
METKA FUJS □ predsjednica Zajednice muzeja Slovenije (Skupnost muzejev Slovenije) i direktorica Pokrajinskoga muzeja Murska Sobota, Slovenija

POVIJEST SLOVENSkih MUZEJA

Povijest slovenskih muzeja seže u 1821. godinu, kad je Kranjski pokrajinski muzej (danas poznat kao Narodni muzej Slovenije) osnovan u Ljubljani. Početkom 20. stoljeća muzeji su osnivani i u mnogim drugim važnim gradskim središtima: u Celju, Kamniku, Ptuju i Mariboru. Prva dva specijalizirana muzeja u Sloveniji bili su Slovenski školski muzej, osnovan 1889. godine, i Jakopčev paviljon, osnovan 1908. (posljednji je preteča Narodne galerije, osnovane 1933. godine).

S iznimkom Kranjskoga pokrajinskog muzeja, koji je od samoga početka djelovao kao profesionalna ustanova, počeci muzejskoga rada bili su u djelokrugu amaterskih i neprofesionalnih muzeologa, vođenih željom za narodnim preporodom.

Uloga muzeja postala je važnija tijekom razdoblja Kraljevine Jugoslavije, između dva svjetska rata, što potvrđuje i činjenica da su u to doba osnovana dva iznimno važna specijalizirana muzeja: slovenski Etnografski muzej (kasnije preimenovan u Slovenski etnografski muzej) i Slovenski prirodoslovni muzej.

Broj muzeja još se više povećao nakon Drugoga svjetskoga rata. Među novoutemeljenim muzejima dva su posebice važna: Moderna galerija i Slovenski muzej narodne revolucije. Posljednji je označio početak osnivanja specijaliziranih muzeja revolucije i narodnoga oslobođenja u Mariboru, Celju i Slovenj Gradcu te mnogih drugih specijaliziranih muzeja koji su se bavili sličnim temama.

Uskoro je upravno tijelo bivše jugoslavenske vlade pokrenulo **inicijativu da se stvori mreža regionalnih muzeja koja će obuhvatiti cijeli slovenski teritorij**. Tako je 1950-ih godina utemeljena većina današnjih regionalnih muzeja i velik broj lokalnih muzeja. Broj muzeja popeo se na pedeset osam (58) muzeja.

U 1960-ima taj se trend unekoliko zaustavio i broj profesionalnih muzeja ostao je razmjerno stalan do danas, unatoč povremenim fluktuacijama. Broj muzejskih zbirki je, pak, u sponu (to vrijedi i za zbirke muzeja i za one u posjedu lokalnih zajednica, tvrtki, udruga ili pojedinaca). Nakon što je 1960-ih zaustavljen trend osnivanja novih muzeja, 1970-ih došlo je do novoga porasta. Trend je

ponovno obrnut 1980-ih godina, tako da svjedočimo blagom smanjenju broja muzeja. Godine 1988. dokumentirano je 188 muzeja i zbirki, a 2003. taj se broj popeo na 252, i otad svake godine raste. Nažalost, to ne vrijedi i za profesionalne muzeje, broj kojih je već nekoliko godina nepromijenjen.

POVIJEST MUZEJSKE MREŽE

Godine 1959. u Jugoslaviji je donesen Zakon o muzejima, koji je osigurao pravni okvir za osnivanje muzeja. Taj je zakon određivao da se muzej može osnovati samo ako se osigura dovoljno građe, prostora, stručnoga osoblja i novca. Na temelju toga je 27 od 58 spomenutih muzeja dobilo je status muzeja – drugi su ušli u kategoriju muzejskih zbirki. Status muzeja dobili su Narodni muzej Slovenije, osam središnjih specijaliziranih muzeja, deset regionalnih muzeja, dva gradska muzeja, tri specijalizirana muzeja revolucije te nekoliko većih općinskih muzeja.

Zakon o muzejima donio je i definiciju muzeja, ali nije uspio osigurati solidnu osnovu za uspostavu teritorijalno, funkcionalno i profesionalno povezane muzejske mreže jer nije bilo stručnjaka koji bi razvijali jedinstvene stručne standarde i nadgledali skladan razvoj muzeja u Sloveniji kao cjelini. Načelni je problem bila definicija muzeja u samome zakonu. Naime, prema definiciji, muzej nije bio središnja ustanova za zaštitu pokretne baštine; umjesto toga, zadatak istraživanja, registracije pa čak i nadzora kulturne baštine formalno je bio u nadležnosti ustanova za zaštitu spomenika, koje, na sreću, nikad nisu preuzele tu zadaću.

Upravno tijelo je bilo posve svjesno manjka stručne povezanosti, nejedinstvenoga djelovanja muzeja i činjenice da su muzeji obuhvaćali teritorij nekoliko različitih općina, što je napokon **godine 1964. potaknulo nastanak prvoga tiskanoga materijala o problemima slovenskih muzeja**.

Ustanovljeno je da bi daljnje širenje muzejskih ustanova moglo ugroziti opstanak i kvalitetu postojećih muzeja. (Moram istaknuti da govorimo o razdoblju slovenske povijesti koje zapravo još ne poznaje privatne inicijative ni službene privatne zbirke.)

U to se vrijeme prvi put spominje pojam **muzejske mreže**. Manjim muzejskim zbiricama preporučeno je da se stručno, pa čak i organizacijski, povežu s većim muzejima i galerijama koji su smješteni u njihovoj neposrednoj blizini, tzv. **matičnim** muzejima/galerijama; ističem to jer se poslije naziv **matični** rabio unutar djelokruga muzejske mreže da označi "najvažniji" muzej).

Jak je naglasak stavljen na važnost programskoga usklađivanja i povezanosti s obrazovnim i turističkim organizacijama.

Premda je uskoro uočeno da bi najučinkovitije bilo kad bi se muzejska mreža razvila na temelju postojećih muzejskih centara, zakon iz 1965. godine ukinuo je svaku klasifikaciju muzeja. Zadržao je standarde za osnivanje muzeja, ali je istodobno dopustio da muzejska zbirka dobije status muzeja ako tako želi osnivač. Zapravo, to je značilo da su stari standardi obezvrjeđeni, što je ozbiljno utjecalo na održavanje muzejske građe. Taj se potez može shvatiti kao pokušaj kulturne politike da deprofesionalizacijom **nacionalizira muzejsku aktivnost**. (U Jugoslaviji je zajedničko društveno vlasništvo bilo zamjena za državu, tj. za državno vlasništvo – svi su građani bili osuđeni na pripadnost radničkoj klasi i zbog toga su smatrani vlasnicima svega državnoga/nacionalnoga.)

Plan kulturnoga razvoja Slovenije za razdoblje od 1976. do 1980. ponovno je obznani da je muzejska djelatnost iznimno raznolika, ali da joj i dalje manjka organizacijske stabilnosti i kohezije; zaključeno je da muzejskoj mreži nedostaje prava struktura, dok je stručni i teritorijalni raspon djelatnosti u pojedinačnim muzejima nedovoljno definiran. **Plan za razdoblje od 1981. do 1985.** naglasio je potrebu za jedinstvenijim pristupom području zaštite kulturne baštine i većom kohezijom muzeja. Predloženo je da se muzeji usredotoče ponajprije na dokumentaciju, konzervaciju i smisleno popunjavanje svojih zbirki; ipak, jedva da je poduzeta ijedna akcija da bi se ti ciljevi ispunili.

Zakon o muzejima zamijenjen 1981. Zakonom o prirodnoj i kulturnoj baštini. Novi je zakon uveo ove pojmovne novosti:

- povezo je muzejsku djelatnost sa zaštitom prirodne i spomeničke baštine te s arhivskom aktivnošću
- muzejima je pripisana uloga zaštite, tj. nadzora pokretne baštine (to se odnosilo na baštinu unutar i izvan muzeja)
- svaka je općina morala imati muzej ili barem neki oblik ugovora sa susjednim muzejom o financiranju muzejskih aktivnosti na svojem području.

Novoizglasani zakon osiguravao je muzejima nekoliko novih prava, ali sustav nadzora putem tzv. kulturnih zajednica odgovornih za kulturnu politiku bio je organiziran tako da zakonodavac zapravo nije imao sredstava da muzeje prisili na provedbu zakona. Činjenica je da je Republika djelomice ili u cjelini financirala muzejsku

aktivnost (tj. aktivnosti jedinica koje su stekle status muzeja), ali više od toga u razdoblju centralizacije nije mogla.

Godine 1985. provedena je posebna analiza koja je pokazala da su se uvjeti u muzejima zapravo poboljšali, ali da su najveće gubitke doživjeli nacionalni muzeji i da je ukupna situacija daleko od zadovoljavajuće. Ponovno je postalo jasno da je glavni problem činjenica da **nacionalni muzeji nisu uspjeli provesti matičnu funkciju pripreme jedinstvenih stručnih standarda na svim razinama muzejskoga djelovanja**. Za druge se muzeje ispostavilo da su obavljali svoje zadaće svaki na svoj način, da su podaci koje su prenosili bili nepouzdati te da sustav u kojemu su osnivač i financijaš dvije različite osobe ne funkcionira kako bi trebalo.

Nakon te analize i zaključka Vlade da središnje funkcije muzeja treba zakonom definirati, uslijedio je 1988.

prvi službeni dokument o mreži slovenskih muzeja. Taj je dokument odredio da u Republici postoje tri tipa muzeja: 1. nacionalni muzeji; 2. specijalizirani muzeji (muzeji koji se bave posebnim stručnim područjima na teritoriju jedne ili više općina) i 3. opći regionalni muzeji (muzeji koji su stručno odgovorni za većinu ili za sva područja muzejske struke, dok su regionalno odgovorni za nekoliko općina ili regija). **Mrežom su se željeli nadići nedostaci u suradnji između muzeja i provedbi središnje uloge nacionalnih muzeja ustanovljene spomenutom analizom.** Ali taj pokušaj nije uspio jer raspodijeljenost "matičnosti" nije bila razmjerno sankcionirana. Dakle, premda su muzejima i lokalnim zajednicama nametnute određene obveze i premda su definirane sankcije za neizvršenje tih obveza, nažalost, nije bilo zakonskih kanala kojima bi se te sankcije provele.

Regionalni i međuopćinski muzeji već su bili doživjeli financijski slom sredinom 1960-ih godina, kad je njihovo financiranje preuzela općinska vlast. Situacija se popravila kad je 1980-ih godina Republika preuzela dio njihova sufinanciranja, ali prilike su i dalje ostale prilično turobne zbog samovolje lokalne politike.

Istodobno je Jugoslavija proživljavala političku krizu. Država se raspadala i očekivalo se da će se s novom državom provesti ne samo političke promjene nego i važne promjene u lokalnoj samoupravi.

Godine 1989. Kulturna zajednica Slovenije (preteča Ministarstva kulture) odlučila je zaštititi muzeje od novih turbulencija. Da bi ostvarila taj cilj, **preuzela je financiranje muzeja koji su bili u muzejskoj mreži**. Mreža se sastojala od 41 nacionalnoga, regionalnoga, općinskoga i gradskog muzeja i galerije, a svi su zakonom dobili status javnih ustanova. Drugi muzeji, tj. oni koji nisu bili u mreži, mogli su se natjecati za novčana sredstva.

U Sloveniji je udio javnih novčanih sredstava za muzeje bio najveći 1990. godine, kad je stara vlada polako silazila s vlasti i novoj je vladi "pred nosom" ispraznila sve blagajne. Godine 1991. taj je udio već bio smanjen

za polovicu i nikad se nije vratio na razinu prijašnje godine. Ipak, to je smanjenje financijskih sredstava pomoglo renesansi slovenskih muzeja, kojoj su pridonijele i muzejske organizacije i mnogi stručnjaci s područja arheologije, povijesti i kulture. Sve bi na kraju ispalo dobro da su zakonodavci bolje slijedili prijedloge struke i da su zahtijevali da oni koji su odgovorni za muzeje stručno obave svoju dužnost, ali su, suprotno tome, odlučili potrošiti svoje dragocjeno vrijeme na stalne promjene zakonodavstva. Naime, tijekom posljednjih petnaest godina radni uvjeti u slovenskim muzejima više su nego zadovoljavajući, ali zbog činjenice da oni često služe kao Vladini pokusni miševi za razne inovacije, ostvarili su manje rezultate no što su zapravo mogli.

A KAKVA JE SITUACIJA DANAS?

Od 2000. godine na snazi je **Uredba o uspostavi muzejske mreže za provedbu javne službe na području zaštite pokretne kulturne baštine i o određenju nacionalnih muzeja**; ta je uredba prihvaćena kao podzakonski akt **Zakona o prirodnoj i kulturnoj baštini koji je donesen 1999. godine**.

Taj zakon (kao i njegovi prethodnici) definira **pokretnu i nepokretnu baštinu**, pri čemu je prva u nadležnosti muzeja.

On tako definira i pojam javne službe. (Pojam javne službe proizlazi iz shvaćanja da se određeni dio kulturnih dobara treba zaštititi kao javna dobra; država ili lokalna zajednica može ostvariti taj cilj izravno ili tako da ustanovi javnu službu na području kulture. Ta se dobra obično osiguravaju kao javne službe ili uz jednake uvjete. Za muzeje se može sklopiti ugovor o provedbi javne službe i u uvjetima financiranja za obavljanje takve službe između države i državnoga muzeja, lokalnoga muzeja ili neke druge pravne osobe. Općenito, cijelo područje kulture potpada pod **Zakon o ostvarenju javnoga interesa u kulturi**, koji definira odnose na toj razini.)

Koje aktivnosti pripadaju kategoriji javne službe, općenito je određeno zakonom za specifično područje, a kad je riječ o muzejima, to je u domeni spomenutoga Zakona o prirodnoj i kulturnoj baštini. Taj zakon definira elemente javne službe, u sklopu kojih su i oni što ih poznajemo pod pojmom osnovne muzejske djelatnosti: evidentiranje, skupljanje, istraživanje, dokumentiranje, zaštita, konzervacija, prezentiranje, registracija itd.

Zakon govori i o različitim **tipovima muzeja: državnim, regionalnim, gradskim, općinskim i privatnim**.

Državni muzeji štite baštinu državne, nacionalne važnosti i proučavaju građu koja se nalazi izvan države, ali nije ništa manje važna za slovensku naciju. Drugi su muzeji odgovorni za baštinu na području ili teritoriju na kojemu su osnovani.

Štoviše, zakon utvrđuje i uvjete nužne za provedbu javne službe, pri čemu je naglasak na stručnosti i

osposobljenosti zaposlenika. (Moram spomenuti da u Sloveniji stručni ispiti imaju status državnih ispita; svaki stručni muzejski djelatnik mora položiti takav ispit.)

U Sloveniji nisu definirani uvjeti provedbe javne službe nekim zajednički prihvaćenim normama i standardima, nego je riječ o više pravilnika. Naravno, slijedimo općenito prihvaćene međunarodne standarde i etičke kodekse, ali problemi nastaju kad treba osigurati određenu osnovnu razinu čvrstih standarda za obavljanje javno financirane službe. Muzeji ustrajavaju na tome da je ustanovljenje takvih uniformnih standarda temeljno za obavljanje javne službe, dok utemeljitelji i financijski redovito izbjegavaju to pitanje i prilično načelno govore o standardima.

Predmet uredbe o muzejskoj mreži samo su oni muzeji koji su osnovani kao javne ustanove i čiju djelatnost, u cijelosti ili djelomice, financira država ili lokalna zajednica.

Uz pojam javne službe u uredbi se pojavljuju i druga dva glavna pojma: **stručna matičnost i teritorijalna matičnost**. Stručna matičnost u nadležnosti je državnih muzeja na cijelom državnom području, dok je teritorijalna matičnost u nadležnosti lokalnih muzeja na području njihova djelovanja.

Stručna matičnost:

- priprema srednjoročnih i dugoročnih programa za zaštitu pokretne kulturne baštine
- stručna pomoć muzejima kao institucijama i na pojedinačnim stručnim područjima
- vođenje registra kulturne baštine Republike Slovenije
- briga o teritorijalnoj pokrivenosti provedbe javne službe.

Teritorijalna matičnost:

- provođenje muzejske javne službe na određenome području, obično na svim poznatim muzejskim stručnim područjima ili u suradnji s drugim muzejima.

Naravno, ta su dva pojma u međusobnom odnosu i uzajamno se ne isključuju, kako to trenutačna mreža predviđa (koja samo ponavlja stare misaone modele).

Udruga slovenskih muzeja organizirala je 1990-ih godina okrugli stol o temi muzejske mreže koja bi trebala postati instrumentom razvoja muzeja i muzejske struke i uz to poticati muzeološke inovacije, konkurentnost muzeja, naobrazbu itd., jer je Udruga sebe vidjela kao glavnoga posrednika i čimbenika komunikacije.

Premda je zakonodavac uredbom sankcionirao zatečeno stanje, malo je pozornosti pridao prijedlozima različitih stručnjaka. To je razumljivo jer je zakonodavčev osnovni cilj bio osigurati postojeći sustav zaštite kulturne baštine u svjetlu reforme lokalne samouprave i njezina financiranja, pa je zato vrlo malo učinjeno na području daljnega razvoja samoga sustava.

Trenutačno mreža nije ništa više no što je tehnički trebala biti: vrlo nedorečen skup dužnosti, muzeja i

područja na kojima muzeji provode javnu službu prema zakonski određenim nalogima, što se financira ili sufinancira iz državnoga proračuna. Mreža nije planirana kao dinamičan model s mogućnošću preustroja pojedinačnih muzeja koji su u nju uključeni. Hoće li određeni muzej biti uključen u mrežu, ovisi o nizu brojčanih i mjerljivih parametara: o broju zaposlenika, veličini prostora, broju predmeta ili zbirki itd. Da bi mreža bila što učinkovitija, trebalo bi uvesti instrument provjere produkcijske snage svakoga pojedinačnoga muzeja. Tim bi se instrumentom procjenjivali ovi parametri: razina stručnosti, učinkovitost rada u društvenome miljeu itd.; potreban je osnovni tip sustava akreditacije koji će biti zasnovan na približno jednakim ishodištima i zatim provjeravan u redovitim intervalima.

Nešto slično uveo je **Zakon o zaštiti kulturne baštine**, donesen 1. ožujka 2008. Taj zakon ukida sve prijašnje zakone (uključujući i uredbu o muzejskoj mreži) i predviđa nove, koje treba donijeti do kraja godine. Muzejsku mrežu zamijenit će sustav registriranih, državnih i ovlaštenih muzeja. Sustav će voditi državna agencija za zaštitu pokretne i nematerijalne baštine muzeja. Osnovni javni dokument osiguran novim zakonom zove se **muzejski registar**, pod jurisdikcijom je Ministarstva kulture i u njemu će biti upisani svi muzeji. Uz suglasnost osnivača muzeja, svim muzejima koji ispunjavaju temeljne prostorne, financijske i kadrovske zahtjeve za pohranu i zaštitu baštine i koji imaju izložbe otvorene za javnost, s točno određenim radnim vremenom i ulaznicama, dopušteno je da uđu u registar. Osnovne uvjete djelomično određuje zakon, a djelomično će biti upotpunjeni posebnim budućim propisima. Svi muzeji koji su trenutačno članovi muzejske mreže bit će *ex officio* upisani u registar 2008. godine. Štoviše, svi državni muzeji i muzeji koji žele biti **ovlašteni za provedbu državne javne službe** ili se žele kandidirati za državna sredstva morat će ući u registar. Pojmovi državne i teritorijalne matičnosti, koji su služili kao temelj muzejske mreže, u zakonu više ne postoje. Uz državne muzeje, čije je financiranje posve u djelokrugu vlade, zakon također postulira tzv. **ovlaštene muzeje**, koje Vlada ovlašćuje da obnašaju državnu javnu službu. Ugovorom koji sklapaju država, osnivač i muzej ustanovit će se udio državnih sredstava, muzejsko stručno područje i njegovo područje (teritorij) djelovanja.

Određeni muzej na temelju javnoga natječaja može dobiti ovlasti na razdoblje od tri godine (interval provjere uvjeta). Prema uvjetima nužnim za dobivanje ovlasti, manje-više je očito da će ih uglavnom dobiti muzeji koji su već u muzejskoj mreži i čija se djelatnost uglavnom financira iz državnoga proračuna, a osnivači su im lokalne zajednice. Trenutačno u Republici Sloveniji ne postoje registrirane regije (regionalno zakonodavstvo već je nekoliko godina predmet gorljivih rasprava) i zato su lokalne zajednice zastupljene putem regija u kojima muzeji imaju svoja glavna sjedišta, što vrijedi i za muzeje regionalnog tipa. Ovlasti će omogućiti muzeju da do 80% svih muzejskih troškova pokrije država. Što

znači to **do i svih muzejskih troškova**, nedvojbeno će nužno trebati podrobnije odrediti daljnjim financijskim propisima.

Jedna od novosti novoga zakona jest **Služba za pokretnu baštinu i muzeje**. Bit će osnovana 2008. godine u sklopu onoga državnog muzeja koji se pokaže najuspješnijim na javnome natječaju i kojemu Ministarstvo kulture dodijeli tu ulogu. Služba će osiguravati stručno mišljenje o tome zadovoljava li neki muzej uvjete da bude upisan u muzejski registar ili da dobije ovlasti; sudjelovat će u drugim upravnim postupcima, poput izdavanja izvoznih dozvola, ali i u raspodjeli građe i arhiva s arheoloških nalazišta, pripremat će analize muzejskih djelatnosti, predlagat će koje mjere treba poduzeti za zaštitu pokretne baštine, nuditi kriterije za sufinanciranje muzejskih programa, osiguravati standarde i norme za muzejski rad, regulirati i koordinirati obrazovne programe, nadzirati pripravnicičke programe, stručne ispite i dobivanje stručnih titula, organizirati kolektivne nastupe, promidžbu i trgovinu muzejskih službi te razne druge zadatke koji će biti određeni u suradnji s muzejima i muzejskim organizacijama.

Mnoge od tih zadaća koje zakon prenosi u nadležnost te službe danas obavlja Udruga slovenskih muzeja u sklopu obrazovnih programa, promidžbe, međunarodne suradnje i nakladničkih aktivnosti, koje djelomice financira Ministarstvo kulture, djelomice sami muzeji, a djelomice se financiraju sredstvima raznih državnih i međunarodnih javnih natječaja. Budućnost i Službe za pokretnu baštinu muzeja i Udruge slovenskih muzeja u stvaranju je organizacijskih i sadržajnih veza radi stvaranja učinkovite potpore slovenskim muzejima.

Zaključak. Određeni krugovi u Sloveniji pogrešno vjeruju da se stručna pitanja mogu riješiti zakonodavstvom, bez prethodnih stručnih analiza i prethodnih određenja temeljnih pravila za stručno obavljanje posla. Analize koje se provode nisu odgovarajuće, sustavi koji su uspostavljeni ne djeluju dobro i sva rješenja tražimo metodom raspodjele istih karata. Ministarstvo i dalje obećava radikalnije poteze, ali ne uspijeva shvatiti da samo reciklira one stare, neuspješne pristupe i da su najbolja rješenja ona najjednostavnija – rješenja koja su već uspješno realizirana na nekim područjima. Rasprava koja je pokrenuta prije donošenja novoga zakona, kao i teškoće i pitanja do kojih je došlo tijekom njegove provedbe, mogli bi rezultirati koherentnim sustavom u kojemu bi društvena uloga muzeja i državnoga blaga što ga čuvaju muzeji mogla čak biti ispravno shvaćena – učinkovitim i prijateljskim sustavom koji će rado prihvatiti svi muzeji i pridonijeti njegovu djelovanju najbolje što mogu, čekujući isto zauzvrat. Takav bi se sustav mogao zvati Mreža muzeja ili, jednostavno, Slovenski muzeji i galerije.

Prijevod s engleskog jezika: Biljana Romić

METKA FUJS □ president of the Slovenian Museums Association and the director of the Murska Sobota Regional Museum, Slovenia

HISTORY OF SLOVENIAN MUSEUMS

The history of Slovenian museums goes back to 1821 when the Carniola Provincial Museum (nowadays known as the National Museum of Slovenia) was established in Ljubljana. The beginning of the 20th century saw the establishment of museums in several other important urban centres: Celje, Kamnik, Ptuj and Maribor. The first two specialized museums in Slovenia were the Slovenian School Museum, established in 1889, and the Jakopič Pavilion, established in 1908 (the latter being the predecessor of the National Gallery, established in 1933).

With the exception of the Carniola Provincial Museum, which operated as a professional establishment from its very beginning, the initial work of museums was in the hands of amateur and unprofessional museum workers driven by the impulses of the national revival.

The role of museums became more significant during the period of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia between the two World Wars, which is reflected by the fact that two extremely important specialized museums were established in that period: the Slovenian Ethnographic Museum (later renamed the Slovenian Ethnographic Museum) and the Slovenian Museum of Natural History.

The number of museums further increased after World War II. Among the newly-founded museums, two were of especial importance: the Museum of Modern Art and the Slovenian Museum of the People's Revolution. The latter marked the beginning of the establishment of specialized museums of revolution and national liberation in Maribor, Celje, Slovenj Gradec and a great number of other specialized museums dealing with related subjects.

Soon afterwards, the former Yugoslav government launched **an initiative about creating a network of regional museums that would cover the whole Slovenian territory**. Thus the 1950s saw the establishment of the vast majority of the present regional museums and a great many local museums. The number of museums rose to 58.

In the 1960s the trend ceased, and the number of professional museums has remained relatively constant ever since, occasional fluctuations notwithstanding. The

number of museum collections, on the other hand, is currently on the uprise (this holds true both for collections within museums and for those possessed by local communities, firms, associations or individuals).

In the 1960s the establishment of museums ceased, but a new increase was seen in the 1970s. In the 1980s, the trend was reversed yet again, and there was actually a slight decrease in the number of museums. In 1988, 188 museums and museum collections were documented. In 2003, this number had risen to 252 and has been growing annually since. Unfortunately, the latter is not true of professional museums, the number of which has remained unchanged for several years.

HISTORY OF THE MUSEUMS NETWORK

In **1959 the Museum Act was passed in Yugoslavia**, which provided the first legal framework for museum establishment. The act determined that a museum could be established only if sufficient material, premises, professional personnel and financial means were provided. On this basis, 27 of the 58 museums mentioned above acquired the status of a museum – others came under the category of a museum collection. The museum status was granted to the National Museum of Slovenia, 8 central specialized museums, 10 regional museums, 2 city museums, 3 specialized museums of the revolution and some other strong municipal museums.

The Museum Act thus provided the definition of a museum, but it failed to provide a solid basis for establishing a territorial, functional and professionally interconnected museums network, since there were no professionals to develop unified professional standards and see to the harmonious museum development in Slovenia as a whole. The principal problem was in the definition of a museum as stipulated by the Act. For according to the definition a museum was not the central institution for the protection of the movable heritage; instead, the tasks of investigating, registering, even surveying of the cultural heritage were formally assigned to the institutes for the preservation of monuments; fortunately enough, the latter never accepted these assignments.

The administration was well aware of the lack of professional unity, unequal operating terms and the fact that museums were scattered across several municipalities. This awareness eventually **gave birth to the first published material on the problems of Slovenian museums in 1964.**

It was established that further propagation of museum establishments might jeopardize the existence and quality of the already existing museums. (Note: I have to stress that we are discussing the period of Slovenian history when private initiatives and formal private collections were virtually unknown.)

For the very first time, the term **museums network** was mentioned. Small museum collections were advised to link up professionally and even organizationally with the more prominent museums and galleries that were located in their immediate vicinity (also called **central** museums/galleries; I stress this because the term **central** is later used within the scope of the museums network to denote "the most important"). **Great emphasis was laid especially on the importance of programme coordination and connections with education and tourist organizations.**

Although it was soon realized that it would be most efficient if the museums network was developed around the already existing museum centres, the act from 1965 abolished all forms of museum classification. It preserved the standards for museum establishment but at the same time allowed a museum collection to be called a museum if this was the will of the founder. Essentially, this meant that the old standards were devalued, which had a profound impact on how the museum material was handled. Such undertakings can be understood as attempts made by cultural policy **to nationalize museum activity** by means of de-professionalization. (Note: In Yugoslavia, common social property was a substitute for the state, i.e. national property – all citizens were deemed as belonging to the working class and therefore seen as owners of the whole state (national) property).

The plan for the cultural development of Slovenia for the period 1976 – 1980 re-established the idea that museum activity was extremely diverse but that it still lacked the organizational stability and cohesiveness; it was concluded that the museums network lacked a proper structure, while the professional and territorial range of activities in individual museums was insufficiently defined. **The plan for the period 1981 – 1985** propounded the need for a more unified approach in the realm of cultural heritage protection and greater cohesiveness among museums. It was suggested that museums focus primarily on documentation, conservation and logical completion of their collections; however, hardly any actions were taken to achieve these goals.

In 1981 the Museum Act was replaced by the **Natural and Cultural Heritage Act**. The new law introduced the following conceptual novelties:

- it regulated the museum activity together with the natural heritage protection, monuments and archive activity

- museums were assigned the role of protection, i.e. supervision of movable heritage (this applied to heritage both inside and outside of museums)

- each municipality was obliged to have a museum or at least some form of an agreement with the neighbouring museum about the funding of museum activities in its territory.

The newly-passed act provided museums with several new rights, but the system of supervision carried out by the so-called cultural communities, which were then responsible for the cultural policy, was organized in a manner that left employees with virtually no means for the enforcement of the act. The fact is that the Republic financed museum activity (i.e. the activities of entities that had obtained the status of a museum) partly or wholly, but could do little more than observe what was going on in the period of centralization.

In 1985 a special analysis was carried out which showed that conditions in museums had actually improved, but that the greatest losses were experienced by national museums and that the overall situation was far from satisfactory. Again, it turned out that the main problem lay in the fact that **national museums failed to carry out their central functions in preparing unified professional standards on all levels of museum work**. As far as other museums were concerned, it turned out that they carried out their tasks as they saw fit, that the data they mediated was unreliable, that the system in which the founder and financier were two separate persons was not functioning as it should have been.

This analysis, together with the conclusion made by the government that central functions of museums were to be defined by law, was in 1988 followed by **the first formal document regarding the Slovenian museums network**. This document determined that there were three types of museums in the Republic: 1. national museums, 2. specialized museums (i.e. museums whose activity dealt with special fields of the profession in one or several municipalities) and 3. general regional museums (i.e. museums that were professionally responsible for most or all fields of the museum profession, while they were regionally responsible for several municipalities or regions). **The network attempted to overcome the shortcomings in the field of cooperation between museums and in the performance of the central functions of national museums that were established by the aforementioned analysis.** But the attempt failed as the distribution of "centrality" was not proportionally sanctioned. Thus, although certain obligations were imposed on museums and local communities and sanctions were defined in case these obligations remained unrealized, there were unfortunately no legal channels for putting these sanctions into force.

Regional and inter-municipal museums had already experienced a financial breakdown when in the middle of the 1960s their financing was shifted to municipal governments. The situation improved when the Republic took over a part of their co-financing in the 1980's, but in general things remained rather dreary due to the stubbornness of local politics.

At the same time, Yugoslavia was in the middle of political crisis. The country was collapsing and it was expected that the emerging new country would bring not only political changes but also significant alterations in the local self-government.

In 1989 the Cultural Community of Slovenia (forerunner of the Ministry of Culture) decided to protect museums against new turbulence. To achieve this goal **it took over the financing of museums that were incorporated in the museums network**. The latter consisted of 41 national, regional, municipal or city museums and galleries, all of which were given the status of public institution by law. Other museums, i.e. those that were not included in the network, could apply for funding.

In Slovenia, the share of public funding for museums was the highest in 1990 when the old government was slowly stepping off the throne and meanwhile managed to empty all the treasuries under the very nose of the new government. In 1991 this share was already reduced by half and it has never increased to the level of the previous year. However, this reduction of funding helped to bring about a renaissance of Slovenian museums, to which both museum organizations as well as numerous professionals from the fields of archaeology, history and culture contributed significantly. Things could have turned out perfectly if the legislators had been a bit more attuned to the suggestions of professionals and demanded that those in charge of museums carry out their duties professionally, but instead they chose to spend their precious time on constant alterations of the legislation. Indeed, in the last 15 years the working conditions in Slovenian museums have been more than satisfying, but due to the fact that we often served as government guinea pigs, our activities being constantly debilitated by perpetual innovations, we provided fewer results than we actually could have.

AND WHAT IS THE SITUATION LIKE TODAY?

Since 2000 the **Decree on establishing a museums network for performing public services in the field of movable cultural heritage and on determining national museums** has been in force; this Decree was passed as a sublegal act of the **Natural and Cultural Heritage Act that was passed in 1999**.

The act (like its predecessor) defines the **movable** and the **immovable** heritage, the former being under the jurisdiction of museums.

It also defines **public services**. (Note: concept of **public services** – it originates in the view that some cultural goods needs to be secured as public goods; the state or local community can achieve this goal either directly or by establishing public services in the field of culture. These goods are usually secured as public offices or under equal terms. In the case of museums, a contract for carrying out public services and financing assignments for the unified execution of such services can be made between the state museum, local museum or any other legal entity. In general, the whole field of culture falls under the **Act on Enforcing the Public Interest in the Field of Culture**, which defines relationships on this level.)

Which activities fall under the category of public services is generally defined by the act responsible for the specific field; in the case of museums, the issue is under the domain of the aforementioned Natural and Cultural Heritage Act.

The act defines the set of elements of public services encompassing all the items that fall under the notion of basic museum work: record keeping, collecting, researching, documenting, protecting, conserving, presenting, registering etc.

The act speaks of different **types of museums**; these are: **national, regional, city, municipal and private**.

National museums protect the heritage that is of national importance, and examine material that is located outside the country but is nonetheless important for the Slovenian nation. Other museums are responsible for heritage protection in the area or territory where they were founded.

Moreover, the act states the conditions necessary for providing public services; here, the emphasis is on the employee's professionalism and skill. (Note: It should be mentioned that in Slovenia professional examinations have the status of state examinations; every professional museum worker needs to pass such an examination).

In Slovenia, the conditions for carrying out public services are not defined by commonly accepted guidelines and standards, but rather by a verisimilitude of regulations. Generally accepted international standards and ethic codes are followed, of course, but serious problems arise when some basic level of secured standards for providing publicly funded services need to be provided. Museums insist that the establishment of such uniform standards is fundamental to providing public services, while founders and financers regularly avoid the issue and speak of standards in rather vague and loose terms.

The subjects of the decree on the museums network are only those museums that were established as public institutions and whose activity is wholly or partly funded by the state or local community.

In addition to public services, the other two central notions found in the decree are:

Professional centrality and **territorial centrality**.

Professional centrality is supposed to be carried out by national museums in the whole national area, while territorial centrality is supposed to be carried out by local museums in the area under their guidance.

Professional centrality:

- preparation of middle- and long-term programmes for the protection of movable cultural heritage
- professional help for museums as institutions and in individual professional fields
- managing the register of the cultural heritage for the Republic of Slovenia
- taking care of territorial coverage and carrying out public services

Territorial centrality:

- carrying out museum public services in a certain area, usually in all known museum professional fields or in cooperation with other museums.

Of course, the two notions interrelate and are not mutually exclusive as envisaged by the present network (the latter only recapitulates obsolete thinking patterns).

In the 1990s the Slovenian Museums Association organized a round table on the subject of a museums network which was to become an instrument in the development of museums and museum profession, and was to additionally stimulate museological innovations, competitiveness among museums, education etc.; the Association envisaged itself as the main mediator and factor of communication.

Even though the legislator's decree sanctioned the unwanted state of affairs, it paid little heed to suggestions made by various experts. This is understandable, as the legislator's primary goal was to secure the established system of protecting the cultural heritage in the light of a recent reform of local self-government and its financing, and therefore very little was done in the field of the system's further development.

At present, the network is nothing more than what it was technically supposed to be: a very undefined collection of duties, museums and areas where the latter carry out public services determined by law and financed or co-financed from the state budget. The network wasn't planned as a dynamic model with the possibility of rearranging individual museums included in the network. Whether a certain museum is included in the network depends on a set of numerical and measurable parameters: number of employees, size of the premises, number of items or collections and so on. In order to increase the network's sufficiency the instrument of verifying the production potency of each

individual museum should be included as well. This instrument would measure the following parameters: level of professionalism, effectiveness of working in the social environment and so on; what is needed is basically some type of system of accreditation, based on approximately equal starting points and then verified at regular intervals.

Something of the kind was introduced by the Cultural Heritage Act which entered into force on March 1, 2008. The newly passed act abolishes all the previous acts (the decree on the museums network included) and provides for new laws that are to be passed until the end of the present year. The museums network will be replaced by a system of registered, national and authorized museums. The system will be carried out by the national agency for the protection of the movable and intangible heritage of museums. The basic public document provided by the new act is called the **museum register**. It falls under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Culture and will contain entries on all museums. With the consent of the museum founder, all museums fulfilling the fundamental spatial, financial and staff requirements for preserving and protecting the heritage and providing public exhibits of their collections with defined opening hours and entrance fees are allowed to enter the register. The preliminary conditions are partly determined by the Act, and will be completed by a special future regulation. All museums that are currently members of the museums network will *ex officio* enter the registry in 2008. Moreover, all national museums and museums wanting to obtain the **authorization** for providing national public services or wishing to candidate for state funds will have to register as well. The notions of national and territorial centrality, which served as the bedrocks of the museums network, are no longer present in the Act. In addition to national museums, whose funding is wholly in the hands of the government, the act also postulates the so-called **authorized museums** that are authorized by the government to carry out national public services. The contract made between the government, founder and museum will establish the portion of national funding as well as the museum's professional area and its field (territory) of operation.

A given museum can obtain authorization for a period of three years (interval of condition verification) on the basis of a public tender. Judging by the conditions necessary for obtaining authorization, it is more or less obvious that the latter will be received mostly by the museums that are already in the museums network, and whose activities are financed predominantly from the national budget and were established by the local communities. Presently, the Republic of Slovenia lacks registered regions (regional legislation has been a matter of fierce debate for the last couple of years) and therefore local communities are represented by the regions where

museums have their main seats – and this holds true even for museums with a regional character. Authorization will enable the museum to have up to 80 % of all of its costs covered by the state. Exactly what is meant by the words **up to** and **all museum costs** will undoubtedly have to be defined in a further financial regulation.

One of the novelties posited by the new act is the **National Heritage and Museum Agency**. The agency will be formed in 2008 within the context of the national museum that will prove successful in a public tender and will be chosen for that position by the Ministry of Culture. The agency will provide professional opinions on the question of whether a given museum truly satisfies the conditions for being entered in the museum register or obtaining authorization; it will participate in other administrative procedures, such as export permits and granting material and archives from archaeological finds; prepare analyses of museum activities; suggest what measures should be taken for the protection of movable heritage; offer criteria for the co-financing of museum programmes; provide standards and norms for museum operations; regulate and coordinate educational programmes; monitor probationary programmes, professional exams and the attainment of professional titles; organize collective appearances, promotions and trades of museum services; and other tasks determined in cooperation with museums and museum organizations.

Many of the tasks that the Act assigns to the Agency are nowadays performed by the Slovenian Museums Association within educational programmes, promotions, international cooperation and publishing activities that are partly co-funded by the Ministry of Culture, partly by the museums themselves, and partly by means of other national and international public tenders. The future of both the Movable Heritage and Museum Agency and the Slovenian Museums Association lies in the formation organizational and substantive bonds with the sole purpose of creating an efficient support for Slovenian museums.

In conclusion. Certain circles in Slovenia wrongly believe that professional issues can be resolved with the help of legislation – without prior professional analyses and definitions of certain ground rules of professional conduct. Analyses that are carried out are inadequate, systems that are being established are not working properly, and all our solutions amount to constant shuffling of the same cards. The Ministry keeps promising more radical steps but fails to realize that they are only recycling old, unsuccessful approaches and that the best solutions are normally the simplest ones – those that were already successfully realized in some areas. The discussion that erupted prior to the passing of the new act as well as difficulties and questions that have arisen during

its realization may actually result in a coherent system in which the social role of museums and the national wealth they preserve will actually be properly recognized – an efficient and friendly system that all museums would welcome wholeheartedly and to the workings of which they will contribute the very best they can offer, receiving the same in return. Such a system could be called the *Museums Association* or simply *Slovenian Museums and Galleries*.

Received: May 29, 2007