Volume 21 Issue 55
Originally issued as A12



Global Journal of human-social science: A
Arts & Humanities - Psychology
Volume 21 Issue 12 Version 1.0 Year 2021
Type: Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal
Publisher: Global Journals
Online ISSN: 2249-460X & Print ISSN: 0975-587X

Zbyněk Zbyslav Stránský's Museological Impact on Spain

By Francisca Hernández Hernández

Complutense University in Madrid

Abstract- Analyzing the trajectory of Z. Z. Stránský's museological thinking and his commitment to the scientific character of museology allows us to assess the importance of his museological legacy.[1] It is not surprising that his contributions have served as a point of reference for many museologists worldwide. The direct contact Stránský had with Spanish museologists, established through the debates held at ICOFOM and the ISSOM courses, makes it important to consider his influence on Spanish museology. Moreover, the study of the philosophical-scientific context, which is the basis of the entire concept of metamuseology, has served as a stimulus for Spanish museologists to direct their research work towards new museological currents. Indeed, they have done so in the conviction that they are providing a way of conceiving museology that is more in line with the needs of contemporary museums.

Keywords: z. z. stránský, museological theory, scientific discipline, spanish museologists, museological education.

GJHSS-A Classification: FOR Code: 190409



Strictly as per the compliance and regulations of:



© 2021. Francisca Hernández Hernández. This research/review article is distributed under the terms of the Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0). You must give appropriate credit to authors and reference this article if parts of the article are reproduced in any manner. Applicable licensing terms are at https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/.

Zbyněk Zbyslav Stránský's Museological Impact on Spain

Francisca Hernández Hernández[1]

Abstract- **Analyzing the trajectory of Z. Z. Stránský's museological thinking and his commitment to the scientific character of museology allows us to assess the importance of his museological legacy.[1] It is not surprising that his contributions have served as a point of reference for many museologists worldwide. The direct contact Stránský had with Spanish museologists, established through the debates held at ICOFOM and the ISSOM courses, makes it important to consider his influence on Spanish museology. Moreover, the study of the philosophical-scientific context, which is the basis of the entire concept of metamuseology, has served as a stimulus for Spanish museologists to direct their research work towards new museological currents. Indeed, they have done so in the conviction that they are providing a way of conceiving museology that is more in line with the needs of contemporary museums.**

Keywords: z. z. stránský, museological theory, scientific discipline, spanish museologists, museological education.

Introduction

A study of the figure of Zbyněk Z. Stránský allows us to become better acquainted with the considerable work he produced during his academic and research life, he combined his knowledge of history, philosophy, archaeology, music theory, and museology. His production has enriched the scientific field and contributed to the deepening of humanistic values in European society. Indeed, Stránský's ideas have had a significant impact on many museology scholars, in Eastern Europe, in other European countries as well as in Latin America, who benefited from his courses at the International Summer School of Museology (ISSOM) and from his theoretical contributions to the International Committee for Museology (ICOFOM) during the 1980s.

Some people wonder whether Stránský's museological thinking is still relevant today and whether it can provide solutions to the questions that contemporary museums are asking themselves to face the challenges when it comes to museums' *raison d'être*.

Author: Retired Professor of Museology and Cultural Heritage at the Complutense University in Madrid. e-mail: francisc@ucm.es

[1] Retired Professor of Museology and Cultural Heritage at the Complutense University in Madrid. She was Academic Director of the Masters in Museology taught at the University from 1989-1999. She is a member of ICOM and ICOFOM and has published several books and articles on Museology, Heritage, and Archaeology. Her current research is devoted to theoretical and practical museology and its interrelation with Natural and Cultural Heritage.

As is usually the case in all areas of theoretical reflection, Stránský had his followers and detractors. By some, he was considered as the creator of scientific museology by formulating and explaining the theoretical foundations of this discipline, while others criticized him because he focused too much on museological theory and, according to them, ignored the practice of museums, devoting himself to "Byzantine questions" that had nothing to do with the problems of contemporary society. However, Stránský never separated theory from practice in his study of museology if he was interested in anything, it was precisely in training museum professionals so that they could carry out their work with the guarantee of a theoretical basis (Stránský 1983: 76; 1987: 289).

This article aims to highlight his contributions to the field of museology, to which he devoted much of his time and effort. In addition, it will analyze the impact on the development of Spanish museology of the man who, without doubt, can be considered the most important promoter of Czech museology during the second half of the 20th century (Dolák and Varíková 2006) as well as the creator and promoter of scientific museology.

I. Stránský and the need to Rethink Museology

From the beginning of his research, Stránský (1981: 73) is convinced that it was necessary to rethink museology, trying to create a theoretical framework that would provide the consistency to become an authentic science. However, like any science, it needs to be based on philosophical principles that consider the ontological nature of its object, the epistemological dimension as a necessary instrument to understand the reality within a museum context, the aesthetic component as a way of discovering the creative capacity of human beings and the ethical requirement based on respect for the freedom of others and for those who are different (Carta de Coro 1999). To this end, he decided to apply systems theory to museology.

Stránský, starting from his solid philosophical background, tried to lay the theoretical foundations of museology as an independent scientific discipline. He was aware that museum theory is presented "as a specific area of human intellectual activities, having certain characteristics of pure theory, with trends towards separating this theory and constituting it as a

© 2021 Global Journals

scientific discipline" (Stránský 1980: 43). Moreover, museological science can only exist and develop if it can respond to the concrete needs of today's society. Therefore, the term museology or museum theory refers to a field of specific knowledge and investigation oriented towards the museum phenomenon (*Ibid*. 44). However, this idea was not readily accepted by all because some considered that it was not easy to determine the object of a discipline that did not yet have a perfectly consolidated definition, nor would it be possible to succeed in defining a discipline whose object is not sufficiently known (Deloche 2001: 106). However, with time, we must acknowledge that many researchers have applied his philosophical principles to the field of museology and recognize Stránský's creative ability to elaborate a museological discourse based on scientific principles.

In any case, we can observe the approach is given to museological thought by Stránský, as a representative of Eastern Europe, and his commitment to the defense of his line of research on the independence of museology from the museum, is of capital importance. Why? Because it opened the doors for his museological investigation to be known in the rest of Europe, having been translated, for the most part, into English and, to a lesser extent, into other languages. However, when talking about Stránský, we must also mention two other museologists from the East who, together with him, worked in the field of museology. All three of them belonged to a group of thinkers from communist bloc countries who showed us the characteristics of a historical moment in which Marxist ideology was still in force. They are Klaus Schreiner, Director of the Agrarhistorisches Museum (Museum of Agraricam History) in Alt Schwerin in the German Democratic Republic, and Anna Gregorová, Research Assistant at the Ústredná správa múzei a galérií (Central Office of Museums and Picture Galleries) in Bratislava (Czechoslovakia).

These authors recount their experiences in the museological field, within a very singular spatial-temporal framework. How they tried to answer the question of whether museology was science or just practical museum work. This was the question posed in the first issue of Museological Working Papers to be debated with the other members of ICOFOM (Stránský 1980). When discussing the topic of interdisciplinarity in museology, each author attempted to analyse objectively what criteria could be used to define museology as a scientific discipline and what its object of study is as well as giving their views on the subject. These theoretical discussions in the field of museology led to philosophical reflections, which have given rise to metamuseology and have favored the theorization of museological concepts. If there is one thing we have Stránský to thank for; it is precisely for having offered us the possibility of considering museology as a genuine museological theory.

There is no doubt that studying Stránský's museological thinking, analyzing his concepts, and the theory of knowledge applied to museology is an important task if one wishes to go deeper into the development of museological theory. We must bear in mind that he represents a line of thought that has served as a point of reference for other scholars from countries such as France, Portugal, Spain, Germany, and Latin America, who have continued to closely investigate his museological orientations and methodology.

II. Stránský's Contributions through his Most Significant Works

Although his publications on museology are numerous, we will focus on two of his most important publications, which best summarise the whole scientific structure of his museological thinking: *Introduction to the Study of Museology* (1995) and *Archeologie a muzeologie* (Museology and Archaeology) (2005).

If we analyze the course of museology throughout its history, we discover that there are different ways in which authors have conceived and approached it from an academic point of view. This fact does not impoverish any encounter with the discipline but rather offers us a vision of the vicissitudes it has undergone throughout its formative process. This is what Stránský tries to explain in his Introduction. According to the author (1995: 5), the current state of museology is none other than the result of how specialists have tried to approach the fundamental questions of gnoseology, methodology, terminology, and the system used. However, we must bear in mind that museology can only be understood in close relation to the evolution that other sciences, as well as culture and philosophy, have undergone regarding their vision of humankind and their *raison d'être* in the world. To forget this would prevent us from situating museological research in its context, where it is called upon to fulfill not only a scientific but also a humanizing mission. In other words, museology is not only there to manage a museum in one way or another but also to give reasons why it is decided that an object is museum-worthy, why we monitor natural changes and disappearances, and why certain components of reality are preserved and not others.

The reason for the existence of museology, as a specific discipline, is therefore not to be found in the choice of an exhibit or a particular means of conservation, but in a "specific relationship between man and reality, which manifests itself in the cultural appropriation of the latter" *(Ibid.: 6)*. It is, therefore necessary to provide an overview of what characterizes museology, underlining the decisive lines that make museology a science. It is, essential to outline the

© 2021 Global Journals

structure of its gnoseological system and its specificity, as well as to motivate newcomers to the field to discover the theoretical and practical reasons why it is necessary to study museology.

Stránský's wisdom in publishing his *Introduction* makes us reflect on why it is necessary for the different specialists working in museums - geologists, botanists, historians, art historians, etc., - to study and learn museology. His justification is that, although the disciplines applied in museums constitute an excellent gnoseological input for all those who work in museums, they do not include the museum aspect. The author (*Ibid*.: 9) thinks that, although each discipline involved in museum work can decide, within its gnoseological context, on the identification of a given object, it cannot, on its own, decide on the *'museality'* of what it considers only as a source of knowledge. However, if these sciences cannot provide answers to the problems of the museum phenomenon, museums must seek help from philosophy, sociology, psychology, and pedagogy. In this way, museology proposes, as an essential task, to promote the professionalisation of museum work. Stránský is convinced that this is the best strategy for specialized museologists to defend, with all the necessary guarantees, the future of contemporary museums.

In his book *Museology and Archaeology*, Stránský (2005) offers an overview of museums and the functions they are called upon to perform from the moment of their creation to the legitimization of their heritage legacy by society. He analyses the museum phenomenon and the importance of the creating of collections. He examines the objective of museology, specifying what he understands by museography, pre-museology, museology, and neo-museology. He devotes a specific chapter, due to its length, to the system of museology. He explains the fundamentals of theoretical museology - selection, storage, presentation - and applied museology or museography - the institutionalisation of museums, settings, communication, preservation, exhibition, relationship with the public. He also distinguishes the diachronic dimension of historical museology and the synchronism of contemporary museology. When referring to historical museology, he studies its autonomy, genesis, and periodization. When he focuses on contemporary museology, he highlights the importance of musealization, the cultural policy of museums, and their future.

Could not miss a chapter dedicated to analyzing the confrontation of museology with the post-modern world, its fields of knowledge, natural and cultural heritage, and the archaeology of monuments. About these, there is a need for close collaboration with other disciplines, which is why he pays special attention to archaeological and museological studies, and the importance to archaeological museums. He also devotes a chapter to metamuseology, where he analyses its philosophical-scientific context, its logical composition, its field of knowledge, its methodology, terminology, and position in the system of sciences. We can affirm that in this book, he summarises the main lines of his thinking set out in his many publications. Thus, anyone wishing to gain first-hand knowledge of Stránský's museological career must take these two works into account.

III. The Contribution of Spanish Museologists to International Museological Discourse

Until well into the 1960s, the Spanish presence in the International Council of Museums was non-existent. It was not until the appointment, in 1974, of Luis Monreal Tejada as Secretary-General of ICOM that Spain began to gain prominence. At the 11th General Conference and 12th General Assembly in 1977, the museologists Xavier de Salas Bosch, María Luisa Herrera, and Consuelo Sanz Pastor were present on various committees (Bellido Blanco 2005: 333).

The same happened with the presence of Spanish museologists in the debates on museological theory promoted by ICOFOM from 1978 onwards. It should be noted that from 1981, several Spanish academics began to participate in ICOFOM, including Rosario Carrillo, a painter, and lecturer in Technical Drawing at the Faculty of Physics in Madrid. They collaborated actively and was elected to the Executive Board in 1984 with 28 votes. In 1986, she stood for re-election for the 1987-1989 term and was re-elected, at the same time as Eulalia Morral i Romeu was elected for the first time for the same period. In 1980, no Spaniards took part in the first issue of Museological Working Papers, as was the case for the second. It was Domènec Miquel i Serra, member of the Advisory Commission of the Museums Service of Catalonia, and Eulàlia Morral i Romeu, Director of the Textile Museum of Terrassa, who, as members of the so-called "*Grup Tècnic de Museologia*", recently created within the *Associació de Treballadors de Museus de Catalunya*, contributed for the first time to the debate on interdisciplinarity (Hernández and Lorente 2016: 37).

Thereafter, other participants included Jaume Terradas, professor of Ecology at the Faculty of Sciences of the Autonomous University of Barcelona, Dolors Forrelad i Doménech, Director of the Museum of Art of Sabadell, Carmen G. Viejo Álvarez, museologist, María A. Mezquinz Irujo, Director of the Museum of Navarre, Eloisa García de Wattenberg, Director of the National Sculpture Museum of Valladolid, Teresa González i Vedaguer, of the Museu d'art de Catalunya, Palau Nacional and Parc de Montjuic, Joan Mayné Amat, of the Museum of Badalona, Andrea García

© 2021 Global Journals

Sastre, museologist, and Xabier Ballbé, Director of the European Heritage Centre Foundation of Barcelona.

All of them were members of ICOFOM, and some of them took an active part in the debates and had a direct relationship with Stránský, with whom they exchanged ideas and opinions on the concept of museology and on the situation of museums in Spain and the rest of the world at that time. However, despite their continued presence for a decade, there was little acknowledgement of these meetings in Spain, and the Spanish ICOM itself did not report on them. Among other reasons, this was because Spanish museologists were more focused on the practical work of museums, which required urgent intervention, and did not see the need to dwell on the theoretical analysis of museums, nor were people aware of Stránský's epistemological proposals because his writings had hardly been translated from Czech. Moreover, Stránský's proposals on museology involved a great effort of reflection and research that was not easy to carry out. This fact meant a delay in incorporating Spanish museologists into museological study within the international sphere, preventing such theories, which were being developed throughout Europe, from being known, studied, and shared within Spain.

From 1994 onwards, there were no Spanish museologists present at the ICOFOM debates until 2002, when we had the sole and brief intervention of Silvia Ventosa Muñoz (2002), curator of the Museum of Decorative Arts in Barcelona. It was from 2006 onwards that Francisca Hernández, professor of museology at the Complutense University of Madrid, joined the debate and publicized in Spain an work carried out by members of ICOFOM (Hernández 2006, 2006 a). Since then, Spanish participation has become increasingly continuous and diverse. The work of ICOFOM and of all the theoreticians of museology, among whom Stránský occupies a prominent position, is now justly well known and acknowledged. Among other Spanish museologists who have joined the ICOFOM colloquia is Jesús Pedro Lorente. It is worth highlighting his intervention in the conference given in 2015 on New Trends in Museology (2016). Mikel Asensio and his research team also participated in the ICOFOM Study Series on Empowering the Visitor: Process, Progress, Protest (2012). The latest contributions have been made by Gloria Romanello (2015, 2017), from the University of Barcelona, Sara Pérez López (2015), Olaia Fontal Merillas and Sofía Marín Cepeda (2015) and Silvia García Ceballos (2015) from the University of Valladolid, Conxa Rodà (2015) from the Museu Nacional d'Art de Catalunya, Francisca Hernández (2016) and Óscar Navajas (2017), from the University of Alcalá de Henares, on the current state of museology in Spain. During these years, the above Spanish museologists collaborated on different issues in the dialogues organized by ICOFOM. They presented their ideas on museology and contributed to enriching the museological debate. The following are the topics they dealt with and their main contributions and interrelations with Stránský.

a) Methodology and Interdisciplinarity in Museology

One of Stránský's (1981:71) questions is whether museology can become an independent scientific discipline. However, he considers that it is first necessary to know whether it has the characteristics of a science. This fact implies that systems theory must be used as one of the determining characteristics of science since it is through this theory that students can be equipped with the knowledge and methodology that will enable them to solve any museological problem they may encounter (*Ibid*. 76). In addition, from a philosophical-methodological point of view, for knowledge to be adequate to its object and to show its content, it must be developed based on a theoretical and systematic plan in the form of a theory (*Ibid*. 74). Thus, museology must have a solid base for positioning itself regarding its relationship with other disciplines.

In this respect, Rosario Carrillo (1983: 52), starting from the hypothesis that museology is a science in making, has highlighted the need to specify the evolutionary stages that have taken place from the perspectives of museological historiography, epistemology, and history. For this reason, there is a need for communication between different branches of science. Indeed, she considers it very positive that museologists give their own opinions, despite the disparity in museological criteria and approaches. She highlights the interdisciplinary nature of the methodology used in exhibitions, one that considers general systems theory, theories of communication and decision-making, semiotic analysis, group dynamics, network theory, or aspects related to ecology and economics. This has helped enrich the scientific and museological vocabulary with a proliferation of new terms that have become part of museological science.

According to the same author (*Ibid*.: 54), the debates at the London Colloquium in 1983 showed how different participants tried to redefine the concept of museology or museological knowledge from a personal point of view. This was the most obvious sign that the idea of scientific museology had not yet been consolidated. Moreover, there was no unity of criteria regarding the method, system structure, and object of museological science. When referring to museology, participants were aware that there is theoretical museology and practical museology or museography, but each one approached them from different perspectives.

Stránský sees the difference in criteria as a natural consequence of the current stage of the practical application of museology and considers that museological science needs a different level evident on

© 2021 Global Journals

an epistemological level. For museology, once freed from methodological constraint, can claim its independence based on its scientific knowledge and not because of the method employed. What is important is that both theoretical and practical knowledge serve to modify the reality of the museum, and Carrillo fully shares this view (*Ibid*.: 55). Moreover, she is particularly interested in semiotic analysis, because, for her, museological science must move towards methodological independence by making use not only of such study but also of other methods that could help it, occasionally, to serve its objectives. Based on her readings of some of Stránský's publications, she defends, like him, methodological plurality, distinguishing between the museological method or system of methods and didactic methods (*Ibid*.: 57). Additionally, regarding the importance given to the synchronic and diachronic study of museology, she believes that both can define the museum as a historical fact (*Ibid*.: 61).

Dolors Forrellad i Domènech (1984: 26) stated, following Ellis Burcaw, that museum professionals have shown little interest in the study of museology, perhaps because they have considered it a complex subject. For this reason, they have preferred to focus their efforts on the day-to-day aspects of the museum, which do not require too much complicated theoretical elaboration or exhaustive analytical study. However, she sees the need to delimit and mark out the path to be followed to define museology as a science laying the necessary foundations for its further study and evolution.

One of the themes of Museological Working Paper (MuWop) No. 2 was interdisciplinarity in museology. In the discussions, which took place in 1981, the philosophical foundations of the museological theory were laid, offering museologists the opportunity to think about museums and museology from an international perspective, based on the reflections of Stránský and other Eastern European museologists. They contributed concepts that, until then, had not been used but which soon became familiar to other museologists, such as museum fact, museality, musealia, the museistic, etc. With these concepts, changes that were taking place in museums could be made clear. In this way, museums began to be considered as social phenomena that are in a continuous process of renewal. As our experiences change our way of conceiving the world, we can see the reality surrounding us and situate ourselves in a different way. Museums, therefore, will be affected by being seen from perspectives that differ essentially from those that previously served as references. Thus, museology, becomes a true social science.

Domènec Miquel i Serra and Eulàlia Morral i Romeu (1981: 43-45) took part in this debate. From an eminently nationalist view of the Catalan reality, they analyze museological development and proliferation of museums to affirm the cultural personality of Catalonia. Dolors Forrellad (1984: 124) confirms and supports this same opinion. For these authors, multi-disciplinarity has contributed to creating an image of the local museum as a group of small, specialized museums located in the same building, without any relationship between them, therefore, lacking a philosophy that defines the why and wherefore of their existence. The result of this situation could not be other than the realization of the beginning of a profound crisis in Catalan museums. But this crisis has given rise to a movement of renewal within museums, which are questioning their *raison d'être*, leaving aside a merely collector's vision and opening to the new perspectives offered by interdisciplinarity as a complementary reality to multidisciplinarity. The publication of the *Llibre Blanc dels Museus* (1979), directed by M. Luis Monreal Tejada, then Secretary-General of ICOM, Els *Museus de Catalunya. Aproximació a la seva problemática* (1981) and Els *Museus de Catalunya. Criteris per a l´organizatciò del patrimonio museistic del país* (1984), commissioned by the *Comisión Técnica de Museos Locales y Comarcales* contributed to this. Museums should no longer be considered as mere repositories of collections but as true centers of culture. However, all museums must have a systematic and multidisciplinary methodology that favors a close relationship between museology and the other human sciences.

b) Museums Facing Ecological and Environmental Issues

Society is becoming increasingly aware of the need to protect the environment, so it is not surprising that museums are called upon to play an active role in promoting ecology. For this purpose, they use exhibitions as a medium in which the values of nature and society can be integrated. According to Stránský (1983: 30 ff.), it is urgent to consider exhibitions on an ecological basis, bearing in mind that any museum activity must be oriented towards reality, and concern for ecology is part of this. This means that museums must create the methodological conditions necessary to meet ecological requirements when collecting, documenting, and exhibiting their collections. From there, museums must work to use an ecological approach by the demands of scientific knowledge and the sensitivities of contemporary society. However, this will require differentiation in museum typology between the concept of the ecological museum, which documents and presents the themes of ecology as a specific branch, and the concept of an ecomuseum, which refers specifically to territorial or regional museums and those of a local character.

The Spanish contribution to ecology and museums has been dealt with by several scholars. Jaume A. Terradas (1983: 8-14), after pointing out the importance of ecology in analyzing the relationship

© 2021 Global Journals

between humans and nature, emphasized the importance of the scientific study of the environment. Furthermore, he strongly recommended that ecological and environmental education should be provided, as has been done in Anglo-Saxon and French-speaking countries. The aim is to increase knowledge of the environment and make individuals and society aware of the need to protect it. Like Stránský, he points out that it is necessary to follow a methodology centered on direct contact with reality, active participation and an interdisciplinary approach, which museums must adopt. Terradas is convinced that all museums, whether recently created, such as ecomuseums, or with a long history, have great potential. They understand the message of museological education and contribute to the renewal of their functions and language, making use of intermuseum programs. It should never be forgotten that museums should never be conceived as just exhibition centers, but as centers of initiatives that are concerned not only with visitors but also with offering the keys of interpretation for the observation of the environment.

Another person who dealt with the subject of ecomuseums was Dolors Forrellad (1984: 28) who, commenting on the contributions of Mathilde Bellaigue, points out that curators of ecomuseums should be closely linked to the territory. She refers to several experiences in Catalonia which confirmed this statement and suggested that all the people, who work in museums should be fully committed to the work they do and to the place where the museums are located, as this way they will be in more direct contact with the public.

c) The Collection of Objects and Selection Criteria

Domènec Miquel *et al*. (1984: 5-7), based on the experience of the recently created *Grup Tècnic de Museologia*, within the *Associació de Treballadors de Museus de Catalunya*, presented their reflections on museum objects traditionally considered as "material testimonies." Given that we are surrounded by new technologies capable of fixing the intangible through videos and audio, they believe that it is necessary to go beyond the materiality of the museum object as a differential element and focus more on the concept of testimony. Objects are no longer considered as mere material testimonies. In this way, all natural elements, material or immaterial, which form the environment in which we live, become testimonies, regardless of their physical condition. All testimonies require subjects that recognize them and can access them – via a museum- and, at the same time, these testimonies can be sent to another subject that receives and uses these testimonies, i.e., the public. During this process, three elements need to be present: the reading through which testimony is interpreted as a document, the document or product of the reading made by the museum and offered to the public, and the added value that is given to it, whether cultural, economic or political. From that moment on, the object is susceptible to being selected and musealised. Without forgetting that today we collect those objects that represent the relatively recent past, leaving for tomorrow, the collection of our present by the existing conception of museological.

When discussing original and substitute objects in museums, Miquel and Morral (1985: 135 ff.) point out that objects in museums can be viewed from different perspectives, either as material elements or as emotional elements that transmit contextualized information about them. From the moment we contemplate an object, this contemplation is mediated by the distance factor, which may be temporal or cultural and interposes an additional value between the visitor and the surrounding object, which may distort the authentic information it offers. When we speak of a substitute, on the other hand, this value does not exist because the distance is not present. Therefore, the substitute produces a feeling of disillusionment in the spectator. And even when the material used may coincide with that of the original object, there is no coincidence as far as the contextual impression is concerned. When a substitute enters a museum, it can be used as a reference to an original - replacing its physical presence - but also to reinstate the memory - replacing the documentary value of the original.

Regarding substitute objects and their implications for museum work, Dolors Forrellad (1985: 169 ff.) raises the question of whether copies can serve as substitutes for originals that have disappeared or are in danger of disappearing, or as a complement that explains objects, and processes that are not evident. From a museological point of view, they can never be compared to the original. They are only useful when the original does not exist or is difficult to preserve. And the public must be warned, especially in the case of little-known works.

d) Museology and Identity Preservation

Commenting on the topic of museology and identity, Stránský (1986: 49) stated that, in analysing the relationship between identity and the social situation in developing and Latin American countries, participants' approach to a topic was one-sided, relying only on European social history. Thus, they only dealt with the cultural aspect and its ethnological, sociological, and historical connotations but did not touch upon the essential museological approach, nor did they realize the importance of the relationship that identity has with the terms: "development" and "memory".

In their contribution to the colloquium, Miquel and Morral (1986: 211) emphasize that the problem of uniformity appears when a collective model is mythologized, and the individual renounces their own rules to adopt, artificially, those of the proposed model.

© 2021 Global Journals

Furthermore, sometimes, people have tried to dominate others, giving rise to a different identity, yet with persistent traces of the original. However, a situation of domination does not always imply assimilation. Acculturation implies an absence of internal group cohesion and the lack of a model with which to identify because it is not possible to identify with a dominator. However, this situation can also occur in the case of immigrants who, faced with two different worlds, the one they come from and the one they find when they arrive in another country, are forced to create a new mixed-race identity.

Crises and acculturation lead to situations of anxiety when a new culture does not meet expectations. In this situation, museums can contribute to satisfying the socio-cultural needs of people by preserving the signs of identity from the past in which people can still find aspects that they recognize about themselves. Museums, thus, become a means of preserving identity and can be a valid model for conserving collective memory, offering elements that allow people to identify themselves as members of a given human group. On the other hand, they can be used to destroy certain identities, presenting unreal models that leave the individual defenseless in the face of deculturation or colonization aggression. Indeed, museums must be committed to defending marginalized and socially excluded populations, if only as a gesture of reparation for the time they spent pandering to the tastes of certain elitist minorities that often dominated museum institutions (Miquel and Morral 1987: 54).

The same authors (1986: 41ff) also speak of identity as a dynamic concept, always evolving and transforming, involving differences, comprising conscious and unconscious aspects, made up of different ingredients, a cultural product, which can be diverse. Museums were an inseparable part of Western cultural identity in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. They are part of our consciousness, a social passage and self-affirmation representing our need for admiration, as well as a market mechanism. Stránský (1986: 50) highlights the ideas of these authors that identity a relationship between the "model", and "reality". The model is created from memory, which serves for identification. Still, it should be borne, in mind that in intellectual memory, everyone creates their model, whereas in objectual memory, it is the museum that creates the model and presents it to the public. On the other hand, Stránský, following Tereza Scheiner's idea, insists on the need to study the identity of the museum by relating both memories because this would result in a new orientation in the development of museums and museology, as well as in the activities to be carried out by museology professionals by their own identity.

e) Museology, Museums and Social Development

At the symposium on *Museology and Museums*, Stránský (1987: 287ff.) asked whether museology as a consequence of the existence of museums, or whether museology already existed before museums were created. Are museums the subject of museology or should they rather be seen as a means of bringing museology closer to reality? Does museology encompass museums and their fruit, or does museology go beyond museums given its objectives? Finally, it is necessary to ask whether museums can exist without museology and whether museology can exist without museums. The answer to these questions is that the theoretical approach to museums is closely linked to museum practice in such a way that the former precedes, penetrates, and succeeds the latter. Moreover, the object of museology cannot be just the museum, as it is something material, an objective element of reality created by humans with the purpose of satisfying certain social needs. Therefore, a museum needs the supervision, criticism, and involvement of museology. But we must not forget that the museum is not an end, but a means and one of the possible ways of realizing humans' approach to reality. Finally, Stránský believes that both contemporary museums and those to be created in the future cannot exist without museology as a science, just as museology cannot exist without museums, because any theory without practice loses its meaning and its social function.

In this respect, Miquel and Morral (1987: 53-55) point out how in 1980, the members of ICOFOM placed museums at the center of the debate: museology exists because there are museums. They stated that the scientific field should not be confused with experimental sites. Stránský ironically commented on the fact that everyone must discover for themselves that the museum is not the centre of the world. Our relationship with the material testimonies of the past can be questioned according to the needs of the ever-changing present. The museum, as Stránský says, is a solution to a problem posed in its twofold spatial-temporal dimension, but not the only one, nor the best possible one, but it is the real one. On the other hand, we must recognize that the heterodox highlights the crisis of the theoretical system but does not overcome it.

For Dolors Forrellad (1987: 105 ff.), the museum has projected itself into the community to fulfill its functions. Museum-society interaction has come about thanks to the efforts made by museums in the field of dissemination. It has ceased to be a repository of testimonies, offered only to some sectors of society, and has become a source of information and research for the whole of society. Many museums have inherited collections as their starting point, which often have nothing to do with the goals they have set for themselves to serve the community. Museum science needs to make itself better known, to define itself more

© 2021 Global Journals

concretely, and to work on theorization, but within a framework of action that allows it to project itself in its experiences, methods, and systems.

Eulalia Morral (1987: 133-135), for her part, summarizes the different opinions on museums and development. She considers that nobody doubts that museums have evolved in fact they have been under strong pressure to transform themselves. This situation divides authors so that while some protect themselves behind the official definition and close themselves to other options, others open their doors so that they can renew themselves and adapt to new realities. We Europeans are used to seeing the museum as an element of our history. However, this makes us forget its colonizing role that, more or less explicitly, it has played in the social framework. Outside of Europe, the museum has been considered as an imposition and as a symbol of the interference suffered due to the intrusion of a foreign culture. But when these countries regained their freedom, they did not close the museums because they continued to be useful to the new dominant minority, in the process of westernization that seemed irreversible. For this reason, Morral insists, the museum is not an innocent creation but is under pressure from different bodies, which it must face up to and respond with answers arising from the new concept of heritage.

Rosario Carrillo (1988: 105ff.) deals with museology and its use in and by developing countries. She commented that, as early as 1982, on the occasion of the International Seminar for the Financing of Culture, a study was presented on "Museums, an investment for development". It proposed that there was a correlation between a country's level of development and its museum development. This is shown by the relationship between the number of inhabitants and the number of museums, or the value given to cultural heritage, which shows that, while in industrialized countries there are on average 983 museums per country, in African countries there are only eight museums. For the author, the application of museology of practical problems is a part of basic museology. But this application today naturally responds to the need to apply resources - the specific field of scientific knowledge - within a global context.

Within the context of the work of the *Sociedad de Sistemas Generales de Madrid* carried out in 1983, Carrillo (*Ibid*. 110) proposes a development option which she calls "Museological notes for integrated experimental development." This makes use of a "Museological Unit" conceived as "an elementary practical-functional cell at the service of specific plans for local - zonal - integrated development." This cell comprises a minimum of human and material elements that can be adjusted to the zonal development team in which museological study and the subsequent modeling of a global plan of action cannot be absent. It is designed to act in an inter-and meta-disciplinary manner, benefiting from the technology applied to global development, and is integrated into management bodies. It can drive development and lead to the creation of a community museum. It is an evolutionary process. It is based on local identity. This process makes an internal and external valuation of its functioning, gives importance to group participation, as it must be open to reflection and criticism. It is distinguished by its capacity for mobility and adaptation to the environment. In this way, museology can be applied to solve practical problems, one of the fundamental aspects of scientific museology.

The last participation of some of the Spanish museologists in ICOFOM was related to the theme of "Forecasting-A Museological Tool? Museology and Futurology". Among the key papers, Stránský (1989: 297) presented his idea of the importance of science without forgetting that science has its limits, which means that the future of museums cannot be approached from the point of view of science or futurology alone. He believes that only with the help of gnoseological and methodological contributions to science can we discover the future of museums, not only to know what we should do but also to understand what museums' evolution and trends will be. But it is not enough to rely on daily practice; we need the counterweight of planning and knowledge. One of the tasks entrusted to museology is to explain the evolution and current state of museums' approaches to reality and to foresee their further development. The ability to integrate the past, the present, and the future are therefore very important from a methodological point of view to answer the questions about the future of museums. On the other hand, the nature of the museum phenomenon is reflected in museum practice, which is manifested in museums' presentation, i.e., their artistic dimension. This helps us to understand reality in its entirety and to integrate scientific knowledge.

Domèneq Miquel (1989: 179 ff.) reflects on how museology and museums can contribute to change. In his presentation, he highlighted how, as early as 1987, van Mensch proposed a twofold way of reflection. On the one hand, the analysis of the basic characteristics of museum development and, on the other hand, the realization that, in the face of this development, there are different theoretical positions that can provide different answers. Today, no one doubts that museums are institutions in continuous development. Museums at the beginning of the century were very different from those of today, both conceptually and physically. Society is also increasingly diverse. For this reason, it is necessary to overcome Western ethnocentrism and stop considering museums as belonging to one culture, which is supposed to be the only valid one. Indeed, there are other cultures that have different visions and solutions to the conservation and use of heritage unrelated to museology, which is better adapted to their needs. Nevertheless, we still tend to think that the

© 2021 Global Journals

museum is the only valid institution when, in reality, we know that it has difficulty keeping pace with society and adapting to new needs beyond the simple management of collections. Museums must be at the service of society and be open to the changes that society is experiencing. Moreover, some believe that museums are the only possible institution, albeit with different typologies. In contrast while others feel that it is temporary and transitory, evolving and changing, and not the only way to relate to heritage. In other words, a museum is no longer the master of public management, and other alternatives have appeared which, although they use museum techniques for their realization, are not strictly speaking museums. Nevertheless, museology can become an "instrument for building the future if it directs its interest to the relationship between man and his heritage, be it a museum or non-museum, cultural or not, material or intangible" (*Ibid*. 183).

Eulàlia Morral (1989: 185), in her reflections on the future of museology, questions whether we will ever be able to foresee the future if we have not yet managed to draw up scientific statements or objective laws that would provide a basis for the development of human relationships with heritage throughout history and the different cultural movements. The same author points out that heritage is the bearer of memory to recognize a collective identity. Thus, we go from heritage to memory and from memory to identity. However, on the one hand, it is doubtful that heritage is equivalent to memory because its preservation is the result of a contingency or a subjective choice. On the other hand, although in 1986, it was claimed that identity is established by process of differentiation, it can often drift into the aesthetic and folkloric fields. But today, the difference is not fashionable, and, through the media, we are inculcated with unique, delocalized models. Memory thus becomes boring and anachronistic. That is why she wonders whether heritage is still of any use, given that we live in a society in which we have two ways of experiencing heritage, one tangible and the other intangible. We know that today real heritage has no validity if it does not become an image since it is the image that gives the original its *raison d'être*. It seems that societies without memory move forward more freely and that the future belongs to the a-cultural generations.

IV. Stránský and his Commitment to the Teaching of Museology at Universities

From his early days as a professor, Stránský saw the need for museology to be recognized as an autonomous, scientific discipline that could be taught within universities with all the guarantees of any other discipline. However, he witnessed how his efforts to introduce museology studies in universities were considered by museum professionals as a product of a certain 'intellectual immaturity' (Stránský, 1993: 127). Even though, as early as 1923, Jaraslav Helfert, Director of the Moravian Museum, had already created the post of lecturer in museology at the University of Masaryk, where he remained until 1948. In 1963, however, Jan Jelinek established a Department of Museology at the University of Masaryk, although Stránský took over all the management and supervisory work. It should not be forgotten that Jelinek was also the founder of the ICTOP Committee in 1968 and ICOFOM in 1976.

In 1990, after the fall of the communist regime, the University in Brno, which since 1960 had been named after the Czech botanist Jan Evangelista Purkynê, regained its original name, becoming Masaryk University, and the Department of Museology was restored within the Faculty of Arts and Philosophy. Of particular importance were the organization and development, in cooperation with UNESCO, of the International Summer School of Museology (ISSOM) courses for students, taught and directed by Stránský from 1986 to 1996.

Certainly, Spanish museologists were aware of these; they had heard about the courses given in the summer and were interested in how they worked. As early as 1994, the *International Summer Courses in Museology* (ISSOM), directed by Stránský, were announced in an Andalusian journal (S/A 1994: 20). It should be noted that this journal, since its beginnings in 1992, has systematically reported on all the courses and conferences on museology and heritage held in Spain and abroad, thus promoting the dissemination and knowledge of these courses and encouraging participation in them. The participation in these courses of more than twenty Spanish museum professionals has influenced, together with their doctoral theses and publications, the development of museological discourse in Spain.

In 1994, both Masaryk University and the International Summer School in Brno were very interested in establishing a chair in museology, so they applied for permission from UNESCO, who granted it through the UNITWIN program, giving it the title of Chair of Museology and World Heritage, to be directed by Vinos Sofka (2002: 41). Between 1997 and 2002, Stránský held the Chair of Ecomuseology at the Faculty of Natural Sciences of the University of Mateja Bela, Branská Bystrica (Slovakia).

It can be said that it was the museologists from Eastern European countries who have been the most committed to the establishment of museology as an autonomous discipline so that it could be taught in their universities without any problem, given the political regime in the countries that signed the Warsaw Pact. The figure of Jan Jelínek, Director of the Anthropos Museum in Brno and President of the Consultative Committee of ICOM, as well as its president between 1971 and 1977, is worth highlighting because he

© 2021 Global Journals

contributed very actively to the creation of the International Committee for Museology (ICOFOM). This took place in 1977, with the aim of promoting research and encouraging theoretical reflection on museology. Subsequently, figures such as Vinôs Sofka, who gave extraordinary dynamism to ICOFOM's research, and was its president from 1981 to 1989, or Avram Razgan, Klaus Schreiner, Jiri Neustupny, Joseph Benes, Wejciech Gluzinski and Stránský, himself, all gave great impetus to museological studies.They attracted large numbers of museologists from other European countries to join their activities, especially Georges Henri Rivière and André Desvallées from France. All of them contributed to give museology a scientific character, reflecting on the different museological conceptions existing in the world.

In 1993, the ICOFOM Study Series devoted one of its sections to the theme "From Theory to Practice: Museum Training in Europe," where the different courses and master's degrees that were being taught at that time at the Reinwardt Academy of Amsterdam, the Department of Museums Studies at the University of Leicester, L'École Nationale du Patrimoine of Paris, the University of Basel, the Faculty of Arts of the University of Masaryk in Brno and the European Heritage School in Barcelona were presented. This debate was enriched by contributions from different countries defining the general lines being followed about the academic teaching of museology.

On the Spanish side, it was Xavier Ballbé (1993:125-126) who, in dealing with cultural assets and the new museum professional, explained the experience of the European School of Barcelona, which he had created. According to this author, museological training should be integrated into the renovating currents and committed to presenting cultural assets as an important sector of activity. For this reason, the European School put all its efforts into preparing new experts and offering programs for professionals in the sector. This training was based on an integral conception of cultural property. One that covered the different historical, archaeological, ethnographic, and artistic aspects, considered from an interdisciplinary perspective. It was possible to see museography, archiving, monument management and natural parks as interrelated. Based on the analysis and evaluation of the new professions and demands arising in cultural heritage, the European School established a training program adapted to the specific needs of universities, cultural organizations and different public administrations. Furthermore, the School, which did not last for long, collaborated with other European centers that promoted training programs aimed at the management, and dissemination of cultural and environmental assets, specifying the different models and levels of professional qualifications existing in each of the countries.

However, we must admit that it was a pity that no mention was made at the symposium of the fact that museology was already arousing great interest within the Spanish university environment. In fact, in 1989, a Master's in Museology had begun to be taught at the Complutense University of Madrid. Subsequently, a Postgraduate Diploma in Museology was organized at the University of the Basque Country, and a Postgraduate Diploma in Museum Educators at the University of Zaragoza. In 1992, the *Antonio Camuñas* Foundation offered a Master's in Museography, and Exhibition Techniques and, in 1995, the Faculty of Fine Arts of Madrid started a Master's in Museography and Exhibitions. From this moment on, numerous universities in the most important cities in Spain, such as Barcelona, Gerona, Granada, Valladolid and Santiago de Compostela, have been offering different postgraduate courses or master's degrees, either face-to-face or virtual, overlapping with each other and causing some to disappear with new ones appearing (Lorente 2010: 75). Even though many museum curators took part in these courses, it was clear that there was little collaboration between museums and universities. The competent administrations in museums did not allow students to carry out internships in state museums. For all these reasons, many of us think that today we need to have a school and even a chair of museology, as is the case in Brno, Paris or Rio de Janeiro.

Although for a long time, the relationship between Spanish museologists and Stranský, through ICOFOM, was quite close, we must acknowledge that in Spain, we do not have well-defined museological currents that would have made it possible to create our schools of research. Rather, we can affirm that the development of Spanish museological research has been based on the Mediterranean and French-speaking sources and, through them, the currents of thought proposed by ICOFOM, Stránský, and the museologists of East European countries have been approached.

It should be noted that some specialists in contemporary art museums have had to rely on Anglo-Saxon sources. Authors such as Jesús-Pedro Lorente (2003) and Javier Gómez Martínez (2006) have paid much attention to Anglo-Saxon and North American situations. These countries have opted for art museums as museums of the future. Spanish museologists believe that there is no point in arguing about who initiated the museological renovation, nor in asking for explanations for the contradictions that can occur in practical applications within museums. On the contrary, these authors are convinced that all initiatives that arise should be accepted and that every effort should be made to ensure that museological knowledge reaches the whole of society. Without a doubt, Spanish museology has tried to find its way and intends to face the challenges of the 21st century.

Today, we can see how Spanish researchers and museologists devote their time and effort to promoting museological research, whether it be the

© 2021 Global Journals

study of the history of museological documentation (Marín 1999), new museology (Alonso 1999), the history of museology (Lorente 2012), cultural and historical heritage (Hernández 2002; VV. AA. 2010), house museums and intangible heritage (Pérez Mateo, 2014), museology courses (Zubiaur 2005), heritage didactics (Calaf 2009) or heritage education (Fontal, 2003), among many others. They do so as a way of enriching knowledge of the human and cultural reality of our society, following in the wake of the teachings of ICOFOM and Stránský. Additionally, they have extended the study of museology to the study of heritage to show that not only can museums preserve material testimonies, but other institutions can also do so. Some authors, when dealing with the theoretical framework of museology, have tried to approach it from the point of view of the close relationship that exists between museums and the heritage. Thus, they highlight the need to approach museology from the perspective of cultural heritage, given that a museum's main objective is to preserve heritage and pass it on to future generations. It is a question of managing museum practices differently, giving them a new meaning more in line with the demands of the new times in which we live. Specifically, in the Master's in Education and Museums: Heritage, Identity and Cultural Mediation, taught at the University of Murcia during the 2011-2012 academic year, one of the activities related to the contents of Block 1 (Theme 1) on Introduction to Museology was precisely the debate of Zbynek Stránský versus Tomislav Sola.

The two authors differ in their approach to the study of museology and cannot agree. While Stránský (1980) considers museology as "an independent, specific scientific discipline whose object of study is the specific attitude of man to reality," Tomislav Sola (1982: 7) states that for him, it makes no difference whether the theory of museums is to be called museology or museography, as long as the content of the discipline is established. Hence, he uses the term *heritology* (patrimoniology) and asks why not call such a broad concept as museology, a discipline that is no longer centered on museums, by the names of "*heritology* and *mnemosophy*" (Sola 1997, 2015). He considers these terms to be the most appropriate to express the central concept of heritage in its full breadth, asserting that the concept implies the relationship between theory and practice without requiring the existence of science. Against the objections of Stránský, who defends museology as a science, Sola points out that his proposal, formulated as early as the 1980s, is an attempt to question the very existence of museology with the express desire to scandalize and encourage museologists to continue researching.

Sola himself (2015: 16-17) states that if he sets out to abandon the term museology, he considers it 'unproductive and confusing.' Moreover, the English, French, Germans and Americans all reject it because they think the term is linguistically inaccurate, and lacks relevance to the museum profession. However, he notes that since the birth of patrimoniology, many different terms have emerged - new museology, ecomuseology, economuseology, social museology, general heritage theory, etc. - reflecting the frustration that has been experienced with museology. This debate is mentioned here, but we cannot expand on it in this article.

Finally, the study of emerging museologies - interdisciplinary, critical, gender, dialogic and radical - is a task of great interest because it offers the possibility of applying new museographies to very different heritage realities. This proves that Spanish museology is in good health and has a promising future. Indeed, many museologists are committed to a serious, scientific, and critical study of museology to put it at the service of society. In the figure of Stránský and his scientific-philosophical thinking on museology, we find an example that shows us one of the many possible paths to follow.

References Références Referencias

1. ALONSO FERNÁNDEZ, Luis: *Introducción a la nueva museología*. Alianza Editorial, Madrid, 1999.
2. ASENSIO, Mikel; CASTRO, Yone; VILLAR, Cristina; CABRERA, Ana; POL, Elena (2012): Evaluación frontal de los públicos para el desarrollo de contenidos de realidad aumentada dentro del proyecto europeo de ARtSENSE. *Empoderar al Visitante: Proceso, Progreso, Protesta. Tunis 1-3 November . ICOFOM Study Series*, 2012, 41: 47-61.
3. AYUNTAMIENTO DE BARCELONA (1979): *Llibre Blanc dels Museus*, Delegació de Cultura de la Generalitat, Barcelona.
4. AYUNTAMIENTO DE BARCELONA (1981): Els *Museus de Catalunya. Aproximació a la seva problemática. Un exemple concret: els Museus de Penedes.* Delegació de Cultura de la Generalitat, Barcelona.
5. AYUNTAMIENTO DE BARCELONA (1984): Els *Museus de Catalunya*. *Criteris per a l´organizatciò del patrimonio museistic del país.* Delegació de Cultura de la Generalitat, Barcelona.
6. BALLBÉ, Xavier. Cultural Assets and the New Professional: The Experience of the Escola Europea in Barcelona. Symposium Museums, Space and Power. Athens-Thessaloniki, *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1993, 22: 125-126.
7. BELLIDO BLANCO, Antonio. La renovación museológica en España durante los años setenta, *Museo*, 10, 2005: 329-345.
8. CALAF, Roser. *Didáctica del Patrimonio: Epistemología, Metodología y Estudio de Casos*. Ediciones Trea, Gijón, 2009.
9. CARRILLO, Rosario. Methodologie Museologique et Formatión Professionele. Methodologie of

© 2021 Global Journals

Museologie and Professional Training. London 1983. ICOFOM Study Series, 1983, 3: 52-61.
10. CARRILLO DE SAN SEGUNDO, Rosario. Museology and its use or misuse in the world. Symposium Museology and Developing Countries - Help or Manipulation? Hyderabad-Varanasi-New Delhi. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1988, 14: 105-113.
11. CARTA DE CORO. *Museología, Filosofía e Identidad en América Latina y el Caribe.* VIII Encuentro Regional. ICOFOM LAM, Coro, Venezuela, 1999: 201-204.
12. DELOCHE, Bernard. *El museo virtual*. Trea, Gijón, 2001.
13. DOLÁK, Jan.; VAVŘÍKOVÁ, Jana. *Muzeolog Z. Z. Stránský: Život a dílo*. Masarykova univerzita, Brno, 2006.
14. FONTAL, Olaia. *La Educación Patrimonial: Teoría y Práctica en el Aula, el Museo e Internet*. Ediciones Trea, Gijón, 2003.
15. FONTAL MERILLAS, Olaia y MARÍAN CEPEDA, Sofía. Educación Y Patrimonio en España: La Educación Patrimonial orientada a la Inclusión Social. New Trends in Museology. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 2015, 43 b: 337-351.
16. FORRELLAD I DOMÈNECH, Dolors. Current acquisition policy and its appropriateness for tomorrow needs. Symposium Collecting Today for Tomorrow. Leiden *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1984, 6: 122-127.
17. FORRELLAD I DOMÈNECH, Dolors. Commentaires: les auteurs à propos des auteurs. Symposium Collecting Today for Tomorrow. Leiden *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1984, 7: 26-28.
18. FORRELLAD I DOMÈNECH, Dolors. The implications for the work of museums. Symposium Originals and Substitutes in Museums. Zagreb. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1985, 8: 168-175.
19. FORRELLAD I DOMÈNECH, Dolors. Basic papers. Society-museology-museums: Development trends Symposium, Museology and Museums Helsinki-Espoo. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1987, 12: 105-107.
20. GARCÍA CEBALLOS, Silvia. Un proyecto de arte contemporáneo con personas mayores. New Trends in Museology. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 2015, 43 b: 352-363.
21. GÓMEZ MARTÍNEZ, Javier. *Dos Museologías. Las Tradiciones Anglosajona y Mediterránea: diferencias y contacto*s. Trea, Gijón, 2006.
22. HERNÁNDEZ HERNÁNDEZ, Francisca. El patrimonio cultural: la memoria recuperada. Trea, Gijón, 2002.
23. HERNÁNDEZ HERNÁNDEZ, Francisca. *Planteamientos teóricos de la museología*. Trea, Gijón, 2006.
24. HERNÁNDEZ HERNÁNDEZ, Francisca. The museological discourse and critical interpretation of History. Museology – A field of Knowlwdge. Museology and History. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 2006, 35: 306-312.
25. HERNÁNDEZ HERNÁNDEZ, Francisca. Documentary Sources of Museology: Reflections and Perspectives. Museology exploring the concept of MLA (Museums-Libraries-Archives). *ICOFOM Study Series*, 2016, 44: 81-94.
26. HERNÁNDEZ, Francisca y LORENTE, Jesús Pedro (2016): Zbyněk Zbyslav Stránský and Spanish Museology. *Museologica Brunensia*, 05, 02: 37-43.
27. LORENTE, Jesús-Pedro (dir.). *Museología crítica y Arte contemporáneo*. Prensas Universitarias de Zaragoza, Zaragoza, 2003.
28. LORENTE, Pedro Jesús. Los estudios de Museología en las universidades españolas. *Revista de Museología*, 2010, nº. 47: 72-80. Madrid.
29. LORENTE, Jesús Pedro. *Manual de historia de la Museología*, Gijón, Trea, 2012.
30. LORENTE, Pedro Jesús. De la nouvelle muséologie à la muséologie critique: une revendication des discours interrogatifs, pluriels et subjectifs. *Nouvelles tendances de la muséologie* (F. Mairesse, edit.), 2016, La documentation Française, Paris: 55-66.
31. MARÍN TORRES, María Teresa. *Historia de la documentación museológica: La gestión de la memoria artística.* Trea, Gijón, 2002.
32. MIQUEL I SERRA, Domènec.; MORRAL I ROMEU, Eulalia. From pluridisciplinarity to interdisciplinarity: the experience of the local museums in Catalonia. Interdisciplinarity in museology. *Museological Working Papers (MuWoP),* nº 2, 1981: 43-45.
33. MIQUEL I SERRA, Domènec; GARCÍA, Andrea; MORRAL I ROMEU, Eulalia. Objects de musée: Criteres de Selection. Quelques reflexions. Symposium Collecting Today for Tomorrow. Leiden. *ICOFOM Study Series,* 1984, 7: 5-10.
34. MIQUEL I SERRA, D.; MORRAL I ROMEU, Eulalia. Typology of substitutes. Symposium Originals and Museums. Zagreb, *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1985, 3: 127-133.
35. MIQUEL I SERRA, Domènec; MORRAL I ROMEU, Eulalia. Contributions to the colloquium on Identity. Symposium Museology and Identity. Buenos Aires. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1986, 10: 211-218.
36. MIQUEL I SERRA, Domènec; MORRAL I ROMEU, Eulalia. Comments and views on basic papers presented in ISS nº 10. Symposium Museology and Identity. Comments and Views. Buenos Aires. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1986, 11: 41-43.
37. MIQUEL I SERRA, Domènec; MORRAL I ROMEU, Eulalia. Contributions to the symposium. Symposium Museology and Museums. Helsinki-Espoo, *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1987, 12: 211-218.
38. MIQUEL I SERRA, Domènec; MORRAL I ROMEU, Eulalia, Comments and views on basic papers presented in ISS 12. Symposium Museology and

© 2021 Global Journals

Museums. Helsinki-Espoo. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1987, 13: 53-55.
39. MIQUEL I SERRA, Domènec. Contributions to the symposium. La Museologie et les Institutions Museales comme Agents Actifs de Changement. Symposium Forecasting –A Museological Tool? Museology and Futurology. Den Haag, 1989, *ICOFOM Study Series*, 16: 179-183.
40. MORRAL I ROMEU, Eulalia. The museum and development –inside and outside. Trends observed and forecasted. Symposium Museology and Museums. Helsinki-Espoo. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1987, 13: 133-135.
41. MORRAL I ROMEU, Eulalia. Muséologie, futur. Quelques réflexions héterodoxes. Symposium Forecasting –A Museological Tool? Museology and Futurology. Den Haag, 1989, *ICOFOM Study Series*, 16: 185-188.
42. NAVAJAS CORRAL, Óscar. L'actualité de la muséologie en Espagne et la definition du musée. *Définir le musées du XXIe siècle. Matériaux pour une discussion* (F. Mairesse, direct.). 2017, ICOFOM, Paris: 250-254.
43. PÉREZ LÓPEZ, Sara. El concepto de Interpatrimonios. Intercambio cultural como resumen de la inclusión social en el patrimonio para el colectivo sordo. La configuración de espacios comunes entre culturas en los espacios museísticos. New Trends in Museology. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 2015, 43 b: 195-220.
44. PÉREZ MATEO, Soledad. *Las Casas Museo en España. Análisis de una Tipología Museística Singular.* Tesis. Departamento de Historia del Arte. Universidad de Murcia, 2016.
45. RODÁ, Concha. Stratégie digitale au musée: besoins, tendances, défis. New Trends in Museology. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 2015, 43 b: 398-404.
46. ROMANELLO, Gloria. Des Etudes de Publics pour Quoi Faire? L'utilisation des Outils de Connaissance des Publics dans la Gestion des Musées et Centres d'art Contemporain en Espagne et en France. New Trends in Museology. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 2015, 43 b: 221-240.
47. ROMANELLO, Gloria. #iononmilasciofregare, #Iwontgetscrewedover Cultural heritage: Time for street-art agents. The Predatory Museum. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 2017, 45: 143-145.
48. S/A (1994): Cursos Internacionales de Verano de Museología (ISSOM) en su Octava sección: Museología Especializada, que se celebrarán del 9 al 23 de septiembre de 1994 en la Universidad de Masaryk, Zerotinovo, Brno. *Boletín Informativo de la Revista de Patrimonio Histórico del Instituto Andaluz*, nº 7: 20.
49. SOFKA, Vinos. Proyecto de cátedra UNESCO: Sociedades en transición. *Museología y Patrimonio Intangible en América Laina y Caribe. ICOFOM LAM 2001. X Encuentro Regional del ICOFOM LAM*, 2002, Montevideo/Uruguay: 39-41.
50. ŠOLA, Tomislav. S. A Contribution to a Possible Definition of Museology. *System of Museology and Interdisciplinarity. ICOM-ICOFOM*, 20-23 October 1982. Museum of Decorative Arts, Paris: 1-8.
51. ŠOLA Tomislav S. *Essays on Museums and their Theory.* The Finnish Museums Association, Helsinki, 1997.
52. ŠOLA, Tomislav S. La définition du musée: étendue et motifs. *Vers une rédefinition du musée ?* (F. Mairesse, Desvallées, A, eds.), 2007, L´Harmattan, Paris: 113-120.
53. ŠOLA, Tomoslav S. *Mnemosophy. An Essay on The Science of Public Memory.* European Heritage Association, Zagreb, 2015.
54. STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museology- science or just practical museum work? *Museological Working Papers*, nº 1, 1980: 42-44.
55. STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museology as a science [a thesis]. *Museologia*, 1980, vol 11, nº 15: 33-40.
56. STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. The theory of systems and museology. Interdisciplinarity in museology. *Museological Working Papers* (MuWoP), nº 2, 1981: 70-73.
57. STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Museum-Territory-Society. Symposium Museum-Territory-Society. New Tendencies/New Practices. London. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1983, 2: 27-33.
58. STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Commentaires et points de vue sur les mémoires de base présentés dans l'ISS no 10. Buenos Aires. Symposium Museology and Identity. Comments and views. *Icofom Study Series*, 1986, 11: 49-53.
59. STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Breaking down the topic. What are the right questions? Symposium Museology and Museums. Helsinki-Espoo. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1987, 12: 287-292.
60. STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. Basic papers. Symposium Forecasting –A Museological Tool? Museology and Futurology. Den Haag. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1989, 16: 297-301.
61. STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. The Department of Museology, Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University of Brno and the Questions of Defining a Profile of the Museology Curriculum. *Symposium Museums, Space and Power.* Athens-Thessaloniki. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1993, 22: 127-131.
62. STRÁNSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Introduction to the Study of Museology, for the Students of the International Summer School of Museology.* ISSOM-Masaryk University, Brno, 1995.
63. STRANSKÝ, Zbyněk Z. *Archeologie a muzeologie* (Museología y Arqueología). Masarykova Univerzita, Brno, 2005.

© 2021 Global Journals

64. TERRADAS, J. A. Écologie, Environnement, Education. Le role des musées. Symposium Museum-Territory-Society. New Tendencies/New Practices. London. *ICOFOM Study Series*, 1983, 2: 8-14.
65. ROMANELLO, Gloria. #iononmilasciofregare, #Iwontgetscrewedover. Cultural heritage: Time for street-art agents. (Center for the Study of Culture, Politics and Society Faculty of Economy and Business, University of Barcelona). The Predatory Museum. ICOFOM Study Series, 2017, 45: 141-145.
66. VV.AA. *El Patrimonio Histórico. XX Cursos Monográficos. Reflexiones sobre la Nueva Museología 30 años después. Corrientes actuales de la Museología en España*. PUbliCAN Ediciones. Universidad de Cantabria, 2010.
67. VENTOSA MUÑOZ, Silvia. Museums Real or Virtual? Museology and Presentation: Original or Virtual? *ICOFOM Study Series*, 2002, 33 b. Cuenca / Ecuador and Galápagos Islands; Museums-Pädagogisches Zentrum: 32-33.
68. ZUBIAUR CARREÑO, Francisco J. *Curso de Museología*. Trea, Gijón, 2005.

© 2021 Global Journals