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**Introduction**

Museums have always been entangled with the practices of ‘traveling cultures’ and ‘contact zones’ (Clifford, 1997) as places and spaces of encounter, translation and dialogue. ‘Cosmopolitanised’ (Beck, 2006) contacts, which include but cannot be exclusively reduced to colonial encounters, have shaped the cultural institution ‘museum’ that inherently depends on the contextualisation, de-contextualisation and re-contextualisation of cultures, people and objects through different forms of travel and cross-cultural engagements. If one considers the complex processes of both muselogical production and experience, then there does not exist an exclusively national museum but instead a particular national *place* that is simultaneously enmeshed in the dynamics of a global discursive *space*. Even the most uneven distribution of colonisation and globalisation cannot thereby produce a totalising prescription for the dynamic interaction and transfer between cultural worlds of meaning. Travel and museums, as interrelated fields of human action, produce arenas which host the clash of cultures. ‘Contact approaches’, which James Clifford (1997) borrows from Mary Louise Pratt (1991), epitomise a promising analytic perspective on this complex collision of cultural worlds. Consequently, the conceptual understanding of museums as ‘contact zones’ has been widely appropriated in the museum literature and beyond. But the discussion lacks ethnographic insights into actual experiences: What does ‘contact’ *mean* for the person experiencing it? How is it *lived, negotiated* and *contested*?

Drawing on a long-term narrative study of global visitors from Australia, Canada and the USA to the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa (Te Papa), I address these crucial questions by considering the ‘contact zone’ as an *experience* by museum visitors. All ‘global visitors’ are linked to geographical *places*, such as Australia, Canada and the USA, but simultaneously face the ‘cosmopolitanised’ dynamics of discursive *spaces*. In other words, all
participants encounter global experiences beyond the boundaries of their national origin when entering cross-cultural arenas such as museums, in this case entangling the Americas and the South Pacific in a common interpretive space. By humanizing the ‘contact zone’ through interpretive actions, movements and performances made by museum visitors, or cultural actors, I am able to open a hermeneutic terrain of cultural negotiation and contestation. This paves the way to understanding how different subjects or human actors engage in the process of cultural world-making, a process, which, I argue, always starts with an act of interpretation (Schorch, 2010, 2013). While institutional and structural critiques certainly deserve their role in academic investigations, it is important to keep in mind that, in Clifford’s (1997: 198) words, ‘a wholly appropriate emphasis on coercion, exploitation, and miscomprehension does not, however, exhaust the complexities of travel and encounter’. This paper addresses this complexity through an in-depth and long-term understanding of the visitor’s museum experience without, however, neglecting the interrelated dynamics of museological production and representation.

I approach travel as a particular cultural practice and medium for the dynamic interaction and transfer between cultural worlds of meaning (Bauerkaemper, Boedeker, & Struck, 2004; Boomers, 2004; Dworschak, 1994). My perspective is aided by the etymology of the adjective bewandert in the German language. Today, this word is a synonym for ‘educated’ or ‘knowledgeable’ while in texts of the 15th century it would have meant ‘well traveled’ (Bauerkaemper, et al., 2004). I set out from the view that ‘culture’ represents the ‘webs of significance’ (Geertz, 1973) manoeuvring a ‘contingent scheme of meaning’ (Ong, 1999, p. 243), which is constantly constructed, deconstructed and reconstructed through cultural practices by cultural actors. Accordingly, it requires hermeneutic explorations of traveling as interpretive engagement and discursive negotiation in order to elucidate travel experiences
that have been mostly ignored in tourism research (Bruner, 1995; Crick, 1995). This facilitates the analytical move beyond the economically determined terminology of ‘production’ and ‘consumption’ (Ateljevic, 2000), which renders the ‘most ineffable of cultural phenomenon – experience’ (Healy & Witcomb, 2006, p. 1.4.) as purely economic and forecloses the more nuanced picture I intend to draw.

The case study for my argument is the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa (Te Papa) and its bicultural policies, practices and programmes. Surveying Te Papa’s bicultural experiment in detail is clearly beyond the scope of this paper. It is worth highlighting however, that, given the complexity of human affairs, ‘biculturalism’ has never been a linear, one-dimensional and superimposed ideology by the state, but is instead the dynamic outcome of the ‘war of position’ in the fluid, ambiguous and indeterminate spaces that Homi Bhabha (1994) calls the ‘in-between’. Conal McCarthy (2007, 2011) for example, has shown how the remarkable encounter of Māori and Europeans unfolded throughout the colonial cultures of display in museums, ultimately leading to Māori control and ownership of Māori collections and exhibitions. Today, Te Papa is committed to developing as a bicultural organization based on the principle of partnership enshrined in the Treaty of Waitangi, signed in 1840 between the British Crown and Māori. The Treaty is widely regarded as the founding document of Aotearoa New Zealand; and after decades of negligence it has gained constitution-like status in recent years. Concrete policies and practices such as Mana Taonga and Mātauranga Māori ensure Māori participation and involvement in the museum (Hakiwai, 2006; Schorch & Hakiwai, forthcoming 2013; Smith, 2006).
The theoretical framework

Clifford’s (1997) ‘contact zone’ concludes with the problem of ‘translation’. This is a problem that Bhabha (1994: 1) had already theorized as ‘moments’ or ‘processes’ in the ‘articulation of cultural differences’, which can be used to provide a distinctive and particularly useful perspective on ‘cultural action’ (Clifford, 1997), paving the way from the physical place of encounter to the discursive space of dialogue. Bhabha’s (1994: 2) work expands on the border experience, the ‘liminal space’, and illuminates the ‘interstices - the overlap and displacement of domains of difference’ which are further magnified in the ‘cosmopolitanized’ (Beck, 2006) life world of our time. By offering ‘cultural difference as an enunciative category’, Bhabha (1994: 60) opens a hermeneutic terrain of cultural negotiation and contestation without resorting to the last bastion of binary oppositions, which are produced by the inherently essentializing concept of ‘a culture’. This throws open the door to cultural world-making, a process which always begins with an act of interpretation. With the help of Bhabha then, I can lay the theoretical foundation for the empirical exploration of ‘cultural action’ as ‘interpretive contests’ (Said, 2003) and their ‘articulation’ or ‘enunciation’ in ‘contact zones’:

The pact of interpretation is never simply an act of communication between the I and the You designated in the statement. The production of meaning requires that these two places be mobilised in the passage through a Third Space. (Bhabha, 1994: 36)

The intervention of the ‘Third Space’, Bhabha (1994: 37) continues, ‘makes the structure of meaning and reference an ambivalent process’, which echoes the hermeneutic phenomenon of ‘polysemy’ (Ricoeur, 1981) and exposes any claim of cultural purity as an impossibility even before unearthing empirical evidence. Consequently, ‘the meaning and symbols of culture have no primordial unity or fixity’ (Bhabha, 1994: 37). Bhabha (1994: 37) further argues that ‘even the same signs can be appropriated, translated, rehistoricized and read
anew’. In other words, there is no *a priori* in the ‘mind-constructed world’ (Dilthey, 1976) apart from the mind itself. Further inspecting the dialogical ‘processes’, Bhabha (1994: 228) concludes that the ‘moment’ of ‘translation’ is the ‘movement of meaning’. But how can we ethnographically dissect the ‘processes’ in the ‘articulation of cultural differences’?

**Methodological framework**

I argue for a narrative construction of meaning and Self through discursive actions, movements and performances (Schorch, forthcoming 2014). Consequently, the research informing this article required hermeneutics as methodological tool and interpretation as its analytical method. By employing narrative hermeneutics, I shed light on the dynamic interrelation and interdependence of ‘action’, ‘narrative’, ‘meaning’ and ‘Self’ while humanizing Te Papa as a ‘contact zone’ through ethnographic research on global visitors and their acts of interpretation (Schorch, 2010, 2013).

A narrative hermeneutics allows us to investigate the relationship between the psychic and the social as mutually constitutive dimensions of any interpretive performance (Redman, 2005). By illuminating these ‘spiralling exchanges’ and their ‘inescapable hybridity’ (Redman, 2005), I argue that without using formalist and deterministic reductions we can find answers to the open question ‘why it is that certain individuals occupy some subject positions rather than others’ (Hall, 1996: 10). I concur with Stuart Hall (1996: 14) who stresses the remaining ‘requirement to think this relation of subject to discursive formations as an articulation’, or more specifically a narrative articulation. Such processual understanding of discursive engagements shifts the analytical focus from identities as essential traits to ‘identifications’ as positional and strategic performances (Hall, 1996).
In this study, I explored the heterogeneous ‘articulations’ and ‘identifications’ expressed through the ‘narrative negotiation’ and ‘performative construction’ of Self (Kraus, 2006). This enabled me to humanize abstract totalities such as ‘culture’ and ‘identity’ to ‘encounter humanity face to face’ avoiding the danger that ‘living detail is drowned in dead stereotype’ (Geertz, 1973: 53, 51). Having translated the theoretical into a methodological framework, I continue my argument with the ethnographic findings in the following section.

**Cross-cultural journeys: Bicultural meanings**

I set out to explore the processes of meaning-making, the ‘growth of meaning’ (Johnson, 2007) and ‘development of understanding’ (Ricoeur, 1981) during cross-cultural encounters. I turn to Julia, a New Zealand born Australian, to begin my exploration of the interpretive processes and moments of cultural world-making throughout the informants’ cross-cultural journeys:

*I loved the Māori side of it and it’s wonderful to see that strength there. I mean I look at the Aborigines in Australia and it's a totally different culture, you can’t compare that, but I think the Māori are in a lot better position as a race in New Zealand than the Aborigines are over there. And I think, yeah Australia has got a lot of work to do really in that regard... And I loved the modern side of it as well, like the meeting house down there with all the pretty colors in it and made not out of traditional wood, that was just beautiful. Because to me that shows more integration, it’s showing New Zealand as being an integrated country, like we are not talking Māori and Pakeha, we are talking about Kiwis or New Zealanders, which is really good too... It was good to see that side of it, but that didn’t dominate. It’s a small part of this museum and this is giving it a more, I don’t know, inclusive feel.*

Julia, like any human being, cannot help but place her cultural experience in a context informed by her own discursive environment, the ‘reader’s world’ (Bauman, 1978).

Consequently, the perceived integration of Māori and European in New Zealand is related to the apparently worse position of the Aboriginal population in Australia. The fact that Julia, as a New Zealand born Australian, is intimately familiar with the socio-cultural situations in both countries attests to the phenomenon of ‘traveling cultures’ in a ‘cosmopolitanised’ world
which goes far beyond the travel encounters interrogated in this study and undermines the imaginary purity of any cultural ‘reader’s world’. While global touristic travel provides the platform for the examination of cross-cultural journeys in this paper, it is essential that one does not lose sight of the diverse forms of travel such as migration, study and work, which combine even within one individual biography. It follows that Julia’s travel and museum experience is no cosmopolitan refashioning of an elitist cultural capital, as the standard over-determined analysis suggests (Bennett, 2006), but the hermeneutic extension of a profoundly ‘cosmopolitanised’ life. Importantly, Julia highlights the advance of the emotive dimension into the cultural domain manifesting itself as an “inclusive feel” (Schorch, 2012).

By following the thoughts of Bruce from the USA, we can return to the ‘reader’s world’ as the point of origin for the making of bicultural meanings:

*When we were sort of booking out our tour around New Zealand, one of the things they did ask us was whether we wanted to do a lot of Māori culture things. Originally our reaction was sort of like no because I think it’s based on our experience with native culture in the United States. That sort of indigenous culture stuff you get in the United States is very contrived and kind of hokey. And there is a little bit of feel of imperialism to it that you sort of…you are looking at this culture not as being immersed in it or really trying to understand it, but you are looking at it as being the outsider and ‘look isn’t that cute’. You are not; it makes you feel bad about it is the easy way of saying it.*

In Bruce’s case, the discursive foundation of his interpretive community, the ‘reader’s world’, not only affects but prevents the engagement with the cultural Other. Remarkably, Bruce did not relate to any cultural aspect in the initial interview I conducted with him about his visit to Te Papa. It was only after I asked him how he experienced New Zealand’s cultures at the museum in the second stage of the narrative interview (Wengraf, 2001) that he started elaborating on this point in the form of a ‘suspicious hermeneutics’ (Crossley, 2004) fuelled by the “experience with native culture in the United States”.

8
From bicultural meanings to cross-cultural dialogue

We accompany Bruce as he reflects on his visit to Te Papa and discover an interpretive pathway which transforms a ‘contact zone’ into a dialogical ‘Third Space’. Bruce undertakes the journey from bicultural meanings to cross-cultural dialogue:

One of the cool things was that according to the tour guide it was basically presented by the Māori not by, you know, a bunch of white guys saying what we present of the Māori, which made a lot more tellable and believable and didn’t have this sort of stench of imperialism on it. So it made it a lot easier to sort of, because if somebody is telling about themselves rather than somebody telling about somebody else, we call that hear-say in the law.

Mediated by the tour host, Bruce dares to engage with another world after his initial reluctance. He appreciates the self-representation of the cultural Other, which enables him to overcome the “feel of imperialism”. Now he is “not looking at” the Other but is “immersed” in dialogue facilitating “understand[ing]” and dissolving the “bad…feel[ing]” of being an “outsider”. This is the ‘moment’ or ‘process’ which translates a ‘contact zone’ into ‘the production of meaning’. As discussed before, this ‘requires that these two places…the I and the You…be mobilized in the passage through a Third Space’ (Bhabha, 1994: 36), such that the ‘pact of interpretation’ or ‘fusion of horizons’ (Gadamer in Ricoeur, 1991) occurs through museological self-representation.

Bruce continues:

There is some sort of indefinable hokeyness that in my experience tends to find its way or can find its way into presentations of non-dominant cultures or any culture really. I mean a non-present culture I guess is what I am talking about. I didn’t get the same idea or the same response here. And I don’t know whether that is just because the Māori culture is more alive right now than say the Native American cultures in the United States, and still practicing Māori are involved in it?! Whereas in the United States there is not really, and I may be completely incorrect on this, but the sort of cultural understanding, the conventional wisdom is there is no real Native American culture left. It’s more or less been subsumed into the American culture.
It is clear that the ‘reader’s world’, in this case the indigenous/non-indigenous discourses in the USA, frame both meaning and dialogue. However, far from being over-determined Bruce engages reflectively and critically with the Self through the Other and admits that “he may be completely incorrect” with his version of “cultural understanding” or “conventional wisdom”. In fact, it is the very mission of the National Museum of the American Indian to contest and revise this ‘doxic belief’ (Ricoeur, 1992) by simply and purely stating: ‘we are alive’.

Strikingly, Bruce departs from the specificity of the situation to assume a wider moral stance. He talks about “non-present cultures” in general and links their alien representation to the “hear-say” concept “in the law”, his own professional field. The multi-facetedness of the story shows, in Lee Davidson’s (2006: 165) words, how ‘narrative, identity and morality are irretrievably intertwined: without one another, they wither and die’.

Cross-cultural hermeneutics: the shifting Self

Andrew from Canada offers more insights into the interpretive dynamics and hermeneutic negotiations between Self and Other within the discursive museum space:

I think it was a significant part of the museum to me. I guess I have the Canadian definition of the Māori house, the greeting house, the house with all the hand-carved work around it. That was very, very impressive. I sort of equated it to the long house of the Iroquois in Canada. So I make the comparison between the two indigenous cultures.

As Andrew proceeds we see how his Canadian Self shifts from the Indigenous to the Scottish inclusion through the experience of the New Zealand Other within the wider context of ‘traveling cultures’:

We were also very interested however in the section about the Scottish settlers right now. Again I can draw the connection because my family being from Scotland coming to Canada in the early 1800s. And stories were quite similar to what was recounted there...the similarities between the Scottish settlements in Canada and the Scottish settlements here is just amazing. I think there are probably more Scots spread around the world than there are left in Scotland now... and it’s something that
people are trying to keep their heritage alive I guess. And I just found it really interesting, the same things happen here that happen at home.

Andrew carries on by shifting the cultural Self/Other encounter to a personal and professional level:

I am a former politician so I am really interested in anything political. And gatherings of people from different places with tribal structures are a very political meeting. So I just found that fascinating and the fact that it’s still used for greeting visitors and used for important ceremonies, like the tour guide had mentioned funerals and weddings had been held there, and that’s very sentimental and meant a lot just to see that.

While describing his experience of a traditional marae (or Māori ceremonial space) he now shifts his Self back to the cultural and equates himself with the Aboriginal Other within the Canadian “we”:

And I guess I am fairly interested in our own Aboriginal culture at home. And we, the Aboriginals in Canada would carve in cedar and we’ve got very few examples that have survived as well as that one.

The sense of the Canadian “we” is realigned through contrasting himself with the Aboriginal Other within the Canadian Self. This happens again through the experience of the New Zealand Other which leads to a cosmopolitan conclusion:

I noticed you have a similar problem here that we have at home, and that’s the number of Aboriginal land claims. A lot of Aboriginals here are claiming they were taken advantage of during the Treaty process and we have still got legal challenges going on. And I am not sure if the tour guide carries a prejudice into it, I don’t know, but it would have appeared to me from his explanations to us is that New Zealand is somewhat ahead of Canada in resolving these issues. And I just found it very interesting to know there was a similar concern going on in both parts of the world.

Andrew’s cross-cultural journey is characterized not only by the opening towards the Other but by a shifting sense of Self. The ‘cosmopolitanized’ condition of our time forces and enables Julia “seeing it and being here through Australian eyes…instead of Kiwi eyes”. It causes Michelle to identify as both Armenian and American and leads to Andrew’s ‘multiple loyalties’ (Beck, 2006), the shifting Self which corresponds to an endemic relativity of otherness.
In the process, the contemporaneous presence of commonalities and differences creates a shared ‘cosmopolitanized’ terrain which represents the ‘common sphere’ needed to transform cross-cultural dialogue into potential understandings. Most importantly, such a vein of thought converts the ‘neither/nor’ predicament of a ‘hybrid Third Space’ (Bhabha, 1994) into a ‘both/and’ outlook of what I term a pluralist cosmopolitan space. The former simultaneously contests and perpetuates the either/or logic of binary oppositions while the latter builds a shared framework for multiple identifications.

Conclusion

The respondents’ interpretive voyage led to a cross-cultural hermeneutics embodied by Julia’s comment that “it is interesting seeing it and being here through Australian eyes...now instead of Kiwi eyes”. The research findings, which I could only touch on in this paper, supported my argument that cross-cultural dialogue was processed not only through the opening towards the Other but through the interpretive ontological endeavour of what I termed the shifting Self. Importantly, the associated multiple identifications emphasized the relativity of otherness and shaped what I called a pluralist cosmopolitan space. This discursive terrain represents the ‘common sphere’ that potentially transforms cross-cultural translation and dialogue into understandings. Its frame of reference is characterised by the simultaneous presence of a ‘cosmopolitanized’ horizon and the humanization of culture through ‘stories’ and ‘faces’.

I argue that the conceptual understanding of the shifting Self offers the clearest mirror of contemporary identity formations. In a ‘cosmopolitanised’ world, identities in their ethnographic sense are neither purely essential and coherent nor completely fragmented and fluid, as the dualistically opposed modern and postmodern perspectives claim. The
inescapable mixing of ‘traveling cultures’ requires us to shift between discursive positions, a simultaneously transient and continuous task. This interpretive ontological endeavour finds its expression in a ‘situational localisation’ (Boomers, 2004) of the Self. In other words, Self and Other, us and them, are articulated from a certain perspective until changing situations and circumstances provoke new ‘moments’ and ‘processes’ of selfing and othering. To put it succinctly, the sense of Self is at once both coherent and fluid – it is shifting.

These theoretical propositions gained through ethnographic examinations compensate for a deficiency in Clifford’s notion of ‘contact zones’. Although Clifford (1988, 1997) refers to contemporary and historical cosmopolitan experiences, his unconditional defence of cultural relativism and scepticism towards ‘cosmopolitan essences’ and ‘universal values’ fails to provide ‘contact zones’ with a shared symbolic terrain which can convert translations into understandings. In contrast, Anthony Appiah (2006) instead points out that one of the greatest achievements of anthropology itself is the awareness that we can make sense of each other. Given the ‘cosmopolitanized’ world of the twenty-first century, ‘contact zones’ are inevitably embedded in such contexts. Although all informants of this study are linked to a national place, they inescapably become part of the discursive dynamics of a pluralist cosmopolitan space. This is not to be misunderstood as some artificial ‘cosmopolitan essence’ or ‘universal value’, but should be seen as a common framework in which the ‘inescapable hermeneutic complexity in moral and political affairs’ (Held, 2008, p. 161) can be contested.
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