PRESENTATION

Each time more, museology professionals are confronted with terms such as community, social inequality, social inclusion and development in their quotidian. Be it in conferences, publications or museum programmes, these are increasingly recurrent terms which, in great part, translate the dynamics of a relationship between museology and community development that has been constructed since the late 60’s. Although it is not new, such relationship has gone through a major bloom in the early 90’s and arrives today as an emerging priority within the world of museology.

A first glance on the subject reveals that very different approaches and forms of action share the efforts in endowing museology with a role in community development today. In addition, despite of its growing popularity, it seems to be some misunderstandings on what the work with community development requires and truly signifies, as can be pointed out in a number of assertions originated from the field of museology. Accompanying such a plural environment, discussions and disagreements about to what extend museology is able to claim a role in social change also mark its affairs with community development. People are faced, indeed, with a rather polemic and intricate scenario. To a great extend, language barriers hinder the exchange of information on current initiatives and previous experiences, as well as on the development of concepts, approaches and proposals. Lack of better interactions among the groups of museology professionals and social actors who carry out different works with community development also contributes to making the potential of museology as a resource for development more difficult to be visualised.

In this way, considering the relevance and growing popularity of the work of museology with community development; considering that such dialectics is marked by diversity, some confusion and polemics; and realizing that most references to museology’s work address on
particular approaches, this thesis proposes to offer a contribution to the discussions on the relations between museology and community development by pursuing an integrative vision of museology as a resource for development. It proposes an integrative vision in the sense of trying to comprise different proposals and relate them in one framework for museology as a resource for development; and in the sense of relating museology proposals to the broader field of community development. The thesis also comes to attend a particular desire to bring to the English language ideas developed in Portuguese speaking countries, in this particular case Portugal and Brazil, where relevant initiatives of development take place.

Two main questions appear central to this work:

- Can museology contribute to community development today and in the near future? If yes, in which ways?
- How can museology fulfil the demands from the broader field of development?

In order to answer these questions, this work aims to:

- identify the features and possible contributions of museology to community development today;
- identify possible demands that the broader field of community development may address to museology practice and theory, and briefly draw suggestions on how to fulfil those demands.

Firstly, a framework for community development will be established. Next, some proposals originated from the field of museology will be investigated and will serve as matter for a general vision of museology as a resource for community development. Finally, a comparative analysis between the two fields aims to identify possible demands that community development may address to museology and provide the final input to answer the questions mentioned above.
This work acknowledges the difficulties in addressing on a topic that only gains sense and form in practice. The same way as the concretization of ideas on community development is intimately related to their application in reality, one could say that a truly understanding of what an initiative of development is requires experience in reality. For that, there has been an effort to meet with museologists and other community development practitioners associated with museology, and visit a few community museums. Namely, they are Hugues de Varine (France), Odalice Priosti (Brazil), Mario Moutinho (Portugal), Judite Primo (Portugal), Fernando João Moreira (Portugal), César Lopes (Portugal) and Alfredo Tinoco (Portugal). Visits included the Ecomuseum of Le Creusot (France), Museum of Monte Redondo and other local museums (Portugal), Ecomuseum of Santa Cruz (Brazil) and the Lusófona University (Portugal). Brief contacts do not fulfil completely the need for a live experience. However, they were vital to provide a clearer view and deepen the understanding of proposals.

The fact that the work of museology with community development cannot be dissociated from practice also imposes limitations to literature review, the main investigation method used in this thesis. In this regard, it is important to explain that ideas and experience/examples reports (which are treated here under the general notion of proposals) were assessed having in mind that they represent authors’ views and opinions, with all the losses dynamic processes such as community development can suffer when translated to words. Because of this, this thesis means nothing but to report a review of proposals (or body of proposals), which have been first treated separately in their own contexts and, later, conjugated to create a framework for museology as a resource for community development in the XXI century. Thus, such framework should not be seen as theory, but as the result of an interpretation of the referred proposals.
As to the thesis structure, the introduction is dedicated to setting a framework for community development today.

Chapters one and two comprise the investigation of proposals on community development originated from the field of museology. Chapter one refers to proposals dated between the late 60’s and early 90’s, and Chapter two to proposals from the early 90’s until the present. Such division departs from the premise that in the decade of 90, community development has become increasingly popular in the field of museology as a whole, comprising the work of other museological structures (e.g. traditional museums) that until then were not involved with community development. With this, new types of proposals have been added to those traditionally related to the subject. Furthermore, the 90’s have also brought transformations those proposals representing “traditional” approaches, i.e. approaches which have been already developed in the decades of 70 and 80. Experiences prior to 1990’s are considered, in this way, as a fundamental source to investigate museology proposals today once they set the foundations of important current approaches to community development.

The investigation of proposals is mostly based on the exploration of a number of past and ongoing initiatives on community development. These cases refer to the work of different types of museums and professional associations. In addition, authors’ personal work or theoretical reflections are also explored. The main criteria for the choice of cases and authors were the availability of publications and the personal contacts with professionals related to the work of museology with development. This has come to privilege initiatives in Western Europe (mainly France, Portugal, and UK), North America (Canada, EUA) and South America (especially Brazil); many of which are already well know examples of the work of
museology with community development. Due to limitations in accessing other publications, unfortunately this thesis brings no mentions to relevant experiences from countries in Africa, Asia, Oceania and others in Latin America (including more experiences in Brazil).

In other to allow a crossed analysis between the different cases, the investigation of proposals has aimed to answer some main questions in each case explored. These are:

- What does community development mean in the scope of this initiative? Are there clear references?
- What is the specific role this initiative claims in community development?
- What are the aims of this initiative (i.e. what does it wish to achieve)?
- What are the targets (i.e. what does it propose to do in order to achieve its aims)?
- What are the methods (i.e. how does it carry out its work)?
- How does the initiative relate itself to the community (i.e. the beneficiaries of development) or other targeted publics?
- What is the level of direct community input?
- In which level of society the initiative proposes to carry out its work (i.e. micro, meso or macro-level)?
- Which are the partners for action?
- What is the relevance/influence of this initiative to following developments in the field of museology?

1 All the sources in French, Spanish and Portuguese have been freely translated into English.
2 Micro-level refers to the individual and group levels; meso-level refers to the community and regional levels; and macro-level refers to the broader regional, national and international levels.
Chapter three is dedicated to creating a framework for museology as a resource for community development today, based on the analysis of proposals explored in the first and second chapters. It includes a general vision of museology as a resource for development (including notions and approaches to development present in the field of museology, justification on the relevance of museology’s work with development, general aims, roles, targets, methods and forms of action, as well as notes on the subject of community participation) and the demands from the broader field of development addressed to museology practice and theory.

The conclusion brings a brief analysis on the place museology occupies in the scope of the broader field of community development (based on the comparison between museology’s trajectory/general approach to development and the framework presented in the introduction), an overview of museology’s proposals and of the possible directions museology may take in order to fulfil community development demands.
INTRODUCTION

A framework for community development

Community development is a complex field of study and form of practice. Considered for years one of the most significant social forces in the process of planned change (CAMPFENS, 1999), it seems to attract each time more interest in a world increasingly faced with global challenges and a common destiny. Be it in rural or urban areas, in rich or poor nations, practices of community development can be found in virtually all regions of the world. These practices are concerned with the improvement of the most varied number of community conditions; respond to international, national and regional contexts and involve different actors, such as social movements and grass root organizations, social institutions, NGOs, international co-operation agencies, governments, as well as professionals from different disciplines- among them, museology.

From the view of museology, the world of community development carries aspects that are vital for understanding the place it does and may occupy in the global efforts to promote change and a better future. Thus, before proceeding with the exploration of museology contents, it is important to set a broader framework for community development, in which contexts, approaches, and current characteristics of the field will be presented. This framework intends to serve as an introduction for museology contents and as a reference to which museological proposals will be confronted by end of this thesis, in order to point out the place museology does and is able to occupy in development, as said before.

The source for this framework is to be found in the book “Community development around the world: practice, theory,
research, training” (1999), edited by Hubert Campfens. The book aims to provide an understanding of the current state of the arts in the field of community development by means of a cross-cultural and a cross-section approach, which serve as basis for a new framework theory that pulls together current shifting patterns and common themes in the field of community development.

**Global transformation and community development**

Campfens departs from the premise that community development is an evolving concept and form of practice, which in the last decades has gone through a radical change due to the dramatic impact of global restructuring. This global transformation has resulted in new tensions at the community and group levels; these tensions have, in turn, influenced the practice and theory of community development. In this regard the author stresses:

“While it is useful to place a study of CD [community development] in a national context, CD must also be placed in an international context that takes note of the unprecedented mega-level changes that are affecting communities across the globe. These changes suggest that we are moving rapidly out of the era of nation states toward a global society dominated by regional market economies and growing interdependence (...) Concomitant with this trend toward a system of internationalized capital, many governments are turning to neoliberal monetarist policies, and this has undermined the politics of social democracy that legitimated the rise of the welfare state in many countries throughout much of this century.”

---

3 Professor of Community Development and Social Planning in the Faculty of Social Work at Wilfrid Laurier University, Ontario, Canada.
4 Based on the exploration of case studies from six countries representing the major regions of the world: Canada, Netherlands, Israel, Bangladesh, Ghana and Chile
According to the author, neo-conservatism, world trade, and the communications revolution are the forces on the world scene most responsible for such megachanges. Having their counterpart in the transformations in the economic, political and social order of each society, concretely these changes consist of the following:

- strong trends toward decentralization and localism, especially in matter related to social development;
- a push for a reduced welfare state in most Northern countries, and the promotion of self-reliance and self-help based on the assumption that it will counter dependency and foster enterprise;
- a growing involvement of the voluntary sector in both Northern and Third world countries;
- the emergence of new grass roots based social movements and their organizations;
- a change in the composition of local communities, with an increase in cultural diversity as a result of rural-urban migration and major population movements (of immigrants, refugees, and migrant workers) across cultural boundaries.

Campfens adds to the row of new political and cultural phenomena to redirect functions and roles of community development practitioners, the disastrous impact of the structural adjustment policies\(^5\) (SAPs) on the poor Third World nations and the fact that “the rich in the world are getting richer and the poor are becoming poorer”. This, “is not merely a Third World problem; it is also true for the United States, where an ‘underclass’ is developing rapidly,

---

\(^5\) Structural adjustment policies (SAPs) have been used as a condition imposed by the IMF (International Monetary Fund) for the loans to finance Third World countries debts. These SAPs involves cutting off existing subsidies for the poor, reducing the state bureaucracy, raising prices for goods and services while reducing wages for labour, devaluting the currency, etc.
and for all other countries in the North.” The author explains that each of these trends has a major influence in which problems are addresses, the level of intervention and the dynamics of practice.

New actors of community development

The new relations between the state and civil society, originated from the struggles with global restructuring and changing ideologies, brought substantial changes to the nature of community development practitioners. If in the 50’s and 60’s community development was promoted by governments and by the United Nations, through its affiliated institutions, today new actors come into scene, carrying out community development in ways that differ greatly from the approaches of earlier decades. The author stresses:

“One very clear trend is the increasing involvement since the early 1980s of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), or voluntary sector agencies, in a field previously dominated by programs initiated and administered by governments. It is estimated that in the South alone, NGOs number in the hundreds of thousands. Many of these Southern NGOs have links with the thousands of international NGOs, which are based mainly in the member countries of the Organization for Economic Co-operation Development (OECD). In the North, where they have a long history as part of the voluntary sector, NGOs are attracting greater attention; more and more, in response to governments pulling back the ‘safety net’ provided by welfare state programs, people are looking for alternative forms of support.”

---

6 As part of the following: the independence and decolonization movements in Africa and Asia; attempts to modernize the underdeveloped, largely agricultural societies and “backward” regions of the developed countries; and the War on Poverty launched by governments in the more affluent nations of the West in the late 1960s.
He adds that there has been a significant growth in “second generation” NGOs, which emphasize developmental strategies rather than the traditional “charity” and “welfare” activities. Other NGOs that belong to a “third generation” have adopted more catalytic roles, i.e. “in coalition with others, they strive to achieve reforms at the regional and national levels that support people-centred and sustainable development at the local level”. Others focus mainly on educating the public about development issues, or acting as advocates for specific groups. Finally, there are the “forth generation” NGOs, which “align themselves with social movements (e.g. environmental, human rights, and women’s movements) for the purpose of mobilizing a movement around people-centred development vision.”

A second trend refers to the rise of social and co-operative movements, many of which serve as agents of community development. These are movements “that exist to create change, being guided by an ideological agenda that challenges the prevailing practices of those industrial systems of the state and civil society that determine the nature of development and the allocation of resources” They are “often driven by the search for alternatives to the capitalist industrial model. To the state-controlled social programs, and to the centralized, hierarchical, top-down, institutionalized structures of decision-making”.

Such groups may apply alternatives focused on economic benefits, social relations or political dimensions. For example, some initiatives aim at redirecting the economy towards the community and the environment, through the creation of participatory and community-based organizations that empower residents, generate income and job opportunities and finance community infrastructure and social services. Other initiatives are focused on the desire “to create a more co-operative, people-oriented society based on mutual aid as an antidote to the highly individualistic, competitive, and alienating
environment prevalent in the economically developed nations of the West”. Those examples that privilege the political dimension, emphasize, for instance community empowerment or the democratization of development enterprises.

As to the relation between new actors of development and established powers, the author explains:

“Many of the current social and co-operative movements carry traces of past movements and intellectual traditions, and arise in the context of a variety of factors and actors that influence their shape. Furthermore, those movements which seek alternative forms of development enter into an antagonist relationship with those groups which want to maintain control over the instruments of transformation and the ‘productions of social life’ (…) For example, current governments may not be very interested in supporting those alternative models of development which challenges the private sector or empower the population to voice its demands and discontents. Consequently, those struggling for economic survival in a rapidly transforming society may prefer to avoid conflict, opting instead for more collaborative approaches (i.e. partnerships) with business and government.

In the current economic and ideological environment, where debt reduction and limiting the state’s responsibility in social welfare have become priorities in the political agenda, governments may look more favourably on community initiatives that promote alternative forms of development (…) this helps governments to achieve their political agendas but also leaves ‘political space’ for those involved in CED, mutual aid and related activities.”
New priorities

In comparison to past decades, new priorities have also emerged in the field of community development. As Campfens stresses, while poverty alleviation and prevention remains a top priority since the decades of 50 and 60, other issues arise, calling for community and state-levels as well as institutional initiatives. In this way, old and new actors of development are faced with problems and issues such as:

- the devastating threat of AIDS, as well as the drug epidemic, crime and vandalism;
- the heightened awareness of the importance of the environment and its relationship to the quality of life;
- the rise of the interethnic groups tensions and multicultural neighbourhoods. This requires conflict resolution strategies and effective approaches to social integration;
- a shift in community development practice that, besides the traditional emphasis on locality development and functional community work, includes a focus on population groups and “people development”;
- the increased interest in community economic development as an alternative or complementary model to macroeconomic development that addresses both economic and social issues at the local level.

On the nature of community development

As said before, Campfens presents community development as an evolving concept and form of practice. Be it in time or space, it varies immensely in order to fit its environment – local but also regional, national and international, as the author strives to demonstrate. He explains:
“Simply put, CD is a demonstration of the ideas, values and ideals of the society in which it is carried out. From a humanitarian perspective, it may be seen as a search for community, mutual aid, social support, and human liberation in an alienating, oppressive, competitive and individualistic society. In its more pragmatic institutional sense, it may be viewed as a means for mobilizing communities to join state or institutional initiatives that are aimed at alleviating poverty, solving social problems, strengthening families, fostering democracy, and achieving modernization and socio-economic development.”

That is to say that interpretations and approaches (in time and space) add new applications to central values and principles of community development—which certainly exist according to the author. In this regard, it is interesting to note that Campfens understands that the rise of new trends and priorities to the field of community development has lead to a review of the practice and strategic approaches, but not to a significant change of central values and principles of community development:

“(…) we find that the social values and principles that underline CD practice have not changed much since the earlier days of CD7, with perhaps a few notable exceptions (…) Mobilizing and nurturing communities remains a central purpose of CD- albeit with a more discriminating understanding of ‘community’ in terms of social structure and scope. Social integration, leadership, development, local or group initiative-taking, and promotion of a more participatory democracy, continue to be the essence of CD. What has changed in CD is that concern has increase for social justice and human rights. This change has moved CD away from its narrow focus on localities and group

---

7 Which correspond to the decades of 50 and 60.
development and toward the larger socio-political sphere of society.”

**Social values and principles of community development**

Campfens presents the common social values and principles that underline the practice of community development as follows:

- co-operative, responsible and active communities of involved men and women should be nurtured and mobilized for the purpose of mutual-aid, self-help, problem-solving, social integration and/or social action;
- at all levels of society, down to the very lowest, participation must be enhanced, and the ideal of participatory democracy must be fostered, in order to counter the apathy, frustration and resentment that often rise from feelings of powerlessness and oppression in the face of unresponsive power structures;
- as much as possible and feasible, community development should rely on the capacity and initiatives of relevant groups and local communities to identify needs, define problems, and plan and execute appropriate courses of action; in this, the goals are to foster confidence in community leadership, to increase competency and to reduce dependence of the state, institutional and professional interventions;
- community resources (human, technical and financial) and, where necessary, resources from outside the community (in form of partnership with governments, intuitions and professional groups) should be mobilized and deployed in an appropriate manner in order to ensure balanced, sustainable forms of development;
- community integration should be promoted in terms of two sets of relations: “social relations” among diverse groups distinguished by social class or significant differences in economic status, ethnicity, culture, racial identity, religion, gender, age, length of residence, or other such characteristics
that may cause tensions or lead to open conflict; and “structural relations” among those institutions—such as public sector agencies, private sector organizations, not-for-profit or charitable organizations and community organizations and associations—that take care of social challenges at the community level. Regarding the latter, the aim is to avoid unnecessary competition, lack of coordination and duplication of services;

- activities, such as circles of solidarity, should be organized that empower marginal or excluded population groups by linking them with the progressive forces in different social sectors and classes in the search for economic, social and political alternatives;
- those who are marginalized, excluded or oppressed should be given the essential tools that will enable them to critically analyse and become conscious of their situation in structural terms, so that they can envisage possibilities of change.

According to the author, the emphasis accorded to any of these social values and principles depends greatly on whether the practice involves a social movement, a process of change or a concrete program. He also stresses on the different types of sponsorships as conditioning aspects. “These differences in sponsorship and emphasis make it particularly difficult to offer a general definition of CD that includes all possible practice situations.”

Intellectual traditions

In order to stress on the complex and contradictory nature of community development today, Campfens appeals to the analysis of intellectual traditions which underlie its practice and theory. These traditions, according to him, range from those preoccupied with societal guidance through the application of scientific knowledge and technical reason to the more radical intellectual traditions. The firsts would basically correspond to a conservative ideology, “representing
those societal interests and professional disciplines that take existing power relations as given”:

“The supporters of this position proclaim their political neutrality, express predominantly technical concerns, view their primary mission as to serve the state and society’s dominant institutions, and apply their scientific knowledge to the task of reconstructing society through social engineering and centrally directed planning. In other words, in advancing the public interests of the state and major institutions, they place their faith in ‘technical reason’”.

In opposition, one is able find those intellectual disciplines that look to alternative forms of development based on oppositional or counter movements:

“Rather than addressing the concerns of the ruling elite, they focus on the people who, as victims of the existing order and members of the underclass, need to be mobilized. This approach is based on the belief that the underclass is fundamentally opposed to the bureaucratic state, to hierarchical relations, and to other such manifestations of alienating power. They place their faith in political and social processes at the grass root levels and within civil society; in doing so, they reject the strong emphasis on rationality and technology that is embodied in the scientific approach to modernization and scientific planning.”

These two opposing intellectual positions (social guidance and oppositional movements) can be identified in two aspects, which for Campfens are of particular interest for community development: social mobilization and social learning.

As to social mobilization, the author explains that during the 60’s the tradition of social guidance have, together with parallel economic
development doctrines, served as basis for the modernization and industrialization strategies applied by the UN agencies, the international financial institutions, the corporate sector, and the ruling elites of the development nations. It was in this context that community development gained prominence and was called upon to join in national efforts to achieve socio-economic development. Campfens adds:

“Besides state agencies, many institutions and NGOs have launched CD, co-operative, and participatory programs that fall within the tradition of societal guidance and social reform. These institutionalists (to use a generic term) are less likely to question existing power relations in society. Their tendency is to focus on the weakness in organizations that undermine the effectiveness of program delivery (…) The search for participation in government or in institutionally initiated programs is perceived by critics as little more than a loyalty ritual for gaining favours and access to essential goods and services.

However, even those NGO practitioners who acknowledge that co-operation and communalism in the social mobilization tradition are the underpinnings of community development in the South and the North have come to acknowledge that it is the state which ultimately determines how much change will be tolerated as a result of such programs.”

In the other hand, oppositional movements can be distinguished from social reform and societal guidance in that “they assert the primacy of direct collective action from bellow”:

“Their main concerns relate to the moral ordering of human life and to the political practices of social emancipation and human liberation. The oppositional movements share two
things: a political analysis that calls attention to the pervasive alienation of human beings under institutions of capitalism; and a determination to change the established relations of power and to achieve social solidarity.”

However, according to the author, they differ in the strategies they choose. These can be grouped under the following:

“Confrontation politics”
Of which inspiration can be found in Marxist ideas on the social class struggles (albeit in forms less driven by ideology) and in the labour union movement. Corresponds to the most activist forms of community development in the late 60s/early 70s, being often carried out in depressed urban neighbourhoods of Western industrialized countries and responding to increasing demands for a more participatory democracy and equitable sharing of opportunities and goods offered by society. Despite of Marxist influence, those initiatives did not aim at fundamentally transforming society (i.e. capitalism) but at “getting a better deal for those living in its margins.” According to Campfens, the same happens with strategies adopted by more recent oppositional movements.

“Politics of disengagement”
Of which inspiration can be found in the Utopians from the XIX century. Rejecting the state as the main vehicle through which to order civil society, and believing in the recreation of “alternatives communities” that would demonstrate more human ways of living based on voluntarism, Utopians laid the foundations for socialism, social reform, trade unionism and co-operativist movement- also inspiring the community movement. In the XIX and XX centuries this lead to the creation of communes and “intentional communities”, such as the Amish religion communities, hippie communes and the modern Israeli kibbutzim.
“Politics of free association and mutual aid”
Of which inspiration can be found in the writings of social anarchists, who strongly rejected all forms of authority (especially of the state) and believed in seeking social reform through grass root mobilization and peaceful means, as well as in creating of alternative, self-governing communities based on the principle of mutual aid and self-help. Many of the modern mutual-aid associations, co-operatives and communitarian movements find their intellectual root in the social anarchists. “Within this tradition, operative principles of voluntary associations include the following: co-operation, mutual aid and exchange, direct participatory democracy, the practice of consensus in decision-making and the formation of a federative structure. The federative principle assumes the need for local action groups to form coalitions to facilitate leadership training and to acquire technical, material, and financial resources. Coalitions also help local groups pursue common objectives in the larger society. The special appeal of communitarianism in an alienating modern society lies in its potential to liberate individuals from oppression so that they can recover their essential humanity and practice political community in free association with others.”

In regard to social learning, the author explains that its practice has contributed greatly to the professional practice of community development. According to theorists, social learning comprises a knowledge derived from experience and validated in practice. It is a complex process that involves the action itself; a political strategy (which includes tactics aimed at overcoming resistance and drawn on a theory of practice that will guide the actor’s conduct in specific roles); theories of reality that assist us in understanding the world (which includes theory of history and theory of the specific situation the social learner is engaged in); and values that inspire and direct action8.

8 Together, these four elements form the “social practice”.

Campfens explains that the early social learning tradition (dating back to the 40’s) had in the “experts”, i.e. trained technicians, the principal actors in resolving the contradictions and problems in society, “since they were especially equipped to undertake and inquiry to the facts (following scientific principles) and arrive at the ‘true’ answer to the problems at hand.” In the late 40’s, new experiments in the field of group dynamics in the USA drove the role of “experts” from “experts in problem solving” to “change agents”, whose responsibility became to act as an enabler, guide or trainer with relevant groups. Target groups’ individuals were called upon becoming both actors and learners in changing reality. Applied in the field of community development in the 50’s, this approach became highly influential in the training of community workers around the world. Professional “experts” were viewed as “guides” (i.e. one who helps the community more effectively in the direction it chooses) or “enables” (i.e. a person who facilitates the development process). These last would have roles such as: awakening and focusing discontent among people at the community level about economic and social conditions; encouraging associations and organizations to assume responsibility for action; nourishing good interpersonal relations; and emphasizing common objectives. Such view on professional roles was later complemented by insights originated from more revolutionary settings, such as the grass root movements in the Third World and feminist practice, driving concerns towards the different forms of oppression in society. With this, “the notion of awakening and focusing discontent has become a central feature of practice with social movements.”

In addition, during the 70’s, Paulo Freire’s work on popular education and his ideas on oppression and conscientization brought a revolution to social practice. In contrast to the focus on what social actors will “do” in order to bring about change, conscientization practice concerns what participants will “be”. Critical consciousness implies a search for knowledge: a critical reflection of reality which
is followed by action that “carries an ideological option up to and including the transformation of one’s world.” This laid the foundation for the “pedagogy of liberation”, which assumes that alienation and isolation generate a state of dependency and domination by the established powers. “It involves a process of desmasking, through action and reflection, the oppressive condition of institutional practice, and acquiring the capacity for conscious and creative intervention.” According to Campfens, when popular education principles are applied in community development, they call for a new concept of professional practice: the practitioner does not assume a top-down, authoritarian position, instead, a horizontal one, that involves dialogue and mutual learning. Community groups are not regarded as recipients of pedagogical or social labour; they become the very subject (actor) of education and collective organizational expression.9

Finally, the author stresses on a “reconstruction” that characterizes the image of the contemporary “development expert” today:

“Proponents of participatory action research, popular education, and liberation theology, have contributed to the deconstruction of the ‘development expert’. Their critique has gone beyond arguing in favour of the adoption of small-scale appropriate technology in development projects; warning against the danger of the community becoming dependent on outside or foreign experts; and recognizing the

---

9 Sharing many principles with popular education, the Liberation Theology also brought contributions to social learning, in ideals such as: if the is to be effective action, the poor and oppressed must be listened and the world must be seen through their eyes; knowledge of the truth and awareness of conditions is not sufficient to acquire a new vision, material and immaterial conditions must be created in order to enable the truth and arrive at truth; the poor must be treated as actors of their own transformation instead of object of charity; priority in development and liberation should be given to the poor (people), rather than to science and technology.
need for human or community capacity-building and empowerment.

Their fundamental concern is with the pre-eminence of Western science and technical reason, and with the present reliance on the modernist framework in defining development. Post modern feminists, in addition to the above, are concerned about the patriarchal character of the knowledge produced about women and their needs. They join other critics by calling for a ‘development expert’ who can be open and listen thoughtfully to others; and who can cut loose from the universalizing theories, conceptual frameworks, and rational discourses on basic needs to allow different voices and experiences to be heard; and who will design policies and practices based on the concrete, spatial, environmental, and cultural contexts in which people live.”

**Context matters**

Campfens also departs from the premise that community development practice needs to be placed in a national and international context that acknowledges the following:

- new forces at work at the global level;
- the vast differences in political systems and policy practices of governments;
- differing economic conditions and social inequalities;
- the social and ethno-cultural composition of different populations;
- differences in relations between the state and civil society.

Such discrepancies make clear that - although it may be relevant to search for common strategic approaches to local development or for a general methodology of intervention - there cannot be a universal formula for community development. Thus, results of such a search
are only valuable provided they are “applied thoughtfully and take into account numerous differences in the political, economic, social and cultural context.” Campfens exemplifies these differences in context and the consequent difference in the own definition development takes in practice:

“For example, in Bangladesh, which has a traditional rural society rooted in Islam, the central question is how to deal humanely with massive poverty and with a rapidly expanding population that is fast approaching its ecological limits. In Israel, one of the main questions of community development is how to integrate the large numbers of Jewish immigrants- who come from a variety of countries and differ greatly in socio-cultural background- into a modern, prosperous society that is an active welfare state. Also of central importance there is how to maintain political and social stability in a heterogeneous society (...) In the Netherlands some of the main factors at play in community development are the existence of an advanced welfare state, and highly individualistic and consumer-oriented lifestyle now enjoyed by a growing majority. Some people perceive these factors as contributing to a loss of community and undermining the long-standing tradition of mutual aid at the interpersonal level that once extended beyond the immediate family and close friends."

Placed in a broader framework of development, such discrepancies generate what the author considers the main contrasts in national/regional contexts, which come to characterize and define the practice of community development today. These contrasts are listed as:

10 More recently, it is also possible to see other issues rising in the country that certainly play a role in development policies and practice, such as the integration of immigrants, increasing poverty (specially among immigrants), and political asylum.
**North-South/ rich-poor**

Refers to the discrepancies between the (rich) countries of the North and the (poor) countries of the South, particularly regarding per capita GNP and human development measurements. With this, issues such as the magnitude of poverty, population growth, the lack of resources, lack of major economic problems, among many others, come to set the policy priorities of national governments and determine local community development practices.

**Urban/rural**

Refers to the proportion of the population that resides in urban centres as opposed to rural areas. This generates tendencies such as the focus on issues related more to ensuring equitable access to public services and power, and to promoting client and citizen participation in urban settings (with community workers focusing on depriving neighbourhoods and groups); and the focus of traditional state-administered programs of community development on promoting community self-help and self-reliance as part of a general plan for rural development. Campfens explains that, with a strong trend toward rural-urban migration in many countries, community development is now taking on greater significance and dealing with other problems besides poverty. Nevertheless, the author also believes that the differences in rural and urban community development are less pronounced than they were twenty years ago, with rural community development moving away from a locality-focused toward a more integrated regional approach that emphasizes target groups.

**Ethno-cultural and religious heterogeneity/ homogeneity**

This set priorities such as promoting integration of immigrants, fostering civic culture and positive social relations between groups, conflict resolution, among others, in heterogeneous societies.

**Decentralization/ centralization**
In direct opposition to centralization (top-down), decentralization (bottom-up) generates local initiatives and the participation of local authorities, NGOs, business sector, grass root organizations, etc. With this, there is a higher level of community spirit and social capital. According to Campfens, decentralization has revived the locality development model, with diverse actors (including the state) being drawn into new horizontal and co-operative partnership arrangements. In contrast, centralization tends to hinder voluntarism, an active civil society and grass root initiatives and control.

**Current approaches to community development**

According to the author, the changes in the macro-context, and the differences between countries in structure, trends and priorities, have given rise to a great diversity of approaches to community development and of organizing, planning and development practices among community workers. Current approaches to community development accompany important trends, which Campfens highlights as:

- in contrast to the past, when the state (through national, provincial or municipal agencies; or society’s major institutions) was the one to initiate the action and then sought community participation in the tradition of “societal guidance”, today action is initiated by different category of actors: the NGOs (representing the ideology of voluntarism); autonomous grass root groups (following the tradition of “oppositional movements”) and collectives. “The most widespread of the newer practices involves organizations whose members are linked in horizontal rather than vertical relationships. This trend reflects how the ideology-driven policy agendas of governments have led to a major restructuring of relations between the state and civil society, and to new expectations that the needs of
communities and groups must be met by sectors other than the state.”

- today, targets of community action and organizing strategies correspond to a broad range of “publics”, from population groups (e.g. single parent-women, youth, families, elderly, ethno-cultural minorities, etc.) and rural/urban communities to the public at large. This shows that “community development practice is moving away from a singular preoccupation with the local community, and toward a strategy that incorporates multiple targets. This is particularly true of programs that aim at poverty alleviation or social integration. In some instances, however, the ‘community as a locality’ is the proper target for development initiatives…”

The author also presents a typology of approaches to community development. He stresses that this should not be equated to “models”, instead, it focuses only on the “dominant” concept apparent in each of the approaches taken in practice. This typology includes:

- the *continuum* concept of community development, which aims at achieving human development through group, community and international development. This includes the advancement of human rights;
- the *group* or *co-operative* concept, which is aimed at individual, social and economic development in the tradition of mutual aid, social support, and social action;
- the territorially bounded *locality* concept, which views the local community as a physical, economic, social and politic unit in its own right. Here, the concern is with the quality of life and the optimum involvement and participation of individuals and organizational members in community affairs;
- the *structural-functional* concept, in which community development forms part of a larger policy framework that focuses on the various partners in development— that is, state, agencies, institutions, NGOs, the voluntary sector, the business sector, and the target group or community as presumed beneficiary;
- the *categorical* concept, in which community development forms part of a larger policy framework that aims to alleviate or prevent social problems (e.g. poverty) that disproportionately affects certain groups or communities which have found themselves economically, socially or politically excluded from the benefits, resources or opportunities offered by society;
- the *self-management* concept, in which community development takes a bottom-up, empowering approach to the development of communities or groups;
- the *social learning or educational* concept of community development, which brings together professional experts, with their “universal knowledge” and the local residents, with their “popular knowledge” and “lived experience”;
- the *intergroup* concept of community development, which focuses on mutual understanding, conflict resolution and social integration.

**Common themes in the field of community development**

The raise of social movements leading development practices, as well as innovative public and institutional policies have brought up some emerging themes in the field of community development. According to Campfens, they can be presented as:

*A proactive policy on nurturing associative communities*  
Due to strong ideological forcers at work (speared by the neoconservative position), there is a trend of endowing the voluntary sector and local communities with the responsibility for the care and
support people in need, with a minimal role of the state. According to the author, these forces are trying to recover certain traditional values including mutual aid, self-help and self-reliance, social through informal networks and civic solidarity, and self-determination. He adds: “however it is not sufficient rationale for states to remove themselves from the sphere of social welfare and social development, especially in an age of profound economic and social transformation. To counter the modern forces of individualism, secularization, materialism, and anomie, there must more than ever be proactive policies that nurture communities through association, local community building, and social integration. To suggest that one can revert to the solidarity and mutual aid traditions of the extended family, village, parish and neighbourhood, ignores the fact that these traditions has deep cultural and religious roots that are disappearing rapidly in the developed nations of the North and even in the Third World, where structural adjustments are taking place.”

**Self-reliance and the role of the state**

Due to neoliberal forces (as a reinforcement of neo-conservatism) and the demands involved in the establishment of free markets, which also reject the notion that state should embody the value of mutual solidarity (through which wealth is redistributed through income assistance and social services), there is a pressure to push social welfare and social development towards local communities, social organizations and the philanthropic sector, i.e. away form the business sector and the state. The author emphasizes however, that cases related to this trend have shown that without appropriate social policies and substantial assistance from the state, popular organizations and other actors were not able to rise above poverty and address quality of life issues.
People development focus
People development focus has gained momentum in recent years. This focus “acknowledges that the classical ‘locality development’ and ‘communitywide participation’ models of community development have a limited capacity to address the personal needs of the more vulnerable or excluded members of society. These people and supportive institutions are becoming aware that in order to advance their own welfare and to protect their own interests, beliefs, and lifestyles in a social and cultural environment that is becoming increasingly diverse, they must come together as groups and form relations with the larger society through circles of solidarity.”

According to Campfens, the people development model in community development departs from the locality development model in two essential ways. First, in development activities, concerns itself as much with individuals as with the community, relying on group development, leadership training, popular education and consciousness-raising. Secondly, “community” is sought and strengthened in places provided for conviviality- co-operatives, grass root organizations, circles of solidarity, as well as in committed relationships in which the participants share common interests (which frequently are extended beyond the locality, in issues that involve social justice or economic fairness, for example).

Program integration (multidimensionality) and organizational partnerships
Refers to state and institutional initiatives in search of greater program integration and new organizational partnerships involving the community and voluntary sector. Such initiatives, in practice, are a response to a number of social forces pursuing very different agendas. According to Campfens, these initiatives must face some challenges. First, they must be able to overcome the nineteenth-century view that the state and its bureaucracy, the civic and voluntary sectors, the business sector, and the community are separate entities; once in such a scheme of things, the various players pursue their respective interests at cross-purposes to each other, with
the community as a loser. An addition challenge is to overcome the boundaries erected during this century through the process of specialization among the disciplines and professions. Finally, he stresses that such approaches may be more realistic in the Western countries, with their liberal democracies and strong traditions of voluntarism and community activism. “They would be more difficult to follow where a centralized state system is entrenched, to the detriment of people’s lives at the community level; and where strong traditions of religion, paternalism, and patronage resist any change that is perceived as undermining the established order.”

**Popular and community participation**

“Participation is the sine qua non of community development. Without it, policies and programs that aim at people development, poverty alleviation, local development, community health, and social integration of the marginalized and excluded are likely to meet with little success.” Campfens calls attention for a series of aspects involved in community and popular participation today. Among them, it is possible to find:

- development programs that see popular participation mainly as cost-saving devices are bound to fail unless other benefits, which are perceived as benefits by community participants, are aimed for and incorporated into participatory program planning. On the list of “real” benefits are increasing spending power, new or better services and facilities, acquisition of technology, etc. At the more intangible level, participants must feel empowered through their involvement in decision-making, and their increased awareness and exercise of their rights and responsibilities, as well as through skills learning, group solidarity, and community or group self-management;

- the degree to which popular participation can be actively promoted among disadvantaged and excluded groups, especially as a strategy for socio-political and cultural
development (i.e. not simply economic development), will vary depending on the government in power, the nature of democracy and cultural traditions.

- for participation to be effective as a central value of community development, a number of additional factors must be in play: an open and democratic environment, reform in public administration, democratization of professional experts and officials, formation of self-managing organizations, training for community activism and leadership, involvement of NGOs, creation of collective decision-making structures at various levels that extend from the micro to the meso and macro levels and link participatory activities with policy frameworks.

The social justice agenda and Human Rights
While in the past social justice issues were pursued mainly through social activism strategies -separate from any locality development agenda -today community development practices incorporate a strategy that views disadvantaged in terms of class differentiation, and of differences based on gender, race, ethnicity, religion, age grouping or sexual orientation. According to Campfens, such an analysis has resulted in a more “group development” focused form of practice, which is usually initiated at the local level and eventually extends to the regional, national, and sometimes international levels through participation in such social movements as human and civil rights, feminism, ecology, and so on. Such initiatives are often supported by NGOs\(^\text{11}\) in their role as educationors and advocates. Campfens also stresses on the contrasts between the practice of

\(^{11}\) The author adds that it is questionable whether NGOs that are dependent on external funding can promote large-scale organized action from the grass roots level. “NGOs, especially international NGOs active in development work, will be tolerated as long as they are not perceived as a threat to vested interest groups.”
social justice in poor and rich countries in view of the dominant global economic model- and its demands:

“The social justice agenda is related to the international debate about individual rights versus collective rights, principally of the poor. Western developed nations, with their liberal cultures, have tended to emphasize the civic and political rights of the individual, which are enshrined in the UN Charter and viewed as synonymous with democracy; advocates of the poor in the Third World countries place greater emphasis on the enforcement of socio-economic rights, which are also backed up by international treaties. Yet NGOs active in international co-operation charge that the IMF ignores these socio-economic rights when it imposes structural adjustment programs (SAPs), which cut food subsidies, health, and education at a severe cost to the poor. The North’s penchant for equating SAPs with democracy and human rights is even more insulting in cases where Southern governments clamp down on dissent in order to force people into new economic straightjackets.”

Finally, the author reminds that the issue of socio-economic rights are also gaining increased attention as well from human rights activists and community workers in developed Northern countries as more and more people find themselves excluded economically, socially and politically as a result of economic restructuring, a shrink welfare state and a hardening position of the public vis-à-vis welfare recipients, refugees, immigrants and migrant workers.

Global networking and the emergence of a “worldwide civil society”
There is an increasing deep concern worldwide on the globalization of forces that undermine mutually and solidarity among people at all levels (in their natural habitat, work places, in their activities as citizens, etc). “To counter such forces and prepare adequately for practice in the twenty-first century, CD [community development]
practitioners must adopt global networking strategies and techniques in their professional activities to strike new partnerships in international social development and link the local with the global, and the global with the local.” Such new action strategies would include the lining of grass roots organizations, NGOs, human rights activists and development workers in both rich and poor countries-through the use of internet, facsimile, teleconferencing, and other electronic devices, in addition to the traditional face-to-face working groups. The challenge for community development in the new century is, thus, to forge circles of mutuality and solidarity around the globe that will lead to the emergence of an active “worldwide civil society” and reinforce development and human rights work done at the local, regional and national levels.

A framework outline

As a conclusion of his work, Campfens presents a framework outline, which summarizes much of the state of the arts in community development today. Such summary presented next.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“FRAMEWORK THEORY” OUTLINE FOR POLICY DEVELOPMENT, PROGRAM PLANNING AND CD PRACTICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Contextual factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The move from East-West ideological rivalry to a new reality of North-South and domestic inequalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The rise of international capitalism, speculative money markets, and multinational corporations; and heightened competition for export markets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The dominant role of UN-affiliated institutions (such as IMF, the World Bank, and the WTO) in shaping global economic realities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Breakthrough in communications technology: facsimile transmission, the internet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• An increase in social turbulence, human rights abuses, and mass movements: refugees, migrant workers, immigrants.
• Population growth, primarily in the Third World.

2. National and Regional Characteristics
• Urban or rural; rural-urban migrations; urban issues.
• Ethno-cultural/religious homogeneity or heterogeneity.
• State of the economy: underdeveloped or developed (welfare state).
• Relations between state and civil society.
• Democratic environment: multi-party, single-party, dictatorial.
• Centralization or decentralization with emphasis on local initiatives and control.
• Population groups excluded from economic, social and political life.

II. Emerging themes in CD practice
• Nurturing associative communities and mobilizing circles of solidarity.
• Self-reliance, and the role of NGOs and the state.
• The people-development focus.
• The groups and organizational expressions of popular and community participation.
• The social justice agenda and human rights.
• Global networking and a worldwide civil society.

III. Approaches to CD
• The ‘continuum’ approach to practice extending from the micro to the meso and macro levels, including global networking.
• ‘Group’ or ‘co-operative’ development for mutual aid and social action.
• ‘Locality’ development, concerned with the quality of life in terms of community economic development, and with the
liveability of the physical and neighbourhood environment, and so on.

- ‘Structural-functional’ community work, working toward the development of relevant policy frameworks, and focusing on organizational structures, partnerships, and program integration.
- ‘Categorical’ focused CD, aimed at emancipation and self-reliance and at the alleviation and prevention of social problems; targeting particularly the economically, socially, and politically excluded and marginal population groups.
- The formation of ‘self-managing’ empowering organizations of the poor and excluded.
- The ‘intergroup’ social integration approach relying on mutual understanding and conflict resolution measures.
CHAPTER 1

The relations between museology and community development: society changes, museology changes.

Much has been written about the critical atmosphere experienced in the 60’s, when struggles for social justice, civil rights, individual freedom, world peace and democracy set a tune of change in society. Episodes such as the students mobilizations in Europe (which have in the May of 68 its celebrated climax), the hippie movement in USA, the voices against dictatorships in Latin America and countries from the Iberian Peninsula; and names such as Nelson Mandela and Martin Luther King, among others, marked a decade of non-conformism and became to cast new social goals worldwide.

It is not by chance that the 60s also brought radical changes to the field of museology as a whole. From the reassessment of purpose and relevance of museology for society to the re-evaluation of effectiveness of the classic museum functions, transformations were profuse in “the traditionally stable and conservative museum world.12” (VARINE, 1996a)

As Hugues de Varine, Peter Davis (1999) reminds that, although the elitist attitude of museums continued into and beyond the 1960s, the changes in society claimed a response from the museological field:

“Museums had, of course, constantly changed the ways in which they worked, and the advances that were made in conservation, interpretation and education in the latter years of the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth

12 “(…) it was not abnormal that, even in the traditionally stable and conservative museum world, a number of original minds would look for solutions outside of the established standards.” (DE VARINE, 1996a)
century (…) are undeniable. However, it is the extent of self-criticism and the considerable speed of change which is immediately identifiable during and following the 1960s.” (DAVIS, 1999)

Societal struggles, being them of social, economic, political, cultural or environmental character, brought up relevant questions to the field and influenced the course museology would follow from then on. According to Maria Celia Santos (2002) many forces in the 60’s contributed to this new shaping. As examples, she mentions the work of ecologists, the demands for the return of stolen or expatriated cultural properties to former colonial countries, and the claims of socialist groups regarding the access to monuments and museum collections until then reserved to a small share of the population. In this context, Maria Celia also identifies in the challenges against established institutions – which included critical assessments of the established powers- and in the review and consequent expansion of the concept of heritage the basis for the following developments in museology.

Still according to the author, ongoing changes through the 70’s led to the development of progressive proposals in the fields of education and research, which had a significant influence in the world of museology. Aiming the promotion of a “social and popular consciousness” -what can be considered as both requirement and soul of the pursued articulation of non-dominant sectors in society- the ideas of popular education (very much based on the theories of Paulo Freire) and participant investigation grew specially in countries of the Third World, although reaching developed countries within a considerable amplitude. They put on focus the role of non-specialists in decision-making processes, the importance in allying investigation and action, as well as the commitment of researchers and specialists to social groups.
In 1992, Peter van Mensch contemplated under the image of the second museum revolution\textsuperscript{13} features of the transformations taken place in museology since the 60s and 70s. According to him, the second museum revolution period (1960/1980) corresponds to the crescent recognition of the social role of museums and their responsibilities towards society, as well as the raise of a political drive in the field. The “revolution” is also connected to the emergence of a philosophical-critical approach in museology, concentrated on the development of a critical social orientation, which encompassed the museum work, museum profession and museological theory. In the core of this new approach, he identifies three main schools of thought: marxist-leninist museology, new museology, and critical museology.

The marxist-leninist museology\textsuperscript{14} advocates the ideological character of museums and the role of museology in helping them in the accomplishment of the socialist project. While the marxist-leninist museology is “a very normative approach, where axiological norms are applied leading to a rather strict system of rules”, the new museology and critical museology “advocate an attitude rather than the application of rules (…) theorization should have the role of questioning, more than defining the frame for a systematic and systematizing work” (MENSCH, 1992).

Sharing a strong political drive with the marxist-leninist museology, the new museology\textsuperscript{15} advocates an essential commitment to people rather than to objects or the traditional museum functions.

\textsuperscript{13} The author justifies that the term revolution is used to emphasize the radical changes that took place in the field of museology in a rather short period of time (MENSCH. 1992)

\textsuperscript{14} Represented by authors from former socialist countries and seen by many as a reaction against a bourgeois museology. As P. van Mensch stresses, “at the moment when the political changes in Europe were settled, most militants supporters of a marxist-leninist museology were already retired or dead.”

\textsuperscript{15} Referring to the French concept of “muséologie nouvelle”.

Community development (in the different possible contexts it might take place) and the principle of community participation in decision-making processes lie in the centre of the concerns in the new museology.

The critical museology\(^{16}\), by its turn, advocates a change in attitude focused mainly on the museum’s work and its functions. This, according to Peter van Mensch, encompasses approaches such as the critical museum (i.e. one that raises questions about myths, the national past and directions for the future); the critical restoration; critical curatorship (which starts by engaging non-specialist audiences in order to cope with issues of representation and others); and, more recently, critical evaluation.

The convergences and divergences among the examples above offer a good sight of the various facets of the second museum revolution. If, in one hand, such plurality can be regarded as an evidence of effective change in the field and attempt to adapt museums and museology to societal dynamics; in the other hand it reveals that, although one can summarize the face of change (by relating it to the raise of social and political awareness), the same is not possible for the wide-range of implied intentions, meanings, forms and methods that have permeated the professional action and the construction of the theoretical thinking through and since this period.

That is to say that various directions shared the crescent efforts in driving museums and museology towards the fulfilment of their social and political responsibilities. Together with approaches focused on audience development, enhancement of education and communication functions of the museum, or aiming more democratic representations in exhibitions, issues concerning community

\(^{16}\) According to P. van Mensch, the term “critical” has been adopted in different initiatives in the Netherlands, UK, USA, along the 80’s and 90’s.
development came to occupy an important position in the agenda of museology.

Starting effectively in the late 60’s, the attempts to bring museology closer to the field of development and respond to its demands in the theoretical and practical dimensions have followed a continuous path until the present days. Today, one could say, community development represents a central issue of museology in different countries around the world\textsuperscript{17}. Its relevancy to the international scene of museology as a whole has grown and tends to grow even more in the future.

However, in regard to the period of the second museum revolution - and until the early 90’s, what can be visualized through evidences such as the theoretical production, actual initiatives and discussions in the field is a concentration of concrete proposals concerning the dialectics museology/community development likely restricted to the sphere of the new museology\textsuperscript{18}.

\textsuperscript{17} For instance: Portugal, Canada, United States and Australia.
\textsuperscript{18} Understood as a school of though. At this point, it may be important to introduce a small difference between new museology as idea and new museology as movement. The movement of the new museology, which will be discussed later on this chapter, dates from the 80s and can be regarded as the result of aspirations, ideas and experiments developed since the late 60’s. Having as backbone an essential commitment to people and their communities, those aspirations, ideas and experiments – starting in the late 60s and arriving to the present days- constitute the matter of the new museology as a school of thought (MENSH, 1992). Hugues de Varine is clear in tracing back to the 60s the beginning of the new museology’s ‘long evolution’ in the article “Ecomuseum or community museum?” (1996). He includes in this evolution a number of examples that encompasses the work of the neighbourhood museum, the formulation of the integral museum concept and the first experiments of ecomuseums, as well as the development of exhibition language and the ecological and educational approaches in the field of museology, among others.
Such statement obviously does not exclude from the broader field of museology a raising awareness on the political role of museums or their obligation to contribute to the improvement of their public’s life. The outcomes of the General Assemblies of ICOM (International Council of Museums) attest that the image of museums as institutions in the service of society was largely debated, representing an important issue:

“They [the new aspects of change] surface first at the ninth meeting in Munich in August 1968. The first resolution agreed by this meeting was that ‘museums be recognized as major institutions in the service of development’, because of the contribution they can make to cultural, social and economic life. The tenth meeting (Grenoble, 1971) urged museums to ‘undertake a continuous and complete assessment of the needs of the public which they serve’ and ‘evolve methods of action which will in future more firmly establish their educational and cultural roles in the service of mankind.” (DAVIS, 1999)

About the meeting of 1971, Hugues de Varine (1996) clarifies that the attentions came to concentrate more in the contribution of museums to the study and protection of the environment. He also stresses that this ICOM conference helped to mobilize the innovators among the museum profession around the world, raising many controversial ideas.

Controversy seems to be, indeed, a recurrent word in the debates on the role of museology as a resource for community development during this period. As seen until now, the subject was present and discussed in the international scene, reaching the point that, in 1972, the Declaration of Santiago clearly stated that co-operation with different sectors of society in the promotion of development should be a primal aim of museology. For that, the Declaration proposed the
implementation of an integral approach in regional and local museums, which will be discussed later in the chapter.

What is important to consider about this matter is that, despite of the fact that the Round Table of Santiago counted with institutional support from ICOM, its outcomes- particularly in relation to political aspects of the Declaration- didn’t have the same impact for the committee as they did for a small group of museologists who credited to community development related subjects a completely different emphasis. Those professionals, of whom some were members of ICOM\textsuperscript{19}, can be associated in their majority –if not in their totality- with the new museology school of thought.

This way, taking into account this and other evidences, it is possible to affirm that the path which followed the emergence of the notion that museology could and should work for community development in the 60’s was gradually directed to the new museology’s practice and discourse.

In time, a crescent dichotomy between the “new” and the “traditional” museology took shape as new museologists firmed their political positioning against what they accused of being an impermeable and monolithic museological environment\textsuperscript{20}. In fact, in the course of all the transformations that were happening, many museums and museologists came to opt for inertia, while others assumed the need of promoting changes within different levels and amplitude- including those who integrated the “traditional” field of museology. An impermeable and monolithic museological environment was, obviously, a qualification to be regarded through the point of view of the new museology. And, in

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{19} Including Hugues de Varine, who was the General Secretary of ICOM from 1965 to 1974 (year when he left the organization).
\textsuperscript{20} See “The ‘bloom’ of the new museology movement” on page 67.
\end{flushleft}
such case, the field of museology showed to be, indeed, rather impermeable to the speed and dimension of the changes proposed by those related to the new museology school of thought.

Considering the dichotomy between the “two museologies”, it might not be precipitated to affirm that, in the referred period, the work with community development was taken by many as synonym of a radical political positioning; namely, a socialist approach to museology\textsuperscript{21}. The same way, it does not seem incorrect to conclude that such situation consequently contributed to the confinement of community development related issues inside the limits of new museology.

Another important aspect that characterizes the nature of the dialects museology/community development until the early 90’s refers to its growing distance from traditional and established museums. As can be traced in proposals from the 60’s and 70’s (e.g. VARINE, 1969; Declaration of Santiago, 1972), the mutation of existent regional and local museums into development agents constituted the alternative for reaching the rising goals on community development. This would be possible by shifting their main focus from the collections to the community, moving their subject matter based on academic disciplines to an interdisciplinary view of community’s life and, in some cases, by promoting community participation in different levels of the museums’ work. However, what reveals to be far more numerous –and represent nearly all of the concrete implementations related to this subject - is the creation of new museums, in fact museums of new type, such as the neighbourhood museum and the ecomuseum. It is also possible to include in this spectrum the development of proposals that did not foresee the creation or use of museums.

\textsuperscript{21} As reminded by Hugues de Varine during a conversation in November 2002.
Although this thesis does not intend to contemplate in depth the reasons why the work with community development moved far from traditional museums, at least two causes for that can be pointed out. The first one is related to the actual difficulties in implementing changes in the “traditional” field of museology and traditional museums, as discussed before. The second reason relies on the limitation of traditional museums in responding to the ambitions concerning the work of museology as an instrument for community development in the way they were being proposed, in special by new museologists. This issue will be subject of discussion later on chapter 3, when the body of ideas that constitute the image of museology as a resource for community development will be addressed and appreciated.

After presenting a general overview of the changes taken place in museology since the late 60’s and how community development can be placed in such context, the next sections of this chapter are dedicated to a brief introduction to some cases which played a decisive role in moulding the concept of museology as a resource for community development. They will serve as sources for the following analysis of the contents and characteristics of such concept in Chapter 3. The cases’ presentation also aims to provide a more detailed view of the societal changes, struggles and aspirations that directed the minds of museologists towards the work with community development in the period between the late 60’s and early 90’s.

**The neighbourhood museum**

The first concepts of the neighbourhood museum came to life in the Smithsonian Institution (USA) during the late 60’s. The impetus for the creation of the neighbourhood museum could be regarded as the result of a general concern of professionals and government on the effectiveness of traditional museums in direct their educational services to the public. Added to this, the critical
atmosphere from the mid-sixties and the social pressure for civil rights of the ethnic minorities in USA, which associated traditional museums to discrimination against significant portions of the population, played an important role in driving authorities’ attention to ethic issues:

“John Kinard […], the founding director [of the Anacostia Neighbourhood Museum], summarized the charges against established museums: “[…] they stand accused on three points: 1) failing to respond to the needs of the great majority of the people; 2) failing to relate knowledge of the past to the grave issues confronting us today or to participate in meeting those issues; and 3) failing to overcome not only their blatant disregard of minority cultures but their outright racism which is all too apparent in what they collect, study, and exhibit and in whom they employ.” (HAUENSCHILD, 1998)

As an answer to the claims for museums’ social and political responsibilities, the Smithsonian Institution decided to implement an experimental small satellite museum in a low-income urban setting (MARSH, 1968). According to Hauenschild (1998), the purpose of such enterprise was originally to test an outreach concept, in which the new museum “was intended to mediate between the traditional, established Smithsonian museums and the African-American public they did not reach. That is, it was supposed to help break down barriers to access and create interest in visiting the large museums located a few miles away. By functioning as an outpost, so to speak, of the Smithsonian in a marginal urban community, the museums and exhibits of the large Smithsonian museums were to be brought nearer to people (…)”. This way, a new type of museum was to be founded and work as a bridge between a deprived community and the cultural resources located in the downtown area of Washington D.C. Against lack of consensus among museum professionals, including those from
Smithsonian, the planners of the neighbourhood museum searched, since the beginning, for public involvement in the shaping of the new institution.

Nevertheless, the development of the neighbourhood museum into an agent of social change has to be credited to the work of the first and experimental neighbourhood museum: the Anacostia Neighbourhood Museum.

Following the first contacts of Smithsonian with representatives of different social groups and organizations, community leaders from the Anacostia neighbourhood – a rather isolated area from Washington and its white neighbourhoods, composed mostly by African-American descendents and suffering from well known “urban diseases” such as lack of essential public facilities and inappropriate housing; crime, drug abuse and unemployment - approached the institution and expressed their interest in being the site for the experimental museum. After the choice for Anacostia was made, an intensive planning took place with active participation of the community. Finally, in September 1967, the Anacostia Neighbourhood museum was opened in an old movie theatre.

As said before, in short time the Anacostia Museum extrapolated the first conceptions held by Smithsonian and proposed to move beyond, towards a meaningful role within the neighbourhood revitalization. According to Hauenschild, this shift was possible due to the strong leadership of the museum’s director, John Kinard, an African-American social worker.

Actually, it is possible to trace the difference in approaches through the speeches of Caryl Marsh, Smithsonian’s consultant for planning and development of the Anacostia Museum, and John Kinard. Caryl Marsh described, in 1968, the Anacostia as an educational agent essentially. In order to exercise such educational vocation in an effective way, the museum should dip into community’s participation as the backbone of the new institution. From the first
arrangements for the establishment of the museum to the planning and participation in daily activities (exhibits, educational programming, etc), the public engagement was to be encouraged. The museum should come close to the visitors, make them feel part of it and fit in their reality, having always in mind that “the neighbourhood museum was not to be a substitute for use of the city’s cultural resources, but rather a bridge to encourage greater use of them” (my underline).

Although stressing many of the Smithsonian’s proposals in forms and ways, a different meaning for the museum can be pointed out in the articles of John Kinard. Serving as main references for the later discussions on the neighbourhood museum’s role as an agent for community development, they offer a resume of the ideas behind this period of the Anacostia, when the concept of the museum as a “catalyst for social change” (KINARD, 1985) was developed from the daily work of the institution and its participants.

Understood as a tool in service of development, the neighbourhood museum was conceived as a cultural institution intimately committed to the area in which it was located and the life of its residents. In order to “satisfy the broader needs of (...) culturally impoverished communities” (KINARD, 1985; my underline), its responsibilities had to go further in meeting various dimensions of urban life, being them social, economic or cultural, as regarded below:

“While the problems of the people may vary from neighbourhood to neighbourhood, city to city, nation to

---

22 Such period lasted from the late 60’s until approximately the late 70’s/ early 80’s. After this time, the original aims of the institution moved from “an instrument effecting social changes to a cultural stimulus” (HAUENSCHILD, 1998). The reason for such change are not all clear, some refer to the museum’s minimal contribution in solving urban problems; others to the limitations of applied methods or to the crescent hardening (institutionalization) of the museum’s management.
nation, the need for action in meeting these problems is common to all. The neighbourhood museum is not unmindful of the frustrations that immobilize the people of the inner city. Because it is the centre of the neighbourhood life, the museum must be conscious of every aspect of that life” (KINARD & NIGHBERT, 1972).

For that, nearly the totality of targets and methods suggested or identified through the action of the neighbourhood museum departed from the assessment of the local community’s life and its heritage. That is to say, the community was to be the foundation and subject matter or the museum.

Among the specific targets that encompassed the work of the neighbourhood museum, it is possible to identify:

- investigate and communicate the history and contemporary issues concerning the neighbourhood\(^{23}\), in a way to strength the ties between present and past; people and place;
- contribute to the community education;
- valorise local culture, in special the local knowledge;
- act as a forum for debates, trying to promote discussions on local issues.

In order to fulfil the aims of the neighbourhood museum as an active agent of social change, methods of work, such as research, exhibitions, educational programming, or socio-cultural activities were based on the use of local heritage, as mentioned before.

The heritage, for instance, appears as a primary source for new interpretations of history and contemporary issues, based explicitly on a local perspective. It was not the main interest whether the

\(^{23}\) In the case of Anacostia, issues also related to African-American culture and history.
museum had a collection or not\textsuperscript{24}; once artefacts, documents and the oral history- elements of the heritage emphasized by Kinard (1985)- could be found and assessed everywhere in the community and don’t need to be necessarily a part of the museum’s collection. Actually, the only mentions to a collection or collecting procedure in the work of Anacostia refer to the maintenance of a mini zoo and the record of local oral history, as a way to produce documentation for research purposes.

One could add to the range of heritage the local culture (and the own local knowledge), valorised in the museum via the direct participation of the residents in the execution of exhibitions’ educational programming and many side activities, such as lectures, artistic performances, and small local art exhibits.

Within the methods proposed to communicate the history and contemporary issues concerning the community the exhibition appears as a main communication media for the museum’s work. Exhibitions were to be created in an unconventional way and its form oriented towards the neighbourhood (HAUENSCHILD, 1998). In order to involve residents, bring the subjects closer to their daily-life and enhance communication effectiveness, they should count with a varied number of side activities and educational programming.

The museum also aimed to dip into the appreciation of community problems as an important part of its communication responsibilities. In the Anacostia, for example, lectures on numerous issues (such as health care, labour and unemployment, race discrimination, etc)

\textsuperscript{24} Actually, in the referred working period of the Anacostia, the museum didn’t have a permanent collection. According to Hauenschild (1998), “as a ‘branch’ of the Smithsonian Institution, the Anacostia Neighbourhood Museum was originally planned not to have its own collection nor perform the collection activity of a traditional museum. All exhibits consist of loans form the Smithsonian or other institutions”. Nevertheless, this condition initially set by the Smithsonian, met the philosophy of the neighbourhood museum as a catalyst for social change.
aimed to “[… offer] to the community a resource of information that can augment individual as well as further development of the community” (Speakers’ Bureau, 1970; quoted in HAUENSCHILD, 1998).

The vision of the neighbourhood museum as an institution that educates the community included the use of traditional education methods in order to convey skills and the collaboration to formal education organizations. As an example, the work of the Anacostia Museum comprised the offering of side classes for neighbourhood residents (art classes in special) and put at local school’s disposal mobile exhibitions, as well as educational material, for teaching on sciences and other disciplines.

It is not surprising that the neighbourhood museum proposed to act as a “community centre” in various occasions, moving away from the use of the object and the traditional functions of the museum in order to welcome community meetings as well as cultural activities, such as the classes mentioned above, festivals or even birthday parties or weddings.

Either acting as a “community centre”, either carrying through some of the traditional functions of the museum (i.e. research and communication), the survival and relevance of the neighbourhood museum as an instrument of social change relies on the ties established with the community. Kinard (1985) resumes this relationship in a short sentence:

“The destiny of the museum is the destiny of the community; their relationship is symbiotic and catalytic.”

The ties between the museum and the community are created mostly by the community’s direct input to a wide range of activities in the museum. Such input, however, assumes different faces and degrees of influence within the museum’s work. It can be considered of a
very high degree when addressing needs and priorities to the museum staff; when participating in offered activities and engaging in volunteer work; and, finally when providing the transference of local knowledge. In a lower degree, there are mentions to the involvement of grass roots organizations in the execution of research and the direct advice of the population in the museum’s planning and financial collaboration. One could appreciate that the public engagement in the museum’s management is very low, although special attention is given to hiring staff members who are close to the community that the neighbourhood museum serves.

Given the range of public participation in the museum’s life, rather revolutionary for the time in which it has been proposed, a natural question that rises from such recognition is why the community input is so important and lies in the centre of attentions of the neighbourhood museum. The answer for that is not all clear in the speeches of those related to the new institution.

The Smithsonian Institution was responsible for bringing the issues of public access to the neighbourhood museum: in order to be relevant it should come closer to the needs of the visitors. Such belief, taken on during the development of the idea of the neighbourhood museum as a catalyst of social change, justifies the importance given to community input in addressing needs and priorities.

As to the other facets of community input, all leads to conclude that, besides matters of ideology and legitimacy of the museum work (which surely existed and played an important role but could not be identified in the examined articles), the community input is vital in providing important resources for the neighbourhood museum. Among those resources, it is possible to point out: work force; knowledge and expertise; and financial aid (in a lower degree). Besides, if community members and organizations, their lives and problems are, indeed, a very important subject matter for the
neighbourhood museum, their input can be considered the only effective way to provide contents for the institution.

This way, an articulated and participative community is a basic requirement to guarantee the museum’s survival as an agent for community development. Concerning this subject, it is also possible to conclude that the neighbourhood museum depends exclusively on the community’s power of self-mobilization. As Hauenschild (1998) stresses, there has never been references of any nature to the work of the neighbourhood museum in community mobilization or in improving public participation.

The ideas brought up from Anacostia Museum’s experiences have been considered an important influence for further initiatives on community development. According to Hugues de Varine (1996), Anacostia represents one of the cases which did lay the foundations of a new approach to museums, strongly linked to the politics of development.

However, such aspect of Anacostia’s proposals apparently has not been as significant for the development of others neighbourhood museums as it was for the new museology. Although it is clear that the Anacostia Museum inspired the creation of other neighbourhood museums in United States, it was not possible to trace effectively how much of its purposes and ways to promote community development were significant for the new enterprises. Actually, due to its celebrated importance and reputation as the “the most enduring and in some ways the revolutionary result of that professional preoccupation” (LEWIS, 1980; quoted in KINARD, 1985), it seems reasonable to admit that Anacostia represents an exceptional attempt in museology to work for the development of a neighbourhood, at least for the time and country in which it was created.

Differently, a number of publications (e.g. MAYRAND, 1985; MOUTINHO, 1995) emphasize the relevancy of the neighbourhood
museum\textsuperscript{25} by including it in the core of new museology’s traditions. A couple of reasons for that can be found in John Kinard’s article published in 1985, where he offers an interesting insight on the relation between the neighbourhood museum and the development of ecomuseums. According to his words, the neighbourhood museum was an important initiative in introducing the community’s participatory process and bringing new visions on the social and territorial integration of museums.

Finally, Peter Davis (1999) stresses that, in general, Anacostia demonstrated that audience development and community empowerment was possible and changed the ways that curators though about museums. With this, he emphasizes the significance of Anacostia’s public participatory processes, as well as the priority given to community related issues rather than to the museum’s collections.

The integral museum approach

The concept of integral museum was introduced in 1972, for occasion of the Round Table of Santiago (Chile), meeting organized by UNESCO and ICOM which aimed the discussions on the role of museums in the contemporary Latin America.

Several authors entrust to the round table the innovation of calling together specialists from outside the field of museology, who were able to provide the meeting with a revealing picture of the current situation and problems faced in the South and Central American cities and rural areas. The impact of such initiative allowed that all following reflections on the role of museums “departed from a severe but realistic assessment on the conditions of material and cultural

\textsuperscript{25} Although some of them do not mention any name in particular, it is implicit that they make reference to the concept of neighbourhood museum introduced by the Anacostia Museum.
development worldwide” (MOUTINHO, 1989). Still according to Mario Moutinho:

“In the first place, the disparities between the general world development (promoted by the crescent use of technology) and cultural development were recognized. In the same way, this disparity enlarged the gap between regions of substantial material development and the regions from the periphery. It was also considered that a large number of the problems in contemporary society correspond to situations of injustice.”

The assessment of museums in face of such context revealed that the institutions stood far from an astonished reality. They were not prepared to respond to the challenges of the continent and actually did too little on behalf of Latin American societies. Mario Teruggi (1973) explains that such criticism brought an immediate reflection on the ultimate purpose of museums. Discussions followed on whether museums were responsible for interfering in societal problems, which did not correspond to their traditional functions. In response, it was defended that museums could not close their eyes for the situation that afflicted the continent, even if they were meant to “fill the gap” left by other social organizations. Those and other considerations finally led to a revision of the traditional concept of museums and the formulation of the integral museum approach.

Hugues de Varine (1995) and Judite Primo (1999), when stressing the type and level of the integral approach’s influence within the museological field, dedicate their attention to a couple of aspects, which characterize the relevancy of this new concept. They are: a) the integral view, or view of the totality; b) museum as action.

a) Integral view, or view of the totality
According to the Declaration of Santiago, from an internal perspective, the functions of the integral museum (preservation, research and communication) should be inter-related in an
interdisciplinary approach (MENSCH, 1992). The quest for this interdisciplinary aspect also embraces the external advice from various disciplines, such as economics, social sciences and education, in order to promote a better understanding of the Latin American development and eventually enable men to look on the world as one world, to be tackled as an integrated whole (Declaration of Santiago, 1972).

From an external perspective, the integral museum should be interrelated to the natural and social environment of humanity – conceived as “global heritage”, which was to be managed in the behalf of men and their communities. The museological object of study would be cast towards the relation between man and his cultural heritage.

b) Museum as action

“The museum in an institution in the service of society of which it forms as inseparable part and, of its very nature, contains the elements which enable it to help in moulding the consciousness of the communities it serves, through which it can stimulate those communities to action by projecting forward its historical activities so that they culminate in the presentation of contemporary problems; that is to say, by linking together past and present, identifying itself with indispensable structural changes and calling forth others appropriate to its particular national context.” (Declaration of Santiago, 1972)

Within the scope of the Declaration of Santiago, the integrated museum is presented as a dynamic instrument of social change. The museum, as an institution in the service of society of which it forms as inseparable part, should join the efforts for the Latin American development, helping both rural and urban communities in the solution of their problems. That is to say, museology was called
upon an active intervention in the processes of social, economic and cultural transformations of society (MOUTINHO, 1989).

For that, the actions of the integral museum were conceived within a strong educational perspective that, in resume, aims to help in moulding the consciousness of the communities it serves and stimulate those communities to action, by:

- raising awareness of the problems faced by the communities;
- showing the visitors their place in the world as individual and members of a collectivity (raising awareness of their surrounding environment and its history);
- indicating constructive solutions and perspectives.

The Declaration of Santiago also proposes some methods in order to fulfil such educational role and achieve the integral museum’s purposes. According to Mario Teruggi, they all depart from the use and interpretation of the object:

“It was accepted that the object is the museum’s point of departure and its justification (…) [the object] will have to be supplemented, extrapolated; and interrelated in a multitude of ways for it to fit naturally into the panorama of social, economic and cultural development. The object would begin to be transformed into a kind of datum, a linkage with the past from which to develop propaganda sequences (…) to serve the community towards understanding itself and plotting its course. [The object] would remain a significant and crucial element.” (TERUGGI, 1973)

It is not very clear whether the object is conceived as an element of the museum’s collection or as any piece of the “global heritage”. By
the words of Teruggi - and the own definition of museum in the Declaration of Santiago, as an institution which *acquires, preserves and makes available exhibits illustrative of the natural and human evolution*— the object seems to be one housed inside the museum. This object would aim, then, to link the individuals to the reality of the communities (of which the heritage is an integrating part). In the other hand, extracts of the document open the possibilities to include in this “object category” the own heritage existing outside the museum, which would function as the institutional collected object for the museum’s purposes.

Using either the museum object either elements of the “global heritage” as data carrier, such approach suggests an enhancing of the museum’s communication function (which includes making collections available to researches and social institutions, updating exhibition techniques and establishing systems of evaluation) and its adaptation to the reality of the communities, in order to accomplish the effectiveness of the proposed methods.

As to the methods themselves, the document refers to the:

- creation of temporary and mobile exhibitions;
- offer of research facilities and
- offer of educational programming inside the museum and, in special, in an outreach basis.

This all lead to a decentralization of the museum work, which is done directly with the communities. The Declaration of Santiago affirms that *the new type of museum seems the most suited to function as a regional museum or as a museum for small and medium-sized population centres*. Going further in this local perspective, the integral museum is supposed to drive its attention into rural, urban and suburban areas, taking into account their needs, dynamic and specificities.
By introducing general notions of in which ways museums should function and relate to the society, the integral approach’s relevancy for the relation between museology and community development does not rely precisely on the establishment of concrete forms to implement such aspirations (TERUGGI, 1973), but rather on stating the moral obligation of the museum professionals to contribute to the development policies and programmes of their respective countries (VARINE, 1996a).

It is important to keep in mind that the integral museum concept brought to the world of museology aspirations - rather than solutions - if one’s purpose is to analyze its influence and importance for future actions in the field. The integral approach came to adopt different faces in different initiatives and not always its political content, related to social development issues, was applied.

As to the consequences of the integral approach to Latin American museology in particular, they cannot be dissociated from the political status of the region in the 70’s. In a context of dictatorships and severe repression against any initiative for democratization, it is easy to consider that changes towards an integral museum would count with one extra and extremely powerful limitation.

Invited to discuss the significance of the ideas brought up in the Round Table of Santiago in 1995, Hugues de Varine (1995) resumed such situation: “What happened since Santiago? It didn’t change much in the museums of Latin America. Most of the participants of Santiago could not implement the adopted resolutions (…)”. Varine continues, emphasizing that the influence of the round table extrapolated the boarders of Latin America: “(…) experiences were and still are done in America. In the rest of the world, the impact of Santiago was appreciable, although delayed to the beginning of the 80’s”. The same way, many other authors stress that Santiago’s resolutions -and the integral museum concept- took some time to be
recognized but had an undeniable influence in the field of museology.  

For the new museology in particular, their significance was enormous. Nearly all publications dedicated to the new museology’s historical development consider the Declaration of Santiago, if not the birth certificate of the new museology, one of its most important foundations. This way, considering the nature of further initiatives on community development after 1972- and the explicit references to the Declaration of Santiago- it is possible to affirm that new museology and the tendencies that it represents were direct heirs to the integral museum’s political content and aims of development.

**Ecomuseology**

While the Round Table of Santiago introduced the concept of integral museum in Latin America, the French province of Burgundy witnessed the initial movements towards the creation of the Museum of Man and Industry, which would be known later as the Ecomuseum of the Urban Community Le Creusot-Montceau les Mines.

The foundation of the Ecomuseum of Le Creusot marks the birth of the ‘development ecomuseum’, a new form taken by museology in its search for a significant role in the work with community development.

From the late 18th century until the mid-20th, the sites of Le Creusot and Montceau les Mines constituted one of the most important industrial regions in France. As Kenneth Hudson (1996) remarks, its prosperity had been built around the production of armaments and

---

26 On a wide basis, the interdisciplinary approach, the notion of “global heritage”, as well as the idea that the educational function of museums should mean more than the pure extension of school, seem to be the most important influences of the Declaration of Santiago to the broader field of museology.
railway locomotives, with the Schneider family as the major entrepreneurs. After the Second World War, the Schneiders fell into disgrace, as a result of collaboration with the Germans. Their manufacturing empire collapsed, leaving Le Creusot destitute.

According to Hugues de Varine (1987, 1996), who had a crucial participation in the planning of the new institution, the situation experienced in the region after the war imposed to the local economy a conversion into new and diversified industrial productions. The traditional coal mining activities slowly diminished and the population was called upon moving from a totally paternalistic era to a more modern and capitalistic industrial development. In addition, a new administrative structure- aiming to provide the area with a common planning, development and investment policy- united under a single urban community twenty-seven sixteen independent and sometimes conflicting municipalities of the region. This all led to an internal crisis, reinforced in one hand by economic difficulties and, in the other hand, by the urge to respond to ongoing social and political changes.

It was in such atmosphere that, in 1971, a working group was created in order to study a request from the mayor of Le Creusot, who wished to open a local museum in a wing of the former Schneider’s palace- the Château de la Verrerie. Besides Hugues de Varine (director of ICOM at the time), the group counted with Marcel Evrard (from the Musée de L’Homme) and Dr. Lyonnet (physician and a local militant).

Varine (1987) explains that, in short time, the initial idea of a traditional museum was developed into something different. The project would be expanded to the urban community as a whole; representatives of the population, grass-roots organizations, unions,

27 The term community in this particular case refers to a legal administrative status used by the French Government.
schools, local authorities, private enterprises would be mobilized in order to set desires, needs, available resources and methods to be implemented.

As an answer to the specific demands of a region undergoing rapid changes and consequent social and economic crisis, a new type of institution was to be conceived as an instrument of action and local regeneration:

“The aim of the museum was clear. There was a serious unemployment in the region and morale was very low. Something was needed to make it possible for the local people to achieve some kind of common purpose and to use the past, with its successes and its disasters, as a way of discovering a new future.” (VARINE, 1993)

In order to enable the new institution to respond to different aspects of community’s life (being them social, cultural, economical, environmental, etc.) and effectively contribute to its global development, the urban complex of Le Creusot-Montceau became site for a pioneer experiment. Namely, it consisted in the application of the ecomuseum idea, not in the current sense of a tool for interpretation and protection of the natural environment, but regarded through an expanded meaning. In this way, the new museum would embrace the whole territory of the urban community, a semi-rural/semi-industrial area of about 500 square kilometres and 150.000 inhabitants, of which the majority belonged “to the poorest social classes, being composed of farm, mine and factory workers.” (VARINE, 1975)

Still considering the experimental aspect of such endeavour, Hugues de Varine (1978) tells that, in the beginning, the new concept of ecomuseum did not have much substance, so that it was necessary to

---

28 The difference between both concepts can be seen on page 52.
depart from some general convictions and attempts of definition. He lists them as: the new institution will be the emanation of the territory and its population; the museum will be interested in the totality of the environment, its heritage and development. It will be distinguished from ordinary museums for two essential features: the idea of permanent collection will be replaced by the notion of collective heritage, the primal mission of the museum is not collecting anymore; besides, the instrument of conceptions, programming, control, animation and evaluation of the museum will be a council composed by representatives of the community.

Starting from those ideas, the following years saw the genesis of ecomuseum with the establishment of a network of contacts, people’s mobilization, and first activities and consequent structuring. Finally, in 1974, the museum was officially inaugurated as a legal entity.

It is by this time that Museum International published Varine’s article “A fragmented museum: the museum of Man and Industry” (1975), through which some of the fundamental features of the ecomuseum were presented. Later on, Varine wrote about the Ecomuseum of Le Creusot in many opportunities, making it possible to go further in establishing the differences in approach between the new institution and traditional museums.

Certainly, what appears to be the most important aspect of the ecomuseum’s approach is the fact that the institution has in the community its subject and object, its actor and user. As to the notion of community as subject and object of action, that is to say, community’s life –and community’s problems- are the theme of the museum and the reason for its existence. The legitimacy of the ecomuseum’s work is to be found in the contribution it can make to improve the living conditions of the local population, especially by serving as a vehicle for participative planning and participative

29 From the French “animation”. See more on animation on note 35 of Chapter 2.
learning oriented towards community development. Considering such will to respond to actual demands, it is possible to affirm that the ecomuseum can only survive as tool for development (in the way it is proposed) when intimately connected to community dynamics, thus gaining the face of a process in constant recreation. In time, as Varine (1993) reminds, changes in structure and organization are inevitable, once they, as well as the methods of work, must adapt to a number of variables such as: available resources, development objectives, community’s power relations and desires. This, in the last case, could even denote disregard to the ecomuseum’s utility as a tool for development.

In order to accomplish its purposes, the ecomuseum relies on the vital resources from the community. The origin of those resources can be identified in the assessment of community’s life as object of action and object of knowledge; in the community’s action (input) itself; and, finally, in the use of the collective heritage, when this last becomes support and raw material for the ecomuseum’s activities. Understood in the broader sense, the collective heritage encompasses all sorts of elements of the community’s cultural and natural environment: traditions, memory, knowledge and know-how, tangible and intangible testimonies of its history, landscapes, etc. Within this framework, the idea of a traditional museum collection (permanent, acquired, etc.) is replaced by the notion of the ‘collection’ of a living heritage that can be accessed everywhere in the community and its territory:

“Any movable or immovable object within the community’s perimeter is psychologically part of the museum. This

---

30 Varine (1975) only mentions an exception to the creation of “reserve collections” for means of preservation, in case elements of the collective heritage, which are considered relevant for the museum’s purposes, face a danger of disappearing or lost the functional and emotional value to their owners.
introduces the idea of a kind of ‘cultural’ property right, which has nothing to do with legal ownership. Accordingly, it is not the function of the museum as such to make acquisitions since every thing existing within its geographical area is already at its disposal.” (VARINE, 1975)

The range of action of the ecomuseum is, in this way, the totality of the community’s territory. Actually, one could consider that the ecomuseum is the territory, being the last one regarded not in the sense of a legal or administrative delimitation but as a setting geographically defined by community’s life itself and the extension of its relations with the surrounding environment. When assuming the idea of the ecomuseum as territory, it is important to have in mind that such vision is not limited to the physical dimension of space, once territory gains in this concept the connotation of “the subjects and community with which the museum engages” (DAVIS, 1999). That is to say, the ecomuseum’s territory is composed not only by the physical space, but also by the human activity (and its cultural, economic, political and social dimensions), its concrete manifestations and the web of interconnections with all aspects of the surrounding environment.

As to the range of action of the ecomuseum Varine (1975) writes:

“The museum’s only boundaries are those defined by the community it serves. Just as, in classical geometry, a plane is composed by an infinite number of points, so the museum is composed of an infinite number of places, closed or open, natural or artificial, situated in a geographical delimited area. These places may be, and are in fact, a mill, a miner’s house, a prehistoric site, a bakery, a canal, and so on. Groups of places can also be envisaged such as part of a town, a village a forest. The whole community constitutes a living museum, its public being permanently inside (…) This does not mean,
of course, that there are not some parts of the museum which are singled out, for practical reasons, as places for organized activities. A certain site or monument will thus be selected for admiration, examination and explanation, while a certain building will be adapted to accommodate an exhibition, a series of events promoted by organizations or community events. This is essential, but only when it serves a specific purpose…”

Such choice for spreading the institution’s action all over the territory gives shape to the concept of “fragmented museum”, of which ways of intervention take place in the so-called antennae, decentralized hosts and interpretative itineraries, as well as in an interpretation centre of the community as whole, based in the Château de la Verrerie.

Once the ecomuseum aims to serve the local community, this last one constitutes, obviously, its main beneficiary and user. In this regard, it is important to consider that in the life of the ecomuseum the notion of user cannot be dissociated from the notion of actor. The same way as the ecomuseum does not have visitors but inhabitants, it also does not count with separate groups of programme deliverers and receivers. The community is a participative user, not only being beneficiary of the ecomuseum’s actions, but also promoter of those actions:

“[The museum] only has actors, namely all the inhabitants in the community. These inhabitants posses, individually and jointly, the museum and its collections; they live in it, they participate in its management, in making the inventory of their common cultural wealth, and in the organization of cultural activities. They give their opinion about programmes. (…) They are therefore real actors, although in varying degrees as regards awareness, responsibilities and initiative. The whole population is concerned with
everything: objects, exhibitions, studies, etc... By their eagerness or by their absence, by the suggestions, opinions or advice, they contribute on every occasion, they express themselves and co-operate.” (VARINE, 1975)

This way, the degree of community direct input is very high in all aspects of the museum’s work, representing, indeed, a requirement for the institution’s own existence in the terms it is sustained. Nevertheless, such input is not exclusive, as can be noticed by the word of Hugues de Varine. A “double input” system, which brings together “specialists” (academic knowledge) and “amateurs” (empirical knowledge), aims to add another dimension of interference to the communitarian activity. It seeks, with this, to ensure continuity to the actions of the ecomuseum, serve as catalyst for community mobilization, fulfil technical demands and, finally, to contribute in keeping the community in touch with the external world. Within this framework, two other categories of actors come into scene: the museum staff and external collaborators- in general specialists in various academic disciplines. Their interference can be regarded, in brief, as a support for decision-making processes, which have to find their final word in the voices of the community.

It is also possible to appreciate the concern in endowing the museum’s management with a structure that aims to guarantee democratic participation and balance of power relations among inside and outside actors (e.g. financing parties) and representatives of the local population themselves. Such concern is translated into the organization of separate committees (user’s committee, scientific and technical committee and management committee), which, together, form the governing body of the ecomuseum.

As to the activities of Le Creusot, Varine (1975) stresses that it is quite impossible to list them, once being so numerous and varied. Actually, if the ecomuseum proposes to act as community’s tool by responding to available resources and all the variety of potential
demands, on principle the institution could perform any type of activity, be it related or not to the traditional sense of museums functions. Such statement, however, does not exclude the choice for a general methodology that may leave open the opportunities for developing different kinds of activities at the same time it draws the main lines for the museum’s ways of action. Three characteristics stand out from such methodology, namely:

- the use of the collective heritage as point of departure for the majority of the museum’s activities;
- the extensive use of the museological language and traditional museums functions, understood as means to achieve the ecomuseum’s purposes;
- the exploitation of a varied number of activities as a way to fulfil objectives related to community mobilization and empowerment.

Within this framework, Varine (1975, 1987) calls attention for some privileged methods and ‘traditional’ activities of the ecomuseum. Among them, it is possible to find:

- temporary and semi-temporary (constantly updated) exhibitions about the community’s life an its environment, and thematic itineraries in the territory;
- research (in special surveys in situ), inventory and creation of archives;
- preservation (via conservation, acquisition of ‘reserve’ collections, registration, etc.) of the tangible heritage and the collective memory as a whole;
- communication to the exterior, via publications, oriented exhibitions, among others;
- programmes on life-long learning and co-operation with educational establishments;
- co-operation with several activities in the community (e.g. debates, programmes on capacity building or youth development);
‘training’ and assistance to museum staff, animators, community militants, researchers, etc.

It is essential to add that, in the scheme of the ecomuseum’s operations, traditional museum functions are direct or indirectly mingled with actions of social character in order to provide effective means for the interventions on the territory. In this regard, the ecomuseum seems to go further in the notion that its activities do not hold a purpose in themselves; they are a medium and, as medium, must serve the broader objectives of development collectively and in every possible ways.

A manifestation of such flexibility can be found in the development of activities that aim to attend a spectrum of multiple purposes. That is to say, in such case, the immediate aim of a research is not limited to collecting and interpreting data, or an exhibition project does not have in the final result (the exhibition itself) its main goal and so on. The purpose of these and others activities is extended to the social sphere of community’s life, by means of a direct interference in this domain. Such interference has, in particular, community mobilization/empowerment as conductor lead. As mentioned previously, the population’s engagement in the core of the activities performed by the ecomuseum extrapolates the notion of passive participation and stimulating its co-operation (by calling to action and building capacity) turns out to be indispensable. For that purpose, actions on community mobilization become integrant part of the processes which involve the planning, execution and evaluation of activities.

An exemplar case of having activities serving multiple purposes and aiming at community mobilization is what Varine calls “pretext-actions”. They are temporary exhibitions on a specific area of the ecomuseum’s territory, where teams of young people are invited to make a survey on the life of its inhabitants (listing objects, housing conditions, oral traditions, etc.) under the supervision of technical
staff. Subsequently, an exhibition plan is drawn based on the survey and adults are asked to mount the exhibition by bringing, displaying and commenting their own possessions (VARINE, 1975). These exhibitions intend to respond to a purely local matter (VARINE, 1975); constituting a way to produce an inventory of objects and the local history at the same time it promotes a direct effect on the community. First, by allowing that people explore history and reality themselves, they involve the population and create awareness. In this case, and in a number of other examples, the process is more important then the result of the activity; the same way, community learning does not start after the exhibition is mounted, it takes place but during the whole creation process. Second, by mobilizing forces around a common task, they are able to stimulate the establishment of voluntary groups, which become concerned with the ecomuseum’s affairs.

As reminded by Peter Davis (1999), much was learned about the practicalities of developing a new methodology for museums at Le Creusot. Be it in relation to the work with community development in particular, or be it in relation to the establishment and testing of ecomuseum patterns (e.g. museum as territory, “fragmented” range of action, living heritage, etc.), the experiments of Le Creusot became important references for the museological theory and further initiatives in the field. Varine (1996) stresses that, indeed, the museum came to be a sort of “model” in France and around the world.

Nevertheless, despite of its significance and degree of influence, it is vital to understand that the experiences of Le Creusot- as well as the

---

31 Particularly for its work carried out until the mid-80s. Varine (1996) explains that after this period “this Ecomuseum underwent a crisis (…), due to the aging of its main leaders and actors and a change in generation: the founding fathers were by then at retirement age, while a new active population was faced more with economic difficulties and unemployment than with the recognition and salvage of a collapsed industrial past.”
concept of “development ecomuseum”- represent only one facet of the complex origin and development of ecomuseology. Thus, it seems important to address some brief considerations on the origin of ecomuseology and its following course(s) in order to clarify the place that proposals related to community development have taken within such context.

Since the birth of the first ecomuseums in France, the field of ecomuseology was far from comprising a homogeneous idea. Varine wrote in 1978: “the richness of ecomuseology resides in its diversity and in the bloom of interpretations, experiences, and active research on all directions, departing from a minimum of common ideas.” He stresses that in the base of these common ideas is the search for an alternative to traditional museums (with a special attention to visitors and communities), which could be also be extended to a number of proposals that reflect the rise of the second museum revolution period.

Added to this, authors such as Clair (1976) and Davis (1999) explain that the origin of ecomuseology is intimately associated with the new ways museums came to deal with the environment in the XX Century. The creation of open-air museums, the heritage movement in UK, site interpretation and the raise of environmentalism in museology after the II World War are some of the evidences of the new approaches to the natural environment and ecology (of particular importance for ecomuseology) that have permeated the museological field.

Considering that new social goals and new approaches to environment/ecology represent the “minimum of common ideas” of ecomuseology and that these are, in fact, much opened issues, it seems evident that further developments would be certainly susceptible to a multitude of interpretations and concrete applications. Such diversity (which, one could say, increased along
the years) was already clear in the first acts taken place in France during the late 60’s and early 70’s.

The initial conceptualization of ecomuseums, dating back to the beginning of the 50’s, is attributed to Georges Henri Rivière. Steeped in traditions of French ethnography, Rivière developed for years a work closely connected to the interpretation of history and culture in an environmental context (DAVIS, 1999). It was also under his guidance that since the late 60’s the first experiments on ecomuseums were carried out within the framework of environmental conservation and management of regional natural parks in France (DAVIS, 1999). Meanwhile, the term “ecomuseum”, created by Hugues de Varine and publicly used for the first time in 1971, gained prominence and the experiments of Le Creusot laid a path for ecomuseology beyond objectives related to the protection and interpretation of the natural environment.

By 1972, an international colloquium organized by ICOM and the French Ministry of the Environment proceeded with the first attempts to create a definition for ecomuseums. Although the meeting’s outcomes restrained the notion of ecomuseums to the research, preservation and communication on the whole of environmental elements, the proposals of Le Creusot were brought up, revealing that distinct tendencies shared label “ecomuseum”.

Making use of the normatization of René Rivard, Peter Davis (1999) explains that the referred tendencies were divided into “discovery ecomuseums” and “development ecomuseums”. “Discovery ecomuseums”, intimately allied to the nature reserve movement in France, were those based on ecological principles, as Varine (1978) describes:
“Certain ecomuseums, faithful to the initial model of the Landes museum\textsuperscript{32}, are institutions specifically associated to the environment and to the framework of natural and cultural life. These ecomuseums are instruments of a new pedagogy in environment, based on the “real” things (objects, monuments, sites, etc.) replaced in time and space. It is a modernization and improvement of two types of museums combined: the open-air museum of Scandinavian origin and the visitor’s centre of natural parks in USA. The French version, called ecomuseum, shares these two models. It uses the natural space and the traditional habitat as well as contemporary problems, in a global perspective, without replacing the elements that are conserved in their normal [original] context. This ecomuseum addresses to a national public, which look for conciliation with its environment. It takes into account, in a certain degree, the local population, considered sometimes as subject of study and as a privileged public of educational action.”

The “development ecomuseums”, differently, were more closely geared to the needs of communities (DAVIS, 1999):

“The other ecomuseums, in the way imagined since 1971 in Le Creusot, are more a formula in constant evolution that carries a character definitively experimental, refuting all normatizations, justifying essentially the function as an instrument for community development. They rely on the same techniques and the same temporal and spatial principles of the other category of ecomuseums; they distinguish themselves very clearly by their communitarian character (…). Actual and future problems foment the

\textsuperscript{32}Officially recognized in 1970 under the name of Regional Natural Park of the Landes de Gascogne. It represents one of the first initiatives on “discovery ecomuseum” and also counted with the guidance of Rivière.
programming basis. These ecomuseums have a predominant urban character in its dimensions, where their [territorial] ‘plate’ is constituted by the organized collectivities and by the associations of all genres that are developed in the core of these collectivities.” (VARINE, 1978)

According to Varine (1978), in this case, the prefix “eco” refers to the notion of “human ecology” and to the dynamic relations that men and society establish with their tradition, environment and transformation processes of their elements.

Keeping constantly in mind that ecomuseology has always counted with a diversity of approaches, it is possible to affirm, though, that the rising objectives of “development ecomuseums” had a very important influence in the field. Actually, they came to mould what Davis (1999) calls the “original ecomuseum philosophy”, of which shaping he attributes in great part to the work of Varine and Rivière. According the author, such philosophy postulated the application of community museology33 to a specified territory, sharing the same essence with other initiatives associated to the new museology school of though. He also stresses that the philosophy has been adapted and moulded for use in a variety of situations along the years.

In this way, it is possible to identify a whole palette of approaches among the ecomuseums influenced by the “original philosophy”. Some have foreseen community involvement and other principles sustained by new museology but did not have in community development a primal aim necessarily- or even an aim at all. In the other hand, a number of ecomuseums around the world responded to the philosophy’s development objectives, elaborating further forms and ways of interference in the territory. Some of the professionals

33 Term ‘community museology’ denotes community development as the primal aim of museology (MENSH, 1995)
involved with those museums also provided valuable contributions to the theories of ecomuseology as a resource for development.

In 1978, the Canadian journal *Gazette* published Varine’s article “L’écomusée”, in which the author offers a “personal contribution to the elaboration of a way of action relevant for development, departing from the museal language” (VARINE, 1978). His work, largely based on the experiences of Le Creusot, provides a theoretical overview of “development ecomuseums” (Varine uses the term “community ecomuseums”, emphasizing their communitarian emanation). Besides bringing a number of considerations presented in previous publications about Le Creusot, the article sets up main targets for ecomuseums and additional reflections on the role of ecomuseums as a pedagogical process. Varine starts by summarizing the theory of “community ecomuseums” as following:

“The community ecomuseum works with a community and with one objective: the development of that community. It uses a global pedagogy based on the heritage and actors of a community. It is a prominent model of co-operative organization for development and a critical process of continuous evaluation and correction.”

In order to accomplish a significant role in community development, five principal targets34 for the ecomuseum are put on focus. They are:

- provide a data bank of all elements of the heritage and knowledge that can contribute to community development;

34 In 1988, Varine (quoted in Davis, 1999) provided a list with four main objectives, which brings a review of the ecomuseum’s targets, keeping the same essence: as an object and data bank for the community; to serve as an observatory of change (and to help the community react to changes); to become a laboratory- a focal point for meetings, discussions, new initiatives; and a showcase- revealing the community and its region to visitors.
present the community to itself and its visitors;
- create conditions (by providing information and stimulating operational research) for decision-making on issues related to organization and development;
- open the community to the exterior, in order to encourage innovation and comparative analysis;
- ensure the interactions between the school system and community dynamics.

The methods applied to fulfil such targets convey the characteristics already mentioned in the core of activities of Le Creusot: they are numerous and varied; they are based on the assessment and use of local heritage; many have as point of reference traditional museum functions (exhibitions, inventories, preservation); they aim to serve multiple purposes and have a strong bias on community mobilization/empowerment.

Varine adds that all the actions performed by the ecomuseum carry a global pedagogy as fundamental background. It is this pedagogy that brings together and associates various activities around the major objective of community development, endowing them with an elemental principle of the ecomuseum, which is:

“(...) to dispose to the community, simultaneously, the elements of information needed for the understanding of existing problems and the effective will to unfasten an original solution by the combination of the elements and factors taken from the past, the repertoire of available technical means and from the possibility of innovation.” (VARINE, 1978).

When analyzing the impact of the global pedagogy in the work of the ecomuseum, it becomes clear that targets and applied methods do not aim to manufacture results. Instead, they aim to create conditions and stimulate processes (related to decision-making, learning,
consciousness-raising, etc.) to take place. Together, these processes, in which the community is actor and beneficiary, constitute the essence of the ecomuseum’s development “strategy” and, why not to say, the essence of the ‘community ecomuseum’ itself.

According to the author, before achieving this “state of consciousness” and being able to act effectively as an instrument for development, the ecomuseum must go across a number of steps. He lists them as:

- acquaintance with community’s identity, by a repeated process of collective reflection, inventory and study of the heritage;
- acquaintance with the complexity of the community problematic, by the organization of repeated contacts among population groups on diverse subjects;
- opening to external contributions, by the multiplication of extra-communitarian references and introduction of thematic activities that reflect radically different situation from those experienced in the community;
- testing of community’s initiative, ability to cope with problems and find solutions, by carrying out pilot-projects in which the community or one of its groups goes through the entire process of development (location of problems, study, research and choice for solutions, application, critic and evaluation).

These steps also serve as a learning process for the community: forces are mobilized, there is a raising awareness about community’s life and its identity, the population is called upon performing interventions in its actual reality. The results of such process, according to Varine, could even cause the ecomuseum to become a superfluous instrument, once the degrees of consciousness and initiative of the community are sufficient to allow a spontaneous
development. Another possibility is that the museum survives as the elected instrument for community development instead.

A corresponding insight on the processes that should precede the establishment of ecomuseums (particularly those oriented towards development) occupies a privileged position in the theories of the Canadian museologist Pierre Mayrand, who came to play an important role in the field of ecomuseology since the late 70’s. Mayrand’s theories, as well as their actual applications, stand a complementation and at the same time a counterpoint to the ideas of Hugues de Varine. Above all, such acknowledgment offers a good example of alternative approaches to community development- and the ways to reach it.

Just as the ‘steps’ introduced in Varine’s article, Mayrand proposes the accomplishment of some preceding phases before the ecomuseum is able to act as a tool for development. Those phases have been represented through the “creativity triangle”, a scheme drawn for the Ecomuseum of Haute-Beauce (Quebec, Canada), the first to be established in North America (DAVIS, 1999).

The foundation of Haute-Beauce followed a period marked by profound reforms of cultural institutions in Quebec. Echoing a growing awareness on the region’s heritage- its interpretation and potentialities- as well as a strong desire to establish Quebec’s unique identity35, they offered the favourable conditions for the

---

35 Matters of identity have been a central subject for Quebec in the last decades. According to Bélanger (2000), the Quebec “Quiet Revolution” (1960-1966)- period when the Canadian province witnessed intense changes and modernisation under the liberal party – brought, together with the questioning of the social order, a redefinition of the role and place of French Canadians in Canada. “Demand for change was heard everywhere: for bilingualism, for biculturalism, for the respect of the autonomy of Quebec, for equal status in Confederation (…) There was no doubt that the Quebeois, governed for so long by “Negro Kings” in the interest of foreign powers, economical and political, had to become masters of their destiny (…) as the
development of ecomuseums and came to place the Canadian province in the forefront of the experiments on ecomuseology together with France (DAVIS, 1999)\(^{36}\).

Rivard (1985) adds that much of the interest for ecomuseums was developed due to exchanges between French and Canadian professionals since 1974. Among those, the ideas of the new museology – and in special Varine’s article, “L’écomusée”- were of particular interest, as Mayrand (1984) attests:

“(...)the ecomuseum, as defined by Hugues de Varine in an article in the CMA’s Gazette, will be the vehicle favoured in Quebec in that it corresponds most closely to the demands of democratization, popularization and decentralization of cultural activities.”

It is also important to emphasize that, behind those demands, issues on affirmation of identity remained as an important -if not primary- goal for the region’s development at the time, helping to shape both theory and action of the Ecomuseum of Haute-Beauce and of other ecomuseums in Quebec as well.

\(^{36}\) Between 1978 and 1979, province witnessed the bloom of the “Quebec movement” (MAYRAND, 1984), which comprised the creation of its first three ecomuseums: Haute-Beauce, Fier-Monde and Insulaire. According to Davis (1999), “from Quebec the ideology of the ecomuseum has gradually permeated into other provinces of Canada and to some degree into the USA, where ecomuseum ideas, if not terminology, have been applied in new community museums, and particularly those initiated by Native American communities”.

state became increasingly the foundation of the nation, rather than the ethnic group as before, it focused the nationalism less on ethnocentric impulses and more on collective goals for all of Quebec. It also gave rise to a powerful separatism movement and even to terrorist manifestations, both of which linked strongly the ideology of nationalism and the desire for social change.” (BÉLANGER, 2000)
As to the Ecomuseum of Haute-Beauce, its origin can be dated back to 1978, year when the Musée et Centre Regional d’Interprétation de la Haute-Beauce was created under the direction of Pierre Mayrand. Hauenschild (1998) explains that Mayrand, after being contacted by a local inhabitant who wished to dispose of his private collection, has decided to take on a project that combined keeping the objects in the region and erecting a museum or interpretation centre. This came to be the opportunity to proceed with the first experiments on ecomuseology.

A promotional campaign followed the project. After one year the museum was able to purchase the collection with the population’s financial support and was officially opened to public visitation (Hauenschild, 1998). According to Stevenson (1982), the idea was to have an institution concerned not only with the preservation of Haute-Beauce’s heritage but also with cultural service; in this way the museum “would be an organization concerned with the present and future as well as the past; its role would be to reveal the identity of that particular part of Quebec”. In addition, Rivard (1985) reminds of the museum’s purpose of helping the “neglected region” to recover a measure of pride through its own identity and the relevance of developing an institution supported by its own people.

37 Haute-Beauce has been described as a rather isolated rural area in the southeast part of Quebec, located in the south-western hinterland of the Beauce region proper, which consists of flourishing small towns. Comprising thirteen rural parishes, the Haute-Beauce region is physically separated from this centre of small town principally by its position on a high plateau that reaches as much as 873 meter in elevation (Hauenschild, 1998).

38 Mayrand was “an art historian and museologist of the University of Quebec and Montreal (UQAM, who owned a second home in St. Hilaire de Dorset [one of Haute-Beauce’s rural parishes] and had visited the small private museum several times.” (Céré, 1982 quoted in Hauenschild, 1998).

39 The author reminds of the conditions of Haute-Beauce, “which has been sleeping for a century and with virtually no cultural facilities.”
If, for some, the perspectives offered by the new museum were taken somewhat as a finished concept, for Pierre Mayrand and the educator Maude Céré they were regarded as initial steps of a careful plan to transform the institution into an ecomuseum\(^{40}\). Such plan, implemented by means of the “creativity triangle”, “paved the way for eventual acceptance of the ecomuseum, the appropriation and interpretation of territory, and research into collective memory and popular creativity” (RIVARD, 1985).

As practical outcomes, it is possible to note that, in the same year when the “triangle” was drawn up (1980), a user’s committee was created and the museum offered the first courses on popular museology. Three years later, an operation so-called “Haute-Beauce Créatrice” gave the “thirteen villages of the ecomuseum an opportunity to express their appropriation of their territory by means of monumental symbols and creative activities” (RIVARD, 1985) and the Ecomuseum of Haute-Beauce was officially recognized as such.

It is clear that Haute-Beauce’s establishment followed a completely different path from Le Creusot’s. Nevertheless, just like in the case of the French museum, the actions planned and performed by the Ecomuseum of Haute-Beauce have attended a will to concretely contribute to local development, as can be seen in Mayrand (1984) Céré (1985, quoted in HAUENSCHILD, 1998). In this way, if one takes such perspective as a final objective of the ecomuseum, eventually he will be faced with different strategies from those

\(^{40}\) When talking about the organizational development of the Ecomuseum of Haute-Beauce, Hauenschild (1998) explains: “After five years of building awareness in the Haute-Beauce, Mayrand and Céré succeeded in officially founding the Ecomusée de la Haute-Beauce. This for them had been the aim from the beginning. But, at first, it was not discussed openly and in the end met resistance. It was not possible to consummate the founding of the ecomuseum without losses: it was preceded by the resignation of the museum’s advisory board, which held a more traditional concept of a museum and distanced itself from the attempts to found an ecomuseum.”
applied in Le Creusot and – the most important – he will realize that, although Varine and the Canadian museologists share much in common, they present distinct approaches to community development.

The first evidences of that can be found in the examination of the “creativity triangle”. In 1999, Peter Davis provided a detailed description of the scheme. The author writes:

“The Canadian museologist, Pierre Mayrand, when setting up the Ecomuseum of Haute-Beauce in Quebec, expressed the process in the form of a ‘creativity triangle’, which shows the ecomuseum developing as a result of interpretative activities within its geographical area. An interpretation centre lies at the apex, which increases public awareness of the geographical area or territory through its activities, which would include the creation of antennae. As the territory (and its natural and cultural heritage) becomes better known, there is a demand for the creation of an ecomuseum and the involvement of the local community. Once the ecomuseum is established, there is a feedback from local people and professionals to the interpretative process.(…)

- Diagram of the creativity triangle: Interpretation at the top, Ecomuseum at the bottom, Territory and Creation forming the base of the triangle.
Mayrand has subsequently refined his ‘creativity triangle’ and placed it within a theoretical ‘three year circle’\textsuperscript{41}; the implication is that within three years it is possible to move from idea to foundation, from apathy to empathy, and to pass through transitional stages of museology which he identifies as pre-museology, museology, para-museology, post-museology and trans-museology. Pre-museology exists before the theoretical framework has been established. The museology stage witnesses the framework based on a museum and a collection, the later encouraging research and communication. Para-museology transcends the museum and collection base, involving other institutions and the community, and includes elements of new museology. These three museological stages are roughly equivalent to the three

\textsuperscript{41} Although the addition of the ‘three year circle’ to the ‘creativity triangle’ dates from the 90’s, in the 80’s the idea of the three-year development already existed, as can be attested in Rivard (1985).
sides of the triangle. Mayrand two further stages of museum development are perhaps more controversial, with post-museology demanding the emergence of social role as dominant force (the museum curator as social worker), and trans-museology being a utopian stage were individuals within the community no longer need the social services of the museum.” (DAVIS, 1999)

In addition, Céré (1985, quoted in HAUENSCHILD, 1998) stresses:

“The creation process of the ecomuseum began with an interpretation initiative taken by specialists. Its power of diffusion made it possible to sensitize the population to the ideas of identity and appropriation of the heritage-action in order to be able to release clearly the sense of territorialization. Thanks to the techniques of creativity, the ecomuseum was produced. Through a phenomenon of retroaction, this population itself can now interpret what it is and determine the directions of its development.”

The statements above clearly present the formation and action of the ecomuseum as part of a wider process, which aims to fulfil specific objectives related to community development. They also suggest that the ecomuseum, while integrating a process, is fated to extinguishment by the time such process accomplishes its objectives. In other words, an ultimate proof of the ecomuseum’s success – and of the process as a whole- relies exactly on reaching their own termination, which, according to Céré, would correspond to the full capacity of the local population to work for its development. Pierre Mayrand (1984) also refers to this approach when he stresses that “the new museography [understood as the practices applied in new

---

42 This perspective is reinforced by Mayrand’s (1984) definition of ecomuseum: “(…) the ecomuseum is not and end in itself: it is defined as an objective to be attained.”
museum, such as the ecomuseum and in particular Haute-Beauce] can enable communities to achieve their own development objectives.”

In this way, it is possible to affirm that the process described in the “creativity triangle” aims to improve a number of conditions in community’s life. These conditions, according to Céré and Mayrand, allude to its capacity to determine development objectives and the directions to be followed afterwards.

In order to achieve such stage, the scheme foresees, during the “pre-museology” phase, actions that culminate in the appropriation of the territory by the local community. This appropriation also launches a continuous process of communitarian animation, which will accompany the whole “three year circle” in different levels. Throughout “pre-museology”, a process of “sensitisation” aims to increase community awareness of the territory and its features. In this way, besides being fundamental for the ecomuseum’s creation, consolidating a sense of territorialization allows the population to start knowing better the value of its region and heritage. This, according to the scheme, leads to a state of “assertion/affirmation” of identity and, one could say, brings the community closer to mastering resources (e.g. heritage, collective memory, etc.) that are crucial for its development.

In the “museology” phase, after a sense of identity is first established, community “sensitisation” gains the connotation of “mobilization”. Here, the objective is to promote a growing involvement of the community in the process and, with this, create “synergy” (concept that combines the ideas of action and co-operation). This corresponds to the moment when the ecomuseum in created.

The ecomuseum’s establishment inaugurates the transition to the “post-museology” phase. From this point on, people are expected to
act each time more actively, together with the ecomuseum. Within this relationship, the ecomuseum becomes an instrument of community mobilization (call to action), supports actions of social character\textsuperscript{43} and works with the population in order to build capacities (which are related to the strengthening of identity and promotion of community’s self-awareness and self-initiate). The community, by its turn, provides feedback to the ecomuseum and can interpret its own history, identity, needs, problems, wishes, etc.

By the closing of the cycle and the end of the “post-museology” phase, eventually the community is expected to master the directions of its development without the services of the ecomuseum (what corresponds to the final aim of the process and the “trans-museology” phase). This stage would correspond to the “plenitude” of community empowerment, understood as a state in which the population has the actual power to interfere in its reality (i.e., from an internal perspective, because is has the awareness, can master resources, take decisions, etc.). As the name suggests, “trans-museology” extrapolates the museological action and, in consequence, suppresses the role proposed for the ecomuseum in face to new demands.

It is interesting to note that, according to Mayrand’s theory, there is a gradual transformation which endows the process initiated by the ecomuseum with new aspects of social work at each accomplished phase, until the moment when such process is confounded with the global action for development itself, as Mayrand (2000) suggests. At this stage, the ecomuseum is supposed to work as a support, a reference in the context of development, finally arriving to the point where its existence becomes superfluous (what corresponds to the “post-museology” phase). In this way, the museological action passes from “sensitisation” to “mobilization”, from “creating

\textsuperscript{43} Such as alphabetization, social work and others which are not considered as museum services in the common sense (MAYRAND, 2000).
awareness” to “leading to action”, until it becomes a mark and reference. At the same time, it is understood that the community accompanies the ecomuseum’s evolution, passing from the “appropriation of the territory” (in the “pre-museology” phase) to involvement (“museology” phase), initiative (“para-museology”) and finally to proper action for development (“post-museology” and “trans-museology”).

Perhaps such idea of transformation can explain some of the differences between Varine’s and the Canadian museologists’ discourses during this period. These differences, which are inherent to each other, refer to the type and level of interference that the ecomuseum proposes to carry out within the community, as well as to the notion of collectivity.

As it will be seen later, for Varine the ecomuseum comprises an active/direct role in community development planning. Differently, the Canadian museologists do not endow the work of the Ecomuseum of Haute-Beauce with such function⁴⁴. Differently from when the ecomuseum aimed to help the population to reach self-awareness, self-initiative and strength its identity in earlier stages, the institution does not foresee actions in helping the community to determine development objectives or directions to be followed. Besides, Varine’s ideas are grounded on a strong notion of collectivity. His emphasis relies on the collective level of community dynamics and target actions that intend to promote a “critical communitarian consciousness”.

On the other hand, the Canadian museologists show to focus more on targets that deal with the individual level of community’s life as means to reach development:

---

⁴⁴ I.e., the museum does not foresee specific actions in this domain. Nevertheless, one can understand that its work provides the accomplishment of the essential requirements to allow the community to master its own development.
“There is individual development, where each person can find its place and develop, can use the museum as a personal spring board, but this is also a tool of regional development. I believe that for me these are the two great objectives of the ecomuseum.” (CÉRÉ, 1985, quoted in HAUENSCHILD, 1998)

In this regard, Mayrand (quoted in HAUENSCHILD, 1998) justifies that without autonomy and self-determination an individual cannot act as a community member and contribute effectively to its development:

“It seems to me that development is very closely linked to the people’s autonomy, to their basic capacity to make these decisions and not to wait for others to impose them, to be capable of taking their own matters into hand and not having them imposed or fabricated, rather than saying “let’s wait for the government to give us something before starting”.

Therefore, it is possible to say that Varine presents the ecomuseum as an instrument of community empowerment, which, among other things, aims to “guide” (or create conditions for) decision-making processes related to development planning, mainly on a collective basis. The Canadian museologists, by their turn, present the ecomuseum (at least during this period) as an instrument of community mobilization/sensitisation, which, among other things, aims to promote a “long term process of self-awareness” (MAYRAND, 1984) with a view to development, mainly on an individual basis.45

---

45 It is important to stress that the comparison between these approaches show is a difference in emphasis mainly. This does not mean that for Varine the collective level excludes the individual level or vice-versa in the case of the Canadian museologists. What changes is the hierarchy in which collective and individual levels appear within both ideas and strategies proposed for the ecomuseums.
Finally, all these differences can be explained by each particular situation and certainly cannot be dissociated from their social context. However, one may also consider appreciating them within a theoretical perspective. By doing this, it is possible to affirm that the Canadian case provides evidences to believe that Mayrand and Cérè interpret community development as the result of a collective development of individuals in a community, standing a fundamental contrast to Varine’s approach.

This focus on an individual approach is also reflected in the ideas proposed for and carried out in the Ecomuseum of Haute-Beauce. The first of them refers to its essential educational role. In 1984, Mayrand defined ecomuseum as such:

“The ecomuseum… is a collective, a workshop expanded to include the whole population of a given area; its basic tools remain those of critical analysis and research. The ecomuseum should be considered an educational process, using the methods of popular education… The ecomuseum is not and end in itself: it is defined as an objective to be attained.”

Aiming at objectives related to community development, the educational character of the museum process calls for action and a direct interference in community’s reality. As Stevenson (1982) stresses, “what the population learns and understands [through this educational process] guides the decision they make, particularly on a community level, about their present and future.”

For this, the ecomuseum strives to initiate a learning process based on the methods of popular education, which comprises the notions of “learning through participation”, “learning through experience” and “learning through action” (HAUENSCHILD, 1998); rather than the idea of learning as passive assimilation of given contents. This is
done mainly in an individual basis and follows the mechanism of a geometric progression: knowledge is multiplied from individual to individual, who, together, will take decision collectively.

In order to exercise its educational role, the ecomuseum focus its activities on the following targets:

- act as people’s university (educate the population through active participation in the museum so that it can answer the questions: “Where do we come from?”, “Who are we?” and “Where do we want to go?”);
- provide means for the population to learn work skills (to reflect, to work collegially, to plan, etc…) and take responsibility;
- stimulate contact with external references and open the community to the outside world.

Among the methods applied to fulfil such targets, courses on popular museology have a strategic role. By giving individuals basic museological knowledge and the opportunity to participate in practical museum projects, the courses aim to train “competent workers for community action” (RIVARD, 1985). The idea is that individuals who take the courses will play an active role in the ecomuseum and disseminate their knowledge to others, multiplying the effect and range of action of the educational process. Besides the fact that the courses on popular museology are a way to promote participation and qualify human resources, they also stimulate the replacement of professional specialists for community members.

---

Other methods refer to traditional museum functions. They all depart from the assessment of the local heritage\textsuperscript{47}. Among those, the authors highlight:

- temporary thematic exhibitions and open-air exhibits (developed in local interpretation centres- ecomuseum’s antennae- and spread in the territory) with workshops, and discussions with the community about the themes;
- \textit{in situ} conservation;
- research on collective memory and local history.

\textsuperscript{47} As to the concept of heritage, Rivard (1985) stresses: “the collective memory of the public is the primary heritage of the ecomuseum”.
Such activities aim to fulfil different purposes. First of all, they intend to “develop awareness of the significance and value” (STEVENSON, 1982) of the local heritage and issues that concern community’s life, and also bring discussions into a present and future-oriented perspective. They are also regarded as means to motivate community members to take initiative, act, deal with responsibilities and, finally, develop their work skills (once they are the ones who are supposed to plan and execute such activities). In regard to this last aspect, Mayrand (quoted in HAUENSCHILD, 1998) emphasizes the importance of stimulating participation in the management of the institution:

“By definition and in accordance with our objectives… administrative and organizational education was one of the priority objectives. In order to be independent, these people needed to take themselves in hand, to set themselves objectives and to be capable of managing the objectives collectively (…)”.

In addition, considerably attention is given to forging links with the outside world. This is done mainly by setting a network of contacts and exchange programmes with other ecomuseums or “any organization working in the field of popular education, economic development and heritage appreciation” (RIVARD, 1985). As another facet of such opening to the outside world, Hauenschild (1998) mentions the work with small-scale tourism (by creating tourist routes), which, besides raising awareness and a sense of value in relation to Haute-Beauce’s territory, also has a view to community’s economical development.

Just like in Le Creusot, the community appears as subject and object, actor and user of the ecomuseum. The degree of community direct input, in this way, is very high in all aspects of the museum’s work. Although it is clear that Haute-Beauce combines community input with specialists’ input (“double input” system), there is a general
belief that the role of the professional/specialist should be minimized during the course of the ecomuseum’s life. Some evidences of that can be found in the popular museology training itself, as well as in the organizational structure of the ecomuseum:

“The approach of the ecomuseums in Quebec is at once interdisciplinary and non-disciplinary, in that none of them has the scientific committee the French ecomuseums have. This fact does not in any way denote fear or disdain of the strict, scientific approach. It shows a preference for integrating professional researchers with the local people and, through the user’s committee, ensuring that they are neither isolated nor made remote from the popular objectives given to their research work by the ecomuseum.” (RIVARD, 1985)

Besides the volunteer work, community input is also high in the ecomuseum’s management and financial support. Actually, financial support is taken as a crucial aspect of participation and proof of the community’s ownership of the ecomuseum, as well as of the institution’s independence. It is done mainly through family memberships and contributions from individuals and local business, representing an important funding source.

Finally, the ecomuseum’s participation structure reflects an effort to decentralize responsibility and decision-making. Local committees carry out activities and are able to take decisions independently from the central governing bodies of the ecomuseum - which, in theory, would respond to the main directions of the ecomuseum’s programming, day-to-day operations and financial affairs.

The cases of Le Creusot and Haute-Beauce are only examples among other approaches to “development ecomuseums”. It is true, however, that they counted with the direct involvement of two of the most outstanding theorists of ecomuseology (Hugues de Varine and Pierre...
Mayrand) and carry the most substantial theoretical frameworks of “development ecomuseum” during this period.

Despite of their differences, it is possible to say that both share the same essence; which is not exclusive to “development ecomuseums”, but also can be extended to a number of other initiatives that followed the development of the new museology school of thought.

One must take such aspect into account when thinking of the relations between ecomuseology and community development, once a number of different –and sometimes discrepant- initiatives shared the label “ecomuseum”, as discussed previously. This becomes even more dramatic when one realizes that, for many who work with community development, ecomuseum became a “distorted” word and does not have the power to express its implicit philosophy. An example of that can be seen in Varine’s attitude:

“For one who invented the word ecomuseum almost by accident, its destiny is difficult to comprehend. As for the phenomenon itself, its substance varies from one place to another, despite the efforts of Georges Henri Rivière to give it specific form and meaning. In some cases it is an interpretation centre; in others an instrument for development; elsewhere a park or makeshift museum; yet elsewhere a centre for ethnographic conservation or for the industrial heritage.” (VARINE, 1985)

Today, Varine shows a preference for replacing the term “ecomuseum” for “community museum”\(^48\). By doing this, he is

\(^48\) In 1993, Varine defined community museum as: “(…) one which grows from below, rather than imposed from above. It arises in response to the needs and wishes of people living and working in the area and it actively involves them at every stage while it is being planned and created and afterwards when it is open and functioning. It makes use of experts, but it is essentially a co-operative venture, in which professionals are no more than partners in a total community effort.”
emphasizing, instead of its form, the museum’s essence as a community instrument and as a process. And it is such idea (which is not exclusive to ecomuseums) that will arrive strongly to the core of the new museology movement in the 80’s.

**The “bloom” of the new museology movement**

*The “bloom” of the new museology movement* was a phenomenon witnessed specially in countries of Europe, Latin America and Canada during the 80’s. In resume, it could be appreciated as the result of a convergence of various tendencies in museology (which existed before and beyond this movement and, in general terms, correspond to the new museology school of thought) around the common desire to change radically museology’s role within the society and drive it towards an essential stage of social concern.

Just like in the cases showed previously, the development of the new museology movement followed a crescent dissatisfaction with the meanings and methods of the traditional museology. Museology’s typical form of action - the classical museum- was regarded as an institution lost in the past and obsolete, isolated from the public and incapable to respond to contemporary societal changes or everyday life challenges. Besides the torpor, more disquieting accusations referred to the use of the traditional museum as an instrument of oppression, a way to impose the dominant cultural view of a minority (the elite) to the national populations as a whole. This view has provided several critics along the time. An early example can be found in Varine (1969):

“It is normal that the institution [museum] is contested and even rejected globally, that it is considered as an instrument of propaganda and oppression in the service of a caste
supposedly in possession of the truth, be it ideological, aesthetic, moral or others.”

César Lopes and Fernando João Moreira (1986) go further:

“More important than indicating, or adjusting to something, is to provide the populations with the chance to realize all this intoxication, colonization and attempts of adulteration of which they are victims – for that we must dare to produce something alternative, genuine e sincere, something de facto new and free.” (LOPES & MOREIRA, 1986)

Within this context, during the decades of 70 and 80, the new museology began to arise as a movement of criticism and renovation in the core of the international scene of museology. Numerous experiences (such as ecomuseums, local museums, neighbourhood museums and others on community museology, popular museology, etc.) carried out alternatives to overcome traditional approaches, facing disagreements and resistance - a segregation according to some - in the professional environment.

As different authors attest, in time, the frustration of some museologists in addressing debates and their points of view during international bodies meetings, as well as in promoting reforms in established museums, led to the shaping of the new museology as an independent movement from the established circles. That is to say, at this first stage, such congregation has been set mostly as a political positioning and protest against conservative approaches - and attitudes - in the field of museology. Pierre Mayrand, in the article “The new museology proclaimed” (1985), offers a resume of the materialization of the new movement:

49 For instance, Moutinho (1995).
“This emerged from the first public pronouncements of a group who met in London in 1983, at the General Conference of ICOM, and then in Quebec in 1984 at the first International Workshop on “Ecomuseums and the New Museology”\(^{50}\). The protest first voiced in ICOM’s International Committee for Museology (ICOFOM) developed rapidly into a movement with its own momentum and structure which is expected to lead the establishment, in November 1985 (Second International Workshop, Lisbon, Portugal), of an international federation for the new museology.” (MAYRAND, 1985)

The first and the second International Workshops referred in Mayrand’s article promoted, respectively, the creation of the Declaration of Quebec and the International Movement for a New Museology (MINOM).

Moutinho (1995) explains that the objectives of the workshop held in Quebec in 1984 were to create conditions for exchanging experiences on ecomuseology and new museology; clarify the relations between them and the established museology; and deepen concepts as well as encourage new practices on ecomuseology and new museology in general. In this way, besides developing theoretical reflections, the meeting aimed to organize “what was felt to be a simultaneous movement in many countries, of which interlocutors were found, in a way, isolated from each other” (MOUTINHO, 1995). Moutinho continues:

“From a vague idea of new forms of museology (…) the workshop evolved to the recognition of a movement with such amplitude that could not be disregarded as a new reality of museology”.

\(^{50}\) Mayrand (1984) also explains that the organization of the workshop was part of the efforts in Quebec to promote exchanges among ecomuseums throughout the world.
It is true that differences in forms and museological expressions led to many disagreements, in special in relation to the protagonist role claimed for ecomuseums within new museology, according to Moutinho. However, the will to give shape to a movement rooted in pluralities finally overcame and the Declaration of Quebec was formulated as a charter of the new museology movement, being adopted in the Second International Workshop in Lisbon.

Still during the meeting of 1984, a resolution was adopted for the creation of an ICOM international committee “Ecomuseums/Community museums” and an international federation for the new museology. The ICOM committee never came into being, but the international federation was instituted under the name of International Movement for a New Museology (MINOM) in 1985 and later recognized by ICOM as an affiliated organization. Since then, MINOM has organized international workshops and regional meetings, in particular through the Portuguese cluster\(^{51}\) (this last happening on an annual basis since 1988).

When analyzing the contents of these and other implementations, one might take into consideration that, indeed, there isn’t a formula for new museology movement. According to Andrea Hauenschild (1998), its discourse is essentially cultural and political, not scientific. She argues that it is not possible to talk about a theory of new museology; at best, one can speak of a “collection of ideas”. She also emphasizes the empiric nature of the new museology, quoting both Hugues de Varine (1983) and Michel Roy (1987):

“There are no established rules or models, just theories that have been immediately belied by practice […]"

\(^{51}\) Today, MINOM has 3 clusters: Canada, Portugal and Mexico.
These practices are characterized by a refusal to develop a precise museological model, a practice based on a precise theory. Exploration and experimentation are still underway.”

Other theorists of the new museology have reinforced this idea, such as Cesar Lopes, who described in 1988 the new museology as a “body of theoretic-practical proposals”. Mayrand also addresses to this matter. In 1989, he wrote with criticism: “the practices that openly claim to be part of the new museology are rarely connected to a structured, continuous museological reflection”. In addition, it seems to be a general consensus that, due to its empiric nature and diversity of initiatives, the new museology can only be defined by “its concerns, positioning and actions.” (Provisory working group, 1985)

Nevertheless, along the 80’s, efforts aimed the definition of basic principles, objectives and means of new museology through the creation of collective documents and publication of various individual papers of those related to the movement’s philosophies. Some of such statements will serve as sources to analyze the proposals related to community development at this first stage of the new museology movement.

In the first place, community development appears as the primal objective of the new museology, as the Declaration of Quebec states:

“While preserving the material achievements of past civilizations and protecting the achievements characteristic of the aspirations and technology of today, the new museology – ecomuseology, community museology and all other forms of active museology – is primarily concerned with community development, reflecting the driving forces in social progress and associating them in its plans for the future.”
Echoing the ideas introduced in the Round Table of Santiago, the Declaration of Quebec therefore reaffirms the social role of museology and evokes an essential commitment to people in opposition to the “sacrosanct principles of the profession” (MAYRAND, 1985), i.e. the emphasis on collections and artefacts.

Just like in the integral museum concept, new museology’s claims for a global view of reality lead to the adoption of an interdisciplinary approach; and museological interference is regarded as a mean to generate action within communities. In addition to this last purpose, the actions of new museology, in general terms, also aim to:

- strength community’s identity and sense of ownership of its territory and heritage;
- raise community’s awareness of itself and its conditions of existence;
- stimulate creativity and self-confidence;
- favour cultural exchanges inside the community and between the community and the outside.

Such aims depart from and respond to the principle of community participation, which is crucial to the new museology movement and can be understood as:

“(…) holders of a cultural identity and knowledge must be the protagonists of this same culture. That is to say, instead of consumers to a certain cultural product, which is outlandish to them, individuals and communities must be the

52 This is a condensation based on: resolutions of the I International Workshop, 1984 (quoted in MOUTINHO, 1989); Provisory working group, 1985 (quoted in MOUTINHO, 1989); Maure (1985); resolutions of the IV International Workshop, 1987 (quoted in LOPES, 1988); Lopes (1988); and Hauenschild (1998).
ones to create their own culture, their own development, they must be the actors of change …” (LOPES, 1988)

In this way, community is taken as user and actor/subject and object of the museological action and, just like in the cases seen previously, it is expected to deliver direct and high input to the processes in which it is engaged (this happens together with specialists’ input, characterizing the “double input system”).

Assertions also refer to the general orientations of applied methods. They basically correspond to the conceptions that were already being developed since the Round Table of Santiago: departing from the assessment of community’s global heritage (defined in relation to its relevance for the “collective memory”), methods in the new museology are largely based on traditional museum functions and the museological language, which are extended in order to respond to defined targets on community development. Thus, methods do not hold an end in themselves. Instead, they are regarded only as means and integrant parts of a broader methodology that strives to achieve social objectives.

Within this philosophy, the “new museum” is the favoured vehicle for the museological action. The museum is conceived as a tool to be used by the community and through which the new museology’s methodology will be delivered. As to its definition, in the same way as happens with the opposition between “new” and “traditional” museology, the new museum’s characteristics are set in counterpoint to the traditional museum:

“The new type of museum could be described as essentially a cultural process, identified with a community (population), on a territory, using the common heritage as a resource for development, as opposed to the more classical museum, an institution characterized by a collection, in a building, for a public of visitors” (VARINE, 1996)
In regard to the distinct types of “new museums” (ecomuseums, local museums, neighbourhood museums, etc.), it is possible to say that the differences in their form simply result from the way they “legally” interact with the territory. Ecomuseology, for instance, consider the whole territory to be the museum; Portuguese museologists consider the territory as an “area of influence” of some of the local museums, etc. Despite of this, they share the same view: the territory is defined by the interactions between community and its natural environment; its contents (people, tangible and intangible heritage, collective memory) are the raw matter for the museological actions; the range of action comprises the territory as whole, mainly through open and decentralized structures.

As to the work of new museums, it is the practice that determines to what extend the main contributions to community development proposed by the new museology movement are actually reflected in their action and come to determine main targets, as well as how methods will be applied.

In 1996, Hugues de Varine offered an insight into numerous initiatives in the 80’s related to the philosophy of the new museology. They all target actions on community development but lay emphasis on different aims:

“The notion of the social role of museums was developed, discussed, studied, particularly in Portugal and Spain. In the North, it was more the question of community mobilisation and strengthening which was debated. In France, the new museology was applied to problems like the conversion of industrial sites in crisis, the salvage of rural areas in the process of desertification, cultural tourism, etc. In 1986, in Jokmokk, a forum of the world oppressed minorities discussed the question of the possible role of museums in
helping these populations to liberate themselves by reinforcing their identities and defending their values.”

In this way, understood as a process and “(…) product of different populations, eventually with different problems e also different responses” (LOPES & MOREIRA, 1986), the work of the new museum is susceptible not only to community demands, but also to a range of interpretations and wider societal contexts. Such regard for particularities has provided new museology with a number of different examples on the ways in which museums deal with community’s life and community’s needs. The case of Haute-Beauce represents one of them. Another example that is important mentioning refers to local museums and the Portuguese context.

By the end of the 70’s, Portugal witnessed the development of several museums based on local initiatives from official authorities or cultural associations⁵³. Known as local museums, some of these organizations became to play an active role in local development programmes throughout the country, aligning their experiences with the new museology movement.

Outcomes from regional Minom meetings, as well as publications of militant museologists such as Mario Moutinho, Cesar Lopes and Fernando Joao Moreira, show that the characteristics of the Portuguese museology in the field of development are marked by a direct interference in communities’ daily problems. Such interference comprises, in special, a need to respond to social challenges which result from the negative impact of the Portuguese political and economical contexts. According to the authors, this negative impact can be noticed in issues related to the inequity between rural and

⁵³ This movement correspond to the changes occurred in Portugal since the revolution of April 1974, which brought more than 20 years of dictatorship to an end.
urban areas, unemployment, the threaten brought by mass tourism, among others.

The aims of local museums are, with this, broaden beyond those already mentioned in the core of the new museology movement in order to include community empowerment -as well as the active intervention in the economical, social or even political domains- as part of local development strategies. Thus, actions that aim, for instance, to ferment employment or minimize negative impact of mass tourism are carried out in the museums’ territories or “areas of influence”; what in some cases means to fill a gap left by other social institutions (MOUTINHO, 1989).

For these purposes, proposals for local museums concentrate in the following targets:\n
\- act as a data bank of all elements of the heritage and knowledge (know-how, knowledge of physical and human environment) useful for development, act as a source of collective memory;
\- protect heritage (i.e. movable, immovable, intangible: air, buildings, professions, etc.) in the sense of protecting local resources;
\- value local resources (human, natural, material), in special the traditional know-how;
\- build capacities (by forming human resources for the museum/communitarian work and stimulating innovations in the domain of professional know-how)
\- promote region and organize the space (territory);
\- support school teaching;

---

54 This is a condensation based on: Lopes & Moreira (1986); Moutinho (1989), resolutions of the Second International Workshop (quoted in MOUTINHO, 1989), Museum de Monte Redondo: brochure (n.d.)
- co-operate with other institutions or individuals that carry out similar projects.

The same way, methods are broaden beyond the traditional sense of museum functions, once local museums’ “collections” are ultimately composed by community’s problems (MOUTINHO, 1989) and museums propose to co-operate with the community in order to solve these problems. Among a variety of activities that local museums supposedly carry out, authors emphasize:

- participant investigation of community problems and elements of the heritage;
- participant conservation and documentation of community’s heritage;
- communication of investigation’s outcomes on community problems and heritage (having exhibition as important media);
- support to community planning and critical evaluation of current situation, problems, etc.;
- professional workshops on traditional techniques.

Other methods, as said before, refer to a more direct and immediate interference in the social, economical and political domains. As a relevant example, it is possible to mention the work with politicians and local authorities in order to raise awareness of the museum’s work and, with this, of community demands. In short, one could interpret these interventions as a “spokesperson’s” role the museum takes on behalf of local populations, what ultimately characterizes an exercise of community empowerment, once the museum conceived as an instrument of the community and represents it legitimately.

Such last aspect of the museum’s work also offers opportunities to cast actions towards a wider level of interference in society. That is to say, besides working in a meso-level (directly with communities), local museums expect to play a political role on behalf of local
communities in the regional and national levels, as can be attested in the resolutions of the first meeting on the “Social Function of Museums” (Jornadas sobre a Função Social dos Museus; Seção “Museologia e Desenvolvimento”, 1988).

In general, the Portuguese experience has provided valuable contributions to the work of museology as a resource for community development; be them in regard to theoretical constructions, training\(^{55}\), dissemination of ideas, organization of the new museology movement, actual co-operation in development programmes or raising awareness of methodologies and their usefulness for society. Its contents, and the contents of the new museology worldwide, have crossed the 90’s and arrived to the new century as a concrete and substantial body of proposals for the active contribution to community development.

The next section will contemplate the development of new museology’s proposals during this period, as well as of the museology as whole, in face to wider societal changes taken place since the early 90’s.

---

\(^{55}\) Since 1989, the Universidade Lusófona de Humanidades e Tecnologias (Lisbon) has offered courses on Social Museology, which have counted with the organization and participation of MINOM members.
CHAPTER 2

The relations between museology and community development: from the 90’s and towards a new century.

In the early 90’s, Mario Moutinho launched the concept of social museology, idea which symbolizes much of the updates taken place in the field of museology during the past years. Created as a framework for the newly implemented museology courses at the Universidade Lusófona in Lisbon, the concept of social museology translates, according to Moutinho (1993), considerable part of the efforts in adapting museology to contemporary society conditionalisms56. It refers to the opening of museological structures to the milieu and their organic relation with the social context that brings them to life.

The notion of social museology, as well as the appreciation of the context in which it was created, serve as departure to analyse two aspects that characterize the state of affairs between museology and community development today -relationship marked by a slow convergence that has become more solid since the decade of 90, period when proposals concerning contributions to development clearly began to extrapolate the circle of the new museology and integrate the broader field of museology. The first aspect refers to the relations of museums (and the museological field as a whole) with contemporary society and the second to an approximation between the so-called new and traditional museology.

Departing from the premise that museology ought to change in order to adapt to the contemporary world and that this change accompanies the realization of an organic relation which shall be marked by the

56 Effort which has been recognized and stimulated by the most important instances of museology according to the author.
enhancement of social impact of museology, Moutinho has provided in different opportunities images of change and resistance within the field. A first issue that appears fundamental to understanding the changes taken place in museology during this period refers to developments related to its communication role. In this regard, Moutinho wrote in 1997:

“Each time it is more evident that museums anywhere in the world have been passing through changes that are manifested in many forms. Beyond the traditional functions of collecting, conserving and displaying objects as enunciated in ICOM’s statutes, museums are coming to intend to be means of communication, opened to the preoccupations of the contemporary world.”

Here, museums’ communication role appears in close relation with the use of “new technologies” of information and exhibition language as an autonomous means of communication (MOUTINHO, 1993)\(^\text{57}\). Other issues presented as support to the courses on social museology also represent some of the topics that arrive to the new century as dominant forces- not only within the context of the new museology school of though but also in the discourse or practice of the field of museology as a whole. They refer to the broadening of the notion of heritage and the consequent redefinition of “museological object”; the idea of community participation in the definition and management of museological practices; museology as a factor of development; and issues on interdisciplinarity (MOUTINHO, 1993). These aspects give shape to what Moutinho

\(^{57}\) It is clear that the major part of the museological field has gone through a communication “revolution”, which finds ground in the “information era” that characterizes our contemporary time. More than other aspects, this enhancement of museums’ communication potential extrapolates the efforts to endow institutions with a social responsibility and also comes to integrate approaches that lay far from social considerations, mainly setting museums as “spectacles” or, at the most, helping to camouflage an educational function as Moutinho (1993) stresses.
(2000) considers the main areas in which it is possible to realize more clearly the changes in the world of museology. He presents them as:

- the right to be different: there is not a single model of museum anymore, based on the idea of collection, building and public;
- the “relativisation” of collections: beyond the dimension of artefacts, there is a general recognition of the material and immaterial character of collections and of the collections that are not stored inside the museums, instead spread on a territory, which the museum supports with its protection and potential of valorisation;
- management forms: partially because of the museum opening to the community, there was the development of non-hierarchical management models. “In a certain way, there was a management democratization, which became a collective responsibility in many museums, at the same time that this responsibility kept from being obligatorily subordinated to orientations from curators or directors in other cases. The technical staff kept from determining the action of museums; instead it started responding to the surrounding environment demands”;
- critics to exhibition: if in one hand modernizations and the introduction of technologies helped to camouflage old discourses, in the other hand exhibitions have been object to critics which provide a better perception of this media and its potential;
- museum as end versus museum as resource: it is possible to realize each time more frequently a new generation of museums (even those that have not changed in the previous points) that organize/define programmes and are put in perspective as a resource for development. In other cases, museums have taken the form of resource itself and because
of this are shaped according to the profile and meaning of this same development.

In the other hand, the author reminds that these areas are not free from resistance. In regard to the change in management models, for example, Moutinho (2000) stresses:

“This process of abandoning power was and still is naturally difficult. Many of the places that museums occupy today are determined by an ambiguity of this situation, which carries on a conflict, in many cases difficult to solve.”

In addition he calls attention to other domains that still remain quite insensitive to societal changes. They are:

- the museological discourse keeps depending on collections: in contradiction to a crescent recognition of museology as communication means and of the exhibition as an independent vehicle that is not confined in the core of museum’s services, there is a resistance against broadening forms of communication and considering exhibition as a resource detached from collections, which may become a resource to develop and present ideas inside and outside museums;
- there is no recognition of a new degree of autonomy in the acquisition of information by the visitors: museums do not respond to increasing demands for information and questioning of the quotidian, as well as for the need of people to recognize elements of their memory in the discourse;
- museums maintain their speeches out-of-date in relation to the quotidian: museums have difficulty in renovating themselves once a number of factor come into scene- museums do not work with an idea of permanent renovation, exhibition resources are not sustainable, the time of
museums is many times understood as the past time, museums do not focus on what happens outside their walls.

Again, it is possible to identify movements of change within these domains. As Moutinho (2000) affirms, there has also been an alteration of museological rhythms: temporary exhibitions have occupied positions in the work of museums and exhibitions on topics related to actual problems are a reality and comprise the orientation of different museums, be them regarded as more traditional institutions or as community museums. Moutinho finalizes stressing that, in general museums have dealt with this new reality by pursuing an “intermediate way”, which intends to conciliate old and new approaches. For the author, such conciliation do not solve the need of adaptation to societal demands and “sooner or later museums will have to abandon this obsession for the past, in order to communicate through objects that express ideas and recognize the existence of a public that do not need guides or labels.” Finally, he concludes:

“There are, indeed, things that changed in museums, just like the society that is in permanent change. And, if there are things that change in museums, it is logical to admit that these alterations provoke a gap in updates in one hand and, in the other hand are an invitation to the production of changes (new and in other areas).”

It is in this context of struggles for continuous changes and adaptation - which have strongly claimed the approximation of museology to social responsibilities since the late 60’s and is now updated to the demands of our time - that draws the state of affairs between museology and community development. If, in the past, resistance to changes and, in this particular case, to issues concerning developed came to confine proposals in one pole of the dichotomy created between new and traditional museology, today such situation is different. Resistance and change pointed to community
development purposes cohabit in the field of museology as a whole, shaping a rather complex scenario, indeed a scenario in construction. Such complexity can be translated in the multiplication of speeches that endow museology with a responsibility towards development, mainly aligning traditional museums with the concerns of the new museology. This becomes concrete through assertions clearly addressed to development issues, as well as through those that do not mention the term, but bring proposals and implementations that turn out to be fundamental in the search for a relevant contribution to development. In this regard, it is possible to appreciate the work of museums that aim to promote a greater approximation with the public, stimulate action (e.g. civic action), discussions on contemporary and community issues, among others. That is to say, these museums make use of their collections, services and other resources in order to reach objectives focused on the public and not (only) on research, communication and preservation of collections. These museums, even if not addressing explicitly to this matter, place themselves in a better condition to contribute to actions that aim at community development, once their energy, attitudes and resources are committed to people and social change.

It is also possible to note that discourses which have assimilated the term development do not bring similar approaches: some are more revolutionary (actions proposed by the new museology can be placed here); some comprise only a number of adaptations of museums functions, establishing fundamental differences with the previous ones; others even seem to consider that museums do not need to go through major changes in order to provide a relevant contribution to development (perhaps due to inaccurate interpretations of what development means and requires), setting an elemental contradiction in their discourse.

---

58 A good example of that can be found in ICOM, which, since 1995, defines museums as institutions in service of society and its development.
From this complex scenario a fact emerges certain: if 30 years ago contributions to community development were regarded as choice of radicals, today they are taken rather as necessity. It seems to be a growing feeling that social responsibilities of museology eventually come to direct attention to develop issues, although it may be not accompanied by correspondent actions in many cases. Moreover, inevitable resistances that accompany such atmosphere address more doubts on the limitations of museums and museology than on the legitimacy of their responsibility towards community development, as happened in the past. This fact naturally leads to the appreciation of the second aspect that characterizes the dialectic museology/community development today, regarding a tendency of approximation between “new” and “traditional” museology.

Short after the formalization of the new museology movement in the 80’s, theorists have gone through an effort to define relations between “new” and “traditional” museology, clearly addressing to a convergence and presenting “new” and “traditional” as facets of one museology. In 1990, records from the third regional meeting organized by the Portuguese cluster of MINOM stated:

“(…) we do not understand the new museology as a fundamental rupture in the field of museology, it is instead an adaptation of what is specific in the museum work to the new conditions 59, to which pre-existing museums were not always (or almost never) able to respond efficiently.”

As seen before, adaptation has also set the tune for the social museology concept, idea that emerges in the context of the work carried out by MINOM and aims to insert new museology and its

---

59 Related to the emergence of a decentralized economic model that privilege local resources and the local and regional spheres as privileged areas of economic development, according to the same document.
manifestation in broader context of museology, as part of a movement of adaptation of museological structures to the contemporary world. It is in this same orientation that many other authors stress that there are not two museologies and that changes occurred in the field during the last decades only translate a natural evolution of the science.

In relation to the contents on community development, certainly one cannot affirm that it was because of such approximation between new and traditional museology that issues on development came to integrate the discourse of the museological field as a whole. However, it is also not possible to ignore the impact promoted by an increasing exchange of ideas, seen in the affiliation of MINOM to ICOM; in the participation of new museologists in ICOM meetings and of different professionals in MINOM’s meetings; in the inclusion of new museology in training programmes and publications (VARINE, 1996), among others.

The most explicit aspect that rises from such interaction refers to the spread of ideas which have been mainly developed in the sphere of the new museology school of thought. In 1995, Peter van Mensch wrote:

“Although new museology was often discussed within ICOFOM, it was always considered as one possible approach rather than the main perspective. Each symposium is seen as an open forum, with a free exchange of ideas. Conclusions are never considered as final statements (…) Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that the rhetoric of the new museology has spread beyond MINOM and similar organizations, and had become a dominant force within ICOFOM.”

The case of “development ecomuseums” (understood under the perspective of community museums) also offers evidences of such
spread of ideas. According to Peter Davis (1998), “today, development ecomuseum are significantly more numerous than other forms of ecomuseums”. The author also explains that, taking proposals and ways of action into consideration, it is possible to note initiatives that do not use the label “ecomuseum” but carry out a similar work. Some of the professionals related to these experiences align themselves with the new museology movement or consider themselves associated to the new museology school of thought, but many others do not. The same happens with a number of other initiatives that make use of the integral museum concept, of popular education, etc.

By admitting an impact of the new museology contents on the broader field of museology, one may even consider that its practice has had a certain influence in placing community development in the spotlight within the museological field. However, if such idea is true, it is also true that it is only applicable to restricted contexts (i.e. where people have access and are aware of the new museology contents) and can only be proved with the use of concrete references, such as the ecomuseums case. Furthermore, ideas on development have permeated the museological field since the late 60’s, being carried out almost exclusively by the new museology until some years ago, when eventually other spheres showed to be opened to development issues.

The reasons for such change of attitude in the 90’s are not completely clear. Some authors provide insights that may be helpful to understand the transformations taken place in recent years. Maria Celia Santos (2002) stresses on societal changes, explaining that radical transformations - such as the communications revolution, the increase of productivity and the emergence of new centres of economic and political power - have characterized our contemporary world. At the same time, development has increased poverty, violence, diseases, pollution and conflicts, facing the world with global problems, of which solutions depend on the capacity of
articulation of a broader spectrum of social agents. Recent times witnessed the growing intervention of civil society that, in an organized way, tries to occupy spaces and place social aspects of development in a privileged position.

It is in such context of engagement of civil society in the solution of contemporary problems that some arguments concerning a change of attitude in the field of museology can be placed. They refer to the contribution museums can make in order to enhance social capital, engaging civil society and bringing long-term social benefits to their public. An example can be found in Carol Scott (2002). She argues that, since the mid-80s, policies of macroeconomic reform that have swept Western industrialized countries introduced an increased accountability for the expenditure of public monies. Models of performance measurement were then introduced in museums, primarily regarding quantifiable indicators. According to the author, in the last decade such model has evolved and “accountability has moved from fiscal accountability to encompass accountability to the public”. In this way, there is a growing pressure on museum to demonstrate public accountability, which according to Scott:

“(...) has focused attention on perceived value for money in terms of whether museums actually provide benefits to the public and what kind of changes museums effect in the world beyond their doors.”

Museums are, with this, “increasingly required to demonstrate that they provide long-term benefits to the community” (SCOTT, 2002), which according to the author can be assessed as regarding aspects of personal and collective development.

During a lecture at the Reinwardt Academy in October 2002, Gail Lord was asked about the reasons of such change of attitude in the field of museology. Confronted with the fact that development issues have surrounded museology since the late 60’s but only recently they
come to play an important role in the orientations of the field as a whole (being until the 90’s restricted to the new museology school of thought), she admitted the need for research on this subject. Yet, Lord mentioned that the opening of museums to community development could be, to certain extend, related to the kind of money given to museums today (i.e. the nature of the funding employed in many museums). Lord’s assertion suggests that museums are regarded differently today, perhaps as institutions capable and responsible for delivering social outcomes to their visitors, once they receive money aimed at programmes of social character and development issues.

In addition, one may also remember the arguments used to define new museology as an adaptation to dominant economic development models (LOPES & MOREIRA, 1986; MOUTINHO, 1989). In the late 80’s, new museology was presented as a response to a new model that privileges decentralization and the use of local resources. Today, one can say that such model has gained even more prominence: the approach to sustainable development claims not only local engagement but a generalized civil participation and responsibility, dragging museums, as well as other societal instructions, into a renewed paradigm of development60.

As said before, although it is possible to identify the increasing number of proposals regarding contributions to development that grow beyond the new museology school of thought, the panorama turns out to be very heterogeneous. Differences refer to the approaches to development, the degree of engagement identified in discourses, the form proposed contributions take, the ways of action, the level of interference, etc.

60 Which stands out as a paradox to the globalized and supra-territorial economic exploration that also characterizes our time.
In this regard, one cannot ignore a “tradition” of the new museology in dealing with development, leading to a more concise discourse than other spheres of the museological field. Another fact that stands out is that, despite of evidences of an exchange of ideas between the so-called new and traditional museology, great part of the professionals do not mention a word about past or current advances of the new museology and, worse, many seem to ignore a knowledge that is fundamental to the understanding and practice of museology as a resource for development. Because of this, the next sections of this chapter will still privilege a differentiation between new museology and traditional museology.

The first section is dedicated to an update of new museology proposals on local community development. This does not denote that these proposals are only used or developed by those associated with the circle of the new museology: they simply appear within the discourse of the new museology in a more concise and substantial way. Once it is one of the objectives of this thesis to identify the forms through which the museological work becomes concrete, the second section will address on the proposals regarding “traditional” museums, in order to highlight differences in forms and ways of action.

Finally, it is also important to realize that advances mainly found in the new museology school of through, as well as other themes-which are precious but not exclusive to it (ex: popular education, “heritage education”) - also constitute a knowledge that is applied in other approaches to development, originated from the museological field, and that escape the predominance of the local development concept (what does not mean that they are not or cannot be integrated to the process of local development). Sometimes, these approaches do not comprise the use or name of museums, being characterized
more as an application of methodologies. Such acknowledgement is important to understand that, although new museology pays much attention to territorial development, many advances in field can be applied in other approaches and circumstances.

**Territorial museologies of development**

In contrary to the belief of many, who insist in confining its climax (via the experience of development ecomuseums, the initiatives on popular museology, the creation of MINOM, etc.) to the decades of 70 and 80, as said before, the contents of the new museology school of thought have crossed the 90’s and arrived to the new

---

61 For example, actions on popular and “heritage education” that target individuals, children and youth, focusing on citizenship, social inclusion, etc. Two initiatives with this profile can be found in the work of MINOM-Portugal’s member Alfredo Tinoco (MINOM archives) and of the Brazilian museologist Maria Celia Santos (1996, 2000 and 2002)). Another example referring to the application of principles of the new museology can be found in Mayrand (1998). During a seminar of ICTOP in Croatia, Mayrand exhorted museology to play an active role in issues concerning “peace & reconciliation”, evoking the knowledge generated by the ecomuseology and social museology. In one hand, he shows belief in the relevance of community museums as conflict mediators, which, through action more than through words, could give priority to respect learning and the comprehension of differences in a context of reconciliation and also of preventive conciliation. That is to say, he evokes a role on political education. In the other hand, Mayrand exhorts other types of museums to compromise with the solving and prevention of conflicts, evoking institutional changes that could find inspiration in the principles of the new museology, such as the recognition of museums’ social engagement, a multi disciplinarily approach and communitarian participation in museums’ initiatives.

62 Some authors even express scepticism in relation to approaches to development that escape the dominance of territory.

63 Perhaps the reason for such misconceived belief is to be found in the impact provoked by the new museology itself during the 70’s and 80’ - which marked the imaginary of museology in this period and can never be repeated, only refined and experimented daily- as well as in the appreciation of some examples that became “icons” of a new orientation (such as Le Creusot and Anacostia) and for many reasons did not last or maintained their “revolutionary” approaches beyond the 70’s or 80’s.
century as a concrete and substantial body of proposals for an active contribution to community development.

Through the considerations presented next, one can appreciate the continued input of activists who have contributed to the work of museology in the previous decades, as well as the input of new actors. It is also possible to recognize a continuity of the new museology philosophy, incremented with a deepening of conceptual elaborations and development of aspects of intervention already worked previously. At the same time, there is a sort of rupture, with updates of challenges to be faced and new orientations. It is important to notice that new museology remains plural and practical. Its forms of action appear more diversified, with the work of museums, as well as through the application of methodologies that do not comprise the use or name of museums.

In the core of the international movement for a new museology (MINOM), there has been an effort to clarify concepts and the notion of development applied to museology (MAYRAND, 2001) and, with this, to refine the idea of a museology (or museologies) of development. In this way, efforts concentrate in conceptualizations of museology that are defined by its purposes and relations with development; at the same time, apparently, trying to bring a clarification to terms such as ecomuseum, new museology and others that do not define purposes and have been object of confusion during the years.

Thus, it is possible to appreciate the elaboration of the concept of “territorial museologies of development” in 2001, which

---

64 With the support from the academy, as Mayrand (2001) attests: “the courses of Maîtrise in New Museologies of the University of Quebec, in Montreal, and of Social Museology in the Lusófona University in Lisbon, work as multi-disciplinary conceptual laboratories to capture the theory of development applied to the museological work.”
comprehends manifestations of the new museology, placing them around the common purpose of local development and around common principles of action:

“The territorial museologies, ecomuseums, neighbourhood museums, cultural parks, emerged from the family of community museums, are characterized by a process that implies the active participation of a territorial community in systematic actions, global and of local development, placing the contribution of the social museology as a recognized partner, that cannot be dissociated from the regional valorisation and revitalization. Departing from the identification, of the analysis in diverse sectors of human resources, cultural, of the memory, territorial museologies are those that have as mission to submerge themselves completely in the project of a common future, to support it during its stages, to facilitate the transferences of a traditional society and of a contemporaneous society, in relation to the spiritual and environmental richness, shared, sustainable. These museologies differ from the nature interpretation centres, from the Musée de Société65, or history museums because of their character of evolution and integration, because of their search for accompanying changes.” (Propose of definition of the territorial museologies of development, MINOM Newsletter, 2001).

The concept of “territorial museologies” confirms the fundamental philosophy of the new museology elaborated during the decades of 70 and 80, evoking the museological intervention in benefit of community development, as an instrument that supports a global

---

65 Definition introduced by the French Government in the early 90’s to classify all museums that dealt with aspects of social history and community life (history museums, anthropology and ethnographical museums, maritime museums, folklife museums and ecomuseums), according to Davis (1999).
view of reality and as a process in constant adaptation that ought to respond to particular contexts. The same document also makes the approach on territorial development explicit and introduces questionings regarding aspects\textsuperscript{66} that result from the proposed museological action. This follows and represents continuity, as well as a deepening of the new museology thinking on issues concerning community development.

Added to its basic philosophy and known guiding principles, it is also possible to identify the rise of an emphasis on the ideas of duration and sustainability (related to the broader concept of sustainable/durable development) inside the discourse of MINOM-International.

In 1996, for occasion of the 7\textsuperscript{th} International Workshop, Minom members initiated the elaboration of a new declaration of the new museology movement. Reinforcing the social and political mission of museology, the project of the Declaration of Pátzcuaro evokes the durability of the relation between a population and its vital heritage (natural heritage), as well as aspects of durability of the museological action.

Among the conditions for the museological action, the document includes, besides the recognition of the social objectives of museology and the need for qualified training, a programming that takes into account the duration of actions with impact in the long-term, of which size must be considered according to the means offered by museology.

\textsuperscript{66} E.g. the interactions between a milieu and its surrounding, the co-existence between the local and the universal factors that condition the human relations, methods of context analysis, evaluation of instruments, formation in museology in order to attend local development processes, etc.
A manifest that accompanies the declaration evokes a “durable development that respects the fragile equilibrium between a population and the natural resources which assure it life and dignity”. Museology is called upon assuming an engaged responsibility towards the populations, defending the natural (vital) heritage against the impairment of economical exploration and suggesting alternative modes of organization in local communities.

In regard to the Portuguese context, MINOM’s regional cluster has been able to carry out a consistent discussion on the social role of museology and its work for development. Through the organization of regular meetings, several publications and the close co-operation with the academic environment, MINOM-Portugal appears as the most articulated nucleus of the new museology, contributing to its development and promoting its opening to the field of museology as whole in the country.

Discussions and outcomes generated from regional meetings organized by MINOM-Portugal (Jornadas sobre a Função Social do Museu, 1991-2001) exemplify some other developments of new museology throughout the 90’s and in the new century. They comprise 3 main aspects, which are:

1) a continuous update of subjects that bring new (and old) challenges to communities’ lives. It is possible to appreciate the effort in apprehending and reflecting on current issues, which are eventually taken as objects of local museums’ interference. Among these, a big emphasis relies on the European Integration and the development programmes for Portugal (in special in the rural areas). Discussions follow on the necessity to protect local communities in face to the European integration process; guarantee equity and their right to representation as ‘owners’ of local identities; i.e. guarantee the “recognition and practice of the right to be different”. As to rural development, there is a concern in responding to problems such as population ageing, migration and economic stagnation. Within this
context, sustainable tourism appears as a strategic element of community development (in special as a strong trend for economic revitalization and a way to stimulate cultural exchanges). Discussions also concentrate on the utilization of EU programmes for rural development (LEADER programmes in particular). Other topics refer to the contribution to education, preservation of the natural environment, etc.

2) discussions on the efficiency of techniques and especially of the museum management. The meetings show a continuous concern in improving the quality of museum services and management, what points to a greater professionalism of the new museology. Discussions follow on the need to renew exhibition techniques, documentation and to respond better to the different groups that compose a community, as well as to external public.

What emerge as a very important innovation in this domain are the claims for a greater professionalism of the museums management. In a position paper, Fernando João Moreira (1995) explains that prejudice and misconceived ideas that cultural institutions should be not-for-profit have hindered possible contributions of Economics (and with this, management theories) to the museological field. According to the author, if one understands profit beyond a restrict financial sense, he will come to the conclusion that “the idea of a cultural institution where there was a given investment of time, knowledge, hope, money and will, without implying objectives of producing a final added-value, (…) is meaningless, a loss of inputs that could be used in other opportunities”. In this way, museums should acquire management tools that, through providing

67 In this case, to the field of the new museology. Moreira aligns such ideas to his personal opinion, although it is possible to extend them to a whole generation.
68 For instance, profit as revitalization of community’s traditional economical sectors, promotion of the region, a higher cultural level of the community, self-financing, etc.
rationalization and “profitability” of resources, allow them to improve efficiency in obtaining “profits”. For that, claims refer to more accurate organizational planning, the need for strategic planning and strategic forecasts. Marketing is also seen as an important management tool, as a way to strengthen the ties between museum and the population and maximize results.

3) discussions related to the fundamentals (aims, targets, methods) of the new museology. At a first glance, some of the meetings’ annual records seem to lack emphasis on crucial fundamentals of the new museology\(^{69}\), evoking the idea of a cooling of the basis launched in the 80’s. In the other hand, in many occasions, records also attest the attention given to reminding participants of new museology’s political fundamentals\(^{70}\), such as the need to drive communities to action (beyond representing them or their cultural identity), contribute to solving social problems and carry out direct interferences in the political and economical domains. In order to comprehend such discrepancy, one must remember that, in accordance with MINOM’s philosophy, the referred meetings have increasingly counted with the participation of a variety of museum professionals, local agencies, as well as specialists from other disciplines, who were not necessarily involved with the new museology or perhaps even truly aware of its contents. The regional meetings were able to gather a plurality of people and ideas, and their outcomes have to be seen not only as product of few members of the new museology movement. Differently, outcomes have complied with democratic resolutions, which were obviously not free from varied points of view, disagreements and controversy.

---

\(^{69}\) Some conclusions of working groups restrict museum’s interference to the acts of collecting, preserving and communicating, neglecting the political role of local museums.

\(^{70}\) This is done mainly by MINOM members.
Taking such aspect into consideration, it is clear that those contents which bring a more traditional view of museums or stay some steps prior to the political fundaments of the new museology (in the way they were established during the 80’s) do not necessarily denote a change in the movement’s philosophy. Actually, due to the recurrent “reminds” from some of MINOM members - and based on a large number of statements- it is possible to affirm that the essence of the new museology remains the same. The effort in responding to new challenges comes to reinforce the idea that museums should play an active role in community development and continuously adapt to changes. Outcomes reaffirm the principle of community participation (through a high and direct input in all the processes in which the community is engaged), the need for a global view of community’s life and for interdisciplinary approaches. Aims, targets and methods for local museums also remain faithful to those proposed in the 80’s, being sometimes adapted to current community demands.

Examples of such adaptation- what may also be interpreted as a stage of greater maturity of new museology within the Portuguese context-

71 In brief, aims for local museums concentrate in: strengthening identity; raising awareness and forming a critical consciousness; strengthening self-esteem; favouring cultural exchange; improving social bonds and articulate forces; promoting community empowerment (ability to plan, execute and evaluate); helping with solving urgent problems. In order to achieve such aims, participants propose the following targets for local museums: act as a data bank; protect and value heritage; build capacities (form agents, stimulate the development of small industrial and handcraft units, etc.); promote region and organize the space; support teaching; co-operate with other institutions. For that, methods depart from the assessment of the local heritage, are seen as local resources for community development and make extended use of the museological language. They refer to traditional museum functions (investigation, documentation, conservation, communication, etc.) and also to a more direct interference in the political and economical domains; be they from an internal perspective (social animation, support to planning and critical evaluation), be them from an external perspective (interventions in the economic and political domains, etc.) This is a condensation based on records from MINOM-Portugal regional meetings (“Jornadas sobre a Função Social do Museu”, from 1991 until 2001).
refer to the consolidation of the idea of an external public. Since the 80’s, efforts in strengthening the bonds between local communities and the outside world pushed museums into improving their outreach services 72. This became even more necessary with the raise of tourism’s role as element of local development strategies. In this way, outside visitors, who are expected to visit local communities mostly because of tourist activities, gain the status of a distinct category of museum users. They are presented as recipients of consistent consumer-oriented services and their input is taken as quantitative (especially in relation to generating income), as well as qualitative contributions to communities’ lives (by helping to preserve and value the local heritage, exchanging experiences, etc).

Still in regard to the tourism activity, the reinforcement of its role as part of development strategies confound itself with the first mentions to sustainable development and a greater emphasis on the promotion of community economical development since the second half of the 90’s. As seen before, Portuguese museologists have already concentrated their efforts in developing methodologies that comprised actions in the community’s economical domain (e.g. aims to ferment employment, stimulate professional improvement, etc.) during the previous decade. Following the outcomes from the referred meetings, it is possible to see that such approach not only remained, but also has being developed into a more substantial conception in time. Aligned to the potentials of tourism and the idea of sustainability, community economic development seems to occupy a fortified position within new museology’s objectives. Thus, it is possible to contemplate assertions on museology’s role in contributing to the diversification of community’s economic

72 According to Moutinho (2000), interdependence bonds between the museum and the exterior are expressed by: the connection between community and regional, national and international institutions; the lack of certain resources inside the community; the capacity of opening to all who share the group’s (community’s) concerns and, as consequence, are willing to participate in the group’s (community’s) actions.
activities (with a special attention to rural populations), as well as a
general tendency to consider elements of the local heritage as
resources to be made “profitable”\textsuperscript{73}.

In order to avoid misunderstandings, it still seems necessary to call
the attention to the position that targets on economical development
occupy in new museology’s strategies for community development.
In 2001, conclusions of a working group from the XIII MINOM’s
regional meeting stated:

“A final question: which tourism do we want? A tourism as
‘engine of the development process’ or, instead, a tourism as
another element of a living and diversified economy centred
in the fulfilment of populations’ necessities and in the
improvement of their life quality?” (XIII Jornadas sobre a
Função Social do Museu, 2001; my underline)

Translating a permanent concern in reminding of the necessity to
sustain an integral approach, the statement above offers a very good
example of the new museology’s posture in relation to actions on
economic development through the case of tourism. As can be
interpreted, if economical development is to be shaped according to
population’s necessities and the will to improve life quality, tourism

\textsuperscript{73} During a class attended in the master course of the Universidade Lusófona in
December 2002, Fernando João Moreira addressed to three main effects of the use
of the heritage as a factor of community economic development: “row effect”
related to the raise of cultural tourisms, which brings a number of risks to the local
economy such as the raise of prices, pressure on the population to move to the
services sector, mono-specialization on tourism, etc.); “competence effect” (due to
the heritage, there is an improvement/creation of competencies/know-how that can
be used in other fields as a way of economic development such as the creation of
small businesses, production re-qualification, etc.); and “innovation effect”
distinctiveness and specialization, which comprise introduction of components of
the local cultural identity, provide added value to products in the market).
is only meaningful when also responding to these demands\textsuperscript{74}. Tourism is conceived as a means and ought to integrate a broader methodology, extending its contributions beyond an immediate contribution to community’s income. In this way, tourism does not only assist development by generating economic activity, but also by increasing the value and protecting the heritage, allowing the community to exercise its power of self-management (once, according to the principle of participation, it is the community to plan and organize tourism), among others. It is possible to understand that these gains, when placed within the integral context of the communities, favour the development of other community’s competencies and contribute to other development objectives, which may not be necessarily directly related to tourism\textsuperscript{75}. That is why tourism itself is not taken as an “engine of development”, but as an alternative integrated to a broader strategy of development.

In this way, according to the new museology’s philosophy, the role of museums should not be confined to promoting tourism, or, in extension, to fermenting economic activities within the community. Understood as instruments, museums are, in principle, supposed to keep an eye on the global situation and respond to all possible community demands, be they related to the economical domain, social, educational, etc. In the cases where objectives on economic development appear as an important demand for community development, actions on economic (re)generation should exist as part of a whole and integrated to other actions, in order to maximize improvements and respond to the principle of integral development.

\textsuperscript{74} One may understand that if the tourist activity does not comprise contributions to broader community’s demands, it may not be an intelligent option for development, once it cannot produce final added-values for the community, as explained by Moreira (1995).

\textsuperscript{75} E.g. the heritage, which tourism helps to value and protect, serves future tourist activity, as well as other objectives, such as professional revitalization, consciousness-raising, etc.
The reason why it seems important to reaffirm such aspect relies on the fact that the 90’s witnessed the development of many initiatives in the broader field of museology that, with a view to community development, proposed to contribute to local economical development and/or organize the tourism activity. In a number of cases, these museums play indeed an effective role in stimulating community development. Nevertheless, many of them differ from the conception of “territorial museologies” in the sense that their proposals are mainly restricted to specific and pre-established tasks within community’s life; while museums that correspond to the concept of “territorial museologies” have, by principle, a responsibility towards the global development of communities, in which economic development may be a key element, depending on the situation. Such acknowledgment - far from intending to produce judgements or state preferences - becomes relevant once it evidences that museums take two different and fundamental roles in community development, as will be seen in the next chapter.76

Finally, records also provide evidences of constant- and, why not to say, increasing- interactions between new museology and the broader museology community in Portugal. In the first place, “reminds” of new museology’s political fundaments during the meetings state the effort in disseminating ideas. Added to this, as mentioned before, the fact that outcomes sometimes lack approaches which are dear to the new museology movement leads to the conclusion that they have complied with varied feedbacks from a number of professionals, who were not necessarily related to the new museology. This suggests an opening of the new museology movement and a constant exchange of ideas. The contents of such outcomes themselves also reaffirm this interaction, once even those assertions that bring a more traditional view of museums and museology evoke basic fundaments of the new museology, such as the will to contribute to community development, the principle of community participation and the use of

76 See museums as instruments and actors of community development on page 147.
the local heritage as resources for development\textsuperscript{77}. In this way, it is possible to understand that much of the new museology was absorbed in the daily practice and thinking of the Portuguese museology, in special by the local museums.

Added to this, Varine (2002) stresses that Portugal has gone through a considerable change in its development policy, privileging an integral and decentralized process (i.e. local development) and recognizing the role of museums as cultural instruments of such development.

João Fernando Moreira comes to reinforce some aspects of change presented above\textsuperscript{78}. He explains that while in the past museums had as main concern issues on population’s autonomy (i.e. give power to people, especially in the countryside), caring out a social intervention of political character essentially, today they respond to a new situation and must face renewed problems. Because of this, other aspects integrate the work of museums and drive their intervention not only to the internal sphere of the community, but also to the exterior. According to Moreira, in the internal sphere, museums must respond to problems such as social inclusion, integration of immigrants, social cohesion, conservation of know-how, mobilization, etc. In the external sphere, they play a role in the valorisation of resources, tourism, handicraft, etc. Finally, he adds to the growing response to the external sphere a more realistic planning, a bigger professionalism and the recognition of museums as new actors of development as important characteristics of the changes occurred in the new museology in Portugal.

Such (quantitative and qualitative) increase of the role of actions aiming the exterior, found in the organization of tourism or in

\textsuperscript{77} Obviously these fundaments take different dimensions depending on specific situations and contexts to which the discourses are related.  
\textsuperscript{78} During an interview in December 2002.
economic stimulus for example, is not exclusive to the Portuguese context. Actually, this can be regarded as a strong trend that integrates approaches to local development, seen in many examples that share the labels of the new museology, ecomuseology (not always identified with the new museology circle) and community museology.

Another example can be found in Mayrand (2001). Providing an update of the state of museology in Quebec, he addresses on a conciliation approach among the economic, social and cultural domains:

“(…) we can evidence a double polarization of the use of the concept of development in the current museology in Quebec, which is seen, in one hand, in the search for partnerships that allow maximizing the offers to the publics and, above all, that can be measured in terms of economic repercussion and number of visitants, and which is seen, in the other hand, in the effort to accomplish objectives common to a region in benefit of a population and of the equilibrated order of its territory.”

It seems to be a close connection between the rise of the sustainable/durable development idea and the increase of interferences aiming the exterior (in special in regard to the economical domain) in the discourse of the new museology school of thought. At the same time that references grow on the durability of natural resources, it is possible to apprehend continuous allusions to the devastating economic exploitation that subject local communities to the logic of the neo-liberalism. Taking these two aspects into consideration, one can understand that conservation of the natural environment appears in narrow connection with creation of a local economical ordering, in order to guarantee a new exploitation based not only on the profitability but also on the durability of natural resources. The same way, this idea is extended to the societal domain
as a whole: in order to sustain a development process based on the use and durability of the global resources of a community (natural, knowledge, memory, etc.) it is necessary to provide an economic ordering that allows it to happen. That is what MINOM’s manifest from 1996 suggests and also what can be placed within the trajectory of the Portuguese museology. In this way, direct interventions in the economical domain appear as a fundamental factor of sustainable/durable development, once they, in one hand, introduce alternatives to the devastating economic exploitation imposed from the outside and, in the other hand, introduce solutions that require an extensive use of local resources\textsuperscript{79}, as well as a need for their conservation as a requirement for the continuity of the development process.

Actually, such approach on sustainability/durability, besides being identified with the scope of new museology since the second half of the 90’s, can also be seen extensively in the museological field as a whole; and its connection to the interference in the economical domain is found in a number discourses today, be them related more to conservation aspects (in special of the natural environment), be them related more to social aspects.

Durable development also came to integrate Mayrand’s theories on ecomuseum by the end of the 90’s. Making use of the stages theory (represented before as the “three-year” cycle of development), Mayrand (2000) evokes a logic in which, once it is understood that the societal objective precedes the museum’s institutional mission in a context of community development, the museal function eventually escapes the museum, relying on a more global context of durable development. With this, one may understand that the ecomuseum’s

\textsuperscript{79} The use can also be understood as a factor of conservation, especially when talking about the conservation of intangible resources such as collective memory and know-how.
action\textsuperscript{80} gives space to a methodology/attitude that finds its references in the principles of the ecomuseology and in the global conservation philosophy (sustainable/durable development).

Such transformation - feasible through the use of the heritage - is possible because the organization created by the ecomuseum becomes autonomous and gains distance from the museological institution. During this change, the ecomuseum still accompanies the development process (until it eventually arrives to the moment of disassociation). In this case, the museum continues to ensure a certain logistic support, remaining identified as a tool of reference to a “memory of development”, as a place of vigilance, as a cultural observatory on the world (MAYRAND, 2000).

The author explains that it was such transformation that took place in Haute-Beauce. Having entered the “para-museology” stage around 1989, the ecomuseum now enters the “post-museology” stage in a non-institutional way. According to Mayrand (2000), a new regrouping rises in Haute-Beauce around a concept of an “environmental triangle” (a reference to “creativity triangle”), associating people formed (trained) during the ecomuseum’s work. Structured on a co-operative, commercial, cultural, environmental and educational network, it appeals to existing associations, which own their development to the work of the ecomuseum. They are transformed in order to participate in the new development objectives, relying on the “solidarity fund” that characterizes the ecomuseum, as well as on new “stakes” and the debates that accompany them (civil society against multinationals, etc.).

Mayrand’s approach comes to clarify in which way the idea of ecomuseology extrapolates the ecomuseum in its contribution to community development – what can also be useful to clarify in which way museology extrapolates the museum within the context of

\textsuperscript{80} Particularly of ecomuseums related to the concept of territorial museologies.
the work for development. What can be understood is that ecomuseology is much more than the action of the institution/process ecomuseum (this one representing a moment in the process of durable development). Ecomuseology contributes with an attitude, principles and methodologies; for Mayrand (2000) it can even be intended as philosophy for its ways of looking at the world and act on it, within the tradition of social animation.

The work developed by Hugues de Varine during this period has also brought important reflections to the dialectics museology/community development. Having moved from the field of museology to the field of development\(^1\), Varine provides museology with an interesting switch of perspective. Perspective which, instead of originating from the museological domain, departs from general conceptions on the local development process and places the museum – namely the community museum - within that context. Such association of museums with broader development concepts allows a progressive understanding of the actual and possible relations between the two fields of knowledge, as well as a clearer view of the socio-cultural role of museums. Finally, this type of association is to be seen as a “rare” contribution to the field of museology (and to field of development), once it has been carried out only in few opportunities by museology professionals, and, surely, even less by development professionals.

One may appreciate that, today, Varine’s ideas depart from a different perspective. However, in regard to the concept of museums as tools for development, he sustains old ideas developed from his own experience in Le Creusot and elsewhere – as well as from the observation of a number of other initiatives (which are related to the new museology school of thought), as he likes to stress. In this way, Varine’s assertions are grounded on the strong idea of collectivity

\(^1\) Today, Varine works as an international consultant for local and community development.
and community museums are taken as processes in constant adaptation and recreation; as community’s option and community’s instrument, of which life as a development tool depends on its utility for the community itself; as instruments of community empowerment; as educational agent in the service of change, etc.

As to its contents, Varine’s assertions drive the actions of community museums towards what he considers to be the two fundamental resources of local development: people and heritage.

The population, the joint of inhabitants (who compose the community, but also must be seen as individuals and groups holders of “living cultures” that interact with one another) constitute the so-called human resources. They are the sources of work force, creativity and initiative, as well as of other competencies. It is necessary, thus, to approach and get to know them, to mobilize and call to action, to enrich, form and reinforce; always taking into consideration the sum of experiences, qualities and handicaps that they represent (VARINE, 2000).

People in a community own, collectively, a multiform heritage, which comprises natural and cultural elements (material and immaterial) on the territory, products of time or recently produced: sites, monuments, landscapes, raw materials, objects, living beings, beliefs, memories, knowledge and know-how, traditions, etc. Heritage is a resource to be used (and consequently transformed), enriched and transmitted; to be known, conserved and managed (VARINE, 2000).

Within the context of local development, the community museum finds its aims concentrated on these two domains and, specially, on their zones of interaction:

---

82 As can be understood by now, conservation in this case does not denote traditional museum conservation.
“The community museum is much more a process that integrates the essential resources of local development, i.e., the human resources and the heritage, natural and cultural (…). The community museum has the possibility and the mission to make a dynamic synthesis between the human resources and the global heritage that exists in the territory.” (VARINE, 2001, my underline).

By “dynamic synthesis” one may understand that while the museum, in one hand, is an instrument through which people can become acquainted, comprehend and value their heritage; in the other hand, once being an tool of participation and by making use of this same heritage, the museum has the chance to generate a number of qualities in the community which are fundamental for its empowerment, such as self-confidence, imagination and creativity.

It is important to say that in any moment Varine states that only museums are able to ferment dynamism in the heritage domain or such integration between human resources and the heritage of a community; or, by extension, that community museums play a role (or roles) throughout local development processes which cannot be replaced by the work of other types of initiatives. Differently, he stresses that community museums are privileged and very important instruments indeed⁸³, implying that they are products of a choice, instead of representing an exclusive or inevitable alternative for actions on community development (even for those actions focused on the idea of local heritage as resource, popular education, as well as other convictions on this subject sustained by the new museology school of thought). Yet, according to the author (2000), it must be clear that museums cannot be taken as lasting endeavours: a museum may be useful and necessary in a given moment of a

⁸³ On the condition that they are conceived as a global territory, or under the concept of territorial museologies.
development process, but its utility as an instrument of development comes to an end by the time development does not need the museum anymore.

As to the actual work of community museums, Varine’s article “La place du musée communautaire dans les stratégies de développement” (2000) states that, once being conceived as a continuous process, the community museum has a place in all stages of development. That is to say, the museum has a place not only in the elaboration of a strategy but also in its execution. In relation to planning strategy, the museum has a role to play in the different components of such process. Thus, the museum is able to contribute to:

- **the diagnosis of the situation**, by participating in cooperative research; by gathering (together with other actors), classifying and making explicit all the necessary data; by establishing relations and interactions among data; by presenting them to those responsible for the synthesis of the diagnosis; by presenting to the population the different choices of the diagnosis. The museum also contributes to the evolution of the diagnosis through its own action along the development process;

- **defining objectives**, by presenting them, stimulating discussions or even validating objectives, according to the principle of “simultaneous subjectivities”.

---

84 Varine defines strategy as essentially a plan of action (leading to the development of a territory) that comprehends: diagnosis of the situation, a table of political and operational objectives, inventory of the available resources and means, a choice of actors to be mobilized and of methods to the used, a calendar (2000).

85 “(…) each individual member of the community, each group, has its own appreciation of the problems (…) and of the solution that can be found. There is no objectivity in matter of strategies for development, but only a research of consensus and a kind of negotiation among the different approaches and the different subjective judgements that coexist in the core of the community”. (VARINE, 2000)
- *the inventory of resources*, by replacing each data into a complex context and giving it signification, in a way that is will be considered for its “potential” in terms of contribution to development;

- *the inventory of means*, by making available its means of expression, education, formation, as well as its space (for storage, documentation, exhibitions, gatherings). The museum can also be used as a complement of means (e.g. by co-operating with economic actors with places and programmes to value their products and projects, if interesting for the development of a community);

- *the choice of actors*, by being a meeting point, a place for debate, initiative taking and project assembly. The museum is also a privileged space for forming/educating actors, and is and actor itself;

- *the choice of methods*, by presenting and interpreting the methodological choices (through the use of medias and modes of participant animation), so that they can be understood by the totality of actors.

Varine also reinforces that a development strategy must hold account and balance three essential dimensions: social, economic and cultural (which should prevail over the social and economic dimensions). In this case, the museum has an important role of valorising the cultural dimension, understood as “living culture” (i.e. the daily culture of a population) as the original and authentic culture of a community.

The actions proposed for the community museum in the course of strategy planning reveals that it assumes two fundamental roles during such stage of development. Firstly, the museum performs a very important communication role, based on its own language and media. The museum also plays an educational role, which appears as backbone of all actions for development and occupies a central position in Varine’s ideas.
Before proceeding with a brief examination of Varine’s conceptions on education for development and the educational role of museums, it is necessary to appreciate the utility of community museums as communication and pedagogical agents in regard to the different stages of the development process. Already seen in the moment of strategy planning, these roles are extended to the whole execution of the development programme. Although the author does not mention it explicitly in the examined publications, one can understand that, in fact, they are also present at earlier stages of development, which precede the elaboration of strategies.

The matter for such notion can found in the book “O tempo social”, published in 1987, in which Varine presents a reflection on the dynamics of development, its components, stages, principles, definitions, etc. Although there are few mentions to the work of museums in particular, this work is extremely relevant, once it offers a view of a dynamic - or “logic” - of development based on principles and convictions that are dear to the field of museology.

In short, Varine presents development as a complexity of cycles that can be described as:

“(…) starting from an initial situation, and by a slow evolution in the core of the concerned society, we arrive to an initiative or to a more or less coordinated joint of initiatives. From there departs an action that evolves through conflicts, failures and changes along the way. Completed, this action ends in a transformation- minimal or important- of the initial situation: the society is not exactly the same; it has changed subtly, gained or changed parts of its matter. It is, then, ready to start a new cycle.”
Communitarian initiative is conceived as condition and fundament of change and, consequently, of development\(^{86}\). Initiative should be understood as a “revolutionary step”, which comprises a series of aspects: the communitarian decision to change and act, the mobilization of the whole community, the refusal to follow imported solutions and decision to take in its own hands the responsibility of setting objectives and elaborating programmes of action. It also depends on many factors, such as the quality of relations of trust among people, the degree of consciousness and opening to the exterior, among others. Taking these aspects into consideration, it is easy to understand why the initiative is presented as the accomplishment of an evolution within the development process (cycle), as well as the start for the actual action for development\(^{87}\).

Thus, initiative becomes concrete through the action. For Varine, rather than words, action is the privileged language of culture and a means to reach community development. It is through the action that the community becomes strong and affirms itself as a political force and social entity. Most important is to realize that action carries a fundamental pedagogical essence. According to the author, the action for development must aim to, besides fulfilling its own objective (which corresponds to solving a given problem in the reality), enrich the communitarian capital (enhance the experience) and constitute a

\(^{86}\) Once it is an answer based on the identification and analysis of a problem in its complexity, followed by a research of means, by the setting of an objective and, finally, by the choice for a project. “If this process is spontaneous or unconscious, or if it is not the result of a combined proposal, it does not matter. What matters is that it emanates from the concerned community and makes use if elements taken from a collective experience.” (VARINE, 1987)

\(^{87}\) One can understand the “actual action for development” as the action that, belonging to a complex process, emanates from the initiative. It differs from pretext-actions (found in the stages that precede the initiative) once it follows a programme and will be judge from its results in relation to objectives set in advance. (VARINE, 1987)
stage of a collective evolution, stimulating new initiatives. These two last factors endow action with this pedagogical essence.

At this point, it is necessary to introduce shortly the concept of pedagogy behind Varine’s ideas. Based on the work of Paulo Freire, Varine explains that the pedagogy of liberation involves all the actors of development indistinctly. It is the source of a consciousness-raising that aims to turn men - or social groups- from objects into actors of their lives and of their future. That is to say, by participating in the communitarian action (which is the result of a synergic effort of the members of a community) people become conscious of their autonomous capacity to think and to be, as individuals, as integrants of a community, as actors of their own lives and as actors of their own development.

As seen before, initiative and action mark the 3 stages of the development’s cycles, which are:

- first stage: precedes the initiative;
- second stage: starts with the initiative and comprehends the action;
- third stage: follows the completion of the action.

The cycle, and consequently these stages, can be regarded in two dimensions. One is the dimension related to the punctual action, which correspond to a limited initiative, aiming to solve a particular problem within the general context of community development. The other dimension is related to the global action, which corresponds to a programme of community development that includes a certain number of complementary actions integrated in a joint plan. Despite

---

88 This stage will not be described. In this regard, Varine talks about the destiny of the action and the importance of a continuous updating and adaptation in order to guarantee continuity of the cycle.
of being different, they co-exist in the scope of the development process and follow more or less the same logic.

One may understand by Varine’s words that, although the description of the three stages concern both dimensions, in the case of the global action, the stage that precedes the first community initiative seems to assume a more dramatic statement. In other words, it is the beginning of everything, and, once being the beginning, it lacks a number of feedbacks and inputs (e.g. previous experience, a bigger familiarity with the development process, a certain degree of confidence, etc.) that would be present in later moments when the community resumes the cycle. That is way Varine affirms that the starting strategy of the global action is organized around the implementation of a self-management apparatus.

According to Varine, the first stage comprehends the pre-existence of favourable conditions (i.e. a “crisis”, existence of organized leaders, a “flash incident”). It inaugurates a phase of “listening”, which must be authentic (i.e. aim to reach the “truth” of the diverse interests and points of view of a community) and comprehensive (i.e. establish a clear communication between those who listen and those who are listened). In principle, the “listening” is opened to everything: opinions, problems, worries, etc, in order to generate the so-called “explicit demands”. After initiating a phase of “listening”, the stage proceeds with the organization of the “pretext-action”\(^{89}\), a kind of micro-project that must concentrate its efforts in gathering a largest number possible of participants. The “pretext-action” holds two main aims: to refine the expression of an “explicit demand” (be it because actors can perceive better the reality and complexity of

\(^{89}\) The difference between the “pretext-action” and the “actual action for development” also can be explained by the fact that the first does not aim to reach immediate results in terms of development; its aim is not conditioned to reaching objectives previously determined, i.e. to solving actual problems. As any action, it must be well organized, be evaluated and hold accountability.
problems through action, be it because there is a chance to correct conclusions taken from the “listening”) and to test the community’s capacity to act, the vitality of the population, the co-operation faculties, the existence of willingness and competencies.

Varine says that “pretext-action” is also an essential instrument of confidence raising (self-confidence and confidence in others) - the basic requirement of participation and, in a longer term, of autonomy and liberation. In a collective level, confidence is also a requirement of co-operation. Confidence is reached by valorising potentialities of individuals and groups, by using them as contributions to a collective endeavour (in this case, the “pretext-action”) and generating experience. To acquire confidence is to undermine inferiority complexes, to realize one’s equality before the action. Once acquired, such accomplishment must be permanently maintained and justified through a responsible and competent participation in the action, in special in decision-making moments. In order to enable such type of participation, it is necessary that members-actors of the community acquire complementary knowledge and skills, what will depend on: the access to information, learning of instruments of expression and action, the exchange and co-operation with other communities and external references.

In this way, this first stage inaugurates a process of collective learning and consciousness-raising, as well as a demand for formation and communitarian animation\(^90\) (mediation that is a determinant factor for acquiring confidence and, because of his, for participation).

---

\(^90\) Varine (1987) defines animation as a global answer for an endogenous demand. That is to say, animation accompanies the process of development and evokes the active and creative participation of users. It intends to be an energy catalyst, leading to a progressive consciousness-raising of the population, or of part of it. Animation is a condition for mobilization.
Finally, when the community reaches a certain degree of self-confidence to make it able to take an autonomous decision, it is mature to take initiative (VARINE, 1987).

The second stage comprehends, besides the initiative itself, the elaboration of a development programme and the actual action. According to Varine, the transition from the initiative to the elaboration of the development programme is concentrated in setting aims in the first place. In relation to community development, aims necessarily correspond to the community’s view of its own interests and must be the result of a collective debate about priorities, which accompanies the moment of initiative taking. The same way, the elaboration of a programme (and the strategy) must depart from the population and follow the debate, as well as the negotiation among diverse interests. The action is to be seen as an integrant part of an articulated whole: it departs from an initiative and responds to previously determined objectives. Varine explains that action always count with a certain number of actors: members of the community (who are actors, uses, objects and subjects), community leaders (who by principle maintain a synergy with the community and are seen as “natural animators”), permanent animators (who become essential after a development programme is adopted and correspond to one end of the “double input” system), public institutions, local organizations (which bring, in their own view, inputs such as knowledge of problems, motivated actors, means, etc.) and external co-operators.

It seems clear that the processes initiated in second stage do not annul those from the first one. Actually, one could interpret that they are in a way fused. Together with the initiative taking, with the elaboration of a programme and with the actions for development, remain the processes of context analysis, “listening”, inspiring actions, promotion of self-confidence, etc. The same way, the necessary factors (“tools”) for that remain: education, animation, formation, communication. These are factors that promote a
progressive upgrading of qualities in the framework of the community. Besides enhancing confidence, the access to information or critical thinking they allow that, in time, the object of the animation also becomes the actor of animation: the object of actions on formation (in special the one related to forming actors for the communitarian work) becomes a formation agent, etc.

In this way, such demand for education, animation, formation and communication, which crosses the whole track of the community development process, leads to the conclusion that, since the first stages of development (which precede the initiative and the strategy planning), a museum is able to co-operate and play a role as an educational and communication agent, as said before. In addition, if one considers the museum’s work from the perspective of the action, it is possible to affirm that community museum are also conceived as a project for global action in the development process, assuming, with this, functions that extrapolate (or that introduces new dimensions to) its education and communication roles.

Varine introduces two concepts that guide the work of community museums as educational (and communication) instruments. The first of them refers to the concept of popular education and the other to “heritage education” (20003a and 2003c, respectively).

Popular education is a term that translates the principles of the pedagogy of liberation. It has found a fertile field for intervention since the late 70’s, especially in countries from Latin America, but

---

91 As seen in many cases, people directly involved with the museum can also act as mediators for communitarian animation.
92 E.g. articulate actors, play a “spokesperson” role, stimulate economic activities, among others. Actually, Varine (1987) mentions the cases of Le Creusot and Haute-Beauce as projects concerned with the global action. The same way, it is possible to add proposals of the new museology to this list.
93 From the Portuguese “Educação Patrimonial”.
also gaining representatively worldwide\textsuperscript{94}. Popular education, as a vital factor of community development, is to be extended to the community as a whole. It could be seen as a factor of community empowerment, once it intends to endow the population with the necessary tools for conception, expression, planning and execution of projects, as well as for the internal and external co-operation. As seen before, this is reached through a process of consciousness-raising, which also includes the notions of capacity building and convey of skills.

According to Varine (2003a), it is the heritage that provides means to accomplish the four main aims of the popular education. These aims, in case a community museum is found as an instrument of popular education, also become the museum’s aims. They refer to allowing an individual to:

- form a consciousness of his identity, of his territory and of the community to which he belongs;
- acquire self-confidence and confidence in others, conditions for participation and co-operation;
- rise the capacity of initiative and creativity, so he can pass from consumer and assisted to entrepreneur and promoter;
- master the expression and the tools for negotiation, allowing an effective intervention in the public domain.

As to the methods of popular education, they assume different facets in each particular situation. Nevertheless, it is possible to say that in general:

- they depart from the assessment and use of the heritage;

\textsuperscript{94} Such concept has also been applied in the Ecomuseum of Haute-Beauce, as seen before.
they are based on the direct participation of the population in actions (i.e. they intend to allow processes to take place, rather than producing results);
- they are based on the concept of knowledge sharing (the one who “educates” has the same value and input of the one who is “educated”);
- they comprise formation (training) and animation.

The dynamics between heritage and education also provides material for the concept of “heritage education”. According to Varine (2003c), “heritage education” is a action of global character, integrated in the community development process, that aims to include the largest number possible of members of a community, so that they can know, master and use the common heritage of this community.

“Heritage education” can be regarded under the perspective of the pedagogy of liberation, once it participates in the efforts to promote consciousness-raising, capacity of initiative, to reinforce identity and social cohesion, through the sharing of a common heritage. It is also inspired by the method of knowledge sharing (mainly through a “double input” system) and must supply a comprehensive communication mechanism that aims to relate messages to the “living” culture of the population.

Varine stresses that “heritage education” must necessarily count with a human mediation, in order to create a link between heritage and people, to decode the message, listen to reactions, repair and valorise the inputs of each information term or suggestion, and finally to foresee a sequence to the action.

Once it is conceived as a global action, ‘heritage education’ involves a number of educational agents (parents, aged citizens, community workers, school teachers, etc.) and instruments to carry out such mediation. Among the instruments of mediation, it is possible to find
the museum, which, according to the author, is not the only, but it is certainly its most important instrument (on the condition that it has in the ‘heritage education’ a primal aim).

It is the practice that determines targets and methods for museum as instruments of “heritage education”. Nevertheless, Varine explains that, in general, methods concentrate on the accompanied observation (ex: excursion in the territory), mediation and exhibitions. He also presents a typology of actions, of which most examples are related to the work of community museums such as the ecomuseums of Le Creusot, Haute-Beauce and Santa Cruz (Rio de Janeiro, Brazil). This typology includes: participant research, exhibitions, interpretation centres, creation of small local museums, publication of documents, contests, workshops, and TV and radio transmissions.

Finally, Varine stresses that ‘heritage education’ has become a specialty developed mainly by Brazilian initiatives, which may comprise or not the interference of community museums. An example of such initiatives can be found in the Ecomuseum of Santa Cruz, experience that has provided many contributions to the reflection on museology’s utility for development95.

The ecomuseum finds its origins in 1983, with the creation of a centre of historical research (so-called NOPH) on Santa Cruz - district in the West Zone of Rio de Janeiro. Product of a community initiative, NOPH was originally conceived to research, preserve and communicate the district’s history as well as its constructed heritage. According to Davis (1999), in time, the role of NOPH changed to include the conservation and promotion of other tangible and intangible evidences of the cultural heritage. This movement also

95 Another very interesting initiative, which was not described in this thesis, refers to the Didactic-communitarian Museum (Museu didático comunitário) in Itapuã (Bahia, Brazil). More information can be found in SANTOS (1996, 2000 and 2002).
accompanied the notion of common-wealth (PRIOSTI, 1997), gradually endowing the initiative with a role in the mobilization of the population and local organizations around the efforts to solve common problems.

As can be read in the ecomuseum’s website, by 1992, for occasion of the First International Meeting on Ecomuseums taken place in Rio de Janeiro, it was noticed that the movement originated in the community of Santa Cruz had much in common with the experiences reported in the meeting. As consequence, in the same year, the district witnessed the creation of the Ecomuseum of Santa Cruz\textsuperscript{96}, which became part of the City’s cultural structure in 1995.

For Priosti (1997, 2000), the whole process that led to the creation of NOPH and culminated in the ecomuseum means nothing but a cultural response to the precarious situation in which the region was found after decades of abandon, yet aggravated due to authoritarian urban interventions carried out by the Government. Priosti explains that since the 60’s the West Zone of Rio became home to several communities originated from the disarticulation of slums in richer parts of the city. Using as an excuse the opportunities offered by the newly implemented Industrial Pole in the region, many residential districts were built to host the new inhabitants. According to Priosti, such intervention generated drastic consequences: thousands of people were relocated to an area of difficult access, the infrastructure did not cope with the population growth and the local industry was not able to absorb the new work-force. The impoverishment of the new communities- and of the region as whole- accompanied the raising of social problems and the progressive degrading of life quality. The disorganization of the

\textsuperscript{96} Today, the difference between the ecomuseum and NOPH is not so clear. Officially a non-governmental organization, NOPH is dedicated to the functions of research and documentation, also providing support to the Ecomuseum.
physical space and social structure (felt mainly in the lack of social cohesion) also brought negative impacts upon community’s heritage and identity.

In this way, due to conflicts that can be regarded as of political order and social cohesion, the cultural response to which Priosti refers is characterized essentially by an attitude of resistance. According to the author (2000), the creation process of the ecomuseum represents a resistance to an imposed order, to the loss of identity and memory of the community, to the political and cultural abandon of the region. As a reaction against a passive attitude, such response foresees the accomplishment of the population’s autonomy, so that this last can interfere— in a responsible and capable way— in the solutions of its own problems, establishing a dialogue with public authorities and not only being an object to decisions imposed from outside. This autonomy necessarily comprises social articulation, exercise of civil responsibility, the appropriation of collective spaces (physical, political and the space to express oneself) and responsibility-taking for the management of its own heritage.

Representing itself an evidence of such process of appropriation and autonomy, the ecomuseum is presented as an “instrument of expression, inclusion and development” (PRIOSTI, 2000), through which the population of Santa Cruz can exercise the expression of its “living” culture, mark its place in the political and cultural context of the city of Rio, as well as exercise its responsibility towards the society and towards the common heritage.

By acting as a community’s instrument, the ecomuseum concentrates its actions on the following targets:

---

- preserve local identity and memory;
- investigate local history and the region, as well as its relations with broader contexts;
- valorise local culture (“living” culture) as a way to set a resistance to standardization (globalization);
- establish an affective and communicative relation between the community and its heritage/territory (i.e. creation of identity bonds);
- create conditions for the mobilization of the community in order to make the preservation of local identity and memory feasible;
- articulate the participation (dialogue and co-operation) of the different sectors of the community;
- assist development initiatives and participate in the claims for social improvements;
- maintain the community opened to the exterior.

In order to accomplish these targets, the ecomuseum relies on the local heritage as a conductor lead of all the actions it performs. Heritage is seen as a political tool for community’s inclusion in the scenario of Rio de Janeiro (PRIOSTI, 2002) and as a tool of social cohesion. That is to say, it is taken, respectively, as an element of distinction and as an element of integration.

In practice, the heritage is the support and raw-material for the educational process the ecomuseum aims to carry out in the community and in which it plays a mediation role. Seen as the museum’s main strategy of intervention and change orientation (PRIOSTI, 2002), “heritage education” follows the ideas already mentioned previously: through an active participation of the population in actions which involve the management of its own heritage, there is a growing control over the territory and decision-making; there is a strengthening of self-esteem and self-confidence, of the community’s identity bonds and self-awareness of its conditions of existence; there is the raise of a critical consciousness and the promotion of citizenship.
As to the methods of “heritage education”, they have assumed many different forms during the life of the ecomuseum and, as can be notice in the referred publications and contacts with Odalice Priosti\textsuperscript{98}, they attend a will of constant renovation and experimentation.

The school is a steady partner in projects that strive to involve children and the youth in the research, interpretation and communication of the heritage. These projects, which are a constant in the work of the ecomuseum, comprise combined activities such as participant investigation, history reinterpretation, creation and participation in exhibitions, theatre plays, contests, among others.

The museum also co-operates with other community organizations and institutions (religious, civil, military) in projects that target different community groups (adults, families, areas from the periphery, etc.). Among them, it is possible to find:

- participant inventory;
- temporary exhibitions;
- workshops;
- forums on themes such as sustainability,
- lectures and seminars on current community issues;
- creation of a community development council.

It is interesting to highlight that the concept of exhibition assumes a very wide meaning in the work of the Ecomuseum of Santa Cruz. It refers to exhibitions in a more traditional sense\textsuperscript{99}, i.e. based on visual communication, as well as to activities such as a theatre play, or even a traditional party, where the population is able to experience its

\textsuperscript{98} Via emails and personal contacts.

\textsuperscript{99} Such as itinerant and “flash” exhibitions on historical and community subjects, or temporary exhibitions of local artists and those created by students.
“living” culture and heritage, be it by organizing the party itself, dancing or tasting traditional food. According to Priosti\textsuperscript{100}, these are also exhibitions, once they explore the information, research, participation, production and entertainment. Most important, they are the translation of a dynamic educational process.

The actions of the ecomuseum count with the support of historical research and the maintenance of collections on local history, archives and a library\textsuperscript{101}. They can be regarded as the constitution of a data bank that supplies many activities of the ecomuseum, in special those related to the educational process, with information, documents, objects, etc.

The ecomuseum (via NOPH) also publishes a newsletter with the participation of community members, through which it communicates local history, current issues, community news, ongoing projects and information about elements of the heritage. Other aspects of the museum’s work refer to punctual actions that comprise a more political interference in the community domain. As examples, it is possible to mention the mobilization of the population against decisions imposed by public authorities and the efforts to revitalize a historical building through the establishment of a cultural centre and centre for professional training.

Many of these aspects of the Ecomuseum of Santa Cruz have been presented in different museology meetings in Brazil and abroad. This has been done mainly by Odalice Priosti\textsuperscript{102}, school teacher, museologist, volunteer of the ecomuseum and member of the local community. The fact that Priosti has been the main “spokesperson”

\textsuperscript{100} In a series of email exchanged in October 2003.

\textsuperscript{101} Done by the NOPH. There is no mention to collecting activities. According to Priosti, collections are originated from “loans” or “donations” of people who entrust the museum with the guard of valuable objects (i.e. of affective or representation value).

\textsuperscript{102} Today, Odalice Priosti is also vice-president of MINOM International.
of the ecomuseum’s experiences to the outside world (at least to the museological field) drives one’s attention to realizing that, among the examples explored in this thesis, this is the only case in which the speaker, besides being a museology or development professional, belongs originally to the community in which the initiative takes place.

Such acknowledgement naturally leads to a reflection on the nature the actor’s inputs to the daily work of the ecomuseum. One may appreciate that, just like in cases of community museums seen previously, the ecomuseum counts with a “double input” system, which combines academic and empiric knowledge. However, the experience of Santa Cruz adds a new dimension to the idea of “double input”, once actors with academic background (e.g. museologists, historians, educators) are in essence –and above all- community members. Contrary to other examples, where the “specialist” input - or great part of it- originated from the exterior, in the case of Santa Cruz it comes from inside the community and seems to be submitted to a feeling that the actor’s roles as “specialists” is secondary when compared to their action as community members.

The particular example of Priosti illustrates well this aspect. Having studied museology exactly to understand the cultural movement of her own community, she stresses:

“We are not the specialists that you are thinking of; we only live this moment with intensity, trying not to hinder the initiative of the community with what I learned from the classic museology.”\textsuperscript{103}

In this way, academic and empiric input characterize the community input as a whole, which is obviously very high in all aspects of the

\textsuperscript{103} Excerpt from an email message.
museum work. Public employees\textsuperscript{104} and volunteers are responsible for the management, animation and programmes of the ecomuseum that, according to Priosti (2003b) cover significant parts of the local society. Community members and organizations participate actively in many different ways, by helping to organize activities, by offering logistic resources, by providing knowledge and expertise, by participating in the educational process (in the creation of exhibitions, research, etc.), by expressing demands, etc.

Finally, there is a special emphasis in the promotion of children and youth participation. Understood as strategic, they represent a “guarantee” of sustainability for the cultural process and through them it is possible to establish bonds with the territory, which their parents were not able to create once being relocated from their original homes.

A last aspect to be emphasized about the ecomuseum refers to its contribution to the conceptualization of ecomuseums and “territorial museologies”, through a concern in endowing the experience with continuous reflection, through communications to the outside world and the museological field in particular, as well as through the organization of international debates.

\textsuperscript{104} Since it integrated the city’s structure in 1995, some public employees were designated to work in the ecomuseum. Priosti explained via email that they are not specialized. Two employees collaborate with the management and the organization of activities, a third works with cultural animation, although “they do a little bit of everything”. She adds that, unfortunately, they were integrated to the ecomuseum for their previous work relation with the City and not for having participated in the movement of Santa Cruz (although they live or were raised in the region). Finally, Priosti also mentions that the ecomuseum is participating in a study for the re-organization of City’s structures, what could lead to a change of this situation. The ecomuseum also has a director employed by the City, who is an active member of the community.
After providing an overview of some aspects that stand out in the new museology’s discourse, it is possible to trace orientations that mark the concept of a museology in service of the local and global development (i.e. development of a community as a whole on its territory) today, adding other dimensions to the developments of the past decades. They are:

- the idea of a museological interference that extrapolates the museum and becomes explicit as “philosophy”, principles and way of action;
- the claims for a greater professionalism;
- the notion of community sustainable/durable development and, with this, the emphasis on conservation of resources or on the conservation of the relations between community and its resources\(^{105}\);
- the growing response to the exterior, in special through interference in the economic domain and, in particular, through tourism;
- the confirmation of the educational role of museology and the notion of “heritage education” as global action for development.

“Traditional” museums in service of development

Proposals - concerning development issues- that extrapolate the scope of the new museology school of thought are mainly related to the work of “traditional” museums\(^{106}\). Such assertion does not

\(^{105}\) It is important to understand that conservation does not mean static preservation. One could understand conservation in this case as comprising use, exchange and preservation.

\(^{106}\) Although recent developments may have added new dimensions to the idea of traditional museums as those museums focused on a building, a collection and a public (in opposition to “new museums”, which are focused on a territory, heritage and a population), it is still possible to identify a differentiation based on one or more of these premises- with a special attention to the idea of collections, which
disregard, though, actions taken place in other spheres of the museological field, which encompass mostly the academic environment, the work of ICOM and some of its committees (e.g. ICOFOM, ICOFOM-LAM, and ICTOP), as well as of other museum associations worldwide. Their contribution to community development can be seen in the organization of discussions and proposals to develop specific training and theoretical/ethical frameworks. It can also be found in the international co-operation for repatriation of cultural properties, conservation of cultural diversity and on other topics considered fundamental requirements in the different approaches to development.

Representing a significant part of the evolution of the critical museology school of thought (MENSCH, 1992) since the late 60’s, of the efforts in endowing museums with a pro-active social role, as well as of the growing desire in aligning museums to development initiatives in the 90’s, proposals on the contribution of museology – and specially of “traditional” museums- to community development can be found today in many discourses around the world. Nevertheless, they do not carry the same unity of the new museology school of though, being rather spread and varied, what makes it sometimes difficult to identify consistent bodies of ideas.

One may argue that these proposals are still quite incipient (most dating from the late 90’s) and, despite of making use of a number of concrete examples, they are very much concentrated on the claims for social responsibility and the possibilities/potential of museums and museology for the work related to community development.

In this way, this section will explore briefly two examples that combine the work of “traditional” museums with topics on community development. They correspond to approaches found in today seem to characterise “traditional” museums more than matters of space or public.
the world development agendas and escape the predominance of the local community development concept (i.e. focused on the global action within the context of local communities). The examples will also address to actions originated from other spheres of the museological field when relevant.

**Museums and sustainable development**

Issues on sustainable development that escape the predominance of the territorial development approach are easily found in the discourses of those related to the work of ICOM and its committees. In this regard, one may consider their relations with the international co-operation environment and, particularly, with UNESCO, body which has taken a leading role in the international discussions regarding culture and sustainable development. In many cases, references to UNESCO’s resolutions and an approach that finds roots in UN’s philosophy contribute to make such relations explicit. A clear example of that can be seen in the discourse of ICOFOM-LAM, ICOFOM regional committee in Latin America and Caribbean. For occasion of its 9th meeting, taken place in Rio de Janeiro (2000), ICOFOM-LAM members discussed the theme “Museology and Sustainable Development”. Some conclusions from the meeting were addressed in the Charter of Santa Cruz, document which states the responsibility and capacity of museology and museum in contributing to development. Such contribution comprises, according to the charter, aims such as the valorisation of cultural diversity as a source of creative resources and way to “dominate the domination” (i.e. to decentralize processes and place development under diversity and self-management prospects); and the identification of the advantages offered by the global model (e.g. technology) to the material and immaterial heritage, which shall be used as tools rather than support.
ICOFOM-LAM’s document brings, with this, three important aspects to understand those proposals related to the contribution of museology to sustainable development which are aimed at a broader level of society or that, in a local level, escape the range of the global action. These aspects refer to: the relevance of cultural diversity to sustainable development, the need to apply alternatives to the economic globalization and the focus on the management of the cultural and natural heritage.

Once responding to the paradigm of the Human Rights, values of diversity, dignity or social justice (which corroborate the claims for economic alternatives to the hegemonic global model) are to be found everywhere. In this particular case within the museological field, the application of such values finds significant support in the work of UNESCO and, specially, in its approach to culture and sustainable development.

UNESCO’s approach departs from the acknowledgement that culture is an essential factor of sustainable development, once:

“People’s attitudes and lifestyles, their responsiveness to educational programmes, their sense of ownership of the drive to preserve a decent future for ensuing generations, the reactions of national and local leaders to scientific and governance policy advice, are all intimately linked to their own cultural identities and values, and no worldwide commitment to sustainable development will get anywhere without that recognition.” (UNESCO website)

Placed in broader contexts, such recognition leads to the dimension of cultural diversity, of which promotion constitutes one of UNESCO’s strategic objectives. In its strongest statement, the Universal Declaration of Cultural Diversity (adopted in 2001), UNESCO affirms that cultural diversity is a source of tradition, exchange, innovation and creativity: it is as necessary for humankind
as biodiversity is for nature. Thus, cultural diversity is to be seen as the common heritage of humanity and one of the roots of development.

“If creativity is essential for sustainability, then memory is in turn vital to creativity. That holds true for individuals and for peoples, who find in their heritage – natural and cultural, tangible and intangible—the key to their identity and the source of their inspiration” (UNESCO website). In this regard, the Declaration states:

“Creation draws on the root of cultural traditional, and flourishes in contact with other cultures. For this reason heritage in all its forms must be preserved, enhanced and handed on to future generations as to foster creativity in all its diversity and to inspire genuine dialogue among cultures.” (Universal Declaration of Cultural Diversity, article 7)

Considering the importance of the heritage for cultural diversity, creativity and development, it is easy to understand why heritage preservation and valorisation appears as a core target in ICOFOM-LAM’s discourse. From the Charter of Santa Cruz and other communication from the referred meeting, it is possible to highlight the following general targets proposed for museology:

- preserve and valorise heritage (with special attention to the intangible heritage, seen as a link between natural and cultural heritage);
- research, in a multi-disciplinary way, the socio-cultural situation in face of globalization;
- put people in touch with their heritage, specially by stimulating community participation in museums and self-management in a long-term period;
train new professionals in order to respond to the new demands.

Once being a theoretical body, ICOFOM-Lam proposes to attend these targets by generating discussion and creating theoretical frameworks on the relations between museology and sustainable development, as well as by developing an ethical support for the actions and training basis (SCHEINER, 2000).

As to proposals that focus more on the action rather than on discourse, the meeting’s records bring references mainly to the work of museums. Among them, it is possible to highlight the claims for the role of museums as educational institutions, orientation that exemplifies well one of the tendencies in the field of museology.

The Charter of Santa Cruz considers the museum as link between communities and heritage, as well as the institution’s commitment to integrate both. There is a clear influence of the integral museum concept, which has left marks in the whole Latin American museological tradition since the Round Table of Santiago (1972), as well as of Paulo Freire’s work. In this way, references to the educational role of museums and to the necessity to apply a multidisciplinary approach come to draw some intersections between the proposals of ICOFOM-LAM and the new museology school of thought. In short, the educational role of museums refers to issues such as:

- facilitating relationships between community and heritage (with much of the integral museum educational approach and by promoting participation and gradual self-management in the institutions);
- conservation and diffusion of the heritage and cultural identities;
- cultural representation in collections and exhibitions;
perpetration of values of environmental preservation through a wide range of communication/educational media, but especially through exhibitions.

Another important orientation found within the efforts to endow museums with an active role in supporting sustainable development, which is mentioned in the meeting records but is better developed in other publications, refers to their contribution to promoting and regulating tourism.

As explained before, cultural tourism appears today as an important factor of sustainable development, not only for economic aspects, but also for social and cultural aspects. Besides the fact that tourism can represent an alternative to develop local economies and a potential asset for the improvement of community qualities and preservation of resources/heritage, as well as a channel of cultural exchange and understanding, professionals remind that to dominate tourism also means to control a powerful industry that can be predatory and extremely harmful.

Within this context, references to the work of “traditional” museums emerge in two different dimensions. The first refers to the role of museums as intermediates between local populations and tourism industry (e.g. PATRY, 1998). Coming close to the ideas of the new museology school of thought, proposals that endow museums with such intermediate role mention interferences related to supporting communities to program attractions, finding funding, training, marketing, etc. Museums are, with this, exhorted to expand their work beyond traditional functions and perform actions which could also be carried out by other organizations, such as community organizations or NGOs.

107 See “Territorial museologies of development” on page 86.
The second dimension, which comprises far more numerous examples, is related to museums role as tourist attractions (e.g. COTE, 1998; BLAVIA, 1998). Assertions appeal to museums’ communication capacities and their focus on the preservation/promotion of the heritage as a way to integrate tourism (and enhance it quantitatively as well as qualitatively), contribute to its promotion (by offering an attractive product) and regulation (in the context of offered activities and, in a broader context, by conveying values). In this way, museums as tourist attractions find their targets related to:

- acting as an information source of the region/country;
- promoting public interactions with cultural processes and products by conveying means, ideas and emotions\(^{108}\); i.e. by transmitting (besides content) values – including values inherent to the idea of sustainable development (preservation, respect for diversity, etc.);
- offering an original product, an authentic experience.

In order to accomplish these targets, proposals rely on the use of museum services, which must be adapted to a specific public (tourists), and on the use of resources to be found outside the museums (particularly the heritage – monuments, sites, traditional products, etc.). Examples include:

- exhibitions and guided tours;
- events inside the museum;
- the use of services, such as museum shop and café, as part of “authentic experiences”;
- visits to sites of interest, discovery programmes (where tourists can travel through the city ad experience elements of the “living culture”).

\(^{108}\) BLAVIA, 1998
One can understand that, placed in a given local or regional context, the proposed contribution of museums to sustainable development as tourist attractions address only indirect benefits to local populations. It is possible to imagine that many activities that involve, for example, the presentation of the “cultural routine” or “cultural traditions” to tourists should count with the input of those who live the culture (i.e. local population). In this case, the process of preparing, presenting and having encounters with outside visitors could possibly enhance populations’ competencies. However, much emphasis in the discourses is taken from the museum and the tourists perspectives solely. They demand too few from local populations in terms of input and refers primarily to museums’ contribution to develop the tourism industry, which would have positive benefits for sustainable development and, consequently, for the local populations.

*Museums and social inclusion*
Terms such as “social inequality” and “museum social value” can be found each time more in discourses of museums and museum professionals in Western-European countries, EUA, Australia, among others. They refer to the growing reflection on the responsibility of established museums in combating social problems related to the marginalization of individuals and groups within the society, approach which occupies a strong position in the agendas of community development today.
The case of museums and social inclusion in the United Kingdom offers a consistent example of such tendency, as well as of the struggles involved in the efforts to endow museums with a renovated social agency role.
In 1998, Richard Sandell wrote:

“Recent years have seen the emergence of the term ‘social exclusion’ within United Kingdom and European political rhetoric and discourse, increasingly used to refer to the process by which groups in society become disenfranchised and marginalized. Since the election of
New Labour in 1997, the United Kingdom has witnessed widespread acceptance of the concept which now appears central to many areas of government policy making. This growing importance is reflected in the government’s creation, in December 1997, of the Social Exclusion Unit which adopts a multi-agency approach to tackle the causes and symptoms of exclusion.”

Following the new government’s agenda, as well as a general societal pressure, museums have been exhorted to assume new roles and integrate the efforts in tackling social exclusion ever since (according to Sandell this became an official requirement from the government in 1998). One can understand from this situation that claims have placed museums in an early difficult position. According to Sandell and other authors\textsuperscript{109}, if, in one hand, museums were expected to assume new roles, in the other hand, little was discussed about the implications of social exclusion to the cultural domain amongst academics or policy makers. In addition, the authors constantly refer to a strong disbelief – or a resistance against museums’ new social responsibilities. Thus, it is possible to notice from the examined publications an effort to develop theoretical frameworks that link museums to social exclusion and to reflect on museums potentialities. They also emphasise the need for evaluation models, as research tools and, perhaps, as the only way bring legitimacy to museums’ role as social inclusion agents.

Sandell’s work “Museums as agents of social inclusion” (1998) represents an early discussion on this subject. Although many publications and research papers have been developed in the UK since then, Sandell’s work appears as an important source, once it offers a comprehensive approach on the dimension social inclusion has taken in the museum world, as well as a base of understanding for the appreciation of more recent proposals.

In his article from 1998, the author explains that social exclusion is largely accepted as a multi-dimensional phenomenon. Within the

\textsuperscript{109} e.g. NEWMAN & MCLEAN, 2002
academic debate it is studied through three main dimensions: economic, social and political (which and interrelated and constantly overlap). Exclusion in the economic dimension refers to issues concerning income, production and access to good and services. In the social dimension, it refers to the access to social services (e.g. health and education), access to labour market and the opportunity for social participation and its effects on the social fabric; hence concerns with self-worth, dignity, identity, participation in decision-making and the marginalisation of disadvantaged groups. Finally, the political dimension comprises the access to citizenship rights, i.e. civil rights, political rights, equality of opportunity, right to minimum welfare benefits, etc. \[10\] Sandell also introduces a cultural dimension to exclusion, affirming that individuals can be excluded from representation (i.e. the extent to which an individual’s cultural heritage is represented within the mainstream cultural arena); participation (i.e. the opportunities an individual has to participate in the process of cultural production) and access (i.e. the opportunities to enjoy and appreciate cultural services).

Departing from these dimensions, he proposes a typology for museums as agents of social inclusion, based on concrete examples and which comprise three approaches of intervention. The first approach refers to tackling social exclusion in the cultural dimension. According to Sandell, most museums have considered their role in combating social exclusion through seeking to become inclusive organizations (i.e. inclusive museums). With this, they pay attention to issues of representation, participation and access, launching “audience development” programmes. Although they can have an indirect effect on broader actions, one can understand that they maintain a passive attitude in relation to social inclusion \[11\].

\[10\] Newman & MacLean (2002) also describe social exclusion as the denial of citizenship rights, which comprises elements of the social and economical dimensions described before.

\[11\] According to the author, around 1998, broader aims such as reinforcing identity, increase self-esteem, did not comprise the mission of most inclusive museums.
The other two approaches refer to a more active attitude, which extrapolates the cultural dimension and endow museums with a role in combating symptoms of social exclusion, such as unemployment, crime, racism, etc.\(^{112}\) This happens mainly through museums as agents of social regeneration that aim to deliver positive social outcomes to defined audiences, making access and cultural inclusion means to reach broader goals of wider social inclusion and combating contemporary social problems (SANDELL, 1998); or through museums as vehicles of broad social change, which aim to educate and influence the public opinion by making use of their potential to communicate\(^{113}\).

Considering the different degrees of intervention –and particularly the proposals that comprise more active roles – today it is possible to place concrete and possible contributions of museums to social inclusion under the individual/ group of individuals (micro), community (meso) and broader societal (macro) levels. They constitute aims such as\(^{114}\):

- promote cultural equality;
- promote democratization within the institution;
- perpetrate values (e.g. tolerance, understanding, etc.) and
- in an individual/group level: forge a sense of self (identity) and its connection to others; develop self-awareness, self-

\(^{112}\) Sandell (1998) stresses that “despite a growing acceptance of the imperative to become more accessible, there is little evidence to suggest that many museums have embraced their potential to act directly as agents of social inclusion and to tackle contemporary social problems”, besides, the author explains that “today, for the majority of museum professionals, as well as social policy analysts, such claims are more likely to be considered quaint, naïve and inappropriate”. More recent works also bring similar claims.

\(^{113}\) This type of intervention has been very much emphasized in recent publications (e.g. SANDELL, 2002).

esteem, self-determination, self-confidence, creativity; convey skills;

- in a community level: contribute to empowerment (reinforce identity, enhance self-determination, creativity, build capacities, increase participation in decision making processes and democratic structures) and convey skills.

Some concrete examples show what museums do in fact in order to achieve these aims. In brief, museums propose to:

- represent culturally marginalized groups and minorities;
- improve public access and participation;
- communicate values, challenge stereotypes, represent diversity, act as a forum of debates;
- in an individual/group level: participate in special programmes for defined groups (e.g. training programmes, group discussions, tailored services, volunteer programmes, therapy, reminiscence work, etc), mostly in partnership with other organizations (schools, social, services, community and health agencies, etc.);
- in a community level: provide means for communities to learn about themselves and learn/practice skills and attitudes needed for community problem solving, specially by cooperating with community initiatives and by offering special activities to defined communities;

These targets are executed through a varied number of activities. In general, they rely on the use of museum objects, exhibitions, environment, services (educational, outreach) and expertise as part of joint ventures with other organizations or community initiatives, aiming at the micro and meso levels – or as means to deliver speeches and provoke discussions at the macro level.

Among different methods, the exhibition is a privileged tool used to fulfil many of the proposed targets. It is the main media through which values are perpetrated and representation of minorities takes place. In some cases, exhibitions serve as support for special
programmes aiming at defined audiences and as a process for community participation and self-awareness. One can understand that, independently from exhibitions, the assessment of museum’s objects and collections also constitute a way to deliver social outcomes. It can be seen, for example, in the collecting of testimonies (objects, oral history) from communities and underrepresented groups, in the use of museum objects to support educational/therapeutic activities, to convey skills or to stimulate group and community dynamics (e.g. the case of the Open Museum\textsuperscript{115}, where people are invited to loan museum objects and create their own exhibitions).

Besides exhibitions and collections, museums also make use of other resources. In the programmes in partnership with other organization, for instance, museums make exhibitions, collections, space, services and expertise available in order to provide the projects with comprehensive means of communication (very much based on the appeal of objects to people), with an environment for individual/collective social and educational experiences, and with matter for learning and acquiring skills.

The same way, museums apply several resources in the work with communities. Be it inside or outside their buildings, they use exhibitions as representation media and as participation experience, as mentioned before. Other resources (e.g. expertise, collections, and services) are used to convey skills, promote learning experiences, to develop activities (discussions, reminiscence and volunteer work, etc.) that aim to improve community qualities and exercise decision-making.\textsuperscript{116}

Finally, other mentioned methods of work refer to the organization of events and debates on relevant social issues, which aim at broader

\textsuperscript{115} Dodd et al, 2002.
\textsuperscript{116} Sandell (2002) also mentions the example of an ecomuseum, which comes close to the principles of the new museology: it is seen as instrument of self-knowledge and as an educational process through which community can practice skills and attitudes needed for community problem solving.
audiences as part of museums’ functions to perpetrate values; and actions on audience development, which aim to improve access to services and participation of defined groups in museum’s activities. Audience development comprises several measures, going from matters of representation and educational programmes to accessible (or free) admission fees.

From what was discussed previously, it is possible to understand that the contribution of traditional museums to social inclusion is related to their communication -and somewhat political role- in the macro level and to their communication and educational roles in the micro and meso levels. Museums’ interference is to be done mainly by delivering discourses and values through exhibitions and debates (and perhaps through collections and educational programmes as well) and by extending their activities and creating tailored projects (via educational and outreach staff mostly) to defined audiences and communities. In this case, if improvements are to be reached based on the input of audiences (be them individuals, groups or communities), this happens basically through their participation in determined activities or partnerships offered by the museums. In fact, there are few mentions to participation in museum’s programme development and no mentions to participation in museum’s management or policy making in the examined publications.
CHAPTER 3

Museology and community development in the XXI Century.

3.1. Museology as a resource for community development
3.1.1. What does community development mean in the scope of museology?

Since the late 60’s, many authors have worked to bring clarifications on the concepts of development applied to the museological field. Until the 90’s, professionals related to the new museology school of thought and MINOM’s philosophy virtually monopolized the efforts to conceptualize and explain community development. With the opening in the field to development issues, today it is possible to find references to community development theory and practice in other publications besides those originating from authors associated to the new museology.

The same way as it happens with the broader field of development, it is not easy to define community development, once a number of variables come to shape ideas that only take concrete form in practice. That is to say, development is a truly ideological concept, being intimately related to the aspirations of each particular community.117

In this way, in order to understand the meaning of community development within the discourse of museology, one must take into account the assessment of theoretical variables (categorized here as key concepts, approaches and principles) under specific contexts and demands (described as development objectives). Before proceeding with their analysis, it seems necessary to present some connotations that accompany to the term “development”, not only within the museological field, but the field of development as a whole.

117 As explained by Fernando Joao Moreira during interview in December 2002.
In the first place, development carries the senses of “change” and “improvement”, as James Cook (1994) explains:

“(…) in the context of community development, development is a concept associated with improvement. It is a certain type of change in a positive direction. While the consequences of efforts to bring about development may not be positive, the objective is always positive. Development efforts that fail to produce results may constitute work intended to bring improvement, but would be unsuccessful in bringing development.”

The author complements, reminding that parameters of success can be only assessed according to specific situations in which development efforts take place:

“There are no objective measures of what constitutes improvement. Objective indicators of change certainly are possible, but that which is better than a past condition must be a subjective judgment. That which constitutes development is a judgment that can only be made by people according to their own values, aspirations and expectation.”

A second connotation refers to community development as a deliberate attempt of change, which encompasses “a joint of concepts, acts and efforts” (VARINE, 1987). That is to say, development only exists when comprising will, synergy and organization around a purpose, in order to produce outcomes related to the improvement of communities’ living conditions. Such aspect is very important to understand that any attempt of development must comprise a global action, to which proposes originated from the museological field are integrated in different degrees. This also means that proposes on the contribution to development that do not endow museological structures and museological interference with
will, synergy and organization aiming at development objectives turn out to be hollow, if not innocuous\textsuperscript{118}.

As to the term “community”, fewer attempts have been done in order to clarify its meanings. A relevant exception can be found in Varine (1987). The author explains that, departing from endogenous criteria, community can be understood as a population living on a territory that is aware of the affinities and differences that characterize its elements, as well as of the relations between those and their environment, of which future is, at least partially, common to them\textsuperscript{119}. According to Varine, communities may depend on institutional structures of political, technical, economic character (e.g. local collectivities, companies, etc.) or may be constituted of spontaneous structures, i.e. a grouping of individuals who pursue a freely chosen social objective, which is not related to material gains and do not originate from the wishes of legislators or administrators. Finally he stresses:

“Even in regard to small communities, more or less local or at least strongly localized, a community take different dimensions: of a village, department, region or country; of companies, religion, school, immigrants, profession and, why not, family. Naturally, each individual belongs to many communities, of which some are chosen and others are imposed. His whole existence is conditioned by the pertinence to these communities.”

Varine’s definition represents much of the thoughts of the new museology in relation to the term “community”. Yet, one must be

\textsuperscript{118} Once proposals of this type fail to respond to the meaning of development, they could be regarded even as an anachronism.

\textsuperscript{119} With this Varine introduces two important aspects that establish a difference between a community and a group of individuals: social interaction and a sense/awareness of belonging.
aware that contemporary transformations have brought great implications to the idea of territory (a key element in the definition of community, composed by a spatial and a cultural aspect) and the relations among people who occupy it. Borrowing the ideas of Varine on ecomuseums, it seems correct to admit that those who work with local development (and concentrate much of their notion of communities on the territorial aspect) also understand that the only boundaries of a community’s territory are those defined by its relations with the surrounding environment. That is to say, if a community is to be found in two different geographical locations, for example, actions on development may encompass both areas, once they constitute the community’s territory. However, such territory fragmentation gains even more dramatic connotations today, due to factors such as the increasing mobilization of individuals on the physical space, the enhancement of communication possibilities (which provides means for the development of many other bonds that may characterize a community) and, finally, the emergence of the virtual space (internet). In this regard, few is considered and discussed in the field of museology.

---

120 See page 47.

121 Although it is possible to say that such notion is present in the conceptions of museology (and especially of the new museology), very few initiatives comprise this approach. An example can be found in the plans of the Ecomuseum of the Murtosa region, in Portugal, that aims to create an antennae of the ecomuseum in New York, city were it is possible to find many immigrants originated from the region.

122 In 2001, Adolfo Samyn proposed a conception that renegotiates priorities in the definition of community and comprises aspects related to the significance of the physical territory. He writes: “(...) we can consider communities as groups of individuals that have common interests, what in many cases is independent from geographical proximity. In general, these individuals are connected through identity traces and have a certain degree of interpersonal relationship. We could say that, in general, communities are not based on the consensus among individuals, neither on the accomplishment of a collective well-being; it is more a notion of belonging – intense or subtle- that comes to compose the identity of individuals who are part of a community.”
It is essential to understand that, although the community is taken as the main beneficiary of development, community members are not the only actors involved in such process. According to Varine, development necessarily comprises co-operation among institutional powers (collective and particular), the community and economic actors present in the territory. In addition, any development strategy must hold account of external partners (i.e. people and institutions that are outside the territory but interact with this) - which represent other territories, as well as different levels of decision, and are also the totality of actors of the macro-development (VARINE, 2000). Finally, the author stresses on a varied number of actors for development actions, such as community members, community leaders, animators, local organizations and external co-operators.

In general, it is possible to say that community development is seen as a deliberate attempt of change that aims to favour advances/improvements of a certain community. Such attempt translates key development concepts, is carried out through different approaches to development (which also characterizes approaches to community), must be adapted to specific development objectives and, although responding to particular contexts, follows some common principles present in the field of museology.

a) Key development concepts

Three key concepts of development are present in the discourse of museology. They have been gradually introduced since the 60’s and, today, they are found profoundly interrelated. In short, they are:

---

123 www.interactions-online.com, last captured on October 2003.
124 See page 104.
**Integral development**

According to Fernando Joao Moreira\(^{125}\), until the emergence of integral development concept in the 60’s, development was largely taken as synonymous with economic growth. The notion of integral development brought other social and political dimensions to the meaning of community development (e.g. culture, health, social justice, etc.) in addition to the economic dimension, introducing the assessment of qualitative aspects in development models.

Within the field of museology, integral development is also called global development. The notion of integral/global development has always accompanied the work and theory of museology regarding community development. The terms are explicitly mentioned in several publications of the new museology movement, predecessors and associated authors, as well as in a number of other publications that since the 90’s have endowed (traditional) museums with a role in community development. They refer to the improvement of communities’ living conditions in all its aspects (social, cultural economic, politic) and carry what James Cook (1994) defined as a holistic approach, i.e. “a way of looking at situations that stress relationships and interdependencies”.

**Endogenous development**

Endogenous development refers to the exploitation of the resources that exist inside a community and are used as main assets of development. Moreira explains that fifty years ago the development of rural areas, for example, meant to follow urban models, establishing a disparity between “developed” and “underdeveloped” areas. With the emergence of the new concept\(^{126}\) –which switched

---

\(^{125}\) This subject was discussed during an interview in December 2002. Dates are primarily related to the Portuguese context.

\(^{126}\) The author mentions in the mid/late 70’s within the Portuguese context. Nevertheless, it is possible to see assertions in this regard since the late 60’s in the field of museology.
the focus to the knowledge, use and valorisation of endogenous resources- a new approach raised and differences became to be valorised. Once based on the exploitation of endogenous resources, new processes were also based on the valorisation and preservation of specificities as a way to promote improvements of living conditions. Respect and valorisation of the difference also introduced the principle of equality, i.e. the right of access to things, despite of differences that communities may experience among themselves.

Although it is rarely mentioned, the concept of endogenous development has also laid deep roots in the field of museology. It can be seen in the claims for the use, valorisation and preservation of endogenous resources (people and heritage) as support for development initiatives, as well as in the principles regarding the respect for the difference and equality among communities127.

**Sustainable development**
Since the early 90’s, the concept of sustainable development has grown in the world. Originally created in the natural environment context, the concept of sustainable development gained broader connotations worldwide. In principle it refers to a model of development that “satisfies the necessities of the present without compromising the capacity of future generations to satisfy their own necessities” (DURAND, 2000).

Within the field of museology, references to the concept of sustainable development are easily found and also respond to the term durable development (found mainly in the publications related to those associated with the new museology). They meet the exact moment when community development became an issue for the broader field of museology. Mentions to sustainable development

127 See common principles on page 134.
also accompany propositions related to different approaches to development that extrapolate the local development approach. It is possible to notice that references to community development today, most addressing on the terms “sustainable” or “durable”, comprise these three concepts of development. In this way, museology’s discourse presents community development as integral (i.e. takes into consideration all aspects of communities’ lives, which are interdependent), endogenous (i.e. rooted inside the communities’ realities, making use of communities resources) and sustainable (i.e. must preserve resources for future generations and is to be regarded in the long-term).

b) Approaches to community development

As seen before, the work of MINOM and of professionals associated with the new museology school of thought privilege an approach based on the global development of territorial communities (living in a neighbourhood, city, region, etc.). With the opening of the museological field to development issues such approach also came to integrate other discourses. Regarding not only the thirty years of work in this domain, but also the impact of initiatives and the dimension of the contents, territorial development can be considered the strongest approach in the field of museology today. Nevertheless, it is also possible to identify other rising approaches, of which some have been explored in this thesis. These are related to the application of principles and methodologies mainly found in the work of the new museology school of thought, as well as in many proposals on the contribution of traditional museums to community development.

Making use of Hubert Campfens’s typology (CAMPFENS, 1999)\textsuperscript{128}, such approaches can be described as:

\begin{quote}
The territorially bounded locality concept
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{128} See approaches to community development on page 18.
Concept “which views the local community as a physical, economic, social, and political unit in its own right. Here the concern is with the quality of life and the optimum involvement and participation of individuals and organizational members in community affairs.”

In the tradition of museology’s work with local community development, this approach appears in combination with people development and other approaches described by Campfens, such as the self-management concept and the social learning or educational concept.

It is interesting to note how the expansion of the museum idea in the 60/70’s became related in great part to the work with local development. As an answer to museology’s limitations in coping with real life problems and playing a relevant role in society, several approaches promoted an opening of museums to the exterior, literally extrapolating the walls of the classic museum: from the building towards the territory, from collections towards the heritage (that is found in the totality of the environment) and from visitors towards a population. When related to community development, such approaches gained the form of territorial museums (ecomuseums, local and community museums), of which beneficiaries (community) constituted the joint of inhabitants living on the territory.

In addition to what could be considered- at least symbolically- a “natural” direction of expansion regarding the opening of museums to society (breaking walls, extrapolating physical boundaries), authors stress on the response of museology to the emergence of a new strategy of development, based on the valorisation of the local and regional spheres. Considering that the relations between museology and development are inserted in a broader context of adaptation of capitalist models to new societal conditions in the 60’s and 70’s, Fernando João Moreira (n.d.) presents the new
museology\textsuperscript{129} as reflex of a new strategy of global economic development:

“Beyond a series of characteristics directly related to the economic domain, such as the movements of direct and indirect de-concentration and the importance given to the endogenous component of the development process, one of the most outstanding traces is a whole philosophy in which, contrarily to the past, regional and local development is not seen as a result from the global development of the country anymore, but exactly the opposite. In practice, a fundamental technique is put in the region and in the local, regarded now as privileged spaces of development (…) The same way as traditional and national museums were the vehicle of a centralised economic model, contributing among other things to the social unification process in the national scale, the new museums will be the expression of a new decentralized development model, contributing in the same way to a social unification process, now and in accordance to new necessities taken place not in an extra-regional but in a intra-regional scale.”

\textit{The categorical concept}

Concept, “in which community development forms a part of a larger policy that aims to alleviate or prevent social problems that disproportionally affects certain groups or communities, which have found themselves economically, socially, or politically excluded from the benefits, resources, or opportunities offered by society.”

\textsuperscript{129} Representing here the initiatives related to the work with local development in that period.
AND

The intergroup concept
Concept “which focuses on mutual understanding, conflict resolution, and social integration”

Many proposals today bring elements of these two approaches to community development. As seen before, the case of social inclusion represents a very good example of traditional museums working with the categorical concept. This can be extended to a number of other examples in different countries around the world, which encompass the work of traditional museums and other museological institutions/processes, being also identified in new strategies of local territorial development and in initiatives that do not comprise the name or use of museums. The same happens with approaches focused on the intergroup concept. A good example refers to the discussions on peace & reconciliation that have occupied a strong position in the debates of ICOM. Finally, just like in the case of territorial development, many times these approaches appear in combination with others (e.g. self-management concept, social learning concept, co-operative concept).

c) Development objectives

The fact of following key concepts or approaches does not determine which improvements a development initiative means to reach inside a community. This can be only determined within specific situations and according to particular contexts (what includes the notions of necessities, possibilities and culture/interpretations). In this way, it is each particular context that defines what improvement means and, consequently, what development actually means.

Examples explored previously show that similar key concepts and approaches take different shapes in practice, due to the development objectives that are (more or less) consciously chosen. For instance,
the cases of the ecomuseums of Le Creusot and Haute-Beauce share the same views on development (integral, endogenous) and carry out a similar approach (local community development). However, they bring many differences in strategies and focus points\textsuperscript{130}. Such differences can be only explained in terms of objectives, which reflect aspects such as community needs, available resources and matters of interpretation. One may argue, for example, that the urgent needs of Le Creusot\textsuperscript{131}, played a fundamental role in shaping actions very much concentrated in community empowerment aimed at decision-making and development planning; while in Haute-Beauce matters of identity have being predominant, settling an empowerment process characterized by a more gradual transformation (focusing on distinctive stages of territorialization, raising awareness, etc.)\textsuperscript{132}. As to issues related to available resources, it is possible to see that, differently from Le Creusot, the initiative from Haute-Beauce bloomed from a traditional museum collection, which certainly influenced the ways the ecomuseum process was carried out onwards. Finally, both cases count with the undeniable influence of interpretations, which can be regarded as individual or collective interpretations, but specially placed in a broader level, related to how nations and peoples shape their mentalities and culture. These differences are seen in the strong collectively approach of Varine\textsuperscript{133} and in the more individualistic approach of Mayrand, for example.

\textsuperscript{130} See page 62.
\textsuperscript{131} Quoted by Varine in 1993 as “essentially a rescue job, an imaginative policy for dealing with an emergency situation”.
\textsuperscript{132} One could argue that before Mayrand’s intervention there was not a clear notion of Haute-Beauce as a geographical region (as Hauenschild explained in 1998), hence the emphasis on the appropriation of the territory and affirmation of identity.
\textsuperscript{133} In 1996, Hudson wrote: “There are strong echoes of Rousseau and Voltaire in all this, of the theoreticians of the French Revolution, which is another way of saying that both Hugues de Varine and the Museum of Man and Industry are very French.”
Although responding to particular situations, many development objectives share much in common. As can be seen in different examples presented previously, this convergence refers to topics such as:

- the concepts of development: in general, development objectives carry the essence of development concepts (e.g. they extrapolate the exclusivity of the economic domain, refer to the valorisation and/or preservation of endogenous resources, etc.)
- the solution of problems that appear common to a globalized world: in most cases, development objectives are related to solving problems that afflict communities. Each time more, many of these problems appear common to all, comprising issues such as social injustice, religious and ethnic conflicts, economic deprivation, etc.

Yet, it is possible to identify common principles in the field of museology that eventually drive the choices for development objectives. For instance, in a case where efforts mean to promote the integral development of a local community (also making use and preserving endogenous resources), responding to the solution of certain identified problems, many questions still remain open. For example, which actors will decide what objectives are? It could be the Government, a small group of experts or the community itself. Where parameters of success can be found? In other “developed” communities or inside each particular community? That is where common principles come into scene, helping to determine objectives and characterizing the substance of museology’s intervention in the field of development.
d) Common principles

Two interrelated principles stand out in the discourse of museology. In general, they integrate rising tendencies of development in the world, being somehow already required within the notions of development concepts and approaches today. As to the museological field in particular, such principles appear more structured in the new museology’s discourse\textsuperscript{134}, although they have been producing undeniable echoes in the entire field and accompany most proposals on development (many times in “light” versions). They are:

*Development means liberation/decentralization*

This principle regards the respect for the difference, equality and liberation from hegemonic models. While in the 70’s and 80’s, authors stressed on the liberation of communities from cultural models and solutions imposed by dominant groups of society, today emphasis relies on the liberation from the depriving economic models of the neo-liberalism. Independently from which aspects occupy a central position in such claims, they refer to a process of decentralization in development, where alternative endogenous solutions replace the adoption of external models and parameters of success. With this, more than making use of endogenous resources, the development process is placed inside community’s reality and must respond not only to specific necessities but also to what development itself means to the community. That is to say, development is to be defined “in terms of aspirations inherent to a culture” (UNESCO Sector of Culture, 2001). Accordingly, interpretations and solutions are (and should be) different, as well as respected (what cannot hinder equality or dialogues to the exterior). In this sense, difference and diversity are seen as positive values in community development.

\textsuperscript{134} It is possible to say that they are the fundaments of new museology’s philosophy (since the early 70’s).
Development requires participation

Departing from the conviction that community members should be subject (actors) and not only object to their future, this principle places development in a bottom-up perspective, in which self-management turns out to be crucial. Participation is the key element of self-management and its meaning extrapolates the idea of participating in given activities of a development programme: it means creation, co-operation, decision-making and, finally, taking control. In this way, participation is closely linked to the concept of ownership, once “actual property and power to decide are two sides of a same coin” (MOUTINHO, 1989), i.e. who eventually decides on the nature of initiatives are those who “own” them.

As said before, these principles appear strongly in the core of the new museology school of thought, the same way as in other few ideas that do not align themselves with the new museology. In other discourses within the field of museology, the principle of decentralization have also gained amplitude, while the principle of participation seem to be minimised many times, specially because of the limitations museums have in relation to community’s ownership (and consequently to the idea of participation in terms of taking control, planning and making decisions).

3.1.2. Why museology?

The relevance of museology as a resource for community development must be first visualized under the broader prospect of culture and its importance for the development process.\textsuperscript{135} By

\textsuperscript{135} Culture regarded as “the set of distinctive spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features of a society or a social group, and that encompasses, in addition to art and literature, lifestyles, ways of living together, value systems, traditions and beliefs” (Universal Declaration of Cultural Diversity, 2001). These last aspects endorse what Varine calls “living culture” of a population, i.e. its daily culture.
appealing to culture as means to reach development, museology places itself in the forefront of a new orientation that strives for being more human and sustainable. Such orientation can be understood as having culture as “both basis and resource of development” (UNESCO Sector of Culture, 2001) or, according to Varine’s words (2000), as referring to a development process rooted in the ‘living culture’ of populations, in which the cultural dimension prevails over the social and economic dimensions.

UNESCO’s publication “Culture throughout the project cycle” helps to clarify some characteristics and the general state of affairs between culture and development today:

“The last two decades have seen an important evolution in perceptions of the relationship between culture and development. The Mexico Declaration stated that development must be grounded on the will of each society and must express its profound identity. If culture is the matrix in which the identity of a society is made and remade, then development is the full name for that process of making and remaking.

To define development in terms of aspirations inherent to a culture, rather than to assess culture in terms of its potential to help or hinder development, would represent a transformation in attitudes to development work (…) The new objectives recently set by development agencies, such as participative, sustainable, human and social development, can only be achieved if these agencies are prepared to rethink the central role of culture in these processes.” (UNESCO Sector of Culture, 2001)

The same document summarizes much of the thinking in museology regarding the actual meaning of conceiving development on the basis of culture:
“Rethinking development on the basis of culture means seeing the cultural traits of a human group as core elements— the most complete manifestation of their economic, social, political, ethical, spiritual, intellectual and ideological operation. The characteristics of populations, their cultural resources, must be mobilised to bring about desired changes. These resources include, together with those mentioned above, knowledge, know-how, technologies and, above all, ‘cultural dynamics’—creativity, self-confidence and the will to resolve problems.”

This assertion translates well what museology essentially proposes to aim at, i.e. the mobilisation of endogenous resources (in which cultural, together with human resources play, a dominant role) and generation of ‘cultural dynamics’\(^{136}\). In the museological discourse, cultural resources respond in a large extend to the concept of heritage, understood as both material and immaterial products of a community’s natural and cultural environment: landscapes, raw materials, traditions, memory, knowledge and know-how, monuments, objects, etc\(^{137}\).

One could say that the use of the heritage is one the factors that characterizes and differentiates the work of museology among other interventions on community development. Certainly, museology is not alone in making use of the heritage, but it stands out exactly by its approach towards heritage. Another factor of distinction refers to the type of communication museology endows development processes with – communication among actors of development, between community and its resources, between the inside and outside—, based on the museological language.

\(^{136}\) See aims and roles on page 138.
\(^{137}\) This notion can also be extended to the ideas of individual, group, national and world heritage.
Considering that such specificities of the museological work can bring valuable contributions to community development, they shall be seen as the main arguments to justify museology’s relevance as a resource for development. In this way, they can be regarded as:

**Approach to the heritage**

Before addressing on how museology approaches the heritage, it seems important to recall the relevance of this last to development. As seen before, according to Varine (2000), the heritage is one of the two fundamental resources of development. As resource, the heritage constitutes the very richness of a territory and a population (VARINE 2000). It is a cultural, social, educational, economical and political factor, a factor of power; a source of tradition and innovation that “allows self-confidence and the opening to the world” (VARINE 2003d).

It is through heritage that development can be rooted inside the ‘living culture’ of communities, consequently becoming a requirement for the process continuity and durability:

“"The development of a territory, in order to be durable, must rely on a balanced and solid basis. The heritage is one of the factors of this balance: balance between nature and culture, between what has gone and what will come, between the real and the imagined, between asset and creation, between generations. It guarantees the continuity of the local society and the integration of those newly arrived to the community.” (VARINE, 2003c)

Taking into account the plural aspects of the heritage and its implications for development, museology proposes to make a joint use of this element (which appears as support for all actions and a main factor to launch development dynamics) as both integrative and distinctive resource. That is to say, in its approach, museology explores the heritage as a factor of cohesion among individuals, of
identity building and a sense of belonging; as a pretext to generate action, dialogue and co-operation – not only inside but also outside the community. At the same time, heritage is valorised as a factor of distinction (which is also an aspect of identity building, once this last requires confrontations to the exterior), a proof of value and a strategic resource (in all aspects: cultural, economic, etc.) within a context that privileges diversity\textsuperscript{138}.

\textit{Museological language}

Museology strives to endow the development process with a language based on the culture and on the heritage (notion which, in the museological discourse, goes from the language of the object, in more traditional approaches, to language of the ‘living culture’, as presented by Hugues de Varine). With this, museology is able to establish a comprehensive communication –especially among actors and beneficiaries of development-, once it appeals to references that are common to all and easily identified (as we all live and produce culture). Thus, the museological language can also help to root development (values and the process itself) inside society, communities, groups and individuals.

Regarding the different degrees in which museological language is presented (from language of the object to language of the ‘living culture’), it is possible to say that they correspond directly to the amplitude initiatives take in relation to their action in development, i.e. language of the object would correspond to one extreme related to the punctual actions, while language of the “living culture”; would correspond to another extreme related to global action\textsuperscript{139}.

\textsuperscript{138} Museology’s contribution may become even more relevant when one realizes that, in general, few approaches rely on the joint use of integrative and distinctive aspects of the heritage as means to promote development.

\textsuperscript{139} See page 147.
3.1.3. Aims and roles

Museological intervention may assume different aims, depending on development objectives. Examples seen before show that these can refer to aspects such as contribution to community’s economic development, matters of social and cultural equality, the development of theoretical/ethical frameworks, among others. However, two main aims emerge characteristic to the work of museology, being present (in different degrees) in virtually all proposals on community development\textsuperscript{140}. They are directly focused on the main beneficiaries of development and concern the micro (individuals and groups) as well as the meso-level (communities). It is also possible to say that these aims respond in great part to what Hugues de Varine means by a “dynamic synthesis” between human resources and the global heritage\textsuperscript{141}. In summary, they refer to:

- generating community/cultural dynamics

According to the principle of participation, this dynamics eventually responds to the notion of empowerment - understood as state in which community individuals (and the community as a whole) are able to visualize, understand and master problems\textsuperscript{142}, becoming main actors in the shaping of their future and not only passive receptors. Empowerment comprises a number of conditions, which, in the museological discourses, appear translated by terms such as:

(regarding both micro and meso-levels)
Identity building
Self-esteem
Self-confidence and confidence in others

\textsuperscript{140} One can understand that these aims are the basis for others aims, which may comprise direct economic interventions, for example.
\textsuperscript{141} See page 98.
\textsuperscript{142} And with this master development; the conception, expression, planning and execution of projects, as well as the internal and external co-operation.
Self-awareness  
Consciousness-raising  
Mobilization (lift to action)  
Self-initiative and self-determination  
Imagination and creativity  
Capacity building (including formation and convey of skills)  
Co-operation

(regarding the meso-level)  
Communitarian consciousness  
Social cohesion  
Internal co-operation

Depending on the proposals and approaches to community development, a number of these conditions form the core of the referred dynamics. For instance, in some cases the aim of generating dynamics appears restricted to the notions of reinforcing identity, self-esteem and self-confidence (although it may consider the further consequences of this aim as indirect contributions to empowerment); in other cases, the dynamics comprises the whole prospect of community empowerment, including all—or nearly all—mentioned conditions.

Finally, it is primordial to address on the opening to external references and favouring cultural exchanges as integrant part of the efforts to generate dynamics. From issues on identity building to community empowerment, they represent a crucial facet for development and can be found (also in different degrees) assimilated in most discourses of museology.

- making resources accessible  
According of the principle of liberation/decentralization, the emphasis relies on the exploitation of endogenous resources (which respond in great part to the notion of heritage), although one cannot disregard the importance (and also exploitation) of external resources
in museology’s proposals. In this way, making resources accessible mostly means to put people in touch with their heritage, valorise and preserve them; so that these can be understood, used and transformed by development actors along the process. Once resources also comprise the human aspect, it is possible to say that by generating dynamics museology also aims to make human resources accessible.

Aims focused on the macro-level (society, regional, national and international spheres) can be found in fewer proposals and mainly refer to:

- perpetrating values;
- professional formation (training);
- representing community and delivering demands;
- promoting debates/discussions;
- participating in international co-operation actions.

In order to achieve its aims (in special the aims referred above), museology proposals introduce a number targets which are conceived under four main perspectives: educational, political, of communication, animation and preservation/valorisation of the heritage. One could consider that, with this, museology assumes fundamental roles that drive its actions, moulding targets and helping to determine the implication of methods in the work for development. These roles can be described as:

*Educational role*

The subject of museology’s educational role appear more elaborated in the discourses of the new museology and many from Latin America, both stepped on the tradition of social learning, more precisely on the pedagogy of liberation, which has in the Brazilian educator Paulo Freire its main character. As explained before\(^\text{143}\), pedagogy of liberation is the source of a consciousness-raising that

\(^{143}\) See Varine on page 102.
aims to turn men - or social groups- from objects into actors of their lives and of their future:

“In contrast to ‘social animation’, which focus on what social actors will ‘do’ in bringing about change in their social reality, conscientization practice concerns itself with what the participants will ‘be’. Critical consciousness, as define by Paulo Freire, goes beyond ‘magical’ consciousness, which is characterised by fatalism and inactivity, and ‘naïve’ consciousness, in which reality is understood in terms of imposed norms and standards. It implies a search for knowledge: a critical reflection on reality followed by action that carries an ideological option up to and including the transformation of one’s own world, be it a community, a social condition or something else.” (CAMPFENS, 1999)

As Campfens explains, it is through participation in action that people become conscious of their autonomous capacity to think and to be, as individuals, as integrants of a community, as actors of their own lives and as actors of their own development.

Pedagogy of liberation’s principles have been mainly translated by the term popular education and, more recently, also by heritage education. This type of education is based on the idea of dialogue and knowledge sharing (the one who “educates” has the same value and input of the one who is “educated”), transforming museology’s educational role in a mediation role.

Although the educational substance of this approach centre on a process of consciousness-raising through critical thinking and action inside the community, it also includes the notions of conveying skills and formation (training)- of community members, as well as of external professionals. In this way, it is possible to say that popular and heritage education appear as main factors for generating
community dynamics, being mostly focused on the micro and meso levels (as referred above, professional training can be placed in a macro-level).

As to other discourses, the contents on museology’s educational role regarding the specificities of the work with development are not so elaborated. However, it is possible to identify tendencies that echo principles of social learning and popular education (some with explicit references to the work of Paulo Freire).

In general, education is presented as means to generate change and socio/cultural dynamics in micro and meso-levels, as well as means to contribute to a societal dynamics in the macro-level (mainly through perpetration of values in traditional museums’ exhibitions). It also seems to be a growing idea that education is synonymous with participative learning and is to be achieved through dialogue and knowledge sharing. In this regard, one must consider that participative learning, dialogue and knowledge sharing may be applied in different degrees, depending on what the concept of participation stands for (i.e., participating is given activities, creation, taking control, etc.).

It also cannot be ignored that many proposals that endow museology with an educational role in development still rely on the transmission of defined contents, rather than on the idea of “learning by doing”. This assertion does not intend to suggest that the educational role based on participative learning (even in those cases that bear the motto of popular education) do not make use of transmission of contents, which can originate from the community’s input or not; instead, it only intends to establish a difference between educational approaches grounded on the transmission of contents (which in general are also seen as means to generate dynamics) and those that use this last as an associate or coadjutor element.
Finally, just like in the case of popular education, these proposals also comprise an educational role in conveying skills and training beneficiaries and other actors of development.

Animation role
This role appears in close relation with education and is also refers to generating dynamics in the micro and meso-levels. In the work of museology with community development, animation assumes different connotations. As Varine (1987) explains, animation can be regarded under the notions of therapy or consciousness-raising. In the first case, according to the author, animation comprises an educational and a leisure dimension; it is mostly destined to alleviate symptoms of depriving social conditions. As to its impact in the generation of dynamics, this type of animation could respond to aspects such as promoting self-esteem, self-confidence and social interaction.

In the other hand, animation aiming at consciousness-raising stands for being an energy catalyst in order to generate action (thus a factor of mobilization) and is mostly found in combination with popular and heritage education. Differently from the therapeutic animation, it requires the active and creative participation of its users.

Communication role
Museology’s communication role is presented as means to transmit contents, to institute a common and comprehensible language (i.e. that aims to relate messages to the culture of individuals and populations) among actors and partners of development and, together with educational initiatives, to put people in contact with resources. It aims at community’s internal and external domains, promoting an interference in the micro and meso levels (by transmitting contents, establishing a communication mechanism, putting people in contact with resources), as well as in the macro-level (by also transmitting contents and values, extending the understanding of the museological language, delivering communities demands).
Political role
In the micro and meso-levels, interventions that aim to generate a dynamics also endow museology with a political role. This political role can be already announced in aims such as the forging or reinforcement of identities; however it is by promoting empowerment and consciousness-raising grounded on action that museology definitely assumes such important facet.

In the other hand, museology’s political role in the macro-level is still very limited, being mainly restricted to perpetrating values and stimulating discussions (which, apparently, do not have a major impact outside the world of museology), carrying out a direct intervention in the political and economic domains on behalf of communities in some cases, and participating in punctual actions of international co-operation.

Culture/heritage preservation and valorisation role
This role aims to attend the demands for making resources accessible and put people in touch with them. It also refers to creating conditions for actions of educational and communication character, once museological intervention privilege the cultural domain and heritage is conceived as raw matter and support of all actions carried out by museology.

In the micro and meso-level, this role appears mainly related to the preservation and valorisation of endogenous resources, although one cannot disregard the importance of making exogenous resources also accessible. In the macro level it refers to mainly to the participation in international co-operation action for the preservation of heritage, valorisation of cultural diversity, etc.
3.1.4. Methods and ways of action

Due to the nature of its work, museology’s ways of action depart from functions traditionally related to the work of museums and other museological structures, such as preservation, communication, research, training, etc. In addition, they comprise other elements which extrapolate the scope of traditional museology (e.g. elements of social animation, education and others that are found in many different initiatives on community development).

In their majority, applied methods are grounded on the assessment of the heritage and the museological language. Previous examples show that they correspond to activities such as: exhibitions; the use of different communication media (e.g. publications); educational and training programmes; research; collecting, inventory, documentation; conservation of collections and in situ conservation; lectures, forums, events; professional workshops, classes; and more: direct support to community initiatives/planning; direct intervention in the economic and political domains; participation in partnerships with other institutions; exchange programmes and creation of networks, etc.

In practice, many of these activities assume diverse dimensions within the work of museology, be it relation to their particular function in the execution of targets, be it in relation to how they are carried out (i.e. by whom, where, for how long, etc.) For instance, as seen before, an exhibition may be used as means to transmit contents or perpetrate values, to promote discussions, launch learning experiences (based on the appreciation of contents or on more participative approaches); it can also stand for a method of training community members, of mobilization, animation, etc. Yet, exhibitions may assume different forms (going from the most classical sense, based on visual communication, to “living” exhibitions- or lived exhibitions\(^\text{144}\); temporary, semi-temporary,

\(^{144}\) See Priosti on page 110.
open-air, etc.) and count with different degrees of community input—
or even no direct community input.

Obviously, these are not fortuitous aspects, the same way as the choice for methods does not follow an unintentional path once development objectives and museology’s typical way of action are assessed. Thus, considering all these possibilities that appear inherent to the methods adopted in the work of museology, it seems that the actual understanding of the ways museology proposes to act is also subject to the different meanings and implications of applied methods to the museological action.

In this regard, it is possible to identify some criteria that help to understand the cause and contents of these differences. Accordingly, methods shall respond to:

*The type of actions which methods aim to fulfil.*

Considering that actions correspond to museology’s fundamental roles (educational, political, of communication, animation and preservation/valorisation), they can also be presented in a similar way: action of popular education, action of communication in the macro-level, action of heritage preservation, action of therapeutic animation, etc.

What is possible to see from museology’s proposals, is that methods may be related to a few or many of these actions, gaining different meanings and forms exactly due to the type and number of actions which they involve. Because of this, it is possible to see a same method being used as means for different purposes and many methods working together in order to fulfil an action, as the examples presented in this thesis attest.

An important difference in meaning and form that emerges from this compliance of methods with types of action concerns the idea of methods that deliver products *versus* methods that allow processes to
take place. For example, a mounted exhibition or the outcomes of a research (that may be used to communicate issues, promote a learning process or support animation) arrive to their target public as finished products, as the result of a previous process (that ended in the mounting of the exhibition or in the outcomes of the research and may have counted with input of different actors, including community members). Differently, the process of creating an exhibition or carrying out a research (that will result in the mounted exhibition or in the outcomes of the research) can serve as communication means, learning process or support to animation before any product is delivered. In this case, the idea of a public that waits passively for the result of an exhibition or a research is replaced by the idea of a participant individuals/groups/communities engaged in creative action.

In this way, methods focused on the final product could be understood as those of which contribution to fulfilling defined aims and targets mainly takes place after they are ready and delivered to beneficiaries of development (or to other publics, e.g. external public, sponsors, etc.). With methods focused on processes, it is the creation process of a given product that constitutes the contribution to defined aims and targets. Such will to stimulate processes becomes very explicit in activities that involve actions of participative learning, and, especially, popular and heritage education. Here, methods are applied in order to generate a learning process (which in actions of popular and heritage education gains a deeper connotation of consciousness-raising) based on creative participation and immediate action.

The concept of participation and degree of community input
Different concepts of participation and degree of community input also play a role in shaping the meaning and form of methods. A good example is the case referred above, about the differences between methods focused on delivering products and methods focused on promoting processes. It is possible to say that the wider the concept
of participation (and input), the more methods will assume the face of processes, in which the creation is more important than the final product.

It is also possible to conclude that the wider the concept of participation and degree of community input, the deeper and more durable the effects of methods will be (particularly when methods comprise actions of education and animation). This happens because participation in creation and decision-making is able to mobilize more energy and commitment, bringing up a sense of ownership that, by its turn, works as spring for new creation (energy, synergy) and commitment to further actions.

*The audience on which the action aims to focus*

In relation to the work of museology for development, an important aspect rises from the compliance of methods with defined audiences. This aspect refers to the differences between methods that aim at the interior of the community (or the main beneficiaries of development) and those focused on the exterior.

For example, an exhibition created for a broader public (in order to perpetrate values or generate discussions in a macro-level) is very different from an exhibition created for community members or individuals who are taken as main beneficiaries of development. In the case of initiatives that make extensive use of the potential of methods as process promoters, this appears even more clear: when aiming at the interior of the community, ways of action privilege the process of making an exhibition, research or inventory, for example, as means to stimulate social interaction, discussion, consciousness-raising, etc. The same initiatives, when aiming at the exterior of the community, tend to privilege the final product, once their target audience is not the community and their demands are different from those related to actions of participative learning, animation, or others behind the use of methods as a way to promote processes.
3.1.5 Forms

As seen before, museological intervention is carried out in various forms (e.g. ecomuseums, neighbourhood museums, traditional museums, professional associations, etc). Through their appreciation it is possible to establish a relation between the different amplitudes that aims, targets and methods may gain in practice and the different degrees of intervention that museology’s proposals strive to achieve in the work for development. This relation becomes explicit especially when talking about the work of museums. Museology’s intervention is carried out mainly through:

- museology associations and universities (or other educational institutions): here, the work is related to professional training, discussions, creation of theoretical and ethical frameworks;

- the application of methodologies (without the use of museums): based on the exploitation of the heritage and the museological language. Most examples refer to initiatives originated from the new museology school of thought and/or related to heritage and popular education;

- the use of museums: comprising most initiatives, the work carried out by museums is very diverse in relation to the amplitude of aims, targets and ways of action, as well as in relation to proposed degrees of intervention. These can be placed inside a scale that has as extremity two types of museum. They are:
Museum as instrument of development

Related to the global action. In the discourse of museology today, it is represented mostly by examples originated from the new museology that aims at the global development of a community living on a territory. In many cases, they represent the main instrument to promote the development of a locality and ought to fill in gaps left by other social organizations.

Once related to the global action, the museum as instrument is, in principle, supposed to keep an eye on all dimensions of community life and respond to all possible community demands, be them related to the economical domain, social, cultural, etc. This does not mean that the museum can or will do it alone, or that it will be able promote a total development. Instead, it co-operates with other community and external partners and, as Varine (1996b) says, it is able to drive its interest to everything (i.e. the global aspects of a community) - in the limits of its objective.

The museum can be regarded as instrument because it is as medium to be used BY someone IN ORDER to achieve something (i.e. development, improvement of living conditions of a community). Thus, without use the museum is meaningless, empty or- one could say- it does not even exist in fact. Its main function as instrument is to allow the approximation of the community to development resources (be this approximation related to the qualitative development of human resources competencies, be it related to the accessibility to exogenous and, especially, to endogenous resources), by means of a “dynamic synthesis” between the population and its

---

145 Which corresponds to a programme of community development that includes a certain number of complementary actions integrated in a joint plan (VARINE, 1987), see more on page 103.
146 See territorially bounded locality approach on page 130.
147 Which also would comprise the acquirement of negotiation tools in order to deal with other development actors.
global heritage\textsuperscript{148}. Once the museum must be able to access the global heritage of a community, it does rely on the exploitation of stored collections. When existing, these are used as an asset and not as basis for the assessment of the global heritage.

In theory, a museum as instrument could be used by anyone (e.g. a group of specialists, government, etc.) in order to promote improvements in a community. However, according to the principle of participation, the museum belongs to and must be used by the own beneficiaries of development (i.e. it must be a community instrument), once they should be the ones to define the direction and promote in the changing/defining of their future. In order to create conditions for the beneficiaries of development to explore this instrument, the museum also plays a mediation role, through which the learning of the instrument is combined with its actual use- and the competencies developed by and for the use of the museum correspond to the competencies necessary to a development process aiming at self-management. With this mediation role, the museum introduces the “double-input” system, in which specialists are seen as catalysts and agents of “instrumentalisation”.

As to the amplitude of aims, the sense of community/cultural dynamics necessarily comprises action and creation, pointing at most- or all- conditions of empowerment. In relation to the amplitude of targets, it is possible to say that much of what the museum proposes to do in order to achieve the aims of generating dynamics and making resources assessable includes actions of education (namely, popular and heritage education as it appears in the discourse of the new museology) and animation (aiming at

\textsuperscript{148} By “dynamic synthesis” one may understand that while the museum, in one hand, is an instrument through which people can become acquainted, comprehend and value their heritage; in the other hand, once being an tool of participation and by making use of this same heritage, the museum has the chance to generate a number of qualities in the community which are fundamental for its empowerment, such as self-confidence, imagination and creativity. See page 99.
consciousness-raising). Because of this, most methods respond to these actions, being largely applied in order to allow processes to take place.

It seems clear that this type of museum has as prime responsibility to attend the micro and meso-levels (i.e. individuals and communities). As to its intervention in the macro-level, one can presume that the museum is able to perform several different actions (e.g. in the current discourse of museology, professional formation, representation of communities and promotion discussions appear characteristic of proposals related to the work of museums as instruments).

Finally, due to its total commitment to community dynamics and existing demands, the museum gains the face of a process in constant recreation. With this, its structure, organization and ways of action should adapt to a number of variables (available resources, will, community power relations, etc), what could even denote a disregard for the museum’s utility for development as an instrument. In this case, according to Varine (1996b) the museum would follow different destinies:

- it disappears after fulfilling its function of mobilization and dynamisation of the community. It can be replaced by something else: a political action, educational, etc…, carried out by other means;
- it suffers an “institutionalisation”, becoming a classic museum, emanating the community in its origins, but working now as an establishment of diffusion and cultural action, based on a collection and on activities common to museums;
- it is transformed in another process, still of museological nature, but very different, once adapted to a new generation, a different community from that which created the first museum ten or twenty years before.
Museum as actor of development
Related to punctual actions. Exemplified in this thesis by the work of “traditional” museums, which employ different approaches to development (local, categorical, intergroup, etc).
The museum as actor focuses its action on one or more specific aspects of a development programme or policy (e.g. social inclusion, community economic development, environmental preservation, cultural diversity, adult education, etc.). In theory, any museum could be an actor of development, on the condition that it places itself (and its resources) in the service of development and integrates broader development programmes/policies.

As long as it serves development, there are no limits for the functions a museum can assume. For instance, it may serve development as a data bank, a tourist attraction, a place for leisure, among others. However, current proposals emphasise functions related to:

-stimulating an approximation between beneficiaries of development and resources, by means of a “dynamic synthesis” between people and heritage;

-making use of museum and exhibition’s communication potential in order to create impact in society (i.e. museum strive to become a communication channel and a forum for debates).

This last function privileges aims related to the macro-level and targets based on museology’s communication role. Methods are, with this, very much focused on delivering quality products and do not have community input as necessary requirement.

149 Which correspond to a limited initiative, aiming to solve a particular problem within the general context of community development (VARINE, 1987), see more on page 103.
In regard to the direct work with individuals and communities (micro and meso-level), it is possible to say that, when compared to the museum as instrument, the museum as actor has many limitations in generating dynamics (i.e. attending all conditions for empowerment and ensuring durable effects) and making resources accessible (i.e. preserving, valorising and putting people in contact with the most varied resources)\textsuperscript{150}. This happens mainly because the museum is not able to access community life as a whole, neither its global heritage, once its focus relies on the use of collections and artefacts, as Varine (1993) stresses:

“The great weakness of the traditional museum, the museum in a building, with collections and curators and an emphasis on acquisition, conservation, research, interpretation and publications, is that it is cut off from the culture of most of the people in the area in which it is located and which it pretends to serve. It belongs to a past age. It continues to look for solutions which are based on a basic understanding of museum objects.” (VARINE, 1993)

Besides, there is a lower degree of community input in the museum, which restricts the exercise of decision-making and creative action. This happens because of the museum’s limitations in dealing with the issue of community ownership, consequently minimising community’s condition to deliver demands, to be involved in planning, as well as engaged in action. Such limitations are also reflected in the choice for targets and in applied methods.

\textsuperscript{150} This assertion does not intend to establish judgement, only to prove that museum takes two distinctive roles in community development.
3.1.6. Notes on community participation

Today, participation appears as a condition *sine qua non* of development; it is a principle that rises so central to that could even be regarded as fundamental substance for a paradigm of development. In the field of museology, participation is presented in several discourses as the only way to guarantee sustainability and the provision of resources. However - more than a tool - participation is itself an ideological concept and determining its meaning also means to determine what type of achievements (especially in the long-term) an initiative is able to promote/stimulate inside as well as outside a community.

As seen before, participation is a very relative concept. In 2003(b), Varine published the article “Les éléments de la participation: concepts, méthodes, acteurs” in which different aspects, means and conditions involved in participation are put in focus. Although the author addresses to the French context, the paper brings many insights useful for better comprehending what participation may mean and comprise within the work carried out by museology. Varine defines four modalities of participation, which are:

- consultation: understood as the demand for the opinion of inhabitants (users, citizens, etc.), not necessarily to follow this opinion/suggestion but to know what they think. It is a step of sociology, generally conducted through surveys: a person makes the questions, consulted people are supposed to answer; someone produces a synthesis via a report, which becomes a supplementary element in a project or in a final decision;
- discussion/negotiation\(^{151}\): understood as a debate, in one or more stages of a development process, which is supposed to

\(^{151}\) From the French “concertation”.

result in changes – i.e., it is not a level of “gratuitous” suggestions;

- participation: understood as a share of decision power that the representative democracy entrust to the population for occasion of specific projects\(^\text{152}\);
- co-operation/co-production: understood as a modality in which citizens not only participate in the debate and decision-making but also contribute to the action with their work and competencies in order to execute decisions\(^\text{153}\).

Regarding the translation of these levels to the field of museology, it is easier to visualise Varine’s definitions in cases of museums that work as instruments of development. As to those museums that play an actor’s role (focused on punctual actions), the participation levels presented above should be placed within the idea of participating in decision making and execution of activities, as well as participating in decision making and operation of museological structures. Such notion adds further aspects to the idea of participating in offered activities in a museum or museological initiative.

It is such perspective of different participation modalities that has defined the meaning of community input within this thesis. That is to say, community input has been treated in terms of level (“modality”) of community participation in the various initiatives presented previously (i.e. participation in offered activities, participation in programming, decision-making, taking control, etc.). Although the idea of a high input has been related to the types of community

\(^{152}\) In this regard, Varine mentions the case of initiatives carried out together with local authorities, in which projects developed by the population, for example, are adopted and financed by local councils. In comparison with other countries, this level appears very characteristic of the French context. Nevertheless, this idea of participation can be transferred to different initiatives in the field of museology.

\(^{153}\) According to Varine, this is a modality of participation common in developing countries and in countries from the south of Europe. Such level turns out indispensable for the development of a sense of ownership.
intervention, it could also be associated with the number of community members who actually perform such interventions.

If one has the chance to examine the references presented so far, one will notice that problems concerning the number of participants/community actors also add a big challenge to the complex subject of community participation. Among the few works that stress on this matter specifically, it is possible to identify concerns regarding the mobilization of participants and the need to assure continuity, as well as renovated participation. In the other hand, authors also stress on the limitations of involving numbers of individuals – leading to the appreciation of a “realistic” idea of participation, in which the difficulties in gathering an extensive number of participants do not pose necessarily an obstacle for achieving improvements in the development process.

Be it in relation to the number of participants, the relations among them (which involve dialogue, co-operation, tension, power relations, etc.) or the degree of intervention, subjects on community participation appear very complex and difficult to manage. Thus, the need for defining what participation means in each situation, as well as developing participation mechanisms, emerges imperative – it is a crucial step for any initiative that consider participation to be indispensable. As explained before, defining meaning and mechanisms also comes to attend the need for assessing participation as an ideological element and as a relative concept.

It is also important to remember that participation is never “self-spontaneous”, hence the need for developing an “apparatus” (means, methods, etc.) in order to pursue stimulus, mobilization and continuity. According to Varine (2003b), promoting participation

---

154 For example: representative participation (through committees or councils with elected members form the community as happened in the ecomuseums of Le Creusot and Haute-Beauce), voluntary participation, etc.
involves some fundamental means, which are: sharing of information, formation, animation and action\textsuperscript{155}. This comes to reinforce the role of specialists and professionals in promoting participation, mostly by means of a “double input” system. Varine also adds that key factors must be taken into account, once they exert influence on the reality of participation. They are: the territory (each policy, project, action has its own territory, even inside a community’s territory); time (duration of the action, project, etc.); rhythms (rhythm of daily life, work, social life - conflicting rhythms that influence people’s capacity of participating in the public life), and language (of the inhabitants, social workers, etc. - which comprise differences in vocabulary, word rhythm, voice tone, etc). Finally, the author stresses on the importance of defining the role of other actors and authorities in the process of community participation; role that demands political will and taking risks. That is to say, effective community participation can be only reached if authorities and other authors (in special professionals, managers and those originally responsible for launching development initiatives) are willing and able to share power of decision.

3.2 Reflections for the future (demands from the broader field of community development)

Considering that museology’s proposals are a valuable resource for community development practice, in special due to its approach to culture and the heritage, and that, based on its current orientation, museology still holds underdeveloped potentialities, this section aims to address on possible developments museology can carry out in the near future in relation to the work with community development. For that, museology’s proposals have been assessed under current trends in community development (found in the

\textsuperscript{155} Action understood under the perspective of new museology’s philosophy, i.e. as a learning process, a source of consciousness-raising, etc.)
introduction of this thesis) in order to point out how museology can fulfill demands from the broader field of development, departing from its underdeveloped potentialities. As a result from such analysis, a number of issues have emerged relevant. Among them, two topics have been chosen and will be explored briefly. They refer to the possibilities of expanding the global action beyond the “community as a locality” approach, and increasing museology’s interference at the macro level (also enhancing its political role outside communities).

3.2.1 Expanding global action beyond the “community as a locality” approach.

Here, one must consider that initiatives concerned with the global action have both the relevance and potential to extrapolate the “community as a locality” approach (which, in practice, comprises most works related to the global action). This does not mean, however, that territorial development is less important; the idea is to apply the thoughts related to the global action and local development in other approaches to community development.

As seen in the introduction “A framework for community development”, current changes in the world\textsuperscript{156} and the emergence of new actors of community development, among other factors, have set a broader range of targets of community action and organizing strategies, which includes not only local communities but also population groups (e.g. youth, elderly, ethno-cultural minorities, etc) and the public at large. This has resulted in what Campfens (1999) lists as new approaches to community development. They include, as seen before, modalities such as the categorical concept and the intergroup concept. Also in regard to approaches based on territorial

\textsuperscript{156} E.g. the increase of local populations’ cultural diversity, degeneration of life quality in urban settings, social inequalities, etc.
development, it is clear that local territories (understood as localities) count each time more with increasing internal disparities, not only in relation to the traditional gap between rich and poor, but also cultural and religious disparities, as well as a growing lack of access to services offered by society. Thus, even an initiative that relies on local development, must take “group” approaches into consideration.

*About the relevance of proposals comprising global action to the new approaches of community development.*

If one thinks of some core elements that characterize museology’s proposals for territorial development and involve global action, such as resources types (people, heritage), aims (e.g. promote empowerment, put people in touch with their heritage and development resources), ways of action (comprising methods of traditional museology, social animation and popular education), there is no reason not to think that the same elements could be applied to other community development approaches focused on population groups and dominated by key concerns as social inclusion, youth development and group reconciliation, for example. Many arguments can be used to justify the relevance of orientations based on global action, such as: the degree of participation they are able to stimulate, the importance given in articulating different domains of community life (cultural, social, economic, political), the extend of pursued social/community dynamics (pointing at creation, empowerment, extensive decision-making), etc.

As an attempt to imagine such an initiative related to the global action being applied to other approaches that not the “locality” one, it is possible to think, for example, of how a museum as instrument would target at minority groups and develop a strategy to combat social exclusion. In this case, the museum as instrument would be able to act in diverse domains: in the economic domain, by stimulating new ways of income, making use of people’s know-how, assessing knowledge and distinctive appeals to the market, etc; in the social domain, by strengthening identity and social bonds among
minorities, strengthening self-esteem in an individual and group level, stimulating collective work; promoting access to society services (by conveying skills, raising awareness, acting as an advocate), etc; in the cultural domain, by valorising their living culture, and stimulating the delivery (to the interior and exterior) of cultural characteristics as a positive assets, etc; in the political domain, by promoting empowerment, creating awareness of rights and duties, advocating such communities at the meso and macro-levels, etc.

Actually, some few examples in the field of museology show such an approach on population groups based on the global action (e.g. the work with “heritage education” and school children or other youth groups). Moreover, even in the scope of efforts aimed at territorial development, it is possible to see a growing concern in focusing more on target groups, as discussed in the chapter 2. Thus, it is possible to understand that museology (and especially new museology, which respond to most of the initiatives related to the global action) has been adapting to current development demands.

However, one cannot disregard that today the great majority of practices involving global action in the field of museology still seem to be attached to the idea of community as one unit, i.e. as the “totality” of the population living in a territory- minimizing the work with population groups. For this reason, the work comprising global action and other approaches to community development should be still seen as potentiality.

The potential of applying proposals concerning global action to other approaches of community development

In order to extend the global action to other approaches in a more substantial way, it would be necessary that professionals and community development practitioners reviewed and developed notions that today appear fundamental to museology (in particular to
new museology). Perhaps, the most important of them refers to the concepts of community and territory.

As explained before, the notion of community is very much focused on the territorial element by those who work with orientations concerning the global action. This does not mean that they disregard the relativity of the idea “territory”, conceived by the relations between the community and its environment and of which boundaries are only defined by those relations. According to this, a community’s territory is, in theory, able to extrapolate regions, countries and even continents, as long as it reflects the community’s relations with the surrounding environment. Despite of the idea, few is seen in this regard in reality; and, in a world with increasing major population movements (that is reflected in local communities), it is difficult to imagine that current initiatives would not have to deal with such aspect.

The concept of a fragmented territory would come to fulfil demands for connecting community groups to each other and to their common heritage\(^{157}\). It is possible to visualise, then, that such fragmented community groups (in particular those groups that live outside their original community) would be target of a sort of “population group” approach, once, according to this view, they live in another community’s territory. They are, at the same time, intimately connected to their original community territory, as well as to a new territory (e.g. another region, country, etc.). Nevertheless, such approach still departs from the dominant idea that a community is a unit in its own right, which may or not inhabit a fragmented territory. That is to say, in relation to their original community, population

\(^{157}\) This is easy to visualise in a case where community emigrants are connected to their original communities, by means of an extension of an ecomuseum’s territory of action, (antennae) for example, as seen in the case of the Ecomuseum of the Murtosa region, in Portugal.
members are treated as part of one same body and the community is seen as the totality of a population living in its territory.

In this way, an approach that takes into account populations groups as community themselves, or as communities inside the local community, requires more than the expansion or fragmentation of the idea of community’s territory; it requires a review of the concept of community itself. And it is perhaps in the concept of community that is found the biggest “resistance” to extending the global action beyond the locality approach.

An expansion in the concept of community towards population groups would allow that local community groups (or simply population groups when the initiatives do not comprise local territorial development) to be connected to a larger number of territories: local community’s territory, homeland (in the case of immigrants), public, private and personal spaces, and to other territories that belong to people each time more in an interconnected world (which would even include the virtual space). Finally, it is important to say that such focus on population groups would not denote a disregard to the global view of community’s reality, once “global view” regards interconnected dimensions rather than spatial parameters. The same way as proposals today comprise the interaction between the different dimensions of a local community’s life –having as support community’s territory- approaches on population groups would comprise the same interaction, but in a different scale and in more plural and interconnected territories. The same could happen in cases where local community development would be combined with the “population group” approach.

3.2.2 Increasing museology’s level of interference at the macro-level; extending its political role to the outside.

Here, the main concern refers to the potential role of museology (as discipline and form of action) and advocates of museological experiences/proposals in policy making and extensive co-operation
in the macro-level (national, international), through increasing the political role to the outside and capacity of co-operating with other development agencies and organizations.

As referred by Campfens (1999) previously\(^{158}\), the face of community development today is market by an increasing program integration, organization partnerships and coordination among different levels of society (from the local to the international). With this, new approaches focus on the coordination between policy frameworks and local action (e.g. the continuum concept and the structural-functional concept). In addition, current demands of community development urge for the forging of a global networking and the emergence of a “worldwide civil society”. This happens because, each time more, common problems appear interconnected in our globalized world (e.g. issues on social justice, human rights, etc), with the local being connected to the global and vice-versa.

In this way, considering the growing importance given to coordinating policy frameworks and local action - which eventually seems to set a standard for practices of community development (conditioning organizational support, funding, etc) - as well as the potential of extensive co-operation at the regional, national and international levels, museology is found in a position where necessity of adaptation to new demands, the possibilities for its actuation that may arise from such an adaptation and the relevance of its proposals to the broader field of development call for a change in the degree and extension of intervention at the macro-level of society.

A matter of relevance

A main argument to justify the expansion of museology’s role at the macro level refers to the contributions its proposals can make to the practice of community development as a whole. This becomes clear when one acknowledges that most initiatives on community development lack the cultural approach museology carries, which is

\(^{158}\) See introduction on page 5.
here considered a vital element for human development. Such marginal position of the cultural domain in community development is equally, or perhaps even more concerning when referring to development policy-making and the international co-operation sector, once, due to the growing coordination between policy frameworks, the international co-operation agencies and local action, these come to set standards and condition development initiatives, as mentioned previously.

With very few exceptions (the most important certainly refers to the work of UNESCO), cultural approaches to development are extensively neglected in policy-making and in the programmes of co-operation agencies. This is felt, for instance, when support, funding or co-operation partnership guidelines exclude initiatives centred in a cultural approach, or ignore cultural workers as development agents. If one considers the importance government development policies can take in community development practice today, as well as the strategic relevance of co-operation agencies, it is clear that the lack of a cultural approach in these domains may also hinder a possible blooming of more human approaches to community development.

A matter of necessity and possibility
Considering these current trends in the field of community development, adaptations related to a greater interference of museology at the macro-level could also be seen as necessity and possibility for future developments of the museological practice and theory. That is to say, if in the one hand the participation of museology in policy making and national/international co-operation might bring contributions to the practice of community development, in the other hand, it shall also bring contributions to the museological field itself. Among these contributions, it is possible to think of:

- museology’s proposals would be better known in the field of community development;
there could be more possibilities of negotiation, support and financing for museology-related development initiatives;

- there would be a greater possibility of creating strategic partnerships and networks, as well as enhancing information exchange.

Perhaps one of the aspects of concern regarding the work of museology is the minimal knowledge\textsuperscript{159} that the “outside world” has about museological proposals for community development. It seems that only in those countries (such as Portugal, Canada and France) where militants have been carrying out such a work for long years that there is some understanding of the possibilities of museology by authorities, development actors and other spheres of society. For the rest, even inside the field of museology, it seems to be a widespread ignorance of the museology’s potential as a resource for community development, helping to minimize its impact and possibilities within the world of development. A greater interference in the macro-level could also fortify museology’s positions and endow initiatives with more power to negotiate with government authorities and possibilities of being eligible for new support and funding sources – particularly when talking about international co-operation agencies, NGOs, etc\textsuperscript{160}.

\textsuperscript{159} At least apparent, although few evidences prove the opposite.

\textsuperscript{160} Among the cases explored in this thesis, very few appear connected to other support or funding that do not originate from the government or from local communities, this last in a smaller scale. It seems clear that the more a development initiative is dependent on external funding, the more it is susceptible to outside control from the government and, eventually, from the economic forces that own funding sources. However, it is naïve to believe that an initiative can be completely free from such type of funding. In the field of museology, external funding comes in its major part from governments, generating a constant tension that, in many cases, could be seen as a struggle between dynamic (community) and hardened, bureaucratic (government) forces. Thus, a greater interference of museology could at the macro-level could work in two ways: first, by contributing to development policies (and, with this, perhaps casting government’s attention/practice towards more human approaches to development) and second, by enhancing its relevance to
Therefore, it is possible to affirm that museology has the need, the chance and relevance to improve its interference in the macro-level, mainly by extending its political and advocate role. As seen before, the core aims of museology regarding the macro-level correspond to perpetuating values to museum audiences, to museums acting as a forum of debates and professional training. A greater interference at the macro-level could make use of these aims, as well as of initiatives such as: bringing to priority in professional associations’ agendas actions focused on communicating and raising awareness of museology’s proposals; making use of the new networks that are been created in the field of museology among community museums, ecomuseums, local museums and other development initiatives to carry on joint actions aimed at the macro-level; and including in the programmes of professional training subjects that could facilitate the communication between museology professionals and other professionals/practitioners from the broader field of community development.
CONCLUSION

The comparison between museology’s trajectory/proposals and the framework of community development shows that this first is able to occupy a solid position in the world efforts for development today, complying with its dynamics, current trends and many of its demands. It is possible to identify in the museological discourse and action the influence of global transformations, such as the trends toward decentralization and localism, growing involvement of the voluntary sector and the emergence of grass roots movements. The same way, museology’s actuation reflects new trends concerning the nature of development actors, which in the past were concentrated in the intervention of the state and today comprise an active involvement of the civil society via social institutions (such as the museums, associations, universities), social, co-operative and grass roots movements (to which many of the experiences of new museology school of thought can be associated with), NGOs, etc.

Rising priorities in the field of community development have also a place in the proposals of museology: environmental awareness, multicultural issues, focus on “people development” and the increasing interest on community economic development, among others.

The differences found inside the museological discourse also corroborate its organic relation with the broader field of community development, in the sense that they reflect the influence of intellectual traditions, the type of relationship with established powers and other factors that determine the dimension of development values and principles in each initiative. A clear example can be seen in the experiences of the new museology school of thought, which, according to Campfens’ view, would respond to the tradition of oppositional movements. In the new museology school of thought, as the author explains, the determination to change the established relations of power and promote human liberation has cast social mobilization towards a “politic of free association and mutual
aid” and based much of the intervention on social learning, particularly on popular education. In contrast, many traditional museums show to respond to the tradition of social guidance, avoiding a direct confrontation with established powers and limiting their political role inside communities (and consequently the degree of community participation).

Other convergences between museology and the broader field of development refer to the reconstruction of the “development expert” image (as the one who is able to carry out planning and action based on the concrete, spatial, environmental and cultural context in which people live); renovated approaches to community development work (e.g. focused on population groups, social inclusion, conflict resolution, local development, etc); and the importance of issues on social justice and human rights.

Within its discourse, museology brings a vision of development which finds correspondent in the world current trends, for instance:

- key development concepts (integral, endogenous, sustainable);
- approaches to development (local development, categorical approach, self-management approach, social learning approach, etc)
- common principles (community participation and self-management/ liberation and decentralization).

In addition, it proposes a cultural approach based on the exploration and valorisation of the global heritage as a resource for development, which can be regarded as a valuable contribution to the field of community development. This becomes even more tangible when as one realises that few interventions from the broader field of development privilege the cultural domain of community’s life. Assuming the importance of culture for development, it is possible to say that by appealing to culture as means to reach development,
museology places itself in the forefront of a new orientation that strives for being more human and sustainable.

Stepped on a cultural approach, the museological intervention may assume different aims (e.g. community economic development, social inclusion, etc). However, two main aims emerge characteristic to the work of museology. They concern the micro and meso level of society and can be presented as:

- generate community dynamics (promote empowerment and/or its preliminary conditions- identity building, self-confidence, mobilization, etc);
- making resources accessible (what mostly means to put people in touch with endogenous resources, in special the heritage, so that these can be understood, used and transformed by development actors along the process).

In the macro level, it is possible to find aims such as:

- perpetrating values;
- professional formation (training);
- representing community and delivering demands;
- promoting debates/discussions;
- and participating in some international co-operation actions;

In order to achieve its aims, museology proposals introduce a number targets which are conceived under four main perspectives: educational, political, of communication, animation and heritage preservation/valorisation. With this, museology assumes fundamental roles that drive its actions, moulding targets and helping to determine the implication of methods in the work for development.

Due to the nature of its work, museology’s ways of action depart from functions traditionally related to the work of museums and
other museological structures, such as preservation, communication, research, training, etc. In addition, they comprise other elements which extrapolate the scope of traditional museology (e.g. elements of social animation, education and others that are found in many different initiatives on community development). In practice, applied methods assume different dimensions, be it relation to their particular function in the execution of targets, or be it in relation to how they are carried out (i.e. by whom, where, for how long, etc.). Among the criteria that can be used to help understanding the cause and contents of these differences, it is possible to find:

- the type of actions which methods aim to fulfil: considering that actions correspond to museology’s fundamental roles (educational, political, of communication, animation and preservation/valorisation), they can also be presented in a similar way. Methods may be related to a few or many of these actions, gaining different meanings and forms exactly due to the type and number of actions which they involve;
- the concept of participation and degree of community input;
- the audience on which the action aims to focus.

Museological intervention is carried out in various forms (e.g. ecomuseums, neighbourhood museums, traditional museums, professional associations, etc). Through their appreciation it is possible to establish a relation between the different amplitudes that aims, targets and methods may gain in practice and the different degrees of intervention that museology’s proposals strive to achieve in the work for development. In this way, museology’s intervention is carried out mainly through:

- museology associations and universities (or other educational institutions);
- the application of methodologies (based on the exploitation of the heritage and the museological language);
the use of museums, which can be place in a scale that has as extremity two types of museums:

- museum as instrument of development: related to the global action, represented mostly by examples originated from the new museology that aims at the global development of a community living on a territory;
- museum as actors of development: related to punctual actions, exemplified in this thesis by the work of “traditional” museums, which employ different approaches to development.

Finally, considering that museology’s proposals constitute a valuable resource for community development (in special due to its approach to culture and the heritage) and that, based on its current orientation, museology still holds underdeveloped potentialities, it is possible to identify some areas in with museology may advance in the near future in order to fulfil demands from the broader field of development. These areas refer to:

- expanding the global action beyond the “community as a locality” approach;
- increasing museology’s degree of interference at the macro-level and enhancing its political role outside communities.
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