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This lecture contains several sets of arguments about why we have to rethink our strategies and theoretical framework. I claim that only by knowing the world around us can we propose an answer that is useful for our users and for society in general.

I also advocate rethinking the role of collective memory institutions, museums included, so that they form a powerful alliance of humanistic, cybernetic response to the challenges and threats we encounter. There is also a claim that we have a solid basis on which to reconceptualise our position via a wider theoretical approach that is also fitting for other kindred institutions.

The terms “heritology” and “mnemosophy” are proposed as an intentional provocation that should lead to a usable, open redefinition. In the same way, the museum institution – or rather the heritage institution – should be re-defined and used differently so that it becomes part of the solution to the problems of contemporary society.

1. INTRODUCTION

Should this article contain any criticism of the état des choses, I hope that the best among curators (and there are many of them) will bear with me: it is not about them. It is about the others – the inert majority.

Any theory is always partly a critique, meant to improve the object at which it is directed. Having once been a museum curator myself, I may be disinclined to adhere to the stringent form of a paper as normally accepted by the academic community. That’s just too bad for the author – but good for the audience. Professionalism is always a form of self-denial.
1.1. **The Mouse Planet**

I believe that any communicative content should start with clear suggestions as to the true nature of our reality.

The Mouse Planet is the name of the Disney entertainment park in Tokyo – but who can really tell where in the world it is?

Philosophers call it a *simulacrum*, so nobody really cares what it actually represents. It is a kitsch panorama designed to fool you, selling illusions at the wicked Vanity Fair: a clear proof that managers and marketers-gone-wild have lost their sense of proportion and their feeling for basic human decency.

Surely they know better, but the future is entirely in their quavering hands. That shaking is not a sign of stage-fright or sudden responsibility, but rather of impatience and frenzy, almost the furore, to be closer to the medical description. Over what? Over an insatiable appetite for consuming, appropriating, possessing, acquiring …. We have finally created the world-without-ideologies: and it is only inhabited by greed. The Old World’s dream of the welfare state – with truth, beauty, justice and solidarity for all – has finally been destroyed. The business oligarchy finally defamed intellectuals, who either became servants and their office pets, or took on the role of outcasts – underpaid, frustrated troublemakers that the masses do not take seriously. The rare exceptions simply confirm the rule.

Democracy based upon biased information and indirect representation is the manipulated reign of philistine oligarchies united – better than ever – with politicians and the clergy. This state of affairs is in its apotheosis in the so-called transitional countries that encountered the plague of globalisation (did somebody say Americanisation?) with no resistant antibodies available. Here there is little use for museums that do not recognise that their time is past and that social/economic and cultural frameworks have changed – or have simply forgotten the fact. Their daily efforts are much like writing letters with no address on the envelope. Funding such museums, just like...
paying scientists who declare that global warming is a matter requiring long, serious research to uncover scientific evidence, is like yet another manipulation by the ruling forces in society.

1.2. SHOULD MUSEUMS CHANGE?

My claim is that artists and intellectuals and the institutions of which they are a part either get pushed into the scientific ghetto, or are generally encouraged to stay out of the way. As heritage professions, we simply make the most of this situation, and at first glance everything is more or less fine. Some would perhaps say that we can attribute much of the success we enjoy to social and cultural conditioning (we are expected to be here, therefore we are needed) and to the fact that the general public is normally unable to formulate its own requirements or needs.

On the other hand, be it due to a fear of disappearance or the need for a stronger profile, we build museums like never before. The problem is that nobody is sure they successfully accomplish what is expected of them. Teaching and training made them better. So did marketing, as a good reminder of the excellence of their professional output.

Happily enough, those who work with the collective memory and its institutions are now aware that at least half of the population has never set foot in any museum whatsoever. Some people might point out that double that number have never toured the Himalayan mountain tops, but that has little to do with our day-to-day reality, requires abilities that only few possess, and is an activity incomparably less needed.

When discussing the conservative question “should museums change?”, the true question not only refers to the profession but also to society as a whole. Do we want a better past (using heritage institutions to create more of it), or do we want a better future (using the past to ensure our contribution to quality development)? If we were more than a mere occupation, however splendid, we would have known better.

2. WHAT THEORY?

I believe that the time for insisting upon museums as a separate, well-defined entity, a sector unto itself (and an issuing profession per se), is finally and irrevocably over. Any serious analysis of the history of museums clearly shows the tendencies and circumstances involved, with the different terms used in any such debate always being just mere conventions.

23 years ago, in order to scandalise the profession in a manner that would help create intellectual impulses, I proposed abandoning the unproductive, confusing term “museology” and using “heritology” instead. Needless to say, the idea was laughed out.

But why on earth would a curator need any theory at all, let alone this kind of neologistic nonsense? Familiar as I am with the milieu inhabited by university professors, I can bear witness to the fact that their grey majority is even more autistic than that of curators. Museology could therefore easily become a form of armchair philosophising of the kind so dear to them. It may well often be so, but a bad product is no proof that we do not need a good one.

Since there is nothing wrong with the eternal striving for wisdom, our philosophy can be
defined as one serving the needs around it, as any form of wisdom should. We also need a clear, critical view of ourselves and our performance. If we ourselves wish to be in charge of the process, this is part of the imperative. If others do it, we’re out.

Improving performance or designing a strategy for the profession to follow requires scientifically serious feedback. The entire advance of our profession is dependent upon the effective transfer of professional experience. If you allow accumulated experience to die away along with its owners and protagonists, you’re committing professional suicide. The destiny of any organised group depends upon the quality of this transfer of experience. The designation of the organiser of the transfer and where will it take place are both rather arbitrary – the important thing is that it gets done. In the ruthless race of professions, you must lengthen the pace.

2.1. THE ELEMENTS OF THE POSSIBLE STRUCTURE

Science X, the general theory of heritage, is therefore supposed to serve these following objectives:  

2.1.1. THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE PROFESSION

Any profession has to have its own world view, and is obliged to have its own wisdom. Any profession should be able to provide itself and its professionals with an answer to the simple but crucial question: Why are we here?

Are we the same as the poets who say they are here to provide enjoyment in beauty and be useful? Are we here just as scientists engaged in research into the past, and with an obligation to render our results accessible? Or are we unwitting performers and entertainers, appropriately tethered in place?

Who are our bosses? Who are the real owners of our museums? Whose past or – a task even harder yet – whose history and identity are we supposed to research or present?

And then another question: are we talking about museums or do we consider museums as pars pro toto – a most obvious example of what to do with the collective memory?

Finally, how do we define our own jobs? No serious marketing expert you invite to help your museum prosper will start the consultancy session without asking “What kind of business are you in?” Do you define your job as science-cum-presentation or communication-upon-science? What are you trying to “sell”? Can you define your own product? Whose needs was it designed to meet? And when you answer, are you supposing and guessing, repeating what you yourself have been told, or do you have a body of scientific or empirical research that supports your answers?

If all this is not a philosophy of our profession(s), then what is? And – to continue with questions of this ilk – can anybody imagine living and working in this field without answering them?

2.1.2. CRITIQUE OF THEORY AND PRACTICE

The critique process provides the material for feedback, and feedback is the method of improvement. Improvement leads to better performance, and later assures the prosperity of the profession and is used to justify the dangerously imposing and rightful claim of “value for money”. Whether you are familiar with
cybernetics or not, whether you possess any wisdom about guidance systems or not, you will probably understand that it is only by correcting what is not good enough that we get better. To be able to perform this simple procedure, you must be familiar with the criteria needed to assess this, and have answers to most of the questions proposed by professional philosophy. To have such criteria available is to have a clear idea of just what quality service really is.

2.1.3. TRANSFER OF PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

When one reads a hundred books about profession related matters, when one inspects hundreds of museums and when one possesses the experience of the museum profession over decades of activity, will anybody try to profit from all this activity?

Any young curator starting his or her career in the vicinity of such a person would do well to seek to learn from them. Any profession will do even better if it establishes forums where professionals like this can share their knowledge, experience, research, achievements, conclusions, reflections, speculations, etc. If you do this in a standardised way and on a regular or even mandatory basis in order to ensure high standards of professional performance, this will put you on a keen lookout for the necessary educational resources, be these human or technical. However, the fact is that learning by doing and within no particular context has been slowing down this profession so much that we can now only gaze longingly at the backs of most other professions. In fact, to be brutally honest, we never even became a profession at all – we are still an occupation. The difference is literally gigantic: the opinions of the members of a profession are taken into account and they are considered partners in the overall enterprise – while those considered a mere occupation are ignored or marginalised. Members of a profession take on responsibilities and their decision-making is considered socially important. And yes, there’s one more thing, one that may sound banal: professionals are well paid. This is why we simply cannot afford our profession (or should we humbly continue saying occupation?) continuing to exist without this natural mechanism of learning, which is the only thing that really makes it possible to take the necessary steps forward.

2.1.4. CREATING THE PROFESSION’S FUTURE

If theory cannot be predictive, then it is but dead speculation. Any analysis is predictive, because it leads to logical conclusions concerning future circumstances and possible answers to the changes they present. On another occasion, I was trying to point out that our professional vehicle is apt to bump into any obstacle around unless we are equipped with “headlights” in the form of accessories that at least help point us towards the best probability as the strategic choice when determining the best direction for future development.

2.1.5. THE RELATION BETWEEN THE HERITAGE PROFESSIONS AND DEVELOPMENT

If it wishes to be regarded as accountable and sustainable, the theory of heritage must provide clear proofs of its pragmatic use. Can it
persuade the professions concerned to consider themselves creative and responsible? Can it suggest that the flow of information, as collected and researched by curators, must be employed for the benefit of the owners of institutions? Can it demonstrate that the past utters powerful words of wisdom to those who use collective memory institutions as decoders and amplifiers?

I can easily imagine curators refusing to consider themselves creative, and avoiding taking their share of responsibility for the world – which makes them part of the problem, doesn’t it?

I can also imagine curators turning their backs on the need to indicate who their true bosses are, or even avoid the question entirely. Yet the answer is right there in full force: the owners of museums are the taxpayers. The sacrosanct nature of the not-for-profit and “never-commercial” approaches cannot be compromised by biasing the democratic obligation to treat all tax-payers equally. Many would say that the opposite would in fact be desirable. The impoverished state is pointing its finger at corporations persuading us to find our future with those tax-payers. They are our reality but should certainly not be our future. Their habit is bossy and particular interest minded. They may even think we are not cooperative enough.

Having taken this stance, everything else becomes possible, with deliberate, beneficial influence exerted on public opinion and public agencies so as to improve the developmental strategies. The simple way to do this is to provide public insight and explain the ethical choices that have to be made: these form the true substance, be it about democracy or sustainable – i.e. balanced, harmonious and responsible – development. The simplicity of our choice is what the protagonists of the cataclysmic scenario hate the most – less greed and reduced profits, more quality via a labour-intensive economy instead of an energy-intensive one, and re-inclusion of decision-making based upon inherited positive values and the ethics of the welfare state. But it would, of course, be hard to imagine that any of the governing pyramids of power would relinquish the repulsive cancerous concept of incessant conquest in which anything – literally – can be turned into more power and any power can be turned into more money. Here, the more serious reader will hopefully excuse the seemingly pathetic tone creeping in here: love is the final intended bite of the abominable Mammon.

2.2. A TRY FOR A DEFINITION

General theory of heritage can be named in virtually any way, provided that we agree about the need, about the scope and some basic definition.

I believe that heritology, to use that name, consists of an entirety of principles, theses and theorems used in elucidating the concept of heritage, the nature of heritage institutions, their practice and their mission, as well as their role in society. That is the shortest possible definition.6 Needless to say, the term is whatever we agree upon, as all such definitions are only conventions7 that are more or less effective in doing the job.

Of course, this definition may need further elaboration, still in compressed form if possible, but more explanatory. In fact, the explanation lies in the concepts it contains – the principles, theses and theorems that make it
perfectly acceptable to any information science. Here there is a long way to go, alas. Museology as such is still a matter of dispute among conservatives who refuse to admit any theory, let alone the introduction of a more ambitious one. The walls and fortresses of specialised disciplines and their specific theories will for a long time prevent us from seeing that we all belong to the same societal, cybernetic reaction.\(^8\) We need to become part of the developmental decision-making through the democratic nature of our wisdom. We need to be one resource with a shared, common philosophy that consists of many different forms of practice, but has the same basic strategic aim in society – the survival of quality.

In this context, museology or museography would just need to stay at the level of institutional history, techniques, technologies and methods. In the same way, there is a need for specific disciplines with the same reach and level of ambition in archives (archivistics), libraries (librarianship), knowledge organisation institutes and databases (encyclopaedistics), etc. (Fig. 1, p. 9).

Yet there might still exist the critical frustration that will lead to abandonment of the 100-odd years of useless trying to make a science out of an institutional practice. Let us therefore take a look at a proposal for a wider, more exhaustive definition:

- **General theory of heritage** is a trans-disciplinary theory of the total heritage that serves the understanding of the inception and pur-
It studies the nature of collective memory, identity and the inherited experiences, and researches public needs and the contribution made by the sciences.

- It applies this knowledge to the policies, strategies and practices of the institutions and professions concerned with heritage so that this heritage is then used as the wisdom necessary to preserve the vitality of inherited values in the process of sustainable development.

- It is a constant effort of evaluation of practice, of transfer of professional experience, and of planning the future of heritage and its professions.

The real story is, of course, more extensive than this because heritage should then be described as an information science par excellence since – curiously enough – many solutions relating to both practice and strategy lie in that exact direction. “Information science is a discipline that deals with the processes of storing and transferring information. It attempts to bring together concepts and methods from various disciplines such as library science, computer science and engineering, linguistics, psychology and other technologies in order to develop techniques and devices to aid in the handling – that is, in the collection, organization, storage, retrieval, interpretation and use – of information.”

Information science disintegrates constantly into theory (computer science), technology (engineering) and management (information systems subjects). However, if it were to consist of additional components such as librarianship, archivistics, museology, documentalistics, encyclopaedistics/lexicography, and informatics, or to function as their basis, the story would be rather different. The general theory of heritage (which you may call by the endearing name of heritology or even mne mosophy) is an information science, in which context it can function as a discrete discipline and finally be more widely institutionalised.

After the premature birth of heritology, a whole range of new terms emerged that all served as similar indicators of frustration: New Museology, Ecomuseology, Economuseology, General Theory of Heritage, Heritage Studies, Cultural Heritage Sciences, Heritage Management, Identity Management, etc. If there is heritology, the “heritologists” must also exist. The closest I can get in defining the one is that it is a curator with the mind of a visitor.

3. WHAT HERITAGE?

Reducing our tasks to the mere technicalities of preserving artefacts and remnants of the degenerating identities around us is, of course, a cynical way of describing them. Nobody ever provided an estimate of the amounts or numbers that would give us some kind of credibility in doing so.

Instead, the truth about credibility remains with the quality of our attitudes, our self-definition, our proclaimed aims, our criteria of selection and our ethics. When concerned about the substance of eternity – which is what is behind most of our truly serious concerns – we will find it in the continuation of quality.

Heritage – be it in museums, other institutions of collective memory or forming a part of the private memory environment – is an expression of culture and a result of our social
ambitions. Institutions are the most obvious expression of such a need for heritage and of its nature. Unfortunately, Anglo-Saxon practice has ruined the neutral value of the term “heritage” so that it has become the epitome of the “profit-making through heritage” approach. What heritage now has to re-conquer in terms of content is the true meaning of patrimony, which contains the core of a sense of identity.

Defining heritage is a long, seemingly endless task, but nevertheless one well worth attempting. A key part of any culture consists of a set of values that are recognised, researched, cared for and communicated as identity. According to the dictionary, identity is:

- State or fact of remaining the same, as under diverse conditions
- State of being own, not other
- State or fact of being same

Using these to set the tone makes an attempt at definition easier. Identity is therefore a relatively stable, founded system of values, indivisible and specific, in which somebody is recognised as being different from others, and who, as thus defined, is readily accepted by bearers of other identities.

The glossary of heritage has been decisively completed by some writers, but our social role is still burdened by history, to the extent of endangering the credibility of the profession. History books are the product of historians who more often than not serve politics and its bosses. Heritage institutions should be free from their mandate and obligations, in order to speak more about the comédie humaine and less about the orderly French garden of historical causal sequences.

It is much more interesting to conjure up the spirit of place than just hand over a particular quantity of information, even if this is done with all the efficiency made available by modern technology. I can therefore only align myself with those who have strong reserves about history – but not just to tell how unnecessary it is. Instead to counter-act, strive against the mythology of history that places it above the reality.

- “Generalised history is a branch of speculation, connected (often rather arbitrarily and uneasily) with certain facts about the past.” Aldous Huxley
- “In history, what we consider causes are really consequences – consequences of causes that lie beyond history. The true course of history does not consist of events.” Egon Friedell

Freed from this fascination, we can turn our sober heads to our own affairs. Once detached from historiographic myths as created in all official histories, along with their seemingly linear and finite causality, we may turn to the disturbing irregularity of our own reality, the one we recognise so well in our own lives. Yet, do we understand it? Most likely not. Neither most of the collective memory professionals and certainly nor their users.

Museums and other collective memory institutions are not here to blur our vision. They are not here to provide the cut-and-dried cartography of our past that better serves the interests of the cartographer than those of the end-user. The configuration on whose behalf we may intercede is not a form of chaos but rather a filtered configuration of values, an analogue system that would reflect the dominant characteristics of the lost original. Objects alone neither form the museum nor the reality it describes. They only form a collection as part of the technicality of the process.

This is why our museums are so rarely a picture of life – they are more like hospital inten-
sive care units for the endangered physicality of the past. In fact, if you actually see any life in a museum, you must be facing an open window. That goes for most heritage institutions, too.

The reason we tolerate this defect and inaptitude or don’t see it at all is part of our cultural conditioning. To any noble savage, our heritage institutions would seem very strange and probably barbarous places, the same way as our Christian churches would represent a blasphemous exhibition of power and greed for any early Christian.

In primitive societies, heritage institutions were expressed through myths, rituals and theology. Modern society can do better by relying upon its technological ability of perfect recall, but is always left with the same task of value choice. In brief, the facts and institutions are not the solution but the means. The essential issue is always basically how we evaluate, how we choose, who does it and with which/whose interests in mind. In brief, we must first compose the quality that constitutes us as a fair proposal for our descendants to take over and continue. This quality of trans-generational solidarity is the definition of eternity given to humans. The

**HERITAGE INSTITUTIONS AND IDENTITY**

**GIVING BACK - REINFORCING - CONTINUING**

- **REINFORCEMENT OF THE CULTUARL IMMUNE SYSTEM**
  (by self assurance, pride, awareness)

- **ENCOURAGEMENT OF CULTURAL CREATION**
  (assistance and to living cultural production by organisational and financial support, heritage institutions, heritage action /revitalisation, reinforcement, recognition/)

- **AFFIRMATION AND SUPPORT OF QUALITY IN CULTURE AND LIFE**
  (by education of the cultural consumer, public promotion of its status and values; training, education)

- **PUTTING HERITAGE INTO THE BASIS OF THE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES**
  (controlled growth, ideology of quality, harmonisation and balance)

- **PROMOTION OF PHILOSOPHY OF SUSTAINABILITY**
  (against excessive profit orientation)

© Tomislav Šola, University of Zagreb, 2001.
era of great greed in which we live consists of interests and strategies that all trigger just the opposite: solitude, fear, decadence, manipulation and fascination with “have” instead of “being”, with (manipulated) facts instead of poetry in all forms and – finally – fascination with materiality as the matter of eternity. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Therefore we will either redefine our collective memory mechanisms as parts of salvation-focused reactions to the endangered richness of the planet, or we will just be attendants in the corrupted suite at the court of liberal economics, present to watch the spectacular fall of the empire before we all sink into irreversible decadence.

An outline definition of a museum may just serve to point us in the direction of the revision needed: “Museum is not a place, it is a relationship between past and present, between what we have been and what we want to be. It cannot be isolated and limited to an institution and distributed to the masses. A museum is an idea, and yet it is a form – a form of relationship.”

The definition of museum as institutional action within the totality of cultural heritage is long, as are those proposed by my mentor Georges Henri Riviere, but at least it does not require long annexes like the short version from ICOM (the International Council of Museums):

Museum is any non-lucrative, regular or temporary activity within the totality of heritage, containing, partly or entirely, research, collectioning, analysis, care and public communication of the complex human experience.

Museum is methodologically diachronous or synchronous; it covers some periods of the past and present, as it responds to the circumstances and needs of its community; it is necessarily founded upon scientific knowledge, but is open to questioning and to the un-known.

Museum is contemplative and educational in its striving to fulfil the human need for the pleasure of understanding of people, animals, plants, things and phenomena, through sensory, intellectual and emotional experience. Museum extends the human senses and amplifies the consciousness of the unity of universe.

Museum is a way of self-knowing, a means of critical insight into the present, a democratic way and counter-active tool towards wise, harmonious development; it preserves the richness of life through survival of any identity and continuation of the creative forces of nature, community and individuals.

3.1. A GLIMPSE INTO THE FUTURE ALREADY THERE

That which constitutes a museum is not the fixation on what is original and palpable but the quality and intention of the process. Museum is about values inherited and passed on. This value system or configuration of values, as recognised, documented, researched, cared for and communicated, is what institutions of public memory are about, museums included. The new definition of conservation, appearing in its preventive quality, actually suggests that we all fit into it.

And one more thing. No heritage institution is doing its job correctly if taking from nature, the technical heritage or culture, be it from artists’ studios or people’s homes. Any taking acquires meaning only as preceding giving. Doing it formally, as when organising a frenzied rhythm of exhibitions, reveals the shallow understanding of the mission we have. You
have to give back, by giving on loan to other public institutions, by giving back to cultures, places, institutions and individuals – by giving back to life and its processes. This means your collections may thus change from being treasures to interpretative inventory, and thus become the quality substance of development. The changes will have to be:

• Social: whose past do we document and communicate?
• Political: whose interests are reflected in collections?
• Conceptual: product or process? Object or concept? Past or present oriented?
• Proprietary: who is the true, natural owner of our institutions and collections? The heritage system as a network and cumulative resource with its own, non-lucrative rules.
• Informational: heritage is first and foremost composed of information, in character, quality and potential.
• Professional: “de-professionalisation” as a policy for the total museum, the later being the prevailing collective awareness, as a sensibility to the values inherited.
• Organisational: coordination, pools, re-distribution, new partnerships, de-etatisation, authonomy from sponsors and patrons
• Intentional: what is the final use of the material, institutions, working process, actions?

Doing all this, one might conclude that public memory institutions are all but a part of an overall collective effort to make our lives meaningful and make/keep our planet habitable for everyone. Responsibility, consisting of deep ethical and professional insight, is the way to salvation. In this context, speaking about museums separately only makes sense when the focus is on museography i.e. the set of techniques and methods specific to museums. The same is true for archivistics and librarianship, which as such belong to their own institutions.

Imagine, however, the day when we will be able to compose a mega-profession in its own right, a strong and unavoidable counterweight to all the aggressive or wishy-washy protagonists we indicated at the beginning of this article. To be able to do so, we will have to undertake a shift in our overall strategy, from knowledge to wisdom. The later is knowledge with noble and moral aims – something simple we decided to forget, and instead used our potential to become like no civilisation in human history, a society of perfect recall. We know everything and seem to understand nothing. The entire body of human knowledge is finally and literally at our fingertips via the endless ocean of knowledge that the spectacular Internet and hypermedia make possible.

And yet, despite this formidable means, we are part of a suicidal planetary strategy solely because we yet again relinquished leadership to Mammon and its evil priests, and turned ourselves into philistines. No heritage, its residue in museum collections or its living remnants can ever make true sense unless it is turned into quality survival wisdom.
1. The lecture in Copenhagen on which this article is based also featured a view of the future as the third question “What Future?”, but any exhaustive account in written form would make this article too long.

2. Some claim that there are no more than thirty true professions whereas occupations abound. Professions are well paid and/or have a very distinctive position in society, in the system of decision-making, or in the composition and transfer of power. Any attempt I have made to analyse our level of qualifications as a basis for achieving the status of profession fails; my conclusion is that building a mega-profession out of all the institutions of collective memory may eventually bring this status into being.


5. An American poet.

6. I have taught this definition to my students at the University of Zagreb since the mid-90s, and propose it widely when lecturing elsewhere.

7. I have proposed the term “mnemosophy” several times only to make the first provocation with “heritology” more obvious and to suggest that possibility. What I expected was merely one more assertion that the best theory we are looking for will actually be related to the quality process of transforming mneme (memory) into sophia (wisdom), a sort of wisdom of memory or memory as wisdom.

8. Cybernetics is the true framework of our role, revealing the nature of our endeavour. I have written about it in some of my published works, but especially in both editions of the book Essays on Museums and Their Theory – Towards the Cybernetic Museum.


10. Italy. Translated as such into English from the original Scienze del Patrimonio by the authors of this university programme.

11. The name of the Chair of Museology in Zagreb is now Chair of Museology and Heritage Management.

12. The name of the proposed collegium at the University of Zagreb, Tomislav Sola.

13. Of course, I did on a few occasions, in order to provoke and ensure feedback – but in vain. My claim was that museums store 30% of the relative totality of heritage and make an average of about 10% of that amount publicly available. That means that they are recounting the story of everything we have ever been and that we currently are with the help of 3% of the material substance of our stored or scattered memory. That is a dramatic claim for credibility in presentation. The pars pro toto is of course not impossible – but it is highly improbable.

14. This is the working definition I have used since 2000 and which I use in my lectures.


17. John Cotton Dana.

18. This definition dates from 1993 and is proposed to my students in their working papers.


20. Dillon S. Ripley often mentioned “salvation” as the ultimate aim of museums and their mission.

21. When dismissing this apparently non-scientific term, please bear in mind the whole libraries of books written about equally non-scientific terms – love, for instance.
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