum, group participation, individual experiences, memories and affects. Jones also highlights the entangled nature of the two discourses of authenticity, suggesting that dismissing either one in favour of the other is to misunderstand both: »when we look at how people experience and negotiate authenticity through objects, it is networks of relationships between people, places and things that appear to be central, not the things in and of themselves«[21]. This is significant in the *Multaka* case in that one of its ostensible aims is to facilitate the integration of refugees and recently arrived immigrants from Arabic-speaking countries in Germany.

THE *MULTAKA* PROJECT

The premise of *Multaka* is that Arabic-language tours of four major museums in Berlin are offered, free of charge, »by refugees, for refugees«[22]. The *Multaka* guides focus on semi-structured dialogue as a key component of the tours, starting with questions relating to the objects – »authentic objects of the past«[23] – which are raised by the tour participants[24]. One example, given by Razan Nassreddine, the *Multaka* project manager from 2015 to January 2017, is of a key display in the Museum of Islamic Art – the Aleppo Room (the interior wall panelling of the house of a Jewish merchant in Aleppo) – around which discussions about historical and contemporary interculturalism can be focused[25]. At the same time, the display also has the

potential to stir up strong memories for participants from Aleppo, from personal emotions relating to the memory of being forced to leave behind their homes, to feelings of pride that this is »their culture« which is in this museum in Berlin[26]. Objects and displays here are acting as transitional objects – mementoes which allow the individual (whether the owner or, here, the museum visitor) to make an emotional transition between an old home and a new one[27]. They also act as testimonial objects – ordinary objects which represent a particular story or history, which »stand for« something important, (whether the idea of belonging to a place, of an emotional »home«, or of nostalgia) and which »act as points of intersection between the past and the present«[28]. This role of the object as interlocutor is also fundamental to the recent academic discussions around the connectedness of materialist and constructivist perceptions of authenticity[29]. As Holtorf concludes: »authentic archaeological objects are simultaneously of the past and of the present. Their authenticity is both culturally situated and firmly connected to their materiality«[30]. In other words, the museums' objects can act as material intersections between past and present, which may enable tour participants to draw comparisons with or make appropriations for their own experiences, as in Bhabha's »Third Space«[31]. Bhabha points out that »it is that Third Space, though unrepresentable in itself, which constitutes the discursive conditions of enunciation that ensure that the meaning and symbols of culture have no primordial unity or fixity; that even the same signs can be appropriated, translated, rehistoricised and read anew«[32], implying that material authenticity is a fallacy.

It is important for the project organisers that tour participants see the museum not as a temple, but as a place for communication and dialogue: »not as part of a formal »integration«, but a first step for newly arrived people to see that there is something in Berlin that is »theirs«[33]. The tour group participants, while all refugees or recently arrived immigrants from war-torn countries, are inevitably a very mixed demographic, and so the museum tours are structured to allow discussion between them and space for their potentially conflicting ideas, with the guide there to structure the dialogues[34]. The added layer of significance attributed by this sense of belonging to a place (and the figurative »ownership« of the objects) based on both the material and cultural authenticity of the objects – despite their dislocation from their original (»authentic«) locations in Syria to Berlin – is in marked contrast to Jones' perspective that »if authenticity is negotiated through relationships between people, objects and places, then removal to museums or any other form of relocation produces a problematic dislocation«[35]. Here the mirroring of dislocated objects, with dislocated people from the same areas of origin, provides an added layer of »authenticity« value – at least for these groups of people. The cultural essentialism which is evident here in relation to the *Multaka* tour participants and from the origins of the project, within the museum and cultural sector in Germany is challenging – it adds to the sense of authenticity value of *Multaka*, yet it also potentially reinforces deeply problematic attitudes and practices: »Encounters between museum professionals and external individuals, particularly those from Diaspora communities, still bear traces of coloniser meeting colonised […] yet the museum adopts a benevolent position, while the community member becomes the beneficiary«[36].

So far the *Multaka* model mostly fits quite neatly with Clifford's contact zone[37] as adopted in much museum practice, which Boast is critical of. Boast's concern lies in the potential for asymmetrical power relationships to be unintentionally reasserted through the institution of the museum holding objects from countries such as Syria, for example. The narrative of transculturality and idea of education though encountering multiple perspectives in the museum displays also echo Boast's criticisms[38], which focus on the persistence of neocolonialism in museum practice, even when the idea of the contact zone is taken as a starting point for a »new spirit of collaboration«[39]. Boast aims to »question why we perpetuate only a partial and rosy portrait of the contact zone. My goal is not to undermine what good work has been done but to expose the dark underbelly of the contact zone and, hence, the anatomy of the museum practice that seems to be persistently neocolonial«[40].

However, this begins to change when analysing the content included in the *Multaka* tours at the Deutsches Historisches Museum – one of the most popular tours from the four museums within the *Multaka* project[41]. Participants are shown sections of the permanent collection relating to Germany's own difficult history of conflict and post-conflict rebuilding, relating to the Thirty Years War, as well as to World War II, the Holocaust, population expulsions, and the rebuilding and reunification of Germany. One *Multaka* organiser describes how, through this exposure to post-war German history, participants see links to their own personal experiences of war and conflict, links which allow them to talk more freely about their difficult memories than if they were asked directly[42]. Seeing the destruction and subsequent rebuilding of Germany, its culture, identity and history reportedly gives refugee participants hope for their own futures[43]. Here the asymmetric power relationship seems to change – the museum as an institution is no longer presenting itself (and Germany) purely as a dominant neocolonial power, but as »an inspiring example of a country which was rebuilt following war – mostly by women«[44], a kind of phoenix which has risen from the ashes. At the same time, the historical mirroring which is being brought into play here, implying that any experience of conflict and dislocation is implicitly comparable to another, undermines both the attempt at »historical authenticity« in the materialist sense and the attempt to break down the power dynamics. Casting Germans in the role of a formerly defeated and dispersed population who nevertheless had the power and agency to rise up and become »successful« again ignores the historical facts of the German post-war *Wirtschaftswunder* which resulted from an unprecedented (and hitherto unrepeated) international programme of support and recovery. It therefore also ignores the significant structural problems faced by contemporary refugees in Germany, indicating that individual agency is all that is needed to turn around one's fortunes. The potential underlying message is that those newly arrived in Germany who may be struggling with multiple challenges (not least the language, as is implied by the *Multaka* tours being in Arabic) are somehow to blame for their lack of »success«.

MULTAKA AS A SPACE OF MULTIPLE AUTHENTICITIES

Notwithstanding these concerns, in many ways *Multaka* is different from the numerous other »migration museum« projects, exhibitions and initiatives which sprang up around Germany and elsewhere in Europe following the »migration crisis«.

Firstly, its focus is not on presenting migration to others (as is the case with most migration-related museum projects[45]), but in empowering refugees themselves – by offering them new skills as *Multaka* guides, and recompense for their time and efforts. It does not merely focus on tropes of refugees, such as helplessness and the loss of control over their own lives as a result of their refugee status. So there is no exhibition *about* refugees and migration, no positioning of representations within the limited and limiting context of migration. In this way it connects to both Clifford's and Boast's reading of the contact zone and some of the contested understandings of the museum as a contact zone. It could be considered »*authentic*« in the sense that the initiative has been accepted and adopted by refugees themselves, as well as being organised by people themselves relatively newly arrived from countries of conflict. The *Multaka* guides are free to shape their tours themselves, according to their own interests and knowledge, rather than following the format and content of the »standard« tours offered by the museums to the general public[46]. As such, their participation in the *Multaka* programme goes beyond participation and could be described as a form of co-creation, within which the museums have relinquished a significant amount of control to the guides, potentially based on what Bernadette Lynch has termed »radical trust«[47]. This is in contrast to the observations made by Waterton and Smith of participatory heritage practices in the United Kingdom[48], despite such

practice being much more common in the UK museum and heritage sector than it has been in Germany. However, the defining of those involved in the *Multaka* programme (both the guides and the tour partici- pants) as »refugees« by both the media as well as the website and press releases of the Staatliche Museen zu Berlin again undermines some of this. The defining of a group by those external to it brings us back once more to colonial discourses (to which museums are inextricably linked) and the issue of authenticity – Jones points out that »authenticity has helped in the critical process of purification that is central to claims assert- ing the existence of discrete, bounded, cultures and groups of people«[49]. Ironically, the very authenticity of the *Multaka* guides' status as refugees was called into question by an audience member at a recent confer- ence presentation, who proclaimed that they were not »really« refugees as some of them had been living in Germany or elsewhere outside of their countries of origin prior to gaining refugee status. That such a statement was made is perhaps not unusual in itself; what makes it particularly significant is that not only was it made at a conference focusing on museums and migration, but by a senior member of staff in the Education and Communication department at one of the museums participating in the *Multaka* project.

Secondly, the project enables the refugees (both the guides and the tour participants) to draw links between the past, present and future for themselves, and in dialogue with the objects and each other, all within the space of the museum. In this way *Multaka* returns to the original idea of the contact zone – as a space for connections and conflicts, for political injustices to be aired and memories to be shared. It does not attempt to trivialise or deny the potential for conflicts (whether within individuals, between participants, with broader museum audiences or across society), thereby addressing some of Boast's concerns about the contact zone idea. Jones reiterates how significant the contact between objects, people and places is: »the process of negotiating the authenticity of material things can also be a means of establishing the authen- ticity of the self«[50]. People could be considered to be having an »authentic« experience within a *Multaka* tour in that it allows them to encounter the objects and to negotiate the relationships between their own experience and those of others through contact with the objects in the museum on their own terms. They are given the authority by the museum to present their own perspectives on the objects' significance rather than to repeat the official museum tour narrative. This inevitably brings the guides into potential conflict with the museum, for as Lynch and Alberti point out: »Contact zones, instead of being regarded by muse- ums as their spaces into which citizens and their representatives are invited, are rather places not only for collaboration but contestation. Different participants bring diverse interpretations and agendas that are not homogenised into a seamless product, but rather remain distinct«[51].

However, this very diversity of interpretations and potential for contestation within the dialogic *Multaka* tours has the potential to be seen as »inauthentic«. For example, where guides may present information or allow opinions to be shared which are historically inaccurate, the conflict becomes evident between the authority of the museum and the authenticity of its voice on the one hand, and, on the other, the right of those participating on the *Multaka* tours to also be authentic to themselves and to share potentially ques- tionable opinions. This would appear to be inevitable in the approach taken by the museums involved in the *Multaka* project, which allows the guides to be self-determining in selecting the material and information which they share with the tour groups. The ideal behind the *Multaka* project of creating opportunities for dialogue »must also recognise that such processes of democratisation are inevitably going to create new spheres of conflict and potential resistance«[52]; at the same time, it does not seem to have escaped the prob- lems of power and agency which museum participation projects frequently find themselves unintentionally perpetuating. So while Jones' proposal for reconsidering authenticity as »not simply a facet of the internal essence of discrete isolated entities as modernist discourses would have us believe, but rather *a product of the relationships between people and things*«[53] rests on the primacy of »the ability of people to establish relationships with objects and the networks of people and places they embody through their unique cul-

tural biographies, [rather than on] the sheer authority of museums«[54], the realities of participatory projects in museums seem to be rather different. Indeed, Lynch and Alberti highlight the fact that »invited spaces' in museums are forever permeated in the power effects of difference« and that »welcomed to the invited space, participants are subtly encouraged to assume the position of ›beneficiaries‹ or ›clients‹, which influences what people are perceived to be able to contribute, or entitled to know and decide«[55].

Thirdly, the *Multaka* project allows the objects and displays in the museums to be emotive and affective within the specific situation, space and time of the *Multaka* tour, without requiring changes to the museums' permanent displays. Participation in a *Multaka* tour does not just afford contact between the museum and the tour group (whether the guides or people participating in the tours), but also among different people, between people and objects, places, memories, emotions, and identities – linking to both Holtorf's and Jones' perspectives[56] that authenticity is both about the objects themselves and also about the ways in which people encounter them, and make sense of them in relation to themselves, each other and both past and present. It is important to note that the *Multaka* project does not make any changes to the nature (or authenticity) of the collections, displays or exhibitions themselves, but instead changes the nature of the »official« or authorised ways in which these are used. This change in who is permitted to hold authority (even if temporarily or within specific constraints, such as time, space, language or audience) over the museum's usage links not only to the idea of the museum as contact zone, and to discussions of authenticity, but also to Gibson's affordances theory[57].

In many ways, therefore, *Multaka* appears to invert aspects of the asymmetric power relationship between the museum and the audience. It allows the museum to appear as non-instrumental politically due to the empowerment of the guides to act on the museum's behalf. Instead, any instrumentalism comes from within the group on each tour. It is they who respond to the combined affordances of the objects, displays and the tour to potentially instrumentalise the museum experience in relation to their past lives and in developing their ongoing »integration« processes, rather than the museum itself. It is possible that, while »the problematic of »real« work with refugees remains, this is perhaps a spearhead of change« within German museum practice[58]. Thus, *Multaka* and »the museum« appear to adher to Clifford's contact zone theory, but perhaps do not yet address Boast's concerns.

Has the institution of »the museum« here, as Boast demands, begun to »learn to let go of [its] resources, even at times of the objects, for the benefit and use of communities and agendas far beyond its knowledge and control«[59]? At the same time as seeing the *Multaka* project and tours as symbolic of possible changing practices in German museums, it is important to note that Boast's demand for »letting go« is to some extent more theoretical than practical, as indicated also by the cases analysed by Lynch respectively Lynch and Alberti[60]. Boast says, »The museum, as a site of accumulation, as a gatekeeper of authority and expert accounts, as the ultimate caretaker of the object, as the ultimate arbiter of the identity of the object, as its documenter and even as the educator, has to be completely redrafted […] This is not only possible but, I would argue, could renovate the museum into an institution that supported the enrichment, rather than authorisation, of collections. To do this, however, requires museums to learn to let go of their resources, even at times of the objects, for the benefit and use of communities and agendas far beyond its knowledge and control«[61]. At the same time, the institution of »the museum« is such that while power relationships and authority may be negotiated and renegotiated over time and in relation to specific issues – whether objects, memories or people – it may not be achievable in the long term for »outsiders« to museum work to take charge of these relationships and to take (or be given) authority, due to the concurrent and ongoing debates over authenticity, value, expertise and the purpose of museums within society.

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

It is evident from the case of *Multaka,* and from other research on visitor encounters with objects and one another in museums[62], that it is the form of encounter and relationship which develops between objects and visitors within the museum space that creates the potential for an affective encounter. On the one hand, an affective experience can be »artificially« stimulated or heightened by means of museum »scenography«, the design and display techniques, the text, visuals, use of audio, and the ways in which these work together or are mediated through guides. On the other, it can also occur spontaneously (or authentically) as a result of the combination of elements internal to visitors – their individual histories and memories, their subjective impressions and reactions – with the objects, their materiality, their histories and what Holtorf terms their »pastness«[63]. This idea of negotiated encounters of authenticity is also at the core of Jones' analysis: »people use authenticity to work out genuine or truthful relationships between objects, people and places, and this process is heightened by the forms of dislocation and displacement that characterise the modern world«[64]. The significance of the group, or the community, to the development of an affective encounter in the museum can be understood in relation to Halbwachs' notions of collective memory: »it is in society that people normally acquire their memories. It is also in society that they recall, recognise and localise their memories«[65] as well as more recent analyses of reminiscence work and the power of dialogue, where »conversations can often serve as a vehicle through which memories spread across a community«[66]. The inherent »sociality of the process«[67] of community – »something that is (re)constructed through ongoing experiences, engagements and relations«[68] – is what characterises the relationship between the museum objects, the *Multaka* guides, the participants in the *Multaka* tours, and potentially with the museum staff and other visitors to the museum. Notwithstanding its problems, the *Multaka* tour creates a situation where the affordances of authenticity (understood simultaneously in the materialist and in the constructivist sense) have the potential to have significant impact on the individuals participating: »authenticity […] provides a means for people to negotiate their own place in a world characterised by population displacement and fragmentation of communities; it is, in this sense, about *reconnecting* objects, people and places«[69].

In *Multaka*, both the encounter itself and the form of the encounter within the museum and in relation to the objects, as part of a group within which a dialogic experience took place, was significant. This aligns with both Lynch and Alberti's and Schorch's research[70], which »suggests that the humanisation of culture and cross-cultural dialogue transforms a ›Third Space‹ into a pluralistic space that pays tribute to the inescapable pluralism from within«[71]. So it is neither the »authentic object«, nor the authority of the museum alone, which is the driver of an affective, meaning-making encounter, but rather it is the combination of the object, the history, the museum as both an authority of, and a site for, meaning-making, with the memories and dialogue between people in relation to each of these, which may provide what I term an »affective opportunity« within the »contact zone« or »Third Space« of a museum group engagement experience. Investigating authenticity as a concept relating not only to materialism but also to constructivism through the example of the *Multaka* tours has shown that a »more than« materialist approach to the authenticity of material objects, their use in museums and for groups of people is highly significant in creating the affordances for meaningful encounters and the (re)situation of the self in relation to the past, present and future. The multiple, simultaneous and potentially contradictory meanings of authenticity explored within this study in connection with theories of community, participation, contact, the physical and metaphorical spaces of encounter and conflict may be complex, yet they help to understand the equally complex nature of human processes of belonging and becoming, of the need to (re)situate the self in the midst of changing circumstances. They highlight the significance of the role of authentic material objects, of public institutions

of power and authority such as museums, combined with »how people construct identities for themselves and others – and for artefacts and practices too – through the continuous, relentless negotiation of authenticity«[72].

Bringing questions and experiences of individual agency and participation, of dialogue and potential conflict with others, of trust and letting go, and of personal memories, stories and emotions into museums, as the *Multaka* project has done, offers museums the chance to become locations where people not only learn about the material objects and »authentic« histories, but where they can also situate themselves through a process of »more than« material authenticity.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Notes

1) Jones 2010. – Holtorf 2013.

2) Pratt 1991. – Clifford 1997. – Boast 2011. – Schorch 2013.

3) Pratt 1991. – Clifford 1997.

4) Clifford 1997.

5) Castles/Miller 1993, 260.

6) Whitehead et al. 2012, 25-36.

7) Appadurai 2016.

8) Clifford 1997, 188-219.

9) Pratt 1991.

10) Boast 2011.

11) Clifford 1997, 192.

12) Clifford 1997, 208.

13) Schorch 2013.

14) Bhabha 1994, 53-56.

15) Jones 2010, 182. – Holtorf 2013, 428.

16) Theodossopoulos 2013, 339.

17) Holtorf 2013, 428.

18) Jones 2010.

19) Theodossopoulos 2013, 339.

20) Jones 2010, 183-184.

21) Jones 2010, 189.

22) www.smb.museum/en/museums-institutions/museum-fuer-islamische-kunst/collection-research/research-cooperation/multaka.html (22.01.2019).

23) Holtorf 2013, 430.

24) Nassreddine, pers. comm. 2016.

25) Nassreddine, pers. comm. 2016.

26) Nassreddine, pers. comm. 2016.

27) Parkin 1994.

28) Hirsch/Spitzer 2006.

29) As seen in both Holtorf 2013 and Jones 2010.

30) Holtorf 2013, 440.

31) Bhabha 1994.

32) Bhabha 1994, 55.

33) Nassreddine, pers. comm. 2016.

34) Nassreddine, pers. comm. 2016.

35) Jones 2010, 195.

36) Lynch/Alberti 2010, 14.

37) Clifford 1997.

38) Boast 2011.

39) Boast 2011, 57.

40) Boast 2011, 57.

41) Nassreddine, pers. comm. 2016.

42) Museum director, pers. comm. 2016.

43) Nassreddine, pers. comm. 2016.

44) Museum director, pers. comm. 2016.

45) See Whitehead et al. 2012.

46) Muhammed, pers. comm. 2016.

47) Lynch/Alberti 2010, 15.

48) Waterton/Smith 2009, 11.

49) Jones 2010, 188.

50) Jones 2010, 189.

51) Lynch/Alberti 2010, 16.

52) Lynch 2013, 3.

53) Jones 2010, 199-200.

54) Jones 2010, 199.

55) Lynch/Alberti 2010, 14.

56) Holtorf 2013. – Jones 2010.

57) Gibson 1986.

58) Berlin cultural professional, pers. comm. 2016.

59) Boast 2011, 67.

60) Lynch 2013. – Lynch/Alberti 2010.

61) Boast 2011, 67.

62) Eckersley 2017.

63) Holtorf 2013, 431-441.

64) Jones 2010, 198.

65) Halbwachs 1992, 38.

66) Stone/Hirst 2014, 316.

67) Waterton/Smith 2010, 8.

68) Waterton/Smith 2010, 8.

69) Jones 2010, 197.

70) Lynch/Alberti 2010. – Schorch 2013.

71) Schorch 2013, 76.

72) Theodossopoulos 2013, 256.

References

Appadurai 2016: A. Appadurai, Aspirational maps: On migrant narratives and imagined future citizenship (2016) www.euro zine.com/aspirational-maps/ (22.01.2019).

Bhabha 1994: H. Bhabha, The Location of Culture (London 1994).

Boast 2011: R. Boast, Neocolonial collaboration: Museum as Contact Zone revisited. Museum Anthropology 34, 2011, 56-70.

Castles/Miller 1993: S. Castles / M. Miller, The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World (London 1993).

Clifford 1997: J. Clifford, Routes: Travel and Translation in the late Twentieth Century (Cambridge, London 1997).

Eckersley 2017: S. Eckersley, People-Place-Process and Attachment in the Museum: a New Paradigm for Understanding Belonging? Anthropological Journal of European Cultures 2017/2, 6-30.

Gibson 1986: J. Gibson, The Ecological Approach to Visual Perception (London 1986).

Halbwachs 1992: M. Halbwachs, On Collective Memory (Chicago 1992).

Hirsch/Spitzer 2006: M. Hirsch / L. Spitzer, Testimonial Objects: Memory, Gender, and Transmission. Poetics Today 27/2, 2006, 353-383.

Holtorf 2013: C. Holtorf, On Pastness: A Reconsideration of Materiality in Archaeological Object Authenticity. Anthropological Quarterly 86/2, 2013, 427-443.

Jones 2010: S. Jones, Negotiating Authentic Objects and Authentic Selves: Beyond the Deconstruction of Authenticity. Journal of Material Culture 15/2, 2010, 181-203.

Lynch 2013: B. Lynch, Reflective Debate, Radical Transparency and Trust in the Museum. Museum Management and Curatorship 28/1, 2013, 1-13.

Lynch/Alberti 2010: B. Lynch / S. J. M. M. Alberti, Legacies of Prejudice: Racism, Co-production and Radical Trust in the Museum. Museum Management and Curatorship 25/1, 2010, 13-35.

Parkin 1999: D. Parkin, Mementoes as Transitional Objects in Human Displacement. Journal of Material Culture 4, 1999, 303-320.

Pratt 1991: M. L. Pratt, Arts of the Contact Zone. Profession 91, 1991, 33-40.

Schorch 2013: P. Schorch, Contact Zones, Third Spaces, and the Act of Interpretation. Museum and Society 11/1, March 2013, 68-81.

Stone/Hirst 2014: C. Stone / W. Hirst, (Induced) Forgetting to Form a Collective Memory. Memory Studies 7/3, 2014, 314-327.

Theodossopoulos 2013: D. Theodossopoulos, Laying Claim to Authenticity: Five Anthropological Dilemmas. Anthropological Quarterly 86/2, 2013, 337-360.

Waterton/Smith 2010: E. Waterton / L. Smith, The recognition and misrecognition of community heritage. International Journal of Heritage Studies 16/1-2, 2010, 4-15.

Whitehead/Eckersley/Mason 2012: Ch. Whitehead / S. Eckersley / R. Mason, Placing Migration in European Museums: Theoretical, Contextual and Methodological Foundations (Milano 2012).

Interviews

Museum director, pers. comm. 2016: Interview undertaken by S. Eckersley with museum director, Berlin, 10 March 2016.

Nassreddine, pers. comm. 2016: Interview undertaken by S. Eckersley with Razan Nassreddine (Multaka Project Manager 2015 - January 2017) Berlin, 11 March 2016.

Berlin cultural professional, pers. comm. 2016: Interview undertaken by S. Eckersley with cultural professional, Berlin, 24 October 2016.

Muhammed, pers. comm. 2016: Interview undertaken by S. Eckersley with Hussam Zahim Muhammed (Multaka Project Manager 2019), Berlin, 12 December 2016.

Zusammenfassung / Summary

Authentizität in Kontaktzonen begegnen? Museen, Geflüchtete und Partizipation

Dieser Beitrag beschäftigt sich mit der Komplexität von »Authentizität«, indem aus materieller und konstruktivistischer Perspektive auf die Vielzahl der Bedeutungen des Begriffs eingegangen wird, sowie auf die Frage, auf welche Arten man »Authentizität« im Museum begegnen kann. Am Beispiel der Fallstudie *Multaka: Treffpunkt Museum,* einem Museumsprojekt für Geflüchtete in Berlin, werden diese mehrfachen Authentizitäten aufgezeigt, wobei deutlich wird, welchen Stellenwert sie für Individuen einnehmen, die sich infolge einer lokalen Entwurzelung (neu) situieren. Im Rahmen des Artikels wird *Multaka* einerseits in Bezug zur Kontaktzonentheorie gesetzt und andererseits zu Robin Boasts Kritik, dass neokoloniale Strukturen in partizipativen Museumspraktiken fortbestehen. Trotz der inhärent politischen Problematiken solcher Museumsprojekte, betont der Artikel den Wert, der aus »mehr als« materialer Authentizität entsteht, dass bedeutungsvolle Begegnungen ermöglicht werden, wodurch wiederum Zugehörigkeits- und Entwicklungsprozesse beeinflusst werden.

Encountering Authenticity in the Contact Zone? Museums, Refugees and Participation

This chapter addresses the complex nature of »authenticity«, its multiple simultaneous meanings from both materialist and constructivist perspectives, and the ways in which it may be encountered in a museum. It uses the detailed case study of *Multaka: Treffpunkt Museum* (Museum as Meeting Point), a museum project for refugees in Berlin, to draw out these multiple authenticities, highlighting their significance for individuals (re)situating themselves following dislocation. To do so, it examines *Multaka* in relation also to the theory of the contact zone and to Robin Boast's criticisms of the persistence of neocolonialism within participatory museum practice. Despite the inherently political problematics within such museum projects, it emphasises the value of »more than« material authenticity in enabling meaningful encounters, thereby influencing people's processes of belonging and becoming.