



# Latin American Arts for Inclusive Cities

---

## Seminar report

Arts & Culture for Inclusive Cities  
Latin America – Europe

22 June 2016

BOZAR – Centre for Fine Arts Brussels

---

Funded by



Implemented by



**BO  
ZAR**

This paper reflects the views only of the project Consortium, and the European Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



## Programme

### 21 JUNE

---

Arrival of participants to Brussels

18:30

Dinner

### 22 JUNE

---

08:30

Arrival to the venue & coffee

09:00 – 10:00

Welcome address & introduction by Mr. Jean-Paul Joulia  
Aims and methodology by Mr. Paul Dujardin & Ms. Mercedes Giovinazzo

10:00 - 11:00

**1<sup>st</sup> Panel: Arts & Cultural Policies for Inclusive Cities: From Theory to Practice (10' each speaker + 30' debate)**  
**Keynote speakers: Mr. Martí Perán & Ms. Paulina Varas**  
**Moderator: Mr. Pep Dardanyà**

*"Why do we talk about theory? The 'From Theory to Practice' debate concerns the way in which discourses of public- and community-based artistic practices are constructed, and from the meaning and use that is given to the concepts implemented in differing contexts."*

11:00 - 12:30

2 Working groups, with Mr. Pep Dardanyà & Mr. Conrado Uribe (moderators) and Mr. Fred Danilo Palacio & Ms. Mieke de Bock (rapporteurs)

12:30 - 13:30

Lunch

13:30 - 14:30

**2<sup>nd</sup> Panel: Arts & Cultural Policies for Inclusive Cities: From Practice to Theory (10' each speaker + 30' debate)**  
**Keynote speakers: Mr. Francisco Paillé & Ms. Marjetica Potrč**  
**Moderator: Ms. Conrado Uribe**

*"What can art do as a practice? Artistic practices related to the public sphere, configuration of self-organisation and relationship spaces, dialogic and community processes, and the urban environment, among others, are strategies that not only have representative capacities but also allow for the construction of knowledge and critical thinking with regard to hegemonic models."*

14:30 - 16:00

2 Working groups, with Mr. Pep Dardanyà & Mr. Conrado Uribe (moderators) and Mr. Fred Danilo Palacio & Ms. Mieke de Bock (rapporteurs)

16:00 - 16:30

Break



16:30 - 17:30

Plenary session & closing remarks

***Conclusions by Ms. Mercedes Giovinazzo, Mr. Pep Dardanyà and Mr. Conrado Uribe***

## Participants

### From Latin America

Mr. Carlos Cadena Gaitán, Representative of the collective “La Ciudad Verde”, Colombia

Mr. Carlos Uribe Uribe, Anthropologist, artist and curator. Director General of the Eduardo León Jimenes Cultural Centre and Former Director of the Moravia Cultural Development Centre of Medellin, Colombia. Speaker Open Debate.

Mr. Conrado Uribe, Curator, researcher and editor. Artistic Director of LOOP Festival of Barcelona. Former Chief Curator at Museo de Antioquia, Colombia. Moderator.

Mr. Edgar Endress, Artist and Assistant Professor at the George Mason University, USA. Speaker Open Debate.

Mr. Francisco Paillè, Co-founder and Director of Dérive LAB, Mexico. Keynote speaker 2<sup>nd</sup> Panel.

Mr. Fred Danilo Palacio, Musician, philosopher and cultural manager. Assistant at the Department of Student Welfare of the University of Antioquia, Colombia. Reporter.

Mr. Gustavo Ramirez, Representative of the collective “LAAL vaca”, Mexico

Mr. Kiko Mayorga, Representative of the “Escuelab” project, Peru

### From Europe

Ms. Ailbhe Murphy, Director of Create, National Development Agency for Collaborative Arts in Ireland. Visual artist and Co-founder of Vagabond Reviews, Ireland

Ms. Dea Vidović, Director of Kultura Nova Foundation, Croatia

Mr. Karl Seiringer, Representative of the collective “WochenKlausur”, Austria

Mr. Martí Perán, Professor of Art History at the University of Barcelona, Spain. Keynote speaker 1<sup>st</sup> Panel.

Mr. Matteo Ferroni, Architect and Director of the Fondazione eLand, Italy. Speaker Open Debate.

Ms. Marjetica Potrč, Artist and architect, Slovenia. Keynote Speaker 2<sup>nd</sup> Panel.

Ms. Myriam Stoffen, Director of Zinneke, Brussels

Mr. Pep Dardanyà, Visual artist, anthropologist and cultural manager. Member of the direction team and Teacher at Escola Massana - Centre of Art and Design of Barcelona, Spain. Moderator.



Mr. Mauricio Brandão, Representative of the Bijari Centre, Brazil

Ms. Rarita Zbranca, Arts manager and cultural policymaker. Director and Co-founder of AltArt Foundation, Romania

Ms. Melissa Guevara, Representative of the collective "The Fire Theory", El Salvador

Ms. Stella Duffy, Theatre director and writer. Co-director of Fun Palaces, UK

Ms. Paulina Varas Alarcón, Researcher and curator. Co-Director of the CRAC Centre, Chile. Keynote speaker 1<sup>st</sup> Panel

Mr. Stefano Bosco, Media Engineer at Stalker Teatro, Italy

Ms. Paulina Varas Alarcón, Researcher and curator. Co-Director of the CRAC Centre, Chile

Mr. Stefano Bosco, Media Engineer at Stalker Teatro, Italy

Mr. Sergio Restrepo, Director of the Pablo Tobón Uribe Theatre, Colombia

## **Organisers**

Ms. Mercedes Giovinazzo, Director of Interarts. Moderator Open Panel.

Mr. Paul Dujardian, CEO Bozar

Mr. Toni Cots, LAIC project coordinator, Interarts

Mr. Frédéric Messeuw, Project supervisor, Bozar

Ms. Dace Kiulina, LAIC project officer, Interarts

Ms. Laia Ros, Seminar project manager, Bozar

## **Observers**

Ms. Anna Kedziorek Ramírez, Policy officer – DG EAC – Cultural diversity and innovation

Ms. Sylvia Reyes, Deputy Cultural Attaché, the Mexican Embassy in Belgium, Luxembourg and the Mission of Mexico in the EU

Ms. Anna Romeu Herrero, Programme Assistant - External Relations, Unit 2 - DEVCO

Ms. Françoise Descamps, Cultural heritage conservation and development management consulting

Ms. Anna-Lucia Pinto, Programme Assistant - External Relations, Unit 2 - DEVCO

Ms. Paola Amadei, Executive Director of the EU-LAC Foundation

Mr. Denis Maksimov, Independent curator, Bozar



## INTRODUCTION

The one-day seminar 'Arts & Culture for Inclusive Cities: Latin America – Europe' focused on the role of arts and culture in social cohesion, urban strategies and policies, and cultural policies and programmes in urban contexts as well as social cohesion, community participation, community work and inclusive urban development in Latin America and Europe.

The general objectives of the seminar were:

- Analyse how the potential of art and culture can empower citizenship, foster social ties, and increase forms of emancipation through critical thinking, in terms of collaborative and community practice.
- Promote the importance of arts and culture in implementing good practices in LA and the EU, analysis and dissemination of research and documents, and dissemination of cultural and urban development policies and strategies.
- Create bridges and 'spaces' where stakeholders and cultural operators from both the EU and LA can not only meet and exchange experiences, points of view and opinions, but also where new projects and ideas may arise.
- Create networks of collaboration and exchange of working models with the aim of forming common areas of action between LA and the EU.
- Enhance exchanges between actors from the cultural and social sectors of LA and the EU to work on cultural initiatives supporting social cohesion and fostering participation.
- Advocate for better integration of culture in a range of urban strategies and policies, in LA and EU cities.
- Raise awareness on the role of cultural policies and programmes and art practices in addressing the needs of those socially excluded in urban contexts.

The seminar brought together 11 professionals from Latin America (Colombia, Chile, Mexico, Peru, Brazil and San Salvador) and 10 professionals from Europe (Spain, Italy, Croatia, Austria, Belgium, Rumania, Slovenia, Ireland and UK) from the fields of research, collaborative arts, community practices, art and sustainability, art and education, public art, and other relevant areas. Representatives of the European Commission (DG DEVCO and DG EAC) and other relevant professionals also participated.



The seminar was split into two parts: closed sessions with invited participants, and an open debate for the general public in the evening.

The closed session was divided into two main panels:

- 1. Arts & Cultural Policies for Inclusive Cities: From Theory to Practice**
- 2. Arts & Cultural Policies for Inclusive Cities: From Practice to Theory**

The first panel, 'From Theory to Practice', was introduced and moderated by Mr. Pep Dardanyà, with Mr. Martí Perán and Ms. Paulina Varas as keynote speakers. The panel focused on and questioned the meaning of the main concepts used in the arts and social cohesion, including, inter alia, participation, collaboration, mediation, inclusion, cooperation, and practices. It was also underlined that when we talk about the art and communities or art and public space, the notion does not have one sole meaning and should be seen from a range of perspectives beyond the definition of art from traditional spaces. The panellists also broached the matter of how to avoid the disconnection and dissociation of stakeholders who promote artistic practices in the community and public spaces.

The second panel, 'From Practice to Theory', was introduced and moderated by Mr. Conrado Uribe with Ms. Marjetica Potrč, and Mr. Francisco Paillié as keynote speakers. Ms. Marjetica Potrč gave a presentation on participation and collaborative practices today, looking at what they attain at neighborhood and professional level. Through community-based projects, residents reclaim ownership of their community and neighborhood, while artists, designers and architects become mediators and fellow workers. Mr. Francisco Paillié examined the issue of public space and the public realm from the arts and architecture perspective in his Manifesto. He also introduced the idea of referring to 'groups of interest' instead of 'communities', which gave rise to a lively discussion among the participants.



After each introduction, the participants split into two groups to continue the discussions on the main points raised by the panellists.

Lastly, Ms. Mercedes Giovinazzo, Mr. Pep Dardanyà and Mr. Conrado Uribe presented the outcomes of the working groups in a final plenary session.

## OUTCOMES OF THE WORKING GROUPS

### 1. Panel: Arts and Cultural Policies for Inclusive Cities: From Theory To Practice - chaired by Mr. Pep Dardanyà. Keynote speakers: Mr. Martí Perán and Ms. Paulina Varas

#### 1.1. Working group with Mr. Pep Dardanyà

##### 1.1.1. Cultural policies and inclusion

Following interventions by Mr. Martí Perán and Ms. Paulina Varas, the debate focused on the discursive questions about the meaning of the concepts used both on projects developed by artists, and programmes set up by institutional agencies. The concepts used to define the seminar, i.e. 'inclusive cities' or Latin American art were discussed. The following questions arose: what are cultural policies for inclusion? To achieve such inclusion, should cultural practices be bolstered as a public service or as an economic resource? Do Latin America and Europe represent different models? Are so-called creative cities more inclusive cities? How should cultural policies implement contemporary art practices to boost inclusion?



Participants recalled the importance of mapping existing artistic practices. One suggestion related to practices highlighted that various types exist, which could reflect on fundamental questions such as individual freedom, values or the commons.

Mr. Martí Perán stressed the failure to reach consensus on democratic use and consumption of culture. New models must be invented and we should not

systematically look at existing models for inspiration.

Mr. Gustavo Ramirez gave a brief description of the Mexican city of Puebla. This historic heritage city is currently struggling to tackle serious racism and segregation. In 2006 an art biennale platform was launched, to which mainly local artists were invited to participate. The aim was to exchange visions to encourage progressive ideas. Urban development in Puebla has been uncontrolled, with devastating ecological and social consequences. In 2012 the city council therefore invited 'Les Ateliers', a French organisation specialised in city planning and urban design, to come up with a long-term vision and identify action plans and ways to put them in place. Unfortunately, the authorities did not engage local communities in the decision-making processes. This example has shown that initiatives can be devastating for social cohesion in a city if they do not involve local communities.



Ms. Stella Duffy referred to the bottom-up 'Fun Palace' project in the city of Stoke. This example raised the question of the 'creative city' concept, which is not always inclusive in practice. The question arises if communities constituting the urban social fabric are stakeholders, subjects, or actors. Policy-makers must look for a participatory framework of participation (e.g. per sector, or including various neighbourhoods).

Mr. Martí Perán argued that the 'creative city' concept cannot be inclusive, but actually turns out to be rather radically exclusive. By promoting the capacity to create, it leaves out those who are not capable of creating.

The real value of 'workshops' with students was also questioned: scholarly exercises and experiments have little projection on the outside, on the real world. On this issue, Ms. Marjetica Potrč referred to an experiment with students in Hamburg who work on-site for several months. Long-term association with on-site projects is essential. However, inclusion is not always obvious in on-site projects. Some people are not willing to be included due to social, economic or cultural borders.

Also on this matter, Ms. Melissa Guevara mentioned the example of initiatives attempting to gain support from wealthy communities, asserting that 'inclusion' should also target people with resources.

The issue of 'cooperation' also came up in many of the comments, in particular in the EU-Latin context and its historic background.

### 1.1.2. Discourses and concepts

It is important to use the right concepts to define artistic practices as a strategy for social inclusion. Concepts such as revitalisation, participation, collaboration, ethnography of the territory, critical thinking, social commitment, strategies for development, intercultural dialogue, empowerment, construction of situations, aesthetics and ethics, community practices, institutional critique, urban, independent, alternative laboratory and others are being used to define these practices.

The discussion was opened with a few starting questions: are these terms relevant in contemporary art? To what extent do they represent the practices that intend to define, or are a euphemism to justify a certain failure? Do they have the same meaning in contexts such as Europe and Latin America?

Several participants questioned the curatorial concept applied to these types of practice, and proposed as alternatives collective curatorial and collective management of projects. For a project to be inclusive it absolutely must be able to work in collaboration with other agents in the territory, involving 'the other' as an interlocutor on equal footing.



Ms. Marjetica Potrč gave the example of the ZUsammenKUNFT initiative on Potsdamer Platz in Berlin, which provides a home for refugee families and a few individuals who own their own apartments there. Socially committed groups and individuals work with refugees without central curatorship in a laboratory of coexistence and cooperation.

With that in mind, Ms. Marjetica Potrč also pointed out that some communities are petrified and are extremely difficult to mobilise. How can we succeed in implementing new methodologies?

Ms. Stella Duffy mentioned the example of the Fun Palaces initiative. In the 1960s, Ms. Joan Littlewood conceived the Fun Palace as a 'laboratory of fun' and 'a university of the streets'. Fun Palaces is an ongoing campaign for culture by, for and with all, in which arts and sciences are a vital catalyst for community engagement and full participation for everyone. Fun Palaces believes in the genius, the artist in everyone, and that creativity in community can change society for the better.

Ms. Carlos Uribe came back to the importance of curatorship to record what is taking place (e.g. at an exhibition), and to launch projects bringing together artists and people from different backgrounds.

The concept of 'border', presented by Ms. Paulina Varas, was also central to the debate, from a broad perspective encompassing its economic, social and political meanings. Finally, the importance of having a glossary of terms, categories and concepts to work on a pro-common system of knowledge was stated.

For the participants in the panel, borders mean non-acceptance, distancing oneself, and excluding certain groups. They highlighted the importance of avoiding the creation of our own borders.

For others, borders or limitations can also be positive:

- Being an artist has the advantage of greater freedom in partnerships with social workers, volunteers, etc.
- It is important to reflect on limitations in time, money and people: what can be achieved within these limits.

### 1.1.3. Public cultural practices and good practices

In general terms, there seemed to be something of a paradox when discussing the idea of an inclusive project and the control that is said to be applied when it comes to generating documents on good practices. After the discussion, the group began proposing some essential criteria to activate projects: 'reversing the pyramid' by incorporating the economic and political elites in the inclusion strategies. This entails understanding cultural projects as



a crosscutting axis to break down social differences. Another proposal was changing the concept of subsidy for financing in this type of project, in both the public and private spheres, by creating the category of investment, which takes into account a long-term process.

The concept of 'social laboratory' to define these practices was also part of the debate, and the question of whether exhibitions, in the traditional sense, are the best option to display the results of processes generated in such 'laboratories' was highlighted.

Ms. Anna Kedziorek (European Commission) mentioned support for projects in cities, such as the 2015 'Culture for Cities and Regions', a programme for citizen awareness about cultural heritage implemented by Eurocities. A manual with 70 best practices focusing on the role of culture for social inclusion was published as part of this programme. This could be inspirational for cities outside the EU, she said. For her, an EU-LA best practices document should be created to highlight various topics: financing, governance, participation, multiplying effects, etc.

## 1.2. Working group with Mr. Conrado Uribe

### 1.2.1. Art practices and transformation

In his presentation to the panel, Mr. Martí Perán argued that art in the social space should resume what the anarchist tradition defined as *prefigurative policies*: point out, try out, and imagine. Those would be the functions of art; not to solve problems, but to detect or provoke them.

On the idea that art as a practice can generate new life forms, during the discussions it was proposed that in contexts such as in Latin America, art has an *unavoidable* power to transform the senses and the existence of individuals, enabling transformative processes rather than fostering only simple changes. According to Ms. Paulina Varas, the difference between the two is that the change has a predefined intent, while the transformative process cannot anticipate the outcome, which from any perspective is riskier.

In support of the idea of transformation through art, the difference between active and contemplative lives was mentioned, noting that purely artistic production is one thing and production that involves the community in participative ways is something else entirely. In Latin America and Europe the active role is very important, taking into account contexts – historical, political, etc., and even economic differences. The issues found in each of these fields can be not only inspiring for artistic experience but also transformed by them.

### 1.2.2. Public space and urban realities: challenge or limit for art practices?



In Latin America public space is being privatised and limited, confined to malls. This leads to public space linked to commercial use, and this situation seems to be getting worse rather than improving.

What can art do to tackle the degradation of public space? It is essential to examine how concepts such as otherness, difference and equality are understood. Artistic practices offer tools and create platforms that enable

and allow work based on affinities, interests and common ground in which the complexities arising from difference, e.g. the possibility of dissent, are addressed from participation and collaboration. A recurring theme in the debate was the need to change certain uses such as 'building bridges' and identify 'grounds for common understanding'. This idea was addressed during the debate about equality and difference: "what unites us is stronger than what divides us." Bridges are built to unite separate territories and generate flow paths that do not



necessarily correspond to territories of action. We should first start by searching for existing meeting points.

Whatever happens on the streets and/or in collaborative works is constantly redefining the relationship between artistic practices and public space. Thus, the collaboration may end when the projects are made public. With regard to policies, we must recognise that the space for politics in society is gradually being reduced.

### 1.2.3. Colonial 'unconsciousness' and 'inner' colonialism.

What should or can Latin American art be, made from the multiple 'souths' that the region comprises? It is vital to take into account not only multiple contradictions in such a vast area, but also the various borders, real and symbolic. A project like LAIC must begin to accept and recognise the survival of this internal colonialism. This is the only way to decolonise memory. Artistic practices should be able to help to reshape the colonial vestige in the subconscious and resolve differences, while also identifying what each specific group can do.

With regard to group differences, how then do we understand the concept of community in contemporary thinking? This issue was discussed in detail during the second panel and the working session in the afternoon.

One notion that the working group agreed upon was the risk involved when differences or conflicts are the setting and departure point for cultural cooperation relations. One of the most visible risks is falling into the roles of victim on the Latin American side and guilty party on the European side. In any event, the issue of 'difference' constitutes a permanent tension that continuously feeds and inspires cultural cooperative relations between Europe and Latin America.

### 1.2.4. Margins and borders: questioning the notions of centre and periphery.

Margins and borders are closely related to differences between contexts. The example and metaphor of a blank sheet of paper with margins was given: most of the space is outside the margin, in the territory of the marginal, and therefore paradoxically represents a large majority.

Art practices call into question these borders, boundaries and barriers that demarcate the inclusion of exclusion, and their symbolic dimension enables them to bypass territorial, temporal and moral boundaries.

It was also argued that after taking into consideration the recognition of subjectivities, art can generate possibilities to access the public domain, facilitating exchanges between groups



without necessarily fully including all of them. The relationship between art and social movements provides an insight into city dynamics.



**2. Panel: Arts and Cultural Policies for Inclusive Cities: from Practice to Theory - chaired by Mr. Conrado Uribe. Keynote speakers: Ms. Marjetica Potrč and Mr. Francisco Paillié.**

*2.1. Working group with Mr. Pep Dardanyà*

2.1.1. Methodologies, tactics and strategies.

During previous discussions, the importance of using crosscutting methodologies for project developments arose repeatedly. These 'overflowed methodologies' that some participants mentioned should provide as broad a framework as possible to research and develop tactics and strategies. A series of questions were raised to begin the discussion: are these methodologies applicable to different contexts? What are these strategies? What contextual conditions should be considered for their implementation?

In the round of interventions, the importance of collective creation re-emerged as a prerequisite for the participation and empowerment of people and communities that are involved in the project strategy. This 'break' from authorship, and therefore authority, regarding the project is essential for the inclusion of 'others'. The discussion then turned to the relevance of using the concept of community or 'interest group', on which the participants had mixed opinions. The debate focused on two lines: the first defending the importance of the work process, rather than merely the results, as essential in any cultural project based on inclusion, and the second proposing that specific local practices must offer global reflections as a means of making a range of problems visible. For this purpose, social networks are presented as fundamental for exchanging knowledge, although their use must take into account the digital gap between communities and countries. Finally, the importance of addressing some institutions' instrumentalisation of art in relation to this type of project was discussed. Using the 'social status of the artist' in our society as a tactic to have a critical impact on the cracks in the system was also put forward.

2.1.2. Management, implementation and assessment criteria.

The issue of how we value and assess cultural projects was recurrent in the discussions: how to value and evaluate artistic and cultural practices with coherent criteria on what they do to improve lives and the inclusion and facilitation of access to spaces for cultural and political participation in urban environments? Is it possible to measure their impact without instrumentalising such practices and, consequently, their agents? Moreover, what are we doing to generate, organise and share those criteria?

The discussion focused immediately on the need for rigorous internal and external project evaluations, in addition to the importance of presenting the results and in particular



disseminating them. To do so would entail proposing 'distant gazes' from outside and having differing perspectives and possibilities to compare. All participants agreed that this is an essential task that to date has not been regularly implemented, especially on visual arts projects. During the debate, the initial topic of 'mapping' artistic practices in Latin America was mentioned as relevant. However, to carry out this task meticulously, it is necessary to generate evaluation criteria based on analysing projects that fulfil 'best practices'.

### 2.1.3. Best practices, funding and remuneration.

The vast majority of cultural projects referred to were financed with public money. This means that the promoters and artists have greater social responsibility in implementing, producing and disseminating their projects. Therefore, evaluations of good practices must include an assessment of the social and symbolic return of projects, and perhaps also the economic outcomes. How can we generate more efficient feedback channels between artistic and cultural practices and local and national institutions where cultural policies are defined? Do art institutions provide the ideal bridge for and in between the basic work of institutions and communities in social exclusion?

As a possible answer to these questions and to conclude, the group endeavoured to list some of the conditions that an art practice should meet to be considered as 'good': firstly, it should be specific and take into account the social, cultural and political contexts in which it is implemented. In interventions with the community, it should be accountable to those communities and their people. It cannot be a self-justified intervention or simply the artists' experimentation, but must generate symbolic and economic remuneration processes, with means for internal and external evaluation and monitoring. The major risk for cultural projects here is that they merely uncritically imitate evaluation models from other areas of knowledge, management or cooperation.



## 2.2. Working Group with Mr. Conrado Uribe

### 2.2.1. Communities versus stakeholders

One of the points made during the afternoon panel was the tension between concepts such as the Community and the Stakeholders. For some, the latter are determined by conditions of class, whereas the former comprise individuals sharing fears, tensions and needs. This debate triggered discussions in the second working group.

The importance of knowing people before doing work in, with or from the community was noted. Sometimes communities are unable to express or speak for themselves because they are threatened in various ways. However, their needs must define what kind of intervention is set up, never the reverse. The first step, therefore, should be to recognise those needs. Professionals and artists involved in these projects would serve as facilitators and catalysts, and provide transformation tools.

On the topic of community actions at local level, Mr. Karl Seiniger noted that identifying a problem is an important preliminary step. A group of people must work on this to identify the appropriate community for collaboration. For him, solutions come from dialogue.

Most participants agreed that we must always bear in mind that work at local level is done with people, often with very vulnerable people.

On that subject, Mr. Carlos Uribe added that dialogue is essential to define and work with a community to respond to a specific need and detect potential engagement. Cultures define their own practices.

Participants agreed that it was important firstly to recognise and analyse what exists and what has already been done.

On artists' roles, Mr. Gustavo Ramirez argued that we are the invaders: "We have to submerge ourselves in the local culture. Doors have to open." It is important to learn how, and symbiosis has to be created with local population.

Artistic practices have the ability to work with existing communities. Apart from contradicting Western narratives about art and its historical transformations, such practices with social projection allow for a reconfiguration of cities. This raises some fundamental questions: how to (re)think urban environments? What does inclusion mean in this context? What is really the contribution of art, and what is it that art does? Mr. Martí Perán's theoretical distinction between *participation* and *collaboration* is important when addressing these questions. Both seem to have areas in common, but a more detailed analysis reveals the differences between them.



In *participatory* processes, individuals are invited to join a framework that has already been created. Here, to participate means to enter, to join. Conversely, in *collaborative* dynamics an invitation entails modifying the framework in which the participants redefine the rules. Being aware of this implies being critical of participatory social cohesion models in which institutionalised notions like inclusion are asserted. Collaborative models, on the other hand, allow us to rethink the conditions defining individuals and communities in social environments, extending and questioning the very idea of inclusion and cohesion. All event-based projects that are carried out in the social space should resolve this dilemma.

### 2.2.2. On 'best practices' and replicable practices: implementation and financing.

For Mr. Conrado Uribe, the 'replicability' of projects needs to be assessed, and an initiative has to be reinterpreted. This enables entirely new approaches to come out of a model.

Notwithstanding, some participants suggested avoiding experimentation for experimentation's sake, and also avoiding the trap of 'fake projects'. On the other hand, they also stated that cultural operators and communities can learn not only from good but also 'bad' practices or failed projects.

What should distinguish a successful practice from false or fake practices?

The ideas put forward included:

- Offer the possibility of continuing in time. The system should guarantee duration and existence beyond the framework of the project or the artistic intervention itself.
- Survive the artist's absence. Contribute to questioning the concept of authorship.
- Centrifugal rather than centripetal movement: from the community as an expanding wave-like motion outwards, bottom up rather than the opposite.
- Factor in political, poetic, philosophical and pedagogical dimensions.
- Be committed.
- Be efficient in addressing the needs of the people involved.
- Be aware and critical about the economic use applied to any symbolic capital generated.

From that perspective, it was noted that there are very small countries implementing numerous good initiatives. However, these are often not sufficiently known about in other countries (in the case of Central America). This raised the question of the circulation of ideas and practices across Latin America and beyond.