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.