

Doing Diversity, Making Differences

Multi-Researcher Ethnography in Museums and Heritage in Berlin

Sharon Macdonald

‘Diversity’ is undoubtedly a key word in contemporary museum and heritage debates and practice. Numerous initiatives and developments to promote, celebrate, identify, manage, preserve and, sometimes, to contest, diversity are underway. Yet what is meant by ‘diversity’ in these many instances—and what it is hoped it will achieve—is itself varied. So too for terms with which it is entangled or that operate as apparent or near synonyms, such as ‘variety’, ‘plurality’ and ‘difference’, and the German ‘Vielfalt’, ‘Diversität’, ‘Verschiedenheit’, ‘Mannigfaltigkeit’, ‘Pluralität’ and ‘Differenz’.

This book brings together studies of the lives and workings of such terms within recent and ongoing museum and heritage contexts in Berlin. While the question of which terms are used is important to this study, the primary interest of those of us writing here is in practice, including both discursive and non-discursive practice. That is, we are concerned both with how and where those terms are used and to what effects; as well as how diversity and difference may be implicated and produced even beyond the explicit use of such language. Indeed, our central proposition is that ‘diversity’ is something that is *done*: that is, it is assembled through specific uses.

To examine *doing* requires ethnographic research. In essence, it means getting up close and personal to what we aim to understand (Shore and Trnka 2013). Accordingly, we have looked in depth and at close range at what actually happens in practice. The studies presented here are part of a large multi-researcher ethnographic research project conducted primarily within Berlin: *Making Differences: Transforming Museums and Heritage*.¹ Our ethnographic approach, which is explained further below, has allowed us to examine processes as they unfold over time. By doing so, we have been able to show how intentions and ambitions may shift or not be met, how particular infrastructures or formats may exert certain shaping effects, and how unexamined assumptions or entangled processes can lead to unanticipated outcomes. This, indeed, can be seen as a central finding of our research. Beyond that general finding, however, we seek to identify some of the more specific forms that diversity and difference take and the ways in which the associated processes work. By doing so, we not only provide in-depth analyses of certain cases

but also point out the implications of certain ways of thinking and doing diversity and difference more widely.

In this introduction, the *Making Differences* project is first briefly outlined. This is followed by a discussion of why and how museums and heritage are especially significant in relation to questions of diversity and difference (a distinction that is explained below), and, correlatively, why such questions are of importance for museums and heritage. This entails charting the rise of the emphasis on diversity and difference, both internationally and more specifically in Germany, together with questions that this raises, especially, though not only, for the museum and heritage field. The introduction then turns to some of the events and developments with major implications for difference and diversity that have occurred or markedly intensified since 2015, when the *Making Differences* project began. Prominent among these are ‘the refugee crisis’ and the wider debates about migration, cultural diversity, Islam and ‘German values’ that this has raised; and calls and moves for the decolonisation of Western institutions, refracted and given added impetus especially by restitution debates and the Black Lives Matter campaign. As experienced in our research, these developments implicated museums and heritage in various, sometimes far-reaching ways—though with more effects surely still to come. A sketch of some ways that they did so is followed by further discussion of the project, including its methodological approach, before introducing the individual contributions to this book. The chapter concludes by commenting on some of the directions of transformation evident in the collective work, together with considerations raised by the chapters for doing diversity in both theory and practice.

Making Differences in Berlin

In a project spanning more than six years—though consisting of a number of mostly shorter studies—*Making Differences* has ethnographically examined heritage-making and its implications for difference and diversity in a wide range of locations and groups within Berlin. In keeping with the project’s focus on transformation in museums and heritage, all of the cases explore relatively new developments and initiatives, including some that are still in process. This has enabled researchers to explore not simply how difference and diversity are being done in contemporary museum and heritage settings but how such processes themselves may be in transformation.

The scope of organisations, groups and practices researched has been broad, encompassing established museums, national heritage organisations and national monuments, as well as more local, quotidian or (self-avowedly) alternative venues and practices. The locations have included, among others, the Humboldt Forum, the Ethnological Museum, the Museum of Natural History, the Museum of Islamic Art, the Museum of European Cultures, the Bode Museum, the German Historical Museum, Neukölln Museum, the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe (colloquially known as the Holocaust Memorial), SAVVY Contemporary, Galerie Wedding and the IfA (Institut für Auslandsbeziehungen) Gallery. As well as with curators and publics, the research has been conducted with postcolonial and LGBTI+ activists, with a Muslim slam poetry group, representatives of Muslim communities, artist collectives, refugee initiatives and

citizen scientists. Research interlocutors have included individuals who hold or do not hold German citizenship, who speak a variety of first languages, who have varying life experiences, and who are connected in many different ways within the city and beyond. This breadth—along with a degree of heady eclecticism—has enabled the project to gain insight into the possible variety of practices, as well as communalities and exchange, in play.

Altogether, around twenty researchers have been employed over the years to undertake this work. They have done so primarily in what were also stand-alone studies, partly organised into themes. Two of topics, Representing Islam and Transforming the Ethnographic, are concerned with areas of the museum and heritage field that are often seen as particularly challenging for questions of difference and diversity. They are also areas in which there have been significant recent developments and increasing moves towards creative practice. The other two themes, Media and Mediation and Science and Citizenship, are more broadly conceived, relating to wider, intersecting areas of transformation. Media and Mediation includes consideration of the role of various media, with a particular emphasis on social media, in transforming museums and heritage, including how certain media may help afford particular forms of diversification. Examining how the relationship between science and citizenship might be in transformation, and its implications for diversity, is the remit of Science and Citizenship, though this is refracted particularly through attention to ‘biodiversity’ and citizen science. It is important to note that not all of the studies have been situated within this framework and not all have worked directly with ‘diversity’, or theorised it as is done in this introduction. Furthermore, there has been considerable conversation between, and often a degree of blurring of, the themes.

All of the research has taken place within a shared working environment, namely the Centre for Anthropological Research on Museums and Heritage—CARMAH—which has allowed for considerable and ongoing exchange. The Centre has welcomed many guests to present their research or otherwise work with us, which has been especially valuable in helping us to consider how far what we are seeing in Berlin is happening elsewhere. The exchange has made clear that while what we have seen in Berlin is unique in its detail, it is also part of wider transformations in museums and heritage—and in the doing of diversity—underway elsewhere too. As we explain below, these transformations build on the inherent capacity of museums and heritage to make differences.

Museums, heritage and making difference

As Daniel J. Sherman points out in the introduction to the classic volume *Museums and Difference* (2008), the performance of classification, which has been a key activity of modern museums, can be seen as inherently concerned with the marking of differences. At one level, this is primarily between kinds of objects, classified into various categories and taxonomies. Such classifying is in part about trying to represent what have come to be thought of as ‘objective’ facts about the world. Indeed, it has been argued that museum processes of presenting knowledge through objects helps substantiate historically and culturally specific ideas of ‘objectivity’ (Bennett et al. 2017; Geismar 2018; Macdonald

2006; Mitchell 1988). At the same time, however, museum and heritage classifications are entangled with other kinds of differences, such as those between nations, peoples or forms of life. While this is widely understood, including by many of those working in museums or other heritage or research institutions, as a matter of the mere *identification* of differences that exist in the world, post-structural scholarship has emphasised such acts of 'differencing' as selective and performative; that is, as involving the *making*, producing or at least *negotiating* of differences rather than simply depicting or displaying them (e.g. Bal 1996; Bennett 2018; Rottenburg 2006). This positions representation and display as significant parts of the inevitably selective 'making' process—acting as 'mediators' rather than 'intermediaries', to use Bruno Latour's (2014) distinction—and, thus, all the more deserving of analytical attention. Given the role of display in making differences evident in legitimised and substantiated form to wider constituencies or publics, this is all the more important. As Sherman emphasises, 'As public institutions assigned both to safeguard and to define culture, museums have always been sites for the negotiation of difference' (2008: 2).

This has been extensively documented in relation to the making and maintaining of nations (e.g. Knell et al. 2011; Levitt 2015; Mason 2013). While the building of a national heritage, including in museums, can be seen as part of the construction of national identity, this simultaneously and inextricably entails marking and making differences from others. '[D]ifference always shadows and doubles identity, always entails a relationship between self and other' says Sherman (2008: 1). In some cases, such difference is made by explicit commentary and contrast. More often, however, it is more implicitly enacted, through what is included and what is not, as well as through how classifications are made, and the explicit or implied hierarchies between them.

The division between 'self' and 'other', mentioned by Sherman, has been a particular focus for investigation of such processes. Inspired especially by Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1978), research has investigated how certain formulations of 'self'—such as that of one's own nation—are constructed through binary contrasts with others or a specific other. Capitalisation is often used here—for both Self and Other—to indicate these as specific categories of analysis. The term Othering is also used to describe the process whereby an Other is formed as part of the making of the Self. In relation to museums and heritage, such processes have been most extensively explored in relation to those museums called ethnographic or ethnological (e.g. Lidchi 1997; Shelton 2006). Here, the focus has been on how peoples outside Europe have served as an Other to the Self-projection of Europe, supposedly embodying contrasting characteristics. It is not, however, only with reference to outside of Europe that these processes can take place. The modern metropolis might, for example, be defined in part through contrast with the rural peripheries within Europe. Here, museums that in some countries may also be called ethnographic or ethnological, as well as other rural museums, may act as the locus for such rustic Others (e.g. de Cesari 2017; Pieterse 1997; Macdonald 2016).

Beyond binaries

While such analyses highlight relevant processes and effects, they can easily overlook complications and contradictions that may be involved. The Other is not necessarily pro-

jected as just the repository for all that the Self does not wish to be. On the contrary, it may be seen as the locus of much that is desired and even sometimes aspired to, such as ways of living perceived as more authentic or sustainable. Moreover, specific local histories and the biographies of particular objects may well speak to alternative possibilities that disrupt simple and simplistic binaries, as well as relating to alternative concerns, emphases and ontologies. This can disrupt the very assumption of a Self and Other binary, as well as complicating the question of to what these designations may refer. Those who act as Other for national selves, may well be engaged in their own projects of Self-definition, which may involve other acts of Othering. There has been considerable debate over many years, some even preceding Said, about such processes and their implications. W.E.B. Du Bois's notion of 'double consciousness' posits that those who are marginalised may be aware of both mainstream perspectives and also their own alternative reality (1903/1994). Gayatri Spivak, however, has posed the question of whether the subaltern—those Othered by the mainstream—can even speak, in the sense of give voice to their experience (Spivak 1988). Much debated by others, her reply is only equivocally affirmative (e.g. Morris 2010). Classical as well as more recent anthropology is replete with accounts of self-definition involving what we might call 'other Othering' (e.g. Barth 1969; Cohen 1985; see also Appadurai 2013; Appiah 2005, 2018; Hall 1992; Minh-Ha 1989). That might include, say, the non-Western Othering of the West, or groups marginal to the national centre differentiating themselves from that centre or from their other neighbours. It has also highlighted the layering of identities, in which, say, it may be entirely compatible to be a member of a neighbourhood, a city, a nation and a continent; and it has demonstrated how self- and other-ascriptions can shift 'situationally' (e.g. Rogers and Vertovec 1995; Jenkins 2014). Notions of 'intersectionality' further complicate simple binaries by highlighting how certain differences may become compounded or 'plaited together' (Pollock 2019: 268; see also, Crenshaw 2017; Hill Collins 2004; McCall 2005). As Patricia Hill Collins and Sirma Bilge explain, intersectionality's 'core insight' is that 'power relations of race, class, and gender, for example, are not discrete and mutually exclusive entities but rather build on each other and work together' (Hill Collins and Bilge 2020: 5; see also Goel 2020 for the implications for ethnographic research). This results in distinct positionalities, and a need for research to recognise that the position of, say, a working-class woman of colour would not be identical with that of a working-class white woman, and that the effects of marginalisation can interact to produce distinct positionalities.

Employed in museums and heritage, practices can be investigated empirically. What differences are produced through the various classifications and displays, their inclusions and exclusions? For whom, or as who, do museums and heritage speak? In terms of the models of differentiation performed, do they posit binaries or other possibilities? And in doing so, do they give recognition to different positionalities in terms of their content coverage, as well as whom they seek to invite as interlocutors? It is also possible to investigate how those who are not part of established heritage institutions relate to these—for example, by visiting or not, and through their interpretations of what is on display (or missing). Moreover, beyond this, the ways in which those who find themselves Othered (possibly in multiple ways) construct their own senses of collectivity and difference, perhaps mobilising certain notions of heritage in the process, can also be explored. In this book, as in the *Making Differences* project more widely, we engage in just such em-

pirical investigation. Before introducing this more concretely, however, more needs to be said about the term ‘diversity’ and its relationship to ‘difference’, as well as about the wider context in which notions of diversity have come to be regarded as so important in museum and heritage practice.

Difference, differencing, diversity

So far in this introduction, the emphasis has been on ‘difference’ as that which results from processes of differentiation. This may potentially indicate differences of many kinds, even referring, for example, to the difference between life and death—a difference which, Sherman notes, has been suggested to be fundamental to museums (2008: 1). Most often, however, discussion centres on cultural differences. Examples of cultural differentiation that we will encounter in the chapters that follow include those made between European, African and Islamic—categories that can all potentially overlap but that readily come to be depicted as mutually exclusive alternatives. Whether and how such cultural difference maps onto lived experience and the social differences that are part of the latter are questions to be explored. But this still does not exhaust the possibility for investigating the work of difference-making. How nature is differentiated from culture, and how not only culture but also nature is then further differentiated (though a whole panoply of notions of genus, species, family, etc), are all (mutually entangled) realms of differencing in which museums and heritage play significant roles. This is the case too for any other kinds of differences that might be drawn, such as those of race, religion, gender, sexuality, ableness/disability, age or class.

Differencing

Here, it is also worth noting that the term ‘differencing’ has also come to be used to indicate active attempts to give attention to and promote differences that have previously been overlooked or underplayed. Art historian and theorist, Griselda Pollock’s germinal call for ‘differencing the canon’ was directed to art history, making a feminist case not simply for adding women into the existing pantheon of great art but for seeing the canon itself as ‘a discursive strategy in the production and reproduction of sexual difference and its complex configurations with gender and power’ (1999: 26). Regarding the canon in this way is to deconstruct it by undermining its claim to be based on pure artistic prowess. While gender was the focus of this original argument, the same moves can also be made, and have been made, with reference to other differences, such as those of sexuality or race.

Museums, as key sites for proclaiming the canon—especially, though not only, of art—are of considerable importance for such moves. Over the twenty years since Pollock’s important text, not only has more scholarship been directed towards disciplinary differencing; it has also been taken up by some museums and heritage institutions, albeit more often through strategies of trying to increase the space given to difference rather than more extensive revision of approach and practice (Bayer, Kazeem-Kaminski and Sternfeld 2017; Modest 2020; Reilly 2019). Tony Bennett, a long-time commentator on museums and power, uses the term ‘differencing machines’ (2006) to refer to this in-

creased tendency of at least some museums to ‘refashion’ themselves in this way, doing so particularly with reference to ‘the promotion of cross-cultural understanding, especially across divisions that have been racialized’ (2006: 46). Such developments can also be seen as significant precursors and accompaniments to more recent moves to diversify, queer and decolonise museums and heritage (e.g. Lonetree 2012; Ndikung 2017; Sullivan and Middleton 2020).

Diversity

The related term that we use in our title here, and that is often used with reference to differencing museums and heritage, is ‘diversity’. While it is often pointed out, rightly, that the term is used—perhaps appropriately enough—in multiple ways and can be hard to define (e.g. Vertovec 2012, 2021; Blum et al. 2016), a basic characterisation is that it denotes the co-existence of many acknowledged differences. This means that it is, in effect, a particular model of how ‘difference’ might exist or be arranged. Alternative models of organising difference include the dualistic or binary, as in the Self-Other distinction discussed above. Unlike ‘diversity’, these involve a limited number of differences—only two. The elements in such binaries may be either in equal or in hierarchical relationship with each other, and sometimes fluctuating, perhaps officially presented as equal but experienced, especially by one side, as hierarchical. In the case of diversity, the various elements—the differences—involved may well also be in unequal relationships. It is often said, for example, that modern cities are characterised by increasing diversity, to refer to the (not always or entirely correct) fact of there being more people from many parts of the globe, subscribing to a greater range of religions and undertaking more diverse cultural practices, living in them. Clearly, there are many inequalities between such groups, including in terms such as income and work opportunities, as well as presence in official heritage institutions. Despite this, however, the language of ‘diversity’ tends to imply a non-hierarchical organisation of difference. Christian Reus-Smit refers to this as the ‘billiard ball model’ (2018)—to capture the sense of neat, separate units of difference all of equal size and on one surface. This idea of diversity as entailing equal differences is also belied by a contradictory tendency for ‘diversity’ to be used as a contrast to an implied background of ‘non-diversity’. An imagined ‘non-diverse’ mainstream is thus reinforced as a norm from which the diverse departs.

In an insightful discussion of ethnographic museums, especially the Musée du Quai Branly, in France, historian Nélia Dias shows well how a distinction between (cultural) difference and (cultural) diversity may operate in museum and heritage contexts. The former, she argues, always involves a ‘comparative perspective’ that is ‘absent in the notion of cultural diversity, which presupposes cultural variability’ (Dias 2008: 124). As she explains, in France, the idea of cultural diversity ‘is shaped by concerns about “l’égalité des cultures”, a concept translated as “equivalence of cultures”’ (2008: 128; see also Debary and Roustan 2017: 5), which is particularly associated with ideas linked to an official ‘denial of religious distinctions and respect for all beliefs’ (2008: 143) that go along with a strong affirmation of the State as purely secular. The Musée du Quai Branly’s stated and performed emphasis on cultural diversity—reinforced by its display of natural diversity in the plants that adorn and surround the building—acts, she argues, to uphold

this State position, and with it, a vision of diversity (and equivalence) without difference (and hierarchy). As she puts it:

At stake...is the desire to solve sensitive political and social issues through culture—the conviction that art and culture can bring together peoples, ethnic groups, and nations, and become the new magical bond. Through objects, museums attempt to palliate government policies and social exclusions. The claim that ‘there is no hierarchy among the arts, and no hierarchy among peoples’ obscures the relationships between France and non-European peoples. Thus the role ascribed to museums: to exonerate society for its failings to deal with peoples and cultures whose objects are in museums devoted to cultural diversity (Dias 2008: 149).

While the strong emphasis on the secular State is characteristic of France, deployment of notions of ‘diversity’ that obscure or flatten difference by making all differences appear equal are widespread in other countries too. In a study of higher education diversity practitioners in Australia, for example, Sara Ahmed makes this point, arguing that the tendency for diversity to be implicitly assumed as a set of equal relations is what makes it feel ‘secure’ rather than ‘threatening’ (Ahmed 2007: 238). For the U.S., Walter Benn Michaels, in *The Trouble with Diversity: How We Learned to Love Identity and Ignore Inequality* (Michaels 2006), argues that the emphasis on identity, culture and race—and the celebration of cultural difference and even events such as Black History Month—supports a vision of ‘different but equal [that] is one of our strategies for managing inequality rather than minimising or eliminating it’ (2006: 10; see also Partridge and Chin 2019). It also means that the problem becomes one of addressing discrimination rather than tackling inequality.

Other potentials?

Yet, to see an emphasis on diversity as inherently or only negative would be to underrate the perniciousness of discrimination and its interplay with inequality. As Michael Rothberg (2009) has argued, one does not have to work with a zero-sum logic here (which he sees as itself neoliberal in its modelling as competition): acknowledging or celebrating diversity does not need to be an alternative to addressing inequality. Instead, the attempt could be to realise what Steven Vertovec calls diversity’s ‘optimistic orientation’ (2012: 302). By this he means its normative aspirations—namely, that there should be equivalence and lack of hierarchy. Moreover, he suggests that the ‘pervasiveness’ of the notion of diversity in many areas of contemporary life has the potential to ‘transform the social imaginary’ (2012: 305) and thus help bring this very change about. He draws here on the theorising of Charles Taylor (2007), who defines the social imaginary as ‘the ways that people imagine their social existence, how they fit together with others, how things go on between them and their fellows, the expectations that are normally met, and the deeper normative notions and images that underlie these expectations’ (2007: 23; and quoted by Vertovec on p.305). If the spread and uptake of the notion of ‘diversity’ does indeed have the potential to transform the social imaginary, what this would mean, according to Vertovec, is acting according to ‘the basic social and moral code that everyone manifests “difference” in some way, indeed multiple ways, and that this fact should be integral to the way that everyone treats each other in society’ (2012: 306). Potentially, one

might argue, it could also be harnessed to an agenda of reducing inequality. Yet whether it does indeed prompt such transformations remains an open question. If it is to do so, however, museums and heritage will necessarily need to be on board, precisely because they have operated as institutions of difference, in Dias's sense, in their establishing hierarchies of value. The question, in other words, is whether museums and heritage can really act as 'differencing machines' in Bennett's terms. That is, can they help change the social imaginary—and actual social practice—by doing difference in other ways?

This question leaves open whether 'diversity' is indeed the best model for the conceptualisation or organisation of difference. Can its tendency to overlook inequalities be addressed? Multiculturalism can be seen as a specific version and cultural-political implementation of the diversity model—one that encourages and even celebrates (certain) differences (Ang 2018; Modood 2013; Song 2020). It is not, therefore, surprising that it too has also been accused of ignoring inequality. Moreover, by imagining diversity in terms of a 'zoological' (Hage 1998) constellation of differences or a set of billiard balls (Reus-Smit 2018), multiculturalism has been accused of failing to acknowledge the relations between the parts and instead reifying into distinct and non-overlapping or non-mixing kinds of difference. Amartya Sen insightfully calls it 'plural monoculturalism' (2006). Furthermore, the difference given attention within multiculturalism is almost always relatively uncontroversial or 'safe' dimensions of difference. Indeed, it might be suggested that one reason for the rise of cultural heritage initiatives is that these are often thought to offer relatively anodyne and apolitical modes for performing diversity. Yet, cultural heritage only sometimes operates in this way (Macdonald 2013). The now large and constantly expanding field of critical heritage studies increasingly recognises not only that heritage is frequently highly political and often fraught but also that it is not merely instrumentalised from above (e.g. *ibid.*; Harrison 2013; Robertson 2012). That heritage is so entangled in senses of self and others, and regarded as an expression of important values, makes potentials to work otherwise integral to it.

Some commentators have recently suggested that multiculturalism can be rethought (perhaps again, Parekh 2007)—and implemented—in ways that avoid the problems identified (Joppke 2017; Modood 2018). Indeed, Modood (2017) regards critiques of multiculturalism as often relying on rather stereotypical accounts; and Chin (2017) argues that there have in fact been very few thoroughgoing State attempts to implement multiculturalism, and that even these have been criticised from their inception and before their results were known. Declaring multiculturalism a failure has been a prelude for various politicians in Europe, especially on the political Right, to argue for more integrationist and even nationalistic policies. In the 2010s this led to a flurry of proposals for new national museums, in which it was imagined that strong national narratives would help instil national values (Macdonald 2016). Interestingly, most of these did not get beyond the proposal stage—suggesting, perhaps, that the task was just too difficult to achieve. The question that remains, then, is whether there are other models of thinking difference and diversity—and even multiculturalism—that can overcome the problems identified thus far.

Diversity in action

It is useful at this point to probe into the question of just how ‘diversity’ is imagined and done in practice—especially in initiatives to address or increase it. As Sara Ahmed puts it: ‘What does diversity “do” when it is “put into action”?’ (2007: 237). Any thorough investigation needs to address explicit formulations of ‘diversity’ and the expectations of the initiatives that are supposed to implement it, as well as the more implicit ways in which it is expressed and instantiated. Do statements follow through into practice? And how does what is produced play through into wider social imaginaries or specific lived experiences? In effect, this pursuit of how ‘diversity’ is done is to shift the analytical focus from being on certain categories as given to instead ‘making categorizing itself the object of investigation’ (Hirschauer 2021: 65).

This does not, however, mean to ignore the forms that particular ideas or models of diversity take, for these are part of what might be called the conceptual infrastructure of thinking and doing difference and diversity. This is not unchanging – far from it – but is shaped by certain conventions and concepts that may be in popular and professional, as well as academic, use to varying extents. Among others, these include notions such as ‘identity’, ‘ethnicity’, ‘race’, ‘gender’, ‘belonging’ and ‘home’, as well as terms including ‘intersectionality’, ‘inclusion’, ‘solidarity’, and ‘difference’ and ‘diversity’ themselves. One longstanding debate that has seen the waxing and waning of some of these terms and that re-emerges at various times and places in somewhat altered ways is that over the extent to which the focus should be on sameness (and identity) or difference (and diversity). This is a political as much as an analytical question and, indeed, the two are intertwined. The act of giving main emphasis to identifying either commonalities or features that differentiate – and just how this is done (e.g. with heed to the repercussions and contra-indications or not) – itself supports certain understandings and has socio-political ramifications. In general, the move during the last decades within social and cultural disciplines, as well as in many areas of cultural life, such as those explored in this book, has been towards greater emphasis on difference (e.g. van Meijl 2010; Gaupp 2021), accompanied by some significant critique of notions of ‘identity’ (e.g. Jackson 2022). There have, however, also been significant attempts to reclaim ‘sameness’ as well as to ‘dissolve’ or blur the distinction, including through notions such as ‘hybridity’ and ‘transculturality’ (e.g. Williams 1991; Hirschauer 2021; Pellilo-Hestermeyer 2021).

While, so far, this introduction has predominantly looked at models of ‘diversity’ that claim an ‘equivalence of difference’, in practice this may well exist alongside ideas of some being ‘more diverse’ or ‘more different’ than others. What this establishes are certain ‘diversity regimes’ – that is, ‘principles underlying the arrangement of diverse populations, their configuration...[which] entail moral orders, sets of beliefs and values that provide guidelines (or imperatives) for right and proper conduct within or between diverse populations’ (Grillo 2010: 3) – which result in being exclusionary in certain ways. Also relevant for exploration is how far various models of difference can persist alongside each other, or whether they come into conflict. So, for example, might binary models of difference—of othering and alterity—persist alongside, or even be produced by, certain diversity practices?

Important too is the question of what further possible models of thinking and doing difference there might be. Notions such as those mentioned above which consider partial difference and blurring – others of which include ‘translocality’ (Puzon 2018) and ‘creolization’ and ‘syncretism’ (Stewart 2011); though all of these begin from a stance in which there are entities to be transcended or mixed rather than regarding the blurry, messy, impure states as the baseline. Rosi Braidotti has also written of the need for a written of the need for a ‘dislocation of difference from binaries to rhizomatics’ (2013: 96) in order to achieve what she sees as a necessary ‘affirmation of the positivity of difference’ (2013: 11). For our purposes here, all of these are helpful ideas to sensitise us to possible assumptions within our own analytical frames, as well as to those of our interlocutors in our museum and heritage fieldsites – frames that may well overlap. Moreover, they also point to possible alternatives for both analysis and practice, a point that recurs during the contents to follow.

While in this book we offer reflection on a range of possible ways of thinking about diversity and other models for organising difference, we do so primarily through considering how they are ‘done’ in actual museum and heritage—and related—practice. This is to take them as ‘ethnographic objects’ that can be observed, described and interacted with. Doing so does not mean that our approach is just to give empirical accounts of specific cases—though that is important. Rather, as we set out further below, we are concerned with how the *doing* that we describe intersects with existing theoretical ideas in the academy and opens up possibilities for future theorising. Before further explaining our approach, however, I offer some comments on the rise of diversity discourses, as well as on the German context.

The flourishing of *Diversität*, etc

The German term *Diversität* is generally agreed to have become more widely used in the later 20th century, though with significant earlier uses, especially in relation to *Biodiversität* (biodiversity) (see Garbellotto and Nadim, below; Blum et al 2016; Kirschhoff & Köchy 2016; Toepfer 2017). Its flourishing is argued to have been influenced by international developments, which are reflected in a parallel (though not necessarily identical or coterminous) expansion of diversity discourse in other languages, especially English and French (Salzbrunn 2014). Three semi-linked inflections of *Diversität*, each with partly distinct trajectories, can be discerned.

Cultural diversity, Kulturelle Vielfalt

One of these is associated with the English term ‘cultural diversity’ and the French ‘*diversité culturelle*’, which, as various commentators note, have come to be used more widely especially since the 1990s. UNESCO (the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation) was a key player in their international spread, prompted especially by French members during the Presidency of Jacques Chirac. That the Musée du Quai Branly was founded and opened under his enthusiastic watch is no coincidence, for the same idea of cultural equivalence, as described by Dias above, was involved here too.

Indeed, he was a leading proponent in successfully introducing ‘cultural diversity’ as an alternative to the notion of ‘cultural exception’ that was previously used in international trade agreements (Musitelli 2006). This position in effect made culture and diversity the baseline—rather than singling out cultural exceptions against a backdrop of economic sameness—and, as such, stood against ‘an Anglo-Saxon model of globalisation as free-trade’ (Smiers 2016: 213). It took until 2001 for the UNESCO’s Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity to be formally adopted—unanimously, shortly after the attacks of September 11th, which, as the Director-General wrote in its preface, made it all the more relevant, emphasising, he said, ‘that intercultural dialogue is the best guarantee of peace’. Significantly, ‘heritage’ was another key word of the Declaration. Cultural diversity itself was proclaimed as ‘the common heritage of humanity’ and said to be ‘as necessary for humankind as biodiversity is for nature’ (UNESCO 2001). This supported a wider democratisation of heritage that was already underway, and in which the heritage of numerous diverse groups and interests was accorded greater recognition, including from national and international organisations, such as World Heritage lists (Brumann 2021; Meskell 2018; Salemink 2021). Casting cultural diversity and its manifestation as heritage as analogous to biodiversity also further embedded an idea of cultural diversity and heritage as being ‘at risk’ and thus as in need of initiatives to ‘save’ or ‘preserve’ it (Harrison 2013; Harrison et al. 2020).

These developments intersected with the rise of what has been called the politics of identity or the politics of recognition in many parts of the world (e.g. Taylor 1994; Heyes 2020; Noury and Roland 2020). Gathering momentum in the later 20th century, this has seen groups of citizens calling for their differences from the mainstream to be recognised and accommodated by the State, and increasingly States have done so, though to widely varying extents, ranging from mere toleration to active support and funding. Culture has often been the focus of such developments, with calls for recognition of religious and linguistic difference to the forefront. That this has often been presented as ‘heritage’ is indicative of the legitimating capacity of that term, ensuring that whatever is so designated is understood as something that stretches back in time and that deserves preservation. The heritage, memory and museum boom of the later 20th century and since is also significantly linked to the rise of identity and recognition politics—or what is sometimes also called the politics of difference—as diverse groups seek to explore and perform their distinctiveness through museum and heritage formats.

As Müller and Schmieder (2017) observe, while *Diversität* is sometimes used as a translation for ‘diversity’ in cultural contexts, more often it is the term ‘*Vielfalt*’, particularly in the formulation ‘*kulturelle Vielfalt*’, which appears in the German version of the UNESCO Declaration.² While *Diversität* and *Vielfalt* are generally listed as synonyms, and used fairly interchangeably, they carry subtly different connotations. *Vielfalt*, which might be translated as ‘variety’, has a less politicised tone, putting its emphasis particularly on the multiplicity of kinds, whereas the differences between the elements seem more central in *Diversität*. With its Old Germanic (rather than Latin) roots and sense of multiple enfolding, *Vielfalt* is part of the everyday vernacular and according to figures provided by the *Digitales Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache* has been in longer use in Germany.³ In the 20th century, *Vielfalt* sees a major upswing in use—perhaps paralleling a wider expansion of publishing—and then levels off in the latter quarter. *Diversität*, by

contrast, has relatively negligible use before the 21st century. Its use has proliferated since then, though its level is considerably below that of *Vielfalt*.

Social diversity, Soziale Diversität and different but equal

While many commentators note the use of *Diversität* in biology starting in the 1960s, most agree that a more recent political use of the English-language term 'diversity' in the US has been particularly influential to *Diversität's* use in Germany. This brings us to its second inflection. Here, 'diversity' primarily designates social diversity, having been promoted by social movements and attempts to bring about socio-political change, especially within institutions and with respect to antidiscrimination and affirmative action policies. A legal case at the University of California in 1978, in which affirmative action was approved for the first time, is often pinpointed as a significant origin (Salzbrunn 2014: 28; Partridge and Chin 2019: 197). Steven Vertovec, who heads up the Max Planck Institute for the Study of Religious and Ethnic Diversity in Göttingen and has written widely on contemporary diversity, including in Germany, sees such developments in the US, especially in relation to affirmative action, as particularly influential in the uptake of discourse about *Diversität* in Germany (Vertovec 2012). Here, rather than cultural or natural diversity, the emphasis is on social diversity—especially that of race and ethnicity (two terms with shifting positions, whose histories are closely entangled, and both of which are sometimes articulated as 'cultural'), though also embracing gender, sexuality, physical abledness, class and age, among others. Moreover, where the former variety or *Vielfalt* conception emphasised equivalence, this notion of diversity/*Diversität* is premised on the existence of inequality that needs to be addressed.

To do so, initiatives employing notions such as 'access', 'accessibility' and 'social inclusion' may be devised (Sandell 1998; 2003). Inherent in this discourse is the idea that some are excluded from full citizenship by not being able to play a full role in society. Diversity, in other words, is also linked to unequal political presence and representation. These terms are not only used in theorising but also with respect to policy and practice initiatives, including in the museum and heritage field. They acknowledge that citizenship is unequally distributed and that effort needs to be made to 'include' more but they have been criticised for seeming to invite to join an already given 'offer' rather than to more fundamentally change the system itself. While some argue that 'access' and 'inclusion' should not be regarded in that way, they have tended to lose ground in the museum and heritage field to the term 'participation', which tends to be considered as indicating a greater degree of activity—though it too is also sometimes criticised as operating from a premise of encouraging joining in, rather than changing the foundations. In the migration field, the term 'integration' is similarly contested, with some arguing that, especially by contrast with 'assimilation', it allows for the maintenance of difference, whereas others regard it as putting too much emphasis on changing those immigrating rather than changing society itself (Schinkel 2017). Likewise, the notion of 'citizenship' has been ambiguously evaluated. On the one hand, the mobilization of the idea of citizenship – and its use in initiatives such as 'citizen science' (see Garbellotto and Nadim, this volume) – is part of a democratizing impulse, seeking to involve a wide range of members of society. On the other hand, however, it can also serve to exclude those who are not recognized as

full citizens and, moreover, risks imposing a narrow set of criteria for what constitutes appropriate citizenly behaviour and, thus, being exclusionary in this way too.

The more social and change-oriented conceptions of diversity – recognized through the use of the term *Diversität* – were, according to Vertovec, brought to Germany through calls for U.S.-style ‘diversity mainstreaming’, which were incorporated into various EU policies, together with the actual presence of the U.S. corporate sector (2012: 292). He notes that it is sometimes employed rather instrumentally in these corporate renditions, either to head off possible accusations of discrimination or as part of managerialist ideas about the creative potential of diversity (2012: 291).

This brings us to what might be listed as the third inflection of *Diversität*. In this, an emphasis on social as well as cultural, perhaps including religious, diversity is coupled with ideas of institutional, as well as broader social, change. But rather than being anchored in ideas of inequality, diversity in this sense is considered more like in the first inflection described above, namely, as ‘different but equal’. Monika Salzbrunn, reflecting on *Diversität*, the Anglo term ‘diversity’ and the French *diversité*, sees all of the terms moving in this direction (2014). Like, and indeed largely influenced by, Walter Benn Michaels, she sees diversity—and its German and French equivalents—as having largely lost the political edge and emphasis on inequality of its earlier association with social movements. Instead, she too suggests that it is more often instrumentalised in ways that allow inequality to be ignored or marginalised.

Differences in diversity debate and practice

Perhaps, however, this diagnosis is too broad-brush. As suggested above, it is not necessarily the case that different approaches supplant one another: they may co-exist and even in some contexts supplement each other. Migration debates and policies are undoubtedly one of the areas in which diversity discourse most often occurs but as literature in the field shows, this cannot be reduced just to one of these senses of the term (Römhild 2014). Indeed, what may happen in practice—as we will see in the volume that follows—is that blurring or shifts between senses can themselves be significant. Differences between countries also deserve careful handling. Michaels (2008) has emphasised that his analysis is primarily about the U.S., noting that the levels of difference between rich and poor—the wealth gap—is significantly greater in the U.S. than in France and Germany, and that U.S. higher education is considerably more hierarchical, which both mean, in his analysis, that diversity is more likely to operate as an alibi for inequality.⁴ This same remains the case today.⁵ Moreover, as noted above, the French tendency ‘to promote the principle of equality as a way of dealing with cultural diversity’, and to do so within ‘a universalist approach to cultural differences, races, and religions’ (Debary and Roustan 2017: 5) is significantly different from the emphasis on the ‘recognition of differences’ that has developed in ‘Anglo-Saxon countries’ (ibid.).

Which histories and differences are given emphasis and how also varies internationally. Questions of race and slavery, for example, have been at the forefront in the U.S. longer than in Europe. But the situation is changing. For example, in 2014, Salzbrunn, describing the role that French museums have played in disseminating certain ideas of diversity, noted that ‘the German debate about memory cultures is...scarcely shaped by

colonial history' (2014: 51). Today, less than a decade later, this is no longer the case. On the contrary, the colonial past and colonial continuities have considerable—and even pre-eminent—presence in current German diversity and memory debates, as is abundantly evident in this volume (see especially Förster, Merrow and Jethro). While Michael Rothberg's argument (2009) that promoting any one particular memory does not necessarily diminish the visibility or effectiveness of any other, precisely what a new presence or emphasis may lead to in practice needs to be investigated. Perhaps, as his 'multidirectional memory' formulation proposes, it will indeed lead to each community's memory—and sense of recognition—being substantiated. But this is not inevitably so. Equally, as his arguments also emphasise, memories do not necessarily stack up cumulatively, each just adding another instance to the library of diversities along the shelf. They might instead change existing modes of engagement by bringing new considerations into play or doing difference in other ways.

This sketch of the rise of a discourse of *Diversität* and some of its entanglements and inflections is not intended to be comprehensive. Nevertheless, it provides some shared background and highlights considerations and questions for the studies that follow. All of the research presented here has been undertaken within this broader context of expanded and pervasive diversity discourse. But that does not mean that the term is necessarily in direct use within them. Rather, all of the cases that we present are concerned in some way or another with how people and institutions handle difference, and the ways in which they do so speak directly or indirectly to concerns about diversity in some of the senses above. At the same time, however, they map out and explore more specific realisations and terminologies, some of which may operate rather differently from organising difference as diversity in the ways introduced above. That, indeed, is precisely our interest: how is difference being done in (or in relation to) museums and heritage within this wider flourishing of concern with *Diversität*?

Ethnographic timing

While this flourishing of variously inflected diversity discourse has provided the broad context for the *Making Differences* project, and thus of the studies we present, it has also taken place amidst more specific events and developments with ramifications for difference and diversity. Indeed, the period from 2015 (when the project officially began) to 2020 (the time when most of the contents here were drafted, though the project continues and many articles have been redrafted since) has often felt like one of seismic change, though how far this is the case will only be fully possible to assess over a longer time span. Nevertheless, with our focus on ongoing transformation, we were well positioned to look at them. This was exciting—and challenging.

'Refugee Crisis'

The project officially began in October 2015 following months of planning. At this time, what came to be widely referred to as the 'refugee crisis' or 'the migration crisis' was newly underway. Hundreds of thousands of people, the majority of whom were fleeing from the

conflict-battered countries of Syria, Afghanistan and Iraq, were arriving in Europe. Germany took in more of these refugees (to use the term in its broad rather than formal legal sense) than did any other country (Bock and Macdonald 2019). The coverage in German media was intense and featured debates about what the influx of refugees might mean for social integration and the diversity of German society in the future. On the one hand were those who saw it as a moral imperative that Germany welcome those fleeing persecution—especially given the country’s Holocaust history—and who often maintained that diversity would enrich German society. On the other hand were those who warned that accepting so many ‘foreigners’ would damage core German values (which they generally considered to be coterminous with Christianity) and lead to social fragmentation and unrest. In effect, these were debates about how much difference and diversity Germany, and Europe more generally, wanted or could accept. They were also about the relative desirability of particular kinds of difference and how to manage the differences that the new arrivals were seen to bring with them.

In the *Making Differences* project, it felt important to understand the significance and implications of the ‘crisis’. To do so, we brought together researchers to provide insight into the longer historical, political and legal frameworks pertinent to difference and diversity in Germany, as well as into the representations and experiences of particular groups.⁶ A workshop in April 2016 became the basis for an edited book (Bock and Macdonald 2019). The workshop and book did not focus specifically on museums and heritage—our aim was to assess the developments more broadly—though these topics appeared intermittently throughout, including in the book’s conclusion, which discussed some of the many museum and heritage initiatives that had sprung up to address ‘the crisis’ (Macdonald 2019). The efforts of these cultural institutions showed them to be active sites not only for reflecting on the plight of refugees but also for engaging with them and with wider publics in often innovative ways. Investigating some of these initiatives in more depth became an unanticipated dimension of our research (see Gram, this volume; Puzon 2019; Macdonald, Gerbich, Gram, Puzon & Shatanawi 2021).

In public debates about the influx of refugees, the difference that was often depicted as the cause for most concern, particularly by those who were opposed to permitting so many to stay, was Islam. While not all refugees were practicing Muslims, the majority were from countries in which Islam was the state religion. This gave fuel to opponents of immigration, especially to the AfD (*Alternative für Deutschland*, Alternatives for Germany) and the anti-Islamist Pegida (*Patriotische Europäer gegen die Islamisierung des Abendlandes*, Patriotic Europeans against the Islamicisation of the Occident) movement, whose negative depiction of refugees included painting them as harbingers of a dangerous ‘Islamicisation of the West’. Due to Islam’s long history of complex and contested entanglements in definitions of Europe, as well as it being the subject of high-profile new galleries or museum refurbishments in various countries—including that underway in the Museum of Islamic Art in Berlin (see Gerbich, this volume)—it was already planned that Islam would be a research topic in the *Making Differences* project. It is represented, among other things, by Christine Gerbich’s longstanding research at the Museum of Islamic Art, which includes a project called Tamam, which works with Imams, and the making of the exhibition *The Heritage of the Old Kings*, as well as Museum Diwan, which is the focus of her chapter for this volume. A separate edited collection, *Islam and Heritage in Europe. Pasts, Presents*

and Future Possibilities (2021), edited by Katarzyna Puzon, Sharon Macdonald and Mirjam Shatnawi, provides further exploration of these themes. The refugee arrivals of 2015 and since have, however, made the issue all the more pressing. Though this context has informed all the work presented in this volume, it is most prominent in the contribution by Rikke Gram, who looks at the award-winning Multaka project, a 'tours by refugees for refugees' programme initiated by various Berlin museums. It is also notable in Katarzyna Puzon's chapter on the *i,Slam* initiative, as well as in her fieldwork with KUNSTASYL, a project with asylum seekers to create an exhibition at the Museum of European Cultures in Berlin on the subject of being a refugee, on which she has published elsewhere (Puzon 2019; see also Tietmeyer 2017).

Colonialism and Decolonisation

As Christine Gerbich's research shows, 'Islamic' heritage in Europe needs to be considered in terms of colonialism. While research on the colonial histories of museums and collections has been underway for several decades now (Förster 2019), the years since the launch of the *Making Differences* project have seen a major escalation of debate and activism. This has been felt in many parts of the world, especially those that had colonies or were colonised. With Germany's colonial history coming into the spotlight only recently, the debates of the past several years have been particularly intense. Much of the attention has been on Berlin, where most of pivotal events and decision-making took place. First and foremost among them was the conference of 1884–1885, at which European powers divided up Africa. The 2016 exhibition *Deutscher Kolonialismus* at the German Historical Museum can be seen as a landmark moment in Germany's acknowledgment of its past colonial atrocities. That the exhibition led to such a mix of praise and criticism—reflected not least in the contributions to its visitor books, discussed here by Harriet Merrow—highlights just how sensitive this history remains. One reason for the subject's contentiousness is the concern that focus on Germany's colonial past might draw attention away from the Holocaust. For others, however, the fact that the first German concentration camp was in colonial Namibia is only further evidence of Germany's long-standing problem with Otherness and race—a problem that predates the rise of National Socialism in the 20th century (e.g. Kössler 2015).

A key site for the playing out of debates about Germany's difficult colonial heritage has been, and is, the Humboldt Forum. Constructed to look like the former imperial palace on whose site it stands, the Forum has widely been seen as a statement about Germany's relationship to its past (von Bose 2016, 2017; Bach 2021; Tinius and von Zinnenburg Carroll 2020; Macdonald 2016, forthcoming). Initially, it was the relationship to the history of the German Democratic Republic that was at the forefront of public debate. The reconstruction of the palace had required the destruction of the GDR's parliamentary building, the Palace of the Republic, which seemed like an effort to erase Germany's divided past from public memory. The past that was being 'returned to' lay further back. This was brought more fully under the spotlight when a decision was made to display exhibitions from the Ethnological Museum and Museum of Asian Art in the Humboldt Forum. Statements maintaining that such a move would be appropriate because some of the first collections from beyond Europe had been housed in the palace inadvertently

served to highlight the fact that some of this collecting had taken place as part of the colonial ambitions of those in power at the time (Bose 2016: 127). Already, ethnological collecting, which took place not only by colonising powers in lands they had claimed but also within broader structures of coloniality between Europe and other parts of the world, was under criticism, with growing calls for repatriation and restitution.

1.1 Humboldt Forum under construction, July 2018. Photograph by Sharon Macdonald.



The Humboldt Forum was a central case for the *Making Differences* project. *Berlin Global*, which is the focus of Sharon Macdonald's fieldwork, is one of the permanent galleries of the Humboldt Forum. Margareta von Oswald conducted fieldwork in the Ethnological Museum as it prepared for its move to the Humboldt Forum and she writes here of how that context impacted on work within the museum, and elsewhere of how curatorial activity inevitably took place, to some extent at least, within existing, and often colonial, infrastructures and assumptions (von Oswald 2020). Nnenna Onuoha likewise explores an aspect of what we might see as part of the preparatory infrastructure for the Humboldt Forum, in this case an exhibition called *Beyond Compare: Art from Africa in the Bode Museum* that was billed as 'on the way to the Humboldt Forum'. Her analysis too highlights the persistence of past models, despite this exhibition's forward-looking ambition. The activities of the curators and artists with whom Jonas Tinius worked, as well as the activists in Duane Jethro's research, were also mobilised in no small part by what they saw as the colonial wrongs coalescing around the Humboldt Forum. Beyond the contents of this book – and forming a subproject in a final phase of *Making Differences*

– Irene Hilden and Andrei Zavadsky have conducted research on the reception of the Humboldt Forum by the press and visitors (Hilden, Merrow and Zavadski 2021; Zavadsky and Hilden 2022). In addition, and also part of *Making Differences*, artist-researcher Tal Adler has created an exhibit for the University’s exhibiting space, the Humboldt Labor, within the Humboldt Forum.⁷ Designed to reflect critically upon collecting and exhibiting practices themselves, this exhibit is also intended not only to reflect upon what is currently done but also to generate debate and contribute to changing practice (Macdonald 2023).

1.2 *Opposition to the Humboldt Forum, August 2020. Photograph by Andrei Zavadsky.*



The making and contesting of the Humboldt Forum underway by 2015 were, along with the wider debates about colonial histories and continuities, followed by further twists and turns locally and further afield. The widely reported 2017 statement by French President Emmanuel Macron that ‘conditions should be created for the... restitution of African patrimony to Africa’ (Rea 2017), was highly significant, especially as it came to be developed in a report that he commissioned (Sarr and Savoy 2018; see also von Oswald 2018), in proposing that instead of the burden of proof for the return of objects resting on proof that they had been misappropriated, the onus should be on proving that there had been ‘free consent’ by those from whom the objects came if they were to be retained. One of the authors of a report that he commissioned to help make the case was art historian Bénédicte Savoy, who, in 2017, resigned from the Humboldt Forum’s advisory board, citing among other reasons the failure of its organisers to sufficiently

address questions of provenance (Haentschel 2017; Förster 2019: 79). Since then, several permanent provenance research posts have been created to work with the collections of the Ethnological Museum and Museum of Asian Art.⁸ One of our team members, Larissa Förster, has worked for many years on the provenance of objects from colonial contexts. She helped create the 2018 provenance guidelines for the German Museums Association, published an edited collection and other contributions dedicated to questions of provenance in ethnological museums (Förster, Edenheiser, Fründt and Hartmann 2018; Förster and Bose 2018; Förster 2018a, 2018b, 2019) and co-edited an introduction to museum ethnology (Edenheiser and Förster 2019) that aimed, among other things, to improve provenance education. In addition, she has undertaken innovative provenance research herself (Förster and Stoecker 2016). Her chapter here draws on some of her experience—in effect treating it as a form of fieldwork—to look at the way that particular terms came to be adopted and the consequences of these within the ongoing debates.

While questions of ethnological museums and colonialism were already on our agenda when we began the *Making Differences* project, particularly for the research area Transforming the Ethnographic, other edited volumes that we produced (Lidchi, Macdonald and Oswald 2017; Oswald and Tinius 2020) reflected more recent events and debates. These works contribute not only to documenting and analysing transformations but also to the transformational aim of decolonising museums and heritage. They bring often overlooked but nevertheless ramifying forms of coloniality within certain heritage and institutions to light, and explore and propose modes of addressing them.

Giving further momentum to decolonisation efforts was the widespread global mobilisation in support of the Black Lives Matter movement, following the brutal killing of George Floyd by U.S. police in 2020. Among other forms of protest, statues of slave owners were toppled not only in the U.S. but also in Europe (see, for example, Atuire 2020; Buchczyk and Jethro 2020; Jethro 2021). Duane Jethro's research on colonial street renaming shows that attempts to decolonise had some success in past years but that the events of 2020 have helped accelerate the process. One example is Berlin's decision to change the name of the street in which our Institute and Research Centre is located—a decision for which postcolonial activists and various others had long campaigned (Azaryahu 2009; Engler 2013; Jethro and Macdonald forthcoming).

These were certainly not the only significant developments during our research. Nazli Cabadağ discusses new developments in the LGBTIQ+ Pride movements in Istanbul as well as in Berlin, further demonstrating how what happens in Germany may be part of a specific transnational dynamic (see also Cabadağ and Ediger 2020). A political move to the right in Turkey is part of the worrying context of these events. A rightwards move, characterised by growing neo-nationalism and intolerance of diversity, has also been evident in various other parts of the world during these years, with museums and heritage frequently being enlisted in service of promoting such positions (Eckersley 2020; Macdonald 2016, 2021). This is recognised by some museums as a particular problem for how they present 'culture', as shown in Magdalena Buchczyk's discussion of attempts to diversify the collections of the Museum of European Cultures (this volume). Increasingly, social media is being deployed to extend the reach of intolerance (though as research by Nazli Cabadağ and Christoph Bareither, this volume, shows, social media is also being used to work against such views).⁹

Notable in recent years is the growth of public concern over the climate, as evidenced by the Fridays for Future protests, which have taken place all around the world. While this recent intensification of public concern was predated by citizen science initiatives, it is nevertheless part of their wider context, and, indeed, of the wider context of all such work.

The ‘busyness’ of the past years is testament to the prominence in public discourse of museums, heritage and questions of diversity. As evident from the persistence and even the resurgence of efforts to deploy museums and heritage against diversity and in service of conservative and exclusionary ends, the ‘direction’ of this activity is clearly not one-way. Nevertheless, certain lines of travel and emphases can be detected amidst the plethora of developments. In order to set out the ways that the *Making Differences* project has approached these tendencies, more needs to be said about our methodology.

Methodology

As noted above, most of the ethnographic research in *Making Differences: Transforming Museums and Heritage* took place in Berlin—hence, the subtitle of this online book: *A Berlin Ethnography*. In the classic tradition of ethnography, our work speaks not only to what is happening in each case but also to wider developments. This includes those outlined above, which the chapters that follow expand on, as well as others that the various authors identify. What we present here, in essence, are particular struggles over, and realisations of, how to do difference and diversity in the present. All of these struggles and realisations, in one way or another, implicate heritage, be it in the form of museums and collections or in notions of belonging, history and culture. And all involve innovation—attempts to craft new ways of doing things or new concepts or new alliances, often against a backdrop of established and even limiting infrastructures, practices and ways of thinking. As such, they highlight the potential of museums and heritage to transform how difference and diversity are done more widely.

‘An Ethnography’

That all of the studies were conducted in Berlin within the same time frame enables an in-depth understanding of a particular setting and moment. It is what allows us to describe our approach as ‘an ethnography’, even though it was conducted by multiple researchers, each bringing a particular kind of expertise, fieldwork experience and set of perspectives to the project. It is a *multi-researcher ethnography* not just in the sense that many ethnographers have all worked on one topic but also in that it preserves their distinct inputs. Rather than begin from the idea of a known or potential ‘whole’, we leave open how different organisations, groups and other components or elements—to use the language of assemblage theory—interrelate or form particular constellations (DeLanda 2016).

Our ethnography does, nevertheless, attempt to include a broad range of museum and heritage organisations and settings. And it does so without purporting to be comprehensive or imagining its selections to be representative of parts within a system. Given

that the city's official tourism organisation, *Visit Berlin*, lists 170 museums alone, and that there are many more heritage sites, and an incalculable number of the heritage-related practices, exhaustive coverage would have been not only exhausting but impossible. Instead, our approach has been to select contexts and venues that tap into questions of diversity and difference from a range of positions and perspectives. How these might relate to each other—whether through similar language or other practices—was a matter for investigation rather than presumption. At the same time, however, we did work on the assumption that there *would* be many interrelationships, not least due to geographical proximity and the potential for shared discourse, as sketched above. Moreover, some of the groups and organisations that we worked with are part of overarching governmental structures—for example, the Museum of Islamic Art, the Ethnological Museum and the Museum of European Cultures, among others, are all part of the Staatliche Museen zu Berlin (SMB) and the Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz (SPK, Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation). They thus operate under various shared organisational conditions, and sometimes are spoken of as a collective. In addition, some of these museums, as well as others, engage in common endeavours, most notably, the Humboldt Forum. By giving recognition to links and interrelationships, we aimed to avoid what—in an article for which Christine Gerbich came up with the apt title, 'No Museum is an Island'—we have called 'ethnographic containerism' (Macdonald, Gerbich and Oswald 2018). Modelled on critiques of the widespread tendency in social science research to regard the nation as a taken-for-granted analytical 'container' ('methodological nationalism'), our collective ethnographic approach avoided taking each component ethnographic study as representing an isolated island of operation.

Here it is also important to note that although a good deal of our research was 'real time'—that is, looking at what was ongoing—we did not see it as disconnected from the past. On the contrary, we were centrally concerned with how the past articulates with the present, be it through consciously addressing history or through the persistence of earlier discourse or infrastructure.

Approaching difference and diversity

The methodological approach adopted was also important in order to break with conventional framings of difference and diversity. By not limiting ourselves to one kind of organisation and by not working with predefined notions of 'communities' or 'differences', we were able to bring together heterogeneous elements (any of which alone might risk becoming a 'container') and to disrupt the ways in which they could be taken for granted. Mixing things up in this heterogeneous fashion allowed for the methodological 'messiness' that John Law (2004) advocates to avoid replicating existing analytical frameworks and, thus, to help open up new perspectives.

A characteristic of ethnographic methodology, especially that rooted in social anthropology, is to give close attention to the framings, categories and practices deployed by those we are trying to understand. How do they see and do difference and diversity? Who is included and how in their grouping of subjects? Accordingly, our research often followed our interlocutors in their networks, groups and communities. In looking at participatory projects at the Museum of Islamic Art, the Museum of Natural History, the

Museum of European Cultures or *Berlin Global*, we examined the ways in which participants were defined and enlisted. Likewise, we explored the affiliations made in Berlin Pride, in *i,Slam*, in the visitor books of the German colonialism exhibition or by visitors posting online about the Holocaust Memorial. And we followed attempts to come up with new and different classifications of difference, as in Jonas Tinius's study of SAVVY Contemporary's 'Dis-Othering' project, conducted with the Belgian Centre for Fine Arts and Austria's *Kulturen in Bewegung*. Centrally, then, our ethnographic work gives attention to the kinds of sameness and difference, the categories and relationships, that our participants invoke through the terms that they use (e.g. 'Berliners', 'Europe', 'Africa', 'community', 'race'), as well as to how they put these into practice (e.g. who they label or define by such terms, whom they invite to participate in certain events, who turns up). Doing so opens up the potential gap between terms and their use. Sometimes the gap is between expectations and results, ambitions and reality. Sometimes it signals interesting possibilities beyond those contemplated at the outset. And sometimes—in processes of recursivity (Tinius and Macdonald 2020)—it can be refracted back into both practice and academic theorising, to show alternatives to the terminologies currently in use.

Our research methodology adopts a particular take on difference and diversity. Rather than following the equivalent of a multicultural model, which would have identified particular groups or venues, or particular kinds of diversity, as offering an equivalent set of distinctive positions, we developed a multi-scalar, multifocal approach that was responsive to the heterogeneous context and approaches of our researchers. If not exactly rhizomatic (in Braidotti's sense, above), it is nevertheless a model that does not presuppose a single 'whole picture'; rather, it allows for degrees of sharing, partial connections, mutual reverberations and traffic between them. As such, it leaves the possibilities for what is going on more open than they would be otherwise.

Ethnographic engagement

The researchers in the *Making Differences* project have spent time in their various field-work settings and engaged with those who participate in them. None of the studies rely on post-hoc documentation by others or recollections by interviewees, though many use these as part of an overall raft of approaches. A mix of techniques is usual in ethnography, though it always includes some degree of 'being there' (Geertz 1988), of being in the presence of interlocutors, even when 'there' can also mean online (see especially Bareither, this volume). A characteristic of much ethnography is the direct observation of objects, images, movements, bodies, spaces, animals and other other-than-human participants. All of the ethnographic contributions in this volume pay close attention to detail: particular words or tones of voice; the placing of objects in relation to one another or to texts; facial expressions in photographs or looks exchanged during a meeting; the mounting disquiet when events are not quite working out or the ebullience of participating in a successful effort. Such details are not 'mere' or 'incidental'. Rather, they are often where struggles or contradictions coalesce or plans get tripped up.

While all of the ethnographic research undertaken in *Making Differences* has involved some in situ presence, the forms that this has taken, and the emphasis given to particular techniques, has varied. In some cases, researchers have been deeply embedded in

their fieldsites over years, even prior to their joining the project. This is particularly the case for Nazli Cabadağ, Larissa Förster, Christine Gerbich, Tahani Nadim and Margareta von Oswald, though depending on how one defines ‘fieldsite’ includes others as well. Their position can be described as observant-participation — a term used here by Margareta von Oswald, who co-curated an exhibition in the Ethnological Museum. Inverting the classical term ‘participant-observation’, which advocates understanding through involvement, observant-participation implies a more active role, even a leading one.

Many of our other researchers have also taken active roles that had the potential to change what they were investigating. Duane Jethro has spoken in public in favour of changing colonial street names in Berlin and describes his position as one of ‘occupying a space of solidarity’ with activists; Jonas Tinius organised activities for some of the galleries that he worked with and acted as a ‘sparring partner’ (Tinius 2021; Tinius and Macdonald 2020); I was a member of *Berlin Global’s* advisory board and made input in other capacities too; Chiara Garbellotto’s innovative approach collaborates with participants, and sometimes also with the visual anthropologist in our team, Nnenna Onuoha, to devise workshops (Garbellotto and Onuoha 2019). In addition, beyond the scope of this volume, the project has entailed further engagements, including, as mentioned above, artist-researcher Tal Adler’s exhibit *Who is ID8470?* which is shown in the Humboldt Labor in the Humboldt Forum. We do not see such roles as contaminating the research process but, rather, as opportunities to learn more and open up spaces for reflection, and to engage deeply by directly experiencing the details, complexities and affective dimensions of practice. Occupying various roles allows a ‘multifaceted granularity’ of understanding, as Larissa Förster puts it below; and it is perhaps inevitable in contexts in which, as Jonas Tinius has written elsewhere, the ‘membranes’ between organizations are ‘porous’ (Tinius 2020). Active participation helps us get a better handle on how those we are working with are likely to see and feel the activities in which they are involved. Hence, it gives us a stronger grasp of how and why things turn out as they do, and, by extension, positions us to make a difference to ongoing practice.

Making a difference in the sense of changing museum and heritage practice for the better is part of the project’s objective. Through careful observation and analysis, researchers identified concepts and practices that can help or hinder the improvement of how things are customarily done. Likewise, highlighting seeming self-evident assumptions or overlooked influences can lead to ways of thinking—and doing—otherwise (CARMAH 2018). Working closely with fieldwork interlocutors helps ensure that our insights and the results of our analysis flow into future practice. So too does the use of multiple formats, ranging from informal discussions to more formal meetings, reports, workshops, films, conferences and various kinds of publications (blogs, co-written experimental pieces, academic articles, etc.). Making as much of our work as possible open access—as with this volume—has also been important in this regard. Other, direct forms of *making a difference* to which the project has contributed include exhibition-making, activism and devising new pedagogical programmes and guidelines.

Team work

All ethnographic research requires reflexivity—that is, attention to one's own role. This is all the more so when research involves as much active participation as the *Making Differences* project has. Work in a multi-researcher team has been invaluable in promoting reflexivity, for it provides an environment of alert colleagues, with complementary experience and expertise, who can ask questions and prompt (sometimes uncomfortable) interrogations of each other's roles, assumptions, actions and findings.

Our team work was aided by the fact that members of the *Making Differences* project were all based in a shared research space—that of the Centre for Anthropological Research on Museums and Heritage (CARMAH). Regular meetings, presentations, co-organised events and co-written publications all helped bring the studies together by detecting connections and disparities, and by highlighting further lines of enquiry. Our ethnography was 'more-than-individual' in that we worked within a constant buzz of information relevant to our research, with news articles being sent around on email and clusters of researchers gathering in the kitchen to discuss them. Attending talks and conferences fostered an ongoing conversation across and beyond specific fieldsites. Not infrequently, the fieldsite of one researcher would be visited by others in the team. For example, many team members collectively visited the *German Colonialism* exhibition, *Da-HEIM* at the Museum of European Cultures, *Beyond Compare* at the Bode Museum and the *Heritage of the Old Kings* at the Museum of Islamic Art. Many also participated in events connected with the renaming of our institute's street. Some of us also visited exhibitions and events elsewhere and analysed them together (e.g. Merrow, Gerbich and Jethro 2020).

The composition of the *Making Differences* team was fluid in that it was made up of various members at different times over a wide range of positions and levels of commitment: some came later than others or left earlier, some were full-time, others were affiliated. We also drew on input from visiting researchers who came either specifically for *Making Differences* or for other projects as well as from external associates of CARMAH and beyond. Nevertheless, this particular volume was the result of a core conversation over a dedicated series of meetings and drafts.

This volume

The chapters in this volume address questions of how difference and diversity are being done in museums and heritage today. Rather than presenting summaries of the overall findings from each study, they explore particular dimensions of the wider research. Collectively, they offer many more insights and deploy many more theoretical resources than I have covered here. The articles in this volume, emanating as they do from the same research project, are linked in a multitude of ways, and need not be read in any specific order. Nevertheless, the following offers one possible approach by means of a meta-narrative about doing diversity in museums and heritage.

Colonial provenance, persistence and decolonisation

Debates about colonial provenance and restitution are a major strand of contemporary diversity discourse in German public culture, which asks how Germany—and Europe more generally—position themselves with regard to other parts of the world, especially former colonies in Africa. Larissa Förster, in her chapter for this volume, discusses the unique forms that growing concerns about colonial provenance, restitution, human remains and cultural artefacts in various parts of the world take in Germany. She gives particular attention to German colonial history and its relationship to other histories such as that of National Socialism, as well as to certain political and cultural structures and developments. From her own close involvement, she highlights changes over time as debates have increasingly come to be framed in moral rather than in exclusively legal terms. This shift also encompasses an emphasis on decolonising museums and heritage more widely.

Margareta von Oswald's fieldwork in the Ethnological Museum in Berlin was carried out as these debates became particularly acute, intensified by the fact that the Ethnological Museum was preparing exhibitions for the Humboldt Forum. As she describes, this led to tense atmospheres within the museum as curators – including herself – sought to negotiate certain resulting tensions. Evident here is also how museums' earlier work of 'making differences' continues into the present, making current attempts by museum staff to work in new ways more challenging (see also von Oswald 2020, 2022; Phillips 2011; Lidchi, Macdonald and von Oswald 2017). Co-curating an exhibition that was intended to address questions of colonial provenance and 'looted art', von Oswald directly experienced the challenges involved, emanating variously from the conditions and assumptions of the organizational context, as well as from issues that only became more evident during the making process (see also Oswald and Rodatus 2017). On the one hand, the resulting exhibition, *Object Biographies*, was an attempt to bring a more critical approach to conventional modes of collecting and exhibiting African objects within ethnological museums – and, thus, to be a form of decolonising – but at the same time, as she herself makes clear, it was compromised in various ways.

Object Biographies was created as part of the process of developing ideas for the future Forum. Another notable exhibition that was developed as part of this process and that also involved objects from the collections of the Ethnological Museum was *Beyond Compare: Art from Africa*, which Nnenna Onuoha discusses in this volume (see also Loeseke 2019). The exhibition placed items from the Africa collections alongside those already on display in the Bode Museum, which is devoted to Byzantine, Gothic, Renaissance and Baroque art. The juxtaposition of Africa and Europe posed the question of comparability alluded to in the title. While this inclusion of African objects in a museum of European art was intended, as Onuoha explains, to 'transcend...stereotypical, Eurocentric perceptions of African Art', she argues that it 'ends up reinforcing' them. Her argument rests on a historically informed analysis that includes detailed attention to the particular juxtapositions of objects with one another and with the accompanying texts and gallery space. Instead of 'difference' being 'enunciated' in ways that open up questions, it is instead, she maintains, 'flattened' into familiar binaries, performing in effect a simple form of 'cultural diversity' in which difference is neatly contained.

1.3 German Colonialism exhibition at the German Historical Museum. Photograph by Wolfgang Siesing reproduced courtesy of the German Historical Museum.



German Colonialism, an exhibition that opened at the German Historical Museum in 2016, was, as noted above, widely seen as part of a turn towards a more direct and open confrontation with Germany's colonial past—in contrast, as some would claim, to the Humboldt Forum. As Harriet Merrow explains, though some saw it as a welcome sign of Germany at long last coming clean about its past, it also received a good deal of criticism from politicians, activists, members of the public and even those who had been involved in its making. Putting it crudely, some believed it was too critical of Germany, whereas for others it did not go nearly far enough. Drawing on analysis of media coverage, thousands of entries in visitor books, participant-observation in the exhibition and interviews, Merrow identifies the variety of statements, the key issues on which disagreement tended to fall and the features of the exhibition that led to particular, sometimes problematic, interpretations and limitations. A better understanding of these responses can help create exhibitions that are effective in tackling the contentious topic of German colonialism and in spreading awareness of its continuities amidst broader decolonisation efforts.

Duane Jethro addresses issues of decolonisation in his examination of campaigns to rename streets with colonial histories and/or connotations in Berlin. He compares the situation with that of post-apartheid South Africa, where he has also conducted research (see especially Jethro 2020). The very efficiency and speed of street-renaming in South Africa meant that a public debate scarcely took place there. The struggles that accompany such debates, he argues, are worthwhile because they raise awareness not only about the past but also about how race is articulated in relation to national identity. Moreover, they show that the term 'decolonisation' itself is variously understood and can indicate a range of different processes, some more unsettling and probing than others.

Diversity initiatives

Scholarship and activism have increasingly shown colonialism to have had much more extensive and lasting consequences than previously recognised (e.g. Azoulay 2019; Stoler 2016), highlighting the need for more extensive decolonisation. This requires thorough-going examination of taken-for-granted structures of thought and action, as well as the challenging of problematic conceptions of difference such as Otherness, and the addressing of diversity and white privilege. Initiatives to begin this work of decolonising and diversifying have begun to flourish in cultural organisations, including museums and heritage (see, for example, Dilger and Warstat 2021; Insaf 2020; Knudsen et al. 2021; Sieg 2021).

One such initiative is the Dis-Othering project, discussed by Jonas Tinius, which sought to look at how various cultural organisations themselves imagine Africa, including as part of their own attempts to diversify. The project was a collaboration between two non-mainstream organisations that had strong reputations for their critical engagement with questions of diversity and difference, and a public cultural and exhibition venue that acted as project manager and, eventually, the subject of curators' criticism. One part of the project entailed creating a survey to map diversity within a wide range of arts organisations, both mainstream and more avant-garde, in Austria, Belgium and Germany. As Tinius' engaged ethnography shows, this turned out to be highly problematic, with contention over which diversities to include, as well as over the format and approach of the questionnaire, and the constituency to address. What became evident, he argues, was that the very attempts to map diversity themselves frequently ended up replicating the categories and formats of which they were critical. While this might seem a depressing conclusion—and it is surely a cautionary one—he points out that the struggle and reflection that resulted were themselves valuable and can be seen as a positive outcome of the project.

Trying to actively diversify was also the aim of a number of our other fieldsites, including the exhibition *Berlin Global* in the Humboldt Forum, discussed by me, and the Museum of European Cultures, analysed by Magdalena Buchczyk. *Berlin Global* attempted to embrace many forms of diversity and diversification while critiquing Othering and exoticisation. As I show, attempting to do the latter—as with *Beyond Compare* and the Dis-Othering project—often risked reproducing stereotypes or dualisms in the very process of attempting to make visitors aware of them. Here again, it was in the practice of realisation that the difficulty often lay. Much debate and careful consideration of the 'visual metaphors' of the exhibition sought to find ways around the perceived problems. This was also the case in relation to the dilemmas of categorisation in the Dis-Othering project, and to the possible endless proliferation of diversities—dilemmas with which political theory also struggles.

Berlin Global is not based on a particular collection: the objects that it includes have been selected primarily to illustrate the story and 'message' (*Botschaft*) that the curators devised. In this, it differs from the Ethnological Museum's presence in the Humboldt Forum, as discussed by Oswald and Onuoha, as well as from the Museum of European Cultures example, presented by Buchczyk. Which objects are present in the collections—and what information is available about them—is inevitably shaped by

previous historical circumstances, chance and the predilections of previous curatorial ideas and ambitions—factors that can limit current curatorial aims, as Buchczyk shows particularly clearly. The desire of curators at the Museum of European Culture to be ‘socially responsive’, which they see as being ‘more diverse’, is often made more difficult due to the coverage of the current collections. During Buchczyk’s fieldwork, the curators devised new ways to try to do what they refer to as ‘diversifying the collections’ and ‘addressing gaps’. This includes writing a new collecting policy, which will diversify not only what is collected in the future but also who is involved. But as the curators’ thoughtful discussions show, operationalising the policy and deciding which specific objects to collect face thorny problems that are inherent to many diversification projects, particularly those that, like museums, carry the weight of the past and stand to shape the future.

Expanding the remit of who is involved in museum work is a major motivation of citizen science initiatives. These have been developed especially by museums of natural history, where an emphasis on biodiversity is variously entangled with ideas of social diversity, as Chiara Garbellotto and Tahani Nadim show here in examples from their fieldwork in the Berlin Museum of Natural History. Initiatives that enlist ‘citizens’ in mapping biodiversity, such as the Nightingale Project on which they focus, tend to do so within empiricist approaches that understand diversity as ‘there’ to be discovered and documented. By contrast, Garbellotto and Nadim emphasise that diversity is ‘co-produced by the material-semiotic devices used to record it’ and, therefore, they explore the practices and infrastructures of producing diversity data (see also Nadim 2021). As with various other *Making Differences* studies, especially those of Tinus and Buchczyk, this brings attention to issues of the classifications used, as well as to the other ways in which certain data-making practices afford particular kinds of engagement (or not) and particular kinds of connections (or not). They show how, on the one hand, citizen science biodiversity initiatives attempt to articulate social diversity by involving ‘more diverse’ sections of the population, including ‘new Berliners’ who are not formally citizens. On the other, however, they also stress that the link between a loss of biodiversity and a loss of social diversity—as when urban gentrification results in a loss of both—tends to be overlooked by views that see citizen science as lying outside the sphere of civic participation.

Forging new belonging and relations

Garbellotto and Nadim argue that citizen science initiatives can be seen not simply as involving citizens but as producing them (or what they call ‘sensing’ them). If citizenship is seen as not just about formal legal status—and not as something that one has or does not—but as a more graded and multifaceted matter including feelings of belonging and of being able to participate in public culture, then cultural organisations and initiatives have an important role to play in enabling it. Indeed, their major motivation for trying to diversify collections, exhibitions and the like is to give recognition—and thus some sense of connection—to the diversity of Germany’s population. Enabling the active participation of ‘citizens’ in this broader sense takes that recognition to another level. As we have already seen, however, opportunities for active participation face certain difficulties, though various innovative solutions have been and are being developed.

One of the established museums in Berlin that has embraced the goal of inclusivity is the Museum of Islamic Art. The goal has been particularly valuable in light of the fact that Islam is often popularly regarded to be, as Katarzyna Puzon writes, 'not German'. Both Christine Gerbich and Rikke Gram present examples of significant participatory initiatives that the Museum of Islamic Art was instrumental in establishing. For example, *Museum Diwan*, a project that Gerbich played a major role in designing and running, brought together people from a range of backgrounds to help rethink the museum's approaches. This included what was called 'revisiting the collections', in which participants explored the potential of the existing collections for connecting with contemporary inhabitants of Berlin and for telling other stories than those of academic art history. As Gerbich shows, understanding these processes merely as 'adding on' to what was already underway was not enough: it also requires from curators and other museum workers a questioning of current accepted practice, undertaking what Gerbich refers to as 'organisational unlearning'.

Multaka was another important initiative of the Museum of Islamic Art, which it undertook together with three other Museums in Berlin (the German Historical Museum, the Bode Museum and the Museum of the Ancient Near East). It began in 2015 in response to the refugee crisis, and it came to win various awards for its efforts to 'integrate' new arrivals. Central to its novelty was the use of Arabic-speaking refugees and other newcomers to the city as museum guides. On the basis of her fieldwork and interviews, Gram shows how the question of 'difference' was variously negotiated in the initiative. On the one hand, the label 'refugee' and the fact that the tours were not only 'by' but also 'for' refugees (though in practice many others also attended) highlighted the 'difference' of the newcomers, something that was also reinforced by certain structural work conditions due to bureaucratic status. On the other, however, the project succeeded in helping newcomers share their expertise through meaningful work that would otherwise have been hard to attain, and it allowed them to bring their own perspectives into these major cultural institutions.

While *Museum Diwan* and *Multaka* were organised by established museums, the developments discussed by Puzon and Cabadağ were realised by individuals and groups. The initiators can be seen as belonging to specific 'communities', though it needs bearing in mind that this term can be problematic because it implies that people can be neatly divided into different but equivalent and internally homogeneous groups. This is often seen, for example, in relation to migration, which is often depicted as resulting in distinct 'communities' with shared 'cultures' and shared sets of ties to their 'homelands'. *Museum Diwan* was designed precisely to avoid such an assumption. The chapters by Puzon and Cabadağ also show how a shared 'migration background' (*Migrationshintergrund*)—a term commonly used by Germans for immigrants and for those whose parents or grandparents are immigrants—does not necessarily lead to shared interests or senses of collectivity. In the case of the poetry slam group, *i,Slam*, discussed by Puzon, individuals from various such backgrounds come together not to express an already fixed identity but, rather, to negotiate what it means to be both Muslim and German. The cultural form that this takes is, likewise, not fixed as 'traditional'; rather, it draws on Islamic heritage in creative ways, sometimes reaching translocally to other parts of the world as well.

The LGBTI+ event *Berlin Walks with Istanbul Pride*, analysed by Cabadağ, can also be seen as a newly crafted translocal 'heritage'. In particular, the activists running it—including Cabadağ herself—sought to express solidarity with Istanbul Pride, which had not taken place since 2015 after being banned by Turkey's right-wing government. But Istanbul-based LGBTI+ activists saw *Berlin Walks with Istanbul Pride* differently, arguing that it highlighted difference and inequality by performing Western privilege and promulgating the idea that Europe was an emancipatory destination for migrants. While Cabadağ accepts the critique in part, she also points out that to see members of the Berlin-based Turkish-speaking LGBTI+ 'community' (or of the Istanbul one, for that matter) as all alike is problematic: here, too, there is difference when it comes to degrees of privilege and freedom, especially between generations. Nevertheless, the possibility of 'community without commonality' enables 'multiple attachments of queer migrants to multiple locations and temporalities'. This means that while an event such as *Berlin Walks with Istanbul Pride* might be rejected by some, it will also be embraced, perhaps ambivalently, by others. Indeed, the very differences of opinion about it can be welcomed as part of a wider reflection on 'making differences queerly'—that is, on finding alternative modes of making not only differences but also connections of various kinds.

As Christoph Bareither shows in his analysis of posts by visitors to the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe in Berlin, an important means for connecting translocally is digital media. Bareither gives careful attention to visitors' practices of photography—especially taking selfies—along with their posting of the images online and their comments about the site's 'difficult heritage'. As he argues, even in cases of what might initially seem like 'emotionally indifferent' or even 'disrespectful' engagements with the site—such as smiling for a photograph—visitors often express more complicated emotions and reflections. In addition, rather than connecting with the site from positions of fixed identity categories, visitors' posts and their responses to Bareither's questions show multiple and varied forms of engagement. These indicate less an atomisation of relationships to heritage, he maintains, than their *personalisation*, one in which visitors forge their own particular mix of connections, both with the site and with others in the online sphere.

Final comments

The chapters in this volume make many more important points than is possible to cover here, and provide rich ethnographic illustration regarding questions of diversity and difference in museums and heritage. To boil them down to one overall set of findings would be reductive. Nevertheless, there are certain core themes and directions that emerge. One of the most notable of these is the struggle against established classifications and other rigid 'containers'. Despite the wide variety of cases that we have taken, models of diversity that rely on mono-dimensional and fixed categories are shown time and again to miss the complexities of contemporary relationships and senses of self. Concepts such as 'community' and 'identity' are increasingly viewed as, if not inoperable and redundant, at least requiring revision and reconceptualisation to allow for more fluidity and less communality, as Cabadağ puts it. When terms such as 'Berliners' or 'Germans' are used, they are often put in quotation marks, or their problematic status is indicated by

changing our tone of voice or by prefixing with 'so-called' (*sogenannte*). Online, users may (and usually do) tag their posts with many hashtags simultaneously, or, as shown in Bareither's study, they may deploy hashtags such as #jewish to signal a sense of connection or to indicate that they have visited the Holocaust Memorial, rather than making a strong identity claim (such as 'being Jewish'). Numerous initiatives—started by local or translocal groups, individuals, alternative venues and more mainstream organisations—have begun the search for new connections and relationships, for new ways of belonging, of being 'German' and of doing diversity. As we discuss in this volume, these new practices are already being forged and realised.

Our cases also show, however, that abandoning or reworking existing categories is difficult and usually impossible. This is perhaps especially true for museums, which in many ways rely on classificatory activity. The classification of collections cannot easily be changed, as the case of the Museum of European Cultures shows. But even classifications that are not materialised in collections can be hard to avoid, as shown in the case of the *Berlin Global*. Figuring out strategies to diversify and engage with those who are not usually involved necessarily involves some kind of naming and labelling, even if it is more or less self-aware, cautious and innovative. Furthermore, the gathering of data can deploy categories that the researchers themselves find dubious, as in the Dis-Othering project, or that do not attend critically to the data assemblages that result, as in the Nightingale Project. At issue here are not simply categories and labels but also the patterns into which they are organised, which may imply hierarchies or deny inequalities. In this way, associations and positions such as where particular exhibitions or museums are located also establish certain 'constellations of difference' to convey meaning and hierarchy (Macdonald 2016).

An aim of our research is to address problematic modes of differencing—an aim we share with some of the organisations and practices that we have explored. In some cases, organisations examined their own practices, as was the intention of the survey conducted for the Dis-Othering project, of the meetings leading up to the new collecting policy of the Museum of European Cultures and of the Museum Diwan workshops. In other cases, the aim has been to make the public aware of past practices by calling attention to them in exhibitions, as the *German Colonialism* exhibition and *Berlin Global* did for colonial practices of display. Activism has also sought to highlight problematic differencing, as in the case of colonial street names, as well as to bring activist-desired difference into the public domain, as in Berlin Pride.

In some ways what activism does is to change the people who get to make differences. Instead of leaving city and cultural management to established institutions, activists rely on more ad hoc arrangements, though these may develop into more structured organisations (such as Berlin Postkolonial). In some cases, activism begins with a focus on a specific issue, though as we see in the case of Berlin, it can gain traction by gathering various causes together and focusing on specific issues such as street names, restitution and the Humboldt Forum. In other cases, activism is based on identity or difference, as in the case of *iSlam* and LGBTI initiatives, though here too these tend to reinforce themselves through translocal networking and online media. While activism is generally regarded as an 'outsider' movement (Pettinicchio 2012) challenging the status quo, what is also clear in our Berlin ethnography is that the boundaries between inside and outside may

be traversed and indistinct, as surprised Margareta von Oswald when she began working in the Ethnological Museum. Organisations such as SAVVY Contemporary and Galerie Wedding blur the boundaries more explicitly. They are semi-established in that they are relatively longstanding organisations with physical premises that have received various types of state funding but they often take oppositional stances and try to change the status quo, sometimes allying themselves with, or even instigating, activist campaigns. In addition, there is what has been called ‘institutional activism’, in which attempts to bring about major changes to established norms emerge ‘from within organisations and institutions’ (Pettinicchio 2012: 501). While there is a risk here of stretching the term ‘activism’ too far, some mainstream organisations have embraced causes that have been promoted primarily by activists and have worked together with the activists themselves. An example of a move towards greater institutionalisation is the establishment in 2018 of an office of the German Lost Art Foundation to deal with objects from colonial contexts. The office is headed by Larissa Förster, whose work falls under both scholarship and activism. Such fluidity is, indeed, another feature of the situations that we have analysed. Duane Jethro’s work is also both scholarly and activist—his scholarship provides further substance for his causes, and his activist participation enriches his scholarly contemplation. The same is true for Christine Gerbich, who works within an established museum and is thus to some degree an ‘institutional insider’. More generally, those identifying as activists as well as scholars participated in events organised by our research centre, and are thus an important part of the overall conversation. Indeed, operating as a locus for such boundary-crossing interaction was a role that CARMAH came to play.

Changing—diversifying—who is involved in heritage-making is something that almost all of the museums that we have looked at have undertaken. This is part of a wider development that often falls under the heading of ‘participation’ and that is often cast as part of a ‘democratisation’ of such institutions. Examples in our volume include the Museum of Islamic Art (both *Museum Diwan* and *Multaka*), *Berlin Global*, the Museum of European Cultures and the Museum of Natural History. In another publication, we have discussed these and other examples in more depth (Macdonald, Gerbich, Gram, Puzon & Shatanawi 2021). Our ethnographic research has made clear that the term ‘participation’ is used in various ways and that the participatory measures go from minor and temporary to more substantial and enduring. Changes to how collecting is undertaken, as in the case of the Museum of European Cultures, are likely to have a deeper impact on the future than, say, a temporary exhibition. But even developments that started out temporary, such as *Multaka*, can have unanticipated effects in the long term by making curators better understand the value of diverse perspectives.

Efforts to increase participation raise the general issue of categorisation and coverage: who ends up being included and how? While participation measures are sometimes less transformational than hoped, they remain worthwhile. The accompanying struggles are part of understanding what the difficulties are—the points at which conversation tends to stop or categories tend to solidify—and can themselves be an important dimension of learning and civic participation. As Garbellotto and Nadim argue when writing about participative data-gathering in citizen science projects, what is needed is not just more understanding ‘of nature’ but also more ‘critical data consciousness’, that is, more awareness of how knowledge itself is constructed. As public organisations of knowledge-

making, museums are especially well placed to undertake that task — a task that, I suggest, might be considered as fostering ‘co-criticality’.

It is worth noting that members of the public may be eager to participate in museums and heritage. (Trans)local heritage marches, musical events, activist campaigns, writing in visitor books, taking photographs at heritage sites and posting comments online are all intellectually and emotionally engaged activities. Sometimes, as with the *German Colonialism* exhibition, engagement is visible and significant. But even in cases in which active participation may not be immediately evident, it may be occurring elsewhere or taking non-conventional forms, as Bareither’s work on the Holocaust Memorial suggests. The question for established organisations is how to engage with public forms of interest and how to do so in ways that broaden involvement rather than making space for only certain voices.

The issue of voice takes us to one of the most important questions of diversification: does it simply create *more* inputs or does it aim specifically at those who are usually left out? This struggle is especially evident in the case of *Berlin Global*, where the question was also raised whether the participative offer should extend to members of right-wing organisations such as the Alternative for Germany party. Is it perhaps especially important to target those less likely to be convinced of the case for diversity? Or should those who seek to exclude others from public debate be denied platform? Just what kind of diversity should be promoted? These are questions that are faced not only by museums and heritage but are of relevance to many cultural organizations.

The fact that we have mostly undertaken ethnographic fieldwork, often over long time periods of months or even years, means that we have directly witnessed debating and struggling with questions such as these, and have, thus, been able to gain an appreciation of the many issues and steps taken or not taken, as well as the assumptions that have been involved. In many cases, this has highlighted the role of a greater range of actors, such as objects and non-human creatures, atmospheres and feelings, in addition to people, along with their specific histories and entanglements. All of this, we hope, will help us offer a deeper understanding of what goes into making heritage and of what heritage produces.

As this introduction has hopefully made clear, and as will become still more evident in the chapters that follow, much of what we present is of relevance to significant questions concerning diversity and difference in museums and heritage in general. At the same time, however, our ethnography of Berlin in the early 21st century paints a vivid portrait of concerns and developments in Germany’s capital. While we certainly do not cover all of what has been going on in Berlin’s museums and heritage, we focus on some of the most significant developments and transformations underway. In particular, we track how a new emphasis on colonialism, on new arrivals to the city from beyond Europe and on participation have reshaped debates not only about what diversity might mean and how it might be done but also about the very nature of Germany and German-ness.

The *Making Differences* project is not yet finished: there is work still to complete and publications to come. The conversation between us and our many interlocutors – now including readers of this book – goes on.

Acknowledgments

This chapter was written as part of my Alexander von Humboldt Professorship. I am grateful to the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation, as well as to the Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, the Museum für Naturkunde and the Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation for the support. I thank all members of CARMAH (the Centre for Anthropological Research on Museums and Heritage) and especially the members of the *Making Differences* project for sharing reading suggestions and discussing ideas over these last years. The following deserve particular thanks for comments on this text: Christoph Bareither, Larissa Förster, Christine Gerbich, Duane Jethro, Margareta von Oswald, Katarzyna Puzon, Jonas Tinius and Andrei Zavadsky.

Notes

- 1 Further information about the project is available here: <http://www.carmah.berlin/making-differences-in-berlin/> (accessed 1 June 2022).
- 2 <https://www.unesco.de/kultur-und-natur/kulturelle-vielfalt> (accessed 1 June 2022).
- 3 <https://www.dwds.de/wb/Vielfalt>; <https://www.dwds.de/wb/Diversität> (accessed 1 June 2022).
- 4 This remains the case today, as the OECD figures show. See <https://data.oecd.org/inequality/income-inequality.htm> (accessed 1 June 2022).
- 5 <https://data.oecd.org/inequality/income-inequality.htm> (accessed 1 June 2022).
- 6 This workshop was a collaboration with the Woolf Institute, Cambridge, UK, and was primarily organised by Jan-Jonathan Bock, a visiting researcher at CARMAH.
- 7 <https://www.humboldt-labor.de/en/projects/other-research-projects/who-is-id-8470> (accessed 1 June 2022).
- 8 <https://www.smb.museum/en/research/provenance-research/> (accessed 1 June 2022).
- 9 We are further exploring the capacities of online media in relation to questions of ‘post truth’ in another project. See <http://www.carmah.berlin/chapter/> (accessed 1 June 2022).

References

- Ahmed, S. 2007. ‘The language of diversity’, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(2): 235–56.
- Ang, I. 2018. ‘Museums and cultural diversity: a persistent challenge’, in K. Drohter, V. Dziekan, R. Parry, and K. C. Schröder (eds), *The Routledge Handbook of Museums, Media and Communication*, 315–329. London: Routledge.
- Appadurai, A. 2013. ‘Diversity and disciplinarity as cultural artifacts’, in C. McCarthy, W. Crichlow, G. Dimitriadis, and N. Dolby (eds), *Race, Identity, and Representation in Education*, 2nd ed., 427–437. London, New York: Taylor and Francis.
- Appiah, K. A. 2005. *The Ethics of Identity*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

- Appiah, K. A. 2018. *The Lies That Bind: Rethinking Identity*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Atuire, C.A. 2020 'Black Lives Matter and the removal of racist statues. Perspectives of an African', *Inquiries into Art, History and the Visual*, 21: 449–67.
- Azaryahu, M. 2009. 'Naming the past: The significance of commemorative street names', in L. D. Berg, and J. Vuolteenaho (eds), *Critical Toponymies: the Contested Politics of Place Naming*, 53–70. London: Ashgate.
- Azoulay, A.A. 2019. *Potential History. Unlearning Imperialism*. London: Verso.
- Bach, J. 2021. 'Brand of Brothers? The Humboldt Forum and the Myths of Innocence', *German Politics and Society*, 39 (1): 100–111.
- Bal, M. 1996. *Double Exposures. The Subject of Cultural Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Barth, F. (ed.). 1969. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. The Social Organization of Cultural Difference*. Copenhagen: Universitetsforlaget.
- Bayer, N., B. Kazeem-Kaminiski, and N. Sternfeld (eds). 2017. *Kuratieren als antirassistische Praxis. Kritiken, Praxen, Aneignungen*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Bennett, T. 2006. 'Exhibition, difference, and the logic of culture', in I. Karp, C. A. Kratz, L. Szwaja, and T. Ybarra-Frausto (eds), *Museum Frictions. Public Cultures/Global Transformations*, 46–69. Durham NC: Duke University Press.
- Bennett, T. 2018. *Museums, Power, Knowledge*. London: Routledge.
- Bennett, T., F. Cameron, N. Dias, B. Dibley, R. Harrison, I. Jacknis, and C. McCarthy. 2017. *Collecting, Ordering, Governing*. Durham NC: Duke University Press.
- Blum, A., N. Schocke, H.-J. Rheinberger, and Vincent Barras (eds). 2016. *Diversität. Geschichte eines Konzepts*, Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann.
- Blum, André, N. Schocke, H.-J. Rheinberger, and V. Barras. 2016. 'Vorwort', in A. Blum, N. Schocke, H.-J. Rheinberger, and V. Barras (eds), *Diversität. Geschichte eines Konzepts*, 9–19. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann.
- Bock, J.-J., and Sharon Macdonald (eds). 2019. *Refugees Welcome? Difference and Diversity in a Changing Germany*. Oxford: Berghahn.
- Bose, F. von 2016. *Das Humboldt-Forum. Eine Ethnographie seiner Planung*. Berlin: Kulturverlag Kadmos.
- Bose, F. von 2017. 'Strategische Reflexivität. Das Berliner Humboldt Forum und die postkoloniale Kritik', *Historische Anthropologie*, 3: 409–417.
- Braidotti, R. 2013. *The Posthuman*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Brumann, C. 2021. *The Best We Share. Nation, Culture and World-Making in the UNESCO World Heritage Arena*. Oxford: Berghahn.
- Buchczyk, M., and D. Jethro. 2020. 'Statues can't swim: Heritage forms washed away in decolonial currents'. *CARMAH Reflection*. <https://www.carmah.berlin/reflections/statues-cant-swim/> (accessed 23 May 2022).
- Cabadağ, N. and G. Ediger 2020. 'We disperse to Berlin: transnational entanglements of LGBTI+ movements in Turkey', in M. do Maro Castro Varela and B. Ülker (eds), *Doing Tolerance. Urban Interventions and Forms of Participation*, 194–210. Berlin: Verlag Barbara Budrich.
- CARMAH. 2018. *Otherwise. Rethinking Museums and Heritage*. Berlin: Centre for Anthropological Research on Museums and Heritage. <https://www.carmah.berlin/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/CARMAH-2018-Otherwise-Rethinking-Museums-and-Heritage.pdf> (accessed 1 June 2022).

- Cesari, C. de 2017. 'Museums of Europe. Tangles of memory, borders and race', *Museum Anthropology* 40(1): 18–35.
- Chin, R. 2017. *The Crisis of Multiculturalism in Europe. A History*. Cambridge, Mass.: Princeton University Press.
- Cohen, A. 1985. *The Symbolic Construction of Community*. London: Routledge.
- Crenshaw, K. 2017. *On Intersectionality. Essential Writings*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Dias, N. 2008. 'Cultural difference and cultural diversity: the case of the Musée du Quai Branly', in D. J. Sherman (ed.), *Museums and Difference*, 124–154. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Debary, O., and M. Roustan. 2017. 'A journey to the Musée du quai Branly. The anthropology of a visit', *Museum Anthropology* 40(1): 4–17.
- DeLanda, M. 2016 *Assemblage Theory*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Dilger, H. and M. Warstat (eds). 2021 *Unkämpfte Vielfalt. Affektive Dynamiken institutioneller Diversifizierung*. Frankfurt: Campus.
- Du Bois, W.E.B. 1994 [1903]. *The Souls of Black Folk*. New York: Gramercy Books.
- Eckersley, S. 2020. 'Between appropriation and appropriateness. Instrumentalizing dark heritage in populism and memory?', in C. DeCesari and A. Kaya (eds), *European Memory in Populism. Representations of Self and Other*.
- Edenheiser, I., and L. Förster (eds). 2019. *Museumsethnologie: Eine Einführung*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.
- Engler, J. 2013. 'Renaming streets, inverting perspectives: Acts of postcolonial memory citizenship in Berlin', *Focus on German Studies*, 20: 41–62.
- Förster, L. 2018a. 'Whoever's Right. Remarks about the Debate on Provenance and Return from the Perspective of Social and Cultural Anthropology', *Boasblog—How to Move on with Humboldt's Legacy?*. <https://boasblogs.org/dcntr/whoever-right/> (accessed 23 May 2022).
- Förster, L. 2018b. 'Provenance' in *Otherwise: Rethinking Museums and Heritage*. Berlin: Centre for Anthropological Research on Museums and Heritage. <https://www.carmah.berlin/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/CARMAH-2018-Otherwise-Rethinking-Museums-and-Heritage.pdf> (accessed 1 June 2022).
- Förster, L. 2019. 'Der Umgang mit der Kolonialzeit. Provenienz und Rückgabe', in I. Edenheiser and L. Förster (eds), *Museumsethnologie: Eine Einführung*, 78–103. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.
- Förster, L. and H. Stoecker 2016. *Haut, Haar und Knochen. Koloniale Spuren in naturkundlichen Sammlungen der Universität Jena*. Weimar: Verlag und Datenbank für Geisteswissenschaften.
- Förster, L., and F. von Bose. 2018. 'Discussing ethnological museums. The epistemology of postcolonial debates', in P. Schorch, and C. McCarthy (eds), *Curatopia. Museums and the Future of Curatorship*, 95–122. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Förster, L., I. Edenheiser, S. Fründt, and H. Hartmann (eds). 2018. *Provenienzforschung zu ethnografischen Sammlungen der Kolonialzeit. Positionen in der aktuellen Debatte*. <https://e.doc.hu-berlin.de/handle/18452/19814> (accessed 1 June 2022).

- Garbellotto, C., and D. Onuoha. 2019. 'Taxidermic cinema. Reflections on a workshop at Berlin's Naturkundemuseum'. *CARMAH Reflection*. https://www.carmah.berlin/reflections/taxidermic_cinema/ (accessed 1 June 2022).
- Gaupp, L. 2021. 'Epistemologies of diversity and otherness', in L. Gaupp and G. Pellilo-Hestermeyer (eds) *Diversity and Otherness. Transcultural Insights into Norms, Practices, Negotiations*, 13–61. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Geertz, C. 1988. *Works and Lives: The Anthropologist as Author*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Geismar, H. 2018. *Museum Object Lessons for the Digital Age*. London: UCL Press.
- Goel, U. 2020. 'Intersektional forschen – kontextspezifisch, offen, selbst-reflexiv', in A. Biele Mefubue, A. Bührmann and S. Grenz (eds) *Handbuch Intersektionalitäts Forschung*, 1–13. Wiesbaden: Springer.
- Grillo, R. 2010. *Contesting Diversity in Europe. Alternative Regimes and Moral Orders*. MMG Working Paper 10–02.
- Haentschel, J. 2017. "'The Humboldt Forum is like Chernobyl". Interview mit Bénédicte Savoy'. *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 7 July.
- Hage, G. 1998. *White Nation. Fantasies of White Supremacy in a Multicultural Society*, Annandale: Pluto Press.
- Hall, S. 1992. 'The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power', in B. Gieben, and S. Hall (eds), *Formations of Modernity*, 185–225. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Harrison, R. 2013. *Heritage: Critical Approaches*. London: Routledge.
- Harrison, R., C. DeSilvey, C. Holtorf, S. Macdonald, N. Bartolini, E. Breithoff, H. Fredheim, A. Lyons, S. May, J. Morgan, and S. Penrose. 2020. *Heritage Futures. Comparative Approaches to Natural and Cultural Heritage Practices*. London: UCL Press.
- Heyes, C. 2020 [2002]. 'Identity Politics', *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, E. N. Zalta (ed.) <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/identity-politics/> (accessed 31 March 2022).
- Hilden, I., H. Merrow and A. Zavadsky 2021. 'Present imperfect, future tense: the opening of the Humboldt Forum'. *CARMAH Reflection* <https://www.carmah.berlin/reflections/present-imperfect-future-intense/> (accessed 1 June 2022)
- Hill Collins, P. 2004. *Black Sexual Politics: African-Americans, Gender and the New Racism*. New York: Routledge.
- Hill Collins, P., and S. Bilge. 2020. *Intersectionality*. New York: Wiley.
- Hirschauer, S. 2021. 'Un/doing differences. The contingency of social affiliations', in L. Gaupp and G. Pellilo-Hestermeyer (eds), *Diversity and Otherness. Transcultural Insights into Norms, Practices, Negotiations*, 62–95. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Insaf, H. 2020. 'The complexities of addressing the past while decolonizing museums'. *The Caravan*. <https://caravanmagazine.in/culture/the-complexities-of-addressing-past-while-decolonising-museums> (accessed 1 June 2022).
- Jackson, M. 2022 *Critique of Identity Thinking*. Oxford: Berghahn.
- Jenkins, R. 2014. *Social Identity*. London: Routledge.
- Jethro, D. 2020. *Heritage Formation and the Senses in Post-Apartheid South Africa: Aesthetics of Power*. London: Routledge.
- Jethro, D. 2021. 'Monuments', in H. Callan and S. Coleman (eds) *International Encyclopaedia of Anthropology* (online).

- Jethro, D. and S. Macdonald forthcoming. 'Difficult heritage at the door. Doing heritage research in precarious times', in N. Shepherd (ed.), *Rethinking Heritage in Precarious Times*. London: Routledge.
- Joppke, C. 2017. *Is Multiculturalism Dead? Crisis and Persistence in the Constitutional State*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Kirschhoff, T., and K. Köchy (eds). 2016. *Wünschenswerte Vielheit. Diversität als Kategorie, Befund und Norm*. Munich: Verlag Karl Alber Freiburg.
- Knell, S. J., P. Aronsson, A. Bugge Amundsen, A. J. Barnes, S. Burch, J. Carter, V. Gosselin, S. A. Hughes, and A. Kirwan (eds). 2011. *National Museums: New Studies from Around the World*. London: Routledge.
- Knudsen, B., J. Oldfield, E. Buettner and E. Zabunyan (eds). 2021. *Decolonizing Colonial Heritage. New Agendas, Actors and Practices in and Beyond Europe*. London: Routledge.
- Kössler, R. 2015 *Namibia and Germany. Negotiating the Past*. Windhoek: University of Namibia Press.
- Latour, B. 2014. *Reassembling the Social. An Introduction to Network Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Law, J. 2004. *After Method: Mess in Social Science Research*. London: Routledge.
- Levitt, P. 2015. *Artefacts and Allegiances. How Museums put the Nation and the World on Display*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lidchi, H. 1997. 'The poetics and politics of exhibiting other cultures', in S. Hall (ed.), *Representation: Cultural Representation and Signifying Practices*, 153–208. London: Sage Publications.
- Lidchi, H., S. Macdonald, and M. von Oswald (eds). 2017. *Engaging Anthropological Legacies toward Cosmo-optimistic Futures?*, special section, *Museum Worlds* 5(1): 95–107.
- Loeseke, A. 2019. 'Beyond Compare – Art from Africa in the Bode Museum, Berlin', *Museum and Society* 17(3): 533–35.
- Lonetree, A. 2012. *Decolonizing Museums. Representing Native America in National and Tribal Museums*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Macdonald, S. 2006. 'Collecting practices', in S. Macdonald (ed.), *Companion to Museum Studies*, 81–97. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Macdonald, S. 2013. *Memorylands: Heritage and Identity in Europe Today*. London: Routledge.
- Macdonald, S. 2016. 'New constellations of difference in Europe's 21st Century Museum-scape', *Museum Anthropology*, 39(1): 4–19.
- Macdonald, S. 2019. 'Refugee futures and the politics of difference', in J.-J. Bock, and S. Macdonald (eds), *Refugees Welcome? Difference and Diversity in a Changing Germany*, 312–331. Oxford: Berghahn.
- Macdonald, S. 2023. 'Perspectives in and on heritage-making. Anthropological engagements with the Humboldt Forum, Berlin', in E. Gilberthorpe and F. de Jong (eds), *Anthropological Perspectives on Global Challenges*. London: Routledge.
- Macdonald, S., C. Gerbich, R. Gram, K. Puzon, and M. Shatanawi. 2021. 'Reframing Islam? Potentials and challenges of participatory initiatives in museums and heritage', in K. Puzon, S. Macdonald, and M. Shatanawi (eds), *Heritage and Islam in Europe*, 212–230. Abingdon: Routledge.

- Macdonald, S., C. Gerbich, and M. von Oswald. 2018. 'No museum is an island: ethnography beyond ethnographic containerism', *Museum and Society* 16(2): 138–156.
- Mason, R. 2013. 'National museums, globalization and postnationalism. Imagining a cosmopolitan museology', *Museum Worlds* 1(1): 40–64.
- McCall, L. 2005. 'The complexity of intersectionality', *Signs* 30(3): 1771–1800.
- Meijl, T. van 2010. 'Anthropological perspectives on identity: from sameness to difference', in M. Wetherell and C. T. Mohanty (eds), *The Sage Handbook of Identities*, 63–81. London: Sage.
- Merrow, H., C. Gerbich and D. Jethro 2020. 'Decolonising museum practices? Connecting "Afro Futures" at Berlin's Kunstgewerbemuseum'. *CARMAH Reflection*. <https://www.carmah.berlin/reflections/reflections-on-the-making-of/> (accessed 1 June 2022).
- Meskel, L. 2018. *A Future in Ruins. UNESCO, World Heritage, and the Dream of Peace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Michaels, W. B. 2006. *The Trouble with Diversity: How We Learned to Love Identity and Ignore Inequality*. New York: Macmillan.
- Michaels, W. B. 2008. 'Against diversity', *New Left Review* 52: 33–36.
- Morris, R. C. 2010. *Can the Subaltern Speak? Reflections on the History of an Idea*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Müller, E., and F. Schmieder 2017. 'Diversität, begriffsgeschichtlich', *ZfL BLOG*. <https://www.zflprojekte.de/zfl-blog/2017/04/01/ernst-muellerfalko-schmieder-diversitaet-begriffsgeschichtlich/> (accessed 1 June 2022).
- Minh Ha, T. T. 1989. *Woman, Native, Other: Writing Postcoloniality and Feminism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Mitchell, T. 1988. *Colonizing Egypt*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Modest, W. 2020. 'Museums are investments in critical discomfort', in M. v. Oswald, and J. Tinius (eds), *Across Anthropology. Troubling colonial legacies, museums, and the curatorial*, 65–76. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- Modood, T. 2013. *Multiculturalism. A Civic Idea*, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Polity.
- Modood, T. 2017. 'Must interculturalists misrepresent multiculturalism?', *Comparative Migration Studies*, 5(15).
- Modood, T. 2018. 'The continuing relevance of a concept of multiculturalism', in Bertelsmann Stiftung (ed.), *Living Diversity – Shaping Society. The Opportunities and Challenges Posed by Cultural Difference in Germany*. Gütersloh : Bertelsmann Stiftung Verlag.
- Musitelli, J. 2006. 'La convention sur la diversité Culturelle : anatomie d'un succès', *Revue internationale et stratégique*, 62(2) : 11–22.
- Nadim, T. 2021. 'The datafication of nature: data formations and new scales in natural history', *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 27(S1): 62–75.
- Ndikung, B. S. B. 2017. 'The globalized museum? Decanonisation as method: A reflection in three acts', *Musee Magazine*. www.museemagazine.it/the-globalized-museum-bonaventure-soh-bejeng-ndikung-documenta-14-2017/ (accessed 1 June 2022).
- Noury, A., and G. Roland. 2020. 'Identity politics and populism in Europe', *Annual Review of Political Science* 23: 421–39.

- Oswald, M. von 2018. 'The "Restitution Report": First reactions in academic, museums and politics'. <https://boasblogs.org/dcntr/the-restitution-report/> (accessed 1 June 2022).
- Oswald, M. von 2020. 'Troubling colonial epistemologies in Berlin's Ethnologisches Museum: Provenance research and the Humboldt Forum', 106–130, in: M. von Oswald and J. Tinius (eds), *Across Anthropology. Troubling Colonial Legacies, Museums, and the Curatorial*. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- Oswald, M. von. 2022. *Working through Colonial Collections. An Ethnography of the Ethnological Museum in Berlin*. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- Oswald, M. von, and V. Rodatus. 2017. 'Decolonizing research, cosmo-optimistic collaboration? Making *Object Biographies*', *Museum Worlds*, 5(1): 211–23.
- Oswald, M. von, and J. Tinius (eds). 2020. *Across Anthropology. Troubling Colonial Legacies, Museums, and the Curatorial*. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- Partridge, D. J., and M. Chin. 2019. 'Interrogating the histories and futures of "diversity": Transnational perspectives', special issue of *Public Culture* 31(2): 197–214.
- Pellilo–Hestermeyer, G. 2021. 'Rethinking diversity and transculturality: introduction', in L. Gaupp and G. Pellilo–Hestermeyer (eds), *Diversity and Otherness. Transcultural Insights into Norms, Practices, Negotiations*, 1–12. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Pettinicchio, D. 2012. 'Institutional activism: reconsidering the inside/outside dichotomy', *Sociology Compass* 6/6 (2012): 499–510.
- Parekh, B. 2007. *Rethinking Multiculturalism*, 2nd ed. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Phillips, R. 2011. *Museum Pieces. Towards the Indigenization of Canadian Museums*, Montreal: McGill University Press.
- Pieterse, J. N. 1997. 'Multiculturalism and museums: discourse about Others in the Age of Globalization', *Theory, Culture and Society*, 14(4): 123–46.
- Pollock, G. 1999. *Differencing the Canon: Feminist Desire and the Writing of Art's Histories*. London: Routledge.
- Pollock, G. 2019. 'Feminism and language', in H. Robinson, and M. E. Buszek (eds), *A Feminist Companion to Art*, 261–281. New York: Wiley.
- Puzon, K. 2018. 'Translocality', in *Otherwise: Rethinking Museums and Heritage*. Berlin: Centre for Anthropological Research on Museums and Heritage. <https://www.carmah.berlin/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/CARMAH-2018-Otherwise-Rethinking-Museums-and-Heritage.pdf> (accessed 1 June 2022).
- Puzon, K. 2019. 'Participatory matters: Access, migration and heritage in Berlin museums', in H. Oevermann, and E. Gantner (eds), *Securing Urban Heritage: Agents, Access, and Securitization*, 31–46. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.
- Puzon, K. 2021. 'Germans without footnotes: Islam, belonging and poetry slam', in K. Puzon, S. Macdonald, and M. Shatanawi (eds). 2021. *Islam and Heritage in Europe*, 68–82. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Puzon, K., S. Macdonald, and M. Shatanawi (eds). 2021. *Islam and Heritage in Europe*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Rea, N. 2017. 'Will French museums return African objects? Emmanuel Macron says restitution is a "priority"'. *Artnet News*. 28, November.

- Reilly, M. 2019. *Curatorial activism. Towards an Ethics of Curating*. London: Thames & Hudson.
- Reus-Smit, C. 2018. *On Cultural Diversity. International Theory in a World of Difference*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Robertson, I. J. M. 2012. *Heritage from Below*. London: Routledge.
- Rogers, A., and S. Vertovec. 1995. *The Urban Context. Ethnicity, Social Networks and Situational Analysis*. Oxford: Berg.
- Römhild, R. 2014. 'Diversität?! Postethnische Perspektiven für eine reflexive Migrationsforschung', pp. 255–70, in B. Nieswand and H. Drotbohm (eds), *Kultur, Gesellschaft und Migration. Studien zur Migrations- und Integrationspolitik*. Wiesbaden: Springer.
- Rothberg, M. 2009. *Multidirectional Memory. Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization*. Stanford University Press.
- Rottenburg, R. 2006. *The Making and Unmaking of Differences. Anthropological, Sociological and Philosophical Perspectives*. Bielefeld: transcript.
- Said, E. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Sarr, F., and B. Savoy. 2018. *The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage. Toward a New Relational Ethics*. <http://restitutionreport2018.com> (accessed 1 June 2022).
- Salemink, O. 2021. 'Anthropologies of cultural heritage', in L. Pedersen, and L. Cliggitt (eds), *The Sage Handbook of Cultural Anthropology*, 423–441. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Salzbrunn, M. 2014. *Vielfalt/Diversität*. Bielefeld: transcript.
- Sandell, R. 1998. 'Museums as agents of social inclusion', *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 17(4): 401–418.
- Sandell, R. 2003. 'Social inclusion, the museum and the dynamics of sectoral change', *museum and society* 1(1): 45–62.
- Sarr, F. and B. Savoy 2018. *The Restitution of African Cultural Heritage. Towards a New Relational Ethics*. http://restitutionreport2018.com/sarr_savoy_en.pdf (accessed 1 June 2022).
- Schinkel, W. 2017 *Imagined Societies. A Critique of Immigrant Integration in Western Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sen, A. 2006. *Identity and Violence. The Illusion of Destiny*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Shelton, A. A. 2006. 'Museums and anthropologies. Practices and narratives', in S. Macdonald (ed.) *A Companion to Museum Studies*, 64–80. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Sherman, D. J. 2008. *Museums and Difference*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Sherman, D. J. 2008. 'Introduction', in D. J. Sherman (ed.), *Museums and Difference*, 1–24. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Sieg, K. 2021. *Decolonizing German and European History at the Museum*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Shore, C. and S. Trnka (eds). *Up Close and Personal. On Peripheral Perspectives and the Production of Anthropological Knowledge*. Oxford: Berghahn.
- Smiers, J. 2016. 'Kulturelle Diversität: Ein vielschichtiges Konzept in den Mühlen der Realität', in A. Blum, N. Schocke, H.-J. Rheinberger, and V. Barras (eds), *Diversität. Geschichte eines Konzepts*, 203–220. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann.
- Song, S. 2020 [2010]. 'Multiculturalism', *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, E. N. Zalta (ed.) <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/multiculturalism/> (accessed 1 June 2022).

- Spivak, G. C. 1988. 'Can the Subaltern speak?', in C. Nelson, and L. Grossberg (eds), *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, 271–313. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Stewart, C. 2011. 'Creolization, hybridity, syncretism, mixture', *Portuguese Studies* 27(1): 43–55.
- Stoler, A.L. 2016. *Durress. Imperial Durabilities in our Times*. Durham NC: Duke University Press.
- Sullivan, N., and C. Middleton. 2020. *Queering the Museum*. London: Routledge.
- Taylor, C. 1994. *The Politics of Recognition*. Cambridge, Mass.: Princeton University Press.
- Taylor, C. 2007. *Modern Social Imaginaries*. Durham NC: Duke University Press.
- Tietmeyer, E. 2017. *Glances into Fugitive Lives*. Heidelberg: arthistoricum.
- Tinius, J. 2020. 'Porous membranes. Alterity, hospitality and anthropology in a Berlin district gallery', 254–77, in M. von Oswald, M. and J. Tinius (eds), *Across Anthropology: Troubling Colonial Legacies, Museums, and the Curatorial*. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- Tinius, J. 2021. 'The Anthropologist as sparring partner: Instigative public fieldwork, curatorial collaboration, and German colonial heritage', *Berliner Blätter*. 83: 65–85.
- Tinius, J., and S. Macdonald. 2020. 'The recursivity of the curatorial', in R. Sansi (ed.), *The Anthropologist as Curator*, 35–58. London: Bloomsbury.
- Tinius, J. and K. von Zinnenburg Carroll 2020 'Phantom palaces: Prussian centralities and Humboldtian spectres', in J. Bach and M. Murawski (eds) *Re-Centring the City*, 90–103. London: UCL Press.
- Toepfer, G. 2017. 'Biodiversität', ZfL Blog. <https://www.zflprojekte.de/zfl-blog/2017/05/05/georg-toepfer-biodiversitaet/> (accessed 1 June 2022).
- UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity. 2001. Adopted by the 31st Session of the General Conference of UNESCO, Paris, 2 November 2001. http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CLT/pdf/5_Cultural_Diversity_EN.pdf (accessed 1 June 2022).
- Vertovec, S. 2012. "Diversity" and the social imaginary', *European Journal of Sociology* LIII (3): 287–312.
- Vertovec, S. 2021. 'The social organization of difference', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 44(8): 1273–1295.
- Williams, J.C. 1991. 'Dissolving the sameness/difference debate: a post-modern path beyond essentialism in Feminism and Critical Race Theory', *Duke LJ*, Vol.296: 296–323.
- Zavadsky, A. and I.Hilden 2022. 'Participatory countermonuments of colonial violence'. *CARMAH Reflection* <https://www.carmah.berlin/reflections/participatory-countermonuments-of-colonial-violence/> (accessed 1 June 2022).

