策展：如何采集展品?

这一案例主要与我们讨论如何增强对多元文化背景的敏感性。

全文都是从人类学反思出发，强调策展人如何能做得不对原地被展的文化施加暴力。

希望大家一边读，一边做笔记，记下这个案例如所讨论到的冲突因素，而策展人是如何来上演这些冲突因素，来证明他自己处理得很敏感的。

ParadIsE : an Ethnography oF collection-making

O’Hanlon’s ethnography of making a collection in Highland New Guinea rests, as already noted, on 先去呆十年，再二次各三个月的回访：previously conducted anthropological fieldwork in the north-west Wahgi area of the Western Highlands of Papua New Guinea, among the Komblo tribe (Kekanen clan) in Topkalap hamlet on the Kar River, between 1979 and 1981. His return to the field for two three-month collecting visits (in 1986 and 1990) raised a number of very interesting questions. Although O’Hanlon was somewhat apprehensive about returning to the community he knew well with financial resources to make a collection for the Museum of Mankind (as the Ethnographic Department of the British Museum then was called), he discovered that his new role was culturally more intelligible than his previous one as a student fieldworker.6 Collecting was recognizable behaviour, comparable to that of an in-law, owing the payments due to ‘source people’—maternal kin in a patrilineal system. As he points out, ‘[i]n a society where much of politics revolves around accumulating objects and presenting them to other groups’ (O’Hanlon 1993: 12), collecting might mean something other than the removal of cultural property emphasized by critical studies 同一采集工作，在不同文化里着不同的事。
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of collecting during the 1980s. The collected objects might, for example, be seen as envoys in a continuing relationship, rather than hostages. The historical background against which his collection was made includes the discovery of the densely populated Central Highlands of Papua New Guinea in 1933 by Australian gold prospectors (see Connolly and Anderson 1987). A crash course in modernity followed, with cash-cropping (coffee) transforming subsistence production and generational relations, bringing in both cash and material goods from the world system. Then there were the effects of the Pacific war, followed by

Australian administration, missionary activity and independence in 1975. Tensions about coffee, land and income were behind an upsurge in violence after the coffee boom of the 1970s. This violence was clearly part of the social context of collecting, including brokerage by the ethnographer’s sponsor, Kinden. During his initial fieldwork, O’Hanlon and his wife, Linda, lived in a house built by Kinden and were necessarily under his protection at a time of escalating violence in the Highlands. The purpose-built house for his collecting visits reminded O’Hanlon of the garden of that earlier house, which Kinden had tabooed to prevent resources from flowing out of it. The social distribution of wealth became even more of an issue now that O’Hanlon had

resources for collecting. Kinden had very clear ideas about the order in which people could offer things for sale, which reflected local social structure: first, people from the local community, then gradually expanding outwards through subclans and other Komblo clans, and finally to other Wahgi. Although there was some flexibility in this ordering, it was broadly adhered to, with Kinden acting as master of ceremonies in the transactions (O’Hanlon 1993: 60). O’Hanlon wanted to collect a full repertoire of portable Wahgi material culture—personal adornment, clothing, netbags, household goods and

weaponry—to fill one of the gaps in the Museum of Mankind’s Oceania collection. One of his aims was to counter the exoticizing stereotypes still attaching to New Guinean people in Europe in the 1990s. Among the principal items represented in the collection were netbags and shields. The colourful netbags woven from imported acrylic yarns are used for everything—women carry babies in them, and men use them as receptacles for war and love magic. The bags have named designs, such as ‘Christmas’, ‘Forestry’, ‘One Ace’ and ‘Diamond’, and are looped from a single thread; they are ubiquitous objects—often exchanged as gifts between women (cf. Küchler 1999). While shields had been scarce during O’Hanlon’s first fieldwork, the upsurge in fighting in the 1980s meant that men started to make them again. This was not a specialist task. New designs appeared, using oil paints instead of traditional pigments and including such details as the date and scale of the conflict and the bearer’s
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name. Other written inscriptions included ‘Now buddy slays buddy’, ‘Wahgi fish’; on a shield, ‘Six to Six’ (a wider Papua New Guinean idiom—originally referring to an all-night party) refers to the ability to fight all day long. Using the shield to advertise South Pacific beer makes sense in so far as clansmen drink together and fight together. Other emblems used on shields include the bird of paradise (O’Hanlon 1993: 67–68). As the collection grew, the O’Hanlon house started to resemble a

museum, prompting visitors to give short performances or demonstrations of the objects’ uses. The shields exercised a magnetic attraction over the men, whose vigorous demonstrations occasionally worried the collector. People’s reaction to the making of the collection expressed their historical experience. Artefacts associated with forbidden practices, such as warfare and ritual, meant a rediscovery of lost or suppressed elements of local culture. Once people had grasped O’Hanlon’s wishes with regard to the collection they became actively involved in its contents and representativeness. They looked into the possibility of obtaining discontinued items, which in turn meant that O’Hanlon felt obliged to commission their making. Artificial though this was, in a way, it brought out all the rules associated with certain items that would normally have remained implicit, in the form of jokes—for example in the making of ceremonial geru boards (O’Hanlon 1963: 62). O’Hanlon notes that technical and social details of making and using certain artefacts, although observed during earlier fieldwork, were only really seen in the context of collecting (ibid.: 63). The negotiation of prices for the objects offered to him underlined that these were not simply purchases but rather moral transactions for the sellers. ‘It’s up to you’, they would say when asked about the price. Since group membership had been extended to O’Hanlon through his sponsor, careful calculation of prices was considered inappropriate. Redefining these transactions as an uncalculated exchange between kin in this way had implications for how the collection was seen by local people: contributors felt they had a stake in it. When it came to leave-taking, the collection was actually compared by one man to a bride. In local terms, a bride leaves her natal kin to go and live with her husband’s clanspeople. There was even a ceremony of beautification for the collection. O’Hanlon’s payments, from this perspective, constitute bridewealth, which is only the first payment made to the bride’s kin. A bride’s brothers can also expect payments for the children she bears—as their source people. The comparison underlines O’Hanlon’s continuing indebtedness to those who had helped him. The frontispiece photograph of the ethnography shows Zacharias and Wik calculating the distribution of pork at O’Hanlon’s leaving party: visual documentation of where local collecting interest really lies: ‘in learning, evaluating, and secreting accounts of past indebtedness and betrayal’ (1993: 63).
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The opportunities for making a collection such as the Komblo-O’Hanlon one are rare, and accounts of the process still rarer. While there are certainly excellent analyses of historical or contemporary collectors and collection processes (e.g. Balk 2006; Elsner and Cardinal 1994), they differ from a hands-on account of making a collection such as O’Hanlon’s. He also provides a brief ethnography of the context of the ‘Paradise’ exhibition at the Museum of Mankind in London where, due to local circumstances, it was installed in the set of a previous Palestinian exhibition. Although this part of the ethnography is much less developed than the former (the exhibition had not yet been made when the book went to press), it makes interesting reading alongside Clifford’s (1995) detailed analysis of the exhibition and Lidchi’s (1997) ‘reading off’ of the finalized exhibition. The ethnography of the collecting process provides insight into the social, cultural and material dynamics involved, from the inside, thereby adding a unique perspective to interdisciplinary scholarship on collections. The agency of those collected from, as well as that of the collector, and the role of cultural brokers in shaping the collection are among the principal findings of this research.7 It is interesting to note that a similar approach to agency in collections can be found in art historical

Figure 4.2 Zacharias and Wik calculating the distribution of pork at O’Hanlon’s leaving party. Photo: Michael O’Hanlon. Reproduced by kind permission of Michael O’Hanlon.
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scholarship.8 Moving now to the use made of collections, particularly in the form of exhibitions, let us turn to Macdonald’s ethnographic account of making a semipermanent exhibition at the Science Museum, London, in the late 1980s.