

Valorization Of Cultural Diversity Through Good Practices. Dissemination On Art Mediation: Sharing Experiences

Dimitrina J. SEMOVA
Universidad Complutense de Madrid
Facultad de Ciencias de la Información
d.jivkova@ccinf.ucm.es

Recibido: 1-8-15

Aceptado: 11-11-15

Abstract

In this article, as part of the Erasmus+ project “Diversity”, we focus on the collection and analysis of good practices in Spain and other countries in Europe. The project revolves around the development of methods that valorize cultural diversity and in this respect, identifying and sharing best practices on diversity and inclusion through artistic mediation inside museums, culture institutions, our urban walks, forms an mandatory stage of the research process.

Key words: Diversity; arts; museum; inclusion; youths; gender; people in disadvantaged situation; good practices.

Valorización de la diversidad cultural a través de la difusión de buenas prácticas desde la mediación artística: compartir experiencias

Resumen

En este artículo, como parte del proyecto Erasmus + titulado “Diversity”, nos centramos en la recopilación y análisis de buenas prácticas en España y otros países de Europa. El proyecto gira en torno al desarrollo de métodos que valorizan la diversidad cultural y en este sentido, identificar y compartir las mejores prácticas sobre diversidad e inclusión a través de la mediación artística dentro de museos, instituciones culturales, nuestros paseos urbanos, constituye una etapa obligatoria del proceso de investigación.

Palabras clave: Diversidad; artes; museo; inclusión; jóvenes; género; personas en situación desfavorecida; buenas prácticas.

Introduction

In this article we focus on the collection and analysis of good practices based on diversity in different countries in Europe. The research is part of the Erasmus+ project “Diversity” which addresses inequalities in access to culture, in particular amongst youths, people in disadvantaged situations and women. The project focuses on the development of methods that valorize cultural diversity as a common resource by

proposing art mediation as a grassroots method for re-appropriation of the city and the district; the addressing of low prestige districts by its inhabitants, in particular young people with disadvantaged backgrounds, as well as re-establishing of museum pedagogy as an innovative source of learning. To achieve our objectives, the research started firstly by identifying and sharing best practices on cultural diversity and inclusion through artistic mediation inside museums, culture institutions and our urban walks.

The “Diversity” partnership addresses the following target groups: young adults with low educational, social and cultural levels – living in low-prestige or marginalized districts, members of minority cultural groups; trainers, facilitators and educators working with them looking for innovative methods for the development of cultural and social competences, and pedagogical staff of museums, cultural centres and artists. As access to culture has become a topical issue, museums have been reinforcing their efforts to engage new audiences from groups not typically known to benefit from museum visits: immigrants, young people outside the school system and people in disadvantaged situations. At the same time, independent initiatives are blooming, but they are not really mainstreamed; cultural diversity is not always a regular component in their training and preparation, and the outreach programs could still benefit from exchange of best practices.

The “Diversity” project involves seven organizations: Complutense University of Madrid (Spain), Elan Intercultural (France), Artemisszió Alapítvány and Néprajzi Múzeum (Hungary), Helsinki Art Museum (Finland), Rede Portuguesa de Jovens para a Igualdade de Oportunidades entre Mulheres e Homens (Portugal) and Caritas der Erzdiözese Wien - Hilfe in Not (Austria). Partners were chosen based on their particular expertise and their motivation to work on the subject: all of them have developed activities connected to diversity, art and inclusion.

Methodology

Firstly, the research group discussed a preliminary template for good practices based on the following criteria: name of the organization, roles and responsibilities of good practice, localization (when and where), format of the project (workshops, events, tours, etc.), aim of the project, topic of the project (e.g. gender diversity, cultural diversity, age), target group, outreach, reasons why it is considered as good practice (incl. indicators), and institutions involved, (specific theoretical or methodological references). In order to test the efficiency of the method, cross-readings were carried out where the group (14 persons) was divided into smaller groups in which feedback on the best practices collected previously were given.

After approving the definitive template, the research group focused on indicators. Projects that are selected as good practice examples should foster awareness of diversity as a specific aim of the project and not just a side effect. A program or project we choose as a good practice example should not just be designed for a specific target group but should be a process orientated towards and including different phases of participation and interaction. There can be different levels of inclusion of the target group, from participation at all levels to the generation of

ideas that originate in the target group. At the same time, the extension of space could refer to the physical public spaces outside the museum's / institutional walls, itineraries in the city, collaboration with other institutions like schools or other, as well as the inclusion of new media and the internet as an extension of the physical space of the institution.

To be considered as good practice, the event /activity should include a new form of (art) education as well as less common and / or creative approaches. The techniques can be innovative, but they can also use traditional methods that are no longer employed, as well as a combination of old and new techniques. At the same time, the project should help to bring together different groups. It should help to overcome stereotypes through information and / or face-to-face encounters of groups that don't usually meet (e.g. a very privileged group and a rather disadvantaged group).

Another indicator: the project should be sustainable amongst the target groups / users; that is to say, it should have an enduring effect on the people involved in the project. Did it make a change? Are there structures to support this enduring effect? (E.g. any kind of ongoing program, a follow-up event or rather a structure that enables the participants to keep on working on a specific topic of interest). The project should also be sustainable at an institutional level and have a lasting impact on the way the institution works, rather than being a one-time event that gives positive publicity.

Ultimately, valorization of city outskirts in its best form means, that the project is designed by and for people living on the outskirts of the city while also taking place there. But it could also be a project that takes place on the outskirts while being announced in the inner city, thus raising awareness. So, it is important to consider where the projects (events, exhibitions, meetings) take place.

After agreeing on methodology, the research group started with the collection of good practices and simultaneously, with the audit procedure: every participant received nine practices from other countries, after reviewing the templates and presenting the results to his / her own research group, they were sent back to the coordination point in Vienna (Austria). Finally, all researchers completed their templates by incorporating feedbacks from the rest of the group.

Theoretical Framework

As Ellen Dissanayake explains in her book *What is Art for?* (Dissanayake, 1988), art implies a whole series of activities, attitudes, experiences and complex abilities such as: the capacity for perceptive and cognitive analysis, integration of contradictions and conflicting feelings, a more complex – and usually neglected – mode of apprehension, to facilitate the understanding of others, among others. While it teaches us to tolerate ambiguity, one of the main components of an adaptive and creative attitude is to help to build an order through repetition, rituals and other aspects.

For many years, social inclusion has been pursued through collaboration between social welfare and arts. We have now, for example, a large bibliography examining the implementation of socially committed public art policies stressing on the

contribution of public art to achieve social benefits within regeneration activities; through the involvement of citizens in place-making processes. In order to achieve this goal, the article will explore and analyse the interconnection among three policy fields – with their conceptual tools and practices – namely public art, urban regeneration and social inclusion (Hall and Robertson 2001; Belfiore and Bennett, 2007; Stevenson 2004; Miles, 2005).

Development of appropriate indicators is one of the most important aspects in the field. For instance, the multi-level approach of Lingayah et al (1996) identifies four levels at which approaches to measuring the social impact of the arts might usefully focus: national, organizational, local and project or programme levels. They suggest that there is a need to go beyond conventional approaches to the measurement of inputs and outputs, with a focus on outcomes (Informe Reese).

We must recognize here the important work of Matarasso, who provides a definition of the potential social benefits of the arts, bringing the issues fully to the attention of policymakers. Actually, it is the first large-scale attempt to gather evidence of the social impacts arising from participation in the arts. Matarasso (1997) proposed to examine the balance between form, function, values and perspectives focusing on the importance of balancing form and function by devising art programmes which combine high aesthetic standards with lasting social value. He also argues for the need for a more balanced understanding of the arts and their worth in society, one which simultaneously embraces their aesthetic, cultural, economic and social values, and allows for the different judgments, inevitable in a pluralistic society.

In our analysis, especially in the case studies, we also take into account the so called skills enhancement approach. In point of fact, this skills enhancement approach includes a very wide range of aspects while also, benefiting education attainment, social cohesion, social change, urban regeneration, etc. Individual skills enhancement include the development of self-confidence and self-esteem, increasing creativity and thinking skills, improving skills in planning and organizing activities, improving communication of ideas and information, raising or enhancing educational attainment, increasing appreciation of arts, enhancement of mental and physical health and well-being; increase of employability of individuals, reducing offending behaviour and alleviation of the impact of poverty. On the other hand, group / community skills enhancement include: the creation of social capital, decrease of social isolation, improving understanding of different cultures, strengthening communities, enhancement of social cohesion, development of community identity, promoting interest in the local environment, activation of social change, raising public awareness of an issue and contributing to urban regeneration, (Landry et al, 1996; Williams, 1996 & 1997; Matarasso, 1997; DCMS, 1999; Blake Stevenson Ltd, 2000; Harland et al, 2000).

Finally, The GLLAM Report: Museums and Social Inclusion (2000) continues to be a reference point in the field: it is an institutional report on museums, galleries and social inclusion trying to identify the reasons why museums' contribution to social inclusion have often gone unnoticed. The report focuses on key indicators linked to exclusion: health, crime, unemployment and education in relation to disadvantage,

inequality and discrimination. Furthermore, it highlights principles on which best practice in social inclusion work is based, as establishing a policy framework for inclusion, training leaders who think in terms of social inclusion and taking risks in order to demonstrate the benefits of inclusive approaches to museum projects. The report stresses on networking and partnership, responsive and flexible approaches, community consultation, involvement and empowerment and finally, analyses the concepts of evaluation, advocacy and accountability in relation to the research.

Results

In a period of eight weeks, the research team collected more than one hundred practices from Spain, France, Portugal, Austria, Hungary, Finland and also, from other countries in and outside Europe: the UK, Germany, Belgium, Canada . The practices (37) that met the previously established requirements were subsequently analysed as case studies. Here, we should emphasize that no quantitative factors were applied in this process, as such the participating countries offered different number of practices. Our evaluation was based on the previously established criteria commented here in the methodology.

Good practices launched by cultural institutions, museums and civil organizations

One of the good practices analysed by the Spanish team was *Subtramas*. The first intervention of the Open Research Area *Subtramas* took place during the months of November and December 2012, in the Reina Sofia Museum and in the School of Fine Arts at the Complutense University of Madrid. Debates were organized every week taking as a starting point the presentation of a set of projects and projections by artists, cultural producers and researchers, in order to analyse questions such as how to enable collaborative processes in audio visual production and what kind of political and social transformative dimension can be achieved.

The focus was on art projects framed in the field of digital visual culture that promote collaborative research and production around the moving image. To do this, *Subtramas* focuses on those works from the collective film and visual arts that question the relationship between knowledge and power, fostering a land crossing between art, participatory democracy, education and everyday life. The target groups are: Youth, women, old people, migrants, and the broad public. *Subtramas* are collaborating with institutions like The Reina Sofia Museum, The Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport, The Generalitat de Catalunya and CoNCA. The most positive aspect of this practice is that members are trying to generate a new critical understanding through narratives expressed by collective social practices that have other forms of life and action which are different from those imposed by bio political administrations in disciplined societies. The methodologies applied are from the field of critical pedagogies, especially those related to co-learning (a process in which learning is shared without distinguishing between teachers and those who are taught) and participatory aesthetics of perception.

Another example of good practice is *EnterArte*, a workgroup of the Movement

for Education Renewal “Education Action” which aims to encourage reflection, research and development in education and to generate and manage innovative projects in arts education. In 2014, they organized street performances in front of the Prado Museum and workshops in the Centro de Arte Tomás y Valiente, Fuenlabrada (Madrid). *EnterArte* has been working for more than 16 years in the attempt to make visible the artistic expression of students in all stages of education. In celebration of the International Day of the Museums, they brought a metaphorical recreation of the work of El Greco, “The Burial of Lord of Orgaz” to the street so as to allegorically reflect the disappearance of the context that promotes artistic expression.” The next day, EnterArte, organized several workshops “Being in Time, Being in Action” as part of the exhibition “BEING IN TIME” (Centro de Arte Tomás y Valiente). Because of its sustainability, this practice is a very important and interesting case study.

Among the practices collected by our European partners, one of the most positive and innovative was *Renovar a Mouraria* (Portugal). The *Mouraria para Todos* project is an initiative of the *Renewing Mouraria Association* for high quality guided tours. It aims at including and showing all the cultural diversity present in this neighbourhood of Lisbon as well as the benefits of multiculturalism and how it is part of the Portuguese culture itself. History and stories of the people involved is the motto of these visits.

The project first started in February 2014, and in just one year more than two thousand people (Portuguese and foreign visitors) have taken part in the guided tours. The research team continues studying this practice and its possible implementation in other cities and neighbourhoods.

In a visit to the museum as a place to encounter diversity, the research group from Helsinki proposed the Unstraight Museum as a case study; an ongoing project in Sweden, since 2011. This project focuses on collective collecting. Anybody can be a collector; anybody can decide which artefact is important. To add something to the collection, anybody can go to the Unstraight Museum’s webpage and in the section “Add your object”, contributes to defining what Unstraight being means. The artefact it-self remains with the person adding it to the virtual collection.

The *Ecomusée du fier monde* in Montreal (Canada) founded in 1980 was also included as a good practice organization by the French group. The concept of an Eco museum reflects a concern with reinforcing the connection between the museum and its social surroundings and environment. An Eco museum promotes the entirety of a culture and heritage related to a geographical territory and sphere of activity. This heritage can be material (artefacts, buildings) or immaterial (personal accounts, know-how). The *Écomusée du fier monde* develops its museum practice based on popular education and establishes participatory projects in close collaboration with the neighbourhoods’ citizens, institutions and organizations. The project was inspired by the Declaration of the Round table de Santiago du Chili (1972) and by the Eco museum philosophy developed by Hugues de Varine, among others.

In the case of good practices taking place in museums in Spain, The Reina Sofia Museum (Madrid) hosted *A really useful knowledge (Un saber realmente útil: Conversadoras)*. It is a Collaborative Digital Library project aimed at creating an

open fund of books and documents as well as a dialogue on editing possibilities outside the cultural industries. Collaboration is understood as an ongoing process that incorporates the disagreements and working strategies available amongst the various sensibilities involved, in order to change the vertical logic of power in the system of production and transmission of knowledge. The authors of the project are *Bookcamping and Contrabandos* (Association of Independent Publishers of political books). The initiative works in the context of social struggles and social movements. The project started from the idea of a collaborative open library to become what it is today, a discussion forum, community tool, (device, location).

Thus, the project articulates new ways of collectively thinking, it is based on participative research and collective work. Methodologies and tools are those common in feminists critical pedagogies, popular education, participative research and collective work.

Good practices, the result of social initiatives and decentralized networks / groups

In this case, Spain has become a laboratory for the results of practices, social initiatives and /or decentralized networks and groups. *No city for young people* is a social online platform where young people have (their own say on) are able to speak up and voice their opinions regarding problems such as joblessness, impossibility to acquire their own home, no access to public services and emigration due to lack of opportunities. The project involved the creation of an online map where young people converted into emigrants tell their own stories and leave their photos: <http://www.nonosvamosnosechan.net/> (*#NoNosVamosNosEchan* denounces the forced exile of the precarious youth.) The project provides a platform for various youth movements, denouncing major social problems through Online and workgroup discussions in different civic spaces (e. g. *Patio Maravillas*, *Juventudes sin Futuro*). It is a good example of sustainable social engagement, proliferation of ideas and new forms of activism through methods preferred by young people.

Another example is, *The Nobodies feature nothing / Los nadie cuentan nada*, a storytelling workshop that teaches story and reality telling, aimed at adults and organized by the social initiative *Patio Maravillas (Take the Square!)*. The workshop begins with some basics: how to prepare stories without memorizing, reinventing every time; learning to reinvent, the control of voice, body and words. It takes place twice a month, on Friday. *The Nobodies feature nothing* is an example of performance teaching based on open formats and extemporization.

Outside Madrid, in Barcelona, *Ruido Photo* (since 2014) is a network of photographers, journalists and designers who understand the documentary as a tool of reflection and social transformation. It focuses on three areas: research and documentation, training and dissemination, and practices for community revitalization. It works in the areas of migration, conflict and violence; devising projects to promote participation, debate and awareness, seeking innovative ways of production and realization in different formats such as photography, text, video; or multimedia, books, films, exhibitions, community revitalization and blogs. *Ruido*

Photo carries out projects of community participatory photography, where through photography workshops it addresses groups with different social problems, in the use of visual language as a new way of expressing their own life stories. Different formats such as visual classrooms in prisons, participatory photography workshops, Digital Documentary Photography Magazines are employed. (other publications format book with various publishers, reportages) Targeted groups are prisoners, immigrants, people of migrant backgrounds, people affected by social conflicts or violence.

Finally, we should point out the reduced presence of these kinds of practices. As a recommendation, we believe that it would be very positive to establish the necessary favourable conditions aimed at promoting practices based on social initiative and / or launched by decentralized networks / groups.

Final remarks

The main problems that the research team faced in the analysis process were in fact related to problems previously experienced, for example in projects carried out by Coalter (2001). He identified a number of key information needs required to address the current 'information deficit' among cultural services. These included output data on the total number of individual users /visitors; the proportion of the local population (within an appropriate catchment area); the socio-demographic characteristics of users (and, by implication, nonusers); the proportion of specified social groups among current users, compared to their proportion in the local community; the frequency with which different types of users use the service; the nature and type of new users (as a result of inclusion initiatives) and the extent of retention of such users; users of local cultural services (especially for urban parks). As a matter of fact, in the process of cross-checking of the collected practices and during the case studies, the most frequent comments that required additional information were:

- "How is the public reached? How fast does the public change?"
- "Was there any further communication between the participants?"
- "How were the participants reached? How was the project advertised?"
- "What kind of dialog does take place between the initiators and the participants? Was there somebody who moderated the workshop and/or the urban action?"
- "In which way is the project sustainable?"

We must also recognize that the difficulties sometimes came from a lack of proper assessment by artists, associations and the museums responsible for the practices launched. The difficulty increases even more if we are dealing with practices that have been launched in the past but have not been sustained. Matarasso (1996a), Moriarty (1997), Shaw (1999), and Jermyn (2001) have all identified reasons for the lack of robust research and evaluation. These include:

- Lack of interest by the arts world (outside the context of funding relationships) in developing evaluative systems through which to prove its value;
- Evaluation regarded as additional, rather than integral to arts activity, requiring disproportionate resources in the context of most arts organizations' limited budgets;

- A lack of a thorough and formal approach to evaluation;
- Lack of planning norms for arts facilities, against which to measure the quality or quantity of provision;
- Organizations' primary motivation for undertaking evaluation being to fulfil funders' objectives rather than evaluating the impact of their activity on a particular neighbourhood;
- Data collection being perceived as a chore rather than a tool to help organizations improve their own practice;
- Cultural resistance to, and negative perceptions of, evaluation by those involved in arts projects, who often regard it as intrusive.

We must recognize, that our experience with the collection of good practice in the Divercity project confirms these points.

In this project, we tried to follow the recommendations made by Suter (2001) who warns that it is not just a matter of collecting data, stressing the importance of being clear about what different information is for, how often it should be collected, and who should collect it. Only with such clarity will it be possible to assess the added-value of information, and ensure it is put to effective use to influence and change policy.

Finally, the Vienna research team, responsible of the coordination of this stage of the project, stressed that due to the broad range of focus as well as the set of indicators, the selection of good practices covers a great variety. We embrace this plurality as it shows that there are many possibilities and ways to address the subject of diversity in museums and art pedagogy.

References

- BELFIORE, E., Bennett O. (2007). "Rethinking the social impact of the arts". *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 13 (2), pp. 135-151.
- COALTER, F, Cultural Services (2011). *Realising the Potential. Research Agenda*, Centre for Leisure Research. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh.
- DEPARTMENT FOR CULTURE, MEDIA AND SPORT (1999): *Policy Action Team 10: Report to the Social Exclusion Unit – Arts and Sport*. London: HMSO.
- DISSANAYAKE, E. (1988). *What is Art for?*. Washington: University of Washington Press.
- DIVERCITY: DIVING INTO DIVERSITY IN MUSEUMS AND THE CITY GOOD PRACTICES REPORT (2015). Project 2014-1-ES01-KA204-004799 funded by the Erasmus+ programme of the UE.
- HALL, T., ROBERTSON, I. (2001). "Public Art and Urban Regeneration: advocacy, claims and critical debates". *Landscape Research*, 26 (1), pp. 5-26.
- HARLAND, J. et al (1998) cited in HARLAND, J, KINDER, K., LORD, P. (2000). *The Arts in Secondary Schools: Effects and Effectiveness*, Slough: NFER.
- JERMYN, H., (2001a). *The Arts and Social Exclusion: A review prepared for the Arts Council of England*, London: The Arts Council of England.

- JERMYN, H., (2001b). *Proposed Evaluation Framework for the Arts Council of England's Social Inclusion Research Programme*, unpublished.
- LANDRY, C., GREEN, L., MATARASSO, F. and BIANCHINI, F. (1996). *The Art of Regeneration: Urban renewal through cultural activity*. Stroud: Comedia.
- MATARASSO, F. (1996a): *Defining Values: Evaluating arts programmes. The Social Impact of the Arts*. Working Paper 1. Stroud: Comedia.
- MATARASSO, F. (1997). *Use or Ornament? The social impact of participation in the arts*. Stroud: Comedia.
- MILES, M. (2005). "Interruptions: Testing the Rhetoric of Culturally Led Urban Development". *Urban Studies*, 42 (5/6), pp. 889-911
- MORIARTY, G. (1997). *Taliruni's Travellers: An arts worker's view of evaluation, The Social Impact of the Arts*. Working Paper 7. Stroud: Comedia.
- SHAW, P, (1999) *The Arts and Neighbourhood Renewal, A Literature Review to inform the work of Policy Action Team 10*, DCMS, 1999.
- SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE CENTRAL RESEARCH UNIT (2000). *The Role of the Arts in Regeneration*. Blake Stevenson Limited. Edinburgh.
- STEVENSON, D. (2004). "'Civic gold' Rush. Cultural planning and the politics of the Third Way". *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 10 (1), pp. 119-131
- SUTER, T. (2001). *Research Needs in the Sponsored Cultural Sector; Paper presented at the Convergence, Creative Industries and Civil Society – The New Cultural Policy Conference held in Nottingham from 26–29 September 2001*.
- THE GLLAM REPORT. *Museums and Social Inclusion. Research Centre for Museums and Galleries (RCMG)*. Department of Museum Studies. University of Leicester. Publisher: Group for Large Local Authority Museums (GLLAM).
- WILLIAMS, D. (1996). *Creating Social Capital. A study of the long-term benefits from community based arts funding* Community Arts Network of South Australia for the Australian Council of the Arts. Adelaide.

DIVERCITY "Diving into Diversity in Museums and in the City" (2014-1-ES01-KA204-004799) es un proyecto europeo liderado por la Universidad Complutense de Madrid (Grupo de investigación "Aplicaciones del Arte en la Inclusión Social en colaboración con el Instituto de Investigaciones Feministas), del que forman parte: Elan Interculturel, París; Stand 129, Caritas, Viena; Museo de Helsinki, Helsinki, Finlandia; REDE, Lisboa, Portugal; Museo Etnográfico, Budapest, Hungría; Fundación Artemiszio, Budapest, Hungría.

El presente proyecto ha sido financiado con el apoyo de la Comisión Europea. Esta publicación es responsabilidad exclusiva de su autor. La Comisión no es responsable del uso que pueda hacerse de la información aquí difundida.



Cofinanciado por el
programa Erasmus+
de la Unión Europea

GEOGRAPHICAL TERRITORY	DENOMINATION OF THE PRACTICE	PRACTICES LAUNCHED BY MUSEUMS(M)/ CULTURAL ASSOCIATIONS(C)/ SELF-MANAGED (SM)
SPAIN	Art Workshop Zubietxe Ruido Photo Subtramas Film Capsules No city for young people Social Cartoon Forum A really useful knowledge The Nobodies feature nothing Arts Education Action AmiArte Authorless Cinema (Cine sin autor) Project Hipatia The Electric Kool-Aid Acid Test Intermediae Art Center EXIT Un corto a la carta Identibuzz, ringing in hybrid identities Finmatun Cultural Association	C SM C C SM C M SM C C C M C C C C C
FRANCE	Musée Précaire Albinet	C
AUSTRIA	Suburb – City – Home? Worldclass-Wieden-Tour	C SM
PORTUGAL	Pictures worth a thousand words Projeto DDIG Human Itinerant Museum Mouraria for All	M C C

HUNGARY	Study Hall and Twenty Questions Cultural diversity, different viewpoints EtnoMobil 2.0 Clothing and body culture Tedd Oda Magad is (Put yourself there) Drama pedagogy The 8th district and me Common places	M M M M C C SM C
FINLAND	Public Art Selfie workshop Musée Ouvre-toi Ecomusée	M M C
OTHER COUNTRIES	Unstraight Museum House of Memor-y/-ies 2013Bundesmigrantinnen	M M C