



R E F L E
X I V E
O V E R
V E W

**11 years of Reflections
and Discussions**

The State of São Paulo's Annual
Museum Conference

Orgs.: Martin Grossmann
Diego de Kerchove
Diogo de Moraes Silva



R E F L E

X I V E

O V E R

V E W

**11 years of Reflections
and Discussions**

The State of São Paulo's Annual
Museum Conference

Orgs.: Martin Grossmann
Diego de Kerchove
Diogo de Moraes Silva

EPM

encontro paulista
de museus

 **11 years of Reflections
and Discussions**
The State of São Paulo's Annual
Museum Conference

PRESENTATION

The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference (SSAMC) is a milestone in the cultural public policies of the State of São Paulo. Since 2009, the gatherings have been held annually without interruption, spanning five government administrations. It demonstrates the importance of museums both in the state government programs and also the maintenance of a State Policy for culture in São Paulo. It is a unique and model case in Brazil.

Since its first edition, the SSAMC's mission has been to put into practice the goals of the State System of Museums of São Paulo (Sisem-SP): the dissemination and sharing of information and knowledge among the nearly 500 museums that make up the museum network of the state of São Paulo. The international conferences, panels, debate tables, among other formats proposed by the SSAMC, enabled the exchange of knowledge and the constitution of a solid base of tools for the professionalization of museums and their teams.

Another important mark left by the SSAMCs was the construction of a long-lasting partnership between the Secretariat of Culture and Creative Economy of the State of São Paulo (SEC), creator of the SSAMC, the Cultural Association Supporting the Casa de Portinari Museum (Acam), which since their second edition has produced the SSAMCs, and the Fórum Permanente, an interdependent platform of cultural mediation and action, which has provided critical coverage of all the gatherings held in the city of São Paulo since 2009. The critical reports, as well as the audiovisual records of the various round tables and seminars given at the SSAMCs throughout its 12 years of existence, are available on the websites/platforms of the [Fórum Permanente](#) and [Sisem/SP](#), ensuring a vast collection of information and living memory of all the State of São Paulo Museum Conferences .

To celebrate both the longevity of the SSAMC and the partnership between these three cultural agents, we are putting forward this historical book, which includes texts from the main leaders involved in building and upkeeping for over a decade a state public policy aimed at museums in the State of São Paulo. Aside from texts signed by four Secretaries of Culture, four coordinators of the Museum Heritage Preservation Unit, and three directors of Sisem-SP, the board of Acam Portinari, and the coordination of the Fórum Permanente, the book contains a selection of the critical reports produced for each edition, as well as a retrospective critical report on the main roundtables and the developments following each of the State of São Paulo Museum Conferences. There is also a postface that discusses this extensive period in which we witnessed, among other things:

- a) the consolidation of the management model of part of the State's cultural institutions by Social Organizations;
- b) the development and institutionalization of Sisem-SP;
- c) the construction of an equitable two-way street relationship between the capital and the cultural bodies in the countryside of the State;
- d) the process of municipalization of some museums, among other relevant themes that mark the SSAMC's trajectory.

Editorial Committee

INTRO DUCTION

The State of São Paulo Museum Conferences: First Decade

Martin Grossmann

Diego de Kerchove

Diogo de Moraes Silva

In a republican tradition such as the Brazilian one, unfortunately, it is not uncommon for State policies to be submitted and reduced to transitional government policies, thus suffering the mishaps of discontinuity. Therefore, it is more than natural that we celebrate a decade of uninterrupted yearly events, quite representative of the São Paulo state policy for museums. Moreover, this continuity allows for public policies, with their interdependent initiatives, to be considered in perspective, as they build invaluable historical series to the indispensable processes of evaluation, maturity, and improvement.

This will serve to explain why The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference - SSAMC, whose first edition dates back to 2009, must have its trajectory reviewed by this publication. It can provide the reader with an overview of the discussions and actions promoted by this event, year after year, becoming a milestone in the museological program of the state and, to some extent, the country. Developed by the State System of Museums of São Paulo - Sisem-SP, an institution linked to the current Secretariat of Culture and Creative Economy, the SSAMC carries a remarkable history of nearness and articulation between museum professionals, political agents, researchers, students, people interested in this subject matter, and the potential in the museum sphere, converging to actions for the qualification and professionalization of the more than 400 museums that integrate the São Paulo network, among state, municipal and private cultural institutions.

The collection and editing of material comprising all the Conferences, up until the year 2020, aim to offer different perspectives of the event in its timeline, covering the 11 editions held so far. Thus, the reader can rely on descriptive and reflexive accounts from several players who have been connected to the SSAMC for over a decade. Among those who occupied or still occupy their positions, we have the contribution of the Secretary of Culture of the State of São Paulo, the coordinator of the Museum Heritage Preservation Unit - UPPM, the executive board of Sisem-SP as well as a member of its Guiding Council and Regional Representations. Representatives of Acam Portinari – a

social organization partner of Sisem-SP in the organization of SSAMC - and of the Fórum Permanente, with its permanent and interim staff, are also present in this compendium through their texts.

Every year researchers join the Fórum Permanente's staff to contribute to its platform. They have been responsible for the production of critical reports about conferences, roundtables, and exhibition panels that, together with other formats and situations, make up every edition of the SSAMC. Besides promoting the elaboration of these reports, whose discussions are thoroughly researched, the Fórum Permanente also entrusted its team, specifically for this publication, with the writing of reports that summarise, one by one, the 11 events - allowing their contexts, emphases, concepts, characters, and developments to be highlighted and analytically commented by researchers.

The Fórum Permanente is an independent platform for cultural action and mediation and a partner of Sisem-SP in The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference since the event's debut, at the end of the first decade of the 2000s. The platform's main focus is the reverberation of the Conferences beyond the places and days in which they occurred, trying to include layers of mediation and critical qualities into the agenda of the museums that make up the state's network in terms of their policies and programs. In addition to the critical reports and the latest annual summaries, the Fórum Permanente has invested, throughout this period, in the audiovisual recording of the SSAMC's activities, allowing unrestricted access to the platform's website and the Sisem-SP portal for remote audiences. This history of permanent construction of a living Conferences' archive, with the institutional memory that it generates, preserves, and disseminates, qualifies the Fórum Permanente for the organization of this e-book.

As a result, several researchers responsible for the production of critical reports on oral exhibitions promoted by the 11 Conferences - from 2009 onwards, involving reference professionals for museology and related areas, regionally, nationally, and also internationally - were once again invited to collaborate in the construction of this book, either to write summaries about the event attributed to them, or as editors of the vast richness of material produced during the Conferences. Here, the positions of a member of the audience, commentator, and organizer of the discussions constituting the SSAMC - as its collection of ideas, concepts, practices and proposals - get in some way overlapped, revealing a two-way process: receptiveness and response to the event.

In fact, the thorough reading of this material, a rich and demanding task involving hundreds of pages - with its various articulations and different approaches - provided the

editorial board with a broad and plural vision of the SSAMC, while at the same time suggested some perspectives by emphasizing certain themes, which can be perceived in the thematic structure of the SSAMC annual programs, or in the readings and comparisons between some critical reports. It is worth noting that the repository of the Fórum Permanente hosts a total of 70 critical reports about the event, produced by more than 40 professionals over the years.

In this respect, the continuity of the SSAMC provides the necessary foundations for its assessment, proposed by this editorial piece, built upon the collection of material produced and depurated based on the activities distributed throughout different cultural institutions in the city of São Paulo, such as the Memorial of Latin America (1st to 5th SSAMC); the São Paulo Dental Surgeons Association (6th SSAMC); the Palácio dos Bandeirantes, the Immigration Museum, the MAM-SP, the Afro-Brazilian Museum, and the Bienal São Paulo (7th SSAMC); the Sala São Paulo, Sesc Bom Retiro, the Pinacoteca, the Secretariat of Culture, the Station of Arts, and the São Paulo State Music School (8th SSAMC); Teatro São Pedro and the Sesc Research and Training Center (9th SSAMC), and, once again, the Memorial of Latin America (10th SSAMC), after the restoration of the Simón Bolívar Auditorium, which was destroyed in a fire in 2013. The last SSAMC included in this publication took place in 2020 in a totally virtual environment, due to the restrictions imposed by the Covid-19 pandemic.

This assessment involves drawing attention to five axes that were revealed in the longitudinal reading of the SSAMC, in retrospect, regardless of its chronology. Although each edition of the event prioritized a specific theme according to the scenario surrounding museums in the period, it is still possible to verify that the issues listed below permeated practically all the Conferences, with greater or lesser incidence. They are the following: (i) policies for museums and museum policies; (ii) museological, curatorial, and programmatic conceptions and practices; (iii) museums understood and articulated in networks; (iv) modalities of interaction with publics and communities, and (v) reflections on memory, heritage, and museology. These vectors, being complementary, allow us to create, a posteriori, the framework of the main questions assembled and treated at the SSAMC, providing, through the records collected here, coordinates for navigation.

These thematic-conceptual indexes were the basis of our selection of an average of two critical reports per Conference. This work was based on the following criteria: (a) robust and substantial reports; (b) attention to text structuring, discursive fluency, and the use of technical vocabulary; (c) thorough detailing of the main problems reported; and (d)

critique and proposition in the rapporteur's contributions as a cultural agent. Based on these criteria, we were able to classify and select reports that, luckily, found balance in the publication; and for each axis, it was possible to select and put together an average of five critical reports.

As far as editorial organization is concerned, the critical reports selected and reproduced here benefit from the synthesis of previous SSAMC editions. Thus, the descriptions and reflections echoed by their lines find support and are opportunely contextualized by the texts that summarize, and often problematize, some of the essential aspects addressed in the Conference under discussion. We refer to the latest syntheses requested from researchers who, in part, were also involved with the previous production of critical reports, in the heat of the moments surrounding the respective SSAMC.

The authors were given full autonomy regarding the choice of content and approach in the writing of their narratives. If, on the one hand, these readings demand persistence from the reader, on the other hand, they allow multiple entries into the SSAMC, freeing us from the risk of being exposed to an unwanted "reporting" standardization – which, as we know, can be discouraging. It should also be noted that these texts were written extemporaneously, based upon commissioning from the Fórum Permanente for the preparation of this e-book.

Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo Brazilian Museums connected to the world

Secretariat of Culture and Creative Economy

The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference, promoted by the Department of Culture and Creative Economy, is essentially a tool for public policies. The event aims to connect São Paulo museums with the most innovative practices in the world, generate constructive and reflective debates about museum preservation and dissemination actions, and ensure a high standard of quality, passed on to the cultural spaces of the State of São Paulo.

In 2019, to increase access to information for professionals in the nearly 500 institutions mapped by the museum network of the state of São Paulo, a cycle of six itinerant editions held in the countryside and coastal areas of the state was created. The intention was to amplify the event and put into practice the goals of the state System of Museums (SISEM-SP).

Despite the challenges faced due to the Covid-19 pandemic, the Week was held in 2020 in a virtual format. The secretariat guaranteed the same quality as in previous years, with international and interstate partnerships, and expanded the technical and theoretical discussions to public culture managers, researchers, and professionals of the sector.

All these actions can be reviewed in detail in the e-book, which highlights the success of an event consolidated in the calendar of the Secretariat of Culture and Creative Economy.

CONTENTS

Presentation	9
Editorial Committee	
Introduction	
The State of São Paulo Museum Conferences: First Decade Martin Grossmann Diego de Kerchove Diogo de Moraes Silva	13
Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo Brazilian Museums connected to the world Secretariat of Culture and Creative Economy	17
PART I	
Institutional Overview	
Former Secretaries of Culture and Creative Economy of the State of São Paulo	
Conferences that Made a Difference Andrea Matarazzo	27
Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo: Thinking about the Construction of a Trajectory Marcelo Mattos Araújo	29
10 years of The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference José Roberto Sadek	31
Directors of the Unit of Museum Heritage Preservation Unit and of State System of Museums of São Paulo	
Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo: Building a Legacy Called Continuity Claudinéli Moreira Ramos	34
São Paulo Museums: A Continuous and Collective Process Renata Vieira da Motta	40
10th SSAMC: A Milestone of Maturity Regina Ponte	43
The SSAMC and Museum Resilience Leticia Santiago	48
Memories: Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo Cecilia Machado	50
SSAMC: A Fruitful Legacy of Partnerships Davidson Kaseker	56

Members of the Guiding Board of the State System of Museums of São Paulo

São Paulo Conference: museums are the life that is not small Nilo Mattos de Almeida	60
Encounters define directions and build dreams Maria de Lourdes Marszolek Bueno	63
Conference of Museums of the State of São Paulo: Earned Recognition Renata Gava	65
Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo: A Milestone in the Trajectory of the Museums' Public Policies SISEM-SP institutional text	67

ACAM Portinari

A publication for the 10th anniversary of The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference Angelica Fabbri	70
---	-----------

Fórum Permanente

A Far-Reaching Critical Coverage: the Fórum Permanente and The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference Martin Grossmann	79
---	-----------

PART II Critical Overview

1st Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo

Research, Public Policies and a New Management Model: the 1 st Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo and Its Effervescent Context Ilana Seltzer Goldstein	89
"A Museum Without Reality Is Not a Museum" Daniele Zaccarão	97
Museums and Their Sustainability: Finances, Management, Content, and ESG Daniel Rubim	101

2nd Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo

A Farewell Tale Carlos Eduardo Riccioppo	109
The Image of Museums: Visions and Proposals or Private Social Investment in Culture: Visions and Proposals Ilana Seltzer Goldstein	112
The Museum as a Cultural Center? Carlos Eduardo Riccioppo	121

3rd Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo

A Past so Close and Yet So Distant Vinicius Spricigo	125
Recent Achievements and Current Goals in the Participatory Context of SISEM-SP Larissa Magioli	130
The Museum as Institution and Research Carlos Eduardo Riccioppo	136

4th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo

New Palimpsests for Museums in Partnership with Current Civil Society Marcia Ferran	140
Beyond the story Maurício Topal de Moraes	144
Democratizing Access to Museums: Experiences and Impasses Ilana Seltzer Goldstein	148

5th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo

Museums and Cultural Policies: A Territory in Dispute Leonardo da Silva de Assis	158
Thinking About Public Policies: New Models, New Institutions, New Systems Ana Avelar	164
Sisem-SP, The Path is Made by Walking Paulo Nascimento	170
Education in Museums and its Potential for Articulation Anny Christina Lima	176

6th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo

Resignification of Museums: Resonances of The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference, held in 2014 Leandro de Oliva Costa Penha	183
"Museum for Social Justice" María Iñigo Clavo	189
Neither Compulsions nor Amnesias. The Measures of Memories at the Museum of London and the Memorial Resistance of São Paulo Vivian Braga dos Santos	193

7th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo

Extended Composition Works Diogo de Moraes Silva	199
Immigration Museum: Collaborative Processes in Museums Julia Buenaventura	205
Museum, Extramural Territory Isis Gasparini	209

8th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo

Museums and the Affirmation of Identities: Between the Local and the Global Marilúcia Bottallo	214
The Transformative Potential of Museums and their Challenges in a Globalised Era Beto Shwafaty	218
The Mobile Architecture of Networks Diego de Kerchove	223

9th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo

9 th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo: Safety, Accessibility, and Financial Sustainability Mariana von Hartenthal	228
From the Schwules Museum* to the Museum of Sexual Diversity: Representation and Recognition Marks of the LGBT community Diego de Kerchove	232
Times of Crisis: A Debate on Museum Funding Amidst the Brazilian Social and Economic Crisis Bruno Giordano	235

10th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo

A "snapshot" of the 10 th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo Cayo Honorato	241
The Memory in Museums: From Instrument of Knowledge to Ethical Criteria and Political Action Erica Ferrari	245
Territory in Dispute: The Museum as Mediator of Difference Amanda Moreira Arantes	250
Participation beyond Proposition Diogo de Moraes Silva	255

11th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo

Future Perspectives: Museums under the Dimension of Mourning Fernanda Lucas Santiago	264
"I Am Much More Than My Pain": A Call to the White Duty of Anti-racism Sofia Gonçalves	269
The Potential of Advocacy in Brazil - Civil Society Organization and Participation in the Development of Public Policies for Culture and the Creative Economy Ana Beatriz Rodrigues Garcia	275

AFTERWORD

What Is the Museum for and How Does It Dialogue with the Needs of Society? Ana Paula Sousa	281
---	------------

AUTHORS

287

CREDITS

303

PART |

INSTITU
TIONAL
**OVER
VIEW**

Conferences that Made a Difference

Andrea Matarazzo

2021

Secretary of Culture of the State of São Paulo 2010-2012

I worked as São Paulo State Secretary of Culture from May 2010 to April 2012. During this period, our administration strove to expand the Secretary's action in an attempt to reach all corners of the São Paulo territory and, at the same time, the peripheral regions of big cities. The challenge was to universalize access, especially for those unable to afford it. We started a process of reevaluating budgets and priorities so as to guarantee the best use of public resources responsibly and efficiently, with less bureaucracy.

This period stands out less for its novelties than for the continuity of cultural policies that had proven efficient. Thus, we organized the second and the third edition of The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference (SSAMC). I could see the mobilization of the museological sector of São Paulo and I set out to increase mobilization efforts for the continuity of actions and the materialization of decisions taken in the plenary sessions.

"Be Different - Make a Difference" was the theme of the 2nd SSAMC, held in June 2010, at the Memorial of Latin America, with a special conference presented by the late Gilberto Dimenstein. "Articulating Territories" was the theme of the 3rd SSAMC, held at the same Memorial, in June 2011. Both events had important national (MinC, state governments, Inhotim Museum, among others) and international guest speakers, as well as presentations from public authorities of several cities, starting with my friend Carlos Augusto Calil, then Secretary of Culture of São Paulo, followed by the Secretaries of Ribeirão Preto, Iguape and Presidente Prudente, the Mayors of Olímpia, Amparo and Socorro - among other important presentations.¹

The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference allows for the sharing of experiences, stimulating innovations and fostering improvements in the museums' public policies.

¹ I highlight this participation of the countryside and the coastal region because it represents much of our effort to interiorize the actions and investments, but the SSAMC relied on several authorities, besides academics, municipal, and state museum managers, professionals from the public and private sectors, and civil society.

The Conferences provided culture operators with knowledge about our rich museological heritage that will allow them to make better use of its wealth. Among some of my achievements, I feel especially happy to have promoted these gatherings, which allowed for such rich exchanges and advancements.

The SSAMC must continue to be held annually, with new themes brought to the discussion tables, encouraging contact with new conceptions. May we take advantage of the growing interest in museums and face the post-pandemic challenges with creativity. Our potential is huge.²

In a context of extremely scarce resources, connecting experiences and technologies that can be used in different contexts promotes an excellent synergy and confirms the relevance of the São Paulo museum system.

² Cultural institutions such as the Catavento Museum, the Museum of Image and Sound, or the São Paulo Library demonstrate that good investments in culture generate more interest and huge visitations. The Football Museum is an example of how a specific theme can be treated in a fascinating way, even for those who are not fans of the sport. And our Immigration Museum is one of the best museums of its kind in the world.

Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo: Thinking about the Construction of a Trajectory

Marcelo Mattos Araújo

2021

Secretary of Culture of the State of São Paulo 2012-2016

The organization of The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference - SSAMC, which already totals 12 annual editions, is an initiative that deserves to be celebrated and properly appraised.

As a museology professional from São Paulo, I had the privilege to participate in or follow all the SSAMCs, since its first edition in 2009, in all its different formats: an in-person in the capital and a decentralized one in the countryside, and last year due to the sanitary restrictions imposed by Covid-19, the format was virtual. This ability to develop new formats suited to the reality of a situation is just one of the positive characteristics of the SSAMC, which in my opinion constitute - above all - an unquestionable evidence of the maturity of São Paulo's museological landscape.

This maturity has historical roots that are too complex to be debated here, including the fact that they have national reverberations and reflections. However, I would like to highlight at least four processes that have taken place or were consolidated in the last decades, which I believe contributed to this situation in a very articulated manner.

The first two are national in scope: (1) the constitution of a federal legal-administrative structure for the museum sector, with the introduction of the National Museum Policy in 2003, the enactment of the Museum Statute in 2009, the creation of the Brazilian Institute of Museums - Ibram also in 2009, and the development of the National Museum Forums, among other actions and initiatives, which remarkably strengthened and gave visibility to the museum sector in the country; and (2) the growing professionalization of the museological field with the creation of many courses at different levels, with emphasis on the Interuniversity Postgraduate Program in Museology at the University of São Paulo - PPGMUS, and the Technical Course in Museology at Centro Paula Souza.

In the context of the state of São Paulo, two other processes are worth mentioning: (3) the consolidation of the System of Museums of State of São Paulo - Sisem-SP and the consequent establishment of an essential networking culture; and (4) the implementation and consolidation of a series of public policies, such as the adoption of the system of management of state institutions of the culture sector by Social Organizations; and the restructuring of the State Secretariat of Culture with the creation of the Museum Heritage Preservation Unit - UPPM; the creation of a series of museological units of great impact such as the Museum of Portuguese Language (2006), the Football Museum (2008) and the Museu of Diversity (2012), as well as the restructuring of countless others; besides the creation of specific public notices for the museological sector in the scope of the Cultural Action Program - Proac of the São Paulo State Government.

All these different agents and vectors, among countless others, including the private sphere, converge in a dynamic interrelation, which both enables and benefits from the SSAMC. These events, attended by an increasing number of people each year, provide productive spaces for extroversions and the sharing of experiences and reflections, working as true instruments of technical training and capacitation. The presence of professionals and students from all over the country, as well as foreign speakers, has amplified the repercussions of these meetings, qualifying them today in the national and international scenario as benchmarks for the development of contemporary museological thought, and definitely contributing to the improvement of the museological practice in the state of São Paulo.

Therefore, I congratulate all the professionals, organizations and institutions that made the development of all the SSAMCs possible, with special emphasis to the dedication and competence of the already mentioned UPPM, and the Cultural Association of Support to the Casa de Portinari Museum - AcamPortinari; and I hope for an even more productive continuation, with many other editions in the future, as part of our shared commitment to building a solidary and participative museology.

10 years of The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference

José Roberto Sadek

2021

Secretary of Culture of the State of São Paulo 2016-2017

Celebrating 10 years of The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference! Great news in such dark times for Culture. A historical moment of great relevance.

People remember many facts of their lives: the first time they saw the sea, what caused that scar on their knee, school friends, a passionate lover - each one recalls moments from his or her personal history whenever they need to or feel nostalgic of a time or situation. We keep adding to our own experiences those of other people, to whom other experiences were passed on, and thus our personal experiences broaden for opportune use. This, by the way, explains why our ancestors developed speech and language more than 300,000 years ago: to transmit their achievements, skills and experiences to other people. Each person has memories that are different from one another. This is what gives them their identity, their uniqueness. Memory is the place where all is stored. Without memory, no one would be able to know what he/she knows, or who they are, or where they come from.

The same applies to societies, nationalities, social groups, and cultural groups. Facts and experiences relating to a group give this group its identity, it helps them know who they are, why and how they do things, why they repeat what they have learned and developed. The place where this personal and collective knowledge is stored is called a museum.

To have a wide range of knowledge is useless if you do not know how to access it when you need it. Just like we organize personal facts in our memory, by using methods and techniques, we organize collective knowledge in museums.

Just like our personal lives, group interactions do not cease to occur, they keep changing, and thus expand artistic, cultural, and scientific production. This living and active coexistence will continue to happen as long as there are humanoids and human groups. This is why museums need to be alive and are alive - sometimes stubbornly. The need to know his/her own group and to interact with cultural production (in the broad sense of the term)

allows each one to know which group they belong to, helps him/her to know their past, understand their present, to avoid making the same mistakes and projects in the future.

Museums - places that organize and register the permanent formation of identity, where knowledge is constantly accessible and updated - exchange experiences with other museums, creating a network that enhances techniques, knowledge, and wisdom capable of offering human beings a better understanding of who they are, what they have produced, and how to proceed from there. No museum can account for everything; however, a group of museums increases the possibility of access to different kinds of past, the diversity of knowledge, and the different productions. That is why the museum system - this valuable permanent network of museums - was created, that is why it works, despite the economic asphyxia, the lack of interest from public policies and the simplistic dichotomies that have plagued the country in recent times.

This fundamental first decade of the Conference of Museums, this moment in which the network of museums is materialized, must be celebrated. May 10 more years come, then another 10, and thereafter 10 more!



**Directors of the Unit of Museum Heritage
Preservation Unit and of State System of
Museums of São Paulo**

Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo: Building a Legacy Called Continuity

Claudinéli Moreira Ramos

2021

Coordinator of the Unit of Museum Heritage Preservation,
from 2008 to 2013

The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference was one of the most fruitful outcomes of the restructuring process experienced as of 2008 in the Museum Heritage Preservation Unit (UPPM) of the then Secretariat of Culture of the State of São Paulo (SEC-SP). The efforts made by many players to keep alive the intention to protect and enhance the museological heritage of São Paulo and Brazil through state public policies were decisive to its success.

In 2007, José Serra took over as governor of São Paulo, appointing João Sayad as Secretary of Culture. This was the beginning of the secretariat's administrative reorganization in light of Decree 50.941/2006. This landmark marked the transformation of the secretariat, which ceased to be a body merely executing cultural policies to become a manager and stimulator of cultural policies. The main characteristics of this change were: a smaller and strategic number of actions under direct execution of the public administration (mainly related to the preservation of the historical heritage); the reconfiguration of the incentive policy organized under the Cultural Action Program - PAC, later renamed Cultural Action Program - Proac; and the growing adoption of the partnership model with social organizations, which, at the end of this restructuring process, would cover all the different cultural institutions, all artistic groups, and the main action programs of the secretariat.

Another consequence of this change of direction was a thorough review of the secretariat staff, with changes in practically all leadership positions, and the recruitment of new civil servants. The organization chart was changed and a new strategic plan was drawn up in 2007, of which only the mission was assimilated, guiding the actions in progress:

The mission of the State Secretariat of Culture is to formulate and implement public policies aimed at excellence in preserving cultural heritage, stimulating artistic production

and ensuring access to cultural assets for the population of the state of São Paulo in all its diversity.¹

This eagerness to remodel included other innovations. Thus, to coordinate the museums area, a four-month selection process led by an independent agency, IDH Ltda., involving various tests and interviews, and the elaboration of a socio-cognitive-emotional profile using indicators such as the MBTI (Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Trust) was conducted, and I was selected to coordinate the UPPM, taking office in January 2008.

Together with Secretary Sayad and his assistant, Ronaldo Bianchi, a great advocate and enthusiast of the museological area, I set the guidelines for this work: reorganize the unit so as to ensure it would work flexibly and efficiently; work with planning and focus on results, contributing for the de-bureaucratization of processes and the break of bad old habits in public service, and do whatever was needed to help the area fulfill its objectives through ethics and respect for the public interest.

I started restructuring the UPPM by running a diagnosis, renovating the physical space occupied by the team, and proposing a change in organizational culture. I adopted as a conceptual benchmark the definition of museum by the International Council of Museums - Icom² and, as a method, the practice of a jointly conceived museum policy, grounded in dialogue, joint learning and a commitment to manage conflict effectively by building consensus to mitigate shortcomings and enable improvements.

In practical terms, it meant the creation of working committees, the establishment of an agenda of internal meetings and training activities - the first of many actions intended to build associations between theory and practice -, and the organization of several forums to promote exchanges with the Secretariat's museum teams - some still directly managed and others under partnership with OSs. Understanding the place and devising strategies for dialogue, remediation and improvement was essential.

Former employees who had worked at the UPPM for decades and young people who joined us in this endeavor were essential for us to move forward. On behalf of museologist Beatriz Correa da Cruz, who left the unit a few months later, of Sildéia Maria Pereira and

¹ With minimal adjustments, this mission remained disclosed to the public through SEC-SP's official channels, most notably the website www.cultura.sp.gov.br, from 2007 to 2018.

² "A museum is a permanent, non-profit institution in the service of society and its development, open to the public, which acquires, preserves, researches, communicates, and exhibits the tangible and intangible heritage of humanity and its environment for the purposes of education, study, and leisure." (Icom, 22nd General Assembly, Vienna, August 24, 2007).

Cristiane Batista Santana, who for many years contributed with outstanding work at the UPPM, and of Luiz Fernando Mizukami, who came with the new recruits and is still there, investing in an exemplary career in museology, I salute each one of those who contributed with their reflections and efforts.

The next step was getting to know the state museum sector better, with a focus on the reorganization of the State System of Museums of São Paulo, Sisem. This process was extremely fruitful, thanks to the talent and dedication of museologist Cecília Machado, the first director of the System in this new phase. With her and dear museologist Juliana Monteiro we conceived the idea of holding annual meetings for the discussion of public policies for museums in the state of São Paulo and in Brazil.

It would not be wrong to say that the initiative was not new, either because some similar events had already been developed some time in the past, when the unit was still called Dema, the Department of Museums and Archives, or because the Ministry of Culture, through the Department of Museums and, later, the Brazilian Institute of Museums, had been promoting the National Forums of Museums since 2004. By the way, it is worth noting that, despite considerable political differences, Ibram has never shied away from actively participating in the SSAMC. José Nascimento Jr., Mario Chagas, Eneida Braga, Rose Miranda and Rafaela Gueiros, among other distinguished representatives, were with us and contributed to broaden the democratic and high-level debate around museums public policies in the country.

But those who say that the initiative was a breakthrough are also right: it was not simply an event by and for the museum segment, it was not just a technical or academic meeting, and there was nothing unpretentious about it. On the contrary, its articulations aimed to insert the museum agenda in the broader cultural agenda and in more decisive debates of public policies in general. From the start, the intention was to organize a conference to promote transformations.

To this end, we invited state secretaries, educational leaders, and leaders in the human rights for disabled; we held meetings with mayors and municipal secretaries of culture during the SSAMCs, and tried to engage various private representatives, from major cultural sponsors to specialized suppliers of the sector.

It is fun to remember the astonishment with which some colleagues reacted when we specified our plans. The first resistance to be overcome concerned the choice of a venue: "What do you mean the Simón Bolívar auditorium? It is huge. Look, if we have 200 people we can call it a success, but because the public will be scattered, it won't look like a success. Our answer was always the same: "We won't settle for less than 700 people in the

audience. There were also those who opposed inviting mayors and secretaries, and those who thought it was unfeasible to expect "so much" *from an area with no tradition of organization and protagonism in the culture of the state of São Paulo*.³

The first SSAMC took place on June 17, 18 and 19, 2009, at the Simón Bolívar auditorium of the Memorial of Latin America, as the first of a series of gatherings in which the allegedly impossible came through as far as the museum sector is concerned. That is how we succeeded in gathering, just to mention the first five events, more than 700 participants in-person, including several mayors and secretaries actively engaged in the event. It is worth mentioning that this initiative had as one of its most lasting legacies the "co-optation" to the museological area of Davidson Kaseker, then secretary of culture of Itapeva, who, after years of dedicated work as a representative in the green southwest region of São Paulo, joined the sector. He has been director of Sisem since 2013.

Thus, without counting on any financial support from SEC to cover the costs of transportation and accommodation for participants, there were people coming to the SSAMC from all corners of São Paulo and from several other states; people who had always worked in museums, people who had just started out, very qualified staff, and many other interest groups with little resources of all kinds.

The SSAMC became a locus of great exchange and joint learning, but, above all, it positioned itself as a meeting place for political discussions in the area of museums in São Paulo. When someone questions the capacity of the cultural sector to organize itself in a large state such as ours, it is worth noting the work developed from the creation of regional representations, which combine local action with qualified technical support, interchange, and support composition. For those who say that the participation of workers from the sector is not viable in the field of public policies, it is worth remembering that the regional representatives and part of Sisem's guiding board are directly elected in the SSAMCs and have their work articulated with a guiding board appointed by the main representative entities of the sector in the state, contributing to enhance the diversity of players in the territory and to qualify demands, actions, and results.

The SSAMC went on to contradict those who believed that gatherings like those would not mobilize or change old policies. The demands for public notices aimed at museums were historical in the cultural sector, but became a reality, through Proac Museums, after the mobilization produced in the São Paulo Conferences. Together with the UPPM's restructuring

3

Twelve years after the 1st SSAMC, many of these people today say that everything that was done and is happening "happened" because *the museum business is easier and more organized*. This is an image of power that is projected when a cultural change is assimilated. Today the museum field is much more organized than it was 12 years ago. This achievement, however, is a story that needs to be known, celebrated, and defended, lest there be a risk of having to start all over again.

process, the proposals debated at each SSAMC unfolded into a new Sisem decree, into the launching of several publications that are today bibliography in the main museology courses in the country and a legacy of infrastructure works, organization of itinerant exhibitions, training initiatives and technical assistance throughout the state, besides a broad museum mapping, which made it possible to verify, in loco, 415 museums in 190 municipalities in the state of São Paulo. The State Policy of Museums of São Paulo and the State Register of Museums of São Paulo are just two more examples of precious evolution and developments of discussions dictated by the SSAMC, along with the platform www.sisemsp.org.br, possibly one of the best repositories concerning museum public policies in the world.

The engagement of social organizations in the SSAMC was another factor that contributed to its success. Acam Portinari became the great partner in the organization of the event, under the outstanding leadership of Angélica Fabbri and Luiz Antonio Bérnago; however, we must acknowledge the active presence of all the museum OSs, strengthening one of the assumptions of the reorganization of the UPPM: that each SEC-SP museum was an active member of Sisem.

The SSAMC was created to outlive each and every one of us present at its creation. That is why, since the beginning, the emphasis was on empowering the sector's agents, on creating strategies to bring them closer and keep them collaborating, on ensuring value to the various people and institutions involved. That is also why partnerships with museological and cultural organizations of national and international relevance, such as Icom-Brazil, the Regional Council of Museology of the 4th Region, the Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation - Aecid, and the British Council are so important. They all helped make possible the participation of renowned national and international experts. It is necessary to acknowledge the qualified and careful mediation by Carlos Roberto Brandão, Maria Ignez Mantovani Franco, Ana Silvia Bloise, Ana Tomé, Lucimara Letelier, and Luiz Coradazzi in these institutions.

In the same perspective, under Martin Grossmann's excellent leadership and Leonardo Assis's commitment, the partnership with the Fórum Permanente - a first-time ally - has been decisive to guarantee the register, extraversion, and preservation of the memory of each Conference. If such records are a valuable legacy, because of the regular changes of leadership in public power, their preservation and availability in the current scenario represent an antidote against denying the importance of the museum sector and a manifesto in defense of public policies for culture. It is worth adding that the Fórum Permanente has also acted to highlight the national and international interest in the SSAMC, always counting on large audiences. Real time Internet transmissions can double or even triple the reach of the Conference.

The effort for continuity proved effective. The secretaries João Sayad, Andrea Matarazzo and Marcelo Araújo - to mention only the three distinguished members of Culture with whom I was lucky enough to work with when I coordinated the museums sector - have not failed to support and attend the event, which had continuity and new developments under the management of Renata Motta and later Regina Ponte, dedicated colleagues who took over the coordination of the UPPM after me and with whom I had the satisfaction of working in partnership with when I took on the task of implementing and coordinating the then recently created Monitoring Unit of SEC-SP.

I actively participated in the conception and coordination of the first four SSAMCs and in the formulation of the fifth. I followed with joy and pride the development of the subsequent ones. I left the Secretariat of Culture 11 years after arriving at a museum unit that was very different from the one I would bid farewell to in December 2018. A lot has changed since then, starting with the name of the secretariat. The SSAMC has also changed - it became an itinerant edition in 2019, the SSAMC Interior (the countryside SSAMC) and, forced by the Covid-19 pandemic, became a virtual edition in 2020 - , yet it did not see its activities interrupted. What is the secret of this longevity? The dedication of people who have worked in the UPPM and in the SEC museums managed by social organizations of culture; the dedication of the regional representatives and Sisem's board; the excellent work delivered to the museological area of São Paulo and Brazil; the adherence of the area that for years has collaborated through proposals, active participation and renewed interest; and the awareness on the part of the political leaders of the Secretariat of Culture concerning the relevance of this event.

Each one of these factors contributed for The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference to take important steps towards what we dreamed of back then, something that so many culture workers expected: that our public policies survive, flourish, advance from government policies to state policies, and contribute to qualify our processes and results in favor of the public interest, cultural development, and the common good. There is still a lot to build and to consolidate, and the threats and difficulties are not small in a country that has seen its cultural sector under attack and defamation. Because so many dangers exist, it is also necessary to celebrate every achievement. I hope people engaged in building the museum sector on a daily basis in São Paulo may help transform the SSAMC into a more effective dialogue and proposition resource for overcoming obstacles along the way, bringing improvements for all. I wish The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference a long and prosperous life.

São Paulo Museums: A Continuous and Collective Process

Renata Vieira da Motta

2021

Director of the State System of Museums of São Paulo
from 2011 to 2013

Coordinator of the Unit of Museum Heritage Preservation,
from 2013 to 2016

The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference - SSAMC is a landmark in the São Paulo state museums policy and nothing could be more opportune than publishing the history of its long trajectory. The invitation was addressed to me as I was director of the state System of Museums Sisem-SP from 2011 to 2013, and coordinator of the Museum Heritage Preservation Unit UPPM, from 2013 to 2016. But I start my account with a personal confession: I am terrible at self-narratives and past accounts.

I believe that Cecília Machado and Claudinéli Ramos, who respectively preceded me as directors of Sisem-SP and UPPM, must certainly have written a detailed report on the structuring path of the museum sector in São Paulo, starting from the early days of the Department of Museums Dema and the fertile period in the last years of the first decade of the 2000s, when our sector achieved its regulatory milestone and the federal autarchy of museums. The Brazilian Institute of Museums - Ibram and the Museum Statute (Law n. 11.904 of 14/01/2009) are collective achievements of generations of professionals who worked relentlessly and systematically for the structuring of a sectorial museum policy. Therefore, some of my observations in this brief text are written from the perspective of the challenges involved in the structuring and implementation of public policies.

In line with this period of democratic activation and the participation of civil society, the Secretariat of Culture of São Paulo, under the administration of João Sayad was restructured. In the museums sector, Dema became UPPM, an update of the state System of Museums was proposed, including the creation of an annual gathering of professionals of

the state of São Paulo - The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference. A moment of excitement and hope with a stronger economy in Brazil, the Secretary of Culture advanced towards implementing the public-private management model in partnership with social organizations of culture and the structuring of sectoral policies. In this period, the autarchy of culture reached its largest historical budget and established, in dialogue with the national dynamics, the bases for the state policy of museums.

It is at this point in the management of the state museums that my professional trajectory in the public area begins; first with Secretary Andrea Matarazzo and then with Marcelo Araújo. In 2011, I became director of Sisem-SP after concluding my doctorate, focusing on the typology of contemporary art museums in Brazil. Based on the history of MAC-USP, my research covered the implementation of other museums of the same typology, in different hegemonic and non-hegemonic contexts. Based on my interest in the articulation of museums of different scales, I took over as director of Sisem-SP, with the foundations laid for the state museum policy.

As already pointed out, it was a moment of renovation and advances in the structuring of policies. So, we guided the work of the Technical Group of Sisem-SP with focus on the implementation and consolidation of the state policy for museums in the state of São Paulo. Such implementation was based on the following premises: structuring, continuity, dialogue and transparency. This meant working for the sanctioning and promulgation of Decree No. 57,035, of June 2, 2011, which established the organizational structure of Sisem-SP, the publication of SC Resolutions No. 95/2011 and 86/2012, which provided for the nominations and elections of members of the Council of Sisem-SP (although it had been provided for since the creation of the System in 1986, the Council had never been composed), SC Resolution No. 60/2012, which established the instance of the Sisem-SP Council. 60/2012, which established the participatory domain of the Regional Representatives (strengthening the dialogue and the necessary regional diversity of a state policy), and also Resolution SC n. 59/2016, which established the State Museum Register of São Paulo (which today is the information base for the registration of São Paulo museums with Ibram). We also developed the visual identity and the Sisem-SP website, which has since been an important channel of communication, information repository and accountability of the Sisem-SP Technical Group.

The same guidelines were applied to The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference during that period. Its third edition was organized in a little more than three months, with the theme "Articulating territories". Through this event we tried to consolidate the SSAMC, transforming it into a mandatory event for the museum community of the state of São Paulo, for information and debates, and also as a participatory forum and a forum for updating

policies for the museum sector. It was during this conference that the decree updating the Sisem-SP was published and that we reached more than a thousand subscribers. Several other editions followed, always with the engagement of the Sisem-SP Technical Group and Acam Portinari's technicians aiming at the organization of an excellent event.

It is hard to mention names without leaving out many important collaborators. However, I would like to mention four representatives of this group responsible for building Sisem-SP and enabling the continuous development and implementation of a museum policy in the state of São Paulo: Luiz Mizukami (public executive of GTC-Sisem), Lourdes Marszolek Bueno (dean of regional representation), Joselaine Tojo (coordinator of the Sisem-SP support group) and Angelica Fabbri (executive director of Acam Portinari). Finally, I would like to give my special thanks to Davidson Kaseker, director of Sisem-SP since 2014, appointed after his mandate as Regional Representative for the Sorocaba region. In times of risks and setbacks, it is a joy and a privilege to narrate part of the history of museum policy in the state of São Paulo, pointing out its procedural, continuous, and collective construction. The current times demand that we celebrate collective achievements and reflect on the next developments: there is a lot to be done!

10th SSAMC: A Milestone of Maturity

Regina Ponte

2021

Coordinator of the Unit of Museum Heritage Preservation,
from 2017 to 2019

During my brief experience at the Museum Heritage Preservation Unit of the Secretariat of Culture and Creative Economy of the State of São Paulo - January 2017 to February 2019 - I worked with museum institutions already anchored in a very structured management system in two major segments: GPPM - Museum Heritage Preservation Group and Sisem - State System of Museums of São Paulo.

During my experience in the management of municipal museums in the city of São Paulo I had to deal with employment legislation lacking in flexibility and out of sync with the nature of cultural activities, and with a history of low budgets for culture. This allows me to make a positive evaluation of the management of museums of the state of São Paulo by social organizations of culture, demonstrating that my previous experience offered me a unique opportunity to work with more promising and challenging management models.

The strengthening of the model that advocates working with the civil society rather than for the civil society - through partnerships with the social organizations of culture - has contributed to broaden dialogue and socio-cultural development in several segments of the population, as well as to implement the public policies of the Museums Unit of the State Secretary of Culture and Creative Economy.

This management model indicated a real possibility of hiring qualified museum professionals, which I believe was a progress. But it is worth pointing out that this requires an economically feasible budget, with the participation of the State and the social organizations which, in turn, should work strongly with the private sector through incentive laws and donations.

It is wrong, however, to assume that there are easy things in this management and little interaction between state agents and social organizations. Since 2005, and especially since 2008, the state administration of museums has developed its public policies, implementing

new guidelines for the museological area and restructuring the institutions under its management. This has created a complex structure that integrates responsibilities from both sides, with judicious calls for proposals establishing propositions for each museum, to be achieved through work plans with clearly established goals.

All this activity is anchored in the technical committees of the museums unit of the Secretariat of Culture and Creative Economy, which monitor the museums and the performance of their professionals, relying on civil society, which participates, for example, in the boards set up in each institution.

The segment of the museums unit, the Sisem – State System of Museums of São Paulo -, impressed me with its small yet excellent team, extremely involved with and committed to the articulation and development of public policies of enhancement and qualification of the museums of the state of São Paulo, in the countryside, and coastal region.

It should be noted that Sisem has already accounted for more than 30 years of continuous articulation in favor of the improvement of museums in São Paulo. All this work has led to the first edition of The State of São Paulo’s Annual Museum Conference - SSAMC in 2009, an event that has become a reference in the field of museums in São Paulo. As coordinator of UPPM, I participated in this event in 2017 and in 2018.

Before continuing with the themes of the conference of museums in São Paulo, I want to mention the construction of the State Register of Museums of São Paulo - CEM-SP, a long and exhaustive work developed in collaboration with various bodies of the state government and partner institutions to systematize all information and share them in a database, which was implemented in 2016 - one year before I took over - during the 8th SSAMC, when its experimental application was initiated with a pilot program in the coastal region.

The Registry’s first actions proposed reflections to the team and the Sisem Council suggesting a reevaluation of classification levels in order to include institutions that although incipient, have a clear museological vocation, i.e., those dedicated to the preservation of tangible or intangible collections and research and dissemination.

The Registry, therefore, is inclusive in character and is characterized as a public policy instrument that contributes to the qualification and institutional empowerment of the museum sector. Its consolidation is dynamic, always attentive to new realities. Since 2017, its actions have covered all the regions of the state.

Returning to our central theme, in 2018 The State of São Paulo’s Annual Museum Conference celebrated its 10th anniversary, which is an enormous satisfaction for the entire administrative and technical team of the state museums unit, as well as for Acam - Cultural Association of Support to the Casa de Portinari Museum, an unfailing partner, which is continuously improving dialogue with the state network of museums of São Paulo.

The gatherings and Sisem’s work over the years have taught many things concerning the different realities of approximately 500 museological institutions in the state of São Paulo and their connections with one another. This effort resulted in the development of public policies and strategic actions for the empowerment of the museological heritage of São Paulo.

With the implementation of the State Register of Museums of São Paulo, the organization of the Conferences, through its Advisory Commission began including as a theme, in 2017, in the 9th SSAMC, one of the guidelines underlying its structure: the infrastructure management, which integrates the management and governance axis of the CEM-SP. These activities allowed the museological institutions to examine more accurately each parameter of the Register, in the wake of a sad history of structural neglect of the buildings that house our collections.

Undoubtedly, each stage and each step of the State Register is the roadmap for each museum - regardless of its size or its collection’s - to seek institutional empowerment, necessary to enhance credibility and visibility with the public authorities, the private sector and society in general.

At the 10th SSAMC, in 2018, the desire to celebrate the relevance of this emblematic anniversary led to the creation of the Waldisa Rüssio Camargo Guarnieri Museum Merit Medal, which is awarded annually to a personality with an outstanding trajectory in the museological field. Professor Ulpiano Bezerra de Menezes was the first person awarded. He delivered the event’s opening lecture with the theme “The Duty of Memory, the Right to Forgetting and the Duty of History in the Field of Museums”, consisting of a vast reflection on memory and its social and anthropological meaning, beyond history.

The 10th SSAMC’s activities focused on the theme of one of the main axes of the Register - management and governance - which provided the opportunity to reflect on one of the dilemmas of today’s museums, namely the diversification in fundraising and the achievement of a balance of accounts to make do with the meager budget made available by the public power and other domains.

The management and governance theme included an exchange of experiences on the issue of participatory museums, encompassing different regions of the country, with touching reports of small yet assertive initiatives. On the one hand, for example, there was the Muquifu/Museum of Quilombos and Urban Favelas and, on the other hand, large scope actions, such as the Fundação Casa Grande/Memorial of the Kariri Man and big museums, such as the Immigration Museum, just to name a few tables and multiple activities that made up that event. The experiences of each institution, within its context, were grounded in critical reflections and historical awareness.

To celebrate the consolidation of CEM-SP's accomplishments, 15 museological institutions were awarded certificates confirming their compliance with the technical parameters.

As a final comment on the 10th SSAMC, I would like to highlight the panel entitled "Contemporary Ethical Challenges for Museums", which addressed censorship of gender and sexuality issues, still hard themes for a big part of the society.

At the time, the discussion was marked by the incidents that occurred in 2017 with the Queermuseu exhibition and the La Bête exhibition, the latter in São Paulo, and also with exhibition age restrictions imposing minimum age classification for visitors.

On the one hand the network of state museums shows clear signs of maturity with, for example, the creation of the Museum of Sexual Diversity in 2012, while on the other hand there are still some groups unwilling to engage in dialogue, acting against freedom of expression, so vital to artistic creation.

If we agree that museums in the contemporary world must follow and include the discussions present in society and that the 21st century society is plural, fragmented and multi-vocal, we can conclude they must be willing to reevaluate their histories and collections, find the links connecting past and present, so that they can fulfill an important role in communication, mediation and relationship with the public, challenging the established references with the changes experienced in our lives as well as society's.

We have seen big misunderstandings in the clashes between those who attack artistic manifestations and those who defend free expression. Nothing is more important than talking about conflicting and contradictory issues. Excluding these themes in museums or even imposing age restrictions to museum visitors mitigates and even eliminates the possibility of reflection, besides, quoting Professor Christian Dunker, "infantilizing the public".

The manifestations generated from the two exhibitions mentioned above became a prologue to the current retrograde and dark period involving every aspect of the Brazilian society, especially the cultural sector, which has been abandoned by the public power, in its highest sphere.

I conclude by thanking the Museums Unit team for the warm welcome I received when I joined. I would also like to congratulate the professionals who have done intense work structuring and renovating the management system of museums in São Paulo over the last years. I hope the difficulties we face today can be overcome so that museums become a stronger instrument of social transformation.

The SSAMC and Museum Resilience

Letícia Santiago

2021

Coordinator of the Unit of Museum Heritage Preservation, since 2020

I have worked in the Secretariat of Culture and Creative Economy since 2015. In 2016, when I first attended The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference - SSAMC, I could see how important it was for the empowerment of the museological sector in the state of São Paulo.

It was a pleasure to closely follow and participate in the organization of the SSAMC in 2019, as director of the Museum Heritage Preservation Group, and in 2020, as coordinator of the Museum Heritage Preservation Unit.

Certainly, these were two intense years of change. The SSAMC, which since 2009 had been a three-day event held in June in the city of São Paulo, was redesigned in 2019 - annual conferences were held in the capital in even-numbered years while regionalized conferences were held in odd-numbered years.

So, the SSAMCi - Itinerant Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo was created. It involved cycles of decentralized events, subdivided into six editions held bimonthly throughout the year in different regions of the state. In 2019, it covered the cities of Ribeirão Preto, Campinas, Birigui, Bauru, Sorocaba, and São José dos Campos.

This new format brought challenges; it demanded planning and logistical efforts from the Technical Coordination Group of the state System of Museums of São Paulo and Acam Portinari's technical support team to conduct all the activities of the year.

The plan for 2020 was to hold the 11th SSAMC on July 1st, 2nd and 3rd at the Memorial of Latin America, in São Paulo. However, due to the Covid-19 pandemic, the Government of the State of São Paulo imposed quarantine as of March 23, 2020, restricting activities to avoid contamination or the spread of Covid-19. Thus, the 2020 SSAMC was revised and

reformulated in view of the uncertain scenario and the impossibility of maintaining the traditional format.

The pandemic forced a switch from physical to virtual environment; the event was conceived in a hybrid format, with recorded videos and live participations.

The social and economic impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic were reflected in the choice of the theme for the 2020 SSAMC: "Museum, society and crisis: from mourning to struggle" and the event's program, built with the members of the SSAMC Advisory Board following a participatory approach.

Despite all the remote experiences promoted by Sisem and Acam Portinari to maintain the activities in 2020, the challenges imposed by the SSAMC's new format demanded important pre-production work to address technical issues such as video production and editing, streaming platform and accessibility tools, besides setting up a broadcast center in the the Football Museum's Auditorium.

As a result, from November 23 through 27, between asynchronous programs and live broadcasts, the 11th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo totaled more than 20 hours of audiovisual production.

The recent changes in the main event of museology in São Paulo have guaranteed the continuity of this important initiative, expanding the participation and dialogue with professionals and institutions in the state of São Paulo and throughout the country. It will certainly become part of a new post-pandemic reality, opening paths for new reflections and perspectives.

Memories: Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo

Cecilia Machado

2021

Director of the State System of Museums of São Paulo
from 2009 to 2010

When I was invited to write about The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference, I did a quick retrospective review of the context we were inserted in at the time of implementation, restructuring and consolidation of what we would come to assume to be the policy for the museum sector.

The perspective I chose was not just related to the actions and conceptions adopted in the State Secretary of Culture, which since 2006 had reformulated its structure, organizing various bodies and departments in units. I also visualized a macro situation, which in that same period of 2003, a new perception of public cultural policy was being structured at the federal level.

My history with the Department of Museums and the state System of Museums starts 15 years before I became director there, in 2008. Therefore, I could not fail to mention the experiences resulting from the management of a great master, Dina Jobst, who, together with Rosa Maria dos Santos and Beatriz Cruz under the direction of Marilda Suyama Tegg, Carlos Alberto Degelo, and Sylvia Antibas, maintained permanent training, conservation, and technical assistance to the museums from the old network of State Museums for at least 25 years.

I went to work at Dema - Department of Museums and Archives in 1994, working directly with museological institutions in the countryside of the state, under two perspectives: Restructuring Processes and Municipalization Processes. In 1997, when I left Dema, there were already annual meetings with the state museological area - incipient, heroic, without any incentive or anything that could be called a public policy for the area, which relied on professional dilettantes that kept them alive.

Dema was the place where people would actually cry for São Paulo's museology, and very little could be done. Without funds, without organizational structure, with no hiring perspectives and therefore with a very small number of professionals in the Department and in the museums under direct management. The State System of Museums of São Paulo survived in this reality. But something seemed to be changing.

With the reopening of the State Pinacoteca, under the competent management of Emanuel Araujo, we observed a new management possibility, combining the public and the private, as it should have long been implemented.

Social organization management began to emerge in the mid-2000s in the state of São Paulo.

At the federal level, a fruitful phenomenon was also taking shape at the beginning of the century. Groups were organized under the need for ample and collaborative debates to structure what would become the National Museum Policy. José do Nascimento Junior, Rose Miranda, Mario de Souza Chagas, Marcio Rangel, among other distinguished names in the museum sector, implemented the Museum Department - Demu, within the Institute for National Historic and Artistic Heritage - Iphan, part of the then Ministry of Culture.

The phenomenon mentioned earlier is national, as it can be seen. Dema, in the State Secretary of Culture, in São Paulo, becomes the Museum Heritage Preservation Unit, - UPPM, which, by restructuring the SEC, begins to manage the museums, which are now managed by social organizations. When qualified, they sign management contracts with the state government, creating a new way to manage the public cultural heritage through administrative structuring, financial viability, and the hiring of human resources appropriate to the emergency needs of the area.

Demu, within the sphere of the Ministry of Culture, gains the status of an Institute, the same as Iphan, becoming the Brazilian Institute of Museums - Ibram, at the same time in 2009, when the first regulation with legal power in the national museological area is published, the Museum Statute, signed by the then Minister Gilberto Gil, an iconic figure in the process. The process of building the Statute, widely discussed in various spheres, with participation and collaboration of countless people, made this document not a final act, but rather the beginning of a long journey still necessary not only to reread it from new perspectives, but to continue building the long path ahead of us.

This overview illustrates the fruitful moment we were enjoying. In the State Secretary of Culture, under Secretary João Sayad, Claudinéli Moreira Ramos was in charge of the coordination of the UPPM, when I became director of the state System of Museums. The first

steps of this administration were to jointly define the structuring of a public policy for the museum sector for the state, as the management by OSs had become an administrative reality bringing big and timely changes into that scenario. New qualified professionals hired, human resources and organizational charts reformulated, resources from the private sector becoming a reality, management conduct and compliance codes created, implemented and inspected, all gave a new character to the museum management in the state São Paulo.

Two milestones were listed for the achievement of this goal: the reformulation of the state System of Museums decree, which dated back to 1985, and a concrete picture of the reality of the museological sector in São Paulo. The second goal had already been drafted by me in 2006, on the occasion of the survey of São Paulo's museological institutions, hired by Demu, for the implementation of the National Museums Registry, part of the reorganization of the Brazilian System of Museums, created in 1985, concomitant to the one in São Paulo.

Based on this survey, contacts were initiated, with subsequent visits to the museological institutions in São Paulo. A team was formed, made up primarily of museology technicians, who were responsible for the production and execution of three of the fundamental actions of Sisem-SP: training, technical assistance, and itinerant exhibitions. Tayna Rios, Juliana Alckmim, and Nayara Abrahão were the first of many technicians working for Sisem. The contribution of museologist Juliana Monteiro both in the structuring of the new decree and in the conception of the methodology for the implementation of the diagnosis and mapping of the institutions was vital, along with her invaluable museological technical feedback. The social organization Acam Portinari provided organizational, infrastructure, and financial support by means of a partnership.

After the first evaluations, data tabulation and projection related to the assessments of the technical visits to the museums, it was possible to draw a map picturing the situation of museums in the state of São Paulo. The work was intense, almost insane. But, results showed that dialogue was being resumed and the disclosed realities were being shared with all the participants of this endeavor. City Halls, Municipal Secretariats, Culture Departments or other governmental spheres, technical teams, managers, private administrators, cultural institutions of every kind and form of management were contacted in order to enable broader parameters of analysis and conversations about problems and possible solutions.

Partnerships to achieve the goals of organizing itinerant exhibitions with private institutions such as the Tomie Ohtake Institute, art galleries, the Figueiredo Ferraz Institute, the Nemirowsky Foundation and the social organizations, in addition to the museums in the most varied spheres of management, helped build the necessary network to give visibility

to the cause, and thus a State Conference of Museums could be outlined that was up to the task of promoting the changes intended by the state administration.

At that point, the general lines produced for the consolidation of the public policy for the museum sector in the state sphere could be seen.

In August 2008, the process for the first Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo began. At first it was an event for guests only, but in September it gained the dimension that established its size and scope. The place chosen for the gathering was the Memorial of Latin America, in the Simón Bolívar auditorium, and it finally took place on June 17 through 19, 2009.

The promotion of the event, besides the Sisem's technical team, had the important participation of Acam Portinari's team, which, as mentioned before, was the main arm of Sisem's actions; however, the organization and administration work of the First State Conference was carried out by Abaçai Socio-Cultural Organization. The other social organizations were real partners and protagonists in the main projects that Sisem developed in the countryside of the state. Special reference ought to be made to Pinacoteca do Estado and Museu da Casa Brasileira.

The first Conference had a motto that strongly appealed to the team as it expressed our feeling so concisely, "Together we are stronger". The Conference's debate perspectives also reinforced this vision:

- Present the state System of Museums - Sisem and reflect on the current proposals for its work.
- Discuss and rethink the participation of small and medium sized state museums in Sisem.
- Enable discussions on the Museum's activities, significance and efficacy, in their purposes, in the community in which it is inserted.
- Give the State Museums full priority in municipal discussions involving opinion makers, politicians and the community that benefits from these museums.
- Broaden the public interest in the preservation and dissemination of historical and cultural heritage.
- Creation, implementation and presentation of a proposal for the activities of the 13 Regional Units, on the premise: *Considering the museological representation in the geography of the state, Sisem-SP proposes that it should work through Regional Units.* They were:

Araçatuba, Santos, Catanduva, Ribeirão Preto, Tupã, Piracicaba, Itapeva, Sorocaba/Tatuí, Presidente Prudente, Marília, Franca, Guaratinguetá and the Greater São Paulo area.

The support of the Spanish Cultural Center in São Paulo/Aecid to the Conference if the Museums of the State of São Paulo enabled the visit of Jorge Wagensberg, director of the Science Museum of Barcelona, who presented the lecture “The panorama of museums in the world”.

The themes addressed in the program were about “Sustainability for museums”, “Strategic planning” and “Incentive laws for culture and museums”.

The event surprised us all. We were thrilled to witness the intense participation and support. The success of the event was marked by the multiplicity of participants from various regions of the state, from different areas of activity, museums and countless institutions that managed collections, besides the massive participation of mayors and public administrators. It was the result of a repressed demand for the lack of interlocution; the opportunity to express oneself, and the real possibility to meet peers to further this reflection.

These findings oriented the preparation of the Second Conference of Museums of the State of São Paulo, which was subtitled “To be different - to make a difference”. A meeting of mayors and representatives of secretaries, executive boards and culture departments that managed museums was organized for discussions from a political and financial point of view about concrete participatory actions together with the State Secretary.

The feasibility of input through state resources was beginning to be examined and debated within the Secretariat. Discussions were conducted about the possibility of public notices and the State Program of Support to Culture - Proac - including lines of promotion and development directed to the museums’ needs.

With the objective of articulating professionals and museum directors to establish strategies for the social and economic development of the cities and to deal with improvement, qualification and empowering actions for museums in São Paulo, the Second Conference of Museums of the State of São Paulo takes place from June 22nd to 24th, 2010, at the Memorial of Latin America, auditorium Simón Bolívar. The Second Conference outperforms the First in numbers and debate propositions. Videos of the whole program were recorded by the Fórum Permanente of Art Museums Between Public and Private, an important partner that immortalized these initiatives through recordings available at the site: forumpermanente.org.

These were the two State Conferences in which I participated as director of Sisem and from which many references were drawn for the wide discussion that they still protagonize almost two decades later.

To conclude this report about the São Paulo Conferences, I share an important perception. In all my three-decade long experience working in the area, the most concrete and relevant action of collaboration, participation and inclusion in the museum sector in the state of São Paulo was and still is through the São Paulo Conferences. They have consolidated themselves as spaces for public debate, critique - sometimes blunt - and respectful expression of opinions, oftentimes diverse, which is just expected, in view of the immense cultural variation and diversity that the state and the country reflect.

Long live the São Paulo Conferences, still a place to expose our admirable differences.

SSAMC: A Fruitful Legacy of Partnerships

Davidson Kaseker

2021

Director of the State System of Museums of
São Paulo since 2013

The construction of memory takes place in the present and it invariably results from choices that determine what will be preserved or forgotten in the future. The production of this document-book registers the trajectory of The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference (SSAMC) covering more than 10 years of uninterrupted annual events. This initiative fills a gap in the preservation of the institutional memory of this event. Organized by the State System of Museums of São Paulo (Sisem-SP), a body of the Secretariat of Culture and Creative Economy of São Paulo, coordinated by the Museum Heritage Preservation Unit (UPPM), with the partnership of Acam Portinari in its organization and production, the SSAMC is recognized as one of the most relevant spaces for exchanging experiences and conducting debates in the Brazilian museum sector.

Speaking from the position of someone who has been on both sides of the podium, as audience and organizer, I can't help but make a biographical account, yet at the same time it refers to SSAMC's own trajectory as a collective construction of a participatory museology.

My first interaction with the SSAMC happened when I was still working as a regional representative of Sisem-SP in the Sorocaba region. I soon realized the potential of the SSAMC in bringing together managers of the state sphere of culture for an open and direct dialogue with municipal managers, museum professionals, students and people interested in discussing public policies for the museological sector of São Paulo.

Then in 2013, after the 5th SSAMC, I became director of the Technical Coordination Group of Sisem-SP. I had the responsibility and the challenge of integrating and coordinating the organizing committee of the event; by then the SSAMC was established, presenting an attractive agenda, the Regional Representations and the Advisory Board (Cosisem-SP) had been institutionalized and a new horizon was opening up. Not by chance, this year the

SSAMC and Sisem-SP adopted a new visual identity establishing a graphic link between them. It was a moment of institutional consolidation. It was also in this year that the SSAMC created a plenary to find subsidies for the elaboration of the methodology of the State Register of Museums (CEM-SP). We were starting a new stage that would definitively mark the SSAMC as a participatory construction.

In the following years, deeply impacted by successive budget reductions as a reflection of the national macroeconomic scenario, the SSAMC would roam around several spaces in the Capital due to the fire at the Latin American Memorial. During this period, as an expression of resilience, thanks to the support of the SEC and Acam Portinari, the standard of excellence in the organization of the SSAMC was maintained. Besides the support of other social organizations responsible for managing the SEC's museums, we had strategic partnerships that ensured a high level of programming at the SSAMC, such as Icom, British Council, Sesc-SP (especially with CPF-Sesc) and the Fórum Permanente, among other cultural institutions.

To meet the challenges in planning and producing the SSAMC, it was vital to persist in a horizontal and participatory management approach, with shared responsibilities and the commitment of all collaborators with common values and goals. Therefore, I must express my gratitude to the Sisem-SP GTC team, initially composed of Luiz Mizukami and Thais Romão, and more recently also of Luiz Palma, in addition to several trainees whom I praise on behalf of Carolina Teixeira. In the same way, I express my gratitude to the technical team of Acam Portinari, dedicated exclusively to supporting Sisem-SP, which is coordinated by Joselaine Tojo and composed of Bárbara Paulote, Carol Ávila, Michael Argento, and Otávio Balaguer, and last but not least Janderson Brasil, Adriano Tardoque, and Léa Blazer, who have also participated in this trajectory.

Some moments deserve to be highlighted. Among them, the celebration of Sisem-SP's 30th anniversary at the 8th SSAMC, held at Sala São Paulo, when the pilot phase of CEM-SP was launched, after three years of collaboration in the construction of its methodology, with intense contribution from the RRs and Cosisem-SP members.

Proud of the growing involvement and participation of our stakeholders, the 9th SSAMC program included the formalization of an Advisory Commission, composed of representatives of partner institutions, such as Icom Brasil, the Palace's Artistic-Cultural Collection, Corem 4R, PPGMus-USP, Blue Shield Brasil, CPF Sesc-SP, and Acam Portinari itself.

The 10th SSAMC, in 2018, with the Simón Bolívar auditorium properly restored, was, once again, held at the Memorial of Latin America. To celebrate this emblematic edition, SEC

signed a cooperation agreement with Ibram, making the Sisem-SP the registrant of museums in the Museum Information Network (Renim).

A unique moment of the 10th SSAMC was the award handed out to Professor Ulpiano Bezerra de Meneses. After receiving the Waldisa Rússio Camargo Guarnieri Medal of Museological Merit, the Professor presented us with a memorable lecture about the role of museums in the contemporary world.

The following year, fulfilling an old aspiration of the RRs, in partnership with SESC, we organized the Itinerant Conference of Museums of the State of São Paulo (SSAMCi), with a cycle of editions hosted in six macro-regions of the state. Its purpose is to reach museum professionals who seldom have the opportunity to participate in the Conferences in the Capital. This is how in odd-numbered years the SSAMC initiates its travels across different regions of the state, giving visibility to museums from the countryside and the coast region, which stand out for their good practices and innovations.

In 2020, forced by the social distancing demanded by the pandemic health protocol, the SSAMC migrated to the digital environment, which demanded huge efforts to guarantee that its format would not limit itself to merely reproducing on social networks its traditional model. It took innovation and resilience to creatively ensure high-quality participation of public and guests with accessibility resources, articulating pre-recorded interventions with online mediations and presence.

More importantly is that through the program of the 2020 SSAMC - under the inspiring theme "Museum, society and crisis: from mourning to struggle" -, built collaboratively with the members of the Advisory Board of the SSAMC, it was possible to advance in discussions on sustainability practices in museum management in its environmental, economic, social and cultural axes, with emphasis on fighting structural racism and social inequalities, as well as on facing ethnic and gender diversity issues.

Finally, the SSAMC 2020 experienced pain and joy paying tribute to the late Júlio Abe, victim of Covid-19. He left us a final message, recorded in a video on the eve of the Conference, celebrating the Waldisa Rússio Camargo Guarnieri Medal of Museological Merit award for his relevant services to São Paulo and Brazilian museology.

Looking back at a decade of public policies oriented to the qualification of museums in São Paulo, to which I had the privilege to contribute, despite all the uncertainties, I reiterate my conviction that, under the aegis of partnerships and shared responsibilities, the path of sustainability to ensure long life to the SSAMC is illuminated!

Members of the Guiding Board of the State System of Museums of São Paulo

São Paulo Conference: museums are the life that is not small

Nilo Mattos de Almeida

2021

Member of the Guiding Board of the State System of Museums of São Paulo since 2019

Was it worth doing? Everything is worth doing if the soul of the doer isn't small.
Portuguese Sea, by Fernando Pessoa

The first question that comes to mind when one thinks of an event that goes by the name "Conference" is: What is the reason for bringing people together?

In the case of The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference, the idea is to bring together the various professionals in the museological area of the state of São Paulo to take a moment to acknowledge and exchange information and experiences.

The conferences held so far were this and much more.

The 1st Conference took place between June 17 and 19, 2009 and was a landmark of the presentation of The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference, staging the launching of the Portuguese-speaking version of the Code of Ethics of Icom (Icom - International Council of Museums, of which Brazil is a member country) for museums, with the participation of Ibram (Brazilian Institute of Museums).

The 2nd Conference took place between June 22 and 24, 2010 and had the theme "To Be Different - To Make a Difference". It was defined by the State Secretary of Culture then as the "biggest state event of the area in Brazil". There were technical visits to state museums and a meeting of mayors and municipal culture leaders. Besides, it opened space for the launching of publications in the museological area, such as: "Documentation and conservation of museum collections: guidelines".

The 3rd Conference took place between June 6 and 8, 2011. Its theme was "Articulating Territories". Its program included a gathering of thematic networks of museums and

stressed the role of Sisem-SP as an articulator of public policies for the museological area. The double tribute to Waldisa Rússio Camargo Guarnieri, with a lecture and the release of a book about her trajectory, was the big highlight. Books about Icom Brazil and art museums were also launched.

The 4th Conference took place between June 13 and 15, 2012, proposing talks about "New frontiers of museum management". Digital panels made by the state's various museum institutions were presented. Regional Representatives elections and the Guiding Board completed the structuring of Sisem-SP.

The 5th Conference celebrated the "Adhesion of the State of São Paulo to the National System of Culture and the museums sectoral policy", taking place between June 19 and 21, 2013. Ten years after the creation of the Statute of Museums, it also marked progress in the museum field's discussion at the national level.

The 6th Conference, from June 2 to 4, 2014, proposed reflecting about the "Resignification of museums", generating deep reflections that would go beyond conceptual issues to reinvent the practices of institutions and professionals.

The 7th Conference brought the theme "Forum of the Communities". Between June 24 and 26, 2015 it provoked the contextualization of the relationship of museums with the communities located in their vicinity.

The 8th Conference, on "Networks and museum systems: collaborative actions", offered between June 13 and 15, 2016 the opportunity to know the various structures of cultural institutions dedicated to museology, both under the management of the State and other agencies.

The 9th Conference, on June 19 and 20, 2017 addressed the Regional Representatives' proposal: "Infrastructure Management and Security". The theme was related to the impact of the fire at the Museum of Portuguese Language, in São Paulo, in December 2015 and proposed a proactive vision to avoid similar situations in the future. Intuitively, a window was opened towards understanding the importance of this issue. The fire at the Museu Nacional, in Rio de Janeiro, in September of the following year, reinforced this need.

The 10th Conference, on "Management and governance", from July 18 to 20, 2018, discussed how to overcome the challenges of museum management through ethics and collective commitment for the dissemination of knowledge.

In 2019, seeking to decentralize the SSAMC, six meetings were held in macro-regions of the state of São Paulo, with the support of the Sesc network. I had the opportunity to participate in a table at the Itinerant SSAMC in Campinas, when I presented the work in process for digitizing and creating the digital collection of the *Casa do Olhar Luiz Sacilotto* and the *Santo André Museum Dr. Octaviano Armando Gaiarsa* in the city of Santo André - SP.

The year 2020 marks and is marked by the pandemic. The SSAMC is back for its 11th edition, now totally virtual. The theme "Museums, society and crisis: from mourning to struggle", was based on an important reflection initiated by Icom Brazil that would guide all the speeches of the event. I had the opportunity to participate in the preparatory commission and, more than collaborating, learn from friends and peers in a moment when, more than ever, being together was essential.

We have to remember that this day is marked by the space that hosted the Conference from the very beginning, the Memorial of Latin America. The Memorial itself had its course affected by tragedy, victim of a fire at the end of 2013. During its restructuring, the São Paulo Association of Dentists, the Palácio dos Bandeirantes, the Sala São Paulo, and the São Pedro Theatre housed the dreams and yearnings of museum professionals between the 6th and 9th SSAMC.

This narrative seeks to share everything that I was able to experience during these SSAMCs - The emotional speeches in the plenary sessions, the heated discussions during lunches, some evening activities.

This annual event has consolidated and given visibility to Sisem-SP - consonant to the impeccable work delivered by its team. We can't apply the cost-benefit rule here for despite all the difficulties, the gain is much greater.

Every year, networks and connections are created or renewed, allowing for dissemination of good museological practices, common solutions, and new work paradigms to be created. We are certain that the advancements achieved in one year's event will be surpassed by the following year events.

I conclude this account with immense and profound gratitude to each one I was lucky to meet throughout the SSAMCs and Sisem-SP, from whom I learnt a lot. Beyond any contribution I may have made, knowing that my soul has not recoiled from this experience is the most precious thing I take away with me.

May the SSAMC continue its journey, guiding our vision, our hearts and minds towards a present filled with hope and a future full of challenges and beautiful achievements.

Encounters define directions and build dreams

Maria de Lourdes Marszolek Bueno

2021

Member of the Guiding Board of the State System of Museums of São Paulo

When we are not instructed to follow a path or change course when faced with obstacles, we feel alone, powerless. Museum institutions and museum workers face analogous situations when we compare the situation "before" and "after" their participating in a Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo.

In 2009 I was like a "speck of dust", a leaf blowing in the wind, sitting in the auditorium, surrounded by many people, probably some of them were feeling just like me. During the meeting, I would listen, reflect, feeling overjoyed that I was not alone. That was a great opportunity I was having to bring to my space of work - Galeria Nilton Zanotti - to my city, and to the Baixada Santista Region (coast region in the state of SP), a reflection: who are the other museums, what are they like, where are they? ...Regional representation. Articulation. That is what was happening at that moment. Thus were born the Representatives of the Baixada Santista Region - nine cities, nineteen museums.

If we don't know the other museums, how do we expect them to know us? So we formed the "Orla Cultural da Baixada Santista" (The Baixada Santista Cultural Rim), with support and advice from Sisem - the State System of Museums of São Paulo. This is one of the greatest goals of the SSAMC, to know the museological institutions, to promote articulations, to contextualize them, and to do what needs to be done: continuous and growing guidance. And I went along, contributing, learning, and growing.

1st, 2nd, 3rd,... 11th SSAMC. We continued strengthening relationships, qualifying people and museological spaces, expanding territories, creating webs, seeking solutions, building dreams, creating tools, registering museums and contributing to the growth of their qualifications by enhancing potential. Bauru, Peruíbe, Ribeirão Preto, Descalvado... why not... United Kingdom? The Kariri Man, Medellín... In short, a museum tour. Friendship, knowledge, acknowledgement, differences, all expressed in one word: gratitude.

I am very grateful for the regional representatives, who consolidate this union, bringing new breath, hope and empowerment to their regions through the collective effort that emanates in their struggle to provide a better quality service, in the exchange of knowledge and experience. Each Conference is unique, special, a physical or virtual party. An achievement. May other Conferences come!

Conference of Museums of the State of São Paulo: Earned Recognition

Renata Gava

2021

Member of the Guiding Board of the State System of Museums of São Paulo

It is a well-known fact that in addition to being a milestone of public policy for the state of São Paulo and Brazil, the biggest event in the museum sector is eagerly anticipated by the professionals of the area for being a unique moment of expression, reflection and action - by and for the museums of São Paulo.

Having participated in organizing committees together with the regional representatives' work group of the state System of Museums, I can testify that the event is conceived and structured horizontally; and it must be emphasized that the successful actions demonstrate the organizers' efforts to democratize the event. From the speakers invited to the themes selected, the activities directed to the public in a variety of ways accomplish the goal of integrating all the participants and providing a space for the exchange of experiences and debates among the media.

Another concern alongside building long-term thinking is to discuss the sector's annual achievements in order to define adjustments and roadmaps for future work. Thus, qualitative and quantitative data of the activities for institutional empowerment by the state System of Museums, in partnership with the State's Social Organizations of Culture, are presented.

Considering the achievements widely discussed and debated during the events and what was built over the first decade of The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference, four very important actions in particular stand out as targeted public policy: insertion of museums in a network; mapping and situational assessment of museological spaces; promotion by means of resources of its own to the area; state register of museums.

Aware of the necessity to learn about experiences and realities in order to suggest paths for the integration of specific projects, the outstanding mapping and assessment of museums were an important tool for targeting and proposals. Obtaining information to propose

actions was recognized as an important action, and the assertive initiative resulted in targeted operations.

The State Registry of Museums of São Paulo follows suit. With the purpose of institutionalizing museums in São Paulo through regulatory instruments for the sector, it helps systematize information and identify spaces' structural conditions. This way, it promotes knowledge of situational reality and proposes specific actions of support and qualification.

Legitimized during the Conference of Museums of the State of São Paulo, the networking - articulation among peers for specific work - has great importance, once the museums, with their specificities and regional particularities, are encouraged to participate in actions, debate and establish demands and share experiences. In order to meet the cultural demands of the state, since the action began to take shape the idea has been to create a collaborative environment among the museological institutions in a continuous way. An important initiative raised and pointed out in the first Museum Conferences was the subsidies and financial resources needed to leverage targeted actions to museums. Through direct investment by the state, there are two specific public notices for the area that aim at the economic sustainability of museums in São Paulo. Without a doubt, this is one of the greatest achievements of the museums.

I conclude by pointing out that despite the regional specificities and the different cultural realities of the museums of the state of São Paulo, The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference has become a landmark of achievements and benchmarks. An earned recognition based on its trajectory, consolidation and legitimization of actions built over time.

Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo: A Milestone in the Trajectory of the Museums' Public Policies

SISEM-SP institutional text

The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference - SSAMC - is a milestone in the public policy of the state of São Paulo in culture. Beginning in 2009, the gatherings have been held annually without interruption, consolidating themselves throughout five different administrations, which demonstrates the relevance of museums in maintaining a state policy for culture in the state of São Paulo. It is a unique and model case in Brazil.

Since its first edition, the SSAMC's mission has been to put in practice the goals of the state System of Museums (Sisem) of information sharing and disclosure for the technical qualification of the nearly 500 museums comprising the museum network of the state of São Paulo. The international conferences, panels, roundtables, among other initiatives proposed by the SSAMC promoted exchange of knowledge and the creation of a solid base of tools for the professionalization of museums and their teams, as well as the development and consolidation of a space for the different members of the museum field to recognize each other and establish connections.

Another important characteristic of the SSAMC is the long-lasting partnership between the Secretariat of Culture and Creative Economy of the State of São Paulo (SEC), creator of the SSAMC, the Cultural Association of Support to the Casa de Portinari Museum (Acam), which has produced the SSAMC since its second edition, and Fórum Permanente, an independent platform for cultural mediation and action, which, by critically covering all the Conferences held in São Paulo since 2009, has offered us an invaluable legacy for the institutional memory of the SSAMC. The critical reports, as well as the audiovisual record of the various roundtables and seminars presented at the SSAMC throughout its 12 years of existence can be accessed freely through Sisem-SP's and the Fórum Permanente's website/platform. They offer a vast amount of information and a living memory of all the State of São Paulo Museum Conferences .

To celebrate both the longevity of the SSAMC and the partnership between these three cultural agents, we have produced this e-book. It includes texts by the main leaders involved

in a process of building and maintaining a state public policy - not just government policy - focused on museums in the state of São Paulo that lasted over ten years. Besides the texts produced by the Secretaries of Culture in the given period, by five coordinators of UPPM and three directors of Sisem-SP, by the Acam Portinari Board, and by the coordination of the Fórum Permanente, this book also includes a selection of critical reports produced for each edition, as well as a retrospective critical report on the main tables and developments of each SSAMC. The testimonials and critical reports represent a multifaceted and multi-vocal vision of this extensive period that, among many other themes that mark the trajectory of the SSAMC, includes the consolidation of a system of management by Social Organizations of Culture of part of the state's cultural institutions, the restructuring of the development and the institutionalization of the State System of Museums of São Paulo. During this long process involving the promotion of dialogue and the bridging of gaps across the museum field, a two-way street relationship of equality was built between the museums in the Capital and those in the countryside of the state. A true milestone in the construction of public policies in the São Paulo and Brazilian museum landscape.



ACAM Portinari

A publication for the 10th anniversary of The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference

Angelica Fabbri

2021

Executive Director of the Cultural Association of Support to the Museum House of Portinari

“Museums transformative actions begin with new reflections they make about themselves.”
Waldisa Rússio Camargo Guarnieri

A publication always guarantees perennality; however, beyond the record, which in itself is a very important achievement, there is the issue of dissemination and reverberation of ideas, experiences, exchanges, reflections, and discussions held during the event and consequently expansion and continuation of their debate.

Bringing together people who share a common interest in museums, having them sit opposite or next to each other, in the true sense of the word Gathering, *Ágora*, is the essence of the SSAMC – Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo. Since its creation, every edition has encouraged new reflections, which is exactly what museums must do, as the inspiring words opening this text suggest.

Thus, uninterruptedly, for more than a decade, in consecutive annual editions, the SSAMC has been bringing together museum professionals, public culture managers, students and groups interested in the problematization of relations between museums and society in the fascinating and challenging field of museums.

It is a merit to see this continuity assured, demonstrating the importance dedicated to museum issues, in its concepts and practices. It is also important to acknowledge the maturity and evolution of the SSAMC at each edition, following the dynamic relations between museums and society, in a constantly changing scenario; and in this perspective, this continuity is a privilege for Acam Portinari - a consistent and reliable partner.

If concerns are the motto, questions are the guiding thread stitching up the themes related to museums, to improve their work processes as well as to guarantee the cultural diversity that characterizes and enriches society.

And the dialogue is strengthened by the plurality and multiplicity of voices and players that the Conference proposes to embrace and include in its deliberate format of joint, participatory, and collaborative articulation that adds to, broadens, and enhances exchanges and discussions.

The partnerships build invaluable bridges that help make The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference a success and reinforce its significance.

Thus, this publication confirms and amplifies, among others, the fruitful and successful partnership of the SSAMC among government, university and civil society, represented here respectively by the Secretariat of Culture and Creative Economy, through the UPPM - Museum Heritage Preservation Unit and Sisem - State System of Museums of São Paulo, the Fórum Permanente of Museums/USP, that has followed and covered the SSAMC since 2009, with broadcasts and the production of Critical Reports, besides Acam Portinari - Cultural Association of Support to the Casa de Portinari Museum, Social Organization of Culture.

A partnership that demonstrates and confirms the positive side of bringing together different entities to achieve innovative public policies for the benefit of society.

The participation of Acam Portinari in this process takes place in the scenario of the last years that saw the creation of a new management model for different cultural institutions and cultural programs that are now managed by social organizations of culture, the so-called OSs, through management contracts celebrating public-private partnerships.

The history of Acam Portinari began with its foundation, on November 27, 1996, having been created to support the Casa de Portinari Museum. Later, in 2008, it obtained qualification as a social organization of culture, in the wake of the implementation of a new management model in the state of São Paulo, with the mission of managing museological units in partnership with the Secretariat of Culture and Creative Economy of the State of São Paulo. This mission involved researching, conserving, and disseminating their collections, with socio-environmental responsibility, contributing to human development, and committing to social justice, democracy, and citizenship.

Alongside Acam Portinari's work in the management of state museums in the countryside region, support to Sisem-SP's actions for the promotion of the state museums was added through the creation of a team of technicians dedicated to this task.

Through these actions, which contemplate the different axes and lines of activity of Sisem-SP, the SSAMC constitutes one of the main initiatives in the realm of articulation.

When looking at the SSAMC, it is also necessary to consider the context within which it was created and materialized, in the context of the reformulations in the jurisdiction of the then Secretariat of Culture of the State of São Paulo and of the definitions of public policies in the field of museums in the state and federal spheres.

It was an emblematic and unique time for at the same time that new museums emerged, a great effort was made towards re-qualifying the existing ones.

If the Conference was conceived in a regionalized perspective, it is also notorious that already in its first edition it crossed the borders of the São Paulo territory, becoming, throughout its decade-long existence, one of the main events in the museological field in the country, with national and international reach and participation, both in-person and remote, enhanced by its desire to increase access to the event through real time broadcasting. This uncommon practice for such events then, was made possible through the partnership with the Fórum Permanente of Museums remaining the Conference's practice and hallmark in all its editions.

In this regard, it is also necessary to consider the relevant aspect of adopting strategies to guarantee a successful and positive event, both for the organizers and especially for participants. To this end, besides participating in the planning as an integral part of the Advisory Board, Acam Portinari, through its staff - particularly the team of technicians dedicated to the initiatives of Sisem-SP, and the various professionals and companies hired to perform different tasks, has been responsible for organizing the Conference, making sure every edition comes out exactly as planned. The only exception was the first edition, in which despite its effective participation, Acam Portinari did not yet play the role it would play in the future.

Also, the SSAMC in different contexts strongly represents these scenarios in the valorization and empowerment of museums. In São Paulo it could be seen in the reformulation the Secretariat of Culture went through then, with the creation of the Museum Heritage Preservation Unit, the restructuring of the state System of Museums, the first to be created in the country in 1986, but which needed updating and a new impetus to meet the demands that have arisen over the years. Thus, a new decree in 2011, repositioned Sisem-SP in its firm purpose of acting in different axes for the qualification, articulation and empowerment of the state's museums and their professionals, as well as for the valorization of the area as a whole.

In the federal sphere, the museum sector has made great progress with the establishment of public policies for the museological area, such as the creation of Ibram - the Brazilian Institute of Museums and important regulatory milestones, such as the Brazilian Museum Statute.

Internationally wise, Icom - International Council of Museums -, among others, reaffirmed its presence and the actions aimed at the development of museums and their professionals, reverberating different initiatives to safeguard heritage in different countries, stimulating good practices, ethical issues and reflections about the role of museums facing the challenges of contemporary society.

These aspects will certainly be more widely and deeply addressed in the other texts comprising this publication, both from the point of view of the institutions and of the professionals who participated in the event in its different moments, and also by all the critical reports produced in each edition.

For our part, we looked to focus on the commitment of Acam Portinari with Sisem-SP to develop actions on different fronts as one of its main partners, especially for the materialization of the SSAMC in all its annual editions, from 2009 to the present date.

Therefore, we regard this publication as highly relevant. It brings together institutions, professionals and themes that constitute an important memory for the state's museology to be recorded, preserved and disseminated.

It is an honor and a privilege for Acam Portinari to be part of the trajectory of Sisem-SP and SSAMC, and to contribute to see this history safeguarded through this publication.

COSISEM

The constitution and inauguration of the Guiding Council of the state System of Museums (COSISEM) is a milestone in the process of the institutional consolidation of Sisem-SP. Envisaged since the creation of the system in 1986, the Council was only effectively established in 2012. Since then, with bimonthly meetings, the Cosisem has been the main consulting body of the Technical Coordination Group of Sisem-SP, effectively contributing to the definition of the premises and guidelines of cultural policy for the museum sector in the state of São Paulo.

As a deliberative forum of the State Register of Museums, the Council plays a strategic role in the empowerment of museums in the state of São Paulo. With civil society making up its majority, Cosisem is composed of seven representations:

1. Coordination of the Museum Heritage Preservation Unit (UPPM);
2. Management of the Technical Coordination Group of Sisem-SP (GTC Sisem-SP);
3. Management of the Museum Heritage Preservation Group of the UPPM (GPPM);
4. A representation of the faculty of Technical Course in Museums, maintained by the State Center of Technological Education Paula Souza (Ceeteps);
5. A representation of higher education courses in museology from universities from the state of São Paulo;
6. Two representations of museological institutions elected biennially by direct vote during The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference.

Regional Representations of Sisem-SP

To share and debate the sector's strategic objectives and mobilize the different regions of the State, Sisem-SP has a Work Group made up of 24 regional representations that are composed of 35 titular regional representatives and 35 substitute regional representatives.

Elected every two years, the RRs work as volunteers and render relevant services of public interest. Besides contributing to the definition of priorities for the museums in their respective regions, together with GTC Sisem-SP, the RRs propose, promote, and support public policies for the museological sector, playing a strategic role in the planning of appropriate actions for the regional peculiarities.

CEM-SP

The State Register of Museums of São Paulo - CEM-SP is a public policy instrument that aims to establish regulatory standards for the museum sector and systematize information on museums in the state of São Paulo, identifying their structural conditions and working in a dialogical way for their qualification.

Adhesion to CEM-SP is voluntary, with free access to cultural institutions that are dedicated, on a permanent and non-profit basis, to the preservation and dissemination of the material and immaterial heritage, in spaces open to the public for the purposes of study, research, education, and enjoyment.

Adhesion to the CEM-SP involves filling out the Register Qualification Instrument on a digital platform. It ensures a technical visit by professionals who will tailor the reports made available for the technical orientation of the institution.

Waldisa Rússio Camargo Guarnieri Medal of Museological Merit

The medal of distinction, created in 2018, honors one of the main thinkers and articulators of museology in the state of São Paulo, who died in 1990. The awarding of the medal fulfills the need of the São Paulo State Secretariat of Culture (SEC) to publicly recognize the contribution of professionals who worked for the strengthening of the state museums. The medal is given every year to professionals who contributed to the preservation and promotion of the museological heritage by means of their professional practice, academic production, or dissemination of the museological institutions. The honorees are nominated by the members of the Advisory Commission of the SSAMC for appreciation and deliberation of the Guiding Council of Sisem-SP (Cosisem) and the referendum of the Culture Secretary.

Waldisa Rússio

The medal honors the memory of the teacher and museologist from São Paulo, known for being one of the most influential personalities in the development of theoretical Museology and its consolidation as a disciplinary field inside and outside Brazil. She started working in 1957 as a state civil servant performing several functions. In the 1960s and 1970s, she was able to contribute to several projects for the implementation of state museums. At the same time, she contributed to consolidate the Museology course and the regulation of the profession in the country. She was the main person responsible for the creation of the first post-graduation course in Museology in Brazil, launched in 1978 at the School of Sociology and Political Science of São Paulo. She stood out as an active member of the International Committee of Museology - Icofom, as of the early years of the 1980s. With her theoretical reflections on the scientific field of Museology, shared through various texts, lectures, and seminars, she left a legacy that remains up-to-date.

A Far-Reaching Critical Coverage: the Fórum Permanente and The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference

Martin Grossmann

2021

Coordinator and Culturer of the [Fórum Permanente Cultural Association](#)

Fórum Permanente

Despite the sanitary isolation, the remote work, the sadness, the mourning, the fears, the anguishes, the afflictions, and the discontent, the pandemic/pandemonium has allowed the creation of spaces for reflection, a critical perspective, revision, either of history or of not-so-distant times such as the recent past.

The purpose of this book is to develop a critical, collective review of the last 12 years of The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference. The result resembles a cubist landscape, with Cézannian pretensions, to which the given title fits well: a reflective panorama.

It gathers statements and reflections from people and institutions that have experienced the State of São Paulo Museum Conferences in an existential, phenomenological way: all of them inserted on and sharing the same Zeitgeist.¹ They were also imbued by the same purpose not only of fomenting the gathering, the coexistence, the exchange, the interchange in the scope of the museums of the state of São Paulo but also of developing, in a participative way, a public policy for museums in this scope, considering alterity, accessibility, inequality, diversity, and plurality, whether in the sphere of cultural institutions or that of its public and agents.

I do not see it according to its outer shell, I live it from the inside, I am encompassed by it. After all, the world is around me, and not in front of me.²

1 The spirit of the time.

2 MERLEAU-PONTY, Maurice. O olho e espírito. Translated by M. S. Chauí. São Paulo: Abril Cultural, 1980 (Col. Os Pensadores). p. 100.

With the exception of the [11th edition](#), held in late 2020 virtually, in the middle of the pandemic, all the other Conferences, [from 2009 to 2018](#), happened on-site, in the city of São Paulo, when we were still modern, part of late, liquid modernity.³

In March 2020, we forcefully and consciously stopped living in the city, in the metropolis, stopped enjoying our urbanity, stopped being integrated into the crowd. We stopped being modern. Ever since the beginning of sanitary isolation, our main reference became the internet, the virtual. Now we are in fact post-modern, subjugated no longer primarily to the city, but to the digital and computational world. Virtuality is our new nature.

This is extremely recent, and we are still groping as we try to cope with this new human condition. In spite of the fascination and amazement that thinking about the unfolding of this new reality provokes, as well as being witnesses of the turn of nature's referential,⁴ it is not this book's task to examine this conjuncture, nor the passage from modern to post-modern, or even to conjecture about the future. It is up to this book, from the time it was conceived in 2018 by the Fórum Permanente,⁵ to build and promote a reflective panorama, celebrate continuity, better understand the main characteristics and make a retrospective assessment of this annual event, conceived by UPPM and its state System of Museums, which receives the support from the Social Organization Acam-Portinari and co-authorship for its realization.

The Fórum Permanente's starting point in proposing and organizing this work was the understanding that the continuity of the SSAMC is equivalent to a state policy, which seems to be the organic result of the collective effort that the very structure of the composition that made this book possible shows, that is, a conjunction of: (a) government policies that minimally cherish the continuity of public policies with a (b) technical body that safeguards the continuity of public institutional infrastructures and their programs for culture, in close relationship with (c) the managing organization (SO), as well as (d)

³ BAUMAN, Zygmunt. *Modernidade líquida*. São Paulo: Zahar, 2001.

⁴ Humanity has three different references of nature; the first (pre-modern), the pre-existing natural nature, the one with which humans had a direct relationship since prehistoric times and which was being dominated by technology, by science, taking us to the Anthropocene. The second nature is the one constructed, constituted by us humans: the city, the urban, shaped by industrialization, by modernization, by a functional modernity. The third, multidimensional, is based on virtuality, also of human origin, but whose hegemony can be supplemented by artificial intelligence (This proposition has been developed over the years and is based on this text: GROSSMANN, Martin. *Do ponto de vista à dimensionalidade*. Item: *Revista de Arte*, Rio de Janeiro, n. 3, p. 29-37, 1996. Available at: <https://archive.org/details/item3alta1/page/n271/mode/2up>. Accessed on May 17, 2021).

⁵ The project of the Book celebrating the 10 years of the ConferenceConferencesState of São Paulo Museum Conferences was registered at the Proac-ICMS Notice in May 2018 with the code 26514.

the participation of and exchange between interested professionals and the public that compose and participate in the museological scene in the state and in the country (catalyzed by the SSAMCs), amplified by e) free and permanent access to all the content generated by the SSAMCs available on the internet and, finally, f) the accompaniment of a synchronic criticism promoted by a floating platform of cultural action and mediation interdependent of governments, cultural institutions, as well as universities.

The last two items on this list are related directly to the work of the Fórum Permanente (PF), which, since the first edition of the SSAMC, in 2009, has been a partner in this endeavor – unique in Brazil and perhaps in Latin America. The PF has developed a “critical coverage”⁶ for each edition of the SSAMC. This very peculiar mode of action that the PF has strengthened over the years since the first event that received this kind of attention in 2005,⁷ invests in real-time access, wide dissemination, and the safeguard of the memory of these events with which the PF is associated – or even which it idealizes and proposes. However, what is fundamental and a differential in this model is the criticism fostered and produced within the museum field and, in an extended way, in the field of institutionalized culture: a meta-criticism.

The centrality of criticism in this mode of action is possible because the [Fórum Permanente, Art Museums between the Public and the Private](#),⁸ was conceived and constituted, since its creation in 2003, as a floating.org, a floating device of cultural action, mediation, and criticism. This changeable and topological characteristic (malleable, permeable, multidimensional, etc.) allows adaptability to each context and circumstance in which it acts. A contemporary fruit of the process of art dematerialization in the second

⁶ The critical coverage consists of a live transmission, via streaming, of the event in question, as well as video recording and critical reporting. For more details, see <http://www.forumpermanente.org/sobre/coberturas-criticas>.

⁷ The first critical coverage by the Fórum Permanente was developed for the Annual Conference of CIMAM 2005: *Museums: Intersections in a Global Scene*, which took place on November 21 and 22, 2005, at the Pinacoteca do Estado, in São Paulo. The main topics of discussion, considered central to museums and art practice today, included the role of the art museum, the erosion of the public sphere, the confusion between ownership and custody of works, and the geopolitics of knowledge. As the event was closed to members and guests of Cimam – International Committee for Museums and Collections of Modern Art –, an organization affiliated with Icom – International Council of Museums, the Fórum Permanente proposed to the organizers a package of communication and memory that, from then on, we called “critical coverage”. This “package” consists of the online live transmission of the Conference and the subsequent availability of the recordings on the Fórum Permanente website, as well as the coordination of a critical report on the entire conference, produced by young critics. The site also published and still maintains some of the texts shared by the speakers.

⁸ The creation, development, maintenance, and updating of the Fórum Permanente are registered in this section of its website: <http://www.forumpermanente.org/sobre>.

half of the 20th century,⁹ PF has, from the beginning, made use of telematic technologies,¹⁰ pioneering the use of webcasting.¹¹ In its collection, there are almost 700 videos, available on IPTV at USP and on YouTube, either on its own channel or on the IEA-USP's channel, where the PF is a research group. Since 2004 the PF has been virtually present through a CMS platform,¹² a site that today, after 18 years, has almost 18 thousand pages, becoming a reference in the WWW,¹³ in the scope of museums, curatorship, contemporary art, cultural mediation and management, institutionality of art and culture, and debates related to processes of decolonization of cultural and educational structures.

The site hosts and organizes more than 130 events that the PF has idealized and produced, or in which it has participated by making a critical coverage or participating as a co-organizer. In addition to this rich material, this memory, the site also hosts and makes available subsites of projects that in some way correspond to the PF's profile. These 22 projects are organized in the "network" module. The unique profile of the PF can also be explored by browsing through the 4,122 news items that have been replicated on the site by the PF team since the beginning of its activities.

Another PF action worth mentioning is the [40 interviews/meetings](#) held by the PF or its members with personalities from the world of culture and, particularly, contemporary art and its institutionality. Thus, the site makes available material that goes from an interview with Paulo Freire, translated from German, to interviews with the main curators of visual arts in Brazil.

Complementing this rich collection, the PF is also a content editor, a publisher, as in the case of this book, produced in partnership with Acam-Portinari and the Sisem of

9 ZANINI, Walter. Vanguardas, desmaterialização, tecnologias na arte. São Paulo: Martins Fontes; Instituto Itaú Cultural, 2018.

10 A set of techniques and services that combine information technology and telecommunications.

11 Essentially, webcasting is the broad broadcast of content using the internet. It can happen in real-time or on-demand.

12 Content management system. Software used to manage the creation and modification of digital content through templates/forms. This platform supports multiple users and allows them to participate in the same collaborative environment for storing and publishing information and knowledge. The CMS thus allows the creation of hypertextual and multimedia websites by facilitating the inclusion of text, graphics, photos, video, audio, maps, and other digitized materials that will be retrieved and related in interaction with each user's navigation through the website.

13 World Wide Web: English scientist Sir Timothy Berners-Lee invented the WWW in 1989. Known as the Web, it is not synonymous with the internet but operates on this computer network. It is an information system in which documents and other web resources are identified by a URL (uniform resource Locators), their "address" (example: <https://example.com/>). They can be accessed by any type of computing device through a "browser", an application installed on this equipment.

UPPM-Sesec. Besides its own book collection, in 2021 alone the PF also edited this book and two other works related to the exhibition it produced this year, About Academia, by Spanish artist Antoni Muntadas, which, due to the pandemic, was "transferred" from the USP's Brasileira Library to virtuality: <https://aboutacademia.iea.usp.br/>.

Last but not least, for floating.org to be fully characterized, it is important to highlight the digital magazine *Periódico Permanente*, published by PF and guest editors/curators. This magazine was created in 2012 with the objective of organizing and editorially reorganizing the various contents archived on the site throughout its existence. Without a defined periodicity, the publication presents texts, video records, and critical reports of present events documented on the site under different curatorial ties, as well as new materials that different curators suggest for each issue. The themes are plural, deepening and expanding floating.org's profile. Some of the themes explored over the past 10 years, so that the reader may have an idea of the nature of the magazine: public-private; institutional critique; the ideal museum; immanent re-composition of artistic practices; strengthening the thoughts of marginalized communities; experimenting with otherness and activating paths, following the outbreak of a complex, proliferating process; cultural mediation; reflection on post-colonial theorization in the Brazilian artistic debate; the role of the Kassel Documenta in the history of exhibitions; possibilities of building a history of Latin American art.

One last fact worth mentioning in this brief characterization of the PF platform: access to all the vast material available on the website is free, under one of the Creative Commons licenses.

Finally, towards the end of this text, we return to criticism, because many people ask where it is going. Until the turn of the century, it was easily located, as it was conveyed by the mainstream media through newspapers, specialized magazines, television channels, as well as through books, not to mention the dissertations and theses produced in the academic context. PF rescues criticism from ostracism by considering it as meta-criticism, a process, an operation, not as an end in itself. Criticism is understood not only as content but also as the critical tool itself acting as floating.org. In other words, the PF performs a permanent reflection on reflection itself, inherent to ideation, the PF's mission and performance throughout its 18 years of existence. We could say that it is a cultural action conscious and critical of its experience in space-time in the participative and thus collective context/field of culture, locally, nationally, territorially, and universally as well as ubiquitous since it has always operated with ease in the digital and computational environment.

Meta-criticism is fundamental to floating.org because to navigate culture is to navigate complexity. From the perspective of visual arts, complexity becomes evident when critical propositions coming from within, from the art system itself, such as the “end of art history” or the “end of art”, afflict and disorganize the established canons.¹⁴ Other perspectives, theorizations, analyses, and reflexive experiences coming from the periphery of this system also affect the hegemony and stability of these Eurocentric (European Enlightenment and modernism) and imperialist (especially North-American modernism) canons. Particularly those coming from Cultural Studies, Critical Theory, and more recently from decolonial manifestations.

A clear effect of this turn, of this critical revision, is in the way the great international museums review their exhibition policies at the turn of the century. Their collections are no longer displayed according to the linear temporal orientation of hegemonic, Eurocentric art history. The curatorship that proposes thematic dispositions comes into play. The milestones of this change are the inauguration of the gigantic Tate Modern in London in 2000 and the expansion of MoMA - Museum of Modern Art in New York, by Japanese architect Yoshio Taniguchi in 2004. Later effects, but equally important, are described by Claire Bishop in her book *Radical Museology*, released in 2013, where she indicates that other models of museological work are being tested by museums that do not invest so much in the spectacularization of their architecture, but rather in the more politicized and experimental way they conduct reforms in their exhibition and educational programs. Examples of this kind of practice, of cultural action, are the Reina Sofia Art Center National Museum in Madrid, Spain, the Van Abbemuseum in Eindhoven, Netherlands, and the Museum of Modern Art in Ljubljana, Slovenia.¹⁵

We invite you to develop your own meta-criticism as you browse through this book. If you would like to share your experience with us, please contact contato@forumpermanente.org.

¹⁴ See DANTO, Arthur. *Após o fim da arte: arte contemporânea e os limites da história*. São Paulo: Odysseus; Edusp, 2006 (original version in English from 1997), as well as BELTING, Hans. *O fim da história da arte*. São Paulo: Cosac Naify, 2006 (original version in German from 1983).

¹⁵ BISHOP, Claire. *Radical museology: or what's “contemporary” in museums of contemporary art?* London: Dan Perjovschi and Koenig Books, 2013.

References

BAUMAN, Zygmunt. *Modernidade líquida*. São Paulo: Zahar, 2001.

BELTING, Hans. *O fim da história da arte*. São Paulo: Cosac Naify, 2006.

BISHOP, Claire. *Radical museology: or what's “contemporary” in museums of contemporary art?* London: Dan Perjovschi and Koenig Books, 2013.

DANTO, Arthur. *Após o fim da arte: arte contemporânea e os limites da história*. São Paulo: Odysseus; Edusp, 2006.

GROSSMANN, Martin. Do ponto de vista à dimensionalidade. *Item: Revista de Arte*, Rio de Janeiro, n. 3, p. 29-37, 1996. Available in: <https://archive.org/details/item3alta1/page/n27/mode/2up>. Accessed on May 17, 2021.

MERLEAU-PONTY, Maurice. *O olho e espírito*. Translated by M. S. Chauí. São Paulo: Abril Cultural, 1980 (Col. Os Pensadores).

ZANINI, Walter. *Vanguardas, desmaterialização, tecnologias na arte*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes; Instituto Itaú Cultural, 2018.

PART II

CRITICAL

OVER

VIEW

Research, Public Policies and a New Management Model: the 1st Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo and Its Effervescent Context

Ilana Seltzer Goldstein

2021

Critical Report; synthesis of the [1st Conference of the
Museums of the State of São Paulo](#)

Introduction

The 1st Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo was a true landmark. It represented the first of a series of subsequent annual meetings in a context of effervescent energy. Lasting three days and hosted in the sumptuous auditorium of the Memorial of Latin America, the event took place in a year that, according to the attendees, looked very promising for museums. Many guests mention, in the video records, the joy of seeing the audience filled with professionals from the area, researchers, and students. The first part of this report attempts to translate this excitement – which today evokes nostalgia.

The second half of the text reinstates what was discussed there about management by social organizations. As we know today, social organizations are public entities of private law, empowered to share with the State activities previously performed exclusively by it, in a process called publicization. In post-Fernando Henrique Cardoso Brazil, the model was adopted in the areas of health and culture, with the *Pinacoteca do Estado* being the first museum in São Paulo to be managed by a social organization, in 2005. Many participants at the 1st Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo addressed the model, still relatively new in 2009.

The report that follows is an individual selection, inevitably subjective, and written 12 years after the event, intended for highlighting some of the important points and transversal issues that permeated the 1st Conference of the Museums of the State of São

Paulo as a whole. We tried to quote and relate contributions made by practically all the guests,¹ organizing them around the two axes mentioned above.

The positive scenario

In January of that year, Law n. 11.904 had established the Statute of Museums. The Brazilian Institute of Museums had also just been created by Law 11.906. José Nascimento Jr., then president of Ibram, was the first to speak at the Conference. His opening speech celebrated the creation of our first National Museum Policy, in 2004. Throughout the event, there was an atmosphere of optimism, associated with the desire to improve management in the museum sector. Not by chance, Rio de Janeiro would soon afterwards host the Conference of Icom – International Council of Museums.

Carlos Brandão, Icom’s representative at the 1st Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo, explained that the non-governmental entity, linked to UNESCO, comprises a general assembly with thousands of members, approximately 100 national committees, and international thematic committees. In 2009, there were Brazilian representatives in practically all of Icom’s international thematic committees. In addition, the entity was holding seminars and making publications. According to Brandão, the purpose of bringing the Icom Conference to Brazil was “to bring technical and ethical standards to a region where museums are getting stronger.”²

Claudinéli Moreira Ramos, from the Museum Heritage Preservation Unit of the State Secretary of Culture of São Paulo, also described an “extremely favorable context for museums, showing deeper engagement with heritage in governments and society.” In illustration to this, he mentioned the creation of *Catavento Cultural* and the the Football Museum, as well as the relocation of the University of São Paulo’s Museum of

1 Two interventions were not contemplated in this synthesis. The first one is the lecture “Planning, Communication and Image”, by Daniela Bousso, director of Museum of Image and Sound and Paço das Artes. Daniela presented war images, media images, and works from the exhibition “Illegitimate”, to discuss the difference among them – artistic images require a different time for reflection, because “art is a sequence of resonances.” The second one is Claudia Aratangy’s talk about a partnership between the Secretary of Culture and the Secretary of Education. The “Culture is Curriculum” program, created in 2008, took students from the public school system to museums, theaters, etc. Initially applied only to the capital, in 2009 it was expanded to the entire state network. The option for the democratization of “legitimate” culture deserves to be questioned – which did not occur in the event – regarding the choice of taking the periphery to the “real” temples of culture. Although both speeches were interesting, they did not dialogue directly with the other contributions of the event and, therefore, were not included in the text.

2 During the 1st Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo, there was a moment dedicated to the launching of a new Portuguese-speaking version of Icom’s Code of Ethics, which contains, among other guidelines, norms about the disposal of pieces and collection of documents.

Contemporary Art to the former *Detran* building, located across from Ibirapuera Park, a place of greater accessibility and visibility.

Cecília Machado, director of the Technical Group of Sisem-SP, explained that the National System of Museums, created in the 1980s to articulate public and private museological institutions, achieved effective decentralization and capillarity only in the 2000s. There was an increase in training programs, itinerant exhibitions and diagnostic research, vital ingredients for good planning. Cecília reported that, according to a national survey carried out in 2006, São Paulo was the state with the most museums in the country: 459 registered museums.

Rose Miranda, from Ibram, presented the national museum register, launched in 2003 with the purpose of mapping the Brazilian museological diversity, including outdoor or indoor in-person museums, virtual museums, and museums under implementation. Among art museums, ethnographic museums, community museums and territorial museums, as many as 2,697 museums were registered at that time in Brazil, with 142 million items stored and 27 thousand direct jobs generated. Rose also noted that museum visitation was growing year after year.

In fact, sectoral studies and applied research were flourishing at that time. They were essential for the planning of cultural policies. Luciana Sepúlveda, from the Museum Observatory of the Oswaldo Cruz Foundation, commented on the results of a research she was involved in on the public of museums in the southeast capitals. In most museums, people are accompanied and in groups, which reveals this is an activity linked to sociability. Among the respondents, 79.9% had concluded or unfinished higher education, which contrasted with the fact that in the Metropolitan Region of São Paulo only 17% of the population had concluded or unfinished higher education. More than half of the visitors who participated in the survey in São Paulo declared that their visit to the museum was motivated by an interest in visiting it (65.1%), a percentage similar to that concerning those who were making their first visit to the museum (63.9%).³ Luciana commented: “Curiosity and desire to discover seem to motivate the visit among the potential public. The search for novelty in the dynamic of appropriation of museums has been verified in other research works as well.” In other words: attracting the public once is easier than building public loyalty.

3 More data and analyses from the two Fiocruz surveys on the profile of the museum audiences in the southeast can be accessed at: http://www.fiocruz.com.br/omcc/media/relatorio0607_sp.pdf.

Museologist Ana Bloise, in turn, spoke on behalf of the Regional Council of Museology, a public agency that oversees and advises the government on professional qualification in this segment. She commented that the demand for museologists – a regulated profession since 1984 – was on the rise, due to the heating up of the cultural sector and the renewal of public policies for the sector. Ana only regretted that, despite there being hundreds of museums in São Paulo, there were no museum studies degrees in the state. From our research, the situation seems to remain the same.

From what has been reported so far, the contrast between the cultural scene in 2009 and today is clear – I am writing in April 2021. It is impossible not to mention the fire at the National Museum, an institution directly related to Ibram, in 2018. It is also sad to think that, for two years, no property has been listed by the National Institute of Historical and Artistic Heritage – Iphan. It is impossible not to regret that, recently, exhibitions have suffered ideological censorship. Equally worrisome is the Federal Government’s decision, in 2021, to restrict the use of federal tax incentive law in municipalities that adopt social isolation measures, due to the Covid-19 pandemic. Not to mention the extinction of the Ministry of Culture, which was allocated within the Ministry of Tourism, and is in the hands of people without proper technical qualifications. Reviewing the videos of the 1st Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo evokes the nostalgia of a time when there was hope, when public policies, however questionable they might have been, were clearly designed by professionals with experience and interest in the cultural sector.

Management and financing of cultural institutions

The 1st Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo “celebrated the new management model in partnership with the Social Organizations”, in the words of Giancarlo Latorraca. According to the director of the Casa Brasileira Museum, the model brought with it the restructuring of the institutions’ organization chart, the implementation of job and salary plans, the regularization of fundraising, besides facilitating the hiring of suppliers.

Marcelo Mattos Araújo, from the Pinacoteca do Estado de São Paulo, said the same thing: museum management by a Social Organization made it possible to hire employees via CLT (Consolidation of Labor Laws) and brought about other improvements: “in the first three years, the collection increased 20%. We started to hold 40 temporary exhibitions a year.” Regarding funding sources, in the same period 56% were state public funds, 35% came from tax incentives, via the Rouanet Law and Proac, and 9% came from ticket sales and the store. “We hired a security specialist, installed smoke sensors, metal detectors, and carried out preventive maintenance. The new model allows us to recover the credibility and efficiency of the institutions”, said Marcelo Araújo.

The Social Organization Acam Portinari, represented in the event by Angélica Fabbri, signed a management contract with SEC in 2008 and started managing institutions in the countryside region of São Paulo, such as Casa de Cultura Paulo Setúbal, in Tatui; Índia Vanuíre Museum, in Tupã; and Prudente de Moraes Museum, in Piracicaba. Fabbri pointed out that the organization responsible for managing the institutions is closely monitored and controlled, and its target achievements are followed up. Still, in her view, the model facilitated the museums’ operations. Acam Portinari was able, for example, to approve and raise funds for a collection documentation project worth 1 million reais through the Rouanet Law, something that would have been impossible for a public museum.

Leonel Kaz, at the time the director of the Football Museum, claimed that, through the system of management by SO, museums should seek to increase their ticket sales, sales, and space rentals, thus decreasing the State’s share of participation. He shared information in this regard with the public. In the first seven months of its publicized management, the Football Museum earned 800 thousand reais from ticket sales, 250 thousand reais from events, and about 400 thousand reais from space rental. Kaz estimated that this amount could increase, considering that 80% of the Football Museum revenue still came from the State Secretariat of Culture – SEC. But a statement made this writer uncomfortable. After explaining that the Football Museum only houses, on loan, a shirt worn by Pelé, besides the photos, videos, installations, and the exquisite scenography, Leonel Kaz said that “the museum is the realm of the word”. I beg to differ, resorting to Ulpiano Bezerra de Menezes, for whom the biggest difference of a museum narrative in relation to a text is precisely that the exhibition is not built by words alone: it articulates statements about human problems and achievements through material things.⁴

Even though it was not questioned at the time, another statement by Leonardo Kaz, referring to the relativization of the unequal distribution of resources for culture in Brazil, deserves questioning: “They say Piauí doesn’t receive money. Well, if it is to spend building a José Sarney Memorial...” It is worth noting that Piauí has nothing to do with the Sarney family. And I suppose generalizing all the northeastern states under one stereotype would be less acceptable these days. But the fact is that inequality was and still is an obstacle. So much so that Roberto Nascimento, from the Ministry of Culture, pointed out in his speech during the Conference that there was a huge concentration of resources

4 MENESES, Ulpiano Bezerra de. Do teatro da memória ao laboratório da história: a exposição museológica e o conhecimento histórico. Anais do Museu Paulista, São Paulo, v. 2, p. 9-42 Jan./Dec. 1994.

in Brazil: in 2008, the southeast had taken 79% of the sponsorship for culture, against 1% for the north.⁵

Private investment without the use of incentive laws is also more likely in big cities and economic centers as it aims at the sponsor's visibility. André Sturm, at one of the roundtables, reported the case of HSBC Belas Artes, of which he was the director: "The bank closed a five-year sponsorship contract with no fiscal incentive because its commercials were shown in every session of the cinema, the HSBC name was on the façade in a large avenue, and there was an ATM inside the cinema." Would this happen in a small town in Piauí? Precisely because the answer is no, the public power must participate in the planning and execution of cultural policies that aim at cultural democracy and the universal right to culture.

As Carlos Augusto Calil warned us, since the 1990s "everything public started to be despised, even consistent and lasting actions, and everything private started to be considered good. What comes from the government is seen as ideological or targeted. As if the companies were not. The public power withdrew from the management and investment in public institutions such as museums." I agree with Calil about the need to find a balance. We should bet on different sources of resources for different cultural initiatives, as some regions and some activities can benefit more than others from tax exemption mechanisms and direct private sponsorship. We should also invest in a balance between state planning and the participation of civil society in the formulation and execution of cultural actions. That should also include the management by SO, so acclaimed in the 1st Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo.

In search of formats that combine the universalizing and ethical obligations of the public power with efficient management practices more often found in the private sector, the debate about SO is still current. In fact, more and more museums are being managed this way.⁶ In a master's thesis defended at Getúlio Vargas Foundation in 2012, Beatriz Matta concludes, based on interviews with the professionals involved, that in the past

⁵ The audience of the event pointed out disparities within the state of São Paulo itself – and not only in relation to funds. A person appears in the video complaining about the lack of public investment in museums in the countryside region of São Paulo. Another, during the "Open Debate" activity, presented requests from small cities for technical advice and training, so that they can strive for the good practices presented at the event.

⁶ In 2021, I found 18 museums in the state of São Paulo managed in partnership with Social Organizations of the field of Culture: Catavento; Casa Brasileira Museum; Casa Mário de Andrade; Memorial of Resistance; Museum of Image and Sound; Afro Brazilian Museum; Casa Guilherme de Almeida; Immigration Museum; Museum of Portuguese Language; Sacred Arts Museum; Football Museum; Paço das Artes; Pinacoteca de São Paulo; Casa das Rosas; Casa Portinari Museum (Brodowski); Felícia Leirner Museum (Campos do Jordão); Índia Vanuüre Museum (Tupã); and Coffee Museum (Santos).

"there was a lack of specialized labor; there was a lack of public contests to fill vacancies; the budget for most cultural institutions and projects was low; and there was practically no planning."⁷ These dimensions have improved, according to the respondents. On the other hand, the scarcity of specialized public power technicians available for the joint formulation and subsequent evaluation of the initiatives is a vulnerability of the model. Another is the fact there is still no real competition among social organizations, due to the small number of SO capable of managing a large institution. Conflicts due to different institutional cultures have also been reported. Finally, it is not a matter of enthroning or condemning cultural management by SO, but rather of continuing to advance towards a discussion about its advantages and limits.

Final considerations

Besides the economic and administrative issues that guided the 1st Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo, there is an unmatched power concerning the experience a museum can offer and that should not be overlooked. Ronaldo Bianchi, during his lecture on strategic planning, articulated an inspiring phrase: "You do not leave a museum the same way you came in." This reflection about the role of the museum was deeply explored during the event by the international speaker with whom I close this report.

Jorge Wagensberg, Ph.D. in physics and creator of the Science Museum of La Caixa Foundation, sustained that a good museum is, necessarily, a space for social transformation. In the case of science museums, "the main thing is not safeguarding heritage, but rather creating encounters between the public and the scientific method and the debate of ideas." The science museum has become vital for revealing the difference between a scientist and a believer: "the scientist will change his hypotheses and explanations when they are contradicted by observable facts in reality; the believer, however, will not." And the great challenge of curatorship for scientific museums as well as art museums is to enable the dialogue between and among objects; objects in connection with phenomena; and objects associated with metaphors, that is, to suggest connections between the elements. In short, "what matters is not the number of visitors, but rather the number of conversations and the quality of the reflections that the visit arouses." To bear this in mind is a motivation for museum professionals in particular and culture professionals in general.

⁷ MATTA, Beatriz. O modelo de organização social de Cultura em São Paulo: potencialidades e fragilidades após sua implantação. Dissertação (Mestrado) – Escola de Administração de Empresas de São Paulo, Fundação Getúlio Vargas, São Paulo, 2013. P. 57.

References

MATTA, Beatriz. *O modelo de organização social de Cultura em São Paulo: potencialidades e fragilidades após sua implantação*. Dissertação (Mestrado) – Escola de Administração de Empresas de São Paulo, Fundação Getúlio Vargas, São Paulo, 2013. P. 57.

MENESES, Ulpiano Bezerra de. Do teatro da memória ao laboratório da história: a exposição museológica e o conhecimento histórico. *Anais do Museu Paulista*, São Paulo, v. 2, p. 9-42 Jan./Dec. 1994.

“A Museum Without Reality Is Not a Museum”

Daniele Zacarão

2021

Critical report on the International conference: [“An Overview of Museums Worldwide”](#)

The international conference “An Overview of Museums Worldwide”, held during the 1st Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo, in the year of 2009, was delivered by Jorge Wagensberg, a Spanish Graduate and PhD in Physics, who worked as Professor of Theory of Irreversible Processes at the Faculty of Physics in the University of Barcelona between 1981 and 2016. In 1983, he created and edited the book collection *Metatemas*, a reference in scientific thinking, which currently has more than 130 titles by different authors. He was the author of a dozen books and hundreds of research articles on thermodynamics, mathematics, biophysics, microbiology, paleontology, entomology, scientific museology and philosophy of science. Between 1991 and 2005, he created and directed the Science Museum of La Caixa Foundation, also coordinating its reformulation in 2004, which resulted in Cosmocaixa, based in Barcelona and Madrid. In 2005, the Generalitat de Catalunya awarded him the National Prize for Scientific Thought and Culture, for his work creating the new Cosmocaixa museum. Jorge Wagensberg remained as director of the Environment and Science area of La Caixa Foundation until 2014. The lecture presented at The State of São Paulo’s Annual Museum Conference is based on his experience directing and advising science museum projects around the world.

Professor Jorge Wagensberg starts his presentation by announcing a first important definition for a new museum model. According to him, we are learning a new craft, inventing a new model of science museum, which, in many ways, will be an essential meeting place for the future. The science museum, just like all other museums, will be a meeting space to promote change – an instrument of social transformation.

In this perspective, Wagensberg presents a brief history of the definition of science museums, pointing out that initially they were spaces that presented objects in showcases. From the 1930s on, there is an important change and museums begin to present phenomena. But it is not until the late 1970s that the so-called “new museums,” interactive

museums considered by many as “modern museums,” start to appear. Among his observations, the speaker emphasizes that the priority of science is to understand the reality of the world, which is composed of objects that occupy space and phenomena that occupy time. Therefore, the most sensible thing to do would be to create museums of objects and phenomena – this is the model proposed in his speech.

Science museums are the intersection of four social areas: the scientific community, which believes in science; scientists, producers of scientific knowledge; the productive sector, which uses and applies scientific knowledge; society, which enjoys the benefits and risks of science; and science managers, business people and politicians responsible for administration. In this sense, science museums are spaces to debate ideas with credibility. Based on these concepts, Wagensberg proposes to define the modern science museum as a meeting space dedicated primarily to promoting interest in three things: scientific knowledge, scientific method, and scientific opinion; and this happens from a very special “museum word”, which is reality.

For Wagensberg, the priority of this proposed model of museum is not to protect cultural heritage, educate, form or inform. None of this is forbidden, but it should not be a priority; its priority should be to promote interest and ignite emotions. To achieve this, the difference is the visitor, who should leave the museum with more questions than when he arrived; the difference lies in what happens after the visit, in the transformation of life, in the awakened need to seek other information channels.

Next, he questions the word/language of museography; if image is the language of a film, if sound is the language of radio, if writing is the language of text, what is the language of the museum? He answers: “I believe that it is reality. A museum without reality is not a museum. All these resources are important – images, texts, videos, etc. – but they do not replace reality, they can support or explain it.

He also questions the museographic elements. According to the professor, the 21st century is not about objects only, like in old museums, nor about phenomena, like in modern museums, but rather all these elements in dialogue, objects with objects, objects with phenomena, phenomena with phenomena, and also a third option, the metaphor. This would offer us “museographic richness” from the multiple combinations between objects, phenomena and metaphors.

He also states that the new function of the museum is not to be visited, but to be used. To explain this, he takes the example of a beach. We don’t go to the beach to see it, we go there to use it. As a teacher, he criticizes schools that usually visit museums once a year; they should be visited every week. In the school everything is virtual – the classes,

the books –, and so, in this sense, museums are one of the few connections with reality. That is why schools should access reality at least once a week. Wagensberg, who has worked in the educational system for 20 years, affirms that there is a lack of incentive and motivation for emotions and conversations.

Wagensberg emphasizes that “conversation” is a way to use and cherish museums. One should not appraise a museum by the number of visitors. The important thing for a museum would be to know how much conversation is generated in a visit and after a visit, in other places, such as the classroom. To exemplify his ideas, the professor projects on a big screen some images of objects exhibited in the Cosmocaixa and their possible approaches and stories to be explored by the public.

Among the examples is a rocky matter announced as one of the most interesting objects in the museum, as they didn’t know what it was. This example is relevant for us to understand that when we come across something “scientifically proven”, or in a science space, it suggests that we are before an ultimate truth. Wagensberg says that one of the most common mistakes of science museums is to present a result without presenting the methods used to achieve that result.

Another example regarding this perspective is a piece of amber, which preserves ants inside it. The investigations about this object were carried out in partnership with the Brazilian scientist Roberto Brandão, and resulted in 14 articles, which are today displayed next to the object, thus evidencing the scientific method. For Wagensberg, science is something alive, and the science museum should be an incentive for this constant evolution.

In another example, by asking “Why is the earth’s vegetation green?”, the teacher demonstrates with his hypotheses that the conversation should not only seek an answer/explanation, but rather provoke a virtuous cycle of questioning. Furthermore, to provoke dialogues between similar objects, or even to look for what is common in different things, as well as what is different in things that seem common – this means understanding science.

However, these dialogues do not always happen naturally; it is necessary to create instruments and situations to provoke such reflections. As in the example of the fossil of a big fish swallowing a small fish, cited by Wagensberg. The museum considered it an extraordinary piece, the fossilization process had eternalized the moment when one fish devoured another, but this object did not appeal to the public. As a dialogue strategy, the museum organized a showcase with eight other cases of large fish swallowing small fish, but with no success either. Eventually, they invited two actors to play the characters Sherlock Holmes and Watson, who, through their dialogue, provoked questions and reflections about the museum piece, information, and scientific method.

Wagensberg explains that there are things we don't see because they are too big, there are things we don't see because they are too small, and there are things we don't see because they are too complex. The function of the metaphor is to extend reality, so that objects, phenomena, and metaphors may complement each other. A museum should promote the crossing between "not being interested in it" and "being obsessively interested in it". Museums are places where scientific vocation is created. The museums of the future are museums that create motivation.

Finally, Wagensberg says that science is universal, the theory is one and the same; however, the practice is not, the examples must be local. Science museums may talk about physics, biodiversity, evolution, but the examples should dialogue with the local reality. This requires brilliant people to build brilliant ideals, so that people who live near the museum feel proud of their museum, and those who visit it can get to know that place from a scientific point of view.

To conclude, a brief update on the future:

This story is written in March 2021, when we are one year into the biggest pandemic of the century. Covid-19 has changed our way of life, closed museums and schools all over the world, reducing human relations to virtual interactions. At this moment, science is the great ally in defense of humanity; perhaps we have never felt the need and importance of science so intensely in our lives. At the same time, we have, in Brazil, a devastating political scenario that denies science and its institutions, minimizes the deaths and the social consequences of the pandemic. The crisis of political representation adds to the health crisis, exposing an incompetent system whose legacy is the fragility of life.

How can museums collaborate with the current context? How to establish a dialogue with a reality that resembles science fiction? How to ignite emotions in bodies anaesthetized by fear?

The museums of the future must imagine the future.

Museums and Their Sustainability: Finances, Management, Content, and ESG

Daniel Rubim

2021

Critical Report on the round table: [Sustainability for Museums](#)

In the 1st Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo, in 2009, Leonel Kaz, the then director of the Football Museum, delivered a lecture on "Sustainability for museums". Focused on financial sustainability, Kaz uses the Football Museum as an example of business model, diversification of income sources and mastery of the administrative day-to-day as fundamentals for the existence of cultural institutions, based on the experience of conducting the implementation of these aspects.

Kaz starts by presenting the main sources of funding for museums, using the operation he had just implemented as an example: ticket sales, event space rentals, and concession of space for restaurants that account for 20% of the budget, while 80% comes from public resources.

This is an extremely serious diagnosis. Far from being exclusive to this museum, the reality of most Brazilian cultural institutions is to further concentrate their income on public funding. Limited diversification of sources of finance exposes culture to regulatory or legal changes: supposing a certain authority decides to suspend access to funds, either for 15 days¹ or three years², or that there is a tax reform, leading to the extinction of state revenue sources, at the stroke of a pen, the entire sector can feel the pinch with its resources

¹ Ordinance No. 124, of March 4, 2021, issued by the National Promotion and Incentive to Culture. Available at: <https://www.in.gov.br/en/web/dou/-/portaria-n-124-de-4-de-marco-de-2021-306744475>. Accessed on 10 Mar. 2021.

² Diário oficial do Estado de São Paulo, January 15, 2021 issue. Available at: http://diariooficial.imprensaoficial.com.br/doflash/prototipo/2021/Janeiro/15/suplementos/pdf/pg_0001.pdf. Access on: 10 Mar. 2021.

being reduced to 20%. For any business, whether for-profit or not-forprofit, having only one major funding source is to give away your freedom of choice and negotiation power.

Besides the legal and regulatory and market risks, the use of public money faces enormous restrictions. Kaz emphasizes the administrative importance of understanding and complying with Law n. 8.666 of 1993³, which rules public expenditure. This law directly affects bodies linked to the federal public power, such as Ministries and Secretariats. It is also the reference on which budgets for cultural institutions and projects that receive contributions or incentives are based on. Hence the absurdity of having museums with leaky roofs jeopardizing their collections: while it is possible to commission new art pieces from artists sponsored by Public Art Commissions or to have art collections donated from private collectors, it is not possible to do maintenance and repair work to guarantee basic building conservation – or, when it is, the overworked technical staff gets bogged down in the bureaucracy of the tendering process.

Returning to the issue of source of revenue mentioned by Kaz, as far as the remaining 20% generated without the involvement of the Public Power is concerned, the scenario becomes even more complex. Tickets not only fail to generate sufficient income to cover for the institution's costs, but also become a hindrance to visitation. How many museums would manage to charge R\$ 46.00 for admission without seeing their public rethinking their entertainment choice? Besides causing a drop in ticket revenue, high admission fees would see a drop in visitor numbers, which could discourage people from renting a restaurant space and, as a result, discourage sponsorships due to low demographic data – a catastrophic failure in revenue. Another negative effect would be restaurants building a separate clientele from the museum, overshadowing its exhibits with their spectacular views, sophisticated dishes, and their own logic of consumption.

There are alternatives to generate revenue from culture, some of which were being practiced at the time of the Conference with the participation of Kaz. We are not considering primarily commercial initiatives such as galleries or fairs, as well as the disastrous decommissioning of works that break up collections in order to iron out last-minute problems. Endowment funds will not be considered either, as they are financial instruments, exclusive for non-for profit institutions that are already in a comfortable situation and wish to accumulate capital for specific purposes. We will only address the museum's symbolic capital, which needs to be recognized and transformed into a product.

³ Law n. 8.666, June 21, 1993. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/l8666cons.htm. Accessed on 11 Mar. 2021.

Offering paid courses is an initial path that is poorly explored, largely as a result of having in tax incentives its largest source of income. Following the aforementioned rules for the use of public funds, institutions immediately adhere to the clear path of directing their educational departments' initiatives only to fulfill the State's obligations: education for children and dissemination of knowledge to those who lack access to it due to poor logistical or financial resources. These requirements are certainly important for building a more just and functional society, but they are a responsibility of the State in order to correct the predatory workings of the market. When regarded as the only option, this path alienates an economically active population, namely, those with enough financial resources. This population who has access to culture and presumably should be interested in it, is not. How to educate an adult? How to attract groups of people who fulfill their daily lives with the massacring routine of productivity? How can symbolic capital circulate in a world of rapid consumption? By drawing on these forces instead of competing with them. There are plenty of models: courses with contents that relate collections to the individuality of the payer, activities that increase the engagement between companies and their employees, gatherings with temporary exhibition artists who could discuss different interpretations of their work...

Besides the courses, education needs to consider other pathways and tools. The Museum of Modern Art of São Paulo (MAM-SP) has opened up a pathway more than three decades ago with its collectors' club – the private museum's second largest source of income for years. They are commissions of multiple works – therefore relatively low cost – created by relevant artists in dialogue with the museum's curatorship. For those who wish to access the contemporary art market, this is a safe source of knowledge, with clear narratives and legitimized by the inclusion of one of the editions of the multiple in the collection. This legitimacy mitigates any risk involved in investing money in unknown products.

Another alternative is suggested by the relationship with the public power. Sesc, Social Service of Commerce, is a model of the integration between activities from different fields of knowledge, very characteristic of Brazil. Different from the funds directed towards culture, the so-called S System is justified by direct relationship between workers' productivity and their quality of life and knowledge. It is especially successful in the state of São Paulo, where culture is inserted in the context of the S System and articulated within Sesc as one of the quality of life aspects. It is also a basic instrument for integrating the individual to society, along with sports, health, citizenship and education.

Just as Sesc understands culture as something inserted in larger contexts, Kaz, as director of the Football Museum, understood the role this Museum should play in people's lives. Strongly criticized for not having a physical collection, the museum proposes, far

beyond materiality, the conception of a mechanism through which visitors will access their affections and identities. It is the physical environment where the intangible and preserved heritage is the family tradition of watching the game with parents, of going to a bar to cheer with friends, the sensory and emotional memory of 20 thousand people shouting together "GOAL!" In Kaz's words, "the relationship between a grandfather and a grandson, a husband and a wife, a kid and another kid, is a never-ending thing." It is through these relationships that the Football Museum remains alive and relevant, relying on institutional aspects already perceived by the population about its object. This understanding converges with the definition of a museum by the International Council of Museums (Icom):

A museum is a non-profit, permanent institution in the service of society and its development, open to the public, which acquires, conserves, researches, communicates, and exhibits the tangible and intangible heritage of humanity and its environment for the purposes of education, study, and enjoyment (Icom, definition of museum ⁴).

Kaz briefly mentions a key point of institutional strategy: temporary exhibitions. Those exhibitions that generate excitement and feature long lines are regarded by Kaz as marketing tools, a delicate balance of the opposition forces between obtaining resources through an attractive program and a purpose beyond mere entertainment and consumption.

Far from being the museum's main mission, temporary exhibitions have a communicative character, which can blur the eyes of both the public and the managers in regards to the museum's other activities. Focusing money on programming, places the museum in the same category as concert halls, bars, parties and other consumer-oriented entertainment that bring in fast revenue. On the other hand, according to the definition of museum, it is clear that the focus needs to be on the preservation of both the tangible and the intangible heritage. The methods for this, however, may result in a posture averse to new contexts and dynamics. In other words, the physical and conceptual protection that do not take into consideration all dynamics and contexts can create gaps between the

⁴ Source: website of the International Council of Museums (Icom). Available at: <https://icom.museum/en/resources/standards-guidelines/museum-definition/>. Accessed on 11 Mar. 2021. It is important to note that at the same time this text was written, Icom was conducting a research for the redefinition of what a museum is.

preserved object and the public that do not belong to the place or time of the creation of this heritage. This creates uninteresting storage rooms rather than museums.

The definition of a museum not only legitimizes Kaz's point in delimiting temporary exhibitions within its instrumental character, but also clarifies the purpose of creating a program. Another side effect of cultural tax incentives (which only finance projects lasting up to one year) is to focus on temporary exhibitions that will bring resources into a museum, diverting attention away from its primary long-term functions. Temporary exhibitions should primarily serve as a tool to attract people to the museum, lending a fresh new look to the collection. There is no harm in hosting blockbuster parties, shows or exhibitions inside the museum; the harm lies in organizing only blockbuster parties, shows and exhibitions inside the museum.

In this regard, the museum urgently needs to understand the Internet in a systematic way. In 2009 it was still possible to imagine, as exposed by Kaz, that relationships should be developed within the physical space of the museum, with restrictions on the use of cell phones and cameras to keep the public from being distracted. Today, it is unthinkable to imagine a museum that will not allow its public to replicate images in its social media. If in 2009 Twitter was only three years old, and Instagram was yet to be founded, after 2020 human relations necessarily happen through digital contact, especially when physical isolation has become a prerequisite for life. How to adapt collections to the dynamics of the Internet? How to reconcile communities of people who have never met in person with the historical narratives built up until today? Is social media really the Internet environment with the biggest potential or is there room for the creation of alternatives? Is there a possibility of reconciliation between the (assumed) immateriality of the Internet and the materiality of collections?

Appendix: Sustainability

It would be careless to revisit a 12-year-old lecture in 2021 with the word "sustainability" in the title without addressing the definition of sustainability in vogue today. In the early 2020s, the global health crisis, coinciding with the turnaround in the international investment markets, resulted in numerous events focused on the practice of Environmental, Social and Governance Sustainability. Included in the acronym ESG (Environmental, Social & Governance), the word "sustainability" was present in high-level international agreements as much as in shallow talks on Zoom, yet almost always with a vague meaning.

ESG is the practice of government and corporate responsibility ruled by the 17 Sustainable Development Goals⁵ (17 SDGs) of the United Nations (UN). These are conceptual frameworks that serve as guidelines for the international community's actions. However, they deliberately leave open to interpretation what would be the means to achieve these results.

The turn of the year from 2020 to 2021 has more than a symbolic value: the American investment office Blackrock, the world's largest asset manager in terms of capital volume, in its annual open letter to clients, defines ESG goals as a prerequisite for companies to continue receiving its resources⁶. If the moral and existential urge to keep society less unequal and the planet habitable were not enough, the economic impact certainly gave this agenda the highest priority possible. Months later, several other large asset managers announced the same measures and even sanctions on companies that would not present similar activities.

The ESG approach is completely dismissed by Kaz at the event, who favored financial sustainability, i.e. management structure and commercial strategy for the museum to guarantee resources aimed at maintaining its operation. The concept closest to ESG is mentioned in only two moments. First, in the introduction, when he mentions the Rio-92 Conference as a milestone for environmental sustainability, quickly ignoring the museum's relationship with the environment. This indicates that at that time there was also such furor over sustainability that it only led to confusion. Then Kaz refers to a brief approach to accessibility for people with special needs without linking it to sustainability itself, which indicates that there was no link between the word sustainability and social sustainability.

Kaz lists the content created for the deaf and the facilities and amenities provided by the architecture as being publicity items for the museum without much impact on social integration or heritage maintenance. Thus, by addressing them as strengths of the museum, he overlooks the obligation of this accessibility as an operational prerequisite

⁵ Platform 2030, the 17 sustainable development goals. Available at: http://www.agenda2030.org.br/os_ods/. Accessed on 10 Mar. 2021.

⁶ Blackrock open letter to customers, published in January 2020. Available at: <https://www.blackrock.com/corporate/investor-relations/2020-blackrock-client-letter>. Accessed on 10 Mar. 2021.

to obtain fiscal incentive via Rouanet Law⁷, as well as the obligation of providing easy access for people with disabilities or reduced mobility in public buildings⁸.

Unfortunately, worldwide the cultural sector today also has difficulty relating to ESG. A big reason is the lack of direct reference to culture in the SDGs which, when correctly interpreted, requires the protection of cultural heritage in only one of its 196 goals. The other big reason is inherent to the SDGs: as they are vague goals, there are no parameters to evaluate success for any of the measures. The ESG present scenario, rather than present impact projects, is interested in learning what the desired impact is, as well as make it verifiable, measurable, and comparable. Corporations create an alphabet soup with acronyms like MSCI or SASB, while governments articulate what the rules of the game are as far as guidelines are concerned⁹.

The opportunity lies exactly in the fact that time is ripe for defining these guidelines and distinguishing philanthropy – by nature, lost funds, from investment – by nature, an activity that demands dividends. Investments in environmental sustainability subsist after more than 20 years using the metric “tons of carbon,” which unifies the existing projects and orients new projects. What are the possible comparable metrics in the field of culture that could justify its inclusion in social sustainability on a global scale?

⁷ Decree no. 7.761, April 27, 2006. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_Ato2004-2006/2006/Decreto/D5761.htm. Accessed on 10 Mar. 2021.

⁸ Law n. 10.098, December 19, 2000, chapter IV. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/l10098.htm. Access on 10 Mar. 2021. This legal requirement later extends to all high-flow buildings, including privately owned ones.

⁹ Sustainability Bond Framework. Luxembourg Trade & Invest, an agency under the Luxembourg Ministry of the Economy. Available at: <https://luxembourg.public.lu/en/invest/competitiveness/sustainability-framework.html>. Accessed on 11 March 2021.

Critical Report; Synthesis of the [2nd Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo](#): “To be Different, To Make a Difference”

In a case of discontinuity regarding public policies related to the sphere of culture like Brazil, it is providential that we look back at the discussions that were the main interests of museums just over ten years ago.

Not that the year 2010¹ could be, from a historical perspective, considered some kind of milestone in the country’s cultural scenario. Rather, what was happening then was that many of the terms, buzzwords, and jargons that have surrounded discussions about the survival of museums to this day seemed to begin to form a kind of lexicon of their own; in other words, they seemed to enunciate ideas in such a cohesive way that they became incorporated in daily speech as a series of new or contemporary *topoi*, which were then freely used. However, today they should demand a serious reexamination of the ideological assumptions of their promises and of those narratives taken for granted at the time, but which, since then, have instead been increasingly revealed to be rhetorical, superficial, generic foils to discourses that have been incessantly replicated and function as an introductory, epideictic tone to the description of “such a state of things,” to which only an immediate and assertive action – without reflection, therefore – would be capable of reversing the problem posed.

In this sense, it is worth noting that terms such as “accessibility,” “participation,” or “inclusion,” which were hopefully becoming increasingly present in the development of

¹ On June 22, 23, and 24, 2010, the 2nd Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo was held in the Memorial of Latin America, São Paulo. The Conference brought together 28 speakers under the following theme: “To Be Different: To Make a Difference.” In this edition, for the first time mayors and municipal culture secretaries had parallel programming to discuss the importance of public policies in the field of culture, partnerships for investments, and incentive laws. During the Conference, the changes and growth of São Paulos’ museological activity were shown, based on the measures adopted by the previous year’s Conference, with the implementation of the regional units of Sisem-SP.

museological plans from that moment in the 21st century until today, were not yet decisively present in the speeches that formed the central arguments of the State Secretary of Culture (SEC) and of the directors and managers who addressed the particular experiences of their institutions.² At that time, expressions like "communication plans," the "dissolving the population's mistrust of museums," a necessary "injection of vitality" into the museums' activities, and, above all, "revitalization" were heard more often – clearly tentative terms, which, were undergoing the process of being established within a language that would eventually be able to determine the future "mission" of museums in São Paulo, in their process of redefinition. Surely those issues will be crucial to reflect on the museum within the contemporary situation: to what extent the museum is increasingly haunted by the threat of becoming a "dead" place of culture; the problem of the detachment between these institutions and their surroundings; the challenge of bringing the public into the museum; the need to rethink the responsibility regarding its collection, available works, and exhibitions.

Who knows, maybe the emergence and elaboration of such questions would have, at that moment, the power to connect the recent Brazilian museum experience to the whole debate about the museum's vocation and public importance formulated by history – from the heated claims in the 18th century France, all the way through the writings of Paul Valéry, Proust, Adorno, and, finally, to the reassessment of the modern institution in the North-American experience, and so on. A debate that could only be reviewed in the confluence between the aspects related to the uniqueness (of type, place, tradition) of each institution – this is perhaps the critical point raised here – and those aspects related to the theoretical complexity involved in considerations regarding the importance of the museum for the non-immediate social experience, as a space surrounded by constant reflection, since it helps develop a sense of respect for what is public, which the Brazilian modern experience took ages to discover.

However, such historical concerns, which fostered the very definition of a public dimension in experiences of memory and tradition, and the modern processes of institutionalization – with the definition of the image of the museum at the forefront of its social nature –, ended up becoming the most occasional, not to say convenient, alibis to the establishment of a policy that was once again not interested in taking on the problem of museums, albeit saying goodbye to it in celebratory tones.

² It should be noted that these terms were still being brewed, or at least absorbed by common use, and would appear with force in the state of São Paulo at that very moment – of course, as museums were finally defining their action plans.

That is how SEC announced a process of municipalization of the museums, until then under its tutelage, as a process capable of reversing the mark of amateurism – fatally felt with greater intensity especially in the countryside regions of the state – towards an ultimate "professionalization" of its activities.

By all means, a promise of *autonomy*, whose rooting started from the shared impression that there was a relationship of disjunction between each museum and the city it was located in. This disjunction required a conceptual reformulation of the museums' curatorial spheres, aimed at establishing effective representation regarding the local populations, maybe including among its outcomes a very attractive impulse towards cultural tourism, even capable of generating and moving its own resources to each small urban center in São Paulo. The materialization of this promise depended, then – but certainly in the name of that attractive autonomy of action – on training teams to seek private partnerships beyond the participation of the state. This would certainly depend on an exhaustive, yet rewarding, effort to establish a clear plan together with the press, service clubs, and those sectors of the population, more innocent and thus willing to cultivate the old – the children on the foreground, with all the promising ideals withholding their interest can bring up.

Moreover, these institutions should have kept in mind that the revival of their collections would have a lot to learn from the activities often proposed in the then still audaciously auspicious cultural centers that were spreading across the country – presentations, maybe performances, shows, happenings, or other activities, preferably interactive, which, when detached from those centers and seized by the aging museum, would certainly be able to attract the population to its lobby, and, as if by magic, keep them there. After all, the power of a growing audience eager for Saturday entertainment would, in itself, trigger the necessary fundraising initiatives³ to enable museums' sustainability.

But then, the uniqueness of the collections of each institution facing the promise of autonomy from the state should be taken into consideration when deciding their action plans. It was, after all, in the very name of such uniqueness that the state advocated its incapacity to elaborate a general plan, compliant to the state's responsibilities.⁴ The decentralization planned now came in the name of that terminal diversity, which could never be disputed, even at the price of a melancholic abandonment to their own fate.

³ This funding, at the time, counted on the Rouanet Law, but was also oriented towards all the spheres of promotion of cultural activities in the country regarded as effective and longlasting that went beyond the public commitment to issues related to heritage and culture.

⁴ N.E: For more details on the museum policy developed by Sisem-SP, we recommend the report "Sisem-SP, The Path Is Made by Walking", by Paulo Nascimento, found in this publication.

The Image of Museums: Visions and Proposals or Private Social Investment in Culture: Visions and Proposals

Ilana Seltzer Goldstein

2010

Critical report of the roundtable "[The image of museums: visions and proposals](#)"

Before commenting on the speeches and debates at this roundtable, it is necessary to make a preliminary observation. Both journalists and art critics invited – Antonio Gonçalves Filho from *O Estado de S. Paulo* and Jorge Coli, a professor at Unicamp and collaborator for *Folha de S. Paulo*, were absent. They would have probably conducted further discussions on the image of museums in the media, in the academic world or among the public. However, only speakers from organizations funded by large business groups were present at the meeting to give their contributions. This led to a slight change in the content of the roundtable, hence the two titles above – the first, as announced in the program of the 2nd Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo, and the second, more according to what actually happened.

The representative of the Votorantim Institute did not talk directly about museums but presented in a generic way – and quite convincingly, by the way – the cultural sponsorship guidelines of the Votorantim Group. The representative of the Roberto Marinho Foundation talked about a specific type of museum that his organization, funded by Rede Globo, has been promoting. Thus, although the roundtable and the report that begins here do not deal with the image of museums per se, they allow us to reflect on other fundamental issues, such as the role of cultural marketing and the museological choices that have been made in Brazil.

Votorantim Institute: A Consistent Sponsorship Policy of a Company with Controversial Attitudes

Rafael Gioielli, from the Votorantim Institute, announced, in the first minutes, that rather than discuss the image of museums, he would expose the investment made by the Votorantim Group to improve the access of Brazilians to different cultural institutions and products. The Votorantim group, which has existed for 90 years, has nine business units and is present in 400 municipalities. It is one of the largest private investors in culture in the country. The Votorantim Institute was created to align and give focus to sponsorship initiatives that were previously diffused throughout the group, "to increase its power of transformation and to pool resources."

The entire strategy of the Votorantim Institute, coined in 2005, is based on the idea that "cultural investment, besides projecting the brand, should contribute to the development of culture in the country." Therefore, the Institute decided to choose the scope of the dissemination of and access to culture.

Among the companies that invested in culture, there was a lot of talk concerning the support for cultural production. But, in fact, after some research, we discovered that there is a big gap between what is produced and what is consumed. Therefore, we decided to invest in promoting cultural initiatives and improving the quality of fruition. In 2005, we had access to a study by the Centro de Estudos da Metrópole, from São Paulo, showing the mismatch between the cultural offerings and the access to these options by the young population. The map showed that the expanded center of the city concentrated all the cultural various institutions while the youth with less access to them lived in the South and East areas of the city. Thus, we prioritized the low-income population, the youth, and the places with less cultural opportunities, with emphasis on free access.

The lines of action of the Votorantim Institute were built with the intention of minimizing three types of bottlenecks concerning access to culture: the economic (whose antidote is to offer low-cost cultural options); the geographic (whose antidotes are the decentralization of supply and guaranteed mobility); and the symbolic one (perhaps the most difficult to overcome, by means of mediation strategies that can break cognitive and social boundaries). This is a macro and accurate diagnosis, which could very well be

at the base of a public policy. Not by chance, Rafael explained that “as a big part of our resources come from incentive laws, we must make a cultural investment that will reinforce public policies.”

The Votorantim Institute works with several artistic areas: performing arts, visual arts, cinema and video, literature, music and heritage. According to Rafael, about 4 million reais were invested in each of the three editions of the contest¹ [1]. Support continuity is a keynote: 80 to 90% of the sponsorships are renewed every year. They seek comprehensiveness, ensuring a diversity of project sizes, valuing both classical and popular codes, making room for new and established talent, and choosing initiatives developed in both large and small cities. The Votorantim Institute is also concerned about following up and monitoring the initiatives it invests in. The use of public notices to select candidates provides a transparent process, carried out by an independent technical committee. In 2007, a Support Manual for the Preparation of Cultural Democratization Projects was also developed, with free downloads, and for the last four years, the Institute has maintained the *Acesso* blog, with articles and news on access to culture.

Among the cultural democratization initiatives supported by the Votorantim Institute are the educational initiative at the Inhotim Museum in Brumadinho (MG); the public and private schools visits to the Museum of Modern Art in São Paulo; the *Embarque na Leitura* project, which sets up libraries in subway stations (the person may borrow a book in one station and return it in another); the *Expedição Vagalume*, which sets up libraries in riverside communities in the Amazon; movie caravans in several municipalities; and the *Guaramiranga Music Festival*, in the mountain region of Ceará.

In short, the speech by the representative of the Votorantim Institute impressed us all both by its general coherence regarding the Group’s sponsorship policy and the clarity and pertinence of the guiding concept of its investments in culture. However, the audience did not fail to overlook an important detail, which, by the way, is far from being a mere detail: the private social investment of a company accounts for only a fraction of its performance in society, which is not enough to grant it the title of ethically and socially responsible. That would require a thorough analysis of the company’s relationship with all its stakeholders. And this is where things can get complicated for the Votorantim Group. Although this reporter lacked sufficient information about Votorantim’s global performance in relation to its suppliers, employees, consumers and neighbors and, therefore, was unable to make a judgment on the matter, it is important to remark two

¹ The next call for proposals by the Votorantim Institute will open in early August 2010. There will be a special category for young people with disabilities. The regulations are at: <http://www.blogacesso.com.br>.

statements from the audience present at the event, which called into question the company’s attitudes towards the communities located close to its units.

José, from the Environmental Monitoring Center of Mogi das Cruzes, asked the following question: “How would the Votorantim Group regard itself as a company that acts upon nature and has an impact on the transformation of the landscape?” To which the speaker replied: “We have high impact industrial, mining, etc. businesses that are in fact transforming the social, cultural and natural landscapes. It has been the role of the Votorantim Institute, within the Group, to improve debates on sustainability and increase the channels of dialogue with communities and other stakeholders. The group is aware of the impact it causes and is willing to work to make up for the inevitable damage caused and, at the same time, generate new positive impacts.” Obviously, Rafael Gioielli avoided mentioning actual environmental accidents, such as the one involving Votorantim Metais Zinco S/A in Três Marias, Minas Gerais, in which a large volume of toxic waste was released into the waters of the São Francisco River.

But his answer made it clear that cultural sponsorship is fundamental to clean up the company’s image with the public authorities and consumers. In other words, the performance of the Votorantim Institute in the cultural area can work as a shield, diverting the attention of society from environmental problems arising from the impacts of the Group’s activities.

Keila, from the Casa da Memória Municipal Museum in Cajamar, made a more forceful and direct provocation: “In my city, Votorantim managed to acquire an area considered by the municipality as a historical center, driven by its interest in economic exploitation. How do you position yourself in this regard?” Here, the answer from the Group’s representative was shorter and less convincing than in the previous case: “I am not familiar with this case and the Votorantim Institute does not manage the environmental impacts of companies, it only tries to make people inside and outside the group aware on these issues.” It sounds strange to hear that if the role of the Votorantim Institute is to “raise awareness on these issues,” it is unaware of the practices of the Group’s companies. It is also strange that it insists on an institutional identity separate from the Votorantim Group. None of this invalidates the seriousness of the Votorantim Institute’s public funding policy for the cultural area, but it requires that we keep our eyes wide open.

Roberto Marinho Foundation: The Option for Museums That Create Their Own Collection with High Technology

According to speaker Hugo Sukman,

[...] the Roberto Marinho Foundation was founded in 1978, based on the intuition that the media would have a fundamental role in education and the preservation of cultural heritage – an idea that was still vague then. Campaigns for heritage preservation were the entity's first initiatives: Tiradentes, Ouro Preto, Fortaleza, some historical buildings in Rio de Janeiro, all of them were restored by the Foundation or with its help. However, it soon became clear that that was not enough; it was necessary to make use of and develop sustainability programs for the restored building. That was when light and sound shows were created in the restored buildings, along with small exhibitions, training courses for priests, to instruct them on how to take care of sacred art collection in their churches, and so on. This cultural production activity grew in parallel to the intangible heritage appreciation. The Museum of Discovery, in Porto Seguro, for example, was a Project developed by our Foundation.

Among the most remarkable experiences of the Roberto Marinho Foundation are the partnerships in the creation of the Museum of Portuguese Language and the Football Museum, both oriented by the "concern for making museums living entities." Sukman said it was a huge challenge to restore the Luz Station in downtown São Paulo and create a museum there. The option for the Portuguese language originated from the immigrants having their first contact with our language at the train station. "The idea was to simultaneously celebrate a material heritage of the city of São Paulo (the building) as well as an immaterial heritage of the Brazilian society (its language), attracting visitors to the central region and improving the quality of life in the neighborhood.

The Football Museum, which had initially been planned for the Maracanã Stadium, was eventually redirected to an abandoned historic building in São Paulo, and it was also decided that the focus should be on the intangible cultural heritage rather than on a pre-existing collection. "It is all about telling the history of Brazil with a broad vision, through football. Similarly, the Museum of Portuguese Language is a museum for the language speakers, enabling a relationship of complicity with the visitor. This is a journalistic and artistic way of doing museology, enriching traditional practices with new technologies and interactive strategies." Today, the Football Museum receives one thousand visitors a day, "an impressive number for a Brazilian museum." The Museum of Portuguese Language is also a huge success with visitors.

The Roberto Marinho Foundation's way of making museums was outlined from these two experiences. It is a new and controversial way, and the state of São Paulo was a pioneer in embracing this kind of institution, which creates its own collection and uses state-of-the-art technology to seduce the public. The success of the two museums in São Paulo led to two other invitations. For example, the Foundation is working on three museums in Rio de Janeiro.

The Rio de Janeiro Art Museum – MAR, in Praça Mauá, will house private collections. It will follow the same journalistic line, promoting dialogues between the communities and the city, the national and the international. Dialogue will be its footprint. Opposite it, the Museum of Tomorrow, a science museum, whose collection will comprise the possibilities of the future, will find its place. Finally, the Museum of Image and Sound, with its huge archive and looking to modernize under the premise of new technologies and proximity to the visitor will, in fact, be a museum of the city of Rio de Janeiro. The documentation center will be digitalized, but MIS will also be a center of cultural production linked to memory.

Just like what was experienced after the speech by Rafael Gioielli, from the Votorantim Institute, Roberto Marinho Foundation's investments left no doubts in the audience as to their coherence and solid basis. However, a certain restlessness and discomfort could be felt among some people in the audience, which became clear with the question raised by Marcelo Araújo, from the Pinacoteca do Estado de São Paulo:

The Museum of Portuguese Language and the Football Museum have addressed a heritage that had not been addressed by any other institution before. The MIS in Rio will see its collection used in the new project. However, in the case of the Museum of Tomorrow and the Rio de Janeiro Art Museum, isn't it paradoxical to have two new museums in the city, while other centennial institutions that are so fundamental to the history of Brazil are not receiving the attention they deserve?

The representative of Roberto Marinho Foundation gave two answers to that question. The first, which he called “simpler”, is that “the Rio de Janeiro Art Museum and the Museum of Tomorrow are part of a project to revitalize the port area of Rio de Janeiro; they are the anchors of this urbanistic project of Rio’s City Hall. The idea is to make a complete renovation of the place and also build hotels, restaurants, etc.” Therefore, yes, there will be positive effects regarding the revitalization of Rio’s historic heritage as a result of the opening of the two new museums. The second answer, which he classified as “complex”, is that scientists involved in these projects are connected to other historical cultural institutions. “In the Museum of Tomorrow project, there are anthropologists from the National Museum, ecologists from the Botanical Garden, astronomers... Several traditional scientific institutions were invited and acknowledged for their participation in the creation of the new institutions. A partnership is expected among all these institutions.” As far as the Rio de Janeiro Art Museum is concerned, “the private collections in Rio de Janeiro, which are among the main ones in the country and that used to be restricted and inaccessible, will now be available to a wider public.” So far, the arguments made sense. But Hugo Sukman’s final sentence was tricky: “Investment in museums is like mother’s love, it never ends, even when it is divided.”

Well, it is not true that “investment in museums never ends, even when it is divided”. Certainly, resources that go to one initiative will be lacking in another. And when funding for the culture sector is scarce, priority for investments must be discussed. Obviously, private investments can go wherever the investor wishes. But public investments, which represent a large portion of the budget of this kind of museum, are a concern of collective interest and must be wisely used. Concerning the Rio de Janeiro Art Museum, for example, many museum professionals are annoyed by the fact that public funds will pay for the construction of an exhibition space that will highlight private collections that will not be donated to the museum. On the contrary, they will continue to belong to the collectors, probably with a higher market value.

A second controversial point that was not discussed in the debate, but was commented upon in the corridors, concern demonization, even if unintentional, of the traditional museum, which owns collections, offers training courses, does research and makes publications. There certainly are old museums without adequate mediation strategies between the public and the institution, with outdated exhibition resources that do not propose new interpretations of their collections. However, while new museums, resembling cultural centers – alive, seductive, high tech, yet possessing no collection – are extolled, traditional museums are automatically devalued, and every effort to rethink them is abandoned, pushing its public even further away.

Finally, it is worth drawing attention to a brief comment by the speaker that should have been explored in greater depth. At the beginning of the panel, Hugo Sukman mentioned the “enormous challenge” that the restoration of Luz Station represented to the Roberto Marinho Foundation. During the debate, he justified the construction of the Rio de

Janeiro Art Museum and the Museu of Tomorrow as strategies for “revitalizing the port area of Rio de Janeiro”. It is quite true that the old centers of many cities – among them São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro – are quite abandoned. American cities are especially susceptible to this process of degradation, as their centers were originally reserved only for economic activities, unlike the Old Continent, where residential buildings are traditionally mixed with commercial buildings in the central areas. In the case of São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro’s centers, in recent decades service and commerce has migrated to newer regions, well-equipped business centers, and shopping centers. Parallel to that, the city has witnessed the proliferation of street vendors fighting for survival, the occupation of empty buildings by citizens facing housing problems, and the departure of the higher socioeconomic classes due to difficulty in parking and the atmosphere of insecurity.

However, the expression “revitalization” should be used in quotes, as it may suggest that central areas are completely dead, as if the people and the practices that exist there should not be taken into consideration. For this very reason, some authors prefer to use the term urban *requalification*, highlighting the importance of taking into account both the history of the place and its diverse users, in order to minimize the exclusionary and authoritarian character of any new initiatives. It is also necessary to prevent such projects – as may be the case of the “Nova Luz” region, where the Museum of Portuguese Language, the Sala São Paulo, and the Pinacoteca are located – from protecting the interests of the real estate sector, eager to increase property value in new areas. As argued by urban planners Cláudia Loureiro and Luis Amorim:

A policy that has impacts on heritage safeguarding would consider [...] a diversity of social classes and [would have] in the public space the means for maximizing interfaces between residents and users. To this end, the municipality would exercise its role as manager of public spaces to allow indiscriminate use by users, fulfilling the law of universal accessibility. The focus of new developments would, therefore, be on contributing to the valuation of the urban environment rather than on the strategy of adding value to real estate developments by means of the appropriation of the imagery related to it. This premise would be based on the incorporation of pre-existing activities and the inclusion of uses suitable to the day-to-day life of current residents as a form of inclusion in the requalification process².

2 LOUREIRO, Claudia; AMORIM, Luis. Vestindo a pele do Cordeiro: requalificação versus gentrificação no Recife. Available at: www.ifch.unicamp.br/ciec/revista/artigos/artigo1.pdf. Accessed on 13 Jan. 2010.

The pioneering contribution of Jane Jacobs to this discussion is worth mentioning: the American author dared to take a stand against the large projects of "orthodox modern urbanism," according to which urban renewal in central areas of cities is based on a clean slate of consolidated urban sectors, replaced by mega-projects with monumental architecture that seek to erase the density and complexity of the metropolis. Jacobs, on the contrary, preaches the need to maintain urban diversity in the center through combined functions and uses of the creation of pathways, the maintenance of varied buildings of different ages, the housing subsidies, among other integrated measures³.

In other words, to effectively "requalify" urban centers, it is necessary to simultaneously promote improved access and circulation in the region, increase job and income generation even for the former occupants of the place, ensure good condition of public spaces and circulation of residents outside commercial hours, restore the entire historical heritage (not just the imposing buildings), and create security conditions that will make all of the above possible⁴.

Therefore, although culture can be – and has been – used as one of the capacities that make it possible to transform and improve the condition of the central areas, cultural institutions alone cannot generate positive, democratic, and long-lasting social impacts. On the contrary, they can actually contribute to prevent such impacts from being achieved. The purpose of this report is not to disagree with the importance of installing museums and concert halls in central areas, but to question the best way to do it, to avoid the propagation of "gentrification" processes in the old centers (replacement of a low-income population by middle and upper class people through evictions, police action and summary eviction). Art museums and other cultural spaces, paradoxically, may end up playing a determining role in these processes⁵.

³ A review of the book *Death and life of great American cities* (1961), by Jane Jacobs, can be read in Portuguese at: <http://www.vitruvius.com.br/revistas/read/resenhasonline/01.001/3259>.

⁴ To learn more about recent urban regeneration processes in Brazil, see VARGAS, Heliana Comin; CASTILHO, Ana Luisa Howard de. *Intervenções em centros urbanos: objetivos, estratégias e resultados*. Barueri: Manole, 2006.

⁵ Eloquent examples of the relationship between art, culture and gentrification in New York City can be found in the article "The fine art of gentrification", by Rosalyn Deutsche, available at: http://www.abcnorio.org/about/history/fine_art.html.

The Museum as a Cultural Center?

Carlos Eduardo Riccioppo

2010

Critical report on the roundtable: "[Being different, making a difference: cultural programming in museums](#)"

After a brief presentation by Claudinéli Moreira Ramos, from the São Paulo State Secretary of Culture, two statements followed – the first by Emanuel Araújo (curator director of the Afro Brazilian Museum) and the second by Camilo Torres (vice-president of Abracirco).

It should be noted that, before starting his presentation, Emanuel Araújo called upon the stage a musical group formed by four refugees from the Belgian Congo who work at the Afro Brazilian Museum – the group paid their musical homage to the museum; at the end of the presentation, during the break of the event, a circus performance by two clowns took place, one of them being Camilo Torres himself. Without dismissing the quality of such presentations, their insertion in the 2nd Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo could well be taken as a prelude to the main issue surrounding the speeches of the two speakers (keeping in mind the differences between them, which will be discussed below), namely: the need for the museums' cultural agenda to address its audience more directly.

Both presentations made clear, in the way they were inserted in the event, a will to demonstrate how much power there would be in artistic interventions that went beyond the traditional modality of art exhibitions in the museum space, calling attention to the possibility that such interventions (of which both presentations were very clear examples) would infuse a kind of "vitality" in that space.

But curiously, in the context of the event, the two presentations seemed to have a somewhat complementary nature, providing moments of diversion from the reflection we, for good or for worse, attempted to develop.

Again, what is at stake here is not the quality of the circus and the musical group performance, but rather to what extent, within that context, their role was one of entertainment very similar to mass entertainment in the sphere of Culture – an event that

would undoubtedly succeed in attracting attention, but an attention that would offer very little reflection to the focused discussion the challenging situation museums find themselves in deserves.

Far from questioning the capacity of a work of art (be it a painting, a play, a musical, a circus performance, etc.) to carry within the possibility of reflecting its own time. We would rather believe that this is the most productive aspect in the contact with these works. But there is no denying the fact that, in recent decades, artistic experiences have been so quickly integrated into an increasingly institutionalized entertainment system, that it has been increasingly difficult for whoever seeks to critically analyze current artistic production to detach it from the functions attached to it by such a system, and approach it as something that possesses some reflective substrate in itself.

What should be asked, from the outset, is to what extent the insertion of those two presentations in the event was not repeating the exact problem of their insertion in the so-called "museums' cultural program": the problem that, regardless of being endowed with great quality, they nevertheless play the inglorious role of a moment of relaxation for, in the case of the event, a discussion that is not immanent to them; and, in the case of museums, of decoys for a space that by itself is not able to attract its public (this, after all, was the current diagnosis regarding museums throughout the event).

Inserted in the program of the 2nd Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo right after the first roundtable in the afternoon, in which the goals of the museums municipalization process on the countryside of the state of São Paulo were presented, this second roundtable, whose main theme was cultural programming in museums, brought to the event the possibility of thinking how the institutions could immediately relate to their audience, which seems to have been the main concern of the two speakers.

Emanoel Araújo, after briefly commenting on the creation of the Afro Brazilian Museum, stated that the greatest difficulty of the institution had always been that, by tackling a delicate subject, often omitted, according to him – the main idea of the project was not to promote an anthropological approach, but to show the black contribution in the Brazilian culture –, the public would tend to distance itself from the institution.

For Emanoel, the museum's activities should consider an involvement with the public, which, for him, would only happen if the exhibitions held there were combined with a series of other events, including courses, lectures, theater and dance performances. Emanoel summarized this in the idea that the museum needed to be thought of as a cultural center.

Camilo Torres' presentation, although brief, regarded the museum space as a dynamic place – again, as a cultural center – and, in this sense, recalled the importance of the circus artist, this "multiple artist", according to him capable of bringing more vitality into the institution, which carried the stigma of being "dead."

One cannot help but notice that although both presenters share the idea that the museum should absorb some of the vitality from the cultural centers, the arguments that lead them to such formulation stem from different and unique trajectories. While Emanoel is concerned about bringing the public to the museum, Camilo seems to be interested in the artist's role before the institution. He also seems to detect a problem of validity in the institution within the context of the contemporary city – which is certainly what moves him towards the idea of the museum as a place haunted by the stigma of being "dead," as mentioned before.

Based on Camilo's brief presentation, it would be worthwhile to think, at this point, to what extent efforts to create an active cultural program within the museum space – even though such efforts prove to be necessary, especially when they are able to agglutinate a certain number of people interested in a formative cultural experience – do not run the risk of concealing a deeper need to question the very status of this type of institution in the current situation, when they only aim at an indiscriminate calling of a public indifferent to the museum's existence (although eager for the possibility of being entertained by the most numerous and exotic events they can find there). Perhaps it would be necessary to consider to what extent the attention given to the institutions' cultural program would try to play a formative role in society, and to what extent it would tend to bridge, inefficiently, a gap that the difficult relationship between some of these institutions and the social space in which they are inserted has only widened – which the injection of "vitality" into the museum space is in no way able to compensate for.

A Past so Close and Yet So Distant

Vinicius Spricigo

2021

Critical Report; synthesis of the [3rd Conference of the Museums](#) of the State of São Paulo: Articulating Territories

Watching retrospectively the debates of the 3rd Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo, held in 2011 at the Memorial of Latin America, can be a way to critically reflect on public policies and the development of the culture sector in the last decade of the 20th century and the first decade of the new millennium. The period coincides with the governments of the Brazilian Social Democratic Party in the state of São Paulo, which began in 1995 with Mário Covas, with brief intervals when the elected officials Geraldo Alckmin and José Serra resigned as governors to run for president in 2006 and 2010, respectively. In the field of culture, the Tucano administrations were responsible for adopting a management model that sought to articulate the public and private sectors. In this articulation, participation of civil society in the cultural sector was increased while that of the public power was reduced. Seen by the critics of neoliberalism as a form of privatization of culture through private management of public institutions, this management model is presented in the SSAMC as a dynamic instrument of modernization of the cultural sector and the management of museums in the state of São Paulo.

In the opening speech of the Conference, whose objective was to collaborate with the development of local museological institutions, there was an emphasis on the dual role of museums: 1. "As a cultural institution which, if well structured and efficiently managed, can contribute to the qualification and vitality of a region"; 2. "As an institution responsible for the preservation of a heritage that must be known and reflected upon in order to be valued." In this sense, the positive vision of the Conference organizers seems to coincide with the political agenda of the state governments, whose priority was focused on "regional development through cultural heritage." Thus, the SSAMC sought to listen to local demands through the presentation of "case studies" and the "creation of specific forums for priority discussions for each museum network." Not by chance, the opening gathered representatives from federal, state and municipal governments, such as the Secretary of Culture of the State of São Paulo, Andrea Matarazzo, the Director of the

Department of Museum Processes, Mário Chagas, representing the Brazilian Institute of Museums and the Ministry of Culture, the Secretary of Culture of São Paulo, Carlos Augusto Calil, representing the mayor Gilberto Kassab, and Claudinéli Moreira Ramos, Coordinator Museum Heritage Preservation Unit (UPPM), from the Secretary of State of São Paulo's City Hall. The celebratory speeches highlighted the professionalization and development of the sector, the protagonism of the state institutions in the regional and national scenario, and even the international aspirations of the cultural complex at Ibirapuera Park, on that occasion inaugurated the Brazilian Cultures Pavilion, housing the collection of the Folklore Research Mission and the former Folklore Museum, and welcomed the Museum of Contemporary Art of the University of São Paulo at its new headquarters in the recently renovated and adapted "Detran building"

The presence of a representative of the federal government functioned as an important counterpoint. Despite the continuity of the PT administration of Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva regarding the neoliberal economic policies of his predecessor, Fernando Henrique Cardoso, the culture sector, between 2002 and 2010, there was a strengthening on the role of the State, beyond fiscal incentive policies.¹ An example of this is the area of museums was the creation, in 2009, of Ibram, which helped formulate specific laws and provide infrastructure for the sector. Representing this Institute, Chagas highlighted "the power of the event and the sector's organizational capacity through the expressive number of people in the audience." Following a line of reasoning that looks at culture beyond institutions, he questioned: "What are museums? Just a word, yet also an institution and a category of thought, a process and social phenomenon, beyond institutions, non-institutionalized processes." Thus understood, cultural territories are not divisions, but points of intersection, "rhizomes," traversed by "lines of force, of resistance, and therefore capable of producing articulations between different territories, people, and cultures [...]." In this strong statement, museums have a "political and poetic" dimension.

Statements like this one, coming from the field of culture, might explain the reason why the ministry was extinct in 2019. The abrupt break with cultural policies for the sector and the health and economic crises arising from the current Covid-19 pandemic seem to have ended a period of development that simultaneously promoted the reflections at the SSAMC and justified its very existence. Not only the reduction in resources and staff but above all the museums closing to the public were challenges impossible to foresee in 2011. Without public support and with the shrinking participation of the private sector,

¹ N.E: In order to deepen the discussion on cultural policies in Brazil, we recommend the reading of the text "Which cultural policies?", by Lúcia Maciel Barbosa de Oliveira. Available at: <http://www.forumpermanente.org/revista/edicao-0/textos/que-politicas-culturais>.

museums find themselves at the crossroads established by this division. Perhaps looking back in retrospect at the debates held at the 3rd SSAMC will help us better understand how we got here and what paths we can take.

Cultural integration in the state of São Paulo

Among the political representatives in the opening ceremony, Matarazzo, together with Ramos, now in the role of mediator, presented, in the first part of the meeting, the organization chart of the State Secretary of Culture, highlighting their actions focused on capacitation of culture agents from the countryside region of the state of São Paulo. These agents are trained to organize projects/events outside the capital as well as to receive initiatives from other cities in the city of São Paulo, as well as to coordinate itinerant exhibitions throughout the countryside region. To achieve this goal, he highlighted the fundamental role of bringing museums together through the System of Museums (Sisem), an association linked to the UPPM that brings together and articulates the state's museums, both public and private.

Along the same line, the following day, dedicated to the sharing of proposals, experiences, and ideas by the cultural agents participating in the SSAMC, was opened with a speech by Renata Motta, director of Sisem. Created by decree in 1986, the system, the first of its kind in Brazil, has sought, since 2008, to reposition itself in light of the development of the museum sector in Brazil and abroad, "aiming to broaden the participation of civil society and museum professionals" through the election of two members of Sisem's guiding council. In this spirit of renewal and democratization, the new legislation would be a milestone, enacted that year, 2011. In addition to social participation in the council, the state's museums adopted a diagnosis to guide and structure the actions of the system, which operates on a large scale (645 municipalities).²

² Contradictorily, according to the study, the precariousness of the system does not correspond to the positive view of public/private management. The mapping was made through visits to the museums, filling out a registration form, photographic records, and the collection of political-administrative, socio-demographic, financial, and historical data. Only 30% of the state's municipalities have museological institutions, and the distribution is concentrated in the east area of the state and in the capital. Two-thirds of the museums are public via direct and indirect administration, and the distribution of employees per institution shows a lack of human resources (most institutions with less than ten employees) and the need for investment in the training of professionals. These institutions also face difficulties in accessing and making their collections available due to lack of systematization; a large part of the museums do not have technical reserves and space for long-term exhibitions, and the lack of space is also an impediment to hosting temporary exhibitions. In addition, more than half of the museums in the state received up to a thousand visitors per month in 2011 and had no digital presence through the Internet for dissemination and communication with the public.

Unlike Chagas', Motta's bureaucratic presentation expresses the understanding of the museum according to the International Council of Museums (Icom), "as a permanent non-profit institution open to the public with the premise of preservation, communication, and research." In her speech, she points out that other para-institutional formats and initiatives, although pertinent, remain outside Sisem. Perhaps precisely because of this marginalization regarding the system, alternative initiatives may indicate possible paths of sustainability for museums in the future and for the promotion of public policies that are more independent from the private sector and from the management models promoted in recent decades.

Museums and cultural identity

Historically in Brazil, we have never paid much attention to the peripheries and the social phenomena and processes as constituents of the institutions. The "poetic and political" dimension of museums pointed out by Chagas was not the focus of the SSAMC, and, once again, the emphasis was on international models. To close the meeting, a conference was given by Ignacio Santos Cidrás, director of Cultural Action of the City of Culture of Galicia, with the project of the City of Culture of Galicia,³ a new public cultural infrastructure "focused on knowledge and contemporary creativity."

Designed by Peter Eisenman (architect chosen through an international competition) as a space dedicated to the preservation of the memory of the community, and also for experimentation, study, and research, the central axis of the project is the cultural identity of Galicia, historically linked to the discovery of the sarcophagus of the Apostle Santiago (a tourist and pilgrimage destination). Thus, the architectural project is related to the Camiño de Santiago (five routes crossing the city towards the cathedral), taking the form of a local symbol, the scallop shell. Despite the grandiloquence and the expenditure of resources, the aim of the project, according to Cidrás, is to strengthen cultural identity, becoming "a nucleus of reflection and renewed discourses about the region's identities for the 21st century. For him, identity is not understood as something hermetic, but rather a process of transformation through time. The cultural objective of the project is politically linked to the autonomy of Galicia, obtained in 1981, with the establishment of its own language, Galician, and the exclusivity of the regional government in the formulation of cultural policies and the management of museums. Certainly, the local museums are the repository of the

³ Located in Santiago de Compostela, capital of Galicia, whose historic city was declared a World Heritage Site by Unesco in 1985. The project included an archive, a library, a museum, a music and performing arts center, an international art center, and a central service building, and began in 2001. The construction of the City of Culture had been going on for a decade by then.

symbols of Galician identity, as pointed out by the director, but the project also seeks interaction with the community through a modern and contemporary profile, with emphasis on citizen participation. Thus, new cultural spaces are created, such as the CGAC – Galician Center of Contemporary Art (Santiago) or the Marco – Museum of Contemporary Art (Vigo). At the end of his presentation, Cidrás states that changes in government led to a political reorientation of the uses of the buildings, and this caused the project to be misunderstood by Galician citizens. It was necessary, therefore, to elaborate a new discourse to change the negative perception of the public regarding the project, prioritizing the artistic manifestations grounded on the Galician identity, "based on the understanding that the project is a key factor for the differentiation and visibility of the Galician mark in the world and, consequently, an asset for the development of the region."

In comparison, it is evident that the administrative and managerial vision presented by politicians and cultural agents from São Paulo leaves aside precisely the cultural aspects central to the Galician project. Although the objectives are similar, namely, regional development through cultural heritage, instead of focusing on social processes and the discussion of cultural identity today, the Tucano administration neglects the "poetic and political" dimensions of culture, thus restricting itself to the management of different cultural institutions and museums. Instead of an international model, federal government programs such as Cultura Viva and the points of culture, which articulate territories, communities, and their cultural identities without the need for architectures in the form of local symbols and signed by celebrities, with decades and large sums of money spent on their building, could have been brought to the discussion. After all, culture understood as a network formed by points of intersection is perhaps a much more interesting image to think about the articulation of territories than a scallop shell that closes in on itself.

Recent Achievements and Current Goals in the Participatory Context of SISEM-SP

Larissa Magioli

2011

Critical report of the roundtable: “Sisem-SP: [“articulating territories”](#) and the lecture [“Presentation of the diagnosis of museums in the State of São Paulo”](#)”

The second day of the 3rd Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo had a morning of data presentations that were intended to address the articulation of museological institutions with the territory and the formation of an interactive network. However, here, the dynamics and enrichment of the experience lived and provided by museums or equivalents formed a basis of speech somewhat distant from the content of the presentation. How to overcome the limits of a brief discussion and yet have a solid proposal reach the public, combined to the somewhat bureaucratic beginning of the work of systematizing information and numbers? During the extensive presentation by Renata Motta, in charge of the State System of Museums of São Paulo, the Sisem-SP, about the project of cataloging the state’s institutions, an overall outlook was presented – a data package that fulfills the formalities – of the purpose of articulating and developing the presence and the role of museums in the cities where they operate and, in the global scenario, how they connect. The intention of having a greater public participation, gradually involving the local population, and creating a closer and more accessible relationship with territory and society is a utopian subject idealized over decades. In the speeches by Renata Motta and Claudinéli Ramos, from UPPM, this strong will appears in several moments, although sometimes detached from a more complex methodology or from investigations that exceed the limits of a substantial systematization. Perhaps this was not the moment. On this occasion, besides the goals at the end of the process, there were discussions concerning the first steps – the starting point of the organization of the systems.

Initially, Renata Motta quickly presented the trajectory of the discussion concerning the articulated system and the importance of modernizing the 1986 decree, which legitimizes the composition of a guiding council for Sisem-SP. Its update, dated June 3, 2011, is

seen as a major step forward towards developments through the presence of museums in the cities, through the legal consolidation of structural actions developed since 2008. The fact is celebrated and it is believed that, based on it, “articulating territories” through museological institutions can be done in a more consistent and organized way. Besides the legislative issue addressed, which will undoubtedly bring benefits from the professional point of view, it is worth asking to what extent this type of measure may represent a significant change in the most present museological experience. Claudinéli Ramos draws attention to the modernization of the decree, because, according to her, it will enable Sisem-SP by means of adequacy vis-à-vis the national and international spheres and, thus, it will have the opportunity to promote the development of the several roles museums play in the region. In such a brief and general way – for all the public or private museological institutions of the State, the maxim is the same –, it is hard to go beyond the speech itself and imagine the Guidance Council will be especially optimized as a result of the legal approval. With these advances, a more efficient organization of events and activities is expected, giving more visibility to the system’s priorities. What is clear is that the main agendas of both UPPM and Sisem-SP are now established according to organizational and functionalist parameters. However, the valid concerns with professionalization and structure in museums seem to project themselves, from the perspective of the State, as too objective and questionable from the point of view of the characteristics and internal particularities of each institution.

Besides the significant and recent fact, the lecture focused on presenting and explaining the process of mapping the museums in the state of São Paulo, which occurred in 2010. This assessment of numbers and data is a tool that can help by offering the necessary subsidies for a general overview of the whole picture. The work developed by the Sisem-SP team so far is all about getting to know itself better. Even though Renata’s speech emphasizes the difficulty of aggregating and articulating information and characteristics of 415 institutions, between public and private, in a network – a concept widely discussed this morning –, the little representation most institutions have always had is very clear – Sisem-SP has existed since 1986 – regarding its own organizing system. The importance of obtaining recent information to begin the drafting of future actions is recognized and the initiative, commendable. However, even this preliminary, almost superficial research, whose aim is to list and categorize according to the clearest of aspects, is capable of surprising lecturers and audience alike, both made up of managers, researchers, and authorities related to museological, cultural and similar institutions. Basic uninformed data, such as the number of pieces in the collection, for example, are the reality of a significant number of institutions in São Paulo, and a sign of neglect towards museums throughout the development of the main cultural policies in the state.

Renata Motta briefly discussed the trajectory of Sisem-SP, especially the actions of recent years, which converge around the state register of museums and the great research that ACAM Portinari developed in 2010. In general, the task of subsidizing the research and dissemination of heritage and cultural debates has been recently faced with a focus on the areas of organization and, in a way, standardization of actions. Since the problem involving the precariousness of information about the museums is clear, the immediate initiative is towards the compilation of data that can efficiently define a functional strategy of operating through a network. Another point highlighted was the need for awareness of scale and focus on the general context as far as structural measures in the public sphere are concerned, so that the coordinating practices are well grounded and have clear objectives. Having said that, the assessment, in the scope of the lectures of The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference, is very welcome, because due to its capacity of mobilizing professionals related to museology, the objective data can be widely communicated. The methodology used by ACAM Portinari to carry out these surveys involved direct visits, producing registration forms organized by categories and photographic records. An important part of this action to be carried out with the municipalities by the end of 2011 is to have these forms permanently available online, thanks to the great capacity of update of virtual media and its public reach capacity. Analysis of the parameters of the form defined for the assessment is still valid, as it demonstrates in a practical way the aspects that Sisem-SP considers priority in order to obtain an image of the context as a whole. Even though it does not produce great conceptual debates at this specific moment of the series of lectures, it helps to ground and promote them in the continuity of the Conference.

Through the focus given to the mapping of the non-profit, widely-open-to-the-public permanent museological institutions, carried out between May and December 2010, some of their aspects were being developed with more impetus. The predominant concept in both Renata's and Claudinéli's speeches is that of articulation. With the assessment in their hands, the intention of promoting different and advanced forms of conventional museum settings, such as itinerant exhibitions, or one-off and long term training courses, shows a symbolic will. One can indeed become more present and active taking as a basis the measures of expansion of the institutions, as proposed. But, what seems to make the most difference is not the measure itself – in this case, widely disseminated and celebrated as contemporary – but the way it is developed in various fields of the cultural industry linked to museums, the way it is conducted.

The proposal through this articulation is that the 415 museological institutions, between public and private, distributed in 190 municipalities across the state, maintain a communication unity between research and activities. Renata does not feel that this will reveal

a tendency towards homogenization and guarantees that within the group, each institution has its unique focus and organization, but together they can operate in a network, according to the requirements noted by Sisem-SP. Even the best possible structure plan is incapable of aligning the yearnings for an ideal museum with the real facts presented.

The transposition of dimensions between managing the isolated unit and working in a system connected among municipalities depends on a significant change of scale and perspective, which becomes essential to effective public management. Even if it is implemented through main action lines, such as the circulation of collections and direct technical assistance, Sisem-SP's main goal is, once again, the programmatic articulation in a network of institutions.

After the explanations about the main motivations and goals of Sisem-SP and UPPM, Renata presented and commented on some figures. In general, it can be said that the present situation does not match at all the expectations regarding the prosperous moment experienced in Brazil. In this sense, the current assessment corroborates the already well-known difficulty of taking advantage of the economic growth and the immediate increase in the purchasing power of a large portion of the population to promote progress related to education and culture. This is the context in which the actions aimed at promoting greater representativeness of museums throughout the state of São Paulo are immersed. The presentation revealed certain optimism in relation to the organization's development, mainly due to Sisem-SP's recent achievements, despite the recognition of the clear difficulties in dealing with the whole group from now on. The distant target is always the ideal – and unique – museum. The "adjustment" sought through the "network" is the image of a cultural institution that is active and inserted in the region, which sounds nice, but lacks tangible proposals. Recurrent targets are the usual itinerant exhibitions, technical consultancies, professional training, etc., which on their own don't seem so robust.

Together with the metropolitan region of São Paulo, the cities of Campinas, Marília, São José do Rio Preto, São José dos Campos and Sorocaba stand out as having the largest number of museological institutions in the state. This type of survey shows little information beyond the numbers; it is unable to explain the difference between the organizations in the municipalities previously mentioned and other less representative regions. Sisem-SP, however, promises to tackle the issue of the absence of guiding councils or any other type of commission qualified to analyze and structure the development line of each of the institutions. The fact that two-thirds of the institutions have no such organization is an example of the current situation. The gap between the existing structures in these cities in relation to the rest of the state, from a qualitative point of view,

would certainly be even greater. In fact, 75% of the institutions have a maximum of ten employees, from basic service workers to technical and administrative staff. This number also explains the lack of courses focused on the museological area, from professional capacitation to research and investigation of the existing institutions.

Concerning the premises in each institution, the mapping of the collections is an interesting aspect. It serves as a warning to hasty conclusions some quantitative data may suggest. The collections that report up to 500 pieces represent 21% of the total, while those with up to a thousand pieces represent 36%, showing that most museum's collections in the state have a maximum of a thousand pieces. According to Renata, this number does point to small collections, yet it should be viewed with some caution, since it can also vary according to the programmatic profile of each institution. One must ponder: further research is necessary. In the programmatic categorization, the survey indicates an absolute majority of museums with a historical and pedagogical profile (50%), followed by institutions related to science, technology and technical skills (15%), and those related to art (12%). However, the biggest surprise is the percentage of institutions that did not inform the number of pieces in their collection. It is amazing that in 25% of the cases this basic data is unknown by the museum administration staff. Moreover, more than half of the units in the proposed network do not have an adequate technical reserve for their collections. It is indeed worrying. And it is in this sense that the survey done in 2010 can find its relevance. It shows that museums need the organization to provide at least proper storage places for the conservation of their pieces. No question about that. Such difficulty of access and documentation represents a huge lack of systematization and organization to be carried out by means of some kind of guiding council, an important aspect, as Renata will make clear.

The presentation shows that Sisem-SP today has plans to implement some good diversified actions, with the intention of articulating the unique museological institutions into a network in which they feed off each other and start working jointly to meet the cultural needs of the state. The plans propose little innovation in the package of measures, although they contain the already mentioned educational activities, distribution of institutional graphic materials, among other similar measures, which are essential to all the different socio-cultural institutions today. The websites comprise one of the fundamental issues to be acted upon immediately, due to its low cost and prompt implementation process. According to data survey, two thirds of the institutions do not exist digitally; they don't even have a blog or news feed. If the idea is to keep the network's structural base connected, building a site that will connect the general information managed by Sisem-SP and by UPPM vis-a-vis the Secretariat of Culture is a basic prerogative to articulation.

And, besides joint work, it is crucial that each museum has its own site, which is expected by the population from the region in which the institution is located.

Another aspect that has been strongly addressed is the physical accessibility of the building. Unlike the online presence of the institutions, it constitutes a more complicated action, requiring higher investments. Nevertheless, democratizing this integration with the general public is part of an ideal and valid conception. And it complies with the objectives presented by Claudinéli Ramos and Renata Motta of architectural and urbanistic integration of the cultural institutions with its surroundings. Based on the reduced number of monthly visits, initiatives can be structured. Most institutions receive up to a thousand visitors a month in total, a very low number. The interlocution with the public and the museums' relation of belonging and democratization are somewhat disconnected from reality. Since the debate today is based on data, this number may represent a summary of how the institutions are represented today, not only in the state of São Paulo, but also throughout Brazil. The organizations responsible for the development of cultural policies should use this reference as a guideline and be capable of interpreting data and proposals appropriate to the context. The articulated insertion of museological institutions is still the current goal.

The Museum as Institution and Research

Carlos Eduardo Riccioppo

2011

Critical report from the roundtable:
[“Museum: territory of research”](#).

Claudinéli Moreira Ramos introduces the guest speakers and, after briefly introducing the theme to be discussed, she defends the need for research by museological institutions on the contents derived from their collections, pointing out that many of them did not include selection criteria; she also affirms the need for museums to set up partnerships with universities, suggesting that the museum should become an extrovert partner for university research. Truths. Or half-truths.

First because sometimes, complaining of “lack of criteria” in the creation of a museum’s collection is merely complaining about the fact that museums are historical things. What, after all, would be the problem of conceiving a museum as an active space or as an aspect of the formation of culture? Mentioning the supposed “lack of criteria” in the creation of the collection of many museums means not to consider the possibility that these museums have often gone through a process of institutionalization imbricated in the cultural formation of the cities. And, thus, to abandon any attempt to think of them as anything more than mere stores of junk to be inventoried and classified.

Needless to say, the second part of the comment perfectly matches the first, both seeking to “solve” once and for all the problem caused by the heavy burden represented by museums as they remain on the shoulders of the State. The claim that research conducted by universities should find in the museum a place for extroversion is promising – after all, who would deny that both institutions often share common interests? What is at stake here is not the moments university research converges with the museum, and vice versa. The question is to what extent the two institutions are regarded from the State’s perspective as two dead weights. The problem of this great insight is that it brings together, in a slant manner, the lack of research in museums (so often pointed out in all the speeches throughout the event) and the inability demonstrated by the universities to bring its discussions into society. The great “discovery” has, let’s be honest, an

ostensibly practical and quick-solution character. But the curious thing is that the presentations – especially those by Clara de Assunção Azevedo, from the Arte do Futebol Brasileiro Institute, and by PhD professor Eduardo Romero, from Unesp, connected to the “Memória Ferroviária” Project – make clear exactly the opposite: that the relationship between university research and reflections about the museum, if it happens, or if it has always happened, happens out of necessity.

There is little to comment on Mariana Rolim’s presentation, which addressed the “Eletromemória” Project. The Project sought to investigate the history of energy in the state of São Paulo, starting from the Fundação Energia e Saneamento, which received, at the time of privatizations, the collections of Sesp, Comgás and Eletropaulo, incorporating 13,500 objects to its collection over time. With at least two spheres of interaction with society (a documentation and research center and the Energy Museum), “Eletromemória” arose from a question about the Foundation’s collection, seeking to find out information on energy. So, two years ago, they hired a history professor and created a research project.

Something different possibly occurred with the “Memória Ferroviária” Project and the activities linked to the “Football Museum”, which apparently did not move towards research, but rather departed from it.

Professor Eduardo Romero, PhD from Unesp, recalled that the “Memória Ferroviária” Project began in 2005 and ended this year, based on the central thesis that the expansion of coffee production would have triggered a railway expansion, which would have enabled the foundation of a number of municipalities. The assets on which the project focused were transferred in 2007 to Iphan, which today has the role of appraising, inspecting, and managing them, but not before they were investigated on the premise that, within history, the companies connected to railroads brought us an image of civilization – the railroad, after all, is a civilizing image, which was established in the 19th century, leading to new patterns of urbanization, such as iron architecture. The project’s objective was to survey the documentation referring to the railroads in the state of São Paulo between 1868 and 1971, and the research was part of a study that sought to consider technology in relation to culture. As we can see, the museum, here, necessarily takes into consideration the urban landscape or everything outside it. Or, more than that, from the very beginning the process of the institutionalization of the museum is not thought out as having the support of a research linked to university, but rather stemming fully from it.

But the case of the Reference Center of the Football Museum, presented by Clara de Assunção Azevedo, seems even more crucial to understand the status of research within the museum. Created in October 2008, the Football Museum is not created of a

collection, but rather from a theme. Therefore, the museum's main exhibition is not, nor is it intended to be, about objects related to football, but rather the idea that Brazil can be understood from football. The case is especially interesting if one can extrapolate a bit stating that the question "should the Football Museum house collections?" is necessarily part of the collection. And Clara reflects about this question quite well, wondering to what extent it would make sense to display the trophies in museums rather than in the clubs that won them. She also recognizes that it is not possible to integrate into the collection the bars where football is discussed, the football fields, and even sociability itself (the very concept of the museum, in this case, resists seeing itself as something separate from the content of its collection).

It seems audacious that a museum should start off not from the premise of safeguarding objects, but from the intention of systematizing, as the speaker says, "a contemporary collection of references." Hence, the attempt to constitute the museum as a place from which one can glimpse the objects, places, and also the personalities and the stories that are grouped under the term "football." Eventually, the whole effort of the Soccer Museum seems to point to a promising possibility of resisting the institutionalization of its object (football), which is approached by the museum not in regards to what it was, but rather in regards to what it is, in its power to still explain aspects of the culture.

Clara says the museum has been accused of allowing itself to be "spectacularized". But therein lies, it seems, its greatest interest: certainly because it encounters an object that is constituted, in good part, by its own character as a spectacle, or, furthermore, because it understands that its object is constituted not only inside stadiums, but also on television, on the radio, in newspapers, etc.; the museum, in this case, admits that it is also part of the spectacle. That is: if there is any desire on the part of this Football Museum to attract its public by means of so-called spectacular solutions - projections, reproductions of films, anthems, cheers by fans -, such desire cannot be expressed without carrying with it some characteristic immanent to soccer itself (in this case, that of perpetuating itself in culture by means of its reproduction, dissemination, etc.).

The confidence of the Football Museum is such that it will not seek support from research; rather, it is a bet on recognizing itself, both as research and as an institution, so that it can even be confused with its object, and, maybe, constitute it.



4th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo

New Palimpsests for Museums in Partnership with Current Civil Society

Marcia Ferran

2021

Synthetic Critical Report of the [4th Conference of the Museums of the State](#) of São Paulo: New Frontiers of Museum Management

While revisiting the rich content produced by the Fórum Permanente, I watched and read the files referring to this 4th SSAMC, focused on *New Frontiers of Museum Management* under the effects of the events of 2020 and 2021. With this emotional mindset, I was especially interested in the video presented by Jorge Melguizo in the lecture “4 museos y medio en el Museu Medellín”¹ and the roundtable *Partnerships Between Museums and Civil Society*.

In his talk, Melguizo explained the historical phases of Medellín, the second most populous city in Colombia, from an urbanistic perspective that is very dear to me. Melguizo uses the idea of *Palimpsest* to talk about the different layers that this city, so stigmatized by violence and drugs, has gone through throughout its history and the resignifications it has gained through innovative management and co-management with urban and cultural policy. There is evidence that the technique used in the original palimpsests accounted for the lack of paper at the time, justifying the need to reuse this tool, or media. So, the solution invented was to remove the original text and write/inscribe over it a new text, thus creating new layers. On the new inscribed text one can see the high-relief marks of the previous inscriptions, because the technique included scraping, which produced grooves on the surface.

¹ Available at: http://www.forumpermanente.org/event_pres/encontros/encontros-paulista-de-museus/iv-encontro-paulista-de-museus/videos/conferencia-201cmuseus-e-cultura-cidada201d-jorge-melguizo.

It is nostalgic to rewind the tape and remember 2012, a phase of opening up to the idea of co-management in different museums was effectively taking its steps and gaining centrality, as shown in Discussion Table 1 - Partnerships Between Museums and Civil Society. Since then, institutions have been hit by all kinds of losses² as rapporteur Ana Luisa Lima had already warned, to the point of the State becoming foreign, if not antagonistic, to the collective-civil interest.

Guilherme Bueno, who was then head of the sculptural Museum of Contemporary Art of Niterói, addressed another interesting experience concerning art museums and their proactivity or resilience in building a perennial relationship with the civil society, unaware of the art codes. Among three guiding sources for MAC, Bueno cited “Milton Santos’ reflections on poverty, citizenship, and urban development”.³ At the same table, Maria Fernanda presented The Museum of the Northeastern Man, alerting to the “stereotyping” of the Northeasterner and stating that undoing these reductionist preconceptions was the museum’s main challenge. In the face of this challenge, the manager presented the initiative of itinerant exhibitions of the collection, decided together with local social groups, thus resulting in different selections at each time. During the Q & A session, a question was asked about what remains of the concept of the museum after the Multiple Project’s itinerancies. Maria Fernanda’s answer was, “The subject prevails above all. We have to think first about the people and then about the objects. All the activities of The Museum of the Northeastern Man share this focus.”

Icom conducted a participatory and collaborative survey in 2019 to update and critically reflect on the potentials and missions of museums. I will use Icom’s idea⁴ of “critical dialogue about pasts and futures” to weave an analogy with the function of the palimpsest. In the Brazilian case, partnerships with civil society are experimentations, almost heroic, and the examples of shared listening and curatorship (as in the case of the Multiple Project of The Museum of the Northeastern Man) inscribe grooves and trails into

² There were museums in need of inventories and mapping of their collections; professional training of employees and directors, elements that concern sustainability and that in terms of French cultural policy parameters mean the “zero degree” or the most basic to enable improvement of the functions of any institution beyond its continuity.

³ Report by Ilana Goldstein.

⁴ From the Icom website, I quote the “edges” of what was being gestated just before Covid-19: “Museums are democratizing, inclusive, and polyphonic spaces that promote critical dialogue about the past and the future. By acknowledging and addressing the conflicts and challenges of the present, they maintain artifacts and specimens in a reliable way for society, safeguard diverse memories for future generations, and ensure equal rights and equal access to heritage for all peoples [...] They are participatory and transparent, and work in active partnership with and for diverse communities [...] in order to contribute to human dignity and social justice, global equity, and planetary well-being.”

the social fabric and geographic space – just like the palimpsest; but these grooves and trails lack continuous oxygenation.¹ In 2019 the SSAMC reinforced the challenging role that museums² can play in the promotion of global equity and well-being cited by Icom, in particular the urgent tasks, which specifically focus on partnerships with civil society. The idea is to consider the marks left by the pilot experiments and the healthy risk as part of a new “collection”: a collection not of objects, but of sensitive, subjective, overlapping layers; to look at these marks as powerful documents containing pre-existing images; to see and hear narratives in fragments, even if momentarily – probably the only possibility in a given moment; to dare expand the museum’s boundaries beyond its walls, accepting the document as a palimpsest in which the preservable objects do not necessarily illustrate a continuous timeline, and this does not mean failure, but a unique power to re-poetize the present itself.

Thus, regarding the missions outlined in this SSAMC, I would like to highlight Melguizo’s question, “what is the museum’s role in a society in conflict?” as a point worth returning to and refining. It seems important to me to return to what came up as the answer³ regarding the mission of the Multiple Project of the Museum of the Man from the Northeast, and that “what matters here is, first of all, the subject”, based on Boaventura Santos’ quote: “The Object is the continuation of the subject by other means”. Maria Fernanda was referring to the dynamics that would change according to cooperative “curatorial” decisions made with each social group addressed by the project. I make a parallel between these social groups and Milton Santos’ idea about the creative and fabulous power of slow men in opaque spaces, which are in general represented by the poorest layers of the population, who live in the outskirts of the city, far from urban investments. It is important to place the “Slow Man”, as proposed by Milton Santos, at the center of museums’ mission, and, for that, dare to offer up experimental projects with civil society. No wonder sustainability, along with the diversity of publics, was the SSAMC theme in 2020.

Drawing a parallel with the recent Brazilian fiction cinema, let us recall the movie *Bacurau* and Melguizo’s question concerning the function or value of a museum in a society in conflict. In that imaginary city’s museum of weapons, the relic weapons of the much stereotyped Northeastern make the insurgence of the residents of that village possible.

1 The system could promote exchanges, capacitation, qualitative monitoring, interviews with the targeted social groups, attempt to obtain collaborative funding per project and per location.

2 Available at: http://www.icom.org.br/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Questionario-do-ICOM-Brasil-sobre-a-nova-definicao_revisao.pptx.pdf.

3 Quoted by Maria Fernanda in her presentation on the Museu do Homem do Nordeste’s Multiples Project.

Those very people had participated in the curatorship of the weapons, and, after experiencing the contempt of the authorities and the outsider visitors, they will be, as in a palimpsest,⁴ covered by marks of both dust and fresh blood, and will continue recounting, for those willing to listen, the local culture with its unique entangled subjects and times.

4 With the impact of 2021, I couldn’t help but intertwine this thread with Doris Salcedo’s 2017 work, supported by the Reyna Sofia Museum, called Palimpsesto. In it, the Colombian artist used the vertical space of the Crystal Palace in Madrid with a horizontal approach, inscribing the names of victims killed at sea on the floor of the exhibition space by means of complex technology. Video available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tt1ieb7v5DY>

Beyond the story

Maurício Topal de Moraes

2012

A critical report on the roundtable: "[Sisem-SP: Balances and Perspectives](#)"

In an article entitled "The trouble with stories", sociologist Charles Tilly addresses the difficulties in teaching sociology, generated by the tendency of students and teachers to frame explanations about social life through simple "stories", which, as such, have very specific causal structures. According to the author, stories necessarily have a limited number of relationships between the characters, be they people or organizations. Assumed to be conscious and self-motivated, the characters perform important actions as a result of their own impulses or deliberations, and the space/time in which they interact is invariably reduced. Everything that happens results directly from their actions, with the exception of accidents, which are regarded as pure chance. Actions satisfy these plausibility rules and produce effects on other characters, who, in turn, maintain that plausibility.

The stories follow the cumulative implications of the actions oriented toward some interesting outcome, or they start off from the interesting outcome to build the narrative based on these specific rules. According to Tilly, such a structure is incompatible with the functioning of social processes. Most of these processes involve indirect, extended, interactive, unintentional, collective, and non-human- environment-mediated "cause-effect" relationships.

The table "Sisem-SP: Balance and Perspectives, and the Launch of the SISEM-SP Website", with Renata Motta, Luiz Mizukami and Neli Viotto, focused on a social process in a form of "network" as the basis for institutional formation of museological activity in the context of the government of the state of São Paulo. Renata Motta, director of Sisem (State System of Museums), begins her presentation by elaborating a historical review of the political organization of culture in the state sphere, of which Sisem is part. Considering this background information, and together with Luiz Mizukami, a member of her technical team, she explains the System's guidelines, objectives, actions, and

perspectives. Finally, Neli Viotto, representative of the regional centers, exposes the implications of the work in Sisem for the countryside institutions and the possibilities generated by it.

The history of the consolidation of a governmental policy for museums in the state, presented by Renata, starts with the creation of the Secretariat of Culture, Sports and Tourism, in 1967, noting that culture did not have a specific secretariat at that time. In 1974, Renata explains, coordinating offices were created for each of the areas, among which was the cultural area. This coordination still demonstrated discrimination between the institutions from the countryside of the state and those from the capital, which were put under the responsibility of different departments. In the following year, culture is grouped with science and technology and separated from sports and tourism, becoming the Secretariat of Culture, Science and Technology. In 1979 a specific secretariat is designated for the area. The creation of a museum system for the state occurred in 1986, and in 2006 the current administrative structure was established. In 2011 the system is renamed Sisem. During her presentation, Renata tries to establish a link between moments throughout this process and events outside cultural institutions or beyond the state scope. The historical unfoldings according to her description do not express the idea of a predefined direction of the agents involved. The facts seem to occur through phenomena established in a complexity of several networks. Despite going through this history in a very concise way, Renata avoids reducing her analysis to the linear structure of the stories, as explained above.

This concept of the historical formation of Sisem is reaffirmed in the description of the guidelines that Renata seeks to clarify or define. As a political proposal for the present time, it is faced with a variety of elements that cannot be reduced to a single category and will only have power through a broad process of negotiation. Thus, all initiatives should be based on this reality. They should also try to make explicit, formalize, and strengthen the processes of training and capacitation, connection, negotiation, and articulation among the elements (museological institutions and technical-administrative staff). Luiz Mizukami, in this sense, collaborates with Renata by presenting some of the actions taken after the 3rd Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo, in 2011. He mentions, for example, the organization of elections to find representations in every Administrative Region of the State, the planning of Sisem's initiatives along with these representations, assessments and advisory services aimed at technical support through qualified professionals, training work through in-presence or remote lectures and courses, and the organization of traveling exhibitions.

Luiz defines the System as a domain of the Secretariat of Culture, whose main goal is the articulation among the museological establishments in the State, be they public or private museums, or culture centers.

Renata also promotes the Sisem website (www.sisemsp.org.br) as an important tool for supporting communication among the organizations or regional representations in the System. She emphasizes the possibility of using this virtual space as a kind of social network by the agents. The site could also allow quick access to information and initiatives concerning Sisem and the participating institutions.

Neli Vitto, coordinator of the Administrative Region of Bauru, explains that Sisem is divided into 15 Administrative Regions and, according to her, their elected representatives periodically organize regional meetings focused on local articulation. She highlights the value of the communication and assistance channels established by the System, adequate to meet the specific demands of each different region in the state. She also mentions the importance and the concrete benefits, for the countryside regions of the state, brought by the interlocution established with the capital, besides the articulation created within the Administrative Regions or between them, with the support of Sisem. In this perspective, Neli reports her practical experiences working in the System, using several examples to explain the work process developed.

According to the content exposed by the three participants at this table, it is possible to recognize the existence of a central concern in regards to objectivity, explicitness or formalization of the means that foster and allow the creation of a network among institutions. This structure would allow the public power to concatenate the set of actions into a desired goal. It would also face the public power with the need to negotiate with the several elements involved and formalize its own administrative procedures. In this way, the communicators at this table emphasize the need for a collective work through mutually beneficial associations. However, as it could be inferred from Tilly's criticism, presented earlier, about the incompatible structure of simple stories with the complexity of the social process, any initiative in the political sphere would need to be produced according to the multiplicity of connections and negotiations among diverse social elements. The specificity in the case of the procedures presented by the table speakers lies in the commitment to the analysis, explicitness, and regulation of these works, which not only result in the possibility of their evaluation, but also constitute the core of an inclusive policy. By creating objective and clear procedural norms, public policy can remain accessible to the entry of new agents and exposed to the critical analysis of those who are subjected to it.

Finally, Renata's understanding of the history of cultural policy belongs to this practical context, which, despite being quite succinct, is far from being a simple-structured story, perceived by Tilly as recurrent in explanatory discourses, including the ones in the academic sphere. Directly involved with the needs of concrete political solutions, the participants at this table take advantage of the privileged position they occupy to understand and describe the functioning of social processes and adequately expose the needs, solutions, and objectives of the work developed by Sisem.

Tilly's article was published in PESCOSOLIDO, Bernice; AMINZADE, Ronald. The social worlds of higher education. California: Sage Publications. 1999. p. 256-270.

Democratizing Access to Museums: Experiences and Impasses

Ilana Seltzer Goldstein

2012

Critical report on the roundtable: Museums and
Social Inclusion

Preamble: what social inclusion are we talking about?

In the last decade, the expression “social inclusion” has been used both recurrently and inaccurately, especially in discussions about sustainable development, within the scope of public policies and in the Third Sector. However, in the opinion of the speaker, perhaps it is not the most adequate to designate the desire to build an egalitarian society. Because, if every human being already lives within a given society, interacting with others, playing social roles, sharing values, no one needs to be socially “included”.

Regardless of physical, ethnic, and socioeconomic conditions, an individual’s ability to fully function as human occurs through the process of socialization. One cannot imagine a human being who is not shaped by a specific culture, whose rules he/she has internalized and whose symbols he/she has learned to interpret. As anthropologist Clifford Geertz¹ wrote, if people were not part of a given society, they would behave chaotically, almost like wild animals. Our behavior programs are dictated less by our DNA than by our social interactions. We learn most of what we need in order to interact with our fellows, to express our emotions, and to fulfill our needs.

Thus, those who work with cultural management or with public policies could, rather than talk about “social inclusion”, simply refer to the democratization of access to certain goods and services. This would reduce the risk of underestimating the knowledge and practices of groups that do not have access to these goods and services; it would help avoid the idea that they are “excluded” from society – a statement that, from an

1 GEERTZ, Clifford. A interpretação das culturas. Rio de Janeiro: Guanabara, 1989.

anthropological point of view, makes no sense. However, it would not stop us from recognizing that their rights are not being fully guaranteed and that inequalities of access to health services, leisure facilities, justice mechanisms, and to the education system need to be fought relentlessly.

The mediator of roundtable n. 3, entitled “Museums and Social Inclusion”, gave an opening speech in which she strongly regretted that those who do not have good financial conditions, besides the elderly, the black, and the handicapped, have few opportunities in our country. Maria Inês Coutinho presented impressive data. Ten percent of the world population has some kind of disability – 400 million people in developing countries. The Mara Gabrilli Institute recently announced that there are 1.5 million people with disabilities in Brazil. However, according to the table’s mediator, only as few as six different cultural institutions in the state of São Paulo are prepared to receive people with disabilities.

Maria Inês Coutinho reminded that artistic-cultural activities are essential for the quality of life and integration of people with disabilities. The possibilities go far beyond what common sense imagines. She mentioned, for example, the case of the French-Slovenian photographer Eugen Bavcar, highly acclaimed by critics and collectors. Despite being blind, Bavcar creates beautiful images using verbal descriptions from collaborators.

Curiously, none of the other speakers that day returned to the theme of disability. In fact, when answering questions from the audience, at the end, Maria Fernanda Pinheiro, from The Museum of the Northeastern Man, and Guilherme Bueno, from the Museum of Contemporary Art of Niterói, admitted that there are no specific projects in their organizations aimed at people with disabilities. Guilherme explained: “Initiatives for special publics are one-off events. The Museum is passive, only receiving groups that request special visits. We still need to adapt spaces. The access is made by ramps, there are wheelchairs available, but there is no access to underground floors. The building is a heritage building, so budget and projects have to be approved by Iphan and the City Hall. The bureaucracy is an obstacle. Maria Fernanda, in turn, said, “The Museum has some activities oriented to this public, yet it is not pro-active. The building is partially accessible; the problem is not fully solved.”

Rather than only representing incoherence in the organization of the Conference, it is precisely a consequence of the inaccurate use of the concept of “social inclusion”, which ends up functioning as an umbrella for problems and proposals completely different from one another. The term “social inclusion”, widely used in museums today, could refer to access for disabled people; income generated through artistic-cultural activities; inclusion of black people and women in the staff; inclusion of social and political themes

in the cultural programs; low-price or free-of-charge events to attract people from the lower classes; or the creation of activities outside the museum's walls, organized within the boundaries of vulnerable communities in order to conquer new audiences and, mainly, to exhibit a socially responsible attitude. The last initiative seemed to be more emphasized in the speeches of the two participants of the third table of The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference.

The Museum of the Northeastern Man (or Men): a vision of an identity both plural and dynamic

After the table's mediator, Maria Fernanda Pinheiro, museology coordinator at The Museum of the Northeastern Man, was the first to speak. This museum is an anthropology museum created by Gilberto Freyre, who was inspired by Franz Boas, a cultural anthropologist from the beginning of the 20th century and pioneer in rejecting biological models to explain human societies. For this very reason, this anthropological museum, linked to the Joaquim Nabuco Foundation, does not house bones, only artifacts related to the material culture of the northeast region.

One of the assumptions of The Museum of the Northeastern Man, according to Maria Fernanda Pinheiro, is that there is no Northeasterner, but rather Northeasterners: multiple, diverse. "The real Northeast is different from the folklorized one, reproduced by the media, hostile to the accelerations of memory," said the speaker. "Preserving memory does not mean denying the ongoing changes in the region. The real Northeasterners must choose whether they prefer to be represented as being always confined in the imagined territories of religious people, *cangaceiros* and drought. In the northeast, there is both rain and change," she provoked.

As Maria Fernanda explained, the museology of the institution rests on the desire to "restore the history of the objects in the collection." The speaker recalled a phrase by Boaventura dos Santos that synthesizes this idea in a poetic way: "the object is the continuation of the subjects by other means." Guided by this principle, a project called "Multiple Museum" was created, which covers the nine northeastern states registering their cultural diversity.

The first step of the methodology consists in talking to the communities in previously chosen locations. The second step is to propose an exhibition jointly organized with the residents of the community, in that location, about the northeast. This way, people can reconstruct their memory, their sense of belonging and identity as they make choices and recount what they know about those images and themes.

In principle, the idea is very good as it updates and broadens the range of interpretations of The Museum of the Northeastern Man's collections. However, only banners and panels with photographic reproductions of the collection are brought to the museum, rather than the actual pieces. Also, it was not clear if the community can choose what they want to have on the banners or if those are previously prepared.

The lecturer explained that the Multiple Museum Project started with the Ilê Axé Ijexá Orixá Olufon candomblé grounds in Itabuna. The babalorixá (spiritual leader in the African tradition) was invited to an advanced seminar on social museology, in which he gave a lecture called "Ethnography seen by the ethnographed." This is when he was invited. He talked to the community, which embraced the idea. Then the museum team spent a week at the *terreiro* (meeting place), participating in its daily life and setting up the exhibition which was on display for three months. During this period, the *terreiro* received visitors, schools and, according to Maria Fernanda, "effectively played the role of a museum or, in other words, a role of mediation between society and heritage and memory. The exhibition was visited by many people who were previously prejudiced against the *terreiro*. At the same time, a desire arose within the *terreiro* to have its own museum in the future. In the words of Maria Fernanda, "her vision of what a museum is – as a place capable of incorporating experiences – changed with this project."

A second experience took place at the Bom Pastor Women's Penal Colony in Recife. The choice of a prison is explained by the contrast it would pose with the harmony that exists in the *terreiro*. Maria Fernanda Pinheiro and the museum's anthropologist were introduced to five inmate leaders. Some of them were allowed to visit the museum. Afterwards, the inmates asked to be offered a photography course, and the museum hired a photographer from Rio de Janeiro who had already worked with prison photography. The inmates also requested help to organize a fashion show, to which a professional stylist was invited. It was clear that the issue of self-representation was critical for the prisoners, who needed to see themselves in the photos as well as explore their femininity.

In the opinion of this speaker, The Museum of the Northeastern Man makes a right decision when it rejects generalizations and stereotypes, and does not favor a few heroic protagonists, seeking, on the contrary, to represent a myriad of practices, representations, and socio-cultural environments. Disseminating Afro-Brazilian traditions in Itabuna to people who don't normally go to *terreiros* is a way of democratizing cultural heritage. To explore identity and self-representation – the focus of the initiative conducted in the penal colony – is an attribution highly cherished by the traditional museum.

In addition, three sets of questions emerged during the museologist's speech. I had no answers for them, but I think it is relevant to share them with the reader.

1. Is the role of a museum completely flexible or should it have a delimited range of action? To what extent is organizing a fashion show the role of a publicly funded anthropological museum? Shouldn't this kind of initiative be carried out by another kind of institution?
2. To what extent do the initiatives of the Multiple Museum Project carried out outside the walls of the institution generate transformations in The Museum of the Northeastern Man? Would such initiatives make more sense if they were musealized in some way, in the form of texts and videos exhibited together with the collection of objects? Or can the mere fact that members of the museum staff have had such experiences be considered as a trigger to medium-term changes in what concerns exhibiting and interpreting the objects inside the museum?
3. Did the members of the *terreiro* community start visiting other museums after participating in the Multiple Project? And did the prisoners have a different vision of what a museum is or of what cultural heritage is? In other words, besides having developed social responsibility initiatives, did the museum promote any museological interest in the project's beneficiaries?

The reader will notice below that practically the same questions apply to the initiatives presented by the second speaker.

If Mohammed does not go to the mountain... Initiatives Beyond the Walls of the Museum of Contemporary Art of Niterói

According to its director, Guilherme Bueno, the Museum of Contemporary Art of Niterói was created in 1996 "to strengthen the city's self-esteem, which has its identity permanently confronted with that of Rio de Janeiro." It houses, on one side, João Sattamini's collection, and, on the other side, a public collection, which has been built since the museum's inauguration.

Bueno said that, "the impact of the museum's implementation on tourism and the economy was considerable. Not only is a heritage exhibited, but relationships with the culture and the surroundings are also established. The architectural project is by Oscar Niemeyer and the building, which is located on top of a hill, resembles a flying saucer.

Surrounded by a water mirror, it creates a dialogue with the vastness of the sea just ahead. The natural and architectural landscapes undoubtedly help to attract visitors.

The educational sector of the Museum of Contemporary Art of Niterói had its guidelines defined by Guilherme Vergara, who was for many years the director of the Education Department and later became general director of the Museum. One of the pillars is the link between art and socio-environmental initiatives. Guilherme Bueno explained:

There is a poor community near the Museum. The Health Secretariat used to bring the Family Health Program there. We decided to do something similar by taking art to these neighborhoods. At the same time, we wanted to raise environmental awareness.

According to the speaker, the theoretical references for the development of the initiatives came from three sources: discussions about overcoming the passive relationship between work and audience, which characterizes contemporary art; readings about education, freedom, and autonomy by Paulo Freire; and reflections about poverty, citizenship and urban development by Milton Santos.

To bring the museum closer to the surrounding community, workshops on neoconcrete games (interactive games based on works from João Sattamini's collection), recycled paper, landscaping and gardening have been offered to youngsters from Morro do Palácio since 2000. The only requirement was that they were enrolled in formal school. In 2008, a bigger step was taken. The Community Action Module, designed by Niemeyer and financed by BNDES, was built on top of the hill. Recycled paper workshops are held there, with the purpose of "poetic activation of handcraft", according to the speaker. "The objects produced in the workshops are sold, combining creativity with income generation and environmental awareness."² Other activities offered at the Community Action Module are singing, guitar playing, silk-screen printing, creative writing, graffiti, and photography, along with a library and a computer room.

² More information about the Community Action Module at Morro do Palácio can be found at: <http://modulodeacaocomunitaria.blogspot.com.br/p/historico.html>. Accessed on 7 Jul. 2012.

Answering a question from the audience, at the end of the roundtable, Guilherme clarified that the professionals who work at “*Maquinho*”, nickname of the Community Action Module, are paid by the City Hall. Another way to finance the projects is through prizes and competitions. In addition, the Association of Friends of the Museum funds special initiatives and building work. In fact, they were extremely necessary in 2010 and 2011: due to landslides on the Morro do Palácio hills, the building was closed for almost two years. It has now been reactivated.

A second initiative by Beyond the Walls of MAC-Niterói resulted from a *partnership* with the Norwegian organization Kultur.Akershus. In 2010, it was proposed to the residents of Morro do Estado that they transformed the façades of their houses and developed a landscaping project in the community. All interventions were designed and executed by the residents themselves. For the first time, the numbering of houses was introduced, which made it possible for them to receive their mail from the postman’s hands. “This is a way in which the museum gives visibility to citizens and provokes transformation in the city,” reflected Guilherme Bueno. For him, the only drawback was the project’s duration: only two weeks of work in Morro do Estado – apparently too short a period to leave lasting effects. The same fear was shared by some residents, whose testimonials can be found in a video documentation of the project³.

Guilherme also mentioned a third democratization initiative by MAC-Niterói: a line of publications called “Pocket Monographs”, whose books are available for free download at the museum’s website.

The specificity of “social inclusion” actions in museums: an open question

At the end of his speech, Guilherme Bueno insisted that it is necessary to re-discuss the role of museums, to find new functions for them and to abandon an elitist position. This has certainly been happening, and not only with MAC-Niterói. The very definitions of museum have changed significantly in the last two decades.

It relevant at this point to revisit two definitions: an international and a national one. First, the definition approved by Icom’s 20th General Assembly, in Barcelona, July 2001: a museum is

³ A video recording the unfolding of the project is available at: http://carvalho.multiply.com/video/item/923/Arte_no_Morro_do_Estado?&show_interstitial=1&u=%2Fvideo%2Fitem. Accessed on 7 Sep. 2012.

[...] a permanent, non-profit institution, at the service of society and its development, open to the public, which acquires, preserves, researches, disseminates, and exhibits the material testimonies of man and his environment, for the education and enjoyment of society.

Iphan’s definition, published in October 2006, addresses in more detail the dimensions of democratization and “inclusion”.

The museum is an institution with its own legal personality or linked to another institution with legal personality, open to the public, at the service of society and its development, with the following characteristics

- I - the permanent work with cultural heritage, in its various manifestations;
- II - the presence of collections and exhibitions placed at the service of society with the objective of providing the expansion of the field of possibilities for identity construction, critical perception of reality, production of knowledge, and leisure opportunities;
- III - the use of cultural heritage as an educational, tourism, and social inclusion resource;
- IV - the vocation for communication, exhibition, documentation, research, interpretation, and preservation of cultural heritage in their various manifestations;
- V - the democratization of access, use and production of cultural assets for the promotion of human dignity;
- VI - the creation of democratic and diversified spaces for cultural relations and mediation, be they physical or virtual.

It is clear, therefore, that “social inclusion” and the democratization of access have become real flagships in the 21st century museum. If, on the one hand, this represents an advance, in the sense of admitting that the inequalities present in society are also reflected in the appropriation of cultural heritage, on the other hand, it seems that when it comes to defining methodologies and specific strategies for museological institutions, we are still groping.

It was not clear to the audience at this roundtable how paper-recycling workshops, developed by Museum of Contemporary Art of Niterói with youngsters from the *favela*, differ from workshops offered by any other Third Sector entities; or why the fashion show organized by The Museum of the Northeastern Man with female inmates could not have been supported by a clothing company owning a corporate social responsibility institute. In short: how unique are the “inclusion” initiatives carried out by museums and how can these actions be coherently aligned with the triple vocation of museums: collection preservation, research, and communication?

I had the confirmation that I was not the only one concerned about this issue when Mila Chiovatto, from the audience, asked Maria Fernanda Pinheiro: “What remains of the Museum of the Northeastern Man in the initiatives of the Multiple Museum Project?” To which Maria Fernanda’s answer was: “The subject prevails above all. We must first think about people and then about objects. All the activities of the Museum of the Northeast share this focus.” Time was running out, or I would have continued Mila Chiovatto’s provocation: “In what way is The Museum of the Northeastern Man transformed after each edition of the Multiple Museum Project? Do the explanations of the objects incorporate the testimonies collected in its field incursions? Do photographs and videos produced in the communities become part of the exhibition route? From what was said in the roundtable, I am almost sure that the answers would be no, no, and no.

I asked Guilherme Bueno what the adhesion of the residents of Morro do Palácio to “*Maquinho*” was like, and if they took up visiting the Museum of Contemporary Art’s headquarters, in the asphalt. To which Guilherme answered: “There was a great adhesion in the community. And some of the former participants of the workshops are now part of the Museum’s staff. But the truth is that attendance by residents of the Morro is still primarily through the workshops; there is no spontaneous attendance by the public from the community.” Another person from the audience asked if, in Morro do Estado, the beneficiaries of the “Colorful Ways” project took to visiting the Museum. Guilherme only answered that, “one of the activities to sensitize the community leaders, at the beginning of the project, was a guided visit to the Museum.”

The “social inclusion” initiatives described in this roundtable are commendable and deserve to be widely disseminated. However, there is still a long path ahead towards strategies that will cause impact within the museums, bringing them new audiences and new forms of co-curation as well as new interpretations of objects.



5th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo

Museums and Cultural Policies: A Territory in Dispute

Leonardo da Silva de Assis

2021

Critical Report; synthesis of the [5th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo](#): The Adhesion of the State of São Paulo to the National System of Culture and the Sectorial Policy of Museums

The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference (SSAMC) is one of the main events in the area in the state of São Paulo. Since 2009, the SSAMC expands the collaboration and interlocution network of São Paulo museums and brings the experiences of professionals from Brazil and from the international scenario to a large audience, aiming to debate subjects of interest to Brazilian museological institutions.

Two important points were addressed at the 5th SSAMC: the integration of the cultural policies of the museums of the state of São Paulo to the federal proposals, with the National System of Culture and the Sectorial Policy of Museums; the transition to the UPPM's and Sisem-SP's new executive board. The event was attended by mayors, secretaries and culture directors, museum professionals, as well as people who work in cultural institutions, such as librarians, archivists, agents, and students from the state of São Paulo and other states.

The "Opening Table" at the 5th SSAMC guided the whole event and brought a political map of the time. It had the participation of Marcelo Mattos Araújo, the São Paulo State Culture Secretary, Valério Benfica, head of the São Paulo regional representation of the Ministry of Culture, representing the Minister of Culture Marta Suplicy, Renata Motta, coordinator of the Museum Heritage Preservation Unit, Jorge Schwartz, representing the Brazilian Institute of Museums (Ibram), Afonso Luz, representing Juca Ferreira, Municipal Secretary of Culture of São Paulo, Luiz Coradazzi, from the British Council in Brazil, and João Batista de Andrade, from the Memorial of Latin America Foundation. Valério Benfica, representing MinC, mentioned in his speech that the state of São Paulo was now a

partner in the construction of public policies for culture. He also reinforced the commitment of the State employing partnerships and the installation of culture points. Finally, he indicated that the city of São Paulo, with Juca Ferreira as the Municipal Secretary of Culture, would adhere to the National System of Culture.

Marcelo Mattos Araújo, Secretary of Culture of the State of São Paulo, began his speech by saying that The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference is a privileged space for the exchange of discussions and experiences regarding São Paulo museums. Also, that the SSAMC is a reflection of SEC-SP's improved internal processes, visible in the quality of services provided to the population as far as cultural programs and different institutions are concerned. As an example of these advances in SEC-SP's internal work, Marcelo Araújo mentions the increase in the number of people visiting museums in the state of São Paulo, the work done beyond the walls of the museums with the participation of the communities, the progress on the issue of accessibility, and the creation of Proac lines to support collections – preservation and promotion. Finally, Marcelo Araújo explained that it is vital that museological issues are included in municipal, state, and national cultural policies.

The table "Public Policies for Museums in the Federative Context" followed the proposal suggested by the opening table. The discussion had the participation of Antonio Sartini (mediator), Renata Motta (coordinator of UPPM), and Afonso Luz (director of the Museum of the City of São Paulo, representing the municipal secretary of Culture, Juca Ferreira). Renata Motta spoke about a proposal to organize the three federative spheres, from the perspective of the National System of Culture, considering the specific participation of the state of São Paulo in this context. Renata Motta explained how UPPM was organized at that moment, describing the Unit's values and mission. In addition, she reinforced the evaluation and monitoring work that is done by SEC-SP in the social organizations (SO) and in the museums that make up Sisem-SP.

Afonso Luz's speech focused on his experiences with Federal Government bodies, to which he was connected in previous administrations at the MinC. His speech addressed the creation of Iphan and Ibram. According to him, Iphan was created out of polarization among intellectuals in the country, with a nationalist perspective that became established in the Estado Novo. Therefore, the discussion surrounding the creation of the National System of Culture concerned the question of whether the System should be Nationalist or Federalist. He pointed out that the first proposal of the National System of Culture was oriented towards a nationalist system, but by the end of the Lula administration, it had become federalist. As for São Paulo, Afonso Luz says the state has a privileged and unique condition in the area of culture. For him, as the Secretary of Culture

comes from the museum sector, he naturally directs negotiations towards it. Afonso ends his speech touching on the issue of discontinuity of public policies in the field of Culture. He also states that Brazil is unable to make a public policy for public collecting; that is, the country is unable to make its collections international.

The table “Museums and the Strengthening of Social Relations: How to Engage the Community in the Museums’ Cause” had the participation of Janet Vitmayer, director of the Horniman Museum in London. In summary, she discussed the engagement of people in Horniman Museum’s programs and activities. She explained that the museum’s programs aim to create initiatives involving works with ethnic, socioeconomic, gender, and age mixtures; and the method to evaluate people’s engagement in the museum’s proposals is the elaboration of questionnaires, which should seek to find out how employees have adopted the vision and values proposed in the programs carried out by the institution. For Janet Vitmayer, the Horniman Museum creates a museum that people want to visit again. This work is done by listening to the community.

The roundtables “Public Policies for Museums and Their Various Actors” and “Thematic Contributions: Education in Museums” discussed the work of the educational sectors in museums. The first presented cases and the national museum programs. The second presented the work of Ceca-Brazil, Icon’s Committee of Education and Cultural Action in Brazil. It is interesting to note that in this table Adriana Mortara, coordinator of Ceca-Brazil then, indicated that the group worked to give support to the educators, to register and establish something in common among all of them. The idea here was to avoid the impression that educational work would always start from scratch.

Regarding the “selected panels”, it is known that The State of São Paulo’s Annual Museum Conference uses these meetings with the museum community of the state of São Paulo to show cases of success in order to give visibility to the projects and also to build a culture of engagement among the museums participating in the event so that other museums in the state will also be willing to create their projects and share their experiences to a larger audience in the future SSAMCs. The main theme presented in the tables was the creation of proposals for museums’ involvement in the life of the communities.

The table “The Icom International Conference in Rio de Janeiro, 2013” was a call for the event, which took place in August of that year. This intervention by Icom at the 5th SSAMC is unique. The call for such an event m

arks another level of discussions about museums in Brazil, which placed the country in Icom’s global debate. Maria Inês Mantovani and Carlos Brandão made an invitation to the event and presented an overview of the conference program. It is worth pointing out

that the fact the Icom conference was being held at that moment also indicated a confluence of cultural policy interests at the time. In other words, a major event in the area of museums that was taking place in Brazil, helped by a political environment favorable to such an endeavor.

The discussion on “Thematic Contributions: Safety of Museological Heritage” dealt with the topic of safety in museums well before the catastrophic fire that hit the Simon Bolivar Auditorium (2013) – the traditional venue for The State of São Paulo’s Annual Museum Conference –, the Museum of Portuguese Language in São Paulo (2015) and the National Museum in Rio de Janeiro (2018). This theme, addressed by the 5th SSAMC, showed the importance of discussing museum safety before the occurrence of such disasters. This only confirms The State of São Paulo’s Annual Museum Conference was at the forefront of discussions.

Finally, the table “Presentation of the 2012 Balance Sheets and Perspectives of Sisem-SP” and the “Closing Plenary” of the 5th SSAMC discussed issues pertinent to the Conference with emphasis on the UPPM and Sisem-SP executive board transition. Internally, both Sisem-SP and the UPPM were going through administrative changes. Renata Motta became coordinator of UPPM, and Davidson Panis Kaseker, coordinator of Sisem-SP. The highlight of these tables was that the new UPPM directors would give continuity to the previous administration’s work, with a stronger presence of the UPPM’s technical group. In addition, new lines of support would be opened for museums under Proac, and the work with regional representations and thematic networks would be intensified.

Considerations

The 5th SSAMC brought to the tables and debates an alignment of cultural policies at federal, state, and municipal levels. However, adhesion of the State of São Paulo to the National System of Culture is a moment marked by political, theoretical, and conceptual clashes in the field of culture. We can make an analogy with a war field, in which the dispute for territories is necessary to advance in the conquest of institutions. This discussion is present in cultural policies, as thoroughly discussed by Unesco (1969; 1982), Néstor García Canclini (1987), Teixeira Coelho (2004), Michel de Certeau (1995; 1998), Jim McGuigan (1996), Toby Miller, and George Yúdice (2004).

Since 2003 there had been a continuous federal political administration that proposed to unify issues related to Culture in Brazilian states and municipalities. In 2010 this proposal became concrete with the National Culture Plan (PNC), through Law n. 12.343/2010. This plan indicated the National System of Culture (SNC) as its main articulator. The SNC

would directly affect the federated entities in the execution of their cultural policies regarding the transfer of resources, funding, and execution of projects. This postponement of the participation of the state of São Paulo in federal policies in the field of Culture, which was exposed in the 5th SSAMC (held in 2013), deserves attention.

The state of São Paulo, through the State Secretariat of Culture, performed robust work in this area. It is worth mentioning that the Secretariat attempted to create cultural policies, in its different historical moments, that were coherent with the political positions of each administration. With this, the cultural policies elaborated in the state of São Paulo have taken shape over the years. What is demonstrated at this moment of the 5th SSAMC is that there was a new political organization, especially in the federal sphere, which created legal mechanisms to intervene in the cultural policies carried out in the states. These interferences include, for example, the transfer of funds, budgets, the signing of partnerships, and participation in public notices. When the PNC was launched, we saw that some cultural institutions in the state of São Paulo were against such binding conditions imposed by the cultural policies elaborated by the Federal Government. We have the case of Masp and Pinacoteca, which became centers of resistance between the cultural policies of the state of São Paulo and those elaborated at the federal level. When the 5th SSAMC was held, these discussions were fragmented, mainly because of the cultural institutions of the state of São Paulo that wanted to participate in the proposals disseminated by the federal sphere.

This situation led to a dispute, a loss of territory in this battlefield of cultural policies, which caused the state of São Paulo to participate in the initiatives proposed by the Federal Government in the field of culture. What the State Secretary of Culture of São Paulo did was to look for loopholes within its cultural policies in order to participate in the initiatives proposed by the Federal Government. And this is reflected in the 5th SSAMC in the museum's clear interest in participating in the National System of Culture and in the elaboration of a Sectorial Policy for Museums.

The result of this moment of clash of cultural policies between state and Federation is that the state of São Paulo compromised on some points of its policies in order to participate in what had been structured in the field of Culture by the Federal Government. What becomes evident is that there was this clash of cultural policies between the São Paulo State Government and the management of the Ministry of Culture. The 5th SSAMC demonstrates this and, at the same time, shows a political environment propitious for the confluence of interests of the different spheres of power and their political preferences.

References

CERTEAU, Michel de. *A cultura no plural*. Campinas: Papius, 1995.

CERTEAU, Michel de. *A invenção do cotidiano*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1998.

GARCÍA CANCLINI, Néstor (ed.). *Políticas culturales en América Latina*. 2. ed. Barcelona: Grijalbo, 1987.

MCGUIGAN, Jim. *Culture and the public sphere*. London: Routledge, 1996.

MILLER, Toby; YÚDICE, George. *Política Cultural*. Barcelona: Gedisa, 2004.

TEIXEIRA COELHO. *Dicionário crítico de política cultural: cultura and imaginário*. 3. ed. São Paulo: Iluminuras, 2004.

UNESCO. *Cultural policy: a preliminary study*. Paris: UNESCO, 1969.

UNESCO. *Declaración de México sobre las Políticas Culturales* (1982). Mexico, DF. Available at: http://portal.unesco.org/culture/es/files/35197/11919413801mexico_sp.pdf/mexico_sp.pdf. Accessed on 29 Jun. 2014.

Thinking About Public Policies: New Models, New Institutions, New Systems

Ana Avelar

2013

Critical report of the roundtable “[Public Policies for Museums in the Federative Context](#)”

Antônio Carlos Sartini, director of the Museum of Portuguese Language, introduces the table formed by Afonso Luz, director of the Museum of the City of São Paulo, and Renata Motta, coordinator of the Museum Heritage Preservation Unit - UPPM, during the 5th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo. Sartini comments on the great adherence to the event and highlights the importance that museums have been gaining within the cultural policies in the last few years. He also reminds us that the state of São Paulo will join the national culture system.

Renata Motta, before starting her speech, gives some information about the structure and organization of the 5th Conference. She explains why it is necessary to organize the three federal spheres for the consolidation of the national system of culture and the specific participation of São Paulo in this context. She observes that the transition of the Brazilian Institute of Museums - Ibram has not yet been consolidated, which made it impossible for a representative of the Institute to attend the event. Besides, she informs that her speech will be complemented by the session on the evaluation of the activities of the technical group of the State System of Museums of São Paulo - Sisem.

Renata goes on to discuss how the administration of museums in the state works and how the various entities linked to this administration relate to each other – a complex network connecting the various institutions. She also explains the principles on which the different spheres operate: the constitutional mission (that guarantees cultural rights to citizens), which has governed the structuring of the cultural sector in Brazil (the State Secretary of Culture – SEC can formulate public policies aiming at achieving excellence in the preservation of the cultural heritage and guaranteeing access to the cultural assets); and the UPPM’s mission, which is to guarantee the preservation, research, and

promotion of the cultural heritage of SEC’s museums, and to promote the articulation and technical development of the museums of the state of São Paulo in favor of culture, education, and citizenship.

According to Renata there are around 400 museums in the state of São Paulo. She says it is necessary to understand how they relate to each other institutionally. Most of them are directly connected with the public sphere, while university museums, museums linked to the local authorities, and private museums, etc. are indirectly connected with it. A mapping of these museums showed that the history of state occupation and economic empowerment defines the geographic concentration of museums on this map. (Although she didn’t mention it, the same happens with the unequal distribution of institutions throughout the country).

Renata states that knowledge about this data is fundamental to outline public policy guidelines, since there is a great demand for implementation of new museums. The question that arises, for her and for all of us who work in the cultural sector, is whether there is management feasibility and availability of budget resources.

All museums under the SEC are managed according to a partnership model with civil society. UPPM monitors and follows up the management contracts, producing quarterly reports, which receive opinions and then are forwarded to inspection agencies.

The Secretariat’s work plans are oriented by a reflection on the capacity of the programs – collection, documentation, and research; exhibitions and cultural programming; educational service and special projects; support actions to Sisem; communication and press; administrative management goals – to express technical management and communication needs within every museum. For Renata, the results of the work being developed by state authorities are positive, there has been an increase in the number of people visiting museums, which reached 3 million in 2012, and more than 100 million reais in resource transfers. She points out, however, that museums still require expanded partnerships and social visibility – a comment that makes us wonder what procedures are being developed by the state in this regard, and whether there will be (or how to ensure there will be) a continuity policy in other administrations.

New guidelines

The speaker explains that Sisem operates through contracts with social organizations and that there is a need to define new guidelines for SEC and UPPM. Thirty regional representatives of Sisem, members of the civil society, make up a fundamental group in

the articulation of the definition and planning of Sisem’s initiatives, which are reflected in the work plans of the social organizations and in the direct actions. Therefore, the System of Museums carries out initiatives in partnership with social organizations and municipalities.

Within the scope of Sisem, there are two important fronts. The first concerns supporting the regularization of municipalization. According to Renata, there is an effort to regularize the donations of collections from the state to the municipalities – which have demanded a lot of time as far as management of museums is concerned, a positive fact, however, to better qualify historical-pedagogical museums.

The second concerns the creation of public notices for museums, in the sense of promotion and preservation of collections. The calls for proposals are open until the end of July 2013, with 1 million and 200 thousand reais available in resources. Moreover, every year, training courses are held for the elaboration of projects in several cities of the state.

Regulation

The speaker notes that the improvement of regulatory frameworks is still an important aspect for the implementation of public policies in the museum sector. There is a pressing need to regulate the National Museum Statute. For Renata, technical cooperation among the various entities is critical to create the necessary actions to bring advancements to the sector, such as the coordination of a system of information and registers both at state and national level. The system should be integrated to the national domain.

According to her, it is necessary to improve the mechanisms that enable discussion about access to financial resources. Partnerships between state and municipality are complicated, especially regarding the mechanisms available today. Renata added that the question – which we understand to be essential – is to figure the actual possibilities for the execution of projects with the proper qualification of the area and the proper access to resources. In addition, to improve the geographical location of museums and the social access to them, it is necessary to have a better understanding of the different contexts, the instruments, and the information available. It might also be necessary to establish partnerships in education to link learning and museum content. She also raised the question as to whether the focus shouldn’t be on integrating the museum into the citizen’s routine, thus articulating a two-way street between the institution and the school.

Nation versus federation

Sartini passes the floor to Afonso Luz, reminding us that the director of the Museum of the City of São Paulo has experience with federal government agencies, having accompanied the separation between Ibram and the Institute for National Historic and Artistic Heritage - Iphan. Luz’s speech will discuss the several standoffs that permeate museums and institutions.

For Luz, many issues still need to be solved within Ibram. He calls attention to the turbulent process that led to the creation of Iphan, a critical issue in museum politics. There was a dispute, which continues until today, between museologists – Gustavo Barroso’s group – and patrimonialists – represented by Mario de Andrade, Lucio Costa and Rodrigo Melo Franco de Andrade, founders of the former Sphan.

For him, the fact that Brazil is understood as a nation and, at the same time, a federation, makes it complex to design a system and its legal frameworks. The Sphan, for example, comes from a nationalist perspective, at a time when the Estado Novo was elaborating its idea of nation – something that is still reflected today.

According to Luz, there was a debate in the Ministry of Culture about whether the nature of the culture system should be national or federal, with the majority leaning towards the national perspective. He noted that one of the differences that marked the transition of Lula’s administration to Dilma’s was the expansion of federativism. The Brazilian System of Museums received this name precisely to prevent an opposition between nation and federation, and create a system that would recognize the legal status of the country.

Another hurdle to overcome when the issue is cultural policies is the inequality in the allocation of cultural funding. In spite of the federative principle of equality, big cities such as São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro receive more funding for the arts than other places in Brazil.

According to the speaker, another issue concerns municipalities. From his experience with the Museum of the City of São Paulo, it is clear that the city of São Paulo differs from the municipality of São Paulo. This is a problem for the management of the Museum’s collection because the historical territory in which it operates is larger than and different from the territory of the municipality.

Luz says that São Paulo enjoys a privileged situation compared to other cities in regards to state policies and museums. Because the secretary of culture, Marcelo Araújo, comes from the museum sector, he brings strong negotiation power into the area. Thus, it is a moment of professionalization of public management, since one of the great problems

faced by this sector in the country is the discontinuity of approach due to electoral policies and political parties.

Moreover, the speaker points to another fundamental fact concerning museums. He affirms that Iphan’s founding decree comprises two fundamental areas: one, responsible for what is considered historical heritage, that is, the management of immovable assets, and the second responsible for integrated movable assets. According to Luz, until today there has never been a management policy for movable assets. The archaeological issue has also not been fully regulated, and there is an effort by universities in this direction. However, archaeology courses are so rare that we wonder, what power do they have in this articulation?

For Luz, there is a lack of knowledge about the Brazilian museum heritage, a term he criticizes due to the confusion regarding its real meaning. There are still many problems to register the museums’ collections, and most of these collections are unknown. For example, there is no register of the antique dealers in Brazil.

According to the speaker, no policy for public collecting has been developed so far, despite some advances in the private sphere. As an example of the importance of a public art collection, he mentions the MASP and MAC-USP collections for art history education. In fact, our art museums face countless bureaucratic hurdles, of every kind, to update their collections, often without being able to afford even works by young artists, whose costs are still affordable.

Regularization of collections

Regularization of collections is structural and, according to Luz, related to the issue of income tax return declarations of individuals and companies, the regulation of the historical heritage field, and the history of museum heritage itself. He reveals that IBRAM has met with the Brazilian Revenue Office on several occasions to discuss the establishment of these asset relations. It is possible, according to him, that we are close to the effectuation of a register of private assets, aiming at the possibility of, in the future, incorporating these collections into museums. Luz considers that the issue also concerns the municipality, because the city hall is responsible for inheritance taxation in Brazil. This is one of the factors involved in the municipal museum policy, since it is a responsibility of the municipality to regulate the succession of assets from collectors and artists’ families so that we can have a public collection – something that we know is an immediate need, especially in what concerns building public art collections. Recently, we have witnessed

large Brazilian private collections being sold to international institutions without any effort from Brazilian public institutions to acquire them.

The speaker mentions the relevance of the field of archeology, since the Museum of the City of São Paulo owns 80 thousand items stored in Sítio da Ressaca. The museum system needs to integrate both urban and Amerindian archeology, and paleontology, besides other findings that are great attractions to our institutions. Another important point would be the integration of archives, which, according to Luz, is an area that became professionalized before the other ones.

At the end of the lectures, the mediator Antonio Carlos Sartini sums up the role of all those involved in the cultural industry in the country:

I remind you that the implementation of new models, new institutions, new systems, requires participation and activism from all of us within our diversities, thoughts, and ideologies, so that we can build something that will bring results and represent us.

Finally, we are awaiting guidelines and a public action agenda that may work in partnerships, mainly with the area of education, in order to promote a “museum culture,” involving several entities and society itself in a more forceful way. Possibly, by ensuring access and distribution of cultural institutions in an equitable way we can foster the integration of the museum into the citizen’s daily life – despite the great efforts made by the educational sectors within museums, a partnership with schools, in a broad sense of joint projects, could be more effective in this regard.

Sisem-SP, The Path is Made by Walking

Paulo Nascimento

2013

Critical report on the roundtables: "[Presentation of the 2012 Balance Sheet and perspectives of Sisem-SP](#)" and "[Presentation of the Guiding Board of Sisem-SP.](#)"

The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference – SSAMC, within the programmatic axes of initiatives of the State System of Museums of São Paulo – Sisem-SP, was inserted in the axis of *Articulation*. Therefore, this event, which is already in its 5th edition, seeks through its initiatives to strengthen partnerships and establish a dialogue between the coordination of Sisem-SP and the representatives and professionals from São Paulo museums. In this context, the roundtable presentations, besides being institutional, play an important role in the 5th SSAMC informing the initiatives undertaken in the last period.

This task was led by Renata Motta, PhD in Architecture and Urbanism from the University of São Paulo - USP, current coordinator of the Museum Heritage Preservation Unit - UPPM, of the São Paulo State Department of Culture - SEC; Luiz Mizukami, graduated in Administration from the Getulio Vargas Foundation - FGV, a master's student in Museology from USP and former director of the Group for the Preservation of Museum Heritage; Davidson Kaseker, with a Master's degree in Museology from USP, former secretary of Culture of Itapeva-SP, former regional representative of Sisem-SP and current director of its Technical Coordination Group; and, finally, Claudia Bassetto, Master's degree in Arts from Universidade Estadual Paulista Júlio de Mesquita Filho - Unesp, coordinator of the Museum of Contemporary Art of Botucatu and counselor of Sisem-SP.

The speakers took turns to make their presentation. They used contextualized interventions based on a brief history of the current conformation of the UPPM, which is facing a transition moment with changes in management positions. However, it is very likely that the initiatives will be given continuity. They clarified that the UPPM's initiatives are carried out on two fronts: one oriented to the 18 museums belonging to SEC; the other, to the other museums in the State, through the Sisem-SP. They talked about budget resources, which are scarce considering the magnitude of the demands, and the difficulty in

transferring them due to the current system. Finally, they mentioned that the current management cycle is to end in a year and a half, with new state elections in 2014.

They said The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference was created in 1986, being the oldest one in the country. They clarified that all museums in the state are part of Sisem-SP. The WG, according to the State Decree n. 57.035, of 06.02.2011, is only responsible for managing its actions. Sisem-SP is actually a large network of museums, which integrates all museums, regardless of their field of representation.

They also highlighted the current focus on the funding, promotion and institutional strengthening of the museums in São Paulo. They also emphasized the freedom of action that the WG Team had, including the use of self-questions:

- "What are we doing?"
- "How are we doing it?"
- "And what should we do?"

These inquiries seek to analyze Sisem's initiatives (since 1986), evaluating what has made a difference since then.

They presented the current lines of action, "created with the goal of qualifying, improving, and valuing São Paulo's museum organizations and collections:"

- **Articulation** (involving the formatting of the Guiding Board, the organization of The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference, meetings with Regional Representatives, creation of Thematic Networks, formalization of agreements and partnerships, municipalization of museological institutions);
- **Technical Support** (involving technical advisory services, assistance in the elaboration of museological plans and several technical visits);
- **Communication** (organization of exhibitions, publications, and the creation of the Sisem-SP website);
- **Training** (organization of training courses, remote learning courses, technical internships, workshops, and lectures);
- **Fostering interest** (this was recently created with specific edicts for the museological area).

Then, the speakers showed some numerical data concerning the initiatives carried out in 2012, reinforcing that the WG is a small group and that, although the budget is not enough, they count on numerous partners.

They also presented the new visual identity of Sisem-SP and SSAMC, a reflection of the development process of their structures; and emphasized once again that responsibilities need to be discussed and shared, since Sisem-SP is formed by the 415 museums in the state and that every municipality has its share of responsibility.

They concluded by saying that with the short management time remaining, the motto now is to move forward in the qualification of professionals, in the municipalization, registration, communication, technical support, and itinerant exhibitions. And they also pointed out that regional representatives would play a fundamental role in taking the museological issues to be debated in the National Conference of Culture.

After the presentation of Sisem-SP's Balance 2012, Claudia Bassetto took the floor to talk about its Guiding Board - GB.

Bassetto presented the composition, definition, purpose, and mandate, based on Decree n. 57.035/11 aforementioned, which also lays out the regulation of the GB. She also exposed the current agendas of the Board, among which:

- Approval of Internal Regulations;
- Definition of the criteria for the implementation of the museum registry;
- Formatting of the PROAC Edict template - museological area;
- SSAMC programming and discussion about its frequency.

Finally, she emphasized the need for the participation of regional representatives in order to include agendas/demands for discussion in the scope of the Guiding Board of Sisem-SP.

In general, the interventions did not reveal any conflicting or divergent aspects; rather, they were marked by several points of intersection, a result of their institutional feature. The speeches showed no ambiguity in regards to the advances and achievements they revealed in the museological area in São Paulo, through Sisem-SP.

This balance and the very creation of the Guiding Board are reflections of the development of the museological policy of the state of São Paulo, which, as Davidson Kaseker

reminded us in the closing plenary of the 5th SSAMC, although it is not formalized yet, can be seen in practice.

In the 1st SSAMC, the initial attempt at articulation, promoted by the current management of Sisem-SP/UPPM, adopted the methodology of having discussion groups subdivided into 13 regions. These groups had the task of outlining possible initiatives and partnerships in the scope of Sisem-SP for each region. Later these regions were redistributed, being equivalent today to the Administrative Regions of the State, which elect representatives in Sisem-SP.

Among the points perceived, both by the organizers of the Conference and by the group discussion mediators, was the unawareness among the participants concerning what exactly the State System of Museums does and what its objectives are. The need to sensitize local leaders and managers about the specific demands of the museological area was clearly noted. This led to the organization of a meeting of mayors and municipal secretaries of culture as a parallel program in the following year's Conference (in 2010).

At the 1st SSAMC, in a climate of uncertainty due to doubts concerning its continuity and frequency, a manifesto was issued in favor of creating undergraduate courses in Museology as well as a specific public notice for museums in the state of São Paulo, which was strongly supported by the participants of the event.

Thus, considering the Sisem-SP reports on the creation of the institutional site, the offer of courses, the level of involvement of the regional representatives, the formation of the Guiding Board, and the special attention to the promotion of museums in São Paulo, with the 2nd edition of a specific edict, it is clear that a lot has been done¹. So, all criticism should also include these visible achievements.

In the testimony of three participants of the 5th SMSP who attended the table's discussions, it was possible to feel the reverberation of this work.

Muhammad Baker, a museum technician, restorer and former regional representative of Sisem-SP, said that there was a significant advance concerning professionals and technicians and their level of knowledge: today they try to get more information, visit more institutions, seek more interchange. Baker believes that the large number of participants

¹ This path can also be perceived in an analysis of the graphs of Sisem-SP's actions throughout its 27 years of existence. See: *Relatório de Atividades do Sistema Estadual de Museus de São Paulo*. 2012. p. 34-36. Available at: http://www.sisemsp.org.br/index.php?option=com_docman&view=docman&Itemid=260. Accessed on 25 Jun. 2013.

in the SSAMC is a reflection of this. However, there is a long way to go with regards to mayors and managers. He also appreciated the offer of capacitation or technical courses, but reinforced the need for graduation courses, a recurring demand since the 1st SSAMC.

Angela Pimenta, the regional representative for the Franca Administrative Region, composed by 23 municipalities, said that last year she took over the job due to the lack of candidates among the public authorities. Pimenta said that although all this activity in the area is very recent, it is quite significant. She said that the subject of museums has gone beyond the realm of public sphere and managers; however, everything is still very incipient. Today she identifies new possibilities, which include creating new museums and mobilizing people to conferences in the area of Culture, aiming to attract more resources.

Ailton César Camilo de Souza, lawyer, representing the Historical Pedagogical Museum "Anita Ferreira De Maria", in Avaré-SP, said he is very "new" to the world of museums. Souza also said he liked the structuring of Sisem-SP; however, in his opinion, there were still many doubts remaining in regards to the SGuiding Board, mainly in what concerns its prerogatives, that is, what it can and cannot do.

These statements reflect a reality based on the interpretation by some of the players who live it, who are on the cutting edge of Sisem-SP's initiatives. Even if they fail to translate the whole universe involved, they show some expectations regarding the next steps of the museological policy of the State, managed by UPPM and Sisem-SP.

In fact, much has been achieved, but much remains to be done. Although we already have postgraduate courses in Museology in the state (*stricto sensu* and *lato sensu*), we need to move forward towards the creation of an undergraduate course, since São Paulo has 645 municipalities and more than 400 museums, being the state with the largest number of museological institutions; the training courses must continue further exploring their subjects; the local managers must really work in synergy with the network created by Sisem-SP; the WG needs more human and budgetary resources to meet the demands.

Comparing expectations between the 1st and the 5th SSAMC:

In 2009, there was a wish for change, but this longing was accompanied by feelings of mistrust regarding proposals and their materialization, as well as the group's capacity to operationalize and coordinate initiatives within the UPPM.

In 2013, the wish for change still remained, but since this change was now something feasible, this feeling came with a demand: more is needed, and with higher quality.

The prospects regarding Sisem-SP and the field of museology in São Paulo were excellent. There were investments and means of communication; there was articulation, and a well-prepared and willing team ahead of the WG and UPPM; there was a State Secretary of Culture who was a museologist with deep knowledge of the demands of the area, and sensitive to its issues. Among the obstacles there was time, given the uncertainties after 2014, and the realization by the various players that Sisem-SP can only exist if it works as a two-way street between the state, the museological institutions (through their managers and professionals), the local authorities, and especially society.

São Paulo, Memorial da América Latina, June 20, 2013.

References

LIMA, Paulo J. N. *Relatório de Mediação do Polo 3 - Catanduva*. 1st Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo. São Paulo: 2009. Mimeo.

SÃO PAULO. State Decree No. 57.035, of June 2, 2011. *It changes the name of the State System of Museums of São Paulo to State System of Museums - Sisem-SP, it provides for its organization and makes related provisions.*

SISEM-SP. *Relatório de Atividades do Sistema Estadual de Museus de São Paulo*. 2012. Available at: http://www.sisemsp.org.br/index.php?option=com_docman&view=docman&Itemid=260. Accessed on 25 Jun. 2013.

Websites consulted:

www.sisemsp.org.br, accessed on 25 Jun. 2013.

www.encontropaulistademuseus.org.br, accessed on 25 Jun. 2013.

Education in Museums and its Potential for Articulation

Anny Christina Lima

2013

Critical report on the roundtable: "[Thematic Contributions for the Development of the State Policy of Museums - Education in Museums](#)"

The 5th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo closed its series of roundtables under the theme of education in museums. For this purpose, it invited two educators with extensive experience: Adriana Mortara de Almeida and Marina Toledo.

Adriana started her speech presenting general data from Icom, the International Council of Museums, of which she is the vice-president of the Brazilian committee, and from the International Committee for Education and Cultural Action (Ceca), in which she is the coordinator of the Brazilian committee. She highlighted that Icom is an international non-profit organization of museums and museum professionals, founded in 1946, presently with more than 30 thousand members from 137 countries.

The Ceca has more than a thousand members in 85 countries. In Brazil, it was set up in 1995, and currently has 106 members in 21 states and the Federal District, with 61 members in the state of São Paulo. Between 1996 and 2011, 14 collective texts were elaborated for the Annual Conferences of the Ceca. She highlighted that this made possible the exchange of knowledge, identification of professionals in the country, and improvement of practices.

For this table, Adriana presented the project "Best Practices" - Best/Good Practices, from 2011, by Marie-Clarté O'Neill and Colette Dufresne-Tassé, as it was identified in the discussions held at the annual conferences that many institutions from different countries carried out similar processes. It was felt that developing a common framework would provide a basis for analyzing museum practices and improving processes. The objective of this project is to assist professionals, students, and researchers in the analysis of the various aspects of the educational programs by highlighting the multiplicity and

complexity of the aspects to be considered, by anticipating the strengths and weaknesses present in any planning and development process, by deepening knowledge of the overall development or specific aspects of a process, and by providing a model applicable to the analysis and/or evaluation of any project/program.

For this framework, three common axes and minimum practices for high-quality educational actions in museums were defined: conception and planning, implementation, and evaluation of the Program.

The axis "conception and planning of the Program" was organized into 11 items for detailing: origin of the project; justification and relevance (social, institutional, scientific, economic); possibility of partnerships; beneficiaries (audiences covered); goals and objectives (to subsidize the evaluation and monitoring of processes); necessary resources; content covered; media/techniques used for mediation (strategies); level of participation expected (what kind of dialogue am I proposing to have with the audience?); media-content adequacy; evaluation forecast.

In the second axis, "implementation of the Program", preparation for the development of the Program, management of the implementation of the Program, and the subsequent adaptations are further detailed.

And in the last axis, the evaluation (execution and results) is specified, starting from two points, report to the Program team (feedback) and corrections and/or changes in the Program.

This process has a clear relationship with the basic steps in project management. It helps visualize the step-by-step, providing greater awareness of the process and more clarity in the analysis of what is being developed, and the measurement of results. Adriana mentioned there are museums that do not develop this basic structure.

After presenting the project, Adriana assessed the current situation of museum education in the Brazilian scenario, in which she highlighted several points: there is a tendency to increase the number of museum educators, creating a stable team; however, there are still many institutions in precarious situations, and there is a large number of them with no educators in their staff; there has been an increase in the number of publications, courses and materials to train museum educators, but with no guarantee of a continuous and consolidated training; there is a concern regarding improvement in the quality of museum education programs, but there are no clear criteria/indicators to measure their quality; in-service training depends on the institution and the professional; there is the

issue of precarious employment and variable pay, which generate a high turnover and difficulty in team building, resulting in an unlikely systematic continuity of the initiatives.

Considering a situation with so many variables, she referred to the initiatives and public policies for this area. At the federal level: training courses (workshops), publications, a National Program of Museum Education with a discussion group (blog), edicts, internships; at the state level: training courses (workshops), publications, consultancy/consulting, public notices; the initiatives of professionals through Ceca Brazil, and the organization of the Network of Museum Educators – REM (in several Brazilian states); and the initiatives of professionals in the museums, such as courses, educational activities, workshops, etc. and an informal collaboration network.

From this general scenario, Adriana raised some questions about the paths of Museum Education in Brazil. In order to encourage reflection about the different realities and establish parameters for the analysis of professionals in this area, she asks what is the necessary training for a (good) museum educator and what are the necessary skills for this professional – whether he would have to be able to: adequately conduct an educational program for the institution he works for; communicate with the visiting public; create educational material for the museum; produce an educational event for the museum; evaluate educational actions; conceive and plan an educational program for the museum (carry out all the steps proposed by the "Best Practices" document?); and train other educators. And finally she questions whether it is possible to expect the educator to do all this.

To conclude, in addition to the issue of the educators' competencies and our expectations about their responsibilities, Adriana raised several questions about the conditions necessary for a (good) educational initiative, namely, whether the museum has professionals/teams from all areas; whether professionals from different museum areas support and/or participate in the educational initiatives planning; whether the museum has a stable/recruited team of educators; whether the museum/the museum management supports educational projects; whether educators support and/or participate in projects from other areas; whether educators participate in the conception and planning of exhibitions; whether the museum publicizes educational projects; whether the museum promotes training of educators.

Considering all these questions and all the work to be done, Ceca proposes a more in-depth discussion. It recognizes that until museums and their professionals do not have their processes structured and their registration systems organized, it is not possible to identify the existing initiatives.

The floor is given to Marina Toledo, who presented the Reference Center for Education in Museums at the Museum of Portuguese Language. She says this program was an initiative of its director, Antônio Carlos Sartini, who has always been involved in issues related to the development of this area. The conception of the program was based on the observation of the large number of good projects as well as on experiences in museum education in cultural institutions both in São Paulo and all over Brazil, but which are not always adequately publicized and, sometimes, remain restricted to their creators and executors. The Center aims to give visibility to these initiatives as well as to promote the sharing of experiences by means of registered in-presence initiatives, which will be accessible to museum professionals in Brazil. Marina pointed out that she understands that museums are spaces of excellence as far as mediation and non-formal education is concerned.

She highlighted the objectives of the program to promote the exchange of educational actions carried out by the invited museums – highlighting the initiatives of education through heritage and for the recognition of heritage – in order to streamline and substantiate the formation and training of museums' and other cultural institutions' employees; create a publication line (digital and printed) for the dissemination of the reflections and contents pertinent to the theme discussed in the meetings; create an archive (digital and printed) that facilitates the access of professionals to the recent production content on "Museum Education" in the various regions of the country; and encourage the production of knowledge from the reflection on educational practices.

The curatorship of the program of invited institutions was based on a survey of museums that offer educational activities. Museums of different sizes, collection typologies, management, etc. were considered. The program is monthly and consists of a three-day period of technical residency for professionals. During this period he/she will participate in the daily activities of the Educational Service to exchange experiences with the team of educators. In addition, he/she will give a lecture, open to museum educators interested in the educational practices of their institution. The Portuguese Language Museum suggests three guiding questions, which are aligned with the public policies for museums, and may change according to each discussion. Currently, the guiding questions are: What does Education in Museums mean for your institution? According to what needs was the initiative created? How does the Educational sector connect with other museum sectors and initiatives?

During residency, the invited professional will also make a technical visit to another museum of his/her choice in the city of São Paulo. The whole process will be recorded and made available on a digital platform, and an annual printed publication will be made. Marina anticipated that the idea is to make it a bimonthly initiative, so they can optimize

the period between residencies to foster exchanges and reflections between museum educators from São Paulo and other cities, either in person or through the Internet.

From the audience

The two professionals presented an example of initiatives developed by them, and from their analysis, the audience's questions focused mainly on the need to articulate the existing educational initiatives offered by museums and cultural institutions, which develop educational processes that are being increasingly perceived as fundamental in the communication of the collection and its exhibitions. Thus, it became evident the challenge museum educators face in order to continue strengthening museum education in the state of São Paulo.

Mila Chiovatto, coordinator of the Educational Action Nucleus (NAE) of the Pinacoteca of the State of São Paulo, began her comments by reinforcing the importance of having educators in such a large and important plenary session, and went on to say that this situation is a more recent phenomenon and an achievement in the area of museum education. She then referred to two previous initiatives to contextualize her question: ME-dteca, developed by the Area of Educational Action at the Lasar Segall Museum, which organized a set of educational materials from national and international museum institutions for teachers and anybody interested to consult and borrow them; and the website Museum for All, from the State Pinacoteca, which makes available reference texts and is exclusively devoted to Education in museums. The question raised for the table concerned the possibility of promoting an articulation between the projects presented and the other initiatives, which she regards as very good and powerful to consolidate the initiatives and reflect about them, and also how to incorporate these actions so that the area of museum education is duly acknowledged.

Adriana highlights another initiative, the Museum Educators Network, which started in Rio de Janeiro, but was also organized in several other states. She believes that it is healthy to have so many initiatives and that the participation of the same professional in several initiatives is beneficial – an atmosphere of collaboration among professionals and institutions can be clearly perceived. However, it is necessary to know how to bring together the various platforms for participation and support, in order to disseminate and strengthen these groups' initiatives and reflections. She points to the use of the Internet as an important tool in this situation, even more so for a country the size of Brazil.

Marina answers the questions based on her experience as an art teacher who organized activities for students and family members with the purpose of encouraging their

autonomy to visit museums. She relates this situation to the reality of museum educators. She says each professional should try to identify which area they resonate with, and that these articulations depend on each and everyone at the same time.

Next, Marina answered the questions by Gabriel Santos, an educator from the Casa Guilherme de Almeida Museum. She said the residency project receives educators for guidance, but there are plans to send educators from other cities for training, which will depend on partnerships and sponsorships. She also said the lectures are being recorded to be part of the virtual platform.

I asked Adriana if Ceca has programs to train professionals. She mentioned two initiatives: a course offered by Ceca International in Armenia and a project organized by Sonia Guarita between Brazil and African Portuguese speaking countries, in partnership with Pinacoteca. However, it was only developed in Nigeria, where Gabriela Aidar gave a training course for educators from several places in the country, yet with no continuity. She clarified that it is not within the scope of Ceca to directly train professionals; instead it creates the possibility for these initiatives to take place.

Finally, I asked Marina whether the Reference Center for Education in Museums would have the capacity to organize educators in a network, such as the Museum Educators Network -RJ, and I mentioned the study group *Educativos em Rede*, which took place between 2006 and 2011 in the city of São Paulo, and was formed by coordinators of the educational sectors of museums and cultural institutions. At the time there was continuous encouragement for the creation of a network by educators, but there was no mobilization on the part of professionals. Marina said she misses the existence of such spaces for reflection and exchange, even within the museum's educational department, and stated that it is essential to have a space for reflection. The idea behind changing the frequency of the meetings with resident educators to every two months is to enable reflection meetings with local institutions in the intervening months. She reaffirms that the possibility exists, but she recognizes that this is a big challenge in a city of such accelerated pace. She thinks it is absurd that there is no Museum Educators Network in São Paulo, but reminds us that this initiative depends on each professional beyond working hours. The spaces exist, but it is up to the professionals to recreate them as spaces for exchange and reflection. The Internet is a great tool, but there must be a collective movement focused on the commitment of each professional.

Resignification of Museums: Resonances of The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference, held in 2014

Leandro de Oliva Costa Penha

2021

Critical Report; synthesis of the [6th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo](#):
“Resignification of Museums”

2014 saw the sad victory of Germany in the World Cup in Brazil, a tight presidential election for Dilma Rousseff, and the water crisis in the city of São Paulo. The year also showed the highest attendance figures in the museums of the state of São Paulo: 3.7 million people, an increase of 12% over the previous year.¹

The 6th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo took place in this context, from June 2 to 4. The theme regarded the process of resignification of museums from a need to rethink the role and practices of these institutions in the context of restructuring the Brazilian museum sector with a new regulation.

The critical reports written by María Iñigo Clavo, Claudia Rodríguez Ponga, Laly Martín Sánchez, Agda Sardinha, Vivian Braga dos Santos, Mariana Galera Soler, Thais Fernanda Alves Avelar, and Viviane Wermelinger about this Conference, as well as the video records available for free on the digital platform of the Fórum Permanente,² formed the basis for the construction of this report.

The three-day event program was composed by an opening table with the participation of Renata Vieira da Motta, coordinator of the Museum Heritage Preservation Unit (UPPM), Juca Ferreira, Municipal Secretary of Culture of São Paulo, Jorge Schwartz, director of the Lasar Segall Museum, representing the Brazilian Institute of Museums

¹ Available at: <https://www.saopaulo.sp.gov.br/ultimas-noticias/numero-de-visitas-em-museus-do-estado-cresceu-12-em-2014/>. Accessed on: 4 Apr. 2021.

² Available at: <http://www.forumpermanente.org/>. Accessed on: 23 Mar. 2021.

(Ibram), Marcelo Mattos Araújo, State Secretary of Culture of São Paulo,³ a lecture by David Fleming, director of the National Museums Liverpool, seven panels with the participation of two to four guests each, six moments for the presentation of individual digital posters (digital panels) and the launching of publications.⁴ Relationship between museums and the areas where they are located, expansion of the institution's action beyond exhibition rooms, new possibilities and perspectives in activist practices in contemporaneity, the importance of networking, and the production of knowledge in a participative and inclusive way were some of the repercussions generated in the debates based on the event's central theme.

In his lecture, David Fleming defended the vital role of museums in confronting social problems, human rights, and reparations. He highlighted democracy as one of the axes chosen by the English museum to fulfill one of its goals: access to and occupation of the institution by the population in general, especially the population not linked to hegemonic discourses. For the museum to become a space not only for the preservation of collections and heritage or for the fruition of elites, but filled instead with narratives without distinction of social class, age, gender, ethnicity, gender identity, or sexual orientation; the museum as a place of legitimization of the discourses of homeless people, transsexuals, homosexuals, prostitutes, the elderly, and children.

Mediated by Mila Chiovatto, the first panel – *Museums in Their Communities* – had the participation of Marília Bonas, responsible for the museological project of the Immigration Museum, in São Paulo, and Simone Flores Monteiro, representative of the Museum of Science and Technology of the Pontifical Catholic University (PUC-RS), in Porto Alegre.

The Immigration Museum was reopened the year the 6th Conference took place, and, despite presenting a permanent exhibition that created and still creates a specific version of the history of Brazil, especially the city of São Paulo, centered around the European and Oriental immigration, since that year it has prioritized the diversity of identities as the matrix of its musealization plan, through its collection, educational materials, and events. The Museum of Science and Technology at PUC-RS was going through changes and sought to achieve one of its main goals, the approximation between the academic community and society.

³ The positions cited in the text were held by the participants in June 2014.

⁴ During the Conference the following publications were launched: *Guia para criação e gestão de Associações de Amigos de Museus*, by Feambra, Catulo Branco: *o homem dos moinhos de vento and Belle Époque na garoa: São Paulo entre a tradição e a modernidade*, by Fundação Energia e Saneamento.

The second panel, *Municipal Museums and New Narratives*, was mediated by Heloísa Barbuy. Rafael Barbi, the coordinator of the Museum of the City of Salto (Salto/SP), presented the concept of *pathway museum*, which takes into consideration the local community and does not limit itself to the characteristics of a historical museum; on the contrary, besides expanding to the whole city geographically wise, reaching peripheral neighborhoods, it assimilates the contributions, questionings, and discussions with the population about history – which becomes “questioned, expanded and/or modified”, as Laly Martín Sanchez described in her critical account.⁵ These adjectives and the project presented establish a dialogue with Assman's reflection (2011, p. 352),⁶ according to which “places are mediators between past and present, they are memory media; they point to an invisible past and maintain contact with it.” With the inclusive and educational activities proposed by the Itinerant Museum project, the Museum of the City of Salto not only provided its citizens with reflections connecting different times but also enabled them to own the museum; after all, as inhabitants of the town, they understood they were important builders of local history.

Júlio Abe, a reference in Brazilian museology, lectured about the history and geography of the country while presenting the creation process of Ananguera Museum, in Santana do Parnaíba (SP). In the conception of the museological project, he prioritized the knowledge of the region's inhabitants, especially the indigenous people, with traditions that go back generations through orality. By observing, reading, and listening to the territory, together with a multidisciplinary team, he was able to put together content that was not restricted or based on myths or untruths related to local history.

Oral histories and testimonies were also emphasized in the panel *Which Memory to Preserve?*, mediated by Paulo Garcez. The presence of this theme in a museological approach refers us to researchers such as Ecléa Bosi, who focused on the importance of this methodology in investigations about memory. By listening to oral testimonies, we can see that the individual evokes the content of his/her experiences and lives his/her experience with a new intensity (BOSI, 2003, p. 44).⁷ Oral histories reveal the way people construct the meaning of the past and how they establish links with the present. Furthermore, listening has an immediate effect on those who share a

⁵ Available at: http://www.forumpermanente.org/event_pres/encontros/encontros-paulista-de-museus/vi-encontro-paulista-de-museus/relatos-criticos/painel-2-museus-municipais-e-novas-narrativas. Accessed on: 3 Apr. 2021.

⁶ ASSMAAN, Aleida. *Espaços de recordação: formas e transformações da memória cultural*. Translated by Paulo Soethe. Campinas: Unicamp, 2011.

⁷ BOSI, Ecléa. *o tempo vivo da memória: ensaios de psicologia social*. São Paulo: Ateliê Editorial, 2003.

testimony, generating self-confidence and a sense of belonging. Testimonies represent a way of understanding identities, communities, and other times, as highlighted by Paul Thompson in his text *História oral: patrimônio do passado e espírito do futuro* (WORCMAN; PEREIRA, 2006, p. 17-43).⁸

As practices related to these reflections, two museum experiences were presented in this panel, one of them in the city of London and the other in São Paulo. Georgina Young, from the Museum of London, pointed out that the progression of urban life in London is not only elaborated through the eyes of curators, but also with the collaboration of public opinion. The voices of the individuals involved in the places are included so as to strengthen the relationship between museum and society. The Memorial of Resistance, presented by Katia Felipini, is practically made up of testimonies from people who suffered torture and persecution during the period of military dictatorship in Brazil. With voices that, for a long time, were silenced or hidden away, associated with quantitative data, it is possible to understand more deeply a period of the country's history and promote struggles and debates to reinforce democracy and freedom.

The other three panels had the following themes: winners of the ProAC-Sisem-SP⁹ edicts (2012), structuring actions, and educational actions of museums of the state of São Paulo. The professionals invited reported the following experiences: the process of creating a memory guide focused on the architecture of the city of Monte Alegre do Sul; the digital catalog of the Psychiatry Pier Museum, in the city of Santa Rita do Passa Quatro; the implementation of a toy library at the Folklore Museum of São José dos Campos; digitalization of newspapers and a newspaper exhibition, in the city of Ourinhos; an itinerant exhibition with 200 photographs treasuring the history of the São Paulo coast (Museu da Baixada/SP); implementation of the biographical museum and technical reserve of the Cairbar Schutel Memorial, in Matão, in the state of São Paulo; the project "Educational initiative beyond the walls. Identity and community - bringing stories together", at the Abbey Museum of São Geraldo; a visit itinerary integrated to the Butantã museums, and a transversal accessibility initiative at the Museum of Modern Art of São Paulo (MAM).

After almost seven years, when taking stock of the discussions presented, one can conclude that the existing optimistic scenario presented the possibility of organizing the museum sector in the medium and long term. The construction of museological projects in different cities around the world saw clear attempts towards bringing museums closer

⁸ WORCMAN, Karen; PEREIRA, Jesus V. *História falada: memória, rede e mudança social*. São Paulo: Sesc SP: Museu da Pessoa: Imprensa Oficial do Estado de São Paulo, 2006.

⁹ Cultural Action Program for the launching of edicts directed to the field of museums.

to the everyday life of their territories, with an emphasis on the narratives of non-hegemonic subjects.

Currently, we see the advancement of identity and social agendas as central to museums with the most diverse structures, from community museums¹⁰ to large-scale institutions with national and international recognition. Unfortunately, the advances stop there. The prospect of structuring the museum sector has been replaced by concerns over the dismantling of public policies for the cultural field in general. We are facing a setback in terms of support, sponsorship, financing, a government that disseminates obscurantism, conservatism, intolerance.¹¹ How can we proceed with objectives focused on subjectivities and collectivities, on curatorships based on several representatives, on initiatives to promote dialogue with communities, on the production of knowledge in a democratic way?

Added to this landscape is a rampant pandemic, growing day by day. The vaccination process is slow. Omission and denialism permeate the government. As a result of social isolation as a preventive measure, access to museums, or rather, only to those institutions that have the resources for major changes in the short term and investment in technology, has become virtual.¹² Who could ever imagine that digital tours or catalogs, such as the one created by the Psychiatry Pier Museum, would become, in a few years, one of the only possibilities of a relationship between some museums and the public? Children cannot possibly climb through the window into the toy room of the Folklore Museum; strolling through the streets of Monte Alegre do Sul or any other location is no longer advisable, nor can an itinerant exhibition take place, the coast cannot reach the countryside through the pictures of the 17 museums in São Paulo. Today, you access educational material through screens and scroll through rooms with mice and cell phones.

The cases presented in the 6th Conference became memories to be cherished right now. As Bosi (2003, p. 66)¹³ wrote, "the reconstructed past is not a refuge, but a source, a fountain of reasons to fight." In 2021, we are resignifying not only museums but life as a whole.

¹⁰ Museums created from processes of affirmation and resistance, of the claiming of rights by social groups, such as indigenous museums, black museums, periphery museums, and slum museums.

¹¹ In 2018, Jair Bolsonaro won the presidential election. His government has been marked by setbacks, especially in the areas of social welfare, health, education, culture, and the environment.

¹² In 2020, the in-person audience, due to the pandemic, was 1,048,357 people, as reported by the State System of Museums of São Paulo (Sisem-SP). There were over 15 million virtual visits to 20 different museums. Available at: <https://www.sisemsp.org.br/museus-da-secretaria-de-cultura-registram-mais-de-15-mil-hoes-de-visitantes-virtuais-em-2020/>. Access on: 4, Apr 2021.

¹³ BOSI, Ecléa. *O tempo vivo da memória: ensaios de psicologia social*. São Paulo: Ateliê Editorial, 2003.

References

- ASSMAAN, Aleida. *Espaços da recordação*: formas e transformações da memória cultural. Translated by Paulo Soethe. Campinas: Unicamp, 2011.
- BOSI, Ecléa. *O tempo vivo da memória*: ensaios de psicologia social. São Paulo: Ateliê Editorial, 2003.
- WORCMAN, Karen; PEREIRA, Jesus V. *História falada*: memória, rede e mudança social. São Paulo: Sesc SP: Museu da Pessoa: Imprensa Oficial do Estado de São Paulo, 2006.

“Museum for Social Justice”

María Iñigo Clavo

2014

Critical report on the Inaugural conference:
[“Museum for social Justice”](#)

The opening of the 6th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo with the lecture of David Fleming, director of the National Museums Liverpool, was a clear positioning on the part of the selection committee of the Conferences, articulated through the willingness to discuss the re-signification of Museums.

Such was the project by Colombian curator Cristina Lleras, with which I would like to introduce that question, as it brings pioneering attempts in this regard in Latin America, a context full of difficulties. Lleras had to leave her post as curator at the National Museum of Colombia soon after the controversy aroused by her work on the Bicentenaries’ re-narration. In the show, the curatorial team included the usual strategies of oblivion of the museum, pointing out the silences of national narratives, that is, what lies behind what is not shown.

Lleras’ project was to go beyond the Museum’s task of conservation, trying to answer the following question that might well introduce this account: “Should the unresolved conflicts outside the museum be ‘resolved’ inside? While societies fail to face social crises, museums are being called on to disseminate civic values or redeem the nation for its discrimination¹.” David Fleming’s lecture has a very clear answer to this question: museums should play a key role in confronting the problems of social injustice, human rights, and reparation.

Fleming’s talk was divided into two parts. The first regarded the foundations of the critical and ideological positioning of the social engagement project in museums. In the second part, the speaker brought several examples, since he became the museum’s director in 2001, showing the initiatives, programmes, and exhibitions that have been

¹ LLERAS, Cristina. Contesting the power of single narratives: lessons from the National Museum of Colombia. Unpublished text.

organized in the different centres that comprised the National Museums Liverpool: Slavery Museum, Lady Lever Art Gallery, Maritime Museum, Museum of Liverpool, Sudley House, Walker Art Gallery, and World Museum.

He began his presentation by problematising the term social justice, which changes depending on the political system, showing the fragility of the term itself. In this regard, the National Museums Liverpool are betting on a Museum of Civil Rights, promoting dialogue and inclusion, thus transforming them into an international benchmark. One of the fundamental axes articulating all the proposals is the concept of "democracy": to be less concerned with preserving collections and heritage than with social responsibility. This is a museum that is not built for the elite, but rather to create space for a community history based on access to the construction of narratives made by professionals.

In Fleming's conception, the museum that values social responsibility is a museum seeking to create social values, awareness of the importance of education, and commitment to decriminalization through positive initiatives. It avoids traditional thinking, seeking local cultures' most disadvantaged points in terms of the discourses of power: prostitution workers, homeless people, transgender people. An interesting thing that Fleming pointed out is how fundamental the role of these supposed "others" is, to what extent British society is also defining itself through them. This means that the project overcomes the old idea of giving a voice to the silenced in an almost charitable attitude, showing how these stories and identities are part of society and shape it. Fleming gave the example of a show about a transgender person, April Ashley, who opened the debate about transgenderism in the UK and the US, showing how dehumanised she was by the press at that time. People with such stories are pioneers in paving the way and bringing change to the society around them. In this regard, the Museum has acted as a space of reparation not only for Ashley's life, but for other transgender and gay people who have had to co-exist with homophobia in the past decades as well. For Fleming, a museum needs partners because it would not get very far on its own. This is an important point to help understand this new museum model.

From this point on Fleming used several examples, such as the exhibition of David Hockney's works. In the 1950s, he based his work on his homosexual identity, creating homoerotic images, and thus challenging homophobia. In the photography show 'Alive: in the Face of Death', held at the Walker Art Gallery's Ranking, the perception of death in British culture was addressed, including the perspective of people with an illness. He also talked about projects such as The House of Memories, involving people with Down syndrome and senile dementia. The idea was to promote better understanding of such illnesses and create learning experiences related to theirs, improving their quality of life,

mixing the children with the elderly and generating encounters where they could relate to each other in positive contexts.

An important part of the lecture was dedicated to an exhibition about football, which was focused on acknowledging an event that marked the city and yet was not fully clarified in Liverpool: an accident in a stadium that caused the death of 96 people. Fleming explained that although the museum remained neutral then, it now focused great part of the show on this fact, which united the two rival teams that divided the city. The Museum focused on the fact that the population came together to investigate what had actually happened. That would be a clear example of the Museum addressing local justice.

The lecture involved many issues, which were reflected in the numerous questions pointing to different directions. One example was the Museum's neutrality concerning engaging in social issues. Fleming gave the example of an exhibition that collaborated with African communities to discuss the artefacts stolen during the colonisation of Nigeria. The Slavery Museum was mentioned as an example of reparation. Another example is the fact that a Natural History Museum can deal with issues related to ecology. There were questions regarding the social impact of these exhibitions, to which he replied that it could not be measured in qualitative terms, although, yes, it is possible to see an increase in museum visits and to see a clear quantitative improvement. He spoke of the organisational model, based on the involvement of young people and de-hierarchized working plans. He also explained how the museum, being a place of legitimisation, can be a key tool to show social problems that are not visible.

This opening lecture was exciting due to the tools it offers, very powerful in the Brazilian context. The speaker indicated that there has been a before and an after in the history of museology since this new inclination towards interests in human rights as an arena for debate in museums. However, I cannot help but point out that it is precisely the contemporary artistic *practice* that has paved the way that is now being institutionalized by museums. Especially since the 1990s in Europe, but since the 1960s in Latin America, the contemporary art context has embraced political and activist practices that had no other space for dissemination. This new wave of social justice and human rights in museums, which collaborate with various social organisations, is nothing more than the legitimisation and institutionalisation of what artists have been doing for 20 years without any institutional support. Still, the artists of the institutional critique of the first and second wave were the ones who started to make critical works about museum collections. Especially the artists of the 1980s, who generally spoke of the place of otherness, like the celebrated African-American Fred Wilson, a classic example that demonstrated that American museums had no trace of the history of racial discrimination. Or Martha Rosler,

with her show "If You Lived Here..." in New York, where she invited social agents to talk about the homelessness issue in the city, the specific problems of homeless people as part of a sub-citizenship without access to civil rights. Experiences with Tucumán Arde in 1968 in Argentina are another example of collaborative work showing the problems of the dismantling of working classes in the poorest areas of the country. That is why I would find it interesting for these museums to outline a genealogy of the tradition that has brought them this far. This would mean that contemporary artistic practices would be responsible for producing thought and models for another museology.

Neither Compulsions nor Amnesias. The Measures of Memories at the Museum of London and the Memorial Resistance of São Paulo

Vivian Braga dos Santos

2014

Critical report of the panel "[Which Memory to Preserve?](#)"

Since the 1970s, the theme of memory has occupied an intense and increasingly recurrent place in contemporaneity. One of the reasons for this intensity is related *to a particular subjective shift that after May 1968 began to increasingly request histories that were once kept at the margins of society as fundamental elements for the elaboration of collective memories*¹. This demand allowed for *the normative historiographical models that had been in vogue for years* to be called into question. *However, such opening faces a problem* similar to the one faced by History, namely, the difficulty of telling, storing, and preserving everything. After all, faced with so many experiences that compose diverse narratives, which memories are to be preserved? How to manage this diversity of possible memories so that the choices between remembering and forgetting (keeping or overlooking) are not disproportionately unequal?

This question guided the discussions of table n. of the 6th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo, which took place in São Paulo in June 2014. It was composed by the senior curator of contemporary history at the Museum of London, Georgina Young, the coordinator of the Memorial of Resistance in São Paulo, Kátia Filipini. The mediator was Paulo Garcez, from the Paulista Museum. This set of conferences discussed a series of directives regarding the relations between the institutions and the preservation (and construction) of recent memories. This dialogue, which reaches interdisciplinary arguments concerned with finding ways to preserve contemporaneity at the same time that it addresses marginalised voices in museological spaces, was addressed at the Conference from the institutions' positionings represented by the two speakers.

¹ Cf. SARLO, Beatriz. *Tempo passado*: cultura da memória e guinada subjetiva. Translation by Rosa Freire. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras; Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG, 2007.

The first proposal outlined in this sense was that of the Museum of London, enunciated by Georgina Young based on observing the projects to which the London museum team has been dedicating itself recently. Generally speaking, these are initiatives aimed at building collections that highlight the global characteristics of the city of London and note the progression of its urban life over the years. Furthermore, these works aim at stimulating public debate and activating the relation between the museum and the city's social life. Despite appearing too established, these aspects allow for alternative perspectives regarding what to preserve in this museum. They also enable the museum to maintain a tradition of organising collections of a contemporary nature. According to Young, this habit recalls the first version of the London museum (called London's Museum) of 1912. Since its opening, there has been a desire to perceive the fugitive and the modern that accompanied London's growth, especially post-First World War. That brought constant changes to the configurations of the urban fabric and society. Thus, to preserve this particular "form of urban life", many objects and clothes were safeguarded and displayed in the museum while they existed outside it. These "artefacts" are intended to maintain the unique and timeless air of the English city.

This desire seems to remain when one examines the new configuration of the institution, the Museum of London. As with the previous format, Young stresses the need for a creative aspect in choosing what to preserve, given the impossibility of keeping everything. The senior curator highlights that selecting items follows a dynamic of what can be perceived in what has been chosen. Which objects can better transmit the desired image of a certain time and space? Young's lecture brings many examples from the current Museum that demonstrate the narratives that can emerge around a single object and its related actions. Unlike other collections, the contemporary one imbricates the history of its own time. That is, particular accounts of their dynamics accompany its objects. In other institutions, this knowledge would be perceived through research work. At other times, this integration is such that the museum objects indicate the construction of initiatives in society, which, in turn, are immediately dropped or "archived" after their completion.

However, despite this constant dynamic concerning the preservation of time itself, the projects of the contemporary collections of the Museum of London do not seem to inscribe themselves in a compulsion to archive as described by Fausto Colombo in *Os arquivos imperfeitos* (The Imperfect Archives)², a text in which the author warns that contemporary society in its archival characteristic has increasingly produced archives of archives. In other words, ways of archiving time itself. Mainly because this compulsion

² Cf. COLOMBO, Fausto. *Os arquivos imperfeitos: memória social e cultura eletrônica*. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 1991.

addressed by Colombo has as its central identity a "myth of durability"³, that is, the possibility of keeping and preserving everything; however, this intention is not the one disclosed by the Museum. On the contrary. In it, choices are made and encouraged because, according to Young, it is necessary to put energy into specific things. But how to select the elements that will be the targets of this specific focus of attention?

One possible answer given by the Museum of London is to select clear and defined perspectives expressing a desire to impact society through the museological space to which it belongs and/or questions. The continuation of this path is an amplification of the curatorial voice raised by the museum as a temporal and spatial archive. From this perspective, this institution dialogues with the subjective turn of the second half of the twentieth century and, instead of imposing a preservationist order based only on the curator's perspective, it includes the voices of others – the subjects involved in the history of places and objects – to determine the importance and decide to conserve, strongly encouraging the dissemination of oral stories.

This aspect guides the museum's collection and also reflects its direction in the coming years. According to Young, her future initiatives plan was based on public opinions about the aspects of contemporary London that should be part of the museum, both geographically and temporally. Thus, the institution selected a list to focus on, refine, and delineate four content priorities for the next three to five years. In this way, the Museum of London's choice of memorialistic tendency seems to come from both the material selection and the subjectivity existing in this institution. And in this sense, the question of which memory to preserve (elect) is also to define which subject the voice is given to (as a type of narrator of everyday life).

This choice for the subject that emerges from the margin and has a place in archival spaces is also present in the lecture by Kátia Felipini about the Memorial of Resistance, located in the city of São Paulo. Similar to the Museum of London, the Memorial celebrates the temporality of the present. Nevertheless, it seeks to draw a dialectical line between the situation of republican Brazil and its traumatic memories, especially concerning the civil-military dictatorship that took place from 1964 to 1985 and remains an open wound both on a national and on an individual level. For Felipini, a way of thinking about these wounds is to summon places of memory, among which the Memorial of Resistance is a crucial space.

³ Idem, p. 100

Inaugurated in 1914 as a group of offices and warehouses of the Sorocabana Railway Company, the building housed several police stations linked to the State Department of Political and Social Order of the State of São Paulo (Deops/SP) from 1940 to 1983. In 2002, three years after being declared historical heritage by Condephaat, the building became the headquarters of the Memorial of Liberty and was later changed into the current Memorial of Resistance. The main guideline for this change was the implementation of a "civic commitment with the (re)construction of Brazil's memory and political history [4]⁴." Following this logic, it is worth highlighting the power of the building where the Memorial is, as its walls held prisoners of the Brazilian civil-military dictatorship for many years. That's why Felipini characterises this space as something beyond a museological organisation. It is also a place of memory [*Lieux de mémoire*]; materiality capable of serving as an anchor to the act of remembrance⁵. In other words, it is a space of refuge for memory. But that is not all. For Felipini, this refuge, specifically, guarantees the existence of a space to deal with specific traumas that remain in society as contemporary marks in the urban fabric as well as wounds in the subjects. The full proof of these wounds is that the claim to transform the Memorial of Liberty into the Memorial of Resistance and to recover its forms and stories are part of a proposal by the former political prisoners locked-up in that space. This place of memory established at a national level is based on subjective attempts.

This founding nucleus that is based on the subjects is reflected in the whole configuration of the Memorial. Its collection is formed primarily by collected testimonies. Even the reconstruction of architectural aspects of the building is directly linked to the testimonies of the survivors. The speech in first-person is the fundamental element linking photographs, documents, etc. Unlike the Museum of London's contemporary collection department, in which the informations surrounding the collection of objects comes from an immediate time, in Memorial it comes from narratives it comes across. To put it differently, although it is dedicated to understanding a certain traumatic trace in contemporaneity, the Memorial of Resistance deals with a fractured contemporary moment.

Thus, the two speeches of table four of this edition of the Conference of the Museums of the State of Sao Paulo can be considered analogous and distinct. Both raise the theme of preservation and interpretation of the present, as well as amplification in curatorial decisions; however, these choices clash. The Museum of London chooses a perspective that disregards objects that are less significant in terms of its goals. The Memorial

4 See <http://www.memorialdaresistencia.org.br/>

5 NORA, Pierre. Entre memória e história: a problemática dos lugares. Projeto História, no. 10, pp. 7-28, Dec. 1993

of Resistance tries to address what had already been discarded from its time, as it tries to understand the marks the resistance left in Brazilian society, trying to fill in the gaps of memories. Or, better yet, it regards memory as a way of resisting. While the London museum tries to incorporate forgetfulness into its choices, the Memorial seems to fight against this attitude; its self-designation as a memorial characterises it as a participant in this kind of endeavour.

According to Paulo Endo's article, entitled "Pensamento como margem, lacuna e falta: memória, trauma, luto e esquecimento"⁶, the memorial can be understood as one of those institutions that highlight one of the aspects of the dialectic between remembering and forgetting, namely, the action of remembering. Despite being commonly associated with physical forms and monumental constructions, "a memorial can be a day, a conference, or some space"⁷, being defined in fact by its injunction to remembrance; it is the space, the day, the conference, the form strategically reserved for remembrance. The memorial establishes "especially for", as a kind of anchor to a specific memory. For this reason, we can hardly perceive in the Memorial of Resistance a conflict between the voices it compiles, that is, the whispers that may have been left to oblivion. The purpose of building remembrance causes the element of forgetfulness to appear non-existent. However, this only represents a boundary of remembrance, often not included in the dynamics of the Memorial, whose way of dealing with such a boundary is different from the Museum of London's. Instead of emphasising remembrance, the latter has its preservation marked by a battle against certain erasure (a forgetfulness limit), preserving aspects that make it possible to narrate stories about the city of London that would have disappeared were it not for its safeguarding initiatives.

Still, the two proposals presented in the 6th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo have a common element: preserving the place of the subject as an inhabitant of the museological space, both an object and a subject that expresses a possible curatorial perspective. Thus, these proposals seem to offer the subjective turn as an answer to some of the questions raised by Garcez concerning the conferences: (1) How to interpret and select the present? (2) How to amplify the curatorial decision to include the citizen? (3) How to think of preservation initiatives as part of the State's duty, even if they contest it? Well, claiming the subject as a fundamental element of the museum seems to be a good guideline.

6 ENDO, Paulo. Pensamento como margem, lacuna e falta: memória, trauma, luto e esquecimento. Revista USP Memória, São Paulo, n. 98, p. 41-50, jun.-ago. 2013.

7 YOUNG, James. The texture of memory: Holocaust memorials and meaning. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1993.

7th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo

Extended Composition Works

Diogo de Moraes Silva

2021

Critical report; synthesis of the [7th Conference of the Museums](#) of the State of São Paulo: Communities Forum

Held on July 24, 25, and 26, 2015, in different cultural institutions in the city of São Paulo, the 7th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo - SSAMC had as its main axes the notions of "museums", "territories" and "communities" - all modulated in the plural. This edition of the Conference, which is established as an annual platform for the exchange of museum practices and repertoires, discussed the relationships between museums of different types and territorially-located communities, as well as the unique ways of interaction and collaboration between museums and territories, with their agents and actors.

The 7th SSAMC tested, for the first time in the event's trajectory, the decentralization of the places involved in the programming, distributing it among several spaces of the institutional network linked to culture in São Paulo - though limited to the Capital of the state. The opening of the Conference took place in the auditorium of Palácio dos Bandeirantes, headquarters of the São Paulo State Government, on the morning of July 24. The subsequent activities were held at the Immigration Museum, at the Museum of Modern Art of São Paulo - MAM-SP, at the Afro-Brazilian Museum, and at the Bienal Foundation of São Paulo, which also hosted the Conference's closing sessions.

In addition to providing programs conducive to museological debate, the SSAMC creates a favorable environment for the promotion of connections and agreements among professionals in the area. The 7th edition of the Conference fulfilled this objective, guided by the presentation of and discussion about museum documentation, especially the State Register of Museums - CEM-SP. Thus, the last day of the Conference was reserved for public examination of the provisions and parameters of the Register, a tool designed to guide actions to support museums in the state of São Paulo, coordinated by the State System of Museums of São Paulo - Sisem-SP, part of the current Secretariat of Culture and Creative Economy of the State of São Paulo - SCEC-SP.

Regulated almost a year after the 7th SSAMC, by Resolution SC n. 59, dated June 13, 2016, the CEM-SP came into effect as an instrument for organizing information about the technical conditions of museums in the state of São Paulo. This service supports the qualification of the work in museums spread throughout the state, through the preparation of technical and situational reports, with a view to the improvement and structuring of museological processes in these various institutions.

With the theme "Communities Forum", the 7th SSAMC's program included conferences, debate tables, and exhibition panels (presential and digital), as well as technical visits, and the launching of publications in the area. Among the work presented by the professionals invited to share their practices and research developed in the museological sphere in their interfaces with specific communities, it is possible to make elucidative connections with the notions announced as the main vectors of this edition of the event – permeated by related concepts, such as "social museology," "ecomuseum," "memory," and "heritage."

Outlining the mottos for the presentations of museum professionals from Brazil (São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro, Minas Gerais, Santa Catarina, and Distrito Federal), England, Greece, and Spain, these works also corresponded to the different places where the activities took place, particularly on the second day of the SSAMC, when the tables and panels were distributed in different cultural institutions in the city. That is why the section "Collaborative Processes in Museums" was reserved for the Immigration Museum, while "Education in Museums and Cultural Accessibility" took place at MAM-SP. "Territories and Publics" was hosted by the Afro-Brazilian Museum, while "City, Management and Sustainability in Museums" and "Museums and Social Movements" took place at the Bienal of São Paulo Foundation.

Suggestive of the history, policies, and actions developed by each of these institutions hosting the works, the messages they conveyed help examine how the notions of "museums," "territories," and "communities" were being postulated and articulated in this edition of the SSAMC. Combining these terms with the guiding statements of the activities allows us to see a conceptual web of meanings rich in allusions to the binomial "museums-communities," central to the 7th Conference. For example, when we link "museums" with "accessibility" and "education"; or when joining "territories" with "city" and "public"; Or "communities" with "social movements" and "collaborative processes".

This web becomes even more complex when we link the triads resulting from this specific exercise, such as "museums-accessibility-education," "territories-city-public," and "communities-social movements-collaborative processes," with the related concepts

of "social museology," "ecomuseum," "memory," and "heritage," which crossed the 7th SSAMC longitudinally. Let us, then, take a brief look back at the program, observing how these interconnections actually occurred, or rather, in some of the explanations that were part of the event.

The examinations around the interactions between museological institutions and the territories where they are inserted – inhabited or visited by different communities – make us think both in the extensive relations between museums and cities, when museums go beyond their walls, willing to deal with urban problems, and also in the perspective of museums as active laboratories interested in researching the city, presented in the panel "The Memories of the Cities: Museums, Territories, and Publics". This permeability between museums and their respective territories is accentuated by the "ecomuseum" modality, aimed at the development of communitarian museological processes, aggregating residents from bordering neighborhoods to certain cultural heritage sites; at the same time that the very concept of "heritage" and the processes of patrimonialization of urban sites and architectural buildings are themselves put into question, as shown in the panel "Territories and Publics: The Museums' Challenge".

The processes of collaborative curatorship among museums and between museums and communities are also a part of this. The presentations "Collaborative Curatorship at Immigration Museum" and "Collaborative Curatorship Project (Sisem-SP)," which occurred sequentially, enabled cross-checking different institutional experiences, concerning both principles and procedures and their results, with emphasis on the itinerant exhibition project "Signs – Inheritances and Journeys", which involved specialists and museum employees from eight cities in the countryside region of São Paulo. In both experiences, the question regarding "what should or should not go into a collection or exhibition" is central, opening discussions about criteria for the receptivity of contributions and donations of pieces and documents. As for the collaborations between museums and communities, the presentation "Building the Program of the Museum of Image and Sound - MIS Campinas" reported the mobilization of the community to defend the permanence of the institution in the Palácio dos Azulejos, from where it would have been evicted if it weren't for the actions of solidarity and defense of the museum. Moreover, the elaboration of the programming of the museum of Campinas now counted with the active participation of the public.

The Museum of Archeology and Ethnology - MAE-USP also seeks to develop an important part of its interlocutions with civil society initiatives, more precisely social movements. In the panel included in the "Museums and Social Movements" section, the "Sunflower" project was detailed. In this project, the Museum interacts and collaborates with residents from Jardim São Remo, a community of approximately 15 thousand people next to the campus

of the University of São Paulo in Butantã. In an attempt to cross segregating frontiers, this and other projects of the MAE-USP provide an opportunity to reflect on another museum modality, the “social museology.” Present in the program through presentations of projects from the Social Museology Network SP, in the section “Territories and Publics,” this modality is based on the understanding of the museum as an instrument for community use, with an eminently participatory character, so that people and groups involved can investigate, understand, safeguard, and disseminate their own histories and trajectories, with an approach and rhetoric consistent with their cultures and agendas.

Underlying all these precedents of museological action is the understanding that, in contemporaneity, it is not enough for museums to exist as a repository, conservator, and exhibitor of objects, whether artistic, archaeological, ethnological, or historical, to the same extent that it is unavoidable to observe, discuss, and experiment with initiatives that go beyond their traditional scope and, moreover, their physical spaces. It is essential, in this sense, to develop strategies to expand museological activities beyond the institutional environment, by incorporating other practices (mediative, educational, social, and environmental) that go beyond its consecrated expertise, which is to hold exhibitions.

In this opening of museums to territories and communities, the very notion of “memory” is revisited and brought back into the discussion, as seen in another panel included in the section “Territories and Publics”, in which one of the projects presented, entitled “R.U.A. - Augmented Urban Reality”, incorporates and explores the understanding that the city is a source of memories. Operating in certain contexts of the city of São Paulo, “R.U.A.” seeks to create the conditions for those involved to intermediate historical and mnemonically-oriented relations with their territories, particularly in environments marked by constant change and, therefore, by the impermanence of the referentials that served as receptacles of memory. Now, reversing the order, here it is the accumulated museum experience, with its concerns and know-how around conservation, research, and historicization of cultural assets, that migrates to urban spaces.

After the partial retrospect of the programming, we can assure the reflective journey proposed by the 7th SSAMC certainly fulfilled its agenda, covering all the themes and issues it proposed. In fact, the very definition of the Conference’s axes and themes, which help weave the conceptual web above mentioned, illustrates what museums and their programs were already developing for their territories and the communities inhabiting or visiting them. Thus, it seems necessary and opportune to create a forum willing to listen and disseminate, among professionals and those interested in the museological area, knowledge, and practices related to this field of action – particularly the actions fit for going beyond the walls.

The longevity achieved so far by The State of São Paulo’s Annual Museum Conference confirms the relevance of the public and discursive platform provided by the event for the examination and questioning of the museological institutions’ accomplishments, especially in their intersections with civil society. If, as the philosopher Rodrigo Nunes (2015) points out, the involvement of communities in institutional actions requires “lengthy work, demanding a gradual building of relationships, the creation of desires and interests, the cultivation of mutual trust,” may the SSAMC continue to provide the conditions for the continuity of the vital exchanges among museum professionals, bearing in mind the cultural institutions’ increasing complexity and the consequent need to reinforce initiatives with territories and communities.

References

- BUENAVENTURA, Julia. As memórias das cidades: museus, territórios e públicos (relato crítico do 7° Encontro Paulista de Museus). *Fórum Permanente*, São Paulo, 2015. Available at: http://www.forumpermanente.org/event_pres/encontros/encontros-paulista-de-museus/7-encontro-paulista-de-museus/relatos/painel-1o-as-memorias-das-cidades-museus-territorios-e-publicos. Accessed on 6 Mar., 2021.
- BUENAVENTURA, Julia. Museu da Imigração: processos colaborativos em museus (relato crítico do 7° Encontro Paulista de Museus). *Fórum Permanente*, São Paulo, 2015. Available at: http://www.forumpermanente.org/event_pres/encontros/encontros-paulista-de-museus/7-encontro-paulista-de-museus/relatos/museu-da-imigracao-processos-colaborativos-em-museus-2o-dia-no-atividades. Accessed on 6 Mar., 2021.
- CUBEROS, Carlos Felipe Guzmán. Atitude e sustentabilidade (relato crítico do 7° Encontro Paulista de Museus). *Fórum Permanente*, São Paulo, 2015. Available at: http://www.forumpermanente.org/event_pres/encontros/encontros-paulista-de-museus/7-encontro-paulista-de-museus/relatos/atitude-e-sustentabilidade. Accessed on 6 Mar., 2021.
- GASPARINI, Isis. Eixo central: territórios e públicos (relato crítico do 7° Encontro Paulista de Museus). *Fórum Permanente*, São Paulo, 2015. Available at: http://www.forumpermanente.org/event_pres/encontros/encontros-paulista-de-museus/7-encontro-paulista-de-museus/relatos/museu-afro-brasil-museu-afro-brasil. Accessed on 6 Mar., 2021.
- MORAES, Diogo de. Patrimônio: para quem e para quê? (relato crítico do 7° Encontro Paulista de Museus). *Fórum Permanente*, São Paulo, 2015. Available at: http://www.forumpermanente.org/event_pres/encontros/encontros-paulista-de-museus/7-encontro-paulista-de-museus/relatos/patrimonio-para-quem-e-para-que.

forumpermanente.org/event_pres/encontros/encontros-paulista-de-museus/7-encontro-paulista-de-museus/relatos/patrimonio-para-quem-e-para-que. Accessed on 6 Mar., 2021.

NUNES, Rodrigo. Por uma política de contracafetinagem. *Mesa*, Rio de Janeiro, n. 3, maio 2015. Available at: <http://institutomesa.org/revistamesa/edicoes/3/rodrigo-nunes>. Accessed on 6 Mar., 2021.

SISEM-SP. Cadastro Estadual de Museus de São Paulo, Resolução SC n. 59, de 13 de junho de 2016. São Paulo, 2016. Available at: <https://cem.sisemsp.org.br>. Accessed on 6 Mar., 2021.

Immigration Museum: Collaborative Processes in Museums

Julia Buenaventura
2015

Critical report of the [2nd day of activities of the 7th Conference of Museums of the State of São Paulo](#)

Morning: between the world and the museum

On the second day of the 7th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo (2015), the programming of the Immigration Museum had two sets of activities. In the morning, visits were made both to the institution's collection and to *Arsenal da Esperança*, a foundation in charge of sheltering more than a thousand homeless and hungry people in São Paulo. In the afternoon, the public attended three presentations on collaborative curatorship among museums or between museums and their communities.

The event began with a brief presentation by the director of the Immigration Museum, Maria Bonas Conte, addressing the institution's operation, its relationship with past and present immigrants, and the ever-present questions – what is a collection? How to select objects? What should be preserved and what should be discarded? These are questions raised by a collection of over 12 thousand objects: from old hat boxes and cameras from the beginning of the 20th century to scale weights, furniture and, of course, suitcases.

The director highlighted the institution's relationship with the children of Italians and Europeans who passed through this place over half a century ago. It is worth remembering that, upon arriving in São Paulo, immigrants had to stay at the current museum's facilities for 40 days, to prove that they had no diseases before moving on to the coffee farms in the countryside of the state, where life would be anything but simple. Thus, the building carries a huge history, being the first home that more than two and a half million people had in America.

Subsequently, Bonas Conte explained the museum's relationship with new immigrants, insisting that the institution has no "salvationist," "paternalistic," or "messianic" idea. This position signaled an unequivocal dissociation from the situation of today's immigrants

on the part of the museum (or its board) – despite the museum activities, such as the Immigrant Festival, an annual event.

Next, we visited the museum archives, followed by some explanations about the conservation of its 12,000 objects, which involves complex cauterisation procedures and a constant struggle against time.

Ivan Sbrana led the visit to the Arsenal da Esperança. Quick, agile and, above all, lacking in adjectives or protocols, Sbrana showed us around the Arsenal, which, as I mentioned above, is a place designed to give refuge to 1,200 homeless men – women in the same conditions are received by other institutions. The Arsenal provides food and shelter and has, above all, a space devoted to courses (six technical courses and two free courses), which work as an incentive, showing the possibility of a different future for these people. They also have a TV room, a game room and a library, the latter consulted by 150 people every night. According to Sbrana, the most popular titles are high-quality literature.

The place is clean and organised. The people are allowed to stay for a maximum of six months. The hours are arranged so that those who are not attending the courses must leave after breakfast, only to return in the afternoon. This is meant to ensure that everyone finds his own way. Thus, at the time of our visit, the place was practically empty.

The most striking image I have seen in recent times was the common dormitory, a huge warehouse with 500 double beds arranged in perfect order; all alike, all aligned, beyond the line of sight. Sbrana said that many people asked if it was a work of contemporary art, an installation, to which he replied with a no. This is the real world.

Going from the museum to the Arsenal, both in the same block, with the same architecture, in short, sharing the same physical characteristics, produced a profoundly strange sensation. It was like crossing a line between the real and the fictitious, between the world and the museum. The museum represented identity, while the Arsenal did not have to represent anything. It was the present, clear-cut identity; it meant seeing São Paulo – and through it, our great cities – without any filter.

Afternoon: Back to the museum

Once we crossed the fence dividing one space from the other, and after a break for lunch, we went to the auditorium to attend the first lecture given by Maria Bonas Conte – who spoke early in the morning –, and by Mariana Martins.

The lecture was entitled “Collaborative Curatorship at the Immigration Museum”, and Conte explained the total restructuring of the museum, which reopened a year ago with a different curatorial and organisational project. Conte spoke briefly, leaving room for questions. The audience asked, among other things, how the museum worked with contemporary immigration and how the relation with Arsenal da Esperança worked. With humour, the director replied that working with contemporary migrants was not an easy task: “we guarantee everybody’s dissatisfaction so that everybody has their own space”; she then referred to the Immigrant Festival as the “most uncomfortable success we have” and ended by pointing out that the relationship with the Arsenal is difficult, since, besides throwing cigarette butts into an old coffee machine in the museum, the inhabitants also bring cats.

From another perspective, Mariana Martins approached the curatorial project of the institution, explaining that the idea is precisely not to have a curator to guide the exhibitions. Martins then summarised the problems regarding the collection, pointing out the difficulty in deciding on donations, that is, which ones to accept and which ones to reject since the collection of objects cannot grow ad infinitum. Finally, the lecturer mentioned the issues surrounding the proposal of a collaborative museum where different departments maintain permanent contact. She explained that the museum’s attempt in this direction had failed, concluding that each department should work in its field.

I have two comments. First, without a curator, the museum’s permanent exhibition contradicts its collection of 12,000 objects, as they do not appear anywhere. It is a room where panels explain the history of immigration in Brazil. Thus, there is some inconsistency between the collection and the exhibition that reveals a void in the museum’s objectives, a void that is filtered by the doubts about donations. In the end, this doubt did not refer to what to receive or not to receive, but rather why keep all this. This is a question a museum must constantly face, theoretically and practically. Secondly, it is important to point out that several of the statements, even if expressed with humour, like jokes, were inappropriate, such as the conclusion that collaboration between the various bodies of an institution is not feasible, and the sad references to the Arsenal or the immigrants’ party. These are points where further exploration is needed because, from my perspective, they reveal a general lack of meaning, both of the collection and of the museum’s mission.

The second presentation, entitled “Project of collective curatorship -Sisem-SP” was completely different. Raquel Fayad explained how a collaborative project with people from several cities in the state of São Paulo (Botucatu, Itapeva, Tatuí, Pratânia, Piraju, São Manoel, Votorantim and Salto) happened. The result of the project was the exhibition “Sinais - Heranças e Andanças”, built by managers and employees in a deep

collective dialogue, which could be seen through a video recording with interviews with each one of the participants. Thus, it became clear that the process was as important as the final result. It was not only a question of setting up an itinerant exhibition but also of creating a network of human contact among the employees of several institutions of the state of São Paulo.

The exhibition, which aimed to create a map of regional identity, had the peculiarity of facing basic problems of museums of historical memory. That is, the previously mentioned question, what does or does not enter a collection? What is representative of a human group? The questions were interestingly addressed at an expositive level, by mixing objects from the past with objects from the present, for example. Among very old tools there was a plastic toy, so that the old would show the past of the toy, while the toy brought the ancient tools – indigenous or Portuguese – to the present. Several of the organisers were present in the auditorium, and their engagement with the exhibition was noticeable. The commitment originated from the fact the exhibit was conceived with the public and questions such as ‘what for’ and ‘to whom’ in mind.

Finally, Juliana Maria de Siqueira presented the lecture entitled “Building the MIS Campinas Program”. She profusely mentioned the history of the museum, which was founded by a group in the 1970s, and had problems finding solid headquarters, but was installed in Palácio dos Azulejos in 2001. Later, there was an attempt to remove it from there, an experience that, in the end, was positive, as it called upon the community to defend the institution.

In Siqueira’s words, the museum is establishing a communication channel with the public, an active interaction; thus, in commemorating its 40th anniversary, the institution decided to ask people and visitors directly what they expected from the museum. The answers served as a basis to carry out the programming project. Likewise, it was mentioned that the museum should stop being a collection and start working with the present; an interesting proposal, yet not well clarified in the presentation.

Thus, the lecture about the MIS-Campinas was more descriptive than analytical. We learned about the history of the museum and its programming, but specific cases regarding the development of activities or the communication channels with the public were not deeply discussed.

After this speech, the second day of the Conference at the Immigrant Museum came to an end.

Museum, Extramural Territory

Isis Gasparini
2015

Critical report on the panel: [Afro-Brazilian Museum - Central Axis: Territories and Audiences](#)

Today it is not enough for a museum to be the depository of works and artefacts; it is necessary to rethink what goes beyond its physical space. It has become essential to rethink its initiatives, paying special attention to mechanisms that provide greater access to exhibitions and bring them closer to a wider and more diverse audience. Furthermore, many museums have discussed strategies that expand their activities outside the institutional sphere, going beyond their traditional mission of holding exhibitions.

The tables and panels held on the second day of the 7th SSAMC at the Afro-Brazilian Museum were marked by discussions about bringing museums closer to communities by expanding their artistic and educational activities. In some of the cases presented, initiatives are proposed by the institutions; in other cases, by independent proponents connected with museums. These projects bring out broader questions exploring who the museum’s public is (and can be).

In the first roundtable of the day, guest Priscila Arantes defined Paço das Artes as “a contemporary space par excellence, which exercises thinking about new territories and cartographies.” Although it is not a museum in the strict sense of the term, the Paço is an institution concerned with debating what a museological institution is, what an art collection is, and its role. She believes that it is the vocation of public institutions to understand the specificity of the territories in which they are located.

The Paço Comunidade project was proposed in 2013 to foster a dialogue with everything surrounding it. It started out from the challenge of rethinking institutional initiatives that should reach the public beyond its walls. The initiative works in the transit between the museum and the community, especially regarding the residents of the São Remo neighbourhood, who had never visited the museum, despite living across the walls surrounding the University of São Paulo.

This initiative, which is still in progress, consists of working with contemporary art in projects that may sometimes attract people to the activities held at the Paço and others take artists and the educational unit to the community. In the 2013 edition, the project invited the artist Anderson Rei to hold a painting and stencil workshop there. The second edition featured Alberto Tembo, who developed a set of games with the community.

The third edition, recently finished, had the collaboration of artist Monica Nador, also present at this panel's table, and was carried out in partnership with Jamac (Jardim Miriam Arte Clube), a project created by the artist in 2003 in the southern region of the city, which became an Oscip (civil society organisation of public interest) in 2005 and is still active. For six months, the project focused on the participants' identities' representations, developed through artistic experimentation in stencil and fabric workshops, resulting in items of clothing.

The exhibition held at the Paço was configured as a closing party for the project, including the community's participation, and giving equal importance to the products (the clothes) and the processes (designing, making, printing). According to the artist, her wish is that "we manage to make art and manage to survive despite the market because art is not only about making an object of art."

From this experience, we can perceive that as the art institution moves towards other public places, it begins dealing with productions whose forms and materialities are different from the objects housed by a conventional collection, giving more emphasis to the processes (games, production of clothing, parties).

Priscila Arantes pointed out the difficulties of an initiative that expands the museum's activities, as it should be carried out together with an already consolidated program, such as the *Season of Projects* (aimed at young artists) and the *Arts and Curatorship Residency* (for mid-career artists who occupy a significant amount of time and space in the institution's available structure). She also highlighted the Paço Comunidade project and its positive outcome regarding proximity to the public.

At the same table, there was the presentation of the *R.U.A.: Augmented Urban Reality Project*, carried out by Lilian Amaral. The project arises from the need for an artistic work platform that has the street as its meeting place (a space to which artists and curators have paid greater attention since the 1980s). This initiative represents a form of urban communication creating a kind of ephemeral museum. By capturing the public's attention through art, the city ceases to be a utilitarian space for displacement, becoming a place for creating meanings.

The *R.U.A.* project assumes that the city is a source of experiences and memories. And it considers it vital to offer conditions for people to create more conscious relationships with their surroundings, especially in centres marked by constant change and, therefore, by the impermanence of the references that allow for such experiences and memories. According to Lilian Amaral, society itself demands this initiative from the museum.

Projects of this nature also allow institutions to reflect about how they fit into a given territory. *Augmented Urban Reality* began in Bom Retiro, parallel to the Iphan's patrimony protection initiative in this neighbourhood. But it was taken to Unesp when the Institute of Arts moved its campus, after 50 years, from Ipiranga to Barra Funda. The change from the old convent, with its interior-oriented architecture, to a new building with glass facades, now more open to the outside landscape, was the starting point to reflect about Unesp's lack of adherence to the neighbourhood.

Projects such as *Paço Comunidade* and *R.U.A.* disturb an order imposed by the tradition of the museum and the gallery as an idealised space, which aims to isolate the work from external references to affirm its autonomy. Such projects respond to the critique made by Brian O'Doherty, who deconstructs the supposed neutrality of what he calls the *white cube*.

As the author puts it, "the work is insulated from everything that would detract from its own evaluation of itself [...]. Some of the sanctity of the church, the formality of the courtroom, the mystique of the experiment laboratory joins with chic design to produce a unique chambre of esthetics. [...] The outside world must not come in, so windows are usually sealed off. Walls are painted white. The ceiling becomes the source of light¹." While museums today strive to connect art with the experience and memory that the public carries from its everyday experience, for this tradition criticised by O'Doherty "time does not exist. This eternity gives the gallery a limbo condition; one must already have died to be there²." As opposed to this perspective, the projects presented in this panel regard the museum as a device that opens to the outside and must assume a more dynamic role, increasingly asserting itself as a producer of knowledge, a place of production rather than storage or display of objects.

We can recognise the concerns discussed in this panel in other current experiences. The project *Esto no es un museo. Artefactos móviles al acecho*, curated by Martí Peran,

1 O'DOHERTY, Brian. No interior do cubo branco: a ideologia do espaço da arte. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2002. p. 4-5.

2 Idem, p. 5.

brought together a series of museum proposals that rethink their tradition in an exhibition that has just finished at the Centro Cultural São Paulo. The different initiatives presented share the desire to get closer to the public in a strategy that often creates “nomadic” exhibitions, or small “open-air” museums that create a more direct access to art.

This is not an art museum [3]³ is also the title of an article by American researcher Douglas Crimp, where he discusses the work of Marcel Broodthaers. In May this year, the author was in Brazil for the event *Before Pictures: Meeting with Douglas Crimp*, organised by Mônica Nador, Sylvia Furegatti (visual artist and Unicamp professor) and Thais Rivitti (curator and director of the independent space Ateliê397).

In the book that contains this essay, *“Sobre as ruínas do museu”*⁴, Crimp discusses the role of these spaces in contemporary art and how they participate in legitimising and constructing the meaning of the works when they exhibit them in their spaces.

Thus, we see the privileged space of exhibitions going beyond the museum spheres towards other public spheres. It is not enough to make the museum’s initiatives in the community a way of bringing the public into the institution. The projects discussed seem to contain a more effective desire to deinstitutionalize art, that is, to ensure that the experiences produced by the museum continue belonging to people, wherever they are.

3 CRIMP, Douglas. Isto não é um museu de arte. In: *Sobre as ruínas do museu*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2005.

4 *Sobre as ruínas do museu*, published as a collection in 1993, brings together essays by the author that had already been part of magazines and exhibition catalogues, added at this time to a set of images produced by the artist Louise Lawler, to demonstrate that the work of art can already contain, in itself, layers of reflection that place it in the universe of critical theories. Crimp starts from the signs that determine the art autonomy and that alienate it from what is outside its system. This isolation is a construction given by the internal dynamics of the museum itself, but which is systematically questioned by the growing presence of more heterogeneous works, such as those produced by photography or by other techniques less related to traditional artistic languages.

8th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo

Museums and the Affirmation of Identities: Between the Local and the Global

Marilúcia Bottallo

2021

Critical Report; synthesis of the [8th Conference of the Museums](#) of the State of São Paulo

2016 was the year of the 8th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo. It was also a year marked by a series of important global events, both nationally and worldwide. Through our network communication systems, already strongly influenced by social networks by then, we saw the “traditional” mass communication newspapers, magazines, TV, and radio stations lose space to innovative forms based on a personal production through personalized editing in different media systems and platforms, which were quickly assimilated into our daily lives. If the news that perplexed us were defined by the editorials of the major networks, the critical review of their content began to be made through parallel networks practically in real-time.

In 2016, the enormous number of terrorist attacks in Europe and the Middle East, the United Kingdom’s exit from the European Union, Trump’s election in the United States, the spread of Zika virus, which by then had affected 4 million people, the Panama Papers scandal, the nations agreement on the slowing down of global warming, and the death of Fidel Castro, in parallel with the impeachment of President Dilma Rousseff, the municipal elections that witnessed the growth of the right wing, the Olympic Games held in the city of Rio de Janeiro, that exposed the fragility of the political and economic structures of the country now ruled by its vice-president, the movement of occupation of public schools against the PEC (An amendment to the Constitution imposing a ceiling on public spending), and the project School without Party were some of the most commented topics by the official media, followed by a countless number of critiques made by individuals connected to the social networks in an attempt register the present, or to reassure themselves that being connected in real time can also be a weapon against arbitrariness, or to express the need to be heard amidst the informational chaos.

In this clash between the global and the local, the public and the private, we see museums and their representatives heralding the importance of the discussion about action through networks. The 8th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo, an initiative of the State System of Museums of São Paulo, defined as the theme for that year “Networks and Museum Systems: Collaborative Actions.” The very idea of a museum system, discussed, formatted, and carried out in the state of São Paulo 30 years before, already pointed to the importance of establishing networks to reflect about different forms of heritage management that could expand its significance and use to the population, seeing preserved heritage as a possible cultural capital that would regard education as part of its responsibility. But, also, trying to think of some pragmatic actions: how to implement programs, actions, systems, strengthen ties, find partners, maintain collections, create new exhibition resources, solve daily problems, among other initiatives. During this 8th conference, Sisem, besides celebrating its 30th anniversary of uninterrupted work, presented another integrating initiative: the São Paulo State Register of Museums, understood as a systematization tool that would deeply understand the museums in the state.

By dealing with “Networks and Museum Systems: Collaborative Actions,” the 8th SSAMC, guided by the interests of the moment, ended up making a series of projections for the future by strengthening the importance of cooperation systems that regarded networks, which were beginning to proliferate and become stronger in museums, as pragmatic and conceptual. The conference’s program, from its opening ceremony all the way through presentations and panels, succeeded in bringing a very clear articulation between the great themes debated worldwide and their reverberation in the local museums’ initiatives and their justified uniquenesses. The idea of network reverberated in the manner in which the Conference’s programming was proposed, as it chose to occupy different institutions to enable greater circulation of a large number of participants in some of the city’s cultural places of interest.

The main themes focused on discussions about operation networks, articulation between museums and the community, besides thematic panels that discussed themes that were relevant and dear to the museological universe, such as communication and services to the public, safeguarding collections, management and governance, and infrastructure and buildings. In addition, a table with regional representatives had as its motto “a vision of the future”.

Some foreign speakers, such as Hugues de Varine-Bohan – a conceptual reference for several generations of heritage professionals –, Edmon Castel, John Orna-Ornstein, Mathieu Viau-Courville, and Sharon Heal, as well as the Brazilians Danilo Miranda and Mario Chagas, emphasized the importance of museums as essential vectors in the

relationship between the global and the local. From supporting programs to being open to recognizing the distinct needs of their constituencies, museum processes and programs were understood as potential transformers of community realities.

The power of museums, an idea present in several speeches, refers to their being spaces for the exercise of citizenship, and the emergence of new museological typologies provided the possibility of including new audiences, which museums look to incorporate in their process of development as institutions. The presentations and debates led to a reflection about museums as places where critical thinking and action are possible, therefore as relational spaces and not only collection spaces. One of the mediated cases exposed in Mario Chagas' lecture¹ presented, on a video, the demand of the residents of Vila Autódromo, a community that was removed from their homes to enable the construction of the Olympic village in the city of Rio de Janeiro, for the creation of the Museum of Removals in the place where the village had existed. The group's strategy was to propose that the village be transformed into an open-air museum, lending itself as a place for discussion about what is memory and what are removals, in a clear political clash with the determination made by the authorities to remove the residents. Mathieu Viau-Courville,² through a project that involves dance, proposed a reflection on how to favor citizen participation in museums. He responded to this demand with the concept of co-construction, because, according to him, this is a way of guaranteeing the presence of the community and, furthermore, of representing heritage. Viau-Courville points out that heritage is not a thing, nor an intangible event, but rather a representation or a cultural process based on actions and values that should be underlined. Hugues de Varine-Bohan,³ in a remote lecture, emphasizes the relationship between museums and local development, especially through heritage, cultural, and environmental mediated actions. For him, the museum must organize itself so as to represent the forces and dynamics of the population and respond to their demands. To do so, it needs legal governance and operationalization intended to represent the opinions and choices of community partners, understood as heirs and users of heritage. However, he stresses the importance of including public authorities and the entire social fabric of local development in the process, among other social and even economic players. He stresses that the museum is a global institution that has a cultural, social, and economic dimension.

1 ——— References from the panel video recordings "Articulando museus e comunidades." Access link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6BPYh8I2wfl>.

2 ——— References from the panel video recordings "Articulando museus e comunidades". Access link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6BPYh8I2wfl>.

3 ——— References from the panel video recordings "Articulando museus e comunidades". Access link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bDCGEL6StVc>.

With these considerations, it is clear that the issue of networks was regarded beyond its technological dimension as a tool; it was rather regarded as a concrete possibility of human agency, having the museum and its concrete actions as an institution that allows heritage and memory to be understood as resources available for the qualification of the distinct groups that work there. The idea of joint construction in the museum becomes important, including the process of heritage safeguarding and governance, which, in their origins, are not detached from such principles. The thematic panels, which addressed topics ranging from the public to collection management and institutional management issues, did not shy away from also reflecting about the relationship with their publics of interest, and with methods of incorporating distinctive voices.

In this regard, the 8th SSAMC set the stage for extremely rich and updated discussions that remain part of the agenda of museums' initiatives in the contemporary world, resonating with the Zeitgeist that embraces integration as a way to promote local cultures. On the other hand, the relationship with a globalized universe is not overlooked; after all, in this clash between the global and the local, the construction of positive identities is possible. Conferences like this, which bring together more than a thousand people to reflect on the role of museums, and that result in vigorous discussions, reiterate, in my opinion, the organic role that museums continue to play in society, reinforcing their cultural, educational, and social functions, which is critical for the diverse communities associated through networks. The very idea of network, as pointed out by Cassio Martinho,⁴ associated with the concept of the six degrees of separation, is important to acknowledge the potentiality of each point, since the same point usually belongs to several networks, in which it occupies different places, according to its relations. Thus, behind each point, there is a hidden network that can be accessed depending on the flow of information.

The idea of museums and network or network museums makes sense by the very transdisciplinary nature of museological work, and it relates directly to its most cherished objectives in the contemporary world: the inclusion and qualification of the interactions that take place in this fundamental space of mediation.

4 ——— References from the panel video recordings "Articulando museus e comunidades". Access link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oXi-cDaEFxs>.

The Transformative Potential of Museums and their Challenges in a Globalised Era

Beto Shwafaty

2016

Critical Report of the [presentation by John Orna-Ornstein, Director of Arts Council England](#)

Lucimara Letelier (deputy director of Arts at the British Council Brazil) opened this section of the 8th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo. She then introduced John Orna-Ornstein. In her brief introduction, she stressed that this event is one of the initiatives aimed at celebrating the four-year-old partnership of the British Council with the State Secretariat for Culture of São Paulo, which has, as one of its focuses, the *Transform Museums* program¹, an initiative which supported the implementation of SISEM². John is director of the Arts Council England, an organization (an autarchy) that develops and implements public policy in the arts in the UK and whose funding comes from the government and from a national lottery created in 1996.

Orna-Ornstein begins his lecture with a parable related to the communities' involvement with museums: when he worked at the British Museum, one of the community programs proposed an evaluation and the engagement of people who had never been to the museum regarding a single object. Different artistic languages were used to make it accessible and there were curators conducting the visits.

One of the objects approached was a very specific and ancient representation of love (some 35,000 years old). For a week, the team and participants engaged with the object. It culminated in an interesting exchange between a 16-year-old girl and the curator – a fact that has marked John. In this exchange, the young girl said that it was the first time in her life that she had been heard. There is a beauty in this case that shows the potentiality

¹ Available at: <http://transform.britishcouncil.org.br>.

² Available at: <http://www.sisemsp.org.br>.

of being impacted by museums. The curator, in turn, stated that she was also impacted by this process and the young girl's speech. She said that she would never be able to look at this object in the same way again because of the the young girl's intervention and response to it. This concrete case exemplifies the power of museums to impact our lives and change how we face our most immediate contexts as well as other contexts based on cultural history. The possibilities of change that these contexts and processes provide are something that gains importance, according to John, making us consider this latent potential of cultural institutions in a scenario of several global crises, affecting not only Brazil but several other countries. Such crises generate uncertainties that, in turn, affect public funding for culture.

John provides a quick historical overview of the creation of civic and public museums in the UK, a process that began in the 18th century and flourished in the 19th century (accompanied by the opening of libraries across the country). Their purpose was to improve society and promote general public and cultural development. He also called attention to the pattern of these museums, as the vast majority was established in the countryside and the northern regions, which were rich industrial areas. According to John, there was a certain competition between cities over building beautiful places for museums and endowing them with rich collections, both from local productions and from other parts of the world. The 20th century saw the consolidation of these civic museum models, and then, around the 1970s, the emergence of private and independent even commercial (i.e. not public-funded) museums. Today, there are more private and independent museums in the UK than public ones (around a thousand). During the last 20 years, says John, museums enjoyed an extremely favourable environment in terms of funding and programs, which has led to subsequent investment in the museums' workforce and buildings, providing an increase in the quality, modernisation, professionalisation and programming of the institutions (around £100 million a year were spent and distributed to museums alone).

Given the large sums invested in these institutions, the social area became their focal point. This led museums to engage in creating and maintaining social impact through their exhibitions and programs (here he stresses that this was also influenced by the public policies of the last labour-oriented governments in the country). Thus, if we look at the last ten years, we can see that museums occupied a strategic position in cultural policies. However, recently, everything has changed very fast, said John. Due to the economic crisis faced by the western world, local (municipal) support was not maintained, with cuts reaching 30% in support reduction. Soon these impacts will be felt where civic museums are most present, a situation that certainly creates an increasing challenge for their upkeep.

John also mentions two other challenges, pointing out that this is not just a financial issue. Given the drastic changes globally, such as mass immigration, pluralism becomes a working point that brings about social changes in the country. The importance of this observation is that, according to John, museums are not yet reflecting these changes in communities – and this observation makes us wonder whether museums in Brazil are concerned with trying to consider the current social situations, and, if so, how?

Orna-Ornstein mentions yet another challenge, related to the socio-cultural and ethnic characteristics of museum professionals. As he recognized, most of them are white, well educated and have a university degree. These characteristics alone may no longer be enough to face the social challenges in a multi-ethnic and global society such as the UK. He also points out that many museums do not know their public well (contrary to supermarket chains that know almost everything about their consumer's profile). A series of cultural and demographic transformations are taking place, and facing them becomes part of the work of institutions.

Another challenge presented by John is the issue of working with collections. Because of the UK's strong imperial (and colonial) history, it has a wide range of collections that seek to represent many parts of the world (mostly those subjugated by English colonial rule). The challenge here is how to address this need to tell the story of the world through these collections. As an aside, such an undertaking becomes a pressing need, and, at the same time, we must point out the dangers and the complex nature of this act, for who will determine what should be told and how? On what historical and ethical bases will this narrative regime about the histories of places in the world be based?

John also informs us that the collections are extremely vast. He even states that "there are more objects than people in the country". There are hundreds of thousands of objects, an extraordinary situation; however, it generates high maintenance costs (about two-thirds of the institutions' budgets) and the challenge of conserving them often makes it difficult to create the necessary transformations to enable them, thus creating a kind of conservatism. However, he gives some examples of museums that go against this conservative situation. There, the forms of exhibition, of public inclusion, and of creation of alternative narratives seem to be rearticulated in the face of the current situations³. But, even if those are unique initiatives, he reminds us that it is impossible to be a museum of everything

³ John lists some museums that exemplify initiatives of unique transformations in terms of program and engagement with the community, such as the Horniman Museum (<http://www.horniman.ac.uk>), which is located in South London, and has a large collection of ethnography, natural history and music; A small museum in the village of Ditchling (<http://www.ditchlingmuseumartcraft.org.uk>); And a museum that works in partnership with the community in the industrial city of Derby (<http://www.derbymuseums.org>).

and for everyone. What makes a museum important is its characterisation and specificity, its collection, its program, and the public it seeks to address. And this is how he stresses a very expressive point in his speech: the museum must adapt to the new ways of approaching its collection and its public, and not the other way round.

On the other hand, John points out that most museums are comprised of companies; therefore, they are commercial entities. It is impossible to reverse this fact, and accepting it becomes necessary for the very survival of the institutions and the system. The problems that arise from this situation lie, perhaps, in the challenge of finding a balance between the public sphere and private interests.

A final challenge, particularly for local governments (he specifically mentions municipalities), relates to giving institutions the freedom to behave in the way they feel is best to fulfil their objectives, whether these institutions are commercial or not. It perhaps involves reviewing the ways of exhibiting, telling and talking about the collections on display, and how connections with the community are built.

John also comments on the Arts Council's work, which was established just after Second World War, some 70 years ago. The importance of cultural work in the post-war period was identified, and from that moment the institution took shape. Through it, some £600 million are distributed to various UK bodies, with resources, as already mentioned, coming from the government and the National Lottery. The Arts Council is a local authority, but not directly linked to the government⁴, and it has five specific objectives that guide its work: fostering great art, making it accessible to all, making it environmentally sustainable and economically resilient, supporting the workforce and leadership for institutions, and ensuring access to culture for young people and children.

John also advocates keeping the status of autarchy to preserve an autonomy concerning the implementation of cultural policies that can influence society and participate in its economy, making them stronger. In this sense, financing culture is paramount, an initiative whose impact is holistic. Its role, increasingly necessary, is to defend institutions that provide cultural services, fostering values that promote social and egalitarian progress, respecting local aspects, their audiences and specificities. Finding ways to respond to local needs accurately is key for museums, just as responding to the communities that connect to them, says John.

⁴ In Brazil, we would have the "S" Systems (Sesi, Sesc and Senai) as a comparative example; however, they work in a more institutional and corporative manner and without the same external support of the English Arts Council.

Finally, he mentions the referendum that would take place a few days after his talk, in which it would be decided whether or not the United Kingdom would remain in the European block, stating that given the current political and economic challenges, it is also challenging for museums to try not to close their borders and impose limits. Instead, they should broaden our understanding of reality, sowing tolerance, facilitating communication and coexistence. For John, this is the soul of our museums. Since the referendum has already taken place as I write this report (and we know the result), the challenges outlined by John Orna-Ornstein are indeed becoming a reality.

The Mobile Architecture of Networks

Diego de Kerchove

2016

Critical report of the [lecture by professor and journalist Cássio Martinho](#)

The lecture of professor and journalist Cássio Martinho was based on the exhibition and explanation regarding networks. This concept was central in the 8th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo, as the 30th anniversary of SISEM (State System of Museums of São Paulo) was being celebrated, and SISEM is precisely an extensive network created among the museums of São Paulo to promote and strengthen the work of similar institutions in the state. In a well-structured approach, the lecturer explained the four fundamental elements that make up a network, particularly networks without scales, that is, those that do not follow a predetermined architecture, for example, a social network.

The first component presented by the speaker concerns the points or nodes, essential elements of a network, which are related and form the structural basis of its architecture. In the example of SISEM, the points would be the different museums in the state of São Paulo comprising it.

The second element presented are the links. They interconnect the different points and configure the whole architecture of the network. The number of connections and the power of each of them defines the place of a point within a certain network. For example, if the point has many strong connections and links with the other ones, it will occupy a more central place; however, if its connections are weak, it will occupy a more peripheral place in that network. In turn, the location of the point within the architecture defines its role. If it is more central, the point will have a cohesive role: flows will pass through this point and quickly be replicated to other nearby points, thus strengthening the links. On the other hand, if a point has weak connections, it will be on the periphery. The role of

this peripheral node is to expand the horizon of the network, taking and bringing connections and flows of new information to other networks¹ [1].

The third element presented by Martinho is the network architecture. As it results from the relationship between the points, a scale-free network structure is essentially mobile and horizontal. According to the speaker, the concept of hierarchy does not fit in the concept of network because networks do not have a fixed centre – a central point that determines and influences its dynamics. In this sense, the centre of a network is mobile, as each agent can assume a central or peripheral role depending on the flow of information.

Associated with the idea of network architecture, the concept of six degrees of separation affirms that we are separated from any person on the planet by an average of six people (or points). This concept is important to show the power of each point, since the same point generally belongs to several networks, where it occupies different places according to its relations. Thus, behind each point, a hidden network can be accessed depending on the flow of information.

Finally, the last element presented by the speaker was the flow or the information that circulates between the different points of the same network. In his presentation, Martinho used the concept of a virus and its mode of propagation. The more central points, being more agglomerated and having stronger links, tend to be the first to be contaminated; on the other hand, the peripheral points do not receive this information – or virus – quickly. The correlation with biology is clear, but the speaker also gave the example of the genocide in Rwanda. In that case, messages calling for the Hutus to massacre the Tutsis circulated for months, mainly by radio. Unfortunately, this hatred turned into genocide, and in just three months, almost 1 million people were killed by their own countrymen. This example allows us to see the importance of the flow (media, in this case), which can significantly alter the network for better or worse. That is why, according to Martinho, the flows have this important characteristic: they give life to the network. It is through them that one can strengthen and expand the network, despite the unpredictability factor that is inherent to flows.

At the end of his talk, Cássio Martinho presented three ideas as a provocation and contribution to the museum network debate. The first two ideas are an invitation to

¹ We can take the platform of the Fórum Permanente as an example of this explanation. The conception of the site and all the association's work is precisely to expand the horizon of different networks and put them in contact many times over. The Fórum Permanente does not belong solely to museology or contemporary art; it approaches both the academic and the artistic milieu. One of its main concerns is to place itself between these different networks and offer information and content that is not necessarily at the core of these networks.

museological institutions to further reflect on the flows; next, he suggests that they should attempt to reach those beyond the horizon or the centrality of the museum network. This idea reverberates in the question of cultural mediation and its concern with inserting the museum more effectively within its own community.

To this end, museological institutions should act in partnership with other institutions, such as schools, and with individuals from that community, offering spaces both physical and in its programming so that this community can exhibit and produce its own artistic expression. However, as we mentioned before, the flows cannot be entirely controlled because they depend on a series of external factors to go viral, crossing the boundaries of a particular network.

Martinho's speech also presents examples of the Arab Spring and June 2013 here in Brazil. In both cases, the flow of information was born in a particular network and then expanded due to a series of factors that caused these events to reach transformative proportions. In general, Martinho suggests that cultural institutions are important hubs, sensitive points in different networks, and it is up to them to transmit, distribute, and create new flows.

The third and last idea suggests that the São Paulo museum network should not be oriented solely by the biased interests of large partnerships involving several institutions. It should, instead, also foster smaller and more frequent partnerships between two or three agents, thus making up its network. The institutions belonging to the network of museums, according to Martinho, should not be rigid, seeking control; rather, they should allow fluidity and freedom among its different components. This process is facilitated by Big Data and other informative tools popular nowadays and allows smaller partnerships to reach other dimensions of importance, depending on the creative flow they generate. This idea came last, yet it is possibly the most revealing concerning the capacity of a flow or an idea to go viral, crossing the boundaries of the museum network. Perhaps a constant production between a few points in parallel with a larger production of other points is more effective in the process of transcending the horizon of the network than a large production controlled and planned between all the points, because the speed, frequency and creativity of these smaller partnerships are more aligned with the concept of horizontality that defines the architecture of a network.

The explanation of the different components of a network and the ideas presented by Professor Cássio Martinho bring both clarity and questions about how museums can take advantage of and expand their information flows beyond their horizons. On the one hand, these institutions must turn to more dynamic and open partnerships, and, on the

other hand, they must understand that the flows have their dynamics of viralization and that this is often unpredictable. Perhaps the most important concept presented by this lecture is the mobile architecture of a network, in which it is impossible to predict which will be the central or peripheral points because they depend on the flow of information. Somehow, this mobility guarantees the perennial life of a network and prevents it from coming apart in the long run, as it remains in constant transformation and renewal.



9th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo

9th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo: Safety, Accessibility, and Financial Sustainability

Mariana von Hartenthal

2021

Synthetic Critical Report of the [9th Conference of the Museums](#) of the State of São Paulo: Infrastructure and Safety

Responding to the fire that hit the Museum of Portuguese Language in 2015, the organizers of the ninth edition of The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference initially proposed infrastructure and safety as themes for the event. However, aware of the indivisible bond between the promotion of adequate conditions for the safety of objects and people and the availability of resources, the organizers decided to expand the agenda to include issues related to the funding of institutions. Economic sustainability, public policies, and management are frequent topics in the Sisem Meetings, which did not abandon its commitment to broader social issues, such as gender diversity – a concern evidenced by the invitation made to the German Schwules Museum.¹

The inseparability between safety and financial sustainability, the correlation between accessibility and safety, the need to diversify the sources of funds and long-term planning, and the institutionalization of museum management were subjects that permeated all the discussions at the Conference. The event was also an opportunity to reflect on the State Register of Museums of São Paulo (CEM-SP), an instrument launched in the previous Conference. Besides discussions and lectures, the Conference offered workshops on the caretaking of the historical and cultural patrimony, the design of safety routines, the attainment of the Fire Department Inspection Certificate (AVCB), and infrastructure management.

¹ Schwules is a vulgar term used to refer to gay men. In 2008, the Museum had decided it should be named "Schwules Museum*" (with an asterisk) in order to allude to the diversity of the LGBTQIA+ community. However, in 2018, the institution removed the graphic sign because some people expressed their discomfort in being reduced to a "footnote". Nowadays, the museum goes by its original name and the abbreviation SMU. (<https://www.schwulesmuseum.de/presseaktuell/neues-corporate-design/?lang=en>; L* Reiter, in a personal statement by e-mail).

Issues of funding were discussed by Uta Stapf, executive director of the Schwules Museum, and Kevin Clarke, journalist and curator, member of the board of directors of the Berlin institution dedicated to sexual diversity. Founded in 1985, a time of rampant discrimination due to the AIDS pandemic, the museum is the oldest institution dedicated to LGBTQIA+ history and culture in the world. The institution emerged as a result of the frustration of a group of activists with the lack of attention to sexual and gender diversity in museum institutions. While in its early years of operation the museum prioritized gay male culture and history, it has currently extended its reach and organized exhibitions on feminist pornography and erotica, historical photographs of transgender people, and sexuality in Pakistan. Comprising more than 1.5 million objects, the collection includes one of the largest collections of pornography in the world. These objects are fundamental to the understanding of the history of sexuality but are rarely collected by other institutions.

The lack of external financial support during the first decades of operation pushed the Schwules to seek funds independently. The museum receives membership fees from members, income from ticket sales for visits and events, and profit generated by a store and a cafe; the institution also accedes to public notices to fund occasional exhibitions.

The museum operated exclusively with these funds until 2010, when the city of Berlin began to partially subsidize the institution with amounts that covered the rent and staff salaries, though they did not allow the institution to give up other forms of revenue. Nevertheless, the public authorities did offer support at critical moments – for example, during relocation to the museum's current building, in 2013. Another solution adopted by the Schwules to cope with the scarcity of resources was resorting to volunteer work for services ranging from the architectural project of the current headquarters, curatorial projects, and lectures to the educational program. Only 12 out of the institution's 50 employees received some kind of salary despite the fact they worked on a part-time basis. Although the presenters were pleased with the volunteers' contributions, they recognized that the lack of financial revenue excludes the participation of people who cannot afford to work for free.

In contrast to the Schwules Museum's success story, the cases discussed in the table "Preventive Measures = Energy Well Invested" were dramatic examples. The panel included professor Rosária Ono from FAU-USP, France Desmarais, director of Icom and Blue Shield development programs, and advisor to USP Dean's office on museums and collections Renata Motta, with the mediation of UPPM/SEC-SP architect Roberta Silva.

The lecturers argued that collection conservation measures must include safety plans that foresee extreme situations such as natural catastrophes and conflicts. Reliable

resources are indispensable for the maintenance of buildings and the execution of inventories; priority actions are needed to avoid or at least reduce damage caused by fires, floods, earthquakes, conflicts, and looting. Moreover, the involvement of managers in the consolidation of safety plans is essential. Desmarais' lecture focused on the impact of conflicts and wars on museums and their collections. These events, besides threatening the integrity of building structures and the safety of people using museums, often lead to looting. Such occurrences can hit museums twice: in the loss of objects and in the inadvertent acquisition of stolen items. The Canadian expert stressed that museums must always demonstrate an ethical behaviour when acquiring objects because an institution's most important asset is its reputation rather than its collection.

Safety and institutionalization were also topics discussed at the panel "Accessibility to Museological Heritage", with the participation of Maria Elisabete Lopes, FAU-USP professor, Elisa Prado de Assis, an architect with a master's degree in accessibility to immovable cultural assets, and Amanda Tojal, vice-president of Corem-4R. The mediation was by Roberta Silva, an architect at UPPM/SEC-SP. The participants agreed it is wise to avoid wrong solutions that can serve as a (bad) example and be copied. They also emphasized the importance of universal accessibility to break down physical, attitudinal, and communication barriers, and to ensure not only physical access but also access to information and the museums' collections.

The architects Lopes and Assis underlined that accessibility is not subordinated to the preservation of immovable heritage because the value of the cultural asset depends on its relationship with society, which includes people with disabilities. As Lopes pointed out, if a building cannot be visited by everyone, it must not be opened, reminding that no law can override the right of the disabled person. The architect prompted a critical reflection: if we can adapt the building in the interest of "everyone's" safety, why do we resist making adaptations aimed at accessibility? The panel also considered the relevance of the institutional attitude to promote more accessible museums, arguing that the very museum administration often imposes unreasonable barriers.

With the theme "Ways of Funding Museums", the last roundtable provided in-depth discussions on resource management, which permeated the other talks at the Conference. The panel included manager Ricardo Blay Levisky, Mônica Barcelos, coordinator of the technical unit of Ibermuseum Program, Aldo Valentim, coordinator of the Unit of Promotion and Creative Economy of SEC-SP, and Regina Ponte, coordinator of UPPM/SEC-SP, who facilitated the conversation. Despite the differences in their professional practices, the speakers agreed on several points. First, they noted that the positive movement toward increasing attendance and expanding the range of attention to include different

exhibition media or cultural display modes, which resulted in increased demands for public resources, has become increasingly scarce since 2014. The panel highlighted the need to diversify the sources of funding, a topic mentioned at the opening ceremony by the Secretary of Culture of the city of São Paulo, André Sturm, who characterized reliance on direct administration for the maintenance of public heritage as increasingly unfeasible.

Another aspect considered vital by the speakers was the need for long-term planning in Brazilian cultural institutions. They also deemed elementary to overcome the person-based, non-institutionalized character of cultural management in Brazil. The incentive laws were seen as instruments that address short-term problems and therefore direct attention to one-off events, which once completed, leave cultural spaces dwindling. Another issue debated was the management model by social organization (SO), adopted by several cultural institutions in the state. Sturm addressed this topic at the opening. If the secretary's vision of the SO was mostly positive, the participants of the panel pointed out that the model is not capable of solving the financial difficulties in a sustainable way, because, as Ponte pointed out, these organizations also depend on the transfer of public funds. Furthermore, Valentim pointed out that the SO cannot rescue museums from the bureaucracy and excessive laws and hierarchies that hamper cultural management in Brazil.

Represented by Barcelos, Ibermuseum is an organization seeking to support museological institutions in Latin America and the Iberian Peninsula in a less bureaucratic way. It uses resources it receives from member countries to promote mechanisms for technical cooperation and financial support. However, rather than helping museums over long periods of time, the organization's goal is to provide one-time assistance. A possible long-term solution lies in endowments, a financial model presented by Levisky. Still relatively unknown in Brazil, endowments are permanent equity funds in which the main value of the investment is protected and only the profits from the investment can be used.

The discussions at the Conference demonstrated that each decision related to safety, accessibility, management institutionalization, or planning needs to account for the financial sustainability of the proposed actions. Especially considering the current context, in which the government links its support to ideological adherence, it is increasingly necessary to diversify the sources of funds to ensure sustainability. This diversification is not limited to public or private fundraising; it also includes initiatives such as the involvement of volunteers and partnerships with community organizations. However, the cases underlined the fact that government support remains essential for cultural institutions to ensure the safety of people and collections, as well as long-term accessibility.

From the Schwules Museum* to the Museum of Sexual Diversity: Representation and Recognition Marks of the LGBT community

Diego de Kerchove

2017

Critical report of the [opening international conference](#)

The 9th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo opened with an international conference by Uta Stapf and Kevin Clarke, from the Schwules Museum* (Berlin Gay* Museum) mediated by Franco Reinaudo, from the Museum of Sexual Diversity of São Paulo. The German speakers first introduced the Schwules Museum* and its particularities and then presented the main challenges of the museum as an institution, before touching on the very sensitive topic of sexual and gender diversity. Finally, the debate was opened to questions from the audience.

Founded in 1985, the Schwules Museum* is the first museum in the world to represent and claim a space for the gay community in the arts. The Berlin museum emerged in 1984 from an exhibition entitled *Eldorado*, which sought to represent gay and lesbian culture between 1850 and 1950 and which was very controversial at the time. The exhibition curators and organisers hoped it would be a starting point in building awareness in the art world concerning the relevance of addressing the issue. However, it did not happen, so they decided to create a museum for the gay community. And, as a provocation, they named the museum Schwules, a term which pejoratively designates gay men. For many years the museum was devoted almost exclusively to representing only the male gay community. More recently, however, they have incorporated the asterisk into the museum's name to indicate its openness and belonging to the LGBT community as a whole. However, they recognize that this addendum is not enough and are considering the possibility of changing the name of the museum every year, with other sexualities and gender identifications, to honour and represent the entire community.

It is interesting to note that this movement that occurred and occurs in Schwules Museum* follows the growing acceptance of the LGBT universe in the West. The museum emerged in a difficult moment, in which, besides the pulsating homophobia in society, the AIDS epidemic was at its peak among the male gay community. At that time, the choice of a provocative name already demonstrated power and determination in the fight for recognition. However, as acceptance widened and different segments of the community emerged, each seeking its own representation, the name Schwules Museum* becomes to some extent anachronistic.

Until 2010 the museum relied solely on donations, volunteering and entrance fees to survive. From that year onwards, they began to receive subsidies from the German government, which made it possible, in 2013, to relocate the museum to a larger space, which was essential to house the institution's ever-growing collection. In 2015, in partnership with the German History Museum (DHM), they put together the exhibition *Homosexuality_ies*. Since 1984 it was the first time a major Berlin museum had dedicated its space to an exhibition dealing not only with gay culture but also with the diversity of genders and sexualities. The partnership promoted the Schwules Museum* in the national and international press. Despite the exhibition's success, the themes addressed still encounter a certain veiled resistance within the most traditional German art institutions today. Some see this issue as something that should be treated as a new "obligation", while others dismiss it, justifying that the very existence of the small museum is enough.

Although homophobia is not as latent a problem in Berlin as it is in Brazil and even in other parts of Germany, the Schwules Museum* still has difficulties building an image that is not directly associated with sexuality, eroticism and even pornography. Kevin Clarke exemplifies this issue while presenting the educational programs developed by the museum. Despite the good relationship with schools that take their students on excursions, parents resist enrolling their children in workshops at the institution for fear of exposing them to indecent materials. Once again, the museum's name becomes a hindrance, as it corroborates this preconceived image of the institution. This example stresses well what is perhaps the greatest challenge faced by museums concerning sexual diversity, particularly the Schwules Museum*.

As mentioned, the German museum's combative and provocative name is explained by its pioneering spirit. It is the first out of only three other museums dealing with sexual diversity in the world. The other two are the GLBT Historical Society in San Francisco, United States, and the Museum of Sexual Diversity in São Paulo. Both are quite new, dating from 2003 and 2012 respectively.

The Brazilian museum is located in the República metro station in the centre of São Paulo. The choice of place is explained firstly because of the station's heavy pedestrian traffic and secondly in memory of Edson Nerris, a victim of homophobia, murdered in Praça da República in 2000. The museum, even today, is still a target to homophobic attacks. Like the Schwules Museum*, the place was born out of a growing need for representation and affirmation of the LGBT community. However, as it is inserted in a completely different context and supported by the government, the Museum of Sexual Diversity enjoys a clearer educational and representative proposal.

By being located in a metro station, the museum is easily noticed and is often visited by passers-by who hadn't necessarily planned on visiting the place. Thus, it opens itself up to people who would initially be unlikely to come into contact with this theme and its questions. The museum's location is in itself a claim for recognition and representation since, for many commuters, the museum and its exhibitions are, in a way, something unavoidable. Thus the museum makes itself present seeking to reach people outside of the community.

This is also reflected in the museum's name, as there are no terms referring to a specific community. Of the three existing museums, this name is undoubtedly the most inclusive. It does not refer to a specific sexuality or community and thus extends it to all. It focuses on promoting respect for sexual diversity as a whole. Therefore, the Museum of Sexual Diversity is not exactly a place of resistance and struggle, yet it doesn't entirely cease to be that. It becomes a place of education, inclusion, and acceptance of human differences – simply due to its name and location. However, it is important to point out that the moment of the foundation of this museum is completely different from the Schwules Museum's*, which was born in a society with serious homophobia problems, but where debate and discussions about the issue already reach the public and governmental spheres.

In conclusion, the names of these two museums mark different eras and histories of the same community and theme. The Berlin pioneer spirit and the name chosen for the museum defined the spirit of resistance and provocation in a moment when the gay community was still completely marginalized by society. In turn, the Brazilian museum seeks, through its name and location, to reach everyone, including those who feel uncomfortable and averse to the topic of sexual diversity.

Times of Crisis: A Debate on Museum Funding Amidst the Brazilian Social and Economic Crisis

Bruno Giordano

2017

Critical report of the lecture: [Funding Form for Museums](#)

There have been expectations over 2017 in all sectors of society, be it in the political, social, economic or cultural field. There has been a visible longing for answers and solutions to the crisis in Brazil in recent years. Apparently, the theme "infrastructure and security" for the 9th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo intended to reflect about alternatives to current models of management and sustainability within the museological field as the crisis in Brazil led to immediate funding cuts in culture. Even if temporarily, the Ministry of Culture was extinguished¹ a measure that was cancelled by the president Michel Temer after the huge and negative repercussions it caused, both inside and outside the cultural sector. The extinction of the Ministry was a clear sign that culture is not among the priorities of the current administration.

Thus, the debate on "Funding for museums" becomes extremely relevant. Since there has been a visible increase in the number of visitors in cultural spaces in recent years,² the costs related to space maintenance and to the organizing of exhibitions has also increased. Based on this brief overview, Regina Ponte, the table's mediator, began her speech. She addressed aspects related to the forms of funding cultural projects, highlighting the scenario of decreased transfers of resources from the State to institutions – because, even with the re-establishment of the Ministry of Culture, the cultural sector has been gradually losing investments since 2014. In contrast to this, we have observed a growth in fundraising for culture in the private sector. Ponte warned us about the finite nature of these resources and the consequent dependence they can generate (often

1 TEMER decide recriar Ministério da Cultura; ministro assume na terça. G1, 21 May, 2016. Available at: <http://g1.globo.com/politica/noticia/2016/05/temer-decide-recriar-ministerio-da-cultura-anuncio-deve-ser-na-terca.html>.

2 <http://gente.ig.com.br/cultura/2017-01-24/exposicoes-de-arte.html>

coming from incentive laws). She pointed out the risks of precariousness faced by cultural spaces and collections when these resources end. It is necessary to seek new ways of obtaining resources and financial security for the execution of projects, she said.

Ricardo Levisky, thinking of an alternative, brought to the debate the concept of endowments, whose objective would be to guarantee some sustainability to financial support. Endowments are fixed investment funds that only use profits and income as funding mechanisms. In this sense, Levisky points to the main differences between equity funds (which cannot be used in their gross value, not even in an emergency) and reserve funds (which are used in case of financial crisis, for example). However, Levisky concentrates his speech on Brazilian cultural characteristics, focusing on two main points that justify why the endowment model is not widely adopted in Brazil, unlike what happens in Anglo-Saxon institutions:

- Short-term culture: Brazil does not plan its budget over the long term. Conversely, endowment focuses on the long term. Here, the speaker points out that such a fact is one of the major barriers to adopting the model in local institutions.
- Personalistic management: whether in the government sphere or in the private administration of cultural institutions, different administrations do not communicate with one another. This fact is very detrimental to the performance of institutions, as they are subjected to new beginnings each time there is a change in administration. Levisky points out here that endowment would bring autonomy, at least financially, to those who always invest in cultural space. However, there is a tendency for institutions to become dependent on the injected capital, and, when the investment is interrupted, the institution finds itself with no other alternative but to reduce its work or even end activities. Also, endowment would serve to create a sustainable cycle of income, since there is a guarantee of return on invested equity.

And, in the search for investments for endowments, Levisky bets on philanthropy, bringing recent data from the Gallup Institute, which received some kind of donation from over half of the Brazilian population in 2016 (totalling about R\$ 13.7 billion, about 0.23% of GDP)³. In addition to philanthropy, resources to make up the endowment fund could also be raised through the privatisation of public companies, money recovered from corruption and severance fines from companies. A model similar to endowments is

³ <http://idis.org.br/idis-divulga-resultados-da-pesquisa-doacao-brasil/>

practiced by Caixa Econômica Federal. In 2016, it transferred about 359 million reais to the National Culture Fund, whose main objective is cultural preservation and development in Brazil⁴.

Ricardo Levisky's speech brought a market-oriented view of culture to the debate. Cultural institutions certainly need financial resources to maintain themselves, but Levisky's view places money at the centre of cultural and museological operation. He defends the autonomy of the cultural space, both from the private and public initiative, but believes this autonomy is achieved through capital. The issue here concerns evaluating what can be considered a cultural offering and what becomes a product in the sphere of museums, in order to figure out the best mechanisms of economic self-sufficiency for this sector.

Next, Mônica Barcellos presented Ibermuseum⁵, its field of action and structure. Within the program, financial cooperation and the articulation of public policies are underlined; fundraising among the member countries enables its activities. The emergency fund for museological heritage at risk can be requested in case of heritage damage caused by natural causes or disasters. Monica mentions Haiti as an example. Even though it is not part of the Ibero-American program, the risk operation was regarded as necessary in the country. Another initiative highlighted in her speech concerned the educational initiatives that promote activities related to social transformation and the integration of the collections of the member countries.

Although fundraising is the method used to develop a project the size of Ibermuseums, it was clear that incentives or even emergency funds are initiatives that do not fully cover the needs of heritage at risk.⁶ Also, in this case, the program structure is still dependent on public-private initiatives, remaining on a more traditional path of fundraising.

The last participant of the roundtable, Aldo Valentim, presented an overview of the State's participation in culture incentive. Coordinator of ProAC (Cultural Action Program),⁷ he introduced his speech starting from the 1988 Constitution, in which it was established that

⁴ Cf. CAIXA ECONÔMICA FEDERAL. Repasses sociais e relatórios anuais. Available at: <http://loterias.caixa.gov.br/wps/portal/loterias/landing/repasses-sociais/>.

⁵ <http://www.ibermuseum.org/instit/conheca-o-programa-ibermuseum/>

⁶ "The amounts allocated to each of the requests will be determined by the Intergovernmental Committee of the Ibermuseums Program." Regulations of the Emergency Fund for Museum Heritage at Risk, available at: http://convocatorias.ibermuseum.org/media/fondo-de-emergencia/2017/Reglamento_FondoEmergencia_Por.pdf. Accessed on 7 Jul. 2017.

⁷ <http://www.transparenciacultura.sp.gov.br/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/2017.02.17-Boletim-UM-n.-3-ProAC-Editais.pdf>

the Brazilian State would receive a greater number of functions and obligations. However, since 1988 the government has not been able to meet these obligations. Therefore, the need arose to create specific policies for the cultural field capable of meeting the demands of cultural activities. Like Regina Ponte, he stressed the finite nature of the State's resources and defended multiple forms of fundraising, aware of the high number of projects that do not always succeed in obtaining funds through the usual forms of financing.

Towards the end of the debate, Regina Ponte opened the space for questions. Valentim, in a provocative tone, spoke about the logic of capital that guides the choices of major exhibitions, eventually making them dependent on the universe of finance, not to mention the risk of transforming museum space into a spectacle. He also commented on Levisky's proposal of endowments and questioned whether this model of fundraising would be effective for small and medium-sized museums.

Levisky argued that Valentim's reasoning touches on philosophical questions related to art. He stated that it is possible to offer art linked to entertainment, even when both art and entertainment are market-oriented. Endowments, according to him, can be used for any kind of organisation and of any size.

When asked by Ponte about Ibermuseus' fundraising method, Monica Barcellos confirmed that the fundraising for the projects is conducted among the project's member countries. And when questioned about the entities that benefited from the project in the state of São Paulo, she did not specify any in particular, she only stressed that the program has operated in São Paulo on several occasions.

Finally, Regina Ponte spoke about the Museum of Portuguese Language. The insurance company fully covered the expenses for the restoration work; no State resources were used in its reconstruction.

The table's composition seemed well articulated, bringing together different views on the same sector. Valentim and Levisky stood out, as they approach their work from technically opposite perspectives, both in terms of how they conceive fundraising and in terms of their ideologies: while one is essentially focused on the State, the other defends the financial autonomy of the institution through private capital. Barcellos, however, adopted a combined path, yet based on the collaboration and integration of the member states of her organisation.

The discussions at this table evoked, even if indirectly, one of the great current debates in the cultural field: the question of whether art and culture should always bring some kind of financial return. However, when there is private investment, financial return is

almost always included as a clause, forcing the exponential growth of the public paying entrance fees. The *quality x quantity* factor is put into question, for oftentimes the place is not big enough to fit the public required to cover the investment made, which may jeopardize both the place infrastructure and the collection, as it puts it in a situation of vulnerability, threatening its symbolic and cultural value. It is undeniable, though, that it was in the midst of the crisis that alternatives for the maintenance of different cultural institutions through private initiative emerged, despite the fact that private initiative is ruled by the logic of the market.

There is not one single path to be followed. Nevertheless, cultural institutions cannot give up their objectives and values for the sake of capital, just as they cannot give up capital to maintain their spaces. Although the cultural sector is part of society, one must consider that it also follows its own rhythm and agenda, which should not be held hostage to all financial interventions. The resources of companies that offer investments for the development of cultural projects should be considered as long as art and cultural entertainment do not become just another product or consumer good.

A “snapshot” of the 10th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo

Cayo Honorato

2021

A critical report, synthesis of the [10th Conference of the Museums](#) of the State of São Paulo:
Management and Governance

This is not a critical report. The assumptions of criticism have been shattered to such an extent that accepting them without further reflection may incur a mere attitude or transfer of responsibility. Although this reflection ought to be made, my intentions here are much more modest.

In this “synthetic” account, I try to fathom what would have been the “snapshot” taken by the 10th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo of the debate about or by these institutions in mid-2018. Although we can see recurrent themes amid the more recent issues facing museums then, three years later, it is not hard to guess that this snapshot has turned yellow prematurely.

After all, what strategic planning or “development” could have foreseen the conjunction between the Bolsonaro government and the coronavirus pandemic? The current situation directly affects the very operation and maintenance of museums, requiring from any institution dedicated to the “public interest” a complete review of its own social role, without assuming the existence of favorable conditions to develop this task. There certainly are more and more challenges and less and less favorable conditions.

The Conference took place in the Simón Bolívar auditorium of the Memorial of Latin America from July 18 to 20, 2018. The auditorium had been reopened six months earlier, four years after its destruction by fire in 2013. In that July, between Lula’s arrest on April 7 and the TSE decision to challenge his presidential nomination on August 31, the result of the 2018 elections was still quite unclear. Nor could the fire at the National Museum six weeks later be predicted. In September 2017, museums seemed to be living in the aftermath of the conservative or even hateful attacks on exhibitions and artwork – which proved to be part of a winning strategy if one considers the political results produced by culture wars.

With the theme “management and governance,” the Conference offered a dynamic program of conferences, panels, tables, sessions, gatherings, meetings, seminars, and workshops, bringing together professionals and interested people from the various regions of the state of São Paulo, but also from other parts of the country, with the presence of international guest-speakers. The Fórum Permanente’s coverage produced 14 video records of the event, as well as seven critical reports, all made available on its website.¹

The circumstances in which I accepted the invitation to write this report – the fateful month of March 2021, when museums and other spaces were once again closed – made me immediately adopt the suggestion to consider only the critical accounts as reference. It is important that the reader is aware of these limits, and also of the fact that I was not present at the event. In any case, the highly mediated character of the references adopted, concerning what happened at the Conference, does not relieve me from attempting to be as objective as possible.

The first element that stands out to me, as part of that “snapshot,” concerns the performance of museological institutions in a society that is increasingly culturally plural and politically fragmented, besides being marked by social inequalities. The challenge that was emerging in July 2018, as can be inferred from one of the reports, refers to the need for museums not only to re-evaluate the objects and narratives of their collections and exhibitions in order to embrace issues and perspectives of marginalized groups but also to respond to the resistance of other sectors of society, which do not accept the presence of these issues in the public sphere.

In 2018, that re-evaluation process was in the process of consolidating, at least in the sense of tending toward a consensus in the museum field. But the challenge here had at least two fronts. The first seems to have been addressed in more than one session of the Conference, accentuating the museum’s responsibility to be somewhat “universalistic” – in the sense of not addressing its revisions exclusively to the groups represented – as well as not to classify specific experiences in closed groups that do not communicate with other narratives. Certainly, in some cases, the opportunity to address an exhibition to the actual “represented” ones, as subjects in formation, brings another layer to the challenge at hand.

¹ Fórum Permanente. Vídeos 10 EPM. Available at: http://www.forumpermanente.org/event_pres/encontros/encontros-paulista-de-museus/x-encontro-paulista-de-museus/videos. Fórum Permanente. Relatos críticos. Available at: http://www.forumpermanente.org/event_pres/encontros/encontros-paulista-de-museus/x-encontro-paulista-de-museus/relatos-criticos.

The second front, which perhaps has not been directly attended to, concerns the museums’ receptiveness towards precisely those sectors that resist those re-evaluations, with a view to the potential formation of publics willing to deal with social alterities and contradictions. It is worth mentioning that, at that moment, the notion of fragmentation in a conflictive sense counterpointed the notion of plurality in a convivial sense. As of the 2018 elections, the very experience of intra-family rifts, with its growing feeling of estrangement towards those we used to regard as our kin, put an extra burden on the problem.

The second element concerns the way the issue of memory, of monuments and memorials – as received by museums – articulates relations between the past, the present, and the future. Initially, the problem is posed in terms of a debate between the duty to remember and the right to forgetting, mediated by the possibility of a just memory, bearing in mind that memory cannot override justice. In this context, the museum is called upon to be an arbiter of the multiple temporalities of life, proposing new configurations of the possible. It is also expected that the community is invited to participate in the processing of traumatic memory, allowing for the experience of suffering to be brought into everyday life, instead of being treated as something sacred or heroic.

The different accounts point to the idea that memory and preservation efforts can sanitize as well as monumentalize the past. In one account, a question is raised as to what preservation can discard, or, indeed, whether some “mischaracterizations” should not, instead, be considered part of the architectural heritage in question. In another report, a “dimension of friction” is claimed, so that musealized memory is not presented as supposedly self-justifying, distorted by a symbolic function that ‘adjectifies’ objects *for itself*, oftentimes to the detriment of these very objects.

What, in retrospect, this debate seems to disregard is that the problem of memory representation can no longer be solved by a simple question of access – no matter how qualified – to documents, research, and exhibits since the propagation of revisionisms through fake news channels occurs at a faster pace than the one at which it is possible to disprove them. Also, the perspective of trauma as something being processed in the present – which, in the case of the Bolsonaro government’s association with the pandemic, has been increasingly associated with a “crime against humanity” –, was not within reach in 2018.

Finally, the third element seeks to reconcile public and private interests, issues of reparation, and social justice with market proactivity. The problem was approached sometimes through the angle of best practices and sometimes through that of trends in the museum field. In it, factors of social legitimacy are mixed with those of financial sustainability.

Economic and social interests are not necessarily mutually exclusive; however, the sustainability of the institution will not necessarily lead to a commitment to social justice. Similarly, the inclusion of the marginalized can be a way to promote change, although its capitalization in “multiple perspectives” will not necessarily contribute to social inequality reduction.

Another aspect in this element concerns an alternation between the directives of democratization and cultural democracy, which in any case signal different perspectives between each other: *roughly speaking*, the first geared towards an affirmation of what the museum has to offer; the second geared towards the museum’s recognition of what other players produce, even when they do not refer to the museum. Oscillating between these positions, the institution either affirms or negotiates its own identity, either relativizes or does not relativize its own reproduction, either promotes or restrains transformation processes. This is its ambiguity: sometimes it is an entity, sometimes it is in a space in between.

In this process, despite the digital culture’s already important role, only now the demand for digitalization has become imperative. Interestingly, the use of communication and information technologies by museums in 2018 was shy. Certainly, digitization is only a limited aspect of the changes taking place right now, if we consider the challenges they pose for museums. In fact, it is the very Internet that threatens to reshape them. Many institutions may see this as an opportunity to reach wider audiences, when it may actually mean entering a highly competitive space, where many of them have no proven experience.

The Memory in Museums: From Instrument of Knowledge to Ethical Criteria and Political Action

Erica Ferrari

2018

Critical report of the Conference: [“The duty to remember, the right to forgetting and the duty of history in the field of museums”](#)

The following report provides an overview of the explanation given by Professor Ulpiano Bezerra de Menezes at the opening conference of the 10th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo. After being awarded the Waldisa Rússio Camargo Guarnieri Medal of Museological Merit in recognition of his professional career and his invaluable contribution to São Paulo and Brazilian museology, in a ceremony opening the Conference. Professor Ulpiano expressed his gratitude stressing his passion for museums, exercised throughout the 65 years dedicated to them, accompanied by the restructuring of the institutions towards their new social roles. In his conference, reported here, he chooses the theme of traumatic memory in museums, establishing a dialogue with the focus of the Conference, concerning the idea of management and governance.

Apparently, never has there been so much talk about memory as today. The proliferation of articles, news and texts involving memory and, in particular, museums dedicated to it, reveal different levels of quality, ranging from generalities to the new facts and ideas. There is a growing need for institutions to open up to participatory management with the community participation, which fuels the practice of dealing with traumatic memory in the space of the museum. Memory itself has a past and a present; it has a history, whose extracts converge with its functioning in society. The first modern studies on memory, at the turn of the 19th century, were developed in the field of psychology and sociology. They were concerned with understanding the human being in his ability to remember as an individual. In the 20th century, the question was transferred to social dimensions, and anthropology, sociology, and history took the lead in studying the ideologies that memory carries. Finally, from the last decades onwards, approaching the pragmatic

character of memory became dominant. From being an instrument of knowledge to becoming ethical criterion and a powerful weapon of political action, memory is now subjected to a multivariate range of disciplines. It is within this framework that the traumatic memory that concerns us is situated.

To talk about memory, one can start out from forgetfulness – another part of the same process. Memory is a selective, controlled procedure of forgetting, and social amnesia is still an area to be explored, especially in the field of museums. It is common sense that remembering and commemorating are virtues, and forgetting is a failure. However, this subject is complex. Several processes are assigned to the verb forget: repressive obliteration, when power suffocates memory, as in dictatorships; prescriptive forgetting, due to pressure from society; forgetfulness, which is a constitutive element of the formation of a new identity, as with immigrants; structural amnesia, subjected to the hierarchies of society; forgetfulness as nullification by saturation; forgetfulness as programmed obsolescence typical of the capitalist consumer system; forgetfulness as humiliated silence coming from shameful or embarrassing events. It is a varied menu, and ignoring it will lead to deforming simplifications.

In a second moment, another very famous key concept is brought to light: collective memory. Successfully formulated by the French sociologist Maurice Halbwachs in the early twentieth century, it has been refuted quite often today. The renowned German historian Reinhart Koselleck, for example, only accepts individual neurophysiological capacity as part of the memory itself; otherwise, all we have is metaphors concealing political interests and ideological instrumentalisation. Collective social memory would be a political myth, a narrative about the past of a community, composed of highly elective, historically accurate events that can mobilize emotions, generate and modify attitudes among the members of this community. However, the implicit or explicit political-ideological motivation does not make the sharing of narratives illegitimate when they contain elements that resist historical and sociological criticism. Collective memory can be regarded as a social reality, but we must always submit it to analytical procedures. Practices of collective memory make its analysis more complex when we observe the processes of privatization of memory, which can be seen in an apparently contradictory way in monuments and memorials.

The monument-memorial is the precursor of the museum-memorial. A clear example of this situation is the 'Vietnam Veterans Memorial' in Washington. The first objective was to legitimise US military adventures in Asia and heal the wounds of war by means of installing a figurative heroic sculptural image. However, the final outcome did not correspond the initial intention, configuring itself as a memorial made up of two black marble

walls inscribed with the names of each of the 60.000 soldiers killed in combat. The mirrored surface designed by the architect Maya Lin makes the viewer part of the work. The place becomes a place for subjective, mournful manifestations, displaying a nation of victims rather than heroes.

The subjectivation of the monument and the deprivation of memory take on a performative dimension, as occurs in Jochen Gerz and Esther Shalev-Gerz's 1986 "Monument Against Fascism". Intended to publicly atone for the German people's guilt, the monument consisted of a twelve-metre high lead column, and, at its base there was an equally large underground hole. On the surface of the column, people could inscribe a message using a chisel. As the monument was being covered with graphism, it was buried until it had completely disappeared under the earth in 1993. Its real function was to subjectivise the feelings it could evoke, and its physical elimination was the culmination of its constitutive process, becoming invisible just like the subjective burden attached to it. Memory is considered here in its crucial ambiguity: at the same time that the subject's participation in the construction of memory is a democratizing factor, it is at the individual level that it takes place.

Traumatic memory is the legacy of last century's ravaging conflicts and violence, which are still lingering today. Cultural trauma is a situation charged with negative emotion, regarded as indelible and threatening to the values of a community. With traumatic memory, new agents in the memorial scenario appeared and concepts were reformulated; for example, transgenerational memory, whose fact gains meaning as it crosses generations; post-memory, or second-hand memory, not experienced but absorbed as one's own in the family sphere; the absent memory, existing but prevented from circulating by social conventions; the silent memory, existing in the body of the witness, unable to utter a word, but which expresses in its immobilization the scale of what happened; the mnemonic landscape, inserting spaces as sites of consciousness and so on.

In this scenario, a heated debate will develop between a duty to remember and a right to forgetting. A fundamental question regards the possibility of a fair memory. When and how is it more legitimate to reopen wounds or to bypass them. Both sides make respectable arguments; at the very least there is a consensus on the following: crimes against humanity are not time-barred, they cannot be forgotten, for forgetting without justice affects not only the present but the future as well; the right to memory cannot suffer any restrictions, including access to documentation and research; work on memory must render a confessional and knowledgeable space; space must be given to the right to compassion; there is the right to history and knowledge of the roots of trauma and its effects.

The 1980s saw the proliferation of memorial museums, preceded by war museums. The Holocaust provided paradigms that can be observed in the most important museums of this kind in Berlin, Jerusalem and Washington. Brazil has not seen this boom like other countries, despite its many projects. A good example is the "Memorial of Resistance" in São Paulo, the first of its kind, inaugurated in 2009. The challenge of representing the Holocaust in museums involved meeting specific political agendas and local demands – be it the celebration of a democracy or a work of redemption –, while at the same time responding to the universal yearning for justice and peace.

The museography implemented took the museums' emotional potential to its extreme, and the very architecture of the museums became an introductory piece to each of them, paving the way for ideological infiltration. In Washington, for example, an impressive pile of used shoes belonging to victims enables the abstract to become concrete. These institutions make use of one of the main qualities of museums: connecting the cognitive with the affective, which amplifies the effectiveness of their work with the public. Affection and emotion are part of the same semantic field associated with movement. By sharpening the imagination, experience and empathy moves individuals, touching them. With this strategy, the Holocaust museums have found expositive words to express the inexpressible and fuel transformative attitudes and initiatives.

Therefore, five crucial issues can be listed concerning the museum's approach to traumatic memory. Firstly, there is the idea of the museum's function as a kind of tribunal. With the rise of historians to public space, since the late 1980s, they have been hired as experts and invited to be witnesses in trials involving crimes against humanity and commissions of inquiry. This process entails the idea that one of the museum's functions is to provide verdicts in the construction of public history. However, the museum must invest in the potential of shedding a light that allows the understanding and the amplification of the commitment with the edification of memory as a space for critical reflection and the development of historical consciousness. It should not only deepen the information about the past in order to retrace our present heritage; instead, it needs to acquire the capacity to denaturalize the past and, consequently, the present. Historical processes are no fatalities but rather productions coherent to the circumstances of the interests in vogue, that get legitimized as if they were natural. An example of this condition is the domination of women by men or of black people by white people. Historical consciousness is the understanding of our responsibility as subjects of history. Historical memory in the museum needs to be multiple, contemplating different visions, presenting a space for a confrontation without domination, as a counterpoint, a place for questions rather than certainties. Secondly, the museum must problematize history critically, as a distinguisher of the components that make up history, reflecting communities as processes

in development that do not involve Manichean views. Victims cannot be infantilized, as this would mean denying them the strength of resistance, the possibility of being the subjects of history. All the characters must be treated as individuals, and stereotypes must also be exposed, enabling the identification of the different agents acting at the level of traumatic processes. Thirdly, the museum's responsibility should not be limited to communities of memory, for the right to memory is morally indisputable. Historians and museologists must be universalists. Oftentimes, the trauma of the first generation is personal; the pain is a private process. After the second generation, the disclosure of crimes provides an ethical and humanitarian status. Fourth, everyday life must always be present in the field of memory, since places of suffering can become points of pilgrimage and sacralization, which produces alterity of pain. The place of the sacred belongs to the other. The space of pain must remain in everyday life. Heroism needs to be treated with caution, valued not as an extra-human quality but as the fruit of values that can be dissipated in everyday life. Fifth and last, memory must not prevail over justice.

There are three stages concerning crimes against humanity: justice, reparation, and memory. Revealing the truth is already a process of justice. Would not justice instead of memory be the opposite of forgetting? We deny justice to those who are not dear to us; Brazil was forged out of endemic violence. In addition to denouncing violence in facts from the past, museums committed to human rights must become beacons that also illuminate today's violence, daily violence of every kind and scale. This does not mean that the museum should become a staged pamphlet, an encyclopedia of small entries, or a market for knick-knacks. This stance is generated from contextualizing each case in its wider context, connecting the past to the present. The museum is not powerful enough to eliminate violence. However, it has the power and capacity to make violence present as something sensitive and concrete, apprehended by our bodies and minds, which underlines what may go unnoticed by us.

Territory in Dispute: The Museum as Mediator of Difference

Amanda Moreira Arantes

2018

Critical report of the panel: "[Contemporary Ethical Challenges for Museums](#)"

The table "Contemporary Ethical Challenges for Museums" brought a necessary debate about the power disputes that are at stake in the field of culture and art. The conversation between Dr. Sérgio Gardenghi Suiama and Professor Christian Dunker, mediated by Regina Ponte, exposed the current situation of museological institutions in an increasingly plural, fragmented society marked by social contradictions.

In her opening speech, Regina Ponte outlined the problem to be discussed: museums, as "mirrors and laboratories" of their social contexts, must reassess their collections and the narratives they present to the public to respond to the changes in society in the 21st century. In this process, the tensions that arise come mainly from the debates about sexuality, class, gender and social conflicts that the museums have brought to the public.

It is interesting to note that, except for Regina Ponte, who has a solid and highly regarded career in museology, currently working as coordinator of the Museum Heritage Preservation Unit, the other guest speakers are not professionals directly connected to museums. Doctor Sérgio Gardenghi Suiama is a public prosecutor and coordinated the Transitional, and Sexual, and Reproductive Rights work group of the Federal Public Ministry. Christian Dunker is a psychoanalyst and professor at the University of São Paulo. The debate was able to go beyond museology and included diverse contributions on the subject, approached from the perspective of law, sociology, and psychology. In this brief report, I seek to present the main contributions to a very urgent debate today.

Doctor Sérgio Gardenghi Suiama was one of the authors of a technical note published by the Federal Attorney General's Office for the Rights of the Citizen in response to the controversies of the case of the *Queermuseu*, an exhibition held at Santander Cultural in Porto Alegre, and the case of the performance *La Bête*, presented at MAM/SP, both

in 2017. On these occasions, conservative sectors of society accused the institutions of promoting pedophilia and offending religious beliefs. In his speech, Suiama seeks to expose the conditions that made these polemics possible. He brought references from the sociology of art to describe the dynamics of production, validation, and circulation of works of art, recognizing three main players in this scenario: artistic institutions, the scholarly public, and the general public. Suiama talks about the growing autonomy of the art field and its system of creating its own validation norms, and recognizes mismatches between the scholarly field and the general public.

The main question that Suiama seeks to articulate based on the *Queermuseu* case is: how could an established institution in the scholarly field, such as Santander Cultural, which presented equally established artists, not be able to ensure the continuity of the show, retreating in the face of the reactions of the conservative sectors? He says that the reason lies in the fact sexuality (one of the many themes presented in the exhibition) is not acknowledged as a relevant issue to be presented in museums. This situation establishes a problematic background for cultural institutions, which are increasingly called on to embrace issues such as sexuality and gender in their narratives but that, on the other hand, find resistance in sectors of society that do not accept that such issues are given space in these institutions.

One of the challenges faced by institutions is the reactive and combative approach of movements such as the MBL (Free Brazil Movement), which promote the depreciation of museums, artists, and works of art among the public opinion. The group's strategies include taking the works out of their contexts, resignifying them by associating them with accusatory discourses. In times of post-truth, these strategies increasingly weaken cultural institutions and focus especially on the weakening of dialogue, which is addressed below in the speech by Professor Christian Dunker.

The museum as a mediator of conflicts

Suiama quotes in his presentation an excerpt from Daniela Name's article "Não há arte possível para gente de bem" [There is no possible art for good people], published in *O Globo* newspaper on the occasion of the *Queermuseu* controversy. He highlighted the passage in which the author states that "art and the contemporary museum will always be more powerful when they are less appealing". But what is this power that museums and art have?

Moving on to Professor Christian Dunker's presentation, I'd like to mention a concept he mentions when introducing his speech: the museum as a *metainstitution*. Besides being

an institution, the museum is responsible for representing other institutions, and, as it builds its narratives about our history and identity, it creates norms. Therefore, it should have the role of mediator, representing and putting into dialogue the social contradictions that show up in the contemporary world; in short, it should contribute to the debate on the construction of society. That would be the art and museums' power: to propose new configurations of the possible.

The title of Dunker's presentation differs from the panel's. He talks about "Ethical challenges for contemporary museums", a slight change that points to a theme widely explored in his speech: contemporaneity. He defends that the contemporary is not defined homogeneously; it is composed of different temporalities. Dunker states that, besides being a mediator of conflicts and giving voice to the diversity of ideas present in society, the museum must fulfill the function of arbiter of these different times in which we live; it needs to negotiate this difference, even if it is necessary to renounce the power of saying "here is the contemporary".

For Dunker, the museum must cease to be only a device for remembering the past; it must also propose inquiries about the future, going through the present time's problem. As a mediator of conflicts and arbiter of temporality, the museum has the challenge of reconciling aesthetic form and social contradiction. Dunker develops this idea through the successful example of the Apartheid Museum in Johannesburg. There, visitors are randomly classified as white or non-white when they buy their tickets, and the course of their visit depends on this classification. By simulating the apartheid experience, the museum succeeds in making an exhibition of the past, showing what kind of future we do not want. It is one of the challenges of an institution that had the historical role of conserving and preserving the past, and that finds today the duty to inquire about tomorrow.

In a world of social contradictions, museology has proposed more empathetic narratives, and in this context, curatorship has an important role in mediation and, therefore, must reinvent itself. We see the emergence of exhibitions that propose to re-evaluate official narratives of art, include authors who were undermined in the past, give space to themes such as sexuality and gender, war and conflict. Dunker reaffirms this ethical and political function of the museum. To have transformative potential, the museum needs to give visibility and voice to marginalized groups, besides exposing forms of suffering in the present and the past. In this context, he raises a very pertinent question. Why isn't there a slavery museum in Brazil?

Dunker suggests that museums seek to reinvent their language and propose "giving shelter to the universal", which we are not sure what it is. He defends the importance of

criticizing the "false universals" and, in this process, museums certainly need to review their collections. In this regard, the museum should reevaluate the guidelines for the acquisition of works and rethink the political guidelines that build narratives. The responsibility is great considering the difficulty we – both individuals and institutions – face in the relationship with the other and in the relationship with time. How to deal with a past that is not definitively abolished and a future that is still unknown? The challenge is already big, and it tends to be even greater in a cultural market often crossed by private interests. Christian Dunker proposes a provocative question: at whose service does the curator work?

The effort made by some museological institutions in São Paulo that have cherished the artistic production of authors previously neglected, such as people from poor and distant neighborhoods, homosexuals, women, and self-taught artists, is remarkable. For a long time they remained outside the institutional circuit but now are finally given space in exhibitions.

Every initiative in this direction is positive, but museums need to be careful not to classify these specific aesthetic experiences as closed groups that do not communicate with a broader narrative of art and culture. It is necessary to give visibility, for example, to the practices of feminist artists, without making them something apart from what is still known as the official narrative of art history. There is a growing demand for a cultural production aimed at groups who are justly demanding more and more representation. These particular identities must dialogue with each other so that the museum can reassess the universal.

Moving beyond what the museum produces, it is necessary to consider who produces it. This includes rethinking to what extent its curators, directors, mediators, and attendants represent the plurality of society today.

Education and freedom

Towards the end of the debate, a member of the audience asked Dr. Sérgio Gardenghi Suiama: "How can art be defined in its general and educational context?" Suiama answered part of the question, stating that art and education go together and that previous education is necessary for the reading of an image. This answer provoked some reflections. There are many ways of reading an image, ways as different as the subjects that read them. The museum needs to learn how to deal with all kinds of audiences, from those already familiar with art and its codes to those unwilling to engage in dialogue.

Soon after the *Queermuseu* controversy, we saw institutions adopting indicative classifications in their exhibitions, as in the exhibition *Histórias da Sexualidade*, held at Masp. For Dunker, solving potential conflicts by imposing a minimum age to see an exhibition is equivalent to abstaining from the debate, refusing to make the necessary mediation between image and public. Dunker compares this attitude with infantilizing the public. To impose classifications seems to be to respond to a demand by part of the society that wants to be controlled. A society that accepts and claims censorship. When this public refuses to face sensitive themes, it gives up its right to think critically.

Censorship is not how museums should deal with the challenges they face. Dr. Sérgio Suiama defends that the right to freedom of expression should ensure free artistic creation and the circulation and receptivity to works of art as well as the protection of spaces and institutions devoted to art.

However, it may be difficult to count on the help of the State in these current days of "culture deprivation," as Professor Christian Dunker defines it. The question regarding the survival of public museums is inevitable. We cannot ignore the fact that, in addition to promoting a space for critical reflection on the past, present, and future, institutions must meet public targets and face the challenge of creating and organizing exhibitions with a limited budget and a staff. The museum's main challenge is to prove its value as a space of freedom of thought in a time of crisis, and, together with other institutions – such as schools –, work to educate a public willing to deal with otherness and social contradictions.

Participation beyond Proposition

Diogo de Moraes Silva

2018

Critical report of the session: [Democratisation of Museological Processes – Community and Public Participation](#)

Communications:

- India Vanuíre Historical and Pedagogical Museum – auto-narrative exhibition: *Fortalecimento da Memória Tradicional Kaingang – de Geração em Geração* [Empowering Kaingang Traditional Memory - from Generation to Generation] (Andressa Anjos de Oliveira and Isaltina Santos).
- Museum of Contemporary Art-USP – exhibition: *"Vizinhos da Arte"* [Neighbors of Art] (Maria Angela Serri Francoio).
- São Carlos Museum - collaborative exhibition: *"Somos esporte!" São Carlos e a história das práticas do corpo* ["We are sport!" São Carlos and the history of body practices] (Vanessa Martins Dias).
- Museum of the Memory of Bixiga – Fábrica de Restauro do Bixiga [Bixiga Restoration Factory] (Diego Rodrigues Vieira).

Dedicated to Session 1 live, Democratization of Museological Processes: Community and Public Participation, part of the 10th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo, the following report, aside from bringing together and organizing the main aspects addressed by the guest-speakers during their presentations, seeks to make some considerations about the format of the presentation of projects as well as the procedures adopted by the speakers regarding the communities and public's participation in their conceptions and/or development.

Concerning its format, Luiz Fernando Mizukami, member of the Technical Coordination Group of the State System of Museums of São Paulo (SISEM-SP), explained that the

model of expository session represents an unfolding of the digital panels held during past Conferences. Bringing together works previously selected by a commission, the current format seeks to enhance the communication of projects that, so far, had been presented for the appreciation of the public through digital support without the presence or public speech of their proponents.

The change in format presupposes, according to mediator Michael Argento, dynamic presentational presentations, with speech illustrated by means of organized contents and slides.

The projects presented in this session were developed by four different museums located in different cities in the state of São Paulo and selected among a significant number of works submitted to the judging committee. They correspond to propositions considered by the commission as worthy of museological and socio-cultural interest and thus worthy of a type of extroversion and visibility that conventional panels would not provide – a perception based on the evaluation of previous Conferences. It is also noteworthy that the selection of projects to be presented in this session sought to contemplate museological practices beyond the capital region and the dominion of museums linked to the State Secretariat of Culture, which, through SISEM/SP, promotes the Conference.

Although we must give credit to initiatives that intend to improve the format of the Conference's exhibition session, making it broader and more targeted, we must point out some aspects in its dynamics that are worth reviewing with a view to possible improvements. The main aspect to be discussed concerns binding the presentations to a pre-defined and programmed slide projection time: 20 seconds, as previously indicated by the mediator of the session. Such a rule ended up compromising the oral presentations (which, by the way, were shorter than expected), as most speakers felt pressed by time. In addition, the complexity of the theme seemed to demand a different forum, open to longer and more detailed discussions, with better-prepared speakers conceptually-wise. In our view, these two aspects produced an asymmetry between what the session "promised" and what it delivered to its audience.

As the reader will notice, the descriptions and comments about the projects reflect, to a certain extent, the superficial character of the presentations. Since this is a critical report of the session itself, we choose to deal specifically with the presenters' utterances, refraining from searching for information in other sources – although there was some consultation done through the institutions' virtual sites and the media. We intend, therefore, to reflect on the potentialities and limitations of the exhibition format in question, concentrating on what was possible to apprehend during the session.

Connected to the State Secretariat of Culture, the India Vanuïre Historical and Pedagogical Museum is located near the city of Tupã, in the western part of the state of São Paulo. Following previous projects developed by the Museum with different indigenous communities of the region, the exhibit *Empowering the Kaingang Traditional Memory - from Generation to Generation* was conceived with/by members of the Kaingang ethnicity, who live in lands located near Tupã. A member of this community, Zeca, is directly responsible for curating the exhibition. He, along with three other Kaingangs, was responsible for deliberating on the emphasis and content of the exhibition.

Representing the Museum during the session, the documentary researcher Andressa Anjos de Oliveira and the educator Isaltina Santos informed us that the institution had already held *participatory* and *collaborative* exhibitions with other indigenous communities, but this could be considered the first of a *self-narrative* nature. Despite suggesting differences between these modalities, the professionals did not take the time to comment on the nature of such differences, which seems to reflect the session's lack of receptivity to more detailed approaches as well as the insufficient preparation of the speakers to participate in them, given the conceptual treatment required to delve into such complexities.

On the other hand, we are made aware that the exhibition in question had as its main theme the production of indigenous ceramics, a practice that, in recent decades, has become rare in the daily production of the Kaingang community, to which Zeca and his three collaborators in the curatorial work belong. Thus, the exhibition project proposes a kind of "recovery" of ancestral productive knowledge to promote its recognition and, possibly, the resuming of its practice by the community – in this regard, it should be noted that the content of the exhibition is bilingual, both in Portuguese and in the Kaingang language. One can infer from this that the approach attempted by the exhibition is not limited to revealing aspects of indigenous culture to the non-indigenous public, since indigenous peers are also addressed by the exhibition and invited to revisit a type of knowledge that, although less present in their daily lives, relates to their material culture.

By electing ceramics, the four Kaingangs in charge of the project's curatorship shed light on the transmission of knowledge between generations. In this sense, the exhibition narrative includes characters such as Zeca's grandmother and mother, who passed on to him the knowledge and skills required to make pottery. The expographic presentation of this tradition takes place in the Museum premises, showing the different stages in the production of ceramic pieces (from collecting and shaping the clay to firing and cooling the piece) through photos, videos, ceramic pieces, and tweezers.

When describing the project, the Museum professionals pointed out that its policy seeks to favor a logic in which the indigenous “speak for themselves,” instead of being represented by white specialists – in this respect, the figure of the *anthropologist* was mentioned. According to them, what was at stake was an institutional policy open to the expectations of the indigenous people regarding the modes of (self)representation provided by the Museum. From this perspective, they affirm that, instead of bringing something to the indigenous, the indigenous can bring their proposals and guidelines to the Museum, and substantiate them with the tools and supports provided by this cultural institution, according to their choices as to what they wish to exhibit, and their view of these elements. This requires that the Museum be willing to review its practices with every project, so as to become effectively permeable to other perspectives and manners of producing narratives and representations.

Despite the focus on the demands of the Kaingang indigenous community – in what concerns, for example, their self-representation and the role of ceramics in their material culture –, the Museum’s presentation was centered mainly on *what* the exhibition was composed of. By focusing on this aspect, they practically did not discuss *how* the exhibition process was developed, including the type of interaction that the indigenous group had with the Museum and its technical staff during the different stages of the project’s elaboration. However, it seems to us that, in initiatives such as this one, considering their content is as important as thinking about and discussing *how* they are established; after all, cultural contacts and exchanges also take place at these moments of symbolic negotiation and shared construction. Furthermore, by peremptorily affirming the criterion that indigenous may “speak for themselves,” regardless of collaborations with anthropologists and other agents of the academic and/or technical field, their communication misses the opportunity to think about this aspect in a more nuanced way; it overlooks significant experiences of collaboration between indigenous and non-indigenous people, for example, in the fields of exhibitions, bibliographic materials, and the cinema, among others.

The Museum of Contemporary Art, an institution belonging to the University of São Paulo, had its museological dissemination initiative (in this case, beyond the walls) represented by one of the initiatives of its education department, the *Neighbors of Art*, a program presented by the art educator Maria Angela Serri Francoio. As the name suggests, the program seeks to promote approximations between the Museum and institutions of different natures (responsible for different forms of working with the population), located in the vicinity of the MAC-USP. Their headquarters are just across from Ibirapuera Park.

Employing reproductions of works, the program “brings” reproductions of pieces from its modern art collection to these neighboring places, with the additional purpose of attracting their public to the Museum, to its exhibitions and works of art – not only those of modern art but also the contemporary production, as observed by Maria Angela.

Based on museographic criteria, the program involves developing an exhibition with reproductions of two-dimensional artworks on the premises of neighboring institutions – turned into partners –, based on the Museum’s policy of democratization of access. These installations are adjusted to the physical and architectural features of the institutions the Museum and its education department interact with. Priority is given to places of daily access, such as waiting rooms and corridors.

Currently, the project involves the community from DERDIC, an institution for deaf people located in the Museum’s vicinity. In this institution dedicated to education, accessibility, and employability for the deaf, the exhibition focuses on portraits, including interactive resources – such as mirrors strategically placed between the reproductions of artwork, which, according to the art educator, would stimulate people to establish bodily and visual games between their self-image and the pictures on display.

The professionals from this and other organizations who have participated in the program, as well the public, welcome the project. In the case of Derdic, besides the deaf public, the program has also established educational interactions with the institution’s staff, including doctors, psychologists, administrative staff, etc. According to Maria Angela, most of the public attending Derdic was unaware of the existence of MAC-USP. In response to this, one of the goals of *Neighbors of Art* is reiterated: to take people who attend these partner institutions to visit the Museum, possibly creating museum-goers. Thus, a bridge is built connecting access to the reproductions of artworks to direct contact with them in the museological space.

Comparing the proposal of the MAC-USP with that of the Índia Vanuíre Historical and Pedagogical Museum requires that we, among other things, point out some differences between the participatory and collaborative logics in the relationship between museums and communities. For the Historical and Pedagogical Museum, the definition of the emphases and contents of the exhibition was shared with members of the community with which the institution interacts. In the case of the MAC-USP, this definition remains circumscribed to the technical staff of the institution. Without delving into this difference, it is worth pointing out, at least, that the first example is close to the collaborative register, while the second tends to connect to participatory dynamics. In other words, while collaborative processes presuppose the distribution of decisions and discursive

elaborations (in this case, expographic) among the various agents and dominions involved, participatory situations imply a “center” that deliberates on the discourses and their form of communication, inviting the other to take part in what is outlined beforehand – in terms of content and purpose.

In the case of the MAC-USP, we should also ask to what extent the institution, concerned about the inclusion of new publics in its physical and symbolic space, would be open and interested in learning and rethinking its practices based on the interaction with these other organizations and their publics – to make sure the pedagogical initiative is not one-sided.

Another museological initiative presented was that of the São Carlos Museum, located in a municipality in the central-eastern region of the state. Managed by the São Carlos Pro-Memory Foundation, the museum is located in the city’s old railway station. Motivated by the 2016 Olympics, *We are sport! São Carlos and the history of body practices* was presented by Vanessa Martins Dias, historian and member of the Museum’s collection policy commission, as a *collaborative* exhibition. The objective of this exhibition was to tell part of the city’s history from the perspective of the sports that have been practiced there.

From what we could gather from Vanessa’s presentation, the option for the collaborative dynamic was linked to a factor different from the one that mobilized the experience of the Índia Vanuïre Historical and Pedagogical Museum. For the São Carlos Museum, the main issue was to face the fact that its collection had many gaps – given the erratic and intermittent history of the Museum, whose activities started in 1957. Hence the option to fill in some gaps, even if through a temporary exhibition about a specific theme, with documents and objects lent by the citizens, athletes, and institutions of São Carlos. According to the Museum professional, this strategy presented an alternative to the limitations imposed by the institution’s collection, as well as the possibility of experimenting with the collective construction of an exhibition.

To deal with this situation and try to build the corpus of the exhibition, the project resorted to oral history – mainly with the employees of the São Carlos Pro-Memory Foundation, regarding their sports practice –, as well as to meetings to define the guiding theme of the exhibition and its title. In addition, the process included borrowing items from the project’s collaborators. Both amateur sports – through the example of the amateur football team Flor de Maio – and high-performance sports – emphasizing, among others, the former female athlete Maurren Maggi – were contemplated.

Another point highlighted by Vanessa concerning this type of construction of an exhibition regards the fact that, as they have directly contributed to its elaboration, people

recognize themselves in the exhibition, thus feeling represented. She mentioned, as an example, that one of the modules resulting from this process was the production of a sticker album on a larger scale, portraying athletes and former athletes who were somehow involved in the development of the exhibition – and the “stickers” were fixed directly on the walls of the exhibition space. This openness to community collaboration in a museum initiative is called a “project differential”, in the words of the historian.

It is believed that, by increasing community participation in the preparation of exhibitions, it is possible to generate changes in museological practices, to the extent that sharing the process with “non-specialized” people would cause the technical professionals to move off their usual places, reviewing their practices at every project. However, to further explore this alleged finding (which is welcome, one must admit) would require a thorough verification of the process at its different stages, including measuring to what extent such collaborations effectively guided the origination of the show, pointing, also, towards possible disagreements and clashes among the people. This would be an indispensable condition to assess if “collaborations” were not used merely to establish assignments stipulated a priori by the Museum and its technical staff, which would configure a mere make-belief of the collaborative practice. But, as was already pointed out, the format of the session does not favor deeper and more complex approaches to the projects, leading, in a certain way, to presentations of a self-affirming nature, implying a kind of publicity of their initiatives.

The last initiative presented in the session comes from a community museum. The Museum of the Memory of Bixiga was idealized in the early 1980s by the self-taught historian Armando Puglisi and established with the help of the local community. Created to guarantee the preservation of this traditional neighborhood of São Paulo, the museum remained closed for ten years, having been reactivated between 2016 and 2017. It is intermittent, a project still under construction, operating in a multicultural territory, composed of social groups from the most different backgrounds, especially the black, Italian, and Northeastern populations. For example, some of its participative initiatives take place in open fairs and *blocos de rua* (street carnival bands).

Responsible for the presentation of the Bixiga Restoration Factory – a project initiated on the occasion of the reopening of the institution –, the lawyer and current executive director Diego Rodrigues Vieira says that his involvement with the Museum is directly linked to the efforts for the reactivation of the institution’s activities. Officially launched in April 2018, the Factory represents the main front of this new phase.

When contextualizing the project, Diego highlights that one fourth of the historic buildings in the capital, listed by the Municipal Council for the Preservation of Historical, Cultural, and Environmental Heritage of the City of São Paulo – CONPRESP, are located in Bixiga. However, as the director points out, it is not enough to have the properties listed, since, due to the lack of preservation policies and initiatives, they have quickly been deteriorating. There is also strong real estate blockbusting in the neighborhood. They covet the land where many of these buildings are located and their adjoining lots. Therefore, the Museum seeks to draw attention to this problem, which it confronts by engaging people in the cause of heritage preservation.

The Factory is the result of a partnership between the Museum and the Mackenzie Presbyterian University and it works as a community agency pilot project dedicated to studying and developing initiatives in favor of the heritage of Bixiga. Having as one of its creators the emeritus professor of the Architecture and Urbanism Faculty of Mackenzie Nadia Somekh, it focuses on the conservation of the neighborhood's architectural heritage. According to the Executive Director of the Museum, there are initiatives to "explain" to the masons and carpenters of the region the importance of the heritage in order to avoid "inappropriate" interventions, such as "patch-ups, reckless renovation and changes disfiguring the original architectural style."

Despite the relevance of the Restoration Factory and its purposes, statements such as those mentioned above deserve more accurate and detailed assessments – which the session's duration and format did not encourage. In our view, the dynamics of a central district of a megalopolis such as São Paulo implies a high level of complexity in terms of the types of occupation (and adaptation) of its buildings. An example of this is Vila Ito-ró, which, by the way, is located in this same area. Whoever visits the architectonic set of the Vila, which today is in a process of restoration, is faced with several improvised structures that were built and attached to the main house by its several residents throughout the decades. The question remains: to preserve the history of a building (and, therefore, of its occupation), should these improvised structures be kept or removed? Were it not for the short time of the session, we might have discussed this issue with the representative of the Museum of the Memory of Bixiga. This is to say that "explaining the meaning of heritage" is just one of the layers of a highly unequal and volatile metropolitan reality and, because of that, we have to consider the "patch-ups, reckless renovations and disfigurements" from another angle and perspective.



11th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo

Future Perspectives: Museums under the Dimension of Mourning

Fernanda Lucas Santiago

2021

Critical report; Synthesis of the [11th Conference of the Museums](#) of the State of São Paulo: Museums, Society and Crisis: From Mourning to Struggle

The pandemic context has caused several academic meetings to be postponed or even canceled. The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference succeeded in holding its 11th edition in November 2020 – its first virtual edition, bringing the theme *Museums, Society and Crisis: From Mourning to Struggle*. The theme could not have been more opportune, given the many deaths claimed by covid-19 (then 168,000¹ and currently 414,600²); the intensification of the economic crisis; the secular genocide of the indigenous and black population; the lack of investment in the artistic and cultural sector, and the public's loss of identification with Museums. In this scenario of grief, there is an urgent need to fight for life, to stand for culture, and to reorganize the museum space so as to guarantee safety and health for its employees and visiting public. How to keep museums alive at a time when our lives are at stake?

For more than 10 years ACAM Portinari in partnership with SISEM-SP organized The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference, to which several professionals from the area are invited, aiming to deepen reflections on the theme as well as to share actions and new technological tools. In this 11th edition, during the 5-day event, several conferences and debate tables demonstrated the power of the whole program, about which I could not possibly write in just a few lines. However, I would like to highlight

¹ Brazil registers 644 deaths by Covid in 24 hours and exceeds 168,000. Available at: <https://g1.globo.com/bemestar/coronavirus/noticia/2020/11/19/casos-e-mortes-por-coronavirus-no-brasil-em-19-de-novembro-segundo-consorcio-de-veiculos-de-imprensa.ghtml>. Accessed on: 22 Mar, 2021.

² Brazil has 1,900 deaths per million inhabitants, ahead of the United States, Mexico and Russia and 10 other countries with over 100 million inhabitants Available at: <https://g1.globo.com/bemestar/coronavirus/noticia/2021/05/06/brasil-tem-o-maior-numero-de-mortes-de-covid-19-por-milhao-de-habitantes-entre-os-paises-mais-populosos.ghtml>. Accessed on: 11 May, 2021.

some activities that allow us to understand the diversity of themes addressed, maintaining cohesion when discussing the necessary struggle to keep the Museum space alive, in terms of its public, qualified professionals, economic provision, and sustainability.

The opening table included a posthumous tribute to Júlio Abe Wakahara. The architect and museologist was awarded the Waldisa Rússio Camargo Guarnieri Museum Merit Medal. The event's organizers had intended to pay him a tribute during his lifetime, which failed to occur as he died only two days before the event's opening date. Nevertheless, thanks to the promptness of the organization, it was possible to previously record the thank-you speech with Júlio's brief account about his professional career of more than 50 years, besides his several projects done in partnership with Waldisa. His legacy will certainly remain alive as a rich example to all professionals in the field of museology.

The Conference opened with the singer and composer Ellen Oléria reversing the logic of talking about the pain caused by racism, choosing instead to talk about all the cultural wealth of black people, inviting white people to strip off their privileges and see themselves as a fundamental part of the anti-racist struggle in the practical organization of everyday life. At this point, we understand that the white-centric perspective needs to die so that there is life possible for museums. In other words, the museological narrative cannot be restricted to a single Eurocentric perspective, excluding the multiple racial identities that make up the Brazilian people. The lack of identification of the public with the exhibitions symbolically represents the death of the public.

Jochen Volz, director of the Pinacoteca de São Paulo, presented and mediated the table *Provocations: Museums for what? And for whom?*, suggesting the need to articulate this question with two other, Why? For whom? Professor Jacques Marcovitch, from USP, contextualized the nature of this crisis in the health, economic, social, and political spheres, proposing as possible answers to this crisis that we regard culture as a mirror, a place where we can reflect on ourselves so that we can see ourselves.

Continuing the *"provocations"*, Ana Carla Fonseca, representative of Garimpos Soluções, a company that works with creative economy and territorial development, talked about the challenges and concrete experiences of museums that are investing in communication to integrate the public in the projects. As a result, the museum is no longer seen as a mausoleum, a place that preserves the past, but rather as a living place, where visitors circulate, where it is possible to "re-signify, reposition and contextualize the past in the present," opening the doors for future proposals to society. In other words, it is up to museums to provoke society, showing the permanence of the past, as well as the ruptures and future possibilities that are linked to the dynamics of each place. Still on

the importance of keeping life in/of museums, Hampaté Bâ's³ ideas can help us think of ways to keep memory and traditions alive.

We can learn about the importance of orality and the chain of transmission of stories, even in our society, so writing-oriented. We know the natural ability that every human being has to narrate his own life story and that of the world around him; therefore, knowledge is not found only in the museum: visitors carry memories with them. It becomes necessary to make them circulate. The de-bureaucratization of the museum structure can be a facilitator of dialogues among the public, managers, and exhibitions.

Closing the "*provocations*", the director of the Afro Brazilian Museum, Emanuel Araújo, also emphasized the importance of museums in safeguarding memories and stories, its social role in activating a sense of racial and national belonging. We are also mourning the genocide of the black population. Among the victims of homicide in Brazil, 75.7%⁴ are black. Considering the black population in Brazil is almost 60% of the total, this number is even more significant. For Araújo, museums can function as "a mirror of self-esteem," a place where the public can see and admire its own image. Like Marcovitch, Araújo also uses the mirror as a metaphor to describe the museums' function of reflecting in their exhibitions the public's image, making the public reflect deeply about our culture, society, politics, etc.

Brazil ranks 5th⁵ in femicide rates worldwide; considering *transgender* people, the country ranks 1st place in the world.⁶ We are also grieving for all the women and trans people murdered. Punitive and educational actions capable of changing this scenario are necessary. At this point, the social and educational function of museums can be improved by including permanent exhibitions about the importance of women and trans people in history, as well as by explaining the artistic production of women and trans people. The panel "Dreaming the World 2020: Women Change Museums"

3 HAMPATÉ BÂ, Amadou. A tradição viva. In: KI-ZERBO, Joseph. História geral da África. 2. ed. Brasília: Unesco, 2010. v. 1: Metodologia e pré-história da África.

4 The number of homicides of black people increased 11,5% in eleven years; the number concerning other groups fell 13%. For non-black Brazilians, the homicide rate is similar to Russia's; for blacks, Guatemala. In 2018, violence against LGBT + population increased 19,8%; data are from the Atlas of Violence 2020. Available at: <https://brasil.elpais.com/brasil/2020-08-27/numero-de-homicidios-de-pessoas-negras-cresce-115-em-onze-anos>

5 One woman is killed every nine hours during the pandemic in Brazil. Monitoring shows that there is underreporting and a lack of data on race, sexual orientation, and gender identity. Available at: <https://www.brasildefato.com.br/2020/10/10/uma-mulher-e-morta-a-cada-nove-horas-durante-a-pandemia-no-brasil>. Accessed on 10 May 2021.

6 Murders of trans people rise again in 2020. Available at: <https://antrabrazil.org/category/violencia/>. Accessed on 11 May 2021.

presented the reflections of lecturers Marián Cao, Lilian Amaral, and Andréia Pegoraro, who presented the circulation of debates on gender relations in museums in Brazil, Argentina, and Spain. How to think about gender relations in Latin American museums? What are museums in Europe thinking about gender relations? Is it possible to think about this theme in a transcontinental way?

To organize the museums' finances in this moment of economic crisis, the panel "The Importance of Advocacy in the Future Scenario of Museums" presented some options. The president of the International Council of Museums (Icom-BR), Renata Motta, the president of the Brazilian Association of Social Organizations of Culture (Abraosc), Paulo Zuben, and the coordinator of Alana Institute and member of Impacta Advocacy, Pedro Hartung, shared their perceptions about the importance of advocacy as a fundamental tool for the cultural sector. Renata began by defining the term advocacy as a set of collective practices that aim to promote public policies. Therefore, it is a tool that can strengthen actions for social transformation. As examples of advocacy, Renata mentioned the approval of the Aldir Blanc Law, which injected R\$ 3 billion into the cultural sector, and the Black Coalition for Rights Campaign.

Concerning the permanence of human life and the planet, the debate panel "The Means and the Connected Ends" addressed the issue of museums' economic sustainability, with the presentation of Victor Magrans Julià. The manager of the National Art Museum of Catalonia reflected on the definition of sustainability according to the World Health Organization (WHO): "satisfying one's own needs." From this definition, another question arises: what are the needs? Magrans proposes that we think about sustainability in a broad way, considering environmental, financial, social, and ethical aspects. As examples of sustainable initiatives, he shared the wide action program conducted at the Art Museum of Catalonia, ranging from awareness campaigns for employees and the public, training in organizational methods, to daily exercises of electricity, water-waste, and plastic reduction, and improving logistics through car-pooling or the use of bicycles.

Even with so many successful proposals for sustainability, it seems appropriate to consider the reflections of the environmentalist Ailton Krenak⁷ regarding the ideas of sustainability. In his critique, he states that the idea of sustainability only serves to justify the continuation of the production and consumption pattern, to ensure profits. Should we defend ideas intended to postpone the end of the world, or would it be more effective to change our habits so that the end of the world is no longer part of our dimension of the future? A more profound action would be to rethink life on our planet rather than talk about

7 KRENAK, Ailton. Ideias para adiar o fim do mundo. Companhia das Letras: São Paulo, 2019.

sustainability. And then, perhaps the profound global grief we are experiencing can make us change the way we live and relate to each other. In short, museums should serve life.

This summary report about the 11th SSAMC intends to promote the readers' interest and invite them to access the YouTube page of the System of Museums of the State São Paulo (Sisem-SP),⁸ where they can follow-up on the reflections proposed by the lecturers.

References

HAMPATÉ BÂ, Amadou. A tradição viva. *In*: KI-ZERBO, Joseph. *História Geral da África*. 2. ed. Brasília: UNESCO, 2010. v. 1: Metodologia e pré-história da África.

KRENAK, Ailton. *Ideias para adiar o fim do mundo*. Companhia das Letras: São Paulo, 2019.

⁸ 11th Conference of the Museums of the State of São Paulo. Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLF9wR3xIXzRYUk3s8h3RX1AF6ZGpTFFz->. Accessed on 18 Mar. 2021.

“I Am Much More Than My Pain”: A Call to the White Duty of Anti-racism

Sofia González

2020

Critical report of the opening conference: “[Lecture for a Racist Country Where No One Declares Themselves Racist.](#)”

Ellen Oléria begins her lecture by introducing herself and her family, and describing her education and professional background. She says she sees her invitation to speak in this event not merely a result of her professional experience but, to a greater extent, the result of the conditions that define her as a subject: woman, black, lesbian, Brazilian. She points out that she simultaneously represents majority and minority in the Brazilian society: “We [black women] are a majority in terms of generating resources in Brazil, yet we are a minority as far as managing these resources is concerned.”

Oléria reports that she was invited to speak about her experience as a black woman in art within the context of racism and its impacts on her career and personal life. She informs her speech has three parts: social markers and racism, ancestral legacy, and perspective.

She says she regards her presence in events such as The State of São Paulo’s Annual Museum Conference – especially in November, the month that celebrates Black Consciousness – as an insult to hegemonic powers. The singer reports that she has often been invited to talk about her experiences fighting racism. And since the event’s audience is comprised of young black men and women, and she is a “successful” black woman, she assumes the purpose of her participation in the event is to mirror the audience as well as bring them hope. After all, she is a black woman who does not occupy underpaid positions – so usual among black men and women in Brazil –, has not been a victim of incarceration in prisons or mental institutions, with a career that involves her exposing herself and “playing with human vanities.”

In addition to these talks, she says she is commonly invited to speak to institutions created and run by white people, mostly men. Not sure if this would be the SSAMC’s case,

Ellen draws attention to the fact that museums are historically white institutions that narrate history from the perspective of the white.

Before moving on, Oléria points out that non-whites experience disqualification quite often, whereas black people like herself experience it even more recurrently. And she warns: "It isn't possible to understand what this pain is like by merely illustrating it." In other words, her 30-minute speech cannot teach the experience of racism to the white people listening to her. With that, however, Oléria is not implying that the conference itself has limitations. Instead, she points to the limiting capacity of a narrative to promote the understanding of a pain experienced by the other: "What convinces human beings of inhuman actions is their consciousness and sensitivity."

Trying to understand the second group of invitations she receives, she wonders, "what is this need of institutions and groups formed mostly by white men to hear the pain of those treated by them and their systems as inferior categories of human beings?" She denounces the processes of domination imposed by men, who objectify and demonize women's bodies. She also points to the attempt by white men and women to dehumanize the black, simultaneously qualifying them by means of negation ("not intelligent, not beautiful, not clean"), and yet making use of their cultural technologies, religious expressions, and artistic manifestations.

Regarding her lesbian condition, Oléria limits herself to pointing out that compulsory heteronormativity does not acknowledge the existence of lesbianism or blackness.

Based upon the assumption – so far implicit – that the pain caused by racism cannot possibly be "learned," Oléria wonders whether the desire to listen to memories of pain and racism by those who experience it would be a sign of sadism or perhaps of total erasure of the very memory of a white identity in the world. A provocation offered to the listeners and organizers of the SSAMC concerning the reasons underlying her invitation to present an opening lecture.

She presents her hypotheses: do white people possibly spend so much time thinking about black people that they have become incapable of thinking about their own identity? Could it be their desperation when reminded of their legacy of violence and extermination? Or even "a renewal of all the historical responsibility put on the shoulders of an imaginary system that has no political agents?" She leaves a warning: black people cannot teach white people who they are: "You need to find out for yourselves." And thus she announces she refuses to tell stories of the times she was a victim of racism.

"I am so much more than my pain. I wish I received more invitations to talk about the power of my artistic production, about the places my voice can reach. Not about being a black woman and a lesbian, which I am, but I am much more than that. [...] I'm not going to show my wounds here. By the way, I'm very well, thank you."

With this poignant yet calm speech, with a touch of irony, the artist clarifies that, while her assumptions may prove to be true in the SSAMC, she won't be contributing to the sadism or the inability of the white to think about their own identity and legacy.

Next, she addresses the issue of reparation and the fear she identifies among white people to face it. She prompts the recollection that historically, white people plundered lands, customs, culture, and belongings of others, implying that the fear of the contemporary white people has no justification.

She then arrives at the theme of legacy and ancestry. "Dear white people, it shows a great deal of arrogance and pretentiousness to assume that black people wish to display and show off what you call wealth." Through examples of behaviour often seen among the white (who, she implies, belong to a more unhappy class, yet with greater purchasing power) and among the black (whose lives are marked, in the artist's words, by precariousness and joy), Oléria offers an insight into "accumulation and scarcity," from which she regards wealth as a complex, multiple-meaning concept. According to her, black men and women do not want that which white people call wealth, as they have been asking white people to "stop killing us" for centuries. Just as pain cannot be taught, neither can joy. What we are claiming for is the very richness and joys. She says to the white: "Give them back!".

In the third part of her speech, the singer recalls an interview in which a journalist asked her what was it like to be a black woman in Brazil, to which she replied: "It is unbelievable to be a black woman in Brazil."

Oléria says she thinks it is unbelievable to be heiress of a powerful tradition that gloriously connects with the planet and sets off to be the guardian and representative of the forces of nature. "Motumbá to the pantheon of the orishas."

She goes on to present a long list of "unbelievable" legacies: black women have survived, they are still alive, despite the biggest massacre in the history of humanity; after extermination and eugenic projects, black men and women influence the world, they make their music the music and culture of the west; from hunger, they created a rich, colorful and tasty cuisine; in the face of religious intolerance, they merged traditions and created religions that respect the differences of nations.

The list goes on: "It is unbelievable that part of the history of Brazil continues making us invisible; and we have torn the pages of this history to rewrite it through mirrors that reflect our perspectives and memories." "It is unbelievable that our ancestors succeeded in overcoming firearms with sticks, stones, and *capoeira*, and in the middle of all that, we created samba." "It is unbelievable that we could overcome the experience of drifting away from our language and input so much into this Brazilian Portuguese [...], that today it is impossible to deny our inventiveness and distancing from the colonizer's language." "It is unbelievable to be able to daily resist the power of this ignorant project, which adapts to the profitable idea of politically correct and masks the vicissitudes of a racist thought that is still alive."

And finally, "It is unbelievable to be black in Brazil, unbelievable because in all this there is a pride that the word cannot express - a black pride."

Having mentioned the samba, that welcomes everyone, democratically, Oléria recalls hearing from a white person that black men and women should not allow exchanges with white people in the *terreiros* (places of worship in Candomblé and Umbanda) to whom she replied quoting the poet Poli Preta, "The weapons of the Lord will not destroy the master's main house." She added, "that is not how we do our things [...] our technologies are generously shared."

Arriving at the third and last theme, Perspective, Oléria addresses the recent wave of anti-racist processes and points out that, if for some unadvised people, racial struggle is a novelty, "for us it has always been a way of life."

She recalls the undeniable markers of inequality in Brazil are race and ethnicity, present everywhere, even in the violent State apparatus that kills children in the *favelas*. Therefore, if rights are unequal, we must shout, rebel, as the Maale people did; denounce, like many organizations and black communities have. "This is a racist country, where nobody declares themselves racist. This is Brazil."

Asked whether she believes protests can increase social awareness, she replies that this development depends more on white people talking about how racism is kept alive in their daily practices and figuring how to fight this social memory.

In dialogue with her previous speech, when she refused to talk about the moments in which he had suffered racism, she urges, "White people, talk about your racisms." So, she shifts the responsibility to combat racism away from black people and their demonstrations, and she calls white people to accept their full share of responsibility.

Oléria denounces Brazil and other Latin American countries that do not address racism clearly and directly, so white people do not even admit their white identity. Intending to provoke the audience once again, she mentions the idea of inertia to explain the accommodation of those who are neither affected nor harmed by racism.

"We need to talk about white ancestry and its legacy," as the current times demand that "we connect with our updated life project, with a life of dignity and humanity, and the deconstruction of a machine that exterminates black people, which is still raging in Brazil."

Again from the idea of inertia, she reaffirms that those "on the move" will remain on the move. They are the same people she mentioned earlier, for whom racial struggle has always been a way of life. "And all people are invited "to be on the move" and question their history and its social mechanisms in their everyday lives." Very subtly she makes clear throughout the conference that "all people" actually means white motionless people, since black men and women have never stopped moving towards resisting the extermination machine and building its "unbelievable" legacies.

When she finally gets to the subject of art, which brings her much satisfaction, she smiles and says that its mechanisms get mixed with those of memory and consciousness. She regards memory as fuel of consciousness.

Based on the idea that "art can be our bridge towards the expansion of a collective consciousness," she mentions a series of musical styles: American (jazz, funk, rock), Caribbean (salsa, cumbia, mambo), and Brazilian (chorinho, pagode, axé music, vassi, afoxé, maracatu, xaxado). All of them, according to Oléria, are ways of diving into memory and learning about "the black presence rewriting history through a rich and diverse culture."

Still on the subject of art, she mentions its power to conquer the imaginary, regarded as a territory. Through art, it is possible to rewrite history, creating a "new realities."

To the question, "how to bring a policy of reparation into everyday life?" she boldly answers: "I don't know," once again sending the message that responsibility is shared and one black person alone will not bring all the answers. Now, more explicitly, she reintroduces the question previously announced: "white people need to think about their communities, about the historical reparation for what was generated by them and for their profit through exploitation and violence."

Still, as an artist, she makes a proposition: she emphasizes the need for an update in black images and states that museums have a fundamental role here, since they are responsible for selecting memory and defining perspectives through which history is told.

She adds that occupying museums with black art is not an issue related only to historical reparation: "Reading a black Brazilian author is an opportunity for the reader to expand his or her imaginary," that is, an opportunity to dismantle archaic stereotypes and make contact with stories that go beyond that.

Finally, she points to the complexity of the fact that the consumption of black art does not mitigate power relations, so that a "daily exercise of connection with our mechanisms" is necessary – and activating thoughts demands effort. Using a metaphor from classical physics, she returns to issue of the necessity of movement: "Isn't work defined as force times distance?"

Closing her talk, Ellen Oléria draws attention to the fragility of the current structures and urges everyone to move towards a transformation of these structures.

An attentive member of the audience points out that the artist's speech is, to a great extent, a paradox: a conference in which she presents the reasons why she refuses to address the themes she was invited to address. Her speech seems to aim at making explicit that the themes suggested by the event's organizers have limitations precisely because they have been proposed by those very people she mentioned: white men, heads of a historically colonial, racist and sexist institution: the museum.

Ellen is assertive, polite, ironic, and therefore very effective in her communication. She leaves an important message to the museum field. Black people cannot be invited to these events to tell white people how to dismantle the racist structures they themselves have created. The establishment of an anti-racist practice is the obligation of white people, since racism is a white problem, perpetuated and updated by white people. By paying attention to this aspect, we move away from the seductions of using the idea of "place of speech" superficially.

Ellen Oléria's opening lecture has the potential to shatter structures because instead of giving answers it proposes transformation through collective movement. Still, recognizing the power, competence, and pertinence of the presence of black men and women in different debates, as well as enabling the construction of more democratic, rich and plural museum practices, is extremely necessary.

The Potential of Advocacy in Brazil - Civil Society Organization and Participation in the Development of Public Policies for Culture and the Creative Economy

Ana Beatriz Rodrigues Garcia

2020

Critical report of the panel: [The Importance of Advocacy in the Future Scenario of Museums](#)

The cultural sector and the creative economy in Brazil have undergone difficult times over the last decade. There was a significant decrease in the amount of money invested by governments (at their various federative levels) in the sector, in addition to the difficulties faced by institutions in accessing the National Culture Fund. This problem has manifested itself in various ways – among which, the various attacks on the system of financing culture through tax benefits, as in the case of the well-known Rouanet Law.

The Covid-19 pandemic has contributed to the worsening of this situation, hitting the cultural spaces and cultural centers hard as their earnings depended largely on box office sales. Without events, shows, and live recordings, hundreds of thousands of professionals saw themselves in an extremely vulnerable situation – especially those from technical areas, who could not adapt to lives and other online formats to do their work.

How then to adapt to these times and seek a more effective approach to public policy-making, bearing in mind the relevance of the cultural sector for the economy and for the development of the socio-cultural life we expect for the country?

On the panel "The Importance of *Advocacy* in the Future Scenario of Museums," Renata Motta, of the International Council of Museums (Icom Brazil), Paulo Zuben, of the Brazilian Association of Social Organizations of Culture (Abraosc), and Pedro Hartung, of Alana Institute and Impacta Advocacy, propose a possible path for this initiative, offering insight into *advocacy*, its possibilities, and potentialities for the cultural sector, especially museums.

Opening the panel, Renata Motta offers an overview of this critical situation of culture, indicating the importance of culture and museums in producing a social life richer in diversity, equity, and social justice, highlighting the need for advances in the promotion of the sector's interests. To this end, she explains that **advocacy** – a set of collective practices and actions aimed at influencing how public policies are built – could help to induce positive social changes in society as a whole

For Motta, this instrument, still not widespread in Brazil and in the national cultural sector, has a history of victories in the realm of other popular causes – as in the case of discouragement of publicity aimed at children and in the anti-smoking policies that resulted in the Anti-Smoking Law, in force nationally since 2014. The panelist says that such changes were made possible through well-articulated campaigns initiated by civil society, and she lists as an example the Aldir Blanc Law of 2020. The Aldir Blanc Law resulted from an unprecedented articulation at the national level and released R\$ 3 billion from the National Culture Fund to help professionals and cultural institutions impacted by the pandemic.

She points to the enormous potential for growth of **advocacy** in the cultural sector – and especially in the museum sector, which has 3,000 institutions in Brazil, 500 of which are concentrated in the state of São Paulo alone –, enabling it to achieve greater organization and fighting spirit in the field of culture.

The floor is then given to Paulo Zuben, from Abraosc – the Brazilian Association of Social Organizations of Culture, who presents a project developed in the first semester of 2021 aimed at the defence of the arts in Brazil. It is an introductory course on **advocacy** practices as a tool for the cultural sector, conducted by Abraosc in partnership with the institution Americans for the Arts (AfA) and Impacta Advocacy, and funded by the U.S. Consulate General through a bidding process. The course will be offered online for employees working in the cultural and creative economy fields and will later be available openly on the Internet.

Zuben explains that the idea of organizing the work in defence of culture and promoting its systematization arose from the realization that the difficulties and crises in the cultural sector might have a common cause throughout the entire cultural system, affecting not only the social organizations that are the focus of Abraosc's work but also other institutions, producers of all sizes, and artists in the sector. The starting point therefore was a joint effort based on the understanding that the cultural system is interconnected and that a coordinated work would be more powerful and effective in the production of positive results.

This idea paved the way for the organization of a coalition to defend certain causes. This initiative would require to decide collectively what this agenda should include, to understand the sector's motivations as well as how and with what purpose this defence should be built. To this end, Zuben stressed the relevance of the previous experience of the institution Americans for the Arts, created in the 1960s and still active in the USA, with many positive results in the defence of the cultural sector, especially concerning its protection during the crisis generated by the pandemic, as well as the national experience, with Impacta Advocacy as a reference, working consistently and effectively in other sectors.

These ideas became an online course for about 50 professionals of the sector. We translated material on **advocacy** from the USA, and together with Impacta we developed a methodology of reflection and built this course. More than 12 hours of meetings to further discuss the issue and choose materials taking other sectors as examples are programmed. Through this initiative we expect to build a coalition that goes beyond the scope of social organizations in the state of São Paulo, building a consistent and permanent defence of the main causes essential to the continuity of the sector's activities at all federal levels.

Zuben reinforces the need for professionals in the sector to work in a more structured way for the development of cultural rights for all, with full access to culture, through concrete actions. He also affirms that many people in the sector already use **advocacy** without being aware of it. The course can change that, strengthening the bonds between the players in the sector and giving them a more solid base to conduct this work.

The third presentation was by Pedro Hartung, from Impacta Advocacy, who explained that this defence of interests – the core of **advocacy** – exists in the country. However, those practicing it can still benefit from learning other tools to defend the interests of museums and the entire cultural sector.

Hartung states that the core of **advocacy** is the promotion of social transformation and the systematized and organized political incidence for the defence of interests in the State's institutional decision-making spaces. According to him, it is a practice widely used by third sector organizations and organizations for the defence of the private sector with the purpose of defending interests in the decision-making process of public entities and in the influence on public and regulatory policies. Hartung mentions other examples of successful **advocacy** in Brazil, such as the Legal Framework for Early Childhood, the Civil Rights Framework for the Internet, the General Law of Data Protection, and the Maria da Penha Law.

The panelist affirms that *advocacy* is concerned about organizing interests for their defence in institutional spaces, not only in Brazil but also in other international organizations, and for this purpose, specific techniques and tools are available. The partnership with Abraosc seeks to democratize access to this technical-strategic repertoire to inspire managers and leaders of the cultural sector to search for common grounds and their defence.

He points out that Brazil experiences not only the problem of representativeness, but also the problem of the participation of the organized civil society, groups, foundations, associations, etc. It would be necessary to break with these groups' tradition of not often participating in institutional spaces, such as the National Congress, the Legislative Assemblies and institutional spaces of the Executive Power.

According to him, *advocacy* is not about political articulation or conversations with people in charge – it means securing this work, with tools that can guarantee transparency and legal security. Hartung reinforces that decision-making spaces are spaces of dispute over budgets and the text of the law. This dispute is reflected in regulatory tools used in the legislative process, which include going to the National Congress, systematically participating in public hearings, proposals, amendments in the text of the law, bills, public consultations, conversations and hearings with all those involved.

Hence the importance of creating coalitions to strengthen *advocacy* and harmonize actions, creating an alignment that allows for internal differences – differences of opinion and different political and institutional positioning – which do not prevent the construction of common agendas and objectives. For Hartung, *advocacy* is a “toolbox” of various types, such as public relations, lobbying, strategic litigation, government and institutional relations, demonstrations, mobilization, and communication campaigns. He reinforces that *advocacy* cannot happen without communication because, eventually, it all boils down to the dissemination of a cause.

The objective of this course developed with Abraosc is to provide training for the “use” of this toolbox, democratizing this knowledge and allowing the cultural sector to benefit from an available technique for social transformation in defence of the cultural rights of the Brazilian population.

Closing the panel, Renata Motta pointed out the enthusiasm in contemplating this space of democracy and society as a space of dispute, in which the toolbox can provide great effectiveness and be very useful for the cultural sector.

Finally, she names other institutions active in the defence of the arts and culture, especially in the museum sector. She recommends following the American Alliance of

Museums, whose website has a section especially dedicated to *advocacy*, with plenty of material and resources available for use. She also mentions Icom's relevant work as the main international network of museum professionals and institutions, with Spanish among its official languages.

Disseminating *advocacy* and its strategies is indeed essential for the Brazilian society. It has the potential to help civil society improve its capacity to exercise influence on decision-making spaces of its interest. This participation is extremely important for more people to understand how the country's institutions work, who are the agents and what are the spaces of greatest influence, and what are the best approaches to most effectively achieve their goals. It is also extremely important to ensure that demands from workers of the cultural sector, who daily experience the difficulties in their day-by-day, are known and taken into account, avoiding distortions and misunderstandings in communication that might negatively affect the implementation of a normative instrument with a distorted view of reality.

Finally, this dissemination is important for citizens and non-governmental players to be increasingly capable of disclosing information about these spaces, the decision-making processes and the development of policies, ensuring increased transparency and a greater need for representatives, elected or not, to justify their choices in the public sphere. These are processes with the potential to enhance political reflections and the complexities of institutional and governmental analyses. Once materialized, these processes can pave the way for the accomplishment of the visionary ideals of society and culture imagined by our Constituent Assembly in 1988 and which are embodied in the Constitution of the Federative Republic of Brazil.

What Is the Museum for and How Does It Dialogue with the Needs of Society?

Ana Paula Sousa

2021

All of a sudden, I understood it was imperative to create an agency with national amplitude to preserve all kinds of artwork in Brazil. I kept thinking how many of them were scattered around the states, works by painters, sculptors, ceramists, craftsmen, without any protection against greedy collectors. This simple recollection led to the creation of the National Artistic and Historic Heritage Service (CAPANEMA, 1983).

There are two moments in the critical reports of the first decade of The State of São Paulo's Annual Museum Conference (SSAMC), whose first edition dates back to 2009, in which the image of flames destroying memory prevailed in the participants' speech.

The first dates back to 2015, the year the Museum of Portuguese Language, located in Praça da Luz, downtown São Paulo, saw its building partially destroyed by a fire. After six years of renovations, the museum, linked to the Secretariat of Culture and Creative Economy of the State of São Paulo, should be reopened in July 2021 – provided are permitted to resume operations.

The second concerns the 2018 fire that destroyed the National Museum, located in Quinta da Boa Vista, in the city of Rio de Janeiro. Created by King João VI in 1818, the museum was under the tutelage of the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ). Its collection comprised 20 million items, including everything from fossils and indigenous pieces to rare books. Practically 90% of its collection was destroyed.

Both events are powerful not only for their concrete meaning but also for the symbolism of the fire, inescapable when we are to discuss museums in Brazil. And they are inescapable because they are not unique; nor are they rare. Anyone who follows the cultural events of Brazil, even superficially, can recall the fires of the Cultura Artística Theater

Afterword

(2008), the Cinemateca Brasileira (2016), and the Liceu de Artes Ofícios (2014), only no mention the city of São Paulo.

The disappearance, albeit temporary, of these two museums actualize what seems to be a constant for museological institutions: the threat of ceasing to exist or, at the very least, becoming extremely fragile.

These reports are also invaluable because they are an inventory of the institutions' possible response to the permanent risks faced by culture. As much as debates can give us a glimpse of fires, they are unlikely to be guided or invaded by them. To the contrary, fires appear as counterexamples of the actions that, over the last decade, have enabled advances in the museum policy of the State of São Paulo. Despite all the obstacles and challenges, institutionalization did happen. And part of its memory is recorded here.

It can be said that the central theme of this series of Conferences was the need to rethink the role of museological institutions in the face of changes that had been taking place in the cultural sector even before the beginning of the Covid-19 pandemic. And part of the challenge lies in the greater porosity institutions have demonstrated concerning society's irreversible momentum, namely, the more organic relationship with technology and the re-signification of the establishment vis-à-vis the identity movements and the voice of the peripheries.

The museums in the state of São Paulo – which are divided among those linked to the state, the city halls, and the private sector – are, in themselves, an interesting example of how to face these challenges. A parenthesis is in order here for a note that extends beyond the time of the reports.

As of October 2020, when cultural institutions were allowed to reopen in São Paulo, with social distancing rules and occupation reduced to 30% of their capacity, two major museums in the city, the Pinacoteca do Estado and the Museum of Art of São Paulo (MASP) saw tickets for two of their exhibitions, by OSGÊMEOS and Beatriz Milhazes, respectively, sold out.

In both cases, virtual tours, online activities aimed at the Educational Center, and specific courses for the digital environment were developed in parallel to the face-to-face activities. Pinacoteca's online ticket sales system became more sophisticated to meet the repressed demand, creating a virtual line and specific dates on which new batches of tickets were to be made available.

Despite their popular profile, in which the idea of art comes close to entertainment, both shows feature contemporary Brazilian artists. This, from a certain point of view, is no small matter, since it was unimaginable two decades ago, which brings us back to one of the discussions that surface in this volume reports: how can public policy be more inclusive?

The first step to understanding what we are talking about when we discuss museums in Brazil is to have an overview of the sector. In her text, Illana Goldstein informs that the survey conducted by the National Museum Register in 2003 reported the existence of 2697 museums in Brazil – among art museums, ethnographic museums, community museums, and territory museums. These places housed 142 million items and generated 27 thousand direct jobs.

Another survey, conducted in 2006, revealed that São Paulo was the state with the most museums in the country: 459 registered institutions. Most of them are located in the countryside of the state, where, as we have seen in these reports, the challenges tend to be even greater than in the capital. These mappings were the first steps towards the desired institutionalization of the sector.

Cecilia Machado's presentation gives a clear picture of the complex scenario there. In 1994, she joined the Department of Museums and Archives (DEMA), working in the museological institutions in the countryside of the state. Later, the historian would coordinate the state System of Museums - Sisem-SP, where she would be responsible for the articulation of the 415 museums integrating it. In this volume's testimonial, she recalls how different the annual meetings with the museological sector in the state of São Paulo used to be three decades ago. "They were incipient, heroic, with no incentive or anything that could be called a public policy for the area, which relied on professional dilettantes who kept these meetings alive," she says.

Not by chance, Cecilia Machado says in her report that although the state System of Museums (SISEM-SP) was created in the 1980s, it was not until the first decade of the 2000s that it started to be effectively articulated and achieved some capillarity. Cecilia says that, since then, the itinerant exhibition programs and the diagnostic research were intensified. Without them, "the manager will plan blindly."

The 2000s saw Gilberto Gil at the head of the Ministry of Culture (MinC) and the incorporation of the idea of decentralization of culture. At that time, there was a wish for Brazil to get to know Brazil and, at the same time, for Southeastern Brazil to stop imposing its own biases on the other Brazils.

At the same time that, at the federal level, an attempt to implement an integrated national policy was being made – which would culminate in the creation of the Brazilian Institute of Museums (IBRAM) in 2009 –, the state of São Paulo was experiencing the emergence of a new configuration for cultural administration: the Social Organizations (SO).

As Vinicius Spricigo, one of the authors of the reports, observes, the SO model emerged out of an attempt, under the PSDB governments in the State of São Paulo, to reconcile the public and the private.

The first Social Organization of the cultural sector in São Paulo was implemented in 2005, precisely in the Pinacoteca. The idea of the SO is that the government should maintain transfer of resources to the institutions, which, in turn, should look for alternative sources of income through private as well as operational initiatives – such as admission fees - to supplement their budget.

With a Brazilian touch, this trend reproduced the arrival of the private sphere in a domain that, all through the 20th century, had been especially state-owned (McGuigan, 1996).

“Seen by critics of neoliberalism as a form of privatization of culture through private management of public institutions, this management model is presented at The State of São Paulo’s Annual Museum Conference as a dynamic instrument for modernizing the cultural sector and the management of São Paulo museums,” Spricigo writes, indicating that the model, despite the fierce criticism it received in its early years, was eventually absorbed.

The discussions about Social Organizations were especially heated in the first Conference, in 2009, precisely because they represented an innovation. However, due to the strong presence of the model in the State’s cultural institutions, this theme would be taken up many times.

Marcelo Araújo, who had been director of the Pinacoteca, said, for example, that the management of museums by an SO made it possible to hire employees under the CLT regulation - formal employment scheme. It also allowed for improvements related to management and governance. Little was discussed, however, about the new issues surrounding the SOs, which no longer revolve around their excessively liberal profile, but rather their fragility in the face of the state’s financial crisis.

If this reality was already emerging before the Covid-19 pandemic, it has become even more urgent with the explosion of public expenditure on health and financial aids to different sectors. In 2020, all Social Organizations in the State of São Paulo had a 14% reduction in government transfers and were forced to implement pay cuts. According

to the Brazilian Association of Social Organizations (Abraosc), the entities in this sector currently employ about 4.5 thousand workers.

Although many SOs have expanded their sources of private income over the years, they still greatly depend on public funds. In the case of the Pinacoteca, for example, the state transferred R\$ 18.7 million in 2018, while private funds totaled R\$ 5.3 million – according to data available on the government’s Transparency Portal.

With the pandemic, all institutions also saw a steep drop in operating revenues – which come from admission fees, the cafeteria, and space rental. This aspect was, in fact, little problematized in the discussions promoted throughout the Conferences. There was little mention of admission fees, except in regards to Football Museum, which is not art oriented.

Based on this observation, it is interesting to consider how sensitive and tricky the issue of attracting the public still is. The government, when allocating resources to institutions, tends to increasingly demand a measurable return. Institutions, in turn, must move within the delicate curatorial balance between what is already assimilated by a wider public and what needs to be shown.

The success of OSGEMEOS and Beatriz Milhazes’ exhibitions in the first year of the pandemic overarches these issues. It is known, however, that turnstile is far from being the only success measure of a cultural policy.

In *A Farewell Tale*, Carlos Eduardo Riccioppo tries to address the issue of the living museum. Riccioppo problematizes “to what extent the museum is increasingly haunted by the threat of becoming a “dead” place of culture; the problem of the detachment between these institutions and their surroundings; the challenge of bringing the public into the museum; the need to rethink the responsibility regarding its collection, available works, and exhibition.”

The questions raised are many. And they are not easy to deal with, since to provide access also means to unclioister. And this is not made possible by organizing exhibitions capable of attracting a wider public. Inclusion goes beyond that. It can be exemplified by Diogo de Moraes Silva’s reference to a panel called “Museums and Social Movements.”

At this Conference, the Museum of Archeology and Ethnology (MAE-USP) talked about its proximity to social movements in the “Sunflower” project, held in Jardim São Remo, a community of approximately 15 thousand residents located next to the University City Campus. “Seeking to cross segregating boundaries, this and other MAE-USP projects provide an opportunity to reflect about another modality of museums, the social museology,” Silva writes.

Cayo Honorato takes a few steps further on the same path, pointing out the need for museums not only to “reevaluate the objects and narratives of their collections and exhibits in order to accommodate issues and perspectives of marginalized groups but also to respond to the resistance of other sectors of the society, which do not accept the presence of these issues in the public sphere.”

The need for museums to go beyond their walls and relate directly to the community permeates many reports. This happens because each institution will be more and more forced to ask itself – and answer it itself, and for the society – the reason for its existence.

At the table Provocations: Museums for What?, Jochen Volz, director of the Pinacoteca, who was the mediator of the Conference, suggested that this questioning be articulated with two others: Why? And whom for? The word “purpose,” increasingly popular among companies and career counselors, tends to gradually find its way into institutions.

What is the purpose of a museum institution and how does it relate with the social and symbolic desires and needs of the population?

The answers to these two questions are certainly very different from those that moved Gustavo Capanema (1900-1985), Getúlio Vargas’ (1882-1954) Minister of Education, to create, in 1937, the National Institute of Historical and Artistic Heritage (Iphan), the cornerstone of the existence of this volume, which appears as another brick in the construction of the institutional memory of Brazilian culture.

References

CAPANEMA, Gustavo. *Pensamentos*. Belo Horizonte: Ibérica, 1983.

MCGUIGAN, Jim (1996) From state to market. In: *Culture and the public sphere*. London: Routledge, pp. 51-73.

AUTHORS

Amanda Moreira Arantes

Graduated in Art History from the Federal University of São Paulo with a master's degree in Curatorship from the University of Essex, England. Since 2015 she has been developing curatorial and research projects, with a focus on contemporary art in Brazil, art collecting in Latin America, and public collections. She worked at the Curatorial Department of the Pinacoteca do Estado de São Paulo between 2015 and 2019 and developed research on Brazilian art at the Essex Collection of Art from Latin America - ESCALA (Colchester, England) between 2019 and 2020.

Ana Avelar

Professor of Art Theory, Criticism, and History at the University of Brasília (UnB), she developed curatorial projects for Casa Niemeyer between 2017 and 2021. She was also the curator responsible for the International Artistic Residency Program OCA, at the same university. She participates in juries of national awards, such as the Marcantonio Vilaça - of which she was a finalist in 2017 -, the Pipa, and the Rumos Itaú Cultural, as well as the Jabuti in 2019. In the same year, she won the Curators Exchange program, promoted by the Brazilian Association of Contemporary Art (ABACT) in partnership with the Getty Research Institute. Her exhibition "Triangular: Art of This Century", held at Casa Niemeyer in 2019, was voted the best institutional collective of the year by a public survey promoted by Select magazine. As a tutor, she teaches criticism and curatorship courses, with a specialization in Brazilian art.

Ana Beatriz Rodrigues Garcia

Lawyer and journalism student, she has experience in the areas of economic and administrative law. She did translation work from Portuguese into English and German, worked in social media management, and as a copywriter and proofreader. She works in the information management of the digital platform of the Fórum Permanente association.

Ana Paula Sousa

Journalist with a doctorate in Sociology of Culture from the State University of Campinas (Unicamp) with a master's degree in Cultural and Creative Industries from King's College, London. For two decades, she has written about cinema, cultural public policies, and the arts and entertainment market for some of Brazil's main media outlets. She has published articles and analyses on the cultural sector in the newspapers *Valor Econômico*, *Folha de S.Paulo*,

and *O Globo*, and in the magazines *CartaCapital* and *Piauí*. She also works in the field of culture as coordinator of the debate forum of the São Paulo International Film Festival and member of the curatorial teams of the Festival and of *É Tudo Verdade* - International Documentary Film Festival.

Andrea Matarazzo

Graduated in Business Administration, he was São Paulo State Secretary of Culture from May 2010 to April 2012. In his twenty years of public life, he worked in the three spheres of government. In October 2012, he was elected councilman for São Paulo.

Angelica Fabbri

Museologist, post-graduate in Museology from the School of Sociology and Politics of São Paulo Foundation (Fesp/SP), she holds a master's degree (MBA) in Cultural Assets: Culture, Economics, and Management from Fundação Getúlio Vargas (FGV-SP). She is a specialist in Art-Education and Museum from the School of Communication and Arts of the University of São Paulo (ECA/USP). She was President of the Regional Council of Museology of the 4th Region (Corem 4R) for two terms (2005/2006) and vice-president for two terms (2009/2010). Affiliated to the International Committee of Museums (Icom) since 1986, she is currently a member of the Fiscal Council of Icom Brazil. She has been working in the museum sector since 1984. Since 2009, she is the executive director of Acam Portinari - Social Organization of Culture, the managing entity of the Casa de Portinari Museum in Brodowski-SP, the Historic and Pedagogical Museum India Vanuïre in Tupã-SP, the Felícia Leirner Museum and the Auditório Claudio Santoro in Campos do Jordão - SP, and the supporting actions for the State System of Museums of São Paulo (Sisem-SP).

Anny Christina Lima

Specialist in Museology from CEMAE/USP, she has a post-graduate degree in Project Management from Fundação Vanzolini, and a bachelor's degree in Psychology and Art Education. She was deputy director of the Brazilian Committee of the International Council of Museums (Icom Brazil) from 2013 to 2015. She is currently advisor of the Artistic-Pedagogical Coordination of the Fábricas de Cultura Program and consultant in museum education at Casa das Rosas and Museu Casa Guilherme de Almeida, managed by Poiesis Social Organization. Since 2012 she has been teaching Applied Museology: Educational Action and Evaluation of Exhibitions, in the specialization course in Museology, Collectionism, and Curatorship at Centro Universitário Belas

Artes. She works primarily in the coordination of educational projects in exhibitions, in the training of museum educators and teachers, and in the development of educational materials for art museums and cultural institutions in the city of São Paulo and the countryside of the state.

Beto Shwafaty

Artist and researcher, he holds a master's degree in Visual Arts and Curatorial Studies from the Nuova Accademia di Belle Arti (Milan, 2008-2010). He attended the study group in sculpture and contemporary research with Simon Starling at Stedelschule (Frankfurt, 2010-2011). He has been involved with collective, curatorial, and spatial practices since the early 2000s, developing, therefore, an artistic practice based on research on spaces, histories, and visualities, with which he seeks to formally and conceptually connect political, social, and cultural issues converging with the field of art. Some of his recent projects include: Remediações, Paço das Artes Projects Season, São Paulo, 2014; El Museo Imposible de las Cosas Vivas, PArC Lima, 2014; Nossa Voz, Casa do Povo, São Paulo 2014; P33_Formas Únicas de Continuidade no Espaço (33rd Panorama of Brazilian Art), MAM São Paulo, 2013; 9th Mercosul Bienal, 2013; Amor e Ódio a Ligya Clark, Zacheta National Gallery, Warsaw, 2013; Conversations Pieces, NBK Berlin, 2013; X Bienal de Arquitetura de São Paulo, CCSP. Visit: www.shwafaty.art.br.

Bruno Giordano

Master of Humanities and Social Sciences (UFABC, 2019) and Bachelor of Advertising and Publicity (Mackenzie, 2015), he explores interdisciplinary by running through the economic, political, and social areas within the perspective of culture. He discusses the role of museums today and the ways in which social minorities have established a relationship of identification with exhibitions and institutions, distancing the museum from a traditional conception (made by-and-for the elite) and bringing it closer to a more diverse public. Such events are reflected in the popularization of cultural spaces and on the influence of information and communication technologies, with the institutional use of social networks and other channels that allow social interactions and increased access to digitally available knowledge. Recently, he has shifted this study to the context of the covid-19 pandemic, when technology gains space in the relationship between museums and the public.

Carlos Eduardo Riccioppo

Ph.D. and Master of Art History, Criticism, and Theory from the Department of Visual Arts of the University of São Paulo (USP). Graduated from the same institution, where he also integrates the study group Centro de Pesquisas em Arte Brasileira. He was curator of the exhibitions "Leonilson - Desenhos" (University Center Maria Antonia, 2008) and "Fim da Primeira Parte" (João Loureiro's exhibition, Galeria Vermelho, 2011). He was awarded the Bolsa Funarte de Estímulo à Produção Crítica em Artes Visuais (2011), participated in the critique groups of Centro Cultural São Paulo, Centro Universitário Maria Antonia, and Paço das Artes, and contributed to the Enciclopédia Itaú Cultural de Artes Visuais.

Cayo Honorato

Professor at the Department of Visual Arts of the Institute of Arts at the University of Brasília (UnB) in the area of Theory and History of Education in Visual Arts, he is Ph.D. in Education (2011) from the University of São Paulo (USP), Master of Education (2005) and Bachelor of Visual Arts (2000) from the Federal University of Goiás (UFGO). Since 2007, he has done research work and published texts on cultural mediation in the framework of the relations between arts and education, with a special interest in documentary and extra-institutional practices, as well as in the publics' response. He collaborates with the group Extra-institutional Mediation, which is active in social networks.

Cecilia Machado

Graduated in history from the Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo (PUC-SP) and post-graduated in museology from the School of Sociology and Politics of São Paulo, she is a specialist in Art History and Costume History. She has worked with institutional memory for 30 years, being responsible for several projects of implementation of museums and memory centers, in institutions such as Masp, Lasar Segall Museum, Museu Paulista da USP, Club Atlético Paulistano, Instituto Itaú Cultural, Museu da Casa Brasileira, Banco Sudameris Brasil, Fundação Lochpe, Cenpec, ESPM, Base7 Projetos Culturais and Abimaq. She has owned the company Profissionais da Informação since 2002. From 2008 to 2011 she was director of the Technical Group of the State System of Museums of São Paulo. From 2011 to 2013 she was manager of the Figueiredo Ferraz Institute of Contemporary Art in Ribeirão Preto - SP. Currently, she renders services in the development and implementation of museological plans, technical assistance, and creation of museological and museographic projects. Since 2007 she has been coordinator of the Museology Technical Course at Centro Paula Souza - Etec Parque da Juventude.

Claudinéli Moreira Ramos

Historian, Master of Philosophy of Education, and Ph.D. student in Culture and Information at the University of São Paulo (USP), she is a specialist in Management and Cultural Policies from the University of Girona and Itaú Cultural Observatory. Professor of the specialization course in Museology, Culture, and Education at the Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo (PUC-SP) and of the MBA in Museum Management at Cândido Mendes University, she worked for 11 years in the Secretariat of Culture of the State of São Paulo, coordinating the Museum Heritage Preservation Units (2008-2013) and Monitoring and Evaluation (2013-2018). Since 2019, she has worked as a consultant for institutions such as Unesco, FGV, Itaú Cultural, and JLeiva Cultura & Esporte.

Daniel Rubim

Cultural producer and project manager, he holds a degree in Visual Arts from Belas Artes de São Paulo. He has worked with cultural institutions such as MAM-SP, Videobrasil, Pivô, and Centro Cultural São Paulo. He has also worked in diplomacy as Director of Institutional Relations for the Honorary General Consulate of Luxembourg in São Paulo and for the Belgian-Luxembourgian Chamber of Commerce in Brazil. He researches the Octagon Project of the Pinacoteca do Estado de São Paulo, in the Post-Graduate Program in Visual Arts of the School of Communication and Art of the University of São Paulo (ECA/USP), under the supervision of Martin Grossmann.

Daniele Zaccarão

Artist, teacher, and cultural manager, with a master's degree in Visual Arts, in the research line Contemporary Artistic Processes from the Graduate Program in Visual Arts of the Arts Center of the Santa Catarina State University (Udesc). Specialist in Aesthetic Education and Bachelor of Visual Arts from the Universidade do Extremo Sul Catarinense (Unesc). Professor of the Visual Arts course and manager of the Edi Balod Room - Space for Exhibitions and Laboratory of Visual Arts at Unesc, in Criciúma-SC. President of the Municipal Council of Cultural Policies of Criciúma (Comccri), where she represents the Visual Arts sector. In 2020, she inaugurated the Cresciuma Art Museum, an artistic/curatorial project configured as a museum-fiction.

Davidson Kaseker

] Holds a master's degree in Museology from the Interuniversity Postgraduate Program in Museology of the University of São Paulo (PPGMUS/USP). He graduated in Language and Literature at the Faculty of Philosophy, Literature, and Humanities of USP (FFLCH/USP) and specialized in Management and Public Policies at the University of Girona (ES)/Itaú Cultural. He has an MBA in Business Administration from Fundação Armando Alvares Penteado (Faap). He is studying Strategic Sustainability Management at Fundação Instituto de Administração (FIA). He was Municipal Secretary of Culture and Tourism of the City Hall of Itapeva-SP. Since June 2013 he has been director of the Technical Coordination Group of the State System of Museums of São Paulo (SISEM-SP). He is a member of the Council for the Defense of the Historical, Archeological, Artistic, and Tourism Heritage of São Paulo (Condephaat).

Diego de Kerchove

Artist, producer, and manager of cultural projects, he graduated in Social Communication from Escola Superior de Propaganda e Marketing (ESPM-SP) with a master's degree in Communication Sciences from the School of Communication and Arts at the University of São Paulo (ECA/USP). His master's research focuses on comics and the use of anthropomorphic characters. Since 2014 he has been the executive coordinator of the Fórum Permanente. He is responsible for the funding, production, and execution of all the association's projects.

Diogo de Moraes Silva

Researcher, cultural mediator, and visual artist, he works as a technical assistant at Sesc São Paulo, in the Management of Studies and Development. A Ph.D. student in the Inter-Graduate Program in Aesthetics and Art History of the University of São Paulo (PGEHA-USP), he has a master's degree in Arts in the research line of Visual Poetics from the School of Communication and Arts of the University of São Paulo (ECA/USP). He graduated in Visual Arts at Centro Universitário Belas Artes de São Paulo. Together with Cayo Honorato, he was resident editor of Fórum Permanente's magazine *Periódico Permanente #6* with a focus on the debate in cultural mediation.

Erica Ferrari

Visual artist and researcher, she is a Ph.D. student at the Graduate Program of the School of Architecture and Urbanism of the University of São Paulo (FAU/USP), with a master's degree in Visual Poetics from the School of Communication and Arts of the University of São Paulo (ECA/USP). She is associate researcher at LabOUTROS at FAU/USP and collaborator of the Movimento Sem Teto do Centro (MSTC). In the last few years, she has produced objects and installations based on research into the relations between urban space, history, and architecture. She has had individual exhibitions in institutions such as XPO Gallery (Enschede, Holland), Funarte (São Paulo), Museu de Arte Pedro Manuel-Gismondi (Marp, Ribeirão Preto), Centro Cultural São Paulo, and collective exhibitions at the Art Museum of Rio de Janeiro (MAR), Sacrow Schloss (Berlin, Germany), and the 32nd Art Biennial (Ljubljana, Slovenia). Her works are part of collections such as Marp and Museu Nacional da República.

Fernanda Lucas Santiago

She has a bachelor's and a licentiate degree in History from the Federal University of Paraná (UFPR, 2015), and a master's degree in History from the State University of Santa Catarina (Udesc, 2019). She is an associate researcher at Aya Laboratório de Estudos Pós-Coloniais e Decoloniais and a History teacher at the pre-college preparatory course Popular Ubuntu and at Colégio Estadual Paulo Leminski. Member of the OAB-PR Commission on the Truth of Black Slavery, affiliated to the Black Women's Network (RMN-PR) and to the Brazilian Association of Black Researchers (ABPN). She is interested in the history of black social clubs, intersectionality, post-coloniality, decoloniality, and the history of the present time.

Ilana Seltzer Goldstein

Master of Anthropology from the University of São Paulo (USP); Master of Cultural Mediation from University Paris 3. She has a Ph.D. in Anthropology from the State University of Campinas (Unicamp). She was a professor and coordinator of the MBA in Cultural Assets at Fundação Getúlio Vargas (FGV). Since 2014, she has been a lecturer in the Department of Art History at the Federal University of São Paulo (Unifesp), an institution in which she also co-chairs the Kaapora Chair, aimed at non-hegemonic connoisseurs and knowledge. In parallel to her academic career, she has worked on cultural projects for organizations such as Sesc, Itaú Cultural, SESCOOP, Ministry of Culture, Base 7, and Companhia das Letras Publishing House. She participated in the curatorship of exhibitions such as "Jorge, Amado, Universal" (Museum of Portuguese Language, 2012), "O tempo dos sonhos: arte aborígene contemporânea da Austrália" (Caixa Cultural, 2016 and 2017) and "Portos" (Sesc Santos, 2021).

Isis Gasparini

Artist in the field of dance and visual arts, with a master's degree in Visual Poetics from the School of Communication and Arts of the University of São Paulo (ECA/USP, 2017). Bachelor of Fine Arts and specialist in Photography from Fundação Armando Álvares Penteado (Faap), she is a dancer performing in independent companies. Researcher of the body, image, choreography, and exhibition space, her works are constituted by the critical and poetic investigation of the body and its movement potential in the relationship with a work of art or institution, understanding the exhibition space as an element that interferes politically in these relationships. She participated in different artist residency programs, such as Cité Internationale des Arts (2014), 7th Choreographic Coding Lab (2016), and Casero's Interval Program (2021). She teaches classes, workshops, and mentors projects. She was an artist-adviser in the Vocational Program and is part of the post-graduation faculty of Estácio de Sá University and São Caetano do Sul Municipal University (USCS).

José Roberto Sadek

Graduated in Communication and Arts from the University of São Paulo (USP), with a master's degree and Ph.D. in Communication Sciences from USP. He also has a degree in Architecture and Urbanism from Mackenzie University. A Fulbright guest artist at the Tisch School for the Arts, New York University, he was Deputy Secretary of Culture in the City of São Paulo (2005-2012), Deputy Secretary of Culture of the State of São Paulo (2015-2016), and Secretary of Culture of the State of São Paulo (2016-2017). Since 2018 he has been a professor of Screenwriting for Cinema at Fundação Armando Álvares Penteado (Faap).

Julia Buenaventura

Critic and historian of Latin American art, she is a Professor at Pontifical Universidad Javeriana and Universidad de los Andes, in Bogotá, Colombia. Postdoctoral fellow in 2016-2017 at the School of Communication and Arts (ECA) and the Institute of Advanced Studies (IEA) of the University of São Paulo (USP) (Capes scholarship), where she developed comparative research between different histories of art in Latin America in the twentieth century. She is Ph.D. in Architecture and Urbanism from USP (Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo - Fapesp, 2014) and Master of History and Theory of Art and Architecture from the National University of Colombia, 2007. Visit: <https://www.juliabuenaventura.com/>.

Larissa Magioli

Architect and urban planner with partial training at Escola da Cidade in São Paulo, she graduated from PUC-Rio. She currently works as an architect and researcher in Dallas, USA. Constantly on the move since the beginning of her career, her involvement in transdisciplinary projects between art, architecture, and territory in different socio-cultural contexts is the basis of her theoretical training and professional production. She participated in congresses and conferences, such as the XXX ALAS Congress of the Latin American Sociological Association, in Costa Rica, with a presentation on territorial and urban development in Brazil. She was part of the project Surfaces of Contact, Peter Behrens School of Arts at the University of Düsseldorf, Germany, with the work Skin and Cloud. She has published articles, essays, and illustrations in magazines and digital platforms, including Fórum Permanente.

Leandro de Oliva Costa Penha

Ph.D. researcher of the Graduate Program in Visual Arts of the School of Communication and Arts of the University of São Paulo (ECA/USP), with a CNPq (National Council for Scientific and Technological Development) scholarship. He is a member of the Multidisciplinary Group for Study and Research in Art and Education (GMEPAE/CAP/ECA/USP).

Leonardo da Silva de Assis

Bachelor of Library Science and History from the University of São Paulo (USP), he has a master's degree from the Information Science Program of the School of Communication and Arts at USP (ECA/USP). A Ph.D. student in the Information Science Program at ECA/USP, he graduated in Public Library Management from Universidad Alberto Hurtado, UAH, Chile. He works as a researcher and collaborator in the Laboratory of Culture, Information, and Society (Lacis) at ECA/USP. He is the creator of the Project "Minhas Citações." He worked as information manager of the Fórum Permanente Cultural Association (2008-2014). He was librarian of the NGO Mais Diferenças in the execution of the Accessibility in Public Libraries Project, of the Ministry of Culture (2014-2016), and carried out different editorial work with institutions such as Projeto Guri, Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo (PUC-SP), and the Brazilian Association of Contemporary Art (ABACT). He is a researcher of themes such as public libraries, cultural policy, accessibility in libraries, and public information.

Letícia Santiago

Historian, specialist in Foundations of Culture and the Arts from the Arts Institute at Universidade Estadual Paulista (Unesp), she has worked as a public executive for 12 years in the state administration of São Paulo in project management, development, monitoring, and evaluation of public policies. She worked in the Museum Heritage Preservation Unit (UPPM) of the Secretariat of Culture and Creative Economy since 2015, where she is currently a coordinator.

Luiz Palma

Social psychologist and visual artist, with a master's degree and Ph.D. in Social Psychology from the Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo (PUC-SP). Former director of the National School of Public Administration (Enap) and former director of the School of Sociology and Politics of São Paulo (ESP), he was part of the technical staff of Fundação do Desenvolvimento Administrativo (Fundap/SP) for three decades. He currently performs technical functions in the Secretariat of Culture and Creative Economy of the state of SP (UPPM/Sisem). Creator of Astrolabio (www.astrolabio.art.br), he is the author of *Arte e psique: um poder sem majestade*, by Escuta Publishing House (2019).

Marcelo Mattos Araujo

Director-general of Moreira Salles Institute, museologist, and lawyer, he graduated in Law from the Law School of the University of São Paulo (USP, 1978). He specialized in Museology at the School of Sociology and Politics of São Paulo (1983). A Ph.D. from the School of Architecture and Urbanism at USP (2002), he was director of the Lasar Segall Museum, São Paulo (1998-2002), director of the Pinacoteca do Estado de São Paulo (2002-2012), secretary of Culture of the State of São Paulo (2012-2016), president of the Brazilian Institute of Museums (Ibram-MinC, 2016-2018), and president of Japan House São Paulo (2018-2020).

Marcia Ferran

Architect and urban planner, she has been an adjunct professor at the Fluminense Federal University (UFF), in the Department of Arts and Cultural Studies, since 2009. She holds a specialization and a master's degree in Urbanism from the Graduate Program in Urbanism at the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (Prourb/UFRJ). She is Ph.D. in Philosophy from the Université Paris 1 in cooperation with Architecture at the Federal University of Bahia (UFBA), with a CNPq scholarship. She was awarded the Itaú Cultural Prize -

Cultural Policy Research. In 2010 and 2011 she took over the Management of the National Culture Plan (PNC) at the Ministry of Culture. In 2015 she worked as a visiting professor at the University of the Arts London with a Capes scholarship. In 2017 she began experimenting with video art with the video installation "Contra Memória; Brasília," a collaborative work with Lígia Nobre. She is also co-leader of the Critical Spatialities Research Group: Bridges between Art and Architecture. Author of the book *O desafio da hospitalidade: arte, cultura e resistência em subúrbios de Paris e do Rio de Janeiro*, published by Editora Circuito in 2020.

Maria de Lourdes Marszolek Bueno

Fine artist. She works as an art-education facilitator in the continuing education of teachers in the Baixada Santista region, as an art coordinator in workshops and lectures in social, educational, and cultural institutions, and as an artistic and cultural producer. She was a curator at Galeria Nilton Zanotti, in Praia Grande. She was regional representative of the state System of Museums in the Metropolitan Region of Baixada Santista and integrated the Advisory Board of the state System of Museums from 2015 to 2020.

María Iñigo Clavo

Post-doctoral fellow at the University of São Paulo (Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo - Fapesp), she is a researcher and sometimes curator and artist, with a Ph.D. in Fine Arts from the Complutense University of Madrid. Her theoretical work focuses on coloniality, migration, otherness, translation, and art in Latin America, with special attention to Brazilian art.

Mariana von Hartenthal

Master of Museology from the University of Southampton and Ph.D. in Art History from Southern Methodist University, she has worked in the Latin American Art Department at the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, and on the Documents of 20th-century Latin American and Latino Art project. She participated in exhibitions such as "Radical Women: Latin American Art" (2017), organized by the Hammer Museum and the Getty Institute, and was the museologist in charge of the remodeling of the Alfredo Andersen House Museum, in Curitiba (2018). In 2019, she completed a research project on the history of graphic and photographic techniques in Brazil at the Moreira Salles Institute. She is currently developing a post-doctoral internship at the Museology Department of Lusófona University (Lisbon) and coordinates the development of the Paranaense Museum's Collections Policy.

Marilúcia Bottallo

She has a Ph.D. in Information Sciences and a master's degree in Arts from ECA/USP. She is a Bachelor of History from FFLCH/USP. She is the Technical Director of the Institute of Contemporary Art and Coordinator of the Post-Graduation in Museology, Collecting, and Curating at Centro Universitário Belas Artes de São Paulo. She was a Museologist at MAM/SP, Pinacoteca do Estado de São Paulo, National Museum of American Art/Smithsonian Institute, MAE/USP, and coordinated the Memory Center of the Bunge Foundation. She is a member of the International Committee of Museums (ICOM), where she was Director and is currently a member of the Advisory Committee.

Martin Grossmann

Full professor at the School of Communication and Arts at the University of São Paulo (ECA/USP), he has been the idealizer and culturer-coordinator of the Fórum Permanente: Art Museums, between public and private since 2003. Since he received his master's degree, his academic research and cultural management programs have problematized, explored, and enhanced: the transition from material culture to culture in virtuality; the art museum in this scenario; trans-disciplinarity; the relationship between contemporary art, its agents and institutions; the processes of action and cultural, artistic, and academic mediation; the development and maintenance of operational and information systems for art, culture, and science, and, in particular, the art museum. He was the director of the Institute for Advanced Studies (IEA) at USP (2012-2016), director of the São Paulo Cultural Center (2006-2010), and deputy director of the Museum of Contemporary Art (MAC-USP, 1998-2002). He is also the academic coordinator of the Olavo Setubal Chair of Art, Culture, and Science at IEA-USP (since 2015).

Maurício Topal de Moraes

Bachelor of Fine Arts and Master in Visual Arts from the Federal University of Bahia (UFBA), he held solo exhibitions at the Museum of Modern Art of Bahia (2008) and at the São Paulo Cultural Center (2009). In 2007 he was awarded the Braskem Prize for Visual Arts. He developed work at the Universidad Politécnica de Valencia, Spain, in 2001, through the Program for Scientific Cooperation and Interuniversity Research between Spain and Iberoamerica (PCI-AECI), and has participated in other art events and group exhibitions. He develops research in theory and criticism, with articles published in journals and annals. His artworks involve installation, performance, and video. He is interested in projects for the Internet.

Nilo Mattos de Almeida

He graduated in Social Communication at the Universidade Metodista de São Paulo (Umesp). Master in Museology from the University of São Paulo (USP), he is currently a Ph.D. student in Museology and Heritage at the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (Unirio). Creator and content manager of the site www.ocuboazul.com.br, dedicated to art and museology. Member of the International Council of Museums (Icom), of the American Alliance of Museums (AAM), and of the Regional Council of Museology of the 4th Region (Corem 4R). He served as regional representative of the State System of Museums of São Paulo (Sisem-SP) from 2010 to 2016, and since 2019 he has been part of the Advisory Committee of this body. Museologist, curator, and visual artist, he does research, develops projects, and gives lectures and courses in several institutions in Brazil and abroad.

Paulo Nascimento

He graduated in Museology at the Federal University of Bahia (UFBA, 2005) and is currently a master's degree student at the Interuniversity Postgraduate Program in Museology at the University of São Paulo (USP). He is a museologist at the Lasar Segall Museum (Ibram/MinC). He was a professor at the Museum Technical Course of Centro Paula Souza - Etec Parque da Juventude and museologist at Museu da Casa Brasileira. He has experience in Museology, with emphasis on Management, Documentation and Research, and Teaching, working mainly on the following themes: museological plan, implementation, management and organization of museums, organization and systematization of collection information.

Regina Ponte

Graduated in pedagogy and fine arts, she worked for nine years in the Department of Historical Heritage of the Secretariat of Culture of the Municipality of São Paulo (2004-13). She was director of the Museum of the City of São Paulo between 2011 and 2013, when she coordinated the implementation of the Circus Memory Center, the Pavilion of Brazilian Cultures, and the Drawing Cabinet. Between 2015 and 2016, she coordinated the musealization project of the Casa de Mário de Andrade of the State Secretariat of Culture. She was the Coordinator of the Museum Heritage Preservation Unit of the State Secretariat of Culture between 2017 and 2019.

Renata Gava

Partner at Engenho Cultural - Advisory and Consulting Services in Museums, Heritage, and Culture, she is a historian, with post-graduate studies in Architectural Heritage and Cultural Management. She works in the museological area with emphasis on museum management, curatorial and educational processes, and in the field of the heritage of material and immaterial goods. Manager, curator and researcher of the itinerant exhibition "Porta, Porteira, Portão: customs and ways of talking in the countryside" and "História Cruzadas, Caladas, Curadas" organized in the Leprosy Museum. She participated in the museological and museographic restructuring project of the Prudente de Moraes Historical and Pedagogical Museum. She worked on the projects for the implementation and creation of the Sugar Cane Museum, the Entrepreneurship Memorial, and the Martha Watts Cultural Center. She was the regional representative for the state System of Museums (2010 to 2020). Currently, she integrates the Advisory Board of the state System of Museums - SP.

Renata Vieira da Motta

Ph.D. in Architecture and Urbanism from the University of São Paulo (USP) and a specialist in Public Management from the Center for Public Leadership (CLP), she was a professor at Escola da Cidade and at the lato sensu post-graduation course "Criticism and Curatorship" at the Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo (PUC-SP). She worked in the museums sector of the Secretariat of Culture of the State of São Paulo, as technical director of the state System of Museums (Sisem-SP), and as coordinator of the Museum Heritage Preservation Unit (UPPM). From 2017 to 2020, she was a technical advisor to the Dean's Office of USP on museums and collections, working mainly on the restoration project of the Paulista Museum. In 2020 she became executive director of the social organization of culture IDBrasil, responsible for managing the Football Museum and the Museum of Portuguese Language. She is the President of Icom Brazil, the Brazilian arm of the International Council of Museums.

Sofia Gonçalves

Educator and historian, she works as an educator in the New Museum of Ipiranga Project. She is a Master of Museology (2018) from the Interuniversity Graduate Program in Museology at the University of São Paulo (USP), and Bachelor of History with a master's degree (2015) from the same university.

Vinicius Spricigo

Adjunct professor at the Department of Art History of the Federal University of São Paulo (Unifesp) and member of the Research Group “Politics and Criticism of Contemporary Art” (CNPq), his research is oriented towards the study of exhibitions. In recent years, he has focused on periodic mega-exhibitions of contemporary art. He has a Ph.D. from the School of Communication and Art of the University of São Paulo (ECA/USP). As part of his Ph.D., he was a visiting researcher at the Royal College of Art (London, 2007) and at the Global Art and the Museum Project (ZKM/Karlsruhe, 2009). He conducted postdoctoral research with the Research Centre for Transnational Art Identity and Nation at the University of the Arts London (2019-2020) and contributed, among other published texts, to the books *The biennial reader* and *German art in São Paulo*, both by Hatje Cantz.

Vivian Braga dos Santos

Ph.D. in Arts (History, Criticism and Theory of Art) from the University of São Paulo (USP) and researcher of the nucleus “Histoire de l’Art Mondialée” at the Institut National d’Histoire de l’Art (INHA, France), her work addresses a wide range of questions about the relations between contemporary art, political conflicts, and history and memory in different geopolitical contexts. She is currently developing research on art and race in contemporary Brazil from two areas of investigation: archive and performance.

CREDITS

Editorial Organization (Fórum Permanente)

Martin Grossmann
Diego de Kerchove
Diogo de Moraes Silva (guest editor)

Editorial board

ACAM Portinari: Angelica Fabbri, Luiz Antonio Bergamo,
Joselaine Mendes Tojo
Fórum Permanente: Martin Grossmann, Diego de Kerchove
SISEM-SP: Davidson Panis Kaseker, Luiz Antonio Palma e Silva

Executive Production (Fórum Permanente)

Diego de Kerchove

Graphic Design (Fórum Permanente)

Arthur Lauriano do Carmo

Reviewer

Davidson Panis Kaseker

Proofreaders

Amélia Ward
Lígia Alves
Ann Colette Farrell (English)

Translations

Helena Spalic - English
Nuria Mauleón Montes and Maria Eugênia Catania - Spanish

Layout

Thiago Guedes

Social Media Design

Jhéssica Rinaldin

GOVERNMENT OF SÃO PAULO (STATE)

Governor of São Paulo

João Doria

Vice-Governor of São Paulo

Rodrigo Garcia

Secretary of Culture and Creative Economy

Sérgio Sá Leitão

Executive Secretary for Culture and Creative Economy

Cláudia Pedrozo

Chief of Staff for Culture and Creative Economy

Frederico Mascarenhas

TECHNICAL GROUP FOR THE COORDINATION OF THE STATE SYSTEM OF MUSEUMS OF SÃO PAULO - GTC SISEM-SP

Davidson Panis Kaseker (Director)

Carolina Rocha Teixeira

Luiz Antonio Palma e Silva

Luiz Fernando Mizukami

SOCIAL ORGANIZATION OF CULTURE - ACAM PORTINARI

Chairman of the Board of Directors

Washington Luiz Aissa

Executive Director

Angelica Fabbri

Administrative and Financial Director

Luiz Antonio Bergamo

ACTIONS SUPPORTING THE STATE SYSTEM OF MUSEUMS - SISEM-SP

Coordinator of Supporting Actions to SISEM-SP

Joselaine Mendes Tojo

Technical Actions Assistants

Ana Carolina Xavier Ávila

Bárbara Rodrigues Paulote

Michael Lopes Argento

Otávio Pereira Balaguer

FÓRUM PERMANENTE ASSOCIAÇÃO CULTURAL

Director-President

Martin Grossmann

Vice-Director President

Ana Leticia Fialho

Administrative and Financial Director

Gilberto Mariotti

Technical Director

Lúcia Maciel Barbosa de Oliveira

Board of directors

Beatriz Matta (associate), Felipe Arruda (associate), Ilana S. Goldstein (associate), Jorge Schwartz (associate), Regina Silveira (associate), Miguel W. Chaia (civil society member), Regina Pacheco (civil society member), Hubert Alquéres (civil society member).

Associates:

Ana Letícia Fialho, Ana Maria Tavares, Ana Tomé, Aracy Amaral, Beatriz Matta, Carla Zaccagnini, Daniel Rangel, Denise Grinspum, Felipe Arruda, Fernanda Albuquerque, Giancarlo Hannud, Gilberto Mariotti, Graziela Kunsch, Ilana Goldstein, Isis Baldini, Jorge Schwartz, Julia Buenaventura, Laymert Santos, Leonardo Assis, Liliana Sousa e Silva, Lucia Maciel Barbosa de Oliveira, Marcelo Monzani, Marcelo Araujo, Maria Lucia Bottallo, Martin Grossmann, Paulo Mazieri, Paulo Rodrigues, Regina Scalzilli Silveira, Ricardo Ohtake, Stephen Rimmer, Yara Kerstin, Walter Zanini (in memoriam).

FÓRUM PERMANENTE: CULTURAL SYSTEM BETWEEN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE

Research group of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the University of São Paulo

University of São Paulo - USP

Dean: Vahan Agopyan

Vice-rector: Antonio Carlos Hernandez

Institute of Advanced Studies - IEA

Director: Guilherme Ary Plonski

Vice-Director: Roseli de Deus Lopes

Fórum Permanente Research Group

Coordinator: Martin Grossmann

Members: Ana Maria da Silva Araújo Tavares, Cayo Honorato, David Moreno Sperling, Felipe Cardoso de Mello Prando, Gilberto Mariotti, Irene Small, Isis Baldini, Julia Buenaventura, Leonardo Assis, Liliana Sousa e Silva, Lúcia Maciel Barbosa de Oliveira, Marcia Ferran, Maria Inigo Clavo, Martí Peran Rafart, Martin Grossmann, Raquel de Oliveira Pedro Garbelotti, Ricardo Basbaum, Teresa Cristina Toledo de Paula

Dados Internacionais de Catalogação na Publicação (CIP) (Câmara Brasileira do Livro, SP, Brasil)

Reflexive overview 11 years of reflections and discussions [livro eletrônico] : The State of Sao Paulo's Annual Museum Conference / orgs. Martin Grossmann, Diego de Kerchove, Diogo de Moraes Silva ; [tradução Helena Spalic]. -- São Paulo, SP : Fórum Permanente : Sisem-SP : Acam Portinari, 2021.
PDF

Título original: Panorama reflexivo : 11 anos de Encontro Paulista de Museus : conceitos, políticas, ações, redes, públicos e memórias.
ISBN 978-65-994089-6-0

1. Artes 2. Cultura 3. Museus 4. Políticas públicas I. Grossmann, Martin. II. Kerchove, Diego de. III. Silva, Diogo de Moraes.

21-78070

CDD-306

Índices para catálogo sistemático:

1. Políticas culturais : Sociologia 306

Eliete Marques da Silva - Bibliotecária - CRB-8/9380

EPM

encontro paulista
de museus

These reports are also invaluable because they are an inventory of the institutions' possible response to the permanent risks faced by culture. As much as debates can give us a glimpse of fires, they are unlikely to be guided or invaded by them. To the contrary, fires appear as counterexamples of the actions that, over the last decade, have enabled advances in the museum policy of the State of São Paulo. Despite all the obstacles and challenges, institutionalization did happen. And part of its memory is recorded here.

Ana Paula Sousa
Afterword