

Summer 2015

# How Museums Colonize the World's Art

Sarah McDonald  
samcdonald@pugetsound.edu

Follow this and additional works at: [https://soundideas.pugetsound.edu/summer\\_research](https://soundideas.pugetsound.edu/summer_research)



Part of the [Race, Ethnicity and Post-Colonial Studies Commons](#), and the [Theory and Criticism Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

McDonald, Sarah, "How Museums Colonize the World's Art" (2015). *Summer Research*. 251.  
[https://soundideas.pugetsound.edu/summer\\_research/251](https://soundideas.pugetsound.edu/summer_research/251)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Sound Ideas. It has been accepted for inclusion in Summer Research by an authorized administrator of Sound Ideas. For more information, please contact [soundideas@pugetsound.edu](mailto:soundideas@pugetsound.edu).

**How Museums Colonize the World's Art**  
by Sarah McDonald

This paper examines the presence of colonial ideology within art history that I argue erases and oppresses art and artists from outside of the Euro-American art world. I define colonial values specifically within the terms laid out by Aimé Césaire in Discourse on Colonialism which I will first outline and then apply to three aspects of the museum: the internal and external architecture, the rhetoric of accompanying text and labels to the art, and the curatorial work that arranges the pieces themselves. I use this structure to organize my qualitative on site museum research.

My research process consisted of reading books and articles related to both museological and colonial theory. I wanted to come at this intersectional research from a more in depth understanding of colonial theories and how I could relate these directly to the museum without other art historical scholarship shaping my conclusions. I chose to base my research in museum visits because I wanted to limit myself to the most accessible form of art history. One could write so much more on the pedagogy of the subject and the canon itself, but more people can go into a museum than can take a class. Given this, I approached the on site investigations into these spaces as the most basic encounter someone would have with art history: walking through a museum space and reading the explanatory text and titles.

The space, rhetoric, arrangement, and implied validation of the museum all dictate this experience and define art itself. I will proceed throughout the paper connecting my experience as

a critical viewer at the museums I visited back to Discourse on Colonialism.<sup>1</sup> I chose this as primary text given its significance within the field of colonial theory and its influence on later thinkers like Franz Fanon and Stuart Hall. It is this field I wanted to work out of, not from within art history itself. Scholarship on colonialism, though highly academic like art history, is still a body of theory based in the necessity to address what had been historicized exclusively by rich white European men. It is in itself a field rooted in resistance to normative scholarship, which is what Aimé Césaire does in his work by directly responding to colonial thoughts or ideology.

Discourse on Colonialism delves into historical accounts/justifications by colonizers themselves which Césaire then refutes. He contests the moral standing of Europe, and questions what constitutes their ‘civilization’ given the savagery of colonization itself. He points to the active violence on the space and bodies of the colonized as well as the lasting psychological damage and mass erasure of language, art, infrastructure and religion as evidence of the brutality of colonialism. He starts by denying the positive affects of colonialism which Europe would claim as the justification for violence. Césaire asks, “has colonization really *placed civilizations in contact*? Or, if you prefer, of all the ways of *establishing contact*, was it the best? I answer *no*.”<sup>2</sup> Césaire does not indulge the European glossing of history that pronounces it “cultural exchange,” it was certainly not mutually beneficial or even mutually sought.

Another argument for colonialism that Césaire engages is the myth of the savior colonizers who bring a place from barbarism into civilization. It is this thought process of superiority and then the need to control a space “for the sake” of its people that is exemplary of

---

<sup>1</sup> Césaire, Aimé, and Robin D. G. Kelley. *Discourse on Colonialism*. New York: Monthly Review, 1972. Print.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid p 33.

the colonial ideology I point to within my paper. This attitude of entitlement to the world, its resources, space and human artistic heritage is specific to the European colonial perspective.

Césaire engages these colonial thought processes, saying “And who is roused to indignation when a certain Rev. Barde assures us that if the goods of the world ‘remained divided up indefinitely, as they would be without colonization, they would answer neither the purposes of God nor the just demands of the human collectivity’?” Here Césaire identifies the othering and superiority implicit with colonial acts. This Reverend Barde is a European advocate for the seizure and control of the resources of the colonized, justifying this through Christian and humanistic ideology. Césaire proceeds from this initial refutation of colonialism as a productive course in history, going on to explain the physical and lasting brutality on the colonized. Not only did violence happen, but it continues when these histories are erased or distorted to fit a sanitized glorification of Europe.

Taking into consideration the history of museums themselves, one can quite clearly see the connection to imperial violence. There are museums functioning on a variety of federal, state and private resources and purposes, but art museums generally serve as a national or regional landmark. The line between artifact preservation and art showcase is often blurred in these spaces as it is where art history unfolds, joining ancient and contemporary artists in one building.

The Louvre in Paris, France is one of the oldest and most visited art museums in the world. It is embedded into the art historical tradition both in its architecture, its visual representation within canonical works (seen in *Les Tres Riches Heures*, a calendar illustrated by the Limbourg Brothers) and now as the home of much of ‘the canon.’ The Louvre exemplifies

the cultural model of the art museum as well as a literal connection between colonialism and art history as the building itself is tied to French aristocracy and Napoleon era imperialism.

During Napoleon's reign the Louvre was changed to Musée Napoléon and its art collection was significantly expanded to what it consists of today. The museum 'acquired' its famous Egyptian display during this period, which was directly stolen from Egypt during the French occupation, the goals of which were colonial expansion. Dominique Vivant Denon who was Napoleon's art advisor and subsequent director of the Musée Napoléon accompanied the military campaign into Egypt himself.<sup>3</sup> This entitlement to global wealth illustrates the underlying belief system of colonialism.

Under Denon ancient art from Egypt was stolen with the pretense of protecting it, apparently from the Egyptians themselves who France deemed incapable of proper preservation.<sup>4</sup> It is the exact same rhetoric of settler colonialism which promises the people whose home is being occupied a better way of life courtesy of European civilization. The notion of 'civilizing' a country for its own good is what Europe uses as justification for the mass genocide and destruction inflicted on the world's colonies. I want to emphasize this direct correlation between the world's first major art museum and our global history of violence.

## PART I

Architecture significantly affects one's experience of a building, regardless of the contents or purpose of the space. Because of its functional aspect, the architecture can easily fade

---

<sup>3</sup> Quynn, Dorothy Mackay. "The Art Confiscations of the Napoleonic Wars." *The American Historical Review* 50.3 (1945): 437. Web.

<sup>4</sup> Bierman, Irene A. *Napoleon in Egypt*. Reading, UK: Ithaca, 2003. Print.

into one's subconscious understanding of the building. We move through designed spaces every day, and with this familiarity comes a different form of aesthetic appreciation. Instead of actively viewing intentional elements of design one more often focuses on the practicality of the space. Nevertheless, architecture plays a crucial role in our relation to space, and should be considered integral to the experience of a building. For art museums which are spaces for the facilitation of a viewer's connection to art, the architecture can become an extension of the museum's content and its artistic function becomes more apparent.

Modern art museums, like the MOMA in San Francisco for example, extends the contents of the museum to the design of the space itself, facilitating a cohesive experience of strikingly modern art. However, many buildings rely on what has become synonymous for significance and power in the West: the Greek temple aesthetic. This includes symmetrical white marble and a facade with columns or a colonnade. This has become a standard for many banks, libraries, post offices and other institutional buildings, meant to indicate power, stability and esteem. Starting with Thomas Jefferson's Monticello, this design has integrated into U.S architecture as a direct connotation of European influence and power.

This aligns with what Aimé Césaire describes as the prioritizing of all colonial powers and their aesthetics over the destruction and erasure of other design elements from outside Western Europe. He addresses this hierarchy stating, "About the Sudanese empires? About the bronzes of Benin? Shango sculpture? That's all right with me; it will give us a change from all the sensationally bad art that adorns so many European capitals. About African music. Why not?"<sup>5</sup> This positions a dichotomy between that which is worthy of power and design that is not,

---

<sup>5</sup> Césaire, Aimé, and Robin D. G. Kelley. *Discourse on Colonialism*. New York: Monthly Review, 1972. p 52

which Cesaire aptly identifies. In every circumstance that this choice of classical facade over something new or different is made, that institution perpetuates this dynamic.

Cesaire expands on this saying “the filters let through only what can nourish the thick skin of the bourgeois’s clear conscience. Before the arrival of the French in their country, the Vietnamese were people of an old culture, exquisite and refined. To recall this fact upsets the digestion of the Banque D’Indochine. Start the forgetting machine!”<sup>6</sup> The forgetting machine he speaks of is the erasing of other cultures in the face of European domination. This occurs within museum architecture, which frames the entire mission of the museum as a celebration of European culture. I found this among my visits to museums, most notably at the Cantor Art Museum at Stanford University, and the Asian Art Museum in San Francisco.

The Cantor Museum’s external design in no way strays from this classicizing trend. The facade looks stripped from a Greek temple, complete with mosaics of posing, contraposto goddesses. (Contraposto is a tenet of sculpture invented by the Greeks, it is meant to be a harmonic pose that reveals the weight bearing of the body, one hip lower than the other, a leg standing out to balance). The facade is made up of an Ionic colonnade with steps leading up to the doors which are obviously modeled after Ghiberti’s Gates of Paradise from the Florentine baptistry, a hallmark of the ‘art historical canon.’ On either side of the stairs are two marble hellenistic sculptures (a theatrical style of Greco-sculpture). These function as literal gatekeepers of the art, flanking the entrance intimidatingly. As you proceed up the stairs, the mosaics come into view which are three different compositions of reclined white women in white robes, which

---

<sup>6</sup> Ibid p 52

could represent the muses of the arts. This is only the front entrance to the museum, and already a narrative is forming which leads the viewer to a conclusion of what they will experience inside.

Were this exclusively a Greco-Roman museum this would all make aesthetic sense and present a cohesive space through which the viewer could understand the art. However this museum is meant to function as one of our country's top university's central space for art history beyond the classroom. One would think that an internationally renowned school would make an effort to include a global art history and community, but the entrance quickly makes clear that the priority is placed on European cultural heritage. This implies that art museums are synonymous with a certain art history, that of the classical West.

That is why, even more shocking, is that this architecture is applied to the San Francisco Asian Art Museum. The goal of a museum such as this would be to carve out space within exclusive art histories and reinsert creations from a continent which is lightly touched by the 'canon' and survey classes. A building such as this exists as a balance to the countless Art Museums that exclude art from Asia, South and Central America as well as all of Africa. The name in itself implies a cohesive whole 'Asia' which is essentializing, but it is understandably an attempt to include what is so often not seen or studied. Given all this, it is telling that the classical facade chosen for the museum entrance holds back this goal of inclusion. It is one thing to 'neutralize' an art museum while relying on this aesthetic, but to use this Greco style to imbue the Asian Art Museum with authority directly supports the assumption that above all else, classical aesthetics are connected to all human artistic heritage. This decision on the part of the museum organizers and architects contributes to this glossing of history that Cesaire describes. To place all art under the banner of classical authority again implies that there is a 'neutral'

aesthetic of power, but really it has been dictated by those that have traditionally written art history- white Western men.

Entering the museums, one is then ushered through a trajectory of galleries or left to wander freely. The internal architecture is the physical organization for the art history on display and is thus important to the viewer's experience of it. The traditional white-cube sterility of the museum implies artistic validation, while artifactually centered museums use lower lighting and colored walls, depending of course on the objects featured. This discrepancy between curating 'art' and 'artifact' reveals a different form of validation for the objects on display. White-walled galleries imply artistic genius while low lighting on glass encased objects imply merit based on historical worth. This is an important difference in the field of curation especially when considering how it is applied differently to Western Art.

In my museum visits a notable example of this was at the Cantor Art Museum at Stanford. The majority of the space is white- cubed, but if you proceed into the depths of the museum you will find way in the back the "Arts of Africa" section. Of course Europe receives no such designation as its art is scattered throughout the museum, and as previously mentioned it occupies the front entrance as well. Upon entering the "Arts of Africa" section it is strikingly different than the rest of the museum. The walls are a deep red and unlike other sections the art is displayed in glass cases. Immediately one feels placed in a history museum, with an emphasis on the preservation of these objects rather than facilitating an artistic experience for the viewer. There are no other continents present in the museum in such a way, which supposes a cohesive "African artistic heritage" which can be viewed as a whole in this small back section of the museum. In this way, whoever designed the internal space reserved special treatment for this

collection, which in the context of the entire museum implies that 'African Art' is essentially different. Consider this in terms of art vs artifactual curation and these decisions become subtle ways to undermine the artistic validity of the section. It is presented as a collection of objects that are important due to their history, while other old pieces in the museum that come from Italy, for example, are displayed as timeless examples of human creativity. This qualification of art with a large region or continent reduces that art to a product of a 'country,' rather than humanity.

These factors illustrate the colonizing mentality of the art museum, which continually prioritizes European creation. This glossing of other art, either through special treatment or its non existence within the museum supports a global narrative of European domination. Under this system, humanity is conflated with 'European' which has been the historical justification of colonial violence and racism. Architectural decisions and this othering treatment of art reflects the contemporary manifestation of colonial violence through re written and unseen histories.

## PART II

Within Museum exhibits there is supplementary information provided in the form of text posts. This rhetorical aspect of the museum visit provides context for the art on view, and further shapes a viewer's understanding and perspective. These text posts generally accompany each work displayed in a museum. The information provided ranges from minimal posts including only the title, artist, medium, date and source of acquisition, to more elaborate explanations of historical and aesthetic background. These frame what is a highly subjective experience in more direct terms, providing a 'way' to look. Given this, the rhetoric of these posts can significantly affect the art-viewing process.

The entire 'Arts of Africa' section at the Cantor Art Museum reduces art from Africa to a product of simplistic history. First of all, it is called "Arts of Africa" which is reductive to the entire continent, as if a land mass produces cohesive art. This essentializes that group of people and their creative output. That is what the title of the section alone implies about its content, but the exhibit is further organized to 'other' Africa. The three rooms are divided into different time periods and within these are the subsections "Fashioning the Body/Defining the Self," "Economics and Exchanges within Africa and Beyond" and "Moments of Transformation." This continues to suppose a simplistic view of Africa. Within each room, which represent a period in African history, there are large text posts that give a summary of that time.

These follow very closely with what Aimé Césaire describes as "the forgetting machine," as he refutes this exact tactic of historical sugar-coating. The exhibit deals directly with colonial eras and the art of those oppressed by them. This is an opportunity for highlighting these violent histories within the spaces that support the oppressors. It is important to use the platform of a museum for open dialogue and a movement toward taking responsibility as this is the least such institutions can do with the power they have. Césaire takes on these altered histories, stating "they talk to me about progress, about achievements, diseases cured, improved standards of living. I am talking about societies drained of their essence, cultures trampled underfoot, institutions undermined, lands confiscated, religions smashed, magnificent artistic creations destroyed, extraordinary possibilities wiped out."<sup>7</sup>

This aligns directly with contemporary museum practice which supports the colonizer's view of history. In 2015 the art museum at one of our country's more prestigious and influential

---

<sup>7</sup> Césaire, Aimé, and Robin D. G. Kelley. *Discourse on Colonialism*. New York: Monthly Review, 1972. p 43

schools uses coded language to gloss over the violence of colonial history. Again, this is a school with the financial means to do a lot with their facilities on campus, and radical changes there would permeate the academic world at large. Instead the Cantor art museum is reflective of a traditional westernized art museum.

Within the “1500-1950” room of the “Arts of Africa” exhibit they briefly mention colonialism. They describe it in this way, “During this time, African peoples experienced large scale foreign migration, interaction and political domination... European colonial control of African resources and labor also contributed to widespread cultural changes. These foreign encounters devastated many African peoples. However some gained power and wealth through new trade networks, religious institutions and political structures.”<sup>8</sup> This entire quote serves to disempower the artists displayed in this section.

Referring to a group of people that are connected only by their inhabitation on a common continent as ‘peoples’ essentializes and historicizes those humans. It is a condescending way to refer to a group of people, that both lumps them and infantilizes them. This refers back to the justificatory system of colonialism which is the degradation of the oppressed group’s humanity and dignity. The quote also deemphasizes the violence, acknowledging devastation but qualifying it with ‘however some gained power.’ This is dismissive of a huge portion of global history and continues to support a narrative of pro-European history.

Next to one of the pieces in the “4000 BCE- 1500 BCE” section there is a text post that elaborates on art history’s dismissal of African art on a large scale. It reads “the art history of sub-Saharan Africa only emerged as an academic discipline in the last quarter of the 20th

---

<sup>8</sup> Wall text, “Arts of Africa,” Cantor Museum Stanford University, Palo Alto California

century, Since most studies of African art has focused on objects from the colonial era, very little is known about ancient or vanished cultures and their art...What we do know about Ancient African arts can sometimes be enhanced by comparative studies of present day cultures living in the same regions.”<sup>9</sup> This goes back to Césaire’s point on the true effects of colonialism, of possibilities lost and art destroyed among both direct and unintentional side effects colonial destruction. Of course the museum misses the point about it being European domination that caused so much physical erasure of art as well as the racialized dismissal of non European histories.

The text post merely describes the rejection of an entire group of art while shifting blame away from themselves. They go on to reduce the diversity of modern African countries to a monolith, and aligning them with ancient civilizations. This is incredibly infantilizing and reductive. The museum has both misrepresented history as well as people in Africa today, not only maintaining a distorted ‘othering’ view of history but perpetuating this into contemporary understandings.

Césaire aptly states this tactic used by colonizers and now museums. He describes the European “view on ‘primitivism,’ their rigged investigations, their tedious speculations, their insistence on the marginal, ‘separate’ character of the non-whites, and although each of these gentlemen, in order to impugn on higher authority the weakness of primitive thought, claims that his own is based on firmest rationalism”<sup>10</sup> The text post cited above illustrates Césaire’s claim by simultaneously degrading and othering art from Africa while positioning the author as a

---

<sup>9</sup> Wall text, “Arts of Africa,” Cantor Museum Stanford University, Palo Alto California

<sup>10</sup> Césaire, Aimé, and Robin D. G. Kelley. *Discourse on Colonialism*. New York: Monthly Review, 1972. p 56

Western authority. This shifts the understanding of these omissions away from European invasion, control and domination to subtly blame Africa for its own exclusion. This separates and then creates a hierarchy wherein Europe (surprise) comes out on top.

Beyond these larger quotes that illustrate a European narrative of art history there is the pervasive denial of colonialism throughout the section. The first thing you read on the way in describes one of the organizing themes as “Economies and Exchanges Within Africa and Beyond.” This is code for colonialism. This relates directly to Césaire’s point on cultural exchange. He asks, “of all the ways of establishing contact, is this the best?”<sup>11</sup> This is one of the basic arguments *for* colonialism that Césaire brings in to refute. Colonialism was not mutually beneficial or sought, and to represent it in any other way is denial.

These rhetorical accompaniments to the viewing experience can provide much wanted insight into the pieces for viewers who don’t come to a museum with a definitive perspective on art. This is a great opportunity to take the viewer a step further. The Tacoma Art Museum actually utilizes this opportunity in their Haub collection exhibit. In contrast to all the other qualitative findings from my visits the text posts in the Haub proved to be the most productive critical use of the museum space. The accompanying posts actually critique and challenge the work it is next to.

The Haub wing at the Tacoma Art Museum was built to display a huge gift from the Haub family who have an extensive collection of western themed art. It consists of many buffalo and plains landscapes, with cowboys and native americans mixed in, the majority of which were done by white men. The portraits of the native americans are particularly essentialized to fit the

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibid p 33

white artist's perspective. The paintings are completely Europeanized, dressing chiefs in military gear in a profile shot akin to any Western portrait of important men. This assimilating portraiture is extensive within the collection, along with many fetishized, othering depictions of native americans. The text posts confront these representations in a great way. The museum extended a hand to local native american communities to ask for their opinion on the images in the exhibit and then posted the responses. Either way, it is still a Western institution exhibiting art representing native americans by white people which will always recall the racial violence of our country. They also tokenized the Native Americans they asked to comment on these representations from so long ago as well as from different tribes which are distinct culturally and linguistically. But the step towards some semblance of accountability and sharing the platform the museum space offers is progress. This shows the possibility of accompanying text and how it can frame the art completely differently, making a commentary on a problematic exhibit is a way to challenge the space while still using it.

### PART III

The curatorial work of the museum is what makes up the bulk of decision making surrounding the actual arrangement of art. A curator is in charge of the art's site specific presentation at a museum. They are the intention behind the relationships between the pieces and the narrative of a gallery and thus play a huge role in the ultimate understanding the museum visitor walks away with. This task of physically arranging art in space, creates meaning through associations between the pieces due to proximity. This supposes that the curator will be mindful of an artistic narrative and put together an exhibit that can be understood as a whole. Simply put,

that is the role of the curator, though many blur the line between artistic curation and historical preservation.

Although the Haub exhibit provides text to accompany the art that challenges the content, the narrative shaped by the curator is dominated by Eurocentrism. The portraits are the most obvious example of European aesthetics functioning as validation of the painting's subject. White artists, often from the East Coast, have represented a fetishized ideal of the 'Wild West.' The values of manifest destiny and white domination of the land are romanticized in the landscapes, cowboys and native american portraiture. The portraits of the native americans are all positioned within a white colonial gaze and rely on two main generalizations: the 'savage' and the assimilated. The 'savage' depictions reinforce the colonial justifications for their oppression of native people. In representing native americans as violent white settlers could affirm their superiority and justify their violence. Aimé Césaire describes this process of dehumanization stating that "colonization=thingification."<sup>12</sup>

The other generalized representation of native americans done by white artists is the 'civilized' assimilation portraiture which relies on European aesthetic traditions to validate the painting's subject. Many of the paintings within the Haub collection apply this method of representation to the native american subjects. These present a false respect for the subjects as they are being completely assimilated into European portraiture, painting them as Roman generals. One such portrait of a native american man is actually placed next to a portrait of George Washington, both rendered in the same profile, same composition, same oil painting in gilded frame. This attempts to neutralize the political and social upheavals that contextualize the

---

<sup>12</sup> Césaire, Aimé, and Robin D. G. Kelley. *Discourse on Colonialism*. New York: Monthly Review, 1972. p 42

relations between these paintings, of a white man, in particular an American general and president, and a native American man who has been on the receiving end of white colonial violence. To juxtapose these two paintings on one wall, clearly making a connection between them, is to reinforce both the literal violence of assimilation and the subsequent white washing of that history.

The TAM only has a family's collection to choose from, but once you've agreed to take on such sensitive material there must be curations that hyperbolically emphasizes its problems through the curation, not just the text posts. This could have been achieved through different grouping choices within the exhibit. The rooms are organized largely by time period and style, with a large collection of bronze sculptures in the entrance hall with the paintings in the following rooms. The overall curation of the native American portraits followed the sanitized historical route that I describe specifically above. Instead of sprinkling them throughout the exhibit there could be a pointed grouping of either the 'savage' or 'assimilated' essentialized portraits with an explanation of the positionality of the white artists to their subject matter, and to history. This could be an unavoidable visual meta critique as it is placed within the western institution of the museum. The only way to frame this material without reinforcing its inherent problems is to highlight them for every viewer, not just those that read all of the text posts.

The Cantor Museum also makes essentializing curatorial decisions. Again the "Arts of Africa" section reveals the extreme 'othering' symptomatic of a colonial perspective. Most striking is the combination of art within a given section. In one room there was both contemporary (early 2000's) photography from Ethiopia and jewelry found in South Africa from 200-400 CE. This decision implies a meaningful connection between these two works of art. But

the only narrative in place is a reduction of an entire continent to a small selection of art. Curating work through their common association with the African continent implies that there is an African 'essence' that can be communicated. This method of association that crosses temporal and spatial boundaries affirms the colonial constructed hierarchy through this vast reduction of Africa. It also affirms the 'success' of colonialism in that the exhibit is constructed as a completed history, that "Arts of Africa" is a totality that can be encapsulated and displayed in such a way. In relying on essentialized definitions of people and space without acknowledgment of violent histories is further harm to those groups, and maintains a colonial perspective.

## CONCLUSION

My paper has worked through the museum experience alongside Aimé Césaire's ideas on colonial mentalities, which I have identified as a colonial ideology. In these three ways, the architecture, the rhetoric of accompanying text, and the curation, the museum applies a procedure of colonization to the world's art and artists. They systematically dehumanize and reduce art and artists from Asia, Africa and the Americas. This is the majority of the human population, and their art is relegated to the periphery of the 'art world.' In conjunction with this deconstruction of artistic value is the affirmation of European superiority, which is the justificatory perspective for settler colonialism. The art museum reinforces this through their privileging of Euro-American art across the board, both in architectural and curatorial decisions, and more generally in the museum's embrace and construction of the canon. I wanted to conclude with something productive as I have spent this whole paper critiquing and deconstructing. I have not offered any grand solutions for the museum but I have come up with a

list of questions that can guide any museum visitor to critically examine their experience. This is a way to frame the museum as it exists now, as significant ideological change will not be swift.

- How does the admission cost limit entry? Is there a student/senior discount? How accessible is membership?
- Who is funding the museum, who is funding specific exhibits?
- What is in the gift shop?
- How does the architecture (internal/external) shape our interaction with the art itself?
- Who is being represented, and by whom?
- What connections can be made between works in a given exhibit? Who made these decisions about their physical placement?
- More broadly, how did the art end up here? Is it on loan from another institution? An acquisition? A gift?
- How does the accompanying text frame the art/artists? Is it complimentary? Reductive? Condescending?

Equipped with this list, any viewer can turn a museum visit into a critical reflection on institutional control of art, rather than being only disempowered by the experience. This is what we can hope to achieve immediately while we put energy towards dismantling these institutions and de-colonizing our understanding of art in the long run.

- Bierman, Irene A. *Napoleon in Egypt*. Reading, UK: Ithaca, 2003. Print.
- Césaire, Aimé. *Discourse on Colonialism*. New York: MR, 1972. Print.
- Duncan, Carol. *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums*. London: Routledge, 1995. Print.
- Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove, 1965. Print.
- Haladyn, Julian J. "Formations of 'Indian' Fantasies: European Museums and the Decontextualization of Native American Art and Artifacts." *Visual Representations of Native Americans: Transnational Contexts and Perspectives*. By Miriam Jordan. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2012. 179-93. Print.
- McEvilley, Thomas. "Doctor, Lawyer, Indian Chief: Primitivism in Twentieth-Century Art at the Museum of Modern Art." *Artforum* 23 (1984): 54-61.
- McMaster, Gerald. "Museums and the Native Voice." *Museums After Modernism: Strategies of Engagement*. Ed. Griselda Pollock and Joyce Zemans. Oxford: Blackwell, 2007. 70-79.
- Memmi, Albert. *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. New York: Orion, 1965. Print.
- Philips, Ruth B. "A Proper Place for Art or the Proper Arts of Place? Native North American Objects and the Hierarchies of Art, Craft, and Souvenir." *On Aboriginal Representation in the Gallery*. Ed. Lynda Jessup. Hull: Canadian Museum of Civilization, 2002. 45-72.
- Preziosi, Donald. "Brain of the Earth's Body: Art Museums, and the Phantasms of Modernity." *Minnesota: U of Minnesota P*, 2003.
- Quynn, Dorothy Mackay. "The Art Confiscations of the Napoleonic Wars." *The American Historical Review* 50.3 (1945): 437. Web.
- Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage, 1979. Print.
- Smith, Andrea. "Heteropatriarchy and the Three Pillars of White Supremacy." *Color of Violence: The Incite! Anthology*. Cambridge, MA: South End, 2006. Print.
- Simpson, Moira G. *Making Representations: Museums in the Post-colonial Era*. London: Routledge, 1996. Print.
- Zolberg, Vera, and Shelly Errington. "The Death of Authentic Primitive Art and Other Tales of Progress." *Contemporary Sociology* 29.2 (2000): 391. Web.