

MULTICULTURALISM AS A WAY OF GLOBAL SOCIETY

Diana DOCHIA

Curator

Anaid Art Gallery, Bucharest

Diversification of themes and museum institutions, in the second half of the twentieth century took place because of certain factors. Democratizing of states led to a broadening of the audience. Globalization will be the one who will transgress the European concept of the museum also in other geographical areas such as Asia, Africa, India etc. Cultural Tourism brings a large and diverse public, which demands a need for new forms of museum that have to adapt to the tourist aims. New technology has integrated into the museum sector and helped developing new forms of museum - interpretation centres, spectacular way - where the goal is not necessarily preserving, studying and dissemination of an object collection. New technology has become a major component of the new policy of promotion and support the museum sector, especially in the global world of 21st century.

Hans Belting stated that “the western art museums have not yet developed the first step in treating globalization. Premises assumed new meanings in a global era. Finally, art is a local idea”¹. In the past twenty years, globalization changed the world and also generated new ambiguities and contradictions. The notion of art changed at one time with the new boom in production and consumption of art and the emergence of new art markets, as Asia and Africa, led to a rethinking and contextualization of the museum system. Art market works, like other economic markets, globally but art museums still operate in a very narrow context, often the closest frame they belong to - urban or national - depending on the audience that remains essentially local. The single case in which museums operate globally are “blockbuster exhibitions”, involving huge resources and providing income and a large audience for the museums that initiated and supported it. Project GAM (Global Art and the Museum) of the ZKM (Zentrum für Kunst und Medientechnologie), Karlsruhe, investigated in 2006 the effects of globalization that has appeared since 1989 in contemporary art. From that moment we can talk more about

1. Hans Belting și Andrea Buddensieg (ed.), *The Global Art World. Audiences, Markets and Museums*, ed. Hatje Cantz, Ostfildern, 2009, p.6

a global art that has a contemporary development. Contemporary art is seen as art without borders and history. Global art is often identified as a manifestation of post-colonial world. The process of globalization was already initiated by the media art.

Hans Belting defines the terms of the global art and world art as two distinct concepts that are in contradiction with each other. Contemporary Art Museum term indicates a new era in which even the contemporary concept becomes a political issue. Enrico Navarra noted: “Contemporary art has become a social phenomenon, a tool for communication. There is no point in comparing it to what we used to know, because it is dependant on the effects of globalization which we are only beginning to discover and whose impact we are still struggling to assess”¹. The opening of art market in the Middle East is an economic project that definitely will change the world of contemporary art. Famous auction houses, like Sotheby’s and Christies, had to open branches in Doha, Qatar, respectively, Dubai. It is no longer a surprise to anyone the opening in 2011 of a whole cultural district in Abu Dhabi, made of two world-renowned museum entities - the Louvre and the Guggenheim Museum - and an entertainment and conference centre. There were no art museums in this part of the world; they become a need in the 21st century because they have economic potential. Hans Belting considers that global art cannot be synonymous with modern art. “Contemporary art is by definition global, not only in the chronological sense, but [...] and even ideological and symbolic sense. [...] Rather than represent a new context, it indicates the loss of context or focus, and includes its own contradiction by implying the counter movement of regionalism and tribalization, whether national, cultural or religious”². Modernity was suffering from a “self-appointed universalism” based on the concept of art hegemony. Contemporary art is global, as so the Internet is global, but not necessarily universal in content and message. Some art historians consider that the new art blurs the established boundaries between art and popular art, abolishing the old dualism of Western art and ethnographic. Joaquin Barriendos considers global art, seen from the perspective of Westerners, as the geopolitical and geoesthetic brand. Art is seen as a symbolic capital whose value changes from one place to another, even if Western revisionism attempts to control its value. Hans Belting has noted that the art is in particular about cultural identities,

1.. Hans Belting, *Contemporary Art as Global Art. A Critical Estimate* în Hans Belting și Andrea Buddensieg (ed.), *The Global Art World. Audiences, Markets and Museums*, ed. Hatje Cantz, Ostfildern, 2009, p. 38

2.. ibidem, p. 39-40



the fact that modernism was not concerned in, hence nowadays there is a focusing on tradition and on own narration, which defines the visual output as a cultural practice. If the universal museum, as idea, is a legacy of modernity that wanted to provide universal models, the globalism will be a response to universalism and serves to spread the symbolic capital of differences of the market.

Contemporary art museums are no longer built on the idea of exhibiting art history, they claim to represent an open world in the mirror of contemporary art. Narrative exposure at Tate Modern replace art narrative history with “alternative ways of art”, as explained in Frances Morris in *Tate Modern: The Handbook*¹. So-called “viewpoints” such as “Poetry and Dream” allow for “multiple readings” of the collection in order to respond to “an open and fluid situation” inviting visitors to write down their thoughts on postcards. Art history had changed the narrative mode in the late modernity, undermining the linear exhibit of the museum. Anthony King, in 1989, in a conference at the University of Binghamton said: “No contemporary question is more urgent than the need to explore alternative ways to conceptualizing and analyzing issues related to the ‘globalization of culture’, frequently perceived in popular terms, as cultural homogenization on a global scale”².

The boom of contemporary art museums in geographical locations as Africa, Asia, Latin America, India etc. doesn't mean that following or implementing the western model of art museum. Although architectural edifice is easily transferable as a model, from one place to another, the idea of art and what it can be considered art differs greatly from one area to another. Modern art museums often change their names in “the Contemporary Art Museum”.

The proliferation of Asian contemporary art museums does not require a clear vision and a clear concept of their destination.

In Japan, collecting, showing and systematic investigation of modern art was launched in the 1950s with the founding of the Museum of Modern Art's Kanagawa Prefecture. The museum organized a series of temporary exhibitions based on the research of the curators, with works of art borrowed from private collections or from other institutions. Curatorial practice was called “Method Hijikta” as the historian and art critic Teūchi Hijikata. The aim of the exhibitions was to present a

1. Frances Morris (ed.), *Tate Modern: The Handbook*, Tate Publishers, Londra, 2006, p. 25

2. Anthony D. King (ed.), *Culture, Globalization and the World-System: Contemporary Contradictions for the Representation of Identity*, Macmillan Education, Basingstoke, 1991, p. VIII

complete picture of art history, both within Japan and in other parts of the world. The method was taken by other museums, as the Museum of Fine Arts of Tochigi Prefecture, the city Utsunomiya. In this museum there were fierce disputes between curators and artists in 1970s – 1980s, the conflict being named “Case Tochigi”. After 1980 a new exhibition project was developed, consisting in two new modes of exhibit. The first focused on artists living in the region, and the second on other artists in Tochigi, living and working in other parts of Japan or abroad. Also in this geographical area new concept of museum arised, called by Masaaki Morishita the “empty museums”¹, temporary exhibitions serving as a kind of “Kunsthalle” - a designation used in Germany and the German space - a museum without a collection, doesn't have a permanent exhibition or curators². The first museum of this type was the first regional museum of art of Japan, the Tokyo Metropolitan Art Museum, built in 1926, whose style had become the model of many museums in the region.

In Japan in 1955 there were built 200 public museums, the cultural policy of that time was to revitalize city centres through the existence and emergence of the Museum. Even if we see a boom of museum buildings but a deficit of curatorial projects, that is because of the existence of a potential public that was unfamiliar with visiting museums.

The cultural policy in the Asian region was a very well thought out and correlated with the economical potential that culture could bring in this area. The interest in cultural investments in Asia has emerged due to the fact that there is a growing economic potential, through the creative industry and cultural tourism. Then participation of Asian contemporary art - especially of China - in the major art auctions, the listing of Asian artists internationally and the opening of new art markets led to an increased interest and a rapid establishment and proliferation of museums in this part of the world. In June 2008, Hong Kong government launched a large-scale cultural plan called West Kowloon Cultural District, with a budget amounting to \$ 2.8 billion. The project has extended over an area of 40 hectares and will be completed by 2015. The proposed area includes 15 buildings possesses different arts, different sizes, a museum of 62,000 hectares and an exhibition centre of 12,500 square meters. Funding will be provided from the sale of 20% of household land to property developers and 80% of the remaining

6. Hans Belting, op. cit. p. 49

2.. Masaaki Morishita, *Struggles between Curators and Artists: The Case of the Tochigi Prefectural Museum of Fine Arts in Japan in the Early 1980s* in *Museum and Society*, 5, 2 (July) 2007, p. 86 – 102, online: <http://www.le.ac.uk/ms/m&cs/Issue%2014/morishita.pdf>



land will be divided as follows: 36% for museum, exhibition centre and other venues for arts, 5% utilities and other cultural facilities 39% other commercial facilities such as hotels, restaurants, shopping areas and commercial buildings. Commercial facilities will be led by the West Kowloon Cultural District, an independent operator, whose members are appointed by the government. Income generated from rental of commercial facilities will support the operational costs of various cultural facilities within the district. In this way the district could be self-funding and it will not depend on regular government financing subsidiary.

But China is the country where development of museums is very powerful. China sees the museum as symbol of civilization and modernity. With the Olympics occasion there were built thirty new museums, and in Shanghai in 2002 the government officially announced a plan to build 100 new museums until 2010 when the city will host the World Expo. China cultural investment represents both a political agenda and a well defined business strategy.

The museum is a place where contemporary art interaction at local and global level. Museum becomes a “contact zone”, indicating a place where the transculturality processes are put into action. The transculturality, as it is defined by Fernando Ortiz in 1940, emphasizes mutual cultural exchanges, even in conditions of extreme inequity, as the colonial state. It indicates a process in which different cultures interact and create a hybrid form. James Clifford would expand the concept and see “museums as contact zones”¹. Museums can discuss the transculturality between separate social groups and cultures within the integrated multi-cultural societies. Museums can function as contact zones in which a reciprocal relationship of mutual exploitation and conflicts between different ethnicities and cultures can take place.

Due to globalization, ethnicity would be a matter of personal identity that has nothing to do with racial discussions. From this point of view, we will rediscuss and rethink the museums of art and ethnographic as two sides of the same coin. See the particular case of Paris with the two museums: Centre Georges Pompidou - contemporary art center - and Quai Branly Museum - dialogue of cultures, collections that include objects from Africa, Asia, Oceania and the Americas.

1.. James Clifford, *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1997, p. 204

Arthur Danto talks about “visual arts in a post-historical perspective”. “The Post-historical narrative period means the end of a certain narrative, under the terms of which making art was understood as carrying forward art history. But the master narrative of Western art is losing its grip, and nothing has taken its place”¹.

Collectors will have an important role in societies in which national and municipal museums have promoted contemporary art. It is for India and Turkey, where collectors formed a sort of global body in the local market development.

Julian Stallabrass acknowledges that “the global events of 1989 and after – the reunification of Germany, the fragmentation of the Soviet Union, the rise of global trade agreements, the consolidation of trading blocks, and the transformation of China into a partially capitalist economy - changed the character of the art world profoundly”².

The major purpose of establishing the museum is to found national and cultural identity. National museum crisis began to make its presence, according to Peter Weibelin, around the year 1900 once with the beginning of the concept of modernity that led to the birth of an international movement. The dispute around modernity was initiated when Hugo von Tschudi, director of the Nationalgalerie in Berlin, began to acquire works of French Impressionists. This led to generally accepted idea that the twentieth century modern national museum would exhibit and collect international art. But thinking in very strict terms modernity refers to Western Europe and North America, Eastern Europe being ignored due to political bloc for half a century. This europo-centred thinking led to the enforcement of the Euro-American museum model in the peripheral areas. Thus, penetration of colonial influences was pretty weak, colonial cultural policy was a history of exclusion rather than inclusion.

Goethe wrote: “The sure way to achieve universal tolerance is to leave untouched what is peculiar to each man or group, remembering that all that is best in the world is the property of all mankind”³.

1.. Arthur Danto, *Beyond the Brillo-Box. The Visual Arts in Post-historical Perspective*, Farrar Straus Giroux, New York, 1992, p.10

2.. Julian Stallabrass, *Art Incorporated. The Story of Contemporary Art*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2004, p. 10ff

3.. Johann Wolfgang von Goethe. *Însemnări*, Fritz Strich, Goethe and World Literature, Routledge / Kagan Paul, Londra, 1949, pag. 13 - 14



Meditation, transfer and translation are central concepts of world culture. Transfers, translations, rewriting, transformation and transcripts serve to enrich all cultures. Mutual enrichment leads to the formation of a global art. Global means confluence of cultures, and not their antithesis. Under the sign of globalisation the whole cultural policy of the beginning of the 21st century will stay. Era of globalization refers to a return to regional and local, not national. It is the establishing of a cultural strategy that function on the principle “think global, act local”.

Maria Todorova in his book *Imagining the Balkans* speaks of “an incomplete self” that is always at the junction between something and something, “in between”. This “in between” describes something between half-colonial, half-civilized, half-developed, half-oriental. Balkan are defined at the beginning of the 21st century as “an alternative space of invention, heterotopias, and transculturality utopia”¹ as Louisa Avgita wrote. We will mention only three major exhibitions that would draw attention to the Balkans. The first exhibition is “Blood and Honey / The Future’s in the Balkans” (2003) curated by Harald Szeemann, and the exhibition concept was Utopia. Rene Block, curator of the exhibition “In the Gorges of the Balkans” (2003), represents the Balkans as a transcultural space, a space that leads to the unification of ethnic and political differences. The third exhibition, curated by Magda Cârneci, “Cosmopolis Q: x Micro Macro” (2004) define the Balkans as an intermediary space between the global and local area, calling it ‘glocal’².

Homi K. Bhabha in *The Location of Culture* considers that “in-between spaces provide the terrain for elaborating strategies of selfhood - singular or communal - that initiate new signs of identity and innovative sites of collaboration, and contestation, in the act of defining the idea of society”³. But these intermediate spaces are often places favourable to develop brand marketing. Brand marketing leads to economic, social, political, cultural development of cities, regions and countries. Brand marketing offers an attractive profile for tourism and multinational companies, leading to economical growth. Culture is one of the areas in which successful brand marketing offers the opportunity of economical growth comparable with the overdeveloped countries. Cash investments, neo-liberal economy and a careful monitoring of the Balkans could transform the region into a brand.

1.. Louisa Avgita, *Marketing Difference: The Balkans on Display* in Hans Belting și Andrea Buddensieg (ed.), *The Global Art World. Audiences, Markets and Museums*, ed. Hatje Cantz, Ostfildern, 2009, p. 91

2.. ibidem, p. 91

3.. Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, Routledge, Londra/New York, 1994, p. 1 - 2

Turkey has adopted a different model of cultural policy through proliferation of private art museums in the recent years that host a series of blockbuster exhibitions. In previous years, Turkey's museums were funded by public money and they were organized more or less according to the linearity of art history, and especially for the idea of national identity. Badly administrated, the public showed little interest for these museums. The existence of five private art museums - Istanbul Modern, Sakip Sabanci Museum, Pera Museum, Project4 / Elgiz Santral Contemporary Art Museum and Museum - brings into question the role of art museum has in the contemporary Turkish society. If in the 20th century Turkish museums were owned and administrated by the state, as part of its modernization process, the 21st century is witness to innovative efforts by opening new private museums whose aim was to face the public modern and contemporary art, but also to make Istanbul a location of a tourist itinerary by organizing blockbuster exhibitions.

Until the emergence of private museums, various exhibitions were showed in public museums and cultural centres, but the private museums are those who decide the benefits of blockbuster exhibitions. We must not forget the fact that since 1987 Istanbul is the host of one of the most interesting and installationist biennial of contemporary art. In recent years private museums in Istanbul hosted various exhibitions as: Retrospective Turkish sculpture, Rodin in Istanbul, sections of the Venice Biennale, art book of the Gulbenkian collection, photos of Kertesz and Cartier - Bresson, drawings by Rembrandt, paintings Dubuffet, image of women in Turkish art, Orientalist paintings of British and Turkish contemporary art masterpieces. Writer Çağlar Keyder in his book about Istanbul speaks about the "intermeriary" city, torn between east and west, centre and periphery, locally and globally. A city that is torn between two extremes: poverty and wealth. "There are sections of the city where a photographer could frame a crowd scene and pretend that it was from Kabul; others could stand in for any modern neighborhood"¹.

This cultural reconstruction begun in the early 1980s when the area known as the historical peninsula, including Topkapi Palace, Hagia Sophia and Blue Mosque, witnessed a series of renovations and even an urban rehabilitation plan for the sanitation and widening the streets, opening new hotels, shops, cafes and restaurants. As a result of economic liberalization and massive privatization of telecommunications and television and radio, state competition with private museums has

1.. Çağlar Keyder, *Istanbul: Between the Global and the Local*, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Lanham/Oxford, 1999, p. 195



become increasingly visible. Using the contemporary art promotional management practices, the educational activities and the practices of conservation for the objects on display lead to a coherent cultural policy and to the building of cultural strategies. Privatization of the economy begun in 1980, private media became part of broadcasting in the early 1990s, and private museums have been established in the 2000s.

Comparing the situation of Romania and Turkey we can only put our hopes in the near future. Romania is facing a special case of cultural policy. Until 1989 part of eastern bloc, behind the Iron Curtain, with a left political leadership in a highly centralized state, Romanian cultural policy was designed to serve the views and visions of Ceausescu and the Communist Party. After 1989, economical liberalization and the transition from a centralized state system to a private system with little resources, and decentralization of cultural institutions that had to be done in stages, led nearly to the absence and lack of cultural policies. Lack of promotional art system - art galleries, auction houses, biennials, museums - and the lack of a clearly defined art market and of mechanisms for tracking and acquisition of contemporary art would rather lead to the emergence of forms without content, and not to a coherent museum policy. The emergence after 2000 of private art galleries that promotes contemporary art, of two biennial of contemporary art in Bucharest - Bucharest Biennial and the Biennial of Young Artists in 2004 and, in autumn 2004, the creation of the National Museum of Contemporary Art have changed more or less the artistic landscape of Romania.

We should mention that the contemporary art museums would be established after 2000 also in Bulgaria, Macedonia, Serbia, Slovenia, etc., all supported, like in Romania, from public money. Hungary is a special case, having a branch of Museum Ludwig from Germany.

The 1990s significantly and substantially changed the economic geography and art system configuration due to a massive intensification of cultural tourism, proliferation of international biennials around the world, gradually increasing of art museums and a transformation of contemporary art into a trans-national corporation. All these phenomena will lead to conversion and rethinking of the function of contemporary art museums, not only in terms of historical heritage, but also from the social view and of the future, as a global structure. In a global era one can speak of a non-hierarchical dialogue between cultures in different processes of economical modernization. The theory of trans-modernity, which recognizes the existence of other modernities, and the colonial theory will be a turning point in creating a new image of Western

museography. 1990s would bring not only the internationalization of contemporary art, but also an opening from emerging cultural economic strategies, such as Latin America ones. Latin American contemporary art breaks in contemporary art museums around the globe. As a peripheral art, of Western origin, with European fantastical and hyperrealist breaches, it opens, in the plan of cultural policy, an emerging region, which could have been economically strongly reassessed.

Museums in Latin America took the model stated after the French Revolution, of the conservative museums that made public the private collections of monarchs and clerics. In the 1960s all over Latin America there were built modern art museums, but they had the same static and rigid relationship with the public. Since the 1980s different kinds of contemporary art museums have emerged. These museums were founded either by independent universities from São Paulo, Buenos Aires, Santiago and Mexico City, or depending on public foundations, as: MAAC, Museo de Arte y antropológico Contemporáneo of Guayaquil, a creation of the Central Bank of Ecuador; contemporary art spaces opened by Fundación Telefónica in different cities of the region - Buenos Aires, Santiago de Chile, Lima; in Buenos Aires also by the Fundación Proa; by Banco do Brasil Cultural Centre in Rio de Janeiro.

Due to these major global changes, the third international committee through ICOM is operating today, CIMAM¹ (International Committee of ICOM for Museums and Collections of Modern Art) had stated itself as “the only international body devoted exclusively to museums and collections of modern art.” Its main objective, as it is affirmed on the CIMAM official website, “is a relevant international forum of professional character for the discussion of philosophical, ethical and practical issues concerning the collection and exhibition of twentieth and twenty-first century art.” The objectives of members meeting is “to provide an international forum for discussion and to anticipate and discuss new developments in contemporary art and theory, promoting dissemination of knowledge and information about modern and contemporary art, and retain and define good practice and professional standards in museums and art galleries and other related bodies”. After 1990’s CIMAM had to rethink its international policy strategy stating three explicit objectives. The first goal was to incorporate the peripheral regions in its geopolitical status; the second was to represent the global diversity in its internal structure, and the third to design itself as a global institution. In 2005 Alfred Pacquement, director of CIMAM from 2004

1.. <http://www.cimam.org>

to 2007, said: “One of the first discussions of the new board was to decide where the annual conference would take place. We immediately thought to Latin America, because of the very interesting developments in artistic creation in this part of the world, and also of its many new museums”. ICOM’s strategic plan was to develop global vision based on “Our Global Vision - Strategic Plan 2008-2010” and ethical code of Museums “Code of Ethics for Museums”. These two tools, strategic plan and code of ethics, were the results of the geopolitical opening that have concluded with the promotion of Regional Alliances, which have been shaped since the 2000s. These things had happened due to the emergence of regionalism phenomenon, of the discussion about the reification of cultural diversity and about the promotion of cross-border movement of contemporary art. This would happen because of new emerging art markets: the contemporary art markets in Latin America, Asia, Eastern Europe, Africa, United Arab Emirates, etc. CIMAM’s General Assembly in November 2005 in São Paulo made an important contribution to the topic of the museums role in the age of globalism by defining the three issues. The first issue was defining the role of the museum in building of a politicized narrative history; the second was the necessity for a constant management and transmission of knowledge; and the third was the colonial as a starting point of thinking the global museum. Urgent topics on the agenda of art museums were: the purchase of works of art and of archives in a cognitive capitalism (exchange of knowledge and geo-epistemic materials), sharing the managerial responsibilities of world intangible heritage (as part of a new era of social engagement and participation in the public sphere), historical return and inter-epistemic dialog (as a deontological working platform of trans-modernity) and the hemispherical transversality of a museographical global imaginary (the knowledge of geopolitics and of trans/national policies of representation).

The proliferation of art biennials in the world, in the late 1980s, and itinerary “blockbuster” exhibitions in the contemporary art museum have formed a dimension of the world of global art. Processes of inclusion and of exclusion of some art forms from Africa, Asia, Oceania, Latin America and Arab countries in art biennials, but also the movement of certain forms of art in museums, especially the ethnographic museums, had determined the lesser or bigger role within the global society. Biennials art created a global culture that through the global art markets provide an opening to new forms of collecting, either official - museums, or private - collections. 1990s were marked by bringing to the forefront of African contemporary art within the large exhibition organized by the Centre Georges Pompidou in Paris - “Magiciens de la Terre” in 1989.

Followed by the 49th Edition of the Venice Biennale in 2001 entitled “Authentic / Ex-centric: Africa In and Out of Africa”, curated by Salah Hassan and Olu Oguibe, and the 2005 blockbuster exhibition “Africa Remix” curator Simon Njami.

The 2006 Sydney Biennale takes place under the title “Zones of Contact”. The notion of “contact zones” is introduced by Mary Louise Pratt and refers to “contact zones”, social spaces where “disparate cultures meet, clash and grapple with each other, often in highly asymmetrical relations of domination and subordination”¹. “A ‘contact’ perspective emphasizes how subjects are constituted in and by their relations to each other ... in terms of co-presence, interaction, interlocking understandings and practices, often within radically asymmetrical relations of power”².

René Block considers the biennial as the most important institution in the global art world, leading to the formation of contemporary artistic production. The biennials regardless of the venue have some common features: globally active curators, artists who travel a lot, intercultural curatorial committee, a concept launched by Gerardo Mosquera, and a public who travels and sees a lot.

Shmuel Eisenstadt proposes the concept of multiple modernities, conceiving the history of modernity as “continual constitution and reconstitution of a multiplicity of cultural programs”³. The concept of multiple modernities allowed the observation of the process of globalization from multiple perspectives. “Multiple modernities focus on the challenging, deconstructing, reflexive and re-formulating of the project of modernity, and thus enables plural spaces of modernity within each society”⁴, Fillitz Thomas noted. “The concept of multiple modernities also structures the notion of global culture”⁵.

A. Hernandández Miguel-Navaro stresses that “the major international events, the new collections, the new global museums of art seek to locate themselves within this third place, intermediate space, beyond nationality, and within a type of cosmopolitan transnationalism”⁶.

1.. Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes. Travel Writing and Transculturation*, Routledge, Londra/New York, 1992, p. 4

2.. ibidem p. 7

3.. Shmuel N. Eisenstadt, *Multiple Modernities* in *Dedalus*, 129, I, (Winter) 2000, p. 1 - 16

4.. Thomas Fillitz, *Contemporary Art of Africa: Coevalness in the Global World* in Hans Belting and Andrea Buddensieg (ed.), *The Global Art World. Audiences, Markets and Museums*, ed. Hatje Cantz, Ostfildern, 2009, pag. 131

5.. ibidem p. 131

6.. Miguel A. Hernández - Navaro, *Contradictions in Time – Space: Spanish Art and Global Discourse*



Museums currently go towards finding the third dimension, the third space, which is considered a hybrid space of integration and towards a third time, combining local and global, centre and periphery.

In 2008 it was held in Berlin the exhibition “Die Tropen. Ansichten von der Mitte der Weltkugel” (The Tropics. Views from the Middle of the Globe). The exhibition was part of the campaign that began in 1989 with the exhibition “Magiciens de la Terre” organized by the Centre Georges Pompidou, and finished with the opening in 2006 of Quai Branly Museum in Paris. The exhibition in Berlin in 2008 took as inspiration the work of Gauguin, “Where do we come from? What are we? Where are we going?” from 1897. The exhibition curator Alfons Hug wrote: “The exhibition forces a link - for the first time ever – between works created in pre-modern times and contemporary works. ...It is an art exhibition, i.e. the older works are chosen primarily according to aesthetic, not scientific criteria. The general aim is a re-aestheticization of the Tropics ... to counteract the all-powerful political and economic discourses”¹. Pre-modern art of the tropics is considered “timeless, while contemporary art, which abandons the linear notion of time and progress, is considered to be” a time machine “².

Great Britain integrated quickly the reflections about contemporary African art in its museum policy. British Museum in London held the first exhibition of contemporary African artists and arts in 1995. The exhibition “Play and Display. Steel Masquerade from Top to Toe” has marked the beginning of a museum strategy and of museum promoting policies in which the exhibit of contemporary African art will become a part of a museum strategy that helps to interpret and redefine the image about Africa. Contemporary art allows multiple ways of interpretation and involvement and makes essential the involvement of the artists in the displays of the works. British Museum is the only museum in Britain that exhibit contemporary African artists, in its permanent collection.

The Indian museum policy concerns both public and private museums that claim to have an educative function correlated with “a travel itinerary, cultural tourism, sightseeing and leisure”. That led to creation of “gray areas where the exposure of retailing and celebrations merge with each

in Hans Belting, Andrea Buddensieg (ed.), *The Global Art World. Audiences, Markets and Museums*, ed. Harje Cantz, Ostfildern, 2009, p. 138

1.. Alfons Hug, *The Tropics. Views from the Middle of the Globe*, in *Hug, Junge, König*, 2008, p. 15

2.. ibidem, p. 16

other”¹. It is rather a complex Indian exposure, as a constellation of museums, festival halls, that forms a context that „ties together the visual pleasures, national and ethnic presentations appetite Consumer”².

Moving from modern art museums to contemporary art museums reflects a change in philosophy and attitude towards social reality but also a cultural evolution, a change which brings itself a number of new conversions. Once with the globalization the museums have ceased to believe that they are representing absolute and unquestionable artistic value. New artistic trends do not last long; they are quickly forgotten after appearing and succeed very quickly. Marcel Proust compares the museums with a railway station. Museums exist as a collection of fragments from which visitor enters and exits. Art scene is the accurate reflection of the structure of a country.

In the globalized world of the 21st century it is impossible to tell art history from the perspective of a single centre - town, country, continent - or a single model of museum. There are several art histories and several forms and museum projects. “A museum is a place for creating identity (including the fictitious and the invented), a sort of labyrinth in which diverse urban tribes, rites, identity ceremonies, and voices coexist”³, wrote Ángel Kalenberg.

Arthur C. Danto considers “the museum itself is only a part of the infrastructure of art that sooner or later will assume the end of art, and art after art”⁴. From which it results the death of history in the Hegelian sense of an era and the beginning of pluralist, diversity and globalization.

1.. Arjun Appadurai and Carol A. Breckenridge, *Museums are Good to Think: Heritage on View in India* in Ivan Karp, Christine Mullen Kreamer și Steven D. Lavine (ed.), *Museums and Communities: The Politics of Public Culture*, Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington/ London, 1992, p. 34 – 55.

2.. ibidem, p. 40.

3.. Ángel Kalenberg, *Museum Scenarios in Latin America* in Hans Belting and Andrea Buddensieg (ed.), *The Global Art World. Audiences, Markets and Museums*, ed. Hatje Cantz, Ostfildern, 2009, p. 287

4.. Arthur C. Danto, *Después del fin del arte. El arte contemporáneo y el linde de la historia*, Paidós, Barcelona, 1999, p. 39

