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CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION

1.1 Motivation and Research Questions

Museums owe their existence to their collections. As places of education, preservation, and conservation, they play an important role in communities across the world by offering exhibitions and enabling research with their collections. Museums are thus custodians of culture and history, holding great responsibility in how the past is interpreted and understood. Ethnography museums in particular hold great accountability for the people and cultures they represent. This thesis will explore the history of how one ethnography museum endeavoured to represent a number of Brazilian cultural groups through exhibitions.

Vienna’s Weltmuseum is a renowned ethnography museum housing thousands of objects which have been amassed over its long and somewhat meandering history. At present the museum has collections from North, Central, and South America, Oceania and Australia, North Africa, the Middle East, Central Asia and Siberia, Sub-Saharan Africa, South-East Asia, East Asia, South Asia and the Himalayas as well as a photo collection and a comprehensive museum library. This thesis will concentrate on the exhibition history of one collection in particular, the Brazilian collection, which is part of the museum’s larger South American department.

This research project is motivated by a general interest in collections management and curatorial practices. I chose the Weltmuseum’s Brazilian collection for this project specifically because of its rarity, importance, and fascinating history. The assemblage of artefacts, some dating to the seventeenth century, has been well preserved making it highly valuable to both the indigenous people of Brazil as well as to Austrian history in general. It is my hope that the findings generated by this research project will increase awareness about the collection as well as the curatorial decisions which are generally made in relation to exhibitions. With my research, I also hope to encourage accessibility and expand awareness concerning the unexhibited materials in the collection for stakeholders, researchers and the general public. Though the findings from this project are most useful to the Weltmuseum and its curators, it raises important questions concerning curatorial practices which can be applied in any museum context. The evaluation of data
from the collection in such a way encourages the necessary self-reflection needed to develop and improve curatorial, exhibition and collections management practices.

Concretely, by using the Brazilian collection as a case-study, this thesis will attempt to answer the following research questions. How has the Weltmuseum Wien’s Brazilian collection been displayed in the past? How is it currently displayed, both in the museum’s permanent exhibit as well as in loaned contexts in other institutions? What parts of the collection have been exhibited most frequently and which pieces have rarely or never been exhibited? What are the possible reasons for, and consequences of, these curatorial choices?

In order to contextualize my research among similar studies in the field, I searched for literature which described collection biographies and included the exhibition history of these assemblages. Few research projects seem to have done a comprehensive analysis of the exhibition or curatorial histories of a single museum collection. Occasionally this information is already known to the museums themselves thanks to a well-organized and updated database. The Weltmuseum’s own database however did not include loan or exhibition data from before 2000. In other words, they have not added archival material to the digital database. Their digital records therefore only contain information the year 2000 onwards. The research I have conducted and the spreadsheet I have compiled will therefore be useful for the Weltmuseum to update their digital database. As is often the case in museums, priorities and resources likely limited their abilities to conduct a time consuming and comprehensive study such as this. By searching through their entire loan records, I was able to identify and list the majority of the outgoing loans for the Brazilian collection. This is only a small part of the total information found in those documents. Their complete digitization would require hours of work, beyond the possibilities of this academic study. Although the timeline for this research project only allowed me to look at the Brazilian collection, this information will nevertheless be useful for understanding the past movements of this collection in particular and the general loan practices of the museum over time. I have presented the data in the form of an Excel spreadsheet, where each accession number is marked with an ‘x’ for every exhibit
where it was displayed. This format makes it easily adaptable and interpretable. It is also the first comprehensive inventory number list which includes the archival loan material, exhibition catalogue data and existing database information in a single document. If curators or researchers wished to use this information for other purposes or to develop my analysis further, this spreadsheet format would enable such work. It would also be possible for the curator or an assistant to add the information to the museum’s database to develop their existing knowledge for each object. Furthermore, the conclusions and information which can be drawn from the data I accumulated will be useful to both the museum and the collection’s current and future curators. Some of the trends which emerged were expected but having concrete numbers as a reference and the new information which was created through this project is valuable. While looking through the archives it also became apparent that some documents were missing, those from the period 1992 to 1993 in particular. I brought this to the attention of Claudia Augustat who alerted her colleagues in the archival department. They may have been unaware of their misplacement and can now begin to attempt to locate the missing documents. It is therefore my hope that this research will be beneficial to the museum and their records as well as to similar collection biographies in the field of museum studies.

1.2 Sources and Methodology

In order to answer these questions, I initially concentrated on the use of specialized literature to contextualize my research and to gather the appropriate background knowledge needed to understand the collection’s biography. This was followed by extensive research of the museum’s loan records, the investigation of past exhibit catalogues, as well as the inclusion of the exhibition histories currently recorded in the Weltmuseum’s database.

1.2.1 Data Collection

In order to collect my data in a useful and presentable manner, I created a detailed excel spreadsheet (see Appendix). The first column was for the object’s accession number, to allow any future cross-referencing of the data to other sources.
managed by the museum. The following 21 columns listed the exhibits which were identified through my research of the various sources. An ‘X’ was marked in each exhibition column where the accessioned object had been displayed. To more readily rank their display frequency, this was followed by a column calculating the total count of the exhibits where the object had been displayed. The following 5 columns included a field to record any cancelled exhibits, a description, the cultural group from where the object originated, the collectors and finally a space for additional notes. This format allowed me to systematically record and compare my data. Drop-down filter menus helped me to organize the information, in ascending order of display frequency for instance. Once all of the data sources had been reviewed and the information recorded in this spreadsheet, I was able to generate tables, graphs and statistics. From these findings, conclusions could be drawn, transforming data into information and understanding.

1.2.2 Loan Records

Since the museum’s current database only includes outgoing loans from after the year 2000, it was necessary to investigate the museum’s past loan contracts in order to get a more extensive view of the historical loans from the Brazilian collection. Currently, the loan documents are kept together in paper files and organized in boxes based on general date ranges of a few years. The earliest documents dated to the late nineteenth century, and the earliest loan of an object now belonging to the Brazilian collection was recorded in 1932. Many of the older documents were particularly challenging to read as they were handwritten. It was also often the case that these older documents did not include accession numbers, and instead they only offered a brief description. Unfortunately, this made it practically impossible to match these records to objects in the collection. Some of the loan contracts were short and only included a few items, while others were lengthy and listed dozens of inventory numbers. These records included the outgoing loans for the objects from the museum’s entire collections. A detailed and systematic search therefore had to be carried out in order to identify and record only the Brazilian objects which were being loaned. The inventory numbers, object description, exhibition, date and receiving museum were recorded in a separate Excel spreadsheet, which was then incorporated into the main
spreadsheet format. Any additional information was recorded when available, such as the exhibition title and the return date of the loaned items.

1.2.3 Museum Catalogues

The Weltmuseum’s library contains all the exhibition catalogues which were made for exhibits organized by the museum. These were useful sources of information about the display history of objects in the museum’s own exhibitions from before the year 2000. A list of exhibitions held by the museum from 1978 to 2012 was recorded in an edited volume produced by the museum (Bussel and Kaufmann 2013). This was helpful to identify previous exhibits which may have displayed Brazilian objects. The catalogues were then found in the Weltmuseum’s library and searched for objects from the Brazilian collection. Some of the identified catalogues listed all of the objects which were on exhibition. In such cases, adding the accession numbers and other information to my spreadsheet was straightforward. Not all of the catalogues however contained such a list. Instead, they only listed the objects depicted in the catalogue. These accession numbers were recorded though the complete overview of the exhibition was not comprehensively represented in my spreadsheet. This bias may have also influenced my findings, as the object images in the catalogues are more likely to be the highlights of the exhibition.

1.2.4 The Museum’s Database

My final source of information concerning the display of objects from the Brazilian collection was the Weltmuseum’s database. Currently, exhibition data is only recorded since the year 2000. The exceptions being 83 entries for the Kaiserhaus exhibition held at Ungarngasse from 1837 – 1840 and 10 objects recorded as having been exhibited in 1992 at the exhibit America. Bride of the Sun held at the Royal Museum of Fine Arts Antwerp. This is a significant addition to the database, as the loan contracts from the years 1992 – 1993 are missing from the museum’s records. Claudia Augustat kindly provided me with a list of all the objects which are recorded in the database as having been exhibited. A meticulous
A review of this list was carried out in order to transfer the information into my spreadsheet.

1.2.5 Limitations of my Research

Whilst conducting my research I was faced with a number of challenges which limited the scope of this thesis. One of the main difficulties I faced was having to work in accordance with current restrictions in place to prevent further spread of COVID-19. This meant that I was only able to travel to Vienna once. I therefore had to make use of the museum’s resources as best I could and carry out my data collection during a two-week time frame in January 2021. Only minor additional clarifications and information could be requested from the curator and librarians once I was back in the Netherlands.

Another notable limitation to my research was the incomplete dataset. Although the information I have gathered is extensive enough to identify general trends and draw conclusions, it is nevertheless incomplete. Aside from the strict time restriction, this was partially due to poor or lacking documentation of display histories. Furthermore, the many sources of data (loan records, catalogues, database) likely mean that some of the exhibited objects were not identified and recorded, despite my thorough search. Having only learnt German in a modern context, reading older handwritten German notes in formal script was challenging, though I believe it did not limit the results of this thesis. Finally, I was not personally allowed to access the museum’s database. This meant that any information needed from there had to be indirectly provided by Claudia Augustat. Although she was helpful and willing to provide the necessary information, it meant an extra time-consuming step in my data collection process.

1.3 Structure of the Thesis

In order to answer the research questions, this thesis is structured in a way which provides context to the research, presents and analyses the data and situates it among the larger debates in the field. Chapter two will look extensively at the evolution of the Weltmuseum, from its imperial roots to the renowned institution
it is today. An overview of the main collectors responsible for the accumulation of materials which now belong to the Brazilian collection will be given. This information is important to understand the historical and societal context as well as the motivation behind the collection practices which formed the basis of the current collection. Chapter three of this thesis will consider the history of exhibition strategies and the development of curatorial practices. In order to understand the loan patterns of the Weltmuseum in particular, the history of loaning will be looked at to assess their general practices. These inferences will be drawn in relation to the information gathered when working with the Weltmuseum’s loan records, exhibition catalogues and museum database. Chapter three is essential for understanding the context of the display data which I was able to accumulate. This chapter will then present the data which was gathered throughout this research project. The statistics which can be calculated based on the compiled data will be described. This data will support my arguments in relation to the patterns which emerge. Quantitative analyses and conclusions will be drawn based on these general trends. The following section, chapter four, will take an in-depth look at some of the collection’s most exhibited objects. Their identification was made possible thanks to the compiled data. These objects are two anchor-shaped axes, two masked costumes, a child carrying strap, a feathered skirt and a ritual tool. Consideration will be given as to why they have been exhibited the most often and what this entails for the narratives they create. While at the Weltmuseum in Vienna, I was fortunate enough to conduct an informal interview with Claudia Augustat. She also kindly walked me through the current permanent exhibition *An Austrian Mosaic of Brazil*. The most interesting points from these discussions will be presented in chapter five, in relation to current ethnographic curatorial and exhibition practices. Chapter six, the final chapter, will draw conclusions and present discussion points in relation to my research. Reflections will be made as to how this research may influence and contribute to work in the field of museum studies in general and collections management and curation in particular.
CHAPTER 2 – THE MUSEUM, THE COLLECTORS AND THE COLLECTION

The development of the Weltmuseum into the world-renowned institution it is today follows a long and complicated history. Wars and expeditions, politics and competition all played their role in shaping the museum and its collections. Among the Weltmuseum’s extensive ethnographic collections are objects from Brazil. South American artefacts in general were some of the earliest collected items which now belong to the museum. The substantial Brazilian collection in particular was also established fairly early. It therefore had an exceptional influence on the evolution of the museum.

In order to better understand the Weltmuseum Wien’s Brazilian collection, it must first be contextualized within history. The first part of this chapter will look at the development of the Weltmuseum and the role the Brazilian collection played in these changes. The key collectors involved in the creation of the Brazilian collection and the circumstances under which they worked will then be presented. Finally, this chapter will look at the types of objects collected, the composition of the assemblage and the peoples represented in the collection.

2.1 The History of the Weltmuseum Wien

The origin of the Weltmuseum’s ethnographic collection goes back to the sixteenth century. This was during the Early Modern Period when European powers were competing to claim large portions of the world as their colonies. European explorers were therefore navigating the world in search of new lands, trade routes, resources and people which they could exploit in order to benefit their empires. These scientific expeditions were closely tied to European interests in political and commercial control (Duncan 2020, 45–46). Returning voyagers brought with them specimens from the natural world as well as cultural objects never before seen by Europeans. These filled European gardens, zoos and museums which had become a source of national pride (Duncan 2020, 46). Imperial houses and wealthy individuals alike also collected these rare and exceptional items to create cabinets of curiosities. They were symbols of power
and wealth and therefore collectors prized the rarest and most exotic items. Among sixteenth-century European courts, collections became important representatives of dynastic institutions (Gschwend 1990, 189).

Like many prominent European collections, the Austrian collection began in the sixteenth century. The Habsburgs were fervent collectors. With the help of Spanish ambassador and dealer Hans Khevenhüller (1538-1606) who precured objects from around the world, they amassed significant collections (Gschwend 2018, 76 – 77). In 1554, Emperor Ferdinand I (1503 – 1564) established Vienna’s first imperial Kunstkammer when he declared that his collection of coins and antiques be kept together in their display cases (Gschwend 1990, 188 – 189). Archduke Ferdinand II (1529 – 1595) followed in his father’s footsteps and continued the collecting trend. He began to collect oddities for his own cabinet of curiosities (Augustat et al. 2017, 305). These sixteenth-century artefacts are the earliest in the Weltmuseum’s collection (www.weltmuseumwien.at). Ferdinand II’s collection grew to the extent that from 1570 to 1589 four interconnecting rooms were built to house the assortment of oddities in his Ambras castle in Tirol (Scheicher 1990, 69). The objects were organized and displayed based on materials, meaning that highly diverse artefacts were presented in the same vitrine (Kern 2018, 330; Mason 1994, 5). Ferdinand II’s interest in history led to the collection of over 1,000 portraits of noble men and women (Scheicher 1990, 69). Ferdinand II also amassed a large number of objects for his arms and armoury halls and even displayed some of his own suits of armour (Scheicher 1990, 69, 71). Among the highlights from his collection were feathered works from pre-colonial and colonial era Mexico (www.weltmuseumwien.at). These were rare highlights as the fragility of feathers caused many South American feathered works to perish before ever reaching Europe (Mason 1994, 6). Given Ferdinand II’s system of organization, his South American feathered pieces were displayed among other feathered artefacts from around the world, such as a decorated Moorish turban for instance (Kern 2018, 330). Like many renaissance cabinets of curiosities, there was a general disregard of geographical specificity. This makes it very challenging for modern curators to establish the exact point of origin for some artefacts and has often led to the mislabelling of objects (Mason 1994, 11 – 12). At this early stage of collecting materials from the Americas, there was a
huge gap between the objects and accurate representations of the cultures and people from which they originated (Mason 1994, 2). It is also important to note, that the sixteenth-century collectors who originally gathered these objects from the Americas are today largely unknown. As are the circumstances under which these objects came into their possession. Furthermore, there are few possibilities to accurately link collected materials with surviving artefacts in current museum collections. It has even been estimated that of the thousands of objects collected from the Americas and brought to Europe before the eighteenth-century, fewer than 300 still survive today (Mason 1994, 3). Ferdinand II’s collection stayed in the Ambras castle in Innsbruck, until it became endangered during the Napoleonic Wars. Emperor Francis I of Austria (1768 – 1835) took an interest in the collection and moved it to Vienna in 1806 in order to protect it (Augustat et al. 2017, 305).

During the eighteenth century, British explorer James Cook (1728 – 1779) undertook three major voyages across the Pacific. The objects he collected on his travels quickly appeared on the market and in prominent private collections and museums across Europe. At this time, Francis I was keen to expand the imperial collection with unusual objects (Augustat et al. 2017, 305). Due to the closure of the Leverian Museum in London in 1806, many items from Oceania and North America collected during the Cook voyages went up for auction. Francis I approved the purchase of 240 of these objects (Augustat and Feest 2014, 287; Reinhard 2015, 53). Among the purchased pieces were ethnographic artefacts, which were the first additions to the ethnographic collection of the Imperial and Royal Court Cabinet of Natural Objects. Despite these exceptional additions, the ethnographic objects were overshadowed by the natural history artefacts. Due to a lack of exhibition space, the ethnographic collection was packed away and stored in the attic of the Court Library (Augustat et al. 2017, 305). Once Napoleon was defeated, so too was the threat to the Imperial collections. Francis I therefore moved the ethnographic collection as well as the Ambras curiosities to the Lower Belvedere palace in Vienna where they went on display in 1821. The organization of the exhibit and classification of the artefacts was not scientific or based on factual evidence about the objects or cultures, and the descriptions of items were sometimes completely fabricated (Augustat et al. 2017, 306).
Although the Habsburg monarchy was well-established and highly influential in Europe, its position as a colonial power was relatively minor in comparison to other empires (Augustat 2012, 11). Since exotic finds could not be collected from distant colonies, the Habsburgs had to make use of other opportunities in order to increase their ethnographic and natural history collections. Such an opportunity presented itself in 1817. Thanks to the marriage of Francis I’s daughter, Maria Leopoldina of Austria (1797 – 1826) to the Portuguese-Brazilian crown Prince, Dom Pedro (1798 – 1834), an Austrian expedition was sent to Brazil. Although Napoleon was defeated in 1814, the Portuguese court stayed in Brazil which led to a revolution in 1817. Conflict culminated in 1822 when the colony of Brazil broke free from Portugal and was established as an independent monarchy with Dom Pedro as its first ruler (Fausto 2014). The political unrest cut the scientific mission short, and in 1821 most of the researchers returned to Europe. Their expedition was nevertheless fruitful as they returned with over 100,000 animal, plant and mineral specimens, as well as ethnographic objects (Augustat et al. 2017, 306). The collected items became the base of the Imperial Royal Ethnographic Collection (www.weltmuseumwien.at). In order to exhibit the over 150,000 collected items to the public, Francis I set up the Brazilian Museum in the Harrach City Palace in Vienna (Seipel 2002, 210, 223). This was in fact a temporary storage solution until the collection had been properly catalogued and prepared for its integration into the History Cabinet (Augustat 2012, 27). The museum boasted 2 ethnographic rooms which displayed the over 2,000 ethnographic objects largely collected by Johann Natterer (1787 – 1843), the research expedition’s zoologist (Augustat et al. 2017, 306; Augustat 2012, 27; Seipel 2002, 223). In 1836, Francis I died and by this time the public excitement about the Brazilian collection had abated. His son, Emperor Ferdinand I (1793 – 1875) decided to close the museum. The artefacts were subsequently placed into storage and divided among the Natural History collections (Augustat et al. 2017, 306).

For a short time between 1838 and 1840 the ethnographic collection went on display again when The Imperial-Royal Ethnographic Museum opened. This museum was referred to as the Kaiserhaus (Seipel 2002, 210). It was housed in the Harrach Summer Palace in Vienna (Augustat et al. 2017, 307). 82 of the
ethnographic objects displayed there are now part of the Brazilian collection. Here, ethnographic materials were exhibited out of context and completely disconnected from their socio-cultural origins, while being forced into a European system of organization (Seipel 2002, 210). Narratives were synthetic and fragmented, and reinforced the concept of the distant “other” (Seipel 2002, 210). When the palace had to be vacated in 1840, the collections were moved into storage in the attic of the Imperial Animal Cabinet (Augustat et al. 2017, 307). In the following years, the Imperial ethnographic collection was neglected. There was no designated caretaker and expansion was minimal. The collections were moved between storage spaces where they were susceptible to damage during transport and from poor storage conditions. In fact, 2 crates of ethnographic artefacts were lost in a fire at the Hofburg’s Animal Cabinet in 1848 (Augustat et al. 2017, 307).

During the 1870s, European powers displayed their global strength through the organization of world fairs. These fairs were important precursors to the development of ethnography museums in the late nineteenth century (Reinhard 2015, 63, 64). Major cities competed to offer the most exotic and fascinating exhibitions featuring objects, animals and sometimes people from around the world. Vienna’s world fair, the *Wiener Weltausstellung*, was held from 1 May until 31 October 1873 (wien.gv.at). It was the 5th of its kind in Europe and the first in a German-speaking area (wien.gv.at; Augustat et al. 2017, 308). Held in Vienna’s Prater park, the fair covered an immense 233.5 hectares, making it five times bigger than the *Exposition Universelle* held in Paris in 1867 (wien.gv.at) (see below figures 1 – 3). The entire exhibition was constructed in only 21 months and once finished, roughly 53,000 international exhibitors showed off their best assets (wien.gv.at). The Brazilian government participated in this fair, putting on a well-received presentation, in order to encourage its recognition as part of the “civilized” world (Schuster 2015, 47 – 48). Though this identification was important to the Brazilian government, it was fairly challenging for the slaveholding monarchy to achieve, due to its mostly poor and ethnically diverse population (Schuster 2015, 68). According to an 1817 census, Brazil’s population was 4.1 million, more than half of whom were slaves (2.1 million). It was estimated that the “Indians or natives” numbered around 440,000 people. Only
900,000 people were recorded as “white”, one third of whom were Portuguese (Pohl 1832, 54). Though recorded half a century earlier, this gives an interesting insight into the composition of Brazil’s population. At the fair, keeping with the main theme of technological, economic and material progress, Brazil highlighted their construction of railway tracks, telegraph poles and steam-driven agricultural machinery (Schuster 2015, 50). These industrial objects and materials were arbitrarily exhibited among natural resources and ethnographic artefacts (Schuster 2015, 51). With no reference to the cultural groups who made them, European visitors were meant to perceive these ethnographic objects as the “tools and weapons of the savages” (Schuster 2015, 65). The pavilion’s presentation of Brazil’s culturally diverse population is a troubling reflection of the era. The Afro-Brazilian population and references to slavery were excluded from the exhibit, while the presentation of indigenous “savages” was an anticipated highlight of the fair (Schuster 2015, 64). Economic crisis and the outbreak of cholera meant the attendance of half as many visitors to the Wiener Weltausstellung as expected (7.25 million instead of the estimated 15 million). With a deficit of 14.8 million guilders, the fair was relatively unsuccessful (wien.gv.at).
Figure 1 – Panorama, Vienna at the time of the Weltsausstellung (1837), by architectural painter Josef Langl (Wien Museum, Inv. Nr. 16864, sammlung.wienmuseum.at).

Figure 2 – Josef Löwy, Weltsausstellung Vienna, main entrance with the Rotunda, 1873 (Technisches Museum Wien, Inv. Nr. BPA-005970-015, www.technischesmuseum.at).
Figure 3 - Emanuel Mally: Complete plan of Vienna’s Weltsausstellung 1873. (Wienbibliothek im Rathaus, Inv. Nr. A 18965, www.digital.wienbibliothek.at).
Although exoticism and othering were highly prevalent in the *Wiener Weltausstellung* and other world fairs, they demonstrate the European fascination with the world’s cultures and people. Cultural heritage had begun to be further acknowledged as being separate from natural history. This recognition in turn led to the formation of the Anthropological-Ethnographic Department of the Imperial Museum of Natural History in 1876 (Augustat and Feest 2014, 287; Augustat 2012, 27). While the department still belonged to the Natural History Museum, this was an important first step towards the separation of human history, particularly concerning cultures thought to be inferior to Europeans, from the history of the natural world. It also implies that European institutions acknowledged that these people had a cultural history worthy of preservation.

Around the turn of the century, the Anthropology and Ethnography department sought to increase the size of their collection. It had grown little since 1806 and there was increased pressure to compete with Europe’s other growing ethnography collections (Augustat *et al.* 2017, 309). The Imperial Academy of Science in St. Petersburg, which had grown since the early eighteenth century from Peter the Great’s (1672 – 1725) cabinet of curiosities, was a particularly concerning competitor for the Viennese museum (Seipel 2002, 227; Anemone 2000, 584). The extensive collections held in the Russian Imperial Academy of Science rivalled those of Austria’s Natural History Museum both in zoological and ethnographic materials (Anemone 2000). One of the key contributing collectors was German surgeon and naturalist Dr. Georg Heinrich von Langsdorff (1774 – 1852). After undergoing a circumnavigation voyage as a member of the Krusenstern Expedition, Langsdorff spent time amassing a botanical collection in Brazil, where he had been appointed Russian consul general in Rio de Janeiro (Beidleman 2006, 42, 47). He was in Brazil from 1813 to 1830 (Ossenbach 2018, 111). As consul general, he conducted one of the first expeditions into the interior of Brazil known as the Imperial Russian Scientific Expedition (Beidleman 2006, 47). This botanical and zoological mission, though largely unsuccessful and plagued by bouts of malaria (Beidleman 2006, 47), led to the collection of significant ethnographic materials which were sent back to Russia (Ossenbach 2018, 145).
In order to increase the inventory of the Anthropology and Ethnography department to compete with the Russians, as well as other European museums, the Habsburg imperial collections were scoured for ethnographic objects (Augustat et al. 2017, 309). Readily available funds were limited. As a solution, the upper classes were asked to donate money and objects from their own private collections. They were encouraged by the possibility of being awarded aristocratic titles and sovereign distinction. This approach was highly successful and by 1919, 94,367 inventoried objects belonged to the Anthropology and Ethnography department’s collection (Augustat et al. 2017, 309).

Heir to the Austro-Hungarian throne, Archduke Franz Ferdindand of Austria-Este (1863 – 1914) also contributed to the expansion of the imperial collections. He suffered from what he called “Museomania” (www.weltmuseumwien.at). He was a highly motivated collector and accumulated around 14,000 ethnographic and natural history objects during a ten-month journey around the world. He displayed his personal collection in the Corps de Logis at the Neue Burg, where the Weltmuseum is located today (Augustat et al. 2017, 310). After the first world war, his collection became part of the Ethnographic department. In 1926, the Ethnographic department moved from the Natural History Museum across the street to the Neue Burg (Augustat et al. 2017, 310). Despite this physical separation, the Ethnographic Department still belonged to the Natural History Museum. Nevertheless, the collection now had its own exhibition space separate from other narratives of natural history. In 1928, the Museum of Ethnology was opened to the public (Augustat and Feest 2014, 287). In the following years, the collection was subdivided based on region. By 1935 there was a department for Africa, the Middle East, Central Asia, South and Southeast Asia, North and Central America (Augustat et al. 2017, 310).

During the Second World War, there was little progress or activity within the museum. Valuable objects were stored away for safekeeping. Any appreciation for other cultures was exclusively limited to politically enforced programs like the 1939 exhibit *Swastikas in East Asia* (Augustat et al. 2017, 311). After the war, part of the Neue Burg continued to be used as a hospital until 1957 (www.weltmuseumwien.at; Augustat et al. 2017, 311). The museum needed to re-
establish itself as a public institution for research and education. Subsequently, the Völkerkunde Museum was formed. A library, archival collection and photographic collection were added. Exhibitions were organized and classified by world regions. Despite the museum’s efforts at modernization, the displays continued to exoticize foreign cultures and people (Augustat et al. 2017, 311).

Although the museum presented many successful large-scale exhibits throughout the late twentieth century, by the early 2000s the museum was having financial difficulties. The Neue Burg’s Corps de Logis was in desperate need of repair as it had not been renovated since 1928 (Augustat et al. 2017, 312; weltmuseumwien.at). Attempts to raise funds had all but failed. In 2012, Steven Engelsman became the museum’s director and was tasked with its reinvention and transition into becoming the Weltmuseum (weltmuseumwien.at). Along with its physical renovations, there was also a shift in the mission of the museum, with a clear focus on the celebration of cultural diversity (Augustat et al. 2017, 312). In 2013, the Austrian government agreed to financially support the extensive project and the plans were presented to the public (weltmuseumwien.at). Renovations were carried out and the galleries were modernized and rebuilt. In 2017 the museum reopened to the public and currently boasts a collection of over 200,000 ethnographic objects from around the world (Augustat et al. 2017, 312).

2.2 The Collectors

The Weltmuseum’s Brazilian collection is one of its oldest and most important. The earliest objects can be traced back to the sixteenth century cabinet of curiosities at Ambras castle. A substantial part of the collection however was gathered by a few key collectors in the nineteenth century. The collection grew significantly thanks to the efforts of those involved in the Brazilian expedition, of whom the most well-known is Johann Natterer. In the mid twentieth century, Austrian ethnologist Etta Becker-Donner (1911 – 1975) also added a number of Brazilian objects to the museum’s inventory list. More recently, new objects have been accessioned into the collection thanks to ongoing efforts to build relationships between the museum and indigenous communities in Brazil.
There are a few objects in the Brazilian collection which originate from the Ambras cabinet of curiosities. According to the Weltmuseum’s database, two of these objects have been exhibited in the past: an anchor-shaped axe and a wooden paddle-shaped club. Both are listed as coming from the Tupinambá people, though little is known about who originally collected them and under what circumstances. Their presence in the Ambras collection dates them to the sixteenth century and associates them with Archduke Ferdinand II of Austria (1529 – 1595). This places them among the oldest known pieces in the Brazilian collection. Both of these pieces have been exhibited multiple times, and the anchor axe is one of the two most exhibited objects in the Brazilian collection. This highlights the importance and rarity of these early pieces among the Brazilian artefacts held by the Weltmuseum.

A couple of centuries after the era of Ambras’ curiosities, the Brazilian collection grew significantly due to the aforementioned Austrian expedition sent to Brazil. In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, Portugal had implemented strict entry restrictions for Brazil. Large areas of the country were left unexplored by Europeans, and nineteenth century naturalists were desperate to investigate the wildlife and catalogue their findings (Augustat 2012, 12). At that time, most of what was known of the country’s environment and indigenous people was a by-product of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century missionary work (Riedl-Dorn et al. 2007, 9) and of early scientists who visited different areas of the country, such as the Portuguese-Brazilian Alexandre Rodrigues Ferreira (1756 – 1815). In order to escape attacks during the Napoleonic Wars, the Portuguese court emigrated to Brazil in 1807. As a result, this opened the country’s borders to trade and scientific exploration (Augustat 2012, 12). Austrian diplomat and foreign minister, Prince Klemens von Metternich (1773 – 1859), saw the Portuguese presence in Brazil as an opportunity for Austria to increase their influence overseas (Augustat 2012, 12). A marriage between the Habsburg and Braganza royal families was organized (Seipel 2002, 217). On the 13th of May 1817, the Austrian Archduchess Leopoldina married Dom Pedro, heir to the Portuguese throne (Augustat 2012, 11). Aside from the political alliance, the marriage offered Austria the opportunity to send an exploratory mission into Brazil.
Emperor Francis I, father or Leopoldina, was passionate about natural science in general and botany in particular (Augustat 2012, 13). When the opportunity to send an Austrian scientific expedition to South America presented itself, he did not hesitate. Nor did he limit the mission by either budget or time constraints (Seipel 2002, 217; Riedl-Dorn et al. 2007, 9). This mission would become Austria’s biggest expedition in the Americas ever and yielded some of the most valuable collections belonging to both Vienna’s Natural History Museum and the Weltmuseum (Seipel 2002, 217).

The expedition team consisted of scientists, naturalists, researchers and artists. Karl von Schreibers (1775 – 1852), director of the Court’s Natural History Cabinet was tasked with detailing the route and providing instructions for the scientific team from Vienna. Johann Christian Mikan (1769 – 1844), professor of natural history at the University of Prague, was the expedition leader. His wife accompanied him and worked with the collection and preparation of plants and insects (Riedl-Dorn et al. 2007, 12). Johann Baptist Emanuel Pohl (1782 – 1834) joined the expedition thanks to his background as a mineralogist and botanist. Additional experts in botany were Heinrich Wilhelm Schott (1794 – 1865), the Upper Belvedere’s court gardener, and Carl Philipp Friedrich von Martius (1794 – 1868). As an employee of the Natural Cabinet and an experienced taxidermist, Johann Natterer was recommended for the mission. Dominik Sochor was the team's hunter and gunsmith, and Johann Baptiste von Spix (1781 – 1826) was the zoologist. Mineralogist Rochus Schüch (1788 – 1844) and Naturalist Giuseppe Raddi (1770 – 1829) also accompanied the group. Among the team were two artists who could illustrate Brazil’s wildlife and landscape. Johann Buchberger was a plant illustrator and Thomas Ender (1793 – 1875) was an academic landscape painter who produced over 1,000 paintings and drawings during his year in Brazil (Seipel 2002, 217; Riedl-Dorn et al. 2007, 6, 10). This was the core group of assorted intellectuals chosen to undertake Austria’s expedition to Brazil.

The mission’s focus was to document Brazil’s plants and wildlife, and although some instructions were given to describe and depict the native populations, this was a low priority for the mission (Augustat 2012, 21). The naturalists and other team members were relatively unprepared to collect ethnographic materials.
It was requested however that, if possible, a skull should be brought back to Austria (Augustat 2012, 13; Seipel 2002, 218). During the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, skulls were compared and measured in order to reinforce ideas of racial superiority and human evolution. For this reason, Vienna’s Natural History Museum is home to a vast number of human skulls from various ethnic groups. A skull from Brazil’s indigenous population would have been a valued addition to this collection. Schreibers said the ultimate goal of the mission was to collect specimens and information which would raise the imperial museum to a higher level (Seipel 2002, 210). In order to gain an overview of the entire country, the team were instructed not to stay in one place for very long (Seipel 2002, 209, 218). Schreibers told the scientists to plan out their routes in advance, to keep journals with exact find locations and notes on collected items as well as their local names. This information, along with the collected specimens, were to be sent regularly back to Vienna (Seipel 2002, 218). When it came to collecting however, Schreibers’ instructions were relatively vague due to his lack of experience in organizing such a mission (Augustat 2012, 21).

In April 1817, the team set sail for Rio de Janeiro from the harbour in Trieste on two ships. Mikan and his wife, Ender, Martius and Spix left on the frigate Austria, while Natterer, Schott and Sochor travelled on the frigate Augusta. The rest of the team sailed in August with the newly married Leopoldina on the Portuguese liner São Sebastião (Seipel 2002, 218). During their travels across the Atlantic, the two Austrian ships were caught in a storm. Repairs had to be made and the ships were separated. The Austria arrived in Brazil in June, while the Augusta arrived in Rio de Janeiro in November of the same year, along with the Portuguese ships (Seipel 2002, 218; Riedl-Dorn et al. 2007, 11).

The team took some time to get settled in the (for them) confronting environment. They were faced with many difficult circumstances such as the destruction of their supplies caused by termites and ants, as well as illnesses and the humid climate (Seipel 2002, 218, 221). Once acclimatized and reassembled after their journey across the Atlantic, the team decided to split off into three groups in order to cover more land. Ender, Spix and Martius set off in the direction of São Paulo. Mikan,
Schott and Buchberger travelled the coast towards Cabo Frio. Pohl, Natterer and Sochor made their way towards Canta Gallo (Seipel 2002, 218).

Despite the challenges their research mission faced, Pohl and Natterer were particularly motivated collectors. A significant portion of the ethnographic objects collected on the mission was the result of their efforts. Though both researchers were more focused on the natural sciences, they were able to collect ethnographic materials and record some encounters with the indigenous populations. They were however products of their time and their references to the Brazilian people are often racist or dehumanizing. Both believed that Brazil’s indigenous population should be educated to join European-Brazilian civilization and that their potential as a labour force should be exploited (Seipel 2002, 212).

Johann Emmanuel Pohl undertook extensive trips through the interior of Brazil from 1818 to 1821, which he recounted in his book Journey to the Interior of Brazil (Pohl 1832). Among the natural objects he collected during his travels which included living plants and animals (Pohl 1832, 8), Pohl collected 120 ethnographic artefacts from at least eight different indigenous groups (Augustat 2012, 23). Pohl described a Kayapó group he observed who were living at the Mission S. José de Mossamedes. He said they were unsatisfied, homesick and generally had a difficult life. Their work was hard, they had little to eat and the village was poorly located. He said that they loved to hunt and fish, which was previously their main food source. Living at the mission however, they had to completely give up this way of life (Seipel 2002, 222). Despite their obvious suffering, Pohl’s description is rather unsympathetic. Furthermore, in his book, Pohl dehumanizes Afro-Brazilian slaves, referring to them exclusively as “Negern” and talks about native populations in the same way he would describe plants or animals (Pohl 1832). He says the following of the Kayapó people: “The colour of these Indians is reddish-brown, their hair is black, stiff, thick, hanging down to the shoulders … The face is round, broad, the eyes small, the nose broadly pressed, the lips are highly turned up, the mouth large, the teeth white and fine” (Pohl apud Seipel 2002, 222). Pohl also saw the indigenous populations as uncultured and in need of real cultural education (Seipel 2002, 222). In October 1821, an Austrian business representative in Rio de Janeiro, then capital of Brazil,
obtained the permission for two Brazilian natives to be brought to Europe (Seipel 2002, 212). Pohl returned to Vienna with a Botocudo man, João (20) and a woman, Francesca (21) (Seipel 2002, 222; Augustat 2012, 24). The pair were selected from among 50 captives presented to the Portuguese king João VI. The king’s daughter-in-law, Leopoldina, sent them to her father Franz I in Vienna (Augustat 2012, 24). They were described as being brought from the hands of nature into the centre of refined civilization (Seipel 2002, 212). The pair made newspaper headlines and captivated the public when seen working in the Burggarten, attending balls and at the theatre (Augustat 2012, 24). Although they were described by Schreibers as “keeping well, and highly satisfied” the woman unfortunately died two years after her arrival (Augustat 2012, 24). Unhappy with life in Europe, the man was brought back to Brazil in 1823 (Seipel 2002, 212, 222; Augustat 2012, 24).

The leading contributor of ethnographic materials to the Brazilian expedition’s collected items was however Natterer. His collection remains unparalleled. It includes objects from extinct groups and offers present-day surviving groups the chance to reconnect with their material culture (Seipel 2002, 225). He was educated in zoology, mineralogy and botany. Despite this, he is often referred to as an “ethnographer” because of the important ethnographic materials he collected during his research (Seipel 2002, 225). For Natterer, the collection of ethnographic objects was a low priority and he only began once his companions had left the country. At first, most of the objects he acquired were through third parties (Augustat 2012, 26). When it came to studying people and culture, Natterer positioned himself as a distant observer, much like he did when researching plants and animals (Augustat 2012, 26). His main goal was to collect objects and he therefore did not attempt to obtain any deeper insights into the life and culture of the people (Seipel 2002, 212). He gave them everything he had in exchange for whatever head and neck adornments, weapons and blow-horns they were willing to give him (Seipel 2002, 212).

While the other members of the Austrian expedition to Brazil returned to Europe a few years after their arrival, Natterer stayed for 18 years. He married a Brazilian woman and they had three daughters (Seipel 2002, 225). During his prolonged
stay, he was able to collect more than 2,000 ethnographic objects from 70 different groups mostly from the Mato Grosso, Rio Negro and Rio Branco regions. Natterer distinguished these indigenous groups between “wild” and “tame” Indians (Seipel 2002, 225; Augustat 2012, 24). He based this on whether their interactions with Brazilian colonists were hostile or not. The latter was often the result of missionary intervention (Seipel 2002, 211). Whether they were what he called “civilized” or “wild” he considered them both to be part of nature and therefore something which can be observed and objectified (Seipel 2002, 212). He did however consult Bororo people in order to expand his ethnographic work and to create vocabulary lists (Seipel 2002, 212). His descriptions of native people nevertheless often reinforced negative stereotypes. For instance, he described them as being generally “very lazy” and one of their settlements to be at the “highest grade of uncleanliness” (Seipel 2002, 211). As to their appearance, Natterer gives a cautious description about their nudity: “They walk around completely naked, the only covering for men is a finger wide strip of palm leaf which they tie in a way so that it forms a kind of ring which they put over their procreative member” (Seipel 2002, 211).

During his travels, Natterer required a significant amount of manpower. He therefore owned two slaves and rented many others when needed. Around this time, discussions mainly based in Europe about the abolition of slavery were on the rise. Natterer stated his opinion on the matter as the following “The more freedom they are allowed and the better they are treated, the worse it is” (Seipel 2002, 213). His slaves therefore worked hard doing manual labour like carrying supplies or rowing boats, but they also helped with research by hunting and preparing animals (Seipel 2002, 213, 225). Most of the references Natterer makes to Afro-Brazilians are, unsurprisingly, negative. For instance, he describes the purchase of another “black” as a “handsome boy of around 12-13 years from Mozambique, who I would like to bring with me, if he stays alive.” (Seipel 2002, 213). Similar to his descriptions of the native population, Natterer refers to slaves as clumsy and lazy (Seipel 2002, 213). This is significant because it is important to remember the unequal and violent circumstances and attitudes under which many of the items which now belong to the Brazilian collection were collected.
Over the following century, the ethnography collection grew and stagnated in tandem with politics, trends and general interest. The collection’s next major contributor was active during the 1950s. In 1947, the Austrian ethnologist Etta Becker-Donner was hired as the Völkermuseum’s first curator for the South American collections (Augustat and Feest 2014, 287). She made two trips to Brazil in 1954 and 1956. Around this time, there were brutal conflicts between rubber collectors and the Pacaas Novos (Augustat 2011, 50). The rubber trade meant intrusions into their forest homeland, which only increased with the demand for rubber during the Second World War (Augustat 2011, 65). The native populations were met with hostility, and in turn reciprocated with aggressive behaviour (Augustat 2011, 50). During her first trip, Becker-Donner explored the area of Rio Pacaás Novos and the Upper Rio Ribeirão (Augustat and Feest 2014, 289). She was, however, reliant on infrastructure which belonged to the rubber collectors (Augustat 2011, 50, 66). This put her in an awkward position; she wanted to observe indigenous groups but her fieldwork relied on support provided by their enemies. During this journey, she was led through the forest by trackers who were following paths made by Pacaás Novos people, in the hope that they would lead them to their hidden settlements. This group however did not want to be found, and the exact locations of their settlements were unknown (Augustat 2011, 53). By the time they had located the villages, they had been abandoned. She was therefore only able collect a few belongings which had been left behind as well as some arrows (Augustat and Feest 2014, 289; Augustat 2011, 53).

Her second journey in 1956 was more fruitful. This time she worked more closely with the SPI (Serviço de Proteção aos Índios), Brazil’s Indian Protection Service (Augustat 2011, 60). It is important to remember however, that although this organization was not hostile like the rubber tappers, they were nevertheless attempting to “civilize” and assimilate Brazil’s indigenous populations (Augustat 2011, 70). The SPI had set up a hut near the mouth of the Ouro Preto as a base from which they would attempt to “civilize” the “wild” Pacaás Novos people, who call themselves Wari (Augustat 2011, 63). The SPI left metal tools as presents in the hut which the Wari came and retrieved at night (Augustat 2011, 54, 68). It took two years of leaving gifts for the Wari to trust the SPI enough to visit the hut by day (Augustat 2011, 57). Becker-Donner was there to witness this
important moment, as one of the first peaceful interactions between the SPI and Warí (Augustat and Feest 2014, 289). It was through this slowly established relationship that Becker-Donner was able to observe and photograph the indigenous group. The objects she collected during these interactions, as well as the film and photo materials she created, are important to the history of the Warí. It is presently one of the only collections of Warí objects from the time of first and pre-contact (Augustat 2011, 64).

In 2011 Claudia Augustat, current curator of the Weltmuseum’s South American collection, travelled to Brazil to visit the Santo André Warí community at Pacaás Novos. She showed them the photos which Becker-Donner took at the time of first contact (Augustat 2011, 71). Although they could not remember Becker-Donner herself, they did recognize relatives and friends from the pictures. This was exciting and fulfilling for the Warí, who could show younger generations their older relatives and grandparents (Augustat 2011, 71). In 2009, the Völkerkunde Museum was able to support the revitalization of Brazilian indigenous culture. The head of the Kanoê, José Augusto Kanoê, accompanied by representatives of the Aruá, Tuparí and Makurap visited the museum’s depot and searched their photographic archives in order to learn more about the history of their own culture. During their trip, they were also invited to other European ethnology museums including the Museum of Cultures Basel, the Volkenkunde Museum in Leiden and the Ethnologisches Museum in Berlin (Augustat 2011, 74). José Augusto Kanoê brought 68 specially made objects with him as gifts to the museum, including a dance costume (Augustat 2011, 75).

2.3 The Collection

The Weltmuseum’s Brazilian collection is one of the most extensive of its kind, comprising almost 6,000 objects. Over the years, it has continued to be an important resource for education and research. Its preservation of material culture has been invaluable to the communities from which it originates. The objects belonging to the collection represent many ethnic groups and cultural histories. They include everyday items and important ceremonial pieces. Some artefacts are centuries old and others are contemporary accessions. Although the collection’s
general narratives may be fragmentary, these objects provide valuable insights into Brazil’s indigenous cultures both past and present. While the items found in the collection are diverse, some types of objects are more numerous than others.

Hundreds of arrows belong to the assemblage. There are a few explanations as to why this is the case. Firstly, arrows were produced in relatively large quantities and were more readily exchanged or left behind once used. Secondly, indigenous groups relied on hunting as a source of food and therefore created and used arrows frequently (Augustat 2012, 22). A final and important reason for their large numbers in the collection has to do with how they were collected. Early instances of contact were often through conflict, such as with the seringueiros (rubber tappers). Once the violence subsided, fired arrows could be gathered and kept or given to interested parties (Augustat 2011, 65). One issue with the disproportionate number of arrows in this collection, like many other early ethnographic collections, is that it puts emphasis on these indigenous groups as being aggressive. Ethnographic museums must therefore be cautious in their displays and aware of the narratives large quantities of arrows may imply for the average visitor (Augustat 2012, 22).

The collection is also home to many feathered pieces. From headdresses and adornments to feather decorated instruments and weapons. Roughly 10 percent of the collection’s exhibited objects are feathered artefacts. Their bright colours and skilful handiwork make them attractive objects for their indigenous creators as well as collectors and museum visitors alike. They are usually made with the feathers of beautifully bright tropical birds, and in some cases, they include entire birds or wings. The collection’s numerous feathered headdresses often grace the pages of the museum’s exhibition catalogues thanks to their captivating intricacy and grandeur.

Other objects which occur in greater numbers in the collection include many body adornments, pipes, horns and flutes, hunting equipment and weaponry like bows, spears and lances, as well as baskets, pots and ceramic sherds, fishing equipment, hammocks, clubs, lip and ear plugs. The collection has artefacts belonging to daily activities such as food preparation, carrying containers and hunting tools. It
also contains specialized items for warfare or ritual practices. The objects originate from groups across Brazil. Although there are some obvious similarities, to a trained eye these items illustrate the cultural diversity of Brazil’s many indigenous groups.

When considering the communities represented by the objects in the collection, a number of them are unknown or simply listed in the database as “Brazil”. Based on the results of my data collection, an estimated 10 percent of the collection has an unknown origin. In some cases, an educated guess can be made as to their source, but their exact find locations may be lost to history. It is nevertheless clear which of the many groups are most represented in the Brazilian collection. The majority of the items originate from one of the following ethnic groups: Apinajé, Baniwa, Bororo, Botocudo, Karajá, Kayapó, Guaná, Huanyam, Kraho, Makuxi, Manao, Sateré-Mawe, Moré, Mundurucú, Pacaas Novos/Warí, Paressi, Parintintin, Porocotó, Tukano, Rolim da Moura, Urubú, Xavante and Yapurá. This is far from a comprehensive list, but rather outlines the most represented groups. A number of objects stem from other groups in the area, but the vast majority of the artefacts come from the above listed ethnic groups. With its over 2,000 objects, the Natterer collection alone covers around 78 ethnic groups from Brazil and the Amazon (Augustat 2012, 24, 182). He collected 217 Bororo items, 193 from the Mundurucú, 265 artefacts from the Uaupés, 137 from the Baniwa and 106 objects from the Makuxi. He also collected singular objects from a handful of groups such as the Naú-a, Kulina, Uririna and Karipuna (Augustat 2012, 24).

From among the collection’s thousands of artefacts, a few highlights can be noted. When completing the analysis of the data which I compiled, it became clear which objects were the collection’s most significant in terms of their public visibility. We can infer that the objects which were exhibited most often constitute the collection’s most important, noteworthy and most valuable artefacts – at least from the perspective of the museum and its curators. Indigenous peoples themselves might have other views about the most valuable or important objects in the collection. These ‘museum highlights’ include two masked costumes from the early nineteenth century, two anchor-shaped axes, a carrying strap for a small child, a feathered adornment and a bone pestle and mortar. In chapter five, five of
these objects, which are the collections most exhibited items, will be analysed in further detail.
CHAPTER 3 – EXHIBITIONS AND LOANS AT THE WELTMUSEUM: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE BRAZILIAN COLLECTION

3.1 Historical Background of Exhibitions and Loans at the Weltmuseum

The importance of a collection to each museum is paramount. Museums are defined by the objects they contain and the stories they are able to tell. When holes in certain narratives present themselves, museums look to similar institutions and private collections for supplementary materials. This shared network and understanding between global museum institutions has a long history. With the rise of national museums, the practice of loaning objects to bulk up existing collections was taking place. An early and quite extreme example comes from the Victoria and Albert Museum in London. From the late 1860s to the early 1880s, the museum started seeking a vast quantity of loans in order to expand their exhibition displays and establish themselves as a substantial museum (Eatwell 2000, 21). These objects mostly came from private collections and individual owners. It is estimated that around a third of the objects on long-term display were in fact loans (Eatwell 2000, 21). At this time, other major museums, Vienna’s imperial collection included, were mostly expanding their inventories through purchases and donations (Eatwell 2000, 21; Augustat et al. 2017, 309). The Victoria and Albert Museum was therefore taking ground-breaking steps to establish an elaborate and well-organized system of loaning objects for their displays.

Through the close inspection of the Weltmuseum’s loan records¹, I was able to see which of the objects from the Brazilian collection had been loaned to other institutions from when records began to be kept in the late eighteenth century until

¹ These archival records consisted of the museum’s outgoing loan contracts, dating from the late nineteenth century until the late 1990s. After the year 2000, outgoing loan information was included in the museum’s digital collection’s database.
today. The date, exhibition title, institution receiving the loan and the objects included were usually described. Most attention was of course paid to the Brazilian artefacts, but the records gave a general overview of the loaning practices of the museum for the past one and a half centuries. What I was unable to gather however was which incoming objects from other museum had been loaned for exhibitions held by the Weltmuseum or its predecessors.

It can be generally said that while the ethnographic collection was in its infancy, particularly in its imperial phase, few loans were exchanged. Instead, the focus was on showing off the monarchy’s own holdings as well as acquiring ownership of new objects (Augustat et al. 2017, 305, 309, 310). While what is now the ethnographic collection was moved around and exhibited in various locations, it was generally shown under the context of the imperial collection. These early exhibitions include the sixteenth century Ambras Cabinet of Curiosities, the Imperial and Royal Court Cabinet of Natural Objects which went on display at the Lower Belvedere palace in 1821, Francis I’s Brazilian Museum in the Harrach City Palace also in 1821, The Imperial-Royal Ethnographic Museum also known as the Kaiserhaus displayed in the Harrach Summer Palace from 1838 to 1840, and Archduke Franz Ferdinand’s personal collection displayed at the Neue Burg until the First World War (Augustat et al. 2017, 310).

In the early twentieth century, attempts were made to establish an ethnographic collection which was separate from the natural history objects. The first step was the physical separation of the Ethnographic Department from the Natural History Museum by moving it to the Neue Burg to create the Museum of Ethnology in 1928 (Augustat et al. 2017, 310). In tandem with the peak of colonialism, anthropology was taking off in the academic world. Exhibitions, and subsequently loan practices, aimed to produce displays which captivated the imagination of their visitors. They did so by depicting foreign cultures, particularly those from Africa, Oceania and the Americas, as “exotic”, “savage” and “uncivilized” (Bennett 1995, 93). These notions developed alongside armchair anthropology, where so-called anthropologists studied other cultures from the comfort of their armchairs through written accounts from other scholars, travellers and colonial informants (Sera-Shriar 2014, 35). Essentially, early ethnography was based on
cross-cultural comparisons (Reinhard 2015, 57). The rise of the ethnography museum was tied to the development of the field of study as a scientific discipline (Reinhard 2015, 53). These modes of thinking were the basis of the general trends embraced by most ethnography and natural history museums at the time, as it was for the objects now belonging to the Brazilian collection (Reinhard 2015, 57, 58).

This tendency took a sharp turn in the mid twentieth century with the events of World War Two. The implications of this conflict impacted Austria arguably more than any other nation involved. While looking at the loan records from this dark period, though it was to be expected, I was nevertheless troubled when I saw documents signed by the museum’s director and underneath stamped with a swastika. During this period the museum’s loans reflected exhibitions which supported anti-Semitic narratives and the historic use of swastikas in Asia. From my observations, these objects did not include loans from the Brazilian collection.

After the Second World War, the museum made efforts to improve their exhibitions and standing as an institution. It was first in the sixties and seventies that more complex exhibitions and the loans required for them began to increase in a substantial way. Based on the loan contracts from this period, there is evidence for more frequent and numerous outgoing loans. The first evidence of outgoing loans from the Brazilian collection was in 1961 when 2 objects were sent to the Natural History Museum. 57 objects from the Brazilian collection went to 8 other museums and company exhibitions in Switzerland and Austria during the decade between 1967 and 1977. The outgoing loans during this period

2 A loan contract from 1942 was signed “Dr. Fritz Röck” and stamped with the museum’s official stamp which says “Museum für Völkerkunde in Wien L., heldenplatz”. At the centre of the stamp is an eagle carrying a swastika. Friedrich Röck (1879 – 1953) was the Museum für Völkerkunde’s first director (1928 – 1945) (www.geschichtewiki.wien.gv.at).

3 According to the loan contract, objects with the inventory numbers 915 and 82849 were sent to Vienna’s Naturhistorischen Museum’s zoological department on 14 February 1961 for a special exhibition.

4 These museums and companies include Museum für Völkerkunde Basel (Switzerland), Niederösterreichisches Landesmuseum (two exhibitions, Austria), Wirtschaftsförderungsinsitut, Handelskammer Niederösterreich (Austria), Swissair (Swiss airline company), Zsolnay-Verlag.
seem to have mostly been directed towards European museums, the majority of which were located in Austria. These museums range from larger well-known institutions, to small-scale private exhibitions at universities or companies, for instance.

The majority of loans from then until around the nineties, focused on displaying foreign objects from around the world, in particular the “New World”. Some examples include the 1985 exhibit Schmuck aus Aller Welt (Jewellery from Around the World) at the Landschaftsmuseum Schloß Trautenfels, the Niederösterreichisches Landesmuseum’s 1977 exhibit Fischerei in aller Welt (Fishing Around the World), Spanien in der Neuen Welt (Spain in the New World) held in 1986 at Vienna’s Künstlerhaus, and the 1988 exhibit Österreichische Forscher in der Dritten Welt (Austrian Researchers in the Third World) held at the Creditanstalt Bankverein in Vienna. In the 1980s, artefacts from the Brazilian collection were displayed as part of the South American permanent exhibition at the Völkerkunde, the Weltmuseum’s predecessor. Though the 1971 exhibition Brasiliens Indianer, brought together under the influence of work by Etta Becker-Donner, displayed over 600 archaeological and ethnographic objects originating from Brazil.

Even recently, the majority of the outgoing loans from the Weltmuseum are to Austrian and German museums in general, but particularly to the Weltmuseum’s affiliated institutions. These include the Kunsthistorisches Museum and Schloss Ambras in Innsbruck. Generally, the outgoing loans go to other museums in small numbers, for example only one object (an axe with the inventory number 91929) went to the exhibit Frauen Kunst und Macht at Schloss Ambras in 2018 (Eichberger et al. 2018). In other words, it is often the case that only one or a couple of artefacts from the Brazilian collection are sent to support an outside exhibition. This is also often the case for more thematic in-house displays, such as

---

(Austrian publishing company), Museum St. Veit (Austria), Museum der Austria-Tabakwerke (Austrian tobacco company).

5 This is based on the Weltmuseum’s outgoing loan contracts for this period.
the Kunstgeschichten Chronologie exhibit in 2016 – 2017 where two only objects from the collection were used, and Pop-Up World in 2017 – 2018 (www.weltmuseumwien.at) where three objects were included. Unless, of course, the exhibit specifically concerns Brazilian history and cultures, in which instance a large number of objects from the collection are displayed at once. This is the case for the exhibit Brasilien. Von Österreich zur neuen Welt (Brazil. From Austria to the New World) held at the Kunsthalle Krems from 2007 to 2008. As well as the Jenseits von Brasilien (Beyond Brazil) exhibit held at the Völkermuseum in 2012 and 2013.

More recent loan activities reflect modern exhibition practices as well as general trends in narration and representation. Recent and contemporary exhibition tend to be more thematic than they were in the past. They often attempt to include the voices of more marginalized groups of people, based on ethnicity or gender for instance. More attention is paid to overarching, cross-cultural themes rather than being limited by geographic settings as well. The Brazilian permanent exhibition at the Weltmuseum for instance is divided based on cultural groups. For this permanent exhibit, only objects from the Weltmuseum’s own inventory have been used, but also only artefacts belonging to living indigenous groups. Rather than grouping similar objects together in order to represent the people of Brazil, objects belonging to one indigenous group are placed together in a single display case. For instance, one display case represents Tukano cultural practices by discussing their creation myths. In this case, an audio recording is supported with objects which are mentioned in the story. Recent exhibits where Brazilian objects were loaned also reflect this trend towards thematic concepts rather than a geographic focus. In 2021, an exhibit at the Kunsthistorisches Museum called Higher Powers will display one of the Brazilian collection’s highlights, a masked costume. This cross-cultural exhibition will display over 80 objects from around the world which reflect how different groups of people believe in and interact with “higher powers”.  

6 More information about this exhibition can be found on hohemermaechte.khm.at.
The Weltmuseum, like most contemporary ethnography museums, has begun to pay particular attention to the stakeholder communities represented in their exhibitions. This is clearly reflected in the Weltmuseum’s current permanent display for Brazilian culture and heritage. In the last decade, efforts were made to build relationships between the museum and its curators, and indigenous communities and their representatives. These relationships resulted in fruitful collaborations in the creation of the permanent exhibition. Opinions and concerns were shared, and the result was an inclusive multivocal representation of existing indigenous groups in Brazil. The collection’s outgoing loans also fit to this pattern. It is the responsibility of the curator to investigate the nature and narratives of the exhibition in which the object will be displayed, in order to assure its ethical use. Curators therefore play an important role as middlemen, not only for the protection of the objects, but also for the rightful representation of the cultures to whom the artefacts belong. As the collection’s conscientious representative, the curator must therefore be aware of possibly damaging narratives, not only in their own museum displays, but also for those where loaned objects are intended to be shown.

Essentially, this has to do with current moral and ethical standards. This is what has driven the past and recent developments of cultural representation in ethnographic museums (Clavir 2002; Feest 2007). Such things are however subjective and develop with time and general trends. Striving towards a fair, objective and truthful representation of the cultures displayed should however be the goal of ethnographic museums. Although one could argue that there is no such thing as an objective exhibition where all stakeholders are satisfied, this should nonetheless be the ambition of curators and exhibit designers. From othering and exoticism, to inclusion and multivocality, ethnographic museums have made substantial progress over the last century. There is however much more still to be done. Stakeholders and relevant communities could be given more authority in the creation of exhibitions. Curators could attempt to include stakeholders on a collaborative level rather than simply consulting them and choosing which opinions and concerns to heed. The thorough makeover and reopening of the Weltmuseum Wien on 25 October 2017, facilitated the creation of modern ethnographic exhibitions. These displays, including the *Austrian Mosaic of Brazil*
are relatively forward thinking in their approach to the representation of peoples and cultures. Although concerted efforts were made to increase stakeholder accessibility and involvement, there is still room for improvement when it comes to the distribution of power in the decision-making process. Multivocality and involvement of relevant stakeholders and communities was encouraged but the initial planning and final choices concerning the content and narratives in the displays lay in the hands of professionals. Essentially, ethnographic museums should rethink and redistribute authority.

One of the fascinating things about museum collections is the ability of their artefacts to illustrate almost endless narratives. Time, place, personal influences, public opinions, trends, politics and so on, all have an influence on both the status of these collections as well as the exhibitions they create. Ethnographic collections and their ties to indigenous communities are particularly susceptible to such fluctuations. An example of this is the *Indigenous Australia: Enduring Civilization* exhibition held at the British Museum in 2015 and its partner exhibition at the National Museum of Australia titled *Encounters* held from 2016 – 2017. One exhibition was held in two globally distant museums. Although the same objects were used in both, the exhibition was not the same. In this case, different interpretations of the same artefacts were made to suit the audience (Sculthorpe 2017). This case study proves that the same objects even in a similar exhibition are subject to the influences of their surroundings, geographically, politically and socially. The same can be observed in the Brazilian collection. Over time and in different contexts the same objects can be used to tell very different stories. The common unchanging factor however is that these objects will always represent the cultures from which they originate, especially when they are contemporary societies. This is why ethnography museums are faced with the extra challenge of representation. Curators must take into account what the narratives they create mean to their stakeholders and how they may influence the cultures they claim to speak about.
3.2 Exhibiting and Loaning Brazilian Objects

In order to find out why certain objects are exhibited more often than others, it was first necessary to create a spreadsheet outlining which objects have been displayed and how often. Based on information from the museum’s database, it was possible to analyse the exhibition patterns for the last 20 years (from 2000 to 2020). The data from the last 20 years should therefore be relatively accurate. Additionally, this information was supported with data collected from catalogues (1971 – 2007) and the museum’s loan archives. The earliest archives dated from the late nineteenth century and included contracts up until 2000. They consisted of all the loan contracts concerning the collections now owned by the Weltmuseum. In many cases, the insurance documents with valuations of the loaned items were also included.

There were a few issues which arose when compiling the data for the spreadsheet. The main flaw is that the list of exhibited objects is incomplete. There are a few unavoidable reasons for this. I recorded all the Brazilian collection’s inventory numbers from the archive’s loan documents as well as those from the past exhibition catalogues when available. The earliest documents from the late nineteenth and early twentieth century however were often messy handwritten notes only vaguely describing the objects and without listed accession numbers. This made it almost impossible to match the associated objects with those currently accessioned in the Weltmuseum’s collection. As the archives held all loan agreements for the whole museum between the late nineteenth century and the present day, it is also possible that some individual Brazilian items were overlooked while researching the archival material. Furthermore, the history of displayed objects in exhibitions from the nineteenth century and earlier are difficult to identify. In some cases, other sources could be used to provide corroboration, such as written descriptions and drawn images. Without accession numbers however, matching descriptions to objects still remained a challenge. Finally, the largest hole in my data is due to a missing archival file. From October 1992 to March 1993, the Schlossmuseum Linz held a major exhibition titled Leben mit dem Regenwald (Living with the Rainforest). This exhibition required a significant number of loaned objects from the Weltmuseum in general and the
Brazilian collection in particular. Unfortunately, the loan contracts for the years 1992 to 1993 were missing from the Weltmuseum’s records. The exhibition catalogue also did not list the artefacts which were displayed. In a final attempt to recover the missing data, I contacted the Schlossmuseum Linz’ archives department. Despite their best efforts, they were also unable to uncover the loan documents for this exhibition. It appears that record-keeping for older collections and especially concerning in-coming loaned objects is a common problem among museums (Van Horn 2013). The Kentucky Historical Society case study presented by Van Horn illustrates how old numbering systems and database migrations can cause unforeseen issues with museum records. The cleaning up of these records was a major task, especially since loaned items involved legal ownership complications. Similar issues can be observed in the Weltmuseum’s records. Their loan records first begin in the late nineteenth century, although the collection has been in existence since the sixteenth century. Furthermore, standardized inventory numbers were not used in the earlier records, and the objects were only described. This makes it highly challenging to match these objects with the existing inventory numbers in the database as many objects are similar. Finally, the ethnographic collection has belonged to a number of monarchs and departments over time. It was, for instance, once part of the Natural History Museum and it could be that documents specifically concerning the ethnographic objects remain among their records. Any attempt to update the museum’s digital database with such records would be a significant undertaking but nevertheless an important one. Such issues can cause complications further on when considering provenance, locating objects or when conducting studies such as this one. Overall, however, I believe that the list I was able to compile, though undoubtably incomplete, is nevertheless thorough enough to distinguish certain patterns and draw conclusions about the history of exhibition practices pertaining to the Brazilian collection.

By drawing together the exhibition history based on the accession numbers of the objects in the Brazilian collection, I was able to come up with the following statistics. The reader should bear in mind that these numbers are likely slightly higher in reality due to the previously detailed difficulties I faced in my data collection, though unlikely to skew the data in a systemic direction that would
impact my conclusions. According to the current database entries, there are 5549 accession numbers in the Brazilian collection. I specify accession numbers, because there are more individual objects than there are accession numbers. This is because of items which come in pairs or have multiple parts for instance. A pair of shoes for example would be accessioned under the same number but the left and right would be specified with a and b at the end of the number. This number does not include objects whose provenances are unknown, even if it is likely they are from Brazil. It also excludes the approximately 17,000 photographs and ethnographic images gathered in Brazil.

Of the 5549 accession numbers in the Brazilian collection, 1123 of them have been exhibited, according to my findings. This means that in the history of the collection, 20.2 percent of it has been exhibited at least once. In contrast, 79.8 percent of the collection has never been on display (see figure 4). Although it is well-known that only a fraction of most collections is ever on display (Clavir 2002; Dean 1997, 15), I was surprised to discover that the vast majority of the collection had not once been on display. Even taking into account the holes in my data, such as the lack of documentation from the nineteenth century displays, this estimate is higher than expected. In total, artefacts from the collection have been exhibited 1447 times. This number includes objects which have been exhibited multiple times.
This pie chart shows the contrast between the number of inventory numbers from the total Brazilian collection which have been on display versus the number of inventoried objects which have never been exhibited.

Table 1 shows the frequency at which objects have been displayed. Of the collection’s 1123 exhibited objects, 944 of them have only ever been exhibited once. That means that 84.7 percent of the exhibited artefacts have been on display a single time only. The percent of exhibited items descends drastically as the frequency increases. This trend is visually represented in figure 5. 100 objects have been displayed twice, accounting for 8.1 percent of the 1123 exhibited items. This rapidly decreases to only two artefacts which have been displayed at least 7 times, which represents a meagre 0.2 percent of all the objects ever exhibited. These two objects are the collection’s most ever displayed accessions. One of them is an anchor-shaped axe from the Tupinambá people (accession number 10403) and a Ticuna mask costume (accession number 1477). We will look more closely at these two artefacts in chapter four.
Table 1 – Of the 1123 objects from the Brazilian collection which have been displayed, this table shows how many objects have been displayed at each frequency. It also shows what percent of the exhibited collection each frequency represents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of exhibition</th>
<th>Number of objects</th>
<th>Percent of exhibited objects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5 – This graph depicts the steep decline in the number of artefacts in relation to their frequency of display.

Table 2 and figure 6 demonstrate the frequency at which objects have been displayed as a percentage of the entire collection. Table 2 shows that of the 20.2 percent of the entire collection which has been exhibited, the 17 percent majority has been exhibited only once. Again, this percentage decreases drastically between 1.8 percent of the objects which have been exhibited twice to a miniscule 0.03 percent of the whole collection which has been shown 7 times (see figure 6).
Table 2 – This table shows the percent of the total Brazilian collection which has been exhibited at each frequency, from never (0 times) to the maximum of 7 times.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent of entire collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6 – This graph depicts the steep decline in the percentage of artefacts from the entire collection in relation to their frequency of display. The reader should note that the low percentage of objects displayed 6 times (0.05%) and 7 times (0.03%) are too small to see at this scale.

There are currently 186 artefacts on display in the Weltmuseum’s permanent Brazilian exhibition *Ein Österreiches Mosaik Brasiliens* (An Austrian Mosaic of Brazil). This accounts for 3.4 percent of the total collection. This is to be expected, as museum collections are often described metaphorically as icebergs.
The visible tip of the iceberg reflects the exhibited objects and the vast majority of the collection is unseen, much like the large part of an iceberg which is underwater. The bulk of the artefacts, 122 of the 186 permanently exhibited objects, are on display for the first time. This is 65.6 percent of the exhibited items. This is significant because it means that some of the older objects from the collection were used to create narratives about living cultures for the first time. These numbers also reflect the newly accessioned objects collected by the curator during recent visits to Brazil as well as newly added donations resulting from collaborations with indigenous groups. Aside from this, 26 objects find themselves displayed for the second time, 16 and 15 for the third and fourth times respectively, 5 for the fifth time and finally 2 objects have been displayed at least 6 times in the past (see table 3). Interestingly, neither of the two most exhibited objects in the collection (which have been on display at least 7 times in the past) are on display in the permanent Brazilian exhibition.

There may be a number of explanations for this, some of which we will explore more closely in the following chapter. The main reason however is that they do not contribute to the types of narratives that Augustat, in collaboration with indigenous groups, were trying to illustrate. They may have even been considered hindering to these depictions by promoting objects which may be falsely interpreted as supporting stereotypes of “uncivilized Indians”. The exhibited objects follow the narrative of the display cases of the permanent exhibition. They mostly belong to the living indigenous groups of Tukano, Mundurucú, Sataré-Mawé and the Wari (previously referred to as the Pacaas Novos). Some folk-culture objects are also included in the rotation display which discusses Brazil’s rubber industry.
Objects currently on display - 186 total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of exhibition</th>
<th>Number of objects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 – Of the 186 objects currently on permanent display in the exhibition “An Austrian Mosaic of Brazil”, this table shows how many of those objects have been displayed at each frequency. Note that the majority of them (122) are on display for the first time in this exhibit.

When analysing the total data which I amassed concerning exhibition trends, some general patterns emerged. There are a few explanations as to why some objects may be displayed more than others. One example for instance is the condition of the item. If it is in good visual condition and stably preserved, it is more likely to be exhibited. Similarly, if one object has had conservation work done on it, it is likely to be favoured over similar objects which have not been recently conserved. For example, if one feathered arrow is better preserved than the numerous others, it is more likely to be chosen for the exhibit. This is especially true in cases where the object is representative for an overarching narrative rather than being the centre of the narrative itself. In other words, any of the arrows could be used to tell the same story, therefore the best-preserved example is consistently chosen. The most prominent pattern to emerge is hardly surprising, the majority of the most exhibited objects consist of visually striking artefacts. These include the masked costume and anchor axe of course (both exhibited 7 times), as well as another similar anchor axe and masked costume (both exhibited 5 times), a number of feathered body adornments, a ritual skull and a bone ritual tool. Another general pattern which can be observed from the data, is that the majority of the exhibited objects were displayed in more recent major exhibitions featuring Brazilian culture and history. These include the Beyond Brazil exhibition which was held in the Weltmuseum (then the
Völkerkunde) from 2012 to 2013, *Brazil’s Indians* held in 1971 at the Völkerkunde, *Brazil. From Austria to the New World* held at the Kunsthalle Krems from 2007 to 2008, and of course the current permanent exhibition, as well as older exhibitions like the *Kaiserhaus Ungarngasse* which displayed objects from the imperial collection between 1837 and 1840. The vast majority of the most exhibited objects were also recorded when looking through the loan archives. This may therefore be an uneven representation of the objects as the numbers are higher because of their occurrence in the archives. As I stated previously, other objects may therefore have been overlooked in the archives or exhibited more often in the past but not recorded. Furthermore, the most exhibited artefacts were almost always also loaned to other museum for temporary exhibitions. These exhibitions include the 2019 Wes Anderson exhibition at the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna (*Ariese and Françozo 2019*), *Dürer. Kunst – Künstler – Kontext* held at the Städel Museum in Frankfurt am Main from 2013 to 2014 (*Sander, 2013*) and *Die Wittelsbacher und das Reich der Mitte* at the Bayrisches National Museum in 2009 (*Eikelmann, 2008*), to name a few. It was often the case that only one object from the Brazilian collection was loaned for these exhibitions. Interestingly, these loaned objects are consistently some of the most exhibited objects. All of these loaned objects have been exhibited 4 or more times, none of them were shown for the first time or the only time as loaned objects in other museums. This is significant to consider as it implies that objects are consistently chosen for similar factors despite the different narratives and contexts of other exhibitions and museums. It would therefore be fair to assume that these objects were chosen primarily for their aesthetic value and that perhaps their historic or cultural values were considered secondarily or not at all. However, it may also reflect the importance of these objects as rare examples of certain types of objects which are not found in other collections.

A final though important observation concerning the exhibition patterns is that according to my research, the Brazilian objects have never been exhibited outside of Europe. In other words, after their initial collection in Brazil, they have not returned to South America. Though some objects may have been repatriated and returned to Brazil, information about repatriated items was not included due to the limitations of this study. This pattern is significant as it has certain implications as
to the kinds of people and audiences who are primarily viewing the displayed items from the Brazilian collection. We can therefore question who benefits from these displayed objects the most, in what ways, and who has access – is it the stakeholder communities they represent, or largely European visitors?

The emergence of frequency patterns are perhaps the most initially useful findings which arose from the compilation of this exhibition data. It is therefore important to consider which items revealed themselves as the most exhibited objects from the collection. Speculations can be made as to why these objects in particular have been on display more frequently than others. Furthermore, we can consider what these objects can tell us about exhibition practices in general and at the Weltmuseum in particular. The next section will therefore look at some of the most exhibited objects in the collection according to my findings.
CHAPTER 4 – HIGHLIGHTS OF THE COLLECTION

During my search through the archives combined with the museum’s database information and exhibition catalogues, I found evidence that two objects in particular had been exhibited at least seven times. This makes them the two most exhibited objects in the collection. Interestingly, both of these objects have similar counterparts which have also been frequently exhibited. Additionally, three objects were displayed a total of six times. This section will take a closer look at these seven objects in particular and consider reasons as to why these objects have been exhibited more often than others. It is important to note however, that neither of the two most exhibited artefacts are currently on display in the permanent exhibition. Two of the objects which have been exhibited six times, a feathered skirt and a bone tool, are however currently part of the permanent exhibition. Interestingly, of these 5 most exhibited objects, only the anchor axe (inventory number 10403) and the feather skirt (inventory number 1295) are included in the museum’s online catalogue which is available to the public via their website7.

4.1 Anchor Axe: Number 10403

Figure 7 – Tupinambá anchor axe, Weltmuseum Wien accession number 10403 (www.weltmuseumwien.at).

7 www.weltmuseumwien.at/en/onlinecollection/
The first of the two objects is an anchor-shaped axe with the accession number 10403. This axe is registered in the museum as having been made by the Tupinambá people. It is recorded as having belonged to the Ambras collection, making it one of the oldest known objects among the Weltmuseum’s Brazilian collection. We can already consider that its longer history as part of the collection allowed for more opportunities for it to have been exhibited.

The axe is 68 centimetres long, 23 centimetres wide and 11 centimetres tall. It weighs 1.2 kilograms. The axe head is made of dark stone which is fastened to a palm wood stick by plant fibre and cotton. Pieces of rhea eggshell as well as the remains of once colourful feathers adorn the top of the staff around the axe head (see figure 7).

There is evidence of this axe having been displayed 7 times. The first mention of it having been on display was in the early nineteenth century at the Belvedere (Augustat et al. 2017, 306). The next time it emerges in the records is in the 1971 exhibition Brasiliens Indianer held at the museum when it was known as the Völkerkunde (Becker-Donner et al. 1971). This was followed by Die Wittelsbacher und das Reich der Mitte at the Bayerisches National Museum in Munich in 2009 (Eikelmann 2008), Dürer. Kunst – Künstler – Kontext at the Städel Museum in Frankfurt am Main in 2013 – 2014 (Sander 2013), the Weltmuseum’s Kunstgeschichten Chronologie exhibit in 2016 – 2017 and Pop-Up World at the Weltmuseum in 2017 – 2018 (www.weltmuseumwien.at). It was most recently exhibited at the Wes Anderson exhibition put on by the Weltmuseum and Kunsthistorisches Museum in 2019. Although it was not included in my tally, it may be important to mention that this object was also on the list of loans which were planned for an exhibition in Mannheim in 2013, which was cancelled.

This anchor-axe is recorded as having been on display as part of the Ambras curiosities at the Lower Belvedere palace in 1821. It was falsely titled the “Tomahawk of Montezuma II, Inca of Mexico”. This description is highly confusing and inaccurate but was meant to capture the imagination of otherwise ignorant Viennese spectators. Though this title gives the object a sense of
significance and likely succeeded in amazing the exhibit’s visitors, it is highly falsified and problematic. The title combines a number of terms from various distinct cultures and ethnic groups. A “tomahawk” is a North American term, Montezuma II was an Aztec ruler, and the Inca empire was largely located in what is now Peru, not Mexico (Augustat et al. 2017, 306). Even while in the Ambras castle, it was falsely identified as belonging to the “Moorish King Montezuma”. This reflects how Europeans at the time blurred the distinction between Asia and the Americas (Kern 2018, 333). In other words, such objects were seen as exotic and coming from the “New World” beyond Europe. The precise location from whence they originated seems to have been fairly irrelevant (Bleichmar 2021). This also causes problems in the identification of points of origin for objects from collections of this era. The way this axe was presented among other fantastic objects from across the world, contributed to how Europeans perceived and understood the world at the time (Mason 1994, 7).

Although this axe has been displayed under false descriptions in the past, now that its point of origin has been refined, it has been exhibited often and fairly recently. Most lately it was on display from November 2018 to April 2019 at the Kunsthistorisches Museum, the Weltmuseum’s neighbour and partner, as part of the Wes Anderson and Juman Malouf exhibition Spitzmaus Mummy in a Coffin and other Treasures. This exhibition was part of an initiative put on by the Kunsthistorisches Museum in order to show objects from their collections which are not usually on display. Creatives such as Ed Ruscha, Edmund de Waal and most recently Wes Anderson and Juman Malouf were tasked with creating an exhibition by selecting objects from the museum’s extensive collections (khm.at; Ariese and Françozo 2019). These include the Weltmuseum’s inventory.

Although this exhibition series offers the opportunity for more of the museum’s unexhibited collection to go on display, it is interesting that one of the most exhibited objects in the collection was chosen once again. Given Wes Anderson’s renowned attention to aesthetics, this may offer one explanation as to why the axe was chosen.

According to curator Augustat, there are a few key reasons as to why this axe has been exhibited so often in comparison to other artefacts in the Brazilian
collection. As we have discussed, it is one of the oldest objects in the collection. Its longer existence in the hands of the Habsburgs, leading up to its eventual addition to the Weltmuseum’s inventory, allowed for more exhibition opportunities. Secondly, it is aesthetically pleasing. Having chosen it for his exhibition, Wes Anderson’s keen eye for aesthetics demonstrates the axe’s visually appealing qualities.

Finally, this sixteenth century anchor axe from the Tupinambá people is particularly rare. The Tupinambá are one of the first Brazilian groups who Europeans had contact with. This Sixteenth century object is therefore a material witness to one of these early encounters. How this axe was collected and by whom remains unknown, but it could be possible that such an elaborately feathered piece was used as an item of exchange between indigenous people and Europeans (Françozo 2015). Nevertheless, the age and rarity of this object likely contributed to its success in museum exhibitions. A similar Tupinambá anchor axe from the Ambras collection (accession number 91929) was also exhibited five times. This example however is more simple and far less elaborate than the axe numbered 10403. These are the main reasons as to why this anchor-shaped axe has been exhibited so frequently in the past.

4.2 Anchor Axe: Number 91929

As mentioned, there is a second anchor-shaped axe held in the Brazilian collection, dating to approximately the same period (accession number 91929, see figure 8). The long axe handle is made of palm wood and the stone axe head is fastened to it with cotton string. The axe is 96 centimetres long, 14 centimetres wide and 4 centimetres thick, weighing just over a kilogram. According to the museum’s database, it was also made by the Tupinambá people. The exact date of its creation remains unknown, but its recorded presence in the Ambras collection means it was made sometime before 1596. Though he is unlikely to be the initial collector, the axe’s earliest European owner is recorded in the database as Count Jakob Hannibal I von Hohenems (1530 – 1587), a member of the Habsburg Imperial House.
Although this particular item was once part of the Ambras collection, it also spent time among the Kunsthistorisches Museum’s weapons collection. At some point it joined objects of a similar geographic origin when it became part of the Brazilian collection. This is interesting as it demonstrates how an object can create very diverse narratives based on the context it is in. This axe has represented exoticism in the cabinet of curiosities, a type of weaponry, and finally it became a representation of cultural heritage and the first contact period. These changing narratives based on context are also found in exhibition practices.

This axe has been displayed quite frequently in comparison to other objects in the collection. According to my research, it has been exhibited at least 5 times: it was displayed at the Völkerkunde museum in Brasiliens Indianer in 1971 (Becker-Donner et al. 1971), it was part of the permanent South America exhibition at the Völkerkunde in the 1980s (Binder and Feest 1980), in 1982 it was shown at Mythen der Neuen Welt: die Entdeckung Lateinamerikas in der europäischen Kunst und Wissenschaft (Myths of the New World - the Discovery of Latin America in European Art and Science) at Charlottenburg Palace in Germany, in 1986 it was included in Spanien in der Neuen Welt (Spain in the New World) at Vienna’s Künstlerhaus, and more recently it returned to Ambras castle in 2018 for the exhibit Frauen Kunst und Macht (Women Art and Power) (Eichberger et al. 2018).

As previously discussed, this object was displayed in the 1980s during a time where exhibits seem to reflect a renewed European fascination with the “New World”. It is interesting to consider how its presence in these various exhibits
reflects the object’s ability to contribute to multiple narratives, only one of which was specifically targeted at representing the indigenous people of Brazil.

4.3 Masked Costume: Number 1477

Figure 9 – Ticuna masked costume of a Storm Spirit, Weltmuseum Wien accession number 1477 (hoheremaechte.khm.at).

Aside from the anchor axe, there is one other object in the collection which, according to my findings, has been exhibited 7 times. It is a 155-centimetre tall, masked costume of a Storm Spirit (accession number 1477). The object dates to around 1830 and was collected by Natterer, Pohl and Schott during their travels. It was made by the Ticuna people of the upper Amazon River. The costume is mostly made up of bark cloth, plant fibres, resin, feathers, mother of pearl and seeds (Augustat and Feest 2014, 61) (see figure 9).

It was displayed in the major exhibition Beyond Brazil at the Völkerkunde in 2012 – 2013, from 2007 to 2008 it was displayed in the Brazil. From Austria to the New
World exhibition at the Kunsthalle Krems, at the Niederösterreichisches Landesausstellung in 2006, in the 1995 exhibition Brasilianische Reise 1817–1820 held at the Staatliches Museum für Völkerkunde in Munich, it was part of the Völkerkunde’s permanent South America exhibition during the 1980s, shown in Brasiliens Indianer at the Völkerkunde in 1971 and it is planned for the Higher Powers exhibition taking place in 2021 from May to August at the Kunsthistorisches Museum. Although the last exhibition has yet to go on display, I found it nevertheless useful to include it in my analysis. A similar object (accession number 1476) is also one of the most exhibited objects, having been displayed 5 times. In all 5 of these exhibitions, the other masked costume (number 1477) was also presented.

Like the anchor axe, this artefact is not currently on display in the permanent exhibition. After consulting curator Augustat the reasons for this became clear. Just like the anchor axe, this masked costume did not fit with any of the relevant narratives from the permanent exhibition. Since they have often been displayed in the past as well, Augustat said it was not necessary to include them in the exhibition. This piece is particularly aesthetically interesting which is why it has been chosen to be displayed in the upcoming Higher Powers exhibition at the Kunsthistorisches Museum starting on the 18th of May 2021. Augustat said that her colleagues with an art history background were particularly fascinated with this artefact. The masked costume is also one of the oldest known examples from the Ticuna people. According to Augustat, older examples were once held in Brazil’s National Museum but they were destroyed in the tragic fire which engulfed the entire museum in 2018. Such events highlight the critical responsibility of assemblages such as the Weltmuseum’s Brazilian collection, in preserving and sharing cultural materials for indigenous people and future generations.

4.4 Masked Costume: Number 1476

The Brazilian collection holds a second masked costume (accession number 1476). Like the other costume, it is made of bark cloth and plant fibres. Pigments
were used to paint and decorate the object. The costume is 175 centimetres tall, 93 centimetres from arm to arm and 24 centimetres wide (see figure 10).

Figure 10 – Ticuna masked costumes, Weltmuseum Wien accession number 1476 (left) and 1477 (right) (Augustat 2012, 77).

The ritual costume was also made by the Ticuna people and collected by Natterer during his travels. Its history is similar to its partner in the collection though its different appearance has led it to be displayed a total of 5 times – two times less than its counterpart. As mentioned, in all 5 occasions when it has been displayed, the other costume (accession number 1477) was also present. These 5 exhibits include: Brasiliens Indianer at the Völkerkunde in 1971, Brasilianische Reise 1817 – 1820 held at the Staatliches Museum für Völkerkunde in Munich in 1995, the Niederösterreichisches Landesausstellung in 2006, at the Kunsthalle Krems from 2007 to 2008 for the Brazil. From Austria to the New World exhibition, and finally, Beyond Brazil at the Völkerkunde in 2012 – 2013.
Speculation can be made as to why these objects are so often exhibited as a pair and furthermore why this particular object (accession number 1476) has never been exhibited alone. Again, I believe we can conclude that alone this object is not as visually striking as its counterpart (see figure 10 for comparison) and therefore when deciding between the two, object 1477 is consistently favoured. We can assume its condition is adequate enough for display, as it has been shown fairly recently, and therefore exclude this as a reason for its less frequent selection. As a pair, their presence is most remarkable, but when space only allows for a single example, the more aesthetically striking object is once again favoured. This is therefore demonstrative of how when two or more similar artefacts can be used to illustrate the same narrative, the most visually captivating is usually chosen. Though this comes as no surprise, it is interesting to see this assumption confirmed with the data.

4.5 Child Carrying Strap: Number 675

Object number 675 is a child carrying strap made by Brazil’s Kraho people. This object was collected by Natterer, Pohl and Schott during their expedition which began in 1817. The strap is made of cotton and tassels on each end are decorated with animal claws and seeds. With the tassels extended, it is 87 centimetres long, 17 centimetres wide and 4 centimetres thick (see figure 11).
Although this artefact is not as aesthetically striking as some of the collections other frequently exhibited objects, this piece has been displayed 6 times. It was first shown at the Kaiserhaus exhibition held at Ungarngasse from 1837 to 1840, then at Brasiliens Indianer at the Völkerkunde in 1971, followed by the 1995 exhibit Brasilianische Reise 1817 – 1820 at the Staatliches Museum für Völkerkunde, the Brasilianisches Museum from 2016 to 2017, Beyond Brazil at the Völkerkunde in 2012 – 2013, and most recently Ein Koloniales Ding (A Colonial Thing) at the Weltmuseum from 2019 to 2020.

It is interesting that this everyday object has become one of the collection’s most frequently exhibited accessions, as it does not entirely follow the pattern which
favours aesthetically significant items. As it appears in exhibits which mostly focus on Brazil, perhaps it was used to demonstrate the way of life for indigenous mothers and children. This object may therefore be the exception among the most frequently exhibited artefacts, as the story it tells is more highly valued than its aesthetic qualities. That being said, it may have been favoured for its aesthetic values over other similar objects such as object number 145044, an Urubú child carrying strap collected by Malkin.

4.6 Feathered Cape: Number 1295

The following artefact is a feathered object which has been described as an “Umhang” which translates to cape, as well as “Hüftschurz” which roughly translates to hip apron (accession number 1295). Whether this piece was originally worn around the hips or over the shoulders, it is nonetheless a fine and colourful example of Mundurucú featherwork (see figures 12 and 15). It is made of cotton, raffia, macaw and curassow feathers.

Figure 12 – Mundurucú feathered cape, Weltmuseum Wien accession number 1295 (www.weltmuseumwien.at).
Having been collected by Natterer, this object has survived for around two centuries and remains in relatively good condition with its many brightly coloured feathers. This is likely to have had an influence over its frequent selection for exhibits, which total 6 times overall. It was shown at *Brasiliens Indianer* (Völkerkunde 1971), *Brasilianische Reise 1817 – 1820* (Staatsliches Museum für Völkerkunde 1995), *Niederösterreichisches Landesausstellung* (2006), *Brasilien. Von Österreich zur neuen Welt* (Kunsthalle Krems 2007 – 2008) and *Beyond Brazil* (Völkerkunde 2012 – 2013).

Finally, it is also currently in the Weltmuseum’s permanent exhibition as part of the Mundurucú display case. Despite its obvious aesthetic qualities, its inclusion in the current permanent exhibit reflects its value as a cultural heritage object for contemporary Mundurucú people. This beautiful piece is an interesting union of aesthetic values and cultural heritage importance. Although its presence in the permanent display add to the overall aesthetic of brightly coloured Mundurucú featherwork (see figure 15), it could also provide descendant communities with a means of connecting with their cultural heritage.

4.7 Ritual Tool: Number 1373

![Ritual Tool: Number 1373](www.weltmuseumwien.at)

The final highlight from the collection is a ritual tool made of wood and deer bone (accession number 1373). It measures 33 centimetres long, 5 centimetres wide and 3 centimetres tall (see figure 13). It was collected by Johann Natterer in 1830. The object was made and used by the Sateré-Mawé people. Tools such as this one
would have been used by a shaman to summon certain spirit people during rituals (Augustat 2012, 131).

This object is among the top 0.05 percent of the total collection which has been displayed at least 6 times. The exhibits in which it appeared are the following: *Brasiliens Indianer* at the Völkerkunde Museum (1971), the Völkerkunde’s permanent *South America* exhibition (1980s), the *Amazonia* exhibit at the Tropenmuseum Amsterdam (1996), *Brasilien. Von Österreich zur neuen Welt* at the Kunsthalle Krems (2007 – 2008) and *Beyond Brazil* at the Völkerkunde Museum (2012 – 2013). It is also currently on display in the Weltmuseum’s permanent exhibit. It is part of the Sataré-Mawé vitrine about “Change and Continuity” which discusses the modern use of guaraná in ritual practices.

The European exhibitions where this object has been presented generally share an attempt to represent the life of indigenous people from Brazil and the surrounding area. The idea of shamanism and the use of mind-altering substances is an intriguing topic, particularly for European audiences. We can thus consider how the frequent inclusion of this object in exhibits attempting to represent Brazilian indigenous life may influence European perceptions of these people. Although it may have perpetuated negative connotations surrounding ideas of shamanism in the past, I believe that the context in which it is currently displayed provides a new and insightful perspective. The exhibition text quotes Ranulfo de Oliveira, a Sataré-Mawé translator and subsistence farmer. He shares his own opinions and concerns about modern shamanism, stating that they were previously respected doctors but have become uncommon, deceptive and untrustworthy.

### 4.8 Consequences and Representation

Having established that these objects are the collection’s most frequently exhibited, we can consider what kinds of consequences their recurrent display may have. Museums tend to be seen as objective, factual and reliable sources of information. In reality, this is of course not the case. Exhibitions are a presentation of narratives which are usually decided by curators and relevant professionals. Even in *An Austrian Mosaic of Brazil* where conscious efforts have been made to
include the opinions and concerns of relevant stakeholders, the final decision-making power lay in the hands of the curator. Museums, and more specifically curators therefore hold much responsibility in the narratives they create using the objects in the collection. Essentially, they have the power to create knowledge as they craft perspectives and understandings of cultures, people and events (Moser 2010).

We can therefore question what kinds of narratives and knowledge these objects produce. This of course has much to do with the context in which they are displayed. It also requires a conscious curator to foresee possibly damaging interpretations of the objects. In my opinion Claudia Augustat has handled her curatorial responsibilities well in this regard. The exclusion of the two most displayed objects from the permanent exhibition reflect this. Careful attention has been paid to the narratives and types of knowledge which is produced through this permanent display. Since the two objects had no place among these thematic threads, they were excluded despite being a couple of the most rare and unique objects in the collection. As we have seen in relation to the anchor axe, false and misleading labels can create damaging and lasting notions of othering and exoticism. Misinformation and biases in museums can create false knowledge concerning other cultures and perpetuate notions of racism, sexism and the like.

On the other hand, however, museums have both the power and responsibility to challenge their own practices and move towards using their collections to produce inclusive and empowering exhibitions. Curators have a challenging duty where they struggle with the tension between showing rare and fascinating objects while considering what the uninformed interpretations of visitors may be. For instance, the materials, age, state of preservation and rarity make the masked costume (accession number 1477) one of the most captivating pieces in the Brazilian collection. In contrast however, the costume has a large and prominent phallus. The face, though captivating is also somewhat intimidating. At a first glance, even when framed in a positive way, such an object may bring forth ingrained perceptions of aggressive “savagery” which ethnography museums in particular currently work so hard to overcome. It is for reasons such as these that it is important for museums to consider which objects in their collections have been exhibited more often, why and in what contexts. Once this is understood, thoughts
about the types of knowledge which is created can be assessed. It is through these types of self-critical reflections that curatorial practices can attempt to move towards more objective, inclusive and factual cultural and historic representations.

The job of a curator is therefore to do a value assessment of the objects in the collection and decide which objects to display based on which values. These values, be them aesthetic, spiritual, historical, economic, scientific, educational and so on, are subjective. They depend on the stakeholders and their own priorities and goals. The curator therefore wields a powerful decision-making position. They have the challenging responsibility of assessing who the relevant stakeholders are and what their interests may be. In the best case, this is done through an interaction and collaboration with individual stakeholders and stakeholder communities. Curators are the final advocates for the interests of these people and must make careful decisions in this respect. In an *Austrian Mosaic of Brazil*, curator Augustat made the careful decision of only including objects in the exhibition which belong to Brazil’s contemporary indigenous groups. This is a respectful decision which comes with its challenges but the product of which was highly rewarding to the communities included in the display as well as for the collection, the museum and its visitors.
CHAPTER 5 – CURRENT TRENDS IN EXHIBITION MAKING AND CHOOSING FROM THE COLLECTION: AN INTERVIEW WITH CLAUDIA AUGUSTAT

During my research at the Weltmuseum, I had the privilege of being able to talk to Claudia Augustat. The discussions I had with her provided an interesting first-hand perspective into current exhibition-making and curatorial trends and issues in the context of a major ethnography museum. The themes we discussed in the context of the Weltmuseum often touched on larger debates and concerns in the wider field of museum practices. The following insights were drawn together based on notes I took during an informal interview at the museum.

I began by asking about the overarching goal of the current permanent Brazilian exhibition. I questioned whether it was to teach mainly European visitors about Brazilian cultures. This assumption was far from reality. Augustat said that the intention of the permanent exhibition was to bring together the historic collection with Brazil’s current indigenous groups. For this reason, the artefacts on display only originate from existing indigenous groups. The permanent exhibition is therefore constructed around the concept that it should be for the people it aims to represent. This is in line with efforts of contemporary ethnography museums to become platforms of self-representation for often marginalized indigenous groups (www.volkenkunde.nl, Hoobler 2006). Although some groups regrettably no longer exist, most of them still survive. The Southern Kayapó for instance, were thought to have been extinct, but a few members were “rediscovered”. Though they now call themselves Panará, they are descendants of the Southern Kayapó (Augustat 2012, 108 – 109). The group therefore continues to exist despite the challenges they have faced. Identifying indigenous groups and thus stakeholders, can therefore be difficult. They can split, adapt, merge and intermarry creating a complex and fluid web of cultural factions.

Augustat kindly took me through the permanent exhibit where she frequently drew my attention to the aspects where Brazilian groups had been involved. Efforts were made to create a multivocal exhibit. The voices of various specialists, stakeholders and indigenous communities were included in both the creation of
the exhibit and the accompanying catalogue. To acknowledge their contributions, their names were written on the exhibit panels and as co-authors for the catalogue (figure 14). Indigenous stakeholders also created content which was included in the exhibition, such as an auto-ethnographic film which was produced by a Sataré-Mawé videographer. There are also interviews in indigenous languages and a voice recording of a Tukano creation myth which can be played in the original language or in English or German. I also asked about a few specific objects on display like for instance the ritual skull which stands proudly in the centre of the Mundurucú vitrine (figure 15). I wondered about their thoughts on the display of this object, particularly as it concerns the ethics of exhibiting human remains. Augustat informed me that the Mundurucú were indeed consulted about its display but had agreed to present it in the vitrine. It would also be incredibly challenging to trace the provenance of this skull as it was collected generations ago by the Mudurukú from a rival group and therefore does not belong to one of the group’s own members. Additionally, Augustat told me about visual repatriation efforts which helped indigenous groups to reconnect with their own material culture by using images of objects in the collection (Augustat 2012, 89). She described her 2011 trip to Brazil where she met with the Wari. Her and her colleagues brought with them photos which Etta Becker-Donner took during her visits in the 1950s. The Warí asked to keep the photos as they depicted relatives who had since passed away and they could show them to younger generations.

By including indigenous voices in the planning of this exhibit, it can be argued that their participation contributes to the creation of a more “authentic” exhibition (Van Broekhoven 2013). This can be beneficial to both stakeholder communities and general museum visitors. The inclusion and empowerment of indigenous voices has become a key goal for major ethnography museums, such as the National Museum of the American Indian, who state they are committed to including Native voices in their exhibits and publications (americanindian.si.edu). The inclusion of non-anthropological or specialist perspectives in the creation of narratives and knowledge has become an important part of the ethical practices of such museums (Watkins 2005, 440, 441). Essentially, museums need to attempt to even the power balance between those who make decisions and control
information access and descendent communities, whose identity may be heavily rooted in their cultural heritage (Leader-Elliot et al. 2011, 11).

Figure 14 – A text panel from the permanent exhibition “An Austrian Mosaic of Brazil” showing the names of the exhibit’s contributors.

It was clear to me that Augustat had made concerted efforts to encourage the participation and inclusion of relevant stakeholders when creating the current permanent exhibition. I therefore asked her how difficulties concerning repatriation requests played into this. When encouraging involvement, I could imagine that some of the communities may wish to have the items repatriated rather than on display in a distant European museum. Augustat said that when planning an exhibit, if relevant stakeholders wish to have an item repatriated, a new narrative is formed. A space can be left in the exhibition where the object was or was meant to go, and a different but equally important storyline can be written. In other words, the object’s absence draws attention and creates a new narrative for the exhibition. Repatriating objects from the collection is an
important symbolic action as it demonstrates a shift of power over heritage objects from museum back to descendent communities (Colwell 2015, S265).

When undertaking this project most of my research depended on Augustat’s support. I therefore thought it important to include her interests as well and attempt to answer questions she may have about the collection. When asked, her answer was both interesting and encouraging. She said for her, it was important to see the characteristics of the objects which were exhibited the most. This is because the Welthwuseum, as an ethnography museum is unlike an art history museum, such as the neighbouring Kunsthistorisches Museum. The objects at the Welthwuseum are not always chosen for their aesthetic value, unlike the artworks hanging across the street. Instead, they may be chosen for their exciting history. Augustat gave the example of the objects which were collected during first contact instances. Although they may not be strikingly aesthetic, they are especially important historic objects. Essentially, they represent the last instance of material culture which is uninfluenced by European contact. We see this tension between aesthetic and historic values reflected in the permanent exhibition as well as in the findings from my data. Some objects are clearly chosen for their aesthetic value, while others have historic significance. Both however contribute to the overall narrative of the display case in particular and the permanent exhibition as a whole. Furthermore, we can see how Augustat has already begun to alter exhibition trends as the majority of the objects in the permanent exhibit are on display for the first time and tend to focus on their added value to the narratives of the exhibit rather than mainly its aesthetic.

After having been through the permanent exhibit together, I asked Augustat if there was anything she would change or have done differently. There is one “rotation” vitrine, which was created with the intention that the objects on display could be interchanged occasionally in order to show more items from the collection and share more narratives. Although a new display has already been planned and prepared for this case, a lack of budget prevents it from being switched with the current display. Augustat therefore hopes this rotation vitrine can be more active in the future. Another small but significant change she would make is the labelling in the Mundurucú display case. In the centre is a ritual
human head (figure 15). Currently, it is labelled as “Kopftrophäe” (trophy head), but Augustat feels this is inappropriate and misrepresents the object and Mundurucú people. She would therefore like to change the name and description of the object to something more accurate and respectful. Lastly, Augustat would like to make one of the exhibit’s audio displays more engaging. Currently, Tukano myths are told in German, English and their original Tukano language. When a visitor stands under a ceiling-mounted speaker, they can hear these myths while looking at related objects in the near-by display case. Unfortunately, few visitors stay to listen to these audio clips. Augustat would therefore like to add images to the video which displays the text in order to engage passers-by and capture their attention, while also encouraging them to connect the stories with the objects on display.

Figure 15 – The Mundurucú display case in the Weltmuseum’s permanent exhibit “An Austrian Mosaic of Brazil”. In the centre is a human ritual skull surrounded by various featherwork objects.
Finally, I asked Augustat about her plans and aspirations for the future. In 2022 an exhibit titled *From the Ground Up* is planned. This will be the next major Brazilian exhibition at the Weltmuseum. It will focus on non-academic art, highlighting works by female and indigenous artists as well as urban artists for instance. These will be displayed alongside loans from Brazilian museums and of course objects from the Weltmuseum’s own collection.
CHAPTER 6 – CONCLUSION

Through the culmination of my findings, I was able to identify general trends in the display of the objects from this collection and draw conclusions which correspond to my research questions. This required an in-depth analysis of my data and critical thinking concerning its implications. Considerations were also made as to how these findings relate to current debates in the field of curatorial and exhibition practices and museum collections management. This research has generated valuable information regarding the choices which are made in relation to these fields. These decisions can then be evaluated in order to continue successful curatorial practices and improve exhibition procedures for the future.

While conducting my research and compiling my findings, one thing became abundantly clear; the Weltmuseum’s Brazilian collection is fluid. It is not a monolithic or stagnant collection. Rather, it ebbs and flows in waves of enhancement and loss. These fluctuations are often tied to larger political circumstances as well as their subsequent financial impact on the museum as an institution. Much of the collection’s fluidity is also related to its complicated history, a common similarity among ethnographic collections. This history and the people involved with the collection, both past and present, continue to shape it. Like many ethnographic assemblages, the Brazilian collection is subject to the tensions created between past and present. The Brazilian collection in general and Claudia Augustat as its advocate, challenge these tensions in order to secure the future of the collection as accessible, multivocal and inclusive.

The development of the museum, the collectors involved and the subsequent assemblage of artefacts which was formed has been discussed. Collection practices are guided by decisions which determine worth as defined in various different ways depending on the stakeholders involved. These are of course subjective opinions though they form the base from which a collection is built. These past actions, decisions and opinions determined what was displayed in the past and how. But they also continue to influence the narratives and exhibitions of the present (Scott, 2012).
When thinking back to the original guiding research questions, this research project has been generally successful in answering those questions. Most prominently this project has shed some light on the most and least exhibited objects belonging to the Brazilian collection. We have seen that the majority of the collection, approximately 80 percent of the 5,549 objects in the collection, have never been exhibited. Of the 1,123 objects which have been recorded as having been on display, the vast majority, 84.1 percent, have only been exhibited one single time. Very few artefacts have been displayed more than once and only two objects in the collection have been recorded as having been on display seven times. These two collection highlights, the sixteenth century anchor axe and rare masked costume were looked at in detail. Reasons for their frequent display were considered as were the consequences to the creation of knowledge and narratives in relation to these pieces and the people they represent.

Despite the overwhelming number of historically and culturally important objects belonging to the Brazilian collection, we have seen that artefacts were consistently chosen for their aesthetic values. This however is beginning to change. Many of the artefacts in the current permanent exhibition reflect the cultural value of the objects by belonging to living indigenous groups only. Furthermore, narratives concerning first-contact events offer the opportunity to display objects which are historically significant rather than purely aesthetically striking. Considering these findings, we can criticise other museums for focusing too heavily on the aesthetic aspects of artefacts rather than highlighting their other heritage values. Compared to art history museums, one would think this distinction was intrinsic for ethnographic or historic museum displays. The data I compiled has led me to believe otherwise. Museums should therefore be more conscious of this, though we must also acknowledge their goal to attract museum visitors. Finding a suitable balance between the heritage, historic, ritual and cultural values of the objects in the display and those of significant aesthetic value, is a challenge faced by curators and exhibition designers alike. By acknowledging this bias towards aesthetics however, steps can made to reassess the values of the objects on display. This opens up opportunities for exhibitions to be designed and curated based on new perspectives which may be better suited to stakeholders and their interests.
The question now remains, how can we use this information to benefit the collection and its stakeholders in the future? One approach would be to make the unexhibited artefacts more accessible to the public. Some museums are tackling this “iceberg” issue surrounding exhibited ratios of their collections in creative ways. The Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen in Rotterdam is currently building a ground-breaking open storage facility to be known as the Boijmans Depot. The depot will house the museum’s roughly 151,000 artefacts in viewable display cases which can be visited by the public (www.smithsonianmag.com). Other museums such as the Victoria and Albert Museum in London have similar ambitions (www.theguardian.com). Such radical solutions are perhaps only a dream for most museums limited by budget, space and resources. Smaller-scale projects can also be considered, such as the rotation display in the permanent exhibit at the Weltmuseum. As we have seen however, although this allows for the more frequent display of various objects from the collection, even small-scale projects such as these can be undercut by budget limitations. Another way of increasing global accessibility to unexhibited objects in museum collections are to put them in an easily searchable online catalogue. Most major museums have begun these types of projects though many of them struggle to put the entirety of their vast collections online. The Weltmuseum for instance has a total of 6,648 objects online, from all their combined collections which total 196,221 inventory numbers and approximately 250,000 individual objects. Though this is a good start, it is only a fraction of the total objects belonging to the museum. Furthermore, when resources are limited, it is often the case that highlights from the collection are favoured. This perpetuates the trends we can observe in display practices, such as the favouring of particularly rare or aesthetic items.

We then have to ask ourselves, is it truly a negative outcome that such large parts of museum collections are never exhibited? If not to be displayed to the public, what then is the purpose of a museum collection and what role does the museum fulfil in owning so many unexhibited objects? The preservation and maintenance of such vast collections are of course expensive and require substantial resources. Although museums are largely seen as educational institutions, they are also important custodians of cultural and historic materials. Not all objects are accessioned into collections with the intension of contributing to a successful
exhibition. Many artefacts are instead collected primarily for their historic or scientific importance. Once in the collection, they can be preserved and conserved for future generations, stakeholders and communities. This is the main function of a museum as a guardian of cultural heritage.

Moving forwards, there are some logical next steps which could be useful continuations of my research project and the information I have gathered. Whilst conducting my research I was faced with some limitations. Unfortunately, I was not able to access the museum’s database myself due to the Covid-19 pandemic and its ensuing regulations. Given access, I would have for instance, liked to analyse the unexhibited objects. It would be interesting to undertake an investigation which looks at why these numerous objects in particular have never been on display yet are deemed worthy of the resources required to preserve them in the collection. It would then be useful to look at what types of narratives they could be used to illustrate as well as which communities and stakeholders they represent. This would ultimately be valuable information to have in order to consider how we can make these unexhibited objects more accessible and available to loan to stakeholders in particular and the public in general. One could thus propose a strategy which could be introduced into the collection’s general management plan to encourage the display of otherwise unexhibited artefacts. Finally, it would be beneficial to reflect on whether or not the display of these objects is useful for the collection, the museum, its visitors and most importantly, the people it aims to represent.
ABSTRACT – ENGLISH

Cultural representation through the use of artefacts is a challenging but vital role of any ethnographic collection. It is therefore important for ethnographic collections to consider the kinds of narratives and knowledge which is created through the exhibition of artefacts. In order to understand the past and present patterns of a collection’s display, a comprehensive study of its exhibition history must first be mapped out. Such information is useful for curators to understand how their collections have been used in the past, how they are used presently and how they may improve their use for the future. This research paper does such a study, by looking at the exhibition history of the Weltmuseum Wien’s Brazilian collection. By compiling data from past exhibitions, the frequency of display for each accessioned object has been identified. The data was gathered using the museum’s database, archival loan contracts as well as past exhibition catalogues. Analysis of this data set was conducted in order to discuss the implications and findings. Particular interest is paid to the most exhibited objects in the collection and the consequences pertaining to their frequent display. Curatorial practices and the creation of narratives in the museum context are discussed. In order to contextualize this research, the history of loaning and curatorial practices are generally considered as well as in relation to the Weltmuseum in particular. The museum’s origins, the creation of the collection and the key collectors involved are described. This information offers the reader a better understanding of the types of objects in the collection and their background. The findings of this research are positioned in relation to the greater debates surrounding curatorial and exhibition practices in the field. Themes concerning stakeholders, indigenous communities and museum ethics are included throughout the paper. This research also contributes to the academic and curatorial management work currently underway at the museum. By combining the three data sources (database, loan records, exhibition catalogues), the comprehensive list which was created in this study will directly benefit the museum and their records.
Liste, die in dieser Studie erstellt wurde, dem Museum und seinen Aufzeichnungen direkt zugutekommen.
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Figure 1 18
Panorama, Vienna at the time of the Weltausstellung (1837), by architectural painter Josef Langl (Wien Museum, Inv. Nr. 16864, sammlung.wienmuseum.at).

Figure 2 18

Figure 3 19

Figure 4 44
This pie chart shows the contrast between the number of inventory numbers from the total Brazilian collection which have been on display versus the number of inventoried objects which have never been exhibited.

Figure 5 45
This graph depicts the steep decline in the number of artefacts in relation to their frequency of display.

Figure 6 46
This graph depicts the steep decline in the percentage of artefacts from the entire collection in relation to their frequency of display. The reader should note that the low percentage of objects displayed 6 times (0.05%) and 7 times (0.03%) are too small to see in this graph.

Figure 7 51
Tupinambá anchor axe, Weltmuseum Wien accession number 10403 (www.weltmuseumwien.at).
Figure 8  
*Tupinambá* anchor axe, *Weltmuseum Wien* accession number 91929 (Feest 1990, 49).

Figure 9  
*Ticuna* masked costume of a Storm Spirit, *Weltmuseum Wien* accession number 1477 (hoeheremaechte.khm.at).

Figure 10  
*Ticuna* masked costumes, *Weltmuseum Wien* accession number 1476 (left) and 1477 (right) (Augustat 2012, 77).

Figure 11  
Child carrying strap from the *Kraho* people, *Weltmuseum Wien* accession number 675. (www.weltmuseumwien.at).

Figure 12  

Figure 13  

Figure 14  
*A text panel from the permanent exhibition “An Austrian Mosaic of Brazil” showing the names of the exhibit’s contributors.*

Figure 15  
*The Mundurucú* display case in the *Weltmuseum’s* permanent exhibit “An Austrian Mosaic of Brazil”. In the centre is a human ritual head surrounded by various featherwork objects.
TABLES

Table 1
Of the 1123 objects from the Brazilian collection which have been displayed, this table shows how many objects have been displayed at each frequency. It also shows what percent of the exhibited collection this represents.

Table 2
This table shows the percent of the total Brazilian collection which has been exhibited at each frequency, from never (0 times) to the maximum of 7 times.

Table 3
Of the 186 objects currently on permanent display in the exhibition “An Austrian Mosaic of Brazil”, this table shows how many of those objects have been displayed at each frequency. Note that the majority of them (122) are on display for the first time in this exhibit.
The following image is an example from the spreadsheet which I created in order to gather and analyze the data. This is only a small section of the spreadsheet, which was too extensive to present in this thesis. Upon consultation with the author, the full data sheet can be made available to the reader. The chart is sorted from most to least exhibited. Every row represents a different object, beginning with its accession number on the left. The columns, which represent the various exhibitions, are then marked with an ‘x’ for each exhibit where the object was displayed. An overall count is then listed to help quickly identify the frequency of exhibition. The following columns include a description of the object, the cultural group from which it originates, the collector and finally a section for any additional notes.