Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK

Available online: 08 Dec 2011

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14443058.2011.619002>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae, and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand, or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

Media and materiality: extending the boundaries of object research

Kylie Message* and Ursula Frederick

Australian National University, Canberra

Articles included in this volume focus on the social role of “things” to examine the relationships between material and media artefacts, the construction of social identities, and the production and use of culture. As a collection, the articles reiterate a shift in contemporary object-based research which sees the study of things as an expanded discourse in which the thing itself is neither tethered to its material properties or a sole narrative. Faced with the challenge of contemplating the object as a virtual moving target, contributors have produced a collection of articles that extend “the object” beyond any singular or delimited site of investigation. In many cases the “artefact” explored is both media and material, and where this is the case, contributors argue that expressions of cultural production can be effectively analysed in relation to other empirical cultural dynamics as well as social and historical structures. Each contributor employs a case-study approach that raises “questions of precedent and futurity, of canons of contextualization”¹ in order to challenge disciplinary norms and boundaries. The resulting volume seeks, in the final instance, to make a contribution to the ongoing processes of formation and reflection that characterise interdisciplinary culture studies.

Keywords: object; materiality; Australian studies; things; culture studies

In these programmes, I’m travelling back in time, and across the globe, to see how we humans over 2 million years have shaped our world and been shaped by it, and I’m going to tell this story exclusively through the things that humans have made: all sorts of things, carefully designed, and then either admired and preserved, or used, broken and thrown away. I’ve chosen just a hundred objects from different points on our journey, from a cooking pot to a golden galleon, from a Stone Age tool to a credit card.²

The “media and materiality” blockbuster of 2010 was undoubtedly *A History of the World in 100 Objects*, a collaborative project between the British Museum and BBC Radio 4 that produced a 100-part radio series written and presented by British Museum Director Neil MacGregor. For 20 weeks, the 15-minute presentations broadcast weekdays on Radio 4 encouraged audiences to embark “on more sophisticated acts of imaginative engagement: mentally reconstructing the world that made the object; pondering the value-systems that gave it meaning; and considering how those meanings changed as the object moved in time and place”.³ The “object biographies” developed from material sourced from the British Museum’s collections of ancient art, industry, technology and arms combined to

*Corresponding author. Email: kylie.message@anu.edu.au

create a narrative that captured 2000 years of human history.⁴ According to MacGregor:

... telling history through things, whether it's an Egyptian mummy or a credit card, is what museums are for, and because the British Museum has collected things from all over the globe, it's not a bad place to try to tell a world history.⁵

Some commentators asserted that the radio show produced a temporal map (a map of world history).⁶ We interpret the series of individual moments and experiences differently, suggesting that what it instead attempted to produce was an antidote that would allow the British Museum to redress the paradoxes—or impossibilities—associated with its status as an encyclopaedic museum. The British Museum's central paradox is, of course, that the museum can never make its whole collection (which provides a much fuller “history of the world”) viewable in one place at one time. It shares this condition with characters in Lewis Carroll's 1893 story, *Sylvie and Bruno Concluded*, who struggle to represent the country with precision and ultimately resort to making a map on the scale of a mile to the mile.⁷ Upon being asked if they had used the map much, they reply:

It has never been spread out, yet ... the farmers objected: they said it would cover the whole country, and shut out the sunlight! So we now use the country itself, as its own map, and I assure you it does nearly as well.

Despite its attempt to present a representative (rather than comprehensive) survey of actual objects and stories as the material evidence of historical narrative, it is difficult for *A History of the World in 100 Objects* to escape from a paradox similar to that which led to the creation of the imagined map.

Another paradox associated with *A History of the World in 100 Objects* was caused by the media form that was employed to convey the materiality of the profiled objects and the web of social relationships and contexts that they have existed within. As a radio program, there could be nothing physical or material about what was conveyed, other than elements pertaining to the listening context. Regardless of whether people tuned into Radio 4 in their car, at home, or whether they listened by themselves, intently in groups, or with others milling around, the objects were physically absent. This absence may have led to two separate outcomes. First, the physical absence of the objects may have worked to communicate something of the argument put forward by anthropologist Howard Morphy that the materiality outside of the object (that is, the materiality in the mind) contributes ways of understanding material culture that is as important in conveying meaning as the objects that are produced.⁸ “The materiality in the mind” that Morphy is talking about refers to the process of socialisation through which people come to recognise and understand the significance and use value of objects. The value of objects, be it the use-value or the social or cultural capital associated with the object, is, in other words, always tied to social context and the relationships therein, be they historical or contemporary.

Second, the physical absence of the objects may have worked to deceive our normal reliance on sight, as the dominant Western sense. The radio form required listeners to think about and respond differently to the object being addressed. It

“beguiled”⁹ listeners to consider alternative ways of knowing the object (be it familiar or strange to us), through a range of alternative sensory meanings or “memories”. It required radio audiences to move beyond a short-cut recognition or consumption of the object as a passive or neutral term. In denying listeners the easy fix or sense of “know-ability” that would be provided by an image, the media form of the program invited people to consider and perhaps move beyond the essentially utilitarian attitude encouraged by Western capitalism to the production and consumption of material objects.

The level of public interest in *A History of the World in 100 Objects* was huge, with the *Guardian* reporting the program as “a broadcasting phenomenon”.¹⁰ In the period leading up to the last week of the series, the radio broadcasts were regularly attracting up to four million listeners, while the podcast downloads had totalled 10,441,884. Of these, just over half, 5.7 million, were from the United Kingdom. In addition, members of the public had uploaded 3,240 objects to the website, and other museums had contributed images and information about a further 1,610.¹¹ The program’s popularity was due to a number of things, including the inclusive tone taken by MacGregor, who cannily repositioned the British Museum’s political mandate of being “a museum of the world for the world” through phrasing that would appeal to the more popular practice of individual choice-making in contemporary culture. While the aim to present “a” rather than “the” history of the world appealed to “choose-your-own-adventure” notions of history-making, it also created a firm grounding for the program’s endeavour to explore cultural diversity through the lens of the collections. According to MacGregor:

When people come to the museum they choose their own objects and make their own journey round the world and through time, but I think what they will find is that their own histories quickly intersect with everybody else’s, and when that happens, you no longer have a history of a particular people or nation, but a story of endless connections.¹²

Commitment to the idea that cultural identities are produced through diversity, heterogeneity, and hybridity is also evident in the new permanent exhibition, *Landmarks: People and Places across Australia*, which focuses on 34 places and displays more than 1,500 objects in relation to ten themes in Australian life to present a history of Australia since the late-eighteenth century European colonisation of the continent. *Landmarks* opened in June this year at the National Museum of Australia (replacing *Nation: Symbols of Australia* that ran March 2001–January 2010). It shares the critique of reductionism that is apparent in MacGregor’s approach to framing and justifying *A History of the World in 100 Objects* in its eagerness to redress “talk of Australia as if it is a singular entity, as if all Australians are the same and ‘the nation’ an undifferentiated concept”.¹³ This commitment to diversity and cross-cultural exchange is at the heart of the exhibition, and is evident from the outset, where the first galleries introduce the interwoven histories of Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians and the complicated and ongoing history of colonisation as central components of Australian history. The exhibition presents objects as the material evidence or historical agents of historical change, and often positions them in combination with others from different periods to encourage visitors to consider how ways of engaging with place today connect with those of earlier

decades. It asks visitors to consider how each place has a past and how that past has shaped our lives today, and makes a strong case for the argument that Australian history has been produced out of connections between different peoples, places, and time frames.

The greatest similarity between *A History of the World in 100 Objects* and *Landmarks* is their shared intention to convey to visitors an understanding that material culture can yield insights into the histories of the social relationships that are produced through situated interactions between people and things. Ruth Phillips, an art historian and anthropologist who has worked for many years on material collections of First Nation art, explains the reasons museums take this approach:

Historical objects are witnesses, things that were there, then. They bear their makers' marks in their weaves, textures, and shapes, and have a compelling agency to cause people living in the present to enunciate their relationships to the past. They also accumulate life histories that can be researched and examined in order to understand more fully the different intellectual, social, economic, and political worlds of their various owners and users.¹⁴

While *Landmarks* is more deliberately place-based than *A History of the World in 100 Objects*, its central historical narrative is similarly generated “object-up”¹⁵ from encounters with a range of objects (some iconic, some everyday) that evoke a selection of historical and contemporary moments and experiences. Privileging the idea of the “visit” rather than the long stay, *Landmarks* also communicates the idea that history is produced out of combinations and conjunctions, and chance and accident, as much as it is the result of good planning or effective social governance. The exhibition conveys the sense that, perhaps more than anything else, history is generated from the exchanges and negotiations that are, at least in the first instance, always personal and grounded. National Museum of Australia senior curator, Kirsten Wehner suggests that “In a way *Landmarks* offers a kind of imaginative tour of the country—the opportunity to ‘visit’ different places, to explore how they have emerged, and to ask how, together, they create a history”.¹⁶

Objects are attributed meaning—including the construction of their social value (and capital)—through a complex process involving relationships between individuals, communities and the nation-state, especially in the context of histories that are told by museums in countries such as Australia, in which collections often evidence the interactions and resistances of the colonial period and also assert its ongoing impact. We can see in *Landmarks* the attempt to keep these relationships close to the surface, for the purpose of education, healing, and reconciliation. A large text banner situated above the initial section of the display greets the visitor with a statement by former Governor-General of Australia, Sir William Deane: “The past is never fully gone. It is absorbed into the present and the future. It stays to shape what we are and what we do”.¹⁷ We understand this statement (as well as the primacy it is given in the exhibition) as performing a self-awareness and reflexivity that was less apparent in the British Museum’s audacious endeavour to produce a history of the world through profiles of 100 of the museum’s own collection objects. The commitment to social justice proposed by the central position accorded to Deane’s comments may also offer a riposte to the contention by American historian Richard White that “historians make maps of vanished countries. There are only the maps [left]; the

past is gone and cannot be recreated".¹⁸ Where the British Museum is like a map (that includes collections created at a time when anthropologists and others sought to capture remnants of "cultures if not countries that they mistakenly took to be vanishing"¹⁹) that cannot be completely unfurled, *Landmarks* aims, as indicated by the use of Deane's quote, to reanimate material evidence that will create new possibilities for exchange between past events, places and peoples, and those between the past and present.

The approach taken by curators in developing *Landmarks* represents a return of confidence in using objects in museum programs and exhibitions. Indeed, Ruth Phillips has argued that "the beginning of the twenty-first century is turning out to be a second 'museum age'" that will become identified as the period in which the materiality of collections was re-embraced by museums.²⁰ Apparent across the museum sector are changing practices that have been strongly influenced by the revisionism characterising related academic and popular discourses (primarily history and anthropology), or what Phillips has described as "the combined momentum of post-colonial and post-structuralist critiques in the academic community, and political pressures for decolonization outside it".²¹ The revisionism evident in exhibitions and programs such as *Landmarks* and *A History of the World in 100 Objects* is motivated by the aim to redress if not reverse several earlier trends, including some of the approaches to exhibition making identified with the new museological era, which is usually associated with a period from the late 1980s through the first decade of the twenty-first century.

The new museology was exemplified in many respects by the new National Museum of Australia,²² which opened in 2001, and which aspired upon opening to be a place of ideas, and "a museum of stories". According to National Museum of Australia senior curators, Kirsten Wehner and Martha Sear, objects were used in the earlier exhibitions "to illustrate themes, ideas or stories, rather than as functioning as raw primary carriers of information or creators of meaning within displays".²³ These exhibitions (including *Nation: Symbols of Australia*) were criticised at various times for the version of history that was presented, as well as for the approach, which privileged the generation of information-rich experiences and education-based approaches at the expense of paying attention to the materiality of the collections displayed.²⁴ The new museology's wariness of objects had itself been strongly informed by a cultural turn away from more traditional styles of exhibit making in which, to quote Australian historian Anne-Marie Condé (paraphrasing Graeme Davison), "the obsession with objects for their own sake amounts to antiquarianism".²⁵ Both Condé and Davison made this observation in relation to local museums in Australia in the 1970s and early 1980s, as a brief era that occupied the tail-end of an extensive period emerging from the mid-nineteenth-century in which public museums became both normative and aspirational institutions of Western modernity. At this time, and "within this world", writes museum scholar Sandra Dudley:

objects behaved themselves. They did not shift their intellectual shapes, or change their places in the received scheme of things, or mean different things to different people, or different things to the same person at different times.²⁶

She then continues to argue that the anachronistic and unchanging quality attributed to objects at this time did not properly reflect the social relationships embedded in

collections or “how we feel ... as we live our lives experiencing our material world”.²⁷

Although the parameters for this special issue of the *Journal of Australian Studies* are broader than those addressed above in relation to a museological context, each contributor has also focused on the social role of “things” to examine relationships between material and media artefacts and social relations. In many cases the “artefact” at the centre of their investigations is both media and material, and where this is the case, contributors have argued that expressions of cultural production should be analysed in relation to other empirical cultural dynamics and social and historical structures. The articles included here emerged out of a seminar series (called “Once upon a Time ...”) that was convened by Ursula Frederick at the Research School of Humanities at the Australian National University throughout 2009. Each contributor has employed a case-study approach that raises “questions of precedent and futurity, of canons of contextualization” to challenge disciplinary norms and boundaries.²⁸ By examining the material specificities of particular objects or collections of things as complex media devices and cultural forms, the authors have explored the potential for materiality to enable communicative action and experience. And, in their explicit attention to both physical “things” and the contexts of circulation and display, the authors have unpacked the symbolic, historical and social values that material properties can convey. By emphasising the interplay between an object’s materiality and the contexts of its production, reception and interpretation to ask “how do objects, in their various arenas of circulation and display, work to communicate?”, each author has contributed a different way of seeing and relating to material culture that adds to the volume’s aim to present an active exploration of the ongoing processes of formation and reflection that characterise the interdisciplinary field of *culture studies*.

While it is clear that the articles in this volume take different disciplinary routes, we propose that it is precisely the interdisciplinarity of this collection that signals the expanding nature of contemporary object-based research. It is perhaps the desire to stretch the boundaries of the thing itself, and the challenges that presents, that most unites our contributors. Asked to take a particular thing as the focus of their study, we see instead, in each of the articles, a plethora of objects, people, voices, places, stories and meanings. What they offer collectively is an insight into objects that are extended, mobile and relational. Where we might at first have seen a stone axe, a ship, a photograph, a string bag or a denim jacket we can no longer ignore the processes of collection, fragmentation, dispersal and assemblage that re-materialise these singular things into relational objects oscillating through a vast material lifeworld. The many interfaces (glass cabinet, lcd screen, silver gelatin print) through which we now encounter these objects has a multiplier effect, allowing the object to “appear” as different iterations and in more than one place. As James Steele and Martyn Jolly suggest, this may well have the effect of destabilising even our most tangible sense of place. Examining a new era of collecting, in the form of crowdsourcing, they consider the implications of the enormous image-sets and archives that are currently being amassed. In pragmatic terms these data sets may work to visually retrieve “lost places”, but they may also work to prescribe a kind of global metaview of particular historical moments and iconic world sites. Their object focus then is a metaview that is ostensibly a conglomeration of multiple perspectives on a single subject.

By contrast, Helen Ennis's article isolates a single photographic print as an entry point into the life, inspiration, and artistic impulses of Australian photographer Olive Cotton. It is not so much the materiality of the photograph itself which draws Ennis's attention as it is the sensory properties of the physical world that the image conveys, a sentimental attachment to a particular place which serves as a source of inspiration and touchstone in the artists' life and practice. What Ennis traces here is that which is both physically and affectively fleeting; the wind pushing the waves, light breaking the sky, memories of the artist's childhood, a vignette in the making of Australian modernist photography.

In a similar way Anne Clarke and Robin Torrence explore the life that lies latent within, behind and around a collection held at the Australian Museum. Through their study of ethnographic objects collected in colonial Papua, Clarke and Torrence effectively illuminate this collection as an assemblage of relationships between producers, collectors, middlemen and objects. In charting how these materialised relationships changed, Clarke and Torrence demonstrate how artefacts are analytically inseparable from the values attached to them.²⁹ More than representing a collection of exchanges, the authors reveal the historical agency of artefact producers and their objects in shaping colonial relationships.

Mary Hutchison is also interested in exploring object agency and takes her methodological departure point from the process of "object biography". Hutchison traces the travels of a denim jacket as it journeys on the back of a Cambodian refugee, across the sea, and ultimately into the National Museum of Australia. Deploying a metaphor of cloth and a reflexive conversational style, Hutchison reveals how this item of clothing carries many narrative threads. Within it we may find one man's personal migration story woven alongside the recent history of his war-torn country. Through her focus on the materiality of the object, as blue denim, we are also made aware of the vast ecological, industrial, economic and geo-political network within which the jacket is identified as a resource, commodity and a symbol of western culture. As Hutchison indicates, the plural narratives mobilised in the journey of Sothea Thea and his jacket are an ongoing act of communication. Most recently, the jacket appeared in a museum display and as a topic of conversation on Thea's Facebook page. Thus Thea and Hutchison point to the way in which history can be read into objects in an open-ended way.

Some biographical studies fail to capture the kinds of spatial and cross-cultural performances that Thea's denim jacket illustrates. Others are too focused on conventional temporalities of life history to examine the precursors and prehistories that make objects matter: the ideas, aspirations, plans and visions. Yet as Alice Gorman's study of Skylab demonstrates, a thing can never be fully divorced from its possible futures and afterlives. That we cannot easily write or even anticipate the forward trajectory of an object is one of the paradoxes with which object biographers must grapple. It is this sense of objects always being recreated that Gosden touches upon when he speaks of objects (and humans) transgressing the boundaries of substance.³⁰ Gorman addresses something of this alchemy of transubstantiation when she explores how Skylab was remade into an icon, through the very disintegration of its form. Her article highlights the challenges of studying objects that are absent or have effectively multiplied through fragmentation.

Alison Wain's article addresses this dilemma directly by considering what it is that makes an object "original". She begins by discussing the bridge of a

decommissioned navy vessel that is now installed, complete with audiovisual dramatisations, at the Australian War Memorial. Through interviews with various stakeholders in large technology objects, including museum curators, visitors, conservators and object owners, Wain canvasses opinions on the concept of originality as it applies to heritage conservation values. As distinct from the various heritage charters that assert conservation values and principles in a more static and ordained fashion, Wain's analysis shows how an object's originality is contingent upon a play of variables that are perceived differently between individuals and institutions.

Like Wain, Louise Hamby addresses the role that different individuals and organisations can play in the mediation of heritage objects. In Hamby's case this concerns the rediscovery and attribution of meaning to a particular type of string bag made and worn by Yolngu people in Arnhem Land. An important part of Hamby's research process is not only the identification of "biting bags" in collections from around the world but also the retrieval of information about these items through conversation with Yolngu colleagues. What Hamby's article most cogently demonstrates is the "relationship between human subjects and the objects they create as mutually constitutive".³¹

In summary, our specific aim in developing this volume was to investigate the productive intersections that arise between cultural studies and material culture studies as interdisciplinary fields that each seek to identify, assess and make interventions based on knowledge about contingent historical conditions and the realm of empirical data. Responding to increasing assertions by commentators that Cultural Studies is in crisis, the editorial hypothesis that we proposed to contributors was that material culture studies may be able to "rejuvenate" cultural studies by recalling it to the material world of data. This hypothesis is consistent with calls made by Lawrence Grossberg and others for Cultural Studies to "bring the conceptual and the empirical (although obviously the separation is never so clear cut and both terms need to be rethought in the light of a radically contextual materialism) together",³² and for it to form new kinds of alliances with other sites of knowledge production. Material culture studies has, we believe, the potential to develop new cross-disciplinary agendas for enquiry in the field of cultural studies, and the capacity to investigate the relationship between media texts and wider questions of culture. This potential has been explored in related fields, including museum studies and anthropology, as indicated by our preliminary comments about *A History of the World in 100 Objects* and *Landmarks*. In also responding to this hypothesis, contributing authors drew on, extended, or challenged the approaches and methodologies aligned with their training as art historians, anthropologists, archaeologists, and historians in order to also reflect the increasingly interdisciplinary nature of what we might call "object" studies.

Significantly these contributions reiterate a shift in the direction of object-based scholarship, due in part to their interdisciplinarity and awareness of the many channels through which objects are mediated. Far from being a denial of materiality, this shift represents a recognition of the complex ways in which objects transform and that "one of the principle ways in which objects acquire special powers is the strength of feeling which has been poured into them. This can happen to any kind of thing, and at every level of social action".³³ What is particularly instructive in this

collection is the varied attempts to grasp hold of a thing that is difficult to keep steady, much like reading a map that has never been unfolded.

Notes

1. Lauren Berlant, "On the Case," *Critical Inquiry* 33, Summer (2007): 666.
2. Neil MacGregor, *A History of the World in 100 Objects*. Programme 1, broadcast 18 January 2010, BBC Radio 4.
3. John Adamson, "A History of the World in 100 Objects by Neil MacGregor: review," *UK Telegraph*, October 24, 2010, accessed June 25, 2011, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/books/8076036/A-History-of-the-World-in-100-Objects-by-Neil-MacGregor-review.html>.
4. Chris Gosden and Yvonne Marshall explain that an object biography examines an artefact's life history to "address the way social interactions involving people and objects create meaning" and to understand how these meanings "change and are renegotiated through the life of an object," Chris Gosden and Yvonne Marshall, "The Cultural Biography of Objects," *World Archaeology* 31, no. 2 (1999): 169–78. See also Igor Kopytoff, "The Cultural Biography of Things: Commoditization as Process," *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*, ed. Arjun Appadurai (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 64–91.
5. MacGregor, *A History of the World*, Programme 1.
6. Maev Kennedy, "Radio 4's A History of the World in 100 Objects draws to a close," *UK Guardian*, October 14, 2010, accessed June 25, 2011, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/media/2010/oct/14/radio-4-history-world-objects>; Jessica Elgot, "He put colour in her cheeks: Did her smile save his life?," *The Jewish Chronicle*, May 19, 2011, accessed June 25, 2011, <http://www.thejc.com/news/uk-news/49167/he-put-colour-her-cheeks-did-her-smile-save-his-life>.
7. Lewis Carroll, *Sylvie and Bruno Concluded* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1893), 169.
8. Howard Morphy, "Afterword," in *Museum Materialities: Objects, Engagements, Interpretations*, ed. Sandra Dudley (London: Routledge, 2010), 285.
9. Adamson, "A History of the World."
10. Kennedy, "Radio 4's A History of the World."
11. Kennedy, "Radio 4's A History of the World."
12. MacGregor, *A History of the World*, Programme 1.
13. Kirsten Wehner, *Exhibition overview* (Canberra: National Museum of Australia, 2011), accessed June 25, 2011, http://www.nma.gov.au/exhibitions/landmarks/about_landmarks/
14. Ruth Phillips, "Re-placing Objects: Historical Practices for the Second Museum Age," *Canadian Historical Review* 86, no. 1 (2005): 108.
15. A phrase used to describe the object-centred approach employed by National Museum of Australia curators to develop the *Australian Journeys* exhibition, which opened in 2010. Kirsten Wehner and Martha Sear, "Engaging the Material World: Object Knowledge and *Australian Journeys*," in *Museum Materialities*, 145.
16. Wehner, *Exhibition overview*.
17. Deane's statement was made in August 1996 as part of his Inaugural Vincent Lingiari Memorial Lecture. It has subsequently been quoted widely, including in the Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation, *Final report of the Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation to the Prime Minister and the Commonwealth Parliament* (Canberra: The Commonwealth of Australia, Dec. 2000). Accessed June 20, 2011, <http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/orgs/car/finalreport/text01.htm>
18. Richard White, "Using the Past: History and Native American Studies," *Studying Native America: Problems and Prospects*, ed. Russell Thornton (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1998), 224.
19. White, "Using the Past," 224.
20. Phillips, "Re-placing Objects," 83.
21. Phillips, "Re-placing Objects," 84.
22. Kylie Message, *New Museums and the Making of Culture* (London: Berg, 2006).

23. Wehner and Martha Sear, "Engaging the Material World," 144. Also see Dawn Casey, "The National Museum of Australia: Exploring the Past, Illuminating the Present and Imagining the Future," *National Museums: Negotiating Histories*, Canberra: National Museum of Australia Press, 2001), 6.
24. The approach to exhibition making was influenced by turns in anthropology and art history in the second half of the twentieth century away from material culture study and connoisseurship respectively. Phillips, "Re-placing Objects," 95. Morphy attributes as "one major factor in the neglect of material culture," the "essentially utilitarian attitude of Western capitalism to the production and consumption of material objects." Morphy, "Afterword," 276.
25. Anne-Marie Condé, "A 'vigorous cultural movement': The Pigott Inquiry and Country Museums in Australia, 1975," *recollections* 6, no. 2 (2011), accessed June 20, 2011, http://recollections.nma.gov.au/issues/vol_6_no_2/papers/vigorous_cultural_movement/. See also Graeme Davison, "The Use and Abuse of Australian history," *Australian Historical Studies* 23, no. 91 (1988): 55–76.
26. Susan Pearce, "Foreword," *Museum Materialities*, xix.
27. Pearce, "Foreword," xix.
28. Berlant, "On the Case," 666.
29. Amiria Henare, Martin Holbraad and Sari Wastell, "Introduction: Thinking through Things," in *Thinking through Things: Theorising Artefacts Ethnographically*, eds Amiria Henare, Martin Holbraad and Sari Wastell (London: Routledge, 2007), 1.
30. Chris Gosden, "What Do Objects Want?," *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 12, no. 3 (2005):193–211.
31. Henare, Holbraad and Wastell, "Introduction," 2.
32. Lawrence Grossberg, "Does Cultural Studies Have Futures? Should It? (or What's the Matter with New York?) Cultural Studies, Contexts and Conjunctures," *Cultural Studies* 20, no. 1 (2006): 7.
33. Pearce, "Foreword," xvi.