

## A Managerial Approach To A Controversial Exhibition: The Human Body

~ Ph.D. Associate Professor **Viorica Aura Păuș** (Faculty of Journalism and Communication Studies, University of Bucharest, Romania)

E-mail: [viorica.paus@fjsc.ro](mailto:viorica.paus@fjsc.ro)

~ Ph.D. Lecturer **Romina Surugiu** (Faculty of Journalism and Communication Studies, University of Bucharest, Romania))

E-mail: [rominasurugiu@yahoo.com](mailto:rominasurugiu@yahoo.com)

**Abstract:** *This paper will analyse the reception of the Human Body exhibition of 2013 in Romania, from a managerial point of view. The research is based on the exhibition visitors' book, to which a content analysis was applied. The main aim of the paper is to investigate how the 'Grigore Antipa' Museum (Romania) constructed the cultural context in which the scientific arguments prevailed over the religious ones, turning the exhibition of plastinated human bodies into an accepted public event, with a strong emphasis on education and science (medicine). At the same time, ethical concerns and religious criticism were downplayed by maintaining the focus on the 'education for health' frame.*

**Key words:** *plastination, management, museum, visitors' book, The Human Body exhibition, Romania*

## 1. Introduction

Society nowadays, with its rapid changes and unforeseen challenges, needs a(n) (inter)cultural approach. Ethnocentrism, stereotypes, and discrimination have become huge obstacles in a world shaped by technology, communication and social mobility. The world has the aspect of a 'collage' in which cultures are juxtaposed, being partially adapted to one another, and still unprepared for a profound dialogue. Multiculturalism presents, interprets and re-evaluates the social experience of diversity and difference (Păuș, 2010, p. 44).

Why is a(n) (inter)cultural approach now necessary in studying our society? Martin and Nakayama identify six imperatives: technology, demography, economy, peace, self-awareness and ethics (Martin and Nakayama, 2007, p. 5). Living in an intercultural world, the above mentioned authors argue, raises significant ethical challenges.

From this point of view, exhibitions that display plastinated human bodies ('plastinates') have ceaselessly raised many ethical concerns and provoked debates. Is it science or entertainment? Is it education or disrespect for the dead? Is it aesthetics or bad taste? It is a fact that these exhibitions have broken the moral codes by showing human bodies dissected, skinned, in 'real-life' situations such as playing tennis or running. But at what point do these things become acceptable or unacceptable in society?

This paper will analyse the reception of the Human Body exhibition of 2013 in Romania from a managerial point of view. This approach is based on the hypothesis that the scientific success of the exhibition in Bucharest is mainly due to the managerial strategy of the museum and its public

relations policy. The research is based on the exhibition visitors' book, to which a content analysis was applied.

The aim of the study is to investigate how the 'Grigore Antipa' Museum, host of the Human Body exhibition in Bucharest, Romania constructed the cultural context in which the scientific arguments prevailed over the religious ones, turning the exhibition of plastinated human bodies into an accepted public event, with a strong emphasis on education and science (medicine). The aims of the exhibition were: "to change the way in which visitors perceive the human body, offering Romanians, for the first time, the unique possibility of seeing their body through the lens of a surgeon and of experiencing a visual trip inside [a human body]" and "to convince the visitors to respect and take care of their body" (<http://www.antipa.ro>).

We argue that the positive reaction of the Romanian visitors (expressed in the visitors' book) was strongly influenced by the actual organization of the exhibition and the management strategy of the 'Antipa' Museum.

Our study is also based on the premise that the exhibitions and the museums, taken as cultural institutions, are not to be considered simple custodians of objects or artefacts. On the contrary, they can generate cultural representations and give a certain social or scientific value to the objects exhibited. "They do not so much reflect the world through objects as use them to mobilize representations of the world past and present." (Lidchi, 2013, p. 127).

## 2. Exhibiting plastinated bodies

Around the world, exhibitions of plastinated bodies have been both criticized and praised by academics. The scientific production related to the plastinated bodies exhibitions practically followed the exhibitions all around the globe, with journal articles published from Brasil or the US to the UK, France, Greece and so on.

Previous research conducted on the academic production of the last 20 years showed several major areas of interest: the pedagogical side, the ethics of displaying, the fusion between anatomy and aesthetics, the legal aspects related to organ donation, body donors and donation, visitors' attitudes and reactions, the 'posthumanity' of plastinated bodies (Scott, 2011, p. 166).

Over the last three years, other categories were added to the ones mentioned above, such as: the feminist approach to the human/nonhuman display (Scott, 2011, pp. 165-181), the banning of the exhibition in France (Claire, 2011, pp.136-142), the reception of the exhibition among young people (Raikos et al., 2012, p. 433), the use of dead bodies as entertainment for the public (Kim, 2012, pp. 309-348).

The literature reviewed shows that there are at least three types of exhibition (Claire, 2011, pp. 136-142). The 'original' exhibition is considered to be 'Body Worlds' ('Korpenwelten'), conceived by the German Gunter von Hagens, the inventor of the plastination technique. Other similar exhibitions – considered by Von Hagens as 'copies' – also travel the world, attracting millions of visitors. (Claire, 2011, p. 137)

The dead bodies are preserved through a special technique that consists in replacing the water and lipids of the human body with

polymers in order to obtain durable, odourless and colourful exhibits.

While improving the preservation technique, Gunter von Hagens also improved the exhibiting technique by composing everyday human poses: such as people playing tennis or chess, or people having sexual intercourse. Some scenes could be considered morally questionable: the Skin Man (holding his entire skin in his right hand) or the Pregnant Woman (with the foetus inside her uterus).

It is this everyday setting of bodies that attracted strong criticism and aroused controversy. In France, the exhibition received a negative response from the National Consultative Committee for Ethics on the grounds of displaying dead human bodies in a way that violates the idea of dignity and respect for humans. Other concerns were raised, too, such as the commercial purpose of the show and the lack of information on the consent of the deceased (Claire, 2011, p. 137).

In Greece, an Eastern Orthodox country like Romania, where the Church considers that burial and funeral are mandatory for every person, the exhibition did not meet with such strong criticism as in France. Nevertheless, almost half of the young visitors (46.3%) had moral doubts, based on religious or philosophical beliefs or on the potential psychological disturbances caused by the exhibition (Raikos et al., 2012, p. 434).

The exhibition entitled 'The Human Body', organized in Bucharest (Romania) in 2013 by an international company, is not related to von Hagens' display, but relies on the same idea – showing plastinated human bodies and body parts to the public. The origin of the bodies is not known; the organisers explained that they were "legally

donated through an organized government process and designated to be used only for education purposes in public exhibitions and institutions of higher education" (<http://thbexhibition.com> ). The organisers added that the individual identities were unknown. However, it is obvious from observing the faces that they have Asian features, fuelling the idea that they come from China and that they are former political prisoners who were executed (see, for example, Dan, 2013). The museum announced on the website that the human bodies exhibited had been offered by Dalian Hoffen Bio-technique Laboratory, in accordance with the Chinese law. The owners of the exhibition stated that the bodies had not been claimed and the death was from natural causes (<http://www.antipa.ro>).

The clear objective of the exhibition (the education for science and health) is reinforced by the prestige of Antipa Museum of Natural History (in fact, Romania is the only country where the exhibition has been hosted by a museum of science). The director of the museum and the PR Department explained on several occasions that the exhibition in Bucharest was organized after a careful selection of the bodies exposed. The educational and scientific purposes were assumed by the museum, and the selection of the exhibits was negotiated with the company GForce (Dan, 2013; Stănescu and Tudorache, interview, October, 17, 2013).

The GForce organizers also declared: "we have worked for two years in order to have the exhibition ready for the museum in Bucharest. We presented the bodies in familiar postures so that the audience could observe the position of the human organs, bones and muscles during a normal daily physical activity" (Chiruta, 2013). The international

media cited on Antipa Museum website restated the praises and positive opinions on the exhibition across the countries (<http://www.antipa.ro>).

However, making a show out of dead human bodies, displayed in everyday life poses in an attempt to familiarise the public with anatomy (to 'democratise' anatomy) is regarded with mixed feelings by the public and scientists. However, this type of display could be seen as being part of *l'esprit du temps*, of an 'interactional post-modernity' which encourages the intersection of information with emotion (Lazăr, 2008, p.15). A typical feature of our society is the 'crisis of representation' (Rovența-Frumușani, 2013, p. 11), which, in our case, refers to a double possibility in the medical field: the virtualisation of the body (the 3D techniques that allow explorations of the human body through non-invasive methods) and the plastination techniques which make the preservation of 'real' human bodies possible. Both situations have consequences in the construction of human identity, leading to a possible "exploration of a new subjectivity without involving the existence of an original subjectivity which could be the true one" (Negru, 2013, p. 133). One could argue that the answer to the question "Who am I?" is not that simple after visiting the exhibition of plastinated human bodies.

On the other hand, when it comes to the **poetics** (the internal articulation and production of meaning) – **politics** (production of social meaning, through institutional power) dyad of representation (Lidchi, 2013, p. 157), we notice that the organisers of the plastinated bodies exhibitions downplayed the politics, emphasising the poetics of representation. All the enquiries related to how

the exhibits (i.e. human dead bodies) had been collected and where they had come from were dismissed in polite press releases or public statements that reinforced the scientific and artistic value of the exhibitions (see, for example, [www.bodyworlds.com](http://www.bodyworlds.com) or <http://thbexhibition.com>).

### 3. The Human Body exhibition in Romania

A 'natural history cabinet' (that would later become the 'Grigore Antipa' National Museum of Natural History) was established in Bucharest in 1834 on the initiative of Mihalache Ghica, who donated important collections of coins, rocks, fossils, animals, and work of arts. The Museum was a 'mixed institution', displaying antiquities, old paintings alongside natural curiosities (<http://www.antipa.ro>).

The name of the Museum pays tribute to the best-known director of the institution, Dr. Grigore Antipa, who managed the Museum between 1893 and 1944. Dr. Antipa (1867-1944), a world famous scientist, organized and expanded the collections of the Museum, bringing valuable specimens from all over the world. He was also the first to create in the Museum in Bucharest the biogeographical dioramas that became an inspiration for many great museums of the world (<http://www.antipa.ro>).

Dr. Antipa argued that museums were organized for a large audience therefore the exhibits had to be selected on pedagogical as well as scientific grounds. In a 1934 public conference, he explained his ideas on the principles of organizing a museum, emphasizing that "the chosen objects should 'speak the language' of every visitor, i.e. to attract

their curiosity, to enrich their knowledge taking into consideration the intelligence, the capacity of understanding and the culture of the visitor." (Antipa quoted in Zbucnea and Ivan, 2008, p. 19).

At present, the Museum manages an impressive collection of insects (more than 1,000,000 specimens), molluscs (250,000 specimens) and crustaceans (103,000 specimens). The vertebrate collections include 46,500 specimens and the collection of Compared Anatomy has approximately 1,600 specimens including skeletons, fluid-preserved specimens (organs and systems kept in formalin), embryos, etc. (<http://www.antipa.ro>)

The 'Grigore Antipa' National Museum of Natural History is the most popular and renowned museum in Romania, according to the data collected in a survey conducted in 2005. 17.64% of all Romanians said that they had visited the museum at least once (Barometrul de consum cultural, 2005, p. 20). As a rule, many Romanians visit the 'Grigore Antipa' National Museum in childhood, during school field trips. Therefore, the Museum is perceived by the public as mainly being an educational site.

The Human Body exhibition was organized between March 22 and August 4, 2013, in the building of the 'Grigore Antipa' National Museum, by two specialized companies, in collaboration with the Museum.

The Human Body exhibition included over 200 specimens. Eight human bodies (seven men and one woman), body parts (organs) and fetuses were displayed in nine rooms. According to the museum website, "thanks to the organ and tissue dissections, the exhibition offers a unique, 3D perspective which accurately presents everything that is hidden under our skin, the

miracle of the human body and its functioning” (<http://www.antipa.ro/categories/55/pages/296>). In every room, there was a guide – a medical student (named ‘docent’) dressed in white, who offered scientific information on the specimens. The exhibits were chosen by the Museum, which set an educational objective for the exhibition and a target group composed of adolescents and young adults. (Stănescu and Tudorache, interview, October, 17, 2013)

Professor Dumitru Murariu, member of the Romanian Academy and director of the museum also explained: “There are people who want to know and people who don’t, but each of them should respect the other’s choice” (Murariu quoted in Dan, 2013).

Both the foreign organizers (GForce) and the representatives of the museum underlined that The Human Body exhibition was an opportunity for the Romanians to find out information on the human body. The exhibition is presented on the website as an event whose “purpose is to change the perspective on the human body by giving the Romanians, for the first time, the unique chance to see their body through the eyes of a surgeon and to experience a visual incursion within themselves”.

Last but not least, the objective of the exhibition would be “to encourage the visitors to respect and take care of their body” by choosing a healthy lifestyle (<http://www.antipa.ro/categories/55/pages/296>).

Therefore, the location of the exhibition is of extreme importance in understanding the cultural context of the Human Body event. There is a strong possibility that the visitors associated the prestige of the Museum with the exhibition, taking into account the fact that the Museum itself displays an important

collection of *Compared Anatomy*, too.

Another aspect that is also important for our study is the fact that almost 400 elementary schools (public and private, urban or rural) in Romania took pupils on organized field trips to the exhibition. More than 8.000 of the visitors were children, between 7 and 18 years old (Stănescu and Tudorache, interview, October, 17, 2013).

#### 4. The research

Previous articles on museums explained that museum visitors’ books, held by almost all museums worldwide, are only seldom used as a source during scientific research (Macdonald, 2005, p. 119).

However, visitors’ books may provide important insights into the views, experiences and understanding of the persons that visit these cultural institutions.

In an interesting study (*Accessing audiences: visiting visitor book*), Sharon Macdonald argues that “an exhibition’s visitor book should, perhaps, be seen as an integral part of that exhibition– an interactive exhibit in which many visitors participate (either by writing or reading)” (Macdonald, 2005, p. 125). The visitors’ books also offer an insight into the intercultural experience of visitors as foreigners also share their views on the museums or exhibitions.

The visitors’ book gave the visitors the opportunity to convey their impressions. “From this point of view, the exhibition must make an effort to inform them [the visitors], to get them to discuss it, to give their opinion, to feed and enrich their point of view. (...) Here, we also find a certain form of cultural emancipation that affects the content less than the way the visitors relate to these

contents. [The audience] find themselves being able to discuss the choices of the museum and the intentions of the organizers, to have a personal or collective opinion on the quality of the exhibition and the speech of the scientists, to confirm and share it." (Rasse, 2003, p. 112-118).

Therefore, as Sharon Macdonald explains, writing a comment in the visitors' book is seen as an 'exit ritual'. It is a form of ritualized communication. That is why children tend to write in a very appreciative manner. The studies revealed that approximately 20% of the visitors write directly into the book: "Others either read some of the entries or look over the shoulder of a companion as he or she writes, it being fairly common for individuals to make entries on behalf of a group (e.g. a school teacher for a whole class, or one comment for a whole family or group of friends)." (Macdonald, 2005, p. 125).

Many entries are conventional, containing only a name, a signature and polite remarks ('interesting', 'instructive', 'good work', etc.). Of interest for our study are the longer comments that cover in some cases half or an entire page of the book, with positive and negative judgments.

Like other forms of qualitative research, the examination of visitors' books will lead to an important gain in insight, relevant for understanding the social and cultural context in which a museum or exhibition exists. We cannot agree with Zbucea and Ivan who exclude the possible research value of the visitors' books in Romanian museums on the grounds that they have been kept for no particular reason since Communist times, when similar books were present in other institutions and even in general stores in order to collect suggestions from the public

(Zbucea and Ivan, 2008, pp. 22-23)

We argue that examining the visitors' books may give access to **authenticity** by exploring direct and immediate comments/entries made by the people that actually saw the exhibition. In the Romanian public sphere, there were many opinions against the exhibition made by people who had not visited it. The PR, Cultural Marketing Cultural and Educational Programs department of the Museum concluded after monitoring Romanian mainstream media that the journalists, opinion leaders, bloggers and their readers negatively reflected on the exhibition, making references to exhibits that were not present in Bucharest, but in other similar exhibitions worldwide (Stănescu and Tudorache, interview, October, 17, 2013). On the other hand, it is also important to note that the misuse of science and technology is not an issue in Romanian media (Surugiu, 2013, p. 198).

In order to investigate the opinions of people who had a first-hand experience visiting the exhibition, we selected for our research the visitors' book of the Human Body exhibition in Romania. We have also taken into consideration the fact that in the contemporary context, museums consider the visitors and their questions, suggestions or opinions a central concern (Rasse, 2003, p. 116).

The Museum reported that approximately 80,000 visitors visited the exhibition between March 22 and August 4, 2013. The exhibition was supposed to end on June 30, but it was extended until August 4 due to the large number of visitors, as the Museum explained in a press release (<http://www.anti-pa.ro>).

The visitors wrote their comments in a notebook (Visitors' Book) named 'Cartea de

impresii' (in Romanian). It was a different book from the Museum's regular visitors' book. The notebook was opened on March 21, when a preview of the exhibition was organized for a selected audience (elementary and high school teachers from Bucharest). The document (22x30cm) contains 1290 comments, displayed on 217 pages (recto-verso). The majority of entries were in Romanian, but there were also entries in other languages such as: English, French, Dutch, Spanish, Italian, an Arabic dialect, Chinese etc.

The visitors usually give their names, address and even institutional data when commenting in the visitors' books. However, in order not to raise any ethical issues, all the quotations reproduced in this paper were kept anonymous in order not to allow the identification of the visitors who wrote the comments. When we drew examples from the visitors' book, we inserted in brackets the initials of the person (if known) and the page number.

We studied the visitors' book using content analysis based on series of keywords. The aim of the content analysis was to establish three series of correlations that could help us outline the **cultural context** of the exhibition:

(1) Exhibition as: science (knowledge) – technology – art – religion (spiritual dimension of the human being).

(2) The Exhibition's aim: education (information) - health education – entertainment (show) – terrifying display.

(3) The Exhibition's components: dead body – human body – exhibit.

The quantitative analysis yielded 1290 entries divided into: short messages (787 entries) and long messages (503 entries).

As stated above, we took into consideration the longer comments that contained at least one or two full sentences.

From the content analysis of long comments (503 entries), we drew the following results:

The exhibition was perceived by the visitors as being a **scientific** event (134 entries), a **technological** display (23 entries) or an **artistic** display (13 entries). Only 35 out of 503 entries debated the **religious (spiritual) dimension** of the exhibition.

The exhibition's aim was considered to be mainly **education (information)** (154 entries), **health education** (26 entries). 24 entries commented that the exhibition was a **terrifying (horrible)** place (display), and 7 comments stressed the **entertainment** aim of the exhibition.

The exhibition's components were characterized as **exhibits** (47 entries), **dead bodies** (25 entries) or **human bodies** (14 entries).

### 5. Discussion. Exploring the 'Human Body' exhibition visitors' book

The content analysis on the visitors' book showed that the visitors perceived the exhibition mainly as a scientific event, with a focus on education and health preservation. The comments on entertainment and ethical issues (including the religious dimension) were rare, but very passionate. For example, a visitor wrote that the exhibition displayed "cynicism because it shows the exhibits with sports equipments" (S.C., p. 128). Another visitor wondered: "Would they have been playing darts and basketball when they were killed and tortured?" (not signed, p. 131).

At the other pole, the comments which praised the exhibition tended to put primary emphasis on the cognitive side. The exhibition offers an opportunity to learn, to understand the human body. "I consider that this



is the result of a serious, scientific work, useful for everyone", explained a medical practitioner on page 89 of the visitors' book. Other visitors mentioned that the exhibition was: "a progress for science" (not signed, p. 110), "anatomy transformed into Art" (F., p. 117) or "an accomplishment of science" (M.C., page 73). "Science means curiosity" (C.C., p. 165) added a visitor, while someone argued: "If it hadn't been for Leonardo Da Vinci's dissection of bodies, we would now be in the Middle Ages of medicine and science" (T.B., page 105).

In their comments, teachers and medical practitioners usually praised the 'craftsmanship' (p. 75) required by the preparation of the specimens, and considered the exhibition a tribute to the human body.

A special category of comments is represented by the ones that praise the divine creation in the context of the exhibition, displaying a mixture of creationism and science. The human body is a perfect result of God's perfect creation: "Very impressive! There is a God!" (not signed, p. 83), "Life is a miracle" (A. and M., page 92), "When God created the human, He made him perfect" (not signed, p. 92), "They are still alive" (illegible signature, p. 114), "How can anyone still say that man appeared by accident?" (A.S., p. 5) or "I have understood why abortion is a crime" (C., page 203). These comments are motivated by the stated purpose of the exhibition, to encourage (self)-reflection on the body. Seeing plastinated bodies represented, for some of the visitors, a chance to direct their eyes towards their own bodies, and admire the perfection of the 'inside'.

It is true that many comments stressed the educational and medical value of the exhibition. However, when it comes to the

exhibition's components, moral concerns are raised. The specimens are described both as 'exhibits' (involving a possible scientific detachment) and as 'bodies' (involving a moral doubt about turning real human bodies into exhibits). Some visitors explained that anatomy books, posters or simulacra were sufficient for understanding the human body. Several visitors complained about the bad smell, which could be seen as an olfactory illusion, based on the idea that dead bodies were displayed.

Others wrote: "I wonder who these people were..." (A. L., p. 143), "Très belle expo. Mais d'où viennent ces corps?" (In French, in original: "Very beautiful exhibition. But where do the bodies come from?", illegible signature, p. 66) or "These humans weren't tortured Chinese, that's for sure (sic!)" (not signed, p. 20).

One visitor negatively commented on the educational aim of the exhibition: "To advise people that they were lucky enough to be born in a country that somehow respects their right to give up smoking while an artistically modelled dead body is behind them... Civilisation?" (S., p. 24). The comment makes reference to an exhibit that displays a lung affected by cancer next to a box where the visitors are advised to throw away their cigarettes and quit smoking.

An intercultural approach to the exhibition must take into consideration the fact that the 'Human Body' displayed the Others, not Us. As mentioned above, the faces of the human bodies have Asian features and the organisers admit they come from China. The negative construction of Asians as the Other shows a lasting cultural stereotype: Asians do not care much about individuality (J.N. Martin and T.K. Nakayama, 2007). In this

context, we note several discriminatory or even racist comments that contain the above-mentioned stereotype.

Many visitors did some research before visiting the exhibition, mainly using the Internet. In some comments, there were questions related to the discrepancy between the exhibition and the images available on the Internet: "On the Internet we saw many interesting bodies that were not displayed in the exhibition..." (H., p. 40), "Where are the other exhibits that were mentioned on the Internet?" (M. P., p. 56) or "I was disappointed by the small number of exhibits..." (C. V., p. 108). The confusion is based on the fact that the Bucharest exhibition was not related to the 'Body Worlds' of G. von Hagens. However, many images available on the Internet come from von Hagens' exhibitions. One example is the Pregnant Woman who can be seen only in von Hagens' exhibitions and was mentioned as 'missing' by the visitors in Romania (A. Stănescu and O. Tudorache, interview, October, 17, 2013).

On the other hand, the visitors argued that "contrary to the negative commentaries in the media, lacking logic or solid arguments, the exhibition is extraordinary" (M. G., p. 9) or that "it has nothing to do with the protests outside (the building)" (not signed, p. 66). The above-mentioned comments refer to two facts: (1) there were many negative articles on the Human Body exhibition in the Romanian media and (2) a protest against the exhibiting of plastinated bodies was organized by a pro-life NGO (Provita Media) in front of the 'Antipa' museum during the exhibition.

The religious/spiritual side is mentioned only in a few comments (35), while the entertainment side is rarely present (7

comments), although there were many articles stressing these issues in the Romanian media. Moreover, the Minister of Education, Remus Pricopie, said that "he would not take his child to such an exhibition" and his staff recommended that schools do not organize day trips to the Human Body exhibition ([ad-evarul.ro](http://ad-evarul.ro)).

## 6. Conclusions

In the present paper, we have analyzed the reception of the Human Body exhibition of 2013 in Romania, using a managerial approach. The research was based on the exhibition visitors' book, and its aim was to investigate how the 'Grigore Antipa' Museum, host of the Human Body exhibition in Bucharest, Romania constructed the cultural context in which the scientific arguments prevailed over the religious ones.

We argue that several factors turned the exhibition into a scientific/medical event in the eyes of the visitors. The exhibition was organised in a Natural History museum in Romania ('Grigore Antipa' Museum), famous for hosting many collections, including a Compared Anatomy one. The Museum selected the specimens in order to meet an educational aim, excluding all the poses that served only for the entertainment of the visitors. In every room, there were medical students who introduced the specimens to the public and offered scientific explanations. Large panels with medical information were also displayed. Other similar exhibitions allowed the people to touch or hold some exhibits and had background music (see, for example, Scott, 2011, p. 170), but this was not the case in Romania where the visitors kept their distance from the bodies. The setting

itself reinforced the idea of a scientific site. These factors created a cultural context that transformed the controversial exhibition into an event found acceptable by the public who actually visited it.

Most of the comments in the visitors' book confirmed the objective of the exhibition set by 'Antipa' Museum. The main topics included as follows: the exhibition as scientific event that facilitates the understanding of the human body and health education, the science-art relationship, a focus on science, not on entertainment, the perfection of the Human-divine creation. There are also comments on the Human Rights regarding the origin of the bodies. These comments are generally questions or responses to the debates launched by the media, that the visitors were aware of. This could be considered the national approach to this international

exhibition. This positive approach would not have existed without a rigorous management of the exhibition, and reflected the scientific and educational objective of 'Antipa' Museum.

### Acknowledgments

This work was possible due to the invaluable help offered by the management of the 'Grigore Antipa' National Museum of Natural History, Bucharest, Romania, host of the Human Body Exhibition in 2013. The useful information and interesting insights provided by Dr. Aurora Stănescu and Mrs. Oana Tudorache allowed us to closely examine the reception of the Human Body Exhibition by the Romanian public.

The author would also like to express her gratitude to Dr. Lucia Opreanu for proof-reading this article in English.

---

### REFERENCES:

1. *Barometrul de consum cultural 2005. Infrastructura de distribuție, nevoi culturale și consumul de bunuri/servicii culturale*, Centrul de Studii și Cercetări în Domeniul Cultural, Ministerul Culturii și Cultelor, 2005.
2. **Claire, G.**, *L'exposition anatomique "Our Body": une atteinte à la dignité du cadavre?*, *Médecine & Droit*, 128 (2011) 136-142.
3. **Chiruta, R.**, *Cadavrele reale de la Antipa, 50 de lei de fascinație și dezamăgire*, *Romania Libera*, March, 20, 2013, <http://www.romanalibera.ro/timpul-liber/evenimente/foto-cadavrele-reale-de-la-antipa-50-de-lei-de-fascinatie-si-dezamagire-296727.html>, accessed on December 8th, 2013.
4. **Dan, A.**, *O expoziție cu trupuri umane de la Muzeul Antipa stârnește controverse înainte să fie vernisată*, *Gândul.info*, March, 13, 2013, <http://www.gandul.info/magazin/o-expozitie-cu-trupuri-umane-de-la-muzeul-antipa-starneste-controverse-inainte-sa-fie-vernisata-10664960>, accessed on December, 15, 2013.
5. **Kim, J. H.**, *Exposição de corpos humanos: O uso de cadáveres como entretenimento e mercadoria*, *Mana* 18(2), (2012) 309-348.
6. **Lazăr, M.**, *Noua televiziune și jurnalismul de spectacol*, Polirom, Iași, 2008.
7. **Lidchi, H.**, *The Poetics and the Politics of Exhibiting Other Cultures*, in *Representation*, 2nd edition (eds. S. Hall, J. Evans and S. Nixon), Sage, London, 2013.
8. **Martin, J.N., and Nakayama, T.K.**, *Intercultural Communication in Contexts*, Fourth Edition, McGraw Hill, Boston, 2007.

9. **Macdonald, S.**, *Accessing audiences: visiting visitor book*, *Museum and Society*, 3(3) (2005) 119-136.
10. **Negru, T.**, *Rethinking the human body in the digital age*, *European Journal of Science and Theology*, 9 (1) (2013) 123-132.
11. **Păuș, V. A.**, *Comunicare interetnică și interculturală*, Ars Docendi, București, 2010.
12. **Raikos, A. G.K. Paraskevas, M. Tzika, P. Kordali, F. Tsafka-Tsotskou, K. Natsis**, *Human body exhibitions: public opinion of young individuals and contemporary bioethics*, *Surg. Radiol. Anat.*, 34 (2012) 433-440.
13. **Rasse, P.**, *Le musée forum des sciences?*, in *Communiquer l'information scientifique. Éthique du journalisme et stratégies des organisations* (eds. C. Le Bœuf and N. Péllisier), L'Harmattan, Paris, 2003.
14. **Rovența-Frumușani, D.**, *Words and Figures: emotion and argumentation in the media*, in *Media, Public Communication and Globalization*, R. Boicu (ed.), Editura Universității din București, 2013.
15. **Scott, R.**, *Body Worlds' plastinates, the human/nonhuman interface, and feminism*, *Feminist Theory*, 12 (2) (2011) 165-181.
16. **Surugiu, R.**, *Science Reports and Religious Insights in Romanian National Media*, *European Journal of Science and Theology*, 9(5) (2013) 187-200.
17. **Zbucea, A., and L. Ivan**, *Muzeu focus: cum să cunoaștem mai bine vizitatorii muzeelor*, Colias, București, 2008
18. [www.adevarul.ro](http://www.adevarul.ro)
19. <http://www.antipa.ro>
20. [www.gandul.info](http://www.gandul.info)
21. [www.romanalibera.ro](http://www.romanalibera.ro)
22. <http://thbexhibition.com>
23. [www.bodyworlds.com](http://www.bodyworlds.com)