THE EUROPEAN MUSEUM OF THE YEAR AWARD

1977-1997

A mirror and a catalyst of

European museum change and development

C O N T E N T S

SECTION ONE

The context: change and development in the museum world since the end of the Second World War

This report outlines the progress of a successful experiment in international co-operation which has its roots in the great changes which have occurred in the European Museum world during the past half-century, and in which the Council of Europe has necessarily been closely involved. Most of the story is built around the development of the European Museum of the Year Award (EMYA), which has recently been renamed the European Museum Forum, to take account of the much greater range of activities which have grown out of the Award scheme and which reflect new concepts of a museum's place in society. The report is also concerned with the fruitful interchange of ideas which has taken place year by year between the Council of Europe's Committee on Culture and Education and the members of the Award's organising body.

In recent years the geographical area covered by the Award scheme has also been considerably extended. It continues to be concerned with the Europe of the European Cultural Convention, which now includes eastern and central Europe. The Europe of EMYA and therefore of the Council of Europe included 22 countries in 1977 and 46 today, including the whole of Russia.

It is almost impossible to define a museum in a way which is universally acceptable. To attempt to do so is as difficult and perhaps futile as the search for a satisfactory definition of a dog. The object is constantly undergoing modification. As soon as a possible description comes within sight, reasonable objections to it are certain to be found. 'Museum' has not proved to be a stable concept. It changes as society itself changes. 20 years ago the members of the Award's jury thought they knew what a museum was. Now they are not so sure.

ICOM, the UNESCO-backed International Council of Museums, was set up in 1946. During the half-century which has passed since then it has tried hard to define a museum in a way which might be found reasonably satisfactory from Canada to the Congo. It has been an unenviable task and inevitably the official definition has had to be modified from time to time, with a diplomatic phrase added here and a word capable of provoking an international incident removed there.

According to the Statutes approved by ICOM's Tenth General Assembly in 1974, and not significantly changed since, a museum is 'a non profit-making, permanent institution in the service of society and of its development. It has to be open to the public and it acquires, conserves, researches, communicates and exhibits, for purposes of study, education and enjoyment material evidence of man and his environment.'

This is vague enough to be reasonably satisfactory, although it creates nearly as many problems as it solves. Who is to decide if a museum is serving society or not? How does one define 'society'? What proportion of 'society' does it have to serve in order to justify its existence? How can one prove that a museum is helping society to develop? How frequently or regularly does it have to be open to the public? But, however much one may criticise the ICOM definition when it has to meet the test of particular instances, it is difficult and perhaps pointless to try to improve on it. What one can assert with confidence is that the most fundamental change which has affected museums during the half-century since ICOM was set up is the now almost universal conviction that they exist in order to serve the public. The old-style museum felt itself to be under no such obligation. It had a building, it had collections and a staff to look after them, it was reasonably adequately financed and its visitors, usually not numerous, came to look, to wonder and to admire what was set before them. Its prime responsibility was to its collections, not to its visitors.

Three-quarters of the museums which we have today did not exist in 1945. This massive growth has been accompanied by an equally impressive increase in the range of types of museum available and by the creation of a new public. During the past 30 years especially, the museum-going public has changed a great deal. Its interests have widened, it is much less reverent and respectful in its attitudes, it expects modern technical facilities to be available as a matter of course, it distinguishes less and less between a museum and an exhibition, and it sees no particular reason to pay attention to the subject-boundaries so dear to academically minded people. The basic question which it asks has changed to 'Does it interest me or not?' People are no longer content to have their lives and their thoughts controlled by an élite of powerful and privileged groups and individuals. They increasingly demand a say, even the major say, in the planning and organisation of what they choose to do and especially of the way in which they spend their leisure time.

This means, inevitably, that phrases like 'serving the community' and 'satisfying' bring problems of their own. Any institution which sets out consciously and deliberately to do these things will find itself compelled to find ways of measuring its success. It will have to discover, as a continuous process, what the customers think about what is being offered to them. The use of the word 'customer' in connection with museums would have been unthinkable 50 years ago, but it causes little or no surprise today. Museums are competing in a leisure market and every market has its customers.

The successful exploitation of markets involves market research, but merely to monitor the results of what one has already done is inadequate and uncreative. The true skill of any form of market or customer research - and that practised by museums is no exception - lies, first, in asking the right questions and, second, in using the results to produce something which is closer to what the customer really wants. In those museums which rely on a system of continuous assessment of public needs and wishes, the traditional distinction between 'permanent' and 'temporary' exhibitions is breaking down. The concept of a 'permanent exhibition' is becoming increasingly obsolete. Social attitudes, educational standards and methods of communication are changing fast and all the time and, in their displays and assumptions, museums either have to keep pace or lose customers. A museum exhibition which remains unaltered

for as long as five years and still retains its power to attract and stimulate is unusual and remarkably fortunate.

50 years ago no museum anywhere in the world was considered to be a business, in the commercial sense, and the notion that museum directors and curators should possess management skills would have been considered absurd, even obscene. Working in a museum was regarded as a quiet, sheltered occupation for men and women with scholarly tastes. It was, like working in a bank or the Civil Service, a safe job in which one could reckon to remain until retirement. Most museums were run by municipalities, universities or the State and those employed in them were usually under no pressure to produce results, either in the form of a steadily increasing number of visitors or of a more efficient use of funds. The modern practice of obtaining commercial sponsorship for new projects was almost completely unknown, at least outside the United States. Money did not condition the museum atmosphere, as it does today.

Local authorities, like the State, regarded it as part of their duty to run museums and libraries. Few museums charged for entry and amenities like museum shops, cafés and restaurants were a great rarity. It was generally accepted that museums should be peaceful places in which visitors of all ages were free to roam about, to look at what interested them and to ignore what did not. Attendance figures were, by modern standards, very low, but nobody seemed greatly bothered by this. What is now known, perhaps flatteringly as 'museum education' hardly existed in any organised form. The more enterprising teachers escorted groups of their pupils round some of the larger museums and took responsibility for their behaviour during the visit. With very few exceptions, museums did not have 'education departments' and 'education officers'.

The big changes have accelerated noticeably during the lifetime of the European Museum of the Year Award. Why have they taken place? What social forces or historical accidents have brought them about? There seem to have been four main causes. The first is the rise in people's social expectations and consequently in what they expect their governments, local and national, to provide for them. These governments in turn have to balance the competing financial demands to which they are subjected and to look for every possible saving which can be made without causing serious political trouble. The second cause, at least in the Western world, has been the increase in the amount of leisure and disposable income. This has led to a demand for more, and more expensive, activities and to an unwillingness to be satisfied with simple pleasures. The third is the development of professionalism among those who work in museums and a corresponding tendency to say 'There must be a better way', defining 'better' in terms which will be approved both by other museum people and by the authorities which have to meet the cost. And the fourth major cause of change has been the great increase, more marked in some countries than in others, of the number and proportion of what are known, often misleadingly, as 'independent museums', that is, museums which do not derive their income mainly from public funds. Most of the museums in this category have, from the time they are born, to think very carefully about getting and spending money and their unavoidable close attention to the business aspects of their work has influenced the atmosphere of the museum world as a whole.

Generalisations are as dangerous in talking about museums as in discussing any other field of human activity, but it is, even so, possible to distinguish certain broad trends and movements which have crossed national boundaries and made themselves evident not only in Europe but in each of the five continents. The variety of museums has become enormous. What one should never do is to invent an imaginary phenomenon called 'the Museum', and to declare that 'museums have' or 'museums will' or 'museums must'. These are meaningless abstractions. The reality is that the world contains many thousands of establishments called museums, each with its special characteristics, its own problems, its own opportunities and its own pace of growth, development and decline.

Even so, it is correct to say that 50 years ago there was much more common agreement as to what a museum was and should be than there is today. A speaker at an American conference in 1995 said, 'When I was a boy I knew a museum when I saw one. Now I am not always sure.' One has no difficulty in understanding what he meant.

ICOM itself has not found it possible to offer a great deal of help in answering a question which is heard more and more with each year that passes, 'Is it really a museum?' The following, it has decreed, are considered to meet its definition.

'1. Conservation institutes and exhibition galleries permanently maintained by libraries and archive centres.

2. National, archaeological and ethnographical monuments and sites and historical sites of a museum nature, for their acquisition, conservation and communication activities.

3. Institutions displaying live specimens, such as botanical and zoological gardens, aquaria and vivaria.

4. Science centres and planetaria.'

Not everyone connected with museums or writing about them appears to have the same liberal views as ICOM itself and there are certainly plenty of people today who find it difficult to accept that a zoo or a science centre is entitled to the name 'museum'. After half a century of definition-broadening it is probably still true to say that museums are essentially places in which objects are used as the principal means of communication. But is it reasonable, without straining ordinary language too far, to call a living plant, fish or animal an object? Does something have to be dead or inanimate to be an object and, if so, why? Is it carrying empire-building to excess to say that a zoo, a botanical garden or an aquarium is a museum? Is there no difference between a library and a museum? A library certainly contains objects and it might perhaps be described as a museum of books, but somehow it seems more sensible to continue to call it a library.

It has been said, not altogether cynically, that theologians thrive best when people question the existence of God. For 'God', one could read 'museums'. 50 years ago

museums were in a strong position, because there was common agreement as to the nature of a museum, but today, after decades of discussion, there is increasing uncertainty. If there is no consensus of opinion about the essential characteristics of what one is defending, how can one defend it? But for the moment and for want of a better cause, 'objects are a museum must' seems to be a battle still worth fighting. To insist that an institution without some kind of collection of objects is not the same as saying that a museum must be object-centred. A very important feature of the majority of museums today, in contrast to what characterised them in the mid-Forties, is the extent to which they have become visitor-centred. This almost amounts to saying that, as good shopkeepers, museum directors have gradually come to think of the customers first and of the goods on sale second.

This takes us back to the major causes of changes outlined above. Since the end of the Second World War and to some extent because of that war, many of the traditional working-class distinctions have faded or disappeared, the lives of those who are conventionally referred to as 'ordinary people' have become more complicated and social expectations have risen to levels which would have seemed ludicrously impossible in the 1930s. Luxuries formerly out of the reach of all but a small section of society are now seen as necessities, demanded by everyone as a right. Pleasures have become more sophisticated and more expensive.

Within this new atmosphere, museums have been forced, however unwillingly, to market and sell themselves. This has been the case for much longer in America, where the tradition of public provision is not so deep-rooted, where people have expected to pay for most of their social amenities and where the salesman enjoys a much higher prestige than he does in Europe. The idea of a museum having to sell itself and to discover its own sources of finance has met with a good deal of reluctance and hostility in Europe. The museum curators of the Forties, Fifties and Sixties were prepared to welcome the customers into the shop, provided they observed acceptable standards of behaviour, but they were not greatly inclined to go out and look for them or to persuade them to buy.

In some respects the task of those who were trying to promote museums was more difficult in the Seventies and Eighties when the museum revolution was really gathering momentum, than it would have been in the Thirties, when there were fewer alternative ways of spending one's leisure time and much less spare money after the cost of necessities had been met. What might be termed the centre section of society, the upper half of the working-class and the lower half of the middle-class, was becoming prosperous to an extent which would have been hard to imagine before the War. Commercial interests were quick to identify and locate this new and highly profitable situation and as a consequence museums, especially those which were traditionally free, found themselves in the wholly unaccustomed and unwelcome position of having to compete for the leisure hours of what ICOM thought of as 'society' or 'the community'.

This in turn led to what has become known as 'professionalism' among museum employees. A professional, in any occupation, might be defined as a person who has followed a recognised course of specialised training and who accepts a recognised pattern of working practices and agreed ethical standards. Such people hardly existed

in the museum world before the 1970s. Before that time those who worked in museums had found their way into their jobs largely by accident. They could have become teachers, craftsmen/artists, civil servants or, in some cases, university professors, but Fate or the wish to change course led them into museums.

During the Eighties and Nineties museum training courses, like museums themselves, have proliferated all over the world, producing more qualified students than museums have work for. These courses fall into two categories, those which provide instruction of a technical nature and those which aim at producing more competent curators and managers. Whether they and other innovations have succeeded in creating anything which could be accurately described as a 'museum profession' remains an open question. Such is the inexactness of language that one can, paradoxically, have 'professionals' without a 'profession', a profession being strictly speaking a self-governing, tightly-knit and exclusive organisation of registered, trained and officially qualified workers.

ICOM exists primarily in order to serve the interests of 'museum professionals', but it is not an international trade union and defining a museum professional is almost as difficult as defining a museum. A major part of the problem is that there is no simple or single word to describe someone who works in a museum at the responsibility-bearing level. A person who plays or composes music is a musician, someone who practises the law is a lawyer, someone who is trained to fight wars is a soldier, but the only museum equivalent we have so far managed to invent is 'museum professional', which is clumsy and slightly ludicrous. 'Museologist' will certainly not do, because in many European countries a museologist is considered to be essentially a builder of theories, not a practitioner. 'Museumist' might be possible, but the word does not yet exist. 'Curator' is certainly not adequate, because, like 'conservateur', it does not reflect the complex pattern of administrative, financial and political duties that anyone in a responsible museum post has to perform today.

20 years ago the director of a large and respected art museum in France, when announcing her early retirement, told the Press and her colleagues elsewhere that she had been 'trained to look after pictures', not to 'persuade people with money to give it to the museum'. Her predicament illustrated a major change in the museum situation, a change which has hit museum directors in the former Communist countries particularly hard, as they have struggled to adjust themselves to the unwelcome economic realities of the capitalist world. A high proportion of the museums which have been established since the 1940s have had to face a hard financial situation from the beginning. They have had to create and sustain a market for themselves in order to exist.

Most of the pre-1950 museums everywhere had a very limited range of exhibits. They were concerned, for the most part, with art, broadly interpreted, archaeology, ethnology, natural history and, within certain limits, local history. With few exceptions, they depended entirely on public finance, they paid little attention to the attractiveness and dramatic effect of an exhibit - the profession of museum designers was in its infancy - and they tended to feel that once objects had been put on display the arrangement should last more or less for ever. What has happened since amounts to a revolution in museum philosophy and in its practical applications.

Some, but not many, of the new museums have been relatively large, employing 100-200 people, but the vast majority have a total staff of not more than 10 or a dozen. Reliable figures are at the moment difficult to obtain, but those, like the members of the jury of the European Museum of the Year Award, who travel regularly and extensively have the impression that three-quarters of the museums in Europe provide a living for fewer than 10 people, and there is no reason to suppose that the same is not true on a world scale. The large municipal and State museums are completely untypical, an important truth which is obscured by the fact that the people who appear at international museum conferences are nearly always representatives of large museums.

Anybody who was in a position to take a God's-eye view of the museum world as it was in 1947 would have been able to notice a very thin scattering of museums in what are politely known as the 'developed' countries and only a tiny number in the poorer or 'developing' countries. Most of the museums in these 'developing' countries had been established by the foreign ruling power in colonial times and they were of the traditional European type. A similarly privileged observer-from-above today would see a much more widespread distribution of museums in all countries and it would soon become clear to him that the average size of a museum today is considerably smaller than it was 50 years ago.

There is plenty of evidence to show that visitors like small museums, museums that one can look around satisfactorily in a couple of hours or less, especially if they are concerned with a single subject or a single person. Most people have experienced the distressing psychological condition known as museum-hopelessness, the feeling that is almost normal in a very large museum, where the complexity and sheer size of the institution presents a series of impossible and discouraging challenges., There is so much to see and absorb that one cannot really appreciate anything. The proliferation of small, single-subject museums, a comparatively recent development, is due partly to the smaller financial investment and risk that is required, but also to a realisation that many interesting types of collector were previously not represented in museums at all. Where, even as late as the 1940s, could one have found a museum wholly devoted to the story of pasta, or the gas industry, or to the development of the umbrella? It is possible, but difficult to prove, that Petrarch is more significant than pasta or that Whistler or Wagner are of greater cultural importance than wine or wurlitzers, but the fact that we now have thriving wine, wurlitzer and pasta museums is sufficient evidence of the extent to which the academic walls around our museums have been crumbling during our lifetime.

There are those who believe and say, that more inevitably means worse, those who lament the passing of the old type of scholarly curator, those who feel that sponsorship is necessarily a vulgarising and corrupting influence, those who long for the old days when museums were adult-centred havens of peace and quiet, in which children knew their place.

There can be no harm in suggesting that the most important and far-reaching change of all is one that is only just beginning, an attempt to make museums a part of the living culture of their time and in this way to cease to regard members of the public as

passive observers of the exhibitions which have been supposedly created for their benefit. Such a change of attitude involves regarding what are called museums much less as treasure-houses and much more as centres of activity and discussion, where the visitors are part of the show and where the past and the present are inextricably mixed. This kind of development is taking place throughout the 'developing' countries, in which museums on the Western model have increasingly come to be regarded as both irrelevant and impossibly expensive. It could well be that the ideas which will characterise and inspire the next museum revolution will arise from poverty, not riches. There is nothing that is automatically right about the Western type of museum and it could be that the well-endowed countries of the world will find their road to museum sanity and satisfaction by studying and following what is happening in Africa and South America, regions in which, in cultural matters, everyone is both an amateur and a professional at the same time.

During the 21 years of its history, what was originally merely the European Museum of the Year Award and is now the European Museum Forum has been closely involved in the changing situation described above. It has had to adapt itself continuously to changing circumstances and attitudes, to identify and publicise pioneering museums and individuals, and to modify the criteria by which it assesses the achievements of museums. In the process of doing this, it may well have influenced the speed and direction of change, a function in which it takes a certain quiet pride.

SECTION TWO

The gestation, birth and infancy of the Award

In 1971 John Letts, a London publisher, established a national support and promotion group for museums. The new Foundation was given the name of National Heritage: the Museum Action Movement. It was to have two functions, to persuade the Government and local authorities to take their museum responsibilities more seriously and to act as a kind of consumer association for museum visitors. Almost immediately it organised an annual competition for new museums in the United Kingdom, under the title of MOYA, the Museum of the Year Award. The time was ripe for such a venture. For several years there had been a remarkable growth of new museums in Britain, some set up by municipal and county authorities, but many more by private foundations. These, at their best, were changing the concept of what a museum could and should be, a place of activity and excitement, very different from the traditional hushed atmosphere and assembly of glass cases with which museum-goers had been all-too familiar since their childhood days. National Heritage set out from the beginning to publicise these new ventures and, as the principal weapon in its campaign, it chose the method, already well-tested in other fields, of a competition.

From that time onwards, about 30 museums a year presented themselves as candidates - the number has varied remarkably little with the passage of time. The members of a panel of judges - some of whom were employed by museums, some not - were under the chairmanship of the President of the Royal Academy, Sir Hugh Casson, and they spent interesting and usually pleasant days visiting the candidates, attending meetings and taking decisions. Then in time there was a splendid lunch at Vintners Hall in London, attended by the cream of the British cultural and political worlds. Speeches were made, the result was announced and the Distinguished Guest, who was not infrequently the Minister for the Arts, presented the Award.

The occasion attracted a satisfactory amount of publicity - there are few things, apart from a murder or a Royal romance, that British journalists like better than a competition - enterprise and innovation had been rewarded, and the winning museums had the pleasure of watching their attendances double during the following year. Not a penny of public money was involved, since the cost of the administration was met by National Heritage itself from its members' subscriptions, and the other expenses, mainly the prize money and the luncheon, were looked after by the old-established and well-regarded monthly magazine, *The Illustrated London News*, for whom the association with the Award was a useful public relations exercise.

On 26 January 1976, at a private lunch at the Reform Club, John Letts suggested to Kenneth Hudson, a member of the MOYA Committee and an international authority on museums, that a European Museum of the Year Award might be possible. He contacted Andrew Faulds, who, as a member of the European Parliament, had good

international contacts and who was also a member of the MOYA Committee, and fired him with enthusiasm for the idea. Faulds approached the European Commission in Brussels, which regretted that it was unable to help - 'The Commission has only meagre resources in this area' - as well as the Directorate of Education, Culture and Sport at the Council of Europe, which also said 'No chance', because it had 'just completed a rigorous compression aid programme for the years 1976-80'. He had better luck, however, with the European Cultural Foundation, which, in December 1976, offered to give National Heritage £5,000 'for research purposes'. Kenneth Hudson, as the only member of the MOYA Committee who spoke any language other than English, was despatched on a whirlwind tour of Western European capitals to talk to the people who seemed most likely to be able to decide if there was any sense or usefulness in the idea. In February and March 1977 he made three journeys, visiting Stockholm, Copenhagen, Berlin, Paris, Milan, Rome and Brussels. He talked to ICOM, both at its headquarters in Paris and at the national level, to the officials of museums associations, to the directors of individual museums, and to anyone else who might possibly have helpful advice to give. National Heritage allocated him £1,000 out of the £5,000 to pay for his 'fares, meals, hotels and postage', and with the assistance of generous hospitality at the various places involved and a good deal of night travel on trains the task was somehow accomplished.

The upshot of the Grand Tour and of the discussions which followed it was that a decision was taken to go ahead with a European Museum of the Year Award and somehow to find the money which would make it possible. But, before describing how this was one, one should say something about two points which frequently arose in the course of that fact-finding mission to Europe. The first took the form of a question, 'Why do you want to do this?', and the second of a statement, 'The situation on the Continent is very different from that in Britain'. It is only when one is challenged in this way that one discovers what one's philosophy, if any, really is. The British are a pragmatic people, who tend to act on instinct and to discuss the reasons afterwards, a method of procedure which other nations often find unsettling and infuriating, and a proof of both shallowness of intellect and inadequacy of education. Instinct certainly preceded philosophy in the case of the British Museum of the Year Award. One can see, with hindsight, that each year the MOYA Committee made the right decision as to the winner, but only realised some time afterwards why it had done so. It is indecorous, in a report published by the Council of Europe, to use the earthy expression, 'gut feeling', but there is no other English phrase which describes so accurately what actually took place. There was a right thing to do and, miraculously, one did it.

But eventually, even in Britain, there has to be an expressed philosophy of some kind, if only as a basis of communication with foreigners. One has to be able to provide a reasonably convincing answer for the person who asks such awkwardly direct questions as 'Why do you want to do this?' and justifiable reasons for saying, 'The museum situation in Britain is fundamentally no different from what one finds on the Continent. The basic problems and opportunities are the same.' How this philosophy was developed will be discussed later. At the moment all that one probably needs to say is that in 1977 there were some people in Europe who found the idea of a European Museum of the Year Award both puzzling and dangerous. Some, no doubt, still do, despite 21 years of missionary effort.

One way of convincing the cynics and disbelievers that one's purpose is serious is to discover influential people who are willing to act as supporters. With this in mind, John Letts wrote to Professor Richard Hoggart, who was at that time both a friend and Assistant Director-General of UNESCO. In this letter, dated 1 December 1976, he said: 'We think it would be highly advisable to establish a Policy Committee to direct the way in which we approach the job. We think it should have, if possible, a small number of members who are well-known in Europe for one reason or another, in the hope that this may reassure other countries that the scheme is no fiendish plot emanating from perfidious Albion. I wonder if I could persuade you to become Chairman of such a Policy Committee?' Fortunately, he said 'Yes' and during the next few weeks a small Committee was formed around him.

The structure of the European Museum of the Year Award scheme during its first year, 1976-77, was ad hoc in the extreme. The only funds available for some time consisted of what remained of the £5,000 allocated by the European Cultural Foundation. John Letts acted as the guardian of this and also carried out what might be described as EMYA's political and money-raising correspondence, since he had a wide range of contacts in high places in England. Correspondence of a more museological nature was the responsibility of Kenneth Hudson and Ann Nicholls, who dealt with it at their office in Bath, where they were leading a busy freelance life researching and writing a steady four books a year, after working together for some years at the University of Bath.

This system, or rather, lack of system could obviously not last for very long and on 25 May 1977 Kenneth Hudson wrote to John Letts, in order to put on record a problem which they had often discussed together. 'It's the very difficult matter of blending the European Museum of the Year Award with one's private business. The blunt truth is that I can't afford to devote any more of my own and, even more, of Ann's time to this without being paid for the work and the postage involved. I'm most anxious to help, as I hope my efforts so far have proved, but a method has to be found of financing what's bound to be an increasingly expensive task. I feel, modestly no doubt, that I can do this better than anybody else can, and, although I'm always busy, this isn't really a time problem. But I do have to pay my way, alas, and I do want to do the job decently. What do you suggest? Putting the Bath address at the top of the European paper means that organising the Award is now, in effect, me, which is well and good, providing it's a solvent me.'

In a further letter to John Letts, dated 28 June 1977, Kenneth Hudson wrote: 'I calculate that I could spend a quarter of my time, possibly more, organising the European Museum of the Year Award, and this is what I would do for two years, until it's firmly established and running. After that we can think again. I shall make myself responsible for it and I should be called something like Secretary, European Museum of the Year Award.' This was agreed, and on 1 September Kenneth Hudson wrote again, saying that 'this year must, of course, be regarded as experimental, with myself as the biggest, fattest, silliest, most exploitable guinea-pig in the laboratory'. At the same time, he suggested that he should be paid 'apart from travelling expenses, £2,500, to cover the very large burden of secretarial and administrative costs of the 1977 Award'.

It is clear from this correspondence that the launching of the European Museum of the Year Award was regarded as a risky business at the time, with no guarantee that the venture would either continue or succeed beyond its first year. An adequate supply of candidates might not be forthcoming and it might not be possible to discover further sources of finance. In effect, what was happening at the end of 1977 was that the Award was living on what remained of the original £5,000, together with what was, in effect, a not inconsiderable subsidy from Kenneth Hudson and John Letts, who absorbed certain costs into the expenses of running their normal businesses, writing in the case of the first, and publishing of the second, and contrived to write them off against tax. Ann Nicholls, who carried out the bulk of the secretarial work, was already being paid a salary by Kenneth Hudson, and did the extra EMYA work in the hope and belief that matters would improve in the future. Without her generosity and self-sacrifice, EMYA would have foundered at an early stage in its voyage.

EMYA's first real annual budget, drawn up on 3 September 1977, reads now like a statement of the impossible, a list of miracles. Sent to John Letts for his approval, it went as follows:

'Balance at Bank of England, to be maintained at all times	£1,000
Printing	£3,000
National Heritage, for various services and expenses during the year	£1,000
Kenneth Hudson, for administrative and secretarial expenses	£2,500
Travelling	£3,000
Contingencies	£1,500
Prize	£3,000
Total:	£15,000'

This followed the first meeting, on 21 March 1977, of EMYA's Committee, known from the beginning as the Policy Committee. It was held in London, at the Reform Club, where the future EMYA infant had been conceived the previous year, and it was attended by six people - Richard Hoggart, as Chairman; Georges van den Abeelen; Kenneth Hudson; John Letts; Luis Monreal; and Ulla Keding Olofsson. Ann Nicholls, who has prepared and carefully preserved the Minutes of every EMYA Committee meeting from 1997 onwards, was not present on this historic occasion. Without her meticulously kept archives, which have survived two changes of office, the writing of the history of EMYA would have been impossible. In the Minutes of this first meeting, the members are described as follows:

'Dr Richard Hoggart
Formerly Assistant Director-General, UNESCO, and now Warden, Goldsmiths' College, London

Dr Georges van den Abeelen
Conseiller général, Fédération des Entreprises de Belgique

Kenneth Hudson
UNESCO consultant on museums, Bath

John Letts
Chairman, National Heritage, London

Luis Monreal
Secretary-General, ICOM

Ulla Keding Olofsson
Riksutställningar, Stockholm, and Secretary, ICOM Education Committee'

Three of these, it is worth noting, are still members of the Committee, one has died, one has resigned for personal reasons, and one because of pressure of other work, which made it impossible for him to attend meetings on a regular basis.

A paper circulated in advance of the meeting emphasised three points, to be discussed on 21 March. They were:

'A. The existing British scheme, now in its fifth year, was instituted mainly in order to make the general public more aware of developments and achievements in the museum field. The prizes, although important as a means of publicity, are secondary. There is no doubt that the award system, which has attracted a great deal of attention, has been successful and National Heritage, which has been responsible for organising it, hopes, on the basis of experience, that it might be usefully extended to Western Europe.

B. In Britain, it has been found necessary, for practical reasons, to have a separate scheme for Scotland. What is referred to as 'the British scheme' therefore covers England, Wales and Northern Ireland. About 30 entries are received in October-November each year. They are from museums which have either opened for the first time during the previous 12 months or which have completed some major item of re-modelling or extension during that period. In practice, the jury exercises a certain amount of discretion in the matter of time limits, but does not publicise the fact.

C. Enquiries suggest that the British situation may possibly be untypical in two ways:

1. The number of potential entries each year is, in the European context, exceptionally high.

2. A significant proportion of the entries, including a number of the best, come from museums run by private trusts, that is, from museums outside the State and local authority system. It is a matter of interest and to some extent concern to National Heritage that every winner of the major award has so far been a private museum and that the jury has never been in any doubt about the rightness of the choice.'

The same document stressed that 'in no sense is the European Museum of the Year Award regarded as a British venture. National Heritage, with its special experience, is well content to get the scheme launched. It claims no proprietary rights.'

And, at this meeting on 21 March 1977, it was launched, in a spirit that now seems, with hindsight, to have been one of mad optimism. The first task was to discover candidates for the 1977 European Museum of the Year Award. This was done by writing to the secretaries of the national museums associations who had recently been visited by Kenneth Hudson during his European Grand Tour. The results were encouraging. 32 applications were received. From these, a short-list of nine was drawn up. At a Committee meeting held in Brussels on 15 October 1977, it was announced that 'each museum on the short-list was to be visited by at least two members of the Committee. It was also agreed that, in addition to visiting the short-listed museums, the Committee should do everything possible to make contact with the other museums which had entered for the competition, in order to maintain goodwill and to make sure that the aims of the Award were well understood.'

This was the only time in the history of the Award that visiting was confined to a selection of the candidates. In every year since then the practice has been followed of visiting each museum, in order to obtain an accurate, on-the-spot idea of the museum and its achievements. For the 1977 Award, EMYA followed the British Award's custom of trusting the Committee's ability to make a preliminary judgement on the basis of written applications, an ability which assumes superhuman powers of insight and imagination, possessed, unfortunately, by very few committees or individuals, partly because museums are likely in some instances to flatter themselves and to lack objective standards of comparison.

The Brussels meeting was important in two respects. First, John Letts brought the welcome news that 'Henry Moore would make a suitable piece of sculpture available as a permanent trophy for the Award, on very favourable terms' - a purchase price of £2,000, a cost which National Heritage generously met at the time, and which was later repaid by EMYA in two instalments of £1,000 each. The brass sculpture, which eventually arrived in time for the first Presentation Ceremony, turned out to be 'six and three-quarter inches high, without the base, and has etched in it the signature 'Moore' and the figures 7/9'. In 1987 it was valued for us by Sotheby's at £12,000, and our practice has been to require each winning museum, which keeps the trophy for a year, to insure it for £20,000, a figure which will soon need to be increased.

Secondly, it was announced that EMYA had been granted the privilege of functioning 'under the auspices of the Council of Europe', an honour granted only rarely by the Committee of Ministers of Foreign Affairs. This was the result of a recommendation adopted by the Parliamentary Assembly introduced by UK MP Andrew Faulds. From his first appearance at that Brussels meeting, Christopher Grayson has been our main contact with the Council of Europe, accompanied from 1978 to his death in 1984, by Victor de Pange, the two representing respectively the parliamentary and inter-governmental sides of the Council's secretariat.

Something more needs to be said about the Council of Europe's association with EMYA. This was greatly helped by a report on the European Museum of the Year Award, presented by Andrew Faulds MP, that was debated in the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe in March 1977 and led to the adoption of Recommendation 806 to the Committee of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, which established the official links between EMYA and the Council of Europe. Day-to-day contacts were the responsibility of Christopher Grayson, the Secretary to the Committee on Culture and Education of the Parliamentary Assembly. The Award scheme owes great gratitude to this kind, hard-working, reliable and always approachable man, who has functioned, in effect, as our European political adviser and guide through the minefields of international diplomacy. Without him, EMYA would have found itself unwittingly on the wrong track on many occasions. He has been the Award's first pilot and candid friend during the whole of its existence and it was a special pleasure to be able to congratulate him on his appointment as Head of Division in 1996.

The governmental side of the Council of Europe was represented from 1978 until his death in 1984 by the equally understanding and helpful Victor de Pange, Deputy Director for Education, Culture and Sport. He was a graduate of both the Sorbonne and Oxford and delightfully bilingual. His father was the Comte de Pange and Victor inherited the title, although he modestly regarded it as a purely private honour and never used it for public purposes. His mother was a member of the Broglie family and had the distinction of being the first aristocratic lady in France to be awarded a higher university degree, having written a thesis on Madame de Staël, who was one of her ancestors.

During the critical first five years, Victor de Pange and Christopher Grayson together helped EMYA enormously - possibly more than either of them realised - to shake itself free from British parochialism and to become a valuable European organisation in its own right. This process of Europeanisation was greatly helped by our great good fortune in adding some indubitable Europeans to the Committee in its formative days. The first non-British member was Ulla Keding Olofsson, whose 1967 doctoral thesis had been written on Swedish translations of English poetry in the 18th century. In 1967, after 12 years' school teaching, she joined Riksutställningar, the Swedish State pioneering organisation for planning and designing travelling exhibitions. Between 1971 and 1974 and then again after 1977 she was a member of the Executive Council of ICOM.

She was joined on the Committee by Luis Monreal, the Secretary-General of ICOM, who unfortunately had to resign in 1979, as a result of his formidable programme of world travel. A Catalan, with art museum experience, his good political judgement and agreeable wit made him a most useful and welcome member of the Committee, and his unavoidable departure was a great loss.

Georges van den Abeelen was another example of the best kind of European, a man whose roots were firmly in his own country but who had travelled a great deal and was well aware of Belgium's shortcomings. Like all the Committee members, he was an excellent example of the most effective type of patriot, a person 90 per cent loyal to his motherland, but 10 per cent constructively critical of its ideas and institutions. He

was also that very precious and rare variety of Belgian, a man at home and trusted in both communities and speaking the two languages equally well. Jesuit-trained, and with a formidable academic record, his wise and considered comments were always appreciated at Committee meetings. He was a master of the art of knowing when to speak and when to remain silent and to listen. He spent from 1941 to 1944 as a school teacher of Greek, Latin and French, took his doctorate at the University of Louvain in 1943 and worked as a journalist from 1944 to 1947, when he joined the Fédération des Industries de Belgique as its Director of Publications. He was Economic Adviser to King Baudouin and a much-consulted friend of both the King and of his wife, Queen Fabiola. He was rewarded for his distinguished career as a public servant by honours from Belgium, France and Norway. He was perfectly competent in English, but preferred to use French, a wish which was always respected, both in correspondence and at Committee meetings.

EMYA's Chairman, Richard Hoggart, had worked at the University of Birmingham from 1964 until 1973, as Professor of English and Director of the University's Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies. In 1970 he went to UNESCO in Paris, as Assistant Director-General, and remained there until 1975, when he returned to England as Warden (Director) of Goldsmiths' College in the University of London, a post from which he retired in 1984. Like Christopher Grayson, Victor de Pange and Luis Monreal, Richard Hoggart was officially European and to be publicly recognised as such was of immense value to EMYA during the years when it had to struggle hard to build up its reputation as one of Europe's most influential cultural organisations. Titles meant a great deal and although in most ways Hoggart was and is as British as they come, as an important part of the UNESCO hierarchy, with an office and a staff in Paris, he had impeccable European credentials. Paris was Europe, in a way that London, Leeds and Birmingham were not. Geographically, Britain was grudgingly admitted to be part of Europe, but culturally it was a non-starter, an injustice and an illogicality that EMYA has spent 21 years fighting against. In this campaign, Richard Hoggart was a powerful weapon in EMYA's arsenal, a living proof that it was possible both to be British and European at the same time.

However optimistic and psychologically well-prepared the Committee may have been, it could not have ventured to organise its first Award without the assurance of financial backing. This arrived later in 1977 and made it possible to set up plans for our first Presentation Ceremony. The only kind of sponsor who was likely to be interested in EMYA was a major industrial or commercial concern with international interests and Luke Rittner, Director of the Association for Business Sponsorship of the Arts, persuaded IBM to adopt us. In the late 1970s IBM was riding on the crest of a wave, although later it had its problems, as world competition in the computer field became more formidable every year, but in 1977 a new and politically independent institution like EMYA met its sponsorship requirements very well and it provided us with £15,000 a year for a period of four years, in addition to covering the costs of the annual Presentation Ceremony. During this time it provided invaluable advice and back-up facilities through its local centres in Paris, Brussels, Stuttgart and London, and in a variety of ways helped EMYA to learn a business for which there was no real precedent. In the process, IBM probably learnt one or two useful lessons itself. Successful sponsorship is not a one-sided business.

One should not give the impression that IBM's £15,000 a year was by any means sufficient to meet all EMYA's needs, even in those early days. It covered the cost of printing the brochure which was produced each year, and it financed the bulk of the visiting. It made only a small contribution towards administration expenses, however. Even during the IBM years, EMYA had to develop the tedious and time-consuming art of finding a little money here and a little there in order to survive and develop. The time and energy that had to go towards finding money could certainly have been better devoted to other and more creative purposes. No ingratitude to IBM is implied in saying this, but the record would be incomplete without it, as it would not to mention the many hours of pleasurable and useful conversation that took place with the two leading members of IBM's Corporate Affairs Department in London, Nigel Corbally-Stourton and Peter Wilkinson, two delightful men, ever anxious to please, whose charming personalities added welcome spice to the commercial pudding.

SECTION THREE

The IBM years

These years included EMYA's Presentation Ceremonies in 1978, 1979, 1980 and 1981. The first of these was held in the distinctly grand surroundings of the Palais des Rohan in Strasbourg. The Guest of Honour was the United Kingdom Labour Party politician, Roy Jenkins, who at that time was serving as the President of the European Community, and the welcoming address was given by the Mayor of Strasbourg, and former Prime Minister, the redoubtable Pierre Pflimlin, who had also been President of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe from 1963 to 1966. The function had to take place in early February - not a good travelling month - because Mr Jenkins was not available at any other time. Four of those who attended - Richard Hoggart, Kenneth Hudson, John Letts and Peter Wilkinson - have good reason to remember their journey to Strasbourg. They came by road from London, by way of Calais, bringing with them the Henry Moore trophy, which they, somewhat foolishly, declared to the French Customs. It was a Sunday, few people were travelling and only a skeleton staff was on duty. The official who dealt with the English party decided to follow the rule-book and announced that they could not proceed further until the following day, when his superior, referred to as 'mon parapluie', would be on the spot to decide what should be done about the Henry Moore. Meanwhile, he asked how much it was worth, what was its market value, and how much it weighed. The reply was '£1,000' and '2 kilos'. 'But', said the custodian of the honour of France, 'it isn't worth that much. It's only brass.' The guardians of the trophy promised to pass that information to Henry Moore, with the implication that somebody was being swindled, and suggested that since the object was merely a worthless lump of metal, the party should be allowed to proceed forthwith. A deal was eventually struck, whereby the zealous French official should be given a wad of English magazines and newspapers for the benefit of his son, who was studying English and, in exchange, Henry Moore would be permitted to continue to Strasbourg. Honour was saved on both sides and the centrepiece of the Ceremony would be in place at the Château des Rohan and available to the winner.

But it had been an unpleasant experience for those directly concerned and, although nothing quite so dramatic has occurred since, there have been other occasions when the organisers have been anxious in case 'Henry', as he has been called for many years, would not arrive in time for the Ceremony. The responsibility for delivering him rests with the previous year's winner of the Award and more than once the Diplomatic Bag has been used to ensure safe passage. Henry is a powerful symbol of tradition and of continuity from one year to the next. His annual movement around the Continent also represents the European nature of the Award.

The prize, originally £1,500, has remained at £3,000 for many years now. To have remained in line with inflation, it should now be about £10,000, and one day, when a wealthy patron appears over the horizon, no doubt that will be achieved. The publicity value of £10,000 would probably be greater than £3,000, although the emphasis has always been on the honour, not on the cash value, and there is no reason to believe that either the number or the quality of the candidates would fall if the money prize were to be abolished. What is certain is that the knowledge that a description and a photograph of one's museum would be circulated in influential circles all over Europe is both a source of pride to 70 or so museums each year and an incentive to compete for the Award, however slender one's chances of winning it may be.

The system was rather different for a year or two during the early days of the Award and there have been experiments, too, with the format of the brochure which describes the annual crop of candidates. The 14 x 30 cm page and the black and gold cover have been standard for many years now, the colour being changed to white and blue with the change of name to the European Museum Forum in 1997. After the IBM and Arthur Andersen period, each edition is printed in the country sponsoring the Ceremony. This Europeanisation of the printing has been another symbol of cultural unity and although it, too, brings its problems, it is a token of cross-border friendship and integration that the Committee would be unwilling to lose.

But it took the Committee some time to find its way, and for the first two Award years the size was different, 12 x 18.5 cm. In 1977 its hard cover was red, with white lettering and Henry in black, while the following year saw three versions, in English, French and German. More important, perhaps, in the first year was the fact that it contained descriptions only of the nine short-listed candidates. The remaining 23 were not mentioned at all, which from today's point of view, was politically unwise, psychologically inept and seriously lacking in public relations skills.

However, the Committee's motives and criteria were quite well expressed in the introduction to the brochure. 'All the short-listed museums have been visited by members of the Committee, who have been asking themselves throughout two key questions, 'What battles has this museum had to fight in order to get itself established?' and 'In what ways is this museum likely to change the course of museum-thinking or museum practice, either nationally or internationally?' The first question aims at measuring determination, efficiency and political awareness, the second originality, innovation and a feeling for what is relevant and needed in the present social situation.'

The first European Museum of the Year Award went to the Ironbridge Gorge Museum in the United Kingdom. The Committee's decision had been taken at a meeting held on 3 January 1978, once again at the Reform Club in London. The relevant Minute declares that the decision had been unanimous and that the success of Ironbridge was due to the fact that 'its influence on museum thinking and practice had been outstanding'. It was also recommended that 'a further award of £1,000 should be made to the Joan Miró Foundation in Barcelona for its success in applying the aims of the Foundation to the encouragement of international ideas, especially among young people, and for creating in this way a new concept of an art museum as a cultural

centre'. This special recognition constituted the basis of a special award established by the Council of Europe. The Council of Europe Museum Prize has always been presented at a ceremony in Strasbourg by the President of the Parliamentary Assembly. In addition to a cash prize, the winner receives, to hold for one year, as a trophy a sculpture by Miró, obtained through the joint efforts of the Council of Europe and Luis Monreal. Although the initial Assembly rapporteur for the museum awards was Andrew Faulds MP (UK), for the greater part of the period under review the late Günther Müller MdB (Germany) has followed our activities. Since last year Josephine Verspaget, Member of the Dutch Second Chamber, has taken up responsibility for the subject.

EMYA's Chairman, Richard Hoggart, had to leave the meeting in Strasbourg shortly before the Presentation Ceremony, in order to fulfil a BBC engagement in London, and in a stock-taking letter sent to him shortly afterwards, on 16 February 1978, Kenneth Hudson wrote: 'Tuesday went off remarkably well, I thought. Pflimlin ('Little Plum') was, of course, the politician pur sang. Luis did a superb job and Roy Jenkins was friendly and surprisingly involved. It turns out that he's been to Ironbridge. He said so publicly. He spoke a sort of French for a couple of minutes and then, very wisely, continued in English.'

At the Ceremony, each short-listed museum was presented with a handsome - and impressive - ceramic plaque recording its achievement. This followed the existing British custom and the intention was that the plaque should be placed on public exhibition in the museum to which it referred. Three of these museums were not represented and a Committee Minute of 28 June 1978 recorded what happened to their plaques.

'The plaques sent to Nice, Horten and Schwäbisch Gmund had most unfortunately been destroyed in the post. Horten had now received a replacement plaque, intact, and the two other museums would be receiving their plaques very soon. A stock of undated plaques was now being prepared and the situation would not recur.' The forecast proved correct - future plaques were not entrusted to the post - but two years later, with the stock exhausted, a safer system was adopted. Instead of the fragile plaques, each short-listed or, as it came to be called Specially Commended, candidate was given an equally impressive hand-lettered scroll.

The previous Committee meeting on 21 April had been somewhat out of the ordinary. With the Committee steadily increasing in size and its members very busy, physical attendance at meetings had become a costly business and, in an attempt to save precious money, an experiment was made with the conference hook-up system recently pioneered by the British telephone authorities. A circular letter sent on 14 March 1978 explained why it was being tried and how it would work.

'We know too well the difficulties of getting all the members of the EMYA Committee together at one place for meetings, and for this reason we are planning an experiment with a new system. This will provide good-quality two-way discussion by telephone between a central point, where the Chairman and the two other English members will be, and up to nine other centres in Europe. This will allow each person to sit in his or her own office in Strasbourg, Stockholm, or wherever, and to take part

in the discussion in a normal manner, using the existing telephone instrument. The cost will be not more than £150 an hour for all the circuits required, which is remarkably cheap. If necessary, they will re-dial circuits during the test period, so that everyone is guaranteed a good, clear line.

We should like to try the system on Friday 21 April, at 14.30, British time. Could you therefore arrange to be in your office then, or to depute someone else to be there for you. It is unlikely on this occasion that the hook-up will last for more than 30 minutes. The experiment will cost us nothing. It comes to us by courtesy of the British Post Office.'

Richard Hoggart was unable to be present on this occasion, but technically the results were considered satisfactory and a full-scale Committee meeting, with a normal agenda, was arranged for 29 June. Taking part were Richard Hoggart, Jean Favière, who had recently joined the Committee, Christopher Grayson, Kenneth Hudson, John Letts, Luis Monreal and Ulla Olofsson. We were required to pay for this second hook-up, during which there were certain problems which persuaded us not to continue with the system, at least for the time being. The Minutes record what happened.

'During the meeting there had been circuit difficulties with Strasbourg. A full enquiry by the British telephone authorities indicated that the loss of connection was probably caused by the habit of the French telephone service of unloading international traffic on to the not always adequate or efficient French domestic network during peak periods, instead of continuing to use circuits reserved for international calls. The matter is being pursued at the highest levels and meanwhile our two members in Strasbourg are offered our sincere apologies.'

In testing this new type of Committee meeting, EMYA was ahead of its time. It is ludicrously wasteful to bring busy people long distances in order to discuss a prepared agenda. Within two years, one could forecast, such routine meetings will be taking place on the Internet as a matter of course, at a great saving of money. Access to such computer-based facilities will be a necessary condition of membership of an international committee. This is not to say that face-to-face meetings will never take place. Direct human contact is still one of the pleasures of life and the basis of understanding. Paradoxically, perhaps, electronic contact between people is likely to be fruitful only when the same people only know one another reasonably well already. All EMYA's telephone hook-ups in 1978 did was to expose the possibilities.

In any case, the members of the EMYA Committee are human beings, not automata, and a major reason why they are willing to devote so much of their time to serving the organisation with out a fee is precisely that the task involves a lot of foreign travel at somebody else's expense. The exchange is a fair one and it is very likely, if not certain, that if all the Committee's business were transacted at a distance, it would be difficult to find people of real quality who would consider membership. An acceptable quid pro quo is essential.

Until the end of 1978 EMYA had no legal basis, which was a potential source of weakness. So, in August of that year the lawyers set to work to establish the European

Museum Trust, as a charitable organisation registered in the United Kingdom. Under British law, trustees must be British citizens and Richard Hoggart, Kenneth Hudson and John Letts accepted this responsibility. A condition of registration is that no trustee may profit financially from his position, except for specifically professional services, a rule that has been strictly observed during the life of the Trust.

The document is very generously worded. Under its conditions, the Trust is permitted to engage in any activities which are likely to be of benefit to museums in Europe and to raise and hold any money which may be required for that purpose. Its existence made it possible to set up an account with the Bank of England, a rare privilege for a non-commercial customer. On 28 August 1978, Kenneth Hudson wrote to the Chairman, Richard Hoggart, about this. 'It occurred to me,' he said, 'that cheques drawn on the Bank of England directly would make a good impression, so good that people might prefer to frame them, rather than cash them.' A further and considerable advantage was that, having been persuaded that the Trust functioned in the public interest and not for sordid financial gain, the Bank agreed to carry out all its transactions without charge, provided a minimum balance was maintained in the account at all times. Over the years, this has saved the Trust a good deal of money.

During 1978 and 1979 a routine was gradually established, on the basis of the experience gained while working towards the first Award. It involved two Committee meetings a year, one usually in England and the other at different places on the Continent. In recent years, the winter meeting at which the Awards are decided has always been in Strasbourg, as a result of the generosity of the Council of Europe, which covers the considerable cost of bringing the members of the Committee together for such an important occasion, which cannot attract sponsorship as the agenda covers policy matters and judging which cannot be made public.

Within the IBM sponsorship period, three new members - Jean Favière, Massimo Negri and Peter Schirmbeck - were added to the Committee, and one, Luis Monreal, was lost. Massimo Negri is still on the list, and Jean Favière retired only in 1995. Both have been a great source of strength to EMYA's work. They brought a great breadth of experience to the activities of the infant international body. Massimo Negri had pioneered the study of industrial archaeology in Italy, where he had first worked as a teacher, then carried out research in the United States and afterwards managed the International Bookshop in Milan, before later entering the publishing and art exhibition worlds. Kenneth Hudson and Massimo Negri had been on close terms for a number of years, as a result of their common interest in industrial archaeology.

Shortly after his appointment to the Committee, when he was about to embark on his first official visiting programme, Massimo Negri was given some practical advice and encouragement.

'1. Never put yourself to unnecessary trouble and expense. Always tell the museum in advance that you will be arriving at this or that airport or railway station at a particular time and ask them to send a car to meet you. They nearly always will. Avoid hiring cars. Let them do the driving.

2. Ask them to book you into a suitable local hotel. If you have to pay for the room, no matter. Say nothing about this when you make your first contact with them. Sometimes they will pay and sometimes they will leave the choice to you. Leave the decision to them.

3. Be absolutely ruthless and selfish in making your arrangements. If it suits you to arrive at 8 in the morning or 10 in the evening, say so.

4. Always give the impression that you are conferring a great honour by visiting them. This is, in fact, the case.

5. Assume that you will be taken out to lunch or dinner, and that the sheer pleasure of talking to you is a fair exchange.'

This may read like a page from the Cadgers' Bible, but such behaviour was forced on EMYA by the pressure of circumstances. There was no alternative. Money had to be conjured out of the air if progress was to be made. This is not a criticism of IBM as a sponsor. They did everything they promised to do and they did it well. They provided the bread and it was our business to provide the butter, but in order to achieve this the members of the EMYA Committee had to be enterprising and resourceful people, a task which they were good at and, on the whole, enjoyed. It was a qualification for the job and, as the German proverb put it so well, appetite comes by eating. Massimo Negri is, in any case, an Italian and the Italians are past masters at the art of interpreting 'public duty' in a creative way.

Jean Favière approached the problem from another direction. Orphaned at an early age, he has always had to learn how to look after himself and how to extract the maximum benefit from the highly centralised French bureaucracy. Between 1954 and 1983 he took a leading part in the work of ICOM, being the Chairman of the French National Committee from 1978 to 1983. He also played a pioneering rôle in persuading French museums to engage in activities outside the walls of their buildings, and he guided EMYA through the French maze for many years in a way which never failed to arouse the admiration and wonder of his colleagues. In charge first of the museums of Bourges and then, at the time when, by God's grace, he came EMYA's way, of Strasbourg, he was an invaluable member of the team, a charming, kind, thoughtful friend. He invariably spoke French, at Committee meetings and in conversation - although he had a good command of English - but curiously, over a period of nearly 20 years, he was never known to address one of his colleagues as 'tu'.

He greatly enjoyed travelling abroad and his well-established network of private and public contacts allowed him to make full use of the French diplomatic service in the countries he happened to be visiting, a bonus which was much to EMYA's advantage.

Attempts to find a suitable German member of the Committee proved difficult, but were eventually successful. In 1979 Professor Werner Knopp, Director of the powerful Stiftung Preussisches Kulturbesitz in Berlin had been invited and had agreed to join, a decision which he soon regretted, because he found himself too busy to attend meetings. The search therefore had to continue and in April 1980 Peter Schirmbeck, the Director of the Municipal Museum at Rüsselsheim, accepted our

invitation. He had been known to the Committee for some time, since his pioneering museum had won the Council of Europe Prize in 1979. At the time of his appointment to the Committee, he was 27 and had been at Rüsselsheim for four years, after a short period at the Historical Museum in Frankfurt.

His international reputation, considerably increased by gaining the Council of Europe Prize, was based on the fact that the museum at Rüsselsheim, which he created, was the first in the world to put the history of industry and technology into its social context. He came to be referred to, perfectly justifiably, as the man responsible for 'the Rüsselsheim revolution'. During the 1980s he became almost equally well-known as a sculptor, specialising in ingenious mobiles made from small pieces of machinery. A person of remarkable talents, his enforced retirement from the Committee as a result of ill-health was a source of grief to his colleagues, who had developed a great admiration and affection for him.

Four museums received the European Award during the years when the basic finance was provided by IBM. They were the Ironbridge Gorge Museum in the United Kingdom; Schloss Rheydt Municipal Museum at Mönchengladbach in the Federal Republic of Germany; the Museum of the Camargue near Arles in France; and the Catherine Convent State Museum at Utrecht in the Netherlands. Within the same period, the Council of Europe Prize went to the Joan Miró Foundation in Barcelona, Spain; Bryggens Museum at Bergen in Norway; the Municipal Museum at Rüsselsheim in the Federal Republic of Germany; and Monaghan County Museum at Monaghan in Ireland. 33 museums were Specially Commended in those four years. If one adds to these the four overall winners and the four which gained the Council of Europe Prize, all of which would otherwise have been Specially Commended, one arrives at the following country-by-country analysis. Belgium (2); Denmark (1); Finland (2); France (7); Germany (3); Ireland (3); Italy (1); Israel (1); Luxembourg (1); Netherlands (3); Norway (4); Portugal (1); Spain (2); Sweden (2); Switzerland (3); United Kingdom (5).

Apart from a steady increase in the German representation, this proportion changed very little during the following 10 years, as a subsequent analysis will show and, assuming that the criteria were justifiable and the judges competent, it probably reflects the degree of museum enterprise being displayed in the different countries, the extent of new ideas and the size of the investment. During its lifetime, the European Museum of the Year Award has been both a mirror of museum change and an encouragement towards it.

The 1979 Award Ceremony at the Hôtel de Ville in Brussels was particularly successful. The Guest of Honour was Queen Fabiola. Afterwards, Georges van den Abeelen, who had been instrumental in persuading her to take an active part in the Ceremony, wrote to thank her, in the gracious and courtly terms which are possible only in French. 'La présence intense de Votre Majesté, Sa disponibilité de tous les instants de ces deux heures, à tout ce que Lui était dit et montrer, donneraient une figure humaine à cette fonction européenne et à ce destin de notre pays.'

The Brussels meeting had its lighter moments. Queen Fabiola, suitably escorted by security officials, arrived in an inner courtyard, to be greeted by Richard Hoggart, who

bowed, 'but not too deeply', and by Ann Nicholls, who curtseyed, 'for the first and last time in my life' and presented the Queen with a 'bouquet romantique'.

By the end of what have been called 'the IBM years', EMYA had developed a life and organisation of its own. It was no longer the little brother of the British Museum of the Year Award and it had produced several developments which were peculiar to itself, including the habit of visiting and assessing all the candidates, instead of only those selected to form a short-list, and an annual award for Special Exhibitions. This was sponsored by the Bank of Ireland and consisted of a cash prize of £2,000, together with a trophy, a bronze sculpture by John Behan, 'relating to the travelling story-tellers in Irish history'. For the time being, three copies of this were to be made, so that the successful museum could keep one each time the Award was made.

The Bank of Ireland's generosity presented the Committee with both an opportunity and a problem. On the one hand, it acknowledged the fact that temporary exhibitions had become an increasingly important part of the museum world and on the other it created an award which was difficult to judge. The essential features of temporary exhibitions is that they are temporary and the period of their existence unfortunately often failed to coincide with the months during which the members of the Committee were making their official visits to the candidates. This problem has never been solved and it constitutes a serious weakness in EMYA's work, because it often makes it impossible to give adequate credit to what is more and more a central feature of a museum's activities, as the concept of 'permanent exhibitions' is seen to be less and less relevant to contemporary needs. Perhaps the main value of the Bank of Ireland's prize was that it drew attention to this situation in an unmistakable way.

But at least one can say that in 1980 there was an atmosphere of continuity and stamina about EMYA, if not permanence. An excellent working team had been brought together, there were solid achievements to record, in the shape of our excellent and prestigious annual meetings, and more than 200 new museums visited and assessed, and a large archive assembled. The original plan to deposit this material in ICOM's Documentation Centre in Paris had unfortunately come to nothing, but on 17 March 1980 Kenneth Hudson wrote to Richard Hoggart, as EMYA's Chairman, to announce what appeared to be a promising development.

'Last week,' he announced, 'Geoffrey Lewis, who is Director of the Institute of Museum Studies at the University of Leicester, came to see me in a large van. He brought a van, not a car, so that he could take back with him a consignment of material for the Institute's library. This was in two parts.

(a) My own very considerable collection of brochures and catalogues relating to museums around the world.

(b) The printed material sent by candidates for the first three EMYA Awards.

We're bursting at the seams here and it seemed to me much better that all this should be in a university library where it will be properly catalogued and where it would be available to students. The Institute, which is almost certainly the best in Western

Europe, was clearly the right place for it and Geoffrey Lewis seemed very glad to have it.'

This letter proved to be somewhat over-optimistic. The pressure on EMYA's Bath office space had indeed been relieved and the material was safely stored, but five years later it was still in the cardboard boxes in which it had been removed. A shortage of staff and funds at the University of Leicester had prevented any sorting or cataloguing from being done. The position had in fact become worse, rather than better, since each year a car arrived in Bath to collect the new annual contribution, which was simply added to the rest of the pile. Eventually, after five years, the truth was revealed and this time a lorry, not a van, appeared in Leicester to transport everything back to Bath, before its eventual transfer to the Institut für Museumskunde in Berlin, where it has been very satisfactorily looked after ever since. A fresh consignment goes to Berlin every year.

By 1980, incidentally, Kenneth Hudson and Ann Nicholls had ceased to refer to their temporary status. They and their office in Bath had become the core and base of the Award and they appear to have accepted their responsibilities as inevitable, the burden which God had placed on their shoulders and which they had to carry until the end of the journey, whenever that might be. But it was a stimulating and worthwhile load and they felt privileged to be entrusted with it.

SECTION FOUR

Arthur Andersen takes over

It is in the nature of competitions that those who win are more satisfied than those who do not and this must apply to the European Museum of the Year Award. However much one emphasises that the competitive element is not the main feature of the scheme and that the real reason for the Award's existence is its usefulness in drawing public attention to Europe's more enterprising museums, one museum each year is certain to be happier than the others as a result of the judges' decisions. The Committee has sometimes wondered if it might be better to select, say, six Specially Commended candidates each year and no overall winners. This, however, would be rather like having no Miss World and indeed, six ladies who were ranked equal as the most beautiful women in the world. It seems doubtful if the competition would prove as attractive in either case.

But any tradesman likes to have satisfied customers and no doubt EMYA should have taken more trouble to discover what each of the candidates thought of the scheme year by year. In a rough and ready way, it does know, because the Committee receives many useful comments during the Annual Meeting and by correspondents, but no systematic attempt has ever been made to gather candidates' opinions. It is well aware that some people are bad losers and complain either that the criteria are wrong or the jury incompetent. One influential English museum director even went so far as to shout 'scandal', when the winner was announced, in preference to his own museum. But such occasions are fortunately very rare and the great majority of people who attend these meetings find them pleasant occasions, which provide exceptionally good opportunities to make friends and exchange ideas.

In 1980, when IBM handed over the torch to Arthur Andersen, EMYA published a short comparative survey of what winning the Award had meant to the three successful museums up to that time. It still makes interesting reading.

'1977,' we recalled, 'was the year of the Ironbridge Gorge Museum in Great Britain'. 'The most obvious and immediate effect of the publicity surrounding the Award ,' wrote the Director, Neil Cossons, 'was the increase in the number of visitors to Ironbridge. For example, in the Spring of 1977 weekly figures averaged in April 3,500, in May 4,000, in June 5,500 and in July 7,000. In 1978 the same averages were April 4,500, May 5,500, June 8,500 and July 11,500. Much of this, I feel sure, can be directly attributable to the Award and there have undoubtedly been longer-term beneficial effects on visitor numbers which it would be impossible to quantify.

'In many respects, however, the greatest contribution which the European Museum of the Year Award has made to Ironbridge has been to underline its worth in Britain. Ironbridge has become a household word, so to speak, in the last few years - synonymous with a new type of museum and identified as a sort of 'brand leader' among the new generation of independent museums. The European Award did an enormous amount to reinforce that view and convinced those who saw museums through traditionalist eyes that new things were happening in the museum world. I feel sure that the Award has done much to assist the re-definition of the word 'museum'.'

For 1978, Dr Eva Brues, the Director of the Schloss Rheydt Municipal Museum at Mönchengladbach, was able to report very similar experiences. 'Immediately,' she said, 'we had many more visitors, and those who came seemed to have a higher opinion of the Museum than previously. Official recognition brought general recognition. The experts had given their opinion and it had been accepted. The Museum remained exactly the same, but overnight its merits had mysteriously increased. In November of the year in which we won the Award, Schloss Rheydt featured on a new postage stamp. This would certainly never have happened without the Award.'

The Museum of the Camargue was placed first in 1979 and here, too, the public response was unmistakable. 'Since our Museum was awarded the prize,' Jean-Maurice Rouquette reported, 'the number of visitors has doubled by comparison with the same period last year. This is a striking indication of the reputation which the European Museum of the Year Award has acquired among a wide public.'

This rise in local and national esteem had not by any means been confined to the winners of the principal award. Those museums whose outstanding work was recognised by the Special Exhibitions Award, the Council of Europe Award and by the Specially Commended Plaque of Honour received similar benefits. The Committee was naturally very gratified by this. 'It amounts to saying,' declared the 1980 Annual Report, 'that on Monday a museum was merely Very Good, but on Tuesday it was Officially Very Good. After four years of hard work, the Committee is glad to have been able to turn the spotlight on so many centres of excellence. This, and not the distribution of prizes for its own sake, was always its aim.'

The winner of the Award in 1980 was the Catharine Convent State Museum at Utrecht in the Netherlands, and EMYA's close association with IBM came to a close at this point. In commemorating the end of one epoch and the beginning of another, one can hardly do better than to reproduce what was said in the introduction to the Award's 1981 brochure which, in customary fashion, was concerned with the events of the 1980 working year. Beneath the heading, *Under a new umbrella,* the Committee expressed itself in these terms.

'With the ceremony in The Guildhall, London, in March 1981 the European Museum of the Year Award reached the end of what might fairly be called its IBM period, an invigorating four years, during which the possibilities and problems of the scheme gradually revealed themselves, the members of what is quite possibly Europe's least

bureaucratic international committee came to understand one another very well and the virtues of cultural private enterprise on the British model slowly began to be accepted by a continent which had come to think of the State as the all-wise, all-providing mother where museums were concerned.

'As we said warmly and publicly in the course of the Guildhall ceremony, IBM had been model sponsors from the beginning to the end of their sponsorship period and it is a pleasure to express our gratitude to them again now. They trusted us to go about our strange task in a sensible way, they never interfered with what we were doing, they gave us every kind of practical help, they set an invaluably high standard for the annual ceremony and reception and, most important of all, they provided, in Nigel Courbally-Stourton and Peter Wilkinson, of their Corporate Programmes Department, two immensely congenial and understanding people, who did more to sustain our morale than perhaps they ever realised. We always knew that our love affair with IBM could not continue beyond 1981 - this is an organisation which plays the good parent by feeding and sheltering its children until they seem strong enough to face the world by themselves and then casting them adrift with introductions to people who could be useful in their future careers.

'One such introduction was to one of the world's most important firms of international accountants, Arthur Andersen, who were sufficient impressed by our record, and perhaps also by the public face we showed at The Guildhall, to take us over at the point where IBM said farewell. To say that we were delighted, although certainly true, would be a very misleading statement. In March of this year we thought it was quite possible that we should have to bring our activities to a close at the very moment when the Award was being acknowledged on all sides as one of the most useful and imaginative of Europe's recent cultural developments. We never really believed, however, that the worst would happen, and, as evidence of our faith in the future, we had already, in January, sent out details and entrance forms for the next year's Awards. As it happened, our optimism was well-founded but, if matters had turned out differently, we could have found ourselves in the embarrassing situation of possessing a large stack of dossiers from museums which we had invited to be candidates for this year's Awards and not even enough money for stamps to put on our letters of regret.

'But we are glad to be able to record that the disaster did not, in fact, take place and that the transition from IBM to Arthur Andersen has been so smooth and so pleasant as to be almost imperceptible.'

The change of sponsorship from IBM to Arthur Andersen was arranged in a most gentlemanly manner. The two companies had close business relationships and simply talked to one another at a high level in order to arrange the new system of support for EMYA. There was direct and most amicable contact from the beginning with Arthur Andersen's senior English partner, Ian Hay Davison, and his equally agreeable colleague, Bob Linger, with frequent meetings at the firm's sumptuous London headquarters. A special advantage from the outset was the availability of their staff designer, David Jevons, who provided welcome help from the beginning on the restyling of EMYA's publications and who, in particular, was responsible for introducing us to John Baber, who produced the ammonite logo which has been used

ever since and which established our identity in a most successful manner throughout Europe. Sadly, John Baber subsequently died at a relatively early age, a great loss to the design world. It was David Jevons, too, who devised the new format for EMYA's annual brochure, with its two-column English and French arrangement that has proved perfectly satisfactory over the years.

Something should be said here about the decision to concentrate on these two languages for EMYA's publications. On one or two occasions, a third language has been added, in order to please the particular country where the Annual Ceremony was being held, but this has not been found satisfactory and it is unlikely that the experiment will be repeated, partly because it leads to design problems and partly because experience has shown it to be unnecessary. Surveys have shown that very few people with whom EMYA is in regular contact, including the candidates, understand neither English nor French and that the addition of any third language would be for political, not communication reasons. The continued presence of French as an equal partner in EMYA's publications has also been a matter of debate. For better or for worse, English has largely supplanted French as the major language for international communication of all kinds and this becomes more evident each decade. If EMYA were able to confine itself to a single language, English, it would be able to make considerable savings on its printing bill, with only a small reduction in efficiency. This point has been made more than once to the Council of Europe, which has, however, continued to insist, for diplomatic rather than logical reasons, on the presence of French as a parallel language. Any reference to French as a second language has always been firmly, but politely, discouraged.

The three years during which EMYA was largely financed by Arthur Andersen were characterised, among other stylistic features, by three very grand meetings, in the organisation of which the Company's national headquarters in the countries concerned played an important part. At the presentations for the 1981 Awards at the Town Hall in Stockholm the Guest of Honour was Princess Christina, who earned the respect and admiration of everyone present, including the Committee, for driving herself in her own car and having parking problems. This, it was felt, was Swedish democracy at its best. The elegant sit-down reception was also greatly praised.

The 1982 Award Ceremony in Milan was equally impressive but very different. It was held in part of La Scala opera house, known as La Piccola Scala, which certainly provided the out-of-the-ordinary atmosphere required on such occasions, but displayed certain eccentricities, such as an imperfect simultaneous translation system, which provoked frustration and amusement in approximately equal proportions. The Guest of Honour was to have been Giovanni Agnelli, who occupied an almost royal position in Italian society, but he was suddenly called away to perform other equally important duties and sent his charming brother in his place. The reception afterwards was lavish and much appreciated, but held in such a confined space that much ingenuity was required to avoid knocking other guests' refreshments out of their hands. On the evening after the official reception, the members of the EMYA Committee were invited to 'a small private party in my apartment' by a distinguished and very charming lady who happened to be influential in the Association of the Friends of Italian Museums. In the event, the 'small private party' was attended by

122 people, one of whom, not a member of the Committee, fell through a window in the elegant first-floor apartment.

Paris was equally noteworthy. The Presentation Ceremony for the 1983 Awards took place in the Hôtel de Ville, with the accompanying reception amid the splendours of the Musée Carnavalet. The Guest of Honour was to have been Jacques Chirac, then the Mayor of Paris, but he, like Mr Agnelli, discovered pressing last-minute reasons for being elsewhere and despatched his wife to act in his place. The evening reception, at a restaurant near the Etoile, was of a quality that lingers in the memory of the Committee and no doubt of the other people present. Arthur Andersen arranged these affairs in a masterly fashion and we remain very grateful to them for demonstrating so clearly the meaning of the phrase 'international standards'.

At a Committee meeting held at the Museum of Art and History in Saint-Denis, near Paris, it was announced that, as expected, Arthur Andersen would not be able to support EMYA for a fourth year. 'They would, however, make every effort to find another sponsor and he (Bob Linger) did not expect great difficulties, as EMYA was now well-established and a very saleable commodity.'

This was no doubt said with the best of intentions and in full confidence that another sponsor would soon appear, but six months later it had come to sound like a bad joke. Before explaining how and why, it seems useful and indeed grateful to mention two very forward-looking and constructive functions which Arthur Andersen made it possible for EMYA to perform during the years when its funds were available to make experiments possible.

The first was to begin a series of publications which could be distributed in European museum circles. These were presented in large-page format and the design, by David Jevons, undoubtedly gave an authoritative impression, which was of great benefit to EMYA's image. David Jevons had a great deal of experience in such matters, because Arthur Andersen's practice was to produce a regular flow of reports on topical issues, especially of a taxation nature, for the benefit of its clients. This work often had to be carried out at high speed, in order to coincide with important changes in Government policy or legal decisions and it was essential that the appearance of the booklets, which were often quite substantial, should reflect the quality of their contents. Anything which looked like a rushed or temporary job was not in order.

The theme of the first of these EMYA reports was *New trends in museum design*, and it summarised the proceedings of the seminar which was held in Stockholm in April 1982 on the occasion of the Presentation Ceremony of the 1981 Awards. The seminar was arranged in co-operation with Riksutställningar, the Swedish State organisation for preparing and circulating travelling exhibitions and it took place on its premises. The report still makes interesting reading 15 years later and, although it was intended to provide a precedent for future years, funds were never available to permit this. The mention of the experiment here may give an incentive to continue with it at a later date. One of the main problems which EMYA has had to face has been the difficulty, bordering on impossibility, of putting its knowledge and experience to public use. It has been all too well aware that, without adequate publication outlets, it has been

fulfilling only part of its potential. This lack of balance between input and output is a defect which must somehow be corrected in the years ahead.

The second of these special publications appeared in 1983 in an English and a French version. It was optimistically referred to as Public Report No. 1 and it carried the title, *Six museum controversies*. These subjects of debate covered a wide range.

> Are art museums peculiar or special?
> Should museums be deliberately objective and neutral?
> How should museum attendants be dressed?
> Are trade unions and professional organisations an obstacle to museum development?
> Are museum publications ripe for change?
> Why are some countries hostile to privately-funded museums?

A list of these questions was sent to 66 people, widely distributed throughout Western Europe, whom the Committee knew to be capable to independent and vigorous thinking and whose views and judgement it had come to respect. In summarising their replies, their actual words are frequently quoted.

'I believe that the overall cost of art museums is out of all proportion to their public value'

'All displays are charged with the values of their presenters, whether they are aware of it or not, and many curators seem to come from the same social background'

'I object to anything which suggests the police or the military. The first day I entered museum employment, I encountered the Head Attendant wearing all his medals.'

'The working hours agreed with the trade unions are often an obstacle to having opening times which would suit the public better.'

'Not enough thought is given to the production of postcards and often dull subjects are produced in great quantities because a member of staff has a specialist interest.'

'French tradition is completely hostile to the intrusion of private capital into a system which is so firmly State-controlled. French industry and commerce has reciprocated by showing no interest at all in the public relations advantages of sponsorship and patronage. French museum directors sometimes become green with envy at the very different situation in Germany and the United States.'

In what other museum-centred publications could one find such pungent and relevant comments brought together for the public benefit? By 1983, if not sooner, EMYA had come to realise that it was uniquely well placed to carry out such a function, because existing as it did on private funding, it was in a position to undertake independent research and offer completely objective judgements. It did not have to please or flatter governments, whether local or national. But, because of a chronic shortage of money, Public Report No. 1 was both the first, and, for the time being, the last of the series. But it is essential that the experiment should be continued.

If one tried to distinguish between the help given by IBM and Arthur Andersen to EMYA, one could justifiably say that IBM made it international and Arthur Andersen gave it style and confidence, without which it would never have been able to face the dreadful years of poverty between 1984 and 1986. This is not the place to analyse the EMYA style, although that will be attempted later, when the 21-year period is discussed as a whole. At this point it is probably sufficient to say that the EMYA style, as it developed, was a curious but fruitful mixture of the British, the American and the European, irreverent and informal on the one hand and cautiously respectful of authority on the other. Kenneth Hudson would be the first to admit, with some justification, that he has been instrumental in encouraging this blend of qualities and attitudes or, as he would prefer to put it, giving EMYA room to breathe. In this process, IBM and Arthur Andersen, with their fingers everywhere in the international pie, have played an invaluable rôle. They were and still are bridges between cultures, which was EMYA's own principal function.

Inevitably, most of EMYA's public face during its formative years was created by Kenneth Hudson, although he tried hard and repeatedly to delegate as much responsibility as possible to other members of the Committee. One reason for the concentration of EMYA's printed word outpourings on him was that he was, fortunately in some ways, a professional writer, who wrote easily and fast and actually enjoyed it. So his style to some extent became EMYA's style. That style may well be modified, perhaps for the better, when the direction of EMYA ultimately passes into other hands, but meanwhile Kenneth Hudson does not feel called on to apologise for being his provocative self and for often being British rather than French, German, Italian or Swedish. Everyone brings to a task such talents and defects as he has.

On 14 November 1983, his greatly esteemed colleague, Jean Favière wrote to Kenneth Hudson wishing that he would take up a 'less Manichaean' attitude in his introduction to the annual brochure. 'Manichaean' is possibly a word which comes more easily to a Frenchman than to an Englishman, but its general meaning is reasonably clear. It could perhaps be defined as a hotchpotch of religious doctrines, based on a supposed primordial conflict between light and darkness or good and evil. To the Catholic Church it was an heretical philosophy involving a radical dualism. Jean Favière hoped that in future Kenneth Hudson's remarks would be 'plus nuancés', a delicious French expression, to be translated perhaps, as 'less black and white' or 'less direct in tone', which is, of course, another way of saying 'less provocative'. But to ask Kenneth Hudson to stop being provocative is like telling ice not to be slippery or an elephant to exchange its trunk for something less obvious and more refined.

Undoubtedly, however, the 2,000-word space which Arthur Andersen gave in the newly-designed annual brochure provided a wonderful platform from which to spread forthright views about the past, present and future of museums and it would have been foolish not to use the opportunity. In 1981-84, the Arthur Andersen years, there were a number of examples of the following kind of comment.

'A phenomenon which we have mentioned in previous years, but which is perhaps even more remarkable today, is that, as the economic recession gets worse, the number of new museums increases. Exactly why this should be so, we are unable to

explain, although we can offer suggestions. Museums are concerned in one way or another with the past, and it may well be that, as the present seems more dangerous, threatening and unpleasant, the past acquires added attractions for us. It is possible, too, as every week brings fresh evidence of private and governmental philistinism, vandalism and indifference to everything but financial gain and electoral success, the wish grows to deposit what can be saved in places of safety. But, even more important, we see an increasing belief in the potential of the museum as a local cultural centre, in which the collections and exhibitions are valued not so much for themselves as for their ability to function as a starting point of discussion, revaluation and, quite possibly, social protest. Even 20 years ago, the notion that a natural history or ethnological museum or an art gallery might willingly, even eagerly, accept a political rôle would have been fanciful or perverse. Now such a rôle is almost normal.'

After Jean Favière's gentle protest, each introduction to the brochure was signed by the person who wrote it, once by himself, in order that individual responsibility could be taken for what was said. One can see his point. The EMYA Committee has always been composed of two sorts of people, those who run museums and those who earn their living in other ways. To bring all the members of the Committee within the royal plural 'we' could occasionally bring problems to those with touchy political masters. Yet, as we all know, anything approved in detail by a committee is almost certain to be so safe as to be unreadable or uneatable. One has to choose between flavour and a medical guarantee of safety.

SECTION FIVE

The art of accomplishing miracles

1984 began normally. In January the usual invitations were sent out to possible candidates for the following year's Awards, and in the Spring the Annual Ceremony took place, amid the splendour that Europe had come to expect, in Paris. At that point Arthur Andersen bowed out, with the assurance that a successor as sponsor would be discovered without difficulty. However, at a Committee meeting held in Bath on 7 July 1984, 'Mr Hudson reported that at the time of the meeting no sponsor had been found. He said that, once the present Committee meeting had been financed, no further funds were available for visiting and while visiting could be planned, it could not be carried out, except incidentally, until he had given the go-ahead to members of the Committee. Administration would meanwhile be continued on a very basic level.'

That 'very basic level' included writing to possible sponsors, in many cases with an introduction from Arthur Andersen, who did their utmost to be helpful in the struggle to obtain a successor to them. A list of the companies approached makes interesting reading, especially when one recalls that all of them said 'No'. In February 1984 EMYA tried British Caledonian, the Charles Barker Group, Morgan Grenfell, English China Clays, Lloyd's, Christie's and Marks and Spencer. In March it was Rank Xerox, Allianz Insurance, and the Banque National de Paris. After a brief respite in April, when attention was focused on the Annual Ceremony, the battle began again in May, with Heineken, Wedgwood and BAT Industries. In June the letters went out to Forbes International, British Olivetti, Ikea in Stockholm and Hallmark Cards in Kansas City. Nestlé had their turn in July and Migros in September, the Carnegie Foundation in October and the Japan Shipbuilding Federation in December. 1985 began with the Schweizerisches Bank Verein in January and then followed Robert Maxwell's British Printing and Communications Corporation in April, together with The Illustrated London News. In May EMYA turned to Nixdorf in Paderborn and to Martin Brinkman AG in Bremen. Rothmans International was approached in June, together with BASF AG in Ludwigshafen, Metallgesellschaft AG in Frankfurt, Grundig, American Express and Citibank. Finally, in July 1985, came Barclay's Bank, John Paul Getty and Baron Thyssen-Bornemitza.

One could hardly have been expected to do more, but all this effort proved completely useless. From each of these 36 wealthy and prestigious concerns came a polite and fairly prompt letter of regret, wishing EMYA well and adding either that they were already fully committed to sponsorship projects or, more frequently, that their terms of reference did not make it possible for them to support international enterprises.

On 25 April 1985, as a gambler's last throw, we wrote, enclosing our usual supporting information, to Edward Heath, the British politician and former Prime Minister who also happened to advise Arthur Andersen on a regular basis. The significant part of our letter read:

'One of the most successful and most efficient international enterprises to have been created in Europe during the post-war period, the European Museum of the Year Award, is in serious danger of foundering unless it can find a new sponsor very quickly. The Committee would be very grateful for your help in preventing this disaster from taking place.

'Its annual meetings and seminars are important cultural occasions and its publications have achieved an international reputation. Yet for the lack of £40,000 a year, most of which is spent on travelling expenses and printing, we seem doomed to close the book. We had IBM as our first sponsor and Arthur Andersen as our second but, hard as we have tried, we cannot find a third.

'The problem seems to be that we are an international organisation. If we operated within one country, we should have no problem. This is a strange commentary on the many years of effort to make European thinking cross frontiers.'

But Mr Heath, too, was unable to provide any assistance. However, there was one ray of sunshine in this otherwise gloomy period. In July 1986, when we were at the bottom of our trough of depression, we received a non-renewable grant of 5000 Dutch guilders from the European Cultural Foundation, as a result of the intervention of Christopher Grayson.

By then we had strengthened our Committee by the addition of three new members - Aleid Rensen-Oosting, Director of the Noorder Dierenpark at Emmen in the Netherlands; Friedrich Waidacher, Director of the Joanneum at Graz, and Udo Vroom, Director of the Amsterdam Historical Museum. Aleid Rensen was the creator of one of Europe's most successful museums - within 10 years it had two million paying visitors a year - and was and still is a tower of strength during all our discussions. Fritz Waidacher, recently made a State Counsellor, was widely respected both as the head of the largest provincial museum in Austria and within ICOM. His common sense and great charm were a continuous help to us in many difficult circumstances, not least our financial troubles during the mid-Eighties, when his constant cheerfulness was an invaluable boost to the Committee's morale. Udo Vroom, the Director of Amsterdam's Historical Museum, was an equally cheerful person, who had impressed us when the museum he was at that time directing, in 1984, the Zuiderzee Museum at Enkhuizen, had won the European Museum of the Year Award, which we were unable to present, owing to our straitened financial position.

As an emergency measure, we decided to combine the 1985 and 1986 Award candidates, and from that time onwards to number the Award according to the year in which it was actually presented, so that what would have been the 1986 Award became the 1987 Award. At the same time we came to the conclusion that our traditional sponsorship strategy was no longer going to work. Time had moved on and the days of one single sponsor were over. We had to find methods of paying our way year by year as we went along. This involved the hard-pressed Ann Nicholls in a great deal of extra and not entirely congenial work, in exchange for which the Committee gave her the title of Administrator, which she may well have considered a poor sort of bargain.

The new plan, which is still followed, involved, first, persuading national bodies, at that time mainly tourist organisations, to meet the costs of visiting and assessing the candidates within their own countries and, second, finding a local institution, usually a museum, that was willing to shoulder or organise the costs of the Annual Meeting. Our administration expenses had to be covered in whatever ways Fate might provide.

The first test of this distinctly ad hoc scheme was the Annual Meeting in Enkhuizen in 1986. At that time, Udo Vroom was still running the Zuiderzee Museum and, being naturally anxious to receive public credit for winning the Award, he agreed - indeed offered - to accept responsibility for financing and organising the Presentation Ceremony. This involved paying the travelling and hotel expenses of the Committee, providing the prize money of £3,000, arranging for a suitably impressive room in which to hold the Ceremony, pay for an equally impressive reception, and fund the printing costs of the brochure. This he did, and the presentation was duly and correctly made, by Gaetano Adinolfi, Deputy Secretary General of the Council of Europe, within the setting of a fine church at Enkhuizen, which was at least different from anything we had experienced before. The Committee was understandably grateful. The deadlock had been broken, EMYA was back in business and continuity had been restored.

The new ad hoc system was tested for the second time in connection with the 1987 meeting in and around Durham in north-east England, where the new method of raising funds was publicly fully tested for the first time. As a result of negotiations through an intermediary, Malcolm Wood, the English Tourist Board's Director of Marketing offered to sponsor this meeting up to a limit of £3,500, having been told that it would be in Durham and that the winner, already decided several months before, would be Beamish, the Open-Air Museum for the North-East. 'In our view,' he said, 'museums play a most important part in tourism by providing places of interest and education for tourists, as well as local people requiring an interesting and stimulating place for a leisure visit.'

Ann Nicholls sent Mr Wood an estimate of the principal costs, which included the hire of the Great Hall at Durham Castle, a buffet lunch for 300, 'with two glasses of wine each', £500 for administrative expenses and £300 for preparing the scrolls to be presented to the Specially Commended candidates. Also to be covered were the 'cost of bringing the EMYA Committee to Durham at the cheapest possible rates, from Amsterdam, Strasbourg, Brussels, Graz, Emmen, Stockholm, Milan, Frankfurt,

London (2) and Bath (2) and the Committee's hotel expenses in Durham, assuming 20 per cent off normal rates.' The printing of the brochure also had to be paid for and coaches hired for the regional museum tour which formed part of the programme.

The £3,500 promised by the English Tourist Board was not sufficient to deal with all this and supplementary finance had to be obtained locally. Coaches were eventually obtained free and prominent commercial concerns in the region, including Newcastle Breweries, looked after the brochure. Certain other facilities, including a much-appreciated evening reception, were provided by Beamish itself.

The Durham meeting marked an important stage in the reorganisation of EMYA, because it showed that it was possible to run what had become in effect a business without a major sponsor. Possible, but very arduous and time-consuming, because it involved finding the money not only for the Annual Meeting, but also for the visiting programme which preceded it. In the 1987 brochure, which was made available at the Durham meeting, there was a page of acknowledgements to the 38 bodies which had provided EMYA with financial help during the year. They ranged from national and local tourist organisations to airlines, hotels, printing and publishing companies.

In order to run such a scheme as this, it was necessary for EMYA's Administration to keep very close control of the visiting arrangements. The days when the members of the Committee/Jury were left to look after their own travel and hotels, sending in the bill afterwards, died when Arthur Andersen left the scene. From 1986 onwards they were sent exact details of what had been organised for them and all they were required to do was to be in the right place at the right time. They were provided with the necessary air and rail tickets, their hotel rooms were booked and the museums had been notified of the day and time of their arrival.

Because this precise organisation was vital to EMYA's survival and success, it seems useful to reproduce one of these travel programmes to illustrate this almost military planning. Every opportunity had to be taken to reduce costs and, in this case, a considerable saving was brought about by persuading the two people involved, Jean Favière and Friedrich Waidacher, to remain in England for a few days after the Annual Meeting in Durham had ended, in order to visit the British museum candidates for the following year's Award. This ensured that their air fares to and from Britain would be transferred to another part of the EMYA budget. So, in 1987, the visiting of the four widely separated British candidates was arranged like this, all journeys being by rail.

'**Tuesday 30 June**

14.40	Depart Durham, arrive Manchester Victoria 17.28. Overnight Willow Bank Hotel, 340 Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M14 6AF (telephone 061 224 0461)

Wednesday 1 July

09.07	Depart Manchester Victoria, arrive Wigan Wallgate 09.52. The Museum is very close to the station.
	Visit *Wigan Pier*: Mrs Hazel Hawarden (telephone 0942 323666)

13.52 Leave Wigan Wallgate for Manchester Victoria, arrive 14.37.

Visit *The Manchester Museum*: Mr Alan Warhurst (telephone 061 273 3333)

Overnight Willow Bank Hotel

Thursday 2 July

09.56 Depart Manchester Piccadilly, arrive Birmingham New Street 11.41. Change trains.

12.15 Depart Birmingham New Street, arrive Plymouth 16.29.

Overnight Copthorne Hotel, Armada Way, Plymouth (telephone 0752 224161). A white minibus from the Copthorne Hotel will meet your train at Plymouth. Please look out for it.'

And so on until the two exhausted visitors, kept going by their flow of adrenalin, returned to Austria and France on Sunday 5 July. This programme conceals as much as it reveals. On the surface all it shows is that two people have to obey exact orders to present themselves at railway stations to catch certain trains, to check in at specified hotels and to visit four museums a considerable distance from one another. Below the surface, however, is a mass of complicated administrative work, spread over weeks and months, which has involved contacting individual museum directors, extracting promises of free dinners, luncheons and hotel rooms, and persuading railway companies to issue travel passes at no cost to EMYA. The number of letters, faxes and telephone calls needed to arrange a single programme of this nature has to be left to the imagination, but it can hardly amount to less than the equivalent of three days' hard work. The 1987 British visiting was a special case, because the two people concerned were already in England, but normally there is also the problem of trying to persuade airlines or tourist agencies to provide free air tickets to and from the country concerned.

In 1987, for the 1988 Award, this travel involved visits to 16 countries, and a little simple arithmetic will indicate that approximately 48 working days had to be allowed, only in order to arrange the official visits to candidates and to ensure that each pair of visitors was given a clear and workable programme. With the disappearance of the East-West divide, 14 additional countries have been added to the pool from which EMYA candidates could be drawn. If each of these countries were to present candidates - only six have so far done so - that would mean a minimum of 42 more working days for the construction of visiting programmes. One uses the word 'minimum' deliberately, because experience has shown that negotiations with the former Communist countries usually take much longer to bring to a satisfactory conclusion, partly because of communication difficulties and partly because, by tradition, official machinery moves much more slowly in the countries of Eastern Europe.

Theoretically, therefore, 90 working days each year could be devoted only to constructing visiting programmes. To this figure one has to add what is required to keep in regular contact with members of the EMYA Committee, with the National

Correspondents, and with members of the EMYA Association, and the time demanded for the organisation of the Annual Meeting and the preparation of the *Magazine* and *Bulletin*, to say nothing of dealing with the extensive general correspondence which the existence of EMYA inevitably involves. Ann Nicholls as Administrator-cum-Secretary has coped with all this on her own for 21 years. It has been a heroic task and it is no exaggeration to say that without her EMYA would have collapsed long ago.

One should perhaps add that until four years ago the EMYA office had no computer. Everything was dealt with on an ordinary IBM typewriter. It is only with the arrival of a first and a second computer that the workload has been made just about tolerable. New equipment, however, does little more than make it possible for the office to catch up with itself. It does not represent a second brain or a second pair of hands.

It would be fair, even so, to mention, since this is a history of EMYA, not a catalogue of complaints or a cry for help, that from the beginning certain Western European countries have always presented more and greater problems than others. EMYA has its private lists of easy countries and difficult countries, countries where human idleness and inefficiency and bureaucratic obstacles are more obvious than in others. To reveal which countries are on which list would be probably unhelpful and politically unwise, but there can be no harm in indicating that the differences exist and that it affects the workload of the EMYA secretariat or, in plainer terms, of Ann Nicholls. If the worst were equal to the best, she could get through more work more quickly and with fewer frustrations.

The purpose of this section of the history of EMYA is to illustrate and document its title, *The art of accomplishing miracles*, and it is to be hoped that some progress has been made towards the fulfilment of that aim. But it would be ungracious not to point out that not all the miracles have been worked at or from, first our office in Bath and then from Bristol. Those people who have worked so hard on EMYA's behalf as members of the Committee, as its National Correspondents - a title first used in 1990 - and as organisers of its Annual Meetings, Annual Lectures and Workshops deserve equal credit. The Lectures, the Two Experts evenings and the Workshops, like the *Magazine* and the *Bulletin,* form most of the subject matter of the final section, which explains why what began as EMYA has recently become the European Museum Forum.

This section is about what might be called the Prototype-EMYA, the original EMYA, built around a competition. Its main purpose is to show the kind of organisational system that developed, out of sheer necessity, once the reliance on a single main sponsor had been shown to be no longer viable. The core of this system was the arrangement of the Annual Meeting and the visiting programme which led up to it. One method was, first, to find a museum or a town which was willing to finance the Meeting completely, and then to leave the local people to organise matters in the best way they could. This invariably meant that they had to put together a group of sponsors, each of whom was prepared to meet a certain proportion of the cost. This sub-division of financial responsibility was usually for specific purposes. The municipality, for instance, might agree to provide a reception or a dinner, a printing firm would produce the brochure at a very low rate or for nothing, a hotel would

provide the Committee with free rooms. In addition, a grant might be available from a Ministry or from the regional government. How it was all arranged was none of our business and we never asked questions. For this reason, it was usually impossible for us to tell the producers of one Meeting how much the previous one had cost. We could truthfully say that we did not know. We were, even so, aware that some centres found the task a good deal more difficult than others and that one or two were searching frantically for money until the last moment.

It was necessary for us to have one person whom we could regard as being in charge of the on-the-spot organisation and with whom we could communicate regularly in order to check on progress and possible complications. Some of these key figures were inevitably more efficient than others, but it is no breach of confidence to say that we were particularly impressed by the organisation in Belfast and Lausanne, which had virtually no faults at all. Elsewhere, the arrangements tended to be 90 per cent good, which is an excellent rating for human beings to achieve. Some of the shortcomings could not be blamed on the organisers. At Delphi, for instance, no official photographs exist of the event, because the photographer chosen had apparently omitted to put any film in his camera, and in Portugal the weather on the day chosen for a long bus trip to a distant National Park and its museum attractions was appalling beyond belief. In Barcelona some candidates did not appreciate the Spanish custom of eating very late in the evening, and when the Ceremony was held in Bologna the hotel facilities, in a nearby town, had imperfections, on which we felt obliged to report. Picking up the pieces after the Annual Meeting can be a time-consuming duty, but it forms a vital part of our public relations.

On this occasion, for example, we felt obliged to write to the management of the large new hotel near Bologna, where the Committee and a number of the delegates were accommodated, complaining of certain shortcomings in his hotel. We congratulated him on the friendliness of his staff, on the breakfast arrangements and on the pleasantness of the bedrooms, but suggested that it would perhaps be wise to have someone at the reception desk and in the restaurant who understood French, and pointed out that the noise made by the band during dinner, combined with its choice of music, was not to everyone's taste. We naturally wished him all success for the future.
We received a very nice letter in reply and felt that, in our modest way, we were making some contribution to better international understanding. One may concentrate on museums, but in order to accomplish this special task properly, one has to live in the wider world.

Work breeds work and we have been very conscious of the fact that every one of our Annual Meetings has taken the form of an iceberg, in which what appears above the surface represents only a small part of the effort that has gone into creating it, of what is below the water. For our Meeting in 1993 at the Agricultural Museum of Entre Douro e Minho in Portugal, for example, we selected what we thought would be an attractive subject for the Seminar, 'Museums and Rural Europe'. This had nine speakers, each being allowed 20 minutes. The arrangement of the Seminar is always our own responsibility and in the case of this one we sent out 272 letters and faxes, including two mailings to our Committee and National Correspondents. Persuading delegates to attend these Annual Meetings is the task of the Committee, not of the

local organisers. They have to pay all their own expenses and we are naturally anxious that they should feel that they are receiving value for money. EMYA's image depends on this. We cannot adopt a take-it-or-leave-it attitude. Our field of operations may be the whole of Europe, but news travels fast and critics and even enemies abound. Problems have to be expected and they have to be dealt with as quickly as possible. The members of our Committee are always very helpful in handling difficult EMYA customers within their own countries, often by means of diplomatic telephone calls or face-to-face meetings, but the major share of this particular burden inevitably has to be carried by the Administrator and, to a lesser extent, the Director.

For 21 years we have experimented with solutions to two closely-linked tasks, introducing candidates to one another at the Annual Meeting and making full use of the same people in constructing the Seminar which forms an important part of the proceedings of the Meeting. We believe that we have improved our performance in both these respects, but we are still far from satisfied that we have found the right recipe for either. The basic question we have to try and answer is, 'What is the Annual Meeting trying to do? What is its purpose?' There have always seemed to be two main reasons for bringing 100 museum people from all over Europe to spend three days together in Sweden or France or England, or wherever. One is to exchange ideas and the other is to give the organisation, EMYA, its public face, bearing in mind that the Awards are a means to an end, the dissemination of new ideas, not an end in itself. This could be expressed in another way, by saying there is only a single aim, to exchange ideas, and that the Annual Meeting is a tool to achieve this both on behalf of the general public and of the more specialised gathering of men and women who have travelled long distances for that purpose.

It has been a matter of great regret to us that year after year the media coverage of our Annual Meeting has been so poor, despite a variety of efforts to improve it. The winner of the Main Award always receives abundant coverage of its achievement within its own country, but internationally very little. In the matter of museums, as of sport, the media are extremely nationalistic. We preach an international message but, with rare exceptions, it is received only if it has national implications. We are looking for urgent and radical solutions to the problem.

The situation within the museum world has been different. There is no doubt, from what we have been told at the time and from letters we have received afterwards that most of those who make the effort and spend the money to come to our Annual Meeting return home feeling refreshed and invigorated. In medical terms, it has done them good. Our problem has therefore been to ensure that it does them the maximum amount of good, by providing the opportunity to meet and understand as many of their fellow-delegates as possible and to come into contact with a wide range of new ideas, some of which may be both heretical and shocking. If we can do that, we can reasonably feel that we have succeeded.

People will, of course, talk to one another anyway, without any prompting or encouragement on our part - this is the main value of conferences - but the official programme, if it has been well planned, should make the process of combination easier and more likely to occur. For the last five years, we have experimented with

the system of conducting public interviews with a representative of each museum-candidate. These interviews, conducted by different members of the Committee, lasted originally for five minutes each, but have since been extended to ten. They provide an opportunity to learn something about both the person being interviewed and about the museum from which he or she comes. In ten minutes a skilful interviewer can extract a lot of information and at the same time create an attractive public performance. There is, however, a considerable art in putting a nervous and inexperienced person at ease and without a doubt some of the interviews prove to be more interesting and effective than others. But, good and less good alike, they all introduce each museum representative to the group as a whole and act as a series of launch-pads for subsequent conversations. Selected members of the Committee have gradually improved their techniques for conducting these interviews and the intention is to persevere with them.

The seminars are another matter. On the whole, they have not been successful. They were instituted in the first place as an attempt to give the meeting a solid core, so that it would be seen as something more than an annual rally and prize-day and that those attending would have an opportunity to discuss matters of topical interest and to make their point of view known. They have failed, not because the speakers have been bad, nor because the subjects were not important, but because the method is ill-suited to the occasion. The word 'seminar' has an academic flavour to it and the Annual Meeting is not an academic occasion. Nor is it a passive affair, at which people assemble to listen to words of wisdom and authority from on high. As the years went on, and as one put the discussions which followed each contribution by the side of the contribution itself, it became clear that in all too many cases the audience was of better quality than the speaker, a situation which is bound to produce discontent and frustration. The people who were running many, if not most, of Europe's new museums, the people who came to these seminars, were exceptionally bright and exceptionally enterprising and they were forced to listen to speakers who were frequently neither, simply because those speakers carried an internationally well-known name. There were, of course, exceptions to both these generalisations. A few of the speakers really had something new and worthwhile to say and not all the members of the audience they addressed possessed acute or questioning minds. But in general there was no particular reason why the 100 or, in better years, 150 people who had made the pilgrimage to Paris or Bologna or wherever it might be should be listening more or less reverently to the experts who confronted them. Eventually and after a great deal of post mortem examination, the Committee learned this lesson and the seminar approach has recently been abandoned in favour of planned visits to one or two museums in the neighbourhood, which examined the museum in question to guided analysis and constructive criticism.

This new method, too, has its dangers, as we have discovered. Its main weakness is one which we hope will become less marked as time goes on. It is that different national cultures respond more or less well to the question and discussion approach. In Spain and Italy, for example, people seem to prefer to listen gratefully to experts and to say little or nothing themselves in public, even when they are invited to do so, whereas the British, the Dutch, the Russians and the Czechs, to give only a handful of examples, tend to be more combative and anxious to put their point of view. The difference, however, depends to some extent on the kind of person who is in charge of

the meeting. It is possible to provoke even the Spanish to express a non-political point of view in public, although it is not easy. National traditions go very deep and the notion that Europe is a single cultural unit certainly requires qualification.

This applies almost equally to the members of the EMYA Committee. One cannot separate the history of EMYA from the history and characteristics of the Committee. Halfway through its 21-year life, in 1988, it consisted of 12 people - Richard Hoggart, as Chairman; Georges van den Abeelen; Jean Favière; Kenneth Hudson; John Letts; Massimo Negri; Ann Nicholls; Aleid Rensen-Oosting; Peter Schirmbeck; David Sekers; and Friedrich Waidacher. 10 years later, the list was Patrick Greene, as Chairman; Jean-Jacques Bertaux; Thomas Brune; Kenneth Hudson; John Letts; Lola Mitjans; Massimo Negri, Vice-Chairman; Ann Nicholls; Ulla Keding Olofsson; Maritta Pitkänen; Aleid Rensen-Oosting; Fernando Riba; Hermann Schäfer; Tomislav Sola; Wim van der Weiden; and Hans Woodtli. A comparison of the two lists is illuminating, especially when one realises that four of those who were there in 1977 are still on active service today - Kenneth Hudson, John Letts, Ann Nicholls and Ulla Keding Olofsson. During the first 10 years we lost two people and added seven, and during the second we lost five and added six. These figures show, first, that the Committee has not remained fossilised, since new blood is being constantly added; second, that the turnover is sufficiently small and regular to ensure continuity; and, third, that Europe as a whole has been increasingly well represented. Forecasts are always perilous, but during the next 10 years it seems fairly safe to assume that Eastern and Central Europe will become steadily better represented and that there will be a slightly reduced emphasis on the countries in the north-west.

In forming the Committee, an effort has always been made to maintain a fair balance of those who currently occupy museum posts and those who do not, in order to preserve a balance between the two groups which EMYA tries to serve, the museum professionals and the general public. In 1987 five Committee members belonged to the first group and six to the second. In 1997 the proportion was six to nine, indicating, perhaps, that when the next vacancies occur preference should be given, if possible, to people actually working in museums. This should not be difficult. In recruiting the Committee, the policy has always been to appoint men and women who have already given good service, either as National Correspondents or in some other capacity.

It would be invidious to suggest what each member of the Committee has contributed to its work during his or her term of office, but no breach of secrecy is involved in indicating certain special qualities for which we have been particularly grateful.

Over many years Richard Hoggart gave us his considerable international reputation, at a time when this was particularly important to us. Georges van den Abeelen provided the balanced judgement resulting from his Jesuit education and invaluable guidance through the complexities of Belgian politics. Thomas Brune, a person of great creative talents and genuine personal charm, understands and communicates the problem of combining artistic inclinations with administrative duties, the central dilemma of the best people in today's museum world, irrespective of national politics and policies. As an interpreter of this situation he is particularly good at persuading museum directors to be less reticent during his official visits to them as candidates.

His German colleague, Hermann Schäfer, is a warm-hearted, easy-going man, whose helpfulness and cheerfulness have endeared him to his colleagues on the Committee. Germany, as the largest and most powerful country in Europe, needs two members, not one, on our Committee, and in Thomas Brune and Hermann Schäfer we have found the perfect pair, each with qualities which complement, yet at the same time, echo the other's. They represent the best type of modern German, anxious to help their country to overcome its problems and seize its opportunities, yet able to put the past and the present into a meaningful European context.

Jean Favière was a splendid pilot through the jungle of French bureaucracy. His successor, Jean-Jacques Bertaux has fitted perfectly into the niche he vacated. He has a wide and up-to-date knowledge of both the museum world and of the labyrinthine complexities of French politics. Patrick Greene, Director of the important and much respected Museum of Science and Industry in Manchester, who became Chairman in 1997, has greatly strengthened the Committee on the professional side. His predecessor, John Letts, the kindest of men, has always given a much-needed flavour of tolerance and urbanity to the Committee's proceedings. Luis Monreal, during his regrettably short period of office, did a great deal to give EMYA at least a veneer of international respectability and prestige. Ann Nicholls turned EMYA into an efficient working machine, possibly the most cost-effective international body in Europe. She also displayed a remarkable ability to curb Kenneth Hudson's occasional excesses, especially his over-use of adjectives and intensitive adverbs. The main Kenneth Hudson ingredient in this successful European pudding has probably been his unquenchable optimism and his tendency to regard all disasters and triumphs as equal parts of the human comedy. Massimo Negri's splendidly humanistic philosophy and his balanced insight into both national and international politics and cultural affairs have been of great value to the Committee. Ulla Keding Olofsson had the enormous advantage of working for a State organisation that was consciously and deliberately devoted to serving the public in imaginative ways. She combines charm with common sense, an infrequently found combination, and the Committee has on many occasions been grateful for her habit, or rather instinct of introducing a welcome note of reality into the discussions. Maritta Pitkänen has earned the Committee's eternal gratitude for her unfailing ability to carry out promises and to raise money from unexpected sources. Her reliability and her willingness to take on ever more duties have been altogether admirable. Aleid Rensen-Oosting inevitably attracted respect and attention both to herself directly and to the Committee indirectly by being the creator of one of the most successful museums in Europe, a hard-headed business woman with wide interests and excellent judgement.

When David Sekers joined us in 1987, he was well-known as one of England's brightest museum stars, the director of Quarry Bank Mill, Styal, near Manchester, and previously the creator and curator of the equally pioneering Gladstone Pottery Museum at Stoke-on-Trent. He was obliged, with great regret, to resign from the Committee after five years' devoted service, because his new job with the National Trust demanded more than 100 per cent of his time and energy. He was a very successful official visitor for us and obviously enjoyed the work. His reports were exemplary and when he left us in 1992 we wrote to thank and congratulate him especially on this aspect of his work. 'We have greatly appreciated your charm, kindness and wit', we said. 'What makes you so special is that you can always find a

kind and graceful word to say about everyone. We have never known you to damn anybody or anything totally. You are an example to us all.'

Tomislav Sola is the incorrigible maverick which every Committee needs in order to prevent its thinking from fossilising. His fountain of creative ideas and his unquenchable good humour have been of inestimable value at times when the Committee has been getting tired and over-anxious to move on to the next item on the agenda.

Per-Uno Ågren came to us when he was Director of the greatly esteemed Västerbottens Museum at Umeå in the north of Sweden. A much-travelled and modest man, with special experience of Portugal, he was fully aware of the new developments which were taking place in Europe's museums and a most valuable source of information about them. He subsequently became Professor of Museology at the University of Umeå. He agreed to be our Swedish representative on the Committee at a time when Ulla Keding Olofsson was unable to carry out her full range of duties.

We acquired Wim van der Weiden in a very similar way. Aleid Rensen-Oosting had been ill and unable to do as much for us as she wanted. Wim, whom we already knew quite well, filled the gap temporarily in a most noble and praiseworthy fashion and, when Aleid was once more in full working order he showed no inclination to want to abandon his new-found delights. Having by then become fully acquainted with his value to us, we encouraged his wish for permanence and decided that this was yet another example of two being better than one. So, by great good fortune, we still have both Wim and Aleid and Europe is well served as a result. Wim is a person of unbelievable energy, a consistently cheerful man, raised in the hard school of Dutch cultural policy, and he has become famous for imposing a more practical pattern on our plans and discussions.

But, to return to Sweden, when Ulla's life returned to an even keel, we found ourselves in the fortunate position of having two excellent Swedish members instead of one, but this advantage came to an end when Per-Uno Ågren retired from the Chair of Museology at Umeå and, without an adequate secretarial and communications base, felt unable to provide us with what he felt was an adequate service. He was well-liked and respected by his colleagues and added an extra and much-appreciated flavour to our discussions.

The departure of Fritz Waidacher was an equal blow to us. He had inherited the traditional courtly manners of the old Austro-Hungarian society and this made him a particular favourite with the lady members of our Committee and indeed with any other ladies whom he met in the course of his duties. He, too, was an excellent official visitor, always willing to devote sufficient time to the task and with an instinct for going to the heart of a museum's problems. Like David Sekers, he was an excellent example of the value of recruiting to the museum profession the balanced critical judgement of someone who already had wide experience of life in the larger world. In the case of David Sekers, the big world had been the textile industry and of Fritz Waidacher the commercial world and music. We had the privilege of Fritz's membership of our Committee for over 10 years. When he took retirement from his

work at the Joanneum, it was at the earliest possible retirement age. Whatever his official reason may have been, what he told us was that he was tired of struggling with bureaucracy and needed a rest from it. So he gave up all his public functions and retreated to his little house in the mountains, to begin a new life of thinking, a change from obeying never-ending orders of which he did not approve. We communicate with him regularly and happily. He is still with us in spirit, although we greatly miss his physical presence.

The two latest recruits to the Committee, Fernando Riba and Lola Mitjans, have been with us only a very short time. They are both Spanish and both delightful human beings, but they have two different functions. Fernando Riba is an international banker, who happens to work in Lausanne. He is also an adviser to the International Olympic Committee and to the Olympic Museum, and provides a most useful introduction for us to the world of sport, which becomes more wealthy and influential each year and in which we are conscious of being mere children. As well as this, he gives hard-headed and realistic financial advice, from which we are doing our best to profit. Lola Mitjans is based in Barcelona, where she has high-level cultural and economic connections and is very active in the Friends of Museums movement. We are relying on her to help us to build a more satisfactory network of museum contacts in Spain, a country which we feel has not yet realised its full potential so far as the Forum is concerned and where an improvement would make us very happy.

It would be quite wrong to suggest that the Committee received no business advice from its members before Fernando Riba's arrival. Money has always been at the centre of our life and there have been a great many suggestions during the 21 years of our existence as to how we might obtain more of it. But, even so, certain people have been more money-minded than others. Hans Woodtli, who joined us in 1990, and who is mercifully still with us, is famous for his patriotic sentence, 'Because I am Swiss, I think of money first and all the time'. One of the kindest and most generous of men himself, he has constantly reminded his colleagues of the possible ways in which their collective experience and reputation could be turned to financial advantage and we have done our inadequate best to profit from his philosophy. However, his main contribution to EMYA's work and success is described later, in Section Six, where it properly belongs.

It should be clear from the last few pages that the Committee is an integral part of the Forum's activities, that its work does not only revolve around it, but is rooted in it. This is the reason why any account of the history of the development of EMYA is necessarily the history of the Committee as well. The fact that the Committee is such a harmonious and effective body is the main cause of its cost-effectiveness. Because it puts such a strong emphasis on personal qualities and on year-round communication, it is not obliged to waste precious time in dealing with disagreements. It has been able to accomplish an enormous amount of creative work on a ridiculously small budget. It represents voluntary work at its devoted best.

We have often wondered why a distinguished international group of busy people should be willing to give up so much time to making the Forum possible. Each member of the Committee will, of course, have his or her own personal reasons for this, but one of the Founding Fathers, John Letts, was probably speaking for others,

too, when we asked him, 'Why do you do it? What sort of satisfaction do you get from it? What has it done for you personally?' 'It has given me,' he said, 'a much better understanding of what museums are and what they could be. It has given me a permanent addiction to the idea that all citizens are equal before a European God, and a total contempt, already fairly well developed before, for Little Englanders, and for the prevailing English vices, which are complacency and arrogance, and made me many good, European friends.'

That is, of course, an Englishman talking, but for 'Little Englanders' substitute Little Italians or Little Dutchmen or Little Frenchmen, and for 'prevailing English vices' include a corresponding list of, say, German vices or Swedish vices. To anyone who has had the privilege of watching the EMYA Committee grow steadily more and more together over 21 years, there can be no doubt about the degree of Europeanness which has developed between its members, to such an extent that an outside observer would often find it very difficult to know from which country a particular person happens to come. This Europeanness is cultural, not political. One member influences the others in subtle and permanent ways, without anyone realising the effects of this gradual process on him or her. By sheer accident, EMYA has become a microcosm of what one would like to think is happening over a much wider field as Europeans have more and more opportunities to meet one another and to discuss common problems.

A by-product of this process of growing together, so marked in the case of the EMYA Committee, has been the steady and sometimes spectacular improvement in the English of the people concerned. Out of sheer necessity, the priests have learned to speak and write better and better Latin. Given a similar incentive, of course, the same people could have developed their French or German in the same way, but the spirit and custom of the age is against such a movement, perhaps unfortunately.

At this point, one should perhaps explain more clearly the precise nature of the relationship between the European Museum of the Year Award/European Museum Forum and the Council of Europe. A well-deserved tribute has already been paid to Victor de Pange and Christopher Grayson, but it would be unfair and less than gracious not to mention the help given to use over the years by three members of the Parliamentary Assembly: Andrew Faulds, Günther Müller and Josephine Verspaget, each of whom has acted as a much-appreciated rapporteur to the Assembly of EMYA's activities and achievements. We have also always received great goodwill from the President of the Parliamentary Assembly, Leni Fischer, and the Secretary General, Daniel Tarschys.

The phrase 'auspices of the Council of Europe' may also require some clarification. The dictionary definition appears to indicate that the granting of 'auspices' signifies that the beneficiary expects and may invoke the support, protection and encouragement of the person or institution which grants them. The main point of 'auspices', in this context, is that the organisation concerned shall 'benefit from the political esteem and the moral support' of the Council. It is clearly stated and understood that such support 'shall have no budgetary implications for the Council of Europe', although, in the case of EMYA, a three-year period of core-funding by the Council for Cultural Co-operation of 100,000 FrF from 1994-1996 was particularly welcome at a difficult time. This was very much the result of support from Tanya

Orel Sturm (Slovenian MFA, Chairperson of the Council for Cultural Co-operation) and Norbert Riedl (Austrian Ministry of Culture, Chair of the Culture Committee of the CCC) and the agreement of Daniel Tarschys (Secretary General) and Raymond Weber (Director of Education, Culture and Sport). In addition, the considerable task of providing a French translation of EMYA's large brochure text has been undertaken each year. Of equal importance, as has already been mentioned in Section Three, has been the Council's most welcome decision to meet the full cost of a three-day meeting of EMYA's Committee in Strasbourg each year, at which the business has included the discussions leading to the decisions on the Annual Awards.

Close links between EMYA and the Council of Europe have amounted to a genuine partnership between the two bodies, as a result of which each has received positive benefits. On the one hand, EMYA has been able to continue its career and improve its reputation, and on the other the Council has been given a willing ally in the achievement of its aims. It is not over-modest to claim that all the conditions have been consistently met under which the Committee of Ministers is 'prepared to involve its political credit'. These are

'(a) The body or activity benefiting from the auspices of the Council of Europe should be of a European character. For example, its structure should include elements or aspects going beyond the purely national context, its vocation should have European significance, its activities should be open to the governments and nationals of all member States of the Council of Europe.

(b) The mission assumed by the beneficiary of the auspices of the Council of Europe or the tasks which are entrusted to it should be compatible with the ideals and principles of the Council of Europe.

(c) The beneficiary should be likely, by its mission or its tasks, to help further the implementation of one of the aims of the Council of Europe'.

During the 1990s the area of Europe entrusted to the Council of Europe's cultural care has been greatly enlarged, notably by the addition of the former Communist countries, and the Europe of EMYA and the European Museum Forum has necessarily and very willingly been similarly extended. In both cases, however, the additional responsibilities have not yet been matched by additional funds or personnel. The bigger Europe has stretched resources to the limit.

As an indication of the fact that there is something special about both Europe and the European Museum Forum, it is worth mentioning a curious event that took place ten years ago. A highly-placed official of the Getty Foundation in California invited Kenneth Hudson to meet him during his forthcoming visit to London. The meeting duly took place, in the not exactly impoverished surroundings of Brown's Hotel and the man from Getty explained honestly and straight away what the purpose was. In making the understatement of the century, he informed Kenneth Hudson that the Getty Foundation was 'not short of a dollar or two' and that it proposed to spend a few of its dollars in setting up an American Museum of the Year Award. Over lunch at Brown's, he enquired how EMYA functioned, what kind of people did it use and how did they go about their work.

The reply was that EMYA was run by a group of widely experienced, very enthusiastic and devoted people, who were not paid for their efforts, that the available budget was very small and that it had to be stretched in all possible ways. The members of the jury were, for example, often transported between the airport and a particular museum at no cost to themselves, and provided by the museum with free meals and sometimes hotel accommodation. All of this, he declared, would be impossible under the scheme he had in mind for the United States. 'Our people,' he said, 'would have to receive an appropriate professional fee for their trouble and they wouldn't be allowed to accept even a cup of coffee without paying for it.' When he was asked the reason for this, he said, 'Haven't you ever heard of the Prevention of Corruption Act?', and at that point Europe appeared special and fundamentally different from America. The thought of members of our Committee being seduced, if not corrupted by a cup of coffee seemed very funny, much as that cup of coffee might be appreciated, especially after a long journey. Incidentally, the United States has not yet given birth to a Museum of the Year Award.

SECTION SIX

The Award becomes the Forum

No more than two years after EMYA was launched, two things had become apparent. One was that, in one way or another, EMYA was creating a great deal of paper - building an archive is the more distinguished term - and the other was that it was accumulating a steadily increasing stock of information and experience. Each constituted both a problem and an opportunity. The first was dealt with by setting up an efficient office filing system from the beginning and, eventually, shipping off an annual load of printed material to the Institut für Museumskunde in Berlin, where it would be properly cared for. The Forum's filing system is arranged in two parts. In Part One are to be found 21 years of correspondence, Committee Minutes and miscellaneous documents, and in Part Two a large collection of photographs and slides relating to candidates for the Award and to the Annual Meeting.

Everything, documents and pictures, that is filed and accessible for use, forms part of an information system, of course, but EMYA's main problem has been with a different kind of information, facts that it has been gathering about Europe's museums during the period in which it has been closely associated with this. The interaction of these facts and the Committee's knowledge of them amounts to experience and possibly wisdom. To keep this knowledge to oneself, whether on paper or in the heads of individual members of the Committee, is a sterile process and one which shows a poor sense of social responsibility, but how to use it for the public benefit is a question which has exercised the minds of the Committee for many years. It represents a special and severe kind of intellectual constipation, in which one takes in so much and gives out so little.

The obvious answer can be summed up in a single word, 'Publish', but publication demands money and money is precisely what EMYA has been so desperately short of. Certain outlets have, nevertheless, been more or less under its own control. The brochure describing the candidates and issued on the occasion of the Presentation Ceremony has provided such an opportunity. Most of these little essays have been brought together by Massimo Negri as a substantial volume called *New Museums in Europe, 1977-93*, which was published in 1994 by Gabriele Mazzotta in Milan. And there have been other opportunities. Every year, for example, EMYA receives at its headquarters in Bristol a number of requests for help. Sometimes these come from institutions, sometimes from private individuals. The subjects range from a plea for assistance in finding a job to visiting suggestions for a local Friends of the Museum group. They quite often involve providing information for a major research project. One commercial organisation in the United States wanted our estimate of the weight of silver held in museum collections throughout the world, and a University department in England was trying to construct a list of European museums that were engaged in research schemes based on international co-operation and exchange of ideas.

Where the request is a simple one that can be dealt with quickly, the answer is provided in a short letter, but in those cases where several hours of browsing through our files and memories are needed we ask for a fee, agreed in advance. This quite often amounts to no more than taking out a year's membership of the EMYA Association, £30, in exchange for which certain other benefits are available. Replying to these enquiries, whether for a fee or not, amounts to a form of publication and is a service which we are pleased to be in a position to provide, knowing that we are uniquely well equipped to offer it. But it is always time-consuming and for EMYA time is in as short supply as money. Answers involve writing and there is a limit to the number of words one can write in a day or a week, given that one necessarily has to do many other things besides writing. It would be true, even so, to say that EMYA has for many years been engaged willy-nilly in a form of consultancy service, from which it has been able to extract a certain amount of income. Recognising the demand and the opportunity, a large organisation would almost certainly have a member of its staff who was able to specialise in such work. EMYA, however, is not yet in that fortunate position and replying to enquiries of this nature somehow has to be fitted into the pattern of inescapable everyday tasks.

Hans Woodtli, who joined the Committee after a successful trial period as our Swiss National Correspondent, was the person who did most to steer EMYA into the direction of publishing in the accepted sense of the word. He is an excellent example of that increasingly rare species of animal, the cultured businessman. Successful industrial and commercial figures who collect pictures or objets d'art are as common throughout the world as the winds that blow, but they do not necessarily or always deserve the label 'cultured', any more than other representatives of the breed who go to the opera or the ballet do. Hans is truly cultured, in the sense that he has refined tastes in all fields, from food to gardening and from museums to motorcars. The business in Zürich which he has run successfully for many years is concerned both with museums and exhibition design and with industrial and commercial publicity, an unusual combination which allows him to switch his highly skilled staff from one function to another, as occasion demands.

He saw perfectly clearly that EMYA was in urgent need of a good *Newsletter* and he most generously offered to design this for us free of charge. The result was a well-styled publication, which not only provided a most welcome outlet for the embarrassingly large quantity of news and comment which the Committee received regularly and could do nothing about and at the same time greatly improved the organisation's image, as well as acting as a public advertisement throughout Europe. The first issue appeared in October 1992 and the last in the winter of 1994, when it was replaced by the more ambitious *EMYA Magazine*, of which more will be said a little later. The printing of each issue had to be sponsored by a variety of different benefactors but no great difficulty was found in arranging this. Usually two issues of the *Magazine* were produced each year, but there would have been no problem in finding suitable material for four, if time and money had been available to write and print them.

Great care was taken to make sure that the coverage of news was equally spread over Europe from north to south and from east to west and the knowledge that the information they sent in to EMYA's headquarters would find its way into print

provided our National Correspondents with a valuable incentive to maintain the flow. The *Newsletter*, for which no charge was made, was widely distributed throughout Europe. The Council of Europe helped a great deal with this, using its own regular network of contacts, and many other copies were mailed in bulk to our National Correspondents, who had their own distribution channels. Each issue was also sent to members of the EMYA Association, as a partial reward for their subscription. At various times we were urged to consider charging for the *Newsletter*, which was a valuable source of information for both institutions and individuals, and to look into the possibilities of advertising, as a means of offsetting the printing and distribution expenses, but the Committee eventually decided against these possibilities, partly because it was considered that advertising would change the character of the publication, and partly because collecting a sales charge would be excessively complicated and demand more time and energy than it was worth. But the Committee was not unanimous on either point.

In the summer of 1995, the *Newsletter* was replaced by the *Magazine*, beautifully designed by the Werberei Woodtli, with an eye-catching portrait on the front cover, illustrating the lead story, an generous ration of pictures to enliven the text. It looked and felt like a magazine, not a mere newsletter. The first issue contained 16 pages and the printing was sponsored by the Haus der Geschichte in Bonn, in conjunction with a German advertising company. The editorial policy was to be deliberately provocative and controversial, whilst keeping on the right side of the law, and to produce a journal which would be interesting and meaningful from the North Cape to Cyprus and from Moscow to Lisbon. In the Summer 1995 edition the articles related to Russia, Germany, Sweden, Holland, Finland, Norway, Switzerland, France, Belgium, Bosnia, Italy and Romania, which is a not unreasonable slice through Europe, and in subsequent issues the range has been very similar, although there has been some increase in the representation of the former Communist countries.

Putting a face and not an object or a scene on the front of the *Magazine* reflects the Committee's belief that museum controversies are created by people and that by concentrating on a person, usually a museum director, one can illustrate and explain what has happened in a more impressive and meaningful way. This point of view is, of course, in itself controversial. There are those who believe that people, however important and influential, always have their actions determined by circumstances and that the correct policy is therefore to go for the circumstances first and the people second, if at all. To this one can reply that the good journalist always tries to bring the actors in the human comedy to the front of the stage. 'People are always more interesting than facts' is a sound and well-tested journalistic principle, although those of a more academic turn of mind would no doubt disagree.

But there is serious and responsible journalism as well as its opposite and EMYA's Committee would say that, positioned as it is between the museum profession and the public, its prime duty is to make serious matters interesting. By publishing at all it is committed to effective journalism, just as by organising public meetings it is committed to good theatre. In neither case is there any virtue in being dull. One does not have to be boring in order to prove one's sincerity and strength of purpose.

Consequently we do not feel that there is any necessity to apologise either for the controversial tone of our *Magazine* articles or for the headlines or for the headlines which aim at enticing people to read these articles. Only extreme purists would object to 'The pain and pride of being history's impresario', 'Setting the record not exactly straight, but less crooked', or 'The Rijksmuseum purrs'. We are also modestly proud of 'The shell and the oyster within', 'Cossons on culture', 'The Finnish oracle utters' and 'Uproar in and around Basel'. It is worth emphasising, however, that we realise that the majority of the readers of our *Magazine*, as of our *Newsletter*, do not have English as their first language and that one must take every care to ensure that, however brilliant our journalism may be in itself, it will be reckoned a failure if it falls down in the performance of its prime task, to communicate. Journalism is essentially a means of communication, not a fireworks display.

It has been pointed out to us many times that the work of the Committee would be much easier to publicise if its visible signs were apparent throughout the year and not only on the occasion of the Annual Meeting. With this in mind we have, since 1990, tried to arrange special events throughout the year at places as widely distributed as possible throughout Europe. Our first effort in this direction was a series of what we called *Two Experts* evenings, although sometimes through force of circumstances these became *Two Experts* afternoons. The form of these was simple, but their organisation also demanded both skill and money, the latter, given our state of chronic penury, involving sponsorship.

On these occasions, a museum or some other institution would undertake to provide a suitable audience of not less than 100 people. On arrival these would ideally be given a welcoming drink, partly in order to encourage them to be well-disposed towards the forthcoming proceedings and partly in order to create a certain initial cohesion. After that each expert spoke for 30 minutes and then the theme was thrown open for questions and discussion, under the control and stimulus of a carefully chosen chairman, who was normally a member of the Committee. The speakers were already well-known to us as people, with a friendly, informal style, who would feel at home in a vigorous, free-ranging discussion. They would usually talk in English or French and ad hoc translation facilities, occasionally simultaneous translation, were always available. We never experienced any considerable language problems. After the planned 90 minutes, the whole company adjourned for 'a good buffet' and for informal stand-up discussion with the speakers and the chairman. If the proceedings started at 6 o'clock, which they usually did, everything was finished by 8.30 and people went home, ideally feeling that it had been an evening well spent.

Over a period of five years, from 1990 to 1995, we arranged 15 of these *Two Experts* evenings, in countries which included Cyprus, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, the Republic of Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, and the United Kingdom. The host museum was required to pay the travelling and hotel expenses of the speakers and the chairman and to meet the cost of the 'good buffet', as well as sending out invitations. The total cost of each evening was probably in the order of £1,000, varying according to the local bargains that could be struck with hotels and caterers. The speakers did not charge a fee for their services.

During the time when these evenings functioned as an EMYA showing-the-flag activity the subjects discussed included Presenting Science and Technology in Museums; Presenting Religion; Presenting Art to Children; Museums and Tourism; and The Problems and Opportunities of Open-Air Museums. They were popular and in theory the series could have gone on for ever, had we not decided that every good idea has its day and that it was time to pass on to something else, mainly because there were countries and regions where local organisation and sponsorship proved difficult to arrange. That 'something else' turned out to be Workshops, which are much more complicated and time-consuming so far as organisation is concerned, but which allow a subject to be explored in much greater depth and make it possible to involve participants from the whole of Europe on any one occasion.

The first experimental Workshop was held in Bologna in 1996. There were more than 200 applicants for the 50 places available. Each person had to pay a registration fee and his or her own hotel and travelling expenses. From Bologna, we learned a number of useful lessons for the future. The first was that in order to achieve this kind of success, the location must be attractive in itself and it must be reasonably easy of access, from an international point of view. It is no use selecting a charming venue if getting to it demands 24 hours of exhausting travel. The second lesson was that, as a condition of acceptance, participants must be able to speak and understand English, the only possible lingua franca on such occasions. Lesson Three was that it is necessary to invite only a very small number of 'experts' and famous names as speakers, for the very simple reason that, given the ability to pick and choose among the people who want to come to the Workshop, one can create a group in which everybody is an expert and able to throw useful and stimulating ideas into the pool of discussion. Lesson Four was that food and drink should be of a high quality, in order to make meal breaks a pleasure rather than a necessity. Lesson Five was that the working sessions must be held in a not-too-large room with a flat floor. The lecture-room type of environment is confrontational and makes fruitful discussion much more difficult. Lesson Six was that the members of a Workshop are not tourists. If, in the course of the four or five days, they are taken on visits to neighbouring museums, they should be given every opportunity to analyse and discuss what they have seen. The visits should be integrated into the Workshop, not used for rest and recuperation.

The Bologna experience appears to have been found rewarding by the majority of those who took part in it and every effort was made to apply the findings to the 1997 Workshop that took place again, with great success, and again in Italy, at Cortona in Tuscany. Our Italian member, Massimo Negri, once again performed miracles of enterprise and organisation in getting it off the ground and moving. In 1998 it is planned to hold two Workshops, rather than one. The first will take place in April in Manchester, built around the theme of Presenting Science and Industry in Museums, and the second, an autumn meeting, will deal with the problems of smaller regional museums with general collections, which have to compete for their budgets with local tourist attractions. The Committee holds these Workshops in high regard, partly because they are very good for the Forum's/EMYA's international image and partly because they make a substantial and much-needed contribution to our administrative budget. They are in every way well worth the effort involved.

The remaining way in which we have tried to spread ourselves over the year and over Europe has been our Annual Lecture, which we began in 1992. The five to date have been arranged so far in Utrecht; at both ends of the Channel Tunnel; Barcelona; Mannheim, and Tuusula in Finland. So far, they have always been given in English or French, with simultaneous translation where required, but other languages are certainly not barred, provided a way is found for the audience to understand what is being said. The texts of the first four Lectures has been published in English and French versions by the Council of Europe, and this facility, for which we are extremely grateful, has allowed the message of the speakers to be much more widely distributed. All five Lectures have been of very high quality and they read as well as they sounded at the time. We have taken great pains to select as lecturers people who are not only well-known within the museum field and who can speak with authority on their chosen subject, but who are able to present museums in their social context. This is a cause especially dear to the heart of the Committee, since it is the ground on which EMYA has always stood and the main justification for its existence. It has never adopted a museums-for-museums-sake policy and to select for its Annual Lecture speakers who followed any different line would be a form of treason and a source of guilt.

So, during the past 10 years, EMYA has added to its original function of promoting an annual award for European museums four other tasks. It runs what is at least an embryonic consultation service; it publishes a magazine and a newsletter; it organises workshops, which have developed out of an earlier series of *Two Experts* evenings; and it arranges a prestigious Annual Lecture. All this has meant that it had become misleading and over-modest to call itself EMYA, the European Museum of the Year Award, and in January 1997 it became officially and on its stationery the European Museum Forum. The choice of this new name may perhaps require a little explanation. A forum is essentially a place where ideas and policies can be presented and discussed, which is precisely what the European Museum Forum conceives to be its duty and its opportunity. A new classical logo has been created by our colleague, Hans Woodtli, to symbolise the new range of activities, although the old and greatly respected ammonite logo will continue to be used whenever the EMYA side of the enterprise is emphasised. Callers to our telephone number will have noticed that they are now greeted by 'European Museum Forum' and not, as before, 'European Museum of the Year Award'. Most unfortunately, 'EMF' does not sound as well as 'EMYA' when it is spoken, so the full form it has to be. It also has a slightly unfortunate suggestion of the European Monetary Fund, which suggests an economic, rather than a cultural emphasis.

At the end of this survey of EMYA's history, it seems appropriate to attempt an assessment as a result of 21 years of hard and devoted work by a body of people who work on an entirely voluntary basis and are always free to cut loose from the organisation and to spend their time in other and quite possibly, from a financial point of view, more profitable ways.

First, and without any doubt, the most important reason for what we will call the Forum's existence, although this is not fully historically accurate, since it was EMYA for 20 years and has been the Forum for only one, is that it has provided a bridge between the professional and the public functions of museums. It has done its best to

emphasise the usefulness of museums to the community, to publicise the institutions which carry out this duty well and to castigate those which continue to look inwards, rather than outwards. Second, it has tried to work out and apply a set of criteria by which the merit of museums can be reasonably judged. Because it is financially and politically independent, it has been able to do this in an entirely objective manner. It does not have to subject itself to the dictates of governments or crusade on behalf of professional organisations. It is, to use an invaluable but almost untranslatable English phrase, its own man and its advice is widely sought for that reason. Its authority has been further increased by the fact that it is a non-governmental organisation with official recognition by the Committee of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Council of Europe and has a direct and privileged relationship with European democratic parliamentary opinion through its Parliamentary Assembly.

The presentation of the Council of Europe Museum Prize has always been made in Strasbourg by the President of the Parliamentary Assembly. Since 1978 these have been Hans de Koster (Netherlands), José Maria de Areilza (Spain), Karl Ahrens (Germany), Louis Jung (France), Anders Björck (Sweden), Miguel Angel Martinez (Spain) and Mrs Leni Fischer (Germany). A full list of the ceremonies is given in Appendix Three.

Third, it has established a new form of international organisation, a unified autonomous body which is not a bureaucracy. It has never had enough money at its disposal in order to set up a bureaucracy and in this sense its poverty has been its friend. It is its Committee which determines its policy and controls its activities, but this is essentially a committee of equals, of which all its members have equal rights and equal powers. It has on it a person who is called, for administrative and communication reasons, its Director, but he does not direct.

Fourth, it conceives one of its tasks to be both to reflect and to influence museum development in Europe, by being continuously sensitive to change and at the same time willing to make its opinions known. It tries to be both a mirror and a catalyst at the same time and, through the quality of the members of its Committee, to be competent to perform the two functions at the same time. It is certainly not a weather-vane, to swing with every museum wind that blows, nor fashion-reflecting, wearing whatever clothes the museum trend of the moment may decree. It is both a referee and a player in the museum game.

How long it will continue is impossible to forecast. Its money supply is always precarious and, as the members of the Committee come and go, it could suddenly and unexpectedly find itself deprived of motive power. If it survives, it is most unlikely to be doing exactly the same things in 10 or 20 years' time as it is today. It is always possible that it will follow the traditional path of so many voluntary and independent organisations in the past, whereby the ideas and aims which it has generated and pioneered will be absorbed by one form or another of official body. Meanwhile, it has given a great deal of pleasure to those who have been privileged to take an active part in its work.

It has had two much appreciated symbols of respectability during its history. One was close to the beginning, when it was allowed to announce that it functioned 'under the

auspices of the Council of Europe', a phrase to which we have never failed to draw attention. And the second came in 1995 when Queen Fabiola of Belgium very kindly agreed to be our Patron. At that point we could be sure that we had arrived. Royal patronage is not given to here-today-and-gone-tomorrow organisations, and this particular Royal patron, most fortunately for us, takes a very keen and personal interest in the activities of the Forum. We do our best to justify her confidence in us.

This history has been written by Kenneth Hudson and was circulated in draft among members of the Forum's Committee for their suggestions and approval.

APPENDIX ONE

THE COMMITTEE AS AT 1 DECEMBER 1997

(The year of joining the Committee is given in brackets)

Jean-Jacques Bertaux (1996)
Museum of Normandy, Caen

Thomas Brune (1992)
State Museum of Württemberg, Stuttgart

Patrick Greene (1994)
EMF Chairman and
Director, Museum of Science and Industry in Manchester

Kenneth Hudson (1977)
EMF Director and museum consultant, Bristol

John Letts (1977)
Chairman, National Heritage, London

Lola Mitjans (1997)
President, Friends of the Dali Museum, Figueres, Spain

Massimo Negri (1982)
EMF Vice-Chairman and
Member of the Executive Committee, Leonardo da Vinci Museum of Science and Technology, Milan

Ann Nicholls (1977)
EMF Administrator, Bristol

Ulla Keding Olofsson (1977)
Museum adviser, Stockholm

Maritta Pitkänen (1994)
Director, Gösta Serlachius Museum of Fine Arts, Mänttä

Aleid Rensen-Oosting (1983)
President
Foundation of the Noorder Dierenpark, Emmen

Tomislav Sola (1994)
Department of Information Sciences, University of Zagreb

Hermann Schäfer (1997)
Director, House of History, Bonn

Wim van der Weiden (1989)
Director, National Museum of Natural History, Leiden

Hans R. Woodtli (1990)
Museum designer, Zürich, Switzerland

Financial adviser to the Committee
Fernando Riba (1996)
Economist and General Manager, Olympic Museum, Lausanne

PAST MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

Dr Georges van den Abeelen (1977-88)

Mr Per-Uno Ågren (1988-94)

Mr Jean Favière (1977-96)

Dr Richard Hoggart (Chairman, 1977-95)

Professor Werner Knopp (1979-80)

Mr Luis Monreal (1977-79)

Dr Peter Schirmbeck (1980-92)

Mr David Sekers (1987-92)

Dr Udo Vroom (1986)

Dr Friedrich Waidacher (1984-93)

NATIONAL CORRESPONDENTS AS AT 1 DECEMBER 1997

Margot Schindler
Austrian Folklore Museum
Vienna, Austria

Francis Van Noten
Director, Royal Museums of Art and History, Brussels, Belgium

Ljerka Simunic
Director, Town Museum
Varazdin, Croatia

Loukia Loizou Hadjigavriel
Director, The Leventis Municipal Museum, Nicosia, Cyprus

Jana Soucková
Director, Náprstek Museum and Chairperson, ICOM Czech Committee
Prague, Czech Republic

Ervin Nielsen
Director, Danish Graphics Museum/ Danish Press Museum
Odense, Denmark

Raili Huopainen
The Provincial Museum of Lapland
Rovaniemi, Finland

Michel Van Praët
Professor of Museology, École Normale Supérieure, Paris, France

Joachim Kallinich
Director, Museum for Post and Communication, Berlin, Germany

Niki Goulandris
Director, The Goulandris Natural History Museum, Kifissia, Greece

Ioanna Papantoniou
President, Peloponnesian Folklore Foundation, Athens, Greece

Aidan Walsh
Director, Northern Ireland Museums Council, Belfast, Northern Ireland

Matt McNulty
Director General, Irish Tourist Board
Dublin, Ireland

Graziano Campanini
Municipal Art Gallery
Pieve di Cento, Italy

Hans Christian Søborg
Director, Alta Museum, Alta, Norway

Margrethe C. Stang
Norwegian Museums Association
Oslo, Norway

Joanna Bojarska
Distillery Museum, Lancut, Poland

Natália Correia Guedes
Museum Curator, Lisbon, Portugal

Virgil Stefan Nitulescu
Chamber of Deputies, Bucharest, Romania

Mikhail Gnedovsky
Russian Institute for Cultural Research
Moscow, Russia

Taja Cepic
Director, Mestni Museum
Ljubljana, Slovenia

Ivan Martelanc
Counsellor to the Government of the Republic of Slovenia
Ljubljana, Slovenia

Camil.la González Gou
Museu-Monastir de Pedralbes
Barcelona, Spain

Per-Uno Ågren
Department of Museology
University of Umeå, Sweden

David Meili
Banque de données des biens culturels
suisses, Bern, Switzerland

CORPORATE SUPPORTERS

Metsä-Serla Oy
Äänekoski Paper Mill, Ääneskoski,
Finland

Metsä-Serla Oy
Espoo, Finland

Kymmene Oy
Kymi Paper Mills,Kuusankoski, Finland

Eurotunnel

Goulandris Natural History Museum
Kifissia, Greece

Fondazione Biblioteca Archivio Luigi
Micheletti
Brescia, Italy

Lexmark International

IBM Personal Computer Company
United Kingdom

Fratelli Carli S.P.A.
Imperia Oneglia, Italy

APPENDIX TWO

THE FORUM'S AWARDS AND COMMENDATIONS SINCE 1977

1977
European Museum of the Year Award
Ironbridge Gorge Museum Trust, Ironbridge, United Kingdom

Specially commended
FN Museum of Industrial Archaeology, Herstal, Belgium
Technical Museum, Helsinki, Finland
Terra Amata Museum, Nice, France
Municipal Museum, Schwäbisch Gmund, Germany
Historical Museum, Amsterdam, Netherlands
Preus Foto Museum, Horten, Norway
International Museum of Clocks and Watches, La Chaux-de-Fonds, Switzerland

Council of Europe Award
Joan Miró Foundation, Barcelona, Spain

1978
European Museum of the Year Award
Schloss Rheydt Municipal Museum, Mönchengladbach, Germany

Specially commended
Louisiana: Museum of Modern Art, Humlebaek, Denmark
Centre of Oceanography, Paris, France
Bank of Ireland, Dublin, Ireland
International Museum of Ceramics, Faenza, Italy
National Museum of Costume, Lisbon, Portugal
National Travelling Exhibitions, Stockholm, Sweden
Museum of London, London, United Kingdom
Erddig Park, Wrexham, United Kingdom

Council of Europe Award
Bryggens Museum, Bergen, Norway

Specially commended
Ecomuseum, Le Creusot, France

1979
European Museum of the Year Award
Museum of the Camargue, Arles, France

Specially commended
Michel Thiery Natural History Museum, Gent, Belgium
National Maritime Museum, Dun Laoghaire, Ireland
Museum of the Jewish Diaspora, Tel-Aviv, Israel
Museum of the Tropics, Amsterdam, Netherlands
Tromsø Museum, Tromsø, Norway
Royal Armoury, Stockholm, Sweden
Pierre Gianadda Foundation, Martigny, Switzerland
Guernsey Museum and Art Gallery, St Peter Port, United Kingdom

Council of Europe Award
Municipal Museum, Rüsselsheim, Germany

Bank of Ireland Special Exhibitions Award
Archaeological Museum, Thessaloniki, Greece - *Treasures of Macedonia*

Specially commended
Crédit Communal de Belgique, Brussels, Belgium - *Brussels: Building and Rebuilding*
Museum of Cultural History, Randers, Denmark - *This is all about us; When the asphalt starts rolling; The vagabonds*

Award for Creative Museum Management
Dr Alfred Waldis
Swiss Transport Museum, Lucerne, Switzerland

1980
European Museum of the Year Award
Catharine Convent State Museum, Utrecht, Netherlands

Specially commended
Sara Hildén Museum, Tampere, Finland
Museum of Art and History, Metz, France
PTT Museum, Riquewihr, France
State Museum of History and Art, Luxembourg
Norwegian Forestry Museum, Elverum, Norway
Museum of Spanish Abstract Art, Cuenca, Spain
Castle Museum, Hallwil, Switzerland
British Museum (Natural History), London, United Kingdom

Council of Europe Award
Monaghan County Museum, Monaghan, Ireland

Specially commended
PTT Museum, Riquewihr, France

Bank of Ireland Special Exhibitions Award

Museum of Ethnography and History, Povoa de Varzim, Portugal - *Signs and symbols used by local fishermen*

Specially commended
Viking Ship Museum, Roskilde, Denmark - *Boats of Greenland*
Children's Workshop, Centre Pompidou, Paris, France - *The sense of touch; Colour*
Gallery of Modern Art, Milan, Italy - *Illustrations of working-class life: Attilio Pusterla and the poor man's eating place*

1981
European Museum of the Year Award
Folk Art Museum, Nafplion, Greece

Specially commended
National Museum, Copenhagen, Denmark
Museum of Prehistory of the Ile-de-France, Nemours, France
Museum of Gardeners and Vinegrowers, Bamberg, Germany
Historical Museum, Frankfurt-am-Main, Germany
The Peggy Guggenheim Collection, Venice, Italy
Museum of the Valley, Zogno, Italy
Ethnological Museum, Muro, Mallorca, Spain
Historical Museum, Olten, Switzerland
Natural History Museum, Solothurn, Switzerland
'Hunday', National Farm and Tractor Museum, Stocksfield, United Kingdom

Council of Europe Award
Music Museum, Stockholm, Sweden

Bank of Ireland Special Exhibitions Award
Northern Animal Park, Emmen, Netherlands - *Flowers and colours; Locomotion*

Specially commended
People's Palace Museum, Glasgow, United Kingdom - *Glasgow stained glass*
Museum of Mankind, London, United Kingdom - *Asante, kingdom of gold*
Royal Armoury, Stockholm, Sweden - *Royal leisure*

1982
European Museum of the Year Award
Museum of Art and History, Saint-Denis, France

Specially commended
National Museum of Marble, Rance, Belgium
Archaeological Museum, Kelheim, Germany
Goulandris Natural History Museum, Kifissia, Greece
Palazzo Pepoli Campogrande, Bologna, Italy
Ringve Museum, Trondheim, Norway
Museum of Crafts and Maritime Culture, Lidköping, Sweden

Technorama, Winterthur, Switzerland

Council of Europe Award
Åland Museum, Mariehamn, Finland

Specially commended
National Museum of Marble, Rance, Belgium

Bank of Ireland Special Exhibitions Award
Awarded jointly to
The Yorkshire Museum, York, United Kingdom - *The Vikings in England*
The Guinness Museum, Dublin, Ireland - *Wine of the country: a James's Gape at Guinness and Dublin*

Specially commended
Museum for the Blind, Brussels, Belgium - *The Cathedral*

1983
European Museum of the Year Award
Regional Museum, Sargans, Switzerland

Specially commended
Museum of Old Technology, Grimbergen, Belgium
Museum of Contemporary Art, Dunkirk, France
German Museum of Locks & Fastenings, Velbert, Germany
Roscrea Heritage Centre, Roscrea, Ireland
Museum of the Mediterranean, Stockholm, Sweden
Scottish Agricultural Museum, Edinburgh, United Kingdom
Ulster Folk & Transport Museum, Belfast, United Kingdom
Museum of Leeds, Leeds, United Kingdom
Royal Marines Museum, Southsea, United Kingdom

Council of Europe Award
Joanneum: The Provincial Museum of Styria, Graz, Austria

Personal Citations
Knud Jensen
Louisiana: Museum of Modern Art, Humlebaek, Denmark -
For his success in arousing the interest of the general public in modern art and in creating an exceptionally sympathetic atmosphere for the purpose

Angelos and Niki Goulandris
The Goulandris Natural History Museum, Kifissia, Greece -
For their outstanding work in creating a centre of public education, scholarship and training of great national and international importance

1984

European Museum of the Year Award
Zuiderzee Museum, Enkhuizen, Netherlands
Specially commended
Paul Delvaux Museum, Saint-Idesbald, Belgium
David d'Angers Museum, Angers, France
Museum of Navigation, Regensburg, Germany
Museum of Early Industrialisation, Wuppertal, Germany
Fota House, Carrigtwohill, Ireland
Archaeological Museum, Chieti, Italy
Museum of Farming & Crafts of Calabria, Monterosso Calabro, Italy
Evaristo Valle Museum, Gijón, Spain
Museum of the Province of Bohuslän, Uddevalla, Sweden
Museum of the Horse, La Sarraz, Switzerland
Museum of Turkish and Islamic Art, Istanbul, Turkey
The Burrell Collection, Glasgow, United Kingdom
Quarry Bank Mill, Styal, United Kingdom

Council of Europe Award
Awarded jointly to
Living Museum of the Canal du Centre, Thieu, Belgium
The Boat Museum, Ellesmere Port, United Kingdom

1987
European Museum of the Year Award
Beamish: North of England Open Air Museum, Stanley, United Kingdom

Specially commended
Museum of Biometeorology, Zwettl, Austria
Waterloo Museum, Waterloo, Belgium
Museum of Prehistory, Carnac, France
Wallpaper Museum, Rixheim, France
Ruhr Museum, Essen, Germany
New State Gallery, Stuttgart, Germany
Museum of Cycladic and Ancient Greek Art, Athens, Greece
Sarakatsani Folklore Museum, Serres, Greece
Municipal Museum, Rende Centro, Italy
Akershus Museum, Strømmen, Norway
National Theatre Museum, Lisbon, Portugal
Forestry Museum, Lycksele, Sweden
Nature Museum, Lucerne, Switzerland
Alimentarium, Vevey, Switzerland
The Ruskin Gallery, Sheffield, United Kingdom

Council of Europe Award
Neukölln Museum, Berlin, Germany

Note: For administrative reasons, the judging of candidates for the 1985 and 1986 Awards took

Note: Pour des motifs administratifs, le jugement des candidats aux Prix de 1985 et 1986 a eu lieu

place in 1986 and the presentations were made in 1987. It was therefore decided to refer to these as the 1987 Awards.

en 1986 et les remises de récompenses en 1987. Pour cette raison, il a été décidée de les inclure dans la rubrique 'Prix 1987'.

1988
European Museum of the Year Award
Brandts Klaedefabrik, Odense, Denmark

Specially commended
Provincial Museum of Modern Art, Ostend, Belgium
Aine Art Museum, Tornio, Finland
Museum of Aquitaine, Bordeaux, France
Normandy Museum, Caen, France
'Tactual Museum' of the Lighthouse for the Blind in Greece, Kallithea, Greece
Sa Dom'e Farra Museum, Quartu S. Elena, Italy
Museon, The Hague, Netherlands
Museum of Medieval Stockholm, Stockholm, Sweden
Maison Tavel, Geneva, Switzerland
Antalya Museum, Antalya, Turkey
Mary Rose Museum, Portsmouth, United Kingdom

Council of Europe Award
Awarded jointly to
The Bavarian National Museum, Munich, Germany
Museum of the Convent of Descalzas Reales, Madrid, Spain

1989
European Museum of the Year Award
Sundsvall Museum, Sundsvall, Sweden

Specially commended
Ecomuseum of Alsace, Ungersheim, France
Museum of Coaches, Carriages, Carts and Wagons, Heidenheim a.d. Brenz, Germany
Municipal Museum, Iserlohn, Germany
International Lace Museum, Nordhalben, Germany
Luigi Pecci Centre for Contemporary Art, Prato, Italy
National Museum of Roman Art, Mérida, Spain
The Futures' Museum, Borlänge, Sweden
Bergslagen Ecomuseum, Falun, Sweden
Swiss Museum of Games, La-Tour-de-Peilz, Switzerland
Dulwich Picture Gallery, London, United Kingdom
Brewing and Brewery Museum, Ljubljana, Yugoslavia

Council of Europe Award
Jewish Historical Museum, Amsterdam, Netherlands

1990

European Museum of the Year Award
Ecomuseum of the Fourmies-Trélon Region, Fourmies, France

Specially commended
Heureka - The Finnish Science Centre, Vantaa, Finland
German Cookery Book Museum, Dortmund, Germany
Municipal Museum, Gütersloh, Germany
Røros Museum, Røros, Norway
Marionette Museum, Stockholm, Sweden
National Museum of Photography, Film and Television, Bradford, United Kingdom
National Waterways Museum, Gloucester, United Kingdom

Council of Europe Award
Manuel da Maia Museum of Water, Lisbon, Portugal

Personal Citation
Graziano Campanini
Municipal Art Gallery, Pieve di Cento, Italy -
In public recognition of his outstanding achievement in stimulating public awareness of the need for conservation of the local heritage

1991
European Museum of the Year Award
The Leventis Municipal Museum of Nicosia, Cyprus

Specially commended
Moorland and Peat Museum, Heidenreichstein, Austria
Dairy Museum, Saukkola, Finland
Museum of Automata, Souillac, France
The Old Synagogue, Essen, Germany
Coastal Museum, Gratangsbotn, Norway
Agricultural Museum of Entre Douro e Miño, Vila do Conde, Portugal
House of Wheat and Bread, Echallens, Switzerland
Natural History Museum, Schaffhausen, Switzerland
Museum of Science and Industry, Manchester, United Kingdom

Council of Europe Award
German Salt Museum, Lüneburg, Germany

1992
European Museum of the Year Award
State Museum of Technology and Work, Mannheim, Germany

Specially commended
National Museum of Asian, African and American Cultures, Prague, Czech Republic
Océanopolis, Brest, France

Museum of Cretan Ethnology, Vori, Greece
Vasa Museum, Stockholm, Sweden
Inveraray Jail, Inveraray, United Kingdom

Council of Europe Award
Argenta Marsh Museum, Argenta, Italy

1993
European Museum of the Year Award
Alta Museum, Alta, Norway

Specially commended
State Archaeological Museum, Konstanz, Germany
King Stephen Museum, Székesfehérvár, Hungary
Museum of the Olive, Imperia Oneglia, Italy
Municipal Museum, Loures, Portugal
Basel Paper Mill, Basel, Switzerland
Manx Museum, Douglas, Isle of Man, United Kingdom

Council of Europe Award
Awarded jointly to
Kobarid Museum, Kobarid, Slovenia
Archaeological Museum of Istanbul, Istanbul, Turkey

Personal Citation
Dr Corneliu Bucur
Museum of Folk Civilisation in Romania, Sibiu, Romania -
For maintaining and developing his museum in the face of all possible political discouragement

1994
European Museum of the Year Award
National Museum, Copenhagen, Denmark

Specially commended
Historical Record of the Great War, Péronne, France
Museum of Modern Art, Frankfurt-am-Main, Germany
Museonder, Hoenderloo, Netherlands
Cotroceni National Museum, Bucharest, Romania
The Tower Museum, Derry, United Kingdom
Museum of Farnham, Farnham, United Kingdom

Council of Europe Award
Provincial Museum of Lapland, Rovaniemi, Finland

1995
European Museum of the Year Award
The Olympic Museum, Lausanne, Switzerland

Specially commended
Museum of Traditional Local Culture, Spittal/Drau, Austria
Lapidarium of the National Museum, Prague, Czech Republic
City Museum, Helsinki, Finland
Westfalian Industrial Museum, Waltrop, Germany
Morandi Museum, Bologna, Italy
County Museum of Västernorrland, Härnösand, Sweden
Lindwurm Museum, Stein am Rhein, Switzerland
Museum of Underwater Archaeology, Bodrum, Turkey
City Art Gallery, Southampton, United Kingdom

Council of Europe Award
House of History of the Federal Republic of Germany, Bonn, Germany

Personal Citation
Gabriele Mazzotta
Antonio Mazzotta Foundation, Milan, Italy -
For his work in developing an exhibition centre of exceptional quality, which is likely to have a profound and far-reaching effect on the museum situation in Italy; for his successful efforts to further international co-operation in the museum field; and for the consistently high standard of his publication programme

1996
European Museum of the Year Award
Museum of the Romanian Peasant, Bucharest, Romania

Specially commended
Museum of the Práchenské Region, Písek, Czech Republic
Lusto - Finnish Forest Museum, Punkaharju, Finland
Countryside Museum, Usson-en-Forez, France
German Safety at Work Exhibition, Dortmund, Germany
Turaida Museum, Turaida, Latvia
Groningen Museum, Groningen, Netherlands
Chiado Museum, Lisbon, Portugal
Gijón Heritage Project, Gijón, Spain
Glassworks Museum, Hergiswil, Switzerland
Museum of Liverpool Life, Liverpool, United Kingdom

Council of Europe Award
MAK-Austrian Museum of Applied Arts, Vienna, Austria

Micheletti Award
German Safety at Work Exhibition, Dortmund, Germany

Since 1996 the Micheletti Award has been presented annually to a museum considered by the Committee, in its capacity as Jury, to be outstanding among the candidates classified as technical or industrial museums.

Personal Citation
Mr Rahmi M. Koç
Rahmi M. Koç Industrial Museum, Istanbul, Turkey
In recognition of his enterprise and pioneering spirit in establishing an industrial and technical museum which will be an inspiration and encouragement to countries which have hitherto lacked such institutions.

1997
European Museum of the Year Award
Museum of Anatolian Civilisations, Ankara, Turkey

Specially commended
Aboa Vetus & Ars Nova, Turku, Finland
Historical Museum, Bielefeld, Germany
Lower Bavarian Museum of Prehistory, Landau, Germany
Historical and Ethnological Museum of Greek-Cappadocian Civilisations, Nea Karvali, Greece
Bonnefanten Museum, Maastricht, Netherlands
Old Royal Observatory, London, United Kingdom

Council of Europe Award
Children's Museum, Tropical Museum, Amsterdam, Netherlands

Micheletti Award
Municipal Museum, Idrija, Slovenia

APPENDIX THREE

THE ANNUAL PRESENTATION CEREMONIES

The European Museum of the Year Award

1977 Award	held at the Château des Rohan, Strasbourg, France
Guest of Honour	Roy Jenkins President of the Commission of the European Communities
1978 Award	held in the Coronation Hall, Aachen, Germany
Guest of Honour	Georg Kahn-Ackermann Secretary-General, Council of Europe
1979 Award	held in the Hôtel de Ville, Brussels, Belgium
Guest of Honour	Her Majesty the Queen of the Belgians
1980 Award	held at Guildhall, London, England
Guest of Honour	Mr Hans de Koster President of the Parliamentary Assembly, Council of Europe
1981 Award	held in the Town Hall, Stockholm, Sweden
Guest of Honour	Princess Christina of Sweden
1982 Award	held at La Piccola Scala, Milan, Italy
Guest of Honour	Giovanni Agnelli President of Fiat
1983 Award	held at the Hôtel de Ville, Paris, France
Guest of Honour	Jacques Chirac Mayor of Paris
1984 Award	held in the Zuiderkerk, Enkhuizen, Netherlands
Guest of Honour	Gaetano Adinolfi Deputy Secretary-General, Council of Europe

1987 Award**	held in the Great Hall, Durham Castle, Durham, England
Guest of Honour	Dr Richard Hoggart Chairman, EMYA
1988 Award	held at the European Cultural Centre, Delphi, Greece
Guest of Honour	Mrs Melina Mercouri Greek Minister of Culture
1989 Award	held in the Barfüsserkirche, Basel, Switzerland
Guest of Honour	Hans-Rudolf Striebel Regierungsrat des Kantons Basel Stadt
1990 Award	held in the Accademia dei Notturni, Bologna, Italy
Guest of Honour	Superintendent of Cultural Affairs Province of Emilia Romagna
1991 Award	held at the University of Helsinki, Finland
Guest of Honour	Dr Richard Hoggart Chairman, EMYA
1992 Award	held in the Pesthuis, Leiden, Netherlands
Guest of Honour	Mrs Hedy d'Ancona Dutch Minister of Welfare, Health and Cultural Affairs
1993 Award	held in the Palace of the Dukes of Braganza, Guimaraes, Portugal
Guest of Honour	Dr Pedro Santana Lopes Secretary of State for Culture
1994 Award	held in the City Hall, Belfast, Northern Ireland
Guest of Honour	Councillor Reginald Empey Lord Mayor of Belfast

** For administrative reasons the judging of candidates for the 1985 and 1986 Awards took place in 1986 and presentations were made in 1987. It was therefore decided to refer to this as the 1987 Award.

1995 Award	held at Engsö Castle, near Västerås, Sweden

Guest of Honour	Mrs Lena Hjelm-Wallén Swedish Minister of Foreign Affairs
1996 Award	held in the City Hall, Barcelona, Spain
Guest of Honour	Her Majesty Queen Fabiola of the Belgians
1997 Award	held at the Olympic Museum, Lausanne, Switzerland
Guest of Honour	Her Majesty Queen Fabiola of the Belgians

The Council of Europe Prize

Since its inception in 1978, the Council of Europe Prize has always been presented at a special ceremony in Strasbourg, followed in most cases by a local ceremony in the winning museum. The functionaries of the Council who have made the presentations in Strasbourg have been

1978 (14 February)	Mr Roy Jenkins, President of the EEC Commission
1979 (31 January)	Mr Hans de Koster, President of the Parliamentary Assembly
1980 (29 January)	Mr Hans de Koster
1981 (26 January)	Mr Hans de Koster
1982 (26 April)	Mr José Maria de Areilza, President of the Parliamentary Assembly
1983 (26 April)	Mr Karl Ahrens, President of the Parliamentary Assembly
1984 (7 May)	Mr Karl Ahrens
1985 (25 April)	Mr Karl Ahrens
1986	No award made
1987 (4 May)	Mr Louis Jung, President of the Parliamentary Assembly
1988 (2 May)	Mr Louis Jung
1989 (9 May)	Mr Anders Björck, President of the Parliamentary Assembly
1990 (7 May)	Mr Anders Björck
1991 (22 April)	Mr Anders Björck
1992 (5 May)	Mr Miguel Angel Martinez, President of the Parliamentary Assembly
1993 (11 May)	Mr Miguel Angel Martinez
1994 (11 April)	Mr Miguel Angel Martinez
1995 (26 April)	Mr Miguel Angel Martinez
1996 (22 April)	Mrs Leni Fischer, President of the Parliamentary Assembly
1997 (22 April)	Mrs Leni Fischer