
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 community¹¹⁷.

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 innocuous¹¹⁸.

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 them¹¹⁹. 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

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

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 ecomuseums¹²⁰, 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 territory¹²¹. 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 museology¹²².

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 Murtoşa region, in Portugal, that aims to create an antennae of the ecomuseum in New York, city where 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 Varine¹²³, 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-operators¹²⁴.

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 Moreira¹²⁵, 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 concept¹²⁶ –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)¹²⁸, such approaches can be described as:

The territorially bounded locality concept

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

museology¹²⁹ 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.”

The categorical concept

Concept, “in which community development forms a part of a larger policy that aims to alleviate or prevent social problems 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.”

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 points¹³⁰. 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 Creusot¹³¹, 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.)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 Varine¹³³ and in the more individualistic approach of Mayrand, for example.

¹³⁰ See page 62.

¹³¹ Quoted by Varine in 1993 as “essentially a rescue job, an imaginative policy for dealing with an emergency situation”.

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.

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 discourse¹³⁴, 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.

¹³⁴ Its is possible to say that they are the fundamentals 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 process¹³⁵. By

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 extent 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, etc¹³⁷.

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 diversity¹³⁸.

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 action¹³⁹.

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.

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 development¹⁴⁰. 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 heritage¹⁴¹. 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 problems¹⁴², 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

¹⁴⁰ One can understand that these aims are the basis for others aims, which may comprise direct economic interventions, for example.

¹⁴¹ See page 98.

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 before¹⁴³, 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 exhibitions¹⁴⁴; 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 action¹⁴⁵. 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 territory¹⁴⁶. 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 to 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 competencies¹⁴⁷, 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 heritage¹⁴⁸. 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

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 actions¹⁴⁹. 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 develop, 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)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.

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/negotiation¹⁵¹: 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 projects¹⁵²;
- 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 decisions¹⁵³.

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 exam 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 had, 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 mechanisms¹⁵⁴, 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 action¹⁵⁵. 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

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 fulfil 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 world¹⁵⁶ 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

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 heritage¹⁵⁷. 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) previously¹⁵⁸, the face of community development today is marked 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 knowledge¹⁵⁹ 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, etc¹⁶⁰.

¹⁵⁹ At least apparent, although few evidences prove the opposite.

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 have 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.

the national and international fields of development (and, with this, perhaps calling attention for the importance of supporting initiatives with cultural approaches).