

MUSEOLOGY AND THEORETICAL DISCOURSE

Yun Shun Susie CHUNG

This monography delves into a wide range of museological topics through theoretical discourse. It explores uncharted areas in museology connecting studies by international authors from multi-disciplines. Museological theories are applied on the importance of national museums and heritage programs that aid in funding for local governments to nurture development and embrace diversity. The definition of the museum is not confined to the acclimatized institutional building. Adopting the extenders' perspectives in museological theory, interpretive planning is an essential function that is contributive toward wildlife rehabilitation centers and the periphery areas on becoming a living heritage museum. Online museology is examined through the perspective of Charles Peirce's semiotics in order to decipher the deeply embedded meanings in online exhibits. Thus, the dichotomy of the sacred and the secular is blurred and not a concern as it was when the virtual was first discussed in museology. Museum architecture has become a symbol of globalization with hybrid cultures in design and setting. The emphasis of indigenous museology in museum architectural design and setting sustains indigenous values. Defining, signifying, and comprehending museological principles set forth the approaches that can be adopted by the museum and the environment.



Published by Muzeológia a kultúrne dedičstvo, o.z. Bratislava



MUZEOLÓGIA
A KULTÚRNE
DEDIČSTVO o.z.

Adobe InDesign. Design by Yun Shun Susie Chung
First edition Bratislava 2020

ISBN 978-80-89881-22-2
EAN 9788089881222

MUSEOLOGY AND THEORETICAL DISCOURSE

CHUNG



MUZEOLÓGIA
A KULTÚRNE
DEDIČSTVO o.z.

MUSEOLOGY AND THEORETICAL DISCOURSE

Yun Shun Susie
CHUNG



Foreword by Jan DOLÁK

Afterword by François MAIRESSE

Reviewed by Mónica RISNICOFF DE GORGAS

**Museology
and
Theoretical Discourse**

Museology and Theoretical Discourse



Yun Shun Susie
CHUNG



Cover Photo: South Plains Wildlife Rehabilitation Center,

Lubbock, Texas, USA

© Yun Shun Susie Chung, 2007

Muzeológia a kultúrne dedičstvo, o.z.

Bratislava

2020

The publication of this book was made possible by
Muzeológia a kultúrne dedičstvo, o.z. Bratislava



MUZEOLÓGIA
A KULTÚRNE
DEDIČSTVO o.z.

Muzeológia a kultúrne dedičstvo, o.z. Bratislava

First edition

Copyright © Yun Shun Susie Chung 2020

All rights reserved

Reviewed by:

Jan Dolák, Comenius University, Bratislava, Slovakia

Mónica Risnicoff de Gorgas, National University of Tucumán,

Tucumán, Argentina

Contents

Two chapters of this monography are extended versions of the International Committee for Museology's workshop symposia presentations. Chapter II is expanded from Chung, Y.S.S. (2019). A museological tradition as a cultural hub: Interpretive planning for living heritage museums. In K. Smeds (Ed.), *The Future of Tradition in Museology* (pp. 35-40). Paris: ICOFOM. This article is in the process of being translated in Chinese and published in the Beijing Museum's journal *Museum*. Chapter III is another extended version from ICOFOM's workshop symposia presentation, which includes a few parts from the paper: Chung, Y.S.S. (2018). Sacred vs. secular, Peircean semiotics, and online museology. In F. Mairesse (Ed.), *Museology and the Sacred: Materials for a Discussion, Papers from the ICOFOM 41st Symposium Held in Tehran, Iran, 15-19 October 2018* (pp. 54-59). Paris: ICOFOM.

ISBN 978-80-89881-22-2

EAN 9788089881222

Contents

Foreword by Jan Dolák	8
Acknowledgments	12
Introduction	14
I Certified Local Government and Museological Renderings for Local Development and Diversity	18
<i>Introduction</i>	19
<i>Federal Program on Museums and Heritage Management</i>	21
<i>The Regional Government and Heritage Management</i>	26
<i>The Local Government and Museums and Heritage Management</i>	30
<i>The Connections Between National, Regional, and Local:</i>	
<i>Discursive Analysis and Diversity</i>	37
<i>Conclusion</i>	40
<i>References</i>	41
II The Future Is Museological Theory of Interpretive Planning	50
<i>Introduction</i>	51
<i>Museological Theory, the Environment Revisited, and the Living Heritage Museum</i>	54
<i>Interpretive Planning and the Future of Tradition in Museological Theories</i>	61
<i>Conclusion: Suggestive Areas for Museological Applications for WRCs</i>	68
<i>References</i>	70
III Online Museology: Sacred Versus Secular and Peircean Semiotics	76
<i>Introduction</i>	77
<i>Semiotics and Museology</i>	79
<i>Sacred Versus Secular</i>	80
<i>Peircean Semiotics on Online Museology</i>	84
<i>Analysis and Conclusion</i>	92
<i>References</i>	95
IV The Museology of Hybrid Cultures in Museum Architecture	102
<i>Introduction</i>	103
<i>Museum Architecture, Color, and Gender</i>	106
<i>Museology, Museum Architecture, and Hybrid Cultures</i>	110
<i>Kickapoo Tribal Museum, Brown County, Kansas Reservation, USA</i>	121
<i>The Bauhaus Museum, Weimar and Dessau, Germany</i>	124
<i>West Bund Art Museum, Shanghai, China</i>	126
<i>The National Museum of Qatar, Doha, Qatar and the Grand Egyptian Museum, Giza Governorate, Egypt</i>	131
<i>Conclusion</i>	134
<i>References</i>	135
Afterword by François Mairesse	144
Biographies	148

Foreword

by Jan Dolák

Foreword

by Jan Dolák

People have ever surrounded themselves with things, used not for utilitarian reasons, but important for people and culture. There was a strong need, since the Renaissance, to organize those things into a system and to prepare a basis on the rules for collecting. It led toward the first theoretical papers that can be counted as a product of “protomuseology,” written by Samuel von Quiccheberg, Bernhard Valentini, Gullio Camillo, Wen Zhen-Heng, etc.

The next period is characterized by a number of papers and teaching activities focused on the explanation of methods and practice of the work in museums – the museographical period. During the latter half of the 20th century, the need for theoretical approaches toward memory institutions, especially museums, became visible, and it led to establishing the university departments of museology and cultivating museology as a science. The period is joined with the names Jan Jelínek, Zbyněk Zbyslav Stránský, Antun Bauer, Wojciech Gluziński, Waldisa Rússio, etc. But museology continues down a few paths, therefore, we can talk about Central European, Francophone, Anglo-Saxon, Latin-American, etc., ways. Because English is the leading language in recent days, Anglo-Saxon attitudes are the most frequent.

Therefore, it is very important that the very advanced and distinguished expert from the USA – Yun Shun Susie Chung - is coming into the field. Her

book, using sources from many countries and several museological spheres, can serve as an example for comparison of different approaches all over the world.

This monography ties several different themes brought together as a result of extended versions of symposia presentations, namely connected with the International Committee for Museology (ICOFOM).

The first chapter, Certified Local Government and Museological Renderings for Local Development and Diversity, describes a special heritage program in the USA and compares it with several similar programs all over the world.

The second chapter, The Future is Museological Theory of Interpretative Planning, opens many questions focused on “museological theory of interpretive planning” and “museological theory of the living heritage museum inside a cultural hub” and using several US American examples.

The third chapter, On-line Museology: Sacred Versus Secular and Peircean Semiotics, deals with the theoretical question of museum communication and presentation, using ideas of the US American philosopher Charles Sanders Peirce as a basic “matrix” for the understanding of recent approaches.

Particular consideration to museum architecture is given in the fourth chapter – The Museology of Hybrid Cultures in Museum Architecture. The context of this part is to examine the series of terms, “hybrid,” “cultures,” “museum,” and “architecture,” within theoretical museology.

It is to be wished that the new monography will grab many readers’ attention, and the theoretical nature of museology will be placed on the new advanced scientific level.

Acknowledgments

Acknowledgments

I am truly grateful to Bratten Thomason and Lorelei Willett at the Texas Historical Commission and Sally Abbe at the City of Lubbock's Planning Department and Certified Local Government (CLG) for the interviews and sharing CLG documents. My sincere gratitude goes to the former executive director of the South Plains Wildlife Rehabilitation Center, Carol Lee, the current executive director, Gail Barnes, and the board members, for their time and resources that they shared during the board meeting (November 8, 2006, Godeke Library, Lubbock, Texas), tours (spring, 2006; spring, 2007 SPWRC, Lubbock, Texas), survey (November 8, 2006, Godeke Library, Lubbock, Texas), and interviews (February 7, 2007; January 25, 2019). My gratitude is extended to Deb Dohrmann, National Wildlife Rehabilitators Association Office Manager, for the information that she provided me via email on August 16, 2019.

My appreciation for museological and archaeological theories stems back to my graduate and post graduate supervisors', Peter van Mensch and Robin Boast, guidance, respectively. It is a great honor that Jan Dolák of Comenius University, Bratislava, Slovakia, Mónica Risnicoff de Gorgas of the National University of Tucumán, Tucumán, Argentina, and François Mairesse of University of Sorbonne Nouvelle, Paris III, Paris, France, who are esteemed academics and practitioners representing Central-European, Latin-American, and Francophone museology, respectively, made it possible for these papers to come to realization as a monograph publication.

Introduction

Introduction

The subject matter on museology has no boundaries. This publication ties several different themes brought together as a result of extended versions of symposia presentations, namely connected with the International Committee for Museology (ICOFOM). The goal of this publication is to demonstrate that a philosophical and theoretical approach to museums can contribute to a deeper understanding of the rationale of museum architecture, living heritage, online exhibits, and local development, which are subject matters that have not been discussed and analyzed through such a methodology.

Museology has been addressed as different terms such as museum studies. However, the former is more focused on theory, history, and philosophy at its base than many of the programs that are called museum studies. More and more museum studies programs are, though, taking the direction of incorporating the importance of discourse on museological subject matter in lieu of sole pragmatism in museum work.

Local development and museums are the topic of the first chapter. National initiatives benefit regional and local heritage, and museums help preservation through local development. The case study is the Certified Local Government program in the US. The discourse and analysis are completed applying a theoretical basis of museological renderings with an emphasis on the inclusion of diverse heritage and museums. This study aims to

demonstrate that such a federal program can promote consistent support for preservation and local development of museums and heritage.

Museums are not confined to traditional acclimatized institutions but incorporate the multitude of various kinds of institutions, including landscapes. One kind of museum that has not been discussed within a museological discourse is the wildlife rehabilitation center as the concept of the “living heritage museum.” This concept is different from what is called “living history.” It is more attuned with hospitals, at the same time, the heritage landscape that the rehabilitated wildlife is released back to. Interpretive planning as a part of the theory applied to practice is discussed.

Online exhibits are becoming part and parcel of physical museums. However, it was not too long ago that online exhibits were shunned. Moreover, the virtual spaces of artifacts, “naturfacts,” and “mentefacts” (Stránský, 1974, compiled in van Mensch, 1994, p. 244) being preserved in such spaces were questioned. The sacred versus the secular of online exhibits is studied with a focus on case-study museums with online exhibits.

Museum architecture is explored from a standpoint of adaptive reuse of buildings and materials rather than the idea of new construction in the last chapter. However, for analytical discussion on new constructions, museums opened in 2019 and 2020 are examined. The discourse is set with a museological basis focusing on the hybrid cultures that make up the philosophical foundations of many of the new museum constructions.

While it is essential to study practical applications in museology, the theoretical discourse and analysis will provide a fundamental basis to “why” the “how” should be conducted in museums.

I
**Certified Local Government
and Museological Renderings
for Local Development and Diversity**

I
**Certified Local Government
and Museological Renderings
for Local Development and Diversity**

Introduction

The role of museums in local development is connected with local governments partnering with regional governments for better management of heritage resources, in addition to the federal government's level of support through financial resources in the United States (US). This chapter focuses on the museological role of the National Park Service's (NPS) Certified Local Government (CLG) program in the US, with funding that is distributed to regional governments, which can help the local government to aid in museums and heritage management. Two museological issues are addressed concerning CLG, museums, and local development: 1) the connections between federal, regional, and local funding distribution and benefits 2) diversity. The remedy is the accessibility of funding from the federal government that allocates financial resources to regional and local governments for museums and heritage management projects that include diversity. The museological role of CLG status and its impact on museums, local development, and diversity will be the gap to be filled in existing pub-

lished literature. This research began in 2007 with the case study CLG in the City of Lubbock, State of Texas. The methodology incorporates interviews conducted in 2007 and 2019, reports from 2004 to 2019, and the NPS database of statistics. The broader implications of this program may be a model for other countries to adopt as the CLG program can enhance regional and local levels through financial support for museums and the community on diversity-related projects.

Literature in the museums and heritage management field that addresses the allocation of federal government funding programs for regional and local government projects would be beneficial to be discussed in conjunction with ICOM and the OECD's *Culture and Local Development: Maximising the Impact, Guide for Local Governments, Communities and Museums* (2018) as the foundations for this chapter. The rapport between the three levels of government is of interest and how it affects museums and heritage management. The methodology includes a museological lens, first addressing a review of already existing literature in the field that discusses the topic. Secondly, the case studies on the information that produces this program, the federal government agency, NPS of the US, the regional government agency, the Texas Historical Commission, and the local government's program adopted from the respective agencies, CLG, City of Lubbock, are analyzed. The chapter focuses on the Texas Historical Commission's (THC) CLG program, which is a state governmental agency on historic preservation, and the City of Lubbock, a local CLG status that has utilized funding through this program. Thirdly, questions regarding the topic are: what is the rapport between the regional and local governments in historic preservation and museums when funding is available for projects on a federal level? How does it affect other cultural institutions in the locality? In what ways is diversity addressed? After collecting information,

analysis and in-depth discussion are formulated to understand the association between the national and regional programs and local government on museums and heritage management. A theoretical perspective to museology will be applied following early ICOFOM museologists with their approach as a scientific discipline and interdisciplinary (Gregorová 1980; Pishchulin 1980; Stránský 1980; Tsuruta 1980). The museological collaboration of the federal, regional, and local governments through a systemized program, such as the CLG in the US, will bring beneficial monetary and symbolic resources for museums and heritage management with a focus on diversity.

Federal Program on Museums and Heritage Management

Federal government funding allocated to regional governments through a heritage preservation program is explored. The objective is to examine documentation from the regional and local CLG coordinators to scrutinize information regarding funding that has been distributed in the years 1982 to 2018. The majority of the published monographs in English on museums and heritage management on funding and development come from a British perspective (Ashworth & Howard, 1999; Borley, 1994; Carman, 2004). To broaden the discussion to a multi-cultural view, this chapter aims to make up for this shortcoming with literature from global contexts - for example, see Brulon Soares and Leshchenko 2018 on the subject of decolonizing museological knowledge and *Museum*, now called *Museum International*. To address the scope of museums, the concept is not limited to an acclimatized institution, but the evolving 21st-century museum that extends beyond the walls and incorporates the landscape such as the ecomuseum (Desvallées, 1983; Rivière, 1985; van Mensch, 1990; Chung, 2007b).

However, the delineation of federal support is geared toward the physicality of the heritage structure including surveys and inventorying with usually tax breaks, privatization, and non-contextual preservation. The landscape as a whole, which includes the archaeological, geological, biological, and intangible, is not distinctly evident in the programs.

The literature on museums and heritage management and its relationship with governments is discussed by Ashworth and Howard (1999) in *European Heritage Planning and Management* on how governments have appropriated tax income to designate heritage and establish institutions. Financial pressures on a national level have defederalized the responsibilities to local governments for local designations of historic properties are also discussed in the book (Ashworth & Howard, 1999). Usually, the local designations are at the cost of the private property owners or the institutions that own the properties. Therefore, charitable organizations and private companies are entities that meet the costs of managing and privatizing heritage. The management of large public monuments is identified as monitored specific costs; yet, the balance between costs and benefits as well as profits is difficult to monitor when private companies or individuals manage heritage.

Museums and heritage management monographs discuss legislation and management issues (Cleere, 1989; Mubaya & Mawere, 2014; Sørensen & Carman, 2009). Mubaya and Mawere (2014) provide a comprehensive understanding of the earliest legislations that were created during the colonial period in Zimbabwe; though the article does not aim to represent the uniqueness of each country in Africa, it helps with an understanding of broad experience as well as a case-study nation. The argument is that museums and heritage management pre-dates this period of Eurocentric perspectives from Pre-Arab and Pre-European with those

in temples, palaces, and the households of higher officials (Mubaya & Mawere, 2014). There is a lack of understanding of intangible heritage in the governance and the elimination of local management systems in Africa. The National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe (NMMZ) was established in 1972 to protect heritage (Mubaya & Mawere, 2014). Zimbabwe saw independence in 1980 from the British as Rhodesia, but the heritage policies that were previously created also produced the segregation of traditional heritage from a narrow view of Rhodesian colonial cosmology; thus, consulting stakeholders and the community at large to establish a new Act or amendment is the authors' argument as the legislation is outdated for the present and policy guidelines (Mubaya & Mawere, 2014).

As in many countries around the world, the politics of the federal government also change the status of support. In 2004, 'Museology-an Instrument for Unity and Diversity?' (Vieregg et al., 2004) included papers on the case of Russia's museums and heritage management administered by the State Informational Computation Center of the Ministry of Culture of the Russian Federation. According to this paper, at least one-fourth of WWII memorials were listed as a part of the registered monuments. They were beginning to work with the Civil Code and the case study was the Altai Territory to collaborate with the state and local authorities in heritage preservation (Nikitina, 2004, p. 168). Workshops entitled "Laboratory of a Governor" have been organized together with specialists such as "land surveyors, architects, ecologists, lawyers, etc." (Nikitina, 2004, pp.168-169). The suggestions made in the paper identified some of the financial issues such as producing a "funds-in-trust" through private sectors and leasing heritage in addition to partnering with programs like "The Russian Culture" (Nikitina, 2004, p. 169).

On a federal government level, it was in 1891 that preservation of open areas of national or regional importance was defined in Massachusetts, US, due to the fast-paced industrial expansion (Borley, 1994, p. 22). The National Trust in England was then established in 1895 following the US example to protect the natural landscape of the Lake District for recreation use (Borley, 1994: 22). The natural conservancy councils and countryside commissions aid in heritage management of national landscapes and natural history (Borley, 1994, pp. 21-22). For example, private property owners in the UK receive state subventions if they provide public access to the properties, but it is difficult to make certain that they are applying it (Ashworth and Howard 1999, p. 56). NPS and a series of other bodies, such as the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service, manage natural areas which include prehistoric and historic heritage. The US National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 provides grounds for NPS to administer regional heritage management through State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPOs) and Tribal Historic Preservation Offices (THPOs) nationwide. It is on a county or city level that commissioners are set up to manage heritage properties that are CLG status maintained by the NPS. Through this status, local governments are encouraged to form a commitment to promote local heritage management. The SHPOs and THPOs maintain regional coordination.

To introduce some definitions of CLG from “Public Law 96- 515- Dec. 12, 1980, the Final Rule states the following:

(b) “Certified local government” means a local government that has been certified to carry out the purposes of the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended, under section 101(c) of the Act.

(d) “CLG share” means the funding authorized for transfer

to local governments per section 103© of the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended.

(e) “Comprehensive historic preservation planning”: means an ongoing process that is consistent with technical standards issued by the Department of the Interior and which produces reliable, understandable, and up-to-date information for decisionmaking related to the identification, evaluation, and protection/treatment of historic resources. (City of Lubbock, 1984)

Grants are awarded to those CLGs that apply for inventorying, evaluation, research, training, planning, and restoration of National Register-listed properties, and publications for interpretation. The program includes encouraging local governments to adopt a preservation program for zoning and local ordinances that address historic preservation within land-use policies. These offices provide expertise and matching grants which amount to 10% of the state’s annual Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) grant allocation administered by NPS and SHPO’s to local communities in the eligible state and US territory, which is a partnership with the local government and the national historic preservation program (National Park Service, 2019b). The number of grants awarded ranges from USD 500 to USD 60,000, which are matching grants with in-kind services (also called a “soft match”) or cash. SHPOs distribute information about the availability of the CLG funds to CLG status local governments and are competitive. Multi-projects can be awarded by phasing and applying for another grant. The period of the grant is dependent on the project, but it usually does not exceed two years and the grants are reimbursable. USD 40 million have been allocated in HPF grants to the CLG program. The SHPO determines the funding criteria and decisions. Every four years, evaluations must be made for the CLG programs.

State Statistics and CLG Reports are available on the NPS website (National Park Service, 2019a). In 2007, 1,228 local governments were CLG status (National Park Service, 2019a). As of 2019, there are 2010 CLGs listed in the program in the US, having grown twofold in a decade. How the grant process is applied in the regional government is further discussed.

The Regional Government and Heritage Management

The regional government distributes museums and heritage management funding to local governments for local projects. The objective is to explore funding for local projects through interviews and documentation from the CLG coordinator in the State of Texas' SHPO and THC to local governments. In most countries around the world, heritage properties are managed on a federal and regional level. There are exceptions to this model such as in Canada. The federal level is identified as Parks Canada and Archaeological Survey of Canada, and on a regional level, the State Minister. On a local level, the Municipal officer and Regional archaeologist manage heritage properties (Carman, 2002). South Korea is also an exception as there are federal, regional, and local levels of heritage management (Chung, 2005). In Germany, the federal states (Länder) administer heritage management, but the federal level (Bund) co-finances heritage of national importance by the *German National Committee for Monument Protection*, while the *German Foundation for the Protection of Monuments* works with public and private sector preservation efforts (Compendium Cultural Policies and Trends, 2016). Therefore, local government funding via regional governments for heritage management is essential for stability of resources.

The importance of heritage management on regional and local levels is stressed in that they provide us with a symbolic “sense of place” or “genius loci” (Ashworth & Howard, 1999; Beatley, 1997; Knudson et al., 1995). The memory of heritage is connected with the visual elements of the city, which offers individual psychological stability in some cases, while rampant change will dissever the past causing clinical amnesia and disorientation (Ashworth & Howard, 1999; Maroević, 1998). Heritage should be considered a collection whether they are moveable artifacts collected inside a traditional acclimatized museum and immovable resources designated by a local government (Chung, 2007a). Under the THC (2018), the requisites for becoming a CLG include incorporating state or local legislation for preservation, establishing a review commission of professional and lay members, systematic surveying and inventorying of heritage resources, and public participation of the process. There are a few differences between the requirements for cities and counties, namely the formation of a commission, where the city appoints a preservation commission and the county incorporates the CLG as a part of the County Historical Commission. First established in 1986, Megan Brown is the current NPS CLG nationwide coordinator (Willett & Chung, 2019). Since 2007, 73 counties and cities together were CLG status; and in 2019, it has reached 75 ranging from under 25,000 to beyond 500,001 by population. Upon interview with the CLG coordinator, Bratten Thomasen (2007), approximately 20 to 25 CLGs apply for grants every year and 15 CLGs receive full or partial matching grants. In many cases, those CLGs that receive partial grants phase the projects that will continue. In the State of Texas, HPF funds allocated for CLG grants vary from year to year, but the funds have surprisingly amounted to USD 800,000 to USD 1.2 million during the last 5 years. A concentration of historic resource surveys, National Register preparation nomination, and

small travel grants for the CLG historical commissions to attend conferences for continuing education on heritage management have been priority fund proposals that have been successfully administered. Other project proposals have included preservation and website planning and implementation. Overall, CLGs have completed the projects that they have sought out including under-represented groups (Willett & Chung, 2019). The Historic Sites Atlas of Texas online provides a comprehensive listing and map of the museums and heritage (Texas Historical Commission, 2019a).

Brown, the NPS CLG nationwide coordinator, oversees the documentation of all the projects, including heritage that is situated on the Texas Atlas Historic map (Willett and Chung 2019). In connection to museological discussion on minority groups and heritage management projects, according to Gard'ner (2004), the federal agencies of England have not been fully addressing the representation of minority groups in heritage management. Gard'ner (2004) focuses on the Bangladeshi (Bengalee) community, which is the largest minority group in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets. This group is represented in many of the buildings and streetscapes through cultural and commercial expression. This idea has been further addressed (Chung, 2007a, 2008, 2017) where minority groups in the heritage management and tourism planning for 34th Street, Lubbock, Texas, should be represented through intangible elements such as commercial and charitable organizations, not only physical buildings. The Bengalee community's views were exemplified through the identification of significant heritage (Gard'ner, 2004, p. 75). Gard'ner's (2004) approach suggests that in areas that consist of distinct characteristics of minority groups non-hierarchical ways can be sought to incorporate their heritage through characterization studies and through Local Agenda 21, which is a scheme where the local authorities and communities take control of heritage management. Local

Agenda 21 suggests consultation and developing action plans for managing change and Village Design Statements pioneered by the Countryside Agency (now a part of Natural England), utilizing parish maps and community consultation techniques to be incorporated (Gard'ner, 2004, pp. 88-89; also discussed in Chung, 2017). Since 2004, the state of the Bangladeshi community has changed to what has been called a "diaspora" to other parts of England. The heritage remnants have not changed, but the area no longer is representative of the active community that once lived since the late 20th century (Mushtaq, 2017). Nonetheless, these historic reminders should not be dismissed, but preserved and communicated as a part of the evolving multiculturalism in the locality. The CLG funded grant projects online data since 2010 include African American farm and ranch complexes in San Antonio, Texas, city limits and Bexar County, with a matching grant to the historic farmstead, which was owned by an African American family, Ransom and Sarah Williams, ca. 1871 to 1905, a project funded in 2014. In 2017, Rio Vista Farm Complex, Socorro phasing for surveys on historic districts took place for economic revitalization through interpretive resources with master plans for the reviewing and evaluation of preservation ordinances and downtown revitalization (Texas Historical Commission, 2019b). New ways of seeing the significance of once under-represented and under-stated heritage are adopted through the projects. A more comprehensive view of what museums and heritage preservation involve are complexes rather than single entities. According to the new THC CLG coordinator, Lorelei Willett (2019), the criteria for CLG projects to be awarded grants is dependent upon "what would become the best public benefit?" Projects that focus on under-represented communities have greater potential benefit than other projects (Willett & Chung, 2019).

The Local Government and Museums and Heritage Management

The use of the local government funding and historic preservation status from the federal government on local projects and how they have addressed diversity are examined. The objective is to study how the local government benefits from the CLG funds from the Texas Historical Commission's Certified Local Government program to the status on City of Lubbock, Texas, as a case study. Interviews and documentation were obtained from the City of Lubbock's Planning Department.

In the UK, the local government has the responsibility to manage the heritage properties. The local government manages the heritage properties in separate charitable trusts and partners with other organizations rather than having the federal government bear the weight of expenses. These kinds of partnerships are increasing since the donations and sponsorships from the federal government are not feasible for local-government-owned properties (Borley, 1994, p. 22). Ashworth and Howard (1999) discuss the importance of conservation and revitalization in rural heritage policies, to endeavor to stop the decline of economies and local cultures. The Council of Europe promoted the European Campaign for the Rural World in 1987-88 targeting European governments to encourage them to develop rural communities through the heritage management of the cultural and natural resources (Ashworth and Howard 1999, p.100). The following are areas that the Campaign focused on:

The protection and conservation of natural environments;

The economic use of local human resources;

The conservation and reuse of cultural heritage and

I Certified Local Government and Museological Renderings for Local Development and Diversity

landscape protection;

Safeguarding local cultural values and developing more active and advanced social relations. (Ashworth & Howard, 1999, p. 101)

Means of subsistence of this rural policy was focusing on the preservation of traditional activities such as agricultural techniques, products, and handicrafts as well as new ones that reflect the heritage of the community, which would be purchased through heritage tourism:

Stimulating the creation of a market for traditional local products;

Fostering local culture and popular traditions through tourism demands;

Revitalizing landscapes, historical centres and architectural heritage, as both a resource and an infrastructure. (Ashworth & Howard, 1999, p. 101)

In the US, the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 amended in 1980 (P. 6.96-515) allows the city and county governments to participate in the heritage preservation programs such as nominating National Register of Historic Places properties and applying for grants to protect local landmarks (City of Lubbock, n.d.b). CLG status in the State of Texas is approved by the THC and NPS. This status demonstrates that the local government is making an effort to conduct historic preservation and encourages community planning and public participation in preservation matters. The local government is required to create a historic preservation ordinance establishing a review commission that is represented by the professional and laypeople in the community and to enforce protection of designated landmarks on a state

and local level through “survey and inventory its historic and prehistoric sites” and “provide public participation in preserving of these sites” (City of Lubbock, n.d.b).

An interview with Sally Abbe (2007), local CLG coordinator in the City of Lubbock, was conducted to examine the role that CLG status plays in heritage management. Sally Abbe came to work for the City of Lubbock in 1981, and the city was among the first to apply for CLG status that year on account of her efforts, immediately after the legislation was passed. Lubbock demonstrates proof of an ordinance to zone property, especially concerning heritage management. The Urban Design and Historical Preservation Commission, appointed by the city council, is the local review board that reviews all construction of buildings and historic preservation status in the City of Lubbock. *A Guide to Lubbock’s Architectural Heritage* published by the Urban Design and Preservation Commission of the City of Lubbock reflect the philosophy of heritage management as an outdoor living museum:

Our business, civic, and residential structures are a living museum of art and history that reflect the philosophy, intellectual trends, and visual values of the people who helped to make Lubbock the largest city on the South Plains. (City of Lubbock, 1993, p. 1)

The commission was created in 1978, thus it has been 41 years of preservation efforts.

With CLG grant proposals that have been successfully administered by Lubbock, projects have been funded for historic resource surveys conducted several times, and National Register nominations have been researched. These two kinds of activities are priority grant projects according

to the State of Texas CLG program. Local annual reports are presented to the Texas Historical Commission on CLG activities. The positive aspect of having a CLG status is that there are no bearing restrictions. In fact, it is beneficial to have CLG status as it allows the local board to review National Register status in their city before going on to the SHPO and the federal level at the NPS. Therefore, the federal and regional governments provide working guidelines, and the local authorities that produce ordinances and policies. For example, the Annual Report for October 1, 2004, to September 30, 2005, for the City of Lubbock’s (2005) CLG activities records in section IV on Public Participation, there was an estimated number of 100 inquiries on historic preservation. Categories of the inquiries included requests for landmark designation, certificates of appropriateness for routine maintenance provision of the local ordinance, general preservation information, property owner requests for information, which was basically property owners seeking historic information for rehabilitation, and publicity and general interest use of the Historic Site Survey files. The listing of the South Overton National Register District generated calls concerning tax credits. There were also educational/informational activities mentioned in the reports such as preservation meetings or conferences attended by staff members.

For October 1, 2005-September 30, 2006, the summary of major activities included “Major Preservation Issues: preservation of brick streets. Ordinance revisions...” (City of Lubbock, 2006) There is also a Recorded Texas Historical Landmark listings and/or applications: St. Elizabeth’s Catholic Church (by Lubbock County Historical Commission). Annual reports run from 1982 to 2018. CLG reports begin from 1995, showing anticipation of a “successful conference in Lubbock” the following year as a

part of preservation priorities (City of Lubbock 1996, p. 2). By 2004, there is a cumulative estimate of 500 historic properties in the CLG inventory and 43 designated properties (City of Lubbock, 2004). Other major activities include a “rehab program for historic landmark plaques using THC instructions from the website” (City of Lubbock, 2007, p. 1). The annual reports pose six questions concerning the CLG program on the following categories:

1. CLG Inventory Program
2. Local Register (i.e., Local Landmarks and Historic Districts) Program
3. Local Tax Incentives Program
4. Local “Bricks and Mortar” Grants/Loans Program
5. Local Design Review/Regulatory Program
6. Local Property Acquisition Program.

In 2013 and 2014, Lubbock CLG was applying for a grant to survey the downtown area for designation status as Main Street (City of Lubbock, 2013, 2014). Thereafter, there are no reports of the current status as they were dealing with sign code to receive approval as a part of the Main Street program. Museums that were reviewed for National Register nomination by the CLG were Lubbock County Jail, situated on 811 Main Street (City of Lubbock, 2017), and Lincoln Theater on 123 Main Street, which “sat vacant for 10+ years before being bought and re-purposed as a community center” receiving a façade grant of \$15,000 (City of Lubbock, 2017).

Concerning the diversity of historic preservation, no requirement within the ordinance addresses ethnic diversity; only technical, archaeological, and historical significance are the requisites. Because of the devastating

tornado on May 11, 1970, Hispanic and African American heritage resources were swept away and destroyed. For example, the historic Hispanic St. Joseph’s Church and a heritage resource of the African American community, Chapman Hospital, were directly hit by the tornado. Overall, the tornado was a disaster for many heritage resources. However, Lubbock’s Hispanic heritage resources are well represented in the State Historic Cemetery program and the African American and Hispanic communities are better represented by archival heritage resources at the Southwest Collection at Texas Tech University.

Historically, the integration of the importance of representation through a “Commission on Architecture and Urban Design” (City of Lubbock, 1972) was made through recommendations by the Planning Department on April 3, 1972. A document that emphasizes the “Preservation of Historical and Cultural Continuity,” “Encourage Participation in the Arts” (and on representation incorporates the following passage:

To broaden the base of citizen involvement, particularly including the youth of the community, in the cultural life of Lubbock. To achieve representation and cooperation among all cultural and ethnic groups, especially educational agencies, in providing exposure of an ever-increasing number of citizens to the best of the visual and performing arts, to the history of the area, and to a general awareness of the need for beauty of environment. (City of Lubbock, n.d.a)

Thus, representation on the various different cultural and ethnic groups was key to the foundations of museums and heritage management from City of Lubbock’s perspective. According to museological theory (van Mensch, 1990), the commission that created these goals were the extenders of museums who considered “the city should be our greatest work of art” with

the integration of the environment for design, aesthetics and function, with “imagination, and taste and selflessness if they are to have a city which is designed for beauty and functional fitness” (City of Lubbock, 1983). To restore the city and preserve its heritage was dire after the tornado, and the commission was looking at Seattle, Minneapolis, Binghamton, and New York to set standards especially on the City’s Design-Historic Zoning Ordinance passed in 1978 (City of Lubbock, 1983). The four members of the Urban Design and Historic Preservation Commission were to have “knowledge and experience in the architectural, landscape architectural, archeological, cultural, social, economic, ethnic or political history of Lubbock” and “at least one representative from the fields of architecture, urban planning, history or political science, archeology or paleontology, sociology or anthropology, building construction, and landscape architecture” (City of Lubbock, 1983, p. 1). The commission promotes the “public awareness of historic preservation and urban design” also sponsoring an exhibit ranging from topics such as Lubbock history, historic architecture, Lubbock’s brick streets, Broadway renovation, and Central Business District revitalization,” at the Lubbock Arts Festival annually (City of Lubbock, 1983, p. 3). Sally Abbe’s idea of “a statewide project to standardize CLG databases and GIS maps to a format that can feed the Atlas project and be easily accessible and searchable on the Internet” would be optimal for CLGs (Abbe & Chung, 2007). Though the Atlas does show the museums and heritage sites today, the project has not come to the realization (Willett & Chung, 2019). Nonetheless, a new app from NPS has been implemented as a Gateway to CLGs and their resources App on the National Parks Service’s (2019b) website (Willett & Chung, 2019). Further discursive analysis calls for the connections.

The Connections Between National, Regional, and Local: Discursive Analysis and Diversity

Culture and Local Development: Maximising the Impact, Guide for Local Governments, Communities and Museums published by ICOM and OECD (2018) covers various areas how museums are interrelated with the infrastructure of economy, urban generation, cultural development, education, creativity, social inclusiveness, health, and the whole environment in the locality with policies and actions sharing practical toolkits and guides. Ivo Maroević (1998), a Croatian museologist had a deep awareness of the importance of the role of museums in local communities, especially referring to Dubrovnik, Croatia, after the wartime in “Towards a Museology of Reconciliation.” Though the article does not cover the financial responsibilities, the importance of the museological role in local development addressing ethnicity combatting racial cleansing is very important for the aftermath of war, ghost towns, and other under-deprived areas. The CLG projects focused on entire farmsteads to master planning, addressing diversity such as African American presence. For example, the African American community in Uvalde, Texas, received USD 15,000.00 for a project that cost USD 28,339.48 to restore the roof in its original condition built-in 1938 listed as an NRHP and Texas Historic Landmark, in addition to preservation workshops with the public and demonstrations (Texas Historical Commission 2019). Another African American and Mexican American Settlement Survey in Travis County, Texas, was awarded USD 7,500.00 with the Total Project Cost amounting to USD 15,000.00:

...[The project] involved researching, identifying, and locating former African-American and Mexican-American set-

tlement locations within Travis County (outside of Austin city limits). Historic maps and archival material including school, church, and cemetery records were included in the final report. Besides, the settlement locations were mapped and history was written about each. (Texas Historical Commission, 2018)

Yet, there might be projects that address the historic indigenous community as the CLG coordinator of the City of Lubbock had stated (Abbe & Chung, 2007), such as Lubbock Lake Landmark, which is an archaeological site and museum. This criterion is also a part of the larger discussions of the dichotomies of cultural resources and heritage management. Another suggestion might be that documents dating back to, for example, 1979, as handbooks can be updated:

Hopefully, this handbook will serve, not only as a helpful guide to Lubbock residents who are discovering their homes and buildings as interesting art forms but will help planners and citizens alike to rediscover their neighborhoods and city as a living museum of art and history. (City of Lubbock, 1979, p. 1)

Several papers cover topics on local empowerment and community development in *Museum International* in China (Bingwu, 2011) about urban development and heritage preservation and management, and community-driven museums in Brazil (Duarte, 2012) and in Uganda (Ssenyonga, 2016). Duarte (2019) explores the challenges of local development especially Afro-Brazilian places of worship *povos de terreiros* through the Brazilian Association of Museums and Community Ecomuseums (ABREMC) administered by the Management Committee for Brazilian Museums of the Ministry of Culture. The Latin American museologist Nelly Decarolis (2004) proposed the idea of “unity within diversity” that addressed the challenges of the mul-

tifarious ethnicity as did the Indian museologist Anita Bharat Shah (2004) who identifies the ethnic groups in India. Though Latin America is very much parallel to US history, there is more differentiation in defining the ethnic background:

When evaluating the world of ideas flowing among the peoples of our region, we understand the need for differentiating and in turn, unifying our cultural reality, to be able to recognize its originality, its own identity and the quality of the symbolic support which permits uniqueness within diversity. (Decarolis, 2004, p. 72)

The empowering of people on a local level with acknowledgement and respect to ethnic differentiation can be supported with symbolic support through museums and heritage management projects. Moreover, Keitumetse (2016) identifies the several factors that involve cultural diversity and identity issues that relate to politics and history in Africa. Furthermore, a Community-Based Cultural Heritage Resources Management (COBACHREM) Model is an initiative that Keitumetse introduced to sustain local indigenous knowledge systems and ones that could impact the local level from the federal. For example, in Sub-Saharan African heritage landscapes, there are multiple identities to be interpreted with balanced representation.

A current issue taking place is proposed regulations on the National Register of Historic Places status of federally owned land that includes historic properties that local communities and THPOs and SHPOs oversee. It would give ‘*carte blanche*’ to property owners to block a nomination to the National Register targeting the mining and energy development such as in Alaska. The Coalition for American Heritage (2019a) produced a “Call for Action” against these changes. This kind of issue leads to how the political environment affects heritage management and the urgency of

protecting diversity using a “human-rights-based cultural practice” (Logan, 2012). Nonetheless, it is of opportune timing that the House of Representatives passed a “record-high” for heritage preservation after the NPS had introduced the changes to be made in the current regulations (Coalition for American Heritage, 2019b).

Conclusion

Through museological discursive analysis and research on a systematic program focusing on diversity of local heritage management in collaboration with the federal, regional, and local governments, the outcome of such a program benefits local museums and heritage through monetary and symbolic resources. Thus, CLG status and grants available allow local governments to take the initiative of local preservation. With the case study CLG in the state of Texas, City of Lubbock, CLG status has been a benefit in the continuation of inventorying resources and National Register designation. In addressing diversity in historic preservation, although the tornado of May 11, 1970, swept away many of the heritage resources representing the Hispanic and African American communities, there should be measures that address the future of Hispanic and African-American heritage resources. Therefore, CLG funded projects can address the need for future representation of diverse communities. On a regional level, the SHPO of the State of Texas, Texas Historical Commission, oversees the current 73 counties and cities that are CLG status and providing opportunities to fund matching-grant projects. The matching-grant projects are a sign of the collaboration that local governments can conduct and take responsibilities for the projects funded by SHPO. NPS distributes the HPF where 10% of it is used for CLG projects. Once the national CLG programs are established on

a regional level, there is autonomous management of the program, “unless it is something I need NPS’s input on like a difficult grant project or a piece of information that must be reviewed by NPS like our CLG Handbook,” states the coordinator (Willett & Chung, 2019). NPS also administers the nationwide database of CLG statistics that measure the growth and progress of historic preservation. This program may be a model for other countries to adopt as the CLG program helps foster and maintain historic preservation on regional and local levels through financial support. This chapter has contributed to the concept of local governments partnering with regional governments for better management of diverse heritage resources, as well as the federal governments level of support through financial resources for heritage management.

References

- Abbe, S., & Chung, Y.S.S. (2007). *Lubbock Planning Department* [Interview]. Lubbock, Texas.
- Ashworth, G., and Howard, P. (1999). *European heritage planning and management*. Portland, OR: Intellect Books.
- Beatley, T. (1997). *The ecology of place: Planning for environment, economy, and community*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press.
- Bingwu, C. (2011). Three lanes and seven alleys: An example of a community museum in China’s urban development, *Museum International*, 63, 1-2, 91-101.
- Borley, L. (1994). Managing strategies and financial considerations:

- Historic properties. In R. Harrison (Ed.), *Manual of Heritage Management* (pp. 21-33). Oxford, UK: Butterfield-Heinemann.
- Brulon Soares, B., & Leshchenko, A. (2018). Museology in colonial contexts: A call for decolonization of museum theory. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 46, 61-79. <https://journals.openedition.org/iss/895>
- Carman, J. (2002). *Archaeology and heritage*. London: Continuum.
- Chung, Y.S.S. (2005). Seoul, Korea: Its concept of culture and nature in heritage planning. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 11(2), 95-111.
- Chung, Y.S.S. (2007a). The collection and exhibition of in situ historic buildings. *Collections: A Journal for Museum and Archives Professionals*, 3(1), 35-52.
- Chung, Y.S.S. (2007b). Thinking outside the museum box: Heritage management of a “laboratory ecomuseum,” Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory. *Collections: A Journal for Museum and Archives Professionals*, 3(3), 223-242.
- Chung, Y.S.S. (2008). Identifying and collecting intangible heritage through community heritage planning projects. *Collections: A Journal for Museum and Archives Professionals*, 4(4), 307-318.
- Chung, Y.S.S. (2009). The role of museums in the preservation and management of international heritage routes. *Collections: A Journal for Museum and Archives Professionals*, 5(4), 325-335.
- Chung, Y.S.S. (Summer/Fall 2017). Collections of historical markers and

- signage and public programming online at public history institutions such as museums and archives. *Collections: A Journal for Museums and Archives Professionals*, 13(3/4), 243-263, edited by Juilee Decker. <https://rowman.com/ISBN/9781538106235/Collections-Vol-13-N3-and-N4>.
- City of Lubbock. (1972). *Commission on Architecture and Urban Design [Correspondence]*. Planning Department, Archives. Lubbock, Texas.
- City of Lubbock. (1979). *Architecture in Lubbock: A guide to identification and preservation*. Lubbock, Texas Center for Public Service, Texas Tech University. <https://ci.lubbock.tx.us/storage/images/rmvYZI7xf3tIil14BDivk1k5go2IwgBwGsPAVKjj.pdf>
- City of Lubbock. (1983). *Urban Design and Historic Preservation Commission compiled for Jubilee 75 [Document]*. Planning Department, Department Archives. Lubbock, Texas.
- City of Lubbock. (1984). *Public Law 96-515, 96th Congress, An Act to amend the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, and for other purposes [Document]*. Planning Department, Department Archives. Lubbock, Texas.
- City of Lubbock. (2005). *Annual report for October 1, 2004 to September 30, 2005 for the City of Lubbock's Certified Local Government Activities*. Lubbock, Texas: Lubbock Planning Department.
- City of Lubbock. (2006). *Annual report for October 1, 2005 to September*

- 30, 2006 for the City of Lubbock's Certified Local Government Activities. Lubbock, Texas: Lubbock Planning Department.
- City of Lubbock. (2017). *Annual report for October 1, 2017 to September 30, 2018 for the City of Lubbock's Certified Local Government Activities*. Lubbock, Texas: Lubbock Planning Department.
- City of Lubbock. (n.d.a). *Certified Local Governments Manual* [Document 1]. Planning Department, Archives. Lubbock, Texas.
- City of Lubbock. (n.d.b). *Certified Local Governments Manual* [Document 3]. Planning Department, Archives. Lubbock, Texas.
- Coalition for American Heritage. (2019a). *NPS Proposed Rule-National Register*; NPS-WASO-NHPA; PPWONRADE2, PMP00EI05. YP0000; RIN 1024-AE49. <https://heritagecoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Coalition-for-American-Heritage-Comments-on-National-Park-Service-National-Register-Proposed-Rule-RIN-1024-AE49-final.pdf>
- Coalition for American Heritage. (2019b). *House Passes Record-High Funding for Preservation*. <https://heritagecoalition.org/house-passes-record-high-funding-levels-for-preservation/>
- Compendium Cultural Policies and Trends. (2016). 'Germany/5.3 Sector specific legislation 5.3.3.' *Cultural Heritage*. <https://www.culturalpolicies.net/web/germany.php?aid=533>
- Cleere, H.F. (Ed.). (1989). *Archaeological heritage management in the*

- modern world. One World Archaeology* 9. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Decarolis, N. (2004). Unity within diversity: A Latin American challenge. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 33, 26-29.
- Desvallées, A. (1983). Les écomusées. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 2, 15-16.
- Duarte Cândido, M.M. (2012). Heritage and empowerment of local development players. *Museum International*, 64, 1-4, 43-55.
- Gard'ner, J.M. (2004). Heritage protection and social inclusion: A case study from the Bangladeshi community of East London. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 10(1), 75-92.
- Gregorva, A. (1980). Museology – Science or just practical museum work? *Museological Working Papers*, 1, 19–21.
- International Council of Museums and the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). (2018). *Culture and local development: Maximising the impact. guide for local governments, Communities and Museums*. Paris: OECD/ICOM.
- Keitumetse, S. (2016). *African cultural heritage conservation and management: Theory and practice*. Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/305214415_African_Cultural_Heritage_Conservation_and_Management_Theory_and_Practice
- Knudson, D.M., Cable, T.T., & Beck, L. (1995). *Interpretation of cultural and natural resources*. State College, PA: Venture Publishing.
- Logan, W. (2012). Cultural diversity, cultural heritage and human rights:

- Towards heritage management as human rights-based cultural practice. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 18 (3), 231-244.
- Maroević, I. (1998). *Museums and the development of local communities in the After-War Croatia*. <http://www.maltwood.uvic.ca/tmr/maroevic.html>
- Mubaya, T.R., & Mawere, M. (2014). *African cultures, memory and space: Living the past presence in Zimbabwean Heritage*. Bamenda, Cameroon: Langaa RPCIG.
- Mushtaq, S.B. (2017). Where are the Bengalis in London's Banglatown? Brick Lane, once renowned for its Bengali immigrants, is changing. *The Diplomat*. <https://thediplomat.com/2017/12/where-are-the-bengalis-in-londons-banglatown/>
- National Park Service. (2019a). *Certified Local Government State reports*. <https://www.nps.gov/shpo/clg-state-reports.html>
- National Park Service. (2019b). *Historic Preservation Fund in action*. <https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1623/hpf-in-action.htm>
- Nikitina, L.A. (2004). The work of state agencies, local authorities, and municipal museums in preserving the cultural and historical heritage. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 33a, 168-169.
- Pishchulin, J.P. (1980). Museology – Science or just practical museum work? *Museological Working Papers*, 1, 30–31.
- Rivière, G.H. (1985). The ecomuseum-an evolutive definition. *Museum*, XXXVII (4), 4, 182-183.

- Shah, A.B. (2001). Museology, social and economic development: summary of the papers presented. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 33a, 173–175.
- Sofka, V. (1980). Museological provocations 1979, in Museology – Science or just practical museum work?' *Museological Working Papers*, 1, 12–13.
- Sørensen, M.-L., & Carman, J. (Eds.). (2009). *Heritage studies: Methods and approaches*. London: Routledge.
- Ssenyonga, F.N. (2016). The emerging role of community museums in Uganda: The need for capacity building among managers. *Museum International*, 68, 1-2, 125-129.
- Stránský, Z.Z. (1980). Museology – science or just practical museum work?' *Museological Working Papers*, 1, 47–49.
- Texas Historical Commission. (2018). *Requirements of CLGs*. <https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/projects-and-programs/certified-local-government/requirements-clgs>
- Texas Historical Commission. (2019a). *Texas historic sites atlas*. <https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/texas-historic-sites-atlas>
- Texas Historical Commission. (2019b). *Past CLG funded grant projects*. <https://www.thc.texas.gov/preserve/projects-and-programs/certified-local-government/clg-grants/past-clg-funded-grant-projects>
- Thomason, B., & Chung, Y.S.S. (2017). *Texas Historical Commission*,

Austin, Texas [Interview].

Tsuruta, S. (1980). Museology – science or just practical museum work?

Museological Working Papers, 1, 47–49.

Urban Design and Historic Preservation Commission and the City of

Lubbock. (1993). *A guide to Lubbock's architectural heritage*.

Lubbock, Texas: City of Lubbock. https://ps.ci.lubbock.tx.us/docs/default-source/planning-file-library/1993-guide-to-lubbock-architectural-heritage.pdf?sfvrsn=db5598c8_8

Willett, L., & Chung, Y.S.S. (2019). *THC CLG questions for research paper*

[Correspondence].

van Mensch, P. (1990). Annual conference: Museology and the

environment. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 17, 13-14.

Vieregg, H., Nash, S., Sgoff, B., & Sofka, V. (Eds.). (2004). Museology-

An instrument for unity and diversity? *ICOFOM Study Series*, 33a, 7-12.

II

The Future Is Museological Theory of Interpretive Planning

II

The Future Is Museological Theory of Interpretive Planning

Theory which is not an aim in itself, but theory to build on strategies and tactics of heritage organs in the struggle for the safeguard of our environment. (Sofka, 1990, p. 9)

Introduction

What is “the future of tradition in museology,” and more specifically, how is “museological theory, past and present, in relation to practice in museums, exhibitions and heritage sites” applied are questions (Smeds, 2018, p. 3) that can be answered on many different levels in museums and heritage management. This chapter addresses those questions on the practicality of museological theory (Smeds, 2018, p. 3). The focus is on a specific kind of museum, the wildlife rehabilitation center and the application of museological theory on museum management; the case study is the South Plains Wildlife Rehabilitation Center (SPWRC) with research beginning in 2006, examining “museological theory of interpretive planning” and “museological theory of the living heritage museum inside a cultural hub” (Chung, 2019). In this chapter, a comparison and contrast is drawn with the Willowbrook Wildlife Center (WWC) of the Forest Preserve District

of DuPage County, Illinois, to demonstrate that museological theory applied to interpretive planning provides wildlife rehabilitation centers to be considered living heritage museums and a cultural hub in the environment revisited.

As a part of the methodology, using Bruno Latour's (2005) analysis on following agents in decision making, this chapter follows the leaders and documents in action of the SPWRC and WWC as case studies. The "*tracing of associations*," further extending Actor-Network-Theory through "deployment," "stabilization", and "procedures" or "composition" is adopted (Latour, 2005, pp. 5, 16, and 249). Research questions include: what are the terminologies and definitions of interpretation, environmental interpretation, planning, and cultural hub as opposed to natural hub, and what is the process of musealization for wildlife in rehabilitation centers? Thus, sociological theory helps to formulate the associations of museological theory and the practice of interpretive planning. In this association, a sociological lens is applied to the tracing of museological theory and practice of the wildlife rehabilitation center. Interviews with the executive directors of the SPWRC, documents such as the DuPage County Forest Preserve and WWC planning documents, surveys conducted on the SPWRC, educational brochures produced by the WWC, website information, interpretive signage at the WWC, and tour of both centers' facilities.

The WWC activities are incorporated within the master planning documents since the center is a part of the Forest Preserve. The websites, tour of the facilities, first-hand account of the author as visitor and researcher, and theoretical applications will serve as the methodology through education brochures, exhibit labels, and wayside interpretation trails.

The first strand of this chapter will formulate the discourse on "Mu-

seological Theory, the Environment Revisited, and the Living Heritage Museum." The Czech-Swedish museologist Vinoš Sofka (1990, p. 9) stressed the importance of a theoretical museological foundation for managing the environment in "Museology and Environment." He stated, "This global concept and the emergency stage of the environment create an occasion for working out the theoretical base for a common environmental action" (Sofka, 1990, p. 9). The environment revisited will elaborate on terminologies discussed in theoretical museology: living, dynamic preservation vs static preservation, heritage, and museum. This chapter will expand on these concepts that will apply to the study of wildlife rehabilitation centers.

The second strand that this chapter examines is the objectives of wildlife rehabilitation centers as a part of a cultural hub of a city or county. The centers' primary objective is to rehabilitate wildlife, and their secondary objective may be to educate the public about the center. However, in order for the centers to maintain their existence when they depend most of the work on volunteers, the strategic measure of adopting the function of communication is vital. In turn, the centers will be able to use fundraising activities to maintain their management and seek grants that fund interpretive activities. The tripod of what museums stand for is in its importance in the professionalization of making the museum relevant to the community they serve (Dolák, 2017, p. 145). By producing a heritage interpretive plan with exhibition design features, it would contribute to the communication function of the wildlife rehabilitation center as a living heritage museum and a cultural hub.

Museological Theory, the Environment Revisited, and the Living Heritage Museum

The association of terminologies that will serve relevance to interpretive planning of the wildlife rehabilitation center is first traced in this section. The cultural and natural environment as already a part of the worldview of indigenous peoples such as in the Iroquois' *Earth Grasper* and transcribed and discussed in literature is a human-made delineation (Mohawk, 2005; Chung, 2005). We live with the natural environment but, in most cases, adapted for human purpose. As Mohawk reflected in the Foreword of the Iroquois Creation Story:

Humans exist in a context of nature, and not vice versa. Everything we have ever had, everything we have, everything we will ever have – our health, our good looks, our intelligence, everything – is a product not of our own merit but of all that which created our world. That which created our worlds is not society, but the power of the universe. Nature, which is the context of our existence, is sacred. A significant manifestation of nature, the regenerative power of life, is also sacred, and we who walk about on the earth are not without obligations to perpetuate this system, the “work” of the Giver of Life, in the greater scheme of things. Society, and all that society has produced, is a creation of the powers of the universe, as was the human genius employed in its construction. (Mohawk, 2005, p. xviii)

Forest preserves are no different as humans have marked boundaries fitted for humans rather than for the natural habitat of flora and fauna. The boundaries include social causes as well as humane ones. The wildlife reha-

bilitation center's purpose of existence is a museum of social and humane causes as humans cannot live without wildlife as we are all a part of a larger ecosystem. Thus to say that the management of wildlife rehabilitation centers should be within a cultural hub is in a sense theoretically and in reality correct because of the idea that there is no natural hub untouched by the human footprint; for example, wildlife are prone to threats in human dense regions around the world that “include poisoning, electrocution, power-line collisions, habitat destruction, insufficient food resources, disruption of breeding sites” and in some parts of the world, “the illegal collection of body parts for traditional medicine...” (Naidoo et al., 2017, p. 21). The history of the indigenous and native wildlife population in the US is connected to displacement and genocide, especially in Texas and Illinois, undeniably bison. Willowbrook is slightly different from the SPWRC in that there is an extensive 26,000 acres of designated pockets of forest preserves surrounded by a suburban area, 26 miles from a metropolitan city, Chicago. Whereas, the SPWRC is situated in a city of 250,000 inhabitants yet serves a larger community in the semi-rural region of the Texas Panhandle, the Llano Estacado, and the South Plains, where bison are no longer living and other native animals and birds have become extinct. Before 1870, there were 30-60 million bison in the Southern and Northern Plains, after which they were slaughtered for their hides (Harper's Weekly, 1874; Ringo, 2017).

Since this chapter focuses on case studies in the US, it is relevant to introduce the National Wildlife Rehabilitators Association (NWRA), which was founded in Illinois (IL) and the first symposium was held in Naperville, IL, in 1982. The association “is committed to the value of educating the public about wild animals as individuals and as part of the intertwining web of life” (National Wildlife Rehabilitators Association, 2015). Thus, in-

dividual wildlife care comes foremost to the individual animal which will account for the continuation of the habitat and, in turn, the ecosystem (National Wildlife Rehabilitators Association, 2015). According to a survey by the NRWA of which 343 rehabilitators responded in 2007, approximately 105,300 wildlife were treated and more than 50% were rehabilitated and released (National Wildlife Rehabilitators Association, 2015). According to Deb Dohrmann of the NWRA, the Wildlife Rehabilitation Medical Database (The Wild Neighbors Database Project, 2019) collects the most recent information on patients.

These figures from the NWRA are relevant on how the SPRWC and the WWC can be defined as a living heritage museum and cultural hub. Why call it a **living heritage museum**? “Living” alludes to rehabilitating animals, a type of “dynamic preservation” as opposed to “static preservation” (van Mensch, 1990, p. 13). As a part of the function of preservation, which includes collections management, the practice of collecting live animals for the purpose of rehabilitation can be expressed as an evolution from curiosity, documentation, scientific research, education, and global care of heritage (Sofka, 1990, p. 7) starting from the individual heritage stretching to the ecosystem heritage.

Dynamic preservation refers to live animals that need care by humans due to natural disasters such as tornados or conflict with other animals or human-made disasters such as electric lines or poisonous chemicals. The term also means that they do not necessarily remain forever at the wildlife rehabilitation center unless they are in need of continuous care such as mentally ill and permanently disabled animals named “Ambassadors” at the SPWRC. The rehabilitated animals are released back into the environment.

Static preservation (van Mensch, 1990) in this case refers to pres-

ervation of collections such as in natural history museums of dead flora and fauna, in the past taxidermized for exhibition purposes. The term also represents those zoos and aquaria that are exhibited for education and amusement, be it a kind of immersed setting called “ecological” in museum communication language (van Mensch, 2003). Thus, the wildlife rehabilitation center is a part of the dynamic process of the environment, not a fixed criterion of static preservation.

The **museological object** can be defined as follows: “*museum object* is sometimes replaced by the neologism *musealia*, modelled on the Latin neuter noun *musealium* with *musealia* in the plural” (Mairesse & Desvallées, 2010, p. 63; also see Mairesse & Desvallées, 2011). It is also considered as “any element belonging to the realm of nature and material culture that is considered worth being preserved, either *in situ* or *ex situ*, or by documentation” (van Mensch, 1990, p. 13). Wildlife are museological objects, and they are both preserved *in situ* or *ex situ* and by documentation for those that have been admitted to the center. There has been much discussion on the museological object in relation to “the landscape as sum total of geological, biological and anthropological formation forces” (van Mensch, 1990, p. 13), which stems back to the concept of the ecomuseum (Rivière, 1985). The “extenders” embrace the ecomuseum as the museological object, and the “limiters” are those people who see the limitations of musealia in an acclimatized collection (van Mensch 1990, p. 13). But an extension of this concept is the combination of objects that have not been designated as a museological object or “heritage” and those that have within a town or city as a part of the tangible and intangible collections (Chung, 2008). These objects and collections are a part of the social, cultural, and natural infrastructure of the area that is partly *in situ*, which is the very essence of the wildlife

rehabilitation center. The importance of the level of value or significance of the museological object is stressed in that it should be horizontal rather than vertical: scientific, information, and emotional (van Mensch, 1990). For example, the kind of wildlife to be considered a significant museological object in the WWC is reflected in the wildlife acceptance policy Top of Form (Forest Preserve District of DuPage County, 2019c). Cottontail and opossum orphans seem to be the most abundant and significant wildlife that need to be rehabilitated. Thus, there is a level of significance in what kind of wildlife should be rehabilitated as for any artifact, naturfact, and mentifact.

The **heritage** discussion is multifarious as authors have noted in numerous monographs and journal articles (e.g., Gathercole & Lowenthal 1990; Harrison, 1996; Knudson et al.; Holechek et al., 2000). “Heritage” in the heritage management discussions refers to animals that are of recognized heritage status, such as the bald eagle, symbolic of a nation, culture, endangered or threatened enlisted status. The International Union for Conservation of Nature’s (IUCN) Red List of Threatened Species is a comprehensive biodiversity indicator of species. But what should be considered as “heritage” is the multifarious animals that make up the entire landscape, not solely the ones on the list.

As for the concept of the “**museum**,” the SPWRC fits into a legal status of “A Non-profit 501(c)3 organization dedicated to rescuing and rehabilitating orphaned and injured wildlife in the Texas Panhandle” founded in 1998, an IRS determined non-profit tax-exempt organization established for a dual purpose of rehabilitation and education (South Plains Wildlife Rehabilitation Center, 2019).

The Willowbrook Wildlife Center was established in 1952 as Willowbrook Wildlife Haven donated to the Willowbrook Forest Preserve in

1956; and in 1981, an outdoor exhibit, clinic and education areas were created and updated with the Master Plan of 2011 (DocPlayer, 2019). It is also a part of the greater extended view of the museum in a non-acclimatized environment, the Willowbrook Forest Preserve and an even larger area of the DuPage County Forest Preserve 501(c)3, and delineated for administration, preservation, research, and communication by the county government (Forest Preserve District of DuPage County, 2019c).

Under the International Council of Museums’ definition, a museum includes the different kinds of entities that administer, preserve, research, and communicate heritage (ICOM, 2019). The only museum that comes close to being called a “living heritage museum” is the Virginia Living Museum; however, this particular museum lays emphasis on non-rehabilitative animals and is in-between the concept of a wildlife rehabilitation center and a zoo & aquarium. The Farm, “A Living Museum in Rural America,” situated in Sturgeon Bay, Door County, Wisconsin, is coherent to the living heritage museum with farm animals and vegetables that are “living” collections. Recently, an exhibition on *Humboldt Park: Jens Jensen’s “Living Laboratory”* a changing social and natural environment, which now houses the National Museum of Puerto Rican Art and Culture, supports the concept of landscapes as living heritage museums or living laboratories.

The case study SPWRC serves a community and landscape that is beyond city or county limits of Lubbock, Texas. The center caters to the needs of animals, the natural and cultural landscape. Moreover, the institution is a “cultural hub” (ICOM Kyoto, 2019) as the center of activity of this landscape. The SPWRC is situated within a neighborhood of surrounding houses within the city outside what is called “the Loop,” a circular highway that surrounds the city. Up till 2015, the SPRWC served the entire

Texas Panhandle community until the Wild West Wildlife Rehabilitation Center was established in Amarillo. The Llano Estacado South Plains is a rural landscape created by ranching, herding, and farming by the settlers and *pastores* displacing the natural habitat of wildlife and the indigenous population (Flore, 2016; Johnson, 2008). In such a case, the SPRWC is the cultural hub that helps wildlife and public education on the importance of wildlife to this community of a metamorphasized rural landscape. For the SPWRC, wildlife cross state borders of the surrounding Texas Panhandle of New Mexico, Colorado, and Oklahoma, but the center can identify itself as catering to the boundary of the state of Texas (Barnes, 2019).

The case study WWC is situated in the suburbs surrounded by a neighborhood of houses and stores, but also a preserved forest, the Willowbrook Forest Preserve and the greater areas of the DuPage Forest Preserve, accounting for 60 forest preserves. In such a landscape, there is a sense of the natural state of wildlife though there are boundaries, physical and conceptual, that have developed in a documented form of maps and titles. The public has access to the extended landscape as the center directs the audience to a trail that leads to part of the Forest Preserve.

The mission statements of both SPWRC and WWC and their everyday practice demonstrate that there is, first of all, a higher purpose as a human being to care for another life. This purpose is not unrelated to laws that care for personal pets, with potential policies against abuse or harm. The goals of the programs are to release them back into their environment, the extended museum of the cultural hub. The significance of such programs has both an emotional and scientific reason. The next but not lesser mission is to provide education to the cultural hub that extends even beyond the geographical limits of the state as some centers reach a global audience such

as the Grey Snow Eagle House in Oklahoma. The exhibitionary role is not the same for wildlife rehabilitation centers. They serve as a cultural hub to rehabilitate wildlife and educate humans about the significance of wildlife and how to take care of them. The SPWRC is working toward this goal of building an interpretive center and amphitheater which would ideally place this 501c(3) entity as museum status in a traditional sense. But if we extend this idea as a part of the extenders (van Mensch, 1990), then there is a sense of coherency to the terminology since the SPWRC brings the live collection like a travelling exhibit to the community in the form of 118 education programs conducted in 2018. The WWC is a combination of both the exhibitionary in the traditional sense with cages of rehabilitated animals that are not fit to be released back into the environment. For example, there are mentally ill animals that have suffered trauma. Thus, museological theory on the environment revisited demonstrates that the wildlife rehabilitation center is a dynamic process of the preservation of the museological object as the total heritage living museum that caters to the social, cultural, and natural landscape stretching beyond legal boundaries as wildlife migrate or are displaced.

Interpretive Planning and the Future of Tradition in Museological Theories

The stabilization of museological theories and the procedures in practice are discussed. Interpretive planning falls under museological theories in museum communication. Different typologies on museum communication in the form of the exhibition have been defined (Verhaar & Meeter, 1989; van Mensch, 2003; Dolák & Šobáňová 2018). Dolák and Šobáňová

(2018) produced a monograph on the theoretical implications of the exhibition in *Museum Presentation*. The process, phases, and development of the museum exhibition as a part of the planning of museum communication are presented, which would be important in producing exhibits for wildlife rehabilitation centers. As discussed in the *ICOFOM Study Series*, only a few papers related specifically to interpretation and planning and from a general perspective (Effibolley 2001; Katsanika-Stefanou & Papadeli-Marconi 1993). Within a comprehensive communication function, an interpretive plan is a holistic approach to constructing both the exhibition and education aspects. Interpretive planning for a wildlife rehabilitation center in the practice for the future will be examined from a broad to narrow discourse on the topic.

In many parts of the world, the application of heritage planning within heritage management is prevalent. World Heritage Sites that are monitored by the World Heritage Committee of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) require the nominations of such sites in national committees to incorporate master planning. English Heritage incorporates the elements of integrated site interpretation schemes (ISISs) within monument plans for the different heritage sites (Goodey, 1994, p. 303). As for the usage of terminology, in the US and Canada, the process is referred to as “interpretive planning,” and in the UK and Commonwealth countries, the term is called “interpretative planning.” The interpretive plan is acknowledged as an important activity that has been produced since the 1960s and sponsored development in the 1970s in the US (Goodey 1994, p. 303). Other planning methods were adopted in the field especially in the late 1980s with consultant planners for museums and heritage institutions (Goodey, 1994, p. 303). The origins of interpretive planning stem back to the National Park Service (Brochu & Merriman,

2002; Knudson et al., 1995). Two terminologies are used within interpretive planning: plan and prospectus. A prospectus identifies the intended audience and what that audience should obtain from the experience for different levels and strategies including circulation for the facilities and programs, producing “a set of customer experiences,” a more specific document than the a comprehensive plan (Knudson et al., 1995, p. 310).

For national parks and wildlife reserves, heritage interpretive planning is also referred to as environmental educational planning (Brochu & Merriman, 2002; Lindsey, 2000). Goodey (1994) adds that Carter’s idea of interpretation is distinct from environmental interpretation, yet Sam Ham argues that they are not fundamentally different. Ham’s *Environmental Interpretation: A Practical Guide for People with Big Ideas and Small Budgets* published in 1992 has been widely applied in interpretive planning. Three types of interpretive plans are dependent upon the space and place where interpretation is being applied: a new plan for a new site, a remedial plan for existing interpretation, and a generative plan (Goodey, 1994, p. 304). The resources-theme-market paradigm demonstrates that resources should be incorporated on two levels, already identified and potential ones to be identified through research (Uzzell, 1991 cited in Goodey 1994, p. 304). “Environmental Education as Strategic Communication: A Paradigm for the 21st Century” has addressed the “common-sense paradigm,” which means targeting behaviors for environmental problems; therefore, it is to persuade people to behave differently in order to protect and improve the environment, a paradigm of problems-audiences-media and messages (Ham, 1992, p. 2), which is different from the interpretive paradigm resources-themes-markets. There are two types of audiences, the formal (school-based) audience with a long-term strategy and the non-formal audience who

are outside of the formal school system as short-term for specific immediate issues influencing specific behaviors (Ham, 1992, p. 3). Knudson, Cable, and Beck (1995) focus on many aspects of interpretation of both cultural and natural resources and do not distinguish between interpretive planning and environmental planning. Rather, the process of planning is outlined as follows:

- Considers the clients who come to a facility or area, as well as those it serves beyond the property.
- Defines the special value, significance, and purpose of the place.
- Sets up key goals, so interpreters know what they're trying to do and evaluators can determine how well they do it.
- Outlines the approaches taken to interpret the facility, from themes to the personnel, methods, and media to use.
- Prescribes the best mix of the methods, media, and messages.
- Gives broad, general guidelines for a new or revised exhibit center and arrangement, trail schema, and other facilities.
- Sets a style for the facility – the signs, the publications, the correlation of personal and nonpersonal services, the balance of efforts on-site and off-site.
- Considers timing and financing of new developments. (p. 361)

The important aspect of these theoretical concepts and terminologies is to

apply the paradigm that fits the wildlife rehabilitation center for professionalization into communication. Wildlife rehabilitation centers are, in most cases, not open to the public due to federal and state regulations on the display of protected rehabilitative wildlife. Yet, permits can be granted to such centers to produce educational displays.

Many institutions rely on external professional interpretive planners to produce the plan which is dependent on funding for it to come to fruition. Bluestone & Associates (2019) was hired to produce an interpretive master plan reflecting WWC's mission to rehabilitate and educate the community on "*Research, Content Development, Interpretive Writing, Interpretive Graphic Design, Habitat Design, Exhibit Design*" which would help them for fund-raising to progress in interpretation. For the SPWRC, the budget is approximately \$4,000-\$5,000 a month. An event and fundraising activity were held in the form of a conference, "Raptors on the Prairie Conference," on November 10, 2006 at the Holiday Inn. T-shirts were sold at the conference. Those who attended came from 13 different states. Another fundraising activity is the annual Open House. Their goal is to eliminate one fundraising event or combine the fundraising events. Fundraising events are important because it makes the SPWRC visible to the public but does not generate a lot of money.

As a part of the procedures and composition of planning, the author produced a survey for the members of the SPRWC. Membership is open to any person who pays \$20.00 dues every year. The members receive newsletters and invitations to Open House which is held every December. The survey was placed in the newsletter of the SPRWC. A link was provided on the author's website to download the survey from Microsoft Word and answer the questions to send back via email and placed at Open House for

people to write down responses. The same survey questions were presented to the board members with the exception of questions 7 and 8 in regard to fundraising activities. The results of the surveys were incorporated into the heritage interpretive plan that includes methods in which the communication media can be generated to reach both the formal and non-formal audience and affect their behavior, educational programs, exhibits, and events, as well as heritage interpretive funding opportunities that will help the SPWRC to depend less on fundraising events (Chowdury & Simecek, 2007). One objective that the board members wish to maintain and improve the SPWRC is to hire a manager, assistant director, and fundraising officer to conduct fundraising and support education programs that would lead to the construction of an environmental education center.

WWC has education programs meeting state curriculum standards for elementary, middle and high schools, and scouts and youth troops. In regard to interpretive facilities, there is a visitor center showing native species of wildlife with labels, a kitchen for dietary preparations, and nursery, where the visitors can view as a lab through windows. Moreover, there are outdoor exhibits for permanently disabled wildlife, some of which are owls, red-shouldered and red-tailed vultures, red foxes, and raccoons (Forest Preserve District of DuPage County, 2019c), with interpretive signage throughout the outdoor exhibit trail. A butterfly garden includes interpretive signage, sensory garden, and educational display cabin for viewing butterflies and plants and play area. In addition, there is a nature trail with two different loops that consist of 40 acres “of restored prairie, savanna, woodland and wetland habitat” (Forest Preserve District of DuPage County, 2019c). The trail is a part of the DuPage Forest Preserve with native wildlife including a wetland bird habitat. There are approximately 30 different brochures on

educating about wildlife and rehabilitation such as *Living With Wildlife Babies in DuPage County* (Forest Preserve District of DuPage County, n.d.a) and *Nature's Limits and Willowbrook Wildlife Center* (Forest Preserve District of DuPage County, n.d.b) in addition to the *Conservationist* (Forest Preserve District of DuPage County, 2019a), a quarterly journal.

Museological theory of interpretive planning calls for systematized planning for the needs of both the wildlife and the public to create that connection of understanding of the local issues that extend beyond to the regional and global urgency. Students from the Heritage Planning course at the Center for Advanced Study of Museum Science and Heritage Management at Texas Tech University contributed in producing the SPWRC Heritage Interpretive Plan and examined four aspects. They are education programs, projects, events, and fundraising. The plan was presented to the board members of the SPWRC (Chowdhury & Simecek, 2007). Today, the SPWRC aspires to raise enough funds to hire personnel to cover grants, education programs and manage over-all activities. The center has been dependent on management through 100% volunteer service. It has considerably grown with funding from individual donations.

The WWC went through up-to-date 50 acres of facility developments that centered on “public engagement and education” and “pre-settlement conditions” through a master plan that made the connection between the wildlife medical clinic and the visitor center with an acclimatized environment of exhibits space in addition to outdoor interpretive trails and the forest preserve area (Bluestone & Associates, 2019). As the WWC is a part of a larger entity, the Forest Preserve District of DuPage County (2017, 2019b), after having conducted a community input for the “Master Plan

Goals, Objectives and Tactics” that were approved recently in February of 2019, share the goals, objectives, and tactics in preservation of the heritage environment and pushing the boundaries and education centers and interpretive planning through the Tactic 3.1c “Develop a vision and plan to renew exhibits at the education centers.”

Conclusion:

Suggestive Areas for Museological Applications for WRCs

An extended version through a comparative study was undertaken to claim that museological theory applied to interpretive planning stabilizes wildlife rehabilitation centers as living heritage museum and cultural hub status, revisiting heritage is the environment. The comparison and contrast were between the SPWRC and the WWC in two different states. Wildlife rehabilitation centers are not a new phenomenon, but it stems back to indigenous healers who have a great respect for wildlife and the balance of life. One example of this phenomenon is found in the planning process of the Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma’s Grey Snow Eagle House in Perkins, Oklahoma (McInnis, 2017). This organization was established under permits by the US Fish and Wildlife Services to create four different kinds of programs addressing rehabilitation, Native American religious use, education, and research. The religious program helps Iowa Tribal members to make homes for disabled bald and golden eagles and use their molted feathers for ceremonial use. The education program provides for the rehabilitation center that has drawn 20,000 visitors annually (Grey Snow Eagle House, 2019) as a cultural hub in the region. This is an important part of Native American cultural practice for the bald eagle center in Oklahoma where the indige-

nous community use their traditional intangible heritage. Another example is seen in the Skyes Spirit Rehabilitation Center in Pennsylvania where Native American heritage is practiced. More and more museums now incorporate the history of Native Americans and their practice of heritage interpretive planning. Interpretive planning encompasses an exhibition plan, but this element would help to disseminate to a wider public and create a visual presence that is required for grant-eligible status for WRCs. Planning requires the cooperation of the administration which includes the board members. The National Association for Interpretation (2009) provides standards and guidelines for interpretive planning. This kind of standard offers suggestive implications for including professional training for the heritage planner position at a wildlife rehabilitation center.

The wildlife rehabilitation center is a museological phenomenon acting as a cultural hub for the surrounding landscape of society and nature. It is the “extenders” version of the museum that goes beyond the idea of museums within walls. The legal borders exist, but the wildlife border is fluid as a part of a habitat definer. Heritage is thus the total heritage of the ecomuseum, and the wildlife rehabilitation center is the cultural hub. The living status of wildlife applies the concept of the dynamic preservation, but also dynamic communication, and to break it further down - dynamic interpretation which will benefit from interpretive planning. In conclusion, the museological ideas past and present, indigenous and foreign, that are formulated into interpretive planning practice will contribute to the future of tradition.

References

- Bluestone & Associates (2019). *Willowbrook Wildlife Center*.
<http://bluestoneinc.com/willowbrook-wildlife-center/>
- Brochu, L., & Merriman, T. (2002). Redefining interpretation as a core belief for certification of professionals. *Journal of Interpretation Research*, 7(1), 11-16.
- Chowdhury, T., & Simecek, M. (2007). *An interpretive plan for heritage resources for the South Plains Wildlife Rehabilitation Center* [Unpublished report written under the supervision of Yun Shun Susie Chung, Texas Tech University, Center for Advanced Study of Museum Science and Heritage Management]. Lubbock, Texas.
- Chung, Y.S.S. (2005). Seoul, Korea: Its concept of culture and nature in heritage planning. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 11(2), 95-111.
- Chung, Y.S.S. (2019). A museological tradition as a cultural hub: Interpretive planning for living heritage museums. In K. Smeds (Ed.), *The Future of Tradition in Museology* (pp. 35-40). Paris: ICOFOM.
- Desvallées, A., & Mairesse, F. (Eds.). (2010). *Key concepts of museology*. Paris: Armand Colin.
- Desvallées, A., & Mairesse, F. (Eds.). (2011). *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de muséologie*. Paris: Armand Colin.

- DocPlayer. (2019). *Willowbrook Wildlife Center Master Plan*.
<https://docplayer.net/58366715-Willowbrook-wildlife-center-master-plan.html>
- Dolák, J. (2017). Otevírání se veřejnosti nebo, nová ortodoxie? [Opening to the public or new orthodoxy?] *Muzeológia a kultúrne dedičstvo*, 5(1), 137-145.
- Dolák, J., & Šobánková, P. (2018). *Museum presentation*. Olomouc: Palacký University.
- Effibolley, P. (2001). Interpretation of the intangible heritage through museums in different continents. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 33a, 158-159.
- Flores, D. (2016). Loving the Plains, hating the Plains, re-wilding the Plains. In *American Serengeti: The Last Big Animals of the Great Plains* (pp. 161-184). University Press of Kansas. <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.snhu.edu/stable/j.ctt1bpm9nk.11>
- Forest Preserve District of DuPage County (2017). *Forest Preserve District of DuPage County master plan: 2017 Community input summary*. <https://www.dupageforest.org/hubfs/About/Documents/Mission-Vision/2018-02-27-presentation.pdf>
- Forest Preserve District of DuPage County (2019a). *Conservationist*, 55(4).
- Forest Preserve District of DuPage County (2019b). *Master plan*.
<https://www.dupageforest.org/master-plan>
- Forest Preserve District of DuPage County (2019c). *Willowbrook Wildlife*

- Center. <https://www.dupageforest.org/willowbrook-wildlife-center>
- Forest Preserve District of DuPage County (n.d.a). *Living with wildlife babies in DuPage County* [Brochure published by the Forest Preserve District of DuPage County]. Illinois.
- Forest Preserve District of DuPage County (n.d.b). *Nature's limit's and Willowbrook Wildlife Center* [Brochure published by the Forest Preserve District of DuPage County]. Illinois.
- Gathercole, P., & Lowenthal, D. (Eds.). (1990). *The politics of the past*. London: Unwin Hyman Ltd.
- Goodey, B. (1994). Interpretative planning. In R. Harrison (Ed.), *The Manual of Heritage Management* (pp. 303-311). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Grey Snow Eagle House. (2019). *About us*. <http://eagles.iowanation.org/about/>
- Ham, S. (1992). *Environmental interpretation: A practical guide for people with big ideas and small budgets*. Golden, CO: North American Press.
- Harper's Weekly. (1874). Slaughtered for the hide. *Illustrated Article*, 1022. <https://thewest.harpweek.com/Sections/buffalo/SlaughteredForHide1005.htm>
- Holechek, J.L., Cole, R.A., Fisher, J.T., & Valdez, R. (2000). *Natural resources: Ecology, economics, and policy*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- ICOM. (2019). *ICOM Definition of a museum*. <http://archives.icom.museum/definition.html>
- Johnson, E. (2008). Landscapes and peoples of the Llano Estacado. In L. Scheiber & B. Clark. (Eds.), *Archaeological Landscapes on the High Plains* (pp. 115-156). Boulder, Colorado: University Press of Colorado. <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.snhu.edu/stable/j.ctt46nvp9.9>
- Katsanika-Stefanou, H., & Papadeli-Marconi, G. (1993). Thessaloniki Museum of Byzantine Civilisation: Organisation and planning of the permanent exhibition [Article in Greek with abstracts in English and French]. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 22, 93–97.
- Knudson, D.M., Cable, T.T., and Beck, L. (1995). *Interpretation of cultural and natural resources*. State College, PA: Venture Publishing, Inc.
- Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor-net work-theory*. Oxford: OUP Oxford. <https://search-ebSCOhost-com.ezproxy.snhu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=211608&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.
- Lindsey, K. (2000). Open minds: What is interpretation? *Journal of Wildlife Rehabilitation*, 23(4), 29.
- McInnis, K. (2017). Feathers, native culture, and rehabilitation. <https://theiwrc.org/archives/31265>
- Mohawk, J. (Ed.) (2005). *The Iroquois creation story: John Arthur Gibson and JNB Hewitt's Myth of the Earth Grasper*. New York: Mohawk

Publications.

Naidoo, V., Wolter, K., Espie, I.W., & Kotze, A. (2017). Vulture rescue and rehabilitation in South Africa: An urban perspective. *Journal of Wildlife Rehabilitation*, 37(1), 21-30.

National Wildlife Rehabilitators Association. (2015). *Facts*.

<https://www.nwrawildlife.org/page/Facts>

Ringo, K. (2017). Herds of bison once roamed Central Texas. For the *Express-News*. <https://www.expressnews.com/sa300/article/Herds-of-bison-once-roamed-Central-Texas-11226704.php>

Rivière, G.H. (1985). The ecomuseum-an evolutive definition. *Museum*, XXXVII (4), 182-183.

Smeds, K. (2018). The future of tradition in museology. *Call for Publication and Participation. 42nd Annual ICOFOM Symposium. Kyoto, Japan, September 1-7, 2019.* ICOFOM.

Sofka, V. (Ed.). (1990). The future is not what it used to be: Heritage and the environment. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 17, 7-12.

South Plains Wildlife Rehabilitation Center. (2019). *Mission statement*.

<https://www.spwrc.org/mission-statement>

van Mensch, P. (1990). Annual conference: museology and the environment. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 17, 13-14.

van Mensch, P. (2003). The characteristics of exhibitions. *Museum Aktuell*, 3980-3985.

Verhaar, J., & Meeter, H. (1989). *Project model exhibitions*. Leiden: Reinwardt Academie.

The Wild Neighbors Database Project. (2019). *Wildlife Rehabilitation Medical Database*. <https://www.wrmd.org/>

III

Online Museology: Sacred Versus Secular and Peircean Semiotics

III

Online Museology: Sacred Versus Secular and Peircean Semiotics

The art of reasoning is the art of marshalling such signs, and of finding out the truth. (Pierce, 1998, p. 10)

Introduction

The sacred and the secular are two polemic concepts that are examined in museology in regard to heritage. Repatriation and restitution of sacred heritage and trade in illicit trafficking in the secular channels leading to desacralization are discussed. To delve deeper into the museum concept and the museological divide of the sacred versus secular, the object-centered approach versus the information-centered approach is explored. This study endeavors to understand the theoretical notion, specifically Peircean semiotics, of the sacred versus secular of the online environment in teaching museology and the structure of museology; particularly, within online museology projects such as online exhibits; not only tangible heritage, but intangible heritage and indigenous territory are digitized as a part of musealization. “Museality-heritage-sacred” (Mairesse, 2017, p. 2) will be analyzed through Peircean semiotics to understand the spectrum of sacraliza-

tion-and-desacralization and the tangible-and-intangible for the future of museums and online museology.

Three decades ago, it was absurd to think that teaching could be possible online in the future. Even today, eyebrows are raised when people read about the online teaching environment for studies in nursing where the “practice” is considered the fundamental requirement for such a vocation. In the beginning stages of the online teaching revolution, museology programs throughout the world were experimenting with the idea of tools in pedagogy, such as iLearn, connecting the physical learning environment with online resources in teaching. Since a decade ago, there has been a trend in museology online programs being established, beginning with certificate programs. Nonetheless, as the wave of the future of online education persists and moves forward, universities are establishing degree programs in museology where the institutions have found ways in which to link the hands-on environment with museums and online pedagogical approaches (See for example, the American Alliance of Museums, 2018). In this chapter, the spectrum of the sacred and secular of online museology in connection with the online exhibits created by museums, libraries, and archives will be examined. Through Peircean semiotic analysis, the future of online museology will embrace a stronger tie with the sacred and the secular – the tangible and the intangible in both academia, museums, and indigenous communities.

Research questions connected with this chapter are: what are the theoretical concepts that have been examined in museology on the sacred versus the secular of heritage; what is the state of issues on the repatriation and restitution as well as the illicit trafficking of heritage in relation to the cultural significance of the sacred versus the secular realm; and what

are the discussions on the object-centered versus the information-centered approach to museology? Moreover, what is the current discourse on semiotics and museology, specifically Peircean semiotics and museology? How can we apply Peircean semiotics to online museology to gain a better understanding of museum exhibits online?

The methodology of this chapter is to structure the discussion into the various subthemes of the sacred vs. secular, exploring the published literature on the subthemes, endeavoring to incorporate an international perspective of authors. In writing up the chapter, it applies a socio-cultural lens through the application of Peircean semiotics. This qualitative research and analysis utilize primary sources from museum online exhibits to support the argument of this chapter. Statistics from reports are formulated to situate and sample physical museums in the US to examine the online exhibits. Case study museums are selected to represent regions from the database and report of the Institute of Museum and Library Services (2018).

Semiotics and Museology

A literature review on semiotics and museology provides context on a gap analysis of what has been already discussed in publications and why Peircean semiotics and the future of online museology is contributing to the field. The doctoral dissertation “Museum Semiotics: A New Approach to Museum Communication” examines museum semiotics centering on the relationship between museologists and the public dialogue, the codes, systems, and rules (Horta, 1992). The main focus is Umberto Eco’s sign-function concept applying it to the museum message. The the-

sis proposition is about museum language and speech in connection with the museum communication process of the museum context. Within the dissertation, museum literature on museums and semiotics using a historiographical approach to examining theories from semioticians to museologists are included. More museological works on semiotics from the same author are a part of the *International Committee for Museology (ICOFOM) Study Series* (e.g., Horta, 1991).

“A Museum Analysis Model-an Outline” (van Mensch, 1994; van Mensch, 1996) published as a part of the readings for *Theoretical Museology* explores the semiotic nature of the museum from the building and environment, exterior, interior and plan, collections on a macro level, exhibition rooms, collections on a micro level, and museum object as exhibit with the idea of the conceptual, structural, and functional. Another unique semiotic analysis is “the characteristics of exhibitions” deciphering various different types into purpose, strategy, style, technique, and diverging policies (van Mensch, 2003). Basic semiotic concepts from museologists to semioticians and linguists are presented in this study. More recent publications on museum semiotics include “*Muzeum a prezentace*” (Dolák, 2015), “Semiotic Aspects of Museum Landscape: Contextual Integration and Symbolic Application” (Ferwati and Khalil, 2015), and “Semiotic Models in Museum Communication” (Plokhotnyuk & Mitrofanenko, 2018). The published literature in theoretical museology does not provide a distinctive in-depth examination of Peirce’s theory and museum semiotics of online museology, which concludes a gap analysis on the topic.

Sacred Versus Secular

The concept of the sacred versus secular is discussed under sub-themes in museological literature.

Heritage

As early as 1970 the UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property has been at the forefront of the repatriation and restitution of sacred objects that have been circulated and displayed in the secular realms of museums and private collections since 1976, forming the Intergovernmental Committee for Promoting the Return of Cultural Property to its Countries of Origin or its Restitution in case of Illicit Appropriation in 1978 (resolution 20 C4/7.6/5) with bilateral negotiations on the return or restitution of the sacred objects using this secular approach. The literature on the illicit trafficking and pillage of heritage is extensive in museum literature (e.g., Brodie et al., 2001; Messenger, 1999). *The Ethics of Collecting Cultural Property* is foundational on the concepts of the sacred of cultural heritage (Messenger, 1999). In “Ancestral Sites, Shrines, and Graves: Native American Perspectives on the Ethics of Collecting Cultural Properties,” the chapter examines the nature of relics as Navajos lay emphasis on the sacredness of prehistoric Puebloan (Anasazi) sites even though they are not their ancestors, but enemies of their ancestors. Places, where the dead are buried are sacred, and looting and destruction of the site and disturbance of the burials are sacrilege or secular. The plundering of American Indian sacred sites and analysis of the effects of the triad connection of the gravediggers, dealers, and the financiers are also discussed, thus the subject of desacralization. In “Rethinking the Debate: An Integrative Perspective” the chapter explores 1) heritage issues to property rights of indigenous peoples 2) cultural heritage preservation as endangered sites

and objects 3) stewardship of the past in terms of the “information, stories, and myths” 4) acknowledgment of the diverse values of heritage 5) resolution of conflicts of heritage through mediation rather than litigation and inter-museum programs 6) restitution of heritage and restrictions on illicit trafficking of heritage (Warren, 1999, p. 22). Thus, some secular programs help protect sacred heritage from becoming desacralized.

Authentic versus substitute

On the discussion of the sacred as original or authentic and the secular as a substitute, this idea was dedicated in an entire *ICOFOM Study Series*, a compilation of various papers (Sofka, 1985). These included topics such as the polarity of concepts and definitions, the ethical implications and legal aspects of the justified and unjustified substitutes, the typology of substitutes. An article on “Reality as Illusion, the Historic Houses that Become Museums” in the ICOM publication, *Museum International*, is about historic houses as objects (Risnicoff de Gorgas, 2001). The article places importance on the original setting of the historic house when it becomes a museum. Some interesting points that the article makes is the importance of the processes of the heritage and that authenticity is not the goal of research but rather “they represent certain ways of seeing and experiencing the world and life per se. . . .” (Risnicoff de Gorgas, 2001, p. 11). Thus, neither for the authentic object nor the substitute, the past cannot be “reproduced” (Risnicoff de Gorgas, 2001, p. 11). Rather, the object is highlighted with new meaning in the production of the display, and the values have changed over time with new ones. The meanings “oscillate between two worlds” (Risnicoff de Gorgas, 2001, p. 14). There is no intrinsic or inherent meaning in heritage.

Object-centered versus idea-centered

These two concepts, the sacred and the secular, can also be understood as the idea-centered versus the object-centered approach (e.g., van Mensch, 1993; Washburn, 1984). This approach is discussed in “Collecting Information, Not Objects” in *Museum News* (Washburn, 1984). The emphasis of the article is on the future of collecting information rather than three-dimensional objects. This concept can be analyzed in relation to the idea that collecting objects is a sacred task without considering the costs in collections management, as opposed to the information value or the idea of those museums that would consider deaccessioning and preserving only the information or copies. In some cases, de-accessioning collections has been frowned upon due to the significance of the collection considered as an indivisible unit, such as the sale of the Egyptian antiquities in the Toledo Museum of Art, Toledo, Ohio (Gedert, 2017). The sacred is considered too valuable to be interfered with. The sacred remains as a collective not to be dispersed, since an object is relative to other objects within the collection. Furthermore, defining the perpetuity of collections in the museum and taking into consideration natural disasters such as floods and human-made disasters like theft are also integral in the discussion. The last point is on the preservation of larger objects such as ships and the costs for doing so. Thus, the sacred of collecting objects or preserving the information or idea-centered and concept-centered approaches to museums are part and parcel of the museological dialogues of museality as sacred and secular.

Tangible versus intangible

In regard to tangible versus intangible heritage and the sacred and the secular, the role of intangible folk heritage and ‘holders’ of crafts and skills and their relationship with museums, the Korean Folk Village in the Republic of Korea (ROK) is presented in connection with UNESCO’s

Living Human Treasures system, presently adopted by numerous countries (Chung, 2004). The paper suggested the connection between Living Human Treasures and technical holders as intangible heritage in Korea to be preserved and managed through ecomuseums. Moreover, museologists discuss the concept of the tangible that can be communicated through the discourse of the sacredness of the tangible's values, cultural, social, and spiritual (Descarolis, 2000, p.36). These intangible concepts or ideas are materialized into the concrete object (Descarolis, 2000, p. 37). Settlements and communities in connection with the sacredness of beliefs, codes, and values are also surfaced through leaders, imagery, and local heroes as the concrete (Nazor & Carre, 2000, p. 95). In parallel with the aforementioned papers, this study embraces the comprehensive approach to the definition of intangible cultural heritage in accord with UNESCO's definition (UNESCO, 2003).

Peircean Semiotics on Online Museology

The *Museological Working Papers* (MuWoP), the results of the ICOFOM Symposium, "Systematics and Systems in Museology" in Stockholm, explore the definition of museology and its structure containing the earlier forms of definitions and the structure of museology as a scientific discipline (Sofka, 1980; Sofka, 1981). "Methodology of Museology and Professional Training" (Sofka, 1983) was the first publication in the *ICOFOM Study Series* providing several definitions from museologists of museology. Museology is broken down into general museology, specialized museologies or sub-categories such as the museum field, and system, history and philosophy, social sciences, professional fields such

as natural history, applied museology or museography and theoretical museology, dividing the schema into three basic ones: historical museology, theoretical museology, and applied museology with stress on interdisciplinarity. In "Museum and Museology: Changing Roles – Or Changing Paradigms (Scheiner, 2008), the paper discusses the role of museology in exploring the concepts of the museum as a social phenomenon and cultural representation beyond institutionalization in connection with heritage as an intangible reference for contemporary knowledge, communication theory, and intercultural dialogue in this information society for diffusion. A discussion on the schemes of museology is relevant to identify the fit of online museology or cybermuseology such as in "Empowering Digital Museum Audiences to Foster Museum Communication" (Leshchenko, 2012). At this day and age, the New Museology is no longer new, because the concept of the museum is functioning on a greater scale for visitors (Brulon Soares, 2012). Evaluations on the visitor before, during, and after programming are a given, especially in regard to the understanding of the visitor and perceptions of the objects within the museum. Another structure of museology that has evolved is ecomuseology, placing importance on the empowerment of the people in the territory (Brulon Soares, 2012, pp.114-115). The forecast on where the history of museology is heading is at the level of heritage, professionalization, and the interdisciplinarity from other sectors in society (Mairesse, 2006, p. 81). If museology is to embrace this change, how can Peircean semiotics construct and deconstruct the meaning of the online museum exhibits through a gaze?

The application of semiotics in museology is understood using the icon, where signs have an iconic element, index as an indexical sign or metonym, and symbol using a metaphor (van Mensch, 1996). Delving deeper into Peircean semiotic concepts, "What Is a Sign?" (Peirce, 1998), writ-

ten in the early twentieth century, but published as a compilation of works in the late twentieth century, best explains the logics approach. For Peirce (1998), logic and semiotics are key to the art of reasoning through the art of arranging signs. For Peirce (1998), there are three kinds of signs connected to three different states of mind: icons as a “dreamy state – feeling without reason,” indices as “a sense of reaction – breaking of one feeling by another feeling / brute force,” and symbols as “thinking – aware of learning” (p. 27). The representation or the sign as a whole is an amalgamation of the three kinds of signs, the three different states of mind, and three kinds of interest: “1) [icon] in it for itself 2) [index] on account of its reactions with other things 3) [symbol] mediatory interest in it, in so far as it conveys to a mind an idea about a thing” (Peirce, 1998, p.27).

Overall, signs represent and act like photographs of an object, the design of a statue, or an architectural plan. First, Peirce refers to icons as likenesses representing what the ideas communicated. He gives an example of the new state of things in mathematics but under one formula of likenesses. Second, indications, indices, or index are connected with the physical attribute or object, indicating, for example, an arrow that points to something that is already understood on a map. Peirce (1998) connotes that understanding the index is dependent on a person’s prior understanding and experience of recognizing the index. Third, symbols are related to their use. The communication process of symbols is categorized according to Peirce (1998) as words, phrases, speeches, books, and libraries. To add to his categories in this chapter, online exhibits are a part of the communication process. The symbol is understood to be a guess, and it is implied to be linked to the object as an idea. An index is physically joined with its object, making an organic pair. Interpretation is completely different and has no connection except when it is verbally identified after it is conceptually established. His

conclusion is that in order for communication to occur, it requires this triad of the sign. In retrospect, he states that symbols flourish and are inside the minds of people, which have different meanings for cultures and individuals (Peirce, 1998, pp. 27-30). This systematic concept of the icon, index, and symbol, which equal the sign, will then be applied within the framework of examining the sacred and the secular in online exhibits from the author’s socio-cultural perspective.

The database of the Institute of Museums and Library Services records an evolving list of museums in the US and District of Columbia, based on the fiscal year of 2015 third quarter, public records, and administrative data resulting in 33,072 institutions. Though the database includes different kinds of museums such as aquariums and zoos or sampling of the institutions that are related to public history, this chapter chose samples from the list of 8,697 Uncategorized or General Museums, 14,862 Historical Societies and Historic Preservation, and 2,285 History Museums. The remaining art museums accounted for 3,738. Arboretums, Botanical Gardens, & Nature Centers consisted of 1,484. There were 513 Children’s Museums, 2,285 Natural History & Natural Science Museums, 1,088 Science & Technology Museums & Planetariums, and 564 Zoos, Aquariums, & Wildlife Conservation (See figures 1 & 2).

A sampling from New England museums is the University of Maryland Libraries Special Collections (GMU) online exhibition (University of Maryland Libraries Special Collections, 2018). *For Liberty, Justice, and Equality: Unions Making History in America* is a topic on intangible heritage, unions. According to the author’s perspective, the icon is the image of flags in the US. The index being injustice in working conditions and wages. The symbol is “Liberty, Justice, and Equality” (University of Maryland

Code	Discipline
ART	Art Museums
BOT	Arboretums, Botanical Gardens, & Nature Centers
CMU	Children's Museums
GMU	Uncategorized or General Museums
HSC	Historical Societies, Historic Preservation
HST	History Museums
NAT	Natural History & Natural Science Museums
SCI	Science & Technology Museums & Planetariums
ZAW	Zoos, Aquariums, & Wildlife Conservation

Figure 1: Museum Disciplines (Grimes et al., 2014, p. 5)

Libraries Special Collections, 2018). Representing a Mid-Atlantic region, GMU or HSC, the Museum of the City of New York (2018) has several online exhibits that are not derived from physical exhibits. In *The Greatest Grid: The Master Plan of Manhattan 1811 to Now* followed by lesson plans and an interactive map, digitized historical maps are the icons showing the grids. The index in the labels state how it is the greatest master plan of urban planning with its advanced grids and numbering. The symbol that the text reveals is New York as an orderly city that was best planned for everyone. For example, the message that the online exhibit communicates before urban planning in 1811 is as follows:

Before the grid, New York City grew organically, with no overarching order. The southern tip of the island of Manhattan was a knot of short streets, some dating back to the Dutch settlement of New Amsterdam. They were shaped by local conditions, built piecemeal, and lacked a unifying order. The rest of the island was a patchwork of farms and meadows, ponds and marshes, laced with meandering country roads and with ample ground for expansion. (Museum of the City of New York, 2018)

Naper Settlement's (2018) online tour exhibit, a sampling of the Midwest region (GMU), is considered to verify what is meant by the sacred. When first examining this online exhibit, there was no explanation for the 19th century painting icon on the first page, but later renamed "Plank Road." A Native American shows the way for the settler businessman who is busily producing plank roads for investment into transporting goods. The index is how Naperville developed and prospered. The symbol is Naperville representing the settlers, and a history before the settlers does not seem to be reflected. By decoding the meanings through Peircean semiotics, each digitized item reflects the sacredness of settler history com-

Code	Name [Number of Museums]	Description
1	New England [2,931]	Connecticut, Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont
2	Mid-Atlantic [5,624]	District of Columbia, Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania
3	Southeastern [6,670]	Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia
4	Midwest [7,353]	Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, Wisconsin
5	Mount Plains [5,188]	Colorado, Kansas, Montana, North Dakota, Nebraska, New Mexico, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, Wyoming
6	Western [5,306]	Alaska, Arizona, California, Hawaii, Idaho, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington

Figure 2: Museums by Region (Grimes et al., 2014, p. 8)

municated through the online tour exhibit. Using Oncell.com, G2L with video, archival digital photographs, scavenger hunt, and interactive tours, technological systems are advancing, and there is great potential to begin the prehistory and history of the Native Americans.

Representing the Southeastern region (HSC), the open-air museum Historic Jamestowne (2018) focuses on the first 'successful' foundations of colonization through the fort. There is neither an icon of Native Americans on the map, nor an index. Rather, there is an assumption that the index is Native Americans who exist outside the boundaries of the forts, a long-held concept of the 'uncivilized' and 'untamed' in US history. The sacred is 'us' - how we got here today through settlement history and the symbol reflecting the beginnings of 'civilization' as sacred. The remedy is to incorporate the indigenous icon in both the past and the present and invite indigenous communities to share their concepts on the sacred to be represented through online museology. At the same time, the open-air museum Jamestown Settlement (2018) boasts of an inclusive story about the Native Americans and their annihilation. The reconstructed settlement has both indoor and open-air museums. These two museums reflect a comprehensive understanding of historic Jamestowne, including reconstructed Native American dwellings. The online exhibit is somewhat inclusive with the portrayal of an African American slave re-enacted in first person, using the chronicles as evidence. The icon of the Native American dwelling is a likeness of a sacred place, though a reservation, but where its place is indicated on the map is not the original sacred place where they had lived since, they were displaced by the settlers. Thus, the dwelling is symbolic of a sacred place which can be further explained in the online exhibit. For tribal communities, elders, and researchers could take part in the process of identifying the sacred as a contemporary understanding of the musealized

dwellings.

The Kansas Museum of History (Kansas Historical Society, 2018), situated in the Mount Plains region (HSC), presents several online exhibits on Kansas heritage. For all of the exhibits, there is a lack of coverage of the struggles of race, ethnicity and indigenous heritage. The earliest history that is represented is that of the settlers, the Russian-Germans, and the Croatians. For the latter part of history connected with sports called *Game Faces*, icons are black and white images of white baseball players and the changing faces integrating women rodeo riders and African American basketball players; the index is multi-colored faces in sports; and the symbol is diversity. Six sub-themes with hyperlinks direct the audience to, for example, "The Town." Each image or icon is connected to a separate page interpreting the artifact history. In other words, the hyperlinks are extended labeling or explicative panels, indices of that particular artifact.

For the Western region (GMU), the Alaska State Museums' (2018) online exhibits, which are digitized archived physical exhibits, were chosen. It has a unique format that allows the audience to read through large labels that match the objects, very much like a physical exhibit. In this way, the physical exhibits are digitized as a part of the historiography of physical exhibits at the museum. For example, *Lure of Alaska: A History of Tourism in the Great Land*, held from April 2007 to February 2008, shows the development of the Klondike Gold Rush to Curio Cabinets of indigenous tourist souvenirs. The icons show the imagery from the settlers and Anglo tourist lenses. The index is the fashionable exploitation of Alaskan indigenous heritage during the period, and the symbol being the exoticness of the indigenous land and peoples.

Examining these sample regions, the GMU, HST, and HSC muse-

ums' online exhibit all began with settler history. For physical museums, there has been a way to solve the preservation of sacredness, and the use of the secular: while the original is preserved through Aboriginal Keeping Places, the tourists to view museums are with substitutes or non-sacred objects in the physical dimensions. The European concept of the museum has been adopted for the secular educational and touristic purposes. Aboriginal Keeping Places were established in the 1960s and 1970s to alleviate the secular approach, but maintain the sacred (Simpson, 2001, p. 119). Museums could thus collaborate with the Keeping Place of any indigenous culture to create online exhibits together. These exhibits can further enlighten the visitor experience in relation to the Keeping Place and museum to produce a sacred understanding in a secular environment. Though many museums focus on the incorporation of the state or city in US history, settler history embracing the struggles of the indigenous peoples and territory should be discussed through the understanding of semiotics in the construction of online exhibits.

Analysis and Conclusion

For many of the online degree programs in museology, what is common for the graduate programs is that at the end of the program, a thesis, project, or internship is a requirement, ranging from online exhibitions to physical tours. At least two decades of museum publications have been published to guide museologists and museographers how to plan and conduct educational programming. Accuracy in interpretation with supportive documentation is, indeed, crucial, whether the kind of documentation is a document, artifact, naturfact, or intangible heritage. Through online theo-

retical museology, with a special focus on semiotics, students can learn the associations that images and text have in communication and understand the efficacy and intricacy of icons, indices, and symbols. There has been an extensive amount of published literature on traditional or brick-and-mortar learning, blended learning, to online learning with a full database available of literature review (See, for example Oregon State University, 2018). However, what can be further researched in museum literature is how online exhibits can be more inclusive of indigenous intangible heritage. The implications of this study and the Association of Tribal Archives, Libraries, and Museums' (ATALM) report on public outreach via technology show that for the 136 tribal organizations that responded, online museology is considered sacred, that it does not defy traditional museological practices: "66% provide access to institutional resources (finding aids, collection catalogs, visual images of materials in the collection) and 58% Create an exhibit experience 13%" (Jorgensen, 2012, p. 10). The findings offered that the ATALMs' plans for technology should focus on "further integration of technology into exhibits, displays, and user/visitor experiences" (Jorgensen, 2012, p.11). The results of digitization are promising as 47% of 129 tribal organizations have digitized their collections. The reasons are for preservation, access collections for both museum staff, users, and audience:

Native Americans are using technology when it is available to interact, communicate, share culture, and gain the skills needed in a digital world. Despite a lack of access, higher prices for broadband and often non-existent infrastructure, leaders in these communities have developed a vision and built self-sufficient networks and community technology centers to connect and strengthen their Native communities.

(Jorgensen, 2012, p. 11)

This report is suggesting in that there could be more opportunities for public history museums to work with tribal museums on online museology projects. Peircean semiotics is one method of understanding how to construct and deconstruct meanings.

In addition, the importance of the intangible and the relationship with the contemporary which is connected with the “sphere of the imaginary” in reference to Bachelard, Nietzsche, and Malraux (Scheiner, 2000, p. XI) is the foundation of materialization (Scheiner, 2000, p. XII). In regard to our illusion of the immortality of objects, museologists can allude to the discussion from Washburn (1984) in relation to the importance of viewing the information value and connecting it to online museology; however, digitization, too, is not immortal as well as there will be new forms of presentation from the microfiche to Polaroid images to slides and computers. For now, though, the virtual environment is an appropriate space to preserve intangible heritage (Scheiner, 2000, p. XII). Thus the “human inner world” (Scheiner, 2000, p. XIII) can be represented by what is presented as Peircean semiotics, icons, indices, and symbols through virtual reality. The earlier discussions on sacralization and desacralization have produced a starting point for exhibitions brick-and-mortar as well as semiotics in museology to attain improved communication. In conclusion, online museology and brick-and-mortar museology are no longer polemics of the sacred and secular; and Peircean semiotics help to define the communication process in online exhibitions as in any brick-and-mortar exhibition. These concepts belong to a dependency within museology programs as a part of the curriculum online or brick-and-mortar, and one that will help to improve communication with indigenous communities in disseminating

the sacred and understanding what exists before settler history.

References

- Alaska State Museums. (2018). *Online exhibits*.
https://museums.alaska.gov/asm/online_exhibits.html
- American Alliance of Museums. (2018). *Directory of museum studies programs*. <http://aam-us.org/resources/careers/museum-studies>
- Brodie, N., Renfrew, C., & Doole, J. (2001). *Trade in illicit antiquities: The destruction of the World's Archaeological Heritage*. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.
- Brulon Soares, B.C. (2012). Museology of the becoming: Museums and their power as schools of perspectives. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 41, 114-124.
- Chung, Y.S.S. (2004). Museums and intangible folk heritage in the Republic of Korea. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 33, 21-30.
- Chung, Y.S.S. (2018). Sacred versus. secular, Peircean semiotics, and online museology. In F. Mairesse (Ed.), *Museology and the Sacred: Materials for a Discussion, Papers from the ICOFOM 41st Symposium Held in Tehran, Iran, 15-19 October 2018*. Paris: ICOFOM.
- Decarolis, N. (2000). The tangible and intangible heritage. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 32, 2000, 35-39.

- Dolák, J. (2015). Muzeum a prezentace. *Muzeológia a kultúrne dedičstvo*, o.z.1. vydání, Bratislava.
- Ferwati, S., & Khalil, R.F. (2015). Semiotic aspects of museum landscape: Contextual integration and symbolic application. *International Journal of the Inclusive Museum*, 8 (3), 17-31.
- Gedert, R. (2017, April 5). Toledo Museum of art selling off over 140 pieces. *The Blade*. <https://www.toledoblade.com/Art/2017/04/05/Toledo-Museum-of-Art-selling-off-over-140-pieces.html>
- Grimes, J., Manjarrez, C.A., Miller, K.A., & Swan, D.W. (2014). *Museum universe data file: Documentation. (IMLS-2014-MUDF-01)*. Institute of Museum and Library Services: Washington, DC.
- Horta, M. (1991). Museum language and exhibitions speeches – a chicken and egg discussion. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 19, 55–60.
- Horta, M. (1992). *Museum semiotics: A new approach to museum communication* (Thesis submitted for the degree of Ph.D. Department of Museum Studies University of Leicester, Faculty of Arts, April 1992).
- Historic Jamestowne. (2018). *Historic Jamestowne*. <http://historicjamestowne.org/>
- Institute of Museum and Library Services. (2018). *Museum universe data file FY 2015 Q3*. https://data.imls.gov/Museum-Universe-Data-File/Museum-Universe-Data-File-FY-2015-Q3/ku5e-zr2b?_ga=2.107429505.2010162304.1542992689-

- 462389872.1542992689
- Jamestown Settlement. (2018). <https://www.visitwilliamsburg.com/trip-idea/itinerary-tale-two-jamestownns>
- Jorgensen, M. (2012). *Sustaining indigenous culture: The structure, activities, and needs of tribal archives, libraries, and museums* [Report]. Oklahoma City, OK: Association of Tribal Archives, Libraries, and Museums. http://www.atalm.org/sites/default/files/sustaining_Indigenous_culture.pdf
- Kansas Historical Society. (2018). *Kansas Museum of History-online exhibits*. <https://www.kshs.org/p/kansas-museum-of-history-online-exhibits/17869>
- Leshchenko, A. (2012). Empowering digital museum audiences to foster museum communication. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 41, 237–244.
- Mairesse, F. (2006). L'histoire de la muséologie est-elle finie? *ICOFOM Study Series*, 35, 81–88.
- Mairesse, F. (2017). Museology and the sacred. *Call for Publication and Participation to the 41st Symposium organized by ICOFOM, Tehran, 15-19 October 2018*. ICOFOM.
- Maroević, M. (2002). What is it that we are presenting in a museum – objects or ideas? *ICOFOM Study Series*, 33b, 69-73.
- Messenger, P. (Ed.). (1999). *The ethics of collecting cultural property*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

- Museum of the City of New York. (2018). *Online exhibitions*.
<https://www.mcny.org/exhibitions>
- Naper Settlement. (2018). *Welcome*.
<https://napersettlement.oncell.com/en/index.html?label=Welcome>
- Nazor, O. & Carre, F. (2000). Certain groups and others: The reclaiming and protecting of intangible heritage in agricultural towns of the so-called “Argentine Pampa Gringa.” *ICOFOM Study Series*, 32, 93–97.
- Oregon State University. (2018). *Online learning efficacy research database*. <http://ecampus.oregonstate.edu/research/projects/online-learning-efficacy-research/database/>
- Peirce, C. S. (1994). *Peirce on signs: Writings on semiotic*. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press.
- Peirce, C. S. (1998). *The essential Peirce, volume 2: Selected philosophical writings (1893–1913)*, The Peirce Edition Project Bloomington and Indianapolis, Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Plokhotnyuk, V., & Mitrofanenko, L. (2018). *Semiotic models in museum communication*. *Muzeológia a kultúrne dedičstvo*, 6(1), 21-31.
- Risnicoff de Gorgas, M. (2001). Reality as illusion, the historic houses that become museums. *Museum International*, 53(2), 10-15.
- Scheiner, T. (2000). Museology and intangible heritage: The virtual experience. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 32(Supplement), viii-xv.
- Scheiner, T. (2008). Museum and museology: Changing roles or changing

- paradigms? *ICOFOM Study Series*, 37, 81 – 89.
- Simpson, M. (2001). *Making representations: Museums in the post-colonial era*. London: Routledge.
- Sofka, V. (Ed.). (1980). Museology – just science or practical museum work. *Museological Working Papers*, 1.
- Sofka, V. (Ed.). (1981). Systematics and systems in museology. *Museological Working Papers*, 2, 67-80.
- Sofka, V. (Ed.). (1983). Methodology of museology and professional training. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1, 126–132.
- Sofka, V. (Ed.). (1985). Originals and substitutes in Museums. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 8 and 9.
- UNESCO. (2003). *Text of the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*. <https://ich.unesco.org/en/convention>
- University of Maryland Libraries Special Collections. (2018). *Online exhibits*. <https://www.lib.umd.edu/special/exhibits/digitalexhibits>
- van Mensch, P. (1993). Towards museums for a new century. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 22, 15–19.
- van Mensch, P. (1994). Museum analysis model – an outline. In P. van Mensch (Ed.), *Theoretical Museology* [Textbook] (pp.183-184). Amsterdam: Reinwardt Academy.
- van Mensch, P. (1996, April 4). Lecture notes by Y.S.S. Chung. Amsterdam: Master’s Degree Programme on Museology, Faculty of Museology, Reinwardt Academy.

- van Mensch, P. (2003). The characteristics of exhibitions. *Museum Aktuell*, 92, 3980-3985.
- Warren, K.J. (1999). Introduction. In P. Messenger (Ed.), *The Ethics of Collecting Cultural Property* (pp. 1-26). Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Washburn, W.E. (1984). Collecting information, not objects. *Museum News*, 62(3), 5-15.

IV

The Museology of Hybrid Cultures in Museum Architecture

IV

The Museology of Hybrid Cultures in Museum Architecture

Introduction

The context of this study is to examine the series of terminologies, “hybrid,” “cultures,” “museum,” “architecture” within “museology,” are connected to understand the complex relationship that they have with each other. To single them out would identify the usage in different fields. Nevertheless, as the terminologies are placed under one sentence in the field of museology, the one statement will highlight areas in museum architecture beyond the museographical features as a “container” or “box” that exhibits and stores the collections of the museum. The cultures that are situated in the geographical location and the “container” that is designed by a non-indigenous person of the locality or region produce a hybrid culture especially in the case of “chain” art museums worldwide. The method in which this chapter applies is a museological lens disclosing the museological literature that is written on museum architecture mainly in English and French. The chapter also examines the cultural groups that are represented in the literature and the authors who have written the publications. The rapport that the local cultural and natural heritage have with the hybridization of the museum architecture is also explored. The museology of hybrid cultures in

museum architecture demonstrates that the tendency of art museums stresses the importance of “designer ware,” which reduces the permeance of the local heritage, especially indigenous heritage.

The methodology is to take a theoretical stance to this chapter developing upon already published literature. Primary sources are used to introduce new bodies of information, incorporating the project ateliers’ public information on the design rationale of the architects of the 2019 and 2020 constructions. The examples have been also selected to incorporate different cultures globally. The philosophy or religious stance that the designs are based on, reflecting the juxtaposition of the structures of the cultural setting they are situated in, are examined and analyzed. In this chapter, several terminologies are used: “indigenous” refers to peoples who are the inhabitants of space before any colonizers; “tribal” means indigenous peoples who belong to tribes; and “people of color” means anyone who is considered non-White in ethnicity. The terms “people of color” to mean non-white races are applied, while “culture” refers to the culture that the person is brought up, immersed, and practicing. Hybrid cultures mean a mixed rapport and projection. The discourse on “hybridization” by the Argentine author Néstor García Canclini (1995) covers an extensive understanding of the word and its epistemological and sociocultural implications from the financial, economic, cultural, to the political sectors.¹ García Canclini’s (1995) argument is based on heterogeneity and the processes that make new meanings within structures through mixing or hybridizing (p. xxix). Therefore, the premise to examining the word “hybridization” is, he states: “I understand for hybridization sociocultural processes in which discrete structures or practices,

¹ Many thanks to my reviewer, Mónica Risnicoff de Gorgas, for introducing the publication by Néstor García Canclini (1995).

previously existing in separate form, are combined to generate new structures, objects, and practices” (García Canclini, 1995, p. xxv). More importantly, his publication shares a Latin-American contextual setting when discussing and analyzing the symbolic and cultural processes of hybridization. There are certainly new meanings produced through the hybridization of museum architectural design as García Canclini’s (1995) theory discussed.

This monography does not claim that heterogeneity is an opposition to indigenous. The emphasis of this chapter is on moving away from hegemonic global marketable museum architectural design firms with globalized designer architects that produce the same kind of “chain” design.² Rather, the indigenous local community and its contextual setting should have stronger input. In “Neocolonial Collaboration: Museum as Contact Zone Revisited,” Robin Boast (2011) discusses the phenomenon of the “contact zone” for stronger meaningful dialogic space in reference to documentation, conservation, exhibition, and events. Therefore, the dialogic space should apply to the museum architectural design and setting.

To begin, this chapter explores the literature that has been published on a similar topic in the field of museology and architecture. In order to justify the theoretical implications of the argument, it is necessary to find out what cultures are represented by the authors of the topic and the cultures that the authors are from. By doing so, this chapter is accountable to whose culture is incorporated in writings and include the diverse voices in representation. The limitations of the study are that the author relies on English and French publications. The importance of this lens and approach has al-

² This phenomenon is the same for public art. In one courtyard of one university, one sees the same public sculpture commodified like a factory-made object in another courtyard of a university.

ready been noted in the early 1990s when multiculturalism was addressed in a program called “The American Cultures.” This particular program was a requirement at the University of California. The following elements were requisites in the courses to especially address amongst five:

4. Take substantial account approach to understanding architecture that has multicultural fusion as its goal” (p. 31). And Davis, herself, is African American, who introduces several publications by multicultural authors. Based on the research that her students conducted, museums, which include libraries and archives, of architecture, had very little resources on “architects of color” (Davis, 1993, p. 32). Adopting this inclusive, cultural approach and lens, this chapter proposes to explore the hybrid cultures in museum architecture.

Museum Architecture, Color, and Gender

The focus of the literature review on museum architecture is to highlight the historiography in museology, at the same time, situate the cultures and ethnicity of the authors who have published on this topic. In museology, Nikolaus Pevsner (1976) and John Lubbock’s (1995) books are frequently used in museology and museum studies curricula as a background to the history of architecture, though historians on museum architecture focus on the development of designs. There are numerous publications by European authors, especially British, on (museum) architecture incorporated in museology and museum studies curricula (e.g., Forgan 1986; Forty, 1986; Waterfield, 1987). Germain Bazin’s (1967) *Museum Age* published in the 1960s is a source that is referenced throughout museum literature. In the late 1970s and 1980s, more literature on museological topics which included museum architecture within the discussions was published (Alexander, 1979,

1983; Duncan and Wallach, 1978). In the 1990s, there was a proliferation of museological literature with aspects of museum architecture and ideological spaces (Bennett, 1995; Davis, 1990; Duncan 1995; Lorente, 1998; Lubbock, 1995; McClellan 1994; Miles & Zavala, 1994; O’Doherty, 1999; Pointon, 1998; Outram, 1996; van Mensch, 1991, 1994, 2003). Notably, Peter van Mensch’s (1991, 1994, 2003) methodology to examine the ideology, philosophy, iconography, and typology of the architecture and exhibit spaces relates to this chapter’s topic. The more recent study by Jan Dolák and Petra Šobánová (2018) provides the fundamentals of museum exhibit communication spaces. Therefore, the history of museological theories of hybrid cultures is examined in museum architecture. Though there is an entire book entitled the *Architecture of the Museum: Symbolic Structures, Urban Contexts* (Giebelhausen, 2003), there is very little diversity and inclusivity with an exception of one Latin American author and museum case study in Brazil. Every other structure and author are represented by a European-centered approach and does not discuss the aspects of the hybridity of cultures within museum architecture.

In order to highlight the museologists of color who have published on museum architecture, there are tribal scholars such as Amy Lonetree (2012), who focuses on three museums applying indigenous museology. The problematics of trying to incorporate museologists of color are that if there is no biography included in the publications, it is difficult to find out solely by the last name they are authors of color. Understandably, because the authors write about a certain culture does not mean they are from that culture. Thus, without a pictorial representation or biography included, it is difficult to know which culture, ethnicity, nationality, etcetera, Carrie Dillely and Paul N. Backhouse (2015) who wrote *Thatched Roofs and Open Sides : The Architecture of Chickees and Their Changing Role in Seminole*

Society, or Joshua M. Gorman (2011) on *Building a Nation : Chickasaw Museums and the Construction of History and Heritage* are from. The same goes for any other colored museologist such as Mario Gooden (2016), who wrote *Dark Space: Architecture, Representation, Black Identity*, and Mabel Wilson's (2012) *Negro Building: Black Americans in the World of Fairs and Museums*. Having searched the World Wide Web, images show that the latter two are authors of color. Not all searches provide images for every author, and the images do not accurately identify the culture that the author is from and practicing. Moreover, there is no way of knowing the gender of the author by assuming that "Carin" or "Anne" is female and "Jamey" or "Aidan" is male, so trying to incorporate a balance of female, male, and transgender perspectives is difficult, too.

The publication *Why Art Museums?: The Unfinished Work of Alexander Dorner* edited by Sarah Ganz Blythe and Andrew Martinez (2018) is included because it seems that one of the scholars is Latin American. The rationale of the exhibit spaces of the Rhode Island Museum of Art that Alexander Dorner produced while he was the director is the focus of the publication; and his work on the history and philosophy of the art museum in view of European standards is included. From Hellenism and Roman beginnings, medieval gothic, to renaissance and baroque, historical revival of neo-classicism, and the trend that was the basis of art museums in the 1938-1941 was considered "a second merging is the trend of 'OUR OWN TIME'" as Dorner argues. He further explains that "the museum will absorb and integrate the heterogeneous inheritance of Baroque and Romanticism" (Dorner, 2018, p. 182). Were there female museum architects or women who helped the main actor in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries? In the twenty-first century, there are women like Zaha Hadid, an Iraqi-British architect, who is a renowned designer architect. Her works go beyond post-

mortem as her designs continue to be constructed into buildings globally. Thus, the history of museum architecture might address these questions in future research.

Though the scope of the history of museum architecture has not been extensive, the limitations of this research are focused on museology and museum architecture. The topic and thesis are examining hybrid cultures reflected in museum architecture as the designer and the culture that the building is situated in. The concentration of this work has been on the publications that are written in English and select works in French. Therefore, there is room for expanded research on publications in other languages. This chapter examines the hybridity of the culture of the architect, what the message conveys in the design, and the environment the museum is built in.

Amongst French-speaking scholars, François Mairesse (2010) discussed "the hybrid museum," or in French, "*Le musée hybride*." The emphasis in the monograph is that the hybrid nature of museums, especially the globalized art museums, spread like brand name chain stores. This monograph also analyzes the hybridity of the administration, markets, and compares and contrasts the art museums with department stores. The book examines the intricate networks between "the museologist, the administrator, and the hybrid motors"³ (Mairesse, 2010, p. 23). The *Economie des Arts et de la Culture* (Mairesse & Rochelandet, 2015) further elaborates on the "three parts of our personality – a hybrid system"⁴ as follows:

Again, it is necessary to ask the reasons that urge certain de-

³ All translations from French to English are by the author: « Le muséologue, l'administrateur et les moteurs hybride ».

⁴« Trois parties de notre personnalité – un système hybride ».

sires to supply the motor: Why finance culture? The answers come from different markets of which are public power and philanthropy. It is for the same reasons that the State, the market, or the citizens decide to consecrate money to consume, to support to invest. Such is the reflection to drive us not to separate the model, of which it is to be (the State, market, and donation) to feed, first composes citizens more or less integrated, and more or less regrouped: individual consumers or active political citizens, political parties, governments or lobbies, organizations of reduced cuts or large global groups....(pp. 48 & 49)⁵

The discourse is founded upon capitalist concepts and compares hybridity metaphorically to a hybrid motor or automobile. The financial dependency of the museum on the different parties, who are the stakeholders and the consumers of the museum, play a significant role in the hybrid composition of museum management. Thus, both publications (Mairesse, 2010; Mairesse & Rochelandet, 2015) address the hybridity of the management and consumption of museums. To add to this discourse, the representation of hybrid cultures in museum architecture is examined.

Museology, Museum Architecture, and Hybrid Cultures

⁵« Encore convient-il de s'interroger sur les raisons qui poussent certains à vouloir alimenter le moteur : pourquoi financer la culture ? Les réponses venant du marché différent de celles des pouvoirs publics et de celle d'un philanthrope. Ce n'est pas pour les mêmes raisons que l'Etat, le marché ou des citoyens décident de consacrer de l'argent pour consommer, soutenir pour investir. Une telle réflexion nous conduit à ne pas séparer le modèle, quel qu'il soit (Etat, marché et don) et ceux qui l'alimentent, d'abord composes de citoyens plus ou moins intégrés, et plus ou moins regroupés : individus consommateurs ou citoyens politiquement actifs, partis politiques, gouvernements ou lobbys, organisations de taillée réduite ou grands groupes mondiaux... ».

A few terminologies are used in this chapter and understood through the specific sources. In *Webster's New Dictionary* (Agnes, 2003, p. 213), hybrid means “anything of mixed origin.” The study of cultures is the focus of numerous disciplines. Culture means “the skills, arts, etc. of a given people in a given period; civilization” (Agnes, 2003, p. 213). Mairesse discusses the transmission of culture that is compared and contrasted with a hybrid motor of a vehicle as mentioned above, in relation to capital, work, and, in effect, commercialization (Mairesse, 2010, p. 197). According to Mario Gooden, “culture is an understanding of one’s internal and external relationships to place (geography) and time (the order in which events occur), as well as an intimacy with one’s existence (the materiality of presence and self)” (2016, p. 13). Museology is defined as “...the study, theory, and philosophy of the museum field and the ethics of its practice and functions,” according to ICOFOM (2019), and “it encompasses museum theory and practice as well as the critical reflection on the museum and the existent field of knowledge for this reflection.” In *Key Concepts in Museology*, museum architecture is defined as follows:

...the art of designing and installing or building a space that will be used to house specific museum functions, more particularly the functions of exhibition and display, preventive and remedial active conservation, study, management, and receiving visitors. (Desvallées & Mairesse, 2010, p. 197)

The history of museum architecture is traced back to Northern Europe demonstrated by “the conquest of museographic specificities”⁶ (Maires-

⁶« La conquête des spécificités muséographiques ».

se, 2010, p. 32). The emphasis of this history is on the climactic role of Carlo Scarpa's designs in museum architecture between 1945 and 1970 as neo-classicism and a systematic approach were displaced (Mairesse, 2010, p. 32). From neo-classicism of columns, colonnades, and friezes to neo-renaissance and neo-gothic, museums have maintained at least two centuries of "classical" architecture. The dissemination of modern architecture in the form of Bauhaus in the western countries and the Soviet Union in the communist blocks influenced the construction and design of museums. In *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de muséologie* (Mairesse, 2011), contemporary museum architecture is described as an absence of systematic doctrine:

By an absence of systematic doctrine, but a choice of solutions in the function of requirements of which it is necessary to expose the imperatives of architecture which welcomes it, Scarpa chose sometimes to take away certain pre-existing elements (or to make them re-appear), sometimes using the natural light, and sometimes artificial light (Museum Gipsoteca Antonio Canova, 1955-57). (p. 40)⁷

At the same time, the design is described as "cold" in its starkness such as the initial museum architecture in Venice for the Galleria del Accademia (1945-60) or the museo Correr (1953; 1957-60) (Mairesse, 2011, p. 40). The next phase was "flexibility" in design with examples of the Ethnographic Museum of Neuchâtel and the lighting installation system of the Museum of Modern Art of Eduardo in Rio de Janeiro:

⁷« Par une absence de doctrine systématique, mais un choix de solutions en fonction des exigences de ce qu'il devait exposer et des impératifs de l'architecture qui l'accueillait, Scarpa choisit tantôt de faire disparaître certains éléments préexistants (ou même les faire réapparaître), tantôt d'utiliser la lumière naturelle et tantôt la lumière artificielle (museo Canova a Possagno, 1955-57) ».

The model of progress seems to impose, in the epoch, thereby to promote the "machine to expose," paraphrasing an expression by Le Corbusier, the architecture – "the box" – bending to the requirements of the versatility, ardently hoped by the directors of the contemporary art museums [21]. The Sainsbury Centre for Visual Arts (Foster, 1974-78; 1998-91) constitutes, to this respect, a reference. (Desvallées & Mairesse, 2011, p. 41)⁸

The introduction of the temporary exhibition rooms, storage exhibit rooms, and study galleries are a part of the development of museum architecture (Mairesse, 2011, p. 42). After World War II, there was an absence or denial of a particular programming of architecture (Desvallées & Mairesse, 2011, p. 44). During the late 1980s, museum architecture is considered a "museology perspective"⁹ (Jean Davallon cited in Desvallées & Mairesse, 2011, p. 47) and "it is not unthinkable after Bilbao to draw a new treasure for which architecture plays a major role"¹⁰ (Desvallées & Mairesse, 2011, p. 47). The perspective of the visitor as the consumer influenced factors of museum architecture (Desvallées & Mairesse, 2011, p. 47). With museum visitor studies research being established such as by Bourdieu et al. (2013), previously considered ancillary spaces are now treated as primary spaces

⁸« Le modèle qui progressivement semble s'imposer, à l'époque, semble ainsi promouvoir la « machine à exposer », pour paraphraser une expression de Le Corbusier, l'architecture – « la boîte » - se pliant totalement aux exigences de la polyvalence, souhaitée ardemment par les directeurs de musées d'art contemporain [21]. Le Sainsbury Centre for Visual Arts (Foster, 1974-78 ; 1998-91) constitue, a cet égard, une référence ».

⁹« muséologie de point de vue »

¹⁰« Il n'est pas impensable qu'après Bilbao se dessinent de nouveaux enjeux pour lesquels l'architecture joue un rôle majeur ».

in museum architecture. These include spaces such as the welcome desk, boutique, restaurants, parking (Desvallées & Mairesse, 2011, pp. 47-48), and currently electronics charging areas and electronic labels and panels, for example, at the Chicago Institute of Art. The whole packaging of the visitor experience from the airport, hotel, shopping, eating and the designer architecture of the museum, noting ones such as the Guggenheim Museum Bilbao and the Getty Museum, is what Walter Benjamin called “qualifying museography”¹¹(Benjamin cited in Desvallées & Mairesse, 2011, p. 48). Into the twenty-first century, museum architecture displays two particular trends in the hybridity of cultures and the indigeneity of culture in design and space.

To continue with this discussion, the hybridity or hybridization of cultures of museum architecture is the focus of this chapter applying a museological approach to the analysis. The closest publication that addresses museum architecture and representation of cultures is *Dark Space: Architecture, Representation, Black Identity* (Gooden, 2016). Gooden’s quest is posed as a question, “How can architecture synthesize the subjective spirit and the objective intellectual product to construct a uniquely ‘American American’ architecture borne of black complexity?” (Gooden, 2016, p.16). This approach is similar to what Mabel Wilson (2012) questions in *Negro Building: Black Americans in the World of Fairs and Museums*:

Taking stock of these laudable advances, what does it mean for black Americans to claim a physical space in the nation’s symbolic cultural landscape and symbolic space in the nation’s historical consciousness, two spheres in which their presence and contributions have been calculatingly rendered invisible and abject for over two centuries? (p. 3)

Some concepts that are relevant to the findings and analysis are Gooden’s

concept of “Space as Praxis as Identity” (Gooden, 2016, p.16) and “The Problem with African American Museums” (Gooden, 2016, p. 98). His views are that a black identity in visual arts and architecture has not been fully realized (Gooden, 2016, p. 100). More significant to the discussion in this chapter is Gooden’s (2016) perspectives of the museum building:

The museum building itself is likewise a contested typology for African Americans, thanks not only to the historical absence of art by African Americans but also the history of segregation and Jim Crow laws that prevented the presence of African Americans in Certain Museums, as well as the generally complex relationships in American history between race, space, and cultural identity. Hence, the conditions of this contestation problematize both the anthropological and aesthetic approaches that enter into the design of museums of African American art, history, and culture. These highly loaded acts of architecture require thoughtful consideration of the multivalencies and complexities of relationships that persist, demanding more than just higher aesthetic quality. Such museums need to interrogate more than what can be seen on the surface. (p. 100)

A pertinent connection that is made with African American museum architecture is the “image” in relation to symbolism and racial colors (Gooden, 2016, p. 101). Yet, Gooden argues that museum architecture stops at form and colors that reflect tokenism but it should go beyond to become knowledge concerning identities and injustices (Gooden, 2016, p. 102). For example, the design of the National Museum of African American History and Culture (NMAAHC) is based on an inverted, tiered pyramid reflecting the Ogoga’s Palace in Ikere, Nigeria, and association with African American women’s church hats; but he argues that the symbolism remains a mystery to most people (Gooden, 2016, p. 112). Furthermore, the NMAAHC is situ-

ated in the National Mall without reference to the historical context of slave labor, legislation on slavery in the “surrounding government institutions within this network of relations” (Gooden, 2016, p. 112). Wilson (2012) notes a similar phenomenon four years earlier in the publication *Negro Building*, where designer architects and landscape architects designed the world fairs. The initial African American museums, however, were not museum professionals with training but through grassroots activism. Wright, Smedly, and Burroughs aligned social and racial activism during the 1960s (Wilson, 2012, p. 295). There is discussion on the rationale of the initial exhibits designed, but very little discourse on the design of the building, only alluding to African domes as a part of the roof and a postmodern design that is much like the white box (Wilson, 2012, p. 294). As observed in *Le Musée Hybride* (Mairesse, 2010) and the *Economie des Arts et de la Culture* (Mairesse, 2015), the agency involved with the management and designer construction of the museum, *Negro Building* also demonstrates that amidst the “racialized structures” as agents, the state, the museum, the stakeholders, Wright had to organize a “black counter public sphere” (Wilson, 2012, p. 295). One other journal publication on “Toward a New Vision to Design a New Museum in Historical Places” by two engineers, Bahar I. Farahat and Khaled A. Osman (2018), address the contextual definitions from an engineering and architecture perspective. The contextual approach is constructive in this chapter as a practical measure to designing new museum buildings.

Lonetree (2012) explains the “hybrid tribal museum” case study in Minnesota, the Mille Lacs Indian Museum, where it “addresses how one Native community constructed a collective public memory and history by developing a tribal museum - in this case, a ‘hybrid’ tribal museum” (p. 26). Currently, though the museum is owned by the historical society, it is run

by the Band due to land and title issues (Lonetree, 2012, pp. 34 & 35). The Mille Lacs site was a trading post and a museum in 1919 (Lonetree, 2012, p. 35). What would be interesting to learn is more about the architecture and how it was transformed in that community. It took seventeen years to open ground in 1996 (Lonetree, 2012, p. 36). Native architect Thomas Hodne designed the new building (Lonetree, 2012, p. 45). Lonetree (2012) calls the process of the new museum “Indian museology” and “Indigenous museology” (pp. 77 & 111). Other museums such as the Ziibiwing Center reflects on “the theoretical concepts of historical trauma and historical unresolved grief to begin the healing process for Native people” (Lonetree, 2012, p. 125); but again, the concentration of what is communicated is through the galleries and exhibits (Lonetree, 2012, p. 148), not the exterior design, ideological, philosophical communication of the building. Thus, the published literature provide groundwork for adding a theoretical discourse to the topic of study.

There is considerable discussion on the museum and the community aligning its functions. Nevertheless, what exactly does the structure and design of the building communicate as a living entity for indigenous communities but ignored by the people who take power to thrust the construction and design upon a community? The radius of the community might be within the city or county level, yet for some museums, it extends beyond the state, and in other forms to collaboration with other museums such as the special programs that permit free passes within libraries that are in different counties. Why was there an initiative to construct a superfluous number of new museum buildings in countries like South Korea? What collections do they serve in such spaces and the information systems that would be planned for such spaces? Construction is now not solely the physical space that the architect is designing; the space for information and storage is accounted for. The cost in construction and maintenance of particular sites has

a long complex history with communities who would be adamant to have new buildings being constructed in their space. In many cases, such lavish designs are produced that do not reflect the community's heritage but designer architects to promote prestige. As a result, the promotion of designer architects from abroad creates a hybrid culture in the museum setting. In most cases, the designer is not immersed in the environment of that area, tangible and intangible.

The late twentieth and twenty-first centuries' trend is hybridity, but then it downplays the local heritage. The Louvre's newly designed entrance by I.M. Pei by a Taiwanese American architect is not indigenous museology as the pyramid could signify France's historic colonial foothold of Egypt and its antiquities. The NMAACH is also designed by an African British architect and already discussed above. Through these implications, there are different concepts on the hybridity of cultures in museum architecture. The Museum of Texas Tech University was purposefully built in the form of a mesa that surrounds the Southwest reflecting the cultural and natural heritage. Though, of course, the indigenous population and buffalo were annihilated and the design of the building and the collections inside convey the Anglo-European version of the Southwest.

What is to be understood from the form then? Construction of extensions continues with white cubes such as Dartmouth's Hood Museum of Art. Though the Sheik's heritage and culture are represented in the new museum design, it is a French architect, Jean Nouvel, who was commissioned to build the National Museum of Qatar. Hybrid cultures such as these create another justification for the concept of the "western" museum. It can be stated that it is being "true" to its concept since the "museum" was conceptualized in Europe. However, in the twenty-first century to continue with

such a design negates the indigenous culture that the museum is situated in. Gooden (2016) made an important point about the discourse in architecture that it should incorporate the juxtaposition of the NMAACH and the rest of the Smithsonian museums in the Mall, White House, and Congress. Thus, these points can be further raised when creating museum architecture as they are the largest artifacts of musealization and can be used as a political tool as an object of exhibit (Chung, 2003, 2007).

There is very little discussion about what the museum architecture communicates in the structure, space, and the iconography and design. As mentioned above, Gooden (2016) emphasizes this relationship while van Mensch (1994) provides an iconographic analysis worksheet to endeavor to make those connections. Since it is the first step into the actual rapport with the traditional acclimatized spaces, the building is the container whether or not it is a traveling exhibit with trucks or trunks, planning of the galleries, layout, and trajectory of the route of the exhibits. This chapter is interested in the "shell" that is a visualization and embodiment of the contents inside and outside in the case of sculpture gardens and how they are juxtaposed with the building, landscape, and beyond.

Hybridity in museum spaces is traced back to the 18th century when commissioned architects such as the classical agenda of "his" idea of what the space should look like with "his" lens from "his" own culture (Dorner cited in Blythe and Martinez, 2018). As Desvallées and Mairesse (2011) summed up museum architecture concise yet comprehensive, the evolution of new museum architecture started in the 18th century, and the proliferation of terminologies used to describe that spaces developed in the 19th and 20th centuries. Some movements tried to break away from the tradition by producing the "white box," but it has now become ubiquitous spaces

as the one-model-fits-all for gallery spaces. Commissioning from abroad has been the trend for many of the designer-made museums. Though the argument made by Georg Simmel cited in Gooden (2016, p. 13) emphasizes that architecture cannot be “racialized” as it could produce stereotypes. These stereotypes could be projected as “American.” Museum architecture goes through the same kind of communication process as moveable objects in a collection, yet even more exposed to the public as it is displayed in the physical environment (Chung, 2007). Thus, as the community in the surrounding area changes with different cultural groups, the same building “object” changes with the rapport of the new community. As moveable objects have lives (Chung, 2018), so do buildings. However, what does remain the same as with any object, after understanding the purpose of that object, is the design and function philosophy of the maker, and in this case, is the building (see van Mensch, 1994, 1996). In lieu of the word racialized, it can be understood as encultured.

Hybrid cultures in museum architecture is not a new phenomenon. The stance on international amalgamation is not the key to preserving an *in situ* culture, and every other “great” museum building should not have chain designs by the same designer. Of course, the local materials may be used to construct the building (e.g., Kuma, 2019), but the design is the foundation for the ideology of that space. In formerly colonized countries such as in Zimbabwe and Brazil, the nineteenth-century neo-classical architecture in museum design was the paradigm. Japan, for example, though not a colonized country, embraced the wave of Western architecture to design museums in the nineteenth century, such as the case of Kyoto National Museum; the building was purpose-built to become a museum. The question then is – how should museum building design take into consideration the ideological, philosophical, and importance of indigenous perspectives?

Three elements should be taken into account when understanding museum architecture through a museological stance:

I. Juxtaposition: The museum in the cultural and natural setting geographically - as in collections within an acclimatized environment, and the buildings communicate through the juxtaposition in space. Indeed, there are pre-existing conditions that are set by the real estate market to what is available and the cost.

II. Museum architect and design philosophy: An indigenous museum architect in the community is ideal as s/he would understand and reflect the philosophy. If it is an international team of architects, an indigenous architect should be included.

III. Materials used to build the museum: The materials in the area or region that the museum would be constructed or rehabilitated are important to help the local economy and for the acclimatization, in material and symbolically, of the structure that would be indigenous to the area.

Collections are different from the building concept as the latter has a dual function to house the moveable collections and as an object in its own right; therefore, more research should be conducted on the juxtaposition, design, and materials.

Kickapoo Tribal Museum, Brown County, Kansas Reservation, USA

A tribal context is studied to understand this phenomenon. According to Lonetree (2012, p. 19), an indigenous museological definition of what

a tribal museum is determined by its management through indigenous governance. The number of museums in North America is 120 to 175 that fit into this category, according to the Smithsonian Survey conducted. Most of these museums are small and run by a few staff members; but Lonetree (2012, p. 20) also mentions the larger ones, such as the Museum of Warm Springs, Tamastislikt Cultural Institute, Makah Cultural and Research Center, and Mashantucket Pequot Museum and Research Center.

An example of a tribal museum of 2019, Kickapoo Tribal Museum, opened in August in Brown County, Kansas, reservation. The juxtaposition of this space is very much a result of colonization as is the concept of the museum in this space. Yet, the fact that the Kickapoo tribal community made all the decisions of their tribal heritage and the design of the building, the museum is considered indigenous. Though the Kickapoo and many other tribes were migratory by culture, they were forced to be placed in reservations, as seen in the “Map showing the lands assigned to emigrant Indians west of Arkansas and Missouri” where 768,000 acres for the Kickapoos were “Estimated quantity of Land assigned to the tribes who have emigrated from the Eastern to the Western side of the Mississippi” (United States Topographic Bureau, 1836). The Indian Removal Act of 1830 (A Century of Lawmaking for a New Nation: US Congressional Documents and Debates, 1774 - 1875, Statutes at Large, 21st Congress, 1st Session, p. 411) displaced Native Americans, and the Kickapoo were taken by force to Texas, Kansas, and Oklahoma from the Great Lakes region. Native Americans believe in the power of objects, whether or not the objects are disassociated from the actual living material. The Kickapoo Tribal Museum opened on August 24, 2019, tracing the ancestry of migrations within the Great Lakes region or preserving the history for future generations (Indian Country Today, 2019). Though the museum is a hybrid space, it is a decolonizing space with tribal

heritage management of design and materials.

Lonetree (2012), an indigenous scholar of the Ho-Chunk Nation teaching at the University of California, Santa Cruz, emphasizes that for tribal nations “objects in museums are living entities” (p. xv). But this is not only the case for the objects in the collections as we have already discussed. There are buildings produced by the so-called “dominant culture”; and if referring to the dominant culture as the colonizers, the Colonial-General Building in Korea was designed by a German architect who was hired by the Japanese, which was later demolished because of political implications (Chung, 2003). The building can be considered as the largest object in the collection and can be regarded and designated as world, national, state, or local heritage, while the collections may reflect something different from the building (Chung, 2003).

van Mensch (1994; 1996) first perceived the building as the largest object in the collection of a museum. Lonetree (2012) and Sadongei (2019) share an understanding representing tribal communities that objects are not “dead” or no longer “unfunctional,” rather they should be used for the purposes for which they were made. Thus, unlike the Eurocentric understanding of museum collections being untouched and unused for the sake of preservation and exhibition, they should have a multipurpose. Both indigenous scholars agree with the concept of the museum as imperative to the education of future generations. Therefore, this chapter argues that buildings, collections, and spatial planning should reflect the significance of the functional and the symbolic essence of an indigenous context.

Museum architecture is a global phenomenon in which designer architects from all over the world are competing to win the design for new spaces. Today, hybrid cultures are apparent in the designs. Changes are be-

ing made, and Lonetree (2012) makes this emphasis in change stating that “today, Indigenous people are actively involved in making museums more open and community-relevant sites” (p. 1). Hybrid cultures do not equal what Lonetree (2012) would call “cultural sovereignty” (p. 1). For example, the Mille Lacs Indian Museum in Vineland, Minnesota, is considered a “hybrid tribal museum,” and the Ziibiwing Center for Anishinabe Culture & Lifeways in Pleasant, Michigan, is culturally sovereign designed with the vision of the Saginaw community (Lonetree, 2012, p. 19; Ryker-Crawford, 2017, p. 114). The new museum theory and practice is the “Indigenous paradigm” (Lonetree, 2012, p. 8), which no longer fits with the traditional museological concept of the temple, church, white cube, or department store. This approach is also called “decolonizing methodologies” (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999, cited in Lonetree, 2012, p. 7).

The Bauhaus Museum, Weimar and Dessau, Germany

Indigenous to space and design is the Bauhaus context. In 2019, the Bauhaus Museum in Weimar and Dessau was designed by Barcelona-based Addenda Architects. Bauhaus has influenced a century of design. In lieu of what designers have been calling the “white cube” or “white box,” the Barcelona-based Addenda Architects are naming the new museum building the “black box” (Barcelona-based Addenda Architects, 2019). Into the twenty-first century, the basis to the philosophy of the design is to show the process and the methods that are involved; and at the heart of discourse in architecture, the designers have entitled it the “Cahier series” of documentation, which includes socio-cultural elements (Barcelona-based Addenda Architects, 2019).

According to a catalog on *Bauhaus, 1919-1928* edited by Herbert Bayer, Walter Gropius, and Ise Gropius (1938), published by The Museum of Modern Art and distributed by New York Graphic Society, the basis to its philosophy in design started in Weimar followed by Dessau, Germany, to train the artists and artisans in the “machine age” in all areas of design including architecture. The director was Walter Gropius who founded and stressed its importance:

1 Because it courageously accepted the machine as an instrument worthy of the artist. 2 Because it faced the problem of good design for mass production. 3 Because it brought together on its faculty more artists of distinguished talent than has any other art school of our time. (Bayer et al., 1938, Front Flap)

It was the architectural design that first demonstrated the Bauhaus movement through Gropius’ factory building at Alfeld in 1911 and office building at Cologne in 1914, which reflected the “new lightness of modern building construction” (Dorner, 1938, pp. 14-15). Conclusively, “The Theory and Organization of the Bauhaus” by Walter Gropius (1938) explains a detailed analysis of this design philosophy and curriculum.

Many more museum buildings will embrace the “white cube” design methodology and philosophy, no doubt, which minimalizes the symbolic and iconographic features that architecture can communicate through intricate indigenous designs as museum buildings are much more than containers. Examples of Bauhaus design include extensions of the Dartmouth Art Museum in the US of 2019, a continuation of the “white cube” and the perpetuation of this stark box design of the twentieth-century museum and into the twenty-first century. Tod Williams and Billie Tsien designed the new space as an extension of the original building by Charles Moore (Dart-

mouth University, 2018). The museum building communicates its physical, symbolic, socio-cultural, political, socio-economic, ideological, and philosophical presence for the reasons that they were built in a certain location with the financial support. Thus, the museum certainly has a rapport with the surrounding community and beyond.

West Bund Art Museum, Shanghai, China

The West Bund Art Museum is a consented antenna of the Pompidou Centre of Paris between France and China, designed by a British architect, David Chipperfield Architects Berlin, Shanghai, and publicly owned by the West Bund Group. The history of what could be called “colonization” of China by the Europeans and the Japanese produced hybrid cultural space in the design and planning of cities such as Shanghai. Though there were phases when Communism deterred the proliferation of “diversity” of hybrid cultures, a new kind of hybrid philosophy of Marxist, Leninist, Stalinist, and Maoist-based design and planning emerged. During the phase of the so-called “modernization” transitioning in China such as in Shanghai, the ideological underpinnings of the architectural design are more capitalist (Song, 2018). Ke Song (2018) defines three political ideologies in connection with architectural design spanning from the late nineteenth-century to the twenty-first century: socialism, nationalism, and modernization (p. 2). Song’s (2018) focus of research is the Mao period (1949-1976) when Confucian traditions interconnected with Marxist-Leninist ideology:

The theoretical concepts proposed as the ‘correct’ theories by the state were all conceptual ‘containers’, including Socialist Realism, national form, modern architecture, the So-

cialist New Style, the Principle and the Design Revolution.
(p. 12)

The proliferation of museums in the twenty-first century in China is the next phase of development. Phasing out of Maoism and embracing all-out westernization, West Bund Art Museum is not a surprise hybrid cultural juxtaposed and design philosophy. Chipperfield’s (2019) rationale of the West Bund Museum is as follows:

The West Bund Museum is a new art gallery on the Shanghai Corniche, an 8.5 kilometre frontage on the northern bank of the Huangpu River. The promenade connects the Xuhui district to the historic Bund and forms a key part of the West Bund Masterplan, which envisages a new cultural district over nine square kilometres of former industrial land. The museum occupies a triangular plot at the northernmost tip of a new public park, at the point where Longteng Avenue and the river converge.

There is hybridity of cultural design philosophy in overcoming industrial design and focusing on a rapport with the river, the use of “jade-like glass” and “pin-wheel” configuration (Chipperfield, 2019). The concept of the pin-wheel is Western represented by the three galleries, a lobby, and an atrium. Though the design may have some factors that allude to Chinese culture such as the jade-like glass and facing the river to the south, it is not indicative of the application of feng-shui.

While a variety of different philosophies flourished (e.g., Taoist and Legalist schools), Confucianism undeniably became the most influential in the Eastern Zhou period, and Confucian virtues (i.e., the five constants: benevolence *ren* -; righteousness *yi* -; propriety *li* -; wisdom *zhi* -; and fidel-

ity *xin* -) have been predominant throughout Chinese history and culture” (Zhang & Pu, 2004, p. 15). Educated in Communist China, Ping Xu (1997; 1998) argues the significance of the application of feng-shui to identify landscapes, not only on Chinese historic buildings and burial sites but Native American prehistoric sites:

American ruin sites, located at cliffs, canyon heads, or near huge rocks, are unfavorable home sites. Differences in criteria between the two methods may be attributable to landscape conditions, or to social needs for defense, communication, and ritual. Feng-shui - and perhaps mystical/ symbolic systems of other cultures – can meaningfully inform our understanding of landscape settlement patterns, and how such settlements can be identified, exhibited, and protected settlements. Therefore, to protect ancient American ruins, to understand how ancient peoples lived in their environment, and to retain the beauty and cultural significance of the Southwestern landscape, it is crucial to research and preserve prehistoric ruins with their surrounding landscape as a whole. (Xu, 1997, p. 174-175)

Both papers (Xu, 1997, 1998) analyze the sites using methodological calculative measures and basing them on foundational Chinese manuscripts on feng-shui by P. Guo (276-324) and Z.Q. Yao (1744). To follow the indigenous philosophy of feng-shui is to respect the landscape, for example, mountains, rivers, direction of the wind, direction of the sun and the moon, which is not so different from Native American traditions. There is a strong belief in good and bad energy and in inanimate objects. For example, the Japanese colonial architecture was to stop positive “*ki*” in Colonial Korea (Chung, 2003). According to Pu, the passage, “1.5 --, ----, ---- ° Therefore,

the collapse of Copper Mountain in the west is responded to by the inspired bell in the east,” connotes that the life energy from the resource is embodied in the artifact (Zhang & Pu, 2004, p. 53). Especially, Asians outside of Communist countries still allude to feng-shui.

The Book of Burial is a manual by Zhang covering the history and historiography, the various historical contexts, the different dynastic periods, the religion that was embraced, and the actors who promoted a Taoistic form of feng-shui and/or Buddhist practice of feng-shui. Geomancy evolved and metamorphosed from burial conditions, cosmological orders, the invention of the compass and different types of compasses that applied to the upper milieu of the class system with power to purchase burial sites with favorable feng-shui qi:

The rise and fall of fengshui practice and intellectual interest (in divination as a whole) throughout Chinese history are often indicators of changes in socio-economic conditions and prevailing ethics. (Zhang & Pu, 2004, p. 32)

Thus, geomancy became theory and practice in Confucianism (Zhang & Pu, 2004, p. 1), and it is based on “intellectual foundations” (Ebrey, 2004, p. x).

Because of these old ways of using feng-shui for class system, for Communist China, it was forbidden to be practiced. But for the Chinese and other Asian communities outside of Communist China, feng-shui continues to be practiced. Though there may be a historical context that applies to the belief system of Pu’s times, there are elements of the contents that relate to the overall cultural and natural landscape of situating structures. Zhang traces back feng-shui’s beginnings on the practice of residences during the Song Dynasty (Zhang & Pu, 2004, p. 7). As mentioned by Zhang, the field of Cultural Geography began to study the application of feng-shui. From

burial, agriculture, to political order to family clan practice in selecting burial sites, structures, entire cities, residences, palaces, the conditions of the climate and reliance on feng-shui changes over time (Zhang & Pu, 2004, pp. 3 & 7). But not only Cultural Geography, feng-shui may be studied under the History and Philosophy of Science with the invention of instruments such as the compass. Zhang mentions that “the golden age of philosophy, known as the period of “One Hundred Schools of Thought” of the Eastern Zhou (770 B.C. – 221 B.C.) developed out of the ritual and divination culture fundamental to the earlier periods. Indeed, the understanding of the practice of divination in early China is associated with the utensils and tools created in the Shang Dynasty (c. 1600 B.C. – C. 110 B.C.) and discovered in archaeological finds (K.-C. Chang 1976, 1980, 1983; S. Allan 1991, 2000). Thus, at the basis of the belief in feng-shui is the following:

- 1) The idea of generative qi (or, “to accord with generative qi,” as the first line in the text), which relates to the origins of Chinese cosmology – the Great Ultimate, Yin-Yang, and Five Elements; 2) The idea of interaction between the dead and the living (e.g. text 1.3 and 1.4) which, although a psychological projection and a mystical construct, is particularly attractive to common people, who have been taught Confucian filial piety as a key to life within an inclusive culture; 3) The idea, which is the core of fengshui practice, of taking advantage of wind and water, with getting water being primary and avoidance of wind being secondary; 4) The ideas of aspects (shi) and forms (xing), which have shaped Chinese architecture, and their relationship to the four directions in building graves, cities, and houses; 5) The ideas of “five harms” (the five types of mountains not for burial), “three auspiciousnesses,” and “six disasters”; and 6) The idea of the four sacred animals as realized in the shape of mountains and water. (Zhang & Pu, 2004, p. 31)

How much of Chinese consciousness of feng-shui still remains and is practiced in China is questionable. Though it may not be explicit due to its abolition since the mid-twentieth century, Confucian practices such as favoring male birth over females illicitly continues. Certainly, the objective of this museum is the collaboration between the Centre Pompidou Centre and West Bund as a form of exchange; the first exhibition is centered on 100 works of art from the Centre in Paris (Shanghai Daily, 2019). As Song’s (2018) article also confirmed, the underlying traditions that have been a part of Chinese society were an amalgamation of the new ideologies and design styles that formed in architecture, with it comes British and French trends that span more than a century in Shanghai.

The National Museum of Qatar, Doha, Qatar and the Grand Egyptian Museum, Giza Governorate, Egypt

In Qatar, a multi-cultural dynamic exists, far from the history of this nation. More foreigners reside than the Qatari people. Though the Qatari people were nomadic by culture, in the twenty-first century, this tradition is no longer practiced. In N. AlSayyad’s (1987) “Space in an Islamic City: Some Urban Design Patterns,” published in the *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research*, a square, agora, forum, or plaza is not the same concept in Muslim architecture and planning. The Maidan is not a public place for news or open-air markets; rather the space served as a large nodal point to move in and out of buildings and passageways (AlSayyad, 1987, p. 109). A bazaar is not the same as an open-air market in a square or plaza space, but the Maidan becomes functional in the space of the bazaar (AlSayyad, 1987, p. 109). Building codes, colonialism, fundamentalism, traditionalism are

now hybrid (AlSaiyyad, 1987, p. 117). Codes “based on Islamic norms and values” were adopted before colonialism (p. 118). “Architectural and Museographical Design: The Desert Rose” by Jean Nouvel (2019), a French designer architect explains his philosophy and rationale of the design of the new museum:

The National Museum of Qatar emerges from a desert that has ventured all the way to the sea. On the site, the Royal Palace of Sheikh Abdullah bin Jassim Al Thani rises up, a twentieth-century landmark of major heritage value to Qatar...

The National Museum is dedicated to the history of Qatar. Symbolically, its architecture evokes the desert, its silent and eternal dimension, but also the spirit of modernity and daring that have come along and shaken up what seemed unshakeable. So, it's the contradictions in that history that I've sought to evoke here...

Qatar is also about the peoples who settled along the seaboard, setting up these coastal towns that became ports of call for passing nomads as much as local fishermen and pearl divers. And so the native fauna and flora, and the nomadic peoples and their long-held traditions, are the very first features of the history of Qatar.

Nouvel (2019) lays emphasis on the three stages of the economic history phases in light of the abundant rare natural resources: pearl, oil, and gas, which are reflected in the design of the building. In addition, the museum building signifies the desert rose, “complex and poetic,” and “utopian” connected into geometric spatial forms (Nouvel, 2019). An illusive design of verticality was created to mimic a natural phenomenon (Nouvel, 2019).

“Geometric spaces” are not indigenous to the narrow circulation spaces of Muslim culture as pathways were meant to restrict freedom to circulate (Al-Saiyyad, 1987). Nouvel (2019) alludes to the desert as the foundations of his design philosophy, “As for the desert, it's always there, even if it has morphed into something else completely.” Perhaps, he means that though there have been dramatic changes to the environment, the fact that the region and biosphere is a desert does not change? Nouvel (2019) wanted to create “surprises” at the same time “tension” and “dynamic” design. The circulation of the museum visitor route leads to the Royal Palace with access to the *Howsh*: “Following the time-honoured template, this is a central courtyard surrounded by buildings where travellers would come and unload their merchandise” (Nouvel, 2019), a kind of Mайдan, but not, as it is used for outdoor programs, and a connection to the Royal Palace and the museum. Nouvel's (2019) overall philosophy in the design “evoked the local geography” with “maximum protection from the sun.” Materials are energy: the disks create shadows and shade all around, with a minimal number of windows and doors. The outer materials of the museum building are made of glass with reinforced fiber and concrete, and the color is sandy beige reflecting “land and history” and “scale and power” of Qatar (Nouvel, 2019).

The same trend is demonstrated in the Grand Egyptian Museum situated in Egypt, northern Africa. The museum design is also a hybrid as it was produced in an indigenous space designed by Heneghan Peng Architects, based in New York and Dublin, Ireland. An international aspect can be achieved through programming, but an Egyptian philosophy should be produced through indigeneity in museum architectural design. The site for the museum is between the Giza pyramids and Cairo in a plateau created by the Nile with the design philosophy as follows:

The design of the museum utilises the level difference to

construct a new ‘edge’ to the plateau, a surface defined by a veil of translucent stone that transforms from day to night. The museum exists between the level of the Nile Valley and the plateau, never extending above the plateau. (Heneghan & Peng, 2019)

Creating visual axes of the emergence of the museum site, at the same time viewing the pyramids from the galleries distance, the museum is established as an Egyptology cultural center with its focal collection of the Tutankhamen artifacts and the Solar Boat (Heneghan & Peng, 2019). But how much of the design philosophy reflects the indigenous understanding of both past and modern Egyptian culture in addition to Islamic culture? According to Omer (2008), there is no official architectural design for Islamic architecture, and it is not restricted but dynamic where form follows function. The stance that Omer takes is one that encourages “imagination and creativity” and that it is based on the spiritual essence of Islam and their “space-time context” (Omer, 2008, p. 499). To connect Omer’s (2008) ideas, creativity should be reflected through indigeneity.

Conclusion

Museological discourse and analysis on museum architecture have been the focus of namely some museologists such as Lonetree (2015), van Mensch (1991, 1994, 1996, 2003), Mairesse (2010, Desvallées & Mairesse, 2011, Mairesse & Rochelandet, 2015), and Gooden (2016). To add to these studies, this chapter examined the museological discourse of hybrid cultures in museum architecture. As a result, three fundamental elements were introduced to conduct the analysis: the juxtaposition, architectural design

philosophy, and indigenous material are three fundamental concepts to preserve indigenous heritage. Though adaptive reuse of certain buildings that communicate indigenous heritage and restoration is the way forward, adaptive reuse could also become a hybrid culture as buildings are re-designed to fit the function of the architectural space for museums. However, it can maintain its cultures such as the case of the Buddy Holly Center in a historic train depot, a Lubbock Historic Landmark and National Register of Historic Places (Chung, 2007), though it can be argued that the space used is a result of colonization. To understand the concepts, the most current new constructions of museums internationally were discussed. These new museum constructions were chosen with respect to represent inclusion and diversity. Do we globalize architecture, even museum architecture, which is supposed to reflect its own unique piece of artwork as the largest object, not just as a container? But to discuss the future of what museum architecture should signify to the community by the community adopted by the culture that it is situated in is the way forward in preserving heritage. For new constructions, however, new commissions of museum architecture to compete with space and the local heritage to build hybrid cultures are not. Further studies could include the focus on colored architects and gender in hybridity and museum space both in the history of architecture and the contemporary context.

References

Alexander, E.P. (1979). *Museums in motion: An introduction to the history and functions of museums*. Nashville, TN: American Association for State and Local History.

- Alexander, E.P. (1983). *Museum masters*. Nashville, TN: American Association for State and Local History.
- AlSaiyad, N. (1987). Space in an Islamic city: Some urban design patterns. *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research*, 4(2), 108-119. <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.snhu.edu/stable/43029486>
- Barcelona-based Addenda Architects. (2019). *Bauhaus Museum Dessau*. <http://addendaarchitects.com/>
- Bauhaus Dessau. (2019). *Architecture*. <https://www.bauhaus-dessau.de/en/museum/architecture.html>
- Bayer, H., Gropius, W., & Gropius, I. (Eds.). (1938). *Bauhaus, 1919-1928*. The Museum of Modern Art: Distributed by New York Graphic Society. https://www.moma.org/documents/moma_catalogue_2735_300190238.pdf
- Bazin, G. (1967). *The museum age*. New York: Universe Books.
- Bennett, T. (1995). *The birth of the museum: History, theory, politics*. London & New York, Routledge.
- Bennett, T. (2004). *Pasts beyond memory: Evolution, museums, colonialism*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Boast, R. (2011). Neocolonial collaboration: Museum as contact zone revisited. *Museum Anthropology*, 34(1), 56-70. https://www.academia.edu/1167358/Neocolonial_Collaboration_Museum_as_Contact_Zone_Revisited
- Bourdieu, P., Darbel, A., Schnapper, D., Beattie, C., & Merriman, N.

- (Eds.). (2013). *The love of art: European art museums and their public*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Burcaw, G.E. (1997). *Introduction to museum work* (3rd ed.). Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.
- A Century of Lawmaking for a New Nation: US Congressional Documents and Debates, 1774–1875. Statutes at Large, 21st Congress, 1st Session, p. 411. <https://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=llsl&fileName=004/llsl004.db&recNum=458>
- Chipperfield, D. (2019). *West Bund Museum*. <https://davidchipperfield.com/project/west-bund-museum>
- Chung, Y.S.S. (2003). Object of exhibit: Legitimizing the building of the National Museum of Korea. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 9(3), 229-242.
- Chung, Y.S.S. (2007). The collection and exhibition of *in situ* historic buildings. *Collections: A Journal for Museum and Archives Professionals*, 3(1), 35-52.
- Chung, Y.S.S. (2018). The poetics and geopolitics of communication and non-profit versus. marketing of the function of museums. *The Issues of Museology*, 9(2), 138-153. https://www.academia.edu/39633944/%D0%92%D0%9E%D0%9F%D0%A0%D0%9E%D0%A1%D0%AB_%D0%9C%D0%A3%D0%97%D0%95%D0%9E%D0%9B%D0%9E%D0%93%D0%98%D0%98_The_Issues_

- of_Museology_-_2018_-_2?fbclid=IwAR3VoyDrap_rsQ3PSDL_CVCgCY0gwsspazUtZTd3_IeQjEVF8ZBLnb_4zMg
Dartmouth University. (2018). Behind the scenes at the new Hood Museum of Art. *Dartmouth News*. <https://news.dartmouth.edu/news/2018/01/behind-scenes-new-hood-museum-art>
- Davis, D. (1990). *The museum transformed: Design and culture in the Post-Pompidou Age*. New York: Abbeville Press.
- Desvallées, A., & Mairesse, F. (2010). *Key concepts of museology* (S. Nash, Trans.). Paris: Armand Colin. (Original book published in 2010.)
- Desvallées, A., & Mairesse, F. (Eds.). (2011). *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de muséologie*. Paris: Armand Colin.
- Dilley, C., & Backhouse, P. N. (2015). *Thatched Roofs and Open Sides: The Architecture of Chickees and Their Changing Role in Seminole Society*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
<https://search-ebSCOhost-com.ezproxy.snhu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=1003001&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Dolák, J., & Šobánová, P. (2018). *Museum presentation*. Olomouc: Palacký University.
- Dorner, A. (1938). The background of the Bauhaus. In H. Bayer, W. Gropius, & I. Gropius, (Eds.) *Bauhaus, 1919-1928* (pp. 11-15). *The Museum of Modern Art: Distributed by New York Graphic Society*.

- https://www.moma.org/documents/moma_catalogue_2735_300190238.pdf
- Duncan, C., & Wallach, A. (1978). The Museum of Modern Art as late capitalist ritual: An iconographic analysis.' *Marxist Perspectives*, 1(4), 28-51.
- Duncan, C. (1995). *Civilising rituals: Inside public art museums*. London & New York, Routledge.
- Ebrey, P. (2004). Preface. In J. Zhang & G. Pu (Eds.), *The Book of Burial* (pp. ix-xii). New York, Ontario, Lampeter: The Edwin Mellen Press.
- Farahat, B.I., & Osman, K.A. (2018). Toward a new vision to design a new museum in historical places. *HBRC Journal*, 14, 66-78.
- Forgan, S. (1986). Context, image and function: A preliminary enquiry into the architecture of scientific societies." *BJHS*, 19, 89-113.
- Forty, A. (1986). *Objects of desire: Design and society, 1750-1980*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- García Canclini, N. (1995). *Hybrid cultures: Strategies for entering and leaving modernity*. (C.L. Chiappari & S.L. López, Trans.) Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press. (Original book published in 1990.)
- Giebelhausen, M. (Ed.). (2003). *Architecture of the museum: Symbolic structures, urban contexts*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Gorman, J. M. (2011). *Building a nation: Chickasaw museums and the*

- construction of history and Heritage*. Tuscaloosa: University Alabama Press. <https://search-ebshost-com.ezproxy.snhu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=420281&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Gooden, M. (2016). *Dark space: Architecture, representation, black identity*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Gropius, W. (1938). The theory and organization of the Bauhaus (Idee and Aufbau des Staatlichen Bauhauses Weimar, Trans.). In H. Bayer, W. Gropius, & I. Gropius (Eds.), *Bauhaus, 1919-1928* (pp. 22-31). New York: The Museum of Modern Art.
- Heneghan Peng Architects. (n.d.). *The Grand Egyptian Museum*. <https://www.hparc.com/work/the-grand-egyptian-museum/>
- Indian Country Today. (2019, August 13). *Kickapoo Tribe in Kansas to open new tribal history museum*. <https://newsmaven.io/indiancountrytoday/the-press-pool/kickapoo-tribe-in-kansas-to-open-new-tribal-history-museum-E9JP-hm0ekiV7z2IUQDVVA>
- Kuma, K. (2019). Keynote speech. International Council of Museums (ICOM) and ICOM Kyoto. *Museums as cultural hubs: The future of tradition* (Program, ICOM Kyoto 2019, 25th ICOM General Conference, September 1-7, 2019). Kyoto: ICOM Kyoto.
- Lonetree, A. (2012). *Decolonizing museums: Representing Native America in national and tribal museums*. Chapel Hill: The University of

- North Carolina Press. <https://search-ebshost-com.ezproxy.snhu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=509034&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Lorente, J.P. (1998). *Cathedrals of modernity: The first museums of contemporary art, 1800-1930*. Aldershot & Brookfield: Ashgate.
- Mairesse F. (2010). *Le Musée hybride*. Paris : La Documentation française.
- Mairesse, F., & Rochelandet, F. (2015). *Economie des arts et de la culture*. Paris: Armand Colin.
- McClellan, A. (1994). *Inventing the Louvre: Art, politics, and the origins of the modern museum in eighteenth century Paris*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Miles, R., & Zavala, L. (1994). *Towards the museum of the future: New European perspectives*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Nouvel, J. (2019). *Musée National de Qatar*. <http://www.jeannouvel.com/en/projects/musee-national-du-qatar/>
- O'Doherty, B. (1999). *Inside the white cube: The ideology of the gallery space*. Berkeley & London: University of California Press.
- Omer, S. (2008). Towards understanding Islamic architecture. *Islamic Studies*, 47(4), 483-510. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20839141>
- Outram, D. (1996). New spaces in natural history. In N. Jardine, J.A.

- Secord, & E.C. Spary (Eds.), *Cultures of Natural History* (pp. 249-265). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pevsner, N. (1976). *A history of building types*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Pointon, M. (Ed.). (1994). *Art apart: Art institutions and ideology across England and North America*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Ryker-Crawford, J. (2017). Towards an Indigenous museology: Native American and First Nations representation and voice in North American museums (Unpublished doctoral dissertation) University of Washington, Seattle. <http://hdl.handle.net/1773/40830>
- Sadongei, A. (2019). The 21st century museum in Native America. In Y.S.S. Chung, A. Leshchenko, & B. Brulon Soares (Eds.), *Defining the Museum of the 21st Century: Evolving Multiculturalism in Museums in the United States* (pp. 53-62). Paris: ICOFOM.
- Shanghai Daily. (2019, November 9). *West Bund Museum*. <https://archive.shine.cn/feature/art-and-culture/West-Bund-Museum/shdaily.shtml>
- Sherman, D.J. (1994). Quatremere/ Benjamin/ Marx: Art museums, aura and commodity fetishisms. In D.J. Sherman and I. Rogoff (Eds.), *Museum Culture: Histories, Discourses, Spectacles* (pp. 123-143). London: Routledge.

- Song, K. (2018). Political ideology and the production of architectural theories in Mao's China (1949–1976). *Architectural Histories*, 6(1), 18, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.5334/ah.307>
- The Spaces. (n.d.) *New museums opening in 2019*. <https://thespaces.com/new-museums-opening-in-2019/>
- Stránský, Z.Z. (1974). Metologicke otazky dokumentace soucasnosti. *Muzeologicke sesity*, 5, 13-43. In P. van Mensch (compiled), *Theoretical Museology* (pp. 243-254). Amsterdam: Reinwardt Academy.
- United States Topographical Bureau. (1836). *Map showing the lands assigned to emigrant Indians west of Arkansas and Missouri* [S.I.] [Map]. <https://www.loc.gov/item/99446197/>
- van Mensch, P. (1991). The language of exhibitions. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 19, 11-13.
- van Mensch, P. (1994). Museum analysis model – an outline. In P.J.A. van Mensch (Ed.). *Theoretical Museology* [Textbook] (pp. 183-184). Amsterdam: Master's Degree Program on Museology, Faculty of Museology, Reinwardt Academy.
- van Mensch, P. (1996). Theoretical museology [Lecture notes by Y.S.S. Chung]. Amsterdam, Reinwardt Academy.
- van Mensch, P. (1996, April 22). Museum analysis – an outline [Lecture notes by Y.S.S. Chung]. Amsterdam, Reinwardt Academy.
- van Mensch, P. (2003). The characteristics of exhibitions. *Museum Aktuell*,

92, 3980-3985.

Waterfield, G. (1987). *Soane and after: The architecture of Dulwich Picture Gallery*. London: Dulwich College Picture Gallery.

Williams, T., & Tsien, B. (n.d.). International competition.
<https://www.hparc.com/>

Wilson, M.O. *Negro building: Black Americans in the world of fairs and museums*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Xu, P. (1997). Feng-shui as clue: Identifying prehistoric landscape setting patterns in the American Southwest. *Landscape Journal*, 16(2), 174-190.
<http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.snhu.edu/stable/43323439>

Zhang, J., & Pu, G. (2004). *A translation of the ancient Chinese: The Book of burial (Zang Shu) by Guo Pu (276-324)*. Lewiston: E. Mellen Press.

Afterword

by François Mairesse

Afterword

by François Mairesse

Yun Shun Susie Chung has very often participated in ICOFOM's symposiums (the International Committee for Museology of ICOM) and has met with many of the authors she quotes. Her international training led her very early to one of the "temples" of theoretical museology, the Reinwardt Academy in Amsterdam, where she followed the teachings of Peter van Mensch. Her training is international, as is her desire to seek out remarkably diverse international references in order to develop her point. Her academic career illustrates a certain number of the topics she analyzes in this work, which suggests numerous tracks to cross the borders of various disciplines and to associate theory and practice in the field of museology.

The question of hybridity that she refers to particularly in her last chapter underlines the importance of cross-referencing, both in terms of nationalities and cultures, as well as in terms of disciplines. I discussed this question earlier in a book (*Le musée hybride*) about museum management. Museum funding never works from a single mode (market and consumers, public funding or the gift economy), but it is always run from a hybrid solution combining these different operating modes. The same goes for museology, which rarely appears "pure" and has always been crossed with different sources of influence: history or art history, ethnography, sociology, economics, information and communication sciences, etc. It is from the study of this more complex environment that new solutions could be implemented in order to better understand, but also better manage museums or heritage sites. Such a perception invites us to cross borders - which is the

raison d'être of ICOFOM: gathering museologists' viewpoints around the world – both at national and disciplinary levels.

The United States, where Chung works, does not appear to be the country that has mostly invested in theoretical museology. We know that a certain number of researchers as famous as George Ellis Burcaw looked upon theoretical museology, such as the works of scientists like Zbyněk Stránský, with great suspicion during the 1980s. Generally, the terms “museum work” and “museum studies” are widely favored over “museology” in order to accentuate the practical nature of teaching these subjects. Other researchers, such as Gary Edson and more recently Kiersten Latham and John Simmons, have developed a more open approach to the theoretical side of this field. But museums or heritage remain first and foremost considered from a professional point of view, seeking practical solutions (how to finance a museum, how to make a good exhibition, how to attract visitors) rather than thinking about why museums have emerged within our civilization and what they really mean to us. These two aspects of the field that interests us here are not contradictory, however, and from my own viewpoint, it is important to know the former in order to find solutions to the latter.

By summoning some of the most important figures in museology, such as Peter van Mensch or Zbyněk Stránský, but also by associating them with a reflection focused on a number of more directly practical fields, such as heritage management, local heritage governance, museum planning and management, online museums or museum architecture, Chung in turn seeks to develop a new reflection, stemming from several trends, in order to show the interest of an approach centered on theoretical museology to evoke more practical questions. In this sense, she also seeks to build bridges to link theoretical museology and applied museology, while showing the links

between museology itself and the various academic disciplines which are linked to the heritage field.

Such a reflection is especially important, because museology, as a field of research, cannot function in a purely autonomous way. As Bruno Latour, also quoted by Chung, mentioned at length, an emerging new field, in order to strengthen, needs colleagues, publications, databases, but also links with other disciplines, with other colleagues, with the general public or with politicians. It is in this perspective that perhaps, this field of research would be able to show the importance or the richness of its contributions, in terms of theoretical knowledge, but also of the practical solutions that it can bring to the development of museums and of heritage, which are major challenges at the start of the 21st century.

Biographies

Foreword Author



PhDr. Jan Dolák, Ph.D.

**Faculty Member at the University of Comenius, Faculty of Arts,
Department of Ethnology and Museology, Bratislava, Slovakia**

Dr. Dolák's educational background is in history, museology and archaeology. Initially, he worked in a few Czech museums as historian, vice-manager, and head-manager, respectively. From 2002 to 2014, he was the chairholder of the UNESCO Chair of Museology and World Heritage at Masaryk University in Brno. He teaches courses in Collection Management, Museum Management and Marketing, Theoretical Museology, History of Museology and Museums, and Museum Communication and Presentation.

Moreover, Dr. Dolák is a member of six editorial boards of scientific journals. He presented his papers worldwide, organized several international conferences, and published a few monographs and about 100 articles. His texts are published in six different languages.

His professional activities include serving as Chairman of the Museological Committee of the Association of Museums and Galleries of the Czech Republic and Board Member of the Museum Councils of the Technical Museum in Brno and the Museum Council of the Museum of Gypsy Culture in Brno. He was Board Member and Vice-President of the International Committee for Museology (ICOFOM). Previously, he was President of the Association of Czech Museums and Galleries.

Afterword Author



François Mairesse, Ph.D.

**Professor of Museology at the Université Sorbonne Nouvelle (Paris 3),
Cultural Mediation Department, Economics of
Culture and Museology, Paris, France**

Professor François Mairesse teaches museology and cultural economics at the Université Sorbonne Nouvelle (Paris 3) and museology at the École du Louvre. He currently holds the UNESCO Chair on the Study of Museum Diversity and Its Evolution. During the past four years, he played a significant role as a member of the International Council of Museums (ICOM) Standing Committee on the Museum Definition, Prospects, and Potentials (MDPP). For two consecutive terms, as President of the International Committee for Museology of ICOM (ICOFOM), he was active in the organizing of multifarious activities on museology, which include symposia

and publications. From 2002 to 2010, he was Director of the Musée royal de Mariemont (Morlanwelz) in Belgium. He is the author of numerous articles and books on museology. Amongst these publications, fundamental theoretical museology monographs include *Key Concepts in Museology* (2010), *Le musée hybride* (2010), and *Zbynek Z. Stránský et la muséologie* (2019).

Reviewer Biography



Mónica Risnicoff de Gorgas, M.A.

**Assistant Professor of Museology at the National University of Tucumán,
Faculty of Arts and Natural Sciences, Master's Degree in Museology,
Tucumán, Argentina**

Professor Risnicoff de Gorgas graduated from the Argentine Institute of Museology in 1980. She was a museum curator and director of the Museo Nacional Estancia Jesuítica de Alta Gracia from 1996. As the director of the museum, she actively contributed in the process of declaring the Jesuit Block and Estancias of Cordoba as World Heritage and coordinated heritage interpretation and conservation projects for several different heritage sites. Since 1986, she is an active member of the International Council of Museums (ICOM), and she was also Board Member of ICOM Argentina (2003-2007). Professor Risnicoff de Gorgas was Board Member of the Ethics Committee of ICOM (2013-2016) and Board Member of ICOFOM

(International Committee of Museology of ICOM) (2006-2019).

She is the co-founder of the Regional Center for the Preservation and Conservation of Cultural Heritage in works on paper, an organization based at the National University of Cordoba that brings together the main provincial archives, libraries, and museums. She also promoted the creation of the Cordoba group “La Ruta del Esclavo,” which promotes the recognition of Afro descendant culture in Argentine history.

Currently, she is Assistant Professor of Museum Management - Master’s Degree in Museology, Faculty of Arts and Natural Sciences at the National University of Tucumán in Argentina. She is also an author of numerous articles published in specialized journals and conference proceedings such as *Museum International*, *ICOFOM Study Series*, *International Jesuit Congress 400 Years in Cordoba*, and *International Journal of Heritage, Museums, Ethics and Cultural Heritage*. Among the journal publications, they include: “Reality as illusion, the historic houses that become museums,” “Lo jesuítico en Hispanoamérica un desafío para los museos,” “Museums and the crisis of concurrent identity populations,” “The value of diversity: Regional heritage – Latin American contributions,” “Muséologie, revisiter nos fondamentaux: quelques apports aux conception de communication, d’éducation et d’interprétation,” “Sitios de la memoria: La presencia de esclavos en las estancias Jesuíticas: el caso de Alta Gracia,” and “Afro-descendant heritage and its unacknowledged legacy in Latin American museum representation.”

Author Biography



Yun Shun Susie Chung, Ph.D.

Team Lead & Adjunct Faculty of Public History at Southern New Hampshire University, Liberal Arts, History Program, Manchester, New Hampshire, USA

Yun Shun Susie Chung is currently Team Lead and Adjunct Faculty of History and Public History in Liberal Arts at Southern New Hampshire University. Previously, she was a professor at Texas Tech University and San Francisco State University’s museums and heritage programs. She was recognized in *Who’s Who Among America’s Teachers* and for her service-learning courses by the Office of the Provost at Texas Tech University. Since 2002, she has been active with various international organi-

zations: Board Member, Editorial Committee Member, and Social Media and Website Manager of ICOFOM, Hughes Hall Society of the University of Cambridge as US Southwest Contact, and Lubbock Heritage Society as Secretary.

Her educational background began in the US, completing primary and secondary schools in California. At Yonsei University in South Korea, she majored in French Language and Literature. Her pursuit in higher education led to the Reinwardt Academy in The Netherlands, graduating with a Master of Arts in Museology, and continued toward receiving a Ph.D. at the University of Cambridge, Department of Archaeology, with a concentration on archaeological heritage and museums.

Her publications are included in the *Journal of the History of Collections*, *Collections*, *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, *Journal of Education in Museums*, and *ICOFOM Study Series*. She was the principal investigator for the Texas Historical Commission's Texas Heritage Trails Program Partnership Grant publishing a heritage tourism pamphlet.