

Abstract

MUSEUMS, THE MARKET AND CIVIL SOCIETY

There are many communities important to museums and many ways of defining such communities within today's global sphere. The two I would like to discuss are the market and civil society. These two communities, with the addition of a third, government, are central to the operation all societies, with the emphasis on each of the three being given varying weights in different countries. These three centres of power are of considerable interest to and have important impact on museums all around the globe. Over the past few decades many museums have determined to operate more like the market, adopting for-profit aspects to their work. At the same time granting bodies, governments and philanthropists have encouraged museums to operate more like business, and have suggested that market forces should regulate museums. But is this the right approach? Should private, market interests be separated from public, civil society interests? Are market forces compatible and helpful to civil society in general and museums in particular? How should these two communities interact? Is there a middle ground, a civil-market system that could be efficacious for museums?

This paper is based on the work of Michael Edwards and his fascinating book, *Just Another Emperor: The Myths and Realities of Philanthrocapitalism*. Civil society is different from the market and those differences must be acknowledged and protected. Markets work because they stick to a clear financial bottom line. Civil society, by contrast, has none of these clear markers. Rather it has many bottom lines and strategies to reach them, and relies on participants outside the control of any one group. Unlike the market, as Edwards explains, "civil society is open to more radical alternatives rooted in completely different visions of property rights, ownership and governance." Museums, part of civil society and agents of social transformation, have to negotiate with markets but keep a clear focus on civil society systems.

Key Words: Market; civil society; museums; social transformation; Michael Edwards; government

MUSEUMS, THE MARKET AND CIVIL SOCIETY

Ann Davis, The Nickle Arts Museum, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada

There are many communities important to museums and many ways of defining such communities within today's global sphere. The two I would like to discuss are the market and civil society. These two communities, or systems, with the addition of a third, government, are central to the operation all societies, with the emphasis on each of the three being given varying weights in different countries. These three centres of power are of considerable interest to and have important impact on museums all around the globe. Over the past few decades many museums have determined to operate more like the market, adopting for-profit aspects to their work. At the same time granting bodies, governments and philanthropists have encouraged museums to operate more like

business, and have suggested that market forces should regulate museums. But is this the right approach? Should private, market interests be separated from public, civil society interests? Are market forces compatible and helpful to civil society in general and museums in particular? How should these two communities interact? Is there a middle ground, a civil-market system that could be efficacious for museums? In this paper, in opposing a market system to a civil society system, I clearly recognize that my method of black-and-white opposition does not and should not provide all the answers, that both the current systems and the potential ones are more nuanced and complex than would appear here. Rather my purpose is to present an argument by looking at a field broader than that of museums and to encourage further discussion.

This paper is based on the work of Michael Edwards and his fascinating book, *Just Another Emperor: The Myths and Realities of Philanthrocapitalism* (2008). As the subtitle suggests, Edwards is concerned with philanthrocapitalism, that form of philanthropy characterized by large donations, backed by the belief that the world may be saved by revolutionizing philanthropy, making non-profit organizations operate like business and creating new markets for goods and services that benefit society. Recent people involved in philanthrocapitalism are Bono and his Global Fund, Bill Clinton and Bill Gates. To study this new brand of philanthropy, Edwards examines in considerable detail the differences between the approaches of the market on the one hand and civil society on the other hand. It is these differences that that I find most useful in considering the operation of museums, a part of civil society. Edwards has both broad and deep experience to back his study. He has held senior management positions in international organizations such as Oxfam-GB, Save the Children-UK and the World Bank. He is currently the Director of Governance and Civil Society at the Ford Foundation, centred in New York City.

Some Definitions

Market

In economics, a market is a social structure that emerged to make possible the exchange of rights, or ownership, of services and goods. Markets enable services, firms and products to be evaluated and priced through supply and demand. There are two roles in markets, buyers and sellers, with at least three actors needed for a market to exist; at least one actor, on the one side of the market, who is aware of at least two actors on the other side whose offers can be evaluated in relation to each other. A market allows buyers and sellers to discover information and carry out a voluntary exchange of goods or services. Today much debate centres on the freedom of the market, or the extent to which it is regulated by laws internal or external to a country or jurisdiction. The Chicago School of Economics, of which Milton Friedman was the best-known proponent, posited that the freest market was the perfect scientific system. Friedman argued for the elimination of all government regulation and trade barriers, and for cuts to social spending. A more centrist point of view was that of John Maynard Keynes, an advocate of interventionist government policy, who influenced Roosevelt's New Deal after the 1929 stock market crash. Keynes' ideas, along with those of his acknowledged successor, the Canadian John Kenneth Galbraith, led to the creation of social security in the USA, public health in Canada, and contributed to the promotion of welfare in Britain and workers' protection in France and Germany. The distinction between business and the state is important in capitalism. Capitalism requires a free

market, for capitalism is a for profit economic and political system in which a country's trade and industry are controlled by private owners, rather than by the state. Within capitalism is found business, a company operating by market forces, where profit is the determining metric.

Civil Society

Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831), a German philosopher, identified civil society as an autonomous self-governing sphere, which can transform individual strivings for particular advantage into the public good. Broadly speaking, the term was then split to the political left and right. On the left, it became the foundation for Karl Marx's bourgeois society; to the right it became a description for all non-state aspects of society, expanding out of the economy into culture, society and politics. A second, related, concept of civil society is Tocqueville's¹ notion that civil society is an intermediate sphere of voluntary association sustained by an informal culture of self-organization and cooperation (Ehrenberg 1998). But then the idea that there might be this third sector, civil society, existing between market and state was lost to contemporary analysis. However, by the 1980s, both the term civil society and the concept were actively revived. At that time the European Union made an attempt to give institutions of society, sometimes called non-government organizations (NGOs), not just governments and business, a voice at the policy-making tables in Brussels. The transition to post-industrial societies was bringing up important questions about social cohesion and social participation in European countries that are increasingly heterogeneous and diverse.

The London School of Economics Centre for Civil Society defines civil society as ...the arena of uncoerced collective action around shared interests, purposes and values. In theory, its institutional forms are distinct from those of the state, family and market, though in practice, the boundaries between state, civil society, family and market are often complex, blurred and negotiated.... Civil societies are often populated by organizations such as registered charities, development non-governmental organizations, community groups, women's organizations, faith-based organizations, professional associations, trade unions, self-help groups, social movements, business associations, coalitions and advocacy groups (Centre for Civil Society 2004).

Robert D. Putnam has argued that even non-political organizations in civil society are vital for democracy. This is because they build social capital, trust and shared values, which are transferred into the political sphere and help to hold society together, facilitating an understanding of the interconnectedness of society and interests within it (1993; Lappé 2006). Typically organizations in civil society, like museums, are built on the principles of cooperation, solidarity and caring, attitudes that are very different from the logistics of business and commerce.

Museums: agents for social change and development

ICOM declared the theme of 2008 International Museum Day to be "Museums: agents for social change and development." As befits a global institution seeking to appeal to big and small, rich and poor alike, this theme is broad enough to incorporate

many points of view and certainly encompasses the two communities of market and civil society.ⁱⁱ The editorial of the spring issue of *ICOM News* sought to delineate some directions for this project, pointing to the need to develop new tools to achieve sustainable development and evaluate the worth of heritage. “Both movements”, the editor contends, “depend on a critical reconsideration of the proprietary divisions apparent in the idea of ‘heritage’: one’s ‘own’ or ‘other’ peoples.” Furthermore science and new technologies “can be perceived of as conflicting discourses and methods” or, “incorporated into new hybrid forms, ... show that there is no monopoly on innovation and that barriers can be overcome (Hochroth 2008, 2).” On the topic of social change, articles discuss the importance of eco-museums and slavery museums. David Fleming, chair of INTERCOM, remarked forcefully that “It is becoming more and more widely accepted that museum can be powerful engines of social change, through their educational power. Over time, and in partnership with others, local museums can help transform communities (2008, 7).” Equally transformative, Peter Friess suggested that technology can change the processes by which we create exhibitions, while Roberta Cafuri cautioned that the digital divide is imposing a northern hemisphere growth model on other parts of the world (2008, 3-5). While the solutions might vary widely, the authors of these diverse opinions all agree that there are serious problems in the world that museums can help to address. These dreadful concerns include famine, poverty, slavery, racism, disease, violence and drugs, just to name a few. Even if museums are not seen to be agents of social change, if their purpose is seen to be educational or entertainment, there still remains the fundamental matter of the style of their activities and governance. What system or systems to use? Some see the solution in the market; others think civil society is the answer. Perhaps the answer is a sensitive mixture of the two.

The market approach

Can the market deal with the social problems of the world? Certainly there are a number of important attempts that have made a difference. Organizations, including the Gates Foundation and the Clinton Global Initiative, have made huge investments in global health. Pharmaceutical companies are becoming active participants in initiatives to sell drugs at reduced prices. Another high-profile success story is micro-credit, increasing poor people’s access to savings, credit and other financial services. On a smaller scale, there are a number of focused initiatives that are successfully using market methods to benefit society. These include SunNight Solar, which produces solar-powered flashlights and sells them at a discount, and One Laptop Per Child, which manufactures and sells cheap computers loaded with open-source software (Edwards 2008, 33-37).

As Edwards asks, “What does the evidence tell us” about the success or failure of these market initiatives? “First, that it is perfectly possible to use the market to extend useful good and services. Second, that few of these efforts have any substantial, long-term, broad-based impact on social transformation, with the possible exception of micro-credit (Edwards 2008, 37).” What about social enterprises that engage in revenue generating activities? A Stanford Business School study of environmental NGOs found that “pragmatic” ones, those that engaged in fundraising, failed more often than “pure” ones, those that did not compromise their principles to attract revenue or profit (Conner and Epstein 2007, 61-65). In Canada a survey of human service organizations determined that organizations that shifted their mission to make money often failed. In

the US, both the YMCA and the YWCA got into trouble in the early 2000s by trying to increase their presence in upscale urban areas and consequently saw their social impact decline. As well the Nature Conservancy and Habitat for Humanity are being investigated because of various deals with business (Edwards 2008, 39-41). It is not a pretty picture, underlining how difficult it is to blend the social and financial bottom lines.

Perhaps the answer is technology. And technology has, unquestionably, revolutionized the speed and methods of information exchange. Thomas Friedman, the *New York Times* columnist, in his book *The World Is Flat* (2005), joyfully proclaimed that the global playing field has been leveled, that today's technology allows anyone working anywhere to participate in the wealth of the market. Through technology, Friedman believes the divide between the very wealthy and the very poor can be reduced, thus addressing many of the globe's systemic problems. Unfortunately his optimism is not universally shared.ⁱⁱⁱ The idea that trade and technology can have a leveling effect is an idea with a long history, at least since the invention of the telegraph and telephone. Professor Richard Florida, recently hired by the University of Toronto, author of *The Rise of the Creative Class* (2002), and, newly published, *Who's Your City* (2008), suggests Friedman is only partly right. He declares in his 2008 book: "By almost any measure, the international economic landscape is not at all flat (18)." He goes on to explain that a lot of really smart people have been tripped up because they "see globalization as an either-or proposition. It's not. The key to our new global reality lies in understanding that the world is flat and spiky at the same time (20)." While, in this new book Florida's thesis concerns the importance of specific locations, cities, the clustering of economic activity and innovation, something of considerable importance to local museums, what is more germane to our current discussion is Florida's documentation of the problems of market growth and the question of the market's ability to solve social problems.

If a free market is the best way to solve global social problems, we might assume that the country with the freest market might be the most prosperous and secure and its people the happiest, Milton Friedman's contention. The United States of America, arguably the world's most important market economy with great technological resources, bears examination in this regard.^{iv} Here flatness has not happened. The reverse is true. Many claim US society is in decay. Today the disparity between the most wealthy and the poorest is greater than at any other time since the fall of the stock market in 1929. Thirty-five million Americans are so poor they do not know where the next meal is coming from. Public education is, in Bill Gates' word, "broken"; quality, affordable day-care is virtually unobtainable; 16% of the population has no medical insurance; 34% of African Americans and 37% of Hispanics keep their children indoors because they live in dangerous neighbourhoods (Florida 2008, 253-259). When teaching in Washington, DC, Florida asked his graduate students from foreign countries where they wanted to eventually settle. He was shocked by their answers: they all wanted to raise their children outside the United States, claiming that in their own countries the educational systems were better, the society less materialistic and there was less pressure to work so there was more time for family (259-260).

Even if civil society organizations are not businesses, perhaps the market can help these organization to improve their financial and management capacities. Certainly civil society organizations, like those in the market, need to have a clear focus for their work, to have strong learning and accountability mechanisms and the ability to motivate staff and volunteers, in short appropriate management practices. However the idea that investment in social action should be cost-effective is too often conflated with a particular

market definition of efficiency (Edwards 2008, 43-45). The idea that civil society organizations are not “well run” often comes from a narrow, market definition of effectiveness, one that is not sympathetic to either the goals or the operating methodologies of civil society. A recent study by the *Nonprofit Quarterly* actually found that non-profit leaders were more effective than their for-profit counterparts on fourteen out of seventeen markers of leadership, including risk taking, persuasiveness and vision (Lobell and Connolly 2007). Museums have adopted many market practices and, at the same time, have experienced pressures to be more business-oriented. Granting agencies, including governments and philanthropic organizations, are exerting increasing control over museums, which has the effect of reducing autonomy and flexibility, for museums are being forced to spend and report on each donation exactly as prescribed. Introducing the different logics of civil society and the market in the same organization, as occurs in museums in much of Western society, can confuse the bottom line, complicate accountability and stimulate mission drift, but is perhaps necessary.

Museums themselves have employed many market strategies, in fundraising, marketing, programming and even ambition. The extent to which this is so depends to a considerable extent on the location of the museum, for museums in the United States are primarily private entities that are accorded public status, while those in Europe and Canada tend to be civic and state institutions. But what is the appropriate division between market behavior and civil goals? As Glenn Lowry, director of the Museum of Modern Art in New York, asks: “How similar to a for-profit corporation can an art museum be, for instance, before it is not longer a not-for-profit institution? At what point do good business practices come into conflict with the core values of mission-driven institutions (Lowry 2004, 130)?” As Lowry notes questionable museological practices of a business nature extend to “allowing a sponsor to effectively buy an exhibition, or ceding curatorial control to a donor or collector, or programming exhibitions solely to generate income.... (132)” Two exhibitions in New York brought some of these problems to light. The first, *Sensation*, mounted by the Brooklyn Museum of art in 1999, a show of young British artists from Charles Saatchi’s collection, was paid for in part by a large donation from Saatchi. The second, *Giorgio Armani*, shown at the Guggenheim Museum in the fall of 2000, provoked one reviewer to call the Guggenheim a “department store” and suggest that a few more exhibitions like that would reduce the museum to “rentable exhibition halls (Smith 2002:1).” The next year the venerable Smithsonian got into trouble after Congress had exerted considerable pressure on that institution to increase its private philanthropy by accepting donations with inappropriate strings attached (Lowry 2004. 144-145). In Canada some years ago there was a scheme whereby collectors bought in bulk directly from artists, paying considerably reduced prices, then these works of art were given to museums for tax receipts calibrated at a non-reduced price. Clearly if museums want to retain their not-for-profit status, their standing as part of civil society, they must reject these shady museological practices or be absorbed by the commercial culture.

Using civil society

Civil society is different from the market and those differences must be acknowledged and protected. Markets work because they stick to a clear financial bottom line. Social transformation, by contrast, has none of these clear markers. Rather it has many bottom lines and strategies to reach them, and relies on participants outside the control of any one group. Unlike the market, as Edwards explains, “civil society is

open to more radical alternatives rooted in completely different visions of property rights, ownership and governance (2008, 57).” Market efficiency is not the same as effective human fulfillment, and market norms do not properly express democratic values, for they do not price real assets such as the environment and social cohesion. Markets exist to satisfy the needs of individual consumers who have the ability to pay; civil society exists to meet needs and rights regardless of people’s ability to pay. “[D]emocracy and civil society ...[work] hard to contain and channel the enormous energies of capitalism and to contain its tendencies to inequality (Edwards 2008, 59).”

There are examples of philanthropy and funding that really do make a social difference. One such is the Society for Promotion of Area Resource Centers in Mumbai, India, that works with slum dwellers to build their capacities to fight for their rights. Another successful organization is Shack Dwellers International, a global movement that has been able to secure a place for the urban poor at the negotiating table when policies on housing are being discussed by the World Bank and other important donors. In the United States, Make the Road by Walking, which builds grassroots organizations in areas most affected by injustice in Los Angeles and New York, is another positive contributor (Edwards 2008, 78-79).

In Canada funding for museums from the federal government comes from two sources, one a government department, the other an arms-length organization. The federal government’s Heritage Department, through the Museum Assistance Program, gives grants that are so prescribed in their accounting methods that my museum recently decided not to apply for a \$100,000 grant that we had a good chance of being awarded. We calculated that the grant would cost us more to administer than it was worth.^v On the other hand, the Canada Council for the Arts, an arms-length organization that can determine its own criteria for accounting, recently awarded my museum a small grant for translation on the basis of a two paragraph e-mail and simply requires a similar e-mail once the translation has been done and the money spent. The first organization, under the control of the present Conservative government, is instituting market policies to regulate museums; the second organization, under its own control, is responding to the needs of museums.

Those groups, be they philanthropists or governments, that do effectively support civil society, are the ones that change the social and political dynamics as needed to enable whole communities to share in the fruits of innovation and success. Key to success is respecting the people, including the marginalized, changing the power relations and the ownership of assets, so that the recipients are firmly in the driver’s seat. Edwards concluded

This is why ... civil society is vital for social transformation, and why the world needs more civil society influences on business, not the other way around – more cooperation not competition, more collective action not individualism, and a greater willingness to work together to change the fundamental structures that keep most people poor so that all of us can live more fulfilling lives (2008, 80-81).

Both Richard Florida and Jane Jacobs, two Americans who moved to Canada, are also interested in how all can live more fulfilling lives, and, since we are globally increasingly urbanized, how we can live better in cities. Cities, too, is where most museums are located, so this discussion is very pertinent to the health of museums.

Jacobs was interested in finding out what economic expansion really is. She determined that it is not just increasing the volume of economic output, making more. Rather it is also, and more importantly, differentiation, making things new and different (1969). This differentiation, for Jane Jacobs as for Joseph Schumpeter^{vi}, turns on innovation, and innovation is the result of a diverse pool of resources. Famously Jacobs, in her book *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* (1961), detailed the pressing need for diversity in cities, diversity of age, race, income, interests, education, housing, commercial establishments, and heritage. Following her, Florida documented and quantified the features which Americans feel make cities livable. Florida identified five factors, two of which lead the list in importance: “aesthetics, physical beauty, amenities and cultural offerings”, and “basic services, schools, health-care, affordable housing, roads and public transportation (2008, 163).”

Given the prominence ascribed to aesthetics in this list, its position as the most important factor in making cities livable, Florida goes on to parse this quality. Topping the pyramid within aesthetics, he identifies physical beauty, such as rugged mountains and picturesque lakes. Next comes outdoor space, including parks, playgrounds and trails. For those concerned that their city could therefore not compete with San Francisco or Vancouver, given the beauty of their natural settings, he contends that the man-made warehouse districts, historic houses, and “magnificent urban park systems hand-crafted by great landscape artists (2008, 167)” also have very real appeal. As well he records that his survey found culture and nightlife play a significant role in place satisfaction, with those communities being strongest that combine traditional high-culture institutions with a vibrant street life of art, music and theatre. Museums, especially when defined broadly to include parks, historic houses and old neighbourhoods, thus are central to urban satisfaction.

Just as some museums have attempted to become more business oriented – a number, including the Glenbow in Calgary, Canada, adopted business nomenclature, renaming their director chief executive officer – others exhibit considerable civil society interests. Many museums are now actively engaged in their communities, seeking to be relevant, engaging people and looking for ways to get them involved. Some museums do this by using social networking, creating Facebook groups, blogs, Flickr and Twitter accounts. One such institution is the Galt Museum & Archives in Lethbridge, Canada. Other reconceptualized museums have taken on a variety of social roles. The Scottish Museum of Fisheries encourages local people to contribute to exhibitions, thereby cementing the museum as a place that citizens feel has powerful ongoing meaning in life today (Sorenson 1989, 65). In the national museum of New Zealand, Te Papa, an attitude of hesitancy and questioning in exhibitions gives a clear example of the relinquishment of curatorial power. As well as conducting extensive consultations with stakeholder groups, here curators mount panels asking questions, for example about abstract art, “Is it art?” Similarly, at The Nickle Arts Museum at the University of Calgary, the 2005 exhibition *Sense of Place* was organized by a committee of community members, not by a curator. This relinquishment of power produced a more relevant, nuanced exhibition, although it certainly required a greater time commitment (Davis 2005). Another successful challenge to the concept of museums providing fixed truths occurs at the Prèhistosite de Ramioul, in Belgium. At this archaeological museum a lack of information is boldly acknowledged: the roof on the reconstructed house is covered in numerous different ways, emphasizing that the experts do not know which materials and methods were originally used.

The financial gyrations of 2008-2009 have had a considerable effect on museums. Interestingly different funding systems, market or government support, have produced different results. Institutions that rely heavily on interest from endowments and private support, mainly US museums, have suffered greatly, for many endowments decreased by 30 % or more. In June 2009 *The Art Newspaper* reported that “The situation seems considerably worse in North America than in Europe. This is probably because North American museums are much more dependent on private sponsorship and endowments – particularly hit by the recession – while European institutions receive more government funding (Kaufman and Bailey 2009).” Revenue from visitors, such as the restaurant and shop, has also declined. As a result the Metropolitan Museum of Art closed 15 of its satellite shops (Kennedy 2009). School attendance is down, although general attendance varies. Organizations that rely heavily on tourists often saw a decline, with Banff Park, for example, registering a drop of 18% (Parks Canada 2009), but a number of museums noted increased attendance, sometimes with greater local visitation. Over 2009 Point-à-Callière in Montreal welcomed 50,000 more visitors than in 2008 and 75,000 more than in 2007 (Perreault 2010). And the Smithsonian as a whole, with 30 million visitors, returned to pre-September 11 figures, with the Museum of African Art registering 403,000 visits in 2009 as opposed to 322,000 in 2008 (Forte house 2010). As a reaction to decreased revenues many museums have cancelled exhibitions, such that the Los Angeles County Museum of Art has dropped three major shows, and other institutions such as Tate Britain, the Art Gallery of Ontario and the Getty Museum have all cancelled or postponed important shows (Kaufman and Bailey 2009). Others have cut staff and reduced hours. Some institutions have looked to their collections to generate revenue, with the National Academy Museum & School of Fine Arts in New York City selling two Hudson River School paintings (Kennedy 2008). The situation at the Rose Museum in Brandeis University is more contested, with the university president deciding to close the museum and sell the \$300 million collection in early 2009. Neither has happened to date. In Canada museums have generally been protected by governments grants, but it is hard to predict whether there will be government cost cutting after the recession. British Columbia, for example, has already slashed support for the arts, although some funding was returned after vigorous protests (Atwood, McLachlan 2009). In the short term museums relying on the market have suffered considerably while those more heavily funded by government grants have not. What the longer term will bring is hard to predict.

Some conclusions

Al Gore, in his recent polemic *The Assault on Reason* (2007), underlined the importance of separating power and wealth, something he contends is not currently happening in the United States. He argued persuasively that self-interest must be subservient to the public good, that the exercise of power can only be undertaken after full and open consultation with those affected. Using somewhat different language, but meaning the same thing, Michael Edwards explained that the best results in raising economic growth while simultaneously reducing poverty and inequity occurs when markets are subordinated to the public interest, when public and private interests are separated (2008, 51). This separation would be done by government. The market, determining to make money, would do so in service to long-term goals that favours redistribution and social stability, goals set and monitored by governments. Edwards sees countries that follow these policies - he names Sweden, the Netherlands and Canada ^{vii} - as scoring high on social indicators, while those which do not, like the

United States, slipping into more violence and inequality. The US now ranks 42nd in the world in life expectancy and, according to Oliver James, “selfish capitalism” has produced a measurable decline in emotional well being there as well.^{viii}

So what to do? How can the market and civil society communities work together rather better than has been happening? How can museums contribute to this vital process? The first step both Michael Edmunds and Al Gore agree is to have a full-throated debate, to ensure that the problems are given appropriate exposure and the solutions are sought from all stakeholders. As Edwards contends, “Deep rooted differences about capitalism and social change are unlikely to go away,” so “why not put all questions on the table and allow all sides to have their assumptions tested (2008, 83-84)?”

If we are to change, to do things differently, we must work seriously to that end. Harvey Weingarten, President of the University of Calgary, in a speech on the topic of sustainability, detailed that in 2006 the university used 72 million sheets of paper, but that by 2007 this frighteningly large number had been somewhat reduced to 56 million sheets by installing printers that printed on both sides of the page. Emphasizing the need to change and the fallacy of a total reliance on technology but the difficulty in doing so, Weingarten concluded that

I suspect that the magnitude of paper use on many of our big universities is similar. The irony is that paper use often increases despite all the new digital technology. A lesson, I suppose, is that if we are to become more sustainable, it is not just about introducing new technology. It is also about doing things differently from the way we did them in the past. This appears to be hard. As John Maynard Keynes said: “...the difficulty lies, not in the new ideas, but in escaping from the old ones...(Weingarten 2008).

Edwards outlines specific actions that should be undertaken. He urges an investment in learning, especially in research and evaluation, surely music to museologists. He seeks a serious commitment to transparency, accountability, and democracy so that recipients would have a real voice in governance and program strategy. He urges devolution to promote the long-term financial independence of civil society and to reduce the costs of application procedures. All of these actions underline the differences between markets and civil society and are dependent, to some extent, on the willingness of governments to rebalance constantly the private and the public good. All these suggestions would be of great value to museums to help them be more effective agents of education and social change.

These two communities, the market and civil society, are vital to the effective working of a democratic, fulfilled society, but it is in recognizing their differences that we find strength. We must clearly isolate the values and methods of business, on the one hand, and civil society, on the other hand, and when we have clearly identified these distinctions, take from each system as useful without inducing museum mission drift. Museums generally need more civil society influence and less business influence, such that success is not calibrated with market metrics, that commercial interests do not triumph and that activities are done with a diffused power structure. Museums will thrive not by being driven exclusively by the market or by civil society, but rather when there is a reblending of the appropriate features of the market with a large dose of elements from civil society. When museums champion innovation and differentiation, while firmly

maintaining their public values, then they will promote and advance their mission. Fundamentally part of civil society, not the market community, museums still need the market community and will flourish when the market and civil society work together, cooperating not competing, to seek collective action not individualism.

ⁱ Alexis de Tocqueville (1805 – 1859) was a French political thinker and historian best known for his book *Democracy in America*, published in 1835 and 1840.

ⁱⁱ It must be noted that not all museologists consider social change to be a valid aim for museums. In fact one reviewer of this paper, who made considered and valuable comments, commented that none of the contributors to Cuno's *Whose Muse?* "would agree with the ICOM 2008 theme."

ⁱⁱⁱ For a devastating review of *The World Is Flat* see Edward Leamer, "A Flat World, A Level Playing Field, a Small World After All or None of the Above? Review of Thomas L. Friedman, *The World Is Flat*", *Journal of Economic Literature*, 45, 1, 2007, pp. 83-126.

^{iv} Two books, along with Lappé 2007, are particularly scathing about the current social problems in the US: Al Gore, 2007, *The Assault on Reason*, New York: Penguin, and Naomi Klein, *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*, 2007, Toronto: Alfred Knopf Canada.

^v This federal government has clearly absorbed the lessons of the Chicago School and wants to reduce spending to civil society organizations. Recently it cut the allocation to the Museum Assistance Program, arguing that all the funds had not been granted, without looking at why that might be.

^{vi} An economist who predicted the destructive forces of corporatism, Schumpeter taught at Harvard University from 1932 to 1950.

^{vii} Regrettably Canada, under the present federal conservative government, is weakening or abandoning a number of its market constraints and reducing its support for civil society organizations.

^{viii} Edwards, 2007, p. 52, quoting Madeleine Bunting's review of O. James, *The Selfish Capitalist*, 2007, London: Vermilion, in the *Guardian*, January 5, 2008.

References

Atwood, McLachln, Coupland join campaign against arts cuts. 2009. *Globe and Mail*, 25 September.

Bunting, Madeleine. 2008. Review of O. James, *The Selfish Capitalist*. *Guardian*, 5 January.

Cafuri, Roberta. 2008. Museums and the Digital Divide. *ICOM News* 61, no.1: 4-5.

Centre for Civil Society, London School of Economics (2004-03-01). www.lse.ac.uk, Retrieved on 8 May, 2008.

Conner, A and Epstein, K. 2007. Harnessing Purity and Pragmatism. *Stanford Social Innovation Review* (fall): 61-65.

Cuno, James, ed. 2004. *Whose Muse? Art Museums and the Public Trust*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Davis, Ann. 2005. Process in Place. *Sense of Place: A Catalogue of Essays*. Calgary: The Nickle Arts Museum: 87-95.

Edwards, Michael. 2008. *Just Another Emperor: The Myths and Realities of Philanthrocapitalism*. New York City: Demos: A Network for Ideas & Action, the Young Foundation.

Ehrenberg, John. 1998. Beyond Civil Society. *New Politics*, 6, no. 4 (new series), whole no. 24.

Fleming, David. 2008. The International Slavery Museum. *ICOM News* 61, no.1: 7.

Florida, Richard. 2002. *The Rise of the Creative Class and how it's transforming work, leisure, community and everyday life*. New York: Basic Books.

_____. 2008. *Who's Your City? How the Creative Economy is Making Where to Live the Most Important Decision of Your Life*. Toronto: Random House.

Forte house de frequentation des musées de la Smithsonian Institution aux États-Unis. 2010. Agence France-Presse, 7 January.

Freiss, Peter. 2008. The Tech Virtual: Digital Democracy in Exhibit Design. *ICOM News* 61, no.1: 4.

Friedman, Thomas. 2005. *The World is Flat*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Girouz.

Gore, Al. 2007. *The Assault on Reason*. New York: Penguin Books.

Hochroth, Lisa. 2008. Editorial. *ICOM News* 61, no.1:2.

Jacobs, Jane. 1961. *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. New York: Random House.

_____. 1969. *The Economy of Cities*. New York: Random House.

Kaufman, Jason E. and Bailey, Martin. 2009. Exhibitions axed as recession bites. *The Art Newspaper* 203, June, [www.theartnewspaper.com/ Exhibitions-axed-as-recession-bites/17453](http://www.theartnewspaper.com/Exhibitions-axed-as-recession-bites/17453), accessed 17 January, 2010.

Kennedy, Randy. 2008. National Academy Sells Two Hudson River School Paintings to Bolster its Finances. *The New York Times*, December 5, <http://www.nytimes.com/>.

Kennedy, Randy. 2009. Metropolitan Museum Completes Round of Layoffs. *The New York Times*, June 22, <http://www.nytimes.com/>.

Klein, Naomi. 2007. *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*. Toronto: Alfred Knopf Canada.

Lappé, Frances Moore. 1971. *Diet for a Small Planet :high protein meatless cooking*. New York: Ballantine.

_____. 2006. *Democracy's Edge: Choosing to Save our Country by Bringing Democracy to Life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Brass.

Leamer, Edward. 2007. A Flat World, A Level Playing Field, a Small World After All or None of the Above? Review of Thomas L. Friedman, *The World Is Flat*, *Journal of Economic Literature*, 45, 1: 83-126.

Lobell, Jean R and Connolly, Paul M. 2007. Peak Performance: Nonprofit Leaders Rate Highest in 360-degree Reviews. *Nonprofit Quarterly* 14, no. 4: www.nonprofitquarterly.org, accessed 18 February, 2009.

Lowry, Glenn. 2004. A Deontological Approach to Art Museums and the Public Trust in Cuno, James, ed. *Whose Muse? Art Museums and the Public Trust*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Parks Canada, "Parks Canada Attendance 2004-05 to 2008-09," *Parks Canada Library*, 2009, <http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/docs/pc/attend/table2.aspx?m=1>.

Perreault, Mathieu. 2010. Record à Pointe-à-Callière. *La Press*. 7 January.

Putnam, Robert D. 1993. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions In Modern Italy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Smith, Roberta. 2002. Memo to Art Museums: Don't Give Up on Art. *New York Times* 2 December, 2:1.

Sorenson, Colin. 1989. Theme parks and time machines. In Vergo, Peter, ed. *The New Museology*. London: Reaktion Books.

Weingarten, Harvey. 2008. Sustainable Development: It's an Imperative, Not an Opinion. www.ucalgary.ca, accessed 23 May, 2008.

Ann Davis is director of The Nickle Arts Museum and teaches Museum and Heritage Studies at the University of Calgary. The Nickle Arts Museum, University of Calgary, 2500 University Dr. NW, Calgary, Alberta, Canada, T2N 1N4, telephone (403)220-5020, adavis@ucalgary.ca

Acknowledgments

This paper is a development of one I initially presented at the annual meeting of the International Committee for Museology (ICOFOM) in Changsha, China, in September

2008. I thank ICOFOM colleagues who made many helpful suggestions, especially André Desvallais, Lynn Maranda and Suzanne Nash. Funding from the University of Calgary allowed me to attend this stimulating conference. I also acknowledge with sincere thanks the care and attention reviewers devoted to considering this paper and agree that their recommendations made it much better. Notwithstanding the help I received, all the mistakes, omissions and lack of clarity are mine alone.