

Darko Babić

Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu
Odsjek za informacijske znanosti
Katedra za muzeologiju
Zagreb
Hrvatska
dbabic@ffzg.hr

UDK 069.01

069.5"19"

Pregledni rad

Primljeno: 13. ožujka 2009.

Prihvaćeno: 10. travnja 2009.

Iskustva i (skrivena) vrijednosti eko-muzeja

Sedamdesete godine dvadesetog stoljeća kreirale su nov odnos muzeja i društva, ponajprije kroz formu eko-muzeja. U međuvremenu se društvo, kontekst u kojem muzeji djeluju, značajno promijenilo. Eko-muzeji i pokret nove muzeologije su, iako izvorno odgovarajući na potrebe ondašnjeg trenutka, svojim konceptom teritorija, baštine, identiteta i razvoja, te (lokalne) zajednice kao osnovnog nositelja procesa, anticipirali mnoga suvremena teorijska i praktična promišljanja. U međuvremenu su tradicionalni (klasični) muzeji preuzeli dio iskustva eko-muzeja dok su i sami eko-muzeji evoluirali i stvorili nove oblike pojavnosti. Namjera je rada kritički sagledati razvoj i inovacije eko-muzeja i nove muzeologije, te pokazati primjenljivost i upotrebljivost ovog koncepta u današnjim, promijenjenim društvenim okolnostima.

Ključne riječi: eko-muzej, nova muzeologija

Uvod

Zašto nam je baština, i briga za baštinu važna? Tko je i kako definira, što utječe i određuje naš odnos prema njoj? Konačno, tko i kako njome upravlja, u ime koga i u koju svrhu? Odgovori na ova pitanja čine se možda jednostavnim, no ipak, razmislimo li i primijenimo naša razmišljanja na situacije koje nas svakodnevno okružuju, primijetit ćemo da razlozi za dodatna propitivanja uvijek postoje, kao i potreba za stručnim i znanstveno utemeljenim objašnjenjima. Baština je fenomen u kojem se mnoge znanstvene discipline moraju smatrati pozvanim (i prozvanim) da nam svojim prilogom ponude (dio) rješenja. Muzeologija je svakako jedna od njih. Vrijeme krize uvijek je bilo plodonosno za nova i kreativna rješenja. Paradigme su samo prividno stalne. Prelazak u novu paradigmu uvijek započinje krizom i revolucijom (ne nužno nasilnom), no time i ne završava - sve dok određeni pojedinac ili skupina ne ponude rješenja koja mogu pri-

vući većinu praktičara sljedeće generacije (usp. Kuhn, 2002). Jedno od takvih dostignuća unutar muzeologije ili, šire gledano, sveukupnog odnosa čovjeka prema baštini započelo je pojavom eko-muzeja.

Sedamdesetih godina dvadesetog stoljeća započinje svjesna, svojevrsna mentalna prekretnica u razvoju odnosa čovjeka i baštine u kojoj egzistira (odnosno koja ga okružuje). Unutar povijesnih pregleda razvoja muzeologije pojedini teoretičari smatraju da se radi o drugoj revoluciji napominjući da se prva dogodila između 1880. i 1920. godine kada je došlo do prepoznavanja sličnosti između praktičnih problema koje gotovo svi muzeji imaju, drugim riječima do povećanog zanimanja za zajedničko područje interesa, a samim tim i za muzeologiju kao disciplinu koja se tim područjem bavi. Iako je dio rasprava imao teorijsko-kritičku pozadinu, one su se dominantno bavile ipak praksom (usp. Mensch, 1995: 133-138) te je stoga tada napravljen muzeografski pomak. Prema istom autoru, u razdoblju između 1960. i 1980. godine došlo je do nove sinergije no ovaj put kao posljedica potrebe transformacije uloge muzeja u društvu i inzistiranja na njegovoj aktivnoj ulozi. Upravo je ova 'druga revolucija' obilježena i pojavom novog tipa muzeja, *eko-muzeja*, a teorijski razvoj koji s njom nastaje kreirao je, iako u još nedovoljno definiranoj i samoj muzeologiji, pojavu tzv. *nove muzeologije*. Zbog važnosti suodnosa eko-muzeja i nove muzeologije, tom ćemo se pitanju detaljnije posvetiti nešto kasnije.¹ Da bi se taj suodnos uopće mogao shvatiti, potrebno je pođrobnno se upoznati sa samim fenomenom eko-muzeja.

Eko-muzeji, izvori i razvoj

Godine 1971. u središnjoj Francuskoj² na teritoriju od približno 500 kvadratnih kilometara oko gradova *Le Creusot* i *Montceau-les-Mines* započinje svoj razvoj prvi eko-muzej na svijetu. To je prostor koji je nakon Drugoga svjetskog rata doživio značajne promjene, ponajprije zato što je obitelj Schneider, koja je posjedovala industrijske komplekse o kojima je ovisilo lokalno gospodarstvo, bila optužena za kolaboraciju s nacističkim režimom, te je upravljanje istima preneseno u Pariz. Dislocirano upravljanje značilo je manjak interesa, a potom, vezano uz promjene u gospodarstvu i potpuno zapuštanje i propadanje industrijskih pogona, time i radnih mjesta za približno 150.000 tamošnjih stanovnika. Početna je to situacija na koju su, u skladu s regionalnom razvojnom politikom, ponudili odgovor *Hugues de Varine*, *Georges Henri Rivière* i *Marcel Evrard* predlaganjem *Muzeja čovjeka i industrije*, muzeja koji smjera ponovno pokrenuti gospodarstvo, ali možda i važnije, pomoći lokalnom stanovništvu u ponovnom pronalaženju smisla, vlastitog identiteta i otvaranja novih razvojnih mogućnosti. Za središte Muzeja čovjeka i industrije određen je dvorac obitelji Schneider koji potječe iz 18. stoljeća. Unutar njega su na adekvatan način interpretirani povijesni ra-

¹ Uključit će se i propitivanje moguće promjene paradigme, odnosno same znanosti i adekvatnog pristupa fenomenu baštine.

² Zapadno od crte koja povezuje gradove Lyon i Dijon.

zvoj i glavna obilježja regije, te prezentiran svakodnevni život populacije i njihovi industrijski i umjetnički proizvodi. Dvorac je na taj način definiran kao početna točka, ishodišni centar za upoznavanje i istraživanja cjelokupne regije. Na ostatku područja razvijen je oblik specifičnoga fragmentiranog muzeja, što znači da su elementi u krajoliku i pripadajuća materijalna i/ili nematerijalna svjedočanstva muzeološki obrađena i interpretirana *in situ*, na mjestu na kojem se nalaze i uvijek bez preseljenja u glavnu zgradu. Time je dosegnut važan teorijski i praktični iskorak - od isključivog fokusa na muzejsku zgradu prema cjelokupnosti teritorija kojeg muzej pokriva. Primarna zadaća minimalnog broja angažiranih stručnjaka bila je da pokrenu muzej, budu svojevrsni katalizatori procesa i obavljaju isključivo zahtjevnije tehničke poslove.³ Godine 1974., kada je dovršen, u muzejskom svijetu postao je poznat⁴ ponajprije zbog svoje definiciji zbirke objavljene u časopisu *Museum*:⁵ "Svaki predmet, pokretni ili nepokretni, koji se nalazi unutar perimetra zajednice idejno pripada muzeju: ovo uvodi ideju oblika kulturnog vlasništva, koje nije u vezi sa zakonskim vlasništvom" (Varine, 1974: 244). Publika muzeja, odnosno korisnici bili su percipirani na sličan način. Muzej je podrazumijevao da njegovu publiku čini cjelokupna zajednica, odnosno njegovim aktivnim korisnicima smatrani su svi pojedinci koji žive na teritoriju (definiranom području) na kojem muzej egzistira.

U mnogim se obilježjima Muzej čovjeka i industrije razlikovao od većine ili gotovo svih tadašnjih muzeja - prije svega u već naznačenom odnosu prema zbirkama, teritoriju i korisnicima, ali isto tako i u odnosima unutar muzeja i organizacijom rada. Dvadesetak godina kasnije, sumirajući vlastito iskustvo rada na ovom projektu, jedan je od njegovih glavnih protagonista napomenuo: "Ništa, volim si misliti, nije ostalo isto nakon Le Creusota. Privukao je ogromni broj hodočasnika i stvorio sljedbenike u brojnim zemljama, koji su onda stvorili vlastite eko-muzeje, ponekad i bez korištenja tog naziva. Retrospektivno, stvarna je vrijednost Le Creusota u tome što je on ustvari bio istraživački laboratorij u kojem su se nove muzejske teorije i prakse razvijale, raspravljale i vrednovala." (Varine, 1993). Novine koje je donio eko-muzej doista su bile revolucionarne, no naravno povijest (dugog trajanja) muzejske institucije bilježi primjere koji nam ukazuju na zanimljive forme koje je moguće prepoznati kao svojevrsne proto-oblike eko-muzeja.

Tijekom devetnaestog stoljeća mnogobrojni muzeji nastali su kao posljedica djelovanja raznovrsnih udruženja koja su se, da bi potvrdila svoje znanstvene pretpostavke, bavila sakupljanjem predmeta materijalne kulture. Interesantno je da su gotovo uvijek iste isticale važnost sudjelovanja lokalnog stanovništva u tom procesu, kao i koristi za dotičnu zajednicu - muzeji su, naime, poput knjižnica tada percipirani kao izuzetno važno sredstvo za obrazovanje širih slojeva društva. Nažalost, takav pristup s početkom dvadesetog stoljeća neprimjetno gubi na značenju i muzeji se ponovno pretva-

³ Npr., sustavno istraživanje, katalogiziranje, organizacija složenijih aktivnosti, zastupanje interesa muzeja prema predstavnicima vlasti itd.

⁴ Odnosno tada osporavan.

⁵ Časopis *Museum*, danas pod nazivom *Museum International*, izdaje UNESCO.

raju u prilično zatvorene institucije, sada ne kao isključiva privilegija vladajućih klasa već kao hermetične ustanove određene jedino i isključivo potrebama znanstvenih istraživanja. Desetljećima kasnije ovu su tendenciju prvi promijenili upravo eko-muzeji, određujući tako i naše današnje poimanje svrhe i smisla muzeja u društvu. Paralelno s tim, dvije postojeće muzejske forme utjecale su na razvoj eko-muzeja: muzej na otvorenom i *heimat* muzej.

Za pojavu muzeja na otvorenom zaslužan je Artur Hazelius po čijem su napatku na brežuljak *Skansen* nedaleko Stockholma prenesene kuće različitog tipa, porijekla, namjene i vremena izgradnje iz cijele tadašnje Švedske. Odgovarajućeg interijera, s uređenom okućnicom i uz demonstraciju proizvodnje 'starom' tehnologijom u radionicama, te organiziranim festivalima i kostimiranim vodičima, ova je forma⁶ težila postavljanju predmeta u njihov funkcionalni kontekst (usp. Maroević, 1993: 40), te postala i ostala do današnjih dana inspiracija svim muzejima takvog tipa, ali i tvorcima eko-muzeja.

*Heimat*⁷ muzeji koji izvorno potječu iz 19. stoljeća, a između dva svjetska rata doživljavaju značajan rast u broju, ostavljaju nam u naslijeđe svijest o važnosti uloge muzeja u društvu i njihovu obvezu na aktivnost i dinamičnost. Ili, kako to napominje J. Klersch u svom zapisu iz 1936. godine: "*Heimat* muzej ne smije biti carstvo mrtvih ... ; on mora pripadati živima i oni se moraju osjećati udobno u njemu. Živuci su stalno u pokretu, od jučer prema sutra, i muzej im mora pomoći da vide sadašnjost u odrazu prošlosti, i prošlost kao odraz sadašnjosti. Oni će tako iskusiti intimnu koheziju prošlosti i sadašnjosti koja će stvoriti budućnost. Ključna zadaća *heimat* muzeja je da služi ljudima i sadašnjosti, i ako ne uspije u tome, on će postati ništa više nego bezživotna kolekcija predmeta." (Davis, 1999: 47). Poziv je to koji, bez značajnih promjena, može biti čitan i kao misija današnjih muzeja. Nažalost, *heimat* muzeji dijele sudbinu povijesnog prostora i vremena. Kako ih je, kao uostalom i mnoge druge pojedinosti, nacistički režim intenzivno koristio za širenje vlastite propagande praktično brišući neželjene dijelove povijesti ili ih interpretirajući neutemeljeno i sukladno svojim potrebama, moguće ih je proglasiti i svojevrsnim perverzним prethodnicima eko-muzeja (Crus-Ramirez, 1985: 242-244).

Ipak, ono što je u konačnici odredilo nastanak eko-muzeja šezdesete su godine dvadesetog stoljeća, čiji je društveni kontekst stvorio preduvjete za njihov razvoj. Sredinom šezdesetih godina dvadesetog stoljeća, naime, dolazi do vrlo intenzivnih previranja generiranih prijevora i nezadovoljstvima postojećim stanjem u društvu. U isto vrijeme, ali tada pod višestruko većom pažnjom javnosti učestale ekološke katastrofe, opasnost utrke u naoružavanju i povezanih mu nuklearnih eksperimenata, utjecaj industrije na onečišćenje atmosfere, te svakodnevno i više nego očividno nestajanje prirodne baštine i ruralnih krajolika rađa novi oblik svjesnosti poznat kao *ekolo-*

⁶ Otvorena za posjetitelje 1891. godine.

⁷ *Heimatmuseum* je na hrvatski jezik moguće prevesti kao muzej zavičaja tj. zavičajni muzej. Riječ *Heimat* ustvari znači domovina, no idejno je bliža pojmu zavičaja.

gizam odnosno *environmentalizam*.⁸ Povlastice i autoritet vladajućih elita idejno su osporene pa su se tražile hitne i značajne promjene. Uz potrebu reforme i demokratizacije školstva ili sveučilišta, na primjer, u prvi se plan stavlja pitanje društvene relevantnosti svih institucija, pa sukladno tome i muzeja. Postalo je jasno da postojeće institucije naprosto ne odgovaraju potrebama društva kojem su namijenjene ili bi trebale biti namijenjene. U slučaju muzeja to je najjasnije definirano kroz zahtjeve da oni obvezatno služe cjelokupnoj zajednici te da, jednako tako, moraju svoju prilično statičnu ulogu zamijeniti dinamičnom, odnosno preuzeti ulogu pokretača promjena i razvoja. Postojeće muzejske institucije naprosto nisu bile u stanju nositi se s takvim zahtjevima i ponuditi kvalitetne odgovore. Mogli bismo konstatirati, pomalo ironično, da su muzeji tada bili toliko usmjereni na sebe da su zaboravili vlastitu baštinu i institucionalno iskustvo.

Kao i ostatak svijeta krajem šezdesetih godina dvadesetog stoljeća i Francuska se nalazi u društvenim previranjima, intenziviranim i tada uočenim posljedicama ubrzane poslijeratne urbanizacije koja je dovela da zapuštanja i propadanja ruralnih dijelova zemlje. Jedno od predloženih političkih rješenja koje je trebalo umanjiti negativne efekte kretalo se u pravcu osmišljavanja razvoja lokalnoga gospodarstva u sklopu regionalnoga razvojnog planiranja, uz istovremeno provođenje svjesnih akcija zaštite prirode - proces unutar kojeg su kreirani i regionalni parkovi prirode. Francuski muzeolog *Georges Henri Rivière* koji je i ranije ukazivao na nužnost osnivanja muzeja na otvorenom u Francuskoj u predloženom je razvoju regionalnih parkova uvidio mogućnost kvalitetne zaštite i prezentacije bogate ruralne baštine. S obzirom na to da je smatrao da se društvo prvenstveno izražava kroz graditeljstvo, G. H. Rivière se zalagao za realizaciju tzv. *muzeja kuća*⁹ objašnjavajući da su "muzeji na otvorenom muzeji kuća, izdvojenih iz njihove sredine i premještenih u ograđeni prostor koji je muzeografski iskorišten" (Hubert, 1989: 147). Na tim osnovama na *Isle de Quessant* u *Parc d'Armorique* u Bretanji tri su kuće i jedna vjetrenjača odabrane kao budući muzej, a *Quessantinska kuća tehnike i tradicije*¹⁰ definirana kao ishodišni centar oko kojeg je formiran muzeografski obilazak čitavog područja. Ova kuća-muzej, otvorena u srpnju 1968., po svojim je osnovnim karakteristikama¹¹ ustvari prvi francuski eko-muzej, iako taj termin tada još nije postojao. Drugi značajni projekt, također povezan s regionalnim parkovima, varijanta je muzeja na otvorenom koji nastaje u *Grande Landes* (pokrajna Gaskonja) gdje se ponovno pod vodstvom G. H. Riviera 1969. godine stvara muzej područja *Marqueze*. Muzej je oformljen oko samo jedne autentične kuće

⁸ Ove pojmove određeni broj autora smatra istoznačnim, no potrebno je ukazati da između njih postoji stanovita razlika. Ekologizam označuje političku doktrinu, ideologiju koja se temelji na ekološkim pretpostavkama, u prvom redu na bitnoj vezi između čovjeka (koji je samo dio, a ne svemoguću upravitelj prirodom) i prirodnog svijeta koji ga okružuje, dok je *environmentalizam* oblik umjerenog, reformističkog pristupa koji traženje odgovora na krizu okoliša razmatra ponajprije sa stajališta ljudi bez dovođenja u pitanje konvencionalnih, antropocentričnih pretpostavki o prirodnom svijetu (usp. Ravlič, 2003: 310-325).

⁹ Francuski *musee de maison*.

¹⁰ Kako se nazivala zgrada sa stalnim muzejskim postavom.

¹¹ Posebno zbog strukture centra (ishodišta) i pripadajućih mu, u prostoru razmještenih, idejno povezanih lokaliteta.

iz 1824. godine kojoj su zatim pridodane druge, premještanjem iz ostalih dijelova područja Grande Landes. Opremljene adekvatnim interijerom, raspored kuća bio je pažljivo isplaniran i raspoređen u prostoru kako bi se stvorila što vjernija slika tog dijela Francuske devetnaestog stoljeća. Dočaravanju ambijenta idejno je pripomoglo i smještanje domaćih životinja u okućnice, a s vremenom i kontrolirani uzgoj isključivo tradicionalnih sorti vinove loze i ostalih specifičnih biljaka ovog područja. Premda se na prvi pogled može činiti da je riječ o klasičnom muzeju na otvorenom, neke ideje, ovdje po prvi put realizirane, nadilazile su tu muzejsku formu. Ovaj je muzej doživio ogromnu popularnost i ubrzo se susreo s problemom prevelikog broja posjetitelja što se, iako postupno, relativno uspješno rješavalo definiranjem, označavanjem i interpretacijom novih elemenata u krajoliku kako bi se posjetitelje raspršilo na što većem prostoru unutar parka. Po mnogim obilježjima ova dva muzeja pripadaju eko-muzejima, iako ni jedan od njih nije imao sve tipične karakteristike, niti se koristio tim nazivom. Kako smo već ranije napomenuli, nekoliko godina kasnije nastaje prvi eko-muzej, Muzej čovjeka i industrije na području Le Creusota i Montceau-les-Minesa. Nakon njega, tijekom sedamdesetih godina, dolazi do realizacije još nekolicine eko-muzeja u Francuskoj od kojih osobito vrijedi izdvojiti dva: *Eko-muzej planine Lozère* te muzej u *Regionalnom parku prirode Camargue*. Godine 1971. u *Nacionalnom parku Cevennes* začinje se idejni projekt *Eko-muzeja planine Lozère*. U početku susretao se s problemom izrazitog nepovjerenja zainteresiranih strana, no tijekom vremena suradnja između stručnjaka i zajednice ostvarena je na kvalitetnoj razini pa se 1983. otvara glavni centar za posjetitelje. S druge strane, u *Regionalnom parku prirode Camargue* pokrenuta je 1973. godine inicijativa s idejom realizacije dva osnovna cilja: a) istražiti lokalnu etnografsku baštinu koja bi postala osnova buduće interpretacije područja; te b) jasna potreba, odnosno svjesna želja aktivnog uključivanja što većeg broja lokalnih ljudi u ova istraživanja i cjelokupni projekt. Drugi cilj imao je izuzetno visoki prioritet jer je prvenstveno bio u funkciji premošćivanja razlika i nesuglasica između lokalnog stanovništva i njihovih gostiju, turista koji su sve intenzivnije dolazili u područje parka prirode. Projekt je zamišljen i definiran kao vrsta neformalne obveze za cjelokupnu lokalnu populaciju koju se time svjesno htjelo potaknuti da aktivno sudjeluje u razvoju i upravljanju budućim muzejom i, posljedično, bolje shvati i vrednuje vlastitu baštinu i okoliš u kojem egzistira. Cilj je to koji bez značajnih promjena možemo i nakon više od trideset godina primijeniti na mnoga područja u našoj zemlji, posebice jer je ovaj muzej morao ponuditi rješenje koje će funkcionirati u harmoniji s izazovima koje donosi suradnja s turizmom. Otvoren 1978., ovaj eko-muzej, koji u konačnici nije koristio ovaj naziv,¹² pokazao se dovoljno dobrim i inovativnim pa je samo godinu dana kasnije, prema mišljenju eminentnih muzejskih stručnjaka, zaslužio i najprestižniju europsku muzejsku nagradu postavši Europskim muzejom godine.¹³ Početkom osamdesetih godina broj novoosnovanih eko-muzeja u Francu-

¹² To je poseban problem, na koji ćemo se kratko osvrnuti nešto kasnije.

¹³ Nagradu za europski muzej godine dodjeljuje Europski muzejski forum (*European Museum Forum*), nevladina organizacija sastavljena od uglednih europskih muzejskih djelatnika, praktičara i teoretičara.

skoj ubrzano se povećava, a koncept eko-muzeja širi svijetom, ponajprije u frankofonim područjima Kanade¹⁴ i Skandinaviji.

Razvoj izvornih, francuskih eko-muzeja moguće je sagledati kroz tri osnovne faze. Prva traje do 1971. godine gdje pripadaju *Armorique* i *Grandes Landes*. Primarno je obilježena jasnom povezanošću s parkovima prirode i naglaskom na prostornoj dimenziji. Druga faza traje približno od 1971. do 1980. i uvodi dimenziju vremena, definiranog teritorija i sudjelovanja lokalnih zajednica u realizaciji projekata (*Le Creusot*, *Camargue* i *Cevennes*). Treća započinje oko, odnosno nakon 1980. i obilježena je dodatnim jačanjem uloge lokalne zajednice, te sve većim naglašavanjem ciljeva i metoda definirane učinkovitosti planirane regeneracija područja. Velika i brza stopa rasta novih eko-muzeja karakteristična je upravo za ovu zadnju fazu (usp. Hubert, 1989: 146-153). Otprilike u to vrijeme iz faze jasne razlikovnosti, čak muzejske hereze kako su ih neki smatrali, eko-muzeji postaju općeprihvaćeni koncept muzejske prakse. Posljedica je to, s jedne strane, promijenjenih društvenih okolnosti, ali, isto tako, i prihvaćanja ideja eko-muzeja (iako često po potrebi adaptiranih) od strane tzv. tradicionalnih, odnosno klasičnih muzejskih institucija.

Recentno razdoblje nije donijelo velike ili značajne pomake u razvoju, već je obilježeno daljnjim širenjem koncepta. Prema podacima P. Davisa (usp. Davis: 1999; Davis: 2007), danas u Francuskoj postoji oko šezdesetak eko-muzeja, dok se u svijetu nazivom eko-muzej koristi preko tristotinjak institucija ili projekata. Od svibnja 1992., kada je u Rio de Janeiru, Brazil održana prva međunarodna konferencija, predstavnici eko-muzeja sastaju se u redovitim ciklusima razmjenjujući praktična iskustva i teorijske spoznaje unutar ekomuzeološkog pokreta. Ono što svakako vrijedi istaknuti vezano uz recentno razdoblje jest da su upravo eko-muzeji svojim specifičnim načinom djelovanja jedni od prvih promicatelja pokreta ekoturizma, te održivog i baštinskog turizma, što je još jedan jasni dokaz da su u svom djelovanju od samog početka anticipirali neke vrijednosti koje su postale općeprihvaćene u posljednjih desetak ili najviše petnaest godina. Slično možemo tvrditi i u pogledu njihova uvažavanja nematerijalne baštine,¹⁵ a skloni smo vjerovati da je koncept eko-muzeja sposoban prilagoditi se i univerzalnim vrijednostima baštine, drugim riječima da je idejno prilagodljiv drugačijim percepcijama i vrijednostima baštine koje nastaju unutar različitih kultura, nadilazeći time formu 'klasičnog' muzeja koji je, i uvijek će ostati, dominantno eurocentričan i kao takav prihvatljiv isključivo na području zapadne kulture.

Definicije eko-muzeja

Nije jednostavno jasno i sažeto definirati eko-muzej. Eko-muzej naprosto treba živjeti. No kako aktivno sudjelovanje u kreaciji i razvoju jednog eko-muzeja, unoseći pri

¹⁴ Već krajem sedamdesetih godina.

¹⁵ Ovdje nećemo ulaziti u teorijsku raspravu o suštinskoj nematerijalnosti svake baštine, uključujući i onu koju nedvosmisleno označavamo kao materijalnu, već podrazumijevamo nematerijalnost u smislu kako ga definira UNESCO.

tome i nužno potrebne vlastite adaptacije na osnovi lokalnih potreba, nije uvijek moguće, definicije ostaju kao nužno početno sredstvo. Uostalom one, kao i teorije, i postoje da bi unaprijed propitale i razbistrile smisao akcije na koju se odlučujemo, pomogle nam u definiranju cilja i uputile nas u ispravnom pravcu. Definicije eko-muzeja koje ovdje donosimo imaju upravo tu svrhu, a specifičnost njihova izraza odražava potrebe kreatora da opišu suštinu i smisao ovoga muzeološkog djelovanja, ali i sudbinu eko-muzeja koji su u svom povijesnom razvoju često nailazili na oduševljenje, ali i nerazumijevanje (muzejskog) okruženja u kojem su djelovali. Najznačajnije su tri definicije koje je formulirao jedan od glavnih aktera u stvaranju eko-muzeja - Georges Henri Rivièra, a koje ujedno i reflektiraju njihov razvoj.¹⁶ Prva potječe iz godine 1973. i sastavljena je iz dva osnovna dijela. U prvom se eko-muzej definira kao 'muzej novog žanra' koji počiva na interdisciplinarnosti (posebice ekologiji), organskoj povezanosti sa zajednicom u kojoj djeluje i sudjelovanju te zajednice u njegovom konstituiranju i funkcioniranju, dok je u drugom dijelu definirana sama struktura eko-muzeja. Kao *musée eclaté*,¹⁷ on je sastavljen od primarnoga koordinatornoga tijela i sekundarnih organa, odnosno ispostava ili antena. Ova je definicija neznatno promijenjena i nadopunjena 1976. godine (tzv. druga definicija). Dana 22. siječnja 1980. godine G. H. Rivière predložio je treću definiciju kojoj je jedna od bitnih karakteristika potpuno izostavljanje riječi muzej koja je zamijenjena izrazima poput izražaj ili interpretacija.¹⁸ Definicija glasi:

"Eko-muzej je instrument koji zajednički osnivaju, proizvode i koriste (lokalna) uprava i populacija. Uprava, sa svojim stručnjacima, olakšicama, izvorima kojim ga snabdijeva. Populacija, prema svojim aspiracijama, svojim znanjima, i sposobnostima približavanja.

To je ogledalo gdje se populacija promatra, da bi se u njemu prepoznala, gdje traži objašnjenja za teritorij za koji je vezana, koje je povezano s objašnjenjem o populacijama koje su joj prethodile u diskontinuitetu ili kontinuitetu generacija. Ogledalo koje ta populacija pruža sama sebi, da bi se bolje razumjela, u vrednovanju svog rada, svog ponašanja i nutarnosti.

Ekspresija čovjeka i prirode. Čovjek je u njoj interpretiran u svojoj prirodnoj sredini. Priroda je interpretirana u svojoj divljini, ali i prikazana kao rezultat koji je stvorilo tradicionalno i industrijsko društvo prilagodivši je sebi.

Izražaj vremena kada objašnjenje seže u vrijeme kada se čovjek pojavio, kada se postupno penje kroz prethistorijsko i historijsko vrijeme koje je proživio, i završava u vremenu u kojem živi. Otvarajući se sutrašnjici bez da se nametne kao onaj koji odlučuje, on igra ulogu informacije (informatora) i kritičke analize.

¹⁶ Ovdje iznesene definicije navedene su prema Hubert, 1989: 151.

¹⁷ Hrv. fragmentirani muzej.

¹⁸ Tako će npr. fraze "muzej čovjeka i prirode", "muzej vremena" ili "muzej prostora" postati "izražaj čovjeka i prirode", "izražaj vremena" ili "interpretacija prostora".

Interpretacija prostora. Odabranih prostora, onih u kojima se zaustavlja ili kojima se putuje.

Laboratorij u mjeri u kojoj doprinosi historijskom i suvremenom proučavanju populacije i njenog okružja i zalaže se za stvaranje formacije specijalista u njihovim domenama koji surađuju s vanjskim istraživačkim organizacijama. Konzervatorski centar u mjeri u kojoj pomaže očuvanje i vrednovanje prirodne i kulturne baštine dotične populacije. Škola u mjeri u kojoj povezuje populaciju s akcijama proučavanja i zaštite, i gdje potiče da ona bolje razumije probleme svoje vlastite budućnosti. Ovaj laboratorij, konzervatorski centar, škola inspirirani su zajedničkim principima. Kultura na koju se pozivaju treba se shvatiti u svom najširem smislu, i oni se uz nju vezuju da bi upoznali dignitet i umjetničku ekspresiju svih slojeva populacije čije manifestacije iz nje proizlaze. Njihova je različitost bezgranična, toliko različitih elemenata od jednog uzorka do drugog. Oni se ne zatvaraju sami u sebi, oni primaju i daju.”

Gotovo poetična, definicija u potpunosti ima svoje opravdanje. Eko-muzeji nisu čvrste jednoobrazne forme, oni se mijenjaju i prilagođavaju zavisno o vremenu, prostoru i, najvažnije od svega, o populaciji, zajednici u kojoj djeluju i potrebama njenog razvoja, pa su i same definicije uvijek evolutivne.

Uz G. H. Rivièra i drugi su protagonisti ponudili definicije ‘novog’ muzeja pokušavajući uvijek naglasiti njegove osnovne karakteristike ili pojedine dijelove koji su se dotičnima učinili posebno značajnima. Navodimo nekoliko najznačajnijih.¹⁹ Pierre Mayrand će 1982. primijetiti da je “eko-muzej kolektiv, radionica koja se proteže preko teritorija koji je populacija prihvatila kao svoj ... on nije sam sebi cilj, on je određen kao cilj koji treba dostići”. A. Desvallees 1987. sugerira da, ako se prihvati definicija G. H. Rivièrea, onda eko-muzej mora biti muzej identiteta (zbog spominjanja vremena, prostora i ogledala tj. refleksije) i muzej teritorija pri čemu prefiks *eko* simbolizira važnost i prirodne i društvene okoline u kojoj je eko-muzej smješten. René Rivard će 1988. usporediti tradicionalni muzej koji se sastoji od zgrade, zbirke, stručnjaka i publike s eko-muzejom koji sačinjavaju teritorij, baština, memorija i zajednica/populacija, dok pak Mark Watson 1992. u *Enciklopediji industrijske arheologije* navodi: “Eko-muzej je projekt koji dopušta populaciji nekog područja da razazna vlastiti identitet kroz svoje građevine, ekologiju, geologiju, kao i kroz dokumente i usmenu povijest, te da njihovo proučavanje učini zajedničkom akcijom, a ne nečim što je ograničeno samo na školovane stručnjake” (225). Peter Davis, tragajući ponajviše za zajedničkim indikatorima eko-muzeja, zaključit će: “... jedna karakteristika pojavljuje se kao zajednička karakteristika svim eko-muzejima, ponos koji imaju za mjesto koje predstavljaju. ... eko-muzeji nastoje uhvatiti duh mjesta - i po mom mišljenju ovo je ono što ih čini posebnima.” (1999: 238-239). U svibnju 2004., trideset godina nakon osnivanja prvog eko-muzeja, sudionici radionice *Europske mreže eko-muzeja* u talijanskom gradu Trentu definirali su eko-muzej kao dinamički način na koji određena zajednica čuva, interpretira i upravlja vlastitom baštinom u pravcu održivog razvoja. Iz toga proizlazi da je eko-muzej uvijek baziran na dogovoru, odnosno sugla-

¹⁹ Definicije su preuzete iz Davis (1999), osim onih gdje je posebno naveden izvor.

snosti zajednice u kojoj djeluje. Zadnja definicija vjerojatno nam je najjasnija i gotovo samorazumljiva. Funkcije čuvanja, interpretacije i upravljanja danas podrazumijevamo kada govorimo o muzejima. Riječ baština, kao i održivi razvoj, trebale bi implicirati ideje koje nije potrebno dodatno pojašnjavati. Prostor ili, figurativno rečeno, vrata suglasnosti zajednice djelomično su otvorena fokusom na korisnika koji je tokom zadnjeg desetljeća postao glavni predmet muzejskog interesa, premda korisnik i zajednica nisu isto i tu još ima prostora za napredak. Ono što je izuzetna vrijednost eko-muzeja jest činjenica da su sve te nama danas samorazumljive vrijednosti anticipirane prije trideset godina ugrađujući u svoje djelovanje i svijest o totalitetu baštine, i potrebu njegove upotrebe u pravcu (održivog) razvoja, i to na osnovi potreba cjelokupne lokalne zajednice.

Prilog nove muzeologije

Kolika je zapravo uloga teorije i je li joj doista prethodila praksa eko-muzeja? Na prvi se pogled može tako činiti ponajprije zato što su se intenzivnije teorijske rasprave, analize i pokušaji muzeoloških sinteza ovog pokreta dogodile tek nekoliko godina kasnije. No, praksa i teorija događale su se simultano (Šola, 1999: 20-23). Baš poput razvoja eko-muzeja, i nova muzeološka promišljanja nastala su kao rezultat procesa koji su se zbivali tijekom šezdesetih godina dvadesetog stoljeća i koji su u domeni muzeja pozivali na intenzivniju brigu o okolišu, društvenu odgovornost i aktivnu ulogu povezanu s politikom razvoja (Varine, 2009). Već 1968. godine u zaključnoj rezoluciji ICOM-ove generalne konferencije²⁰ napominje se da "muzeji trebaju biti prepoznati kao vodeće institucije u službi razvoja zbog doprinosa koji mogu pružiti kulturi, društvenom i gospodarskom životu" (Davis, 1999: 52). Slične preporuke pojavljuju se i na međunarodnom simpoziju u studenom 1969. održanom u Parizu,²¹ te na desetoj generalnoj konferenciji ICOM-a 1971.²² gdje je pred muzejske djelatnike iznesen i zahtjev da poduzmu detaljnu i kontinuiranu procjenu potreba svojih korisnika. Okrugli stol, odnosno sastanak održan od 20. do 31. svibnja 1972. pod pokroviteljstvom UNESCO-a u Santiagu de Chileu, Čile označio je prekretnicu. Ovaj skup izvorno je zamišljen kao rasprava o ulozi muzeja vezan uz društvene i ekonomske potrebe stanovnika Latinske Amerike s četiri ključne teme: 1) muzeji i kulturni razvoj u ruralnom okolišu, uz mogućnosti razvoja agrikulture; 2) muzeji i problemi okoliša; 3) muzeji i znanstveno-tehnološki napredak; te 4) muzeji i cjeloživotno obrazovanje. Glavni zaključak proizašao iz sastanka jest jasan stav da je povezanost sa zajednicom u kojoj se muzeji nalaze, i kojoj služe, neophodna jer će jedino ona inspirirati i muzeje i zajednicu na kvalitetno promišljanje i zaštitu, što će posljedično potaknuti i ekonomsko napredovanje određenog područja (Davis, 1999: 53). Okrugli stol u Santiagu re-

²⁰ Te je godine u kolovozu održana deveta generalna konferencija ICOM-a u Münchenu, Njemačka.

²¹ Organiziranom od strane ICOM-a; naziv simpozija bio je "Muzeji u suvremenom svijetu".

²² Održane u Grenobleu i Parizu, Francuska.

zultirao je i idejom novog oblika muzeja nazvanog *integrirani muzej*,²³ potpunog u smislu povezanosti s društvom i okolinom koja ga okružuje, ali i u smislu njegove integriteta sa svim ostalim organizacijama ili institucijama društva koje služe i pomažu razvoju lokalne zajednice. Dio usvojene deklaracije to i potvrđuje: “Muzej je institucija u službi društva kao njegova neodvojivog dijela, i u svojoj osnovi on sadrži elemente koji mu omogućuju da pomogne u oblikovanju svijesti zajednica kojima služi, čime može stimulirati te zajednice na akciju projicirajući njihovo povijesno iskustvo kako bi ono kulminiralo u prezentaciji suvremenih problema ... Transformacija u muzeološkim aktivnostima traži postupnu promjenu u gledištima kustosa i administracije i u institucionalnim strukturama za koje su oni odgovorni. Dodatno, integrirani muzej zahtijeva stalnu ili povremenu pomoć stručnjaka raznih disciplina, uključujući društvene znanosti.” (Davis, 1999: 54). Nažalost, niti deklaracija, ni ideje proizašle iz ovog sastanka nisu naišle na razumijevanje i spremnost većine prominentnih muzejskih djelatnika da ih prihvate i primijene u praksi. Nakon sastanka u Santiagu, na još jednom seminaru u organizaciji ICOM-a pod nazivom *Muzeji i okolina*²⁴ dodatno se preispituje uloga muzeja, ovog puta u izravnoj vezi s problemima okoliša. Sam neologizam eko-muzej koji je po prvi puta javno iznesen godinu dana ranije,²⁵ odnosno predstavnici koji podržavaju tu ideju zauzeli su u ovoj raspravi bitnu ulogu, a zaključci seminara definiraju eko-muzeje kao specifične muzeje okoline (Hubert, 1989: 150). Daljnje muzejsko-muzeološke rasprave vezane uz eko-muzejski pokret razvijaju se unutar sastanaka ICOFOM-a, najprije u Ciudad de México, Meksiko 1980., a zatim i u Parizu 1982. gdje se posebno, iako dominantno u kontekstu prakse, raspravlja o ulozi muzeja i eko-muzeja u društvu, ali i o odnosu muzeologije i nove muzeologije. Iako ni sama muzeologija tada još nije bila potpuno definirana i prepoznata kao samostalna znanstvena disciplina, dio članova komiteta inzistirao je da se upravo drugi termin (tj. nova muzeologija) postavi u prvi plan rada komiteta što je dovelo do značajnih nerazumijevanja i razmirica. Slična su se nastavila i na generalnoj skupštini ICOM-a 1983. u Londonu, Velika Britanija gdje je Kanadanin Pierre Mayrand predložio formiranje nove radne grupe tzv. *društvene muzeologije*. Novoizabrano vodstvo ICOM-a odbacilo je taj prijedlog uz obrazloženje da bi on mogao prouzročiti dodatne nejasnoće u odnosu na muzeologiju koja i sama još uvijek teži potpunijoj afirmaciji. Ipak, odlučeno je da se P. Mayranda zaduži da organizira privremenu radnu grupu i pripremi poseban sastanak o eko-muzejima i novoj muzeologiji u okviru sastanka ICOFOM-a planiranog za iduću godinu. Kako taj sastanak nikad nije održan (zahvaljujući i opstrukciji dijela vodstva ICOM-a), pripadnici okupljeni oko privremene radne grupe, potaknuti neuspjehom iz Londona i osjećajem sustavnog ignoriranja, odlučili su samoinicijativno organizirati *Prvu međunarodnu radionicu eko-muzeja i nove muzeologije* 1984. godine u Québecu, Kanada. Glavni je produkt ove radionice tzv. *Québeška deklaracija* u kojoj je izričito naglašeno da “muzeologija mora pospješiti svoje

²³ Eng. *the integrated museum*.

²⁴ Održan je od 25. do 30. rujna 1972. godine u Bordeauxu, Istrasu, Lourmarinu i Parizu, Francuska.

²⁵ Smislio ga je Hugues de Varine, a iznio francuski ministar za okoliš *Robert Poujad* 3. rujna 1971. u gradu Dijonu prigodom primanja muzejskih predstavnika iz cijelog svijeta okupljenih na desetoj generalnoj konferenciji ICOM-a.

izvore kroz multidisciplinarnost, moderne načine komuniciranja koji se koriste u svim kulturnim akcijama, i moderne metode upravljanja koje uključuju i korisnika. Dok štiti materijalna dostignuća prošlih civilizacija i čuva karakteristična dostignuća aspiracija i tehnologije današnjice, nova muzeologija – ekomuzeologija, društvena muzeologija i svi ostali oblici aktivne muzeologije, u prvom je redu zainteresirana za društveni razvoj, odražavajući porivnu snagu u napretku društva i stavljajući ga u svoje planove za budućnost” (Mayrand, 1985: 201). Akcije nove muzeologije dobile su time zamah i u studenome 1985. godine u Lisabonu, Portugal održana je *Druga međunarodna radionica eko-muzeja i nove muzeologije* na kojoj je, nakon neuspješnih pokušaja osnivanja komiteta unutar ICOM-a, ustanovljen *MINOM*,²⁶ međunarodni pokret za novu muzeologiju. U tekstu objavljenom u časopisu *Museum* P. Mayrand iznio je svoje viđenje razmimoilaženja i nužnosti paralelnog djelovanja:²⁷ “razlog može biti u kašnjenju muzejskog establišmenta da bude u toku s brojnim suvremenim - kulturnim, društvenim i političkim razvojem ... ali, po našem mišljenju, glavni je razlog u monolitskoj prirodi muzejskog establišmenta, površnosti reforma koje on predlaže i marginalizaciji svakog eksperimenta ili pogleda koji može biti označen kao ni na koji način obvezatan” te stoga “uzimajući ponovno ideje okruglog stola iz Santiaga koje su bile šutke sklonjene, deklaracija [quebeška – nap. a.] potpuno reafirmira društvenu misiju muzeja kao novo ishodište i prvenstvo ove funkcije nad tradicionalnim muzejskim funkcijama zaštite, zgrade, predmeta i publike ... od Santiaga do Lisabona mi smo svjedoci tranzicije od muzeologije prema društvenoj i političkoj svjesnosti i savjesnosti” (Mayrand, 1985: 200). Usprkos navedenim deklaracijama i istupima njenih predstavnika, nova muzeologija osim prepoznatljivosti u inzistiranju na povezanosti muzeja i zajednice u kojoj se nalaze, te naglašavanju društvene i razvojne uloge muzeja ostala je na epistemološkoj razini ipak prilično nedefinirana. Peter van Mensch (Mensch, 1995: 135-136) napominje da se sam termin nova muzeologija izvorno javlja u tri različita vremena, na tri različita mjesta i s tri različita značenja. Po njegovom istraživanju, prvi put, što je prošlo gotovo bez ikakvog odjeka, javlja se tijekom pedesetih godina u Sjedinjenim Američkim Državama kao pokušaj revitalizacije edukacijske uloge muzeja; zatim krajem sedamdesetih godina u Francuskoj kao nov način promišljanja uloge muzeja u društvu²⁸ i naposljetku krajem osamdesetih godina prošlog stoljeća, isključivo u Velikoj Britaniji vezano uz podizanje razine kvalitete muzejske komunikacije. Ipak, prema dostupnim podacima (usp. Davis, 1999: 54) čini se da je sam termin nova muzeologija, koji je po prvi put javno objavljen 1980. u tekstu koji potpisuje Andre Desvallees u *Encyclopaedia Universalis*, nastao slučajno jer je ovdje upotrijebljen atribut *nova* semantički trebao ukazati da se radi o isključivoj nadopuni ranijeg pojma muzeologija. Bez obzira na to što intencija stvaranja neologizma moguća i nije postojala, sažetak koji je opisuje zadobio je nove sljedbenike, uključujući i sve izvedenice koje su do tada nastale poput muzeologije zajednice, društvene muzeologije, aktivne muzeologije, ekomuzeologije, popularne muzeologije itd. Prema P. van Menschu, ova relativna zbrka mnogobrojnih termina lako je objašnjiva, naime:

²⁶ MINOM je akronim za *Movement International de Museologie Nouvelle*.

²⁷ Napomenimo da je MINOM danas službeno pridruženi komitet ICOM-a.

²⁸ I u relaciji s eko-muzejima.

“u novoj muzeologiji muzeološki ciljevi usmjereni su prema razvoju zajednice, odatle termin društvena muzeologija. Predstavljanje i čuvanje baštine smatrano je unutar konteksta društvene akcije i promjena ... Sami ljudi iz zajednice moraju se brinuti za svoju baštinu, odatle termin popularna muzeologija ... koncept muzeja nije ograničen zgradom. Muzej može biti bilo gdje, i jest bilo gdje i svugdje unutar određenog teritorija. Za ovaj koncept muzeja izmišljen je termin eko-muzej, odatle termin eko-muzeologija.” (1995: 136). Peter Vergo prepoznaje novu muzeologiju kao “stanje široko rasprostranjenog nezadovoljstva sa starom muzeologijom koja se previše bavi muzejskim metodama, a premalo svrhom muzeja” (1989: 3), iako se zbornik eseja pod istim naslovom kojem je upravo on urednik gotovo isključivo bavi prezentacijom muzejskih predmeta i osvrtima na poboljšanje uloge muzejske komunikacije prema korisnicima.²⁹ Peter Davis (1999: 58) iznosi interesantno promišljanje da bi se novu muzeologiju trebalo sagledati u širem kontekstu općeg interesa za baštinu, kulturni identitet i odnose vlasništva, odnosno unutar odnosa posjedovanja baštine. Sažimajući sve navedeno, možemo zaključiti da su glavne karakteristike nove muzeologije primarno određene nezadovoljstvom tradicionalnim muzejima, njihovom praksom inertnosti u odnosu na probleme društva u kojem egzistiraju i nužnošću promjene iste, ali i postojanje želje za unapređenjem i osmišljavanjem kvalitetnijeg koncepta (s jasno izraženom praktičnom primjenom) koji će obogatiti muzeologiju i dati joj novi smisao i ulogu. Ili, izrečeno drugim riječima, nova je muzeologija skupni naziv za novo teorijsko promišljanje uloge institucije muzeja u društvu, ali i suodnosa čovjeka i baštine u kompleksnosti realiteta u kojima egzistiraju, s naglaskom na nužno potrebnoj primjenjivosti teorije u svakodnevnoj praksi.

Kako god ih interpretirali, eko-muzeji i nova muzeologija označili su važnu prekretnicu u razvoju propitivanjem odnosa na relaciji čovjek-društvo-baština, iako njeni izvorni zagovaratelji nisu napravili kritično potrebnu teorijsku sintezu u smislu redefiniranja postojeće, ili pak formuliranja nove znanstvene discipline,³⁰ odnosno samog fenomena izučavanja. Eko-muzeji su odbacili koncept muzeja kao zgrade-ustanove,³¹ a koncept muzejskog predmeta kao središnjeg fenomena zamijenili su konceptom totaliteta baštine. Gledajući iz perspektive razvoja znanosti, oni su time ukazali na moguću anomaliju muzeologije. I iako su određene ideje, pa čak i djelomično razvijene teorije u tom pravcu donekle formulirane,³² brojni izazovi još uvijek ostaju pred nama, od kojih nam se najznačajniji čine oni strukturalnog definiranja temeljnog pojma izučavanja, kao i sveobuhvatne teorije koja ga objašnjava. Analiza baštine kao istinskog fenomena samo je započeta praksom eko-muzeja i novom muzeologijom. Uz nužnost priloga tradicionalnih znanstvenih disciplina vezanih uz muzeje danas nam komunikologija i javni mediji, sociološke ruralne, urbane i regionalne studije, geografija (koja je često bila zanemarena u ovom segmentu), ekonomija, osobito kroz upravljanje i marketing, pa i mnoge druge discipline koje dodiruju ili istražuju sadržaj bašti-

²⁹ Kao značajni predstavnik trećeg pravca nove muzeologije koji definira P. van Mensch.

³⁰ Samostalne ili interdisciplinarne.

³¹ Nova muzeologija čak i potrebu institucije uopće.

³² Usporedi, npr.: Šola, 2003: 301-319 i Šola, 2005: 5-7.

ne i identiteta mogu pružiti osobit i iznimno vrijedan prilog. Sadržajno preklapanje temeljnog pojma izučavanja od strane ponekad prividno ne toliko bliskih znanstvenih područja ili grana, konvergencija koja se događa na praktičnoj razini i već donekle postojeće artikulacije u pravcu sinteze ukazuju da nova znanost i nije tako daleka budućnost. Istina je da ni u novoj muzeologiji kao teoriji, niti u eko-muzejima kao pragmatičnim oblicima nećemo naći dovoljno elemenata da bismo mogli tvrditi da smo tu razinu već dostigli, no istovremeno nećemo pogriješiti ukažemo li upravo na njih kao glavni potencijal onoga što će se, odnosno vjerujemo da će se razviti u novu, očito je, interdisciplinarnu znanost o baštini.

Umjesto zaključka, ili vrijednosti eko-muzeja

Eko-muzeji nastali u Francuskoj početkom sedamdesetih godina prošlog stoljeća, osobita su materijalizacija novog načina promišljanja odnosa društva i okoline u kojoj egzistira. Inzistiranje na razvojnoj komponenti imanentna im je odrednica. Iako se njihova praksa povremeno koristila nekim već postojećim institucionalnim iskustvima, eko-muzeji posjeduju bitnu, distinktivnu funkciju novog pristupa tvoreći tako svojevrsnu razvojnu paradigmu - samih muzeja kao institucija društva, ali i teorijskog promišljanja suodnosa čovjeka i totaliteta baštine. I nakon više od trideset godina od svog nastanka, oni su za mnoge još uvijek inovacija. U potpunosti ironično, iako tako u životu često biva, eko-muzeji su pored svih svojih dostignuća još uvijek najpoznatiji isključivo po svojem nazivu. Neosporna je činjenica, potvrđena i od samog autora, da je neologizam nastao kao kompromis kada je riječ muzej bila prilično nepopularna, te je tada aktualni prefiks *eko* poslužio da se novoosmišljenoj muzejskoj formi dade potreban politički i društveni kredibilitet. Nažalost, ni gotovo četrdeset godina nakon toga mnogi još uvijek ne razumiju da taj prefiks ne podrazumijeva isključiv fokus na probleme povezane s prirodnom baštinom ili pak ruralnim krajevima.³³ Izvorna intencija njegove upotrebe doista proizlazi iz značenja ekologije koja svoj korijen ima u grčkoj riječi *oikos*,³⁴ ali za razliku od površnih tumačenja koje je kasnije zadobila upotreba riječi ekologija u slučaju eko-muzeja podrazumijevala je istinski odraz razvoja kulturnog i gospodarskog života na nekom području određenog uvjetima i ograničenjima prirodnog okruženja (Engström, 1985: 206). Drugi problem izvorne koncepcije eko-muzeja, ponovno ironično s obzirom na njihov početni razvoj, nastao je kao posljedica pomodnosti koju su u jednom trenutku uzrokovali. Često je korištenje ovog naziva³⁵ značilo sigurnije i lakše osiguravanje potrebnih sredstava za ustanovljenje novog muzeja ili njegovo funkcioniranje. Treba ovdje napomenuti da se oblici koje nazivamo istinskim eko-muzejima,³⁶ ponekad zbog otpora pomodnosti, ali i

³³ Pa time i suvrstom prirodoslovnih muzeja, odnosno etnografskih muzeja.

³⁴ U značenju domaćinstva, kuće, familije.

³⁵ Interpretiran u smislu upotrebljivog alata za zaštitu prirodne baštine.

³⁶ Možda bi pravilnije bilo kazati: razni oblici baštinskih akcija koje se svojom praksom i teorijskim razmišljanjima preklapaju s idejama vezanim uz prvobitne eko-muzeje.

zbog razumijevanja da se jedna praksa i oblik funkcioniranja utemeljena na identitetu ne može preslikati na drugu lokaciju kao njena jednostavna kopija, nisu ni koristili tim nazivom. Uzmu li u obzir sve varijante tako da pod jedan pojam, ma koje mu ime dali, uvrstimo sve pojave i prakse koje su se u posljednjih četrdeset godina dogodile kao rezultat novog načina promišljanja, moguće je izdvojiti nekoliko im značajnih i zajedničkih karakteristika. Osnovni indikatori eko-muzeja tako su:

- posvojenje, odnosno protezanje teritorijem koji nije nužno određen konvencionalnim granicama;
- prihvaćanje politike dislociranih, fragmentiranih lokaliteta koja je povezana s *in situ* zaštitom i interpretacijom;
- napuštanje konvencionalne percepcije vlasništva; zaštita i interpretacija lokaliteta odvija se putem veza i suradnje;
- osnaživanje, ovlaštenje lokalne zajednice - uključenošću lokalne populacije u muzejske aktivnosti i u stvaranje njihovog kulturnog identiteta;
- prisutnost interdisciplinarnosti i holističke interpretacije.³⁷

Eko-muzej, dakle, implicira jasan interdisciplinarni pristup, posjeduje čvrstu regionalnu karakteristiku (definiran je granicama identiteta i kulture, a ne administrativnim granicama) i, naravno, podrazumijeva uključenost i suradnju s lokalnom zajednicom koja uvijek i obvezatno sudjeluje u njegovom planiranju, radu i upravljanju - ona je pravi kustos eko-muzeja.

Na kraju, razmišljajući o dosadašnjem razvoju, ali i o budućnosti eko-muzeja, možemo prihvatiti razmatranja Tomislava Šole koji napominje da su eko-muzeji "ujedinili na kompaktan način teoriju i praksu ... jer (stvaranje) eko-muzeja znači slijediti jednu filozofiju, mentalno i društveno ponašanje koje se pretočilo u profesionalnu metodologiju koja je značila svugdje prepoznatljiv pristup. ... (Stoga) jedan eko-muzej ne može biti model nego dapače način osluškivanja / spoznaje institucionalne misije i odgovornosti ove u ostvarivanju ciljeva zajedničkog ideala. ... teorija eko-muzeja, ako je točno shvaćena, predstavlja potpunu prekretnicu, onu tako dugo očekivanu mentalnu promjenu koja daje prevladavajuću svjetlost i inspiraciju muzejskoga svijeta. Razinstitucionalizirani muzej u krajnosti je potpuna svijest o individualnom i skupnom identitetu, način življenja s prošlošću, osjetljivost na vrijednost određenog identiteta. Te vrijednosti trebale bi biti poznate, sačuvane i uzgajane s ljubavlju, sa svrhom iznalaženja kontinuiteta unutar neizbježnosti promjena" (1999: 20-23).

Literatura:

Crus-Ramirez, Alfredo. 1985. "The Heimatmuseum: a perverted forerunner". *Museum* 148, vol. 37 (4): 242-244.

³⁷ Navedeni prema: Davis, 1999: 228.

Davis, Peter. 1999. *Ecomuseums: a Sense of Place*. London & New York: Leicester University Press.

Davis, Peter. 2007. "Ecomuseum and sustainability in Italy, Japan and China: concept adaptation through implementation". U *Museum Revolutions: How Museums change and are changed*. S. J. Knell; S. MacLeod; S. Watson, ur. London & New York: Routledge, str.198-214.

Engström, Kjell. 1985. "The ecomuseums concept is taking root in Sweden". *Museum* 148, vol. 37 (4): 206-210.

Hubert, François. 1989. "Historique des ecomusees". U *La Museologie selon Georges Henri Riviere*, J-F. Barbier Bouvet et al., ur. Paris: Dunod, str. 142-154.

Kuhn, Thomas S. 2002. *Struktura znanstvenih revolucija*. Zagreb: Jesenski i Turk.

Maroević, Ivo. 1984. "Od muzeja na otvorenom do eko-muzeja". *Informatica museologica* 1-3 (67-69): 18-19.

Maroević, Ivo. 1993. *Uvod u muzeologiju*. Zagreb: Zavod za informacijske studije.

Mayrand, Pierre. 1985. "The new museology proclaimed". *Museum* 148, vol. 37 (4): 200-201.

Mensch, Peter van. 1995. "Magpies on Mount Helicon". *ICOFOM Study Series* 25, 133-138.

Ravlić, Slaven. 2003. "Ekologizam kao ideologija". U *Suvremene političke ideologije*. Zagreb: Politička kultura, str. 310-325.

Šola, Tomislav. 1999. "L'innovazione degli ecomusei e i musei di tradizione". U *Musei per l'ambiente*. F. Cechini, ur. Argenta: Comune di Argenta, str. 20-23.

Šola, Tomislav. 2003. *Eseji o muzejima i njihovoj teoriji: prema kibernetičkom muzeju*. Zagreb: Hrvatski nacionalni komitet ICOM.

Šola, Tomislav. 2005. "What theory ? What heritage?". *Nordisk museologi* 2005/2: 3-16.

Varine-Bohan, Huges de. 1974. "Un musée "éclaté": le Musée de l'homme et de l'industrie Le Creusot-Montceau-les-Mines", *Museum* 25 (4): 242-249.

Varine-Bohan, Huges de. 1993. "Tommorrow's community museums", <http://assembly.coe.int/Museum/ForumEuroMusee/Conferences/tomorrow.htm>. (20.01.2009.)

Varine, Huges de. 2009. "The origin of the new museology concept", http://www.interactions-online.com/page_news.php?id_news=170&filtre_visu=30&pr (05.02.2009.)

Vergo, Peter, ur. 1989. *The New Museology*. London: Reaktion Books.

Watson, Mark. 1992. "Ecomuseum". U *Blackwell Encyclopedia of Industrial Archaeology*. B. Trinder, ur. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, str. 225.

Darko Babić

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb
Information Sciences Department
Museology Chair
Zagreb
Croatia
dbabic@ffzg.hr

UDK 069.01

069.5"19"

Review paper

Received: March 13, 2009

Accepted: April 10, 2009

Experiences and (hidden) Values of Ecomuseums

The 1970's created a new relation between museums and the society, most of all through the concept of ecomuseum. In the meantime, the society – the context in which museums exist - has changed considerably. While originally responding to the needs of the moment, with their concept of territory, heritage, identity and development, and (local) community as the basic pillar of the process, ecomuseums and the new museology movement anticipated many contemporary theoretical and practical discussions. In the meantime, traditional (classic) museums took over some of the experience from ecomuseums, while ecomuseums themselves evolved and created new forms of manifestation. The intention of this paper is to provide a critical insight into the development and innovations of ecomuseums and the new museology, and show the applicability and usability of this concept in today's changed social circumstances.

Key words: ecomuseums, new museology

Introduction

Why do we consider heritage and care for heritage important? Who defines it and how? What affects and determines our position towards it? Finally, who controls it and how, on whose behalf and to what purpose? Answers to these questions might seem too simple, but still, if we take some time to consider and apply our deliberations to the situations that surround us on a daily basis, we will notice there are always reasons for additional examinations, as well as a need for expert and scientifically grounded explanations. Heritage is a phenomenon that can be explained (at least in part) using a number of scientific disciplines. Museology is certainly one of them. The times of crisis have always provided fertile ground for new and creative solutions. Paradigms are only seemingly

constant. A move into a new paradigm always starts with a crisis and revolution (not necessarily a violent one), but it does not end there – until an individual or a group offers solutions that appeal to the majority of practitioners of the next generation (cf. Kuhn, 2002). One of such accomplishments inside museology or, in a wider perspective, the relation of man towards heritage in general began with ecomuseums.

In 1970s a conscious, mental turning point in the development of the relation between man and the heritage in which they exist (i.e. that surrounds them) was set. Inside historical overviews of the development of museology, some theoreticians believe this is in fact the second revolution, arguing that the first one happened between 1880 and 1920, when a similarity between practical problems that almost all museums share was recognized. In other words, interest in the common field was increased, as well as in museology as the discipline that deals with this field. Although some of the discussions had a theoretical and critical background, the dominant subject was still practice (cf. Mensch, 1995: 133-138), so a museographic turn took place. According to the same author, in the period between 1960 and 1980 a new synergy occurred, but this time as a result of the need to transform the role of museums in the society and insisting upon their active role. This ‘second revolution’ was marked by the creation of a new type of museum – *ecomuseum* – while the theoretical development that followed it created, even if museology was still insufficiently defined, the so-called *new museology*. Due to the importance of the correlation between ecomuseums and the new museology, we will deal with this matter in more detail later in the text.¹ In order to grasp this correlation, it is necessary to get a detailed insight into the very phenomenon of ecomuseums.

Ecomuseums, sources and development

In the year 1971 in central France², in the area of approximately 500sqm around the towns of *Le Creusot* and *Montceau-les-Mines* the world’s first ecomuseum started to be developed. This area has seen major changes after the World War II, mostly because the Schneiders, who had owned industrial complexes the local economy depended upon, were accused of collaboration with the Nazi regime, so their management was moved to Paris. A dislocated management meant lack of interest, which was followed, due to changes in the economy, by a complete neglect and deterioration of industrial plants, and the loss of jobs for roughly 150,000 locals. The answer to this original situation, in line with the regional development policy, came from *Hugues de Varine*, *Georges Henri Rivière* and *Marcel Evrard*, who proposed *The Museum of Man and Industry*, a museum that was to startup the economy again, but also, perhaps even more importantly, help the local population rediscover meaning, their own identity, and

¹ We will also include the questioning of possible changes to the paradigm, i.e. the science itself and an adequate approach to the heritage phenomenon.

² West of the Lyon-Dijon line.

open new development possibilities. The Schneider family's 18th century château was set as the center of the Museum of Man and Industry. Inside it, there is an adequate presentation of the historical development and key features of the region, as well as the everyday life of the local population and their industrial and artistic products. This way, the castle was defined as a starting point for learning about and exploration of the entire region. In the rest of the area, a specific form of a fragmented museum was developed, which means that elements in the landscape and the belonging tangible and/or intangible testimonies were processed by museologists and interpreted *in situ*, at the site of their origin and without moving them into the main building. This enabled an important theoretical and practical breakthrough – from an exclusive focus on the museum building towards the wholeness of the territory the museum is covering. The primary task of the lowest possible number of hired experts was to launch the museum and act as a sort of catalysts to the process, performing only the most demanding technical jobs.³ In the year 1974, when it was completed, it became known⁴ in the museum world most of all due to its collection definition published in the *Museum* magazine:⁵ “Any movable or unmovable object within the community's perimeter is a notional part of the museum. This introduces the idea of a kind of cultural ownership, which has nothing to do with legal ownership” (Varine, 1974: 244). The museum's audience, i.e., users, was perceived in a similar way. It was implied that the museum's audience was made of the entire community - all the individuals living in the territory (defined area) in which the museum exists were considered its active users.

In a number of features, the Museum of Man and Industry differed from most or nearly all museums of the time – especially in the already mentioned position towards collections, territory and users, but also in the relations inside the museum and organization of work. Some twenty years later, looking back at his own experience of working on this project, one of its key initiators said: “Nothing, I like to think, has been the same since Le Creusot. It attracted a large number of pilgrims and it bred disciples in a number of countries, who in turn set up their own kind of eco-museum, without always using the name. With hindsight we can see that the real value of Le Creusot was to be a research laboratory, in which new museum theories and practices were developed, argued about and evaluated.” (Varine, 1993). The novelties ecomuseums introduced were revolutionary indeed, but of course the (long) history of museum as an institution also records examples that indicate interesting forms that can be recognized as sorts of proto-forms of ecomuseums.

During the 19th century, many museums were created as the result of actions by various associations that, in order to support their scientific hypotheses, collected tangible culture items. It is rather interesting that they always emphasized the importance of participation of the local population in this process, as well as the benefits for a spe-

³ E.g., systematical research, cataloguing, organization of more complex activities, representing museum's interests to the authorities etc.

⁴ i.e. disputed at the time.

⁵ *Museum* magazine, today called *Museum International*, published by UNESCO.

cific community – museums, just like libraries, were at the time perceived as essential means for educating wide circles of society. Unfortunately, with the start of the 20th century, such an approach slowly started to lose importance and museums were once again transformed into rather closed institutions. Now they were no longer an exclusive privilege of the ruling classes, but hermetical institutions with the sole purpose of serving the needs of scientific research. Decades later, ecomuseums were the first to change this tendency, thus defining today's understanding of the purpose and sense of museums in the society. Parallel with this, two existing museum forms influenced the development of ecomuseums: open air museums and *heimat* museums.

The credit for open air museums goes to Artur Hazelius, who had houses of different type, origin, purpose and age from all parts of Sweden moved to the *Skansen* hill outside Stockholm. With an adequate interior, decorated house lot, demonstration of manufacturing with the 'old' technology in workshops, and organized festivals and costumed guides, this form⁶ attempted to place items in their functional context (cf. Maroević, 1993: 40). As such, it became and remained to this day an inspiration to all the museums of this type, as well as to the creators of ecomuseums.

*Heimat*⁷ museums originated in the 19th century, but their popularity rose between the two world wars. Their heritage is the awareness of the importance of the role of museums in society and their obligation to be active and dynamic. Or, as J. Klersch writes in 1936: "The *Heimat* museum must not be a kingdom of the dead (...). It is made for the living; it is to the living that it must belong, and they must feel at ease there. The living are continually on the move, from yesterday to tomorrow, and the museum must help them to see the present in the mirror of the past, and the past in the mirror of the present. They will thus experience the intimate cohesion of past and present which begets the future. The crucial task of the *Heimat* museum is to serve the people and the present, and if it fails in that task, it becomes no more than a lifeless collection of objects." (Davis, 1999: 47). This is an appeal that can, without major changes, be interpreted as the mission of today's museums as well. Unfortunately, *heimat* museums shared the destiny of historic space and time. As the Nazi regime had intensively used them, just like many other things, for spreading its propaganda, practically erasing the undesired parts of history or interpreting them without any foundation to fit its own agenda, it is also possible to see them as a sort of perverse predecessors of ecomuseums (Crus-Ramirez, 1985: 242-244).

Nevertheless, what defined ecomuseums in the end was the 1960s, when the social context created prerequisites for their development. In mid 1960s there was a highly intensive turmoil generated by disputes and discontent with the situation in the society. At the same time, but with a much higher publicity, frequent ecological disasters, the danger of the arms race and nuclear experiments, impact of industry on environmental pollution, and the daily and more than apparent disappearance of the

⁶ Opened for visitors in 1891.

⁷ *Heimatmuseum* can be translated to Croatian as *zavičajni muzej* (native place museum). The word *Heimat* in fact means *homeland*, but its idea is closer to the term *native place*.

natural heritage and rural landscapes gave birth to a new form of awareness known as *ecologism* or *environmentalism*.⁸ The benefits and authority of the ruling elites were disputed at the ideological level, so urgent and considerable changes were sought after. Along with the need to reform and democratize school system or universities, for example, the issue of social relevance of all the institutions, including museums, was paramount. It became clear that the existing institutions were simply not adequate for the needs of the society they are or should be intended for. In the case of museums, this was best defined through demands that they by all means serve the entire community, and that their rather static role be replaced with a dynamic one, i.e. that they take on the role of the driver of change and development. The existing museum institutions were simply not able to cope with such demands and offer good answers. We could conclude, somewhat ironically, that back then museums were so focused on themselves that they forgot their own heritage and institutional experience.

Just like the rest of the world in late 1960s, France was also in the midst of social turmoil, intensified by the discovered consequences of a fast postwar urbanization that lead to neglect and decline of the rural parts of the country. One of the proposed political solutions that were supposed to offset the negative effects was designing the development of the local economy as part of regional developmental planning, while at the same time executing conscious actions to protect the environment – the process in which regional nature parks were created as well. French museologist *Georges Henri Rivière*, who had been pointing to the necessity of founding an open air museum in France for a while, saw in the proposed development of regional parks the possibilities for good protection and presentation of the rich cultural heritage. Since he thought that a society is primarily expressed through construction, G. H. Rivière advocated the realization of the so-called *museum of houses*⁹, explaining that “open air museums are museums of houses, detached from their environment and relocated into a fenced space that is used in a museographic manner” (Hubert, 1989: 147). On these bases, three houses and a windmill on *Isle de Quessant* in *Parc d'Armorique* in Bretagne were chosen for the future museum, while *Quessant House of Technique and Tradition*¹⁰ was defined as a point of origin around which a museographic tour of the entire area was formed. This house-museum, opened in July 1968, is by its basic features¹¹ in fact France's first ecomuseum, even though this term did not exist at the time. Another significant project, also connected with regional parks, is a variant

⁸ A number of authors consider these terms to be synonymous, but it needs to be noted that there is a certain difference between them. Ecologism denotes a political doctrine, an ideology based on ecological hypotheses, first of all an important link between man (who is just a part, not an almighty ruler of nature) and the natural world that surrounds them. On the other hand, environmentalism is a form of a moderate, reformative approach that searches for answers to the environmental crisis primarily from the human standpoint, without questioning the conventional, anthropocentric presumptions on the natural world (cf. Ravlić, 2003: 310-325).

⁹ French *musee de maison*.

¹⁰ Which was the name of the building in which the permanent exhibition was located.

¹¹ Especially because of the structure of the center (origin) and its accompanying localities, distributed in the space and connected in terms of their ideas.

of an open air museum that came to life in *Grande Landes* (Gascony Region), where again under leadership of G. H. Rivière the museum of the *Marqueze* area was created in 1969. The museum was formed around a single authentic house dating from 1824. Other houses were then added to it, by relocating them from other parts of the Grande Landes area. Equipped with an adequate interior, the arrangement of houses was carefully planned in space in order to create an image of this part of the 19th century France that would be as faithful as possible. The atmosphere was also supported by placing domestic animals in house lots, and in the course of time also by a controlled breeding of exclusively traditional varieties of wine and other plants specific to this area. At first glance this might seem like a classic open air museum, however, some ideas realized here for the first time surpassed this museum form. This museum was immensely popular and it quickly faced the problem of too many visitors. This was gradually and with a relative success tackled by defining, marking and interpreting new elements in the landscape in order to disperse visitors over a larger space inside the park. By their many characteristics these two museums belong to ecomuseums, even though neither of them used this name. As was mentioned earlier, the first ecomuseum was created several years later - the Museum of Man and Industry in the area of Le Creusot and Montceau-les-Mines. After that, during the 1970s, several other ecomuseums came to life in France. Two were especially noteworthy: *Ecomuseum of the Lozère Mountain* and the museum in the *Regional Nature Park Camargue*. In the year 1971 in the *National Park Cevennes* a project design of the *Ecomuseum of the Mountain Lozère* was initiated. At first, it faced the problem of extreme distrust of the interested parties, but over time, the collaboration between experts and the community reached a solid level, so the main center for visitors was opened in 1983. On the other hand, in 1973 the *Regional Nature Park Camargue* became home to the initiative launched with the idea of realizing two basic objectives: a) explore the local ethnographic heritage that was to become the basis for the future interpretation of the area; and b) a clear need, or a conscious wish, to actively involve as many locals as possible in these explorations and the project as a whole. The second objective was given a very high priority, as it was primarily in the function of bridging the differences and disagreements between the local population and their guests, tourists, who started to visit the nature park more frequently. The project was designed and defined as a kind of informal obligation for the entire local population, which was in this manner consciously encouraged to take an active part in the development and management of the future museum and, as a result, better understand and value its own heritage and the environment in which it exists. This is a goal that can be still, after more than thirty years, applied to a number of areas in our country without major changes, especially because this museum offered a solution that would function in harmony with the challenges brought by cooperation with tourism. Opened in 1978, this ecomuseum, which in the end did not use this name¹², proved to be good and innovative enough to deserve, only a year later, a prestigious award presented by renowned museum experts, becoming the European Museum of the Year.¹³ In early

¹² This is a special problem, which will be discussed later in the text.

¹³ The European Museum of the Year Award is presented by the European Museum Forum, an NGO composed of distinguished European museum workers, practitioners and theoreticians.

1980s, the number of newly founded ecomuseums in France increased rapidly, while the ecomuseum concept was spread across the world, first of all in the French-speaking Canada¹⁴ and Scandinavia.

The development of original French ecomuseums can be perceived through three basic stages. The first one lasts until 1971, with *Armorique* and *Grandes Landes*. It is primarily marked by a clear connection with nature parks and an emphasis on the spatial dimension. The second stage lasts approximately between 1971 and 1980 and introduces the dimension of time, defined territory and participation of local communities in the realization of projects (*Le Creusot*, *Camargue* and *Cevennes*). The third one starts after 1980 and is marked by an even stronger role of the local community and a further emphasis on the goals and methods of a defined efficiency of planned regeneration of areas. A fast growth rate of new ecomuseums is characteristic for this last stage (cf. Hubert, 1989: 146-153). Roughly at this time, from the state of clear differentiation, or even museum heresy as some believed, ecomuseums became a generally accepted concept in the museum practice. This is the result of changed social circumstances on one hand, and the acceptance of ecomuseum ideas (although usually adapted as necessary) by the so-called traditional or classic museum institutions on the other.

The recent period did not bring any major breakthroughs in the development, but was marked by a further expansion of the concept. According to P. Davis (cf. Davis: 1999; Davis: 2007), there are around sixty ecomuseums in France today, with more than three hundred institutions or projects worldwide being described as ecomuseums. Since May 1992, when the first international conference was held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, representatives of ecomuseums have been meeting on a regular basis, exchanging practical experiences and theoretical insights in the ecomuseum movement. Regarding the recent period, it needs to be noted that ecomuseums, with their specific way of acting, are one of the first promoters of the ecotourism movement, as well as of sustainable and heritage tourism. This is yet another clear proof that since their very beginnings, ecomuseums have anticipated certain values that became generally accepted in the past 10-15 years. A similar thing can be said about their respect for intangible heritage,¹⁵ and we tend to believe that the ecomuseums concept can also be adapted to universal heritage values - in other words, that it is adaptable to different perceptions and values of heritage created inside different cultures, thus overcoming the 'classic' museum form, which is and will always be dominantly Eurocentric, and as such acceptable only in the western culture domain.

¹⁴ Already in the late 1970s.

¹⁵ Here we will not get involved in a theoretical discussion on the essential intangibility of any heritage, including the one we unambiguously denote as tangible; instead, we take intangibility as defined by UNESCO.

Ecomuseum definitions

It is not easy to define ecomuseum simply and in few words. Ecomuseum simply has to be experienced. However, since active participation in creating and developing an ecomuseum, and thus introducing the required own adaptations based on local needs, is not always possible, definitions are still the necessary starting point. Nevertheless, the same as theories, they exist to question and clarify in advance the meaning of the action we undertake, thus helping us define our goal and directing us on the right path. Ecomuseum definitions we present here have exactly this purpose and their specific expression reflects the needs of their authors to describe the essence and significance of this museological action, as well as the destiny of ecomuseums, which were in their historic development often met with enthusiasm, but also lack of understanding for the (museum) environment in which they existed. Three definitions formulated by one of the key players in creating the ecomuseum - Georges Henri Rivière – are the most important, and they also mirror their development.¹⁶ The first one originates in the year 1973 and is composed of two parts. In the first one, ecomuseum is defined as the ‘new genre of museum’ that is based on interdisciplinarity (especially ecology), organic bond with the community in which it exists, and participation of this community in its constitution and operation. The second part defines the very structure of ecomuseums. As *musee eclate*,¹⁷ it is composed of the primary coordination body and secondary bodies, branches or antennas. This definition saw major changes and amendments in the year 1976 (the so-called second definition). On January 22, 1980 G. H. Rivière suggested the third definition, which completely left out the word ‘museum’, replacing it with terms such as ‘expression’ or ‘interpretation’.¹⁸ The definition is as follows:

”An ecomuseum is an instrument conceived, fashioned and operated jointly by a public (e.g. local) authority, and its local population. The public authority’s involvement is through the experts [staff], facilities and resources it provides; the local population’s involvement depends on its aspirations, knowledge and individual approach.

It is a mirror in which the local population views itself to discover its own image, in which it seeks an explanation of the territory to which it is attached and of the populations which have preceded it, through the discontinuity or continuity of generations. It is a mirror that the local population holds up to its visitors so that it may be better understood and so that its industry, customs and identity may command respect.

It is an expression of man and nature. It situates man in his natural environment. It portrays nature in its wildness, but also as adapted by traditional and industrial society in their own image.

¹⁶ Definitions given here are cited from Hubert, 1989: 151.

¹⁷ Eng. fragmented museum.

¹⁸ In this way, phrases such as “museum of man and nature”, “museum of time” or “museum of space” will become “expression of man and nature”, “expression of time” or “expression of space”.

It is an expression of time, when the explanations it offers reach back before the appearance of man, ascend the course of the prehistoric and historical times in which he lived and arrive finally at man's present. It also offers vistas of the future, while having no pretensions to decision-making, its function being rather to inform and critically analyze.

It is an interpretation of space – of special places in which to stop or stroll.

It is a laboratory, in so far as it contributes to the study of the past and present of the population concerned and of its environment and promotes the training of specialists in those fields, in co-operation with outside research bodies. It is a conservation centre, in so far as it helps to preserve and develop the natural and cultural heritage of the population. It is a school, in so far as it involves the population in its work of study and protection and encourages it to have a clearer grasp of its own future. This laboratory, conservation centre and school are based on common principles. The culture in the name of which they exist is to be understood in its broadest sense, and they are concerned to foster awareness of its dignity and artistic manifestations, from whatever stratum of the population they derive. Its diversity is limitless, so greatly do its elements vary from one specimen to another. This triad, then, is not self-enclosed: it receives and it gives.”

This nearly poetical definition can be fully justified. Ecomuseums are not solid homogenous forms, they change and adapt depending on time, space, and most of all, population, the community in which they operate and its developmental needs, so the definitions are also always evolutive.

Along with G. H. Rivière, other main characters in the movement also offered their definitions of the 'new' museum, always trying to emphasize its main features or specific parts they saw as especially significant. Here we will mention some of the most notable ones.¹⁹ Pierre Mayrand in 1982 noticed that “eco-museum is a collective, a workshop extending over a territory that a population has taken as its own ... it is not an end to itself, it is defined as an objective to be met”. A. Desvallees in 1987 suggested that if G. H. Rivière's definition was to be accepted, then an ecomuseum must be a museum of identity (because of the mention of time, space and the mirror, i.e. reflection) and a museum of territory, where the prefix *eco* symbolizes the importance of both natural and social environment an ecomuseum is placed in. René Rivard in 1988 compared a traditional museum consisting of a building, collection, experts and audience with an ecomuseum consisting of territories, heritage, memory and community/population, while Mark Watson in 1992 in the *Encyclopedia of Industrial Archaeology* says: “An ecomuseum is a project that allows the population of an area to discern its own identity through its buildings, ecology, geology, as well as through documents and oral history and to make the studying of those a common action, and not something limited only to educated experts “ (225). Peter Davis, searching primarily for common indicators of ecomuseums concludes: “(...) the one characteristic that appears to be common to ecomuseums is pride in the place they represent. (...) ecomu-

¹⁹ Definitions have been quoted from (1999), except from those with a specific source given.

seums seek to capture the sense of place – and in my opinion it would appear that this is what makes them special (...).” (1999: 238-239). In May 2004, thirty years after the creation of the first ecomuseum, participants in the *Network of European Ecomuseums* workshop in Trento, Italy, defined ecomuseum as a dynamic way in which a specific community conserves, interprets and manages its own heritage through sustainable development. According to this definition, an ecomuseum is always based on agreement, i.e. consent of the community it operates in. The latter is probably the easiest to understand and almost implicit. Conservation, interpretation and management are today the functions that are understood when we talk about museums. The terms ‘heritage’ and ‘sustainable development’ should imply ideas that need no additional explanation. Space or, figuratively said, the door to consent of the community is partly opened with a focus on the user, who has over the past decade become the key subject of museum interest, even though user and community are not the same and there is still room for improvements. An exceptional importance of ecomuseums lies in the fact that all these values that are today implicit had been anticipated thirty years ago, by integrating in their operation the awareness of the totality of heritage and the need of using it for (sustainable) development, based on the needs of the local community as a whole.

Contribution of new museology

How important a role does theory play and was it really preceded by practice of ecomuseums? At first glance it might seem so, because more intensive theoretical debates, analyses and attempts at museological syntheses of this movement happened only several years later. However, practice and theory happened simultaneously (Šola, 1999: 20-23). Just as in the case of the development of ecomuseums, new museological reflections originated as the result of the processes taking place during the 1960s, which called for a more intensive care for the environment, social responsibility and an active role of museums, connected with a development policy (Varine, 2009). As early as 1968, in the final resolution of the ICOM general conference²⁰ it is required that “museums be recognized as major institutions in the service of development, because of the contribution they can make to cultural, social and economic life” (Davis, 1999: 52). Similar suggestions were also heard at the international symposium held in November 1969 in Paris²¹, and at the ICOM tenth general conference in 1971²², where museum workers were also presented with a request to take a further and continuous evaluation of the needs of their users. The roundtable held on May 20-31, 1972 in Santiago de Chile, Chile, and sponsored by the UNESCO was a turning point. This summit was originally planned as a discussion on the role of museums with regards to social and economic needs of the people of Latin America with four key top-

²⁰ In August this year, the 9th general conference of the ICOM was held in Munich, Germany.

²¹ Organized by ICOM; the symposium was named “*The Museums and the Modern World*”.

²² Held in Grenoble and Paris, France.

ics: 1) museums and cultural development in a rural environment, with a possibility of agricultural development; 2) museums and environmental issues; 3) museums and scientific/technological progress; and 4) museums and lifelong education. The key conclusion of the summit was a clear stand that the bond with communities in which museums are located and which they serve to is a must, because only such a bond will inspire both museums and communities to a high-quality reflection and conservation, which will then, as a result, encourage economic progress in a specific area (Davis, 1999: 53). The roundtable in Santiago also resulted in an idea of a new form of museum, called *integrated museum*,²³ integrated in the sense of a bond with the society and the environment that surrounds it, but also in the sense of its integration with all the other organizations or institutions of the society that serve and help the development the local community. A part of the adopted declaration confirms that: “the museum is an institution in the service of society of which it forms an inseparable part and, of its very nature, contains the elements which enable it to help in molding the consciousnesses of the community it serves, through which it can stimulate those communities to action by projecting forward its historical activities so that they culminate in the presentation of contemporary problems (...) The transformation in museological activities calls for gradual change in the outlook of the curators and administrators and in the institutional structure for which they are responsible. In addition, the integrated museum requires the permanent or temporary assistance of experts from various disciplines, including the social sciences.” (Davis, 1999: 54). Unfortunately, neither the declaration, nor the ideas coming from this meeting, was met with understanding and willingness by the majority of prominent museum workers to accept and apply them in practice. Following the summit in Santiago, at another seminar organized by ICOM called *Museums and Environment*²⁴ the role of museums was assessed additionally, this time directly in connection with environmental issues. The very neologism ecomuseum, which was publicly presented a year earlier for the first time²⁵, i.e. representatives advocating this idea, took on an important role in this discussion and in conclusion the seminar defined ecomuseums as specific environment museums (Hubert, 1989: 150). Further museological discussions over the ecomuseum movement were developed at ICOFOM conferences, first in Ciudad de México, Mexico, in 1980, and then in Paris, France, in 1982, where special attention was paid to the role of museums and ecomuseums in the society, although dominantly in the context of practice, and the relation between museology and new museology. While museology itself was not fully defined or recognized as a separate scientific discipline at the time, some committee members insisted on placing the second term (new museology) in the highlight of the committee’s operation, which lead to major differences and disputes. A similar thing happened at the ICOM general assembly in 1983 in London, when Canadian Pierre Mayrand proposed forming a workgroup, the so-called *social*

²³ Eng. *integrated museum*.

²⁴ Held September 25-30, 1972 in Bordeaux, Istras, Lourmarin and Paris, France.

²⁵ Created by Hugues de Varine and presented by French environmental minister *Robert Poujad* on September 3, 1971 in Dijon, on the occasion of receiving museum representatives from across the world gathered at the ICOM 10th general conference.

museology. ICOM's newly elected leaders rejected this proposal, explaining that it could create further confusion in relation to museology, which was itself still seeking a fuller affirmation. Still, it was decided to trust P. Mayrand with organization of a provisional workgroup and the preparation of a special meeting on ecomuseums and new museology as part of the ICOFOM summit planned for the following year. Since this meeting was never held (also thanks to obstructions by a part of ICOM's leaders), driven by the failure from London and a feeling of being systematically ignored, members gathered around the provisional workgroup decided to organize the *First International Workshop on Ecomuseums and the New Museology* on their own accord, which was held in 1984 in Québec, Canada. The main product of this workshop is the so-called *Quebec Declaration*, which explicitly underlines that "museology needs to advance its sources through multidisciplinary, modern means of communication used in all cultural actions, and modern methods of management that involve the user. While conserving the material achievements of past civilizations and protecting the achievements characteristic of the aspirations and technology of today, the new museology – ecomuseology, community museology and all other forms of active museology – is primarily concerned with community development, reflecting the driving forces in social progress and associating them in its plans for the future" (Mayrand, 1985: 201). The new museology actions were continued in November 1985 in Lisbon, Portugal, with the *Second International Workshop on Ecomuseums and the New Museology*, where, after unsuccessful attempts of founding a committee inside the ICOM, the international movement for new museology - *MINOM*²⁶ - was founded. In the paper published in the *Museum* magazine, P. Mayrand presented his view of differences and the necessity of parallel action:²⁷ "the reason can lie in the belatedness of the museum establishment to keep pace with many contemporary – cultural, social and political developments ... but, in our opinion, the main reason is the monolithic nature of the museological establishment, the superficiality of the reforms which it proposes and the marginalization of any experiment or viewpoint which might be described as at all committed", and therefore "taking into account the ideas that originated from the round table at Santiago which were tacitly put away, the declaration [Quebec declaration, D.B.] completely reaffirms the social mission of the museum as the new starting point and the precedence of this function over the traditional museum functions of protection, the building, object and audience ... from Santiago to Lisbon we are the witnesses of the transition of museology towards social and political consciousness and conscientiousness" (Mayrand, 1985: 200). Despite the above declarations and actions by its representatives, and apart from being recognized by its insistence on the bond between museums and communities they operate in, and the emphasis it places on the social and developmental role of museums, the new museology remained rather undefined at the epistemological level. Peter van Mensch (Mensch, 1995: 135-136) says that new museology as a term originated in three different times, three different places and three different meanings. According to his research, it first appeared, almost without attracting any attention, during the 1950s in the United States

²⁶ MINOM is the acronym for *Movement International de Museologie Nouvelle*.

²⁷ Note: The MINOM is today an official associate committee of the ICOM.

as an attempt to revitalize the educational role of museums; then in the 1970s in France as a new way of perceiving the role of museums in the society²⁸; and finally in late 1980s, exclusively in the United Kingdom, as an attempt to raise the quality level of museum communication. Nevertheless, according to available data (cf. Davis, 1999: 54), it seems that the very term ‘new museology’ first appeared in a published form in 1980 in a paper by Andre Desvallees in *Encyclopaedia Universalis*. This happened accidentally, because the attribute *new* was supposed to semantically indicate only a supplement to the earlier term ‘museology’. Although it is possible it was never an intention to create the neologism, the abstract that described it won over new followers, including all the derivatives that were created up until then, such as museological community, social museology, active museology, ecomuseology, popular museology etc. According to P. van Mensch, this relative confusion of so many terms is easily explainable: “in new museology the museological goals are directed towards the development of the community, hence the term social museology. The representation and preservation of heritage was considered in the context of social action and change... The people of the community themselves have to take care for their heritage, hence the term popular museology ... the concept of the museum is not confined to the building. A museum can be anywhere, and it is anywhere and everywhere within a certain territory. For this concept of the museum the term ecomuseum was invented, hence the term eco-museology” (1995: 136). Peter Vergo recognizes new museology as “a state of widespread dissatisfaction with the ‘old’ museology, both within and outside the museum profession in that it is too much about museum *methods* and too little about the purposes of museums” (1989: 3), even though the almanac of essays with the same title edited by himself deals exclusively with presenting museum items and comments on improving the role of museum communication with users.²⁹ Peter Davis (1999: 58) presents an interesting perspective – that new museology should be perceived in a wider context of a general interest for heritage, cultural identity and property relations, i.e. inside the relations of ownership of the heritage. Summarizing all of the above, we could conclude that the key features of new museology are primarily defined by dissatisfaction with traditional museums, their practice of inertness in relation to problems of the society they exist in and the need to change it, but also the wish to improve and design a better concept (with a clearly pronounced practical application) that will enrich museology and give it a new meaning and role. Or, in other words, new museology is a group name for a new theoretical reflection on the role of the museum as an institution in society, but also a correlation between man and heritage in the complexity of realities they exist in, with an emphasis on the necessary applicability of theory in everyday practice.

However we might interpret them, ecomuseums and the new museology have marked an important turning point in development, by questioning the man-society-heritage relation, even though its original advocates failed to make a critically required theoretical synthesis in the sense of redefining the existing or formulating a new scientific

²⁸ An in relation to ecomuseums.

²⁹ As a significant representative of the third tendency within new museology as defined by P. van Mensch.

ic discipline³⁰, i.e. the very phenomenon of studying. Ecomuseums shed the concept of museum as a building/institution³¹, while the concept of a museum item as the central phenomenon was replaced with the concept of the totality of heritage. Looking from a scientific development perspective, in this manner they pointed to the possible anomalies of museology. While certain ideas and even partly developed theories were somewhat formulated in this direction³², many challenges still lie ahead - structural definition of the fundamental subject of study and a comprehensive theory that would explain it seem like the most significant ones. The analysis of heritage as a true phenomenon was merely initiated with the ecomuseum practice and new museology. With the required input of traditional scientific disciplines relating to museums, today communicology and public media, sociological rural, urban and regional studies, geography (which was often neglected in this segment), economy, especially through management and marketing, and even other disciplines which remotely deal with or research the content of heritage and identity, can provide a special and exceptionally valuable contribution. The overlapping of the basic subject of study between seemingly distant scientific areas or branches, a convergence that is happening at a practical level, and partly existing articulations aimed at synthesis, indicate that a new scientific discipline is not such a distant future. It is true that in new museology as a theory, or in ecomuseums as pragmatic forms, we will not find enough elements to conclude we have already reached that level, but at the same time we will not be wrong in pointing to them as the key potential of what we believe will develop into a new, clearly interdisciplinary science of heritage.

Instead of conclusion, or value of ecomuseums

Ecomuseums created in France in the early 1970s, are a special materialization of a new way of looking at the relation between the society and environment in which they exist. Insisting upon a developmental component is their immanent determinant. While their practice sometimes used some of the already existing institutional experiences, ecomuseums possess an important distinctive function of a new approach, thus creating a kind of a developmental paradigm – of museums themselves as institutions of the society, but also a theoretical deliberation of the correlation between man and the totality of heritage. Even after more than thirty years after their creation, they are still being considered an innovation by many. The irony is, as often happens in life, that despite all their accomplishments, ecomuseums are still most famous by their name alone. There is no doubt, as the author himself has admitted, that the neologism was created as a compromise at the time the word museum was rather unpopular, so the prefix *eco* served to give the newly created museum form the necessary political and social credibility. Unfortunately, as late as forty years lat-

³⁰ Independent or interdisciplinary.

³¹ The new museology even sheds the need of an institution.

³² Compare, e.g.: Šola, 2003: 301-319 and Šola, 2005: 5-7.

er, many still fail to understand that this prefix does not imply an exclusive focus on the issues related to the natural heritage or rural areas.³³ The original intention of its use indeed stems from the meaning of ecology, which has its root in the Greek word *oikos*³⁴, but unlike superficial interpretations that followed, the use of the word *ecology* in the case of ecomuseums implied a true reflection of the development of cultural and economic life in a specific area defined by conditions and restrictions of the natural environment (Engström, 1985: 206). Another problem of the original concept of ecomuseums, again, ironically, considering its initial development, was created as the result of the trendiness they had caused at some point. The use of this term³⁵ has often meant a safer and easier provision of funds needed for establishing a new museum or its operation. It also has to be said that the forms we call true ecomuseums³⁶ did not even use this name, sometimes as a resistance to the general trend, but also because of the understanding that practice and form of operation based on identity cannot always simply be copied to a different location. Taking into consideration all the variants to be included under one term, whatever name we may give it, all the phenomena and practices that have happened over the past forty years as a result of the new way of thinking, it is possible to extract several significant and common characteristics. The basic indicators of ecomuseums are:

- adopting, or spreading over the territory that is not necessarily defined by conventional borders;
- accepting the policy of dislocated, fragmented localities that is connected to an *in situ* conservation and interpretation;
- departure from the conventional perception of ownership; conservation and interpretation of a locality is carried out through bonds and collaboration;
- empowerment of local community – by involving the local population in museum activities and in creating their cultural identity;
- presence of interdisciplinarity and holistic interpretation.³⁷

An ecomuseum therefore implies a clear interdisciplinary approach, it possesses a firm regional characteristic (it is defined by boundaries of identity and culture, rather than administrative borders) and, of course, implies involvement and collaboration with a local community that necessarily participates in its planning, operation and management – it is the real curator of an ecomuseum.

Finally, looking back on their development so far and considering the future of ecomuseums, we can accept the view of Tomislav Šola, who says that ecomuseums have “united in a compact way theory and practice ... because it (creating ecomuseums) means

³³ Including the co-type of natural museums or ethnographic museums.

³⁴ In the meaning of household, house, family.

³⁵ Interpreted in the sense of a usable tool for the preservation of natural heritage.

³⁶ Perhaps it would be more correct to say: different forms of heritage actions that with its practice and theoretical deliberations overlap with the ideas relating to original ecomuseums.

³⁷ Listed by: Davis, 1999: 228.

to follow a philosophy, mental and social behavior transformed into a professional methodology that has always implied a recognizable approach. ... (Therefore) an ecomuseum cannot be a model, but rather a way of listening to / comprehending an institutional mission and responsibility in realizing objectives of a common ideal. ... ecomuseum theory, if understood correctly, represents a complete turning point, the mental change so eagerly awaited that it gives a dominant light and inspiration to the museum world. An institutionalized museum in its finality is a complete awareness of individual and group identities, a way of cohabitation with the past, awareness of the value of a specific identity. These values should be known, preserved and cherished with love, in order to discover continuity within inevitable changes” (1999: 20-23).

Translated by Ivona Grgurinović