INFLUENCING THE CONSTRUCTION OF HISTORICAL DISCOURSE IN MUSEUMS: POSTMODERNISM, POSTSTRUCTURALISM AND THE SPANISH MUSEOLOGY

Miguel Senra Hermana

INFLUENCING THE CONSTRUCTION OF HISTORICAL DISCOURSE IN MUSEUMS: POSTMODERNISM, POSTSTRUCTURALISM AND THE SPANISH MUSEOLOGY

Miguel Senra Hermana

s2262746

Master Thesis

Supervisor: Dr. G. D. J. Llanes Ortiz

Master in Heritage and Museum Studies

Leiden University

Leiden, June 2019

INTRODUCTION

Since its inception, the museum has always been linked with the propagation of the historical discourse. The museum was, and most probably still is, conceived as a displayer. When we visit a museum we expect to attend to a kind of show, where the displayed objects, paintings or artifacts tell us a story that will impact us, surprise us or make us reminisce about our own past. Museums rooms and corridors are standing still storytellers that narrate a tale about our history to everyone who walks across them. Not only a tale about our individual past but also about our shared past and legacy. However, museums are human creations and as every human being, they are subjected to human ideas, opinions, and interests. Therefore they have a considerable influence in the construction of that narration. Aspiring to present a narration of the history and the past from an objective point of view is almost impossible, no matter how objective a narration may seem for the eyes of the one who is telling it. There will always be some aspects and considerations taken from the subjectivity of the narrator.

Therefore in museums, the display will be always embedded with some subjectivity. Once it is acknowledged that subjectivity is present on museum's displays and narrations and that objectivity is almost always impossible to achieve, the problematic appears in how are we using and including that subjectivity in the creative processes of the discourses presented in museums. The main objective of this master thesis is to attempt to address that problem. Museums are, in the majority of cases, places with a high number of visitors, this means that the influence of this type of institution within the population is quite high too. It is said that the truth behind a story sometimes depends on how many times it is told. In this regard if the stories and narrations presented in museums are not exactly factual or they are one-sided, they can look slightly false or inaccurate. Thus, it is highly probable that those stories became false narrations in the long term and its significance, which may have affected a great part of the population, would have created false conceptions, and discourses. According to several authors we are now living in the postmodern era and it carries with it a series of characteristics and precepts that influence not only discourses in museums, but also society itself.

- CONTENT AND STRUCTURE

The main issue when I started to work in the central research question for this thesis was that the context of the influence of postmodernism and poststructuralism was too big. Therefore, it was necessary to propose a

research question that narrowed the context of influence to a particular area. In this case I chose Spain as an example for this thesis. The proposed research question for this thesis is the following:

To what extent have been the postmodernist ideas, thinkers, and theories an influence in the shift on the creative processes and display of historical discourse in Spanish museums?

By narrowing the context and time frame of the research I was able to present a more specific analysis of the processes and developments that took place in Spain at that time. Spain lived during the most part of the 20th century under a dictatorship with a very strict nationalistic and historical discourse. Then during the last quarter of the century, the country's government shifted into a parliamentary democracy, where there was more cultural freedom. Thus, there was a massive process of cultural renovation in Spain that was directly influenced by the postmodernists. The spread of postmodernism across Europe and the cultural developments in Spain took place around the same period of time, and this is why Spain can make a good example when addressing the influence of postmodernism and poststructuralism in museum discourses.

Identifying the characteristics of the postmodern era will be the main focus of the first chapter. Therefore in this chapter what I am trying to answer questions such as: What is postmodernism and poststructuralism?; who are the main authors and the main theories of this trends?; how did those authors influence the new generation of museum professionals? Besides, I will also differentiate two types of understandings of postmodernism, that of postmodernism as an era, which comes after modernism, and that of postmodernism as theoretical trend. This differentiation is basic for the further development of the thesis. Moreover, in this first chapter I will identify the main authors and their theories about postmodernism. The second understanding, that of postmodernism as a theoretical trend, will be the most used during the thesis. The reason behind it is because this conception of postmodernism allows the development of other theoretical trends from it, in other words by understanding it as a theoretical trend we can identify a set of characteristics that will lead to the creation of other theoretical trends such as poststructuralism. This is relevant due to the fact that most of the authors mentioned will be mainly identified as poststructuralists, like Foucault and Derrida.

 Once this is done, the second part of the chapter is on the use of the theories and ideas of postmodernists and poststructuralist in the scope of museums. This second part aims to identify those authors that have brought to the context of museums the ideas and theories of postmodernists and poststructuralists. In fact both parts of the chapter work as the pillars where the rest of the thesis is built. In order to exemplify what is stated in the first chapter, the second chapter gathers a few international examples where there is a representation of those ideas. In those examples, I will try to analyze to what extent has been possible to

include and use the postmodernists and poststructuralists ideas in museums all over the world and answer the question of how the postmodern and poststructuralist theories have been implemented in museums around the world?. Every example portrays a different aspect of poststructuralist and postmodernist conceptions in relation to the construction of historical discourse. Relevant issues such as the inclusion of new voices to historical discourse, the creation of displays, the analysis of historical discourses presented in museums or the discussion of hegemony in discourses will be analyzed. In addition to this, the last section of the chapter will present few critiques to the inclusion of postmodernist and poststructuralist thinking into museums. This critiques will work as a counterpart to the relevant issues named before. The inclusion of these critiques and examples I believe are necessary to contextualize what is stated in the first chapter in an international scale.

In the third, and final chapter, one last example will be presented. This example is not included in chapter two because it is analyzed more deeply. If in the case of the earlier examples (chapter two) the only intention was to identify postmodern and poststructuralist, in this last example exposed in chapter three I will analyze a wider process. The aim of the third chapter is to identify the features presented in chapter one and the implementation of them, analyzed in chapter two, into the context of the development of museums in Spain. And also to answer the central research question of the thesis. I picked this example due to the fact that the main developments of Spanish museology took place at the same time that postmodernism and poststructuralism started to spread across Europe and the world. Therefore I will look for the characteristics that Spanish museology and the construction of historical discourse within the Spanish museums could have in relation to postmodernism and poststructuralism.

- METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

In order to answer the central research question and the sub-questions proposed in each one of the different chapters I had to carry out a deep literature review. The thesis can be divided in two clear sections. Chapter one and two are both inside of the first part. For this part I work with the texts of postmodernist and poststructuralist authors such as Foucault, Derrida or Barthes among others. Being the first two mentioned the most relevant for this thesis. However, I also made use of the work of other authors such as Butler. Most of the authors cited in the first and second chapter are authors that have made use of the works of poststructuralists and postmodernist to carry out their own research on museums. The analysis and the application of the work of Foucault and Derrida in museums was the main reason why I use this references. For the second part, most of the references that I used are from Spanish museum professionals and scholars.

During this literature research there were some difficulties, especially in the case of Spanish references. Museology in Spain is still a young science therefore there were not many authors and references on the topic.

However, during the research I found out that regardless a young science the works of some scholars were quite complete and accurate. Most of the quoted authors are the main references for Spanish museology. The challenge for the first section was to narrow the amount of information on the influences of postmodernism and poststructuralism. Therefore I had to make a selection on the authors that I was going to include on my research. I chose Derrida and Foucault as the main representation of these movements due to their work on the analysis of discourse. I consider this as the main criteria for selecting their works.

In a sense what this thesis aims to highlight is that the construction of historical discourse and the displaying of it in museums through artifacts, objects, paintings or another kind of pieces is not without subjectivity. Every presented narrative has a background that needs to be understood and well displayed. During many decades these processes have been overlooked and in most cases, the narrative was no truthfully displayed. Voices, ideas, and feelings from entire groups of people have been relegated or even wiped out of the historical discourse on museums. All of this to favor a certain period of time in the past and present it as one-sided, creating from a complex multi-faced narration a simplistic overview of the history. Postmodernism is presented in this thesis as a tool to change that presentation but also as a way to create a new, and possibly more accurate, depiction of history.

PART 1

CHAPTER 1: THE POSTMODERN AND POSTSTRUCTURALIST METHODOLOGY AND MUSEUMS

1.1- FOUCAULT AND DERRIDA: INFLUENCES FOR FUTURE CHANGES IN MUSEOLOGY

To understand the changes that have occurred in museums and museology over the last few decades, it is necessary to first define the theoretical background that motivated those changes all around the globe, but especially in Europe. Human societies are in constant change, and museums are the reflection of it. Nowadays museums are very different from the first 19th century museums. Most of these changes had been influenced by the trends of Post-modernist thinking, which developed in the 60s and 70s of the 20th century. It is especially remarkable the influence of the French school with important figures such as Foucault, Derrida or Barthes among others. The relevance of the French school in the postmodernist and later on the poststructuralist trend resides in fact that was in France where the first steps of this trends started. If we were to set a date for the beginning of it could very well be May of 1968 in France (Butler, 2002,6). During that month and the following, in France and more precisely in Paris, there were a series of protests, strikes and social movements that rise against the established order. The protests were mainly against the capitalist society and consumerism and were carried out mainly by students. This was the perfect context to set the bases of what postmodernist thinking will be. Those processes brought together students and scholars that thought necessary a change of direction in the way our world is understood. Some of them understood that society was rapidly changing and they needed to catch up with it. Is in that moment when they realized that new meanings for culture and society were needed, especially in terms of inclusion and representation. (Butler, 2002, 13-14) Old historical discourses were not representative of the new society that was being created, and thus new meanings and discourses were needed, as we will see further in the text. Most of the authors discussed in this thesis were part of this movement. Foucault, for example, was very active during the following years by giving lectures in the university about the outcome of that period.

In this first chapter, I will make a brief account of the main ideas and concepts of the postmodernist and poststructuralist theory all together with a depiction of some of the most important and representative authors of these movements. As simple as it may seem to define such trends, it is not. Postmodernist ideas and theories are different from other currents where there is a strict theoretical direction with little variations to it. One of the principal aspects of postmodernism is based precisely on the contrary to that idea, here every direction is allowed and acknowledged. In addition to this aspect, postmodernism attempts to end with the so-called `Grand Narratives´ as we will see in the different examples given along the next paragraphs and chapters. In a way what postmodernist thinking is trying to do is to rewrite history (Butler 2002,32). On the

other hand, poststructuralism, is a based on a rethinking of structuralism. Both postmodernism and poststructuralism have some points in common but there are still some nuances that differentiate both movements. Defining such terms is complicated, especially due to the different meanings that some authors give to the term postmodernism. For some scholars postmodernism is the chronological period that follows modernity, in this sense every trend that developed during that period, can be characterized as postmodernist. Therefore and attending to this division, structuralism and poststructuralism could be considered postmodernist. On an opposite side to this idea is the understanding as postmodernism as one theoretical trend itself, a set of frameworks, ways to see the world and methodologies that are unique to the trend, and differentiates from others. In this thesis, I will locate my analysis in a place in between those two definition. I will understand postmodernism as a chronological period, in the sense of everything that is after modernity, and that tries to break with it. Also, I will depict postmodernism as a trend itself, that sets particular frameworks and methodologies that identify it. However, I will understand these frameworks and trends as not something unique for postmodernism, but something that being mainly postmodernist can be find in other trends. Postmodernism is understood as a kind of center of influence where other trends, such as poststructuralism , can find concepts, frameworks and methodologies to add to their own understandings of reality.

Until the emergence of postmodernism the tendency in the study of history was for the historians to deliver a narration of the past, the `Grand Narratives´, where for example individuals were depicted as heroes or historical events were magnified to the extreme. This responded to a biased analysis of the past where the main goal of the historians was to extol the glories of their countries, regions or cities and belittle the adversary´s discourse, meanwhile portraying their own discourse as a universal truth. Example of this could be the historical discourse on the colonization of America by the Spanish. In that case in, during decades a discourse has been presented where the colonization of America was one of the greatest accomplishments in Spanish history. Example of this is that the 12th of October, day of the arrival of Columbus to America, is since 1987 a national holiday in Spain. The so-called conquerors were depicted as national heroes and indigenous peoples were seen as savages and enemies of the Spanish Empire. This empowerment of the Spanish importance on the discovery of America has its roots in the decades after the Spanish Civil war where the government of Franco established in 1958 the 12th of October as *Día de la Hispanidad* or day of Spanishness. After the democratic regeneration in 197 the presentation of the discourse was still the same, and even reinforced with the law of . 1987, aforementioned. The explanation given in the law to select the 12th of October as national holiday is the following: *The chosen date, 12th of October represents the historical event that helped to the construction of the Spanish Nation and led to a period to of expansion of the Spanish language and culture* (BOE 241/1987, 30149). Therefore the discourse presents the arrival to America of Columbus as one the key points to the birth of the Spanish state, which was used by the regime of Franco to

strengthen the nationalistic discourse during the dictatorship.

Postmodernist thinkers tried to put an end to this tendency, especially when they referred to universal truths. As Butler writes: `We are following a story, but no historian can claim that this one is The Story´ (Butler 2002,34). With this statement, he clarifies that an exact narrative of the past cannot be made and all of them are subjected to the interpretations of the historians. So, for postmodernist authors, the objective was to deliver a narrative as close to the reality as possible to the past, attending critically to whatever influences, bias and absences that can be part of it. This rewriting of history will affect directly to the construction of historical discourse in the museums, it will be one of the main causes of the shift that museums suffered during the last decades of the 20th century.

Continuing with the shift in the narratives is worth mention that much of the postmodernist thinking is based on the critique and the direct attack to the stereotypes or established ideas that have been implemented in our society by different groups of power. In this area, the postmodernist ideas are particularly orientated on emphasizing the voices that have been suppressed. One good example could be the rise of the feminist movement in the 60s. Once again, Butler (2002) tells us how the development of new feminist artistic enterprises have a lot to do with postmodernist thinking. He states that the rise of feminist art, writing and thinking was a direct response to the exclusion of women from the heteropatriarchal discourse that have led the society across the history (Butler 2002,57) . This small example will be further analyzed in the second chapter but shows what these authors were trying to accomplish: a discourse that is far away from the old-fashioned statements, where stereotypes and prejudices have disappeared and there is a recognition of the groups left aside during history. Museums, as I will analyze, will try to introduce these new ideas and concepts with more or less success.

As it is mentioned before the postmodernist theory includes and is direct consequence of different branches or theoretical trends but one of them is particularly relevant when we speak about the museums due to the large influence that some of the ideas and writings of this most relevant authors had in this particular institution. I am referring to poststructuralism and authors like Foucault and Derrida. According to Lundy, and regardless of this identification, neither of these two authors nor the majority of the so-called poststructuralists identified with the term (Lundy 18,70). Poststructuralism was born as a continuation of structuralism. Basically what the structuralists were trying to accomplish was the scientification of the social sciences, they were aiming for new techniques and insights that allowed them to unfold the synchronic models that rule our society. In other words, they were looking for the system of relations, structural and inter-structural, that conformed the whole of the society. This, in a sense, will prove that everything was interconnected in a universal structure. Structuralists argued that a diachronic explanation of history, as

Marxists proposed was not enough. With this method we would have to wait until the string of events that are unknown may happen. However, with the synchronic model, this problem would not matter due to the fact that all the possible relations and situations will be simultaneously present (Lundy 18,71). Based on this main theory the structuralist thinking developed in different fields of analysis with prominent figures such as Levi-Strauss and his *Structural Anthropology* (1963) or Lacan (1980) among others.

Nonetheless, in the core of the structuralist movement, were starting to appear some critical voices. Some of them like Foucault and Derrida have been already mentioned in this text but they were others like Althusser. These authors started to criticize the fundamentals of the structuralist movement transforming it into something new. I will now focus my analysis in the figures of Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida who besides being some of the principal influences of the shift from structuralism to poststructuralism are also directly related with the postmodern ideas explained in the previous paragraph.

Michel Foucault´s work started at the beginning of the 1960s. One of the singular aspects of Foucault´s works was his goal to reconcile history with structuralism. As we have mentioned before, the structuralist movement was ahistoric, it condemned the diachronic development of events in favor of the synchronic method. The well-known work of *History of Madness* (Foucault 1961) is a good account of this attempt. He also submitted science to a profound critique which could be considered as a new type of trend, he opened the gate for the new trend of poststructuralism. This shift is well accounted in the example mentioned before, *History of Madness* is a work essentially structuralist. Lundy defines this work in this way: "it sought to elicit the vital role that the unapparent (in this case madness) played in the operation of apparent norms (in this case reason) through a consideration of their structural relations and systematic coincidences" (Lundy 18,77).

So here, what Foucault is doing is a purely structuralist analysis, looking for the system of relations that conform history which is not always what it seems. Lundy specifies the main difference of this analysis: *[...] however, History of Madness was a story , a seriated account of events to try to explain the system of relations that conform history. Much of its persuasive was, thus, derived through historical contextualisation, historical interpretation, and more specifically, the historicization of structures* (Lundy 18,77). This mixing of concepts is what makes Foucault more than a mere structuralist, his aim to structure history proves that poststructuralist authors were trying to rewrite history in new ways. The old discourses were proved not to be enough for these thinkers and there was a need for new explanations, accounts, and interpretations of the history that represented the events of the past in better ways. With the new types of understandings about the formation of discourses, there was a chance to create more accurate and representative depictions of the historical past. In addition, Foucault points out that some of the terminology that we have always considered as *universal* and

timeless are constructed and determined by history. This means that no idea is protected from the influence of history and is that influence what shapes our current understandings of them. Along the pages of *History of Madness* Foucault uses the term Madness as an example this. The foucauldian analysis of history is one of the most relevance issues in its writings, however the aim of this thesis is to unravel what is behind the construction of the historical discourses in museums. Taking this into, Foucault makes an analysis about the power relations between society and its influence in the construction of discourses based on power. This analysis will have an enormous impact in the new processes that happened in museums during the following decades. As I mentioned before, Foucault used the typically historical methods like archival research to undertake his own research. In his account of Foucault´s research methodology, Hardy (2013) points out that the remarkable component was not so much in the use of historical methods but in the methodology that he used. According to Hardy, it was the use of `particular theoretical frameworks´ that made it so innovative, is in this particular area where it the term discourse analysis´ first appeared. This is the questioning of a series of related statements in order to discern the overt or covert interrogation of a series of assumptions, generalisations or prescriptions that they contain (Hardy 2013,96). In the case of this thesis, for example, I will try to question the methods and representations of the historical discourse in Spainsh museums to see to what extend they have been influenced by the so called *Grand Narratives.*

The influence of Postmodernist thinking in Foucault's ideas is shown again in his development of a framework where the discourses are put to test and where the over-repetitive stories and narratives are identified and changed for other more representatives and inclusive. In a sense this could be understood as a way of identifying power in the discourse, identifying also the power relations inside the discourse and of course identifying the actors involved in that matter. Butler in his book *Postmodernism: A very short introduction* (2002) depicts the relation between discourse and power as one of the most important postmodernist ethical arguments. He describes the term `discourse´ as: "Historically evolved set of interlocking and mutually supporting statements, which are used to define and describe a subject matter.[…] They involve politically contentious activities, not just because of the certainty with which they describe and define people [….] but because such discourses at the same time express political authority of their users." (Butler 2002,44)

It is clear that with this definition that the main idea behind a *Grand Narrative* discourse type is to empower the authority of certain users or, most of the time, whole groups of individuals over others. This empowering method has been used most of the time across history to exclude individuals or groups that were on the opposite side of the speaker. The relation between power and discourse is then clearly unbalanced, where the main voice is that which has the authority to make itself heard while the rest of the voices are silenced by it. If we go back to the beginning of this chapter we can recover one of the main consequences that postmodernist ideas had in the construction of history : to balance the scale and make room for the excluded. The main tool for the empowering of discourses is language. It is through the systematic use of language where the individual is reinforced inside of a group. Most of the time is the difference in the use of those

systems of discourse creation what empowers certain people and diminishes others. One good example is given by Butler when referring to this: *you believe what the young surgeon tells you, and so give him permission to anesthetize you (Butler 2002,45)*

The endorsement here originates from the different uses of language, we tend to believe and give authority to people when they show us their knowledge in the form of discourses. In other words, society is keen to put the authority onto the hands of those who supposedly know better, or we tend to believe they know better. Discourses provided by institutions such as Catholic Church or national governments could be good examples of these ideas. However, this does not mean that those individuals have the incontestable truth in their hands. So what is important is that this recognition of power over someone most of the times comes from within the society itself. Postmodernist believed that the construction of discourses should be generated for and by the society and not from a top-down approach where powerful and dominant institutions implement a discourse under their own terms.

After this brief account of the parallelisms of postmodernism and poststructuralism and the introduction to the creation of discourses I will move to Foucault's theories and ideas. In the Foucauldian theoretical framework we must identify both of the main frames of work that he developed. *Archaeology* and *Genealogy* are the terms that he chose to name his methodologies. Both of them were influenced by the work of, the also French structuralist, Ferdinand Saussure and his *structural linguistics* (de Saussure et al. 1960) a theory which questioned the link between the language and the objects that language describes. Saussure questioned the relation that language had with the elements that it described, he tried to understand why we use language in particular ways to define objects and if indeed those are the correct ways to use it. He also described the three main elements that are contained in language: First are the signs. Secondly, are the signifier, which is the mental image the people have of words and thirdly, the signified, which are the concepts. *Archaeology* in Foucault is directly linked with the construction of discourses. Most of the work in this area is in his *Archaeology of Knowledge* (Foucault 1972) where he sees archaeology as a method to explain the background of knowledge and more precisely the orderings that allow certain wisdom to develop. The construction of discourses begins with statements which are according to Foucault the smallest possible object of inquiry. The statements function as a way of defining particular aspects or parts of the discourse and also to operate within singular forms of enunciation. The ensemble of these statements is what can be called discourse. However, discourses have their own structure which limits the relation between its elements. One example of these rules could be the language but, for that be possible, discourses must be part of a wider set of parameters that enable them to be formed in the first place. These are called discursive formations. This discursive formations are not static and they differ from each other. This is due to the fact that each one of them has their own set of rules to appear. There is not just one discourse and therefore one truth, on the contrary, there is a multi-faced reality and we as individuals can confront, understand and explain as we seem

appropriate. However, discourses of power work the other way around, normally, these kind of discourses serve to reinforce one face of the reality instead of the proposed multi-face

Inside this process of construction of discursive formations there are three key elements or concepts that must be highlighted. Foucault differentiates between *Connaissance*, *Savoir* and *Épistémè*. It is stated before that discourses are not static formations to Foucault, in addition to this non-static character we can say that discursive formations give structure to these three concepts. Nevertheless, discourses have the characteristic of exercise power due to their internal coherence. This allows a disourse to be established as truth and being accepted by socienites. First to generalized knowledges or *savoirs;* or to specific knowledges or *connaissances*. It must be said that both concepts can also be interlinked with each other and provoke changes between them. If we analyze these terms closely, we see how *connaissances* are specific knowledges that regulate the replacement and interaction between a knowing subject and an object (Hardy 2013, 101). Contrary to *connaissances* and its singularity, *savoirs* work in a more generalized scope. *Savoirs* refer to a wider range of objects, in this range one can find the particular objects that can be identified as *connaissances.* However, both terms are intertwined and therefore influence each other and constitute each other. In addition, Nick Hardy (2013, 102) notes that *savoir* is a set of continually reassessed principles and the *connaissance* is a particular form of `knowledge-as-practice´ that `applies´ the *savoir* but also generates new knowledge as a result. These relation are identified by Foucault with the last of these three concepts: *épistémè.* For Foucault the *épistéme* is the totality of relations that can be discovered, for a given period, between the sciences when one analyses them at the level of discursive regularities (Foucault 1972, 190-192).This analysis of the discourse on Foucault is complemented with the study of power relations.

I mentioned before that there are two main methodological frameworks inside of Foucault's work. *Genealogy* is the other principal framework, the basic concept of *Genealogy* is the rejection of history as a seriation of events predetermined in a singular way. For a genealogist every event occur on their own, there is no destiny that will make events happen, therefore they oppose to the definition of history as a predetermined path. Here the emphasis will be the circumstances surrounding, instead of the proper event. This is directly related to the creation of discourses and his foundations on knowledge. Hardy (2013,109) summed up this idea by pointing out that in Foucault's work the establishment of knowledge and therefore discourses is founded in power relations. This power is what determines the shape of the social relations and in the long term the happening or not of the events. Thus what genealogy is trying to examine is how the events are formed, when and why. This is called "eventalisation" and is what will allow us to establish when an event has become `self-evident´.

Like the concept of *Archaeology*, G*enealogy* is also based in various key terms that shape the structure of it. *Genealogy* as a study of history is based first on the analysis of how present circumstances came to form. With this type of analysis Foucault is trying to unravel the structures and the connections that took place in order

to understand how an event came to happen. Basically the history of the present is based on the study of the series of events that had as a result a particular moment in history. In most cases, there is a particular form of domination in those events. The second key concept of genealogy relates to the fact that in the history of the present usually some groups of people or parts of the society tend to dominate others, imposing an outcome for the events and creating an unequal relation between those groups. Foucault´s *Genealogy* tries to identify that type of processes that allow discourses to *dominate*. As an addition to the idea of domination Foucault identifies a third key concept in the process of discursive formation, the truth. This concept is one of the most relevant topics on the critical discourse analysis that we will analyze further in the text when referring to the truth behind some implemented discourses in museums. In Foucault, it appears as the ability of a dominant social group to impose or instill a conception of what is true into the discourse or even in the society. By doing so two processes are being applied, first there is an imposition of a discourse and secondly there is a negation of every other type of discourse. In other words, what Foucault is trying to point out with its *Genealogy* is that social relations are the tools of this kind of dominant groups to reach the goal of marginalization. Sharon Macdonald translates these workings of power as `*politics´* in her revision of the influence of Foucault in museums (2007,178) and exemplifies it in the sphere of the exhibitions where she defends that *politics* is a negotiation between knowledges down to the smallest details such as the classification, display or absence of objects. This term will be used also by Henrietta Lidchi (1997) as one of the main key concepts that will structure her work. The influence of Foucault´s writings will be great on the context of the museum as I will further analyze through some examples but he was not the only poststructuralism thinker that influenced the evolution of museum practices.

Without leaving the French post structuralist school, I will focus now in the figure of Jacques Derrida and his definition of   *deconstruction*. This concept is directly related to language and the problematic of the relationship between words and things. Here, I go back again to the point where I said that postmodernism allows multiple points of view, in this case with this term Derrida allows the creation of new points of view, or new meanings from an already existing meaning. Poststructuralism is also present in the concept of D*econstruction* due to the fact that is based on the relativist idea that truth is always relative to the judging subjects. Therefore is part of a structure that shapes its meaning. The subject's values openly and influence the decision of whether something is true or not. For that reason, Derrida´s thinking believes that there is no possible final or true definitions because of new and different explanations can appear depending on who is looking. Therefore if, for example, we use language to try to explain the reality we will be failing because according to Derrida no language system is reliable in terms of cultural construction. (Butler 2002, 16–17)

John W. Philips (2013, 124) calls the attention on how this process influenced literature and writing, in fact, he locates *deconstruction* in a middle point between literature and philosophy. To identify the unreliable aspects of language the reader must then do a critical reading of the texts. According to Derrida's ideas when

reading, in a person, a kind of writing takes place. Repairing, revising, decontextualizing and re-contextualizing are some of the processes that take place inside that person and that will shape a new meaning of the read. This is what allows the reader to develop a critical attitude towards a text and to confront and deconstruct such piece of work. Therefore there will be skepticism against the veracity of texts and it will spread eventually to other aspects of culture. In fact, this skepticism is well founded, it is based on the idea that in the majority of the intellectual activities there is a tendency for such activities to be organized in a hierarchical ladder. According to Butler (Butler 2002,22), this ladder is formed by the language and the conceptions of texts, extendable to another kind of cultural and intellectual actions, and *deconstruction* allows the readers to interact more freely with the texts, in this case, without any restriction or delimited arguments or narratives.

The result of this interaction or at least its intention is what will be defined by Roland Barthes, another integral part of the French structuralist school, as the *The Dead of the Author* (Barthes 1977). The main idea behind this concept is that it was the author of the text, continuing with this example, who imposed the hierarchy and the restrictions into the reader's argument. Then what was needed to be done was erasing this influence from the picture so the reader interpret the text in his own way and construct it however he or she pleases. Every process of deconstruction starts with a process of construction. Once the reader has constructed his own text he or she is capable of using his own rules to deconstruct it. Butler (2002, 24) exemplifies the complex definition of deconstruction by using Derrida´s lectures in the university which are cataloged by the author as "freewheeling, disorganized and unfocused" showing that no hierarchy was needed to organize the texts.

1.2 - THE NEW WAYS OF MUSEOLOGY

The previous part must serve as foundation knowledge that will allow the reader to understand and identify the influences that motivated the series of changes in the field of museology during the last decades. The mention of Foucault and Derrida must not be mistaken, as the only influences in this process. The lack of space made me prioritize the figures of Foucault and Derrida, which I believe are more relevant to the topic of this thesis, but other thinkers such as Roland Barthes, briefly mentioned, Martin Heidegger or Louis Althusser should be taken into account as important figures of postmodernism and poststructuralism. In this section, I will focus my attention on what came after these authors, how their ideas influenced the museum practices and what has been the result of the implementation of some of those concepts.

Foucault's ideas are probably the most influential of all the poststructuralist and postmodernist trend. What is mentioned above about the synchronic method in history, the relations between knowledge, power, and discourses will translate in a new wave of museological scholarship. The first example is directly related to the

Foucauldian concepts of disciplinary power, panopticism, and governmentality. Mason (2006, 31) tell us how those ideas had been reflected in the works of various authors on museum studies, in this case she refers to Eilan Hooper- Greenhill´s `*Museums and the Shaping of Knowledge* (1992) and Tony Bennet´s various works such as *The birth of the Museum: History, Theory, politics* (1995) In Hooper-Greenhill´s work we find the development of Foucault's epistemes or discursive forms, which is represented according to the author (Mason 2006, 31) in the emergence of the disciplinary museum during the end of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth. Therefore what Hooper-Greenhill is talking about is the development of discourses inside the museums with the intention of `civilizing´ the population. It is the representation of the concept of Foucault´s *dominating discourse*. In the work of Tony Bennett, we see the continuation of this interpretation, also in the context of museums during the 19th century.

  The *civilizing* concept in the museums is now complemented with the idea of a population capable of auto-regulate themselves through the acquaintance of knowledge. Auto- regulation in Foucault is mostly presented in one of his theories. In that theory Foucault described a prison called *Panopticon*. The singularity of this prison is that was based on auto-regulation. This process took place thanks to the particular layout of the prison. In that prison there will be a certain number of high towers that will serve as watch points . Supposedly from those watchtowers the guards were able to control the prisoners but Foucault argued that no guards were needed. This was because the towers were planned in such a way that from the rest of the prison the prisoner was never able to see if someone was inside them. Foucault defended that an individuals were keen to behave better if they have the feeling that someone was watching. Therefore, the prisoners were able to auto-regulate their conduct and in extension its small societies long as they had the feeling of observation over them. The relation of this theory with museology has to do with the fact that museums should let visitors wander at free will, under their own autoregualation and not impose controlling measures that could diminish the experience of the museum itself.

However, what makes Bennet´s analysis of Foucault ideas relevant is the relation that he made with Antonio Gramsci. We see again the problematic relation between museums and power. According to Bennett what relates both authors is the idea that museums can be constructed far from a hierarchy, where the community as a whole is the one that shapes the museum. There will be then a dethroning of the established elitist hegemony in favor of a newly empowered community (Mason 2006,31). An alternative conception of how museums works is what James Clifford depicts on his *contact zones.* He does it in this way:

When museums are seen as contact zones, their organizing structure as collection becomes an ongoing historical, political, moral relationship-, a power-charged set of changes, of push and pull (Clifford 1997,192–93)

For Clifford museums are the meeting point of the different actors that are involved in the creation of historical

discourse, culture, past and present. In that institution communities, stakeholders and museums professionals, can embark on relationships between each other with the aim of sharing influences, interests, and interactions. In this regard what Clifford is defending is a new type of museum where the relations of power are no longer top-down but leveled. Then museums will be transformed into something capable of adapt and change according to the times that surround it. For example, the colonialist discourses, imposed by power relations, will no longer be accepted, not only by the museum's professionals but also from communities and visitors who, in this model, have a leading role in the matter.

Deriving from Derrida´s ideas about reading or *textual approach* and deconstruction in this New Museology we will find the first concerns about the authorship in museums, especially focused in what is authorship and who is or are the authors in museum´s objects, displays and exhibitions. In this regard the shift will be that in museums the curator will no longer be seen as an author. This role will be out of their hands and will be put in the hands of the visitors, from this new point there will be an increasing consideration towards the critical attitude of the visitor and the influence that they can have on exhibitions and on the museums itself. The museum visitor has become the reader that Derrida was talking about. In one of her writings, Margaret Lindauer (2008) develops some of the main aspects of this new type of visitor who is no more a mere spectator but an active part of what is going on in the museum. He or she pays critical attention to details in displays, objects, and architecture. The visitor becomes a fundamental part of the museum displays, it becomes an active participant inside the cultural process.

Essentially this transformation can be inserted in the search of meaning. This new museum visitor is trying to read the new meanings that are been born in museums. As we have seen, according to Derrida there is a multitude of possible meanings in the scope of the language and words. Mason sees this as an advantage (2006, 33) due to the chance that museums have now to move away from *privileging and compartmentalizing* in favor of a wider range of possible meanings to objects and displays. Therefore, and thanks to this kind of analysis, new topics will come up to discussion like the unintentional meanings inside the displays and the omissions or absences and the contradictions within the displays. However, this must be taken into account cautiously because sometimes there could be no hidden meanings but just a lack of funding, time or space. This aspect will be in the hands of the museum professionals to be dealt with.

All of this leads us to the work of Henrietta Lidchi (1997) her writings draw two major categories in this new wave of museum practice. She used the terms *poetics* and *politics* to identify and refer to two issues. In the case of *politics*, the role of exhibitions and museums in the creation of knowledge and in the case of *poetics*, to the practice of producing meaning through the internal ordering and conjugation of the separate but

related components of an exhibition. So again we see how the influence of the structuralist is tangible. The *politics* is directly related to the *domination* conception and the creation of knowledge through power relations and the *poetics* is under the umbrella of meaning production that Derrida told us about. This categorization will be basic in the new developments of museological literature (Mason 2006,28) making the analysis of museum much simpler, this subdivision on manageable and separate components allowed the scholar to work on different aspects of the museums separately but always emphasizing their interconnectedness. Therefore the analysis of displays will be made singularly but not without paying attention to the political background that surrounds them. This will transform what was before an apparently neutral and value-free display into a power play between different groups of people based on cultural influences and judgments on the display of objects. The aim of Lidchi is then to highlight that no display is created without meaning and that behind every one of them hides a cultural context that cannot be avoided, on the contrary, it   needs   to   be   studied   in   depth.
To conclude this part every one of these ideas and concepts can be comprehended into what has been called New Museology or New Museum Theory by authors like Peter Vergo (1989) or Janet Marstine (2006). What this new terminology entail every new process that is being carried out in museum practices. The ideas of the French poststructuralist school and the influences of postmodernism are being put in practice. The path that Foucault, Derrida, and others opened is now being followed by a new wave of scholars and museum practitioners who are looking for new ways to interpret and display the world that surrounds us. Museology is suffering a total makeover. A shift from being about something to being about someone.

This second chapter will, in a sense, be a continuation of what has been stated before. Along this section, I will analyze various examples from different countries where the influence of the ideas, authors, and trends early mentioned play a prominent role. The aim is to show the level of influence that postmodernism in general and poststructuralism more precisely had or still have on curating and exhibiting practices. Some of the examples given will be of English speaking countries, such as the United States, Australia, and the United Kingdom because is in this countries where the New Wave of museology or New Museology based in postmodernist thinking started to grow and develop in a meaningful way. To close this section I will attend to the different critiques of which this New Museology has been subjected to. The changes in exhibiting and curating from modernity to postmodernity are something visible , not only to the museum's experts but also to the museum´s visitors. Many authors agree in this idea such as Eilean Hooper-Greenhill (2000) , Marta Wieczorek (2015) or Suzanne Keene (2013) . As Wieckzorek states in one of her articles: *This far-reaching contemporary tendency provoked radical changes in exhibition concepts and themes. It led to the museum´s space reinvention.* (2015, 20).

Museums are adapting to the new processes that have arisen from this new theoretical framework and with this adaptation new topics that were never thought before of a museum are coping the rooms of such places. However, is not only the face of the museum that is changing but also the museum profession in its deepest form. The influence of this evolution has affected to curators and curating practices altogether. Curators have moved now to a second place and they are no longer the *master of the show* as Wieczoreck characterizes them (2015, 19). Hooper-Greenhill in one of her works also states that new narratives are appearing in museums (2000, 31), she mostly talks about art museums but this can be extended to all other kinds of museums. The shift that postmodernism proposes when referring to *Grand Narratives* is something visible in the following examples, where one can see how the processes of abandoning old discourses, embracing new narratives and including new voices and communities shape the face of a new type of museum. One that can be identified as postmodern.

2.1- NEW CURATING PRACTICES: FEMINIST CURATING

Katy Deepwell defines curation as: "a modern practice, a late twentieth-century specialty linking arts management, knowledge of art history/criticism, and close collaborations with artists toward the production of an exhibition" (2008, 65). And as every modern practice, it has been challenged by postmodernism. In this

first example, I will focus my analysis on the development of new ways of curating that came up at the end of the last century, particularly around the rise of the feminist movement and its influence in the matter. To do so, I will base this section on the work of Katy Deepwell (2008), where she makes an overview of the process of implementation of feminist concepts in curating and museums, and try to relate it with the postmodernist thinking. Also this brief section will be complemented in the following chapter with a more precise overview of some of the feminist practices carried in Spain during the last quarter of the previous century. The feminist theory played an important role in the evolution of postmodernist ideas. In the same manner that indigenous and constrained voices were being included in the new discourses, feminism started to gain power and importance around the scope of museums. The influence of feminism started around the 70s (Deepwell 2008, 65) when many museum curators opened feminist initiatives within their programs. Before that, in the early 60s, the presence of women artist in most major collections was less than twenty percent.

The role of the women in these collections was secondary or non-existent. In order to tackle this disparity, feminists art historians started to criticize the structure of museums. The main characterizations that these scholars gave to the museums and their displays were ideologically and gendered (Deepwell 2008, 67). The main critique to these displays and collections was focused on the deconstruction of the concept of *genius* artists as middle-class, white males predominantly. By doing so, they were attacking directly the empowered discourse of masculinity in art history. They were reclaiming a space for the female artists which, as they considered, had at least the same influence in the development and innovation of art techniques than male artists. From that moment on, Deepwell states, there was a reassessment of women's contribution to changing the nature of art´s discourse (Deepwell 2008, 68) . However, this reclamation is seen by other authors as a misguided attempt to locate women in art history.

In the third chapter of this thesis, this argument will be extended with the examples of feminist curatorial practices in Spain. In those examples several authors such as Sara Rivera Martorell (2013) and Sofía Ángela Albero Verdú (2017) will critique the way women are being represented in museums and art history. They will base their arguments in the fact that even though the inclusion of women in the art discourse is a positive thing, sometimes this inclusion does not attend to the value of the piece of art or the context of the exhibition and it's simply included due to the genre of the artist. In this sense this critique will be directed not to the inclusion of women, which they celebrate, but to the way that is being done. As I will analyze those authors consider more important to feminist curatorial practices the context of the piece of art, the theoretical background that surrounds it and the proper content of it more than the fact of whether the artist was a women or not. They consider that not all women´s art is feminist and not all feminist art is made by women.

Before this critiques, some of the earliest examples of this change of paradigm, from the absence of women in the art discourse to the integration of them to it, were the first feminist art- historical exhibitions based in

a chronological display of women artists works such as *Women artists, 1550-1950* by Linda Nochlin and Ann Sutherland Harris (1976, Los Angeles County Museum of Art) and *Kunstleriennen International, 1877-1977: Frauen in der Kunst* (1977, Schloss Charlottenberg, Berlin) by Linda Nochlin and Ann Sutherland Harris. According to Deepwell, these exhibitions had the aim to "insert women artists into the standard narrative of art history and correct the bias which had contributed to their neglect" (2008, 69) . This has very much to do with postmodernist thinking where there is a search for the inclusion of constrained voices to the discourse. In the Ration Shed Museum example we will see how they deconstructed the discourse in order to include the indigenous perspectives, in this early phases of the feminist curating we saw a similar process where the aim is to equate the women's work to the male's. The next phase of this development started in the 80s when the shift towards a more detailed analysis of women artists works in specific historical and theoretical case studies. New approaches such as the one of Catherine de Zegher in 1996 *Inside the Visible: An Elliptical Traverse of Twentieth Century Art In, Of and From the Feminine* show that feminism was still looking for new ways of representation and reinterpretation of the discourses in museums and in art galleries. In this case, Zegher ambition was to show how women artists had generated distinct practices which explored, critiqued and questioned concepts of the feminine and *otherness* in aesthetic terms (Deepwell 2008, 74). Thus, with this example we see how from the early exhibition that was looking for inclusion in the established discourse there has been a shift to such extent that feminist curating is able to develop a process of self-interrogation and self-critique.

All of this can be also understood as ways of opposing the pre-existing modernism. A challenge to modernist norms, assumptions, and stereotypes that represented women. The re-examination of art practices, methods of display and exhibition practices from a point of view that was never taken into consideration made from this type of curating and art practices something far from modernism and closer to what we understand as postmodernism. Feminist art practices achieved a new status for women's work reversing the expectations on it by deploying methods or media in new ways and by challenging conventions in representation, content, form, and display becoming standard tropes (Deepwell 2008, 76).

As a conclusion to this brief example, I believe important to remark what are those characteristics that make of this feminist curatorial practices something that can be considered into the scope of postmodernism but also what are the characteristics of the movement that could be inserted in Derrida or Foucault's theories . First of all, the feminist theory and the feminist movement aims deconstruct the male-bias discourse in order to include the voice of women in a relevant way. Here the poststructuralism and Derrida´s theories are strongly present leading the way to the construction of a new discourse in art history where women are present .

Secondly, It has extended to the current curatorial and artistic practices. This movement is not only theoretical but also practical. In the various examples given along this brief overview one can see how there is an implementation of the idea about the deconstruction of the ˋgrand narrative´. By re-examining the ways of display and representation and challenging the stereotypes and assumptions on women's works these feminist practices are giving a new and more complete meaning to those works. And finally, another characteristic of this practice is that it is a process that is still very much alive, the example of de Zegher is a clear sign of it. Feminist practices are looking constantly for their reinvention and self- questioning, actions that make of them a postmodern practice.

2.2 - POSTMODERNISM IN THE FORM OF A MUSEUM: THE RATION SHED MUSEUM

The Ration Shed Museum (RSM) located in the Queensland´s South Burnett region in Australia exemplifies accurately what a postmodern museum should be. The location of the museum in the small Aboriginal city of Cherbourg could be a hint of what is one can find inside the museum. The originally settled Salvation Army Aboriginal mission known as Barambah in the early 20th century was taken over by the government of the region of Queensland and renamed in 1904 with its current name. Indigenous Australians from the region were then relocated into the city. They were forcibly relocated under the Aboriginal Protection Act of 1897 with harsh conditions and under the strict control of the authorities. The foundation of the museum dates back to 2004 when two local sisters, Sandra Morgan and Lesley Williams, found the old ration shed of the area where food was distributed. Since that moment the shed became a symbol of the colonial aboriginal past of the region (Smith 2014, 34–35).

From the layout to the visitor experience the Ration Shed Museum is filled with postmodern ideas. The physical historical layout of the museum is not constrained by a strict structure. The museum doesn't try to impose a path to the visitor, on the contrary, they are invited to wander around the different buildings. The main buildings of the museum are the superintendent's office, the boy's dormitory and the Old Country Women's Association shed, which has been restored. Between them one can find large open areas thought for social gatherings (Smith 2014, 36). The fact that there is no constriction to the visitor's experience is what characterizes the layout of the Ration Shed as postmodernist. There is no imposition of discourse from the architectural point of view, in fact, the relaxed flow of the museum avoids imposed narratives and subconsciously helps the visitors to start forming their own ideas about what is presented in the museum.

The strong link that the RSM has with the surrounding community is another sign of the influence of postmodernism. The inclusion of new voices to the discourse is capital to this trend of thinking as we have seen in the previous chapter. As Carly Smith points out (2014, 38) in the RSM this is also one of the pillars where the museum is sustained. The relation between the community of Cherbourg and the museum has made it evolve in order to fulfill the needs of that particular people. And not only in the sense of filling a gap in the knowledge about their ancestors but by delivering a place where they can participate of that heritage. Smith defines these particular characteristics of the RSM as *socially and culturally situated* (2014, 44). This means that the museum is a representation of the past and the present culture of the society of Cherbourg. This is showed in the displays, where the visitors find a mix between colonial artifacts and traditional indigenous objects. By doing this, the museum is showing that new meanings can be given to the colonial objects shown. By deconstructing the past's meaning of brutality and pain linked to these objects the museum is providing new understandings of them, is helping to create knowledge around them, knowledge of past events that will have an influence in present times. New meanings are helping the community of Cherbourg to shape new identities where new voices are being included. The displays in the museum are the very best example of this. In them, indigenous epistemes and practices are influencing directly the visual representations of the museum. They also affect the presentation of information and the inclusion on oral narratives and personal reflection (Smith 2014, 44).

Through all of this, the Ration Shed Museum is partially breaking with the traditional western modernist institution. The rupture is not complete however, and as Smith argues there are still some details that link this example with earlier modernist museums. She states that the RSM: *appropriates aspects of the form and function of the traditional museum in order to meet the current needs of the local community […] The Ration Shed Museum seeks to construct a narrative, as did the modernist museum* (Smith 2014, 39) .

 In the case of the RSM is true that the museum is looking for a new type narrative, and in a sense, it is able to find it. The main difference with the modernist museums is that this narrative is under postmodernist precepts therefore there is not imposed discourse and every visitor is able to elaborate its own, personal and individual discourse about what is shown. The inclusion of new voices, deconstruction of meanings of colonial past and representations of silenced communities are the motto of this new narrative. In this sense, the RSM has the autonomy to create its own narrative in its own terms. This is possible thanks to the self-funding of the museum through different touristic and educational activities. Therefore there is no outer institutional imposition that may affect the management of the museum (Smith 2014, 39). Every one of these characteristics is what made Carley Smith (2014, 35) state that the Ration Shed Museum is the example of Hooper-Greenhill *Post Museum* (2000). She argues that in the RSM there is a clear representation of the

critical, reflexive and dialogic nature of the post-museum (Smith 2014, 47). And indeed, as anyone that is a bit familiarized with concepts of postmodernism could see, the Ration Shed Museum represents many of the precepts of postmodern theory. In this case the RSM museum as we have seen has a strong local identity, is a small museum for a small town but represents perfectly the complex context and past of the area.

2.3 - THE INCLUSION OF THE CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS IN MUSEUMS: THE HONG KONG MUSEUM OF HISTORY AND THE MACAO MUSEUM.

Central to the postmodernist and poststructuralist theories is the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) especially in Foucault's writings (Foucault 1972). The deconstruction, reevaluation and further reconstruction of established discourses are the main concerns of both postmodernists and poststructuralists, as is pointed out in the previous chapter. Although it is central to both trends, the use of CDA by the so called poststructuralists authors is not the same as the postmodernist ones. Again the small nuances between both trends surface again. In this case the use of CDA by the poststructuralist is base in a nihilist approach to present the arguments. For poststructuralist every discourse is or could be hegemonic. In other words, if we substitute a discourse that we believe is hegemonic by other that, in our opinion, is not we are not really solving the problem because this last discourse could, in theory, be also hegemonic. In postmodernism the aim is to eradicate the dominant discourses by substituting them by others more representatives of history and reality. In poststructuralism this is taken to the extreme and they argue that regardless this substitution the new discourse could be as dominant as the old one. With the cases of Hong Kong and Macao, and further in the third chapter I will analyze examples where this substitution could not mean the disappearance of dominant discourses.

Foucault believed that this critical analysis could be applied to museums. And that the rethinking and restructuration of the texts and discourses exposed in museums should be done in order to advance as a society and to include every possible voice or point of view to the historical discourse. Hong Kong and Macao examples will follow that idea. I will take a look in the ways that critical discourse analysis has helped to reshape the figure of museums' texts and discourses, for that I will use the examples given in the article *Politics of memories : Identity construction in Museums* by Carol X. Zhang, Hoggen Xiao, Nigel Morgan and Tuan Phong Ly. In this piece of work, they analyze two museums one in Macao and the other one in Hong Kong, both cities

with colonial past, in order to understand how the use of the Critical Discourse Analysis could demonstrate the unbalanced power relations that exists in such cities during their colonial past but also if the change of the presented discourse meant a disappearance of a dominance in the presented discourse. CDA is also a good tool to evaluate how this past is presented nowadays. Further in the text it will be shown how the use or lack of use of certain words can affect to the discourse presented in the museum. The colonial past of both cities is, in this case, central to the interpretation of these examples. The two islands have a similar past related to colonization. Both were colonized by European countries, Macao by the Portuguese and Hong Kong by the British. Moreover, both were freed from the colonial powers at the end of the 20th century to become a part of the actual People's Republic of China in the form of Special Administrative Regions. This is the starting point of what the authors identify as a shift in the production of discourse, especially those related to the creation of national identity, but extendable to the whole process of heritage production (Zhang et al. 2018, 116). In this sense they argue that the place where this process is most visible are the museums. This is because, in the mystique that surrounds such an institution since its inception. Museums are places of heritage making and memory shaping and also an attraction for tourists and non-tourists that are looking for an insight of the history of the place. So, in order to create and deliver a new discourse that represents fully the new conditions of the area of Macao and Hong Kong the museum´s discourse had to be reevaluated and rephrased.

The Hong Kong Museum of History and the Macao Museum present two different stories with a similar idea behind it. The museum of Hong Kong presents a *Long Chinese but Short British* (Zhang et al. 2018, 122) history and the case of Macao is somewhat similar with being cataloged as *An Eternal Chinese City Where the East Meets the West* (Zhang et al. 2018, 122) . Basically, what one finds in both places are exhibitions with a major focus in the Chinese heritage rather than the colonial. In fact, the colonial past is in a way left aside, thus, being placed in a second stage with minimal representation in contrast with the Chinese past. Hong Kong, for example, is presented as a settlement that was Chinese before being British were the colonial time was only a lapse in the history that had a small influence in the future of the region. In addition, the colonial time served the region to *rebirth* as a Chinese city and to embrace again the cultural heritage of China. With Macao, there is a similar conception, the fact that Macao was an international trading port for centuries (Zhang et al. 2018, 125) is understood as the central point where the western culture meets the eastern, or in other words where Europe meets China. All of these conceptions are supported across the exhibition by the use or the lack of use of different terms such as colonial. In the case of Macao, for example, the authors point out that the word *colony* is absent (Zhang et al. 2018, 123) underlining the continuity of Macao as a Chinese settlement and passing over the Portuguese period.

In these examples, the authors used the Critical Discourse Analysis to identify cases such as the word *colony* and its use or not throughout the exhibitions. Another use of CDA was the analysis of the tour guides and its presentations of the collections. Also a series of guided tours were analyzed from the language perspective. First, they pay attention to the use of certain language and realized that multilingualism was present in them. Tours were done in Cantonese, English and Chinese during different days of the week. Which shows that the presented discourse attempts to have an international scope that can be related to the shared past of the cities with its colonial powers. Both examples are the type of issues that postmodernist want to highlight in the development of historical discourse construction nowadays.

This analysis is relevant to identify the internal structure of the discourses presented in both museums. As we have seen previously in the text the discourse is often, from the postmodern point of view, formed by power relations. Most of the times, when it comes to museums, these power relations could either be visible at plain sight or on the contrary be hiding along the texts or exhibition. The power relations are often related to a division between the *Us* and the *Others* where the second one always is overpowered by the first. In the case of the museums of Macao and Hong Kong the dominant story, the one that unbalances the power relation and that is visible by the CDA, is the Chinese. In both examples the authors found that by using the CDA it was possible "to understand the discursive, fragmented, contested and transnational memories within postcolonial Chinese museums and also to understand too how changes in broader socio-cultural and political environments result in different constellations of positive and negative memories of being and becoming Chinese cities" (Zhang et al. 2018, 119). This can be all sum up by stating that by using the tools provided by the postmodernist thinking on museums, such as the CDA, one can identify the discursive processes that are directly influencing the memory and identity-shaping of cities, nations and even identities.

However, from a poststructuralist perspective this could be understood in a different way. We pointed out before that poststructuralist considered that every discourse could be hegemonic. In this sense these two examples could very well show this characteristics. We have seen how in both museums there is a small representation of the colonial past of the cities. This could be understood as a sign of a new type of dominance inside the Macao and Hong Kong museum. What was before a dominant colonial discourse has transformed in to a Chinese dominant discourse. This shows how thin is the line in the construction of discourses between the integration of voices and the dominance of them. The use of Critical Discourse Analysis can be used again to prove this fact. In order to tackle colonialism and everything that surrounded it in both museums the curatorial decisions were aimed to represent as little as possible the historical colonial past of the cities, the displays, text and tour guides were strategically created to reinforce the Chinese legacy of the cities. The fact that both cities are part of the Chinese state but as a special administrative regions could be also important to the implementation of this new hegemonic discourse. The necessity of the Chinese state to strength the historical discourse around both cities in order to assimilate them in to the chinese culture, and

erase the possible western cultural remnants, could be understood as the imposition of a new hegemonic discourse. In this sense what we would find in these two museums is not an eradication of the dominant discourse but a shift from one dominant discourse to another. I will take a look at this complex process again in the third chapter when referring to the development of Spanish museology and the shifts in the historical discourse presented in museums before and after the dictatorship of Francisco Franco.

2.4- THE CRITIQUES TO THE INCLUSION OF POSTMODERNISM AND POSTSTRUCTURALISM ON MUSEUMS.

The three previous examples of feminist curating, the australian Ration Shed museum and the museums of Hong Kong and Macao are three different ways in which the inclusion of postmodernist and poststructuralist thinking has been implemented in a successful way. From the innovative layout and display of the Ration Shed Museum to the Chinese identity shaping in Macao and Hong Kong the postmodernist and poststructuralist ideas have been a central part of the development of these museums and practices. However, these processes have also been the objective of the critiques of some authors that questioned the result of such enterprises. The first of these critiques is related to the functioning of the museum and the feeling that the visitor has in the postmodern museum. In its classification of the three generations of museums, Esben Kjeldbaek (2016) differentiates three generations of museums. The first one are those derived from private collections of 19th century collectors, usually they were individual private enterprises that presented a narrative of that particular individual and its collection. The second one, has an educational goal and they are generated as an opposition to the first generation of museums. The third generation museum, which is in his opinion the postmodern museum, is *not challenging but comfortable* (2016, 124) . He argues that museums have shifted into something different from the original meaning of museums, to the level that the visitor is *not quite certain that you are really in a museum* (2016, 124).

One of the reasons of these statements, he argues, is that the museum has been in a sense commercialized and that is directly linked with the attitudes of public opinion and the fluctuations of the economy. Museums, nowadays, have shifted from what was in the first generation of museums something *personal* (Kjeldbaek 2016, 122) in to something public in the third generation (Kjeldbaek 2016, 124). The third generation of museums are the most recent ones, where instead of that individual character of museums has been shifted for a more general scope that could represent more people.   According to the author, during the change between generations there has been a loss of the individuality represented in museums, as in the figure of the people that made possible such places, especially how their ideas have disappeared by the time and with it the whole purpose of the institution (2016, 126) . What Kjeldbaek is defending is that postmodern museums have derived into a homogeneous institution where the public opinion and economy drive the purpose and

discourse of it and that it led to a blurred understanding of collective thinking inside the museum in detriment of the individuality that one found on the first generation of museums. Those places were about the representation of an individual, the curator or funder, that shared his vision with the collective in contrast with the third generation of museums where that figure of the individual has disappeared. Linked with the notion pointed out by Kjeldbaek of museums becoming a business that depend directly on the fluctuations of the economy is the second critique of the postmodernist thinking in museums. In his account on postmodern museums, Serge Guilbaut (2015) argues that museums today are places where the only important data is the number of visitors and where the intellectual debate has been lost. More and more museums are becoming franchises such as the Guggenheim or the Tate where the aim to reach a great number of the public in different parts of the world is affecting directly to the experience inside of these museums. The changes in society are being reflected in the halls of the museum where the exhibitions and displays are more and more short experiences based on what the visitors want to see, always in a positive way, instead of creating an intellectual debate (Guilbaut 2015, 4). Thus, museums in its aim for including new voices, discourses and erasing old narratives have become places with a flat discourse dedicated to content every layer of the society with the result of lacking intellectual debate. In addition, this last effect of postmodernism is reinforced according to Guibault by a decrease of academic and intellectual research in museums (Guilbaut 2015, 4).

Finally, one of the last critiques that I want to highlight of the postmodern way in museums comes by the hand of Suzanne Keene and her article *All that is solid: Museums and the postmodern* (2006). In this article, she identifies the roots of the problems that museums will face if they embrace postmodernist approaches (Keene 2006, 185). Most of the critique of Keene is focused in the things that museums will lose by embracing postmodernism and how those precepts will change the purposes of such institutions. So, by engaging with the postmodern processes, she argues, museums will lose the capacity of delivering objective truth within the displays and exhibitions changing it for delivering only personal meanings for each individual (Keene 2006, 194). This is related with the postmodern notion that defends that any interpretation of the reality is valid, therefore, museums can not present an objective universal truth due to the fact that this will be false because every meaning considered as truth is directly linked with each individual. This heterogeneity of meanings and concepts is also the base for the second critique of Keene (Keene 2006, 188) where she states that this fact affects directly to the internal structuration of museum specifically to the collections. The fact that every object is now subject of new meanings avoids the possibility of creating an ordered and categorized structure for them which threatens the purpose of museums of portraying knowledge in an organized way.

As a conclusion for this chapter, I would like to briefly point out the relevant features of the inclusion of postmodern and poststructuralist thinking in museums. First of all, and in my opinion, the most relevant of

them all, is the fact that the inclusion of postmodern thinking has provoked a very much needed change inside of the institution of museums, both theoretically and practically. Examples such as the RSM or the Macao and Hong Kong are proof of that. Secondly, this shift has also provoked an inclusion of new stories in the discourses but also new ways of doing things like the feminist curating practices that revitalized the museological processes in a better way. Despite this the introduction of postructuralism in the critique of the creation and inclusion of these newe discourses and voices is also a good sign of the right path that the development of museums is following. In regard to these last three critique that I pointed out it must be said that the losing of individuality in museums, especially of the figure of curator could be also understood in two ways.. the first one is a representation of the homogenization of the 21st century society that is leading to a disappearance of unbalanced power relations. There the authority of the curator or donator is subverde to the fully representation of the society. In those cases no discourse is imposed over others, not even those form the museum owners. On the other hand this could be also understood as a loss of authorship and the death of the author that is mentioned in the first chapter. There the homogenization of society and discourses in art is leading to a context where the author or owner is not recognised anymore, there is a loss of individuality in the figures that conform the museum .

However, I must say that it is true that some museums are losing or seem to be losing the purpose of acquiring knowledge, becoming more and more simple places of entertainment where culture is something just to see instead of something that one can admire and learn from. Finally, it is visible that the new wave of postmodern museums is erasing old precepts and substituting obsolete institutions.

PART 2

The last section of the thesis will be focused on the analysis of a case study in depth. The aim of this last section is to prove to what extent the theories, ideas, conceptions, and values raised by the postmodern and poststructuralist thinkers and scholars had influenced the development of museums and museology in a particular area. In this case study, I will pay attention to the development of museological structures in Spain. I chose this particular case study for various reasons. The first of those reasons is directly linked with the national history of such country. The fact that Spain lived under a dictatorship for the majority of the 20th century isolated the country from what was happening on the rest of the world. Most of the philosophical and artistic trends that were spread throughout Europe, especially after WWII, did not have a big impact in Spain. The closure of the military regime prevented Spain from developing socially and economically at the same rhythm of other European Nations. Museology also suffered from these *closed doors* to Europe. We will see how during the years of the dictatorship the cultural developments related to museums were minimum but once this period was over there was a clear intention to regain the time that was lost. After the end of the dictatorship, Spain went through a complete process of renovation, restructuration, creation, and reinforcement of the museum structures.

 Unlike other European countries, in Spain, the implementation of the so-called New Museology based postmodernist and poststructuralist ideas took place at the same time that the creation of a museological network, so both processes followed parallel paths. In European countries like France or Great Britain with a longer museological tradition, the implementation of New Museology had to be adapted to pre existing institutions. This fact is what makes the Spanish example worthy to be looked at. Museology in Spain is still a young science and for that reason analysis like this could add new approaches and knowledge to a still-developing field. As a final note before beginning with the actual analysis of the study case I must say that I will focus mostly on the decade of the 70s onwards, however, the previous years will be briefly analyzed in order to add some historical background to the process. Also note that most of the examples that are mentioned in this case study are art museums, more specifically, contemporary art. This is due to the fact that during the transition in Spain from the dictatorship to the democratic government contemporary art was identified as the example of cultural development but also because this type of museums were the most common and therefore there are many more examples to compare.

3.1 - SPANISH MUSEOLOGY UNTIL THE DECADE OF 1970

The victory of the National side in the Spanish Civil War meant the establishment of a military dictatorship that lasted more than 35 years. From the end of the conflict in 1939 to his death in 1975, Francisco Franco ruled over Spain under the flag of fascism and nationalism. The three years of the war (1936-1939) dragged Spain into a ruined state. The events of the conflict, the casualties and the economic effort from both sides put the country on the edge, socially but also economically. The situation was such that Franco avoided, by all means, the participation of Spain in WWII due to the fact that the country could not afford the military and economic effort that a conflict carried . Instead of participating actively in the conflict, in those early years after the Civil War, Spain went through a process of self-reconstruction and at the same time of closure towards Europe. Therefore the social and economic developments that slowly happened after WWII in countries like Germany did not happen in Spain. Franco´s government built a nationalist state were the patriotic and fascist discourse worked as pillars of the society, and everything out of this authorized discourse was condemned and forbidden, especially in the first one or two decades. Little by little the regimen started to open the gates to the world which had a direct impact in the society and therefore in the Spanish museology.

From this period we can highlight the work of two authors that, in a sense, set the basis for what would happen in the museological works in Spain in the following decades. Later on this chapter I will analyze the practical enterprises that happened in Spain but as a starting point I will refer to the theoretical work of Gaya Nuño *History and guide of the Museums in Spain* (1955) and María Elena Gómez-Moreno's book *Yearbook guide of the Museums in Spain* (1955) . Both books try to describe the current museological scene in Spain at that time. In the decade of the 50s of the last century, both authors agree that this scene was almost non-existent. They claim that there was no investment in developing and taking care of the existing museums and that the government showed a lack of interest in all the matters related to the museological world. Both authors were the first ones to write about the need for a renovation in the entire system of museums in Spain, starting from the formation of the museum's professionals and finishing with the renovation of institutions and buildings. These two publications will be the pillars where the museums' professionals of the 1970´s built the new museological scene (Hernández Hernández 2015, 145–46).

As we have pointed out the artistic and theoretical trends that were being spread through Europe, especially in contemporary art, did not have a real impact in the Spanish culture. However, this is not entirely accurate, in his account of the development of museums under the dictatorship the Spanish author Jesús Pedro Lorente (1998, 295–296) tells us that in Spain a double process was being carried out, one looking to the external and international cultural relationships and another, completely different, in regard to the internal every-day

cultural life. As a result of this, the avant-garde art and in extension, the modern and contemporary art museums, were marginal to the every-day culture of the Spanish society within the walls of the dictatorship. But when we talk about the outside of the frontiers the picture is somehow different. Outside the walls of the regime the General Direction of Cultural Relationships of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Dirección General de Relaciones Culturales del Ministerio de Asuntos Exteriores) was promoting the Spanish art throughout Europe quite successfully.

Firstly, I will refer to the internal situation. Although marginal, the cultural development in the post-war in Spain *was not a wasteland* (Lorente Lorente 1998, 26). The cultural development of this moment can be identified under two processes. The first one is an attempt to erase every trace that was left of the government of the II Republic from before the civil war. During that period, the republican government was preparing a plan to reform and restructure the whole network of Spanish modern museums but the beginning of the war blocked the successful implementation of it. So, once the *National* side took over the government they started the opposite process. They reinforced the already existing structures in order to emphasize the nationalist discourse through the museums. In addition the new regime considered that every cultural and educative body or organism that survived to the war after 1939 was condemned to disappear due to the their influence in the creation and establishment of the republican government (Hernández Fraile, 1987, 620) . From the republican times two examples of museums should be highlighted, both of them disappeared early after the end of the conflict. The first one was called National Educative Museum. This institution was born in the late 19th century as an educational institution. The aim of the institution was purely educational through its years of existence. The museum was born under the umbrella of the *Institución Libre de Enseñanza* (Free institution of education) and had an autonomous character, far from political . The name of museum does not really represent the character of such institution, it could be considered more as a library or educative center than as a proper museum. The ultimate goal of that institution was to create a library full of educative text that will help teachers and professionals . Some of the promoters of this institution were Francisco Giner de los Ríos and Manuel Bartolomé Cossío, both relevant scholars in their time. However, the latter is the most relevant in this case. Was under his direction when the National Educative Museum had its best years.

He is also the promoter of the second example of the republican enterprises shut down by the dictatorship. The so called *People's Museum* was an itinerant mission that toured across the most rurals regions of the early 20th century Spain. This mission was also under the umbrella of the *Institución Libre de Enseñanza,* and was part of the project *Misiones Pedagógicas* (Educative missions) . The goal of this missions was to *bring art to every rural part of Spain* (Grau Lobo, 2015-2016, 254) . To do so an itinerant caravan carried copies of some of the most famous paintings in Prado Museum among others The established itinerary exhibitions in many small country villages. The idea behind this project was to share art with those who cannot participate form it due to different reasons. Both practices had the ultimate goal of educate society, the Institución Libre the

Enseñanza took special care in promote this kind of activities during the II Republic., but once the war was over the military regime put an end to it.

The other process apart from this reinforcement was the creation of new museums, most of them similar to the Italian fascist *gallerie d´arte moderna* (Lorente Lorente 1998, 298). So what can be inferred from Lorente´s depiction of the museum's creative process is that during the postwar years, the regime tried to implement a new cultural discourse. First from the reinforcement of already existing museums such as the Prado Museum transforming it in a symbol of the central state and the nation and secondly through the creation of new institutions very similar to other authoritarian fascist powers in mediterranean Europe. Some voices started to appear in different regions of Spain to fight this discourse with the arrival of the decade of the 1960s. Twenty years had passed from the end of the war and some small breaches started to appear in the centralism of the regime. As an opposition of what was going on in the capital, where the central power had its base and the nationalistic discourse was strong and represented in Prado Museum, across the country a contemporary art museum started to develop, looking to deliver a new regional discourse that extols the values of their own art. However, it must be said that the influence of the regime was still strong. In this context, the Museum of Contemporary Art of Barcelona was born in the summer of 1960, not to be confused with the one that will open its gates at the end of the century. The aim of this institution was to bring to Catalonia the most relevant contemporary artist and their works but also to represent within its walls the Catalonian art. The premise was specific and this was not well received by the military elites that saw it as a threat to the authorized discourse. The museum lasted only three years and closed due to the lack of funding. Lorente argues that although the institution was not a victim of public persecution of the regimen it never benefited from it (1998, 300). As a second example of this first Catalonian attempt, I will mention the case of the Picasso Museum in Barcelona, also from the 1960s. Picasso was at that time the *international personification against the Francoism* as Lorente rightly points out (1998, 300). So as a way of rebellion against the dictatorship he decided to donate some of his most recent works to the museum which was inaugurated in 1963 promoted by the town hall of the city.

Spain was starting to develop a decentralization process that will last for a few decades. This was a direct response to the centralism of the government and in opposition to the authorized discourse of the dictatorship. The willingness to pay tribute to regional and local values was being born and it did it mostly in the form of Contemporary Art Museums and Galleries. Following the two Catalonian examples, there were more institutions and artists from smaller regions of Spain that also wanted to take part in the creation of the new cultural discourses. The main actors of this processes were artists that moved from the capital, Madrid, to cities like Ayllón, in the province of Segovia, or Cuenca. Both places were not far from the capital which made them the perfect escape places for the artists from the capital. In such places, they could express their creativity without the constraints of the military regimen. In Ayllón, for example, in 1965 they created the

Municipal Museum of Actual Art and in Cuenca they created a museum called Museum of Spanish Abstract Art (Lorente Lorente 1998, 303). Both examples gathered under their roofs nonconformist contemporary artists that brought to the region the new artistic trends. In the case of the Catalonia new museums openings, the reaction of the government to them was not very friendly. With the examples of Segovia and Cuenca the case was a bit different. This is linked with the external aspect of the cultural policy of the regime during these years. Outside Spain, the Cold War was taking place and Spain situated itself in the side of the so-called *free world*, which were the capitalist nations. Thus, the export of an image of cultural development and artistic freedom was vital to the regime. So while in the capital the national discourse was strong and reinforced by the government, in regions such as Ayllón and Cuenca the nationalistic belt was a bit loose and the artists could develop their work more freely, and sometimes, even with some economic help from the Fine Arts General Direction like in the case of Cuenca (Lorente Lorente 1998, 304). So what we can see is that at the end of this decade the dictatorship managed to play in two different cultural realities. One is played in Madrid, the capital, where the authorized discourse ruled and every cultural institution is reinforced and secured through it, and the other one represented in the outer regions of the capital by contemporary artist with an innovative and nonconformist spirit. Both trends however may seem different but worked with a similar aim: reinforce the regime. One did it internally by strengthening the myth of the old cultural traditional Spain liberated by Franco and the other one, externally, by selling the image of a new Spain that was part of the capitalist, free, non-communist world, where the contemporary art was taking over the cultural life and the museums. In the next decade, the 70s, both of these processes will be directly affected by the death of Franco and the arrival of democracy in Spain.

3.2 THE 1970s: THE BEGINNING OF THE RENOVATION

Until this decade we have seen how there was a small attempt to renovate the museology in Spain. The regime was still strong until the arrival of the 1960´s, after that, the final transitional period started. During this decade the museological renovation will take place in a definitive form. Legislation, new museums, ideas, and goals will be created, settled and promoted. This process was not built by chance. It responds to the end of the dictatorship and the arrival of the democracy. 1975 is the year of the death of the dictator Francisco Franco and marks the beginning of the transitional period from the military regime to a fully-implemented democracy. By the hand of the new democracy, a new cultural approach arrived, an attempt to regain those lost years and get back on track on the cultural environment. The new Spain, democratic and cultural, wanted to be at the same level as other European nations like the United Kingdom or France. What stands out from this period is the massive development of the academic museological field. Academic publications, university courses for museum professionals and a dedication to the improvement and promotion of the field will be the bullet points of the museological work of this period.

Museology at the time was still a small field in Spain. There was not a real corpus of museum professionals per se, but those who were considered museum professionals were starting to be self-conscious of their position and to become interested in the further development and research on their own field. As a consequence the first real publications about museological work were written in that period. We have mentioned before the work of Gaya Nuño and Gómez Moreno as the originators of the movement but these books were merely accounts of the list of existing museums in Spain at their time, not actual museological and critical works. With the new museological works, the listing of museums was transformed into a list of needs. In this list of needs the authors wrote down every aspect that museums and museum professionals needed to improve, it was a list of duties for those museum technicians that served to transform the museum from the inside out (Bellido Blanco 2005, 333–34).

 The first of these works that I will mention is considered as the first academic museological work ever written in Spain. María Luisa Herrera, the first women to direct a National Museum in Spain, published in 1971 the book called *The Museum In The Education* (1971). In her book she established what she believed were the main topics to address in the museological work in Spain. Things like the definition of the museum; the history of the institution, both in and out of Spain; the functions of the museum and the duties of the conservators. The formation of the museum professionals were embedded by a desire to promote the educational aspect of museums (Bellido Blanco 2005, 334). For her, the main objective of a museum was to educate, especially aimed to groups of schoolchildren that would visit the museums. However, she states that in order to be able to complete that task, the museum professionals must be better trained than they were at the moment (Herrera Escudero 1971, 171). In the same page of Herrera, Gratiniano Nieto wrote about the importance of education in museums. The book of Nieto Gallo called *Status of the Spanish museums and museological matters* (1973)   can be cataloged as the first museological work in Spain that refers to the ICOM (Hernández Hernández 2015, 146) this is the first example of the will of Spanish museology to break the barriers of his own state and be involved in what was happening outside the regime.

These theoretical works were implemented in a practical way with more or less success. As Bellido argues (2005, 337). The proliferation of museums in Spain during the previous decade did not mean a rise in the quality of such museums. They maintained old-fashioned displays, old equipment and lack of organization. Although they were relatively new museums, the theoretical context of its foundations was outdated. The changes in the museums came by the hand of the government. First with the 2006/1973 decree of the Ministry of Culture which stated the rules of selection of public servants of the Facultative Body of Conservators of Museums (Hernández Hernández 2015, 146). This regulation was destined to legislate the access to the job of museum curator by implementing a series of requirements that ensured the capacity of the candidate. For example, one of the requirements was a year of professional internship in any of the National museums, also

there were other academic requirements that proved the interest and knowledge of the applicant. This can be seen as the professionalization of the job of the museum conservator. The effect could be noted also inside of the universities were some of the academics started to develop an interest in museological topics. In those times, departments of museology or museum studies as a course did not exist in Spanish universities, so the first examples of them were a derivation from other departments. The first to include museology studies into academic courses was the Department of Art History of the University of Santiago de Compostela in 1977 (Lorente Lorente 1998, 147). The New Museology was arriving in Spain and was demanding new museum practices but also new museum technicians that were well prepared and that were capable of dealing with the new influences that came from Europe and the rest of the world.

One of those influences was the new definition that ICOM gave in 1972 about the museum, which stated that the museum was now a service for the society and must be an integral part of the development of the community (Hernández Hernández 2015, 152–53). In this regard, the transition that Spanish museums were doing in the direction of creating new institutions educationally oriented was aimed to engage with this new definition. This is complemented with the General Law on Education of 1970 where is stated that every archive, library, and museum could offer free access to interested groups (Hernández Hernández 2015, 157). This shift in the educational system transformed Spanish museums into places were the interdisciplinary work between museologists, archaeologists, school teachers, artists and sociologists could take place. The Spanish museums were opening to the implementation of new voices to the museological work, most of them influenced by postmodernism. Bellido Blanco marks the National Archaeological Museum as the most relevant in this aspect in the Spanish museological scene at that time (2005, 339). He highlights the different campaigns of divulgation during the last years of the decade that took place in the museum like the opening of new rooms in the museum and the organization of temporal exhibits. However, the most influential change was the creation of the educational cabinet which was in charge of creating educational materials, working with schools and contacting school teachers to organize educational events.

The late half of the 70s marked the end of Francoism. In 1975 the dictator died, and after that the decentralization processes that were starting to appear across Spain finally find a friendly context where it could fully develop. The democratic transition in Spain is a complex process that I will not explain in detail . However, some notes must be given in order to picture a historical background. On the political side, the arrival of democracy after more than 30 years of military regime was a breath of fresh air. For the first time in decades, Spanish people could express their ideologies through the vote, there was no fear for repression and also there was a feeling of renovation that covered the whole society. Example of this renovation was seen in the new structure of Spain with the creation of the System of Autonomies regions that divided Spain into seventeen different autonomous regions. This broke the centralism of the state and gave these regions the

opportunity to create and spread their own political and cultural discourse. It must be said that this regionalist conception of the state was not only happening in Spain but across Europe too (Gilabert González 2011, 189). Once these regions gained this authority they started to deliver new messages and meanings to their own history. Examples like the already given of Barcelona will be repeated throughout the whole country. The culture was pointed out as the chosen tool for social change. From the national government to the regional and local governments they focus on the cultural change as the first step to social change. This is very much related to the new conception of culture given by UNESCO early in the decade where culture was not necessarily related to elites (Gilabert González 2011, 226) . This is one of the key points of what postmodernists defended. Art, culture and the ways of presenting it, such as museums or art galleries were considered from that moment on, places where there should be no more division of classes. Every citizen of the newly democratic Spain was entitled by right to enjoy their own culture and especially they were encouraged to be an active part of it. As we have seen one of the other bullet points of the postmodernist thinking was the active participation of the public in the museums, for the new processes that were happening in Spain at that time this was also very important. Contemporary art and the museums that specialized in this type of art were the perfect channels of expression for this postmodernist ideas. Although the democracy had arrived in Spain it took a few years to settle a newly elected government and therefore to implement the social and cultural changes that arrived with it. In 1977 the first democratic elections, since 1936, took place and one year later a new constitution was written and published. So at the end of the decade, the context for change was settled ad it was time for museums and museology to take the last step into contemporaneity.

During these last years of the 1970s decade the artistic production in Spain started to grow . Step by step the influence of postmodernism in art started to settle. New forms of museums were born outside the classical idea of museum. This is the case of the Open air museum of sculpture of Hecho in Huesca. From 1975 to 1984 in the small and rural village of Hecho in the north-east of Spain a yearly symposiums took place gathering artists, renowned or not, with the only intention of creating. These symposiums were organized by Pedro Tramullas, a sculptor form in France. The relevance of the fact that the organizer was formed in France reside in the influences that he took back to Spain. The already mentioned May of 1968 supposed a great influence for the artists and under the precepts of postmodernism he decided to carry out these symposiums. The goal behind this artistic meetings was desacralize art and artistic practices (Bermués and Lorente, 2013, 49-50). During almost ten years the small village of Hecho gathered during one or two weeks a great deal of artists. For Tramullas the objective was to create art without barriers, and to do so in a communal space. Barriers were also erased from the architecture of the museum. The art productions that came out from the symposiums were not located inside of a building. One of the main characteristics of the Hecho Museum was that it was an open air museum. Tramullas wanted to incorporate art in to nature and the city. To do so, and at least in the earlier years of the project, the artist had freedom to locate the art around the area of Hecho. This village is a rural village near to the Pyrenees and most of the artistic creations were thought to be part of

that characteristic nature.

The Hecho museum was very influenced by the postmodernist ideas, as we have pointed out before, and the fact that artists were not constrained by displays or the museum architecture shows a shift in the conception of what a museum was, there was no need to locate art inside of a building where access is limited. The access to art was also one of the concerns of Tramullas, he wanted the artists to engage with the locals of Hecho and the locals of Hecho to enjoy the pieces of art that were located in their hometown. This engagement was not easy, Bermués and Lorente highlight how in those early democratic days in such a rural part of Spain there was still some remnants of the previous totalitarian military regime (2013, 52). In Hecho there was not a full support from the local government as we saw in the examples of Cuenca and Ayllón. Nowadays, the symposiums are not celebrated anymore but there is still a walking route that goes through the different sculptures that started in the House of Artist, to the rustic country house where the artists lived together and all the way to the mountains.

3.3 – BETWEEN THE 80S AND THE 90S: THE ESTABLISHMENT OF CHANGE

The renovation of Spanish museums, as we have seen in this chapter, was directly linked with the changes in the Spanish central government. If we previously saw examples of centralization and small attempts of regional identification outside of the centralization of the state, with the arrival of the 1980´s and the democracy the situation will be completely upside down. Gilabert Gónzalez selects two events that made possible this change: the first one was the configuration of the Spanish Constitution of 1978, where it was stated that the state and the public power was entitled to promote and safeguard the access to culture to every citizen under the scope of this document. And also that the State and public power will protect and promote the national heritage. The second event was the new political, legal and administrative territorial restructuring that gave the different autonomies within the State more authority (2011, 355). This was translated in new processes of regional identity, in the creation of regional museums that promoted the local art and heritage, a decentralization of the administration, more access to culture for people and the creation of new values and meanings for monuments, artifacts, paintings, and more cultural representations.

In 1982 the socialist party PSOE (Partido Socialista Obrero Español) won the elections and Felipe González was named prime minister, a status that maintained until 1996 when after three wins in a row, he lost the election to the opposite right wing party, Partido Popular. The socialist government believed in culture as the

perfect tool to renovate Spain. The budget for the Ministry of Culture raised more than a 70% and it was mainly dedicated to the improvement of the infrastructure and the staff of the already existing institutions but also to the publicity work (Gilabert González 2011, 358). Thus, every aspect that authors such as Herrera and Nieto claimed necessary for Spanish museums to improve in order to place Spain in the highest museological and cultural level in Europe were being accomplished a decade later. To reinforce those changes the socialist government also implemented new laws that protected the historical heritage. In 1985 the Law on Spanish Historic Heritage was put into action. With this law, every aspect of the cultural heritage was under the protection of the government. In addition, a new definition of the museum was given under the direct influence of ICOM principles (Gilabert González 2011, 359). Under this new legislation, the different Autonomies of Spain had the freedom to implement their own regulation which allowed them to adapt their heritage necessities to their legislation. For example, the Catalonian legislation of 1990 delivers a different understanding of the museum functions than the Andalusian of 1984 but always under the similar guidelines of the National Historic Heritage law, which was reinforced in 1987 with the creation of the Normative for National Museums and the System of Spanish Museums. This is also an example of the regionalism of the democratic Spain.

As we have seen in the examples of Macao and Hong Kong museums of History, the identity processes are one of the most identifiable postmodernist processes in a museum. With the regionalization of Spain and the decentralization of the state during these two decades of socialist government, we will see a process to reclaim the different identities that conform the Spanish state. After decades of the military regime there was a chance to deliver new discourses far from the authorized discourse of the dictatorship. To do so, the new museums that appeared in those times turned themselves to Contemporary art. During the years of Franco, the institutional art and discourse was represented in the Prado Museum. There, one could find the masterpieces of the Golden Age of Spanish Art History, which from Goya to Velázquez they represented the glories of the Spanish past. Paintings such as the *Surrender of Breda* (1634-1635) worked as a reminder of the great empire that Spain once was, one where the "Sun never sets" as the common spanish prays say. Most of the nationalistic ideology of the regime was based on the conception of Spain as an empire that ruled over the world. Contemporary Art became then the escape pod from this type of discourse. In this particular type of artistic expression, individuality is placed over nationality, there is a clear intention to provoke and ultimately, contemporary art is built upon suggestion, every person is invited to have their own understanding of the painting and all of them are valid. In this regard, pieces such as the *Surrender of Breda* were not so inviting. So new institutions were born under this new influences, some of them could be characterized as poststructuralists and postmodernists. The three examples of this first wave of regional contemporary art museums were the Atlantic Centre of Modern Art of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria (CAAM), the Valencian Institute of Modern Art (IVAM) both in 1989 and later the Museum of Contemporary Art of Barcelona (MACBA)

in 1997 (Gilabert González 2011, 366).

The first examples shared more than the same opening year. Both were opened under the recent Historic Heritage Law of 1985 and in both there is an intention to create a dialogue and discussion about their identity and the region that they represent. However, they do this in different ways. The museum of the Canary island tried to deliver a message based upon a triple relation between America, Africa, and Europe. This was well suited with the cultural identity of the region: firstly due to its geographical location the influence of Africa is notable; secondly, the Canary islands were the starting point of Columbus's journey to America and finally the relation to Europe can be identified in the colonial past of the island and the actual status as Spanish Autonomy. On the other hand in the IVAM one found an attempt to study the contradictory meanings of the actual structuration of the Spanish State. In both of them, there was a will to educate through art with the organization of symposiums, the representation of discourses out of the authorized and the promotion of local and regional talents. As the last example, the MACBA follow in a way the path created a few years earlier by the IVAM and the CAAM. By representing Barcelona and Catalonia, the MACBA is representing one of the most relevant regions of Spain. Catalonia, especially Barcelona, was probably the most renowned region of Spain in Europe and the world. Barcelona was a sign of multiculturality, contemporaneity, and tourism. But it was also a symbol for the Catalan identity with roots in the medieval times. Therefore the MACBA situated itself as a new type of museum that is far from the old typology and where the hegemonic discourses had no place.

It is interesting however to analyze if the inclusion could have the same effect as in the Macao or Hong Kong museums. In the case of those museums the new discourse about the chinese past could be seen as the implementation of a new hegemonic discourse. In IVAM, MACBA and CAAM a similar process happened. The regionalist movement that was happening in Spain claimed for a more representative institutions , and to do so the regional authorities found in those museums the perfect tool to represent their own past. What could differentiate both cases is the fact that the Spanish museums were contemporary art museums, and the chinese museums were historical. This difference could be definitive if we talked about the strength of the discourse or message presented. After all in contemporary art museums the pieces displayed are mostly directed to provoke and suggest an individual reaction in the visitor. They are based on the personal experience that the visitor has when is looking at the piece of art. On the contrary in cases such as the chinese the imposition of a new discourse could be simpler. The curatorial decisions and the historic objects presented are the ones telling the story to the visitor. The discourse could be imposed easily in those museums through the absence of objects and the reinforcement of stories. In contemporary art museums this could be harder due to the fact that is expected from the visitor to be the creator of the discourse of the piece. Therefore and if we come back to Foucault's ideas about power relations we can see how the possibility of an unbalanced power relation in the case of Hong Kong and Macao is higher than in the cases of MACBA, IVAM and CAAM. As a final example of this last two decades of the 20th century museology in Spain, I will mention the Reina Sofía Museum. This example mainly differs from the ones analyzed before in its regional aspect. In MACBA,

IVAM and CAAM the spirit of regional and local identity were present, in Reina Sofía however we find a museum created by the National Government that will be the one in charge of delivering the nation´s discourse on contemporary art. As a centerpiece of the Spanish national discourse on Contemporary Art the Reina Sofía will place itself at the top of this new Spanish museums network. The Reina Sofía was born under the already mentioned premise of the cultural renovation of Spain. Regardless the decentralization processes that we observe, the central government in Spain was still strong at the time of the opening of the Reina Sofía thus the necessity for an institution of national and international recognition was a pillar of the socialist government of the PSOE.

The first planning of the museum are from 1980 when the restoration works of the San Carlos Hospital, the actual building of the museum, started. In 1986 the Reina Sofía Art Center opened its gates to the public. Two years later the 535/88 Royal Decree of may 27 stated that the museum was now an autonomous organism with a dependence of the Ministry of Culture which will be reinforced in 1996, as we will see later in the text. However, before 1992 the museum had only presented temporary exhibitions and its in that precise year when the permanent exhibition was opened (www.museoreinasofia.es). The most relevant issue of the creation of the Reina Sofia was the configuration of the collection. Although the Spanish contemporary artist were internationally recognized the structures for displaying this art in Spain were not. The Reina Sofía is the heir of the Spanish Museum of Contemporary Art (MEAC)(Montaner 2005, 113) and its collection. However, this collection was not enough to accomplish the aims of international recognition that the government was looking for. With the support of the Ministry of Culture and the increased budget for cultural expenses, the museum started to acquired masterpieces from the most recognizable Spanish artist. The most relevant addition to the collection was Picasso's *Guernica* which was located at the time in Prado Museum. This piece represents the bombing of the vasque city of Guernica by the Germana aircraft during the Spanish Civil War. This symbolizes the importance that the Reina Sofía was gaining and that with the time will definitely acquire in the structure of Spanish museums situating itself at the top, therefore, displacing other museums such as El Prado.

This shift its not made by chance, we pointed out that El Prado Museum was the main reference in museological issues during the dictatorship and with the opening of the Reina Sofía the new democratic governments saw a chance to deconstruct the national discourse given until that moment and rephrase it in new meanings. To do so the museum was built under some of the postmodernist ideas that we saw in earlier parts of this thesis. The main aims and functions of the museum are specified in the foundation statutes:

Promote the access and knowledge of modern and contemporary art to the public in its diverse manifestations and help to the social communication of plastic arts.[...] Promote the knowledge,

The diffusion and communication of the pieces and cultural identity of artistic heritage and develop didactic activities regarding its content. [...] Contribute to the formation and improvement of the museum technicians. (Ministerio para las Administraciones Públicas 1996, 3)

This translation of an extract of the statutes of foundation proves that the intention behind the creation of the Reina Sofía was mainly educational. The aim to spread knowledge about modern and contemporary art was the ground where to build this new institution. Another pillar was engaging with the public. The visitor in postmodernism is no longer a spectator but an actor that looks to be a part of the museum and the Reina Sofia acknowledges that by promoting the inclusion and the access to art for the visitors from its statutes. In conclusion, the Reina Sofía, in its national scope, and the other examples given each one of them in its own regional or local area are examples of how the changes initiated in the 1970's were implemented. The new democratic government, especially the socialist PSOE, invested a great effort in making it possible. The restructuring of these two decades started from the legislation with royal decrees and law, after that the implementation and creation of new administrative structures such as the Spanish Museum Network under the direct management of the Ministry of Culture and finally the opening of new and contemporary institutions. This processes would have been unattainable without the direct influence of postmodernism. In this sense, the postmodernist ideas and poststructuralist on discourse, identity, and public engagement played a vital role. The attempts to recover regional identities through museums helped to the revitalization of oppressed discourses by the military regime, such as the Catalan, shows the decentralization that Spain lived on those years. To reinforce these new discourses and meanings those institutions trusted on the educational and didactic activities as the key to success.

3.4 – THE NEW CENTURY AND THE ECONOMIC CRISIS

With the new century, the museological context in Spain stabilized. The institutions that were created in the earlier decades, both administrative and museistic, were maintained and some of them even improved as I will show later on the text. However, changes did happen in the government where the classic Spanish right party, the Partido Popular (PP) took over the socialist by winning the two elections in 1996 and 2004. The following years to this government were marked by the global economic crisis which had a huge impact in the Spanish society. In this last section of the case study I will try to analyze to what extent the changes based on postmodernist ideas have still some impact in Spanish museology. Before the economic crisis of the last years

of the 2010 decade, some of the most relevant Spanish museums were renovated but as I said the effects of the crisis were devastating for Spanish economy which influenced directly to the budget of the Ministry of Culture. In this sense, I believe important to draw a picture of the status which museums were during those times.

From 1996 to 2004 José María Aznar, leader of the right wing party Partido Popular, was the prime minister of Spain. In the cultural aspect and more specifically in the museological context his policy focused mainly in the renovation of the most relevant museums of the capital. The architectonic renovations of the Reina Sofía museum and El Prado museum were the main museological enterprises of this period. In both museums, there was an enlargement of the museum space with the addition of new buildings and the restoration of adjacent buildings. In the case of the Reina Sofía Museum, added a new building was designed by the architect Jean Nouvel. With this new building, there is not only a change in the inside dynamic of the museum but also on the outside. In the inside, the museum adds a large space with a multifunctional objective with no barriers. The new addition is the characterization of the new conception of the museum as something with no constraints and that is modifiable and adaptable (Montaner 2005, 114). Something similar happens with the outside of the building, the large new space of the interior of the museum has its counterpart in the outside with the creation of a public place.

 The creation of this new space by the reorganization of the buildings turned the museum into an urban actor capable of shaping the space around itself (www.museoreinasofia.es 2019). This relates to the idea of a new museum capable of being an active part of the society, as the postmodernists claimed. Now the museum has become a center of social activity not only inside the walls of the building but also outside. Something similar happened to the Prado museum. In 1998 the project of Rafael Moneo, one of the main specialists in museum architecture of Spain at the time, began (Montaner 2005, 116). The difference with the Reina Sofia will be in the type of the extension. If in the case of the Reina Sofia there was a construction of a new building from the start, in the Prado Museum we will see how the project was based on the adaptation of already existing buildings. The nearby buildings such as the Jeronimo´s building were renovated and included in the museum structure creating something similar to a university campus (Montaner 2005, 117). In both cases, the renovation of the museums answered to the necessity of adapting them to the new century.

Changes were not happening only in the main museums, as we have seen in earlier examples outside of the capital different and innovative projects were being carried. In these projects artists and museums had more freedom to carry out new practices and types of exhibitions and displays. One of the examples of these innovative projects that appeared in the first decade of the 2000s was inside of the Fundació Pilar y Joan Miró (Pilar and Joan Miró Foundation) at Palma de Mallorca, capital of the Balearic Islands. There the foundation offered since 1996 scholarships destined to the organization of different workshops within the museum. The

workshops were thought from an educative aspect and aimed to school children from ages 6 to 14. In this example the workshop was called *Sotaiart,* and offered a mix between the japanese art of sotai with a new understanding of the work of Joan Miró. What makes interesting this example according to Rodrigo Montero (2007) is the use of the museum space. The different activities that the workshop offered were carried in the less common spaces of the museum. Hiromu Saiki, sotai artist and men in charge of the workshop used spaces like corridors, entrances or passing-by areas to carry out the activities. These spaces are called *interstices,* the term derived from marxist theory and defines those blank spaces that industrial workers used to carry out social activities (Montero, 2007, 98). In the sotai art example the interstices are transformed from blank and flat spaces to dynamic and outreaching areas. The aim was to create a counternarrative to the official discourse of the museum (Montero, 2007,100) , being this process always under the supervision of museum officials. These could be understood as a derridean deconstruction of the discourse presented in the collection of Joan Miró by the sotai artist. In addition, education was also one of the pillars of this project. The targeted age group was children with the aim to educate them in *sotai* art but also in the work of Joan Miró.

Sotai is a a japanese art related with body position and body balance. All of the activities presented in the workshop were also destined to active participation of the children. One of them for example consisted in the creation of a `garden´ through activities such as water painting, creation of sculptures base on equilibrium or building columns from pieces of wood. All of these activities were considered artistic but also helped the children to improve their body language. Also the materials used in the creation of this garden were extracted from some of the works of Joan Miró. What this example shows is that in the early 2000s the understandings of museums in Spain were shifting. The Joan Miró Foundation understood that and opened its gates to new types of representation. With the sotai art a new type of discourse was delivered, the work of Miró was deconstructed and presented in its own museum from a different perspective and from a different location. There were also new uses for museum spaces, allowing more dynamism and flexibility to the institution. However, as we have said this process was always under the direct supervision of the Foundation and every part of the workshop was agreed beforehand, this again shows that the relations of power between institution and artist in terms of discourse creation and especially implementation were still very present.

Following this example of introducing new practices in museums I will now turn the analysis to the introduction of voices. To do so, I will come back to the feminist topic started in the second chapter and relate it with the practices that have been going on in Spain. One of the most relevant exhibitions about feminism that has been done in Spain in the last decades is the one called *The feminist revolution.* The exhibition took place in 2012 in the already mentioned Reina Sofía museum and was an account of the different feminist and women artworks done in Spain from 1962 to 1982. The goal of the exhibition was something similar to what we saw in Linda Nochlin´s *Women artists, 1550-1950* in the beginning of the second chapter, it was an revision of the spanish women and feminist artwork that was overlooked during that period. In this case the time frame selected for the context of the exhibition is very relevant. Is during those decades when the feminist

movement start to develop in the anglo-saxon context, especially relevant to it was the essentialist feminist movement in the 1970s, movement centered in the female body as a tool against oppression (Rivera Martorell, 2013, 111). The influence of this movements and the ones that came after like the *queer* theory or postcolonial feminism was slowly introduced in Spain. Thus, in that period relevant artwork was done by women, and this exhibition aimed to show it to the people. However, the critique that we pointed out in the second chapter was present in this case. Authors such as Rivera Martorell (2013) and Albero Verdú question the ways that the feminist art was showed and displayed in museums and especially in the particular case of *The Feminist Revolution.*

Along with this thesis various examples about the implementation of discourses in museums of new voices have been discussed. In this case, the process is similar to the one presented in the Ration Shed Museum. There is an attempt to introduce female voices and especially those representing the feminist movement in the scope of the Reina Sofía. The problematic appears again in the ways that those voices are included. Rivera Martorell argues that despite this exhibition was a a step forward in the inclusion of female and feminist voices in the art discourse it was not enough and was also misguided (2013, 111-112). She argued that the pieces displayed were not contextualized properly and that sometimes were shown only due to the fact that were made by women. In addition, other relevant pieces were not even displayed, such as *Discriminació de la dona* (1977) a piece from Eulália Grau about the division of roles in the male and female scope. This shows the flaws in the construction of a proper and contextualized feminist discourse. The attempt to create a micro-narrative or micro-discourse only about feminist art provoked that the final result of that process was not fully representative of the reality of a movement such as feminism is. The fact that pieces were out of context, not related to each other, and sometimes not even representing feminist ideas were the main cause of the lack of strength of the discourse presented in this room. Therefore, this is an example of how the postmodernist precept of inclusion could be wrongly used. It is not enough to include those oppressed voices in to the discourse just for the fact that are oppressed, it needs to be done in a proper manner so the result is clear and fully understandable. Therefore changes in museum´s discourses must be accomplished but not at all cost.

That continuous process of change and adaptation that museums have been suffering in Spain since the 70s and 80s of the last century was not isolated and, therefore, it is not particular of Spain. This process had been occurring across the whole globe since the spreading of postmodernism. If we go back to the early mentioned author Hooper-Greenhill and its concept of post-museum (2000) we see how well suited it is to this new wave of Spanish Museums. The introduction of new narratives and the creation of new spaces for dialogue between the institution and the public in a non-hierarchical relation started to be visible in the Spanish contemporary museology. However, this never-ending adaptation have raised some concerns about the direction that museums are taking. We have seen how there deconstruction of hierarchical power relations could be tricky and also in Kjelbaek (2016) and Guilbaut (2005) how most of these concerns are mainly related to the inclusion of museums into the economic sphere and the transformation of the institutions in commercial franchises.

Spain is no stranger to those concerns and authors such as Luz María Gilabert Gozález (2016) have identified this process as the last turn that Spanish museology has taken. As a participatory institution, the post-museum is no longer isolated from society. The character of being just a displayer of objects is long gone. In this sense is understandable that museums nowadays are directly influenced by the economic market (Gilabert González 2016) and as an extension, the internal policies and strategies that museums follow and implement are equally influenced by this. Especially since the arrival of the new millennium, museums and cultural management have shifted towards a market economy where the most relevant issue is the number of visitors and income. This can be summarized in a very particular process that is the franchising of the world top museums. The Hermitage of Moscow and its franchise in The Netherlands, the Rijksmuseum and its franchises all over The Netherlands as well are some of the European examples. Spain is also part of this with the opening of its own franchise of the Guggenheim in Bilbao in 1997. The Guggenheim, a contemporary art museum can be considered as part of the first wave of contemporary art post museums in Spain as Gilabert states (2011, 370) with the already mentioned IVAM or MACBA. The difference with those examples is that the Guggenheim is part of a bigger network that can be identified as `commercial museums´. In this commercialized museums, the main aim is to reach the public, connect with them but mainly provide them with what they want. In other words, these museums are bound to public´s like or dislike in order to attract a great number of visitors. This main critique of the franchise-type postmodern museums can be analyzed from two different perspectives. The first one is directly related to public engagement and visitors experience and inclusion. By attending to the public demanding and becoming an institution highly adaptable content-related, the museum can be much more reachable for the public and the chances of involving visitors in the discussion are higher but the museum subverts to the economy. On the other hand, the second approach to this is the possible loss of the own identity of the museum. By attending the demands of the public, the museum is losing its personality and the message and discourse that tries to send to the society fade in favor to the daily tastes of people (Gilabert González 2016, 148). Spanish museums are now in the middle of this dichotomy. And the question that arises from it is: *How museums can maintain its identity without giving it away to the economy market?* The best way to tackle this problematic, Gilabert González (2016, 156) argues, is to create museum networks controlled by the state or regional powers. By creating these networks with horizontal structure there will be a safeguarding of the institution as a cultural institution that does not bend to economic fluctuations. The public engagement will still be mandatory but in cultural terms and not economically, the aim is not to sell the museum as a thematic park but to create an institution where the visitors are encouraged to visit and participate culturally. Another characteristic of these networks will be the cooperation of different museums with each other with the aim of supporting the smaller institutions and help to its development. Most of these networks are based on regional areas such as the Galician System of Museums or the Regional System of Museums of Madrid (Gilabert González 2016, 157). Basically what the networks do, is provide a secure area of development for the institutions that take part in. By supporting each other the museums of the networks can be culturally

active and public engagers without subverting to the economic market. This was an attempt to locate the museum as an institution outside of the power of economic revenues. However, the economic crisis that started in 2008 proved this wrong. The critical situation of many museums in terms of budget and visitors showed that nowadays that this institution is not only in Spain but also in the rest of the world part of the market economy and that whether we like or not museums must play under its rules in order to survive.

Currently, Spanish museums are suffering again a period of change. The effects of the economic crisis are slowly disappearing and the Spanish economy is slowly recovering A new institution is being shaped after the crisis. Museum professionals have realized that the market economy is nowadays one of the principal parts of the cultural world. In Spain culture has become a business that aims to be integrated into one of the principal sectors of the Spanish economy: tourism. The cultural tourism is growing in Spain but also in most of the European countries and with it, the museums. The future of the institution resides in how well will be able to integrate that type of public, the cultural tourist, in the museological discourse. We have pointed out how thin is the line between serving to public demands in terms of content and at the same time offer a critical and engaging discourse and enslaving the content of the institution to a global economy where the museum revenues are more important than the content. In this sense, Spanish museums are still sailing on uncertain waters. Projects such as the ampliation of Prado Museum and the Reina Sofía have created in the core of Madrid an area dedicated to cultural consumption together with the museum Thyssen-Bornemizsa around the Paseo de Castellana (Montaner 2005, 17). Within a reasonable distance the cultural tourist can find three of the biggest museums in Spain. This makes it easier for tourists to visit all three of them and not having to pick between them.

As a final note to this study case of the evolution and development of Spanish museums and museology from the mid-twentieth century until after the crisis we should try to look forward into the future of the institution in Spain. If the aim of the scholars of the 70s and 80s, represented on the works of Gaya Nuño, Nieto or Herrera Escudero was to create an academic and educational base where museology could grow in Spain the aim of the current scholars is to understand how museums can be part of the globalized society without losing its identity. The globalization tendency is spreading more and more every day throughout every aspect of society. From the economy to the culture, society is becoming global which means that is interconnected in one way or another. The future of the Spanish museums will, in my opinion, be marked by how well they are able to integrate this globalizing process into their own discourse and also on how they will confront the issues related to the inclusion of new voices and the deconstruction of discourses. By doing this, new meanings will be created that will enrich the discourse and narratives provided in the institutions. Public and visitor engagement should continue to be the principal strategy to create those new meanings. The growth of cultural tourism will make this process transnational and multicultural. The meanings and narratives will no longer be caged in

national borders, on the contrary, there will be spread all over the globe influencing other meanings and narratives in other parts of the world. Globalization will mean for Spanish museums the inclusion of and acceptance of narratives never considered before that will shape a new identity, both culturally and socially.

CONCLUSION

Throughout the different chapters of this master thesis the central topic that has been discussed has been the creative processes of historical discourses in museums. My ultimate goal with this research was to understand how societies construct, implement and narrate historical discourses in museums. As it has been shown along the text this is a very complex process affected by multitude of different influences. From those influences, I picked those which in my opinion where the most relevant. The postmodernist and poststructuralist ideas, theories and methodologies presented in the first chapter of this thesis have been a constant reference to the examples given in the rest of the chapters. The main motivation to analyze this complex process was to know better why societies decide to construct and implement a type of discourse above others. What are the reasons and influences that affected the construction of the historical discourse and how that historical discourse is presented in an institution such as the museum. I realized that in this process multitude actors, factors and interest are deeply intertwined. It is this complexity what made this thesis something challenging.

Postmodernism and poststructuralism have been proved as the ground where the current discourse creation process takes place. In that sense, it was mandatory to make a brief overview of both methodologies. Thanks to this first chapter the examples given in the rest of the text have all a common meeting point where it was possible to compare the characteristics of every example and evaluate the influence that postmodernism and poststructuralism had in them. The outcome of this comparaisons, especially in the examples given in the second chapter proves that both methodologies and the main authors related to them were direct influences for the development of historical discourses. Authors such as Foucault or Derrida influenced a generation of museum professionals that started to change the museum from within. As we have seen with the arrival of New Museology not only the historical discourse was affected but also displays and even the architecture of museums started to change. This influence is still strong in current museology and new developments such as the extensions of Spanish museums mentioned in the third chapter prove it. The influence of this methodologies have been proved beneficial in some of the examples presented in this text such as the feminist case or the Ration Shed Museum, however, on other cases the use of this methodologies did not have the presumed outcome, for example in the case of Hong Kong and Macao museums. This also shows that in the complex process of discourse creation postmodernism and poststructuralism also have limits, and they are

not always the only solution. Identifying those limits must be the ultimate goal of the future creative process for historical discourses. For example in the case of the earlier mentioned museum we saw how a hegemonic discourse was substituted by other one with similar characteristics, in this case the aim for including the chinese voices in the museum discourse led to a new chinese hegemonic discourse.

Once was acknowledged that poststructuralism and postmodernism were big influences for the changes in the construction of historical discourses in museums but the had limits is it possible to really identify to what extent were influential. In order to see the level of influence that could have had those methodologies in museums I had to choose a narrow context. By doing this, it was much simpler to show in which areas postmodernist and poststructuralist theories had more effect. In the third chapter I analyzed the developments of Spanish museology during the last century and the decades of the current century. Having in mind that postmodernism and poststructuralism were influential but that they also had limits I managed to identify few processes that could be related to them. For example the feminists practices in Reina Sofia Museum or the Open Air museum of Hecho could perfectly related to the rise of feminism under postmodernism in the 1907s and the changes of museum architectures and displays derived from the new postmodern conceptions of museum spaces. On the other hand, processes such as the impulse of regionalism in Spain could be related to other influences such as decentralization of the state after the disappearance of the military regime. It is true that this could also be related to the creation of new identities and the revitalization of oppressed voices that postmodernist defend, but not as a direct influence of postmodernism.

Therefore postmodernism and poststructuralism played a big role in the developments of museums and New Museology, in Spain but also in the rest of the world. This process is still ongoing and is subverted to multiple influences that are reshaping understandings and meanings in museums constantly. Discourses in museums are the ultimate result of this changes and we must understand them as what they are, representations of our past constructed under our premises and ideologies. In that sense this research could open some new approaches in the understanding of historical discourses in museums, especially in the Spanish museology, which is still very influenced by Franco's dictatorship. In conclusion, the construction of historical discourse should be seen as a representation of the whole society, should be inclusive and engaging. To be so, it must be under constant self-critique and self- examination by the society, which in a sense will mean that those communities will be self-critiquing and self-examining themselves continuously.

ABSTRACT

The construction of the historical discourse within museums has always been one of the key issues of discussion in the study of such an institution. Since its inception, museums have been considered as mirrors of the society and therefore carriers of the historical discourse of a town, nation or society. With the rise of Postmodernism the based where the museums and, particularly, the construction of historical discourses inside them started to shattered. The main purpose of this master thesis is to analyze and study the key postmodern concepts that influenced the changes in museums and museology that we are now witnessing. In order to evaluate the real influence that those ideas have had in contemporary museums this thesis will be based on the study of Spanish museology as case study. The choosing of this country is built upon the fact that the most relevant museological developments in Spain took place almost at the same time as the spread of postmodernist thinking throughout Europe, therefore Spain is a great example to understand how influential was postmodernism in that regard.

La construcción del discurso histórico en los museos ha sido siempre uno de los principales temas de discusión en el estudio de dicha institución. Desde el inicio del museo como institución, siempre se le ha considerado como un espejo de la sociedad. Y no solo eso, si no también un representante del discurso histórico de una localidad, nación o sociedad. Con el desarrollo del Postmodernismo la base sobre la que se construían los museos, más particularmente el discurso histórico que en ellos se presentaba, se empezó a tambalear. El objetivo de este Trabajo de Fin de Máster es analizar y entender los conceptos claves del postmodernismo que influenciaron los cambios en los museos y la museología de los cuales ahora somos testigo. Para ello esta tesis tomará como ejemplo el caso de los museos españoles. La elección de dicho ejemplo está basada en el hecho de que los principales cambios en la museología española coincidieron en el tiempo con el máximo auge del posmodernismo en Europa. Por lo tanto, España está considerada en esta tesis como un gran ejemplo para entender hasta qué punto el postmodernismo pudo influenciar el desarrollo de un nuevo tipo de museología y de construcción del discurso histórico en museos.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albero Verdú, S. A. ,2017. *La perspectiva de género en el ámbito educativo de los museos y centros de arte españoles*. Navarra (Phd Thesis Universidad Pública de Navarra)

Barker, R. and Smithen, P. , 2008. *New art, new challenges: the changing face of conservation in the twenty-first century* in *New museum theory and practice an introduction*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd. 85–10

Barrett, J. , 2012. *The museum as public space*.

Barthes, R. , 1977. *Image, music, text*. London: Fontana.

Beier-de Haan, R. ,2006. Re-staging histories and identities, in *A companion to museum studies*, *Blackwell companions in cultural studies ; 12*. Malden, MA ; Oxford: Blackwell Pub, 124–30

Bellido Blanco, A. ,2005. Renovación museológica en España durante los años setenta, in *Revista de La Asociación Profesional de Museólogos de España*, 329–45.

Bennett, T. ,1995. *The birth of the museum: history, theory, politics*. London; New York: Routledge.

Besley, A.C. 2013. 'Foucault: the culture of self, subjectivity and truth-telling practices', in *The Edinburgh companion to poststructuralism*. Edinburgh University Press, 227–46

Bermués Sanz, J.I. and Lorente Lorente, P. , 2013. The open air museum of sculpture in Hecho(Huesca): output of a hippie utopia of conviviality. On the waterfront, 26, 48-68

Jefatura del Estado Español, 1987, BOE- Boletín Oficial del Estado, disposiciones generales, 30149- 30149.

Butler, C. , 2002. *Postmodernism: a very short introduction.* A Very Short Introduction. Oxford University Press.

Cameron, D.F. , 1992. Getting out of our skin: museums and a new identity, in *Muse* 10(2 3), 7–15.

Choat, S. ,2013.'From Marxism to Poststructuralism, in *The Edinburgh companion to poststructuralism*. Edinburgh University Press, 47–68

Clifford, J. , 1997. Museums as contact zones, in *Routes: travel and translation in the late twentieth century*, edited by James Clifford. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 188–219

Clover, D. E., Sanford K., Johnson K., and Bell L., 2016, Adult education and exhibitory practice within and beyond museum and art gallery wall*. Journal of Adult and Continuing Education* 22(2), 113–116.

Crane, S. A. ,2006, The conundrum of ephemerality: time, memory and museums,   in *A companion to museum studies*, *Blackwell companions in cultural studies ; 12*. Malden, MA : Oxford: Blackwell Pub, 74–79

Crooke, E., 2007 *Museums and community: ideas, issues and challenges*. London [etc.]: Routledge.

Crow, J. ,   2011. The Mapuche museum of Cañete (1968–2010): Decolonising the Gaze. *Journal of Latin American Cultural Studies* 20(2), 161–78.

Cutler, A., 2013. The museum of now, in *The Edinburgh companion to poststructuralism*. Edinburgh University Press, 352–67

Davis, P., 2007, Place exploration: museums, identity, community, in *Museums and their communities*, *Leicester readers in Museum studies*. Routledge, 53–75

Deepwell, K., 2008, Feminist curatorial strategies and practices since the 1970S, in *New museum theory and practice an introduction*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 62–84

Dillet, B., Mackenzie I., and Porter, R., 2013, *The Edinburgh companion to Poststructuralism*. Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.

Foucault, M., 1965, *Madness and civilization: A history of insanity in the age of reason*. London [etc.]: Tavistock.

Foucault, M., 1970, The archaeology of knowledge *Social Science Information/Information Sur Les Sciences Sociales* 9(1):175–85.

Foucault, M., 1972a, *The archaeology of knowledge and the discourse on language*. New York, N.Y.: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. , 1972b, *The archaeology of knowledge and the discourse on language*. New York, N.Y.: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. ,2006, *History of Madness*. London [etc.]: Routledge.

Fyfe, G., 2006, Sociology and the social aspects of museums in *A companion to museum studies*, *Blackwell companions in cultural studies ; 12*. Malden, MA ; Oxford: Blackwell Pub, 37–46

Gilabert González, L. M., 2011, *La gestión de museos: análisis de las políticas museísticas en la Península Ibérica*, Murcia (Phd Thesis. Universidad de Murcia).

Gilabert González, L. M. , 2016, Economía y gestión: reflexiones sobre las políticas de los museos públicos en España. *Cuadernos de Arte de La Universidad de Granada* 47, 147–64.

Gómez-Moreno, M. E., 1955, *Anuario-Guía de los museos de España*. Ministerio de Educación Nacional. Madrid: Dirección General de Bellas Artes.

Grau Lobo, L. , 2015-2016, Museo del pueblo. Una pequeña remembranza. *Revista de La Subdirección General de Museos Estatales,* 11, 251-261.

Goulding, C., Saren ., and Pressey A., 2018, "Presence" and "absence" in themed heritage'. *Annals of Tourism Research* 71, 25–38.

Guilbaut, S., 2015, Museum ad nauseam? Museums in the post-modern labyrinth . *Perspective. Actualité En Histoire de l'art* (2).

Hardy, N., 2013, A History of the method: examining Foucault´s research and methodology, in *The Edinburgh companion to poststructuralism*. Edinburgh University Press, 96–121.

Harrison, R., 2009, What is heritage?, in *Understanding the politics of heritage*. Manchester University Press, 5–42.

Herle, A., 1997, Museum , politics and representation. *Journal of Museum Ethnography* (9), 65–78.

Hernández Hernández, F., 2013, Líneas de investigación en la museología española. *IBICT*, 344–57.

Hernández Hernández, F.. 2015a. Evolución de la teoría museológica en España, in Aula Inaugural do Programa de Pós- Graduação em Museologia e Patrimônio-UNIRIO/MAST, Rio de Janeiro: Museologia e Patrimônio - Revista Eletrônica do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Museologia e Patrimônio - Unirio | MAST, 143–67.

Hernández Hernández, F., 2015b, La Museología: entre la tradición y la Posmodernidad. *Complutum*, 9–26.

Herrera Escudero, M. L., 1971, *El museo en la educación : su origen, evolución e importancia en la cultura moderna*. Madrid: Index.

Hernández Fraile, P. , 1987, Museo pedagógico Nacional . *Boletín de la ANABAD,* tomo 37, 4, 615-640

Hooper-Greenhill, E., 1992, *Museums and the shaping of knowledge*. London [etc.]: Routledge.

Hooper-Greenhill, E., 2000, Changing values in the art museum: rethinking communication and learning. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 6(1), 9–31.

Kaplan, F. S. , 1994, *Museums and the making of 'ourselves': the role of objects in national identity*. London; New York; New York: Leicester University Press ; Distributed in the U.S. and Canada by St. Martin's Press.

Kaplan, F. S., 2006, Making and remaking National identities, in *A companion to museum studies*, *Blackwell companions in cultural studies ; 12*. Malden, MA ; Oxford: Blackwell Pub, 103–14 .

Keene, S., 2006 All that is solid?: museums and the postmodern. *Public Archaeology* 5(3), 185–97.

Keurs, P., 2011, Museums between Enlightenment and Romanticism. Early nineteenth century roots and modern practices. *Putting University Collections to Work in Teaching and Research* , 11–20.

Kjeldbaek, E., 2016, Post-Modernism and the three generations of museums. *Nordisk Museologi* 0(1–2), 119-126.

Lacan, J., 1980, *Écrits: a selection*. London: Tavistock Publications.

Lévi-Strauss, C. , 1963, *Structural anthropology*. New York, N.Y., [etc.]: Basic Books.

Lidchi, H., 1997 The poetics and the politics on exhibiting other cultures, in *Representation: cultural representations and signifying practices*. London: Sage in association with the Open University, 120–91 .

Lindauer, Margaret, 2008, The critical museum visitor, in *New museum theory and practice an introduction*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 203–5 .

Lorente, J. P., 2015, Current museological strategies related to critical museology. *Complutum* 26, 11–120.

Lorente Lorente, J. P.,. 1998 , Los nuevos museos de arte moderno y contemporáneo bajo el franquismo. *Anagrama*, 295–313.

Lubar, S., 2007, Exhibiting memories, in *Museums and their communities*, Leicester readers in Museum studies. Routledge, 398–405 .

Lundy, C. 2013. From structuralism to poststructuralism, in *The Edinburgh companion to poststructuralism*. Edinburgh University Press, 70–92 .

Macdonald, S., 2006, *A companion to museum studies*. Malden, MA ; Oxford: Blackwell Pub.

Macdonald, S., 2007, Exhibitions of power and powers of exhibition. Introduction to the politics of display, in *Museums and their communities*, *Leicester readers in Museum studies*. Routledge, 177–96

Macdonald, S., 2015, Is "difficult heritage" still "difficult"?. *Museum International* 67(1–4),6–22.

Marstine, J., 2006, *New Museum theory and practice an introduction*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Marstine, J., Bauer, A. A., and Haines, C., 2011, New directions in museum ethics. *Museum Management and Curatorship* 26(2), 91–95.

Mason, R., 2006, Cultural theory and museum studies in *A companion to museum studies*, Blackwell companions in cultural studies *; 12*. Malden, MA ; Oxford: Blackwell Pub, 28–36.

Mcdavid, C., 2002, Archaeologies that hurt: descendant that matter: A pragmatic approach to collaboration

in the public interpretation of African- American archaeology'. *World Archaeology* 34(No. 2), 303–14.

McLean, F., 1997, *Marketing the museum*. London ; New York: Routledge.

Mctavish, L., 2008, Visiting the virtual museum: art and experience online in *New museum theory and practice an introduction*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 226–46 .

Ministerio para las Administraciones Públicas, 1996, Real Decreto 318/1996,de 23 de Febrero,. Vol. BOE-A-1996-5937. https://www.boe.es/buscar/pdf/1996/BOE-A-1996-5937-consolidado.pdf accessed on 5 may 2019

Montaner, J. M., 2005, La renovación arquitectónica de los museos de Madrid. *Museos.Es: Rervista de La Subdirección General de Museos Estatales*, 112–21.

Morente del Monte, M., 2007, Museo y patrimonio. Del objeto a la planificación estratégica. *Revista de La Subdirección General de Museos Estatales* (3), 16–32.

Nieto Gallo, G.. and Archiveros y Arqueólogos, 1973, *Panorama de los museos españoles y cuestiones museológicas*. Madrid: Asociación Nacional de Bibliotecarios, Archiveros y Arqueólogos.

Nuño, J. A. G., 1955, *Historia y Guía de Los Museos de España*. Espasa-Calpe.

Phillips, J. W., 2013, Derrida, deconstruction and method,in *The Edinburgh companion to poststructuralism*. Edinburgh University Press, 122–42 .

Rivera Martorell, S. 2013, *El arte feminista y su exhibición: la musealización de un conflicto. El caso del Museo Nacional Centro de Arte reina Sofía*, in Encrucijada: revista crítica de ciencias sociales 3 , 106 – 120

Rodrigo Montero, J. , 2007, *Sotaiart: critical practices in museums with interstices*. Arte, individuo y sociedad, 9, 95-116.

Ruiz de Lacanal, M. D., 1995, *El conservador de museos en la primera mitad del siglo XX: conservadores de monumentos, jefes y directores, anticuarios y arqueólogo*s ANABAD 2, 117–31.

de Saussure, F.,Bally, C., Sechehaye A., Reidlinger A., and Baskin W., 1960, Course in general linguistics. *The Journal of American Folklore* 73(289),274.

Shelton, A.A., 2006, in *Museums and anthropologies: practices and narratives*. Blackwell companions in cultural studies *; 12*. Malden, MA ; Oxford: Blackwell Pub,55–63

Silvén, E., 2010, Difficult matters. Museums, materiality, multivocality , in *The Museum as a forum actor*. Stockholm: The museum of national antiquities, Stockholm Studies, 122–46.

Smith, C., 2014, Post-Modernising the museum: the ration shed . *Historical encounters: A journal of historical consciousness, historical cultures, and history education* 1(1),32–49.

Smith, L. T., 1999, Research Adventures on Indigenous Land, Pp. 78–93 in *Decolonizing methodologies . Research and indigenous peoples*. Zed Books, 122–46

Thompson, J. M. A. and The Museums Association, 1984, *Manual of curatorship: A guide to museum Practice*. London [etc.]: Butterworths.

Valdés Sagués, C., 2008, La difusión una función del museo. *Museos.es: revista de la subdirección general de museos estatales* (4), 64–75.

Vergo, P., 1989. *The new museology*. London: Reaktion Books.

Walsh, K., 2002, *The representation of the past museums and heritage in the Post-Modern World*. Hoboken: Taylor and Francis.

Watson, S., 2007, *Museums and Their Communities*. Routledge.

Weil, S., The museum and the public , in *Museums and their communities*, *Leicester readers in Museum studies*. 2007: Routledge, 32–46

Wieczorek, M., 2015, Postmodern exhibition discourse: anthropological study of an art display Case'. *Journal of Science and Technology of the Arts* 7(2):19–24.

www.museoreinasofia.es. 2019. 'Museo Reina Sofía'. *Museoreinasofia.Es*. (https://www.museoreinasofia.es/museo/historia) accessed on 10 may 2019

Zhang, C. X., Honggen Xiao, H., Morgan, N., and Phong Ly, T., 2018, Politics of memories: identity construction in museums. *Annals of Tourism Research* 73. 116–130.