

Social Contexts for Conservation: Time, Distance, and Voice in Museums and Galleries

Miriam Clavir

Journal of the Canadian Association for Conservation (J. CAC), Volume 34
© Canadian Association for Conservation, 2009

This article: © Miriam Clavir, 2009.
Reproduced with the permission of Miriam Clavir.

J. CAC is a peer reviewed journal published annually by the Canadian Association for Conservation of Cultural Property (CAC); <http://www.cac-accr.ca/>.

The views expressed in this publication are those of the individual authors, and are not necessarily those of the editors or of CAC.

Journal de l'Association canadienne pour la conservation et la restauration (J. ACCR), Volume 34
© l'Association canadienne pour la conservation et la restauration, 2009

Cet article : © Miriam Clavir, 2009..
Reproduit avec la permission de Miriam Clavir.

Le *Journal de l'ACCR* est une revue arbitrée qui est publiée annuellement par l'Association canadienne pour la conservation et la restauration des biens culturels (ACCR); <http://www.cac-accr.ca/>.

Les opinions exprimées dans la présente publication sont celles des auteurs et ne reflètent pas nécessairement celles de la rédaction ou de l'ACCR.

Social Contexts for Conservation: Time, Distance, and Voice in Museums and Galleries

Miriam Clavir

Conservator Emerita and Research Fellow, UBC Museum of Anthropology, 6393 NW Marine Dr., Vancouver, British Columbia V6T 1Z2, Canada; Adjunct Lecturer, Graduate Program in Museology, University of Washington, Box 35-3010, Seattle, Washington 98195-3010, USA; clavir@interchange.ubc.ca

This paper explores developments in conservation influenced by social changes over the last fifty years, particularly by those changes occurring in conservation's art gallery and museum milieu. These shifts include evolving concepts of time, distance and voice in museum practice, illustrated here in relation to the contemporary museum's approach to research, access and exhibitions. These examples provide a reference point for discussing these concepts in relation to conservation. Comparisons are made with similar changes in perspective in the fields of history and, briefly, pain management in medicine. All these examples illustrate that the times conservators live in matter in their work, and not only in the sense of available technology, knowledge or materials.

Cet article explore les développements dans le domaine de la conservation-restauration dûs aux influences des changements sociaux qui ont eu lieu au cours des cinquante dernières années, et en particulier aux changements qui se sont produits dans le milieu muséal. L'évolution des concepts de temps, de distance et de la parole dans la pratique muséale compte parmi ces changements, et ceci est illustré dans cet article en relation avec l'approche des musées d'art contemporain sur la recherche, l'accès aux collections et les expositions. Ces exemples fournissent un point de référence pour une discussion de ces concepts par rapport au domaine de la conservation-restauration. Des comparaisons sont faites concernant des changements semblables de perspective dans le domaine de l'histoire et, plus brièvement, dans le domaine médical de la gestion de la douleur. Ces exemples démontrent comment le travail du restaurateur est marqué par son époque, et ce, non seulement du point de vue de l'accès aux nouveaux produits, nouvelles connaissances ou technologies.

Manuscript received April 2008; revised manuscript received October 2008

Introduction

Most conservation of material culture is practised in or for public collections, in particular those situated in museums, art galleries, archives and at historic sites. Collections are conserved with future generations in mind; they are preserved with minimum intervention for as long as possible, beyond the reach of the politics, trends and vagaries of the times the conservators work in. At least this is what we, as conservators following our codes of ethics, try to aim for, especially for collections owned or stewarded in the public interest. That we can conserve collections out of reach of society's trends is a belief, however, and beliefs are social constructs, as are codes of ethics. The discussion presented here will focus on several social trends in art galleries and museums in the last fifty years that have had an impact on conservation. The times conservators live in do influence our work, and not only in the sense of the use of available technologies, knowledge or materials.

First, however, this paper will examine another field, history, a discipline that is closely allied to artifacts and to collecting institutions. Changes in what historians over the years have considered 'history' show a strong parallel with changes in collecting institutions, and parallel developments in conservation. In fact, historians might reconfigure conservation as an historical discipline rather than separating the two fields. Conservation elucidates history by different means, and concentrates on history in two- and three-dimensional works rather than history in words.

The Field of History

What is history? Like museum objects, which fragments and facts out of complex cultural happenings are collected, deliberately chosen as important, and become recognized as history by virtue of their survival into a later time period?¹

Previously, history was usually written and studied as a chronology of great events involving renowned men. In the last half century, as readers know, Western society has experienced many value shifts, and one result is that the history of people who were left out of the traditional writing of history is now accepted as a legitimate subject of academic research: for example, women's history, the history of the poor and otherwise marginalized, and oral history unverified by documents.

The idea of who can make what is officially called 'history', then, has expanded, and not just by subject matter. A second development has been a change in voice. Traditionally, historians did their research, for example in archival documents, and most people accepted the result as an account of 'what happened in the past'. Historians brought a certain distanced objectivity to their work with primary sources, enhancing accuracy, in a verifiable manner, much the same as post-Enlightenment science.

As the subjects of historical research expanded, so did the documents used as evidence, and so did the voices in those documents; the writing of history began presenting these voices,

rather than historians imposing their own voice.² For example, research into why Jews left Germany between 1930 and 1939 grew from looking at Hitler's increasingly restrictive laws against Jews and the political events of that period, to historians looking at documents such as diaries and letters to find out what it was like *to be* a Jew in an increasingly Nazified Germany, to the historian being as much a facilitator as an interpreter, so that the voices of the Jewish women or men who wrote those diaries and letters became privileged. Later oral and written histories from post-war survivors added documentation. In other words, the traditional analytical distance of academic history writing became less prominent in favour of the subject's personal, intimate experience—the day-to-day happenings and feelings: history as it is being lived.

This shift in writing history is also situated in a larger social context. Annette Wieviorka, an historian, writes that the political activism of the 1960s was characterized by efforts to seize control of public discourse, and this phenomenon spread not only to academic and other institutions but to the media—radio and television—which increasingly sought out 'the man in the street'. She continues, "It was also in the 1970s that the ideology of human rights triumphed. Every society, every historical period came to be measured by the degree of respect it gave to human rights. The individual was thus placed at the heart of society and, retrospectively, of history."³

Today's historian still poses research questions, analyzes and draws conclusions, but the reader draws her or his own conclusions too from the first-hand evidence presented. History is seen as a multi-layered stratigraphy and a multi-vocal construct.

Museums and Art Galleries

The Modernist Museum and Gallery

What are the parallels between developments in the field of history and developments in public museums? The traditional museum (as ICOM defines it, in the broad sense that includes galleries, historic sites and more) had a mandate to educate, collect, and preserve.⁴ Museum curators are experts in particular types of collections the way historians are specialists in certain time periods or subjects. Museums often present their exhibits from the anonymous curatorial point of view, equivalent to the analytical, distanced view of traditional historians. For example, a label that reads "This Ming dynasty porcelain vase was used for . . ." is not unlike the statement "The United States entered World War II because . . ."

Objects in museums, like government documents in an archive used by historians, are valued as evidence, as facts, the material witnesses to the truth of the times and places they were created and used in. Conservation came of age in these modernist, object-centred museums.

Art galleries and museums may differ in the values they emphasize pertaining to their collections. As the art historian and

curator Ruth Phillips has discussed, art galleries have traditionally privileged the aesthetics of the works shown, as well as the concept of the masterpiece—the rare, the extraordinary.⁵ The modern gallery purposefully creates a space with minimal labels, plain walls, good lighting, and room around each display so that visitors can appreciate the formal visual qualities of the work of art without distraction. The art gallery experience for some is almost spiritual—wonder, awe, a core sort of 'in the presence of greatness' feeling. In contrast, ethnographic and history museums have concentrated on making the viewer understand the cultural meaning of what they are looking at: it is intended to be a cognitive experience for the visitor as much as a visual one. Whether in a modernist museum or an art gallery, however, conservation of the collections remained a valued mandate, assuring responsible preservation and restoration of the pieces, and imaging the institution as a good steward of its public holdings.

Becoming the Contemporary Museum/Gallery

As Hilde Hein, a scholar at the Women's Studies Research Center at Brandeis University, has written, "Today, these 'collection-based' museums are challenged by advocates of a new approach. . . . The museum's collection . . . becomes but one of a number of resources to be deployed in carrying out the museum's primary objective, now characterized as public service."⁶

By the 1980s, and certainly in the 1990s, the educational mandate of the public museum was enlarged by—some would say replaced by—the desire to provide an entertaining experience for the visitor. For example, one method for achieving this has been the use of sophisticated technologies and interactive displays. Also in this time period, marketing, not the collections themselves, became a key feature behind the success or failure of museum exhibits and programs. A primary purpose of the exhibit or event was indeed the presentation of interesting collections and their information, but what would constitute a 'good exhibit' was that (a) visitors were attracted and came to the museum, preferably at times when they had to pay, and (b) the visitors enjoyed themselves. In this time period, also an era of budget cutbacks to the cultural sector, many museums cut curatorial academic research, favouring using their budgets for public information and eye-catching programs. In Canada at least, jobs in conservation were cut as well.

In addition to changes in museum public outreach, the 1980s and 1990s saw the traditional museum functions of collecting and classifying also being challenged by strong requests for repatriation and for indigenous cultural values to be respected. The result was that curatorial voice and authority began to be shared with people from the collections' originating communities and others who are now termed the museum's stakeholders. Many areas of museum practice felt the effects of this reconceptualization of power and authority in the museum (implemented, however, to greater and lesser extents). For instance, Aboriginal people have become not merely informants for exhibit content, but partners in the whole exhibit development

process from the start, including negotiated rights to copyright of information coming from their participation. Indigenous groups are not the only community stakeholders; the ‘new museology’ that began in the 1960s and the ‘ecomuseum’ involved “community participation in all aspects of museum operations.”⁷ Much like history writing presenting the voices of those who ‘lived the history’, many curators now act as facilitators for the presentation of first-hand perspectives and voices from the communities whose cultural history or contemporary realities are the focus of the exhibits, through extensive collaboration, mutual protocol agreements, and the use of direct quotations for the exhibit labels.

Community involvement can be seen today in how ‘time’ as well as ‘voice’ is presented. The pervasive grammatical tense that was used in many anthropology museum exhibit labels, the so-called ‘ethnographic’ present—for example, “Baskets are made of twined spruce root”—has begun to be replaced by labels reflecting the passage of time, including right up to today. For example, a contemporary label in a basketry exhibit might now say, “My grandmother told me how she used to go out and dig spruce roots” or “I go out with my grandmother who shows me how to dig.”

Another effect of community involvement concerns the dimension of ‘distance’, a concept first discussed in the field of history by the historian Mark Phillips.⁸ Museum labels have begun to reflect more understanding of contemporary reality. For example, in 1999 the Horniman Museum in S.E. London, England, redid their gallery on Africa, installing *African Worlds*.⁵ The exhibit relies at one level on curatorial knowledge and interpretation, but it highlights knowledge and interpretation from outside the museum. The statements used on labels come not only from the traditional ethnographic source of people in the communities that originated the objects, but also from people of African and Caribbean descent living in London and in the greater African diaspora, “even though some [of these statements] criticize or express sadness about museum treatment and ownership of African objects.”⁹

To summarize, the dimensions of time, voice, and distance have been changed in museum presentations, as they have in contemporary historicity. ‘Distance’ carries a metaphorical as well as a dimensional linear implication. At the Horniman, Africa is no longer represented as a place far away from England. Put another way, this ethnographic museum no longer presents what has often been called ‘the Other’. Instead, since today we live in a much more globalized and mobile world—‘the Other’ is recognized as being here, as being us, our society, our world. It is the same society, the public, for whom we are preserving objects, as it says in the conservation codes of ethics. *African Worlds* highlights what a part of their African cultural heritage means to people living in the same neighbourhood as the English public museum interpreting that heritage, as well as what it means for them to have their material culture inside a museum. The ‘New Museology’⁷ and the contemporary ‘Appropriate Museology’¹⁰ and ‘Tactical Museology’¹¹ stress a participatory, community-based, bottom-up approach rather than the

conventional top-down museum model. Again, this approach is similar to history’s inclusion of people previously marginalized from that discipline, and in their voices that historians now highlight.

People and collaborative relationships, not objects, are the focus of today’s museums, especially ethnographic museums and contemporary art galleries. Where does this leave conservation?

Conservation

Conservation became a profession in the era of the traditional modernist museum with its mandate to collect, preserve and educate. Both the ethnographic museum and the modernist art gallery are object-centred, as conservation is. Both these models can be said to essentialize the object: what is important, whether it is emotional or cognitive, is contained in or can be appreciated via the object. Conservators often speak on behalf of objects, similar to historians and curators writing about what happened in history or what a Ming vase was used for. Like historians and curators, conservators have specialized knowledge, and over the course of the last fifty years the conservation profession has become the acknowledged source for expertise about how to preserve collections. Many conservation decisions are based on science, as historians’ modus operandi were based on documentary evidence; both good science and good archives represented unimpeachable evidence. This is not to say that museums, galleries, and history writing have not represented bias. Ideological purposes, for example, either deliberate or underlying, have often been served by history writing and museum institutions. Having original physical evidence from the past, though, meant that interpretations of it could subsequently be reconsidered. In addition, it was only when evidence and voices previously ignored were admitted into discipline boundaries—women’s writings into traditional history, for example, or native peoples’ views on preservation into the conservation field—that we professionals began to consider points of view often in conflict with our own, as having merit within our discipline.

Understandably, conservation is still very comfortable being part of an object-centred museum perspective, but with post-modern perspectives, ‘objecthood’ is acknowledged as having equally valid multi-vocal meanings. The example of an ancient flint point, now broken, provides an illustration. An archaeologist values the point as evidence of big game hunting or a trade route. An art historian theorizes about aesthetics 12,000 years ago. A conservator’s key interest might be identifying how the pieces correctly line up together and which adhesive is appropriate for repair, or if DNA evidence is present on the point that might be removed by cleaning. An Aboriginal viewpoint might focus on identity, the flint point found in their territory as support for land claims.¹²

This example is intended to represent more than simply differing viewpoints; that would imply knowledge-based interests only, such as a cognitive, scientific use of the object to provide the date of a site. But one artifact can carry many dimensions of

meaning. To continue the example, the deep meaning of the flint for the Aboriginal person might also be tied to an emotional sense of connection to this part of her or his tradition. Perhaps the legal, ideological attribute of the object as evidence of a land claim will be the deeply felt significant dimension. Perhaps the person is an artist and the artistic or formal qualities of the piece—shape, colour, tactile qualities, for instance—will influence the artist’s own work.

These dimensions of meaning that the object holds are of course addressed very well by “preserving physical, conceptual, historical and aesthetic considerations.”¹³ It is the subtle difference in outlook that is emphasized here. How can conservators include in their decision-making process a deeply-held ideological dimension, for example, or the emotional meaning, without shifting then from the object to the people? In other words, how can conservators really appreciate, value, and give weight to the emotional aspect, for example, that people are expressing about a particular object, without accepting the corollary that preservation would then become an action done for people rather than for the safeguard of objects?

Conservation, like the traditional writing of history, takes the distanced approach,⁸ but museum stakeholders such as Native Americans often present the proximal, closely personal perspective. Conservation’s base in science, on objective evidence, helps to distance it.¹⁴ Conservators’ study and treatment of collections is a distanced intellectual as well as a skilful exercise; for instance, the emotions people feel about certain objects do not usually come into conservation decision-making. Yet today, for museums, easily illustrated, for example, by repatriation requests, what people feel about objects from their heritage is central, as it is in the *African Worlds* exhibit. This author gave students a question on a conservation examination asking them to discuss whether musical instruments in a museum’s collection should be returned to a functioning state. A Yakama student, Miles R. Miller, talked about his tribe’s drums, ending with, “you know if you believe, whole heartedly believe, and listen carefully you will hear the gentle tones of these instruments, the soft beat of their music, waking the foods that are so important to my people.”¹⁵ This is a proximal, intimate view, not at all a teacher’s distanced, analytical one concerned with the potential for the deterioration of restrained rawhide. Museum exhibits and programs, and the collaborative way museums and communities are going about them today, highlight the ‘near’; does it matter that conservation and its codes of ethics have been traditionally based in the ‘far’, an older outlook that is less favoured now in the milieu in which we work?¹⁶

Concerning the proximal, the intimate meanings, conservators today respect the importance of preserving intangible as well as tangible heritage. Nonetheless, our specialty lies with the objects. In preserving intangible attributes, we generally leave them alone, fulfilling another contemporary conservation principle, minimal intervention—because they are often not for us to preserve. As Gloria Cramner Webster, a ‘N̄amgis (Kwakwaka’wakw) Elder and Director Emeritus of the U’Mista Cultural Centre in British Columbia said, “your job is to

preserve those things. Our [‘N̄amgis] job is to preserve the culture those things have meaning in.”^{17,18} Many conservators, including the author, agree with Cramner Webster’s comment concerning cultural preservation, in particular where sacred or culturally sensitive pieces are concerned. At the same time, for conservators preserving “those things”, intangible qualities and social context can influence technical conservation decisions and treatments beyond the decision for minimum intervention.¹⁹

When museums began to shift away from collections being central to their mandate and began to compete with the entertainment industry—what Hilde Hein describes as museums finding more efficient and appealing ways of achieving a desired effect⁶—and when museums acknowledged that their stakeholders may or may not buy into museum methods of preservation—conservation certainly felt the impact. Conservation had to either work harder to sell the idea that preserving material heritage is important and if not done the losses are irreversible, or conservation could shift some of its own beliefs. In fact conservation did both. In many countries conservators made great efforts to promote public awareness of conservation and made excellent information on care and preservation available, especially on the internet. At the same time the profession internally examined some of its basic beliefs and knowledge, arriving at new parameters for relative humidity guidelines, for example, and introducing into our field concepts such as risk management that provided, for instance, a new way of conceptualizing standards of care for collections. Conservation became a profession dedicated to “managing change,”²⁰ a different way of considering “preserving for the future.” For example, Sarah Saniforth,²⁰ a conservator and the Historic Properties Director at the National Trust in the U.K., compares the older with the present Act governing the National Trust. The 1907 Act describes the National Trust as “promoting the permanent preservation for the benefit of the nation”; today its conservation purpose is described as “the careful management of change.” This description acknowledges the National Trust’s mandate to make cultural property available to the public, and the resultant damage and deterioration that occur in situations and environments which might not represent conservation’s first-choice decisions for physical preservation.

When formal conservation training in Canada began in the 1970s, basically it was centred on preserving objects. Today conservators are preserving the meaning of those objects, their cultural significance. This is not quite the same as preserving “physical, conceptual, historical and aesthetic considerations.”¹³ Preserving cultural significance is harder, because “respect for the integrity of the property”¹³ focuses on the object, but cultural significance focuses on the people.

Many conservators have worked with collections’ stakeholders: with contemporary artists, for example, or organizing conservation projects in response to community requests. What is being asked here is: should conservation go further? Do conservators consider as equally valid the deep, proximal meanings—emotional or ideological, for example—as we do scientific and intellectual knowledge? Does the teacher

give Miles Miller's answer on his examination the same full marks as an excellent discussion of the properties of rawhide? Do we look at a museum's need to use objects in a public program as a compromise or a necessity? Is conservation by its very nature 'distanced', and if so, is this problematic if the milieu in which we work is changing?

Conclusion

This discussion began with a brief examination of the discipline of history and went on to illustrate how changes in the last half-century in history writing parallel changes in museum priorities and perspectives. Conservation has been affected by these changes, although it is in the rather difficult position of being a discipline centred on preserving the physical aspects of cultural materials in a setting increasingly placing value on their cultural aspects. In its recent history, however, conservation has expanded its expertise to emphasize the significance of the whole phrase 'material culture'. The conservation literature now includes excellent examples of collaboration and community involvement in preservation. Conservators whose practice includes such partnerships are similar to colleagues in today's art galleries, museums and academic disciplines such as history, who see their role as being partners with people who originated the collections or the archives of primary evidence. While contemporary artists have always been included, many other 'originators' were marginalized, and it is these whose voices are now being acknowledged in conservation decision-making. Conservation is challenged by and responding to today's post-colonial, globalized world, where multiple perspectives on cultural significance are increasingly recognized.

Medicine provides another example of changes in a western profession that are analogous to changes in conservation. The medical model is one which conservators have embraced, at least symbolically, for decades—doctors in our white coats treating inanimate (for our profession) patients with physical problems. Conservation is no longer a simple 'treat the disease' analogy, however; instead, it resembles the model used in the medical speciality of the treatment of pain. Contemporary pain management is as much about restoring quality of life to the patient as it is about addressing the physical source of the pain.²¹

On-going changes in museums affecting the conservation profession have occurred in the dimensions of time, distance and voice. All these dimensions come together to situate much museum work (not just the work of contemporary art galleries) in the realities of the present, not only the past for which museums have been stereotyped. Conservation today acknowledges cultural and intangible factors that increase the 'quality of life' for our 'patients' and also the 'patient's family', all those who have an interest—and these may be diverging interests—in the well-being of the objects and works of art we treat.

No formal conclusion presents itself here, if one wishes an outcome to an argument, or the solution to the questions raised. There is also no conclusion to this discussion in the sense that

museums, conservation, and societies will continue to change. This paper is, then, in Alberto Manguel's words, "less an argument than a string of observations."²²

If this article is intended to be of some use to conservation, however, is the above paragraph not simply an excuse for avoiding difficult further thought? Are there no prescriptions the author can offer towards a new practice for conservation?

Well, actually, no. Trying to answer the above question reminds me of an old New Yorker cartoon. (Observant readers will notice the shift from the Journal's style to a proximal point of view.) The drawing showed a guru on a mountaintop, with a supplicant. The guru was saying something like, "I can't show you the meaning of life, but I can tell you how to get stains out of a cotton madras shirt." Now, that sounds like a conservator! If I gave guidelines for future practice in conservation (an appropriate conclusion to this article if I had found it possible), I would be denying the importance of the collaborative ways in which new practice develops. I believe the conclusions to this article will continually arise from the interactions between its readers and their work environments, rather than from what any one person might recommend.

I also have difficulty drawing prescriptive conclusions from my past experience. I am aware how much my own research has been influenced by one particular institution where I worked and the vision and practice of its directors, its institutional culture, a university setting, a type of collection, various colleagues, and the relationship of that museum with many communities, both indigenous and otherwise. All of these are different in each reader's situation. It would be presumptuous to predict what is most appropriate for another setting, especially since it is not just a question of offering knowledge or practice but for the end result to work successfully for all parties concerned. In addition, I have heard parallel observations in meetings with representatives of Aboriginal communities, who have emphasized that each community has its own needs; there is no template.

What there is, though, now and in the future, is the opportunity to listen to what people say. To do this without already having a template of your own educated suggestions or solutions at the back of your mind is difficult, no matter who the conversation is with, including colleagues, friends, even family. My discussion is also open-ended because I am using it as a metaphor for an open mind.²³

This paper may have presented unfamiliar territory to some conservators. Questions such as 'what exactly is the new museology?' are perhaps best answered not by a few lines in this article but by bringing a curatorial colleague or a museology student into your conservation area for discussions. Theoretical issues underlying the enterprise that is the museum, such as 'why do people collect?', 'what is authenticity?', 'objects and memory', give perspectives on the objects we treat, but if a conservation workshop were to be organized on these topics, would conservators consider it relevant? Only you can answer.

The passion in my conservation practice has focused on the meaning of preservation rather than on treatments. I am grateful to work in a field that includes so many sub-disciplines and specialties, both in knowledge and skills. It is up to you, however, to decide if and how the kinds of subjects I have found illuminating in my own practice, many of them external to but offering reflections on conservation, are of use to you. I have had wonderful opportunities to have my say, but it is you and your collaborators who will move conservation forward.

Notes and References

1. I am profoundly indebted to Prof. Mark Salber Phillips, Department of History, Carleton University, for ideas relating to the discipline of history. Any errors and all the simplifications in the information presented here are, however, entirely my own. See also Phillips, Mark Salber, "On the Advantage and Disadvantage of Sentimental History for Life," *History Workshop Journal*, vol. 65 no.1, Oxford University Press, Spring 2008, pp. 49-64.
2. Burke, Peter, ed., *New Perspectives on Historical Writing*, 2nd edition, (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001), 316 p.
3. Wieviorka, Annette, *The Era of the Witness*, (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2006), p. 97.
4. "A museum is a non-profit making, permanent institution in the service of society and of its development, and open to the public, which acquires, conserves, researches, communicates and exhibits, for purposes of study, education and enjoyment, material evidence of people and their environment." From the International Council of Museum (ICOM)'s Statutes. Available online at: <<http://icom.museum/statutes.html#2>>. The definition has evolved over the years. See: *Development of the Museum Definition according to ICOM Statutes (1946 - 2001)* at: <http://icom.museum/hist_def_eng.html>. Accessed September 2008. See as well: ICOM News Thematic Files: The Definition of the Museum, ICOM News, vol. 57, 2004 n°2; also available online at: <http://icom.museum/definition_museum.html>. Accessed September 2008.
5. This analysis of modernist art galleries and of the *African Worlds* exhibit is drawn from: Phillips, Ruth B., "Exhibiting Africa after Modernism: Globalization, Pluralism and Persistent Paradigms of Art and Artifact," in: *Museums after Modernism: Strategies of Engagement*, Pollock, Griselda and Joyce Zemans (eds.), (Boston: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2007), pp. 80-103.
6. Hein, Hilde S., "The Authority of Objects: from Regime Change to Paradigm Shift," *Curator* 50/1, January 2007, p. 78.
7. Kreps, Christina F., "Appropriate Museology in Theory and Practice," *Museum Management and Curatorship*, vol. 23, no. 1, Jan. 2008, p. 28. See also: De Varine, Hugues, "The Museum as a Social Agent of Development", *ICOM News*, no. 1 (2008), p. 5, available at: <http://icom.museum/pdf/E_news2008/p4-5_2008-1.pdf>. Accessed September 2008. In this reference, Hugues de Varine, former Director of ICOM (1965-1974), describes "new museology" in the following manner: "A new concept on the involvement of museums in regional development emerged in the 1970s (Santiago 1972, Le Creusot-Montceau 1975-1980). The 1980s saw the appearance of initiatives resulting from this movement, henceforth known as "the new museology", in Canada (Haute Beauce, Fier Monde), Sweden (Bergslagen), Norway (Toten), and Portugal (Seixal). In the 1990s, this new museology was universally adopted and the terms eco-museum or community museum coined to distinguish these "heretical" or, quite simply "heterodox" museums from the traditional institutions."
8. For the original conceptual discussions of Historical Distance, see: Phillips, Mark Salber, "Relocating Inwardness: Historical Distance and the Transition from Enlightenment to Romantic Historiography," *Publications of the Modern Languages Association* vol. 118, 2003, pp. 436-49.
9. Phillips, Ruth B., *op. cit.* (see reference 5), p. 92.
10. Kreps, *op. cit.* (see reference 7), pp. 23-41. Kreps defines "Appropriate Museology" as "an effort to refashion professional museum practices and technologies to better fit local cultural contexts and socioeconomic conditions." (p. 23).
11. Buntinx, Gustavo and Ivan Karp, "Tactical Museologies," in: *Museum Frictions: Public Cultures/ Global Transformations*, edited by Ivan Karp, Corinne A. Kratz, Lynn Szwaja and Tomás Ybarra-Frausto, (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2006), pp. 207-218. According to Gustavo Buntinx, "Tactical Museologies ... refers to processes whereby the museum idea is utilized, invoked and even contested in the process of community formation." (p. 208).
12. Phillips, Mark Salber, "Distance and Historical Representation," *History Workshop Journal*, vol. 57, 2004, pp. 123- 41.
13. Canadian Association for the Conservation of Cultural Property (CAC) and the Canadian Association of Professional Conservators (CAPC), "Principle II, Code of Ethics," *Code of Ethics and Guidance for Practice*, Third Edition, 2000, p. 1. The Code of Ethics is available for download on the CAC website: <<http://www.cac-accr.ca/english/e-CAC-publications.asp>>. Accessed September 2008.

14. Conservation's base in science can be seen both in its history and today in the vast majority of papers published in conservation journals, accepted as Master of Art Conservation theses, and presented at conservation conferences. For brief discussions of conservation's historical base in science see, among others: Introductory chapters in: Munoz-Vinas, Salvador, *Contemporary Theory of Conservation*, (Oxford: Elsevier, 2005), 239 p. Clavir, Miriam, *Preserving What is Valued: Museums, Conservation and First Nations*, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2002), 295 p. Clavir, M., "The Social and Historic Construction of Professional Values in Conservation", *Studies in Conservation*, vol. 43, 1998, pp. 1-8; and in various articles by Keyser, Barbara, Debra Hartin and Marion Barclay, in: *Shared Responsibility*, Proceedings of a Seminar for Curators and Conservators, National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa, Canada, 26-28 October 1989, edited by Barbara A. Ramsay-Jolicoeur and Ian N. W. Wainwright, (Ottawa: National Gallery of Canada, 1990), 185 p.
15. Miller, Miles R., personal communications, April and December 2007.
16. For an example of conservation training in collaboration, see: Pearlstein, Ellen, "Collaborative Conservation Education: The UCLA/Getty Program and the Agua Caliente Cultural Museum," in: *Preserving Aboriginal Heritage: Technical and Traditional Approaches*, edited by Carole Dignard, Kate Helwig, Janet Mason, Kathy Nanowin and Thomas Stone, (Ottawa, Ontario, Canada: Canadian Conservation Institute, 2008), pp. 305-310.
17. Cramner Webster, Gloria, as quoted in Clavir, Miriam, *Preserving What is Valued: Museums, Conservation and First Nations*, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2002), p. 161.
18. In another role concerning the preservation of intangible heritage, conservators also advise on the longest-lasting media to record intangible heritage such as songs, dances, and oral histories. See: Grattan, David, "The Challenge of the Preservation of Intangible Heritage: The Importance of Electronic Media," International Council of Museums (ICOM) 20th General Conference, Seoul, Korea, October 2-8, 2004, or: Grattan, David and John Moses, "Intangible Heritage: Museums and Preservation," in: *Preservation Management for Libraries, Archives and Museums*, edited by G. E. Gorman and Sydney J. Shep, (London: Facet Publishing, 2006) pp. 42-53.
19. See, for example: Brooks, Mary M. and Dinah Eastop, "Matter Out of Place: Paradigms for Analyzing Textile Cleaning," *J. AIC*, Fall-Winter 2006, vol. 45 no.3, pp. 171-181; David Saunders, Joyce Townsend and Sally Woodcock, (eds.), *The Object in Context: Crossing Conservation Boundaries: Contributions to the Munich Congress*, International Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works, (London: IIC, 2006), 345 p.
20. Staniforth, Sarah, "Conservation: Principles, Practices and Ethics," *The National Trust Manual of Housekeeping: The Care of Collections in Historic Houses Open to the Public*, (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2006), p. 35.
21. Jackson, Marni, "The Problem of Pain," *University of Toronto Magazine*, vol. 34, no. 3, Spring 2007, p. 25.
22. Manguel, Alberto, *The City of Words*, CBC Massey Lecture Series, House of Anansi, Toronto, 2007, p. 3.
23. "To give your sheep or cow a large, spacious meadow is the way to control him." Suzuki, Shunryu, *Zen Mind, Beginner's Mind*, (New York: Weatherhill, 1970), p. 32.