Léontine Meijer-van Mensch & Peter van Mensch

FROM DISCIPLINARY CONTROL TO CO-CREATION – COLLECTING AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF MUSEUMS AS PRAXIS IN THE NINETEENTH AND TWENTIETH CENTURY

The history of museums is, first of all, the institutionalisation of collecting. Even though some contemporary practices may point at a tendency of de-institutionalisation, collecting practice in the twenty-first century is still highly institutionalised. This article will explore the institutionalisation of collecting as it becomes visible in professionalisation, specialisation, and the canonisation of museum practices.

It may be argued that collecting as such did not change very much throughout the nineteenth and twentieth century. What did change was the approach to collecting development, i.e. enhancing the use value of the collection (in relation to the institutional mission) by adding and removing collection items, as well as documentation and conservation, but also the organisation and structure of the collection. As will be shown, the discussion about collecting is foremost a discussion about collection profiles. Contrary to common belief, collections are dynamic. The history of museums in the nineteenth and twentieth century shows a continuous shaping and reshaping of collections, following disciplinary and political agendas.

By the mid-nineteenth century, the idea of a public museum had taken root throughout Europe. During the second half of the century, the museum model became more or less standardised. At the same time, some basic concepts of museum work as a profession were being formulated and widely shared through new channels. At the beginning of the twentieth century, a sophisticated professional infrastructure contributed to the canonisation of processes and procedures. During the second half of the century, this canonisation was increasingly being challenged by internal and external developments. In the beginning of the twenty-first century, the term Museum 2.0 became the symbol of a new museum model, involving new concepts about museum work as a profession and the new canonisation of processes and procedures. The keywords of this transformation are participation and co-creation.

33

MEIJER-VAN MENSCH & VAN MENSCH   FROM DISCIPLINARY CONTROL TO CO-CREATION . . .

During the second half of the eighteenth century and the early years of the nineteenth century, 'open to the public' developed into 'public ownership' along two lines.

In the cause of the eighteenth century, princely collections gradually obtained a more autonomous status, as described by Susan Pearce in the previous article. The Vatican museums in Rome, such as the Museo Capitolino (1734), the picture gallery in the Palazzo dei Conservatori (1749), and the Museo Pio-Clementino (1772) are early examples of princely collections that gradually developed into public museums and early examples of museums where the concept of 'public' became attached to the concept of 'national'. A decisive step in this respect was taken in Paris. On 27 September 1792, the National Convention decided to create a national (art) museum in the Louvre, based on expropriated royal collections, and collections taken from noble families and religious institutions. The French example was soon followed throughout Europe, as a 'tidal wave of activity', as Germain Bazin wrote: 'the flood coursed through a Europe which at first resisted but then saw itself constrained to adopt certain ideas propagated by the Revolution. The museum became one of the fundamental institutions of the modern State' (Bazin 1967: 169).

In the redefined political structure of Europe, the emerging (as well as the old) states felt a need to create national museums either in response to the ideological threat – or potential threat – of the French Revolution. Art and archaeology were perceived as the most suitable for this task, because, as Prussian minister Von Altenstein wrote to the king: 'the fine arts are the expression of the highest condition of mankind', thus it is the duty of the state to make them accessible to everyone (Duncan and Wallach 2004: 59). By following the model of the Louvre, these museums were national in the sense that they were state institutions, but also because they reflected a national pride, even patriotism. They were much less national as to the content of their collections.

In a similar way the founding of the National Museum at Warsaw (1862) needs to be seen within the context of Polish nationalism. The museum was partly based on the art collection of King Stanisław August. In Poland, divided by Prussia, Habsburg and Russia, King Stanisław August (1732–1798), who was the last King of Poland and Grand Duke of the Polish Lithuanian Commonwealth, served as symbol of national unity and national pride.

A large-scale nationalisation of princely and other private collections happened again in Russia after the Revolution of 1917 and in Germany after the First World War (1914–1918), when the empire became a republic. The state

took control over the collections as a self-evident national responsibility. Important (art) collections should by definition be owned by the nation.

The creation of the British Museum by Act of Parliament in 1753 foreshadowed a new concept of public museum. Even though the initial collection of the museum might be based on private collections, the initiative itself originates from one person – or usually a group of persons – expressing a concern for public education and the advancement of science. This type of museum took root in Central Europe during the early nineteenth century as Landesmuseum. With an emphasis on cultural history (including folk art) and natural sciences, these museums expressed the nationalistic pride of the autonomous regions of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. The first of its kind was the Hungarian National Museum (Budapest). Started as a national library (founded in 1802), it soon developed into a national museum (1808). Its focus was national with a collection documenting the prehistory, history, and natural history of the country (Korek 1977). The museum founded in Graz in 1811 by Archduke Johann – hence called Joanneum – became the model for a series of Landesmuseen in the Austrian Empire, such as the 'national' museums of Brno (founded 1817), Prague (founded 1818), Ljubljana (founded 1821), and Innsbruck (founded 1823) (Wagner 1977). The collections cover the natural history, ethnology, archaeology, and cultural history of the region. As documents of the natural and cultural characteristics of the regions, the collections were instrumentalised in the process of achieving national autonomy.

Elsewhere in Europe, similar tendencies can be observed. The Norsk Folkemuseum at Oslo (founded in 1895) was said to be 'a monument erected to the evolution of our race, to the development of national thought and culture' (quoted in Bazin 1967: 195). It is no coincidence that the museum was founded shortly before Norway separated itself from Sweden. Finnish resistance to the policy of Russification was behind the creation of a national museum in Helsinki, founded in 1893 and opened in 1916, just before independence.

In the course of the nineteenth century, following the creation of the national museums, new museums were established on a provincial level and in major cities in many countries of Europe according to the model of the Landesmuseum. By the foundation of these museums, an important role was usually played by local or regional learned societies. In the 1820s and 1830s, many English antiquarian, philosophical, or natural history societies decided to turn their collections into a public museum. The ideal-typical learned society museum was constructed around four basic components: lecture hall, library, collection, and laboratory (Mellinghoff 1977: 87). One earlier example is Teylers Museum (Haarlem, the Netherlands), established in 1778, and opened to the public in 1784. The museum, now a museum of the history of science, was created as a science centre *avant la lettre*, focussing on

contemporary concerns as to natural sciences and technology, but also on contemporary art. Part of the present collection consists of instruments that are designed for conducting research and giving public demonstrations, for example about electricity.

AWAY FROM ENCYCLOPAEDIC IDEALS

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the museum field was basically dominated by two types of national museums: more or less specialised art museums and encyclopaedic museums covering a wide range of subject areas, combining cultural history and natural history. One century later, the encyclopaedic ideal was declared obsolete. Many encyclopaedic museums had been split up in a series of more specialised museums, a tendency that would continue during the twentieth century. At the eve of the twenty-first century, however, the encyclopaedic ideal witnessed a revival. The classical encyclopaedic museums proudly present themselves as 'universal museums', while large numbers of specialist museums seek cross-disciplinary collaboration. New museums have emerged with an integrated, multidisciplinary profile.

In discussing the creation of a national museum in the 1790s, the revolutionary government in Paris deliberately decided to break away from the model of the encyclopaedic museum. Visions of transforming the Louvre into 'a physical encyclopaedia of knowledge' (McClellan 1994: 92) were not adopted. Encyclopaedic schemes remained paper proposals as 'last gasps of an Enlightenment dream' (McClellan 1994: 93). The new Musée de la Republique (created in 1792) did not follow the model of the British Museum. Instead, in the early years of the new state, four specialised national museums were established: the Musée de la Republique (in the Louvre), the Muséum National d' Histoire Naturelle (1793), the Conservatoire des Arts et Métiers (1794), and the Musée des Monuments français (1795), all in Paris. The French example was followed in many countries. Despite increased specialisation, in many publications even today a basic distinction is still being made according to the French scheme: art museums, natural history museums, museums of science and technology, and history museums.

The specialisation and branching off collections involve complex disciplinary and political issues. This will be explored for two types of collections: art and anthropology.

Throughout the nineteenth century, it was not common practice to include the works of living artists in the collection of major art museums. In Paris, the Musée du Luxembourg was transformed into 'a sort of novitiate for the

Louvre' in 1818 (Bazin 1967: 216). In the Netherlands, a museum of contemporary art was created in Haarlem (1838). Other examples of nineteenth century contemporary art are the Neue Pinakothek at Munich (opened 1853), the Nationalgalerie at Berlin (opened 1876), and the Tate Gallery at London (opened in 1897).

The tension between museums and contemporary art resulted, in the early twentieth century, in the creation of museums of modern art, following the model of the Museum of Modern Art in New York. Many museums started to neglect their nineteenth century collections. The last decades of the twentieth century showed a revival of the museological interest in art of the nineteenth century. Former nineteenth century contemporary art museums were revamped, such as the Nationalgalerie at Berlin (re-opened in 2001). In addition, new museums were created to fill the gap between Old Master collections and Modern Art, such as Musée d'Orsay at Paris (opened in 1986), and the Neue Pinakothek at Munich (opened in 1981). At the same time, tension grew between the concept of modern art and contemporary art. New museums were created to host the newest developments in art, such as Hamburger Bahnhof, Museum für Gegenwart (Berlin 1996), Kiasma Museum of Contemporary Art (Helsinki 1998), Palais de Tokyo, and Site de Création Contemporaine (Paris 2001). After the allocation of Palais de Tokyo (Paris) as a site for contemporary art, the question was raised as to whether there should be a clear demarcation line between the profiling of this site in relation to the Musée National d'Art Moderne. The idea of becoming a museum of the twentieth century, i.e. a museum of the past, was unacceptable for the staff of the MNAM.

A mixture of pragmatic, opportunistic, scientific, ideological, and even nationalistic criteria was used to legitimise the demarcation line between the collections. In London, it is simply the year 1900 that separates the collections of the National Gallery and Tate Modern. The same pragmatic solution is used in Stockholm for the Nationalmuseum and Moderna Museet. The creation of the Musée d'Orsay (1986) in Paris, however, brought about serious discussions about its chronological boundaries, involving the country's leading intellectuals including President François Mitterrand. In considering the position of Classicism and Romanticism in the Louvre, it was clear from the start that the Musée d'Orsay could not be the museum of the entire nineteenth century. But where to start? The reference date became 1848, which is a political and not an art historical key date. The Musée National d'Art Moderne starts its collection with Henry Matisse and the Salon d'Automne of 1905 when the nickname Les Fauves was introduced. The date automatically became the end date for the collection of Musée d'Orsay, but the museum increasingly tends to use 1914 as reference date, which again is not a date with any art historical relevancy.

37

MEIJER-VAN MENSCH & VAN MENSCH   FROM DISCIPLINARY CONTROL TO CO-CREATION . . .

The definition of Modern Art is not without nationalist connotations. Whereas the French Musée National d'Art Moderne starts with Les Fauves, the Spanish Museo Nacional Centro de Arte Reina Sofia at Madrid (opened to the public in 1990) starts with the presentation of surrealist painting as new phase in art history. The German Pinakothek der Moderne (Munich) starts with German Expressionism.

The second example concerns anthropology collections. Many anthropology collections were once connected to natural history collections (and some still are). For example, part of the collections of the Musée de l'Homme (1937) originated from the Muséum d'Histoire Naturelle (Paris). Thus, the museum combined physical and cultural anthropology, which was reflected in the theme of its exhibitions, such as *Tous parents tous différent* and *6 milliards d'hommes*. When the natural history collections of the British Museum were moved to a new building in South Kensington in order to form the Natural History Museum (1883), physical anthropology moved with the zoological, botanical, and geological collections, while cultural anthropology stayed behind to be branched off later as Museum of Mankind (1970). The profile of the Musée de l'Homme was, therefore, very different from the profile of the Museum of Mankind.

In 1968, the ethnographic collection of the Musée de l'Homme was branched off to form the Musée National des Arts et Traditions Populaires. In 2005, this museum was closed to become a part of a new ambitious project: the Musée des Civilisations de l'Europe et de la Méditerrannée, to be opened in 2013 at Marseilles. The re-organisation of collections reveals a political agenda. More than in many other countries, the presidential political agenda sets the parameters for museum policy in France. It was President Chirac who wanted to develop the Musée du Louvre into a real museum of world cultures. The Musée du Quai Branly is the result of the resistance of the director and staff of the Louvre to accommodate part of the collections of the Musée de l'Homme and the Musée des Arts d'Afrique et d'Océanie. As a consequence, Egyptian archaeology in the Louvre is shown alienated from its African context, as in most archaeological museums. As a compromise, a few rooms in the far end of the south wing show the 'Arts d'Afrique, d'Asie, d'Océanie et des Amériques'. On the website of the Louvre, no information can be found about these rooms. It is even almost impossible to find the rooms on the interactive map on the website. The British Museum makes a completely different statement. By recalling the Museum of Mankind in 2004, the British Museum was able to present itself as a museum where cultures from all parts of the world are presented at an equal level: 'a museum of the world for the world' (the museum's tagline in 2010). The plan to reconstruct the former Stadtschloss in the very centre of Berlin and to bring the ethnographic collections from the suburb of Dahlem to this building, show a similar ambition: the extended Museumsinsel as the museological centre of world cultures.

IDENTITY MUSEUMS

The Landesmuseum was the model for the documentation and (re)presentation of the own region. Knowledge of the natural and cultural characteristics of the region served as a vehicle of regional identity. During the nineteenth century, this concept was further decentralised. A new generation of an encyclopaedic museum emerged: the local history museum. The archetypical continental local history museum is the German Heimatmuseum. By the end of the twentieth century, the Heimatmuseum concept was actualised (and, in fact, revolutionised) in rural areas in the idea of an ecomuseum, while the concept was transplanted into an urban context as a neighbourhood museum. In Germany, urban neighbourhood museums are in a sort of self-irony called Heimatmuseum. It appears that decentralisation (i.e. geographical specialisation) resists disciplinary specialisation. This is also the case with museums that represent specialisation beyond territorial specialisation. Such museums are often referred to as ethnic specific museums, but this category also includes identity museums such as Jewish museums, women museums, gay and lesbian museums, etc.

The Landesmuseum concept offered, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, a model for the documentation of the regional and local identity. A specific concept for presentation was offered by Alexandre Lenoir's Musée des Monuments français. This model became increasingly influential, even though the museum itself was abolished in 1836. Lenoir's synthetic approach by creating assemblages of works of art and decorative art to evoke the spirit of historical periods was refined in Alexandre du Sommerard's Musée de Cluny (1833), which is also in Paris.

One of the first museums outside France with a national ambition emphasising national identity, using the synthetic approach of Lenoir and Du Sommerard, was the Germanisches Nationalmuseum in Nürnberg. This museum became the model for a whole generation of cultural history museums realised around 1900. Examples of such 'agglomerierte Museen' (Joachimides and Kuhrau 2001: 12) are: the Schweizerisches Landesmuseum at Zürich (opened to the public in 1898), the Bayerisches National Museum at Munich (1900), the Märkisches Museum at Berlin (1906), and the National Museum of Finland at Helsinki (1916). The museum building is a pastiche of several national, regional, or local building styles and building types in order to achieve harmony between the building and collection: religious objects should be shown in a chapel, arms in a weapon hall, etc.

When the new Rijksmuseum (Amsterdam) was built in the 1880s, the ground floor was reserved for the Nederlands Museum voor Kunst en Geschiedenis (Netherlands Museum of Art and History). Its collection profile resembles the Germanisches Museum. The architect of the Rijksmuseum,

39

MEIJER-VAN MENSCH & VAN MENSCH   FROM DISCIPLINARY CONTROL TO CO-CREATION . . .

Pierre Cuypers, designed the galleries according to the architectural schemes of the 'agglomeriertes Museum' (Van der Ham 2000: 184). Hardly twenty-five years later, the concept of a cultural history museum was rejected. The newly appointed director of the Nederlands Museum in Amsterdam, Adriaan Pit (1897), decided to whitewash the rooms, remove plaster casts, and focus on art rather than history (Van der Ham 2000: 203–204). His decision echoes the opinion of Antoine-Chrysostome Quatremère de Quincy one hundred years before. Quatremère de Quincy did not like the Musée des Monuments français because it 'kills art to make [art] history' (McClellan 1994: 195).

Even though period rooms remained popular throughout the twentieth century, it was not until the end of the century that local history museums reintroduced evocative approaches in their exhibitions. These evocative approaches did not fall back on earlier nineteenth century models, but rather connected to models developed in a new type of museum that emerged in the late nineteenth century: the ethnographic open air museum. The first ethnographic open air museum was Skansen near Stockholm, which was created by Artur Hazelius and opened to the public in 1891. Open air museums introduced a new approach to collecting and exhibiting. As in the nineteenth century 'agglomerierte Museen', open air museums use evocative contextualisation but emphasise a high degree of authenticity. Ethnographic open air museums can be considered as offshoots of the International Exhibitions phenomenon. Rural houses and furnished rooms symbolised nationality based on folk sovereignty (Stoklund 1993: 111). The attractiveness was enhanced by costumed persons, preferably persons from the same rural area as represented by the houses.

In the United States, the European ethnographic open air museum concept developed into historical open air museums. As 'living history', the American approach started to in turn influence ethnographic open air museums and history museums throughout Europe.

The development from evocative assemblages to detailed, naturalistic representations required adapted collection policies. When living and acting persons are introduced, it is necessary to make a clear distinction between 'objects belonging to the collection' (not to be used) and objects that have been acquired or made to be used. The collection policy of a museum needs to deal with both kinds of objects.

The youngest generation of identity museums may not even want to acquire tangible objects. Increasingly, the emphasis is placed on personal stories. To share these stories, museums may not need exhibitions in the traditional sense. In this respect, websites challenge the idea of museums as frameworks for collecting, preserving, and communicating intangible heritage.

Contrary to common belief, collections are dynamic. The history of museums in the nineteenth and twentieth century shows a continuous shaping and reshaping of collections following disciplinary and political agendas.

41

MEIJER-VAN MENSCH & VAN MENSCH   FROM DISCIPLINARY CONTROL TO CO-CREATION . . .

Specialisation cannot be isolated from the increasing disciplinary control of professionals. Even though princely and other wealthy collectors may have employed professionals already as far back as the sixteenth century, the emergence of the public museum resulted in the creation of a new professional field: museum work. Museums were increasingly run by hired staff rather than persons who considered their employment as an honorary position. In art museums, the first professionals were artists who were gradually replaced by art historians. For example, the first director of the Kaiserliche Gemäldegalerie in Schloss Belvedere (Vienna), Christian von Mechel, was a painter, as were his successors. An art historian was not appointed until 1911 (Haupt 1991: 9). The same practice can be seen throughout Europe.

At the time of the creation of the national art museums, there was no consensus about their profile. Art critic Jean Clair referred to the discussion of the early nineteenth century by using the dichotomy between an intensive museum and extensive museum (Desvallées 1992: 62). This dichotomy acts on two levels: the level of disciplinary specialisation (art museum versus encyclopaedic museum), and the level of selection (masterpieces versus contextual approaches). The first arrangement in the Louvre was intensive; the paintings were organised 'deliberately to dazzle the beholder, to create a spectacle revealing the full extent of the nation's artistic wealth' (McClellan 1994: 106). After renovation between 1797 and 1799, the museum reopened with an art historical arrangement according to schools (McClellan 1994: 139).

Taxonomic arrangements became the standard way of organising collections in museums, thus contextualising individual objects from an academic point of view. In fact, taxonomy, i.e. the practice and theory of classification, was considered the essence of museum work. George Rathgeber, director of the ducal museum at Gotha, may have been the first to use the term museology for this (Desvallées and Mairesse 2005). In a preface to his catalogue of the numismatic collections of the ducal museum, he defined museology as the study of the proper arrangement of works of art in collections. As such, museum work made essential contributions to the development of science. While working on private collections in Italy, Johann Joachim Winckelmann developed a classification model for antique sculpture. His masterpiece, the *Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums* (1764), formed the basis of the arrangement of most of the European collections ever since, by replacing thematic schemes as in the Museo Pio-Clementino (Rome). Winckelmann inspired Christian von Mechel to develop his classification model, based on the distinction between schools. Von Mechel successfully arranged the collection of the Imperial Picture Gallery in Schloss Belvedere at Vienna in 1781. Von Mechel's arrangement became the standard model for art museums. Swedish naturalist Carolus Linnaeus worked on several private natural his-

tory collections in the Netherlands. His rich knowledge of animals and plants resulted in *Systema Naturae* (1735), a classification model that was very soon adopted by all natural history museums. As the curator of the antiquities department of the National Museum at Copenhagen, Christian Jürgensen Thomsen developed the three-age system in archaeology: stone age, bronze age, and iron age, which was published in 1836.

The examples show that Christopher Whitehead's observation 'that the curatorial act to representing art history in museum display... was actually constitutive of certain intellectual approaches and practices of art history as a discipline' (Whitehead 2007: 48) holds true for many other disciplines as well. As such, the specialisation of museum collections supported the development of many disciplines, but also contributed to the boundaries of disciplinary study by isolating groups of objects from other forms of material culture or nature (Whitehead 2007: 58).

The second time the term museology was explicitly used to refer to museum related practice and theory is in Philipp Leopold Martin's *Praxis der Naturgeschichte* (1869–1870). Martin's textbook discusses collecting, preservation, and exhibiting in natural history museums and zoological gardens. Part Two is called 'Dermoplastik und Museologie' and describes how to mount animals for display (taxidermy) in realistic poses and settings (Dermoplastik). The term museology is not defined, but it is obvious that Martin uses the term in a similar way that the term 'muséographie' is used in France, referring to the practice and theory of making exhibitions.

The two different uses of the term museology illustrate how the profession is in search of its identity. While by the 1870s the museum as an institution had established itself, the profession had not. The third documented use of the term museology, however, indicated that some widely shared opinion emerged concerning the definition on the museum work as a profession. The *Zeitschrift für allgemeine Museologie und verwandte Wissenschaften* (later *Zeitschrift für Museologie und Antiquitätenkunde sowie verwandte Wissenschaften*), was the first journal promoting museology as an academic discipline. It was published in 1878 by J.G.Th. von Graesse, director of the Grüne Gewolbe at Dresden. The journal was discontinued in 1885 when Von Graesse died (Hilgers 2005: 7). In 1905, a new professional journal was again published in Dresden, *Museumskunde. Zeitschrift für Verwaltung und Technik öffentlicher und privater Sammlungen*. The publisher was Karl Koetschau, director of the Historisches Museum Dresden. In 1917, the journal became the official journal of the Deutscher Museumsbund, founded that year by Koetschau and others (Hilgers 2005: 8). In the meantime, in the United Kingdom, the Museums Association was founded as the first national association of museums and museum professionals. In 1902, it started to publish *Museums Journal*.

43

MEIJER-VAN MENSCH & VAN MENSCH   FROM DISCIPLINARY CONTROL TO CO-CREATION . . .

With regard to its concern for the duties and rights of the museum professionals, the Deutscher Museumsbund was the first national organisation to adopt a code of ethics. In 1918, it published a code of behaviour towards art-dealing and the public: *Grundsaetze ueber das Verhalten der Mitglieder des Deutschen Museumsbundes gegenueber dem Kunsthandel und dem Publikum*. The code can be seen as an expression of a tendency to find a balance between techniques and professional behaviour, on the one hand, and to service and society, on the other hand.

This search for a balance is a part of the authorised and hegemonic discourse that has been described by Laurajane Smith as the 'Authorized Heritage Discourse' (Smith 2007: 5). Professional associations, their code of ethics, their journals, handbooks, and training courses provided the parameters of this discourse. This discourse was very much influenced by two American museologists: George Brown Goode (assistant secretary of the Smithsonian Institution) and Benjamin Gilman (director of the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston). Their publications inspired many European museum directors. In some respects, Brown Goode and Gilman represent two conflicting views on the purpose and method of museums. In his *Museum Ideals of Purpose and Method* (1918), Gilman explains why he does not agree with Brown Goode. 'The essential nature', Gilman writes referring to fine art museums, 'is not that of collections of abstractions illuminated for us by examples [as in science museums], but that of collections of concrete things introduced to us by ideas' (Gilman 1918: 80). As a consequence, 'a museum of science is in truth a collection of labels *plus* illustrations; but a museum of art is collection of objects *plus* interpretations' (Gilman 1918: 81). Gilman refers here to Brown Goode's frequently quoted statement: 'An efficient educational Museum may be described as a collection of instructive labels, each illustrated by a well-selected specimen' (Brown Goode 1895: 40).

Despite their differences, both authors agree on the principles that define the modern museum, i.e. the museum that has emancipated itself from the sphere of dilettantism and connoisseurship. During the first decades of the twentieth century, the principles, as outlined by Brown Goode and Gilman became canonised as 'Authorised Museum Discourse'. This canonisation process was more or less completed by the publication of the proceedings of the Muséographie conference, organised in 1934 by the International Office of Museums. This study conference was held 28 October – 4 November 1934, in the Académie des Beaux-Arts (Madrid). The seventy participants (mostly museum directors) discussed the architecture, installations, display, organisation of collections, etc. Since the emphasis was placed on the practice of museum work, preference was given to the term museography. The term stood for an inventory of contemporary best practices.

Gradually, the term museography started to be used for museum practice in general, as opposed to museology referring to museum theory. Even though this terminology is not used in a consistent way throughout Europe, museum professionalism developed within the framework of the triangular relation between practice, theory, and ethics. In the profiling of the museum profession, the increasing number of museum related university programmes played an important role. The first museum studies programme was offered by the Ecole du Louvre (founded in 1882). This programme was most of all a curatorial programme with a strong subject matter orientation. By the mid 1970s, the role of the curator as a leading professional in a museum was increasingly being challenged by the so-called new professionals. The professional profile of these new professionals reflected the emancipation of the museographical disciplines i.e. collections management, conservation, exhibition design, and education. The organisational structure of museums changed accordingly. Collection based, curatorial departments were replaced by a functions oriented structure. One of the first regular training programmes preparing students for this new situation was the Dutch Reinwardt Academie (founded in 1976 in Leiden and, since 1992, in Amsterdam). The programme does not focus on curatorial responsibilities, but offers specialisations in the field of collections management, conservation, exhibition design, and education.

The danger of a fragmenting profession in turn brought about a (re)new(ed) interest in a museum related theoretical framework as well as a general code of ethics for all museum workers. It is no coincidence that the International Committee for Museology of the International Council of Museums was founded in 1976. In addition, it was also no coincidence that during the first years, museologists from Eastern Europe played an important role in this committee. Due to the specific political situation in Eastern Europe, museum studies programmes were forced to develop museum related theoretical frameworks to underpin a genuine Marxist-Leninist museum practice. Important centres of museological training and research were Zagreb (Ivo Maroevic) and Brno (Zbynek Stransky). The Brno school of museology met with international recognition (mainly in Eastern Europe, but also in Western Europe) thanks to the publications of the International Committee for Museology, but in particular due to the International Summer School of Museology (founded in 1987). The model of Brno was followed by the Baltic Museology School (based in Riga, Latvia) and the International School of Museology (based in Celje, Slovenia).

45

MEIJER-VAN MENSCH & VAN MENSCH FROM DISCIPLINARY CONTROL TO CO-CREATION . . .

One canonised principle of the modern museum is the bipartite concept (Bazin 1967: 263), the separation between a collection for the public and a collection for researchers and connoisseurs, which is usually referred to as a reserve collection. Brown Goode (1895: 38–39) proposed to separate exhibition series (the People's Museum) from study series (the Student's Museum). Gilman spoke in this respect of a dual arrangement (Gilman 1918: 401). However, whereas according to Brown Goode the study series should not be accessible to the general public, Gilman suggests that, as in public galleries, reserve collections should also be 'open to anyone wishing to enter'. This agrees with the concept of open storage, visible storage, or study collection as a part of a tripartite museum model.

The principle of internal editing was one of professional principles discussed during the Muséographie conference (1934). Even though the conference focused on the architecture and installation of art museums, a separate chapter was dedicated to the concept of 'collections d'études'. By distinguishing between study collections and storage, the tripartite model was followed.

At the end of the twentieth century, new interest was shown to the role of open storage (Pes 2002). George Henri Rivière modernised the concept in the Musée National des Arts et Traditions Populaires (Paris, 1972) by adopting a mutually complementing thematic approach in the 'galerie culturelle' and the 'galerie d'étude'. An updated version of Rivières 'galerie d'étude' is the collection centre. An example of this is the Darwin Centre at the Natural History Museum at London (built 2006–2009).

The report of the 1934 Muséographie conference mentioned a fourth category of collections: the 'collection didactique', a collection of copies. The Cast Courts of the Victoria & Albert Museum, London (created in 1873) are a good example of such an educational collection and, at the same time, a good example of the changing popularity. In the mid-twentieth century, the collections were considered obsolete. Because of overdue maintenance, the rooms were closed to the public. In 1982, however, the casts were cleaned and the rooms restored. Similar renewed interest in cast collections are seen in Berlin (Abgusssamlung antiker Plastik, re-opened in 1988) and Paris (Cité de l'Architecture et du Patrimoine, opened in 2007). This renewed popularity in collections of copies also shows in the foundation (in 1987) of an International Association for the Conservation and Promotion of Plaster Cast Collections (www.plastercastcollection.org).

MUSEUM EDUCATION AND IDEOLOGY

To Brown Goode as well as Gilman, museums were educational institutions by definition. Their publications present an elaborated ideal model for museums of the twentieth century. Both authors were aware of the fact that the reality was often different. As Gilman wrote: 'Museums of fine art began by subordinating their role of showing to their role of keeping.... This was the magazine era of museums, when they were built and arranged with chief preference to the preservation of their contents' (Gilman 1918: 309). However, Gilman is equally opposed to the contemporary practice of 'subordination their role of showing to their role of teaching.... To the magazine era has succeeded... a school era'. 'The primary aim of exhibitions of art' according to Gilman, 'is to bring it about that certain artistic intentions shall be apprehended by the spectator' (Gilman 1918: 310). In this respect, Gilman's ideals were shared by a number of leading museum directors of the early twentieth century. Gilman for his part was influenced by the German museum director Alfred Lichtwark. As director of the Kunsthalle at Hamburg, he was one of the founding fathers of museum education. He believed that the German schools emphasised knowing facts about art at the expense of understanding how to look at and appreciate art. Lichtwark made it his life's work to change the German educational philosophy and system and, therefore, to change the Germans themselves. In 1903, he was one of the speakers at the 'Die Museen als Volksbildungsstätten' conference at Mannheim, organised by the Centralstelle für Arbeiterwohlfahrtseinrichtungen (Central Bureau for Welfare-Work, Berlin). The conference was an important step in the development of the social museum concept. Social museums, or also called people's museums (Volksmuseen), were museums that emerged during the second half of the nineteenth century with the special purpose of educating (and emancipating) the lower class. A part of these museums was founded by social-democratic inspired persons and organisations, but another part had a strong conservative-nationalistic signature (Kuntz 1980).

During the early twentieth century, the concept of a social museum radicalised, basically in two directions. In the Soviet Union, a network of local social museums was created. The profile of these museums was not very different from the most common German version of a social museum: the Heimatmuseum, even though their political orientation was different. In both countries, social museums became the backbone of the ideological museum infrastructure, but the ideologies (communism and national socialism) increasingly affected the work of other museums as well, from natural history museums to art museums, from history museums to anthropological museums.

The lasting impact of state ideology on art museums has been the subject of many academic studies, but also still plays a role in collection research in individual museums, and not just in Germany and Russia, but also world-

47

MEIJER-VAN MENSCH & VAN MENSCH   FROM DISCIPLINARY CONTROL TO CO-CREATION . . .

wide. Concerning Germany, two issues should be mentioned here: the removal of 'entartete Kunst' (degenerated art) from museum collections and the looting of museums in Nazi occupied countries, as well as the confiscating of Jewish cultural property.

'Entartete Kunst' was a term used by the Nazi regime to describe almost all modern art. These works of art were banned because it was considered un-German, and dangerous as being cosmopolitan, deranged, negrified, and inspired by Jews and Bolshevists (Ginzkey Puloy 1996: 202). 'Entartete Kunst' was taken out of museum collections and was first put together for a travelling exhibition that started its tour in Munich in 1937. After this exhibition, most of the works were sold through Swiss art dealers for the disposal of foreign currency. Therefore, the works of art became widely dispersed over the world, leaving painful gaps in German museum collections. From any museums in occupied territories, important objects, sometimes even whole collections, were transported to Germany. However, most of all, Jewish private collections and museums were confiscated or at least acquired by forced sale. All of these looted materials were either sold in Switzerland, added to the private collections of Nazi leaders, or selected for the to be newly built huge art museum in Linz, the Führermuseum (Anderl and Caruso 2005).

In 1945, the American forces collected all the looted works of art that they could find in Collection Points to be restituted. National committees started the process of the recuperation of national treasures. The restitution of private (Jewish) cultural property and the property of (former) Jewish museums was not always properly dealt with. Many works of art ended up in collections of national museums. Other works of art ended up in museums in Israel or in the ownership of Jewish institutions elsewhere in the world (Gallas 2008: 214). It was a complex situation: who was the rightful claimant especially when the actual owner did not survive the concentration camps? In 1995, in his book *Le Musée Disparu* (*The Lost Museum*), Hector Feliciano drew attention to the unsatisfactory way in which the restitution of Jewish private property was handled in France. This prompted governments, museums, and descendants of the former owners to reconsider the procedures followed in the years after the war. Provenance research, in particular concerning acquisitions in the 1933–1945 period, has become standard procedure in many art museums all over the world.

At the end of the war, the Soviet Army annexed many cultural treasures of museums in the part of Germany that they controlled, including cultural property that was stolen from Soviet museums, which the German authorities had expropriated from Jewish private collectors and that was 'bought' from Jewish art dealers. The Cold War complicated any discussion about restitution. Collections originally coming from the territory of the German Democratic Republic were little by little returned, but even after 1990, much is still unclear.

WHO OWNS HERITAGE?

The discussions around restitution and the return of looted and expropriated cultural property essentially circle around the basic question: who owns heritage? From the late 1960s onwards, public ownership was no longer by definition ranked higher than private ownership, national collections were not automatically considered to be more important than regional or local collections, and capital cities of former colonial powers should not, by nature, be the rightful location to show world heritage.

The political changes in Central- and Eastern Europe since the late 1980s created new dilemmas. The dissolution of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia brought about difficult discussions about ownership and mutual heritage. The new independent states claimed treasures that they considered to be theirs for their own national museums. New nationalism also gave rise to claims that referred to the political geographies of a much earlier date. The political map of this part of Europe did considerably change in the course of the twentieth century, in turn initiating the re-invention of national identities. At the same time, the role of the state as the owner of all the nation's heritage is being challenged. Monuments and other heritage that was confiscated after the creation of the socialist states are now increasingly being claimed by the former owners, private owners, and institutions such as the Church alike.

On a local level, respect for ownership – individual or collective – was one of the cornerstones of the concept of an integrated museum. The concept was proposed at the Round Table on the Development and the Role of Museums in the Contemporary World, which was organised by UNESCO in Santiago, Chile in May 1972. Integration refers to (1) the integration of the academic disciplines that are related to the subject matters' fields, (2) the integration of the museographical disciplines, and (3) the integration of museum and community.

The principles of the integrated museum reflect the principles that are outlined by the UNESCO *Recommendation on participation by the people at large in cultural life and their contribution to it* (1976). According to the *Recommendation* 'participation by the greatest possible number of people and associations in a wide variety of cultural activities of their own free choice is essential to the development of the basic human values and dignity of the individual' (UNESCO 1976, Preamble). This awareness has led to significant developments in the following decades, from the more politically engaged grass roots initiatives, such as ecomuseums and neighbourhood museums, to the constitution of a critical museology or a reflexive museology.

49

MEIJER-VAN MENSCH & VAN MENSCH   FROM DISCIPLINARY CONTROL TO CO-CREATION . . .

The concept of an ecomuseum (formulated in 1971 by Hugues de Varine and George Henri Rivière) is about the relations – and the development of these relations – between people, their heritage, and their environment. It became one of the most important concrete expressions of an integrative approach. Heritage is very close to the notion of place, including the history of inhabitants and things, what is visible and what it is not, tangibles and intangibles, memories and the future. The emphasis is placed on the availability of these resources, and not on assembling them in storehouses. In other words, ecomuseology is about shared responsibility, and respecting the existing ownership.

New demands created by, for example, policies on social inclusion (which brought the work with community development closer to traditional museums), by emancipation movements and by the growing multiculturalism, contributed to the opening of a new chapter in the relations between museums and society. It is possible to say that the 1990s represent a turning point in the application of a new participation paradigm in the museum and heritage field. Following the disappearance of the distinction between users and producers on the Internet (Web 2.0), the new paradigm in museum work has been referred to as Museum 2.0.

Museum professionalism developed within the framework of practice, theory, and ethics.

Collection development according to this new paradigm can be described as 'new collecting' (Kok 2009: 55). Three forms of 'new collecting' can be identified:

- The museum does not collect objects, but interactions;
- The museum participates as an equal within a heritage community;
- The museum acts as a platform for individuals and groups to collect their own heritage.

The first form of 'new collecting' starts from the assumption that, in certain fields, private collectors have achieved a high level of sophistication. The role of the museum is to support these collectors, for example by taking care of storage, conservation, and restoration, but also to create new meaning by using the collections for curatorial exhibitions.

The second option refers to museums as functioning in networks of private and institutional collectors, but the owners of objects are also still in use. In 2005, in its *Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society* (also known as the Faro Convention), the Council of Europe introduced the term heritage community for such a network. According to the convention, a heritage community consists of people who value specific aspects of cultural heritage that they wish, within the framework of public action, to sustain and transmit to future generations.

The third approach emphasises the role of source communities. Most 'new collecting' projects are self-documentary; these projects intend to give people the opportunity to share their stories, providing a platform for the attribution of meaning. However, in more recent projects in the Netherlands and Germany, 'new collecting' also means working with the public as a co-curator. In these projects, museums take on the role of a facilitator, rather than authority. Laurajane Smith's 'Authorised Heritage Discourse' refers to the dichotomy between professionals and source communities. Participation projects illustrate the contemporary practices of liberating culture from this discourse (Kreps 2003). The 'New Heritage Discourse' advocates co-creation and co-curatorship. 'By identifying and naming the material and non-material elements that constitute their environment, people realize their right to their world and gaining control over it' (Kreps 2003, 10).

RATIONALISING COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT

In the second half of the 1980s, the influence of the rapidly rising art prices on the collecting policies of museums received quite a lot of media attention. There was, however, little understanding of the true acquisition costs, or the long-term financial consequences of acquisitions. In 1988, the British Office of Arts & Libraries commissioned an enquiry into the costs involved

51

MEIJER-VAN MENSCH & VAN MENSCH FROM DISCIPLINARY CONTROL TO CO-CREATION . . .

in the developing and managing of museum collections. The results were published in a report in 1989, *The Cost of Collecting*. Besides for mapping the different kinds of costs, it also tried to gain some information as to the height of these costs and the respective differences related to the kind of collections and the type of museums.

This approach to collecting and collection development is an example of an increased rationalisation of museum work from the end of the 1980s onwards. This is also shown by the discussion about developing rational criteria to raise the use value of collections. The example of a rationalised collecting policy that is quoted most often is the SAMDOK project in Sweden. This collaboration of Swedish museums was started in 1977 to record contemporary Swedish society methodically and systematically by means of collections and documentation. Its starting-point is to distinguish a number of sectors in society and to divide these sectors into areas for special study. A number of aspects from each of these areas is scrupulously documented by some of the collaborating museums.

Collecting leads *ipso facto* to a growing collection. Contrary to what has happened in the library world, little research into the nature of collection growth has been conducted in museums. Obviously, until the middle of the 1980s, the museum world did not feel – or refused to feel – growth to be a problem. After a number of surveys, notably the investigation into cultural history collections, the Netherlands Museums Association devoted a meeting in 1988 to the issue of quality and quantity. It was the start of a national debate on de-accessioning. In the meantime, most of the museums in the Netherlands have accepted deaccessioning as a tool for collection development, not in the least because clear guidelines have been developed. In the United Kingdom, similar discussions, with similar outcomes, have taken place. This illustrates an important shift in perspective concerning the theory and practice of collecting. Not collecting but rather collection development is the main focus in contemporary museology.

Léontine Meijer-van Mensch is a lecturer of heritage theory and professional ethics at the Reinwardt Academy (Amsterdam). She studied new and theoretical history and Judaic studies in Amsterdam, Jerusalem and Berlin and was a post-graduate in European Cultural Heritage Studies in Frankfurt/Oder with a focus on museology. Her PhD research focuses on the museology discourse in the German Democratic Republic and its international resonance. Her main interest is remembrance culture and contemporary collecting.

Peter van Mensch is a professor of cultural heritage at the Reinwardt Academy (Amsterdam) and as such is responsible for the Academy's research programme. He studied zoology and archaeology at the University of Amsterdam (Netherlands) and earned his PhD degree in museology at the University of Zagreb (Croatia). He has worked for several museums (history, applied art, and natural history) in the Netherlands. As a researcher, he is interested in developing an integral and integrated approach to heritage.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderl, A. and Caruso, A. (eds) (2005) *NS-Kunstraub in Österreich und die Folgen*, Innsbruck: Studien-Verlag.

Bazin, G. (1967) *The Museum Age*, New York: Universe Books Inc.

Brown Goode, G. (1895) 'The principles of museum administration', *Annual Report of the Museums Association*, York.

Desvallées, A. (1992) 'Museology and cultural identity', *Papers in Museology 1*, Umea: Umea University, 50–77.

Desvallées, A. and Mairesse, F. (2005) 'Sur la muséologie', *Cultures et Musées* (6), 131–155.

Duncan, C. and Wallach, A. (2004) 'The Universal Survey Museum', in B.M. Carbonell (ed.) *Museum Studies. An Anthology of Contexts*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 51–70.

Gallas, E. (2008) 'Die Restitution Jüdischer Kulturgüter Europas zwischen 1945 und 1952', in I. Bertz and M. Dorrmann (eds) *Raub und Restitution. Kulturgut aus Jüdischem Besitz von 1933 bis heute*, Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag.

Gilman, B.E. (1918) *Museum Ideals of Purpose and Method*, Boston: Museum of Fine Arts.

Ginzkey Puloy, M. (1996) 'High art and national socialism. Part I. The Linz Museum as Ideological Arena', *Journal of the History of Collections* 8 (2): 201–215.

Haupt, H. (1991) *Das kunsthistorische Museum. Die Geschichte des Hauses am Ring*, Wien: Brandstätter Verlag.

Hilgers, W. (2005) '100 Jahre – 69 Jahrgänge. Zum Jubiläum der Museumskunde', *Museumskunde* 70 (1), 7–17.

Joachimides, J. and Kuhrau, S. (2001) *Renaissance der Kulturgeschichte? Die Wiederentdeckung des Märkischen Museums in Berlin aus einer europäischen Perspektive*, Dresden: Verlag der Kunst.

Kok, A. (2009) 'Het Nieuwe Verzamelen in Zoetermeer', in A. Koch and J. Van der Ploeg (eds) *4289 Wisselwerking. De Wonderkamer van Zoetermeer. Verslag van een geslaagd museaal experiment*, Zoetermeer: Stadsmuseum Zoetermeer, 54–58.

Korek, J. (1977) 'Der Museumsgedanke und die Sammlungsmethoden in Ungarn', in B. Deneke and R. Kahsnitz (eds) *Das kunst- und kulturgeschichtliche Museum im 19. Jahrhundert*, München: Prestel Verlag, 29–36.

Kreps, C.F. (2003) *Liberating Culture. Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Museums, Curation, and Heritage Preservation*, London: Routledge.

Kuntz, A. (1980) *Das Museum als Volksbildungsstätte. Museumskonzeptionen in der deutschen Volksbildungsbewegung von 1871 bis 1918*, Marburg: Jonas Verlag.

McClellan, A. (1994) *Inventing the Louvre. Art, Politics and the Origins of the Modern Museum in Eighteenth-Century Paris*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Mellinghoff, G.-T. (1977) 'Zur Entstehung und Eigenart des bürgerlichen Museums in England', in B. Deneke and R. Kahsnitz (eds) *Das kunst- und kulturgeschichtliche Museum im 19. Jahrhundert*, München: Prestel Verlag, 82–98.

Pes, J. (2002) 'Reserve judgement', *Museum Practice* (19): 50–52.

Smith, L. (2007) 'General Introduction', in L. Smith (ed.) *Cultural Heritage. Critical Concepts in media and Cultural Studies*, London: Routledge, 1–21.

Stoklund, B. (1993) 'International Exhibitions and the New Museum Concept in the Latter Half of the Nineteenth Century', *Ethnologia Scandinavica* 23: 87–113.

Van der Ham, G. (2000) *200 Jaar Rijksmuseum. Geschiedenis van een nationaal symbool*, Zwolle: Waanders Uitgevers.

Wagner, W. (1977) 'Die frühen Museumsgründungen in der Donaumonarchie', in B. Deneke and R. Kahsnitz (eds) *Das kunst- und kulturgeschichtliche Museum im 19. Jahrhundert*, München: Prestel Verlag, 19–28.

Whitehead, C. (2007) 'Establishing the manifesto: art histories in the nineteenth-century museum', in S.J. Knell, S. MacLeod and S. Watson (eds) *Museum revolutions. How museums change and are changed*, London: Routledge, 48–60.

53

MEIJER-VAN MENSCH & VAN MENSCH   FROM DISCIPLINARY CONTROL TO CO-CREATION . . .