

The Museum, a Temple or the Forum¹

DUNCAN F. CAMERON, DIRECTOR

THE BROOKLYN MUSEUM

Our museums are in desperate need of psychotherapy. There is abundant evidence of an identity crisis in some of the major institutions, while others are in an advanced state of schizophrenia. These, of course, are relatively new museum ailments, and we still have to live with the more traditional complaints—delusions of grandeur on the one hand and psychotic withdrawal on the other—but the crisis at the moment, put in the simplest possible terms, is that our museums and art galleries seem not to know who or what they are. Our institutions are unable to resolve their problems of role definition.

Having made a statement as damning as that, one is obliged to provide some evidence. Here, in a more or less random way, are a few anecdotes and examples offered in the hope that the gestalt of these will justify the psychiatric diagnosis.

In Toronto the provincial government spent somewhere between thirty-five and fifty million dollars building and putting into operation the Ontario Science Centre. In its earliest days—from 1964 to 1966—this immense new institution was planned as a museum and was staffed by museum professionals with a variety of backgrounds. By the end of 1966, the government and some members of the board had decided that museums were somehow a bad thing. The word *museum* was unacceptable. A museum with collections and a research program, with a conservation laboratory and a research library—this kind of museum was of no real interest, in their view, to the modern public.

In the course of a few months, all but one of the staff members with any museum background had left. The planning and development of the institution switched to the design group, public service officials, and a staff borrowed from the provincial Department of Education. There was

¹ This article is derived from the 1971 University of Colorado Museum Lecture. It is prepared for *The Journal of World History* special number, "Museums, Society, Knowledge" (1972), reprinted with the permission of Unesco.

an absence of museum expertise and the Centre, as a matter of policy, was not to be a museum.

When the Science Centre opened to the public, with much fanfare, the brochure that was distributed carried this statement on the front cover:

“Make a list of everything you’ve been taught about public places, especially museums.

Things like

don’t touch anything

don’t get excited

don’t take pictures

don’t laugh out loud

Got your list? Good.

Now tear it up in little pieces and throw it away.”

The Ontario Science Centre is certainly not a museum, although it was originally planned as one. Today it contains a veritable chaos of science exhibits mixed with industrial and technological exhibits sponsored by corporations. There is an infinite number of buttons to push and cranks to turn. Interspersed among all of these are hot-dog stands and purveyors of soft ice cream in a claustrophobic maze of cacophonous noncommunication.

It is an “activity center,” as the government promised, but how did a plan for a great museum of science and technology turn into the most expensive funfare in the world?

The Art Gallery of Ontario, also in Toronto, never had any doubt about its role as a museum of art history and a place for exhibitions of modern art. It was an art gallery, plain and simple. In the last twenty years, the gallery had to make difficult decisions about the exhibitions of local artists’ societies. Perhaps the quality of the annual society shows was in question, but there was, quite rightfully, a concern with the maintenance of standards of excellence at the AGO. Then, during the 1960s, the problem of accommodating new contemporary forms, including happenings, electronic environments, and so forth, was faced by this gallery as it was by dozens of others. They did the best they could. Now, in the 1970s, there are plans for a greatly expanded art gallery building, and, at least in one stage of the planning, it was the intention to include large exhibition spaces, or environmental chambers, designed with maximum flexibility, wherein it was said that anything could be tried or made to happen.

The gallery had decided that it was no longer simply a place where proved works of excellence should be exhibited and interpreted to the public. Rather, it was also to be a place where the unknown and the experimental should be given a chance to happen, to become whatever it became, good or bad.

In Washington, D.C., in Anacostia (one of the great black ghettos of that city), there is a museum that has attracted international attention. The Anacostia Neighborhood Museum is sponsored by the Smithsonian Institution. It has an important program, which is defensible in every way. (Some readers may have seen the film about the rats exhibition. The purpose of that project was to examine the rat as an urban problem and especially a slum problem; to come to some understanding of the nature of the beast itself. Museum techniques were used, museum professionals were involved, but, most important of all, there was a remarkable degree of participation by members of the Anacostia community.) Here one must ask whether or not the name *museum* is appropriate to the operation of Anacostia. Is it not a community center serving an important and very necessary function in interpreting the immediate environment and the cultural heritage of that community by means of exhibition techniques but without permanent collections and curatorial functions? Is it not therefore a community exhibition center as distinct from a museum?

And what can be said of the new centers for contemporary art, of Sue Thurman's pioneering efforts in Boston or of Jan Vandermark's work in Chicago? In those instances, surely, the word *center* is more appropriate than the word *museum*. And if that is so, what of the Museum of Modern Art in New York? It is a center that became a great museum.

One can find many examples of the new science centers that hold no collections and do no original research but present a continuing program of science demonstration exhibits. There are many art history museums pushing back yesterday's heritage to make way for today's experiments. And then there are the growing numbers of cultural centers that strive to be all things to all men. Many of these include, somewhere in their complex and often frenetic programs, something called a museum.

Is a museum something that can be housed, with any degree of compatibility, side by side with ballet classes for three-year-olds, amateur arts programs of every variety, and the occasional bingo game benefit for a local charity?

There are institutions such as the Roberson Center for the Arts and Sciences in Binghamton, New York, that would say "yes" in answer to that question. The recent brochure from the Roberson says on the cover, "Roberson—the happening place—it is the center." And, on the back of the same handsomely designed piece, it says, "It is an art museum, a science museum, an historical museum, an arts council, an activity center for art, music, dance, drama—an educational center for all." There is little doubt that the Roberson is relevant, that it is serving its community well, and that the director and his staff are to be commended. But consider the question that is more significant than mere semantics: "Is there really a museum at the Roberson?"

Of course, none of these questions can be answered until it is decided what a museum is. Attempts to define a museum have been made for almost as long as there have been museums, yet there is no definition to my knowledge that meets with everyone's satisfaction. Another attempt is made here to provide a definition of a sort that may at least help to clarify the issue central to this discussion.

In order to approach the problem of definition, it is necessary to repeat some things that I have said elsewhere but which may not be familiar to the reader. The starting point is the idea of collecting as a universal behavior. It is argued that men, in all times and all places, have collected things and gathered objects around themselves and arranged them and rearranged them in an attempt to come to terms with the reality they perceived. It might be added that men also collect ideas and arrange them and rearrange them, collect words and sounds, have collections of stories and songs, and use these in a similar way. But, at the moment, the concern is with the collecting of objects.

The best evidence I can provide for this universal collecting behavior is not just the fact that collections and the arranging of collections of objects are recorded throughout history and are evidenced by archeological findings, but, more important, that this same behavior continues today on an intimate and individual basis. Here are examples that may strike chords in your own memories or recall earlier observations in a new light.

Consider what happens to a little boy or girl taken from the city into the country on a vacation for the first time. Does the child not bring into the house or the cottage or the hotel an unusual variety of objects that he has gathered from the new environment? Does he not bring in the dead toad and the mushroom and the colored leaves, as well as the pebbles, bits of driftwood, a dead fish, shells, and the jetsam of the seashore, depending upon where he may be? And, characteristically, will he not take these now prized possessions to a corner that he regards as his own (perhaps a window ledge or a table close by his bed)? And does he not arrange them and rearrange them as he examines and studies his new finds?

The child has been busy sampling a new environment, and with his sample he is attempting to structure a model that will help him to understand it. The importance of structuring a model is demonstrated by the child's reaction when a parent or brother or sister disturbs the child's arrangement of his collection. Mother, perhaps, while tidying up takes the childish array and reorganizes it in a neat row along the window ledge. The child is distressed not because his objects, his prizes, have been damaged but because the meaningful relationships he was establishing among them have been destroyed.

Over a period of time, if a child were to remain in that environment

and it became familiar to him, he would collect in a somewhat different way. He would then be selecting objects from the environment that were significant or important in that environment—as he had come to understand it. Eventually, at a level of greater sophistication, he would select from the environment and enshrine in his collection those objects that best symbolized the operating values he employed in the environment or, alternately, the accepted values of the society in which he participated.

Isn't this a behavior common to us all in one way or another? Next time you have the opportunity, take a thoughtful look at the objects that are arranged in your own house or in your private room. Take a good look at an executive's desk with its collection of mementos and souvenirs and the so-called office equipment (much of which is not nearly as utilitarian as it first appears). These structured collections will tell you something about the way in which the collector perceives reality.

For a very dramatic demonstration of all of this, watch what happens in the private rooms of young people in their teens and even their early twenties. Their rooms very often appear to be in a state of constant chaos, upheaval, and unreasoned change from the viewpoint of the parent or the adult. In fact, what is happening there is that the young person, trying very hard to find his place in the scheme of things, is collecting, rejecting collections, building new collections, reorganizing them, establishing new relationships, and seeking a nonverbal reality model that will express his dreams and aspirations—the answer to his search for identity.

Another, and last, example of this untested hypothesis about the individual and collecting is that of the houses or rooms inhabited by the aged. In our time, especially, it is very difficult for those who have now lived the better part of their lives to accept the virtually revolutionary changes that continue to take place in society. Thus, in their rooms, we find extensive collections of memorabilia and souvenirs, photographs and keepsakes; they have structured them in their attempt to maintain belief in a reality they once perceived but which is, in fact, long passed. It becomes clear, then, that the collection as a reality model serves the collector first and may aid or deter not only the objective perceptions of the collector but also the perceptions of the visitor.

Until a century ago, or at most two centuries ago, collections were private collections, and public museums did not exist in any contemporary sense. These collections were autistic in that they reflected, in virtually all cases, some individual's private perception of reality and self-image. The collections may have said, "Look how curious I am and how meticulous and how thorough. Here is my scientific collection, which reaffirms my belief in the order of the universe and the laws of nature." The collection may have said, "See how rich I am," or, "Look at this. Look at how I surround myself with beautiful things. See what good taste I have, how

civilized and cultivated I am.” It may have said, “Oh! I am a man of the world who has traveled much. Look at all the places I have been. Look at all the mysterious things I have brought back from my adventures. Yes! I am an adventurer.” And if you or I were invited to view one of these collections, it presented no serious problem. We weren’t being told that this was *our* collection nor that *we* had to accept the collector’s view of the world or of himself. We simply saw his collection and through it, perhaps, saw him more clearly.

Noting the exceptions, it can be said that it was but a century or a little more ago that we began, in western society, to create public museums. In large part, these public museums were private collections opened to the public, and, as long as that was made quite clear, there was, as mentioned earlier, no real problem. The trouble began with the introduction of a new idea: the democratic museum.

The idea was simple enough. It was to assemble collections of many different kinds and interpret them to the general public for the furtherance of its education, for its enlightenment, and for its recreation. In declaring these collections to be public in the sense of being publicly owned, however, it was no longer being said that this was someone else’s collection that you, the visitor, could look at. Rather, it was being said that this was *your* collection and therefore it should be meaningful to *you*, the visitor.

The public museum was now an institutionalization of the individual collecting behavior. Thus the public had a right to expect that the collections presented and interpreted would in some way be consistent with the values of its society and with its collective perceptions of the environment or, if you wish, of reality. Unfortunately, there were two principal problems in creating such public collections and, it is suggested, these are problems that have not yet been solved in the majority of museums and art galleries.

The first of these was that the collectors and those responsible for organizing and structuring the collections were now the members of an academic, curatorial elite; they were most familiar and most comfortable with the models that were specific to their academic disciplines. Thus the public collections were structured as models that could only be meaningful to those with an education in which they had been introduced to scientific systems of classification, to prevailing theories of history, or to the academic approach to art and art history. One might almost say that the private collectors had been replaced by an exclusive, private club of curators. The public was still being offered private collections but with a new name over the door.

The second and related problem was that the value systems that determined not only the selection of material but also the priorities for its

presentation tended to be the value systems of the middle class if not an upper-middle-class elite. This was, of course, most particularly true of museums of art.

We created great science museums that might be described as no more than three-dimensional textbooks. We created great art museums that reflected the heritage of bourgeois and aristocratic culture to the exclusion of popular or folk culture.

But, even given these faults or limitations, those segments of society with the power to do so at least created museums that were the temples within which they enshrined those things they held to be significant and valuable. The public generally accepted the idea that if it was in the museum, it was not only real but represented a standard of excellence. If the museum said that this and that was so, then that was a statement of truth. The museum, at least for a time, was the place where you could go to compare your own private perceptions of reality with the *soi-disant* objective view of reality that was accepted and approved in your society.

I suspect that it is for this reason that I have said from time to time that the museum, sociologically, is much closer in function to the church than it is to the school. The museum provides opportunity for reaffirmation of the faith; it is a place for private and intimate experience, although it is shared with many others; it is, in concept, the temple of the muses where today's personal experience of life can be viewed in the context of "The Works of God Through All the Ages; the Arts of Man Through All the Years."²

It might be inferred from this attempt at a definition that this paper is to be a conservative and reactionary defense of the traditional museum; it may be useful, at this point, to deny the implication. It *is* argued that the museum as a temple is valid and furthermore that such museums are essential in the life of any society that pretends to civilization. But there will also be an argument for museum reform. That will lead to the question not of reform but forums, which are something else again.

Reference here to the reform of museums does not mean plans to convert them into social clubs or funfairs but reform to make them better and more effective museums in the sense of the museum as a temple. The initial step will be to reestablish the museum's role or, if you wish, its social function. The museum must be steadfast in its insistence on proved excellence, on the highest possible degree of objectivity in selection, organization, and interpretation. There must be a willingness to admit to the things that are not known, are not understood, as well as to argue with confidence for those things that are held to be true and for those things that are the considered judgments of time, if there is to be credibility.

² Inscription at the entrance to the Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto, Canada.

The academic systems of classification, which constitute an undecipherable code for the majority of museum visitors, must either be replaced, or better, be supplemented by interpretation of the collections that is based on the probable experience and awareness of the museum audience. Those collections that are essentially representative of bourgeois and aristocratic cultures of the past must be put into the context of popular culture, folk art, and the life style of the peasant or working classes in the culture from which the collections are derived. Social history and the insights of the anthropologist must be used to develop techniques of interpretation that will put the collections, and especially the museum "treasures," in a more realistic perspective.

A very special task in reform for those museums concerned with alien, exotic, or historic cultures is to relate those collections to contemporary life and society. Most museum directors would be shocked if they knew how their visitors interpret oriental collections or collections from the classical world when they are presented in the traditional fashion. By failing to provide meaningful interpretation of the collections, museums are, by that omission, guilty of misrepresentation, distortion of fact, and the encouragement of attitudes toward cultures other than our own that are dangerous and destructive in what McLuhan has called today's "global village."

In effect, these museum reforms are part of social responsibility in cultural programming. They are necessary to the democratization of culture, or, to use an expression I prefer, to the creation of an *equality of cultural opportunity*.

These reforms, of which much more could be said, are in no way new suggestions, and they are certainly not original here. Such reforms of museums have been proposed for decades, and a great deal has been said and written about them since the end of World War II. Unfortunately, the majority of the great museums have yet to do very much about it. The time has come, however, when museums must institute these reforms or perish.

Some readers may have heard of the disruption of the meetings of the American Association of Museums in New York City in the spring of 1971. A protest group, composed principally of disenchanting artists in New York City, demanded admission to the meeting. When a representative group was admitted, they disrupted meetings, presented a manifesto, struggled for microphones on the platform, and refused to be silent. The majority of the American museum professionals present were not only shocked but greatly surprised by these developments. They did not expect to find protest against museums and art galleries. Having been in Paris and Brussels at museum meetings only a few months earlier, I was less surprised. The alliance of artists with the intellectuals and with the radical student movements of protest in Europe is a matter of record, and there I had heard

much discussion of the antimuseum protest movement.

The argument that there can be no progress in the arts, or in the democratization of the arts, until the Louvre is burned is a cliché in the West European radical art movement. There is protest against the maintenance of great public museums that do nothing more than enshrine the evidence of bourgeois and aristocratic domination of society, and there is protest against arts education in which bourgeois values, exemplified by the Louvre, are imposed on the masses. One may or may not wish to use the vocabulary of radical protest, and I doubt that many in the museum world wish to set fire to the Louvre, but I do feel that it must be conceded that the protest against the museums and art galleries does have a basis in reality and that museum reform is long overdue.

A far more important inference that can be drawn from current protest is that there is something missing in the world of museums and art galleries. What is missing cannot be found through the reform of the museum as a temple. In my view, it is clear that there is a real and urgent need for the reestablishment of the forum as an institution in society. While our bona fide museums seek to become relevant, maintaining their role as temples, there must be concurrent creation of forums for confrontation, experimentation, and debate, where the forums are related but discrete institutions.

In an address to the Canadian Conference of the Arts in September 1970, Dr. Mavor Moore of York University summed up his proposals for democratization and the creation of equality in cultural opportunity, saying that the essence of the problem was, "Will the establishment finance the revolution?" I agree with Dr. Moore that the establishment (and by that is meant the corporations, governments, and private individuals) must, in effect, finance the revolution by creating opportunities for the artists and the critics of society to produce, to be heard, to be seen, and to confront established values and institutions. What they have to say must be subjected to public judgment and to the test of time. These are the functions of the forum.

In practical and specific terms, I am proposing not only exhibition halls and meeting places that are open to all, but also programs and funds for them that accept without reservation the most radical innovations in art forms, the most controversial interpretations of history, of our own society, of the nature of man, or, for that matter, of the nature of our world. It intrigues me and at the same time distresses me that the need for a forum applies primarily to experimentation and new thought in the arts and humanities but not in the sciences. The scientist who wishes to undertake research, even though his results may upset established scientific theory, is provided with laboratories, his work is published, we give him grants. And if he does upset the apple cart, we award him great honors

even if the new theories he produces have disturbing effects upon our society and our way of life.

We are quite prepared to debate the virtues or evils of new birth-control methods, the fluoridation of water, test-tube babies, or the exploration of space, but it never occurs to us to put in jail the research scientists who created the very thing that we are prepared to argue about and which we oppose. In the arts and humanities this is not the case. The artist or scholar who criticizes our society and offends our sensitivities or our values is, in effect, regarded as an enemy of society even before we have allowed time for his work or his statements to be judged and considered.

At the outset it was suggested that there was schizophrenia and an identity crisis in the world of museums. Perhaps now that can be made more clear. Many institutions cannot decide whether they wish to be a museum, as a temple, or wish to become the public forum. Some have tried to bring the forum inside the temple. That is true of many of the institutions that call themselves museums but now claim to be "the place where it's at, an activity center, an institution swinging with a hip philosophy of social relevance." Unfortunately, the idea of bringing the forum—the place for confrontation and experimentation—inside the temple is to inhibit and, in effect, to castrate the performance in the forum.

Admission to the museum (even a swinging museum) is acceptance by the Establishment. So often the introduction of controversial, experimental, or radical activities into the museum is little more than paternalism. Some museums, I suspect, have decided to incorporate manifestations of the antiestablishment movement within their establishment institutions because they feared protest or perhaps violence and sought to neutralize the enemy. Others, I suspect, have gone this route because they simply wanted to be where the action was. (Surely it must be frustrating to follow the excitement and vitality of the contemporary art scene if you happen to be a curator of modern art, stuck in a museum, and you're not really a part of it.) But, regardless of the motivation, it is argued here that those museums that attempt to integrate these two discrete sociological functions of forum and temple are in error.

The error, as said, is in part that they rob the forum of its vitality and autonomy. There is an even more serious aspect to this error—the acceptance into the museum of the untried and experimental tends to devalue those things that are properly in the museum. Museum collections, as suggested earlier, are based on the careful sampling of reality where both time and expert judgment determine what shall come in and what shall stay out. It has to be understood that the very nature of an object changes when it becomes a museum object. A work of art, an archeological specimen, or an antique is just that and nothing more when it is in the shop or in the street or perhaps in the forum. The moment that it is pur-

chased or accepted by the museum it takes on a new quality. You and I will judge it differently. When the object was not in the museum, we were completely free to decide whether we approved or disapproved, liked it or disliked it. Once it is in the museum, we make our judgment in the knowledge, if not awe, of the fact that the experts have already said, "This is good," or "This is important," or "This is real." The object has been enshrined.

If the museum has opened its doors to all manner of innovation and experimentation, can we go on believing in the value of the museum's other judgments? Or, looking at another possibility, will we begin to accept with little reservation the importance of all innovations and experiments just because they happen to be in the museum?

To underline the point and to summarize for the moment, the forum is where the battles are fought, the temple is where the victors rest. The former is process, the latter is product.

Something must also be said about social responsibilities in museum programming that are somewhat apart from the issue of the museum as a temple or as a forum. It was suggested that protest, confrontation, the experiment, and the innovation were all appropriate to the forum and not to the temple. Some might infer an argument for the museum as a temple being apolitical, sitting on the fence, unconcerned with social issues, and so forth. That is not at all the case.

Years ago I worked in a museum where the natural scientists talked frequently at coffee breaks about problems of the pollution of our lakes and rivers. In the mid-1950s those scientists were deeply concerned with pollution and some of them sat on international commissions that were studying the growing problem. The galleries and special exhibition programs for which those scientists were responsible as curators did not reflect these concerns, however. It is only now, when pollution is a rather popular subject for discussion, that the museum in question is thinking of turning its resources toward the interpretation of the pollution of our environment.

That is a story of social irresponsibility in museum programming. Where museums, be they of art, history, or science, have the knowledge and the resources to interpret matters of public importance, no matter how controversial, they are obliged to do so.

Propaganda has, at no time, any place in the museum. Public education, the interpretation of science and of art, and attempts to explain what little we do know of the nature of man and of human society—these things have a place at all times, assuming objectivity and willingness to tell all sides of the story.

To return to forums and temples, certain organizational and functional relationships are important. It is desirable that each should have its own

administration and governing body. Where there is a common administration, it seems far too likely that the forum would become a kind of purgatory and the museum a paradise, with the museum director playing the role of St. Peter at the pearly gates.

A most difficult question, because of the financial crisis in the world of museums and the increase in cost of construction, is whether or not the forum and the museum can be housed within the same structure. Ideally it would be most desirable to establish those manifestations of the forum that require a physical structure apart from the museum, but with a relationship such that they could not only share some common services but also could share the audience. Where both functions must coexist within one structure, then it is necessary to create a visual separation and a psychological distinction of the two by the use of color, signs, and interior architectural modifications.

The important thing, and it need hardly be repeated again, is that they be recognized as distinct, one from the other; that each make its own function and its own role clear in the minds of the visitor. The distinction must be equally clear in the minds of the curators, the directors, the trustees, and the funding agencies.

Thought must also be given to the question of potential audience and communication effectiveness, whether we are concerned with the forum or a museum. Although there have been dramatic increases in museum audiences in the last two decades, it can safely be said that the majority of the population are not museum or art gallery goers. There should be great concern about the audience that museums do *not* have rather than excitement because the members of the present audience come more frequently and pump up the attendance statistics that are so gleefully printed in annual reports.

One of the studies of the use of leisure conducted in metropolitan Toronto³ convinced me that museum visiting and attendance at spectator sports were very much alike in that they were functions of the characteristic use of leisure time rather than functions of special interests in either museums or baseball. It appears that there are some people who are not mobile in the use of leisure and who tend to rely heavily on television, radio, newspapers, magazines, books, records, and tapes. There are others who are highly mobile and seem to go everywhere to see everything and do everything.

There is evidence of a correlation between high educational achievement levels and the use of art museums and the more traditional performing arts. This does not appear to apply, however, to general museums,

³ An unpublished study of leisure and the use of cultural resources conducted for the Royal Ontario Museum by Dr. David S. Abbey and the author, 1961.

museums of history, archeology, or natural science. It can also be hypothesized from the study in question that individuals who have sophisticated or, if you wish, educated tastes in music, literature, and the visual arts may not be museum goers simply because they are not mobile, while others who would appear to be most unsophisticated show a high frequency of visitation.

All of this leads to the conclusion that, whether the concern is for the temple or the forum, the mass media must be used if the total audience which is prepared to listen is to be reached. Museum exhibitions should be designed from the very beginning so that they become the basis for television programs, films, feature articles in magazines, and well-designed, highly readable museum publications. There must also be extension or "outreach" programs that take museum materials into the community, into the inner-city areas of large urban concentrations, and especially into the schools. Similarly, the relatively unprogrammed and often unexpected events in the forum must be transmitted through the mass media. The public forum must be integrated into the circuits of electronic communication networks if it is to be significant in society. It must not be confused with the "forums" created by these networks.

More than half of the potential audience will not come to either the forum or museum. They will have to go to their audience. And even the roughest cost-benefit analysis will show that a telecast, a radio program, or a weekly newspaper column will get more information and experience to more people for fewer dollars than publicity campaigns designed to drive the unwilling in through the front doors.

Museums and art galleries, like the majority of other established cultural institutions, must institute reform and create an equality of cultural opportunity. Society will no longer tolerate institutions that either in fact or in appearance serve a minority audience of the elite. As public funds in support of these institutions increase, the public will demand its right to more than it has now. The public will make its demands known.

It is a difficult and precarious time for museums and art galleries, and those in the museum profession are charged with greater responsibilities than ever before.

Museums must concern themselves with the reform and development of museums *as museums*. They must meet society's need for that unique institution which fulfills a timeless and universal function—the use of the structured sample of reality, not just as a reference but as an objective model against which to compare individual perceptions. At the same time, and with a sense of urgency, the forums must be created, unfettered by convention and established values. The objective here is neither to neutralize nor to contain that which questions the established order. It is to ensure that the new and challenging perceptions of reality—the new

values and their expressions—can be seen and heard by all. To ignore or suppress the innovation or the proposal for change is as mindless as to accept that which is new because it is novel.

In the absence of the forum, the museum as a temple stands alone as an obstacle to change. The temple is destroyed and the weapons of its destruction are venerated in the temple of tomorrow—but yesterday is lost. In the presence of the forum the museum serves as a temple, accepting and incorporating the manifestations of change. From the chaos and conflict of today's forum the museum must build the collections that will tell us tomorrow who we are and how we got there. After all, that's what museums are all about.