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Preface

ICOFOM, the International Committee for Museology, discussed the topic "Museology, Tangible and Intangible Heritage" for the first time on the occasion of the Annual Meeting 2000 held in Munich/Germany and Brno/Czech Republic. Already two years ago the UNESCO-initiative “Proclamation of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity” had been established. It started from the model of a preservation system of intangible heritage in Republic of Korea and aimed at a world-wide examining and finding of those Masterpieces. Proposals were given by many states from all over the world. 2001 the first Proclamation was carried out. As a result a list of nineteen Masterpieces was declared. In the following years 2002 and 2003 over sixty member States of UNESCO evaluated and recommended further outstanding examples of intangible heritage of humanity. 2003 twenty-eight additional Masterpieces were acknowledged and supplemented to the first choice 2001. All of them relate to immaterial, aesthetic and ethic values, virtual “reality”, creativity, spiritual heritage, qualities of art or contemporary methods for art-interpretation. In this concern “Shanghai Charter”, drawn up after the 7th Regional Assembly of the Asia Pacific Organisation/ICOM/UNESCO (2002) and “UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Heritage” (2003) are a very helpful context because they paraphrase the “intangible” in regard to theoretical and practical structure.

Whereas ICOFOM tangible and intangible heritage particularly considered with reference to Museums and Museology, UNESCO defined intangible heritage as a value itself that could be related to various tangible characters. Although from the ICOFOM point of view intangible heritage is particularly associated with museums, monuments, documentation centres and memorial sites – and of course, Museology - by UNESCO references and definitions a more varied approach to intangible heritage was designed. ICOM NEWS 4/2003 “Museums and Intangible Heritage” set supplementary convincing examples of the “intangible” by introducing various types of museums. Above all, the “provocative paper” of André Devallées, ICOFOM permanent adviser and responsible for “Thesaurus Museologicus” starting this edition of ICOFOM Study Series is of great importance in reference with the terms of the “intangible heritage”, Museology and Museums.

In reference to museological points of view and particularly to the essays in this issue intangible heritage may be classified into four criteria:
Firstly, the forms of expression that are closely connected to tangible heritage as e.g. traditions of communities or customs of peoples. Secondly, individual and common, cultural, social and creative expressions independent of any physical form – as e.g. language, literature, oral traditions, dance. Thirdly, symbolic and metaphoric significance of objects that characterize the tangible heritage as e.g. its phenotype, size and importance as cultural possession. Fourthly, identity and remembrance not only as a kind of positive but also of “negative” intangible heritage - particularly in reference to the heritage of former totalitarian states of 20th century.

However, according to the UNESCO “Convention for Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage" the intangible heritage is imparted from the present to the successor generation and requires a permanent renewal by communities and groups – in correspondence with both the historical conditions and the present circumstances. Thus the role of Museums and Museology is also consisting in the responsibility for records and transcriptions of the intangible heritage that is – as you might say – in this way “materialised” and "musealised" independently from time and space.

Munich, September 8, 2004

Hildegard Vieregg
Resumé

1) Un premier problème est la traduction du mot anglais « intangible » par le mot français « immatériel ». Il produit un malentendu du fait que la langue française possède deux mots : « immatériel » (= qui n’est pas matériel) et « intangible » (= que vous ne pouvez pas toucher). Les sens sont différents puisque, en français, la matière peut être « tangible » ou « intangible ». Ce qui est « immatériel » ne peut jamais être « tangible », en français.

2) D’un point de vue muséologique, « l’immatériel » (en anglais « intangible ») est seulement l’émanation du matériel : il ne peut exister et être exposé sans témoins tangibles (artéfacts ou spécimens naturels). La présente campagne en faveur du patrimoine immatériel provient du mépris des cultures extra occidentales par les politiques et un grand nombre des gens de musée – particulièrement ce qui concerne la religion et le sacré, toujours mal compris.

3) Les membres de l’ UNESCO (et peut-être de l’ ICOM) sont atteints d’amnésie et s’obstinent à nier l’évidence lorsqu’ils redécouvrent le patrimoine immatériel. Les scientifiques savent qu’il existe toujours quelque chose qu’ils ne peuvent percevoir jusqu’à ce que quelqu’un en donne l’explication. Les historiens d’art savent que la plus grande partie de la création est immatérielle. Et, par dessus tout, ce n’est pas la première fois que les ethnologues enregistrent toutes les manifestations culturelles des différentes cultures, au sein desquelles nous trouvons les fêtes, les cérémonies, les danses, les processus de fabrication ou des moments de vie. Je voudrais ajouter que ce n’est pas un nouveau problème pour ceux qui assurent depuis des années et des années qu’un objet n’a pas de sens par lui-même.


1) d’une part un mauvais passage du français à l’anglais (ou inversement), dès les premières réflexions de l’ UNESCO sur le patrimoine, lequel s’est appelé en français « immatériel » pour les uns et « intangible » pour les autres, et toujours « intangible » en anglais ; 2) d’autre part une séparation arbitraire entre ce qui est matériel et ce qui ne l’est pas.

1 Avec le concours de Suzanne Nash pour la version anglaise.
1 Le français distingue ‘*immatériel*’ (= qui n’est pas matériel, c’est à dire qui peut être spirituel, intellectuel, moral) de ‘*intangible*’ (= que l’on ne peut toucher, que l’on ne doit pas toucher, impalpable, inviolable,) alors que l’anglais ‘*intangible*’ ne peut revêtir les deux sens (l’impossibilité et l’interdiction). Et, de là, au moins en français, une confusion, dans la mesure où un objet que l’on ne peut ou ne doit pas toucher ne peut être ‘*immatériel*’. Qui plus est selon le dictionnaire Girodet, seules les choses, concrètes ou abstraites, peuvent être ‘*intangibles*’, tandis que les personnes peuvent être ‘*intouchables*’. Seul le Grand Robert ouvre une porte vers le sens adopté par l’UNESCO en ajoutant le sens de sacré. C’est sans doute cette ambiguïté possible avec le sens figuré qui a conduit les gens de l’UNESCO à ne pas adopter le dictionnaire Girodet, seules les choses, concrètes ou abstraites, peuvent être ‘*intangible*’ alors que l’anglais ‘*immaterial*’, ‘*impalpable*’, ‘*inviolable*’, ‘*non-touchable*’ lorsqu’on se réfère au mot ‘*intangible*’ avec un seul sens (WEBSTER'S Dictionary, Oxford Dictionary), et si, en français le terme ‘*immatériel*’ n’est pas nécessairement le meilleur, en tout cas, les deux termes ne veulent pas dire la même chose dans le contexte qui les a fait choisir l’un et l’autre.

Peut-être serait-il nécessaire, pour lever toute ambiguïté de nuancer le mot ‘*intangible*’ lors de la traduction en anglais en ajoutant le concept ‘*unsubstantial*’ lorsqu’on se réfère au mot français ‘*immatériel*’ – compte tenu que ‘*intangible property*’ se traduit par ‘*biens incorporels*’. En traduisant le terme français ‘*intangible*’ en anglais, on ajouterait ‘*immaterial*’ ou ‘*non-touchable*’ (le terme ‘*intouchable*’ qui existe déjà serait exclu parce que trop chargé de son sens social aux Indes).

2 Séparer le matériel de l’immatériel suppose ignorer que tout *artefact* comprend lui-même une part d’immatériel. Or l’unanimité n’a pas été faite (je me contenterai sur ce point de rapprocher les textes de l’UNESCO et les contributions de membres de l’ICOM parues dans *Les Nouvelles de l’ICOM*, vol.56, 2003/4 et vol.57, 2004/1).

2.1 Constatons tout d’abord que les scientifiques, même en français, rejettent l’utilisation du terme ‘*immatériel*’, au bénéfice du seul ‘*intangible*’, dans la mesure où tout objet d’expérience scientifique ne peut être que ‘*matériel*’, même s’il est difficilement perceptible par les sens humains, et donc ‘*intangible*’ sans des instruments spéciaux (c’est le cas pour les sciences naturelles, et, dans son article (*NI*, 2004/1 : 11), Michel van Praët tient pour acquis ce rejet, sans même y faire allusion).

2.2 Or, à la différence des musées, la définition de l’UNESCO ne s’intéresse pas au patrimoine naturel ! Doit-on donc considérer cette définition comme « pré-logique » ou « pré-cartésienne » et se rattachant elle-même au monde de l’irrationnel. Dès lors, on pourrait appliquer au patrimoine le constat qu’avait déjà fait, il y a un demi-siècle, le célèbre physicien français Louis de Broglie et utiliser le terme de ‘*transcendance*’ pour qualifier ce qui échappe à la tangibilité : « La Vie nous apparaît sous des aspects opposés : tantôt elle semble se réduire à un ensemble de processus physico-chimiques, tantôt elle paraît s’affirmer comme caractérisée par un dynamisme évolutif qui transcende la physico-chimie. » (Physique et microphysique 1947:60).

2.3 C’est ainsi que l’on pourrait expliquer que, concernant la *forme* que revêt le patrimoine immatériel, la définition établie par l’UNESCO, inclut aussi bien les éléments qui peuvent être attribués à la transcendance (*pratiques, représentations, expressions, connaissances, savoir-faire*) que les supports matériels qui ont pu les générer (*‘artefacts et espaces culturels qui leur sont associés*). Or, il n’est pas nouveau de remarquer que, les musées sont pleins d’objets (patrimoine matériel) qui sont des supports de patrimoine immatériel. Et, en premier lieu, toutes les œuvres d’art plastique, dont la part la plus originale est justement celle qui échappe à toute évaluation matérielle. Mais tout
autant, également par essence, toute œuvre humaine dont le sens ne se lit pas au premier degré, mais est généré par le contexte dans lequel elle se trouve dans la vie ou lorsqu’elle est exposée.

2.4 Si l’on considère le texte même de la Convention de l’UNESCO, « les domaines d’expression couverts » sont un melting-pot qui comprend à la fois : « les langues, la littérature orale, (mythes, chansons, jeux, généalogies), les arts du spectacle et les pratiques corporelles (dont les rituels, les sports, le mime), les savoirs et savoir-faire (relatifs à la nature et à la cosmologie, aux apprentissages, aux pratiques médicales et culinaires, à l’artisanat traditionnel, aux techniques de production), les formes narratives dans toute leur diversité ». En distinguant trois catégories de patrimoine immatériel, Giovanni Pinna (NI, 2003/4 : 3) a proposé une répartition plus muséologique du contenu des définitions de l’UNESCO ainsi que quelques compléments à l’énumération :

1) « les expressions, fixées sous une forme tangible, de la culture ou des modes de vie traditionnelles d’une communauté donnée : rituels religieux, économies traditionnelles, modes de vie […] (l’opéra Kunqu, en Chine, les marionnettes siciliennes, la place Jema’a-el-Fna de Marrakech, par exemple) » ;

2) « toutes les expressions individuelles ou collectives dépourvues de forme tangible : la langue, la mémoire, la tradition orale, les chansons, la musique traditionnelle non écrite, etc. […] (par exemple le patrimoine oral du peuple Zapara d’équateur et du Pérou) » ;

3) « les significations symboliques et métaphoriques des objets qui constituent le patrimoine matériel. Tout objet possède deux dimensions : son apparence physique – c’est-à-dire sa forme, sa taille, etc. – et sa signification, qui découle de son histoire, des interprétations qu’il suscite, de sa capacité à servir de lien entre le passé et le présent, etc. ».

2.5 Et Giovanni Pinna de faire une distinction, dans l’ordre muséal, entre les deux premières catégories et la troisième. Dans le premier cas, il considère que le patrimoine immatériel peut être transcrit ou enregistré et se voir alors transformé en patrimoine matériel – mais ces « expressions culturelles vivantes », par leur matérialisation, se trouvent alors comme fossilisées, dans l’espace et dans le temps, et cessent d’être patrimoine. Dans le second cas, il appartient au musée de sélectionner, dans leur contexte historique et scientifique, les objets à significations symboliques et de les restituer pour un large public, avec ce même contexte – même si chaque individu en garde sa propre interprétation, et même si les expressions culturelles non patrimonialisées continuent d’évoluer.

2.6 Le patrimoine immatériel est tantôt donné comme véritable objet de musée, (Giovanni Pinna, NI, 2003/4 : 3 ; Michel van Praët, NI, 2004/1 : 11), parfois il est considéré comme simple documentation (Amareswar Galla, NI, 2003/4 : 4). Il s’agit alors surtout des ‘processus et phénomènes’ (catégorie que l’UNESCO avait placé dans le domaine culturel lors de sa réunion de mars 2001), liés aux écosystèmes et à la diversité. Mais si le même point de vue peut s’appliquer aux processus liés aux sciences exactes, aux sciences appliquées ainsi qu’aux techniques, ces dernières sont plutôt à rattachner au domaine culturel.

Conclusion

En bref, muséologiquement parlant, l’immatériel ne peut exister qu’en tant qu’émanation du matériel et sa restitution ne peut qu’être une évocation par des témoins matériels. La présente campagne pour la protection du dit patrimoine immatériel provient en fait de ce que ce patrimoine a été largement ignoré, voire méprisé, par une grande partie du personnel politique – mais le personnel des musées n’en est-il pas le plus grand responsable dont la majorité agissante a également méprisé, pendant des années, ce qui ne ressortissait pas au ‘grand art’ ? Et, c’est bien certain, si les témoignages plastiques des cultures non occidentales ont été dévoyés pour être rattachés au domaine de l’histoire de l’art et des musées d’art, des champs entiers de ces cultures ont été délaissés, dont les plus importants touchaient au sacré et donc à l’immatériel.
L’UNESCO (l’ICOM également, dès lors qu’il met ses pas dans les siens – serait-il amnésique ?) nous donne l’impression d’enfoncer une porte ouverte en découvrant un patrimoine qui, même sous d’autres noms, est familier à la fois aux scientifiques, depuis deux millénaires et demi qu’ils constatent qu’une partie d’irrationnel leur échappe jusqu’à ce que la poursuite de leurs recherches leur permette d’en résoudre les zones d’ombre, aux historiens d’art, depuis deux siècles qu’existe l’histoire de l’art et qu’ils savent que l’essentiel de la création artistique est insaisissable, et aux ethnologues (Yves Bergeron, NI, 2003/4 : 8), depuis près d’un siècle qu’ils photographient, enregistrent et filment des cérémonies, des fêtes, des danses, des processus de fabrication ou tout simplement des morceaux de vie. Ce qui est (peut-être) nouveau, c’est la ‘ré-injection’ dans la vie de ce qui a été conservé (Nguyen Van Huy, NI, 2003/4 : 5), sauf de prolonger toutes ces fêtes folkloriques dans lesquelles baignent l’Europe occidentale, depuis un siècle et demi. J’ajouterai que ce qui apparaît comme un nouveau concept n’est pas non plus une nouveauté pour tous ceux qui, depuis un demi-siècle, assurent que l’objet de musée n’a pas de sens par lui-même, que sa lecture est assujettie à la fois au contexte expographique qui lui est donné et au point de vue subjectif de chaque visiteur.
Provocative Paper: Museology and Categories of Intangible Heritage – Issues of terminology: the relevance of *patrimoine immatériel* and *patrimoine intangible* in French, and *intangible heritage* in English

André Desvallées¹ – France

---

**Abstract**

1) A first problem is that the same word "intangible" exists in both English and French with different connotations. The translation of the English word ‘intangible’ to the French ‘*immatériel*’ can cause misunderstanding. The French language has two words: ‘*immatériel*’ (i.e., what is not matter) and ‘*intangible*’ (i.e., you cannot touch or grasp it; you are not allowed to touch it). “Intangible” in French assumes that matter can be both ‘*tangible*’ and ‘*intangible*’ but this is not so in the English. In French what is ‘*immatériel*’ can never be ‘*tangible*’, and in English it is ‘*intangible*’ that refers almost exclusively to what has no material form.

2) From a museological point of view, *intangible* (in English – and *immatériel* in French) is only an emanation of matter: it cannot exist and be exhibited without tangible evidence (artefacts or natural specimens). The present campaign for intangible heritage derives from the scorn of non-western cultures by policy-makers – and a lot of museum people too, who neglected, in particular, the fields of religion and the sacred in favour of ‘great art.’

3) The people at UNESCO (and maybe ICOM) have amnesia when they persist in denying the evidence, saying that they have now discovered the intangible heritage. Scientists know that some element has always existed, which they cannot perceive until somebody explains it. Art historians know that the essential element in creation is intangible. And, above all, it’s not the first time that anthropologists record expressions of different cultures, in which we find festivities, ceremonies, dances, manufacturing process, or simply slices of life. I would add that it is not a new concern for museum people who have stated for many years that an object does not have meaning by itself.

---

¹ With the collaboration of Suzanne Nash for the English version.
and 'intangible' by others, whereas it is simply 'intangible' in the English. 2) An arbitrary separation between what is material and what is not.

1 The French language differentiates between 'immatériel' (that which is not material, that is to say, which can be spiritual, intellectual, moral) and 'intangible' (what one cannot touch, or should not touch, impalpable, or inviolable) whereas the English 'intangible' cannot have both meanings (impossibility, and interdiction). This causes confusion, at least in French, in so far as an object that one cannot, or should not touch, must have substance and therefore cannot be 'immaterial'. Additionally, according to the GORODET French dictionary, only concrete or abstract things can be 'intangible' (in the sense that touching them is prohibited), whereas people can be 'intouchable' (= untouchable). Only the GRAND ROBERT French dictionary opens a door to the meaning adopted by UNESCO by adding the idea of 'sacred.' It is undoubtedly because of the possible ambiguity with the figurative meaning in the French use of the term 'intangible' that UNESCO did not adopt the word in the French. This would have led to confusion with other terms regarding the conservation of materials (which one should not touch – 'impalpable'), whereas, with regard to our problem of heritage, we are talking about that which one cannot touch. Not because one would cause damage, but because it is impossible to grasp them physically, thus they are 'immaterial.' The ROBERT dictionary (and here I translate from the French) defines 'immatériel' as 'not made of matter, not having any material consistence, incorporeal, spiritual,' and by extension, 'foreign to matter, not concerning the flesh or senses.' The bilingual dictionary ROBERT & COLLINS translates the French 'immatériel' to the English almost literally by 'immaterial,' to which the bi-lingual dictionary HARRAPS'S adds 'insubstantial.' If 'intangible' were used in French in this way, it would lead us back to matter (impossible to touch) which is exactly the distinction we want to make. If English speaking people feel that the word intangible has only one meaning (WEBSTER'S Unabridged Dictionary, Oxford Dictionary), and if in French the word 'immaterial' is not necessarily the best, in either case the two terms do not mean the exactly same thing in the context in which one or the other was chosen.

Perhaps, to remove all ambiguity, it would be necessary to further define the English use of 'intangible' when translating by adding the term 'insubstantial.' This is necessary with reference to the French term 'immatériel,' considering that intangible property is translated into French by 'biens incorporels.' One could also add to the English translation of the French 'intangible' the defining terms 'impalpable' or 'non-touchable' (the existing word 'untouchable' is too heavily loaded with social meaning in India).

2 To separate the material from the immaterial assumes that we dismiss the fact that artefacts have an immaterial part to them. People are not unanimous on this point. I will only compare texts from UNESCO and papers by members of ICOM which appeared in ICOM News, vol. 56, 2003, no. 4, and vol. 57, 2004, no. 1.

2.1 We should first note that scientists, even in French, reject the term 'immatériel' in favour of 'intangible,' in so far as the object of scientific experiments can only be done with what has material substance, even if this matter is difficult for human senses to perceive. Thus 'intangible' without special instruments (this is the case for natural sciences, and in his article, IN, 2004, 1:11, Michel van Praet takes this rejection for given, even though he does not refer to it.)

2.2 In contrast to museums, UNESCO’s definition is not interested in natural heritage. Should we therefore see this definition as ‘pre-logical’ or as ‘pre-Cartesian’, itself attached to an irrational world? If so, we could apply to heritage the statement already made half a century ago by the famous French physicist Louis de Broglie and use the term ‘transcendance’ (= transcendence) to qualify everything that escapes tangibility. “Life appears to us in opposing ways: sometimes it seems to be reduced to a cluster of physical-chemical processes, and sometimes it seems to assert itself in a way characterised as an evolving dynamism which transcends physics and chemistry.” (Physique et microphysique, 1947 : 60).

2.3 Thus we could explain that, regarding the form that intangible heritage takes, the UNESCO definition includes both elements that can be attributed to transcendence (practices,
representations, expressions, knowledge and skills) and the material supports that generated them (instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces that are associated with them). There is nothing new in mentioning that museums are full of objects (material heritage) which are the support of the intangible heritage. First of all, in these physical works of art the most original element is exactly what escapes material evaluation. But just as much, and also by their very essence, in all human works whose meaning is not obvious in the first degree, understanding is generated by the context in which they are found in life, or when they are displayed.

2.4 If we examine the text itself of the Unesco convention "the domains of expression covered" are a melting-pot which includes at the same time "languages, oral traditions and expressions (myths, song, games, genealogies), performing arts and body expressions (including rituals, sports, mime), knowledge and skills (relating to nature and cosmology, to apprenticeship and medical and culinary practices, traditional craftsmanship and production techniques), narrative forms in all their diversity". In distinguishing between three categories of intangible heritage, Giovanni Pinna (IN, 2003, 4:3) suggested a more museological breakdown of the UNESCO definitions, as well as some additions to the lis:

1) "expressions, embodied in physical form, of the culture or traditional ways of life of a certain community, for example, their religious rites, traditional economies, ways of life, folklore […] for example […] Kungu Opera in China, Sicilian puppets, the Jernaa al Fina Square in Marrakesh…";
2) "individual or collective expressions which do not have a physical form: language, memory, oral traditions, songs and non-written traditional music […] for example the oral heritage of the Zapara people in Ecuador and Peru…";
3) "symbolic and metaphysical meanings of the objects which constitute the tangible heritage. Every object has two dimensions: its physical aspect – for example its shape and size, – and its meaning, which derives from its history, from the interpretation it receives from others, from its capacity to link the past to the present, and so forth."

2.5 Giovanni Pinna differentiates, in museological order, between the two first categories and the third one. In the first case, he considers that intangible heritage may be transcribed or registered and then transformed into material/tangible heritage – but these 'living cultural expressions,' through their materialisation, are then fossilised, both in space and in time, and are no longer heritage. In the second case, museums should select, within their historical and scientific context, those objects with symbolic signification and return them to the broad public. These objects should be placed in the same context, even if individuals keep their own interpretation, and even if the cultural expressions, which have not yet been absorbed into the heritage, continue to evolve.

2.6 Intangible heritage is sometimes given as a real museum object (Giovanni Pinna, IN 2003, 4:3, and Michel van Praët, IN, 2004, 1:11), and sometimes it is considered to be documentation (Amareswar Galla, IN, 2003, 4:4). The question is that of 'processes and phenomena' (a category which UNESCO added to the cultural sphere during its meeting in March 2001), linking them to ecosystems and diversity. If the same approach can apply to processes linked to exact sciences, and applied sciences and technologies, the latter should be attached to the field of culture.

Conclusion

In short, speaking museologically, the intangible can only exist as an emanation of the material, and its restitution can only be an evocation through material evidence. The campaign today for the protection of the intangible heritage comes from the fact that this heritage has been largely ignored, even scorned, by a majority of policy-makers. However, are not museums the most responsible, where, during many years, the majority of the active personnel also scorned anything that did not stand out as ‘great art’? If material evidence of non-western cultures was misled to be attached to history of art and to art museums, it is certain that whole fields of
cultures have been neglected, of which the most important are those touching the sacred, and thus the intangible.

The people at UNESCO (and at ICOM too, when they follow in the same footsteps – do they have amnesia?) give us the impression of forcing an open door when they discover a heritage which, even by any other name, is already familiar. It is known to scientists for two and a half millennia, who see a dimension that is not rational, which escapes them until the pursuit of their research allows them to understand the grey areas. For the two centuries that art history exists it is familiar to art historians, who know that the essential part of artistic creation cannot be grasped. For more than a century it is familiar to ethnologists (Yves Bergeron, IN, 2003, 4:8), who photograph, record and film ceremonies and festivities, dances, manufacturing processes, or simply slices of life.

What is (perhaps) new is the re-injection into life of what had been preserved (Nguyen Van Huy, IN, 2003, 4:5), except for the continuation of all those folklore festivities that western Europe bathes in for the last century and a half. I add that what appears to be a new concept is not something new either for all those who, for the past half-century, state that museum objects do not have any meaning by themselves. Interpreting the objects is subject to the context of their display and to the subjective view of each visitor.
Cosmologie et patrimoine immatériel: une expérience au Musée d’Astronomie

Marilia Braz Botelho – Brésil & Luiz C. Borges – Brésil


La participation de chercheurs et d’astronomes dans ces actions devient de plus en plus significative, notamment en ce qui concerne la fourniture de bases scientifiques pour le contenu des activités proposées. Devant des défis conceptuels et pédagogiques, tels que traiter des sujets liés au patrimoine immatériel, cette collaboration devient encore plus essentielle, en générant des relations étroites entre les équipes de l’histoire de la science, le service d’éducation et la muséologie.

L’idée d’approcher des questions liées à la théorie scientifique est apparue grâce à ce partenariat et à l’occasion de la préparation des commémorations autour de la Semaine Internationale des Musées, dont le thème cette année était Musées et Patrimoine Immatériel. Nous avions compris que les théories sont des produits culturels qui ont une existence indépendante des formes et des appareils qui sont construits grâce à ces théories. Nous avions aussi à l’esprit qu’on devait traiter des questions universelles ou du moins pas restreintes aux procéssus de compréhension occidentale ni aux carcans académiques. Sur ce point de vue, nous avons alors décidé de choisir le thème de la Cosmologie. En effet, les systèmes d’idées et de savoirs sur le Cosmos peuvent aussi être considérés comme un patrimoine culturel intangible.

Il fallait ensuite mieux définir notre idée de ce qu’était la Cosmologie, afin de mettre en place un langage culturel et muséologique. La Cosmologie étant l’étude du Cosmos, son but est d’expliquer l’existence de l’Univers et de tout ce qui existe. Nous avions donc d’emblée deux problématiques qui dans l’ensemble nous paraissaient constituer le meilleur chemin pour atteindre nos buts. D’un côté, il était nécessaire de montrer que l’interrogation cosmologique existait dans toutes les sociétés humaines, actuelles ou passées. De l’autre, la possibilité d’atteindre un sens largement diffusé qui oppose le mythe à la théorie. A partir de ces éléments de fond, nous avons décidé de présenter quelques exemples de mythes sur l’origine, car ce sont eux qui expliquent toute la génèse de l’univers. Dans ce sens, nous traiterions sans distinction les mythes d’origine produits aussi bien dans les académies que ceux qui ne se sont pas conformés à ces règles. On croyait, d’autre part, que le dialogue entre ces diverses disciplines permettrait une vision intéressante sur la Science et son interprétation au musée.

1 Historienne de l’art, muséologue de la Coordination d’Education du Musée d’Astronomie et de Sciences Corolaires à Rio de Janeiro.
2 Chercheur de la Coordination d’Histoire de la Science du Musée d’Astronomie et de Sciences Corolaires à Rio de Janeiro.
3 Du grec Kosmos: univers, ensemble de tout ce qui existe.
4 Cf Abreu et Chagas, 2003.
Nous avons donc décidé de proposer au public une activité temporaire diversifiée qui diffuserait non seulement les mythes et les théories mais tout un ensemble d’informations et de savoirs – érudits ou non – qui serait en rapport avec l’existence du Cosmos. L’événement proposé, appelé *Mythes d’Origine – l’homme et sa compréhension de l’Univers et de la planète où il vit*, serait en même temps une expérience scientifique et culturelle, inédite au musée. Normalement, les thèmes traités sont plus en rapport avec la science académique, quoique présentés de façon ludique et interactive. Ce que l’on proposait serait une expérience conceptuelle, sensorielle et pédagogique dans le but même de déconstruire des savoirs traditionnels. Ce serait aussi une occasion de présenter des narrations en référence avec la cosmologie qui jusqu’à alors n’étaient connus que de quelques spécialistes ou des initiés sur le sujet.

Le comissariat de cet événement était à la charge du linguiste Luiz Carlos Borges qui a réalisé des recherches sur la cosmologie des indiens *guaraní mbyá* au Musée d’Astronomie. La coordination et la réalisation ont été à la charge du service d’éducation du musée. La production d’un CD-Rom pour relater une partie du contenu a été décidée pour une des activités proposées. La sélection des images et des sons a été réalisée en concertation avec les équipes impliquées.

Notre but était au départ d’inclure plusieurs versions de la création du monde qui pourraient représenter un échantillon des questionnements de l’homme face à ses origines. Dans ce sens, nous voulions présenter côté à côté des narrations scientifiques, bibliques, indigènes, africaines et asiatiques. Pour mieux les caractériser, ces narrations seraient proposées dans leur propre langue originale, puis traduites en portugais. Toutefois, la difficulté de récolter des narrations ou des enregistrements de groupes africains et asiatiques, alliée au peu de temps et de recours pour les recherches ont limité l’horizon de notre travail. Notre présentation s’est donc limitée à un exemple de cosmologie scientifique, une de cosmologie religieuse et deux de cosmologie d’indiens brésiliens. Toutes ces narrations ont été enregistrées *live*.

Les images qui accompagnaient la sonorisation étaient en rapport avec les représentations de chaque culture traitée, quoique pas présentées de façon simultanée avec la narration. Une recherche sur chaque mythe ou théorie a permis une sélection d’images de galaxies, objets, peintures, dessins, rituels, danses, art rupestre, etc, en relation avec le thème de la cosmologie. Nous avions d’ailleurs constaté la rareté de cette iconographie, aussi bien dans l’histoire de l’art occidental, que dans les cultures indigènes recherchées. Notre proposition consistait à pousser le public à la réflexion, en dehors de visées scolaires.

Nous attendions que cette lecture puisse produire une sensation de quelque chose de bizarre tant par le contenu que par la forme. Et d’un autre côté, il y avait la difficulté de transmettre des concepts et des théories abstraits, avec peu de ressources techniques. Comment par exemple sélectionner, apprivoiser et présenter des concepts aussi abstraits et éphémères à un public diversifié de musées ? Comment rendre tangible ce qui est par nature intangible ? Quels recours utiliser ? Comment diffuser et expliquer des concepts liés à la notion de patrimoine intangible et en même temps utiliser un langage perméable au public? Autant des questions auxquelles il fallait faire face avant tout choix de démarche.

Certes, la conception plus large de la notion de patrimoine culturel requiert une ouverture intellectuelle et de nouveaux référentiels de savoir. Et, dans le cas des narrations cosmologiques, l’art érudit et l’art populaire, des systèmes de savoir universels et particuliers se confondaient dans une même thématique de compréhension de l’univers. Par rapport au type de public, on aurait besoin d’une préparation initiale ou encore de changer des préjugés ou des idées déjà établies, comme ce serait le cas pour les cultures indigènes. Cet exercice complexe pourrait aussi être envisagé comme un instrument d’action sociale et intellectuelle.

La thématique choisie a été déclinée en trois activités distinctes mais liées entre elles. Lors de la première activité ont été présentées des images et des sons du CD-Rom qui décrivaient quelques-unes des théories et des mythes et des théories sur la création de l’Univers. De la formalisation religieuse, nous avons sélectionné un fragment biblique du Livre de la Genèse; du

---

1 La Rennaissance italienne semblent concentrer les rares iconographies de ce sujet, comme c’est le cas pour Michel-Ange et la Chapelle Sixtine.
domaine philosophique-scientifique, une explication sur la Théorie du Big Bang, la théorie scientifique la plus acceptée sur l’origine de l’univers; et du champ mythique deux narrations de groupes indigènes brésiliens, l’une des Guarani et l’autre des Tukâno. Les images étaient projetées dans la dite Salle Obscure du musée, où est présentée une partie d’une exposition de longue durée sur des images de secteurs du ciel. L’effet produit par une lumière noire dans une ambiance d’obscurité permet de mettre le spectateur l’impression dans la même situation que s’il était au centre de l’univers, sans une perspective géocentrique.

La deuxième activité était plus participative et a englobé une dynamique de questions-réponses sur les planètes et les mythes du système solaire, selon la mythologie gréco-romaine. Plus destinée au public scolaire, elle a obtenu un grand succès de participation des présents.

Finalement, un cycle de conférences et de débats avec des spécialistes traita de sujets spécifiques sur la Cosmologie et le patrimoine immatériel. Des thèmes comme la patrimonialisation des différences, la Cosmologie du XXIème siècle, le darwinisme cosmologique et le ciel guarani ont été proférés pendant la Semaine des Musées. Le musée surgit alors non seulement comme un locus où toutes ces activités sont arrivées, mais aussi comme un lieu de collecte et d’enregistrement de savoirs.

La culture indigène au Brésil est assez vaste et diversifiée avec plus de 200 ethnies parlant autour de 180 langues. Et quoique le processus de déculturation du Brésil, les Guarani représente encore aujourd’hui l’une des nations indigènes les plus importantes du pays. Historiquement, depuis la découverte du Brésil, ils sont en contact avec le monde des blancs, mais ils restent un exemple de résistance et de sauvegarde culturelle. Il y a une certaine facilité de contact et de proximité avec quelques-unes de leurs tribus, ce qui a contribué à la sélection de leurs mythes. Les indiens Tukâno sont aussi des exemples de résistance et de développement culturel et politique. Ils habitent le Nord du Brésil, dans la région de la forêt amazonienne, aux marges du fleuve Uaupés, où avec d’autres peuples, ils formèrent un complexe linguistique et culturel sans pair au Brésil.

La narration de la cosmologie Guarani Mbyá a été brève et succinte. L’indien interviewé nous avait juste raconté que l’univers guarani se partageait en ce qui était visible (le ciel, les corps célestes, les personnes) et invisible (la demeure des dieux). Il a mentionné le nom de quelques dieux (Tupã, Verá, Karai, Jakaira) qui habitaient de différentes régions du ciel. Il a expliqué que du nom de ces régions proviennent les noms de famille des guarani.

Le récit de l’histoire du monde selon la mythologie des Tukâno a été un peu plus long et détaillé. L’univers tukâno a été créé par une entité qu’ils appellent “le Grand-Père de l’Univers”. Il aurait créé des êtres-tonnerres qui auraient la capacité de générer d’autres êtres. Quant à l’humanité elle trouverait ses origines dans un voyage fait par des êtres divins à l’intérieur d’une gigantesque nacelle-serpent. En arrivant à la surface de la terre, les êtres invisibles ont débarqué et au moment où ils ont touché le sol, ils ont acquis une forme physique humaine et une nouvelle identité avec sa propre langue et ethnie.

Entre ces deux narrations, se trouvait une présentation de la Théorie du Big Bang par un scientifique. Cette théorie soutenue par le prêtre belge Georges Lemaître en 1931 voulait que l’Univers ait surgi et se soit développé à partir de la désintégration d’un noyau. Elle a gagné en crédibilité en 1948 avec l’astronome russe George Gamow qui a affirmé que l’état initial de l’Univers serait un condensé de particules contenant des radiations électromagnétiques. Et selon lui, il y a treize milliards d’années une explosion aurait eu lieu – l’instant zéro du Big Bang – et aurait déclenché l’expansion de l’Univers. D’autres théories scientifiques auraient pu aussi être traitées (dont quelques-unes très discutées récemment), mais cela aurait allongé la durée de la projection et cela n’était pas notre but.

1 Transformation d’une culture en une autre, différente de la culture originale.
2 La tribu des Guarani Mbyá qui a participé des enregistrements se situe dans les proximités de la ville de Paraty Mirim, dans l’Etat de Rio de Janeiro.
3 Le fleuve Uaupés se situe dans l’Etat de l’Amazonas.
5 Actuellement, le physicien brésilien Mário Novello soutient que l’univers est éternel et en expansion continue (cf Novello, 2004).
La perception des activités par le public scolaire a été assez variée. Les scolaires représentaient la majorité du public lors des activités dans la Salle Obscure et dans les échanges des Mythes du Système Solaire. L’évaluation qualitative de la première proposition ne serait possible que par l’application systématique de questionnaires. A la fin de quelques séances, nous avons demandé à quelques participants leurs avis sur les projections. Lors de la deuxième interaction, la vérification des résultats était immédiate, par l’intermédiaire des conférencières.

Le sujet des théories cosmologiques selon leurs peuples traité dans la Salle Obscure a reçu une acceptation mitigée du public. La séquence des narrations (biblique, d’une tribu Guarani, sur la Théorie du Big Bang et d’une tribu Tukâno), associées à des images aléatoires, en référence à ces cultures a causé l’impact prévu. Le public en général a été surpris par la projection. Ce qui confirme que le modèle de reproduction de connaissances, tel qu’il a lieu dans les écoles a tendance à l’uniformisation et agit de façon à rendre moins nette la variété des différences. La difficulté de compréhension était encore plus grande, du point de vue du public non initié, d’autant plus que le CD-Rom manquait d’explications générales de fond. On a essayé de neutraliser le discours pédagogique traditionnel, tout en montrant qu’une culture ne peut se superposer à l’autre, ainsi que les formes de savoir.

Face à la réaction du public, nous avons été obligés à reflécher sur nos méthodes d’approche. Peut-être que l’accent mis sur les couleurs locales1 a dû en partie être un frein à l’acceptation générale. D’autant plus que la qualité finale du CD-Rom n’a pas été celle souhaitée. Les enregistrements réalisés in loco avec le récit des indiens ont subi des interférences qui n’ont pas favorisé la compréhension des mythes.

Quand on a questionné le public plus spécifiquement à propos du contenu du CD-Rom, les réponses ont été diverses. Quelques professeurs ont apprécié la séquence des théories et des images et ils ont l’intention de traiter ultérieurement ce sujet dans leurs classes. Ils ont regretté de ne pas connaître le thème à l’avance pour pouvoir le traiter avec les élèves avant la visite au musée. D’autres ont été plus intéressés par le contenu des narrations et souhaitaient savoir plus afin de pouvoir mieux les expliquer aux élèves. Quelques uns n’ont cependant pas apprécié ou pas compris l’intérêt de la non association entre les images et les sons: "les dessins n’ont rien à voir avec les narrations", ou "les musiques des indiens sont fatigantes". Les élèves entre 12 et 14 ans semblent avoir été ceux qui ont le plus apprécié le contexte général des activités. Quelques-uns ont dit avoir beaucoup aimé les dessins (réalisés par des indiens), les images et la façon dont ont été expliquées les origines du monde. D’autres (du même âge) ont préféré les images des étoiles. La théorie qui les a le plus intéressés a été celle des Tukâno. Ensuite ils sont passés à une autre activité prévue pour les scolaires, appelée Mythes du Système Solaire.

Le principe de la dynamique des Mythes du Système Solaire était simple et direct. Il consistait en une brève présentation introduisant la mythologie gréco-romaine, suivie d’un choix entre un numéro (de 1 à 11) par les participants. Le numéro choisi représentait une question sur une divinité de cette mythologie à laquelle les participants devaient répondre. Bien que les questions posées fussent faciles, elles suscitaient maintes controverses. Suite aux réponses du public, une présentation par Datashow était faite sur la planète et sur son histoire mythologique. D’autres questions ont aussi surgi, étant donné que l’Astronomie suscite toujours un grand intérêt de la part du public.

Les conférencières chargées de cette activité ont pu nettement percevoir le vif intérêt des scolaires2 de l’enseignement fondamental (des 7èmes et 8èmes séries) pour la mythologie gréco-romaine. Certains élèves (situés entre le 13-14 ans), ont même démontré un tel intérêt et des connaissances préalables sur le sujet qu’ils semblaient en connaître plus que leurs professeurs et même plus que les conférencières qui guidaient la visite ! Curieusement, l’opposé s’est avéré pour les élèves de l’enseignement moyen qui n’ont pas démontré ni intérêt ni désir de participation aux séances des questions-réponses.

---

1 C’est-à-dire le fait d’avoir enregistré en différentes langues que le portugais.
2 Aussi bien des écoles publiques que des écoles privées.
La dernière activité présentée a consisté en un cycle de conférences. Les sujets étant plus spécifiques, le public participant a été plus restreint aux spécialistes, suscitant néanmoins des débats pointus. Cet événement a entraîné la proposition de continuer ces débats entre les chercheurs du musée et ceux des universités, en un partenariat scientifique dans l’avenir.

Conclusion

Il serait intéressant que le Musée d’Astronomie continue dans ce type de recherches, vu l’intérêt démontré par le public en général. Les autres cosmologies indigènes brésiliennes mériteraient, elles aussi d’être incluses dans ces recherches. On pourrait certainement récolter des informations intéressantes et méconnues. La connaissance d’autres formes de savoir pourrait contribuer à mieux comprendre la formation culturelle du Brésil. Dans ce sens, nous considérons que l’enregistrement du patrimoine immatériel va à contre-sens des mouvements de globalisation et d’homogénéisation de la culture.

L’intérêt des élèves et des professeurs de l’enseignement fondamental pour les mythologies (aussi bien indigènes que non indigènes) a été nettement marqué, lors des activités et mériterait d’être plus exploité tant dans le champ de l’éducation formelle que dans le champ de l’éducation informelle.

La recherche de perfectionnement des produits proposés au public ne devrait pas être limitée aux événements en soi, mais inclure une préparation pour les professeurs et leurs élèves et une recherche sur des questionnements plus variés.
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Contention and the contemporary world – the roles of museums in global culture

Fiona Cameron – Australia

Museums now exist in an academic, cultural and social context of contest and controversy. This situation places museums into new territory, an area few museums are willing to embrace. Therefore, what potential roles can museums in the 21st century play in this climate of contestation and as civic spaces?

The focal point of the paper will be an examination of the potential roles and positioning of museums around contentious topics and sensitive issues drawing on qualitative and quantitative research findings from the international research project Exhibitions as Contested Sites – the roles of museums in contemporary society funded by the Australian Research Council with partners the University of Sydney, the Australian Museum and the Australian War Memorial. Key questions to be addressed include the following. What is the role of museums as information resources? Should museums act as provocateurs, leaders of public opinion and transformative spaces to challenge and change views? Or are museums to be safe civic places for the exploration of a range of views? Can museums take on a social activist’s role, to assist in the resolution of issues on a personal or political level or should they be places for non-challenging social experiences? Key themes to be addresses include transformations in museum authority, expertise, censorship and institutional trust.

Resume

Dr. Fiona Cameron is a Postdoctoral Research Fellow in history at the University of Sydney. Fiona is the Chief Investigator for the Australian Research Council funded project, 'Exhibitions as Contested Sites – the roles of museums in contemporary society.' She has been working in the museum profession for 18 years in the curatorial field as a social history curator, consultant on major exhibition projects in Australia, New Zealand and Singapore and as a lecturer in museum studies.
Museums and Intangible Folk Heritage in the Republic of Korea

Susie Chung Yun Shun – USA

Abstract

This paper examines the relation between intangible folk heritage, especially ‘holders’ of crafts and skills, and museums. The case-study country will be the Republic of Korea (ROK) with focus on one of the sole museums in Korea that began preserving intangible folk heritage in the early 1970s, the Korean Folk Village. Essential elements to be examined in this paper are: how the Korean Folk Village has evolved in preserving intangible folk heritage in the Republic of Korea; the strengths, weaknesses and challenges faced by the Korean Folk Village in preserving intangible folk heritage; the Korean National Commission for UNESCO’s system for preservation, management, and communication of intangible folk heritage, which is called, “Living Human Treasures”; the application of this system in the Korean Folk Village; other outlets viable for the future of ROK museums and intangible folk heritage.
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Intangible folk heritage, open-air museums, Living Human Treasures, holders, cultural identity, ecomuseums.

Museums are institutions that preserve the physical aspect of heritage as well as the intrinsic quality of it that is defined by human significance. These institutions also must play an important role in preserving not only three-dimensional objects but ones that are intangible. The focus in museums and literature on museums has been laid on material culture or the ‘materiality’ of culture as opposed to ‘intangible’ culture. Moreover, the materiality of culture has emphasized material ‘high’ culture as opposed to ‘folk’ culture. When it comes to preserving intangible heritage, museums have preserved and displayed the exotica of other cultures under colonialist, post-colonialist or neo-colonialist perspectives, especially in museums of anthropology (Ames 1992; Karp & Lavine 1991). Thus, museums should also endeavor to contribute in preserving, researching, and communicating (van Mensch 1985) the regions own intangible heritage as opposed to other cultures. What is the significance of intangible heritage in the form of human beings who carry knowledge of distinctive skills and arts in museums? How are they preserved, managed and communicated in ex situ settings? In the Republic of Korea, the Korean Folk Village, which is an open-air museum, has played an important part in displaying the ‘technical holders’ and their works. This paper will explore the role of the Korean Folk Village and examine other outlets where exhibition of these holders can be held. There is also a need to look at the role of these ‘holders’ of crafts and skills in an in situ or original setting and its relation with cultural identity. Throughout some parts of the world, these holders have been preserved in in situ settings called, ‘ecomuseums’. It will demonstrate the relation between the social, political, and economic implications that are connected with both the holders and museums today.

A great deal of importance has been laid on folk material culture (Berger ed. 1992; Schlereth ed. 1990; Schlereth ed. 1982; Sweeney 1978); but what should also be explored in literature is the significance of folk ‘immaterial’ or ‘intangible’ culture. The tangible is material and it can be argued that it is the finished product of an intellectual pursuit. Nonetheless, the material changes in significance and meaning in its production, circulation, and consumption (Pomian 1990:5). It changes in significance even when it comes into a collection as the researcher, the curator and the viewer of the material give it social meaning (Pearce ed. 1990; Pearce 1992; Pearce 1994; van Mensch; Vergo ed. 1997). The intangible is something that is not a physical
form (Edson and Dean 1994). UNESCO’s definition of the criteria of intangible cultural heritage is:

The intangible heritage might be defined as embracing all forms of traditional and popular or folk culture, i.e. collective works originating in a given community and based on tradition. These creations are transmitted orally or by gesture, and are modified over a period of time through a process of collective recreation. They include oral traditions, customs, languages, music, dance, rituals, festivities, traditional medicine and pharmacopoeia, the culinary arts and all kinds of special skills connected with the material aspects of culture, such as tools and the habitat (UNESCO 2003).

According to UNESCO’s guidelines for the preservation of intangible cultural heritage, those that should be preserved are recommended as follows:

(i) the protection of forms of expression that are in danger of extinction or irremediable loss. This may mean a loss of significance within contemporary culture, a loss of historical authenticity in current practice, a decline in the number of people nurturing this heritage, or a modification in legal status of the heritage that brings about a diminution in its protection;

(ii) the representative or exceptional nature of the chosen intangible heritage;

(iii) the distinctive characteristics of the heritage reflecting a particular school, region, minority or ethnic identity;

(iv) the quality of performance or production of a manifestation of cultural expression (UNESCO 2002).

The intangible has different characteristics than the tangible as the process, procedures, and methods as well as the recorded or finished product are equally significant. There are the problematics of authenticity with the intangible heritage when trying to create historical authenticity from the product (Howard 2003). David Lowenthal has explored the forms of authenticity and states that its goals are “faithfulness to original objects and materials, to original contexts, or to original aims” (1997:185). For example when speaking of early music he states that “In so far as the retrieval of past music requires modern performance, present circumstances are bound to impinge on original intentions, original scores, original instruments, original ambiances” (Lowenthal 1997:185). Therefore the intangible bears different meanings each time it is performed or demonstrated in the form of a dance, music, or woodworking. Examining the concept of the ‘holders’ of these arts and skills, they are better known as ‘Living Human Treasures’ and regarded as intangible cultural heritage. This is a concept that is embraced by Japan, the Republic of Korea, The Phillippines, Thailand, France, Romania, and The Czech Republic. The concept of Living Human Treasures in the U.S. is recognized by some Native American tribes but it is closer to an award system rather than a preservation system. Keith Howard (2003) has examined cultural heritage management of Living Human Treasures in Korea. He explored the theory of historical authenticity or original form (wonhyoung) in the Korean system and UNESCO’s system of preserving and managing Living Human Treasures.

The beginnings of the preservation of intangible heritage in Korea are found in the Cumulative Research Reports on Important Intangible Cultural Assets from 1964-1985 in 165 volumes created by the Cultural Asset Committee (Howard 2003). The Korean Cultural Assets Preservation System was enacted in 1962 under Article 2 of Law 961 which created categories of Tangible Cultural Assets, Intangible Cultural Assets, Folk-Cultural Properties and Monuments. The specific categories of intangible heritage in legislation include music, dance, drama, plays, rituals, crafts, food preparation and martial arts. Technical holders of arts and crafts receive stipends and they are required to teach ‘primary students’ who receive small monthly stipends, and are supported by paid ‘assistants’ and ‘future holders’. These holders are also managed by the city government. They are given stipends to teach and for other activities such as holding performances or exhibitions. The Korean Living Human Treasures system follows the UNESCO Guidelines for the Establishment of Living Human Treasures System (2002). When nominating Living Human Treasures, it is stated that

(i) The degree of skill possessed. From this point of view, professional experience and training are the most important assets, but the Commission may also assess ties to a
master teacher, a school, or a region. As time passes, it is recognized that certain cultural heritages may remain solely in preserved forms, and new assessment criteria will need to be applied in order to determine relevant links to the past …

In writing and doing research on the Korean system of preserving Living Human Treasures, Howard finds three problems concerning the system in which one is linked with the concept of the past and the present. These holders are usually a generation apart from what one can call “pre-modern times” art or craft, therefore, before the 1894 Choson Dynasty Reform Movement which called for adoption of Western practices and ideas (Howard 2003:unpaginated). Howard states that the ‘holders’ have learnt only the preserved forms of the past and that Korea is conserving something from a “distant past” and trying to “ensure relevance in the new world” (Howard 2003:unpaginated). Scholars look for historical preservation and authenticity. However, Korean legislation calls for the promotion of Korean cultural identity. Thus changes made by contemporary artists are not considered heritage. Nonetheless, Howard praises the workshops on the Living Human Treasures that Korea has held and considers the system as the “trailblazer” for UNESCO’s system(Howard 2003: unpaginated).

On the subject of the holders of intangible folk heritage, Howard has observed that the difference between the Korean preservation system and Japanese preservation system (which was established before the Korean system) is that the former concentrates on intangible folk heritage rather than ‘high’ cultural intangible heritage such as those of court or literati culture. The latter intangible culture is the focus of what is called UNESCO “Masterpieces”, e.g. Jongmyo jaerae and jaeraeak (Park 2002). Here the definition of intangible folk heritage or in UNESCO terminology “folklore” needs to be defined: “Folklore (or traditional and popular culture) is the totality of tradition-based creations of a cultural community, expressed by a group or individuals and recognized as reflecting the expectations of a community in so far as they reflect its cultural and social identity; its standards and values are transmitted orally, by imitation or by other means. Its forms are, among others, language, literature, music, dance, games, mythology, rituals, customs, handicrafts, architecture and other arts” (Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore adopted by the General Conference at its twenty fifth session. Paris, 15 November 1989).

With this concept in mind, we must examine the state of the Korean system in the preservation, research, and communication of intangible folk heritage, especially communication which includes the concept of exhibition, education, and promotion. As of December 2002, there are 108 Living Human Treasures in Korea. There is a transmission center of these Living Human Treasures and their products in the KOEX Building, Samsongdong, managed by the Korea Crafts Promotion Foundation. In addition, other promotion takes place in outlets such as television programs, performance halls, and traditional shops. Other outlets that play a role in promotion of these holders include museums. Therefore, we must first examine the historical background of museums in Korea to understand the relationship between holders and museums.

The following evolution reflects social, political, and economical influences that have shaped the regional, local, and open air museums in Korea today. One of the initial museums founded was by the Japanese Government-General in 1915 called, “Museum of the Japanese Government-General in Korea” during the Japanese occupation (1910-1945). Excavations led by the museum shed light on historic sites and moveable tangible artifacts. Artifacts were also collected from Buddhist temples (Lee N.Y. 1986). Exhibitions were for the cause of “Japan – Korea One Body” (Won 1986), which was viewed as undemocratic in any sense. More museums were established regionally in historic cities in liaison to the Museum of the Japanese Government-General in Seoul. Three of which still remain today are: The National Museum of Kyongju, The National Museum of Puyo, and The National Museum of Kongju.

After independence in 1945, the division of Korea (1950), and the establishment of the Government of South Korea in 1953, museums continued to play much the same role as before independence. The Museum of the Japanese Government General was renamed the National Museum, combining the collections of the Yi Royal Household Museum, while the branches in the regions were administered under this museum with a paucity of specialists (Lee, N.Y. 1986). To this day, the museum has remained the “traditional, centralized and encyclopaedic museum”
van Mensch 1993:17) exhibiting 4,500 art and archaeological objects from the Prehistoric Period to early 20th century in rotation. During the 1960's and 1970's, concentration on research in archaeology with extensive excavations was the pattern of museums without the notion of how to efficiently conserve the excavated objects (Kuklib Bakmoolkwanae Heowa Shil ["The Strengths and Weaknesses of The National Museum of Korea"] 1989). Importance on regional museums were placed such as on the development of The National Museum of Kyongju and the formation of new regional museums such as The National Museum of Kwangju. The regional museums were founded as branches of The National Museum to reveal and secure the true Korean identity (Kuklib Bakmoolkwanae Heowa Shil ["The Strengths and Weaknesses of The National Museum of Korea"] 1989; The National Museum of Korea 1995). The 1970's did realize a trend in the formation of more regional museums; cultural lectures were set up for the public; and drawing contests of cultural relics were held for children. However, the permanent displays and temporary exhibitions remained object-oriented and concentrated on tangible cultural heritage.

In the 1970's, the first open-air museum was introduced in South Korea called the “Folk Village" that brought houses and structures and intangible heritage that were in situ to a contextualization of ex situ. Some are replicas of homes from various parts of the region. In the 1980’s, the founding of contemporary art museums and galleries was a great trend and the art market grew as well as the number of artists and commercial art galleries with focus on the tangible cultural heritage.

The government called the 1990's the “Museum Age" for South Korea. In 1992, a plan was conceived to establish 1,000 museums by the year 2000 (Lee, K.H. 1993). As many museums were established in the 19th century in Europe for nationalistic purposes to flatter the country (Greenhalgh, 1988), so are the museums in South Korea to be founded for the same reasons (Munwha Minjokae Jakeungshim ["Our Culture’s & Race’s Pride"], 1995). For South Korea, the goal slightly differs in that it strives to become more modern than the modern nation in the West. Through the foundation of more museums, the nation believes it will be able to say that it is a modern state, thus, enabling the nation to compete in the international competition of economics and politics through these socio-cultural institutions which stand as a symbol of a modern nation (Kuklib Bakmoolkwanae Heowa Shil ["The Strengths and Weaknesses of The National Museum of Korea"], 1989). Into the 21st century, there has been more concentration on the intangible aspects in museums. There are several museums that deal with intangible aspects, however, there are not so many museums that preserve intangible ‘folk’ heritage. Thus it is the Korean Folk Village that remains one of the sole museums that continues to preserve intangible ‘folk’ heritage.

One of the aims of this paper was to examine the relationship between the intangible folk heritage and the Korean Folk Village. Around the world there are open-air museums with many of them representing folk heritage. One of the earliest establishments was Skansen in Stockholm, Sweden and the Arnheim Open Air Museum in Arnheim, The Netherlands. In the United States, there is Greenfield Village in Dearborn, Michigan where Henry Ford established an expansive collection of buildings and tools representing America. There is also Colonial Williamsburg in Williamsburg, Virginia which presents historical buildings in situ as well as those that have been reconstructed representing the 1700s. These are some museums that have endeavored to preserve intangible folk heritage. There are more than 250 museums in the U.S. which display ‘living history’ mostly located in New England (Runyard 1996). This includes Old Sturbridge Village in Massachusetts. This is called ‘interpretation’ where research is done to act out the part of the characters’ lives. As this paper will demonstrate, living history is not the same as the holders of skills and arts.

The Korean Folk Village was established in order to collect and preserve the ancestral spirit and mind of folk cultural material, to grow as an active learning center for children, and as a tourism development resource for foreigners in order to introduce Korean traditional culture. The Korean Folk Village’s functions include to collect, reconstruct, restore, exhibit, perform, preserve, and instruct Korean cultural policy and to investigate and research the folk cultural heritage and the folk cultural material, to exhibit, educate, and exchange as a museum where families can also take advantage of the amusement park, eat traditional food, crafts, and purchase souvenirs at the markets. Drastic change took place in the history, society, and culture due to the Choson
Dynasty Reform Movement (1894), Japanese Colonial Period (1910-1945) and the Korean War (1950-1953). With economic development in 1960 onwards the Cultural Properties Administration began to take interest in the establishment of the Korean Folk Village and its management in 1971. During the fourth republic, President Park Chung-hee, who came to power through a military coup in 1961, started the *Saemaul Undong* or New Community Movement in 1971. The Movement would continue even after his assassination in 1979 to raise the economic status of Korea for the price of democracy of the people by the implementation of *Yushin* or Revitalising Reforms. *Yushin* aimed towards forming one identity, the national identity. A series of plans were made to develop rural communities:

Clean and trim farm houses, widened and straightened farm and village roads, consolidated fields, afforested hill and mountains, and the Saemaul (New Community) factories scattered here and there – all these are the reality of our farm villages as transformed under the Saemaul Undong...Our aspiration for construction of an abundant society and a rich and strong fatherland will be achieved when all the villages of the country take the pattern of these ‘proud exemplary Saemaul villages’ (Office of the President, Preface, unpaginated).

In consequence, those villagers who protested got their share of their old houses in the form of an open-air museum called, "Folk Village." Those who wanted to be nostalgic could go see the houses there. Clifford states:

Saemaul was a product of the military reformist spirit that animated Park and the men around him. Away went the thatched roof huts that had dotted the countryside for centuries. Park considered these roofs too primitive for a would-be developed country, so he ordered their replacement with corrugated metal roofs and, later, concrete tiles. The fact that straw was a far more effective insulator against the bitter winters and steaming summers of Korea did not trouble Park. Metal was modern, and straw was not. For those villagers who protested, Park offered a sop: the Korean Folk Village was built near Suwon, a walled city south of Seoul, where traditional houses were preserved for future generations. Peasants who refused to re-roof their houses had their traditional roof destroyed by zealous local officials (Clifford, 1994, pp. 94-95).

With the government’s initiative to establish a foreigner tourism industry, the Korean Folk Village Committee was formed in January 15, 1972. The Korean Folk Village was founded in May 8, 1973 with approval of the Folk Construction Business Plan. Originally with 660,600 sq.m. of spatial area, the Korean Folk Village was opened to the public on October 3, 1974. By 1999, 282 structures were collected or reconstructed on 726,962 sq.m. of open-air space and 330 staff members employed. *Feng shui* has been applied to the foundation of the grounds according to the direction of a mountain, a stream, and the entrance faces south. The Korean Folk Village is a private museum at the same time a theme park. It is not a place where it shows the entirety of Korean culture, but a reconstructed village 150 years ago and was a theme park (Lee 2002).

'The Style Tradition and the Dream of the Future' was the idea for a new park concept for the Folk Family Park opening in April 1997 within the Korean Folk Village. The theme park part of the folk village includes the Family Park with rides such as Viking Express and Wonder Wheel, Snow Sledding, and the Korean Traditional Haunted House. The Contemporary Art Museum or Modern Art Museum is also an extension of the future experience of the Korean Folk Village. Other museums include the Folk Museum, World Folklore Museum, and Art Museum. The Korean Folk Village does not receive any funding from the national government nor from the provincial government. It operates on entrance fees and museum shops. Unlike other museums, it must direct management for profit. This is related to the teams as well. It consists of the executive director, managing director and director and six departments: General Affairs Team : Financial management, Personnel, Administration; Business Team: Restaurants, Souvenir Shops; Publicity Team: Publicity and Visitor Management; Management Team: Facilities and operations; Folk Team: Exhibitions of houses, holders skill places management, performances, Folk Museum, Museums exhibition and events planning, filming management, publications and design, network management; Art and science team: World Folk.
Museum, Contemporary Art Museum Exhibition and Events Planning. Research is done by the folk, art and science team.

For the Korean Folk Village, the concept of ‘folk’ is very important. There are reconstructed agriculture specialty shops with a contemporary flair. Theme concepts of the Korean Folk Village are divided into Traditional Houses, Education & Administration, Livelihood & Handicrafts, Religion & Ceremonies, Festivals & Entertainment. Between workshops and outdoor markets serving Korean traditional food, there are 20 traditional skilled crafts persons or holders who make traditional pottery, keys, traditional baskets, rice scoopers, rice cakes, wooden shoes, mulberry paper, masks, embroidery needlework, leather brushes, pyrography engraving, grassware, instruments, fans, agricultural tools, ropes, and furniture. Handicrafts workshops include: Sesame oil mill/ wooden mask workshop, knot workshop/ embroidery workshop, leather brush painting atelier, musical instrument workshop/ fan workshop, brassware workshop, and gluten candy workshop. There are also performances called, “farmer’s music and dance” and “acrobats on a tightrope” twice a day in the performing arena. During traditional holidays, there are re-creations of customs and ceremonies such as coming-of-age, marriage, funeral and ancestor memorial (Korean Folk Village Museum 1997). The Korean Folk Village is also a place where broadcasting is done for historical dramas, educational programs and overseas publicity. Despite the display of these workshops and technical holders who have learnt the trade and worked all their lives as traditional artisans and craftsmen, there are no nominated or registered Living Human Treasures at the Korean Folk Village. Yet, these technical holders are rare in Korea although they have not been nominated (Lee 2002). Therefore, the role of the Korean Folk Village has created a good starting point for the conservation of both tangible and intangible folk heritage as we have seen it to be a reconstruction of a traditional Korean village 150 years ago. However, we would like to look at the possibilities of in situ communication of the intangible folk heritage by the establishment of ecomuseums in Korea.

Ecomuseums are a product of the museum revolution of 1960-1980, with an outcome of democratization (Renaud, 1992). In effect, ecomuseums are connected with cultural identity, territory, and in situ preservation (Fédération des écomusées et des musées de societé 1996). Identity is how people see themselves and the territory or the ‘landscape’ that they are connected to, and in situ preservation of cultural heritage (van Mensch, 1988; 1990; 1993). The ecomuseum, in the words of Georges Henri Rivièrè, is “l’environnement : le milieu concret construit par l’homme” (1973:26). It is, in other expressions, a museum of time and a museum of space, something that I argue would be appropriate for the preservation and exhibition of technical holders.

Furthermore ecomuseums save an environment and not create false environments, to protect and preserve them (Duclos, 1980). For example, they preserve housing traditions (Duclos, 1980). They lay importance to what the people in the villages do for a living connected with the territory. They serve to tell others the importance of this landscape and their identity to others. They create the connection between art, industry, economy, and nature. In ecomuseums in France, agriculture, hunting and fishing, viticulture, woods and forests, irrigation, cheesemaking-products of their activities in connection with the land are displayed and developed in its state (Association Française des Musées d’Agriculture 1991:12).

Ecomuseums provide in situ preservation. Time does not stand still. The point of this paper is to suggest the creation of ecomuseums in areas that have had to go through such traumatic changes instead of the 19th-century traditional museums in democratizing society at large connected to the identity and the territory. It is a tool for the government to look ahead, by looking back at the deprivation of the public audience who was forced to give up their traditions, and finding ways to save cultural identity in place: in situ.

The identity is not only the beauty of how most museums portray the culture. The dominant has always seemed to have found what should be displayed and what should not be displayed. Cultural identities are meshed into one pot. The identities of the colonists were reflected in the colonial museums. The identities in 19th century traditional museums or open-air museums exhumed 19th-century values. The open-air museum, a 19th century concept (which actually is traced back even further to the 18th century ‘Le Jardin Elysée’ in France), created by Artur Hazelius in Sweden, continues with encyclopaedic motives. The Korean Folk Village was a
remedy for the villagers whose houses were transformed or destroyed; however, it eventually became an encyclopaedic open-air museum.

Ecomuseums embrace the beauty and the horror of the real life situation. Once culture is torn down, it cannot be re-made (cf. P. van Mensch 1986). Ecomuseums do not re-build but continue the life and develop the identity in relation to the territory and how they live. The cultural identity in the ecomuseum is distinctly associated with the territory. Ivo Maroević (1988) and Marcel Evrard (1986) stress self-consciousness as a part of identity placing it in the users’ context. The context is the territory in which one lives. Georges Henri Rivière defines that ecomuseums portray how the local population sees itself (Rivière 1985:182) trying to find an explanation in relation to the territory.

The ecomuseum is also called the “museum of space” and “museum of time”. The ecomuseum is not a normative definition, but an evolutive definition (Rivière 1985). Space and time are not confined to a building. Space is the territory, the ecology, the environment (Hubert 1987). Time is the explanation of society (Hubert 1987). The concept of the museum is broadened to include the architectural, cultural, industrial, and natural (Renaud 1992). An example of an ecomuseum in the City of Rennes in France is given. The “museum of space” concerns the agricultural field on which the socio-cultural center is situated show the evolution of the cultivation methods, etc. in connection with the space. The “museum of time” is a permanent exhibition of the history of Rennes from the 16th century to the present displayed in a creative manner with an interdisciplinary approach (Hubert 1987). The ‘museum of space’ and the ‘museum of time’ is another word for museum without walls or museum without borders. The ecomuseum thus democratizes the concept of the museum in which ‘space’ and ‘time’ is perpetuated beyond a building (Desvallées 1983) and thus can serve to promote technical holders.

This brings us back to Howard’s (2003) argument that relevance of living human treasures whether they have been nominated or registered, or technical holders who have been traditional craftsmen and artisans all their lives, can be made by connecting past and present via the ecomuseum. Therefore this paper endeavored to link Living Human Treasures and technical holders, which are both intangible heritage, with museums in Korea. It demonstrated that an important outlet has been maintained and managed for Korean intangible folk heritage, however, a suggestion that more outlets in the form of ecomuseums should be created. Before development takes place in every part of Korea, the intangible folk heritage especially these technical holders should have a place in their hometowns or in situ to perpetuate heritage.
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Museology and the Intangible Heritage of Learning

Ann Davis – Canada

There is much debate as to the meaning of intangible heritage. Some argue that the term should refer to the virtual, others that it should encompass the cultural and yet others that it should mean those aspects of culture, such as song and dance, that are not rendered as material objects. Each argument has considerable validity. I would like to take the discussion in another direction and argue that, for museology, one of the most important meanings of intangible heritage is encoded in museums as learning institutions.

In 1992 the American Association of Museums produced a seminal document clearly proclaiming that the basic purpose of museums was to be learning organizations. While this concept has been around for decades, often muddied by the inclusion of entertainment, Excellence in Equity forcefully but poetically delineated the centrality of learning for museums. Numerous studies followed, but none as important as Learning from Museums: Visitor Experiences and the Making of Meaning, by John H. Falk and Lynn D. Dierking, of 2000. Falk and Dierking boldly proclaim “Learning is the reason people go to museums, and learning is the primary ‘good’ that visitors to museums derive from their experience.” In this increasingly complex world, people are anxious to find knowledge and meaning and go to museums to do so. Museums, Falk and Dierking argue, “are places that both children and adults can leisurely browse to discover the past, present and future of humanity, the natural world, and the cosmos, where the public can seek and find meaning and connection.”

But what is learning? Learning from Museums posits that in the past we have erred in trying to define museum learning too tightly and too restrictedly as that which takes place in schools, or should take place there. After years of study Falk and Dierking suggest that learning, “a product of millions of years of evolution”, is “an adaptation that permits an ongoing dialogue between the whole individual and the physical and sociocultural world he or she inhabits.” They identify three contexts: the personal, the sociocultural and the physical, and add to this time. Learning, then, is the process and products of the interactions of these three contexts over time, a never-ending, fluid process. The purpose of learning is to make meaning and find connections.

Much of the basic belief system in Learning from Museums is common to the work of John Dewey. Conscious or unconsciously, I suspect that this book is based on Dewey’s beliefs. Dewey (1859 – 1952), an American philosopher, made groundbreaking contributions to philosophy, psychology, art history and educational theory. He was especially interested in museums, working for Albert C. Barnes at the famous Barnes Foundation in Baltimore, and dedicating his seminal 1934 book, Art as Experience, to Barnes. Dewey was influenced by Darwinian biology, which accounts for his conception of experience as an interaction with and a reconstruction of the environment.

Dewey believed that the interests and habits of people, their situations, influenced how they chose to live. In writing the Foreword to the 1929 Barnes Foundation collection of essays called Art and Education, Dewey explained that the method and material contained therein had a bearing not only on education in the plastic arts but on education in general. We might well paraphrase this to add not only art museums but also all museums. Certainly Dewey’s influence in education has only grown and grown. Dewey wrote:

1. p. 2.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid., p. 10.
5. Merion, Pennsylvania, p. 3.
For many years, I have thought and taught that experience is an interaction between the self and some aspect of its environment. Purposeful, intelligent action is the means by which this interaction is rendered significant. In the course of such action, objects acquire meaning and the self becomes aware of its own powers, since, by intelligent control of the environment, it directs and consolidates its own capacities.¹

For Dewey intelligent living involved three components, action, emotion and understanding. Learning then is a difficult undertaking. It involves the activity of the whole personality. When the self is intelligently adapted to his or her surroundings, these three are in balance. But, too often, in formal educational institutions, schools, actions are divorced from purpose or meaning; the acquisition of knowledge is transformed into the amassing of mere information. On the other hand, in intelligent living facts and principles are so intricately connected with one another that they become active agents for grasping meaning and enhancing values. This means that our experience in museums only becomes alive as it is grounded in concrete, lived experience. Dewey placed a heavy emphasis on the role of social and cultural institutions as agents of continuing adaptive activity.

More recently Dewey’s ideas about intelligent living were expanded by Howard Gardner in his theory of multiple intelligences. Gardner rejected the idea that all cognition is the same, or even restricted to verbal and mathematical skills. Rather he proposed a pluralistic view of mind, one that recognizes that people have different cognitive strengths and contrasting cognitive styles, identifying seven intelligences, of which linguistic and logical-mathematical are just two. Any sophisticated cultural role requires the use of a combination of intelligences to master. Like Dewey, Gardner firmly attached intelligence, the ability to solve problems, to a particular cultural setting or community. This, in turn, encouraged Gardner to examine the ways both formal and informal learning institutions, schools and museums, advance or restrict the development of an individual’s particular intelligences.² Here Gardner had special praise for the Reggio pre-school system, with its emphasis on context and experience.³

Dewey too discarded the limited, compartmentalized theory of cognition, decrying the division commonly made between mind and body. He rejected the separation of the logical, strictly intellectual, which terminates in sciences, the emotional and imaginative processes which dominate poetry, music and the other arts, and the practical doings which rule our daily lives in business and politics. A full, rich and free life, on the other hand, requires the elimination of the separation of science, art and practical activity, in favor of the unity of experience and mental life. ⁴ For Dewey “knowledge, feeling and volition are all manifestations of the same energies.”⁵ Repeatedly Dewey asserted that scientific and artistic systems are both involved with the relationship of life to its surroundings, both involve the same fundamental principles and satisfy the same fundamental needs. In this holistic vision, if life is to be meaningful, then connections must be developed between the organism and the environment.

As an aside it is interesting to note that the environmentalists are telling us today that we are in very serious trouble because we have neglected the big picture, because we are not thinking and sensing holistically, because we are not linking our habits to effects in nature. Our blind belief that we will never run out of oil or water, our rejection of climate change, our assumption that technology will solve all our ills, are symptoms of this disastrous disconnection. One environmentalist, the Canadian Alanna Mitchell, like Dewey, sees indelible links between people and nature and, unlike many environmentalists, adds a cultural dimension to the scientific one. While for Dewey the glue is art, for Mitchell the glue is legends, the stories that explain to us how our lives work and what our place is thought to be in our mysterious world.⁶ Mitchell emphasizes not only the efficacy but also the necessity of actively maintaining and developing imagination and myths, of legends, to balance and sustain our selves and our world.

¹ Ibid.
⁴ “Affective Thought in Logic and Painting”, in Art and Education, p. 96
⁵ Ibid.
⁶ Dancing at the Dead Sea, (Toronto: Key Porter Books), 2004.
Returning to Dewey, he also underlined this activity. He contended that intelligent life is clearly participatory rather than passive. And this is a very important point for our understanding of learning as intangible heritage in museums. Inquiry is a form of behaviour. Dewey suggested that

An organism has certain basic needs which cannot be supplied without activity which modifies the surroundings; that when the organism is in any way disturbed in its “equilibrium” with its environment, its needs show themselves as restless, craving, desiring activity which persists until the acts thus induced have brought about a new integration of the organism and its relation to the environment.1

The special “click' that occurs between a visitor and a museum object, between a spectator and a work of art is an activity, an effort on the part of the person. These efforts are valid and repeated because, as Dewey comments, the contact, the “click” releases “old, deep-seated habits or engrained organic ‘memories,’ yet the old habits are deployed in new ways, ways in which they are adapted to a more completely integrated world so that they themselves achieve a new integration.” 2 To make of museum objects an educational means is the understanding that the intellectual realization is, in Dewey’s words, “such a deep and abiding experience of the nature of fully harmonized experience as sets a standard or forms a habit for all other experiences.”3 Emphasizing the active role of the visitor, Dewey notes:

The perceiver as well as the artist has to perceive, meet, and overcome problems; otherwise, appreciation is transient and overweighed with sentiment. For in order to perceive esthetically, he must remake his past experiences so that they can enter integrally into a new pattern.5

In many ways with his emphasis on the visitor’s activity, learning, Dewey anticipated the new museology. New museology, as Mieke Bal explains, is differentiated from old or plain museology by the “idea that a museum is a discourse”5, Duncan Cameron’s forum. “…[S]uch a perspective,” Bal continues, “deprives the museal practice of innocence and provides it with the accountability it and its users are entitled to.” Accountability plays a central part in the making of meaning and value.

In Experience and Nature, Dewey discusses making intelligent life, guiding actions by ideals towards ends that intrinsically fulfill us. “The characteristic human need,” Dewey claimed, “is for possession and appreciation of the meaning of things ...”6 Recently in examining Dewey’s aesthetics, Thomas Alexander explained that Dewey was asserting that the aesthetic experience and the intelligence exemplified by art are the necessary conditions to achieving a life of intellectual conduct. Alexander isolated three pivotal thoughts here. First that Dewey suggested that “human life is guided by a desire to experience the world in such a way that the sense of meaning and value is immediately enjoyed.” Here is desire propelling motivation. Second that “our utilitarian obsession with means apart from ends makes us ignorant of the widespread poverty and emptiness of human experience ...” This is a means first pragmatism that takes ends as an arbitrarily given. Third:

Dewey claims that in the idea of art we find the moment in which human alienation is overcome and the need for the experience of meaning and value is satisfied. Through art, in the aesthetic experience, the rift in the world that frustrates our primordial desire for encountering a sense of meaning and value is healed.7

Thus we see the link between meaning and value in museums on the one hand and the unified and fulfilled life on the other hand.

---

1 “Affective Thought in Logic and Painting”, p. 97.
2 Ibid., p. 100.
3 Ibid., p. 104.
7 Ibid., pp. 3–4.
By making meaning the center in the art museum Dewey was again a leader challenging the erstwhile norm of beauty. This theme was taken up by André Malraux in his *musée imaginaire*. For Malraux the modern museum was one in which value was reorganized. Rather than having Classicism at the center and everything else marginal to it, deviations from the ultimate, the museum now had a range of epicenters, organized by type. This enabled comparisons to be created between types or styles or geography or purpose, and gave value to what Rosalind Krauss called “so many variants within the field of meaning.”1 With meaning at the core, all the arts, useful and not useful, native and foreign, court and folk, could find a place in the museum. Again Dewey was prescient in his interest in the continuity rather than the distinctions between high and low arts. Malraux’s *musée imaginaire* then is the exercise of comparisons on the part of the receiver, democratized through the camera and the book press, as they are today democratized through the web. Here were “great fictions” made visible, stories about the collective spirit of human creativity and inventiveness, Mitchell’s legends. And here in the *musée imaginaire* the users are able to participate in the writing by creating their own “fictions,” endless imaginative productions.

Parsing intangible heritage in museums is a layered and complex matter, open to rich interpretations and differing approaches. What I have attempted to show is the centrality of learning as an intangible heritage in museums, one that might be the most important of all. From John Dewey we learn that people constantly seek meaning and value and that this search is a fluid, ever-changing and every-developing one. Dewey, along with Gardner, Mitchell and others, emphasized that learning must be holistic and contextual: it must occur within the breadth of the environment but is based in the specific culture of the individual. Meaning, then, is gradually created through a never-ending series of experiments in which a person tests his or her own self against reality. Learning, and learning in museums, is a participatory activity, a dialogue that requires engagement and effort. Dewey’s three components of intelligent living – action, emotion and understanding – are expanded by Gardner’s seven intelligences, opening an understanding of different forms and styles of learning. Finally Falk and Dierking link theory and practice by clarifying the central role of personal, sociocultural and physical contexts in learning as the intangible heritage of museums.

---

1 “Postmodernism’s Museum Without Walls”, in eds. Greenberg et al., p. 343.
Ethnological Museology of Intangible Heritage / The Culture of Masking in Museums

Aleš Gačnik – Slovenia

Introduction / Definition of Museology, Ethnology and Ethnological Museology

As usual, the problems in science already start with the defining of basic conceptions and definitions that mark every scientific discipline, its research subject and its mission. That is why I would like to introduce three "new" basic definitions (of museology, ethnology and ethnologic museology) that in continuation offer us a methodological base for museological understanding and evaluation of intangible traditions / heritage inside or outside museums, at the very beginning:

1. Museology is a holistic theory about preservation, research, communication of heritages and their inclusion into various forms of sustainable development. (Gačnik)¹

2. Ethnology is a science about the past, the present and the future of the way of life and culture. (Gačnik 2003: 29)

3. Ethnological museology is not a science about ethnological museum objects, collections and museums, but about relations between people and objects and their relationships to heritage, her preservation, research, communication and development. (Gačnik 2000: 34)

Introduction to the Ethnological Museology

In the established and developed systems of museology the field of ethnological museology can be placed inside of special museology or "other museologies", something similar happens with critical museology, experimental museology, comparative museology, new museology ecomuseology, etc. Peter van Mensch recognizes the tendency to the diversion of special museology to a series of different museologies, like "ethnographical museology", "historical museology", "artistic museology", "literary museology", "zoomuseology", "antropomuseology" and "ethnomuseology".²

Ethnological museology was not appreciated much in the previous developed systems and structures of museology.³ This is partly understandable, because the leading European museologists, like the system of studying museology itself, are directed to forming complete universal methodologies, useful for theoretical and practical work, especially in various museums and museum like (heritage) institutions. Despite their various classifications and types "knick-knacking" in the way of making special museologies would lead them away from forming basic principles of museological work, which would reflect in the museum practice as an even greater chaos, non-unificated standards and understanding of documenting, preserving, researching and communicating heritage. Museology is a common base for all developing special museologies, just like the fundamental principle of marketing is mostly common to all scientific disciplines, institutions, economic and non-economic systems, that are occupied with it.⁴

---

¹ The definition of museology was first introduced on a lecture called The development of museum – tourist destinations: example Superegg and The eco-museum of provincial cultures Skorba, to the participants of The Elementary School of Museology, that took place in Celje and Ptuj between 28th June and 2nd July 2004.

² Mensch 1992: 64–65, 277–281

³ Stransky objects to the beginning of ethnology or history for the purposes of museums or the other extremity – ethnological or historical museology. (Stransky 1970:43). A similar opinion came from Sergej Vrišer at the conference of ethnologists and historians in Maribor (The relationships between ethnology and history, Brochure GSED, 16, 1986: 263).

⁴ Similar analogies could be found in medicine, advertising, computer science etc.
The museological view of ethnological museology must also be opened from a different perspective, that is, from the part of ethnology. That view is mostly focused on the so-called museum practise ethnology, (Brumen 1987: 1) on the state of ethnology and not ethnological museology in museums. The basic problem that arises from that, is, that ethnologists in museums think above all like ethnologists and rarely like ethnological museologists, which indicates the lack of knowledge of aspirations in modern museology and their application in daily museum practice. There has much been talk of the crisis of museums, for which Tomislav Šola finds, that the crisis of museums is not a crisis of institutions, but a crisis of motives and methodology, (Šola 1992: 115-122) as well as the crisis of museological illiteracy.

While searching and discovering the causes for this sort of crisis, ethnology proves co-guilty, because it does not focus enough on relationships with museology in terms of research and methodology. The crisis of ethnology in museums will not be solved until we start thinking museologically and not just ethnologically. The methodology of museology is not a priori responsible for the incomplete methodological base, some blame also goes to ethnology. The higher the degree of museological knowledge between the ethnologists, the greater will become the need for forming special ethnological museology, not merely as a contact point, but mainly as a section between two scientific disciplines.

**The subject of ethnological museology**

Resulting from the definition, that ethnological museology is not a science about ethnological museum objects, collections and museums, but about relations between people and objects and their terms to heritage, its preservation, research, communication and development. (Gačnik, 2000: 34), the object of ethnological museology is connected with researching the objectivity of our life, with the socialization of objects and with studying the relationships between objects and people. Close to these terms are the thoughts of anthropologist (and museologist ) Arjun Appadurai, who discusses about the "social life of things", and those of Igor Kopytoff, who talks of the "cultural biography of objects" (Kopytoff1986).

Eloquent is the fact that we cannot find the term ethnological museology between numerous museological terms in the big museological dictionary (Dictionarium museologicum, 1986). On the other hand, the duty of the modern ethnological museology is not only the concern for the preservation and display of museum objects, but also the concern for the preservation of traditional knowledge and wisdom and their inclusion in different forms of social, economic and...
areal development. Transition from basic (theoretical) to applicative research must be followed by the transition from applications to system planning and managing sustainable durability, based on wealth of traditions as an alternative for the future way of life. Transition from preservation to development on the terms of ethnological museology and heritage is an invention that must be improved on completely concrete changes of methodology of (ethnological) museology and innovations administration, organizing etc. heritage institutions.

Ethnological museology, defined in system, structure and methodology, is co-dependent on the course of development of general ethnology and general museology and the degree of their connection. Unlike the ethnological museum practice, which is oriented in history, ethnological museology also looks into the present and future. It is oriented into the future of tradition, heritage and culture.

A distinctive feature and strategic development direction of ethnological museology is, regarding all previous world museologies, that it shows itself in terms of pointing out a broadened understanding of the museological concept, on the transition from traditional museological direction towards material culture to the one from the field of social and spiritual culture. If a museum artifact is the essence of traditional museums and museology, then not only objects form the contents of ethnological museology, but also people, customs and traditions, place and time. The duties of ethnological museology are not oriented just in preservation of material testimonies mostly movable heritage, but also in protecting people, knowledge, (traditional) time and place connected with the biology of customs and traditions.

**SAMDOK and ethnological museology**

Complete investigation of the present, following the changing if tradition etc. is one of the current affairs of ethnological museology and has been studied in ethnological and sociohistorical museums under the patronage of the Swedish system SAMDOK since the early eighties. Their relation to tradition, documenting and investigation of the way of life is unique also because their researchers give greater attention to the investigation of the present rather than the past. This system, used mainly in museums, gives the present advantage over the past, vial over the dying, ordinary over the unusual and typical over the unique! (Cedrenius 1995: 61)

SAMDOK, the system of contemporary documenting of objects and people, is marked by an internationally recognizable and enforced slogan: "Collecting today for tomorrow". This motto, which is one of the methodological directions in modern ethnological museology, can be broadened to "Researching and developing today for tomorrow". From the standpoint of ethnological museology the SAMDOK system is the enforced philosophy, a documentary and research system, that also greatly marked my own view on investigation of masks as an object of ethnological museology. To the researchers of (traditional) carnival culture it offers a great base, numerous experience with documenting and investigation of especially modifications, metamorphoses and innovations, without which our understanding and of the historical heritage and its further development would be much more difficult. Because the lifetime of numerous changes and novelties in heritages can be very short, their constant documenting, research and evaluation is even more important.

Similar systems SAMDOK and neoethnography are suitable directives while researching masks (the heritage of ) masks as an subject of ethnological museology. The processes in the culture of masks and masking, especially traditional ones, must be studied on a time line between the past, the present and the future. At discovering modifications, metamorphoses and innovations we can so help ourselves with the experience of the Swedish SAMDOK system.3

---

2 Like the Slovenian SAMDOK we could develop the neoethnographic system, which I discussed in relation with museology. More about that in: Gačnik 1995.
3 The charm of studying the universal nature of masks is, that different scientific disciplines can be engaged in their research, wether they are sociological and humanistic or biological and technical. Every one of them can study a mask from a specific point of view, in accordance with different methodologies of their branch. The informational potential of a mask as a complete information is then reduced to its individual components.
Ethnological Museology and Masks

In the structure of ethnological museology we must study intangible traditions / heritage, like masks, inside the following basic categories, as an interlace between material, social and spiritual culture: the morphology of a mask, customs and traditions, place and time. Every one of these basic categories must be studied through a prism of modifications (M), metamorphoses (M) and innovations (I). If you do not observe, document and research the changes and novelties on every single field, you cannot suitably evaluate the meaning of modern occurrences because you do not understand them. The studying of MMI in traditional carnival culture means to study the phenomenon of the mask also on a daily basis. (Gačnik 2000:15)

Basic museological categories on the field of complete preservation, research, communication and development of intangible heritage. (Gačnik 2000: 44)

On the level of research function of ethnological museology we must study masks (traditional, carnival) from two closely linked and co-dependent views:

1. museological: forming criteria and methodology of complete protection and presentation of heritage, preparing applicative and development programmes
2. ethnological: studying the biology and the evolution of the mask in the context of the complete culture of masks and masking, with special emphasis on the research of MMI in different time periods

The basic problems and dilemmas with integrated evolution of intangible heritages lie in the understanding of traditions/heritages as a development process that constantly changes. Because of that, the relation between the preservation of heritage and its own development is one of the basic starting-points of ethnological museology. “Violations” of masking traditions or their evolutionary change occur in almost every level (morphology of the object/mask, customs and traditions, traditionally denoted place and time) therefore this sort of studying must be a priority research task of ethnological museology. The integrity of the topic demands an integrated research accession. Otherwise, we can form a disfigured image about a specific cultural phenomenon, which can cause incorrect expert decisions about preservation as well as planning further development.

The "kurent" mask as an ethnological museological challenge

While studying masks, the incompleteness in the research accession at investigating the traditional carnival culture shows itself by the fact, that the researchers mostly recognize only one of the four mentioned changing categories. In the case of the "kurent" mask heritage, as the most dominant traditional carnival figure in Slovenia, the relation of the holders towards respect to the regional designation of heritage it is often emphasized as a criterion of 'determination' or authenticity. For example: 'kurenti' or 'koranti' from the village of Markovci near Ptuj are convinced of their superior 'originality' just because they respect tradition more than other groups; they are supposed to appear only in rural areas, in their own and neighbour villages and on some village 'fašenk' carnivals. In comparison to them, the urban 'kurents' of Ptuj are denoted as a folkloristic hybrid without any value, because traditional carnival masks belong only into rural surroundings, not into the urban ones.

With most of the groups we recognize the violation also on all other levels: not only the unmarried young men are wearing the 'kurent' costumes 'kurentija', but also married man, children and even women; their robes are prettier, different from those from previous decades (materials, method of production); most of the groups occasionally takes part on different events also in other surroundings and outside the traditionally apportioned time etc. In short, all groups of 'kurents' violate the tradition, although some find it binding or 'holy' to appear only in their own cultural environment, others believe, that only (unmarried) men can wear the 'kurent' costume.

More than thirty years ago Niko Kuret, the most important maskologist in Slovenia, thought about masks as a subject of scientific research and tourism, and all that in a time, when tourism was 'kept alive' by a lot of past time traditions, the contents of which went to ruin long ago. What we see today is mostly just the hull, form, theatre, living museum, if you will. But interesting, attractive, still rooted inside the people, it is sooner or later sensational for the public. The press, film radio, television are interested in it. (Kuret 1989: 7) Kuret also notices, that the 'folk culture' is in an obvious defence and that it is changing at the most into a museum reserve in many ways. (Fikfak 1985: 184)

Similar views as Niko Kuret's can be found with ethnologist Janez Bogataj, who believes, that the heritage of carnival masks reveals itself in two ways: as reforming of tradition and as a form of living museum or a theatre of the past, (Bogataj & Berk & Pukšič 1993:242) where those, who put on these 'old' masks, perform a part of the past in front of us every year. (Bogataj 1998: 17) In these old costumes they are only actors of the past and in a living way present masks that are already an item of historical memory of museums. (Bogataj 1998:18).

I emphasize the above critical thoughtes, because they underline important questions of ethnological museology, connected with changing and evolution of intangible heritage, that I present on the example of the heritage of masking and its changing. We can ask ourselves the following strategic ethnological museological questions:

- Is it even possible to preserve the traditional carnival culture (intangible heritage)?
- And if yes, should we even preserve our traditional carnival masks; why, for who and finally, how?
- What would we like to preserve in our traditional carnival culture: is it individual creativity and spontaneity, traditional customs and uses (ritualism), traditionally appointed period of appearance, the place of presentation or 'just' the unification and the image of the mask along with the materials, out of which it was made?
- Which is the image that we want to preserve, that we see as criteria (of heritage, authenticity): is it the modern image of the mask or the one from 30, 50, 100 and more

1 UNESCO reports are directed in the preservation of heritage in the primary cultural surrounding. Dr Janez Bogataj is among Slovenian ethnologists the most interested in putting these references into effect: The Ptuj carnival should be a representation of extraordinary wealth of carnival or masking tradition of north-east Slovenia. Addition of anything else is artificial and verges to trumpery. We would advice tourist workers to include carnival in the 'primary surrounding' like Markovci and nearby villages as well. After all, the understanding of 'kurent' or any other mask in this surrounding is much more comprehensible than in the sphere of 'theatrical' appearance on the squares and streets of Ptuj. (Bogataj 1985:42) The questions about integrated preservation, especially moveable and 'living' heritage in international spheres, remain open.

2 Folklorism in some areas tries to keep alive at least some of the old wealth, even though in unspecific surroundings and in entirely different circumstances. (Kuret 1984: 48)
Displaying Masks in Museums

If we can be satisfied with the studies of traditional carnival culture in Slovenia and in Europe, we still cannot be satisfied by seeing the culture of masks and masking in Slovenian and European museums. Perhaps the museums have always propagated elitistic and urban culture (Šola 1985:165), that had no room for traditional masks of rural origin. The museums as ‘mirrors of life’ (Šola 1985: 128), as ‘islands of beauty’, as centers where processes of world re-materialization, the fight against anonymity and the loss of identity take place (Bellaigue 1999), are the most important institutions connected with preservation, research and communication of objects and cognition about heritage.

In modern societies museums are challenged from two sides: as guardians of cultural heritage and as transmitters of culture. (Schouten 1989: 108) A good museum (of masks) is therefore much more than just a well-guarded collection of documented objects, interesting mostly for the experts. The more socially needed a good museum is, the greater is its importance. (Hudson 1994: 11) That is why the mission of ethnological museology is connected with methodological principles, directed into re-establishing such museums that not only illustrate the past, but create and predict it. A good, even historical museum is oriented into the future, is a generator of culture, knowledge and learning, for the good of sustainable development. The mission of such museums is not connected merely with social memorizing, reconstructing of historical consciousness etc., but also with creating something new, with inventions and innovations on the field of tradition and their inclusion in various development efforts. Even though the research object of ethnological museology are not merely museums and museum displays, but also heritage in the broadest meaning of the word, I must point out the fact, that the culture of masks and masking is presented very insufficiently and unsuitably in European museums because the traditional and modern masks are mostly displayed like art sculptures with the emphasis on the aesthetics. In such settings they do not reflect their uniqueness, besides, we get to know very little about masking cultures from museum settings.

If we would try to measure the strength of a certain phenomenon on the field on tradition and culture only with museum settings, we would receive quite sad results and a disfigured image in the case of masks and masking. We would get the impression that masks are a certain marginalized object in the history of mankind, mainly beautiful, but still totally unimportant and as such interesting only to few ‘eccentrics’ and researchers. The blame for such presenting of masks in museums can be found in research methods of different scientific disciplines, in deficient museological education of museum workers, in museum collecting and displaying strategies.

We can learn from the history of masking, that the aesthetic function of masks was not negligible, but not at all predominant, something that Niko Kuret also drew to attention: As any creation of folk art, the mask is not intended for itself. It also is subject to a certain function therefore its aesthetic side is not primary neither for the creator nor for the bearer. (Kuret 1973:113) It is undoubtedly somewhat different now, because rituality is being replaced by entertainment, grotesqueness, beauty etc. We could say that we are witnesses to a greater and greater aesthetization of traditional European culture of masking. Aesthetically directed museum exhibitions of masks only confirm this practice.

At displaying masks in European museums we can notice, that the so-called museographic academism and museum elitism reveal themselves in emphasizing the aesthetic relation at displaying material, where the information potential of objects is focused primarily on the aesthetic level, when masks talk to the visitors primarily with their exterior. This sort of setting resembles the one of works of art, especially sculptures.
The galleristic way of displaying masks blurs their multi-meaning, because it makes the aesthetic of the mask the leading and dominant criterion. Exactly because of the disciplinary appropriation of the material world, many museum items are known strictly as beautiful objects, that lost all traces of their own, realistic meaning that they once had, according to their role, purpose and ambition that created them. (Mensch 1995: 15)

Aesthetic criterion predominates all other functions of the mask, placing them into secondary, even marginal position and thus creating a very truncated information image of the mysteriousness of the culture of masks and masking. Probably just the mask as a museum item most distinctively testifies about the absurdity of this sort of displaying national material. Claude Levi-Strauss thinks that it could come to a removal of especially non-European collections from ethnographical museums into art museums. (Wyatt 1994: 3) If so, we can also witness the removal of all other material displayed in the museums merely through its own aesthetic and morphological image, weather it is a collection of tools, cars etc.

At the aesthetically emphasized way of displaying material in museums the visitors of the exhibitions see the world of objects through two dominant criteria: beautiful and ugly. By this sort of displaying masks all the differences in symbolic and meaning, that distinguish African masks from European, the carnival splendour of Nice from traditional rural masking tradition of Bulgarian ‘kukers’ from Pernik etc. are destroyed.

If we have masks of different cultures (on national and international level) in one museum, we must see to it that this diversity will be recognizable in the museum settings. Masks of different cultures should talk to us in different manners, with different possible experiences. The universal measure at displaying among other stimulates the creation of monotone museum atmosphere, by which the colorfulness of local and other masking cultures is reduced.

This can be avoided with the holistic and interdisciplinary approach, proper to ethnological museology, at researching masks as well as at communicating of information and findings in form of museum displays. By knowing the methodology of ethnological museological and museum exhibition as a specific (museological) medium we prepare different author poetics (like in film, theatre), at the same time we create conditions for the jump from creating to directing exhibitions.

Every museum display is an assembling, an interpretation, is a unique communication that allows us to manipulate with masks (objects) and thus create and discover new meanings and comprehensions. At total, museologically theatrical presentation of the culture of masks and masking we must devote special attention to sound (noise, music) and color. Just by using these two elements we can contribute to creating a different atmosphere of the exhibition, to a more integrating informative meaningfulness of the musealised atmosphere, which will bring the culture of masks and masking closer to the museum visitors.

Decisions for the academically and aesthetically oriented collections and museums of masks and masking are legitimate and necessary. However, they should not become a rule or guidance at creating new museum exhibitons. Rather, they should be an exception. The fact is, that traditional European culture of masks and carnivals is not an academic and aesthetic phenomenon. By doing so we would create an incorrect image of the role and meaning of masks in the history of world civilizations among the visitors of exhibitions. Aestheticizing excellently supplements with idealizing reality and fetishizing museum artifacts as seen at the exhibitions in necrophillic museum atmosphere where the logic of rationality and clinical objectivity prevails. It is time we pass from ethnological galleries of masks to museums of masks.

---

1 The galleristic way of displaying in the way of ‘art gallery’ as one of 6 methods of displaying in the history of European and non-European museums, agrees also Josef Kandert (Kandert 1998: 420).
2 This sort of museum direction can be labeled in our part of Europe as the heritage of the 19th century, as heritage of cultural-historical thinking that strongly influenced the image of traditional museums then and now.
3 More about the use of color in museum presentations in: Gačnik 1991: 5 – 12
4 More about the relations to museum artifacts in: Šola 1985: 123 – 143.
Epilogue

So what is it with the recipe for a ‘good’ museum exhibition? Similar as with the recipe for a ‘good’ movie. It is impossible to provide. Nonetheless, it is advisable to build the future of museums and collections of masks and carnivals on global megatrends for the 21st century, on the methodology of ethnological museology and on the general standards of EMYE,¹ that apply to all museums apart from particular types, themes, size or location. Among several dispositions for a ‘good’ exhibition we should mention at least some: the one that protects the visitor, staff, the building, the artifacts…, the one that is clearly visible and illuminated, that has a nice appearance and is clean, that stimulates the emotional and the rational, that tells the story on a simple (not banal!) and sensible way, that stimulates curiosity and imagination…²

And what should a modern museum of masks and masking be like: warm and colorful, associative, comprehensible, accessible and visitor-friendly. It should not tire and humiliate, but awake the memory and creativity, imbued by the dimension of the past, by traditional knowledge and wisdom.³ It should offer us a feeling of connectedness, inclusion into the history of world civilizations and lead us to thinking about the future. In this sort of museums the artifacts and collections tell us as much as we ask them!
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Keeping trace –
Immaterial heritage, living heritage, object
museology: a paradoxical relationship

André Gob – Belgium

The expression “immaterial heritage and the museum” comprises three terms that are not entirely self-evident and deserve further examination. The question of immateriality throughout the history of the museum is analysed at length by Maroević (2000). Meanwhile, Deloche (2000) starts by looking at the immateriality inherent to museum objects only then to turn his attention to a generalisation of this theme with regard to the virtual. Many authors (Desvallées, 2000; Jadé, 2004) have repeatedly underlined the semantic problems related to hasty translations: one should keep in mind that the term “intangible” cannot be used in this context in French. With regard to the word “heritage”, this was perceived as covering an essentially European concept, based on the object. Its expansion to include immaterial objects aims precisely to meet the expectations of non-European cultures and civilisations and to preserve cultural diversity (Rusconi, 2000; UNESCO Charter, 2003). One need not re-examine these questions as a good synthesis has recently been produced by Jadé (2004).

To me, it seems that one cannot examine this problem from such a general viewpoint. On the one hand, one must distinguish between the museum’s functions of conservation and exhibition: the museum conserves material objects, but through these, it exhibits or should exhibit ideas and concepts (except when the scope is limited to object museology sensu stricto). On the other hand, one evades the issue by arguing that there is an immateriality inherent to each museum object, thus generalising the concept of immaterial heritage, which then turns out to be nothing more than an empty shell.

I look at things from the restricted perspective that has motivated the actions of UNESCO and ICOM in this domain – expanding the European conception of the monument (in the classical sense of the term) to embrace phenomena that do not materialise principally in objects. I stress that today heritage is what is fundamentally at stake, and by that, I mean living heritage. Otherwise, only that which has been materialised through the object would exist as heritage.

The following are the questions that arise:
- how do we conserve these phenomena?
- how do we exhibit them?
- how do we avoid fixing, or fossilising living heritage?

These questions shall be discussed with reference to examples.

Following analysis, one is forced to conclude that immaterial heritage in itself cannot be conserved. One can only try to keep some trace of it. Material or materialised, this may take many diverse forms: witness accounts, recordings (written, audio, video, digital) objects or places. Authenticity, which is so important in the European museum conception of heritage, has hardly any meaning in this case. The traces “revolve around” the phenomenon that one wishes to guard as heritage, lending images, from different points of view, at a given moment in time. All of these traces together make up a dynamic representation of the phenomenon and its evolution. It is through this representation that the phenomenon may be exhibited.
Finally, one stresses that the museum is not the only, nor even the principle agent for preserving immaterial heritage. While it may assemble collections of documents that may serve as a reference, one must try to ensure that these do not become normative in character, definitively fixing and fossilising the forms of immaterial heritage.
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Garder une trace –
Patrimoine immatériel, patrimoine vivant et muséologie de l’objet : une relation paradoxale

André Gob – Belgique


Il m’apparaît qu’on ne saurait discuter cette problématique d’un point de vue aussi général. D’une part, il convient de distinguer les fonctions de conservation et d’exposition du musée : celui-ci conserve des objets matériels mais, à travers ceux-ci, il expose ou est censé exposer des idées, des concepts (sauf à se restreindre à une muséographie de l’objet sensu stricto). D’autre part, on « noie le poisson » en tirant argument de la part d’immatérialité inhérente à tout objet de musée pour généraliser le concept de patrimoine immatériel qui se trouve ainsi vidé de sens.

Je me placerai donc dans la perspective restreinte qui a motivé les actions de l’UNESCO et de l’ICOM dans ce domaine, celle de l’élargissement du concept européen de monument (au sens classique du terme) vers des phénomènes qui ne se matérielisent pas principalement dans des objets. Je souligne qu’il s’agit forcément de patrimoine d’aujourd’hui c’est-à-dire de patrimoine vivant. Sinon, il n’existerait plus que matérialisé dans un objet.

Les questions qui se posent alors sont les suivantes :
- comment conserver ces phénomènes ?
- comment les exposer ?
- comment ne pas figer, ne pas fossiliser, le patrimoine vivant ?

Celles-ci seront discutées à travers des exemples.


Enfin, on soulignera que le musée n’est pas l’unique ni même le principal agent de la préservation du patrimoine immatériel. S’il peut rassembler des collections documentaires de référence, il faut éviter que celles-ci n’acquièrent un caractère normatif qui fixerait définitivement les formes du patrimoine immatériel et le fossiliserait.
Gob: Keeping trace
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Intangible Sources of Ancient Chinese Objects – a Spiritual & Material Patrimony

Alfonz Lengyel

Introduction

This short paper is presented according to the following requirement for discussion in the 2004 Congress of ICOM-ICOFOM in Seoul, South Korea

(1) Museology and certain type of museums in relation to Intangible Heritage, and
(2) Museology, as an instrument to preserve the Intangible Heritage.

There are some conflicting and contradiction about meaning of the term of tangible and intangible heritage. Long before ICOM recommended to museums in its 2002 Congress in Barcelona, the recognition and interpretation of intangible heritages, the Law in the United States already included it in its National Historic Preservation Act, in 1966. (36 CFR. Chapter 16.) Although the law did not spell out the word of “intangible”, only used its closest synonym by using the term of “transcendent”.

The following provision of the Act (Paragraph 65.4 (b) (3) reads as:
“A site of a building, or structure no longer standing but a person or event associated with it is of transcendent importance in the nation’s history and the association consequential”

The definition of “transcendent importance” in fact could be considered in this context as synonym to “intangible” not only in above quoted text but also in Paragraph 65.4 (a) (3) “That “(the Site) represents some great idea or ideal of the American people”

With this consideration the paper was written, about intangible sources of specialized collections on Ancient Chinese Sexual paraphernalia.

Discussion

There was a private specialized Museum in Shanghai. In this museum was housed various objects about Chinese sex culture, which included among 3700 erotic toys, images, and other sensual and sexual object. Among them was about 20 which corresponding with findings which were discovered, in Xi’an and elsewhere in tombs from Western Han Dynasty (206 BC- 5 AD.)

In Shanghai a retired sociology professor Liu Dalin organized in 2001 from his own collection the first Chinese Sex Museum. >From his first location in the famous fashion street the Nanging Lu was for economic reason forced out to a cheaper location in Wuding Lu, then was transferred to Tongli, a small but scenic village about 60 miles Southwest of Shanghai. Professor Liu and his partner Hu Hongxia, aided by the village government established his museum in an abandoned but restored for museum purpose the Li Zil girl’s school.

The Sex Museum in Shanghai intended to be part of a healthy sex education, which is “taboo” for the Chinese up to date. First Mr. Liu’s Museum was falsely attacked with a prude communist attitude as being “pornographic”. However, Professor Liu with the principles of the Science of Sociology, fought against this misconception. Although, in the TV more and more sexually explicit images appeared, due to the liberalization following the new ideology of Market Socialism, but it was so far difficult to change the objections of still living members and followers of the “Long March”.

It is important to mention that Liu Dalin never had intention to vulgarize the feeling of sex, as people in Shanghai accused him. He was the author of great number of books in sexual sociology. In his book on Chronological Research of Sexual Performance in China, Liu Dalin
explained the gradual development of Human Sexuality from prehistoric times created “Intangible Myth” around the fertility rite, through the appearance of Chinese medical science. However, during the already existence of medical research, the folklore produced great number of different fertility symbols, some of them with specific desire, such as having a son. Some of the symbols still exist today in folk art.

From early Chinese literature it became evident the importance of sexual act for healthy mental and physical function. It is important to mention that in these literatures the biological description of sex related terms were rather metaphysical than direct reference to the outcome of a sexual act. Such as, for the women’s secretion the term used “cloud” and for the men’s ejaculation of semen was named “rain”.

The scholarly research about sex culture in Ancient China was quite neglected by China specialists, although popularized and less sensually exploited publication often appeared in the pornographic market. This is not the direction where scholars want to go.

The first publication appeared the very much-criticized book of Robert Van Gulik in 1960, then republished in 1974. It was entitled Sexual Life in Ancient China. So far the latest one in this subject was written by Paul Rikita Goldin, The Culture and Sex in Ancient China. Because lack of larger volume of scholarly works on this area of research, the state of scholarship in this subject is still heavily subjected to individual interpretation of the available ancient and modern text. To understand and then interpret

The symbolism in ancient Chinese text, which related to sensual feeling, or sexual act of that time, requires a holistic approach to encompass the “intangible” cultural and psychological fabrics of the period.

In order to examine only the “intangible” value of Ancient Sexual Paraphernalia, those objects would be discussed in this paper, which had definite Taoist connotation, and never used for any sex education, or sensual pornographic purposes. In other words, the purpose is to present a juxtaposition of the spiritual (intangible) with material (tangible) heritage.

Taoism as a “Way “ of philosophy gradually transformed into a quasi religious belief without a “supreme God” idea, from the 6th century B.C. through the Eastern Han Dyn (AD 25 – 200). At the appearance of the Buddhism the two teaching were inter-mingling. Then following the Buddhist ideal, a Taoist assembly of Gods was created with great number of Gods and Goddesses, on the top placed the TRINITY of “Supreme” Gods. The priesthood, from that time, included some of the ordained members of Imperial family.

According to the Taoist Sexology, it was recommended a healthy balance between the male sexual act (Yang) and the female one (Yin). Both sexes have their own ‘Qi’, which is a vapor like undifferentiated substance. However, both have different essence of “Ching”, because man produces semen, and woman vaginal or ovarian secretion.

In the process of sexual act Qi of the Yang absorbs the Qi of the Yin, and vice versa. In order to male sexual energy, the Taoist recommended for man to hold back his ejaculation, and let woman have multiple orgasm. It was also believed that if man abused his “Yang Ching”, it may cause sickness and perhaps death. Therefore, only female masturbation was recommended, because according to the Taoists, female have unlimited “Yin Ching”. Therefore, the male masturbation could result a totally abused “Yang Ching”, because it was not reinforced by absorbing, through a sexual act the “Yin Ching” of a female.

According to the Encyclopedia of Unusual Sex Practice, the Taoism proposed if not immortality, but at least longevity. The Taoist manual mentioned that the legendary Yellow Emperor became immortal because he had sex in a single night with 20 virgin girls. During the sexual act, he held back his “Yang Ching” while absorbed the vaginal secretion of these virgins. For this reason, he lived 3000 years. Perhaps, this is the reason, that in folk art, up to our time, the female organ is associated with longevity. In embroidery often appears the upper part of a peach (symbol of longevity) shaped as a vulva.
The Confucian Sexology took during Qin Dynasty the lead over the sexual theory of the Taoist. Then, woman became an inferior subject of men’s pleasure. Copulation was used only for procreation and a tool to create a “sacred” family life. The theory was carried out through the Western Han Dynasty, and only in the Eastern Han Dynasty (AD 25-220) the Sexology of Taoists returned with new sexual guides such as the Admirable Discourses of the Yellow Emperor and the Plain Girl, and the Art of the Bed Chamber. Both literature are advocating conserving vital energy of “Yang Ching”. In contrary to the earlier sexual manual, in the Discourses, the Plain Girl encouraged the Emperor to try and enjoy all variety of sexual style and combinations.

During the Three Kingdom (AD 221-590) a chaotic political situation occurred and the same time the unified China disintegrated. At that time the Buddhism made a great advancement in China while in way of life the Confucian ideas mixed with Taoism.

During Sui Dynasty (AD 590-618) the Taoism gained strength over the Confucianism, and in addition to the old Taoist sex manuals some new quite bizarre manuals appeared. Some of them named the sex position with animal names, and even advocated that some cure of ailments.

Sexual images even in funerary coins let us to believe, that there is a direct “intangible” line in the mind of the Taoists between procreation, birth, longevity, and death. The Taoist “sexual balance” idea also could be translated to that not only could cause death of an individual, but could threatened the power and the existence of the Empire.

Perhaps this was the fate of Tang Emperor Xuan Zong’s (r.712-756) sexually unbalanced relations with his favorite concubine Yang Yuhuan. Hong Sheng (1645-1704) wrote a drama about this tragic love story in 1688 under the title of Palace of Eternal Youth. Hong Sheng explained the story in the angle of eternal love story. However, if someone analyzes this historical event in light of the Taoist sexology, the person would conclude differently. The tragic end of the life of the concubine and the fate of the Emperor, should be rather connected with the late Tang period’s Taoist view about unbalanced sex, which could ruin even the Empire, than envelope it in an emotional love story. The Emperor was accused that the reason they loosing the battle against the rebellion of An Lushan, because the Emperor only pay attention his sexual life with his favorite concubine. In order to save the Empire he was forced by his own military officers to execute his concubine. In spite of this ultimate sacrifice, the Emperor last the battle and his crown.

Often happened, that eunuch and or disappointed concubines were involved on intrigues and became instruments of political violent changes in Imperial Palaces. It suggests that sexual contacts between the “master” and the concubine, not consequently based upon any cohesive emotion, but on sexual duty. The sexual act in this case, had been making them the same way biologically satisfied, as did the usage of sexual objects.

Most of the male paraphernalia was discovered in Han Dynasty tombs. They were made of silver, bronze, porcelain, ivory or some narrow sack like instrument filled with flour, or dried stalk of plant, which increase in size when moistened.

In 1968 two bronze dual headed sexual tool were discovered in Mancheng, Hebei Province, in the tomb of Liu Sheng, the elder brother of Han Emperor Wu D in Hebei Province. (Died in 113 B.C.) He was known that he had over hundred children. This fact puzzled archaeologists, why those sexual objects were buried with him. Why he needed to use these tools? One could speculate, that these tools were used for pre-sexual play by woman, or used the neglected part of woman among the numerous young and also aging population of his harem.

In 1982 two bronze, in 1987 one bronze, and in 2002 Jianyi Xiao of Shaanxi Institute of Archaeology discovered two more bronze, and a hybrid bronze and bone male sexual organ in Xi’an. Previously in 1959 two porcelain sexual tools were discovered in Tongchuan (Shaanxi province, near Xi’an), and one porcelain tool in a Song Dynasty tomb in Huangling (Shaanxi Province).
Novels, from the Ming and Qing Dynasties suggested to use these tools, that not only the people at the Royal Court, but also some commoners did use them. From later illustrated publications we learned that these single phallic objects were used by women for sex foreplay, some woman fixed on her waist and placed the artificial male sexual instrument to a man’s anus. The double phallic image could be used by two woman for the sexual pre-play purpose, or perhaps placed one end of the artificial phallic image in her sexual organ and the other end in to the men partner’s anus. More archeological find would be necessary, in light of the development of Chinese sexual practice, to get more definite answer for the usage of them.

Abraham N. Franzbau, published in 1977, a collection of sexually explicit colored prints. It is proven fact that Early Chinese sexual manuals before 1570 were only description of positions, without illustration, only after that date appeared the illustrated one. After the Manchu conquest in 1644, moist of these albums were destroyed, but few were rescued and smuggled into Japan.

These prints are illustrations sexual encounters in polygynous society, which allow, according to the economic strength of a man, to have more than one wives, and concubines. Some of the illustrations depicting, that not consequently the sexual act was in privacy in the bedroom. Some shows that a third person, helped on sexual act or its pre-play.

For example one print shows a couple, who are engaged in a sexual act in a nowadays, popularly called “missionary position”: A second female pushes on the buttock of the male, to help him to achieve a deeper penetration. In another print the help came in a most complicated manner. The helper, or perhaps the second wife, pushing a female nude sitting on a swing toward a man who is standing in the front of the swing in erected sexual organ.

Many variety of assisted copulation was illustrated according to the Discourses of The Pain Girl and the Yellow Emperor. In one of the prints two women embracing one another while lying one above the other. They are robbing their organ together almost they reaching the orgasm. A man who is watching this act while his organ became strongly erected take over the job from the woman who laid above.

Masturbation of women was encouraged. It was used as self-satisfaction, or a preparation for male–female intercourse. It could be done with or without sexual paraphernalia. Van Gulic Mentioned in his book, that happened that woman fastened to her hill an artificial male organ and masturbate with it. Among the illustrations, which were printed in the book of Franzbau, a woman does it as from ancient sources Gulic described.

Conclusion

The objects, which so far were discovered in ancient tombs, in light of the Taoist sexual manuals, certainly had their intangible values. One needs not to confuse these objects, with the erotic images of paintings, prints, small statuettes or ceramics, and even porcelain tea cops, in the Ming and Qing period., or with the present days porno graphical images. These later ones had only tangible and monetary values, which now skyrocketing in the so-called antique market.

Even some of the nude images, which were used for medical training purposes, have its high tangible value. However, if we look at the ancient sexual paraphernalia and understand the sacred spirit behind it, we should realize the intangible value of them.

The ancient spirit was quite different from that of our own time, then, the mysterious and sacred feeling and it consequences were explained with the Taoist sex manuals. In our time, started in the West, it was replaced with modern biological mixed sexological science. Therefore, in the still prude Chinese society, not even for sociological reason wanted to tolerate the Sex Museum in Shanghai. However, after some cultural education, certainly its intangible value will prevail, and specialized museums, as part of the important sex education, will gain respect in every Chinese community.
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Samuel Quiccheberg et le patrimoine immatériel

François Mairesse – Belgique

Le concept de *patrimoine immatériel* tel que défini en 2003 par l’UNESCO comprend essentiellement les traditions et expressions orales (y compris la langue), les arts du spectacle, les pratiques sociales, rituels et événements festifs ainsi que les connaissances et pratiques concernant la nature et l'univers. C’est souvent à partir de ce contexte que la réflexion sur le patrimoine immatériel est envisagée. Les contributions du colloque que l’ICOFOM a consacré en 2000 à ce sujet apportent cependant une vision plus large sur ce patrimoine particulier. D’abord, à l’instar des interventions de Bernard Deloche ou d’Ivo Marojević, force est de reconnaître qu’il est impossible de séparer matériel et immatériel : l’objet matériel ne se conçoit qu’à l’aune de l’immatériel qu’il représente et vice-versa. Ensuite, comme le remarquait André Desvallées, le patrimoine immatériel peut être conçu de manière plus large – il est en cela déjà bien présent dans nombre de musées – englobant notamment les faits sociaux ou scientifiques (sociofacts et kinétifacts) que l’on peut visualiser par des expériences ou des procédés virtuels ; en cela, le patrimoine immatériel peut être assimilé aux vraies choses, selon l’expression de Duncan Cameron. La question fondamentale liée à la présence de ce patrimoine au musée et à son exploitation touche à sa visualisation, soit les moyens muséographiques permettant de le communiquer mais également de le préserver.

Si le patrimoine immatériel – dont le terme ne remonte à guère plus loin que le dernier quart du XXe siècle – est bel et bien déjà présent dans les musées, à quand remonte son introduction et comment ont été résolues les questions liées à sa visualisation ? Bien que ce débat soit très contemporain, la problématique semble avoir toujours existé ; elle est déjà abordée dans le premier traité de muséologie au monde, rédigé par Samuel Quiccheberg en 1565.2


1 « On entend par "patrimoine culturel immatériel" les pratiques, représentations, expressions, connaissances et savoir-faire – ainsi que les instruments, objets, artefacts et espaces culturels qui leur sont associés – que les communautés, les groupes et, le cas échéant, les individus reconnaissent comme faisant partie de leur patrimoine culturel. Ce patrimoine culturel immatériel, transmis de génération en génération, est recréé en permanence par les communautés et groupes en fonction de leur milieu, de leur interaction avec la nature et de leur histoire, et leur procure un sentiment d'identité et de continuité, contribuant ainsi à promouvoir le respect de la diversité culturelle et la créativité humaine. Aux fins de la présente Convention, seul sera pris en considération le patrimoine culturel immatériel conforme aux instruments internationaux existants relatifs aux droits de l'homme, ainsi qu'à l'exigence du respect mutuel entre communautés, groupes et individus, et d'un développement durable ». Convention pour la sauvegarde du patrimoine culturel immatériel, Paris, 17 octobre 2003 ; http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0013/001325/132540f.pdf
2 Museology and the intangible heritage, Munich and Brno, Nov. 26–Dec 05 2000, *Iconom Study Serie* 32. Les noms cités dans ce paragraphe renvoient aux articles de ces auteurs dans l’ISS 32.
C’est dans ce contexte qu’il écrit, en 1565, les Inscriptiones vel Tituli Theatri, dont le titre complet peut être traduit par Inscriptions ou titres du théâtre immense comportant toutes les matières de l’univers et des images extraordinaires si bien qu’il peut à juste titre être appelé aussi réserve des objets fabriqués avec art et merveilleux ainsi que de tout trésor rare, qu’on a décidé de réunir tous ensemble dans ce théâtre afin qu’en les regardant et les manipulant fréquemment on puisse acquérir rapidement, facilement et sûrement une connaissance singulières des choses et une sagesse admirable.

**Le traité des Inscriptions du théâtre immense**

L’ouvrage de Quiccheberg est relativement bref : en 56 pages, l’auteur prétend plutôt mettre au net le premier jet d’un ouvrage qu’il souhaite nettement plus vaste, enrichi par les remarques que son premier traité aura suscitées. Le cœur du traité est le système de classification qu’il propose, celles-ci ayant pour but de décrire l’ensemble des merveilles de l’univers. La classification comprend 53 inscriptions – c’est le titre du livre – réparties en cinq classes : la première décrit principalement le fondateur du théâtre – le collectionneur – sa généalogie et l’ensemble de ses possessions ou des faits se rapportant à sa région ; la seconde classe aborde les ouvrages d’art ou les réalisations humaines : statues, artisanat, vases, mobilier, monnaies et médailles ; la troisième classe décrit les œuvres de la nature : animaux merveilleux, animaux, fruits, plantes, pierres et terre ; la quatrième classe recense les outils nécessaires à l’activité humaine : instruments de musique, outils mathématiques ou de médecine, armes, vêtements… enfin, la dernière classe énumère les images produites par l’homme : peintures à l’huile, aquarelles, gravures, blasons, etc.

Cette classification peut sembler de prime abord déroutante. Quiccheberg explique la raison de ses choix dans la seconde partie de son ouvrage, décrivant certaines des inscriptions qui lui semblent particulièrement importantes. C’est avant tout en fonction des matières que le classement a été opéré, et non en fonction des chronologies ou des styles : ainsi, les statues, modernes ou antiques, de toutes civilisations confondues, figurent dans la même inscription. Au fil des lectures, une certaine logique transparaît dans cette structure peu ordinaire de nos jours. Quiccheberg se réfère probablement à d’anciennes classifications, mais aussi à des collections déjà constituées1 : le savant semble, plutôt que de collectionner l’ensemble du monde, dresser un inventaire des collections que toute personne peut prétendre rassembler – il remarque par ailleurs qu’il est loisible à tout un chacun de collectionner, du plus riche au plus modeste, pour autant qu’il se spécialise dans l’une des inscriptions. Quiccheberg ne destine par ailleurs pas son ouvrage aux philosophes, mais aux princes, et recense donc plutôt, « suivant les ordres qui ne soient pas difficiles, la plupart des choses qu’il est plaisant de conserver »2.

Cet inventaire des collections est clairement ordonné de manière à glorifier le collectionneur et sa famille qui sont seulement précédés par Dieu à qui est attribuée la première inscription. Toute une classe leur est réservée. Une sorte de hiérarchie apparaît assez clairement dans le système des inscriptions qui débute avec le divin et le collectionneur démiurge, reproduisant le monde dans sa chambre, puis énumère les productions humaines, passe ensuite à celles de la nature et aux outils nécessaires pour les produire. Enfin, la dernière classe est consacrée aux images – le savant belge semble ainsi s’inscrire à la suite de Platon, pour qui les images ne constituent que des copies de copies3. À l’opposé des livres qui n’apparaissent pas directement dans sa classification, Quiccheberg range les images parmi les objets, en leur octroyant cependant ce statut singulier. Quiccheberg voit dans les images un substitut utile aux livres, puisque « en effet, la seule vue d’une image est parfois plus profitable à la mémoire qu’une

---

1 Ainsi, la première inscription de la première classe, relative aux « grandes peintures d’animaux », pour laquelle Quiccheberg remarque que « dans les palais des princes d’Allemagne et les châteaux des grands personnages, on voit beaucoup de choses peintes de ce genre dans les salles à manger et les salles de réception » (fol. Eir, BROUT N., Op. Cit., p. 103.


3 Comme le remarque Nicolette Brout dans son article.
longue lecture de beaucoup de pages. On rendra donc, petit à petit, grâce à ces images, un grand service aux lettres »¹.

Ce principe transparaît dans l’ensemble du programme de Quiccheberg et fonde son projet, puisque les objets, présentés au regard ou à la disposition du collectionneur, offrent un support de connaissance direct afin qu’en les regardant et les manipulant fréquemment on puisse acquérir rapidement, facilement et sûrement une connaissance singulière des choses et une sagesse admirable (selon le titre de son livre).

L’éloge du collectionneur, inscrit en bonne place au sein de la classification de Quiccheberg, se retrouve également dans la dernière partie de son ouvrage. Le savant y dresse le portrait des principaux collectionneurs allemands, se référant essentiellement à la liste établie par Hubert Goltzius deux ans plus tôt dans son Jules César. Le traité du savant belge se clôt par quelques citations bibliques, justifiant le fait de collectionner et d’acquérir des connaissances scientifiques, ainsi que par quelques citations laudatives sur le travail de Quiccheberg lui-même. Ce dernier décrit également les autres espaces attenant au musée universel : bibliothèque et réserve, bien sûr, mais aussi ateliers (de typographie, de fabrication de mobilier, etc.) pour poursuivre le travail de création auxquels incitent les objets exposés.

Le monde des cabinets à l’époque de Quiccheberg

L’ouvrage de Quiccheberg s’inscrit à la croisée des chemins et peut, à juste titre, être considéré comme un traité d’un genre nouveau dans lequel les objets et les images, utilisés comme support de connaissance universelle, prennent la première place.

Malgré les hommages très appuyés de Quiccheberg aux princes et à ses protecteurs, notamment Albert V de Bavière, son traité illustre aussi l’émergence de l’érudit, à cette époque, comme troisième pouvoir au sein de la société, entre le pôle de la noblesse et celui de la religion. On peut en attribuer l’origine au courant humaniste venant d’Italie et se propageant à travers l’Europe, parallèlement au mouvement des collections².

Car un grand élan de constitution de collection est en train de s’opérer à l’époque de Quiccheberg, dont l’activité témoigne des mérites de leur possesseur – et le savant y participe par son éloge des grands collectionneurs. Les origines de la collection, bien entendu, précèdent cette époque, puisqu’elle s’inscrit parmi les plus anciennes activités de l’homme et s’est développée de manière continue, au travers des temples, des églises, des trésors princiers ou religieux. On observe cependant, jusqu’à la Renaissance, une séparation très nette entre la collection et l’institution intitulée musée, fondée dans le sillage des grandes écoles philosophiques de l’Antiquité. Ce qui jusqu’alors est considéré comme musée (Museion), durant l’Antiquité, est un foyer de réflexion philosophique dont Alexandrie établit définitivement la renommée. Les savants logés au Museum ont recours à la bibliothèque ou (peut-être) à des collections, mais ces dernières sont loin de constituer le centre de l’activité du musée antique, basé sur la discussion, la méditation et l’enseignement³.


¹ fol E iii v, Ibid., p. 109.
Insensiblement, l'idée de musée liée à celle d'exhibition d'objets commence à s'imposer. Le fonctionnement de ces nouvelles « institutions » va évidemment transformer radicalement le principe du Mouseion antique. C'est que le « cabinet d'homme de lettres », que l'on intitle alors musée, s'emploît progressivement de collections destinées à l'étude et à l'érudition, non seulement en Italie (on parle alors souvent de Studiolo ou de Musaeum), mais également en Europe du Nord, qui voit se constituer nombre de cabinets de curiosités, de Kunstkammern et de Wunderkammern. Quiccheberg traduit le premier de ces termes allemands par « cabinet des objets fabriqués avec art », le second par « réserve de choses merveilleuses ».

Le programme de la collection vise la recherche mais aussi l'émémerveillement, l'enseignement du prince, la discussion. Ce principe est très différent de celui des collections antérieures. Auparavant, la constitution d'une collection était rarement liée avec des projets liés à la connaissance. Les trésors de temples ou de cathédrales étaient des lieux protégeant de la concupiscence humaine, tant matérielle que spirituelle. L'activité du musée moderne, à la suite de Quiccheberg, se recentre de plus en plus sur l'objet lui-même qui devient fonds d'étude alors qu'il n'était que support de réflexion.

A première vue, Quiccheberg ne parle cependant pas de conservation des objets. Du moins ne parle-t-il pas de mesures physiques pour les conserver, aussi simples soient-elles. Le savant belge aurait-il oublié cette notion, si importante de nos jours ? A vrai dire, son système n’est pas basé sur la rétention physique des objets, mais semble plutôt construit sur la conservation des connaissances. Quiccheberg prétend d’une certaine manière remplacer un système par un autre. Bien entendu, la conservation de la connaissance passe surtout, à son époque, par celle des textes et donc des livres. C’est avant tout par les livres que l’on a redécouvert l’Antiquité ; Quiccheberg propose à ce titre une méthode spécifique de rangement, mais également d’organisation typographique des livres. Mais le système le plus ancien sur lequel il semble se baser est celui de l’art de la mémoire, à l’époque encore très vivant, notamment par le biais de Giulio Camillo, auquel Quiccheberg se réfère.

**L’art de la mémoire**

Le *Théâtre de la mémoire* (*L’Idea del Theatro*) de Giulio Camillo est le titre d’un ouvrage posthume publié d’après manuscrit en 1550, six années après la mort de l’auteur, 15 ans avant le traité de Quiccheberg. Camillo a réalisé un théâtre, en bois, dans lequel il a disposé des milliers de citations de grands auteurs de l’Antiquité. Camillo, dans son théâtre, n’expose aucun objet, sinon quelques images emblématiques. Sa portée est cependant tout aussi universelle et vise à préserver la totalité des connaissances. Mais le savant italien se réfère directement à l’art de la mémoire ou mnémonique.

La mnémonique est un aspect fondamental de la rhétorique dont la tradition remonte aux présocratiques. Dans une enveloppe architecturale imaginaire, l’auteur dispose en des endroits spécifiques, intitulés *lieux*, des images frappantes, merveilleuses, qui lui permettent instantanément, lorsqu’il parcourt ces lieux par l’imagination, de se remémorer toutes les connaissances acquises et d’ainsi pouvoir reproduire son discours. Les images de Camillo, disposées au sein de son théâtre, lui permettent de se souvenir de l’ensemble des citations qu’il a inscrites et de discouvrir sur tous les sujets. Mais les objets du monde réel, dérisoires face à l’idée et la connaissance, ne pourraient y trouver leur place. Cette tradition connaît encore à l’époque de nombreux spécialistes, tels Ravisius Textor, Théodore Zwinger ou Conrad Gessner, publiant de longues listes de faits et de lieux communs, structurés parfois hâtivement en catégories.
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Le projet de Quiccheberg est fondamentalement différent de celui de Camillo. Le médecin anversois se positionne comme un héritier de Camillo, dont il mentionne le musée, mais s’en détache pour se rapprocher du monde sensible. Les *Inscriptiones*, bien que concentrant des choses extraordinaires et dignes d’émerveillement, n’ont pas pour objet le rappel d’autres idées qui leur auraient été associées et ne participent plus directement à l’art de la mémoire. Il ne s’agit pas d’images mentales, encore moins d’images idéales, mais d’objets matériels. Cependant, Quiccheberg retient quelques-uns des principes de la mnémonique, qui permettraient à un érudit rompu à ce système de se remémorer l’ensemble du théâtre, une fois celui-ci visité. D’abord, le savant belge parle d’*inscriptions*, « comme si un roi, un prince, ou quelque autre patron avait inscrit de cette façon chacune des choses collectionnées sous des lieux définis ou avait déjà décidé de les y inscrire »¹. Ce système semble se référer directement à l’activité mentale d’inscription de *lieux* dans la mémoire. Quiccheberg propose également, pour ranger les objets, de construire des armoires en forme d’arcs de triomphe, de tours, de pyramides ou de théâtres antiques, qu’il retient au système de classification des sept planètes, utilisé par Camillo. Ces éléments remarquables permettront également au savant versé dans la mnémonique de se souvenir des emplacements dans lequel il a vu un objet spécifique, afin de se le remémorer le moment venu.

Cette organisation double, sous forme de classification pour l’étude, mais aussi pour la mémoire, lie chacun des éléments en un tout et modifie totalement le projet muséal. La collection n’est plus un ensemble d’objets disparates assemblés avec plus ou moins de goût mais devient une entité indissociable : l’agencement de la présentation rejoint la structure de pensée. Un collectionneur privé peut vendre l’un de ses spécimens, il en achètera un autre ; l’érudit ne pourra bientôt plus ; ses recherches fondées sur sa collection entraînent implicitement l’obligation de garder les « preuves », mais aussi les objets qui entourent celles-ci, c’est-à-dire la totalité de sa collection.

Encore cette rupture entre le monde des idées, figuré par Camillo, et celui des objets, initié par Quiccheberg, n’est-elle pas directement visible. Le changement de direction est encore hésitant mais il se verra confirmé par la suite, notamment par le biais de Francis Bacon, puis de Leibniz². Le *museum*, pour au moins un siècle encore, procède autant de la pensée de Camillo que de celle de Quickeberg. La préservation des collections s’en ressent de la même manière. S’il existe un nombre grandissant de collections d’objets (cabinets de curiosité, *Wunderkammern*, etc.) décrites et définies comme des musées, il en est encore d’autres, intitulées de la même manière, qui se présentent sous forme de recueils encyclopédiques ou d’espaces de discussion, rappelant les écoles philosophiques antiques.


**Quiccheberg, la muséologie et les musées virtuels**

On peut, à juste titre, considérer Samuel Quiccheberg comme le fondateur de la muséologie et le promoteur du musée moderne classique, fondé sur une collection d’objets. Le concept de muséologie, bien entendu, n’existe pas encore à l’époque – il semble que ce soit en Allemagne que l’on trouve son origine, vers la seconde moitié du XIXᵉ siècle. Mais c’est dans l’esprit du
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traité de Quiccheberg que le terme semble avoir été utilisé pour la première fois, se confondant avec celui de muséographie, pour définir, de manière globale, les méthodes de description, de classement et d’exposition des collections de musée. C’est encore ce principe que l’on retrouve au début du xxᵉ siècle, notamment dans l’Enciclopedia universal illustrada, publiée à Barcelone et s’inscrivant dans une logique étymologique parfaite : « Museographia : catalogo o description de uno o mas museos »1. Quiccheberg est en effet l’un des premiers à proposer, par le biais de son système de classes et d’inscriptions, une méthode d’inventaire ou de catalogage des collections – ce qu’il prône d’ailleurs avec vigueur dans son traité.

Mais le projet de Quiccheberg dépasse celui du seul musée classique tel que nous le connaissons. Sans doute l’un des aspects les plus intéressants, pour notre époque, du classement de Quiccheberg, réside-t-il dans cette « réserve d’image » que l’on traduirait aujourd’hui par « cabinet des estampes », mais qui pour le savant belge revêt une importance documentaire de premier plan. Quiccheberg, on l’a vu plus haut, oppose le livre à l’image. Il attribue à cette dernière le mérite de pouvoir imprégner la mémoire avec parfois plus d’intensité que la lecture assidue d’un livre. L’auteur se situe encore sur le plan de la mémoire et de la conservation des connaissances. Il sait aussi que ces œuvres imprimées sont souvent plus faciles à conserver ou à se procurer, notamment pour les spécimens d’histoire naturelle – il cite ainsi Ulysse Aldrovandi, qui faisait dessiner les animaux qu’il ne pouvait conserver en son cabinet. Quiccheberg propose, au sein de cette inscription, une classification complète des images en trois régions, chacune de celles-ci étant répartie en dix ou onze titres ; certains de ces titres étant eux-mêmes encore subdivisés en sections2.

Quiccheberg souligne bien la différence entre « le théâtre qui est notre fameuse institution illimitée et immense où on collectionne les matières, le mobilier, les images, les livres, etc. et la réserve d’image qui est en quelque sorte une partie du théâtre, ou un musée, ou quelques coffres et étagères qui contiennent seulement les feuilles qui, imprimées en nombre incroyable à partir d’une plaque en cuivre, sont empilées en un seul tas et conservées étalées à plat, éventuellement sur des étagères »3. Car tous les sujets sont abordés par l’image, laquelle forme à son tour un musée tout aussi universel.

Ce principe du musée par l’image présente une direction quelque peu différente de celle du musée classique. Cette acception du musée, qui existe déjà à l’époque de Quiccheberg, sera abondamment suivie tout au long des siècles par des collectionneurs, tels Cassiano dal Pozzo, né à la fin du xviᵉ siècle, qui rassembla une collection de plus de 7000 aquarelles, dessins et gravures sur tous les sujets, constituant un véritable musée de papier, ou Michel de Marolles, dont le prodigieux fonds de gravure constituait un des premiers fonds du Cabinet des estampes de la Bibliothèque nationale de France4. On a également souvent parlé du museum de Paolo Giovio, qui réunit durant le second quart du xviᵉ siècle une collection extraordinaire de portraits d’hommes d’État, de pontifes ou d’artistes. Cette galerie de portraits comportait peu d’originaux, surtout des copies, des gravures, des peintures d’après des médailles, etc. Le musée de Giovio ne réside pas seulement au sein de cette collection ou dans les ouvrages qu’il édite à partir de celles-ci (les « éloges des hommes illustres » qu’il a rédigé en 1546), mais également au sein de la grande salle de son palais de Côme, donnant sur le lac et dont les murs sont ornés de peintures représentant Apollon et les neuf muses – qui ramène au musée antique, lieu de discussion et de contemplation5.
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1 Enciclopedia universal illustrada Europeo-American, Barcelona, t.37, sd.
2 fol E iii v ; BROUT N., Op. Cit., p. 109. On serait tenté d’inférer, vu le nombre pratiquement toujours identique de subdivisions qui tourne autour de dix unités, tant pour le théâtre complet que pour la bibliothèque ou pour la réserve d’images, que ce nombre est considéré comme un maximum à ne pas dépasser pour permettre d’en retenir la structure.
3 Fol D iii v, Ibid., p. 102.
On peut rattacher, à la suite de Bernard Deloche, ces collections avec des entreprises plus récentes visant à diffuser, par l'image, une connaissance encyclopédique pour tous. De tels projets sont à la base de nombre de revues populaires du xixe siècle, comme le Musée des familles ou le Magasin pittoresque, dont les nombreux volumes dressent, au fil des années, un inventaire poétique et surprenant du monde et des connaissances, et qui conservent d'étranges similitudes avec les tentatives d'ordonnancement imaginées dans les premiers cabinets de curiosité. C'est dans ce même courant d'idée que le projet de musée imaginaire prend sa source, conçu par Malraux, basé sur la faci"]alité de reproduction des photographies. C'est, bien sûr, également dans cette catégorie que l'on peut inscrire tout ce que l'on range actuellement sous l'étiquette à la mode de « cybermusée ». Le principe du cybermusée, qu'il soit structuré de manière scientifique ou qu'il propose un parcours erratique, repose avant tout sur une base de données constituée d'images rassemblées en grand nombre.

**Quel patrimoine immatériel ?**

L'importance réservée à la réserve d'images traduit la préoccupation de collectionner (et de visualiser) bien plus que les seuls objets matériels. Si Quiccheberg prend soin de consacrer une inscription aux instruments de musique ou une autre pour les instruments de jeu, il sait qu'il ne rassemble dans ces catégories que la seule partie tangible d'un univers plus vaste et complexe. C'est dans cette perspective que les images (qui sont ici envisagées par le médecin anversois non comme œuvres d'art mais comme supports visuels) s'attachent à refléter une réalité moins tangible ; Quiccheberg inscrit dans sa classification d'images des rubriques pour les danses et les fêtes, les plaisanteries et les obscénités, les partitions musicales, les aventures des dieux, etc. Le souci de collecte et de documentation du réel dépasse donc, dans ce premier traité de muséologie, la frontière des seuls objets matériels. Si le musée constitue le réceptacle de l'univers, tous les moyens devront être mis en œuvre pour constituer un thésaurus aussi complet que possible. Il ne semble pas trop présomptueux de déduire que si d'autres moyens que les images peintes ou gravées avaient existé en 1565 pour visualiser l'intangible, Quiccheberg les aurait introduits dans le classement de son musée. En ce sens, on peut inférer que tous les moyens susceptibles de dresser l'image la plus complète de l'univers, en ce compris les images numériques (dites virtuelles), les sons ou les odeurs, participent de plein droit au projet du musée, et peuvent constituer des musées à part entière.

Si l'immatériel, par le biais de tous les moyens qui lui sont propres pour se manifester, occupe une place importante au sein du projet muséal, la question de sa transmission semble, pour Quiccheberg, à la fois simple et complexe. Simple, elle l'est parce qu'il paraît évident, pour l'auteur des Inscriptions, que tout ne peut être conservé : le vivant ou le règne de l'organique est promis à une dégradation (à une transformation) inéluctable dont le savant ne se soucie guère. L'écrit et l'image en préserveront les traces. Complex, car face à cette certitude, Quiccheberg paraît encore se référer à l'art de la mémoire – ou au travail en atelier – qui passe par l'homme pour conserver la connaissance. Une mnémonique qui prend en compte l'étendue des connaissances – objets mais aussi gestes immatériels – et transite par l'objet ou l'image, avant de s'inscrire pour un temps dans le cerveau. Patrimoine immatériel s'il en est ! Ce recours à l'humain pour assurer la préservation sera, au fur et à mesure du développement de la technologie muséale moderne, progressivement efficacé au profit de la conservation des objets eux-mêmes. Ironie du sort, une partie du patrimoine immatériel, existant dans le fonctionnement même du musée, a ainsi disparu au profit de technologies et de procédures impliquant moins l'humain.

La notion de patrimoine immatériel, telle qu'elle ressort de sa confrontation avec le traité de Quiccheberg, traduit peut-être quelques-uns des plus importants dilemmes auxquels nous sommes confrontés aujourd'hui. Si l'immatériel joue un rôle prépondérant au musée – tant du point de vue de l'étude que de la transmission vers les publics – sa conservation partielle passe par le transfert sur un autre support (papier, enregistrement, etc.), mais sa préservation totale ne se produit que par le recours à l'intervention humaine, engendrant un processus de création continue. C'est cette intervention qui, notamment par le biais de l'art de la mémoire, du travail en atelier ou de toute autre technique de transmission, induit chez Quiccheberg une certaine
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légèreté dans le rapport qu’entretient l’homme avec les objets. La focalisation sur les objets matériels inverse le processus, amenant la crispation de ce rapport et, en corollaire, la disparition inéluctable d’un patrimoine seulement transmissible par la chaîne des générations humaines.
Museology and intangible Heritage –
the Museum is the Message

Lynn Maranda – Canada

Messages are recognized in accordance with the structure (medium) in which they are conveyed. Marshall McLuhan’s phrase, “the medium is the message” holds true for the museum as it does for any other form of communication. In the museological world, the museum itself is the message. In a didactic sense, the museum presents its message in a manner commensurate to its ‘museumness’ and by which it can be recognized by its consuming publics. Over time, the museum has developed its own culture – one of collecting, preserving, documenting, interpreting and this has become its recognized hallmark of operation.

Historically, this evolution has occurred with the natural ambition of institutions to assemble objects for showcasing as a form of enlightenment for a curious public and this endeavour has been successful. There has developed, however, an unintended division between those cultures which are cataloguing and preserving and those which are supplying the materials for inclusion. This division is such that it has created distinct sets of ethos: one which pays allegiance to taxonomy, preservation and display; the other which creates objects for use and social context. By this interpretation, it is seen that the museum is the product of a particular intellectual society, mostly Western in stature, which has acquired objects of other societies for their own uses whether they be for showcasing or as items of intellectual property. In other words, the museum is ‘our’ institution whereas the objects housed in its confines are mostly from ‘other’ cultures and having been institutionalized, we assume, they become intellectual property of ‘our’ culture.

To interpret these remarks in terms of the thesis, from its inception, museums own (tangible) objects which have been collected because they are deemed to be treasures, both intellectual and monetary. As such, the museum’s initial mandate, therefore, is as a storehouse of things of value to be preserved in order to convey important information to present and future generations. The acquisition, preservation, documentation and display of valued objects is the premise on which museums are founded. This is the museum’s primary role to society and how it is perceived by those it seeks to serve. How these tasks are accomplished vary from one institution to the other, but in the most fundamental sense, the categories of endeavour remain the same and are no different than what they have always been.

Recently, the museum community has been edging towards embracing an expanded mandate which would see the acquisition and preservation of intangibles. This would suggest that the museum is now debating the issue because there is, like the diminished realms of exploration and ‘discovery’, a diminishing supply of prime physical objects, and is, out of necessity, compelled to seek secondary level materials to fill the void. Or perhaps it is an alternative route in an attempt to meet or counteract the ever increasing assaults museums are experiencing in the face of the growing repatriation aspirations of national and indigenous populations. This latter issue has caused an angst in the museum community which has, in the extreme, cautioned museums about collecting anything at all.

With the advent of educational and other types of programming aimed at enlivening the interpretive function of the museum, the museum moved to balance its object-centric preoccupation to one inclusive of the visitor. Nevertheless, museum objects remained pivotal to such presentations, whether either as the focus of or as the inspiration for tangential subject matter. Regardless of the extent to which museums have gone to revitalize their often static and forbidding image, the notion and purpose of the museum is still and foremost the object. So too, museums have reconfigured objects placed on exhibition to communicate different aspects and associations of cultural, historical, or scientific reality. The act of interpretation, however, is a closely tied relationship to the object and the information it can impart.
Museums have focused on the object – the tangible products of human existence to preserve the culture and historical inheritance of humankind. Through all of the processes which comprise the museum culture, intangibles have been created. As these processes are repeated over and over again, they have become part of the record created by activity and have thus worked their way into an intangible heritage that is extant in museum institutions.

While museums have become aware of intangible realms of knowledge, they still act in accordance with their fundamental reflex by finding ways and means to convert intangibles into tangible objects. Museums are now looking for other ways to solidify the social aspects not only of objects, but also of cultures by bringing them into their realm of knowledge to showcase. This requires that the museum goes beyond the recording of information which either accompanies acquired objects or is assembled through the process of research. Other forms of intangible heritage are now sought and obtained outside of that which is already associated with objects. On what basis this should proceed, and whether this is just a product of museum-centric thought or commensurate with or relevant to the wants of others, especially those from whom the information comes, are important issues which need to be addressed.

The ‘bring ‘em back alive’ era is long over. The physical items deemed by museums as ‘truly representative’ of a culture which museums themselves have been guilty of locking into a fixed point in ‘times passed’, are fast disappearing as are the cultures that have created them. This has contributed to a sense of necessity to preserve other aspect of cultures which are still extant or which reside in the memories of still living ‘witnesses’ or ‘culture keepers’. Thus, there are valid reasons to preserve other aspects of cultures that have created the tangible items. There is also the responsive fear that something is going from the cultural milieu and the resultant desire to contain it for posterity.

The paradox of preserving something that was once fluid and alive, is that by encapsulating it, its viability is ultimately terminated. This is most evident when addressing the issue of oral traditions. The cultural value of this tradition is that is ‘oral’. How can an oral tradition be written down and not be changed in so doing? If, however, oral traditions were alive and strong, there would be no need and thus no compulsion to record them. The fact that there is a move to record oral traditions would indicate that they are already either fast disappearing or entirely dead. In any case, the act of recording oral traditions spells its death knell. Under such circumstances, it is no longer an ‘oral’ tradition, and this essential aspect of indigenous cultures is destroyed.

These are important ethical issues. Is it acceptable for the museum, a creation of ‘our’ society, to constantly want the products of another? How would the museum, which is already under scrutiny and criticism for having been a party to the removal and housing of other peoples’ patrimony, justify this new imposition into indigenous cultural spheres? Is this really in the realm of preservation or more closely aligned to interference or appropriation? While many cultures may well approve museum initiatives to preserve their intangible heritage, there are those which would be vehemently opposed to such an intrusion.

Of course, as museum-cultured people, we feel compelled to acquire the intangible, feeling or believing that the greater benefit for mankind is to be found in the preservation of such materials – this we do not think is in doubt – and yet, cultures constantly changing is a natural progression along the continuum. Why then interrupt this to preserve intangibilities when the recording of intangibles is a form of translation which converts the temporal quality of a phenomenon into a tangible quantity which can be stored for reference or other use. The point being that an intangible, by its very nature, cannot be itself stored, but that only a tangible record, video-audio-schematic-verbal record which, having been captured, immediately freezes, as it were, the vitality of the contextual tangents and cultural purposes of the intangible events.

While it can be argued that the need to preserve an intangible is most keenly noticed when culture has waned and its ability to produce tangible objects would be lost forever, there remains, however, another area which museums should consider an important source of object acquisition because, if nothing else, it is certainly representative of the cultural continuum. In many cultures, the production of objects which museums would consider ‘tourist’ pieces are a significant indicator of cultural innovation, individuality, and resistance to cultural fusion in a
changing world, a world McLuhan has referred to as “the global village”. While some of these objects may appear to be of ‘assembly line’ quality, many are works of art and fetch a considerable price in the marketplace. In the 21st century, are such pieces any less valid as products of cultural expression?

To reiterate the premise that the museum is an institution founded upon principles of collecting physical objects, the tangible stuff of culture, and as it is moving towards the collection of what is perceived to be ‘intangible’ phenomenon, it is, in reality creating translations of these phenomenon from their ethereal intangible status into records with physical tangible qualities. The consequence of making such a record is that though the intent is to preserve something which is diminishing, the consequence is that the phenomenon is being capsulated and removed from the vitality of its primal existence. With that conclusion, the museum continues in its quest to house, categorize and display ‘other’ cultural materials using technologically superior methods of keeping record. Captain James Cook’s illustrator, John Webber, returned to England with a visual account of a great voyage to the Pacific, and such renderings held great intellectual and educational interest among Europeans. The resultant engravings, however, were for a folio media to inform through print and not to capture the social activities of peoples to be preserved in the archives of a museum.

Cultures change and the museum’s culture is not exempt. It is to be expected that as the social context of museums evolve in new directions and find new meanings of existence, the museum should seek to re-establish its contact with its society. The museum instinctively knows that its mandate is to collect physical property, unlike a theatre which is mandated for performance, and sensing that its prime sources of acquisition have been exploited and drained of its resource and that these areas of collection have also undergone dramatic cultural changes, the museum seeks to import new ideas into its confines and jurisdiction and has become concerned with what are intangible phenomenon and thereby converting their existence into tangible forms of record.
Museum has become a global metaphor of culture. It is a depository of material memory and something else. Nonobject activity of a man is, perhaps, one of the most projective museological realias, demonstrating that there are no such things as a final, an end. As a matter of fact, death for a museum will not be the end, but the beginning.

Every person has an imaginary museum inside, a museum with no walls. Such a collective museum is a certain country “Doukhoboriya”, inhabited by people, inspired by their archaic oral culture, which was not written on paper, but was passed over for almost three centuries, from mouth to mouth, from generation to generation. All this time they were composing psalms about their dramatic existence, immortalizing thus the memory about themselves, preserving their history and culture. Psalms of the doukhobors became a “contemporaneous concord” of life, a fruit of their collective creativity, a memory about themselves. Thus they encroached upon the most precious – memory – God’s prerogative power.

The doukhobors movement is a sort peasant, protestant, dissident movement, which appeared in the XVIII century, and which had its own concept of insight of the world, based on pacifism. The doukhobors fate was a simple one: they were persecuted by the Czarist government and sent to Tauria and the Caucasus. L.N. Tolstoy knew many of them. He was attracted by their pacifist pathos. That is why he even helped them move to Canada, having donated for that purpose his royalty for the novel “Resurrection”.

Many years have passed since then, and just at the end of the XX century, there opened an exhibition “People of the XXV century” in L.N. Tolstoy museum-estate “Yasnaya Polyana” (curator N. Nikitina). The name of the exhibition was not a random choice: Lev Tolstoy used to call the doukhobors “the people of the XXV century”. The exposition space held a huge world – spiritual and physical: books, paintings, memorias, welfare items, photos of traditional doukhobors rites (bread baking, ploughing without a horse) and shots of their final departure from Russia. It not by chance that this exhibition was shown in Yasnaya Polyana in particular: Lev Tolstoy took a direct part in the tragic fate of the people that were in disgrace. Moreover, the writer’s name became inseparably connected with the doukhobors. They had many things in common: “communal” view on farm keeping that did not involve private property; rejection of the official church and military duty, and, of course, wonderful chanting of these simple hardworking people. Tolstoy could not remain indifferent to their archaic oral culture, which was reflected in capacious psalms that were addressed mainly to God, the world and man. It is not accidental that the most attractive, live “exhibit” of that exhibition was the doukhobors themselves – the performers of psalms. It is them, who became the emotional dominant of this action. Singing women were dressed in bright clothes with white kerchiefs on their heads. The traditional doukhobors vests and aprons were decorated with motley bands symbolizing a long journey. They performed psalms a capella in a strange language that not everyone could understand. It was difficult to grasp the meaning of these verses. It seemed that here, in Yasnaya Polyana, in the center of Russia, the strangers were not the doukhobors, who had come here, but we, their listeners, and we were from different time periods. It looked as if they were envoys of a different epoch – either past of future. While listening to them it occurred to me that, at times, each of us is more attracted by the future than the past. But here was a paradoxical phenomenon: all of us fell in love with the past and submerging in fascination into the lexical world of their ancestors.

1 L.N.Tolstoy. Complete works in 90 volumes. V.71. Page 316.
There were two realities at the same time at the exhibition “The people of the XXV century” – the past and the future. This was the main intrigue of the exposition. Why did Lev Tolstoy call the doukhobors, most of whom could not even write, “the people of the XXV century”? Perhaps, because they were recording their history in an unusual way, by passing it from mouth to mouth, ignoring some material nature of writing? Collective creativity preserved ontological foundations of their life: journeys of the doukhobors about vast expanses of Russia, the flight of their spirit. That was one of the ways to immortalize their distinctive character, their “version” of the environment. The secluded style of life of the doukhobors gave rise to a special perception of the world, a special type of archaic culture. Their distinctiveness revealed itself in a original manner of singing – a plangent singing of words, with mouths almost closed. All this was imposed the doukhobors wish not to be understood by strangers, those, who could destroy their secluded communal mode of life that demanded some kind of “encapsulation”. The unusual manner of singing turned over usual logics, producing a strong effect.

The doukhobors psalms are a sort “cocktail” of folklore styles, religions, and cumulative memory. They are the very mystery, hidden from strangers eyes. Verses, passed from generation to generation orally, embodied the “connection” of times, becoming a large Book of life, without pages and without an end. A naive oral creative work of the doukhobors – an ideal model of intangible heritage that can be called “Pre-culture”¹, presented in a triumphant eternity of existence.

The plots of the doukhobors’ psalms are very varied. They are about seeing off young men that go to serve in the army, about two Lazaruses, King David’s incest, taken from the Old Testament, etc. Their genre is many-sided – from dogmatic to lyrical. Some of them are read aloud, but most of them are, of course, sung. A soloist’s voice is supported by a harmonious choir. It should be mentioned that the singing of psalms requires that the performer should have a certain talent. Free rhythmic creates the sensation of hovering resembling a flight of a crane. The doukhobors singing is solemn, without any haste and deep. It is not accidental that there are such words in one of the psalms: “The God created, first of all, singing”. Creative activity became for the doukhobors a “decoration” of their soul, protection from any evil, penetration into the origins of their existence, the insurance of wisdom. But the most important achievement was durability of the traditions, the refusal from which would deprive the doukhobors of the main meaning of their existence. It is the preservation of the traditions, their kind of “museufication” that promoted the formation of ancestor worship. Archaic culture eliminated conflicts between the fathers and the sons. For the children inherited the answers to their existential questions, by means of psalms, which were passed from mouth to mouth and taught to see the meaning of life, participate in a cosmic game between life and death. The semantics of these psalms appeared top be almost global – to fit well into the circulation of time and “fly about” it organically. The anachronism of the doukhobors culture is, to the present day, moving relentlessly around a circle, like a hand of a clock on the face of Time. Therefore, listening to the songs of the doukhobors in Yasnaya Polyana, the visitors of the museum as if relapsed in a state of eternity, leafing their Book of Fates, a certain token of eternity where all people are authors and contemporaries. The cultural space of the doukhobors psalms unites the past and the present, conquering history and enclosing the time and leaving the listener some free space for co-creative work. Thus, the doukhobors art is not a instant hat has been stopped, but the one that has been extended.

The doukhobors creative work gave them a chance to live a normal life in an unusual way. That queerness was also felt by the people listening to the psalms, as they turned out to be on the territory of their creativity and felt themselves “swimmers” in the river of Time.

In 1909 the creative work of the doukhobors was museuficated and collected in «Living book”, which embraced a lot of psalms. Nevertheless, one cannot say that we may quit the creative folklore activity of the doukhobors: there should be further collection and description of their psalms that came into being during the XX century.

Une proposition pour l’art contemporain :
le musée de projets

Maria Pugliese – Italy

Art contemporain : un système en pleine expansion

Les années quatre-vingt-dix ont été marquées par une expansion manifeste du système de l’Art contemporain, expansion dont témoignent le nombre de nouvelles biennales d’Art (Melbourne, Johannesburg, Taiwan, etc.) et le désir du monde des affaires de lier son image à des partenariats dans ce domaine, de l’inauguration au niveau international de nouveaux musées, de galeries d’art et d’espaces consacrés à l’Art. Ce phénomène s’accompagne de la conception et de la réalisation de nouveaux musées ainsi que de la conversion de zones industrielles délaissées en espaces d’exposition. L’intérêt pour l’Art contemporain se manifeste également au niveau muséologique, à travers des études portant sur les diverses façons d’associer les œuvres entre elles. Elles reconnaissent, aujourd’hui, la nécessité de présenter les collections par thèmes et non plus suivant l’ordre chronologique propre à la lecture moderniste du vingtième siècle.

Traditionnellement, le rôle du musée est d’acheter, de conserver, et de faire connaître le patrimoine historique et culturel de l’humanité. Pourtant, définir en quoi consiste ce patrimoine dans le temps présent, sans les garde-fous de la distance historique et de la critique, pose des problèmes au niveau des choix. L’Art contemporain se situe de plus en plus sous le signe de l’interdisciplinarité, de la “connivence” entre des domaines d’expression différents et d’une relation étroite avec le monde de la communication.

La dématérialisation

La dématérialisation, dont Lucy Lippard et John Chandler ont énoncé les théories à la fin des années soixante, voit l’art en tant que concept et en tant qu’action. Dans un cas comme dans l’autre, l’objet perd son aura traditionnelle et c’est l’aspect reproductible de l’œuvre qui prévaut. La réalisation, d’ailleurs, est souvent déléguée à des tiers qui travaillent sur la base d’un projet. Pensons aux peintures murales de Sol Lewitt et David Tremlett, tout comme aux néons de Dan Flavin ou aux installations de jeunes artistes comme Gregor Schneider et Thomas Hirschhorn ou, encore, aux œuvres éphémères de Cornelia Parker et Cai Guo-Qiang.

L’usage exagéré de la technique vidéo, dans les projections ou dans les installations, de même que les nombreux projets artistiques en réseau, montre à quel point la présence objectuelle est absente d’une grande partie de la production contemporaine. La présentation d’une œuvre de Gary Hill ou de Doug Aitken se résume, la plupart du temps, par une division précise des espaces et par l’utilisation d’un projecteur à fibres optiques et d’un certain type d’écran. C’est-à-dire que la seule chose qui se conserve est le disque vidéo.

L’importance accordée à la performance en tant que moyen expressif, souvent confiée à des tiers (pensons au fakir de Maurizio Cattelan ou aux extra-communautaires de Santiago Serra) en est un autre exemple. L’artiste vend le projet bien défini de la performance qui, une fois qu’il fait partie des collections, pourra être reproduit à nouveau sur demande.

La projection d’œuvres in situ s’apparente, elle aussi, souvent à cette tendance et les œuvres conçues pour un espace précis peuvent être documentées, déplacées et reproduites.
Un musée de projets réalisables…

La caractéristique principale de la collection du musée de projets pourrait donc être de se limiter à acheter de simples projets réalisables et reproductibles suivant les instructions précises de l’artiste, chaque fois que cela s’avère nécessaire, en fonction des expositions prévues et du renouvellement de l’accrochage.


L’archivage et la documentation se substituent, en fait, à l’existence matérielle de l’œuvre, mais la possibilité de pouvoir effectuer des répliques du projet devra obligatoirement être réglementée de manière très détaillée par un contrat protégeant à la fois l’œuvre, l’artiste et le musée. Il existe, d’ailleurs, une très vaste littérature sur le problème épineux de la désinstallation et de la réinstallation des œuvres ainsi que sur la protection des œuvres entrées dans les musées et exposées suivant des critères antithétiques par rapport à l’époque de leur création, où l’on s’aperçoit que, souvent, l’histoire, les instances de l’œuvre et les intentions de l’artiste ne sont pas respectées.

Et pas réalisables…

En outre, la conservation des projets non réalisés ou non réalisables pour diverses raisons, constitue un patrimoine important qu’il convient de protéger en tant que témoignage des processus créatifs et de l’histoire de l’Art : Hans Ulrich Obrist et Guy Tortosa, dans la préface à l’une de leurs publications où ils présentent 107 projets d’artistes jamais réalisés, insistent sur la nécessité de conserver ce patrimoine en se demandant d’ailleurs pourquoi, à la différence de ce qui se passe pour les projets architecturaux, on ne s’intéresse pas à la documentation des projets artistiques. En Italie, par exemple, il existe un centre d’archives, le CSAC de Parme, qui, depuis les années quatre-vingt, comprend un département consacré aux projets de différents type. Il conserve un million de projets d’architecture et de design, 800 maquettes et des archives de mode renfermant 70 000 dessins de vêtements ainsi que des collections. Il manque, par contre, un espace muséographique consacré à la conservation et à la documentation des projets d’Art contemporain.

Au niveau muséologique, le fait de collectionner des projets devant être réalisés ou non réduirait de beaucoup les frais de gestion des dépôts et cela permettrait de résoudre le problème épineux de la conservation de l’Art contemporain : le matériel en papier, les photos ou les maquettes d’œuvres non réalisables seraient conservés et exposés suivant les paramètres requis tandis que les œuvres réalisables seraient reconstruites ex novo à chaque fois, la seule exigence étant de stocker les parties difficiles à se procurer (par exemple un certain type de téléviseur ou de néon).

Quant au problème des acquisitions, si, comme nous l’avons déjà dit, le fait de faire entrer au musée le présent constitue un défi non exempt de risques, acheter un projet est déjà plus simple par rapport aux coûts de transport et de gestion du patrimoine. C’est aussi moins coûteux au niveau de sa conservation (les dépôts des musées débordent d’œuvres dites “ mineures ” et la conservation des projets les moins intéressants ne coûte rien…).

Un musée sans œuvres ? La production contre l’accumulation

Il est évident que la dématérialisation n’épuise pas tout le domaine expressif de l’Art contemporain et de nombreux artistes seraient donc exclus dans un musée consacré uniquement aux projets. Il va de soi que tout choix, de quelque type que ce soit, de même que
l'orientation donnée aux collections entraînerait des exclusions. A l'inverse, une partie du budget du musée de projets, grâce à d'évidentes réductions sur les coûts de dépôt, de conservation et de restauration, pourrait être employée à la production d'œuvres inédites.

En effet, en réalisant de nouvelles œuvres, ce musée conserverait son rôle crucial de promoteur de la culture contemporaine, sans exclure pour autant les formes d'expression liées à l'objet. Le musée investirait sur le présent en produisant des œuvres de genres variés (peintures, sculptures, installations ou performances) dont l'importance serait reconnue par la recherche actuelle.

Cette démarche pourrait, éventuellement, se traduire par des acquisitions soit pour le musée de projets, dans le cas d'œuvres en syntonie avec le concept à la base de sa création. Par la suite, on pourrait également, à travers les œuvres non achetées, reconnaître l'activité promotionnelle du musée par le biais de la courtesy de la légende de l'œuvre.

Un patrimoine d'idées et sa gestion

Comme nous l'avons déjà dit, la gestion d'un patrimoine constitué de projets est, d'une part, beaucoup plus aisée et elle induit, d'autre part, une réduction des coûts au niveau des assurances, du gardiennage, des dépôts et de la conservation des œuvres. Par ailleurs, La réduction des coûts, par rapport à ceux inhérents à la gestion d'un patrimoine traditionnel, sera due à l'archivage du matériel en papier ou sur support informatique des projets et à la réalisation ex novo des œuvres et de leur déplacement. En effet, étant donné la nature du patrimoine qui devra être catalogué et documenté de manière irréprochable et tout aussi bien reproduit et présenté, le musée devra disposer d'un personnel compétent en mesure de s'occuper de ces différentes tâches.

Dans le domaine du prêt des œuvres, la gestion sera, ici aussi, notablement avantagée du point de vue pratique. Le prêt se traduira par la disponibilité à autoriser la réalisation temporaire des œuvres selon les critères prévus et sous le contrôle du personnel du musée. Il n'y aura aucun frais de transport et, en aucun cas, les œuvres ne risquent d'être endommagées par les déplacements ou les changements de climat. Il ne sera pas non plus nécessaire de contracter des assurances.

MUSÉE DE PROJETS

Projets ------------------------------- installations
installations multimédias
projections vidéo
peintures murales
art en réseau
performances

Documentation et archivage ------------------ projets réalisables et irréalisables

Expositions ------------------------------- préparation des projets
hébergement d'expositions
production d'œuvres inédites
sélections d'œuvres sur le présent

Gestion du patrimoine ----------------------- élimination des coûts de restauration
diminution des frais de transport
diminution des frais d'assurances
flexibilité des espaces d'exposition et des dépôts
posibilité de consulter les projets en réseau
At the entrance of villages inside South Korea long poles of wood can be seen, topped by beautiful sculptures of birds. Delicate and fragile, they reign over the landscape, as if in a brief rest that could be at any moment interrupted, to proceed in an eternal flight towards unreachable spaces. Those are the sotdae – messenger images which take to the gods the vows of peace and prosperity of the Korean peasants. Erected at the beginning of each year amidst ceremonial rites, they also protect against evil and help peasants keep in synchrony with their deepest wishes and expectations.

The birds are an unquestionably strong representation of the intangible, and the sotdae birds, an elegant metaphor of the deepest wish of all human beings: the guarantee of a prosperous and pacific life. No image can better and more beautifully represent the projection of the human will towards something that is still out of reach, waiting somewhere beyond now – in the future. Apparently fragile, the bird is able to project itself into space, controlling matter and movement in different trajectories on the air, a fundamentally intangible medium; when in flight, its very body is simultaneously essence and movement, a very special mixture which can be only apprehended at a distance.

It is not by chance that the sotdae have been chosen as the official symbol of the 20th International Conference of Museums, the first one to be organized in Asia. And the theme ‘Museums and the Intangible Cultural Heritage’ is a perfect background to the analysis of the deep intellectual, psychological and spiritual landscapes of the several cultures and traditions that will be present in South Korea. This time, we museum professionals will be challenged with the task of working with the intangible fundament of culture, leaving on second plan its material expressions. The Conference recognizes and legitimates the communicational character of heritage, opening our minds towards the realities of culture as a mediation process, which includes objects and places ‘as spaces of manifestation of human beings and their ideas’; and of cultural heritage, as the set of integrated processes of invention, diffusion, acculturation and retrieval of experiences. It reaffirms the present tendency of the world organizations in the fields
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of culture and development, to give special emphasis to the intangible, as a strategy for the reassignment of cultural difference – under the belief that understanding diversity will certainly contribute to the advent of an era of peace and social development. Such effort in reconciling differences reveals a universalistic tendency in trying to find solutions for social crises, building a global society that is harmonious and pacific – thus realizing the belief in a world of goodness and justice, where community life is thoroughly possible.

The attention of present societies is thus focused in the domain of ethics: we are still reaching for models of social practice where each one can be recognized and respected by his/her own value. There would lie the importance of heritage: in its quality of symbolic complex founded on the continuity of cultural manifestations, built over values that are essential to the existence of societies. This is also the essence of ethics, 'the community effort on the continuity of life and of the human group on the terms of the desire of their founding principles'\(^1\) – a movement that implies the existence of common values, which defense reassures the continuity of different cultures. The idea of heritage could be used as a strategy to measure the possibilities of survival – or redesign – of an ethical conscience in our contemporary society, so overwhelmed by the rationality of technique and by the omnipotence of the markets. It would be possible to understand and treat ethics not as a result, but as a (pre)condition\(^2\), from which relationships develop.

Sociocultural analysis is today being oriented towards the recognition of the importance of everyday life knowledge and practices. This positive emphasis on intangible symbolic exchange is taken as basis for the establishment of politics of cooperation, at world level. The discourse of the world organizations calls attention to the 'unifying aspects of cultures\(^3\)' and to the improvement of information interchange, to promote the recognition of the plural nature of heritage. The debate on the theme is based on three central questions: a) the social implications of cultural heritage and the necessity of acceptance of differences; b) the amplification and diffusion of the concept of heritage; and c) the importance of heritage to the information society. This implies considering the 'patrimonial' aspect of communication: for both communication and information are viewed today as capital (symbolic capital) – and consequently, may be treated as heritage.

The tendency to understand the communication media as instruments of the cultural industries could lead to the conclusion that all cultural production must be subordinated to the laws of economy. But information cannot be treated as a merchandise or product, given its character of permanence: although transformed, all information remains as such, through all the processes in which it takes place. To imagine information as a rentable asset is thus a risk or a clear mistake. So, it is necessary to review the ethic parameters linked to the production and/or re-signification of symbolic assets perceived as ‘heritage’. And it is vital to recognize and understand the role of the contemporary ‘agoras’: local and regional discussion forums; transnational organisms; and also the Internet. The recognition of a new ethos will allow that the new interfaces between communication, heritage and development gain the proper shape to meet the physical, mental and emotional necessities of the different social groups, in a better and more just way – at least, in a way less marked by social injustice. Research on Humanities has proven that what has been considered up to the present as ‘heritage’ is a formidable significant complex, constituted by dominant ideologies. Today, we know that it is impossible to guarantee sustainability without facing the convergences and divergences between global knowledge – which identify every social group as a component of a ‘contemporary humanity’ – and local knowledge, where the fundamental identities of each social group are defined. And this cannot be done without honestly and openly facing alterity: it is imperative to review the concepts of knowledge and information and to put under quest the perception that all reason, knowledge and truth come from the experience recognized as ‘the occident’.

The importance, to heritage, of local and traditional knowledge must be thoroughly investigated – not as exoticism, but as a cultural pattern as important as literature. This is the difference to be made with reference to the 20\(^{th}\) century: the design of a new geography of cultural
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transmission, that gives rise to new forms of being and of living in this planet – recovering relational aspects from folklore and tradition. Although knowledge, capital and political power do not depend predominantly, today, on territorial grounds, it is still in the territory that culture develops; and human work still develops on a determined physical space. Not all social relations occur in the so called virtual space, mediated by the media or by new technologies. But the amazing capacity of articulation and generation of signs of the virtual media must also be recognized. New communication technologies have been provoking a return of human society to the domain of orality\(^1\), leaving on second plan the cultural universe based on relations founded on writing (values over which Modernity was founded). It is imperative, though, to identify the possibilities of existence of a heritage that is constituted and operates in the virtual environment, in permanent re-actualization. It is equally relevant to recognize heritages as nomadic structures of representation\(^2\) and as a powerful instance of mediation, specially in what refer to the new technologies.

Local, regional and virtual media are different experiences of spatiality which have constituted, through time, the idea of presence – an idea that is at the base of the perception of heritage. But heritage is also perceived through the affection and feelings which are part of our physiological, psychological, sensorial and emotional universe: that which museum theory recognizes as 'the inner museum' or 'the inner heritage'.

Such a wide concept of heritage will lead to the understanding that not everything is realized, today, by way of the capital: it is still possible to believe in spontaneity as a fundamental movement for the development of societal values and processes. Heritage may be operated as a powerful dispositive to help promoting the encounter with alterity, thus diminishing the immense guilt generated by the many episodes of 'abomination of the Other', enacted by contemporary societies: explicit ones, such as armed conflicts, terrorism, narcotraffic, neo-Nazism, fundamentalisms and global epidemics; or subliminal ones, such as the social blindness that makes us immune to neocolonialism and to the pathetic vision of social exclusion. As a compensatory mechanism, the idea of heritage would help reminding that, after all, we have another face – a truly humanized face, which allows a creative relationship with the world. It could also offer some answers to the compulsive tendency of contemporary societies to consume themselves in consumption; or in getting disconnected from reality, in an attempt to escape indetermination, contingency and exaggeration (demasia).

Thinking of ethics as a pre-condition opens up the question of collective responsibility and brings into light some delicate questions. First, it must be remembered that the insertion of heritage as a privileged concept in the field of culture does not necessarily signify that this concept is being totally apprehended – or understood. The study of the symbolic dispositives by which new heritages are being constituted demonstrates that the idea of heritage may be used in a distorted way, generating more conflicts than synchrony. This becomes clear in the actual interfaces between heritage and identity, which not always take into account the fluid and elusive character of these two manifestations, giving way to wrong mechanisms of apprehension and interpretation of reality. Examples of such distortion are the overexposure of heritage in the media; or the treatment of heritage references as spectacle – either as magnificent scenery (natural or historic monuments; huge promotional exhibitions) or exotic ritual (immaterial manifestations). In both cases, heritage may be used as illustration – a strategy that drains out the conflicts, substituting \textit{homo belicus} by \textit{homo faber}, or \textit{homo aestheticus}.

The second question refers to the apprehension of heritage: heritage does not exist as a separate entity or pre-existent reality, but results from a very special mode of apprehension of reality – which, in contemporary times, may be operated by means of different strategies of capture. One of the mistakes of contemporary knowledge is to imagine that the technologies of information will be able to encompass the formidable plurality of manifestations inscribed today under the sign of ‘heritage’. And even if it was possible to create the Great Data Bank of Human Cultural Production, a ‘memory of the world’ operating as the contemporary ‘double’ of the tower

\(^1\) Here meaning the domain of speech.
\(^2\) An example is the project No’mad – European Foundation for Heritage Skills (FEMP), developed within UNESCO – an international project that promotes vivencial experiences among youngsters, through voyages and heritage, aiming at building a new perception of ‘European’ citizenship. Available at www.unesco.org
of Babel; even then, the true essence of heritage could not be captured: not the intangible, complex, delicate and elusive perceptual thread inscribed in the ways and forms by which culture is manifested. The articulation of meanings around the strategies of capture of heritage remains, thus, as compensatory mechanisms. New technologies can apprehend heritage as a flux, but they cannot do it in plenitude: thus, what becomes apparent, more than the essence of heritage (fundament), is the movement (process) through which such meanings articulate.

The virtual environment masks the complexity of cultural manifestations, specially those linked to material culture. It also gives an incomplete idea of the intangible character of heritage – now taken in a simplified way, as a product of the media. Acting over each individual’s desiring machine, the virtual landscape may present references of heritage as powerful instances of seduction, covering their true essence, only possible to apprehend by means of affection. The result is the emphasis on narcissistic relations of individuals with themselves and with the products of their culture. Heritage is used, tough, as new type of distorting mirror, where contemporary societies reflect themselves under idealized forms – as has already happened, during Modernity, with art and the museum. A new example of substitutive mechanism develops: if, to the industrial society, the narcissistic mirror was the object (or the monument), to the information society it may be the intangible heritage – presented as enunciative mode of the new forms of living with alterity and tradition.

It must be remembered that the potential of the networks does not really constitute a potency: they are nothing else but a mechanism, a mechanical artifice which simulates in a seductive way the new relational dimensions dreamed by techno-science (or by philosophy). And, even if around and because of them a new semiosis and a new set of practices and behaviors are being developed, the core of the question is the cultural id. A critical view to this dynamics will help understanding the real possibilities and limits of the interfaces between heritage and the nets, making clear that, anxious to ‘tame’ the potency of the fluxes through method, a new form of ‘demasia’ has arisen: the hyperbolic proliferation of signs nominated as ‘patrimonial’. Plurality is being taken for complexity – and repetition for difference.

The advent of cyberspace as a new field for sociocultural interfaces has given way to the belief in the flourishing of a ‘new culture’, theoretically based in ‘ethics’ and ‘democracy’. But the possibility of putting into practice a techno-democracy is already under quest: the new techniques are becoming more and more co-opted by the hegemonic structures. We must not forget that technique is neither an ontological construction or an effective trans-historical entity: it must be understood as micro politics in acts, which true agents are individuals situated in time and space, with all their complex network of feelings and behaviors. Technique would be precisely the set of material dispositives and objects exchanged among such individuals, with all the consequent deviations and transformations; although it is taken as a non-human actor, in the universe of strategies and mechanisms of gathering, interaction and repulsion human beings still play the leading role. And even Lévy, who some years ago has foreseen the idea of the cyberspace as a new instance of existence for Humanity, admits now that the Net will not be accessible to all, considering the different technical and cultural horizons from where societies speak.

But if the Net does not solve the questions of ethics or democracy, it can be thought of as a mechanism which introduces new ways of apprehending the world. Its experience has taught us how to perceive reality as an hypertext or ryzhome, reorganizing our world visions in non-linear form, starting from multiplicity – and establishing differences between the world scripts elaborated by different societies, throughout history. We know today that, from cave inscriptions to the multiple folds of informatics interface, our reading of reality has been somehow subordinated to the nature and characteristics of each support of information – and to the possibilities they have to offer significance, through series of sequential meanings. Yes, we can read the world in many ways: and the virtual experience teaches us to understand things not as pre-given texts, but as elements from which it will be possible to establish a series of different scriptures. This ‘metamorphosis of reading’, known today as ‘navigation’, will allow different pathways of exploration, from the world within ourselves to everyday life experience.

Thus, the new experiences of approach to identities will develop in multiplicity. We must remember that identity does not constitute a pre-given instance, and that ego and alter are not
manifestations that come ready and finished, ‘to be connected by an attractive nexus’ – on the contrary, they are dynamic instances of elaboration identity, in permanent mediation. In what refers to heritage, this means that it is necessary to de-centralize the looks and the narratives, recovering cultural experiences that have been put in second plan by Modernity: simple and/or traditional societies; urban tribes; hybrid cultural spaces, such as the Near East, Andalusia, Latin America; autochthonous societies; and even the everyday experiences of common people. Yet these must be seen not as ‘ethnic’, but as Other – as in the Other in ourselves. So, before naming those experiences as ‘heritage’, we must wait until they are identified as such, by the subjects therein involved. The ethics of heritage ignores, as possibility, the nomination of references from outside the experience. It must be remembered that heritage is made of times and spaces very specific of each culture – and that assigned values are linked to complex mechanisms of subjectivity. Thus, the search for a more pacific and prosperous life would reside not in the accumulation and consumption of tangible goods, but in the valuation of immaterial assets linked to the fundamental desires of the human beings, such as security, peace and self-recognition.

In the process of constitution (or renovation) of heritages, the great risk is to apprehend heritage references in a reduced form, as a mere figure of language, in which case they would waste their senses in the act of enunciation (discourse); or under the form of mechanisms of seduction (appearance), in which case they would soften, through showing, the precision of sense. This is what happens in the cooptation of heritage by the media or by the cultural industries, as in tourism – where heritage is used as an illusional perspective. It is thus necessary to apprehend heritage not as discourse – a movement that wears out in the act of enunciation – but as narrative, a movement which describes in continuity, through different forms of language, the different interfaces between the humane and their worlds: textual and pictured language; poetic language; scenic language; the language of the object.

But it is also necessary to apprehend heritage beyond language, towards the different perceptual worlds which configure the universe of the imaginary. Philosophy teaches us that not all that is absent (from Logos) lacks essence; and not all which invades the field of presence is truly present: it may be mere appearance. The return of the extra-ordinary as alternative (not necessarily the wonder, but that which exists beyond commonness and the logic order of things) would reinstate the possibility of thinking reality by way of ritual, dreams and sentiments, making possible to understand heritage as a mode of unveiling culture in its Self. Such mechanism of elaboration of cultural practices may install and legitimate what truly identifies human beings: the imaginant capacity (cause and consequence of memory) and its organized expression – the Logos. Such capacity is proper of the individual, but expresses itself essentially inside the shared world that we call ‘society’.

All this implies a review in the relationships between heritage and community: past the experience of the ‘salvationist idealism’ in which some communities were expected to have absolute power to arbitrate over their heritage, we come to a point of balance where it is fundamental to consider: a) the limits of action in the relationship communities-heritage; b) the reports made by those communities about their own experiences; c) virtual communities, as new and true instance of sociocultural representation. May heritage be seen, though, not as a mode of apprehension of the past or ‘spectacularization’ of the present, but as an alternative of acting the human capacity of sharing (communion of interests and sense, in difference) – which, after all, is also the most legitimate fundament of communication. Heritage must also be seen as a dispositive of reinforcement of ‘the strategic practices of promotion or maintenance of the social links’, defined not only by machines but precisely by their opposite: the interactive forms of communication. Which may even include the mediatic activity, though not wearing itself in it: because what is in the base of heritage is not the set of logic nexus, but interpersonal relationships (relations between affections).

Understanding heritage as a manifestation of the creative genius of the humane, expressed in everyday life through forms which evidence sharing – from ritual and tradition to the movements of capture and disposal of experiences by means of the nets – will make possible to perceive that the dynamics of giving and retaining is at the base of the adaptive capacity which allows the
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2 Ibid., In Op. Cit, p. 234.
survival of the humane. This is the source of the experience of constitution of heritages: the possibility of acting, within cultural production, the experience of democracy as a vivencial experience of everyday life. It may be expressed not only in the political movements between governments and communities, as in local open museums and ecomuseums, but also in the opening of spaces for the manifestation of commonness, in its essence (as in some virtual museums – of which the Museum of the Individual1, in Brazil, is a good example).

The analysis of the ways through which instituted heritage becomes present in the cyberspace reveals the incidence of a normative (and somewhat simplifying) discourse which keeps the receiver at the surface of happenings, pushing away the essential truth of heritage as manifestation. The same happens with scenically treated heritage, which enunciation (or showing) may generate contemplative reactions that push aside the spirit of the observer from social realities, kept behind the show. Heritage may thus appear as a deformative mirror. But it may also be operated as a dispositive which facilitates the relationships between the humane and nature, culture, technique, identity and solidarity: after all, looking at a mirror is a form of self-knowledge… In this case, heritage could also be ‘a conductive thread to sense’ 2, helping the walk through complexity and indetermination, conducing and giving meaning to our symbolic territories and enabling us to trace an existential map compatible with our realities – like geodesic lines, that conduct and give meaning to the occupation of geographic territories. Tradition could also offer indicators and alternatives, relinking the humane to what is fundamental and true in culture: the complementary relationship between the imaginary and its manifestations in the realm of conduct.

Finally, it is necessary to recognize the deontological limits of the world organizations dealing with culture and heritage (including the natural environment), understanding their essentially bureaucratic and normative nature, which is put into practice through diplomatic action – thus, tending towards conciliation. To imagine that world agencies are, or will ever become, fighting arenas is a serious mistake. Yet they should, and must, become spaces for the exercise of the complex and difficult art of cohabitation among the different, not only in the field of ideas, but also in what refers to language: in those agencies, discourse and hearing acts become political acts by excellence – they refine the capacity of saying things, as well as the art of listening.

Agencies such as UNESCO, ICOM and IUCN act in a significant way in the identification and nomination of new heritages, giving them diplomatic and legal legitimacy, as well as visibility in the world forum. They also contribute to the diffusion of new perceptions and new discourses about heritage, objectifying heritage references as symbols of new social relations. It is through them that societies may apprehend that what lies in the genesis of new heritages is life – movement, flux, processes – an idea which breaks the determinism of monumentality, proposing a new interpretive plan of reality. The concept of ‘new heritages’ values diversity and the contradictions that lie at the base of social processes, breaking the consensus established around the paradigm of conservation of tangible references: heritage is no more about knowing how and why material assets are conserved, but about ‘apprehending the social functions of memories, within the metamorphoses of societies3.

This process includes the concept of live heritage 4 – which refers to the perception of the importance of establishing some form of contact with the everyday flux of transformation of the constitutive traits of experiences, named or recognized as ‘heritage experiences’. Here, the communities and social groups are the enunciators of heritage themselves; and the concept of loss, base of the whole rhetoric of heritage of Modernity, is now substituted by the perception of transformation as a value. We can thus accept cultural change as part of reality – no more as a menace, but as a constitutive element of cultural fluxes. In this sense, the constitution of new heritages may be understood as a product of complex mechanisms of negotiation: in what refers to the traditional and/or local communities, such dynamics will occur by means of the articulation, in everyday routine, of the most varied instances, from the official agents to voluntary action, including the presence of the Church, the media and of other agents of civil society. This is the dispositive that moves the institution of the references of the total heritage,

---

1 Museu da Pessoa – São Paulo, Brazil.
2 Ibid, ibidem, p. 223.
4 Living heritage, ou patrimoine vivant.
among which are the cities-monument and the Ecomuseums. In those cases, it is up to the local articulators to establish to which extent they will accept the inclusion of exogenous influences.

As for virtual heritage, their institution will happen through the articulation between the humane and the machine, through mechanisms of capture and unraveling of experience, as information. Here, the navigator will identify him/herself as a constitutive element of heritage – since each access to hypertext is, in reality, a virtual construction. It is also possible to participate of such universe creating, at individual or group level, the information while it is made available, by means of text, image, sound or movement.

There is a third mode of institution of heritages, proper of present times: the recognition, as World Heritage, of intangible cultural references. In this case, a prevailing role in the process is played by UNESCO, to where initiatives of identification, nomination, protection and diffusion of world heritage converge. The theme has such a relevance that the year of 2002 was named The International Year of Heritage. The intervention of UNESCO allows a permanent debate around the theme of heritages and the values through which heritage references are recognized and legitimated, not only on the official level but among small communities as well. It also renders to heritage the statute of question in the realm of political science, international law and diplomacy – recognizing the importance and the role to be filled not only by the agents which create and give continuity to those experiences, but also by the receptive agents. The notion of ‘public’ is here substituted by the idea of receptor as the one who receives the legacy of heritage: on a first instance, the communities identified as such – from traditional societies to the new urban tribes; from the communities in the cyberspace to the globalized society; and as a consequence, new generations – present and future.

This is where the true ethics of heritage becomes effective: in the projective dimension, where cultural references gain the dimension of a legacy. In what refers to the intangible, it is necessary to analyze if and how those references subsist – since it is in the sphere still called ‘the present’ that the cultural traits that will be passed on as heritage gain form and continuity. We could even question, in the movements of international organizations, which are the intentions and the hidden agendas lying under the acts of officialization of heritages: since every preservation movement also implies the shedding of remains, attention must be given to what is left to oblivion. Contemporary ethics does not recommend the institution, from above, of pre-designed patrimonial frameworks (characteristic of Modernity): it is imperative that such movements come from the bases, by means of spontaneous dispositives of legitimation. May the constitution of heritage be not only the result of official choices, but the reinforcement of our tentatives of leaving, to the future generations, some indicators of what we are, in spontaneity and diversity – as clues that will enable them to ‘discover’ and interpret us in a more complete way.

This mechanism has been influencing the identification and the tentative of protection of the intangible traditional manifestations – specially those which exist in the realm of orality. Important local initiatives are on the move, such as the project, by the Amazonic Museum in Venezuela, of incorporating indigenous music to the curricular design of the State of Amazon, as a strategy of multicultural education – thus giving special emphasis to this millenary tradition, part of the magic universe of the peoples in the region or the project ‘Plays and games’.

---

2 The memory of oblivion, or memory of silence, constitute today a fundamental element of heritage ethics, giving rise to debates about emblematic situations, such as the ‘re-reading’ of Nazi concentration camps.
3 The indigenous cense, realized in 1992 by OCEI and published in 1995, informs the existence of around 50.000 Indians, almost half of the population of the Venezuelan State of Amazon. They represent different ethnic groups, with different languages and cultures, with predominance of the Yanomami. Of such contingent, 80% are in high degree of acculturation, having lost an important part of their cultural values. It must be remembered that, in the magic-religious universe of South-American indians, singing is inseparable from belief. Among the Piaroa there are shamanic songs, which come from the gods and amplify, in the singer and in the audience, the knowledge of the universe; curative songs, enunciated to fight diseases; and evocative songs, which remind mythological events. All of them are recited in ancient languages, with metaphorical structure and specific vocabulary, only dominated by the elder (the wiser) – leading to the perception that singing is a social privilege and a conquest. The Yanomami songs refer either to hunting and gathering or to details of social life – such as invitations to visits, news and congratulations. Singing is thus a natural manifestation of the sentiments, something that enlarges the communicative power of interpersonal relationships. There are also profane songs, related to bird singing. The insertion of Indian music in the universe of
developed in the region of Campinas, São Paulo State, Brazil. National and regional initiatives are also important – such as the Virtual University, a project established in Kenya, with funds from the World Bank. This is the main ethical duty of UNESCO and other world organizations: to detect where such experiences exist and give them room to develop.

It is in the domain of the imaginary, of creation and of affection that heritage gains meaning. This is its true essence – the creative potency which identifies the existence of the humane. Heritage is, though, as a bird: it only exists in liberty and spontaneity. It may be apprehended in form, through the register of its movements and sounds; but having it in our hands does not make us owners of its potency of flight – its true nature. More wise would be to make as our Korean fellows: to erect, over the complex thread of everyday life, precise poles of recognition, safe platforms where such potency may be kept for a brief moment. By doing so, we can perceive and take knowledge of its presence – letting it reconcile us with the infinite worlds which exist in and outside ourselves. And then, we will let it go free – to survive in movement, designing shapes which are only apparently tangible, but which are intangible in essence.
Lebanese Museology and the Responsibility towards Society

Lina Tahan – Lebanon

Introduction

Like most academic disciplines, archaeology has generated, as well as become the subject of, numerous debates and controversies. Despite attempts to achieve objectivity and neutral scientific rigor, the discipline has inevitably become embroiled in politics, financial concerns, and human emotions. Operating within the heritage management and the museum environment, archaeology becomes particularly vulnerable as it is in this realm that the profession most visibly takes on the mantle of public service, preservation for posterity, and interpretation of the past. Ideas concerning the nature of the past and the artefacts it left us are diversifying, and discourse about the past, both academic and popular, is increasing. Unfortunately, as is often the case, the initial human reaction to such an atmosphere of emerging or newfound diversity is one of mistrust and conflict. In Lebanon, a pervasive malaise has thus settled among the archaeologist community, museum professionals and the general public as the struggle unfolds to correctly understand and handle the diversity of opinions and ideas concerning the past. As stated by Bray (1996: 441), the “ [...] past remains a crucially important and deeply contested myth and reality [...] ,” with archaeology caught in the centre of the debate, “[...] legitimately subject to criticism on the level of ‘values,’ not just ‘facts.’”

The interest in archaeological museums is fairly recent and in some parts of the world, such as Lebanon, archaeological museums have been affected by the recent Western developments. “The national and racial discourses of the nineteenth century established a self-evident and ‘natural’ tie among identity, history and territory” (Olsen, 2001: 50). The museum becomes a fixed cultural space where the present frameworks of identities are shaped. The challenge lies when we reconsider the idea of colonial legacy and its impact on Lebanese archaeological museums. This involves questioning the meaning and social values of the past and makes us challenge why colonialism should be re-addressed and re-assessed in modern society in order to make museums ethically responsible.

The museum becomes a space where constant demand for reform is needed (Bennett, 1995: 90). At the same time, the most important accentuations have remained the same throughout time and place and this is due to the political constituencies which have been caught up within the museum space; the discourse of reform which initiated these demands has remained relatively the same over the last century. This discourse of reform should be characterised by two principles: first the principle that states that museums should be accessible and equally open to all members of the public, and second that it should represent adequately the cultures and values of different sections of the public (Ibid.). This is not the case of Lebanon, where adequacy is not practised and not all archaeological periods are given the same weight; hence, we fall into the trap of not being socially and ethically responsible towards the public and in many ways this is due because of the colonial influences that have infiltrated Lebanon. There are no definite narratives present in the Lebanese museum space and the content of the displays remain traditional in that they carry an embedded view of how the past was perceived by the French. This is not to refer to the technical methods of display, which are very modern.

Ethnic and religious conflicts: the social nature of the problem

Once questions about how, with what and to whom museums should make links, are recognised, it becomes obvious that the focus of the museum in Lebanon has to shift from collection to communication. Museums should stop being storehouses of objects and turn into active learning environments for people (Hooper-Greenhill, 1994: 1). The problem with
Lebanese Museums is that they have never been popular\(^1\). The need for marketing a museum lies in its management process, which confirms the museum’s mission and makes it responsible for the efficient identification, anticipation and satisfaction of the needs of its users (Lewis, 1991: 26). This is what is missing in Lebanese archaeological museums. It is through museums that an ‘inclusive history’ of Lebanon could be achieved, where various people of different religious backgrounds can include their voice(s) towards their understanding of the past. There has never been a ‘National History of Lebanon’ accepted as such by all Lebanese (Naccache, 1998: 147). Such a history cannot be achieved by presenting conflicting views of the past, but by presenting one ‘inclusive history’.

While neglecting more than a millennium of the Muslim past, the emphasis that the Maronite\(^2\) Christians in Lebanon have given to ‘Phoenician’ links, allocating supreme importance to this ancient era, exacerbates sectarian antagonisms and politicides archaeology (Seeden, 1990: 146). The ‘Phoenician/Arab rift’ has torn Lebanese society apart and has imploded under the pressure of regional factors. This rift is the Lebanese model of the ‘ethnic’ doctrine that has ruined the country in the last part of the previous century (Naccache, 1998: 146). The so-called ‘Phoenician/Christian’ past has always been represented in museums and the exclusive focus on this period has been detrimental to the archaeology of Lebanon’s ‘Arab’ and Islamic past (Seeden, 1990: 146). There is a contrast between ‘Phoenician’ and Christian. Despite this, the ‘Phoenician’ pagan past and Christian monotheism were sublimed to constitute an imagined ancestry. For the sake of the other communities, how can Muslim Lebanese develop an interest in a ‘national’ past that excludes their cultural tangible and intangible heritage? As a consequence, Islamic fundamentalist ideology is, in turn, generally dismissive of archaeology altogether. These dogmatically exclusive ideologies have uncritically been accepted by many in the respective local communities (ibid.).

The body of Lebanese laws reflects the sectarianism of Lebanese society. The executive, legislative and judiciary powers, along with the public offices are assigned to people according to religious sects. Sectarianism is present in the Lebanese Constitution and in governmental and some ordinary employment. As museums reflect societies and communities, Lebanese museological narratives mirror this sectarianism. The ‘Phoenician/Arab’ ancestries have always been in an acute phase, and are recognised as the main ailment of the Lebanese body politic (Mourad, 2003). This leaves us to wonder whether the archaeological museums in Lebanon could play a very important role, since different concepts of ancestries are the background to the representation of heritage. Does Lebanese society demand an ‘inclusive history’? How should an ‘inclusive history’ be constructed, taking into account the Lebanese archaeological past?

Lebanese Museums today are making little effort to display the Islamic period. The problem is that the period is ill-studied in Lebanon. According to the curator of the NMB, there are not many archaeological artefacts that can represent this period (S. Hakimian, pers. com. 1999); according to other sources within the Directorate General of Antiquities (DGA) there are Islamic artefacts in storage (A. Seif, pers. com. 2000). Upon my last visit to Tripoli’s crusader fortress, I saw many Islamic stelae at the entrance of the site. These could have been placed within the lapidary section of the ground floor of the NMB to illustrate the Islamic period. Nevertheless, curators tried to remedy this problem in one regional museum, the Baalbek Museum, where Islamic art is exhibited through inscriptions, architecture of mosques, ceramics and texts, and illustrations that explain the art in detail (Farchackh, 1999: 10). It must be noted, that at the time of its excavation, Baalbek was an ‘Islamic’ site and had a Medieval citadel. Yet, when German archaeologists came to excavate it in 1898, they destroyed the Islamic layer, though they recorded it fully, in order to uncover the classical remains (T. O. Mourad, pers. com. 2003).

Indeed, the fact that archaeological museums were initiated by the French and the American missionaries and that the colonial legacies of the French and Western ideas were still influential

\(^1\) A visitors’ survey was conducted in 2002 at the National Museum of Beirut and the American University of Beirut Archaeological Museum. It showed that very few Lebanese visit their museums. The only Lebanese visitors are students and their teachers.

\(^2\) The Maronite religious denomination refers to the ‘Oriental’ Catholic Church and community present mainly in Lebanon. In 1510 the Maronites were officially recognised by Pope Leo X. as an Oriental Christian Group of special historical standing (Salibi 1988: 72).
in the conception of the recently founded museums did not at all erase this ‘cultural imperialism.’ Christian Lebanese considered France as a ‘Mother Nation’ or ‘Puissance Protectrice,’ whereas the Muslims associated themselves with the other Arab nations as ‘protectors.’ The French were the ones who initiated research in ‘Phoenician archaeology.’ These ideas appealed to the Maronite intellectual elites of the Oriental Faculty of the Saint Joseph University and were re-adapted in order to associate them with a ‘Phoenician’ ancestry. This discourse as we have seen was perpetuated later on by many other Christian Lebanese to suit their own ideological needs and fragment the Lebanese society; it became a colonial residue and is still present among Lebanese museums’ narratives. The responsibility of the curators in nowadays museums needs to be urgently reviewed and the ‘voices’ of what was the Muslim minority prior to the Lebanese Civil War, became a Muslim majority in nowadays Lebanese post-Civil War society. Hence this past needs to be given more weight within the museum exhibits. While conducting a visitors’ survey at the NMB, visitors were asked whether they thought that the Islamic period was satisfactorily represented in their national museum, 72% of the 79 Lebanese visitors responded ‘no’ (NMB visitors’ survey, 2002, Q12). One should bear in mind that most of those Lebanese visitors seem to be pupils or university students along with their teachers and professors. Hence one can speculate whether the majority of the Lebanese public do not visit museums. Perhaps the local Lebanese communities are not as interested with their past as the Lebanese elites who use it as a symbol of prestige, a symbol of political power and control over a national heritage that should belong to all Lebanese regardless of religious sects or social backgrounds.

Museums are known to be institutions that collect, conserve, preserve, document, register, research and classify the material culture of ‘others,’ but they should be concerned mainly with the construction of representations in the present. Despite the number of case studies, some of the general effects of representations have not been addressed fully, such as the colonial legacy and its impacts on post-colonial museums. As Merriman (2000: 302) has argued the archaeological museums are facing a "crisis of representations." Museums produce knowledge and this has been widely accepted and recognised by various critical museologists (Hooper-Greenhill, 1992: 192 and 2000: 3; Macdonald, 1996: 7). However, how they amplify meaning(s) and what these meanings consist of, is not made clear. It is certain that for the case of Lebanese museums, artefacts will play an active role in their ability to create and re-create meanings and are actors in situations of conflicts. The creation of meaning in the Lebanese museum space should be challenged as it is a very complex and continually unfolding process.

The museum, it has been noted, is probably the main institutional connection between archaeology as a profession and a discipline, and wider society (Shanks and Tilley, 1992: 68). In Lebanon, the museum is an institution, like schools and information and communication networks, represent the dominant ideology and through which the Lebanese state authority is controlled and propagated. In this respect, Lebanese museums are susceptible to ideological manipulation. What they present about the past or how they tell their 'story' is never neutral; rather, it may give us insights into concepts or attitudes towards this past, otherwise invisible. Displays, in particular, are a mode of interpretation which may consciously try to disseminate an ideological message or may implicitly reflect an ideological system, through certain display elements or structures. In this way, displays become an entirely new ideological artefact, an ideological statement which requires analysis in its own right (cf. Pearce 1992: 136-43). It follows from this that displays are part of the present social and cultural practices which inevitably have a political or ideological character. It is important to bear in mind that the display procedure always involves selection and that selection is always culturally a selection of artefacts to be included in an exhibition display, and is guided by criteria derived from the political ideology of the curators who, in turn, are conditioned by the specific ideological orientation of their time, environment and society. One may further comment that, if selection is a first act of ‘appropriation’, in an extended sense, then display is a second one because, as Baxandall (1991: 34) clearly puts it, "it is not possible to exhibit objects without putting a construction upon them." One thus comes to recognise why displays are not a reflection of the

2 What is meant by the term ‘appropriation’ is a cultural appropriation of knowledge and power, western and other, inclusion and exclusion, identity and difference.
past, but of aspects of the present; they are an act of persuasion intended at spreading a particular view of the past and so, by implication, a particular view of the present. Pearce (1990: 158) interestingly remarks that "because exhibitions have to be intelligible to the visitors in the most basic sense, they tend to take a comfortable choice from the range of contemporary options." But, in this way, "they usually end up preserving stereotyped ideas about the past, and confirming a particular political view of the nature of the present."

This is a point of paramount importance for any discussion of archaeological museums, displays and interpretation because, as widely acknowledged among contemporary museologists and archaeologists, there is no such thing as a monolithic, universal and undifferentiated past; rather, concepts of the past change according to ethnic, cultural and gender political orientations (Shanks and Tilley 1992: 11; Sørensen, 1999; Olsen, 2001; Kreps, 2003). Thus, the past has no fixed meaning; rather, meanings are always temporarily constituted (Shanks and Tilley 1992: 20). "The museum object – selected, displayed and interpreted – has an extra layer added, fixing it within textual information and/or a guided interpretation or experience. The object in the museum is never 'pure,' unaffected by intentions. It is being spoken for at many levels, and it becomes imbued with meaning" (Sørensen, 1999: 136).

So, if one accepts the fact that displays are not so much a representation of the past, as they are a reflection of their own time and culture, an analysis of display form and content could expose invisible facets of ideology as well as the kind of meaning(s) generated by them (Tilley, 1990: 333). Such an analysis seems reasonable if one considers that contemporary thinkers, like Foucault (1966 and 1969), have reminded us that the manner in which statements are elaborated is as important as their propositional content (Tilley, 1990: 333). During the last three decades or so museums have increasingly become challenged institutions, where the representation of cultural variation, and the ways in which we perceive ourselves is played out (Kaplan, 1994). As audiences become more varied, as notions about 'culture' become more complex, and as museums around the world achieve a higher profile, so issues about the 'appropriation' and 'repatriation' of culture become more acute (Simpson, 1996).

Museums around the world have 'appropriated' culture(s) in many ways. All of our collections in Lebanon were made with political agendas – albeit unconscious ones – in mind, and all bear the indelible marks of the contexts from which they arose, once one chooses to look for them. Exhibitions cannot fail to give a particular point(s) of view, and all offer an interesting tool for investigation. Curatorial practice, in all its aspects, is embedded in past and contemporary social practice, with all that implies. Museums have an ethical responsibility to try and understand more clearly what messages they are giving and how these are received by their visiting public (Pearce, 1994: 1).

Final Thoughts

Archaeology as a discipline is an on-going dialogue between past and present, mediated by many groups, of individuals and institutions. Inevitably, it becomes political and ideological. The knowledge it generates does not comprise a body of detached subject matter to be transmitted and learnt. It is and always will be a form of individual and cultural experience, which is continuously being changed and modelled (Tilley 1989: 106).

The role of the twenty-first century museum in Lebanon should be to enhance an 'archaeology of contact', not of conflict. Because of the fragmentation of the various Lebanese communities, we need to represent their various cultures through time. Several different publics exist side by side, and each one views the past according to its own perceptions. Lebanon's past can live only if it makes a contribution to the present as a continuity of experience connected with life today.

To conclude, one can say, "[...] more often than not museums are replete with decontextualised objects lacking a consideration of both contexts and historical processes" (Walsh, 1992: 163). Perhaps the ideal museum would be what Walsh suggested, the 'ecomuseum', which "integrates archaeology, social history, natural history, ecology, in fact any discipline which contributes to the understanding of peoples and places" (Walsh, 1992: 162). The most
important point for Lebanon, however, is that its people come to terms with the historical processes that have affected their land. They should become aware of the elements which were likely to have been instrumental in forming their identity. The museum can help in that by externalising these elements and allowing the people to interact with them; it allows them to become consciously and actively aware of the processes that shape and are shaped by articulations of identities. Museums must be the point where the seemingly immutable past and the in-the-present-making-future meet: they can tell us about the past, the multifaceted, ever-changing past, while inviting people to decide with them what that past should be.
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The Paradigm of Cosmogenesis and Eschotology in the mythopoetical Heritage of the Siberian Peoples

Olga Truevtseva – Russian Federation

The swift and accelerating development of the planet civilization leaves no opportunity for the functioning of the ethnic cultural traditions in those nooks of the planet, where the people have been reproducing the stereotypes of their mode of life and entity, developed before civilized period, for centuries.

The historians of culture, ethnographists, archaeologists, museologists realize the threat of loss of the smallest minorities’ spiritual values, tracing to the global cultures and having archaic character. The reconstruction of the extinct cultures’ fragments, especially their outlook integrity, is the problem for the ethnographist, archaeologist as well as for the specialist in folklore. There is an obvious necessity of the specific museum preservation not only of the material objects, but also of the spiritual culture, if they have the status of sacred values.

The museum folklore keeping means the written fixation of the most fundamental epic codes, mythological texts, magic verbal formulae, versions of apocryphal mythic creation and etc.

The subjects about the birth and fall of the world are of great importance among these questions. Their significance is obvious because of some causes: the comparative analysis of the similar texts allows to determine for the earthly men the general idea on the life’s beginning, to understand the connections between the global and naive cultures and etc.

The idea of recurrence of the universe development, represented in the myth poetical tradition of the Turkic Siberian peoples, in the capacity of the general sign, supposes the situation of temporary stopping of the habitual man’s existence. The coincidence of Universe cycles is analogous to the biological recurrence of the man’s life and other natural objects. But this analogy is not the only reason for the appearance of cosmogonical and eschatological myths and their folklore versions. The historical memory of ethnos designs in the artistically – figurative version the most dramatic moments of its existence, where the moments of world’s birth and fall are the most important “points of tension”.

The inspiration of origin as well as the tragedy of end is perceived as one episode in the infinite whole, where the death is an inevitable stage to the new existence, and birth is the first step to death. Moreover, the Altai and Yakut heroic epos contains the signs of archaic beliefs, which are being read through the layers of the latest stratifications. If you try to turn the plot back, the sequence of eschatology elements will reproduce the picture of the world’s birth: the living water is thickening, all the indispensable components of existence are polarizing, the oppositional pairs are uniting, concentrating around the sacred center. The endless great number of derivatives is being generated; the new world began his movement in the striving for the triumph of the new life. The eschatological version presents the disappearance of the land under the water, annulling plurality at the expense of the united one. The fire is an analogue to the water in the plots, describing the world’s death.

The archaic philosophical and mythological systems unite the elements of water and fire. So “Rigveda” calls Agni (God of Fire) as “born in the water”. The tradition of amalgamation of these elements is characteristic not only of the myth, but also of the folklore, i.e. the water and fire are considered to be the different sides of one substance. The mythological logic united not united, from the logical point of view, phenomena, explaining the endless chain of the earthly and cosmic transformations this way: the death of one thing leads to the birth of the other one, which is opposed in the shape and characteristics. In the Altai and Yakut folklore the border between the peoples’ world and monsters’ world is the fiery sea, where the horse – hair serves as a bridge. The worlds are separated and united simultaneously, and this border is very relative. Its
relative character assumes the possibility of the penetration of destructive elements into the middle world, built according to the divine direction and intended for the man.

The presence of the border between the worlds in three – layered Universe is taken into account by the shaman mysteries, showing ritual shaman’s visit of the underworld, overcoming of all the dangers and reaching the North Star, where the intermediary between the supreme deity and man lives. Such scheme of journey embodies a number of complicated ideas: firstly, the idea of ephemerality between the worlds; secondly, the idea of the victory over the doubtful temptations of the lower world (which is formal in the myth and literal in epos); thirdly, the idea of principle not destruction of the life in its basic forms (death is fraught with a birth, birth leads to death). The third idea, in my opinion, means the principle correlation of the concepts and phenomena “upper part” and “bottom”, their polysemy.

The category of the opposition «existence – non-existence» is presented in mythical poetics of these peoples as the category of “shown existence” and “non-existence”. The similar situation is evident in the mythological Egyptian plots (the myth about Osiris and the corresponding mystery present both a calendar cycle and finding the dead Pharaoh in Osiris’s status in the way of semantic plan). As for the mythological Greek tradition, the plots about Demetra and Persephone, Aphrodite and Adonis, Ishtar and Areskigal, Ishtar and Dumuzi, going back to Shumero – Babylonian oppositions, illustrate the polysemy of the categories “life”, “death” as “existence” and “non-existence”.

The Altai and Yakut epos shows the plot frame of this myths’ category, preserving all the necessary peculiarities of the mythological plots. So, “Maadai Kara” epos includes not only the story about Kogyudei Mergen, descending to Erlik’s world, but the associative information about such chance. The hero’s name speaks for itself: Kogyudei means “good shot”, Mergen is “a grey (blue) dog”. The second name concerns she-wolf, the Ashin’s original mother, whose underground nature allows the descendant to accustom to the lower world’s mysteries. The first name clears from the epic context, “a living red arrow” (a repeating epithet) is undoubtedly not only the peculiarity of the epic poetics, but it is also the semantic sign of the heroic attribution. The hero of the Yakut epos Yuryunh Uolan with his attribute “a living arrow” is depicted in the similar way. Yuryung Uolan as Kogyudei Mergen can overcome the borders between the worlds, confirming the idea of interpenetration of the constructive and destructive, for the earthy existence, elements, which are interpreted in the divine context as the neutral elements. In the archaic mythologies, cosmogenesis is considered the point of the world’s recreation in the circle of eternal existence after the death of the former world. The moment of the circle’s completion is the moment of the new turn; it stimulates the birth of the new God’s generation (such theogonic generations are characteristic not only of Egypt, Greece, Mesopotamia, but also of the Slav world, of the Siberian peoples, speaking the Mongolian language). The affirmation of the new one is the sequence of the victory over the former one, that is the concept “chaos” for the myth and “the world of the dead people” for epos, includes not only the amorphous feature, but also an underground monster. Taking into account these views of cosmogenesis and eschatology on the whole, it is recognized that some “primary substance” existed in not existed world. The world was being undergone a modification, and Gods gave those shapes to the substance, which were intelligible to the new generations.

The presented paradigm of cosmogenesis and eschatology in the mythical poetics of the Turkic peoples of Siberia is the variant of reconstruction so far as sacred archaic information has been already stated in written form. There is still some doubt; it is our point of view on birth and death of the world, presented by shamans, wise men, and narrators. Collecting out of folklore, preservation of the texts, as museum exhibits become gradually a conscious documentation of the past, a basis for scientific research and for pleasure.
Reflection on Intangible Heritage

Hildegard Vieregg – Germany

Museology and Typology of the Intangible Cultural and Natural Heritage. Challenges to Museums in the Future.

Intangible Heritage is defined as “the practices, representations, expressions, as well as the knowledge and skills, that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognise as part of their cultural heritage. It is sometimes called living cultural heritage, and is manifested inter alia in oral traditions and expressions including language as a vehicle of the intangible cultural heritage; performing arts; social practices, rituals and festive events; knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe; traditional craftsmanship.”


Starting from the 32nd Convention of UNESCO General Conference in October 2003 in Paris/France, from symposia and publications of different Committees of International Council of Museums (ICOM/UNESCO) – concerning topics of “Intangible Heritage” as well as “Shanghai Charter” – the terminology and the role of Museology shall be examined. Furthermore the responsibility of museums in regard to conservation and preservation of the cultural and natural intangible heritage has to be considered in the context of globalisation.

This contribution is dealing with the following main points:

Firstly, the Summary of papers represented in ICOFOM Study Series 2000
This summary signifying general ideas and a classification of the articles in ICOM Study Series 2000 concerning the topic “Museology and the Intangible Heritage”, that were an important step for preparing the theme “Museums and Intangible Heritage” for ICOM General Conference 2004, shall be carried out.

Secondly, Intangible Heritage, Proclamations of Masterpieces by UNESCO and the Role of Museology

Thirdly, “Positive” and “Negative” Intangible Heritage

Fourthly, Challenges to Museums and Museology in the Future

1 Summary of Papers Represented in ICOFOM Study Series 2000

The publication “Museology and the Intangible Heritage”/”Muséologie et le Patrimoine Immateriel”/”Museologia y Patrimonio Intangible”/”Museologie und das immaterielle Erbe” was intended to prepare the ICOFOM Annual Meeting 2000 that took place in Munich/Germany and Brno/Czech Republic. The goal of the publication was to introduce into the various kinds philosophy of museologists from different parts of the world and to discuss the statements in the
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course of the Meeting. The authors were attending various topics in the interrelationship between Museology, the tangible and the intangible heritage. The papers represent in a scientific way on the one hand cultural identity and diversity and on the other hand cultural approach. In the context of museology questions concerning inspiration, spiritual and cultural heritage, the eventuality of a cyber-world, the association between musealisation and visualisation as well as modes of the philosophy in different countries and regions arose.

Additional articles were treating with museums of particular importance concerning the heritage in contrast to the traditional museum. An up-to-date facet was put by a contribution related to dialogue between museum and school concerning history, art and culture, nature and techniques.

Several authors emphasised particularly on the contemporary approach. They tried on the one hand to define the interrelationship between intangible heritage and contemporary art, on the other hand possible methods of treatment concerning both "depressing heritage" – relics of the totalitarian past in 20th century – and the remembrance-culture of our society.

The general topic "Museology and the Intangible Heritage" discussed in those articles was represented by museologists from Argentina, Australia, Bénin, Brazil, China, Germany, France, India, Canada, Croatia and in the publication respectively on the occasion of the Meeting with participants of other countries, too, as Burkina Faso, Finland, Congo, Lagos, Lithuania, Norway, Russian Federation, Sweden, Switzerland, Slovakia, Czech Republic, Venezuela.

2 “Intangible Heritage”, Masterpieces of UNESCO and the Role of Museology

In this concern shall be pointed out in what extent intangible/immaterial heritage is closely connected to tangible heritage, as well as traditions of communities (festive events), economic traditions (traditional craft, skills), national customs – as e.g. in correlation with objects, artefacts, instruments, performances, cultural spaces. In this context ethnological museums and “Museums of World Cultures” play, on my view, a particularly important role because they are to be seen in the context of an international evaluation.

Individual and common, cultural, social and creative forms of expression – independent from any physical form as e.g. language, literature, oral tradition, dance, songs and non-written music, but also the knowledge of long-established practices – shape a particular group.

Symbolic and metaphorical meanings of objects are to be discussed. Those are making up the “tangible heritage” as e.g. its outward appearance, size and importance as cultural assets. In this context is to focus on the important function of museums particularly concerning the acquisition and conservation of those objects, whose scientific interpretation in a historical context and an adequate presentation. Additionally, formal principles, exemplary in regard to exhibitions and the symbolic messages to the visitors shall be mentioned.

In this sphere for example also theatre-museums play an important role because they are represents of the stage and other kinds of performing arts. They are focusing on performances which take place on a certain place, at a certain time and in each case with other visitors. Therefore they are connected to a unique power of statement, nevertheless concerning “tangible” heritage as e.g. the place of events, theatre-costumes, requisites of various kind. What remains from a performance to the visitors is only remembrance of immaterial and intangible nature.

This examination is corresponding from this reason with an adequate context as of new “theories of heritage”, immaterial, aesthetic and ethic values, virtual “reality”, creativity, immaterial heritage and communities, the spiritual heritage, the interdependence between musealisation and visualisation, qualities of art and contemporary methods for art-interpretation, the relationship with the “negative” and indelible heritage of twentieth century as well as the commemorative culture of our society at present.

Each type of museum shows in a very impressive way how the “interactivity” on the one hand between objects as “tangible” and qualities as “intangible” are running.
Vieregg: Reflection on Intangible Heritage

Shanghai Charter

Anyway, ‘Shanghai Charter’ is a very good framework clearing up the importance of creativity, the adaptability of peoples, localities and communities as frame-conditions concerning ethical and everlasting values, traditions, languages, oral history and the various ways of life. Shanghai Charter was drawn up after the 7th Regional Assembly of the Asia Pacific Organisation/ICOM (October 20-25, 2002 in Shanghai/China), refers also to “Museums, Intangible Heritage an Globalisation”. It describes in fourteen paragraphs the most important “contents” and responsibilities of Museums and Museologists in regard to “intangible heritage” related to Asia Pacific Regions. It also focuses on the significance of “intangible heritage” defined in the preamble, and moreover gives practical advice and tips for using and carrying out the various possibilities in order to safeguard the heritage. Shanghai Charter is both a model and a structure – exemplary for other regions of the world, too.

Definitions according to “Thesaurus Museologicus”

Anyway, typology and categorisation of the intangible heritage should be discussed. This is particularly interesting in regard to the “Thesaurus Museologicus” (definitions) elaborated as a specific project of ICOFOM since several years – by the expert André Devallées (Paris/France). In this concern different criteria are involved and classified by museological points of view. They are – in each case – respectively clarified by examples of museums of various typology that are relevant for the conservation of the intangible heritage and its process of development. In this concern the statement of André Devalleés, Honorary President and Permanent Adviser of ICOFOM, as well as an expert in definitions, is of particular importance. He wrote in his article “Museology and Immaterial Heritage. Musealisation and Visualisation” (2000):
“Immaterial and virtual contents put some important museological questions:
The translation of the words ‘intangible’ and ‘virtual’ in English, ‘immateriel’ and ‘virtuel’ in French, is very delicate, because their meanings are ambiguous in each language. The question is not settled to know, if all the processes (specially dynamic) which are generally classified in immaterial range (because we cannot touch them) are not merely part of concrete and real things which are studied and exhibited with difficulty: These ‘real things’ that Duncan F. Cameron has named ‘kinetifact’ since 1968.
A second question is to know, what we name ‘virtual’, because it is non visible … (biological, chemical and electronic processes) but given in reproduction by apparatus complex digital processes is not also merely real: it is not settled, if these processes have to be classified in the ‘real thing’ or ‘substitute’ range.
In this short survey, we might catch a sight of the immense possibilities provided by the new technology of information and communication leading to a without wall new range of museum integrating the world heritage.”

Proclamation of Masterpieces

Each consideration of definitions of “Intangible Heritage” was incomplete without the great undertaking of UNESCO that is of serious consequences for the sciences of museums. 1998 UNESCO started the international initiative “Proclamation of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible heritage of Humanity” 4 Usually cultural heritage is associated with museums, memorial sites and monuments. Nevertheless, it includes also “Intangible Heritage” which can
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1 Shanghai Charter, drafted by the coalition of participants in the Meeting was signed by Zhang Wenbin, President ICOM China; Jacques Perrot, President ICOM; Amareswar Galla, President ICOM Asia Pacific.
2 André Decallées since years is responsible for the ICOFOM project ‘Thesaurus Museologicus’ and Museum-adapted definitions.
4 2001 19 “Masterpieces” were proclaimed, 2003 28 more; 2005 the proclamation will be continued.
be defined as “the body of cultural and social expressions that characterize communities and are based on tradition.”  

2001 the First Proclamation was carried out. At that time a list of 19 Masterpieces was proclaimed that covered the different kinds of Intangible Heritage as e.g. “The cultural Space of the brotherhood of the Holy Spirit of the Congos of Villa Mella” (Dominican Republic) to “Cross Crafting and its Symbolism” (Lithuania/Latvia) and “Nôgaku Theatre” (Japan).

2003 the Second Proclamation took place. Already between 2001 and 2003 over 60 member States evaluated and recommended outstanding examples of intangible cultural heritage of humanity from the different continents to UNESCO. Finally, twenty-eight Masterpieces were selected that supplemented the first choice from 2001. They are from Africa (2), e.g. “The Oral Traditions of the Aka Pygmies of Central Africa”/ Central African Republic; Asia (11), e.g. “The Wayang Puppet Theatre”/Indonesia; Europe (4), e.g. “The Art of the Meddah, Public Storytellers”/ Turkey; the Arab States (3), e.g. “Song of Saana”/ Yemen; Latin America and the Carribean (6), e.g. “The Carneval of Barranquilla”/ Colombia; Multinational (2), e.g. Shashmaqom Music/ Tajikistan and Uzbekistan. Looked at in this way Ritual Music and Songs, Arts and Creativity, Literature and Poetry play an important role, not only as “Masterpieces” but also in relationship to exhibits in museums.

At the same time, in October 2003, the “Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage” was adopted on the occasion of the 32nd session of the General Conference of UNESCO.

This Convention is followed by numerous Festivals and Events in different countries. One of the up-to-date is the “Children’s Performing Arts Festival” in Suwon/Republic of Korea that children from five countries brings together: China, Democratic Republic of Korea, Japan, Mongolia and the Republic of Korea. Anyway, those Festivals could easily become connected with Museums that are most important representatives for the tangible heritage and intangible culture as a mirror of Cultural Diversity.

3 “Positive” and “Negative” Intangible Heritage

A study of definitions and descriptions of Intangible Heritage leads to the result that the cultural importance is usually considered with reference to a positive development of culture and civilisation. In the most cases museums present objects in this positive way – even exhibits in several War-Memorials or Memorial Museums are presented in an artificial and aesthetic way. Therefore it seems necessary to focus on examples that elucidate the “positive” and “negative” approach to Intangible Heritage.

Literature and Stories as Intangible Heritage

In order to show an example for the realisation of a “positive” project concerning intangible heritage, I would like to relate to “International Museum Day 2004” with the topic “Museums and Intangible Heritage”.

On this occasion – The International Museum Day 2004 – a very exciting Reading-Festival took place in Staatliches Museum für Völkerkunde (Governmental Museum for Ethnology) in Munich. Concerning its museum departments – Africa, India, China, Japan, Orient, North- and South America and South Seas – the museum is seeing itself as mediator between identifiable and foreign cultures.

Books – chosen for the target groups of children, youth and adults – fulfil in a specific way the conditions to bring the public home to the world, and to arouse both the pleasure in reading exotic literature and stories in context with the museum and in the interest on foreign ways of life.

On this occasion visitors tried with great pleasure to become well known with museum-objects by reading and listening to literature.

2 The Festival is intended to create international friendship, understanding and peace between the five countries which were for a long period hindered to communicate because of political differences.
The trial to take museum-objects and appropriate literature in a context is not unusual, rather more the problem between the Staatliches Museum für Völkerkunde (Governmental Museum for Ethnology) and the target groups of the museum. Therefore for the reason of the Reading Festival was intended not only to present literature but also narrative traditions of foreign cultures in relationship to the exhibitions of the different departments.

In addition to the literature-events and readings an extensive creative supply in the “Workshop of Cultures” as well as specific information about the foreign countries and a filmlet were offered. There was also a bookshelf with books of different continents for browsing. Own reviews could be drawn up, novels could be drafted.

There was also particular information about narrative traditions outside Europe. The visitors could also have a critical look at book-production here and elsewhere. In this context and in a specific workshop was also offered to become familiar with various handwritings. Anyway, the visitors could develop their creativities in drafting of masks, folding of Origami-figures, creating music-instruments and toys, getting known with Chinese and Arabian characters, adapt a figure for shadow play or knotting a piece of carpet; in this context they experienced the arduous physical effort of professional carpet-knotting.

"Negative" intangible and “indelible” heritage of 20th century

Identity and remembrance, “negative” intangible and “indelible” heritage of 20th century should be examined.

While usually Museums of different typology portray the “positive” cultural and natural heritage, Museums concerning with “Contemporary History” and Documentations on “Memorial Sites” are closely related to “negative” intangible heritage e.g. Museums: Mémorial in Caen/Normandy; Musée de la Grand Guerre/Péronne/France; Musée de la Paix/Verdun. Memorial Sites: War memorials and commemorative ways; memorial sites on areas of former National Socialist Sites (e.g.”Topography of Terror”/Berlin/Germany). Identification and remembrance are in this context also categories of the intangible heritage.

„Musée de la Civilisation in Quebec“, „Museum of Mankind“ in London or „Musée de la Civilisation Gallo-Romain“ are also characterised by “remembrance” and “identity” as intangible heritage. Nevertheless, the focus is different: The Museum in Quebec emphasises with the permanent presentations „Memories“ and „People of my Country“ not on history rather on identity and character. In Contrary “Museum of Mankind” in London stresses on anthropological relations, “Musée de la Civilisation Gallo-Romain” in Lyon on identification with a certain level of civilization.1

A specific focus is on prototypes and authentic areas as well as memorials designed in the five decades running after Second World War. Memorial sites are much closer to the recent past than museums with their “Intangible Heritage” are ever able to be. Yet in memorial sites, the way documentation is conceived museologically plays an important role, and the typology of such documentation centres is similar to that of classical museums. Beyond, such documentation is usually integrated in the memorial site.

The memorial sites of Auschwitz, Groß-Rosen, Sobibor, Treblinka (Poland), Bergen Belsen, Dachau, Flossenbürg, Buchenwald, Sachsenhausen, Mittelbau Dora, Neuengamme (Germany), Mauthausen (Austria), count as the prototypes of Nazi-terrorism and its increase to the industrial extermination of individuals.

In contrast to museums, memorial sites as authentic places and environments are particularly characterised by their relics of the history of former concentration camps or sites of war theatre.

Above all, the “Transition Project”, one of the main projects of ICOFOM stands for dealing with “negative” Intangible Heritage the conservation and preservation of former GULag Camps and the remembrance to totalitarian states as intangible and immaterial heritage. But not only the GULag camps are affected by this unhappy memory rather former and present totalitarian states all over the world – even countries where genocide is carried out like in Ruanda. Therefore the programme “From Oppression to Democracy” is the basis for the framework of

the mission and action of the International Movement – finally established on the occasion of ICOFOM Annual Meeting 2000 in Brno, Czech Republic. Vinoš Sofka, former President and now Honorary President of ICOFOM and Permanent Adviser of the Committee (Stockholm/Sweden) drew attention to the people responsible for heritage care to realize the fact that former totalitarian regimes are now history. This also transmits important intangible messages by the kind of memorial sites, written and visual documents, records etc.1

Challenges to Museums and Museology in the Future

The UNESCO „Convention for Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage“ explains in a very convincing way, how the intangible heritage is as a developing process transmitted from generation to generation and needs permanent “revival” by communities and teams – in correspondence with historic conditions and circumstances of life in present. This is the requirement for the sense of identity and continuity, cultural development and creativity. People responsible for Museums and Memorial Sites are in this concern asked of ethical questions related to:

- the transmission of knowledge to younger generations and interactive possibilities concerning culture and nature
- training programmes and workshops (e.g. “From Tradition to Innovation”)
- dissemination of knowledge concerning immaterial and intangible heritage
- documentation and publications
- exhibitions and museum-presentation.

The role of Museums includes also responsibility for records and transcriptions of immaterial and intangible heritage which by this way will be both “materialized” and recorded as immaterial heritage, and musealised independently from time and space. “The City Network of Cultures“ which is propagated by UNESCO and connected with a specific award could also be an important step to connect tangible and intangible heritage by the museums. The interdisciplinary and intercultural dialogue that is enabled by this way is on its part an important component for a peaceful social life of men and peoples.

Anyway, these thoughts are not completely new and a recognition of our society or our period of time. Rather Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767 – 1835), the famous philosopher, in his “Theory of the Education of Human Being“ thought about these questions almost two centuries ago.

He was one of the first who developed a “Theory of Museums” with the leitmotif: “The Life itself Provides the Topics”. The reflection of Humboldts ideas is also the starting point to his museum philosophy including anthropological, aesthetic and philosophical basis. Humboldt’s museum-philosophy is closely connected to the essential imagining of education. That is characterised by himself as “most tolerant interaction” between receptivity and activity, the human being herself/himself and the world outside, individual and universe. ²

By this interchange culture is not only protected, rather life and “world” of the human being are involved into the developing process. On the origin from education it supports human development and improvement. In this bcontext particularly art and history, aestheticism and language are of great importance. Individual and social education without language is impossible, rather language is the most decisive factor between the human being and the world as a whole.³

---
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To Search *in the* Exposition and the Intangibility of the Museums

Marília Xavier Cury – Brazil

**Summary**

To search in a context is different from searching the context, therefore to search in the museological exposition is not to search the exposition. This observation opens theoretical perspectives of interest to ICOFOM, because in the context where the museological communication occurs – exposition and educative action – one finds a profitable field of search and museological theorization.

This text has two objectives. The first is to discuss the intangibility attainment in the museums, institutions that have their genesis in material culture. For that, one defends that the intangible character is intrinsic to the material heritage preservation, because no object, inside or outside the museum, exists by itself, that is to say, without a collection of values and significations to qualify them and qualifying the relations among persons – and cultures – mediated by the material culture.

The second objective is to reflect about the intangibility of the museums, that is to say, the museums have ritualistic and performing qualities expressing themselves and making them exist in the museological communication. At the same time, museums can assume the compromise to discuss, starting from their mass, the rituals of several cultures, inclusive the occidental, because the rituals are phenomena good to be lived and to think about. This posture can open new discussions in the field of expology, of expography and of education in museums, contributing with the theorization in museology.

The commemoration theme of the international day of museums and 20th General Conference and 21st General Assembly of ICOM in 2004 is “Museums and Intangible Heritage”. The theme is not exactly unpublished or provocative in innovation for the professionals of Brazilian museums, because we are already discussing it and even applying it for some time. Anyway, it is always possible to seek for new forms to discuss and/or to go deeper in the question.

For example, in the anthropological museums it is almost impossible not to meditate about the intangibility, because we are confronted with it every moment of the curatorial process: acquisition, search, conservation, documentation and communication (exposition and education) of artefacts. This is easy to be understood, because the anthropological collections have a big intangible appeal: each artefact is related with others and all of them are related with a way of leaving, feeling and thinking and all this make part of a quite complex cultural system of communication.

Nowadays in Brazil, the problematic of the intangible and/or of the intangibility of collections is provoking because it elucidates another problematic in the order of communication, expology, expography and education. The intangible, in museums, should be transposed to the expositive and educational discourses. Such being the case, the construction of these discourses must be faced in this manner, that is to say, new expositive and educational models must be proposed, because the museological communication of the intangible requires another museological posture, different from those already known and hegemonic – but failed – transmitting forms of information. As I understand, the acceptation of these models of communication – without critics and/or meditations – expresses a lack of deepening in the theory of communication and a

---

1 This text was elaborated based on the original accessible in www.revistamuseu.com.br.
2 Museologist and educator of museums. Museu de Arqueologia e Etnologia da Universidade de São Paulo. Av. Prof. Almeida Prado, 1466 – CEP.: 05508-900 – SP – SP – Brasil. e-mail: maxavier@usp.br.
3 “The ‘intangible cultural heritage’ means the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills – as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage.” UNESCO
Weakened point of the museological theory and this becomes important because the museums are phenomena of communication. At the other hand, expology, expography and education are branches of knowledge in museology and, being so, a theoretical and methodological support for communication in museums and for democratization of these institutions. The democratization of museums, as we know, is a process that is occurring for decades, but is still in discussion; that is to say, the museums are still looking for effective strategies to give access to the society, and not to some elected, to the musealized cultural heritage. Access, however, can be understood in different manners. In accordance with the Portuguese dictionary, access is "approximation, arrival, entrance". This understanding refers to a physical relation, to have physical access to something and applying it to museums, the physical approximation to the museological collections. The access that I am referring to goes far beyond the possibility of approximation between the public and the museological mass, because it refers to the knowledge one has of this mass and, above all, its universe of significations. Access, also, refers to make the mass disposable – materiality, knowledge, significations of argumentative manner and, for being democratic, – the public can counter-argument. Access corresponds to the society rights to participate of the processes of cultural (re)signification as a plain right to the citizenship. The museum must be understood as a right of the citizen to participate of a social democracy, a right so relevant such as transportation, lodging, health, alimentation and education. To guarantee these rights to the citizen means to guarantee to him the right of participation in the process of cultural (re)signification concerning the cultural heritage, action substratum of museums. The museums facilitate or make difficult to the society to participate in the cultural dynamics in which the material culture is inserted; in proportion as the uses the public makes of the museum is what give to it its social form.

Thinking about expositive models in a simple form, we can describe them in two ways. The first consists in exposition of objects in shop windows, selected starting from criterions of the curator. In general this type of exposition involves collections of prestige, credited curators, (some times) sophisticated scientific concepts, competent professionals of conservation and creative designers. On the other hand, it involves a big budget and a strong work of marketing. So, this event reaches a big success. We can and must question the criterions of success evaluation of an exposition. In this evaluation, several aspects should be considered, and some of them are essential, such as the forms of the public interaction with the expositions. In the model I am presenting and discussing, the participation of the public is restricted, despite of the visitation statistics, because the exposition is not intelligible and, worse, does not respect the public taste and values. There are extreme cases, when the public is subjected to dark ambiances with lights in their eyes, badly idealized spaces, long texts with academic language and lack of context elements, etc. The educative action consists in educators trying bravely to make what the exposition does not succeed: to communicate. In extreme situations, it is the educator’s duty to assume the responsibility to re-pass the information to the visiting public and, then, the only thing he can do is to serve as a guide. Besides, let us take the opportunity and say that what is made in expositions like this one is everything but education. It is some other thing, but not education, because to educate implies the construction of mental models and attitudes. The educators know that this is a process work that respects and invests in the public participation as agent, as actor.

If we consider the social and educative functions of the museums, we will assume, in consequence, a quarrelling attitude concerning the model of communication as a way of transmission. If we address ourselves to the definition of Museology as a study of the museological fact, that is to say, “it is the deep relation between the Man, subject who knows, and the Object, part of the Reality to which the Man also pertains and over which he has the power to act’, relation that is processed ‘within an institutional scenery, or a museum’

3, we will say that what is made in expositions like this one is everything but education. It is some other thing, but not education, because to educate implies the construction of mental models and attitudes. The educators know that this is a process work that respects and invests in the public participation as agent, as actor.

---

2 In Brazil we make difference between educative action and guided visitation and between educator and guide. The difference is of theoretical-conceptual and methodological nature.
expological and educational reflection and about expographic processes, starting point to the theorization about museological communication.

The second simplified expositive model I would like to discuss is that in which the public participates because understands the exposed ideas. This is the basic objective of the team that conceives this type of exposition and, therefore, this team actuates inter-disciplinarily. The process is thought for the public to have participation. However, this model can be enlarged in such a manner as to offer to the visitor a participative and creative experience. For that, a team must be formed, composed by searchers, museologists, educators, conservators, designers of exposition (that is much more than a designer of shop windows in dark ambiences) and, in this model, curators are all those participating in the conception of expositive and educative discourses. Some people are still having the conviction that the curatorship of an exposition is the act of only one, two or three searchers: the searchers elect the theme, the focus, choose the parts, and define the objectives... On the contrary, the theme, its focus, and the objectives are collective decisions, this because a cooperative attitude must prevail – and not autocratic – in the search of an objective of communicational nature. The objectives, and consequently the expositive and educative discourses, are defined starting from the debate on "what" and "why", having the public as reference. It is the collective’s duty to define "what" from the knowledge about the collections will be informed and this decision involves a "why" of communicational nature. In this perspective the education is plainly present in the exposition as well as in the actions elaborated for the public, this because it is understood that education is much more than that collection of activities offered to the visitor after the inauguration of an exposition. The model I present for discussion integrates a search of basis and museological communication, enlarging the possibilities of search in museology.

My professional experience is in the field of museological communication. First I reflected about how to communicate in museums the "moment of beauty" of another social group and I suggested the **symbolic efficacy** as an experimental path of expographic representation\(^1\), that is to say, the concept of beauty is not universal, each culture has its conception of what is beautiful. One ritual is carefully prepared; it happens in an accorded day and time and has its climax. The climax is the "moment of beauty"\(^2\). It is a process that has middle and that culminates with an end, being an informative event.

"The ritual is a cultural system of symbolic communication. It is made of ordained and patronized sequences of words and acts, in general expressed by means of multiple ways. These sequences have contents and arrangements characterized by varied degrees of formality (conventionality), stereotypy (rigidity), condensation (fusion) and redundancy (repetition)."\(^3\)

To present the process and the "feast" in museums is not difficult. To discuss the conception of beauty of this event and its performative character is very difficult, because it goes beyond the materiality of the involved artefacts, as a matter of fact, it goes far beyond the materiality and is difficult for unaware persons to understand it. The symbolic efficacy is the expographic proposal to handle with cultural turnpikes. It is a path to elaborate the expositive and educative discourses that consists in elaborating a **performative expographic experience** – considering our cultural codes – qualitatively equivalent to the performatic and intangible experience of the cultural group represented in the museological exposition. I do not understand this as a solution but as a proposal that needs to be expographically developed, tested many times\(^4\) and consists in the starting point for elaboration of other proposals. What is important in all this is to perceive that, by means of expositions about rituals, we can understand how other cultures live, think, transform themselves. As performance and symbolic communication are intangible and intelligible for the cultural Other, we and the public of museums as well must seek for models of exppository representation that will not disparage the virtue of the rituals ritualistic character.

---

2. VIDAL, Lux apud DORTA, Sônia Ferraro; CURY, Marília Xavier. Ibid. p. 410.
4. Expologic and/or expographic experimentation must be tested until being exhausted, that is, come to interpretations constructed after empirical analysis. The construction process of knowledge in museology requires theoretical basis and a professional protocol that can sustain this construction.
Also, to connect explanation to comprehension – considering that not all what is explained is comprehended -, creating inter-subjectivity among cultures. "Starting from this point, to comprehend includes a process of identification and of projection from subject to subject".¹

Presently, to conceptually enlarge the previous proposal, I will dedicate myself to reflect on how to communicate rituals, that is to say, how to elaborate expositive and educative discourses that make people reflect on special and not quotidian events making part of persons' life, giving reason to those (social groups) represented and developing a sentiment of alterity: to take into consideration the reasons of the cultural "Other" represented in relation with the "I" that I represented this other and/or the "I" that appreciate the exposition. For that, it is important to develop the sentiments of tolerance and cultural diversity. It is necessary to make clear that there is not a hierarchy among the special and not quotidian events; qualitatively they are alike. There is, inclusive, a mutual relation between quotidian and ritual,

"[...] starting from the principle that a society possesses a relatively defined (although flexible) repertoire, shared and public, of categories, classifications, forms, values, etc., what is found in the ritual is present in the day by day – and vice-versa. We consider the ritual as a special phenomenon of the society, that indicates to us and reveal representations and values of a society, but the ritual expands, illuminates and projects what is already common to a specified group".²

But, rituals have special characteristics and, I suppose, the most important is, from the museological communication point of view, its performative character. There are several senses for the performative: a sense of attitude, when to say is also to make; in a second one, persons live intensely a performance through many ways of communication simultaneously; and a third sense, when values are created and absorbed by the persons participating of the performance. The performance and their senses possess big qualities to be explored by exposition and education³. As in museological communication the ideas gain form (expographic and educative), the proposal of symbolic efficacy is maintained and aggregates an education, because a performatic action possesses by itself educational values. And if the symbolic efficacy is possible, one can create an expographic-educative-performative-experience, the museum will not only represent the intangible but will also acquire an intangible attitude and, starting from this point, it will claim back its participation and relevance in cultural dynamics and in the society.

Returning to the second expositive model, I propose a creative participation for the public visiting expositions. To live an expographic-educative-performative-experience is a creative participation that, by its qualities, cannot be analysed by rationality, but by criterions of creativity and efficacy. As for the analysis of the expographic-educative-performative experience of the visiting public, this is only possible to empirically apprehend. This would be an important discussion involving the hegemonic postures of evaluation that will be left to another moment. However, it is important to register that the discussion on empirical search in exposition is important because it is the half of a theoretical iceberg interesting to ICOFOM/ICOM.

Back to the proposal, the idea I defend is that the expositive and educative models must change. It is not enough to contextually expose starting from the artefact origin but to expose making establish that vinculum among cultures, among groups and among individuals of different cultures. I believe that only by establishing this vinculum the museum will be able to establish a dialogic relation between exposition and public. This way we must renown and/or grow ripe our conceptions and methodologies of work. We have to assume a participative and also creative attitude and, what seems to be fundamental, to throw down the artificial limits between expography and education in museum that (try to) fragment the experience of public and teams. By this I do not want to destroy the conquest of these two fields – expography and

² PEIRANO, Marisa. Ibid. p. 10.
³ The educator of the Museum of Folklore Edson Canémeiro, Beatriz Muniz Freire, took "as reference the classical theory of Arnold van Gennep about rituals, because the visit to a museum can be seen as a ritual". O encontro Museu/Escola: o que se diz e o que se faz. 1992. 134 p. Dissertação (mestrado) – Pontifício Universidade Católica, Rio de Janeiro.
education – but to promote the museological communication face to the public quality of experience that we all ardently desire. They are the two heads of a single coin.

On the other hand, I understand that mentioning the ritual is of the interest of various typologies of museums, because the rituals make part of our lives: anniversaries, baptism, carnival, certain political movements, native Country day, wedding, graduation, signing of a document, a compromise, a shaking of hands, a discourse, a scientific discovery, the final of the World Cup, etc. And there are rituals of different natures: profanes, religious, sacred, cívics, festive, scientific, formal or informal, simple or elaborated. From the examples it is possible to understand that the ritual is a phenomenon of life and not of certain areas of knowledge and, therefore, must not be restrict to the anthropological museums. I believe even that we must rescue the ritualistic movements of our lives, or at least make some quotidian events as rituals, and represent them in the museums, independently of typology. "We consider the ritual a special phenomenon of the society, that indicates to us and reveal representations of values of a society, but the ritual expands, illuminates and projects what is already common to a specific group”.1 If an event is considered a ritual is because it has some specific characteristics, and why not to discuss these characteristics?

"Rituals are, therefore, good to think about and good to live. As starting from them we get acquainted with our ideal world and with our projects and ambitions; starting from them some paths, crossways and dilemmas are revealed and, in this process, one achieves, many times, to guide changes and transformations".2

To know how to distinguish the ritual moments of our lives and to think about their qualities seems to me a good alternative for museums. Perhaps this path could be less despotic, because we would not be imposing the importance of a fact but arguing about its importance. Finally, I would like to make it registered that in museological communication, the expology and the expography should be treated as a methodological place essential for the search in museology. Moreover, that the museological language – the expositive – is a condensed language and, for this reason, highly ingenious and this is the starting point for future analysis in the exposition.

And because of all that was presented in this text, I invite everyone – when appreciating an exposition – to answer to the question: What exist of museological knowledge in this exposition?
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Rechercher dans l’exposition et l’immaterielité des musées¹

Marília Xavier Cury – Brasil²

Résumé

Rechercher dans un contexte c’est différent de rechercher le contexte, c’est pourquoi rechercher dans l’exposition muséologique n’est pas comme rechercher l’exposition. Cette constatation ouvre des perspectives théoriques d’interêt de ICOFOM, parce que dans le contexte où arrive la communication muséologique – exposition et action éducative – se trouve un champs profitable de recherche et théorisation muséologique.

Ce texte a deux objectives. Le premier est de discuter l’atteignement de l’immaterielité dans les musées, institutions qui ont sa genèse dans la culture matériale. Pour cela, il défende que le caractère immatériel est intrinsèque à la préservation du patrimoine matériel, car aucun object, dans ou hors le musée, existe par soi même, c’est-à-dire, sans un ensemble de valeurs et significations pour les qualifier et que puissent qualifier les relations entre les personnes – et cultures – partagées par la culture matérielle.

Le deuxième objectif est de réfléchir sur l’immaterielité des musées, c’est-à-dire, les musées possèdent de qualités rituelistiques et perforatives qui s’expriment et se font exister dans la communication muséologique. En même temps, les musées peuvent assumer le compromis de discuter, à partir de son monceau, les rituels de diverses cultures, y compris de l’occidental, car les rituels sont phénomènes bons à vivre et à penser. Cette attitude peut ouvrir de nouvelles discussions dans le champ de l’expologie, de l’expografie et de l’éducation en musées, de façon à contribuer pour la théorisation en muséologie.

Le thème des commémorations du jour international des musées et de la 20e Conférence Générale et 21re Assemblé Générale du ICOM en 2004 sera “Musées et Patrimoine Immatériel”³. Le thème n’est pas exactement inédit ou provocatif d’innovation pour les professionnels de musées brésiliens, car nous le discutons et l’appliquent même il fait déjà un certain temps. De toute façon, il est toujours possible de chercher de nouvelles formes d’aborder et/ou d’approfondir la question.

Par exemple, aux musées anthropologiques il est presqu’impossible de ne pas réfléchir sur l’immaterielité, car nous nous confrontons avec elle à chaque moment du procès de la curatelle: acquisition, recherche, conservation, documentation et communication (exposition et éducation) des artefacts. Celà est facile à comprendre, car les collections anthropologiques possèdent un grand appel immatériel: chaque produit manufacturé se rapport à des autres et tous se rapportent à une façon de vivre, sentir et penser et tout celà fait partie d’un système culturel de communication assez complexe.

Aujourd’hui au Brésil, la question problématique de l’immatériel et/ou de l’immaterielité des collections est provocative parce qu’élucidé une autre question problématique de l’ordre de la communication, expologie, expografie et éducation. L’immatériel, dans les musées, doit être transposé par les discours expositif et d’éducation. Celà étant, la construction de ces discours doit être afronté de cette façon, c’est à dire, de nouveaux modèles expositifs et d’éducation doivent être proposés, parce que la communication muséologique de l’immatériel exige une

¹ Ce texte a été élaboré à partir de l’original accessible en www.revistamuseu.com.br.
² Muséologiste et éducatrice de musées. Musée d’Archéologie et Ethnologie de l’Université de São Paulo. Av. Prof. Almeida Prado, 1466 – CEP.: 05508-900 – SP – SP – Brasil. e-mail: maxavier@usp.br.
³ “On entend par ‘patrimoine culturel immatériel’ les pratiques, représentations, expressions, connaissances et savoir-faire – ainsi que les instruments, objects, artefacts et espaces culturels qui leur sont associés – que les communautés, les groupes et, le cas échéant, les individus reconnaissent comme faisant partie de leur patrimoine culturel.” UNESCO
Xavier Cury: Rechercher dans l’exposition et l’immateriété des musées

autre attitude muséologique différente de celles-là déjà connues et hégémoniques – mais faillies – formes transmissives d’information. À mon avis, l’acceptation de ces modèles de communication – sans critiques et/ou réflexions – dénote un manque d’approfondissement dans la théorie de la communication et un point de fragilité de la théorie muséologique et celà se rende important parce que les musées sont phénomènes de communication. D’autre part, expologie, expografie et éducation sont branches de connaissance de la muséologie et, de cette façon, un support théorique et méthodologique pour la communication en musées et pour la démocratisation de ces institutions. La démocratisation des musées, comme nous savons, est un procès qui arrive déjà pour décades, mais est encore en discussion, c’est à dire, les musées sont encore en cherche de stratégies efficaces pour donner accès à la société, et non à quelques élus, le patrimoine culturel muséalisé. Accès, cependant, peut être entendu de différentes manières. Selon le dictionnaire de la langue portugaise accès est "rapprochement, arrivée, entrée". Cette compréhension se rapporte à une relation physique, avoir accès physique à quelque chose et, en l’applicant aux musées, le rapprochement physique aux collections muséologiques. L’accès dont je me rapport va beaucoup au-delà de la possibilité de rapprochement entre le public et le monceau muséologique, car il se rapport à la connaissance qu’on a de ce monceau et, surtout, de son univers de significations. Accès signifie aussi rendre disponible le monceau – matérialité, connaissance, significations de manière raisonnante et, pour être démocratique, – le public peut contre-argumenter. Accès correspond au droit de la société de participer des procès de (re)signification culturelle comme plein droit à la citoyenneté. Le musée doit être entendu comme un droit du citoyen participant d’une démocratie sociale, un droit aussi important que le transport, l’habitation, la santé, l'alimentation et l’éducation. Garantir ce droit au citoyen signifie l’assurer le droit à la participation dans le procès de (re)signification culturelle pour ce qui concerne au patrimoine culturel, substrat de l’action des musées. Les musées facilitent ou rendent difficile la participation de la société dans la dynamique culturelle à laquelle la culture matérielle est insérée, alors que sont les usages qui le public fait du musée qui lui donnent une forme sociale.

Pour penser d’une forme simple en modèles expositifs, nous pouvons les décrire en deux. Le premier consiste à l’exposition d’objets dans de vitrines, sélectionnés à partir de critères du curateur. Généralement ce type d’exposition engage collections prestieuses, curateurs de créance, (quelques fois) concepts scientifiques sofistiqués, professionnels de conservation compétents et designers créateurs. D’autre part, engage un grand devis et un fort travail de marketing. De cette façon, cet événement obtient un grand succès. Nous pouvons et devons questionner les critères d’évaluation du succès d’une exposition. Pour cette évaluation, plusieurs aspects doivent être considérés, et quelques d’eux sont essentiels, comme les formes d’action réciproques du public avec les expositions. Dans le modèle qui je présente à la discussion, la participation du public est restreint, malgré les statistiques de visite, parce que l’exposition n’est pas intelligible et, pire, ne respecte pas le goût et les valeurs du public. Il y a des cas extrêmes, quand le public est assujetti à des ambiance obscures avec lumières sur ces yeux, spaces mal idéalisés, textes longues dans une langage académique et manque d’éléments de contexte, etc. L’action éducative consiste à éducateur essayant bravement de faire ce qui l’exposition ne réussi pas: communiquer. Dans des situations extrêmes, c’est le tour de l’éducateur d’assumer la responsabilité pour repasser l’information au public visitant et, donc, il ne peut que jouer le rôle de guide. Autrement, nous pouvons profiter de l’opportunité et dire que ce qui est fait en expositions de cette nature peut être tout, excepté éducation. Il peut être quelqu’une autre chose, mais pas éducation, car éduquer implique la construction de modèles mentaux et d’attitudes. Les éducateurs savent que ce travail est un travail processif qui respecte et investit sur la participation du public comme agent, comme acteur.

Si nous considérons les fonctions sociale et éducative des musées, nous assumons, par conséquence, une attitude de dispute pour ce qui concerne au modèle de communication comme transmission. Si nous nous rapportons à la définition de Muséologie comme étude du fait muséologique, c’est à dire, "c’est la relation profonde entre l’Homme, sujet qui connaît, et l’Objet, partie de la Réalité à laquelle l’Homme fait partie aussi et sur l’aquelle il a le pouvoir

2 Au Brésil nous faisons différence entre action éducative and visitation guidée et entre éducateur et guide. La différence est la nature théorique-conceptuelle et méthodologique.
d’agir, relation celle-ci qui vient dans une scène institutionnalisée, ou bien le musée1, nous constatons que le modèle de transmission d’information est surpassé, malgré d’être encore appliqué dans quelques musées. Je comprends qu’il incombe à ICOFOM/ICOM la responsabilité d’indiquer de chemins théoriques pour la réflexion expologique et de l’éducation et sur les procès expografiques, point de départ vers la théorisation sur communication muséologique.

Le deuxième modèle expositif simplifié qui j’aimerais discuter est celui où le public participe car il comprend les idées exposées. Celui-là est l’objectif basique de l’équipe qui conçoit ce type d’exposition et, pour cela, cette équipe agit interdisciplinairement. Le procédé est pensé pour que le public puisse y avoir une participation. Cependant, ce modèle peut être agrandi de manière à offrir au visitant une expérience de participation et de création. Pour cela, on forme une équipe composée de chercheurs, muséologues, éducateurs, conservateurs, designers d’exposition (ce qui est beaucoup plus qu’un dessinateur de vitrines dans des ambiances obscures) et, dans ce modèle, curateurs sont tous ceux qui participent de la conception des discours d’exposition et d’éducation. Quelques personnes ont encore la conviction que la curatelle d’une exposition c’est l’action de seulement un (deux ou trois) chercheur: le chercheur élit le thème, l’objet d’évidence, sélectionne les pièces, définit les objectifs... Au contraire, le thème, son objet d’évidence, les objectifs sont décisions collectives, parce que doit prévaloir une attitude coopérative – et pas autocratique – en recherche d’un objectif de nature de communicabilité. Les objectifs, et par conséquent les discours explogaphiques et éducatifs, sont définis à partir du débat sur "le quoi" et "pourquoi", tenant le public comme référence. C’est au public de définir "le quoi" entre la connaissance sur les collections ce qui sera communiqué et cette décision engage un "pourquoi" ayant une nature de communicabilité. Dans cette perspective l’éducation est pleinement présente tant dans l’exposition que dans les actions élaborées pour le public, parce qu’on entend que l’éducation est beaucoup plus que cet ensemble d’activités offertes au visitant après l’inauguration de l’exposition. Le modèle qui je présente à la discussion intègre la recherche de base et de communication muséologique, augmentant les possibilités de recherche en muséologie.

La mienne expérience professionnelle est dans le champs de la communication muséologique. En premier lieu, j’ai réfléchi sur comment communiquer en musées le "moment de beauté" d’un autre groupe social et j’ai suggéré l’efficacité symbolique comme un chemin expérimental de représentation expografique2, c’est à dire, le concept de beauté n’est pas universel, chacune des cultures a sa conception de ce qui est beau. Un rituel est soigneusement préparé, arrive dans un jour et horaire déterminé et a son climax. Le climax est le "moment de beauté"3. C’est un procès qui possède un moyen et culmine avec un fin, étant un événement performatif.

"Le rituel est un système culturel de communication symbolique. Il est constitué de séquences ordonnées et standardisées de mots et d’actions, en général exprimés par l’intermédiaire de moyens multiples. Ces séquences ont le contenu et les arrangements caractérisés par degrés variés de formalité (conventionnalité), stéréotypie (rigidité), condensation (fusion) et redondance (répétition)"4.

Présenter le procès et la "fête" en musées n’est pas difficile. Discuter la conception de beauté de cet événement et son caractère performatif est très difficile, car il va au-delà de la matérialité des produits manufacturés engagés, d’ailleurs, il va beaucoup au-delà de la matérialité et est difficile aux personnes d’autrui de le comprendre. L’efficacité symbolique est la proposition expografique pour traiter avec des barrières culturelles. Il s’agit d’un chemin pour élaborer les discours exposiphique et éducatif qui consiste en élaborer une expérience expografique performative – prenant en considération nos codes culturels – qualitativement équivalent à

---


3 VIDAL, Lux apud DORTA, Sônia Ferraro; CURY, Marília Xavier. Ibid. p. 410.

l'expérience performatique et immatériel du groupe culturel représenté dans l'exposition muséologique. Je ne comprend pas celà comme une solution mais comme une proposition, qui doit être développée expografiquement, essayée à plusieurs de fois 1, et consister en point de départ pour l’élaboration d’autres propositions. Ce qui est important dans tout cela est percevoir que, par l’intermédiaire d’expositions sur rituels, nous pouvons comprendre comme des autres cultures vivent, pensent, se transforment. Comme la performance et la communication symbolique sont immatériels et intelligibles pour l’Autre culturel, nous, ainsi que le public des musées, devons chercher des modèles de représentation expositive qui ne puissent pas adultes le caractère ritualiste des rituels. Et aussi, faire connection entre explication et compréhension – considérant que ni tous ce qui est expliqué est compris –, de façon à créer intersubjectivité entre cultures. "À partir de ce point, comprendre comporte un procès d’identification et de projection de sujet à sujet".2

Actuellement, pour agrandir de manière conceptuelle la proposition antérieure, je me dédie à réfléchir sur comment communiquer rituels, c’est-à-dire, comment élaborer des discours expositifs et éducatifs qui fassent réfléchir sur des événements spéciaux et non-quotidiens qui font partie de la vie des personnes, donnant raison à ceux (groupes sociaux) représentés et développant un sentiment d’altérité: prendre en considération les raisons de "l'Autre" culturel représenté par relation au "Moi" qui j’ai représenté cet autre et/ou le "Moi" qui apprécie l’exposition. Pour cela, il est important de développer les sens de tolérance et diversité culturelle. Il faut éclaircir qu’il ny a pas une hiérarchie entre des événements spéciaux et non-quotidiens; qualitativement ils sont égales. Inclusivement, il y a une relation mutuelle entre quotidien et rituel,

"[...] en partant du principe qu’une société possède un répertoire relativement défini (bien que flexible), partagé et public de catégories, classifications, formes, valeurs, etc., ce qui on trouve dans le rituel est présent dans au jour le jour – et vice-versa. Nous considérons le rituel un phénomène spécial de la société, qui nous indique et révèle représentations et valeurs d’une société, mais le rituel épanche, illumine et fait sauter aux yeux ce qui est déjà commun à un groupe détérminé."3

Mais, les rituels ont de caractéristiques spéciales et, je suppose, la principale est, du point de vue de la communication muséologique, son caractère performatif. Il y a plusieurs de sens pour le performatif: un sens d’attitude, lorsque dire est aussi comme faire; un deuxième, les personnes vivent intensivement une performance pour différents moyens de communication simultanément; et un troisième sens, lorsque de valeurs sont créés et absorbés par les participants de la performance. La performance et ses sens possèdent grandes qualités à être explorées par l’exposition et par l’éducation4. Comme en communication muséologique les idées gagnent forme (expografique et éducative), la proposition de l’efficacité symbolique se maintient et agrège l’éducation, car une action performatique possède par soi même de valeurs d’éducation. Et si l’efficacité symbolique est possible, on peut créer une expérience-expografique-éducative-performative, le musée ne va pas seulement représenter l’immatériel mais acquérir une attitude immatériel et, à partir de ce point, va revindicuer sa participation et importance dans la dynamique culturelle et dans la société.

Revenant au deuxième modèle expositif, je propose une participation créative pour le public visitant d’expositions. Vivre une expérience-expografique-éducative-performative est une participation créative que, par ses qualités, ne peut pas être analysée par la rationalité, mais par de critères d’ordre créative et d’efficacité. Pour ce qui concerne à l'analyse de l'expérience expografique-éducative-performative du public visitant, celle-là seulement pourra être saisie empiriquement. Celle-là serait une importante discussion engageant d’attitudes d’hégémonie

1 Une expérimentation expologique et/ou expografique doit être essayée jusqu’à épuiser, c’est-à-dire, arriver à des interprétations construites après d’analyses empiriques. Le procès de construction de connaissance en muséologie exige de bases théoriques et un protocole professionnel qui puisse soutenir cette construction.


3 PEIRANO, Manisa. Ibid. p. 10.

d’évaluation muséologique qui sera laissée pour un autre moment. Cependant, il est important d’enregistrer que la discussion sur recherche empirique en exposition est importante parce qu’il s’agit de la pointe d’un iceberg théorique intéressant au ICOFOM/ICOM.

Pour revenir à la proposition, l’idée qui je défends est que les modèles expositif et éducatif doivent être changés. Il n’est pas suffisant d’exposer en contexte à partir de l’origine du produit manufacturé mais exposer faisant établir de liens entre cultures, entre groupes et entre individus de cultures différentes. Je crois que seulement par l’établissement de ces liens le musée réussira établir une relation de dialogue entre exposition et public. Avec cela nous devons rénover et/ou murir nos conceptions et méthodologies de travail. Nous nécessitons d’assumer une attitude participative ainsi que créative et, ce qui me semble fondamental, renverser les limites artificielles entre expographe et éducation en musée qui fragmentent (essayent de fragmenter) l’expérience du public et des équipes. Par cela je ne veux pas détruire les conquêtes de ces deux champs – expographe et éducation – mais promouvoir la communication muséologique devant la qualité d’expérience du public qui tous nous désirons ardemment. Sont les deux faces d’une même monnaie.

D’autre part, je comprends que l’abordage du rituel interesse à plusieurs typologies de musées, parce que les rituels font partie de nos vies: anniversaires, bapteme, carnaval, certains mouvements politiques, jour de la Patie, mariage, licence, signature d’un document, un compromis, une poignée de main, un discours, une découverte scientifique, le final de la Coupe du Monde, etc. Et il y a de rituels de différentes natures: profanes, religieux, sacrés, civiques, de fête, scientifiques, formels ou non-formels, simple ou élaborés. À partir des exemples il est possible de comprendre que le rituel est un phénomène de la vie et pas seulement de certaines aires de connaissance et, donc, ne doit pas être restreint aux musées anthropologiques. Je crois même qui nous devons racheter les moments ritualistiques de nos vies, ou même rendre certains événements du quotidien comme rituels, et les jouer aux musées, indépendant de typologie. "Nous considérons le rituel un phénomène spécial de la société, qui nous indique et révèle représentations de valeurs d’une société, mais le rituel épanche, illumine et fait sauter aux yeux ce qui est déjà commun à un groupe déterminé". Si un événement est considéré c’est parce qu’il possède des caractéristiques spécifiques, et pourquoi ne pas discuter ces caractéristiques?

"Les rituels sont, de cette façon, bons à penser et bons à vivre. À partir d’eux nous prenons connaissance de notre monde idéal et de nos projets et ambitions; à partir d’eux se révèlent des chemins frayés, carrefours et dilemmes et, dans le procès, on arrive, très souvent, à mettre en chemin des changements et transformations".

Savoir discernir les moments rituels de nos vies et penser sur ses qualités me semble une bonne alternative pour les musées. Peut-être ce chemin pourrait être moins autoritaire, car nous ne serions pas imposant l’importance d’un fait mais argumentant sur la sienne importance.

Finalement, j’aimerais laisser enregistrer que dans la communication muséologique, l’expologie et l’expographe devraient être traitées comme place méthodologique essentiel à la recherche en muséologie. Encore, que la langage muséologique – l’expositive – est une langage condensée et, pour cette raison, hautement ingénieuse et celui-ìà est le point de départ pour des analyses futures dans l’exposition.

Et pour tout ce qui a été présenté dans ce texte, j’invite à tous – lors d’apprécier une exposition – à répondre à la perquisition: Qu’y a-t-il de connaissance muséologique dans cette exposition?
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Je dédie ce texte avec toute m’affection à Norma Rusconi. Elle laissera tendre regret.
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In Search of the Role of Museum for Preservation of Intangible Heritage in Korea

Hyun Mee Yang – Korea

I want to discuss about the relation between museum and the preservation system of intangible heritage related to the traditional craft arts in Korea. Korea has managed the most creditable preservation system of intangible heritage in the world. It was the model when UNESCO designed "Proclamation of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity" in 1997.

The Scope of intangible heritage is very broad. It is often difficult to decide what to preserve because it varies in accordance with what point of view to take. In Korea, Cultural Heritage Preservation Act defines intangible heritage as "drama, music, dance, and craft skills etc. that are the outcomes of the intangible culture and have historical, artistic, and academic values". According to the Act, types of intangible heritage are classified into two categories that are, performing arts and craft arts. The preservation system of intangible heritage in Korea focuses on the support of those who have the traditional skills worthy to preserve. The governmental supports help them to maintain skills and hand over them to their successors.

However, this system has nothing to do with museum. Museum has related to the tangible moving heritage while the ethnography museums collect instruments, costumes and craft items that had been made or used by the predecessors. In such museums most secrets of the traditional skills are hidden in the tangible objects. Fortunately there is a living history of the traditional craft skills in Korea. It is the national and regional intangible heritages. Museum has developed methods to conserve the tangible past. How museum can help preserve the living intangible history? In order to preserve the traditional craft skills, museum has to transfer the tacit knowledge that masters have obtained through the long experiences into the explicit knowledge. For examples, that is how to get and treat raw materials, how to make and use tools, how to design and create craft items etc. In most cases the distribution of this kind of knowledge has been confined to some successors and academic researchers.

Museum can change this situation. But in order to preserve intangible heritage, museum has to change its core activity from collecting objects to organizing knowledge through converting the tacit knowledge into the explicit knowledge. The most important activity related to production of knowledge is the research on the whole process of craft skills and the life of masters. The process of systematization of knowledge produces not only the collections - raw materials, tools and craft works etc. but also the diverse types of documentations - interviews, multi-media records and research papers etc. The traditional museum regarded the latter as complementary rather than the former. However in regard of intangible heritage, the latter may be as important as, or more important than the former. At this respect, museum cannot help being combined with archive.

This museum/archive is able to help masters to hand over the traditional skills to their successors, to provide useful information to academic researchers and to inspire contemporary craft artists. National Heritage Research Institute has been a crucial role in these kinds of activities. But it is not enough in the era of knowledge-based society, because in such a society it is important for people’s welfare not only to produce knowledge but also to distribute and apply knowledge. Here is the essential role of museum. Museum can make intangible heritage live in the cultural life of people through the diverse communication and marketing techniques adopted by it - exhibition, education, production of cultural commodity, tourism etc. There is the reason why museum has to combine with the preservation system of intangible heritage in Korea. Museum can make a living history live in our everyday life rather than in our memory.
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