

Collecting with(in) the city

Publication
CAMOC & COMCOL
Conference
09–11 October 2024

AMSTERDAM X MUSEUM

imagine


ICOM International
Council
of museums

MI CAMOC ICOM
International Committee
for the Collections and Activities
of Museums of Cities

MI COMCOL ICOM
International
Committee
for Collecting

Collecting with(in) the city

**CAMOC & COMCOL
Conference
09–11 October 2024**

Collecting with(in) the city
Publication is realized by:

Scientific committee on behalf of CAMOC and COMCOL

Andrea Delaplace	Leen Beyers
Annemarie de Wildt	Njabulo Chipangura
Danielle Kuijten	Rachel Roy
Flora Nguye Mutere	Sandra Vacca
Glenn Perkins	

Imagine IC

Danielle Kuijten	Jules Rijssen
------------------	---------------

Amsterdam Museum

Imara Limon

Project Manager and Final Editor

Roísín Douglas

Layout Design

Bo Gijzen

Special thanks to

All contributors and Patrick de Bruin for the visual identity of the conference.



Guided tour in Amsterdam Museum
Photo: Françoise Boleschowski



Guided tour in Amsterdam Museum by Marysa Otte
Photo: Françoise Boleschowski

Table of Contents

Introduction	6
Words from the Hosts	8
Keynote lectures	12
Collecting Activism	26
Digital City Experiences	44
Practices of (co)curating	62
Working with artists	116
Decolonial practices	130
City identities and conflict	152
Oral histories revisited	174
City Identities – plural narratives	188
Senses	210
Folk Perspectives	266
Rapid Ideas Collection - participants reactions	284

Keynote lectures

Power in This Place: Unfinished Conversations

Zandra Yeaman

Biography

Zandra is the Curator of Discomfort and Head of Strategy Development and Implementation based at The Hunterian, University of Glasgow. Curating Discomfort is looking at ways outside of traditional museum authority to explore the interpretation of contested collections and to design and deliver a series of museum interventions that takes the museum out of the institutional comfort zone. As an anti-racist activist, Zandra works with museums to gain an understanding of current social systems and how they are influenced by the legacy of empire, slavery and colonialism. Support them to explore a historical narrative that does not centre or privilege colonisers but re-frames the stories to acknowledge and be representative of our shared histories.



Zandra Yeaman, Keynote Conference Day 3
Photo: Francoise Boleschowski

Introduction

My career in the museum sector did not begin inside its walls. For decades, I lived only minutes from The Hunterian yet never stepped inside. Museums in my city are deeply civic, yet this particular institution held no cultural capital that felt available or welcoming to someone like me. The fact that I now serve as Curator of Discomfort and Head of Strategy Development speaks to the profound shifts occurring within museums—and to the urgency of continuing that work.

This article reflects on themes I have engaged with as both activist and institutional insider: power, belonging, storytelling, and the emotional and political labour of change. I focus on four interconnected areas: building social and cultural capital, values-based leadership, inclusive curation, and participatory frameworks. Each illustrates how museums can move toward more equitable practices that recognise the complexities of lived experience and the multiplicity of communities we claim to serve.

1. Building Social and Cultural Capital in Museum Practice

1.1 Social Capital as Collective Resource

My presence at international conferences marks a shift in my own social capital. Five years ago, I would not have been invited into these spaces. Today, my visibility grants access—but access is not the endpoint. The value of social capital lies in its redistribution. When people who have historically been excluded gain access, we must not protect the seat; we must change the table, dismantle the table, and create new ones where different voices define the agenda.

Social capital emerges through relationships, networks, solidarity, and shared struggle. It cannot be individualised. In the context of museums, this means embracing the idea that expertise resides beyond the institution and that communities—especially those pushed to the margins—hold knowledge essential to our work.

1.2 Cultural Capital and the Right to Belong

Cultural capital operates differently. It is embedded in spaces, aesthetics, forms of knowledge, and what is deemed valuable. Growing up, the cultural capital of The Hunterian—its architecture, collections, narrative framing—signalled clearly that it was not for me. This is a reality for many communities whose histories and identities have been minimised or erased in cultural institutions.

Museums frequently claim they are “open to everyone,” yet openness does not equate to access, and certainly not to belonging. Cultural capital becomes a gatekeeper when it reflects—and reproduces—racial, class, and gendered hierarchies. To dismantle this, museums must critically examine not only what they display, but how their spaces speak, who their language assumes to belong, and whose stories are centred.

1.3 Intersectionality and Generational Exclusion

My experience as a mixed-heritage Glaswegian woman born in the late 1960s, illustrates the intersection of classism, racism, and sexism that shapes access to cultural and social capital. Intersectionality, as defined by Kimberlé Crenshaw, enables us to understand how structures of oppression interlock and multiply. Museums cannot write feminist programmes without women of colour; cannot write racial justice programmes without disabled participants; cannot treat identity as a single axis.

City museums, especially, sit at the heart of intergenerational inequality. We have a responsibility not to maintain these structures but to disrupt them—through equitable access, power-sharing, and co-created cultural knowledge.

2. Values-Based Leadership: Transforming Internal Culture

2.1 Listening, Communication, and Institutional Courage

Museums excel at producing exhibitions, yet rarely interrogate the internal cultures shaping that work. At The Hunterian, our leadership team has been developing a values-based approach requiring emotional and relational labour:

- Active listening, practiced intentionally rather than performatively
- Non-violent communication, recognising how seemingly small behaviours diminish colleagues
- Transparency about language, expertise, and the limits of our own understanding
- Radical candour with compassion, allowing for honesty without harm

These practices help us confront assumptions we hold about one another and about the communities we engage with. If we carry prejudice internally, it will inevitably surface externally.

2.2 Challenging Saviourism and Reframing Power

A critical part of this leadership approach involves naming and dismantling white saviourism—an insidious dynamic in which marginalised communities are treated as fragile, helpless, or lacking knowledge. In my anti-racist work, I have witnessed extraordinary resilience among women navigating the refugee system. The ways they are sometimes patronised within cultural institutions reveal our failure to recognise their strength and agency.

Values-based leadership requires that we hold communities with respect, recognise their power, and refuse to reproduce harmful dynamics under the guise of inclusion.

2.3 Upskilling Cultural Literacy

Museums devote significant time to museum studies and object care, yet often neglect the study of the societies we inhabit. Staff must deepen their literacy around racism, disability justice, migration policies, queer identities, and more. This literacy is not optional—it is foundational to meaningful engagement.

When we asked staff at The Hunterian whether they had ever experienced exclusion from a venue, only a few could answer. This highlighted a gap between those writing inclusion policies and those living the realities those policies must address. True inclusion requires that communities shape strategy, policy, and institutional direction—not simply programmes.

3. Inclusive Curation: Reinterpreting Collections Through Equity and Justice

3.1 Four Lenses for Re-Reading the Collection

To make our curatorial practice more inclusive, we adopted four interpretive lenses—political, economic, cultural, and equality and social justice, grounded in the legacies of empire and their contemporary impact. Once these lenses were introduced, curators could no longer view the collections through a neutral or apolitical frame. The past became porous, entangled with the present.

3.2 Community Perspectives as Essential Insight

In one project, we invited community curators to reflect on selected objects. Their contributions were not token additions but necessary provocations, illuminating gaps in our institutional framing. Even where engagement was low intensity, the act reshaped curatorial thinking; it forced us to confront our own biases, assumptions, and neutrality.

4. Participatory Frameworks: Co-Creating with Intention

4.1 Internal and External Communities

Museums often conceive of “community engagement” exclusively in external terms. Yet institutions have internal communities as well—teams whose relationships determine whether external participatory work can succeed. If we cannot collaborate internally, our external collaborations will be shallow.

4.2 Moving Toward True Co-Production

The Hunterian’s participatory framework spans informing, consulting, involving, collaborating, and co-producing. We have begun shifting from consultation toward collaboration, but true co-production remains challenging. It requires beginning with no predetermined outcomes, not titles, not objectives, not funding applications. It requires allowing community partners to define the work from its inception. This level of shared power is rare in museums, but essential to achieve genuine transformation.

4.3 Resourcing Participation

Co-production demands time, money, and training. Without adequate resources, institutions risk exploiting community labour while congratulating themselves for doing “participatory work.” Investment is not optional; it is the ethical cost of shared power.

Conclusion: Discomfort as Catalyst, Not Obstacle

Transforming museums is not easy work. It asks us to embrace discomfort, confront our assumptions, and acknowledge our complicity in systems that marginalise. But discomfort is not a barrier—it is a sign of growth.

People are complex. Institutions are complex. Collaboration is complex. And yet, when museums commit to the redistribution of social and cultural capital, embrace values-based leadership, and co-create with communities, the result is more than institutional change. It is a shift in power—one that opens the possibility for collective power sharing with equity.

The work is ongoing. We are not yet where we hope to be. But we are moving in that direction, rebuilding the table together.

Keynote lectures

Re-calibrating the city museum and our professionalism

Léontine Meijer-van Mensch

Biography

Léontine Meijer-van Mensch is director of Museum Rotterdam. Previously she was director of the State Ethnographical Collections of Saxony, programme-director of the Jewish Museum Berlin, deputy-director of the Museum of European Cultures at Berlin, and lecturer of heritage theory and professional ethics at the Reinwardt Academie, Amsterdam. She is active in the boards of several museum organizations. She was, among others, member of the Executive Board of the International Council of Museums (ICOM) and founding president of the International Committee for Collecting (COMCOL). At present, she is chair of the ICOM Ethics Committee and member of the Board of Trustees of the European Museum Forum. She is a frequent speaker at international conferences and a regular guest lecturer at various heritage studies programmes throughout Europe.



Léontine Meijer-van Mensch, Keynote Conference Day 3
Photo: Françoise Boleschowski

Introduction

I am happy that COMCOL and CAMOC are having a joint conference again, not in the least because I have such good memories of the 2011 joint conference we had in Berlin, COMCOL's first annual conference!² But, most of all I am happy with this joint conference because I consider these two international committees as natural allies. Both committees share an intrinsic interest in documenting the present through participatory practices and share an interest in re-thinking what collection development and representation mean in a superdiverse society. Both interests are illustrated by many of the contributions to the present conference.

For me personally, the collaboration between COMCOL and CAMOC has an extra dimension. Since eleven days I am the director of a city museum: the city museum of Rotterdam.³ COMCOL and CAMOC thus represent two souls in my body, impossible to separate.

The following input reflects very much my thinking process on the why, the how and the because of city museums. I am taking you with me on this ongoing process. The thinking does not have its definite form yet. I am therefore sorry for the possible incoherences and open ends. But I do know it circles, at least in the present text, around melancholy and hope.

The process of becoming director of the Rotterdam city museum was for me a sort of museological homecoming. In the past I did many projects with city museums in different parts of Europe, and in my most recent work in Saxony (Germany) the similarities between the ethnological museums and the city museums were all too obvious.⁴ But I have come to notice that there are also important differences. I will come back to that later.

The Museum Rotterdam was (and still is) famous for its advanced methodologies and programming. It worked with the concept of 'liquid museum' long before the term was coined by Fiona Cameron.⁵ It organized successful participatory projects with a multitude of communities in different neighbourhoods of the city. As we have seen in the many case studies presented throughout this conference, the discourse on the relevance of city museums is very much dominated by the concepts of community and participation. City museums are successful in giving a voice and a platform to a variety of groups in society. In doing so, they have embraced the participation paradigm.⁶ In fact, the concept of participation in the museum domain emerged first of all in the sphere of neighbourhood- and city museums. However, there are different forms of participation, with different degrees of transferring authority. The more authority is transferred to an external group of people, the more our expertise as professionals is challenged.⁷ This is an important issue will come back to later.

Melancholy

I must admit that, in general, I am a bit melancholic with the rather inflationary use of the term participation and other critical-museological jargon. It is therefore that for a couple of years I try to avoid using lots of terms: not talking the talk but walking the walk. Yes, participation is part of THE toolbox I have been using for the last twenty years, but I more and more feel this toolbox has been hijacked. I sometimes laugh silently when I hear people speak in this museological ‘buzzwordology’. ‘Our’ effective instruments, ‘our’ innovative museological toolboxes have been adopted as standard jargon in third wave money applications and in practices in all sorts of museums and projects but consequently have lost much of their insurgent potential. We may call this – as Marcuse wrote – the effect of repressive tolerance.⁸

Similarly, I have my melancholic problems with the concept of community. It has its utmost importance and usefulness in the attempts to acknowledge the special needs of certain marginalized and other groups, but apart from the question of who has the power to define a community, the concept tends to separate more often, rather than it unites.⁹ For me, as director of a museum in a city consisting of a vibrant mix of over 170 nationalities and many cultures, subcultures and communities, connection is a key concept in how I perceive the role of the museum. A few days ago (9 October 2024) Carola Schouten was sworn in as the new mayor of Rotterdam. It was interesting that the main theme of her speech was connection. Schouten focuses the spotlight on all those unknown Rotterdammers who try to make the city a little more beautiful. She calls those people ‘City Warmers’. ‘Rotterdam has a warm heart,’ she recently said to a large group of volunteers. ‘A heart that is formed by a fine-meshed network of good, nice and well-meaning people.’¹¹

In the context of a city museum, all communities are implicated, as they are all in some way connected with the past, present and future of the city. For a few years I have embraced the concept of implicated communities. This concept, be it in a slightly different way, was introduced by Michael Rothberg and adapted by Erica Lehrer.¹² Lehrer proposed the term ‘to include people who are affected by or can be said to be implicated in certain tangible or intangible cultural products, in ethical terms’.¹³ In the Dutch journal *De Groene Amsterdammer*, the journalist Lotfi El Hamidi argued that the deeply humane tragedy of the Second World War bombardment of the city of Rotterdam can be a point of identification and a joint memory although people themselves may not have historical ties with the city.¹⁴ Refugees from war zones can thus also experience a form of implication with the Rotterdam cultural memory. This notion gives extra contemporary relevance to the narrative of the bombardment and its documentation in the collection. The bombardment, according to El Hamidi, could serve as a uniting force.

We are always in one way or the other implicated. In Dresden, at the beginning of 2021, together with the Nigerian artist Emeka Ogboh, I initiated as a museum project a poster intervention in the public domain.¹⁵ Two hundred posters were hung throughout the city of Dresden. The main message of this intervention was that the Benin Bronzes were missing in Benin and that the city of Dresden

and its people were in one way or the other implicated in this missing, but also that as a consequence the people had a stake in the possible restitution. The project created a meaningful dialogue and contributed to a larger debate within German society and politics about the transfer of ownership and the restitution of the Benin Bronzes. At the end of December 2022, I was sitting in the airplane of the German minister of foreign affairs, restituting the first Bronzes back to Nigeria.¹⁶ I have learned that activating an implicated community can indeed create a powerful movement.

City museums have a huge impact on the museological discourse. Just mentioning our hosts for this conference, Imagine IC and the Amsterdam Museum. Both heritage initiatives have an inspiring tradition in critically reflecting on current societal issues of importance. It is regrettable that, in general, bottom-up neighbourhood heritage initiatives and even city museums do not seem to receive the credits from outside our professional ‘bubble’ that they deserve. That too makes me melancholic.

Polarisation

Neighbourhood heritage initiatives and city museums seem to experience an increased pressure of current social, political and economic developments, not just financial pressure as result of municipal policies of austerity. It is my melancholic conviction that we pay far too little attention to recent political developments. As an example, a lot of museums have been engaged in co-creative projects with refugees. When I was working in the Museum of European Cultures (in Berlin) we – together with an artist – made an exhibition in 2016 engaging with a group of refugees living in a nearby Asylum Seekers Centre.¹⁷ We as a museum perceived this project as part of our mission statement where social responsibility played an important role. At that time no critical voices were heard; local media were by and large positive. Nowadays such projects would probably meet huge opposition. I am melancholic since unfortunately in this respect much has changed. How do we deal with the growing societal opposition against refugees? How do we deal with programmes that are in society perceived as expressions of a ‘woke agenda’? Have we perhaps been too naive in this regard? I can say I was.

Many of us, I assume, are as melancholic and as worried as I am, about the present political climate in our respective countries. I recently came back to the Netherlands from Saxony. In this German state, elections were being held on 1 September 2024. On the same day also in the state of Thüringen, and almost one month later in the state of Brandenburg. You may have read that in all three states the extreme right-wing party Alternative für Deutschland (AfD) has won considerable support.¹⁸ About one third of the electorate voted for this party with a shocking revelation that in particular among young people this party was by far the most popular one. Already before the elections, the AfD used its parliamentary position to put pressure on the policy of museums. It is not known yet what the consequences will be in Saxony. But even though the AfD did not succeed in becoming the biggest party in the election and will probably not become part of the government, the impact the elections will have should not be underestimated.¹⁹ Right wing parties don’t like pluralism, they want control.

But this is only part of the problem. We witness an extreme polarisation of our society. A recent survey of 31 European countries showed that populist parties (left and right) have more than doubled their vote share in the last 30 years.²⁰ Where do we find common ground when the middle of society is disappearing? I cannot speak for the whole world, but in the countries I am familiar with, extremist positions make a public debate hardly possible. And again talking about a deep melancholy, the post-October 7th world-wide turmoil and the on-going war in the Ukraine also make that painfully visible.

Not just the polarisation itself makes a public debate hardly possible but also the perception of it. The slightly conservative German newspaper *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, claiming it represents the middle of society, asked its readers whether left-wing activists do impose their views on society. About 86 % of the respondents agreed with the statement that a small, loud minority is putting pressure on society.²¹ Such perceptions are part of a 'post-truth society' based upon conspiracy theories, fake news, distrust and even hate. There is a lot of what we might call 'populist truth-making' especially in the digital world.

Dutch sociologist Quita Muis has recently argued in her PhD that indeed different groups judge each other's opinions more harshly, but that it is mainly about a perceived polarisation, not about an actual polarisation. "Unfortunately, that incorrect image then becomes the starting point for our actions," concludes Muis: "Social cohesion is diluted because we no longer know each other. And so our assumptions ultimately become reality."²²

It is more than ironic that within this situation, city museums are experiencing extreme difficulties. You might have read in the newspapers about city museums in several countries that were forced to close or are forced to suspend their activities. I strongly believe in the value of city museums – I accepted my present job not for nothing. And, although city museums cannot solve all social problems, of course, I strongly believe that they have an important social role to play.

Hope

So now I want to shift from melancholy to hope. In times of fragmentation, we need to offer the inspiration for connecting; in times of polarisation, we need to offer spaces for dialogue; in times of fake news and conspiracy theories, we need to offer frameworks of critical reflection. Aforementioned Quita Muis argued: "If people exclude others because of their opinion and avoid a conversation, then that is a wrong form of polarisation. What you should want is for people to enter into debate and continue talking to each other. And it may occasionally be abrasive. But in debate you can find each other and make compromises."²³ Because there is no contact anymore, the stereotypical image one has of the other is being reinforced. People end up in a vicious circle, which is very difficult to break.

For the Museum Rotterdam I would like to adopt the notion of the 'village well', a place where people come together to discuss issues of common interest, where people get water to survive, where people gossip, and where sometimes princes and princesses turn into frogs or the other way around.²⁴

This is not far from the concept of 'third place' as advocated by Ray Oldenburg and the concept of 'third space' as introduced by Homi Bhabha.²⁵ In the museum in Leipzig we designed a Bonvenon Space, from the Esperanto word for welcome. Centre piece in the space is a Leipzig pub that we musealized. Among others, the space serves as meeting place at the opening of exhibitions. I was emotionally moved when in the museum pub after an opening, representatives of the queer community of Leipzig and members of the rather conservative so-called Indian hobbyists ('Karl May devotees', a very former GDR thing) had a beer together. Two groups that would hardly meet in everyday life. This is the power of museums as dialogical space.

The museum should respect multivocality, of course, but should in my opinion put a stronger emphasis on connection. In the museum in Leipzig we have adopted Donna Haraway's principle of 'staying with the trouble'.²⁶ In her book the central question is how we deal with the challenges of our time, which, as Haraway writes, is best done collectively and in unfamiliar relationships, which brings me back to the main point I wanted to raise: the issue of connectedness. For a long time, city museums have benefited from theories and methodologies of the field of ethnology. However, traditionally ethnological museums focus on distinction. Communities are defined and, often for an exhibition or a collection project, isolated.

In my view, city museums should focus more on connection, on recalibrating towards a shared middle ground. In addition, from the perspective that the constituent force of a city museum is the city, it is easier to develop programmes on the basis of a shared identity, an identity, I would like to stress, that is in terms of Zygmunt Bauman, 'liquid'.²⁷ Collections in ethnological museums are highly 'toxic' as they are too often products of all sorts of violence and alienation. It is often too painful to speak of 'shared ownership'. From the perspective that the constituent force of a city museum is the city, shared ownership has another dimension. It is the shared ownership of the cultural biography of the city, with its collection(s), with its physical structures, its street names, etc.. It is that binding hopeful potential of city museums that goes from 'them' / 'the other' to 'us and we' that made me move from the ethnological museum domain to the city museum, knowing that the potential of museums in encouraging 'implicated ownership' can only be realised if the museum staff is really reflecting the composition of society. This has been a dream in our professional field for many years, but still far from being a reality. But I am hopeful.

The red thread in my talk is the increasing polarisation of our world. In the recent past several research projects have shown that people trust museums more than any other medium or government agency. This trust is based upon the expectation that objects tell one objective truth. As professionals we know that this is hardly the case. Trust is a delicate thing, but it is an enormous treasure to work with.²⁸ City museums can use this treasure to underpin the idea of

'village well' in order to be of value to achieve a more just and cohesive society. I would love to start a collaborative research project on this and what it means for our collecting policies.

Who's with me?

Notes

- 1 Between reading the text on 11 October 2024 and writing the present version for publication on March 2025 much has happened in the world with consequences for the views expressed in my keynote. In footnotes reference is made to some of these recent developments, but I want to stress that the text reflects my perceptions as they existed in October 2024.
- 2 Meijer-van Mensch, L., and Tietmeyer, E. (eds) (2013). *Participative Strategies in Collecting the Present*. Berliner Blätter Heft 63. Berlin: Panama Verlag.
- 3 <https://museumrotterdam.nl/>
- 4 As director of the State Ethnographical Collections in Leipzig, Dresden and Herrnhut.
- 5 Cameron, F. (2015). 'The Liquid Museum: New Institutional ontologies for a Complex, Uncertain World'. In: Witcomb, A., and Message, K. (eds) *Museum Theory. The International Handbooks of Museum Studies 1*, pp. 345-361. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons.
- 6 Meijer-van Mensch, L. (2016). 'Partizipation in der Museumsarbeit – zwischen Hobbyismus und Professionalisierung'. In: Walz, M. (ed) *Handbuch Museum. Geschichte, Aufgaben, Perspektiven*, pp 329-332. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler Verlag.
- 7 Meijer-van Mensch, L., and Mensch, P. van (2022). 'Hosting and insurgency: post-participatory challenges', *The International Journal of Museum Studies*, 2, 45-54.
- 8 Marcuse, H. (1965). 'Repressive tolerance'. <<https://www.marcuse.org/herbert/publications/1960s/1965-repressive-tolerance-fulltext.html>>, accessed 19 March 2025.
- 9 Waterton, E., and Smith, L. (2010). 'The recognition and misrecognition of community heritage', *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 16 (1-2), 4-15.
- 10 Bormans, A. (2024). 'Carola Schouten wil verdeeld Rotterdam tot toenadering bewegen', *De Volkskrant*, 10 October.
- 11 My translation. From: Groenendijk, P. (2025). 'De eerste 100 dagen van Carola Schouten: 'Ze brengt een nieuwe energie met zich mee'', *Algemeen Dagblad*, 18 January.
- 12 Rothberg, M. (2013). 'Multidirectional Memory and the Implicated Subject: On Sebald and Kentridge'. In Plate, L., and Smelik, A. (eds), *Performing Memory in Art and Popular Culture*, pp. 39-58. (New York-London: Routledge.
- Lehrer, E. (2018). From 'Heritage Communities' to 'Communities of Implication' <<http://www.tracesproject.eu/index.html?p=3595.html>>, accessed 19 March 2025.
- Lehrer, E. (2020). 'Material Kin: 'Communities of Implication' in Post-Colonial, Post-Holocaust Polish Ethnographic Collections'. In Oswald, M. von, and Tinius, J. (eds), *Across Anthropology. Troubling Colonial Legacies, Museums, and the Curatorial*, pp. 289-322. Leuven: University Press.
- 13 Lehrer 2020: 304.

- 14 Hamidi, L. El (2024). 'Stenen tranen', *De Groene Amsterdammer*, 15 May. Also published in *NRC*, 18 May 2024.
- 15 <<https://www.skdmuseum/en/besucherservice/press/2021/vermisst-in-benin-an-artistic-intervention-by-emeka-ogboh/>>, accessed 19 March 2025.
- 16 Sommer, T. (2023). 'Zurück in die Zukunft', *Art. Das Kunstmagazin*, February, 48-52.17
- 17 Müller, K. B. (2016). 'Ein kleiner Daumenabdruck aus Blut', *taz*, 21 July.
- 18 In the national (Bundestag) elections of 23 February 2025 the AfD became the second largest party.
- 19 The impact it has had on my work would be a topic of another keynote. The present keynote was written with the East-German election results fresh in mind. In the meantime, the US presidency of Donald Trump has given reasons for serious concerns about the extremist right-wing pressure on universities and museums. See, for example, 'Trump Moves to Dismantle Federal Institute That Support Museums and Libraries', <<https://news.artnet.com/art-world/trump-executive-orders-arts-2605142>>, accessed 19 March 2025.
- 20 Henley, J. (2023). 'Revealed: one in three Europeans now vote anti-establishment', *The Guardian*, 21 September.
- 21 *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 19 November 2022.
- 22 My translation. Quotations from: Oostveen, M. (2024). 'Hoger opgeleiden lijken in hun opvattingen meer op elkaar dan mensen die lager zijn opgeleid', *De Volkskrant*, 22 September.
- 23 Idem.
- 24 In hindsight, the 'village well' may not be the most appropriate metaphor for a contemporary city museum. I am still looking for a better catch word.
- 25 Oldenburg, R. (1989). *The Great Good Place*. Boston: Da Capo Press.
- 26 Bhabha, H. (2004). *The Location of Culture*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- 26 Haraway, D. (2016). *Staying with the trouble. Making Kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham NC: Duke University Press.
- 27 Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- 28 *Museums and Trust*. American Alliance of Museums/Wilkening Consulting, Spring 2021. <<https://www.aam-us.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/Museums-and-Trust-2021.pdf>>, accessed 19 March 2025.

ISBN 978-2-487970-26-7

AMSTERDAM X MUSEUM

imagine
ICOM

ICOM International
Council
of museums

MI CAMOC

ICOM
International Committee
for the Collections and Activities
of Museums of Cities

MI COMCOL

ICOM
International
Committee
for Collecting