

**3rd
International
Scientific
Conference**

**31 May - 2 June, 2018
Vrnjačka Banja, Serbia**

2018

**TOURISM
IN FUNCTION OF DEVELOPMENT
OF THE REPUBLIC OF SERBIA**

Tourism in the Era of Digital Transformation



**THEMATIC
PROCEEDINGS
II**



**UNIVERSITY OF KRAGUJEVAC
FACULTY OF HOTEL MANAGEMENT
AND TOURISM IN VRNJAČKA BANJA**



CHALLENGES AND POTENTIALS OF THE MUSEUM TOURISM: BUILDING THE AUDIENCE OF THE MUSEUM OF YUGOSLAVIA

Milena Jokanović¹;

Abstract

Since a museum has developed from the institution which is dedicated to selection, preservation and presentation of objects to the one willing to communicate, educate and extend the audience, the museum tourism has become really important branch of cultural tourism. There are many theoretical perspectives of how to build the image of a museum, how to develop its audience nowadays and many mechanisms of museum management which show this theory functioning very well practically. Still, when it comes to the region of ex Yugoslav countries, there are many heritage spots which are floating in the limbo of shifted ideologies that once where spaces of the ruler's representation and magnification and today are more or less successfully being converted into particular museums. Museum of Yugoslavia in Belgrade, an institution still linked to Josip Broz Tito in public discourse due to its position and collection, is maybe the most illustrative example to research how, through complete image building, new mission and vision, new name, new interpretation of inherited collection and new setting development, one place of memory and political happenings is being converted to a contemporary museum. In this paper, all the challenges of the new museum audience and programs building will be followed on this quite unique example of the (re)construction of the Museum of Yugoslavia.

Key Words: museum tourism, museum image, museum audience building, Museum of Yugoslavia

JEL classification: Z10, Z30

The museum tourism is today an important branch of the cultural heritage tourism. Thus International Museum Day 2009 carried the message of

¹ Milena Jokanović (Gnjatović), Research Assistant, Center for Museums and Heritage, Department of Art History, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade, Čika Ljubina 18-20, +381637535789, gnjatovic.milena@gmail.com

sustainable tourism with the theme “Tourism and Museums”, while the International Council of Museums (ICOM) has dedicated the whole conference, publication and follow-up activities to this topic. There are many different tools and examples of good practices showing how various museums have succeeded in audience development, image building and becoming recognized by the whole world. Next to the collection and the setting which are primer, marketing tools, extravagant contemporary building and effective use of new media definitely make many museums desired tourist destinations. In this paper we will follow how the image of a museum can be built and how museum can become a recognizable brand competing for visitors with other museums, but also amusement parks, cultural centers, multimedia events, etc. Still, we will see that an image is always a representation of the identity, and, that, when there is no clear identity set, many museums face problems in audience development and image building. The identity of a museum should be based on the clear mission and vision and on the heritage it preserves, its collection of objects, place of memory or immaterial practices it keeps. Thus, following the example of the Museum of Yugoslavia, we will examine how, through complete image building, new mission and vision, new name, new interpretation of inherited collection and new setting development, one place of memory and space which is still connected to the socialist leader in the public discourse, is being converted to the contemporary museum.

Short museum history – towards an open and communicative institution

The term *museum* (*Μουσείον*, *Mouseion*) signifies the space dedicated to Muses, daughters of the Goddess of Memory, Mnemosine and the king of the gods, Zeus. However, connecting of the museum with systematized collecting and examining of materials has probably started with Aristotelus and his excursions to the island Lesbos in 340 BC where he has started gathering, classifying and studying botanical items. Aristotelus continued these experiments in Lyceums, communities of scientists and pupils organized to study in details botanic, history and other disciplines. There was a Museion in Lyceum, which, as Jeffrey Abt explains, was a place where scientists lived, but which also was a cultural center for different researches. Museum in Alexandria, one of the most famous institutions of classical antiquity is direct successor of the Aristotelian Museion. (Abt, 2014) However, the period which is in the history of museology recognized as a beginning of this heritage institution is the age

of Renaissance and development of humanistic thought but also of a wish to collect antiquities, reveal antique monuments copy them and preserve as the most valuable items. Following the previously said, we can conclude that the idea of a *museum* is to gather objects valuable for individuals or smaller groups. Through time, these collections became more opened to public, at first for higher classes, so they were a necessary point in the route of students from Western Europe on their Grand Tours. In the 19th century, the institutionalization and instrumentalisation of collections will position a museum as an important representative of ruling ideologies, while objects will be used in national identity construction. Finally, the French Revolution has brought a new position of the institution of museum which became more open to bourgeois class and available for citizens.

Consequently, following social changes through time, museums will become more opened and start extending their audiences using various tools in order to serve the desired image to wider population. While observing a museum as a particular medium, Jorge Glusberg recognizes two types of a museum: the “cold” medium as radio or TV, which just transmits the information, communicates one way and it does not offer possibilities to different interpretations of a message it carries. On the other hand, there are “hot” museums that can be compared to the phone in ways they call audience for participation and constant dialog. (Glizberg, 1983) Following this trace, Tomislav Šola stresses that contemporary museum should communicate with visitors and provoke critical observation and possibilities for different interpretations of the information hidden in museum objects. (Šola, 2011) Both authors will conclude that the traditional (19th century) museums are too closed and that those “serve” very one-sided image of the world created by ruling minority with selected objects, while modern museums should have tendencies towards opened structure in aspects such as: choosing of various objects and different messages they carry, architecture of museum building which should not be rejecting the visitor with its academic style, using new media and contemporary ways of audience development and inviting to communication. In other words, contemporary museum should not just send information to visitors, it should communicate, provoke critical thinking and please its audience. For the most eclarant examples of the first “opened” museums of the 20th century which influenced many others in the world, Glusberg chooses Museum of Modern Art in New York and Center Georges Pompidou in Paris. With the position in more transparent glass edifices, collections of modern art and modernist setting,

these two were opposite to the paradigm of the *cold*, traditional museum. Therefore, even very famous museums have started following the contemporary fashion, changing, building the recognizable image and opening their doors to wider audience in order to make them see the collection.

Very important aspect contemporary museums use when thinking on how to be attractive for its audience, is, as we mentioned, the building itself. After the Georges Pompidou Center in Paris placed in an extravagant, transparent and contemporary building which opposes completely to its surrounding, and after the spiral building of Guggenheim Museum in New York, contemporary society brings new type of a museum, a particular brand positioned in contemporary, outstanding edifice designed by some famous architect. These buildings, for the first time in museum history, are more important than the collection when it comes to audience attracting. In this context, definitely the most famous example is the Museum Guggenheim in Bilbao, Spain, which provoked so called “Bilbao effect”. After the shift of sociopolitical circumstances and the crash of industry, the government of Spain has succeeded in surpassing the economic crisis in a province Baskia by building the museum in a recognizable contemporary building designed by Frank Gehry. Guggenheim Bilbao is the museum which did not have its collection that would be interesting for visitors, but after 1997 when it was opened, this museum constructed the image on this sensational building and it was visited by 5 million people in 4 years becoming a symbol of the whole city. Even in 2002, which was a turbulent period for the tourist industry, the city has succeeded in bringing 851.628 visitors and produced the income of 162 million dollars for the local economy. “Museum Bilbao generated various images of itself, astonishingly different forms. It became iconotype: the image which does not just represent a concrete artifact, person or place, but possesses enough strength to present some category of human experience.” (Smith, 2013, p. 257) However, not all the successful world’ museums could change their buildings and construct completely new identity, but they added some elements to the existing ones (Pyramid gate in the Louver, new part of Tate Modern etc.) or rebuilt the old edifices and transformed settings and successfully responded to the needs of contemporary audience in this way. Even though there are many examples of the good practices in this context, we will see that not every solution could be applied to other museums with similar challenges.

Contemporary branding of a museum

The idea of applying the marketing theory to the cultural institution dates back in the 1970s when it was published in different papers by Philippe and Neil Kotler, Levi, Zaltman and Shapiro who started applying the concept of the social marketing to non-profit activities. In any museum today, marketing has a multilevel role to remind the public about the existence of the museum and its offer, attract visitors and raise the awareness about the museum as a necessary institution in society, but also to help fundraising and offer more qualitative programs of the museum.

If we would like to offer one particular definition of the terms *brand* and *image building*, we must say that there is no such; these terms are mostly considered as a concept, feeling, life style, the main sense of the contemporary corporation existence, whereas the commercial is meant to communicate this sense to public (Klein, 2003). Brands are promises. They are made of advantages (additional immaterial values) which are being linked with the name or trademark symbol, giving a higher value to it. Brand differentiation is of great importance; brand is the representation of one's identity. (Olins, 2003) It is necessary that brand is, except for these "abstract" terms, defined also by visual elements, its material bases, in order to be complete. Roland Bart gives his analysis of the image basing it on already existing semiotic models of communication, developed by Charles Sanders and Umberto Eco. (Bart, 1981) Brand takes the place of the mental image. The image/symbol/commercial is a referent, and it is denotatively connected to the product itself. Bart concludes that there are three messages, or three levels of the communication in every branding, and that is: linguistic, iconic coded and iconic non-coded message. Visual identity of the brand is composed of logotypes, selection of colors, design etc. and these elements express the attitude. Branding is, as Milan Jovanović concludes in his paper: "Brendocracy" (Brendokatija), incorporated in the social heritage and it is equally important as the Renaissance or Modernism, as any of the world's tendencies important for the culture and life style in global measures. Branding is more than trend; it is a part of ideology. (Jovanović, 2006)

In his book *Museum Branding*, Margot A. Wallace suggests that nowadays, museum needs a brand, "an identity that instantly communicates what it is, has, and does". (Wallace, 2006, p. 37) A museum needs an image, which is how others perceive its identity and which helps in creating reputation. By the museum image building, he

recalls supporters and friends, exhibition designers and docents to help organize a visitor's journey through exhibits, set of symbols and logotypes that tie all materials, publications, programs, departments, and events together. (Gnjatović, 2014)

Therefore, many museums apply marketing tools in order to be competitive in a globalized cultural market. Still, again, the image is a representation of the identity. Therefore, in the following discussion we will question if it is possible to build an image of a museum and attract audience with it, if the identity of this institution/place/collection is not clear to its own employees, nor to the wider public or to the state.

Serbian museums – in search of identity

In the year 2000 in Serbia there were around 100 museums (*Muzeji Srbije*, Benderić ed. 2000), mostly public, supported by the Serbian government, the province of Vojvodina, cities or municipalities (i.e. founders), while private museums were only few. As many of these institutions are founded after the Second World War, during the period of Socialism, it is quite clear that settings inside were sending clear messages and following the image of the state regime at the time. During the 1990s all of them have passed through a difficult period of general social pauperization and stagnation, as well as through dramatic and frustrating processes of social and political changes. On all levels of social structure, public institutions have been submitted to often violent shifts that demanded instantaneous changes, policy adaptability and constant protection of professional ethic values: following the shifts of state politics in the 1990s, legal framework, cultural policy, cooperation policy, staff policy, as well as objectives of cultural institutions (including museums) have been changing radically. In such situation, “museums and museum professionals have been facing various risks: from incompetent directors and other responsible staff, lack of finance for urgent repairs, absence of necessary systems for collection protection (alarm and surveillance system, humidity control system, dry and safe depots etc.), rupture with all outer partners and lack of international cooperation, restriction of professional development of museum personnel and experts, to malversations with museum collections and space, and to direct physical threats during the NATO bombing campaign in 1999.” (Cvetković 2006, p. 17) “Museum scape in Serbia was characterized by modest exhibiting, research and publishing activities, while educational

function was almost completely neglected. Museums were surviving in both inner and outer isolation: they were losing more and more connection with the society and its needs – their primary reason of existence; they were far from the international networks, projects and partnerships.“ (Gnjatović, 2014, p. 216)

Unfortunately, even today the position of museums in Serbia, but of some regional ones as well, is not completely different. It seems as changes are coming into these institutions too slowly, losing the pace with the world's famous museums' development and the new museum management concepts. Most museums here still search for the identity which will be represented, many are in the long period of the (re)construction of the building and the setting, many are creating new mission and vision, trying to reach new audience and to become recognisable cultural spot of the city, to bring foreign tourists... There is, on the other hand, one completely unique example in Belgrade, of a place which, while being in constant search for the right positioning of its identity, is following many contemporary managerial paths and being second visited destination in Serbia – a Museum of Yugoslavia.

In search of the identity – historical perspective of the Museum of Yugoslavia

The institution today named Museum of Yugoslavia has passed through two decades of a very turbulent search of identity which should be represented. This place, today embracing three buildings and big Park of sculptures, is complex on many different levels. In the context of identity construction, at first we can issue the name of this institution. Consequently, the name *Museum of Yugoslavia* is already making question what should be represented in this institution, from which point of view this museum observes Yugoslavia – through different phenomena, historical events, social life, folklore? On the other hand, question is also what is the collection of this museum, unique with its name in the whole region? And finally, who are visitors of this institution, is it recognized as tourist cultural spot in Serbia, how can it build better image and develop audience? Still, many of these questions are still to be answered by employees of this museum, as this name is quite new, given to the institution in 2016.

The space which is now housing a Museum of Yugoslavia has very complex history and is still influenced by many different social, political

and economic circumstances. The Park of Sculptures and the three mentioned buildings were surrounding the residence of lifelong president of the Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia Josip Broz Tito, in Belgrade, being positioned at the Topčider hill, a part of the city of Belgrade overlooking the city center and being symbolically connected with leaders through history (the royal palaces are just a bit up the hill). As Tito tendentiously ruled from this spot, through time this particular space of memory got many layers of meaning. The only building made for museum purposes and being still a part of the complex is the edifice which was a museum of presidents' gifts, Museum May 25th. One of the pillars of the Yugoslav socialist ideology was building the cult of personality through a constant reproduction of 'spectacular' image of Tito. His representation was created as an image of a politician who rose from the masses and continued to have a good relation with the people. During his lifelong rule, as he was a figure of national and international charisma, he was given many gifts – both as a result of diplomatic protocols and a part of way peoples of Yugoslavia wanted to show their devotion. A gift for the president was the way to position oneself as a part of the socialist community. In 1950's the idea of creating space where all Marshal's presents would be exhibited came up and the depot for the 'museum' of gifts was built in the residential complex. In 1962, the building of Museum May 25th was constructed and given as a present to Josip Broz from the City of Belgrade for his 70th birthday. Its mission was to collect, keep, study and exhibit all presents dedicated to and connected with the personality of Marshal Tito and his political and other activities, with accent to his contacts with citizens, representatives of political, industrial and other workers' associations related to socialist development, fight against colonialism, spreading policy of peaceful coexistence and fight for the world peace. (City assembly, 1962) This modernist total artwork building that celebrated presidents' personality and stressed how much he is respected and loved by his people but also by the whole world, functioned as a modern cabinet of wonder, collection showing a microcosm of its owner. It is interesting that the building is constructed by the same architect, Mihajlo Miša Janković, who has done the stadium across the street – arena in which the 25th of May was celebrated every year as the Day of Youth but as presidents' birthday as well. The strong identity in the sense of geographical position, architecture of the whole area and collection therefore was well thought and clear during the period of Socialism.

When Tito died in 1980, 18 years after the opening of the Museum May 25th, as it is today known following his word of mouth, president was buried in the complex in front of the residency and just behind the Museum. The House of Flowers, a winter garden in which many tropical plants were grown, became Mausoleum of Josip Broz Tito, quite unique for this region and quite hybrid in existing funeral culture. It was at the time a logical solution to pronounce the whole area gathering residencies (the one in which JBT lived and the other built for him but finished just before the death), some surrounding houses, the Museum May 25th and the Mausoleum – the Memorial Complex of Josip Broz Tito. This was a space visited by 10 to 15 thousand people per one day in 1980 and 1981, just after the funeral. The very funeral also gathered the biggest number of different nationalities at one place in the modern history. However, this frequency of people visiting Memorial Centre primarily because of the tombstone and this name for the whole complex could not last long as the end of '80s and beginning of '90s brought new socio-political circumstances and new attitude towards socialist ideology. The fall of the Berlin Wall marked the end of Communism in Europe – in next few years all of the countries of former Eastern bloc faced changes of the existing political and economic order. In Yugoslavia the nationalistic tendencies were more and more present, and the new elites (majority of whom were actually ex members of the communist party) changed the rhetoric and embraced the discourse of nationalism and long neglected national aspirations that were enslaved in form of multinational socialist Yugoslavia. Once beloved president, Josip Broz Tito, became the dictator in public discourses of all former republics and the ideology of *brotherhood and unity* was then reinterpreted as repressive and untrue. The institution that had the mission to keep the memory on him, Memorial Centre, was no longer considered to be important nor the institution of public interest. On the contrary, it had lost its prestige, many of employees got fired and the Museum May the 25th fell from federal, under the authority of the City Council. Many debates were organized with the intention to decide the future of this institution. (Slavković, 2009) Finally, in 1996, the government made a decision to put an end to work of the Memorial Center and Museum of Revolution (never ended idea of JBT which did not get the building while the initiation of the collection was exhibited in different spaces until joining it with the collection of presents to JBT) and decided to found the Museum of Yugoslav History as the only federal institution at the time.² The new

2 In 1992 a broad panel discussion Memorial centre JBT – how to continue was

formed museum inherited all the art and cultural history content of the both museums and existing three buildings surrounding ex Tito's residency at the Topčider Hill. Due to two completely different huge collections, space which is already politically stigmatized in public discourse and the name of a museum which is not responding to its objects completely, Museum of Yugoslav History faced many problems from the first steps in new identity construction. The character of museums' collections which gather more than 200000 artifacts bear testimony on Tito's Yugoslavia and its heritage. By time, space and content, each of the museum objects is a fragment of the Tito's representation in the mirror of the peoples. (Radić 2012:126)

However, standing behind the name Museum of Yugoslav History, many visitors, naturally did not expect to see a setting celebrating Tito, but a historical one, an exhibition which will objectively answer questions of constitution of Yugoslavia from the very beginning of the use of this name for a Kingdom and other historical events which are not always linked just to Second Yugoslavia and ruleship of Josip Broz Tito. This is why a Museum started recreating the identity of this already recognised place of memory and political happenings. We will see that, even they followed contemporary standards of museum management, worked a lot on the permanent setting construction and new image building, it was very hard, even impossible to reshape completely the identity of this space and to use the existing collection for the new purpose.

(Re)construction of the identity – the Museum of Yugoslav History

The fact is that many authors have recognized the policy of renaming as important strategy in shaping and reshaping the collective memory at the time, while the most prominent examples are the names of streets, schools

organized by The Art Historians Association suggested the need to establish museum that would deal with the Yugoslav idea among many other suggestions (to become an information and documentation centre, science centre, art school, etc.). In order to find solution for the function of Memorial centre JBT, White Palace, Old Palace, Museum of 4th July and MRPNY, the Government formed the experts' group in 1992. (some of the members of this experts' groups were: Dragoslav Srejšović, Dejan Medaković, Vojislav Đurić, Branko Petranović, Irina Subotić, etc). This experts' group passed proposal to the Government regarding the future use and function of representative institutions that were state-owned. This experts group proposed in 1993 that White Palace, Old Palace and Memorial Center JBT, together with all their collections and surrounding parks should be preserved as a whole and proclaimed as cultural and historical good of exceptional value and importance for Yugoslavia.

and towns all over ex-Yugoslavia. The case of the Museum of the Yugoslav History, its foundation through renaming of two other forerunner institutions is also example of this policy. New name brought new obligations and possibilities for conceiving broader programming policy. In addition, a vision and a mission statement were formulated to express the focus and course of development of this institution. (Slavković, 2009)

The new vision and the new mission positioned this museum as a *significant, contemporary, modern and networked cultural and tourist destination* which communicates with the public through its collection and through modern resources, constantly raising questions about Yugoslavia and Josip Broz Tito. (Museum of Yugoslav History, 1996)

Contrary to this optimistic beginning in new identity construction, as one of the biggest exhibiting spaces and the building under authority of the City Council, the Museum hosted many shows of contemporary art, design, diploma exhibitions of students from the Faculty of Applied arts etc. Therefore from 2001 to 2008, there were evident advancement neither in museum management practices, nor in development of the museological concepts and clear program policy creation within the Museum. The fact that only 21 exhibition out of 86 that took place in this period, were autonomous projects of this institution indicates the lack of initiative but also the lack of public interest for the heritage kept in this Museum. In the same period, there was no clear focus in choosing guest programs – exhibitions varied from Chinese bronze to Swedish Contemporary Design. However, there is one positive aspect of this period of Museums' functioning – this practice kept the venue present in contemporary cultural life, giving chance to new generations to gain the habit to visit it.

Finally, in 2007, this museum has become a cultural institution on the state level and it got the new managerial team, wanting to follow tendencies and trends of the contemporary museum working positions and divisions. It seemed that the task of 'becoming the museum' and establishing the ways of functioning based on criteria of museum profession and new managerial standards was still to be completed, but the situation was more promising than earlier.

The current Museum director, Neda Knežević, summarises the turbulent period and constant tryings to constitute one permanent setting after the

death of Tito comparing the history of this space with the destiny of Yugoslavia: “The effort of transformation of the Memorial Complex JBT and creation of the new permanent setting was firstly stopped by the civil war in 1991. Just after the official formation of the Museum of Yugoslav History in 1996, requisition of the most valuable funds and objects of the previous institution has initiated many problems, from legal to storing ones (...). Three years after, just nine days after the Museum has given a proposal of the future permanent setting conception to the Government, the NATO aggression has started. When finally, in 2002 Museum got back parts of its collection, this institution came to legally no regulated status due to one more division of the country (...)” (Knežević, 2017, p. 10) Moreover, this space was used for political purposes even in the very recent past with the exposure of the dead body of Slobodan Milošević in 2006, (president of Yugoslavia in nineties who even lived in one residency of the Memorial complex JBT wanting to conquer the symbolical position of the leader of (already almost completely dissolved) Yugoslavia), for public condolence. The House of Flowers is, on the other hand, from 2013 housing also a tombstone of Jovanka Broz, last Titos’ wife. These happening were loudly discussed in public, while museum management, not willingly, needed again to accept the Government decisions and to stop with all the programs in order to organize them. Even today, a Mausoleum of Josip Broz Tito welcomes many different delegations in there, often political, visits to Serbia where Titos’ tombstone is one of the points on their route. The representative of each delegation writes an official message in the Memorial book on this occasion. All this is not helping Museum to reconstruct the identity and not to be seen as a political institution by the wider population.

The first project starting the period of autoreflexion of this Museum was, however, in 2009. It was named the *New Old Museum* and gathered experts from different professional backgrounds and from different Balkan, ex-Yugoslav countries. In the same period some changes in management and programming policy of the Museum of Yugoslav History became visible. As Katarina Živanović, a curator of the Museum, stresses in an interview in 2013, it is now an obligation and the everyday need of this institution to restructure and to change in order to fulfill demands of its audience. There were in that moment and still are (at least) two different types of visitors coming to the Museum (and we will see this in more details afterwords) – the one admiring Tito and coming to his tombstone, and the other, critically asking for an answer what Yugoslavia

is, considering political, but also social and everyday-life history. (Jokanović, Stanković, 2016)

Museum of the Yugoslav History was one of the first state museums to introduce new concepts of museum management and new working positions in the last decay. Katarina Živanović (2013) has seen the coming of a person from NGO sector for the museum director in 2008 (another Katarina Živanović being previous director of the MYH) a great advantage considering new, more project oriented logic and employing many young curators who will have enthusiasm to be educated and up to date. It is not therefore accidental that from the coming of the new director in the museum in May 2008, new logotype, followed by the whole new visual identity made by one of the most famous contemporary visual designers Mirko Ilić, was introduced. Even though this logotype has been a present to the Museum from the designer already in 2005, it was in 2008 that it has been officially used in all materials, while the old logotype, made by Branko Mikelić was used in the meantime. Mirko Ilić's logotype is minimalistic, modern, catchy and easy to remember. As the designer himself explained: "Three lines, three dashes, represent three reincarnations of Yugoslavia. Blue and red, beside the flag, represent also two persons speaking, perhaps arguing - the communist and the anti-communist." (From the interview of Ana Panić with Mirko Ilić in July 2013: "Tri crte, tri recke, predstavljaju tri reinkarnacije Jugoslavije. Plava i crvena osim zastave, predstavljaju dvije osobe u razgovoru, možda prepirci, komunistu i ne komunistu."). Consequently, symbolical meaning of this logotype reveals constant struggle of curators to make a balance between Titostalgia (Velikonja, 2010) and all the memories kept in this complex of buildings.

Even with this catchy public presentation and young enthusiastic team, the museum management faced many problems when trying to construct a setting out of old collection but answering the new given name and purpose.

In January 2013, the sketch of the future permanent exhibition was shown in the central exhibiting space in the Museum of Yugoslav History. The team of experts, gathered from the whole region, explains that their ambition was not to show an encyclopedic exhibition and include all aspects of the social system, nor to present all available data. "The aim of the exhibition is to create a space that will introduce the visitors to one of the most interesting and most controversial state-building experiments in

the 20th century, in a modern, attractive and objective way. The idea is not to show a timeline of crucial events, but to cover all the important phenomena that left their mark on the countries and the societies in the land known, for more than 70 years as Yugoslavia.” (Muzej istorije Jugoslavije, 2013)

Problems which creative team, coming from different ex-Yugoslav states had, were numerous. Not to mention the lack of economical means for the making of technically more advanced and interactive exhibition. One of the first problems was definitely, which materials (images) from the museums’ collection to use for this purpose when 90% of the whole museum fundus is bond to Tito. Therefore, the exhibition is made out of archive materials and documentary movies – so called meta, or secondary museum materials – so the first comment that could be found in the evaluation of this setting is that there is too much text no one is able to read in whole while visiting.

Co-author and the main curator, Ana Panić explains that the exhibition presents ten Yugoslav phenomena without any chronological order. Different thematic parts dealt with economy, regime and social life aspects. There were also the most famous events, assassinations and assemblies, important for the Yugoslav history. Culture and art were presented fragmentary through, mostly documentary TV shows and there was almost no presentation of the individual, every-day life in Yugoslavia. This aspect will be afterwards represented in another exhibition curated by the same author: “They Never Had it Better” which was very well and widely accepted by the whole region showing positive fact that curators of this institution are working on after evaluation and criticism. Another museum exhibitions dedicated to phenomenon of Gastarbeiters, movie industry, socialist art and design in the last few years will also respond to this need of audience to understand the every-day life of Yugoslav people.

However, in this continual research, it is concluded that Yugoslav ideology and political perspectives are still live in many of the visitors minds and that an objective interpretation cannot be formed while the living witnesses of this country still deeply believe in its doctrine and are still commemorating Tito’s thomstone. Even when making exhibitions, experts coming from various ex-Yugoslav countries, still could not make a compromise on some crucial aspects of the Yugoslav history. Moreover, the problem of making balance between the pro Tito oriented and the new

audience coming to get objective answers about the construct called Yugoslavia was central again. The idea of the “Yugoslavia from the Beginning to an End exhibition” for example, was to critically observe and give many interpretations of this phenomenon, but the curatorial team wanted still, as Ana Panić suggests, to skip and exclude nostalgic feelings. And there we come to the question if this is possible; if we know all the history of the space and collection where the exhibition is taking place, and if there is no long historical grasp, and some people who lived in one of *Yugoslavias* exhibited can give their opinion on it, is it possible to make a distance, be objective and exclude nostalgia from the place where people still long for their Marshal and bring flowers to the tombstone? One of the comments in the book of impressions is: “You completely killed the idea of Yugoslavia”. This was not the first time that the museum employees could not make a balance between audience coming just to worship Tito and the one truly interested in the exhibitions. “Similar neglecting of the Yugo-nostalgia and disrespect to audience coming to Tito’s mausoleum from the new museum management could be recognized earlier in the attitude towards the celebration of the 25th of May, when no one of employees have paid much attention to this audience. Still, hundreds of tickets given for this occasion are finally counted in the annual report and number of museum visitors.” (Adić, 2013, 336)

On the other hand, the young and urban population already used to coming to this exhibiting space, from 2001 to 2008 as mentioned before, could not understand the basic idea of the exhibition nor the idea of Yugoslavia, as the museum collection cannot respond to the needs of museums name.

Museum of Yugoslav History – balancing with different audiences

These problems in balancing between different purposes and different audiences of one place of memory are the best visible in the House of Flowers, a space which is literally a mausoleum and an exhibiting space in the same time.

As the author of the concept of exhibition currently present in this space stresses: “The House of Flowers is a delicate space that demands a thoughtful and carefully considered display. Some contents, allowed in some other exhibition areas, cannot be shown in this particular place (out of respect for the person buried there). Due to this, making an exhibition

in the House of Flowers is maybe the biggest challenge of all. And the question is – What kind of exhibition is appropriate/adequate for this space?” (Đorgović, 2016, unpublished paper)

Actually, for the first time in 2014, the museum management has started the systematised audience research (Jauković, 2014) and has decided to openly accept the “Titostalgic” audience as a *recourse*, living witnesses who still have the aurathical feeling towards the heritage the Museum is preserving. Finally, these visitors are still a great number in the statistics of annual museum audience. However, the mentioned concept of the exhibition set in the House of Flowers is named “Figures of memories”. This syntagma, borrowed from the culture of memory theory observes different images of the past (such as objects, photos, documents including the Condolence books and Memorial books abounding with messages of sorrow because of the death of Josip Broz, but the tombstone as well) as images which will help nostalgic audience recall their memories and share emotions about the life in Yugoslavia. Through this invaluable resource, museum curators are not just researching and involving current visitors, but also understanding which are the crucial (immaterial) elements of Yugoslav heritage for its living witnesses to be preserved and represented for younger generations and foreigners. The initial exhibition was designed to suggest and provoke, to make you wonder, not to indoctrinate. It was not full of objects as the exhibition in the Old Museum, but it was more conceptual, showing data on the history and visitors of the museum (represented with a big 3D graph), videos of the contemporary visitors coming to commemoration on the 25th of May and actually being a part of the whole setting. As Marija Đorgović, the author of the exhibition concept concludes: “We can say that it is less informative, and more performative. The exhibition was basically designed as a *scenery* (in which museum visitors also “play their role” as an integral part of the set-up) with a very reduced but clear and strong conceptual determination and visual identity which looks more like some site specific art installation, than a classical museum display. The conceptual approach of *work in progress* (already an endemic phenomenon in artistic and curatorial practice, which is not as elaborate in the museum practice), was chosen on purpose. It refers to its dynamic (not static), processual character which is reflected in *re-creation of exhibition space* (House of Flowers) by visitors, the main carriers of memory and active participants in its reproduction, and represented by: ritual circulation through the House of Flowers which has been held for more than three decades (visually suggested by huge photographs with

people in procession/line of people all over the interior or people standing at Tito's funeral in front of the House of flowers), the continuing tradition of leaving messages in *Memorial room* (which is an integral part of the exhibition) and through the entries made in *memorial books* and *guest books* (visible through live "performances" in Memory room), social interaction between visitors (community) in this site, especially on certain dates (May 4 and May 25).“ (Đorgović, 2016, unpublished paper) The most important thing for this topic is that, the “Figures of Memory” exhibition was the first setting continually raising a question: *What is the function of the House of Flowers today?* and including visitors who do not observe this spot as a museum but as mausoleum, in the research.

Still, the inherited collection and spaces needed to be interpreted together, not separately one from the other, where content makers i.e. custodians should follow one perspective which would link all the parts of the museum and exhibitions together and send a clear message to the audience. Changes of “figures” and interventions by other curators from the museum already revealed that the initial concept was not priority for everyone. On the other hand, settings in other two buildings continued being linked in between each other and with this one as well just physically, not conceptually, just being surrounded with the same garden. Even though management produced a map linking all the places in the Museum and organized guided tours through the complex, audience research show that exhibitions and map did not send any clear message to the audience, while the current interpretation was a bit more understandable with the official museum guide.

It was soon clear that, even the image of the museum was rising between younger population because of the good visual identity and some interesting exhibitions, with all the courage and work of curators which is up to date with the principles of the new museum management theory, the collection of this institution will hardly respond to the name Museum of Yugoslav History. Therefore, negotiations for the new identity creation and new image building have started.

Constitution of the Museum of Yugoslavia – recreation of the identity

Finally, in the last few years, museum curators are openly speaking about the complex position of the institution they are working in: “The two collections, set together in 1996 under the name, in that moment founded, Museum of Yugoslav History, are different in many ways. On one hand,

historical and documentary direction of the Museum of Revolution, its precisely developed methodologies of chronological and thematic interpretation of objects have formed organized unity with clear policy of the future politics of collecting. On the other hand, Memorial center “Josip Broz Tito” which also incorporated a fond of the two previous institutions on the same location, Museum May 25th, as well as a small Museum “4th of July 1941”, had the collection which was seen just from one perspective for years.” They conclude that particular contrast to the practice of acquisitions for the Museum of Revolution was that this one was elemental, constituted mostly of presents from different foreign state representatives but also from the people of Yugoslavia to the Marshal. “Due to this key conceptual difference, although the objects from two different collections were in one institution, during the period of 20 years of Museum of Yugoslav History, neither one attempt of systematization did not succeed.” (Momčilović Jovanović, Đorgović, 2017, p. 12)

However, if we follow the audience research final document done in 2016, just before the official change of the name and strategy (Đorđević, 2016), we can conclude that there is still strong differentiation in perception of this space by different groups of people. If the already mentioned visitors who are coming to this space in order to commemorate Tito and relive their memories on Yugoslavia do not consider this space a Museum and are often offended if they need to pay an entrance ticket to (in their perception) the Mausoleum, then there is also a contemporary, real museum audience interested in exhibitions and other programs. Coming to visit an institution with a name Museum of Yugoslav History, they expect to see chronological setting with many historical events explained. It is then normal that, the foreign visitor were sometimes leaving Museum very confused, even mad as they did not see any timeline, any setting which would be deciphering Yugoslav history, but just some small segments of it.

The audience perception of this institution is maybe the best visible in its comments: “Change the name of the museum or add more factual information on the history of Yugoslavia.” Still, it was not a problem just a name alluding historical perspective. What audience which came to exhibitions also concluded is that Museum is still “Tito fun-club oriented”, while many people in Serbia and the region refused visiting this space as they link it only to the celebration of Tito’s personality and Socialism. Consequently, we can conclude that Museum did not succeed in building the new image and even in 2016, 20 years after the constitution of the

Museum it was still narrowly linked just to the Marshal. The comments such as: “Please take out this propaganda about Tito, it is absolutely not an art work and it cannot stay in a museum. How can we learn more about life and work of Tito by hearing someone tell us *Tito is God... Unbelievable!*” and “The museum does not contain many historic info, but seems to be only some Tito’s advertisement.”, illustrate these problems. (comments published after the audience research: Đorđević, 2016)

Being aware of all these issues, but also of the fact that there is finally a historical distance from the period of Yugoslavia and that many theoreticians have started writing about this heritage freely just in the last decade, museum management succeeded in changing the name on the 1st of December 2016. Until this moment, the Museum curators have already done many researches and experimental programs, recognising the geographical and symbolical position of the Museum complex (project *Prepoznavanje/Recognition*), wider socialist heritage in Belgrade (project *Bajskultura/Bikeculture*), taking care not just of the “official” heritage but also of the memories of the living witnesses of the Yugoslav period (project *Razgovori o Jugoslaviji/Conversation on Yugoslavia*, many different exhibitions dedicated to social life in Yugoslavia, possibilities for audience to give a new object to the museum collection or to see opened storage and recognize and interact with some of the objects important for them such as some particular baton etc.).

Therefore, the new name was followed with the complete reconstruction. The term reconstruction in this context could be read in three different meanings: the physical one, as the Museum May 25th building is now under the reconstruction and as the new gate with a representative visitor center is being built promising that the complex will finally look like Western museums having enough facilities, big museum shop and the restaurant; the reconstruction is also referring to the systematization of the collection and making of the future permanent setting which will finally give the key to reading different phenomenon of Yugoslav heritage; also, the new image and new visual identity followed with a new web site are already in use.

We can recognize that museum management is now completely aware of the roll it has in contemporary society and of the needs the audience has, even from the new mission and vision of the Museum: “The vision of the

Museum of Yugoslavia is to patrimonialize³ two funds and their documentation, history and remembrance of the employees, as well as to patrimonialize the Kingdom of Yugoslavia and socialist Yugoslavia and preserve memorial character of the space in the Museum complex. Turbulent and multilayered histories could be read from documentation, object information, exhibition catalogues and documents. Bonding together not just the two collections but also two *institutions* in 1996, which were different in its space, mission, work, documentation and employees, in a new institution with the new mission of patrimonialization of Yugoslavia, was a political decision, as well as a challenge in defining and building of Yugoslav heritage in a discussion with existing opinions and prejudices about it.” (Vasiljević, Kastratović Ristić, Cvijović, 2017, p. 21)

Consequently, a well-known graphic designer Slavomir Stojanović has produced a new logotype combining two golden lines with Cyrillic and Latin letters composing the word Yugoslavia on the black background. “The visual identity dissociates itself from the symbolic that refers to political ideology, but in the same time it leaves space for some kind of emotional reference which enables a continual life of the Museum project. New design of symbol and logotype starts from universal graphic symbolism of the flag which, during the whole existence of Yugoslavia, constituted of the three horizontal visual elements. The simple intervention of making the upper element longer, we get the metaphor of the Yugoslav continuity, referring to the concept which is continued to be researched phenomenologically through the Museum of Yugoslavia; the downer element stays unchanged, stopped in time, symbolizing factual end of Yugoslavia. The golden color, a symbol of whiteness, as deposits of the past time and as a metaphor of the history, imposes itself as a good solution instead of the usual red-blue-white tricolor flag which has strong ideological connotations.” (Stojanović, 2016 p. 53) Typography on the other hand, as Slavomir explains, refers to different peoples living once together under the name Yugoslavia. All of them are invited to interact in a Museum nowadays.

While being reconstructed, Museum is still being opened, working hard on the new permanent setting construction, and offering to its audience

³ The Serbian word “baštinjenje” referring to the complete process of selection, preservation and presentation of heritage and creation of particular contexts important for contemporary culture.

sincere answers on its current state and floating identity. They organize guided tours through the complex and explaining all the history and challenges this institution faces every day. These tours are sometimes a particular dialog with visitors offering one more perspective to audience research for curators.

“The working process is aimed at turn from the bare packing of the recent past in the shelves of museum storages, to the socially useful museum, which tends to treat important issues which still do not have answers, becoming and staying relevant dialogist in contemporary topics.”
(Momčilović Jovanović, Đorgović, 2017, p.13)

Finally, from all the above discussed, we can conclude that the image and audience of one museum is never easy to (re)build. Maybe the Museum of Yugoslavia is one of the most complicated examples when it comes to the new identity of the place of memory construction, but it is still not unique, at least not in the region. Many institutions in the ex Yugoslav countries, once serving to represent the socialist ideology and its leader, are afterwards simmilarly renamed and recontextualised with the dissolution of the country. Many are still trying to reach new audience and tending to position themselves as cultural and socialy relevant institutions which are not promoting some political ideology but researching objectively and interpreting heritage from different perspectives. However, the big and popular museum institutions in Europe and United States are as well planning for years their positioning on the cultural market, their competition for audience and their image building. It is therefore not enough just to follow examples of good practices, but also to make the systematic audience researches, experiment with programs and exhibitions in order to construct a clear identity which will be easily seen in clear messages disseminated through different media, all the visual materials and all the programs of one institution. The continual and constant awearness and work of museum employees is the only recepy in sustainable and longterm reach of the goal visitors.

References

1. Abt, Dž. (2014), Poreklo muzeja in: *Vodič kroz muzejske studije*, ed. Šeron Mekdonald, Clío, Beograd, 171-200.

2. Adić, V. (2013). Nevidljivi poklonici: Dan Mladosti. u Muzeju istorije Jugoslavije. *Tematski zbornik: Muzeologija, nova muzeologija, nauka o baštini*. Kruševac, 335-345.
3. Bart, R. (1981). *Retorika slike*, Izdavački centar, Rijeka.
4. Benderić, Lj. (ed.) (2000). *Muzeji Srbije*, Zavod za proučavanje kulturnog Razvitka, Beograd.
5. Cvetković, M. (2006). *Reform of Serbian Museums through Contemporary Art Projects*, Master thesis, University of Arts in Belgrade
6. Cvjetićanin, T. (2013). Interview with the author
7. Đorđević M. (2016). *Studija posetilaca - Muzej istorije Jugoslavije*, Muzej istorije Jugoslavije, Beograd.
8. Glusberg, G. (1983). „Hladni” i „vrući“ muzeji, Muzejski dokumentacioni centar, Zagreb.
9. Gnjatović, M. (2014). An Image Building of the National Museum: Edifice Reconstruction or Complete Transformation. *Culture and sustainable development in the times of crisis*, Belgrade, 216-226.
10. Jokanović M., Stanković I. (2016). Le Musée d'histoire de la Yougoslavie soumis aux interférences politiques. *Culture et Musées* No 28, Paris, 31-45.
11. Jovanović M. *Brandokratija*, <http://www.brandocratia.com/teorija.html>, (April 29 2014)
12. Momčilović-Jovanović A., Đorgović M. (2017). Muzealizacija nasleđa Jugoslavije: Od (re)valorizacije fonda Muzeja istorije Jugoslavije, preko stalne postavke ka koncepciji Muzeja Jugoslavije. *Otvaramo depo*, Muzej Jugoslavije, Beograd, 11-13.
13. Muzej istorije Jugoslavije (2013). *Jugoslavija od početka do kraja*. Ur. Ana Panić, Muzej istorije Jugoslavije, Beograd.

14. Narodni odbor Beograda (1962). Odluka o osnivanju Muzeja 25. Maj, / Peoples committee of Belgrade (City assembly), Decision of foundation of Museum May 25th, Belgrade.
15. Olins, W. (2003). *On Brand*, Themes&Hudson, London.
16. Radić N. (2012). Jedan muzejski predmet kao metafora jugoslovenskog kulturnog nasleđa. *Ogledi o jugoslovenskom kulturnom nasleđu*, Beograd, 125-139.
17. Smit, T. (2013). Bilbao efekat: kultura kao industrija. *Savremena umetnost i muzej: kritika političke ekonomije umetnosti*, priredila: Jelena Stojanović, Muzej savremene umetnosti, Beograd, 245-271.
18. Slavković M. (2009). *Mediation of memory of socialist past – Dealing with nostalgia and politics of oblivion: Case study the Museum of Yugoslav History*, Master thesis, University of Arts in Belgrade.
19. Stojanović, S. (2016), Metafora ideje. *Muzej Jugoslavije*, Muzej istorije Jugoslavije, Beograd.
20. Šola, T. (2011). *Prema totalnom muzeju*, Centar za muzeologiju i heritologiju, Beograd.
21. Vasiljavić M., Kastratović-Ristić V., Cvijović M. (2017). Predistorija: osnova za razumevanje Muzeja Jugoslavije. *Otvaramo depo*, Muzej Jugoslavije, Beograd, 15-21.
22. Velikonja M. (2010). *Titostalgija*, Beograd.
23. Wallace, M. (2006). *Museum Branding: How to Create And Maintain Image, Loyalty, And Support*, Altamira Press, Oxford.
24. Živanović, K. (2013). Interview with the author.