

THE OCCIDENTAL MUSEUM AND ITS NEO-ORIENTALIZED “OTHER”

Marina Gržinić

Izvorni znanstveni rad /
Original scientific paper
UDK 069.01(4+7)“20“

POVIJEST UMJETNOSTI
KAO OTVORENI PROJEKT

157

Abstract

In a not-so-distant past, I offered a genealogy tracing the evolution of the Occidental museum as a passage from the 20th-century modernist model to a 21st-century neoliberal institution. The aim of this paper is to consider the Occidental museum and its neo-Orientalized “Other” in the present moment, in the midst of the COVID-19 crisis, as museums are cautiously reopening under a new set of regulations, and the post-COVID-19 reality remains elusive. More precisely, my aim has been to consider the current status of the Occidental museum. The first part of this text presents a genealogy of museums in the post-WWII world, before COVID-19. The second part discusses the symbolic, imaginary, and real implications of the suddenly “dead” museum. What does this mean for the museum’s surviving hegemonic practices in the post-COVID-19 future? The main thesis posited in this paper is that the “Other” multiplies within the museum to the extent that the Occidental museum becomes “the other” to itself; however, I maintain that even this transformation does not absolve the Occidental museum of its responsibility to critically reflect on proper hegemonic practices and the processes of racialization.

Keywords: Occidental museum, neo-Orientalized “Other,” othering, trophy object, COVID-19

In a not-so-distant past, I presented a genealogy outlining the evolution of the Occidental museum, identified as a passage from the 20th-century modernist model to a 21st-century neoliberal institution. However, as I elaborated on the proposed Occidental museum and its neo-Orientalized “Other,” I found myself amidst the COVID-19 crisis, with the post-COVID-19 reality still unclear.¹

Nevertheless, one certainty emerges: The Occidental museum, with its advanced ideologies and practices of collecting and exhibiting, will have to reopen under a new set of regulations. This entails a reduction in funds, which is a sobering scenario marked by diminished programs,

1 The article was written as part of the project J6-9392, The Problem of Objectivity and Fiction in Contemporary Philosophy, funded by the Public Agency for Research of the Republic of Slovenia.

layoffs, and either closure of exhibition spaces within the museum or the museum's complete shutdown. At the same time, there will be a radical transformation in the museum's symbolic role, as the Occidental museum lived off the idea of being an open sanctuary of collecting and displaying. The introduction of social distancing measures, hygienic protocols, counting visitors, etc. will drastically change its role. This poses a crucial question: Is the Occidental museum, with its neo-Orientalized "Other", a question of the past? Not at all!

On the contrary, my main thesis is that the "Other" multiplies within the museum to the extent that the Occidental museum becomes "the Other" to itself. Nevertheless, I maintain that not even this absolves the Occidental museum of its responsibility to critically reflect on its proper hegemonic practices and processes of racialization.

Introduction

In the era of COVID-19, the Occident faced a moment of total implosion. Rebecca Kahn (2020) explores this in "Corona as Curator": How are museums responding to the pandemic? "The current COVID-19 crisis has prompted hand-wringing and self-reflection among some museum professionals. What they are asking is the point of a museum that remains closed to the public? How can museums remain relevant if people can't visit them? Can exhibitions, which take years to plan and execute, be transferred to the digital realm, to keep museums open virtually? This crisis has raised a raft of questions for museums, some of which pertain to their relevance – if they have to remain shut – and others which address how best museums might evolve to reflect the current situation, and what their role might be post-COVID-19."

If the capitalist processes of reterritorialization and deterritorialization resemble a form of (auto) cannibalistic transformation of centers into peripheries and peripheries into centers, then my next thesis is that closed Occidental museums (internally and externally, at a distance) find themselves stuck, or in the process of autophagy (self-devouring).

Achille Mbembe (2020) states regarding autophagy during the COVID-19 era: "The hour of autophagy is upon us and, with it, the death of community, as there is no community worthy of its name in which saying one's last farewell, that is, remembering the living at the moment of death, becomes impossible."

If the reader is perplexed by this thesis, the status of MoMA New York on May 7, 2020 is illustrative: "Less than a year after the Museum of Modern Art in New York unveiled its \$450 million expansion – creating 47,000 square feet of gallery space and presenting more of its vast collection than ever before – the institution is preparing for a new reality, one with COVID-19. According to a report by *Bloomberg*, when MoMA begins wel-

coming visitors again it will have a slimmed-down staff and exhibition program, and a budget that was slashed by \$45 million" (Artforum, 2020).

However, the issue of immobility, or being stuck, is not exclusive to museums. Audrey Macklin contends: "Mobility is essential to refugees, but refugee mobility is not essential to states. And to the extent that the pandemic has propelled foreigners to return 'home,' refugees (and stateless people) have no home if by home one means a place of safety, security, and protection. We know that refugees, whether confined in overcrowded camps or precarious make-shift shelters, are especially vulnerable to COVID-19. So, the one group of people for whom movement is most essential – literally essential – is the group most immobilized by this pandemic. Some things have not changed" (2020).

My aim is to consider the Occidental museum and its neo-Orientalized "Other" in the present moment, in the midst of the COVID-19 crisis, when the museums are cautiously reopening under a new set of regulations and when the post-COVID-19 reality remains elusive. More precisely, it is to reflect on the current status of the Occidental museum. Therefore, the first part of the text presents a genealogy of the museum in the post-WWII world, before COVID-19. The second part discusses the symbolic, imaginary, and real implications of the suddenly "dead" museum. What does this mean for the museum surviving hegemonic practices in the post-COVID-19 future?

Part 1: The genealogy

The museum of the 1970s, as an outcome of the events of 1968, when the notion of a museum revolution arose, had to face symbolic destruction that endowed the museum with a kind of spectral power – as being indestructible even in the case of its potential destruction.

In the 1970s, Harald Szeemann advocated for the idea of the open museum. Attempts were made to make social contradictions visible within the museum, liberating art from its confinement and reconnecting it with the world outside. The rallying cry was: "Art must awaken, museums are prisons!"

In the 1980s, Harald Szeemann argued that the museum was a house for art (1988), and "art is fragile, [...] an alternative to everything in our society that is geared to consumption and reproduction [...] that is why art needs to be protected, and the museum is the proper place for this. The museum is not what it seemed to be – the museum is, therefore, not a prison!" (cited in Meijers, 1993).

The 1990s and the early 2000s witnessed an increasing proliferation – a boom of museums. World architects competed for dream amounts of money, funds allocated for a third-millennium deal-of-a-lifetime in culture by city councils, state associations and funds in Western Europe and

America, from Texas to Boston, Helsinki to Berlin. It was the construction of new art museums and the renovation of old ones. In Berlin, for instance, the so-called Inner City Island saw the reconstruction of five museums starting in 2000. According to various reports at the time, it was an unprecedented surge in the number of museums and galleries, supported by substantial financial backing.

By the late 1990s and early 2000s, the catchphrase that I cited in contrast to the 1970s “prison” and the 1980s “house” expressed the real triumph of the Occidental museum: “Does the Western museum of modern art need art anymore?”²

To recapitulate, in the 1970s, the museum was perceived as a threat to the art community, as it endorsed rigid historical and chronological classifications and the idea of constant progress in art and culture with different styles and trends. The museum was seen as a place of restriction and power, which provoked conceptual and neo-avant-garde art world to undermine it forcefully.

The shift that took place in the 1990s/2000s, when the museum openly and transparently asserted its power and its ties to capital, money, and architecture, was a process that can be described as bringing to light, acting out, or performing the underlying fantasy of power of the museum in the 1970s! The spectral power of the 1970s became a real power of the museums in the 2000s.

In the 1980s, museum was a house for art, but in the 1990s/2000s, it emerged as the obscene museum, revealing all its power unabashedly, without any disguise. It should not be forgotten that this new museum structure threatened art precisely by directly and brutally acting out its absolute power in the social and political reality. In a way, this directness was also a cynical gesture. It was as if the museum, as an institution, was giving directly to the art world what this world had been hallucinating about for decades. Suddenly, it seemed that this was the most effective way to distort the art world. At that point, sabotaging the museum as an institution of power was practically impossible.

These two periods, the 1980s and the 2000s, can be perceived as two extremes: on one side, the “protective museum,” and on the other, the obscene, authoritarian, empowered museum. This dichotomy can be understood as appearance versus reality, the protective institution juxtaposed against the over-empowered museum, which moreover became so transparent that it was nearly obscene in its visibility.

Nevertheless, it is crucial to understand that this was not merely an opposition between the protective museum’s facade and the harsh reality of the dominant institution of contemporary art in the 2000s, revealed upon demystifying its appearance. The overpowered museum, far from being the Real beneath the respectful, protective appearance, is itself a fantasy formation, a protective shield. Both museums, the one from the 1980s and the other from the 1990s/2000s, are psychotic, incapable of reintroducing art into the realm of social reality.

In contrast to the 1970s, the neoliberal Occidental museum of the 2000s is definitely vulgar and cold in its endless assertion of its real power, manipulative and almost deprived of any aura. The museum of the 2000s is well aware of its financial, economic, and symbolic power, particularly the museums of (modern) art in the developed Western world (North America, Japan, etc.), considering the millions that are invested in reorganizing, building, and rebuilding museums. The case of MoMA New York in 2020, mentioned above, serves as one of the most remarkable illustrations to elucidate my point.

The next point to recognize is that in the 1970s, the obstacle, the failure, was inherent (the relation between the museum and the neo-avant-garde movements in art simply did not work smoothly). In the second half of the 1990s, this intrinsic impossibility was externalized into what could be described as a positive obstacle; suddenly, history, progress, and chronological time started to be comprehended through anti-historical views. A-historical exhibitions, ruptures with styles, trends, classifications, etc. all worked with the implication that once the obstacles were overcome, the relationship would run smoothly. When all chronology and historical concepts came down to earth, the rearrangement of museum and gallery spaces was based on the curators’ ingenuity and taste. They were, and still are, perceived as creators of an objective, collective memory. I pose the question: Which collective, what memory?

This shift from an inherent impossibility to an external obstacle is the very definition of fantasy! It is as if an internal deadlock suddenly acquired an actual existence, and everything was magically resolved.

In contrast to the 1970s, when the museums put all their efforts in disguising their power structures, relying on their spectral, phantasmatic power, the museum of the 2000s openly assumed the role of what may be called the devil of transparency. However, the paradox of self-exposure, self-transparency, tells us that this transparency made it even more enigmatic. The art community thought – not wanting to accept this – that behind the cold, manipulative surface, there must be something else! – But the question is: Is there anything behind the cold, manipulative surface?

As opposed to the 1970s, when the museum was segregated and survived as a spectral entity, it seems that in the 1980s and 1990s, the

2 This thought was elaborated upon at the CIMAM conference, The International Committee of ICOM – The International Council of Museums of Modern Art, Ludwig Museum Budapest, 22-25 September 2000 (see Author, 2002).

museum survives in reality by sacrificing, destroying its phantasmatic support. – Or not? The museum structure of the 2000s was no less hallucinatory and no less a spectralization of the phantasy scenario of the power of the art institution of the past.

My further thesis is that the very circular form of such a narrative directly renders visible the circularity of the (a)historical process of the museum. In short, this circularity is based on the impossibility of the museum to encounter itself, its proper position. And if I make a very fast conclusion, before the very end, I can assert that when the museum in the COVID-19 pandemic finally met itself, it was close and empty.

If in the 2000s the figure of the museum was the figure of an excessively exuberant institution that was alive, but castrated, incapable of performing its social, symbolical role, then in the time of COVID-19 it was a decapitated father. MoMA New York is again the best example. Before it was empowered on the surface, with such an exuberant, excessive architecture that it was almost unnecessary to enter the museum (it was enough to see it from the outside!).

More general conclusions are that the museum of the 2000s was not a situation opposed to the virtualized world of the museum in all its abstracted versions. On the contrary, the museum of the 2000s presented itself as an abstract category, without any kind of problematic exaggeration, with no causality. In the end, just before COVID-19, the aura generated by museums in the West was genuinely suffocating and a psychotic experience, but in the sense of protective care (that protected, in the end, only the institution itself, obscenely visibly), erasing all traces of difference, (a-historical) positioning, etc.

In former Eastern Europe, the psychotic dimension was also present. The Museum of the Macedonian Struggle for Statehood and Independence (opened in 2011 in Skopje), or, in short, “Museum of the Victims of the Communist Regime” or VMRO, is a fortified, kitschy, overtly nationalistic fabrication of Macedonian history. From the very entrance into the museum, the visitor is followed across the museum by a live museum guide that in real time corrects any possible way of thinking differently. It is impressive to see the madness of erasing history; this is not about communist terror, but about a fascist comeback of a societal structure that presents itself as one body, with one mind and one history.

More generally, this evacuation of history from the “historical” museum – represents an attack on history in general. Moreover, the museum is not a dead institution that lives in “silence,” no; these museums talk incessantly to prevent thinking!

I call this a passion for history, to the point of its destruction! The French philosopher Alain Badiou (2007) stated that in contrast to the prophetic character of the nineteenth century, the twentieth century had as its main feature the passion for the real. I will sustain that the

twenty-first century has as its main feature the passion for history as a repetition of the twentieth century.

“History is not a matter of sentimentalism and heroism; history is already a product of hegemonic narratives!” (Author, 2013)

Part 2: COVID-19 Occidental museum’s reality

If we return to Rebecca Kahn’s (2020) question on “How museums are responding to the pandemic” and “How museums can remain relevant if people can’t visit them,” it is possible to state proverbially that the refusal to reflect on the museum’s proper, or rather hegemonic, imperial, colonial position implies an unwillingness to face a proper mortality, the (symbolic) death of the museum itself!

Before proceeding, let’s recall the arguments developed in the first part, asserting that both the old (the 1980s) and the new museum (the 2000s) – along with the “new” museum in the post-socialist context – were caught in an ideological trap.

The museum of the 2000s defended itself against the threat of any critical reflection, questioning, or opposition by staging, within the museum itself, an aggressive, destructive threat to protect the abstract, sanitized situation. An illustrative example of this reasoning is provided through a meticulous analysis by Véronique Clette-Gakuba (2020) concerning the renovation of the Royal Museum for Central Africa or RMCA, colloquially known as the Africa Museum, a natural history museum and ethnographic museum in one, situated in Tervuren, Belgium, just outside Brussels.

In November 2013, the museum was closed for renovation (including the construction of new exhibition space) to reopen in December 2018. The renovation was a response to demands from Congolese and other post-colonial communities in Belgium, as the RMCA was initially built to showcase King Leopold II’s Congo Free State in the 1897 World Exhibition. Clette-Gakuba writes: “I have myself been involved in groups belonging to the so-called African diasporas enrolled in the process of collaboration with the Royal Museum for Central Africa (RMCA), popularly known as the Africa Museum. These diaspora groups form the COMRAF (RMCA – African Associations’ Advisory Committee), the consultative body linking the RMCA and African associations in Belgium” (2020, 48-49).

In her in-depth analysis of the status and process of museum renovation, she concludes: “Inside the multiple power relations of the Royal Museum for Central Africa (RMCA) the category of the African diaspora is therefore interpreted in a way that does not undermine the museum’s institutional authority. There is no internal alternative to the opposition of universal knowledge on one side and subjectivity on the other. In 2017, when African diasporas asked for a bigger role in decision-making, they were accused of wanting to take power. In the same way, the publi-

cation of a 'carte blanche' calling for restitution provoked informal reactions from institutional actors leading to a description of the authors of this text as 'radical militants'" (Clette-Gakuba, 2020, 63).

I propose that we navigate through the universe of the Occidental museum not only by way of direct criticism, but also strictly theoretically, relying upon philosophy, psychoanalysis, and decolonization, while reviewing fantasies about the museum's current position in the COVID-19 situation.

Achille Mbembe, in his article "The Universal Right to Breathe" from April 13, 2020, at the peak of the COVID-19 pandemic, writes: "We must answer here and now for our life on Earth with others (including viruses) and our shared fate. Such is the injunction this pathogenic period addresses to humankind. It is pathogenic, but also the catabolic period par excellence, with the decomposition of bodies, the sorting and expulsion of all sorts of human waste – the 'great separation' and great confinement caused by the stunning spread of the virus – and along with it, the widespread digitization of the world."

Of course, this takes us back to the body, now indeed a specific object, a dead object, a corpse, that reappears centrally in the Occidental nation-state. The refugee crisis brought our lives into the very proximity of death, desperation, and misery; those deaths were not prime concerns of the Occident. With COVID-19, death once again returns as a central theme within the societies in Europe and the USA, spreading across the global capitalist world. Art is now called back to rethink its representational forms and to question the proximity of death, distance, and surveillance.

In Occidental museums, specifically in ethnological ones, we were, and still are, confronted with histories of the relationship between race and physical anthropology made tangible in museum collections. The anthropological collection at the Natural History Museum in Vienna includes 40,000 objects, human remains, including skulls, bones, hair, and body drains. The collection mostly contains relics from historical and prehistoric times, but also problematic chapters of human remains that mark colonial and National Socialist times. The human biologist Maria Teschler-Nicola, Head of the anthropological collection at the NHM in 2016, reflected on questions of restitution of human relics as trophies.

Teschler-Nicola (2016) stated: "Quite critical is the Nazi period, which has made anthropology hard to deal with and still makes it difficult to manage. During the Nazi era, purchases were made – for example from the Anatomical Institute in Poznań. It was clear to the curators that the relics came from resigned resistance fighters or Polish Jews. There was still no hold. During the Nazi era there were also excavations at the Jewish cemetery in Währing."

Teschler-Nicola (2016) argued that "Rudolf Pöch is a good example. What he did in South Africa in 1909, he could not have done in Europe: go

to a graveyard and dig up someone who died recently. This, of course, is related to colonial power, even if Austria had no colony there. Pöch has traveled with the support of other colonial powers." Rudolf Pöch (1870-1921) is regarded as the founding father of the Institute of Anthropology and Ethnography at the University of Vienna. During the First World War, Pöch became ill-reputed for his ethnological studies in prisoner of war camps. Although many of Pöch's theories on the indigenous people of New Guinea proved false, scientific research and museums still profit from his collections. Today, his technical equipment is on display at the NHM in Vienna (Wikipedia, 2019).

Suvendrini Perera, in her text "Dead Exposures: Trophy Bodies and Violent Visibilities of the Nonhuman," asserts that "What distinguishes the trophy among this multiplicity of relations, organic and inorganic, living and dead, at the edge of human, are its aesthetics of exposure, display and performance, its representation and re-production as artifact and performance of the bodies and properties of that which has been captured or killed" (Perera, 2014, 3).

The Natural History Museum in Vienna, boasting one of the biggest crania collection, assembled by the Austrian anthropologist Augustin Weisbach (1837-1914) in the second half of the nineteenth century in Europe, shows clearly that at the root of the museum persists scientific and cultural racism, as seen in the justification of the exhibited trophy bones.

Marius Turda (2015), in his study "Sub-Cultures and Narratives of Race in Hungary," argues that "If one comprehensively investigates the extent to which the emergence of racial sciences in Hungary during the 1910s and 1920s marked a watershed in the relations between the Hungarian state and its ethnic minorities (Jews, Germans, Roma and so on), one could then evaluate the impact which race had on the development of particular internal discourses on identity, its changing definitional framework caught between cultural traditions and biological visions of national belonging. [...] During the 1930s and 1940s, mathematical formulae, statistics and analyses of blood groups formed a corpus of arguments that racial science hoped would demonstrate that certain ethnic groups were either 'inferior,' and should thus be excluded; or that they were biologically verified 'members' of the ethnic majority and, consequentially, be forced to assimilate."

Therefore, the status of the Occidental museum, whether modern, ethnographical, natural, or contemporary, has a specific history. When we find ourselves in front of a closed museum due to "social distancing," we must insist on an unembellished analysis of the main museum procedures that overtly or subtly involve racialization.

Turda (2006) warns us about "the significant role that the concept of race played in articulating anthropological and ethnic narratives of national belonging. It is necessary to understand the appeal of the idea of

race in this context. With idealized images of national communities and racial hierarchies creeping back into Eastern European popular culture and politics, one needs to understand the latent and often unrecognized legacies of race in shaping not only scientific disciplines like anthropology, but also the emergence and entrenchment of modern Hungarian and Romanian nationalism.” Precisely such “racist scientific results” are used in sorting and exposing bones and crania collections in the museum.

As exposed by Mbembe (2020), “in the long reign of capitalism, has constrained entire segments of the world population, entire races, to a difficult, panting breath and life of oppression.” These executed violent deaths, colonial genocides, were not delegated; what was delegated were the trophy objects that were seized, removed, torn apart from the bodies by Occidental colonialism, and then exhibited so that Western audiences could study the Other, dispossessed, exploited, and exhibited. To finally reach a genocide – mass murder – required a further crucial step as outlined by Mbembe in “Necropolitics” (2003, 24): “That colonies might be ruled over in absolute lawlessness stems from the racial denial of any common bond between the conqueror and the native. In the eyes of the conqueror, savage life is just another form of animal life, a horrifying experience, something alien beyond imagination or comprehension.”

In conclusion, I reiterate my initial point: the “Other” multiplies within the museum to the extent that the Occidental museum becomes “the other” to itself. However, I maintain that this will not absolve the Occidental museum of its responsibility to critically reflect on proper hegemonic practices and the processes of racialization.

Moreover, the trophy objects, until recently stored in the Occidental museum, metastasize into the social body of the nation. It is even possible to say that the COVID-19 crisis has made it evident that in contemporary manifestations of pandemic violence and geopolitical wars, the life and death of populations and individual bodies may no longer be the primary concern.

What is of concern, instead, is what François Debrix calls “the horror of the dismantling of the human” (2017, 97). Aligning with Debrix, this means that, in terms of COVID-19, it is not terror that prevails, but horror “that directly assaults human life, including the capacity to die a human death” (5). To articulate this further, horror’s extreme violence “breaks down the human body into parts, bits, pieces, shreds of flesh, tissue, pulp, and fluids, and it renders human matter indistinct from non-human materiality” (6).

We could say that, just as the trophy object in the museum replaces the trophy body, during the COVID-19 era all individuals undergo a transformation marked by isolation, surveillance, and abandonment, reducing civil society to a state of non-human materiality. Of course, this condition has long been the historical reality of Black people, enslaved

and subjugated. Presently, we found ourselves in a historical moment that echoes the dehumanization experienced by them – a non-human materiality representing, in our view, not merely some sort of cheap Anthropocene, but (maybe) an understanding of a hyper-violent global universalization rooted in the past colonial dehumanization of the enslaved Black people by the supremacist, capitalist white regime of power, dis-possession, extraction, and exploitation.

Works cited

- *Artforum*, MoMA cuts Budget by \$45m, Shrinks Operations for Foreseeable Future, May 7, 2020, retrieved from <https://www.artforum.com/news/moma-cuts-budget-by-45m-shrinks-operations-for-foreseeable-future-83012>
- Badiou, A., *The Century* (trans. Toscano, A.), Cambridge, 2007. First published in Paris, 2005.
- Clette-Gakuba, V., An Attempt at Black Political Subjectivation in a White Institution: The Case of the Royal Museum for Central Africa in Belgium, in: *Opposing Colonialism, Antisemitism, and Turbo-Nationalism: Rethinking the Past for New Conviviality* (eds. Gržinić, M. et al.), Newcastle upon Tyne, 2020, pp. 48-66.
- Debrix, F., *Global Powers of Horror: Security, Politics, and the Body in Pieces*, New York, 2017.
- Gržinić, M., Does contemporary art need museums anymore? in: *Interarchive: archivarische Praktiken und Handlungsräume im zeitgenössischen Kunstfeld = archival practices and sites in the contemporary art field* (ed. Von Bismarck, B.), Köln, 2002, pp. 154-159.
- Gržinić, M., The emergence of the political subject, *Emancipation of the Resistance* (blog), March 2013, retrieved from <https://emancipationofresistance.wordpress.com/grzinic/>
- Kahn, R., Corona as Curator: How museums are responding to the pandemic, *Elephant in the Lab*, April 15, 2020, retrieved from <https://elephantinthelab.org/corona-as-curator-how-museums-are-responding-to-the-pandemic/>
- Macklin, A., In Canada: Who is Really Essential? *openDemocracy*, May 6, 2020, retrieved from <https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/author/audrey-macklin/>
- Mbembe, A., Necropolitics (trans. Meintjes, L.), *Public Culture*, vol. 15, no.1, 2003, pp. 11-40, <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/39984>
- Mbembe, A., The Universal Right to Breathe, *Critical Inquiry* (blog), April 13, 2020, retrieved from <https://critinq.wordpress.com/2020/04/13/the-universal-right-to-breathe/>
- Meijers, D., The Museum and The A-Historical Exhibition: The latest gimmick by the arbiters of taste, or an important cultural phenomenon? in: *Place, Position, Presentation Public* (ed. Gevers, I.), Maastricht, 1993.
- Perera, S., Dead Exposures: Trophy Bodies and Violent Visibilities of the Nonhuman, *Borderlands e-journal*, vol. 13, no. 1, 2014, retrieved from http://www.borderlands.net.au/Vol13No1_2014/perera_exposures.pdf
- Szeemann, H., De overwinning op het materialisme [The victory over materialism], interview by van Graevenitz, A., and de Graaf, R., *ARCHIS* 3, 1988, pp. 8-11.
- Teschler-Nicola, M., *Ein heikles Thema* [A sensitive topic], Maria Teschler-Nicola interviewed by Irmgard Kirchner, *Südwind-Magazin*, no. 7, 2016, retrieved from <https://www.suedwind-magazin.at/ein-heikles-thema-rueckgabe-von-relikten>

- Turda, M., Craniometry and Racial Identity in interwar Transylvania, *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie George Barițiu*, vol. XLV, 2006, 161-172, retrieved from <http://www.historica-cluj.ro/anuare/AnuarHistorica2006/06.pdf>
- Turda, M., Sub-Cultures and Narratives of Race in Hungary, *Cahiers d'études hongroises et finlandaises*, vol. 20-2014, 2015, pp. 229-241, retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4909140/>
- Wikipedia, Rudolf Pöch, updated March 23, 2019, retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rudolf_Pöch

Marina Gržinić, PhD, is a philosopher, theoretician, and artist based in Ljubljana, Slovenia. Since 1993, she has been employed at the Institute of Philosophy at the Scientific and Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts (ZRC SAZU). Since 2003, she has held the position of Full Professor at the Academy of Fine Arts in Vienna. Gržinić publishes extensively, lectures worldwide, and has been involved in video art since 1982, working collaboratively with Aina Šmid, an art historian and artist from Ljubljana.