COMCOL

International Committee for Collecting

www.comcol-icom.org

COMCOL is the International Committee of ICOM with the mission to deepen discussions and share knowledge of the practice, theory and ethics of collecting and collections (both tangible and intangible) development. COMCOL is a platform for professional exchange of views and experiences around collecting in the broadest sense. The mandate includes collecting and de-accessioning policies, contemporary collecting, restitution of cultural property and respectful practices that affect the role of collections now and in the future, from all types of museums and from all parts of the world. COMCOL's aims are to increase cooperation and collaboration across international boundaries, to foster innovation in museums and to encourage and support museum professionals in their work with collections development.

COMCOL Newsletter (formerly *Collectingnet Newsletter*) is published four times a year and distributed to members of the committee. It is also available at COMCOL's website http://www.comcol-icom.org, at ICOM's website http://icom.museum/who-we-are/the-committees/international-committees/international-committee/international-committee-for-collecting.html and at the Swedish Samdok website http://www.nordiskamuseet.se/Publication.asp?publicationid=4213&topmenu=143 .

Editors
Eva Fägerborg, Samdok, Nordiska museet, Stockholm, eva.fagerborg@nordiskamuseet.se
Catherine Marshall, Royal Irish Academy, Dublin, catherinemarshall5@yahoo.com

---

From the editors

Welcome to the eleventh issue of the newsletter, which from now on will be called *COMCOL Newsletter*. We have kept the numbering from *Collectingnet Newsletter* to mark the continuity. We invite museum professionals and scholars to take part in developing the work of the committee by contributing to the newsletter. We welcome short essays on projects, reflections, conference/seminar reports, specific questions, notices about useful reading material, invitations to cooperate, new research or other matters. Please send your contribution for the next issue by **1 December 2010** to the editors, and contact us also if you wish to discuss a theme for publication.

Contents of this issue

COMCOL News

Please note that COMCOL now has its own website http://www.comcol-icom.org where you can see information and also contact the committee!

COMCOL is organizing two sessions during ICOM's General Conference in Shanghai in November 2010. These will be the first meetings of the new committee and we are very happy to welcome you to share ideas and experiences on how collections can be developed to make them more effective in supporting the social role of museums.

On Tuesday 9 November there will be a debate on topical issues concerning the practice, theory and ethics of collecting from the broader perspective of collection development. The second session, on Wednesday 10th, is dedicated to the working programme of the committee.

PROGRAMME TUESDAY 9 NOVEMBER

14.30-15.00 Peter van Mensch (interim president): *Why a new International Committee for Collecting?*

15.00-18.00 Open debate about the practice, theory and ethics of collecting the present

Moderated by Léontine Meijer- van Mensch, lecturer of heritage theory and professional ethics at the Reinwardt Academie, Amsterdam

Panel:

- Prof. Hans Ottomeyer, director Deutsches Historisches Museum, Berlin (Germany)
- Tanja Rozenbergar, director Museum of Recent History, Celje (Slovenia)
- Zvjezdana Antoš, curator Ethnographical Museum, Zagreb (Croatia)
- Eva Fägerborg,curator Nordiska Museet, Stockholm (Sweden)
- Peter van Mensch, professor of Cultural Heritage, Reinwardt Academy, Amsterdam (Netherlands)

PROGRAMME WEDNESDAY 10 NOVEMBER

14.30-15.15 Léontine Meijer-van Mensch (lecturer of Heritage Theory and Professional Ethics, Reinwardt Academie, Amsterdam): *Contemporary tendencies in the practice, theory and ethics of collecting*

15.15-15.45 Eva Fägerborg (curator Nordiska Museet, Stockholm): *SAMDOK and the pre-history of COMCOL*

16.00-18.00 COMCOL Business meeting (chair: Peter van Mensch)

- Election of the new board
- Adoption of the Statutes
- Discussion about the Triennial Programme
- Introduction of the 2011 annual meeting (to be held in Berlin)

Essay:

"Against all norms and values" Dilemmas of collecting controversial contemporary objects

Peter van Mensch

In the end of September 2010 Dutch media staged a hot public debate on the role of museums concerning documenting the present by collecting. The cause of this debate was the initiative of two museums to document two dramatic events in recent Dutch history by objects that relate to the act rather than the social impact of the events.

On 6 May 2002 Dutch politician Pim Fortuyn was assassinated during the 2002 national election campaign by activist Volkert van der Geest. It was the Netherlands' first modern political assassination (excluding WW II events). The impact on Dutch society can be compared with the impact of the assassination of John F. Kennedy in the United States (22 November 1963) and that of Olof Palme in Sweden (28 February 1986).

During the celebration of the annual Queen's Day on 30 April 2009 a man rammed his car into the crowds at the parade in the city of Apeldoorn in an attempt to attack the open-topped bus with the Royal Family. The Royal Family remained unharmed but the car smashed through barriers killing and injuring bystanders. Seven people died and many were severely wounded. The driver, Karst Tates, was killed when his car crashed into a monument. The event shook Dutch society deeply. As *The Times* observed, it could be "the end of an era of openness and approachability from the monarchy" (*The Times*, 2 May 2009).

This article will briefly describe how a public debate arose about the initiative to document these two events by preserving the most emotionally charged objects: the pistol and the car wreck.

Documenting Fortuyn

Almost immediately after Fortuyn's death was confirmed, a great need to express the collective shock and emotion arose. As Peter-Jan Margry described, these expressions were published on the internet as well as around several locations which were connected with his person or the assassination. The locations were appropriated as makeshift memorial sites and gradually transformed into shrines with accumulations of personal expressions of grief and anger, such as flowers, teddy bears, letters, photographs, drawings, bottles of wine, cigars, and other objects (Margry 2003). Some of this material is being preserved in museums, archives and research institutions, such as the Fortuyn Archive at the Meertens Institute (Amsterdam) and the Rotterdam Historical Museum.

Private entrepreneurs acquired Fortuyn's house in an attempt to turn it into a museum. The Rotterdam Historical Museum refused to be involved in this project and decided to focus on a few characteristic objects that accorded with its collection profile instead. In the end the entrepreneurs were not successful and it was necessary to sell Fortuyn's furniture and other objects found in the house. The auction (27 June 2009) prompted Fortuyn's political heirs in Rotterdam to force the municipality to acquire some objects thus creating a conflict between the municipality and its museum, i.e. the Rotterdam Historical Museum.

No public debates took place, either in 2002 (the assassination), or in 2009 (the auction) on the role of museums in documenting contemporary events. The policy of the Rotterdam Historical Museum was not discussed, at least not on a national level. In September 2010 the policy of the Rotterdam Historical Museum again went unchallenged, when, unexpectedly, a hot national debate was stirred up concerning the preservation of the key object documenting the assassination: the pistol.

A Suzuki Swift as heritage?

The debate did not start with Volkert van der Geest's pistol. It started with a media scoop when one of the commercial Dutch television networks news programme (RTL Nieuws) of

Thursday evening, 16 September 2010, announced that the city museum of Apeldoorn (CODA) had acquired the wreck of the Suzuki Swift, car used by Karst Tates in his horrific attack on the Royal Family. Although the director of the museum was given the opportunity to explain her reasons for acquiring the wreck, the tone of voice of the news item was critical, as was the drift of most of the articles in the newspapers the following day. The daily *De Telegraaf* (a tabloid newspaper) and the local Apeldoorn newspaper *De Stentor* invited their readers to react to the decision of the museum. *De Stentor* also interviewed local politicians. Interestingly, apart from the director of the museum, museum professionals were hardly interviewed; neither did they position themselves in the media.

Local politicians in Apeldoorn showed little understanding of the mission of museums and the role of the collection to support this mission. The mayor showed his anger about the initiative of the museum, saying that the museum should not address the event, as it was too emotional for the people of Apeldoorn. The alderman of culture did not want to consider the wreck as a historical document as it was, in his opinion, still too recent. One of the members of the city council shared his worries about the wreck being considered as a work of art thus failing to discriminate between art objects and historical documentation. Although the museum does have an art as well as a history collection, it explicitly considered the wreck as historical document. Throughout the interviews no clear distinction was made between collection and exhibition, even though the museum emphasized that it did not intend to exhibit the wreck in the near future.

The same issues were raised by the readers of *De Telegraaf* en *De Stentor*. I analyzed 188 online comments. The first analysis shows that 65 % of the respondents were against preserving the car wreck, while about 30 % reacted in a positive way. In an online poll, organized by *De Stentor* on 17 September, 80 % of the readers voted against exhibiting the wreck and 20 % for (1 000 voters). The confusion between collecting (preserving) and exhibiting may explain the difference. In their online comments many people wrote that they were in favour of preserving the wreck, but against exhibiting it now or in the near future.

Among those in favour of preserving most respondents mentioned the importance of documenting this important event. Opponents were accused of hypocrisy. After all, many even more controversial or sinister objects are being preserved and exhibited such as items from World War II and the Holocaust. As could be expected those against preserving and/or exhibiting the car were much more emotional than those in favour. Very often words like “insane”, “disgusting” and “absurd” were used. The museum’s initiative was condemned as a publicity stunt. Many respondents asked for the dismissal of the director or the termination of public funding of the museum.

The argument used most often against preservation was respect for the relatives of the victims (mentioned by 37 % of those against preserving the car). An interesting comment made by some respondents was that collecting (of course the term itself was not used) the car wreck in a museum would turn the perpetrator into a hero. Apart from this, it is obvious that for many respondents a museum should focus on positive topics.

Can a pistol be national heritage?

By Monday, September 20th, it seemed as if everybody had given his or her opinion. During the following days the case was not mentioned again in the daily newspapers until Friday 24 September, when the daily *NRC-Handelsblad* decided to ask the opinion of museum specialists (directors and academics). One of those interviewed was Wim Pijbes, director of the Rijksmuseum (Amsterdam). He mentioned the interest of the museum in the pistol used by Volkert van der Geest to kill Pim Fortuyn. This object, according to Pijbes, could be an important exhibit in the new Rijksmuseum (to be opened in 2013). To the *NRC-Handelsblad* this was important news and was given front page coverage.

This news generated much more public debate than the initiative of the Apeldoorn museum a week before. Pijbes was invited to present his views on television and in newspapers. Contrary to the earlier discussion, museum professionals entered the discussion by writing to the editor of *NRC-Handelsblad* and other daily newspapers.

I analysed 40 online comments from readers of *NRC-Handelsblad* as published on its website on 24 September. As in the previous week, a majority of respondents found it hard to understand why it should be necessary to preserve the pistol. About 55 % of them rejected the idea, against 27 % who were in favour. New to the discussion was the perception of the collection profile of the museum. Like the Apeldoorn museum, the Rijksmuseum houses an art as well as a history collection. Since it moved into its present building in 1885 the Rijksmuseum is both the national museum of art and the national museum of history. Many respondents seemed to be unaware of this.

Similarly to the earlier discussion, many respondents did not like the idea of documenting the event through an object that basically relates to the perpetrator rather than the victim. It was suggested the focus should be on objects that represent Fortuyn's role in Dutch politics rather than portraying him as a victim.

The reactions of museum professionals have yet to be analysed. Most of them, however, did not relate to the issues raised above, but rather focused on the position of the Rijksmuseum as the national history museum. The public debate on the acquisition of the pistol was used to re-address the legitimacy of the new National Historical Museum that was founded in 2006. This debate still continues.

Conclusion

The two case studies show the other side of the participation paradigm. In fact, neither the Apeldoorn museum nor the Rijksmuseum asked the opinion of those directly or indirectly involved in the events. The Apeldoorn museum was accused of not respecting the emotions of the relatives of the victims. In the present anti-intellectual and anti-elitist climate in the Netherlands the decision making process of both museums was mentioned by some respondents as examples of the "anti-social" behaviour of the cultural elite. The initiatives to acquire the controversial objects were referred to as "against all norms and values" as the objects themselves were described as representations of the lack of "ethics and morality" (among the perpetrators).

Over and above populist criticism concerning the cultural elite and its toys (art museums!), is the lack of public understanding of museum work. It is important that museums are prepared to engage in an open dialogue with all groups in society not only about content, but also about method.

Reference

Peter-Jan Margry (2003) 'The Murder of Pim Fortuyn and Collective Emotions. Hype, Hysteria and Holiness in The Netherlands?', *Etnofoor: antropologisch tijdschrift* (16): 106-131. Also available at http://www.meertens.knaw.nl/meertensnet/file/edwinb/20050420/PF_webp_Engels_lang.pdf

***

Peter van Mensch
Professor of Cultural Heritage
Reinwardt Academie, Amsterdam
peter.vanmensch@ahk.nl

Essay:

Collecting the present – historical and ethnographical approaches: the case of entrepreneurs

Renée E. Kistemaker and Elisabeth Tietmeyer

Entrepreneurial Cultures in European Cities (ECEC) is a project that involved eight regular partners and three associate partners from eight countries in Europe, who jointly explored an important and relatively new subject (see Collectingnet Newsletter No 6). Questions at the start concerned the potential contribution of small and medium-sized businesses, and the

possibility of finding common characteristics, despite their cultural and economic diversity, regarding entrepreneurial strategies, the official licensing of business start-ups, and the interaction between entrepreneurs and customers. Local projects at the museums and cultural centres involved, which included exhibitions and educational events, were to provide a basis for this enquiry. From the start intercultural dialogue was an important and natural part of the work. Many of the entrepreneurs in the participating cities have an immigrant background, as is the case with their customers. Intercultural dialogue moreover played an important part in the contacts and the meetings of the project partners themselves.

Learning and sharing

Learning processes and the exchange of information between the project partners were crucial elements of the ECEC project. This took the form of several work meetings where the results of local projects and exhibitions were discussed. Each of the meetings was assigned a specific theme alternately consisting of one of a total of three museological methods that played an important part in the work of most of the local projects. One of these methods was *Collecting the present*, which concentrated on differences and similarities of historical and ethnographical approaches in the case of our local projects.

Approaches to collecting

Here the leading questions were: How can we document our recent history and present time by collecting cultural heritage, and how do we select what to preserve? Do we have to limit ourselves to collecting only material heritage (objects, photographs, documents) or should we also include intangible heritage (oral history, interviews, stories, music)? Cultural history museums, in particular, started asking themselves these questions as early as in the 1970s, partly driven by anxieties about the rapid economic, technical and cultural changes in a modern society where mass production and mass consumption were quickly becoming the norm. The best known example is the Swedish Samdok project established in 1977. Comparable initiatives were also started in other European countries, although on a smaller scale. In the Netherlands, for example, a national working group including historical museums and a number of archives discussed these issues and published a report with recommendations in the 1980s.

In the intervening years the historians and curators working in historical museums have been able to learn a lot from the ethnographers and curators in ethnographical museums, and vice versa. From the mid 1990s, for example, several historical museums increasingly started to implement what was then called a ‘biographical’ approach, in their acquisition policy as well as their presentations. Objects, photographs and other two-dimensional materials were contextualized by interviews, videos or photos documenting the person connected with them, their owner, or someone who felt emotionally attached to the object. This was one of the reasons why some historical museums in the same period started to seriously think about not just collecting material heritage, the customary thing to do, but intangible heritage as well.

In recent years the approaches and methods pursued in collecting the present have also been influenced by the fact that many museums have, more and more, come to shift the focus of their audience and collection strategy from the objects to the visitors. This has led them to pay greater attention to the public in the collection of heritage, and to increasingly involve citizens in documenting their own history and culture. Today, the long-established role of the museum curator as a singular authority in collecting contemporary heritage is slowly changing: curators nowadays often cooperate with colleagues from educational departments, while the public (communities, groups, individuals) plays a central role as ‘practitioners’, as the ones who attach a special value to a specific heritage. This is especially true for intangible heritage.

The objectives of the ECEC project hence included a discussion of interdisciplinary approaches to collecting the present: how similar or dissimilar are the methods currently applied by ethnographical and historical museums in documenting the tangible and intangible heritage of our own present and recent history? This question also had some bearing on a number of our local projects, of course, where not only curators, but also the members of education departments were actively considering possible acquisitions for

the museum collections in close cooperation with 'practitioners', in this case the entrepreneurs involved in the projects. The underlying idea is that by collecting their specific heritage, the museums may include the people who had initiated, created or contributed to it within the national or local collective memory. This was furthermore meant to help the entrepreneurs in question to identify with the museum as a place which also contains *their* history, and as a forum for intercultural dialogue.

Contextualization

Ethnographical museums are generally concerned with documenting, analyzing, presenting and archiving characteristic objects from people's everyday lives. In this sense some museums are dealing with cultural history and others are also concerned with contemporary life. Whilst many museums in Europe exclusively focus on rural societies that are now mostly history, others also pursue an interest in urban life. They no longer accept the differentiation between 'high' and 'low' culture still commonly made in scientific and popular opinion. Their characteristic research topic is 'culture' in general, not as a static phenomenon but always understood as a process and by way of its complexity, meaning that everything is connected to everything else. Hence the key questions asked in those ethnographic museums are: how do people lead their lives? How do they structure and symbolize them? Which behaviours or actions, objects or texts do they express themselves with? How can museums deal with that heritage as a locus of collective memory? According to which criteria should curators collect and classify objects?

A scientific classification into cultural areas, topics or functional groups within the material culture only occurs for reasons of analysis. Structurising or categorization efforts of this kind are in turn culturally conditioned, uniform criteria being unavailable as fields of culture may overlap in terms of content. It is, therefore, essential to gather as much information, written and/or oral, about an object as possible, and index it as deeply as possible in the museum's documentation system. Thus artefacts need to be situationally integrated. This process of 'contextualization', as the task facing any museum interested in explaining cultural, political, historical and social connections is best known, also offers their audience an opportunity to make discoveries of its own.

In ethnographical projects curators often work with a 'biographical' approach, as a number of historians concerned with recent history have also done. This means that they interview people – as contemporary witnesses of their culture and history – on a specific issue, for example asking them which objects they associate with their place of origin (if they have migrated) or which objects have been important to them in the recent past. The interview can then contribute to the contextualization of an object once its owner decides to donate or sell it to the museum. This kind of information, and also data concerning an object's (original) function and probable use, is crucial for the museum, because once items are put into storage, they are completely decontextualized from their original use and meaning.

Collecting contemporary objects which document the life and work of people, in the case of the ECEC project – of entrepreneurs, is not that difficult for ethnographical museums, as long as they already have corresponding historical collections concerning everyday life like the Museums of European Cultures has for example. The curators of course need to ask themselves what should be considered characteristic for contemporary society, and then select relevant objects jointly with contemporary witnesses who are understood as experts in their own culture. This cooperative documentation of an expert's tangible and intangible culture is called 'participative collecting' and comparable to the approach pursued by historians delving into recent history. Meanwhile, establishing a new collection that reflects the cultural issues of contemporaries of course also entails the creation of a cultural heritage for a specific community at some point in the future.

One example for collecting the present is provided by the local ECEC project *Doner, Delivery and Design* at the Berlin Museum of European Cultures, where the curators amongst other activities focused on a typical facet of global 'food culture'– fast food predominantly produced, traded, advertised and sold by entrepreneurs with immigration backgrounds – here exemplified by the doner kebab sandwich, a snack food that enjoys great popularity in

Parts of the equipment of a doner snack bar, 2009; © Museum of European Cultures – National Museums in Berlin (photo: Ute Franz-Scarciglia).

Germany, which had been invented by a Turkish immigrant in Berlin, and is now rapidly conquering the whole of Europe. Items documenting the production, sale and promotion of doner kebabs were collected along with photographs, documents, stories, books and films. This comprehensive collection not only represents a typical fast food consumed by many people from the last quarter of the 20th century, but more importantly also documents the successful integration of an element of a largely foreign culture into Germany through the commitment of bi-cultural entrepreneurs.

Use of internet

Some of the historical museums involved in the ECEC project which considered collecting the heritage linked to entrepreneurs and their customers actually implemented quite similar methods. It is interesting to note that they more strongly relied on the internet as a vehicle for involving communities and collecting data in the process. In the Museum of Liverpool's *The Secret Life of Smithdown Road* project, Facebook was used as an innovative tool for developing partnerships with a local urban community, especially useful with a view to acquiring new, contemporary objects for the museum's permanent collections. On a Flickr website the Facebook members were meanwhile also able to upload contemporary photographs of the street and its shops. This enabled the museum to start a small collection of best selling items or objects considered most representative of an entrepreneur's business, in addition to interviews, videos and photographs.

Zebra Hair Extensions, African print clothing and necklace donated by Catherine Maduike from Ebony, 167 Smithdown Road; © National Museums Liverpool.

In Amsterdam, an interactive website launched by the historical museum in autumn 2009 allowed entrepreneurs, customers and interested parties to upload stories, interviews, videos, photographs and other objects relating to neighbourhood shops in Amsterdam. The museum staff will use some of this material for exhibitions on neighbourhood shops scheduled for Spring 2011, with a selection of the objects ultimately being acquired for the museum's collections.

Scientific classification

In the examples presented above the approaches pursued by ethnographical and historical museums in collecting these contemporary objects appear to be quite similar. But there is nonetheless one important difference concerning the continuity of scientific classifications into cultural areas, topics or functional groups applied to earlier collections. Whereas most ethnographic museums have an established tradition of collecting and documenting popular culture, in the process applying scientific classifications that easily lend themselves to contemporary heritage, historical museums do not. Their classifications are to a greater extent of an art historical or historical nature (iconographical, material, historical events, topographical). This complicates the establishment of a scientific connection between the tangible contemporary

heritage and their collections from previous centuries, a fact that was already noted in the discussions in the 1980s, because the scientific contextualization of objects is a relatively new phenomenon in historical museums. It consequently appears crucial for historical museums to reconsider some of the classifications used in their older collections.

The project lasted 1 September 2008-31 August 2010 and was financially supported by the EU Culture Programme (2007-2013) of the Education, Audiovisual &Culture Executive Agency in Brussels.

The article is an excerpt of the publication *Entrepreneurial Cultures in Europe. Stories and museum projects from seven cities*, edited by Renée E. Kistemaker and Elisabeth Tietmeyer. Berlin 2010.
For more information: www.eciec.eu

***

Dr Elisabeth Tietmeyer
Deputy Director of the Museum of European Cultures - Berlin State Museums
e.tietmeyer@smb.spk-berlin.de

Renée E. Kistemaker
Senior Consultant research and project development, Amsterdam Historical Museum
reneekistemaker@ahm.nl

Research Projects; Calls for assistance:

Call for examples of everyday mass-produced objects

Harriet Purkis

My name is Harriet Purkis and I am currently studying for a PhD at the University of Ulster in Northern Ireland. Previous to this, I worked as a curator in the UK for a number of years. My PhD is entitled: *Real Life Stories in Everyday Objects: Approaches and methodologies in the documentation of contemporary everyday life through material culture*. The PhD explores the potential of mass-produced consumer objects from the late 20th and early 21st centuries to document everyday life, and attempts to explore their values and meanings. Three main case studies/ fieldwork are involved in my research:

1. Everyday mass-produced objects in contemporary art.
2. A pair of jeans – an object study from a variety of 'material culture' interpretative models.
3. Systematic contemporary collecting through everyday mass-produced objects.

My research question for the contemporary collecting study is: 'Why should museums be involved in collecting everyday objects, and can present day everyday life be successfully archived or collected by a museum through objects? Are museums viable institutions in collecting, interpreting and displaying everyday material culture? I would be very grateful for your assistance. If there is one example you could write down for me about collecting an everyday, mass-produced object, I would be delighted. You can email your responses back to me.

Can you help? It won't take too much time, and I really am interested in hearing from you. I am very interested in hearing from those people who have been or are working in practice on contemporary collecting projects. All responses are welcome, if you have a little time.

I ask that you may think about examples of your work in actively collecting the present day in practice and write down:
• An example of 1 everyday, mass-produced object you collected and why.
• In what collecting context was it collected? Which theme/experience did you aim to collect as a curator? Home life, work – what specific experience or theme or life were you trying to

document – a personal biography, a factory visit?
• Consider its value and meaning. What is its value and meaning? Did you define its value, pinpoint it's meaning in some way – did you write on a documentation card or write a note as a curator? Did you specifically ask the person connected with it for its value and meaning to them - if so how? In an interview?
• In terms of the context the object was collected from – the actual real life context from which it came, what other information did you record with the object? What media were used – photos, interview, film? Which is most important and why? Is a mixed method approach required?
• In addition, what was the main method you used in documenting the whole theme, experience, subject, and the role you consider mass-produced material objects played in this in general terms.
• In general, do you think the collecting of everyday mass-produced consumer items is important and why? Or if not why not?

If you have an image of the object to hand, it would be appreciated.

Thank you very much in advance!

Please email your responses to me:
Harriet Purkis
University of Ulster
purkis-h@email.ulster.ac.uk

2010 International Museums & Mobile Survey

Dear Colleague:

It's time for the 2010 International Museums & Mobile Survey – the international research project that explores the museum community's current use and ambitions with mobile technology tools. Last year over 200 responses were received from 20 countries.

Just 5 minutes of your valuable time could help thousands of museum professionals. Click here to begin: http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/G27MCCM

For more information about this research or the results of the 2009 Survey, please visit: http://www.learningtimes.net/museums-mobile/
We hope you choose to participate, and we look forward to sharing the results!

John Walber, CEO
LearningTimes

New book:
Encouraging Collections Mobility – A Way Forward for Museums in Europe

Should the museums stop hoarding and start concentrating on the better use of the already existing collections? Should they have easier access to those parts of each others' collections that are being underused? Should museums start thinking differently?

Encouraging Collections Mobility – A Way Forward for Museums in Europe offers some starting points for working together and sharing collections. It provides information about the history of collecting and suggests different ways to approach the collections and collecting related activities. It proposes that museums should rather be encouraged to build collection strategies of the 21st century than repeating the old pattern that is based on the idea of eternal growth.

The book also looks into the value building process of museum objects and discusses some principles that determine the economic value of art and antiquities. It analyses the use of collections and suggests using them actively for the enjoyment of all who wish to have access to our cultural heritage. It explores the ways in which conservation and the care of objects affect the mobility of museum objects, and discusses, how the collections and their displays answer the needs of the contemporary visitor.

Whereas most of the articles provide a philosophical context for the collections and their use, the book also addresses the practical issues concerning collections mobility. The core questions were indicated at the European Union level during a long process and a great deal of work has already been carried out in order to make things easier for museums. Specific collections mobility issues, as discussed in the European Union Open Method and Coordination Expert Group on Mobility of Collections 2008–2010, have also been addressed in this book. These issues include immunity from seizure, insurances, non-insurances and state indemnities, long-term loans, loan fees, and digitisation. It is also pointed out that standards, trust, and good networking form the basis for all co-operation. The material is completed by a practical guide to the Collections Mobility process: it pulls together current good practice in developing loans procedures and sets it out in a clear format.

Encouraging Collections Mobility is the ideal text for students, researchers, and museum professionals who are determined to explore and research collections in order to open our rich collection resources and learn more about European heritage.

Edited by Susanna Pettersson, Monika Hagedorn-Saupe, Teijamari Jyrkkiö, Astrid Weij

Authors Frank Bergevoet, John Carman, Anna Catalani, Suzanna Choulia-Kapeloni, Henrietta Galambos, Susanna Hillhouse, Jere Jäppinen, Kaija Kaitavuori, Minna Karvonen, Mechtild Kronenberg, François Mairesse, Freda Matassa, Léontine Meijer-van Mensch, Peter van Mensch, Norman Palmer, Susan Pearce, Susanna Pettersson, Elizabeth Pye, Tomislav Sladojevic´ Šola, Astrid Weij, and Nout van Woudenberg

Publisher
FINNISH NATIONAL GALLERY, ERFGOED NEDERLAND & INSTITUT FÜR MUSEUMSFORSCHUNG, STAATLICHE MUSEEN ZU BERLIN – PREUSSISCHER KULTURBESITZ

Education and Culture DG
Culture Programme

N
W E
S
LENDING FOR EUROPE
21ST CENTURY

The book forms part of the project *Collections Mobility 2.0, Lending for Europe 21st Century*. The partners of the project are Netherlands Institute for Cultural Heritage, The Netherlands Institute for Heritage, General Directorate of Fine Arts and Cultural Goods of Spanish Ministry of Culture, Hellenic Ministry of Culture & Tourism – Directorate of Museums, Exhibitions & Educational Programmes – Department of Exhibitions & Museum Research, Finnish National Gallery, The Romanian Ministry of Culture and National Patrimony, Agency for the Arts and Heritage of the Flemish Community, Department for Culture Media and Sport of the UK, State Museums Berlin, Institute for Museum Research, and Museum of Fine Arts, Budapest.

From October 1st all the articles are also available at www.lending-for-europe