Publics and Commons: The Problem of Inclusion for Participation

By Helen Graham

The article uses the concept of ‘commons’ to put forward a model for participation at the museum that rethinks ideas of access, use and participation. This is explored specifically in the context of cultural history museum conservation, arguing for an understanding of conservation as a participatory practice that prevents the object from not only ‘running out’ materially, but also running out of people’s interest.

A central purpose of museums is to enable people to use their collections in ways which do not stop others also using them. Objects are placed in glass cases. Security measures ensure that art works are not stolen. Watercolours are rotated regularly. Textiles are kept out of direct light. Touch is discouraged. To put it in terms drawn from economics, it is precisely the aim to ensure that use by one person does not preclude use by others that makes it possible for museums to describe their collections as ‘public goods’. If ‘private goods’ are excludable, in the sense that an owner can prevent others using their property and dispose of it at will and rival, in the sense that use by the owner precludes use by others, ‘public goods’ have to be non-excludable and non-rival. While museum collections are best considered ‘quasi’ public goods – as light, movement
and touch have an impact, collections are sometimes disposed, entrance fees might be charged, you might not be able to see the Mona Lisa through the crowds – it is illuminating to recognize the desire to be able to include all, and through this to act as a ‘public good’, as crucial to museums’ political form and their contemporary political legacy.

The role of museum professionals in generating the public political form has very often been framed in terms of stewardship. The job of the museum steward has been to look after and protect the collections. Museums have done this by holding the rival and always potentially excludable material culture in trust and by deploying a variety of methods and regulations – such as those mentioned above – to make the collection as close to a ‘public good’ as they can. Yet in working ‘on behalf of’ the public and ‘in the general interest’ to achieve the public political form, more interpersonal or reciprocal relationships with specific people have tended to be sacrificed. The desire to ensure museums are for all, has meant holding at armslength specific people that want to use, to touch, to make work or to play. When read in this way, it is possible to see the participatory turn that this publication is seeking to explore, as a testa-
ment to an ongoing trend to test the legitimacy of the public political form more generally.  

In the current proliferation of participatory methods, the re-emergence of the idea of ‘commons’ has been notable and has found particular currency in activism concerning urban space and privatization and digital culture and copyright.  

As the examples to which ‘commons’ is being applied suggest, ‘commons’ has become so widely used due to its potential to articulate not simply ‘taking part’ but more specifically a participative use of shared resources. For example, Creative Commons, the digital platform that has created off-the-peg copyright licenses, is a mechanism that enables authors to avoid defaulting to full copyright and instead to enable others not simply to view their work but to more actively use, chop up, sample, collage and re-edit. What legal scholar and founder of Creative Commons Lawrence Lessig has referred to as the remixing ‘hybrid economy’.

Users of the term ‘commons’ – even in its digital iterations – tend to cite as inspiration what Lewis Hyde calls ‘traditional English commons’: “lands held collectively by the residents of parish or village: the fields, pastures, streams, and woods that a number of people […] had a right to use in ways organized and regulated by custom.”
The crucial words in Hyde’s definition are ‘a number of people’. Not everybody. Not a public. This has been reemphasized by other key theorists of the networked and digital commons. In Lessig’s terms, “the commons is a resource to which anyone within the relevant community has a right without obtaining the permission of anyone else.” Or as Yochai Benkler puts it,

“The salient characteristic of commons, as opposed to property, is that no single person has exclusive control over the use and disposition of any particular resource in the commons. Instead, resources governed by commons may be used or disposed of by anyone among some (more or less well-defined) number of persons, under rules that may range from “anything goes” to quite crisply articulated formal rules that are effectively enforced.”

When thought of in terms of museums and their collections, a participatory commons approach to their rival resources is clearly of use. It has the very real potential to recognize certain ‘relevant communities’ as active participants in using and managing specific objects and collections. Yet, crucially, thinking museums-as-commons also clearly calls into question the fragile achievements of museums as a public political form. The very idea of commons – use by a defined number of people – requires generating inclusion of some, ‘the relevant communities’, through excluding others from the same rights of use. This article will explore how the political forms of public and commons might be restaged in contemporary museum practice. How might museums act as both commons and (quasi) public goods? One line of argument – developed through a participatory research project with people who very much wanted to actively use the collections in question – will be that museums need to reclaim the legitimacy of commons ‘use’ and reread ideas of public ‘access’ through a living and dynamic reading of collections ‘conservation’. As such a key question for community participation in museums today seems to be: How might we imagine productively generating inequalities of use of collections – collections as commons – while retaining equalities of public access?
Use to access: From Commons to Public

Commons are usually theorized with reference to Garett Hardin’s 1968 highly influential article ‘Tragedy of the commons’. Hardin argues that we live in a world of finite resources and if all ‘men’ [sic] are ‘rational actors’ they can be expected to want to ‘maximize their gain’. As population growth continues, Hardin reasons, common use of land can no longer stand and other forms of management are required. Hardin deploys the examples of US National Parks and of cattle grazing. In terms of cattle grazing – what Hardin refers to as ‘the herdsman’s commons’ – a rational actor economic approach is deployed where the only course of action for famers to take is to constantly increase the size of their herd: “ruin is the destination towards which all men rush, each pursuing his own best interest in a society that believes in the freedom of the commons. Freedom in commons brings ruin to all.”

In terms of National Parks – an example with much in common with museums – Hardin diagnoses that being ‘open to all, without limits’ sees visitors also “grow without limit.” As a result, Hardin argues, “the values that visitors seek in the parks are steadily eroded.” Hardin argues that both the Herdsman’s Commons and the National Parks fail to manage their resources effectively because they are neither fully private nor public goods.

Yet Hardin’s argument ignores that the history of National Parks, museums and heritage generally has been about making rival resources of various kinds into public goods through transforming use into use-as-access. For example, a museum without an entrance fee transforms rival material culture into public goods through the use of display cases and climate-controlled conditions. Access is secured through sight. Anyone (who is sighted) can see the object without damaging it or precluding others from doing the same so, it could be said, a (quasi) public good is generated. In an outdoors context, the codes of behaviour such as the Countryside Code are another mechanism for transforming rival into (quasi) non-rival goods. You are encouraged to use stone paths that will degrade more slowly and prevent muddy patches. You are supposed to not leave rubbish. You are supposed to not take wood from the forest or pebbles from the beach. In the famous maxim, you are supposed to ‘take only memories, leave only footprints’. Both offer access as a form
of use rather than use in the traditional ‘commons’ sense of the term. To make the object available to touch – or the woods to be used for the old common right of estovers (to pick up firewood) – would tip it back from being a public good to being rival. The management of use-as-access has offered remarkable successes. The techniques challenge Hardin’s assumption by suggesting that if people – even many people – are careful when they visit the US National Parks, then the parks can be for anyone. If we all consent not to touch or use museum collections and access them through sight, then all visitors can. However, these techniques deployed to solve the problem of heritage as rival and excludable create other equally significant problems. Making rival resources quasi-public goods through use-as-access requires that art, culture or nature are held at arms length so that all can potentially be included and have equal and non-excludable access. This has certainly become a more problematic dynamic as museums have sought to be more participatory.

No longer scarce and rival?:

From Public and Commons to Common

Needless to say, since its publication in 1968 many people have taken issue with Hardin’s analysis. For example, David Harvey has pointed out that if the cattle were also owned collectively rather than privately then the very issue Hardin outlines in relation to the Herdsman’s Commons would simply not arise. However, one recent way in which Hardin’s ‘tragedy of the commons’ thesis has been challenged is to question whether the rivalry and scarcity of resource – which underpin the political logics of Hardin’s analysis – apply to today’s dominant forms of economic and political production. Marxist theorists Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri have sought to reimagine ‘commons’. Fundamental to their argument is a rereading of ‘commons’ in the light of the post-Fordist economic shift from mass production of material goods to a greater emphasis on the production of information, knowledge, affects, experience and relationships. Hardt and Negri argue the results of capitalism are increasingly not material but immaterial and take “common forms” which are “difficult to corral as private property.” While Hardt and Negri recognize that expropriation and enclosure remain key
ways in which contemporary capitalism operates, they emphasize the non-rivalry of these common forms – like that of common sense and common knowledge – rather than ‘commons’ in ‘the English sense’, bound up with the logics of scarcity. In the case of museum collections, Hardt and Negri’s argument finds some productive connections with recent thinking which has argued that heritage is best thought of as a process not a thing and that, in Laurajane Smith’s terms, ‘all heritage is intangible’ because it is primarily about what we value. As such, when brought into a museological context, Hardt and Negri make room for an argument that we need not focus so much on the scarcity of materiality culture but focus on the common ideas, knowledge and social relations that can be generated from use-as-access.

For Hardt and Negri this ‘common’ – that is being constantly reproduced – is crucial because it also leads to alternative political possibilities which allow them to take issue not only with private forms of management but also the public political form. Hardt and Negri identify a link between the Roman idea of Res Publica, the root of the word ‘republic’, and private property. Drawing on the political wranglings which followed both the American and French revolutions, they argue that “the concept of property and the defense of property remain the foundation of every modern political constitution.” They then draw a line between the relationship between ‘public’ and certain forms of representational government which seek to transform, what was often known in early modern political tracts as ‘the multitude’ as a collection of individual people (Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s ‘will of all’), into ‘a people’ (or Rousseau’s ‘general will’). Through this conflation of property with the state and the state with ‘the people’, “the concepts of public goods and services were developed in the light of a legal theory that considered the public as patrimony of the state and the principle of general interest as an attribute of sovereignty.” Nineteenth-century European national and civic museums emerged from this political move which linked institutional forms of ownership and governance on behalf of the ‘general’ or ‘public’ interest. In the place of ‘the public’ – bound to property and state – Hardt and Negri seek to cultivate, through the capacities of post-Fordist economy, the premodern idea of ‘multitude’. As such the political domain of the
multitude is neither property nor the state but rather: “a new form of sovereignty, a democratic sovereignty (or, more precisely, a form of sovereignty which replaces sovereignty) in which social singularities control through their own biopolitical activity those goods and services that allow for the reproduction of the multitude itself. This would constitute a passage from Res-publica to Res-communis.”

Evoking the idea of participatory democracy and self-organizing management of the common resource, they ask:

“How can people associate closely together in the common and participate directly in democratic decision making? How can the multitude become prince of the institutions of the common in a way that reinvents and realizes democracy? […] Every social function regulated by the state that could be equally well managed in common should be transferred to common hands.”

The moves Hardt and Negri have made are compelling; that the crucial insight that new economic forms, affective labour and the precarity of work and housing, also make for common participative management. Or, to put it another way, because economic production is immaterial and nonrival there is less requirement for either private property forms or state forms of government. But it does seem that in speaking of common not commons Hardt and Negri side step the hard questions we face in the 21st century: the management of material resources at worldwide scale. They also – significantly for my purposes here – effectively elide ‘common’ with public good in the economic sense and, through this, the productive distinction between commons and public as political forms are lost.

The relationship between rival materiality, scale in terms of number of people involved and forms of governance is the crucial issue at stake in the difference between commons and public political forms. Harvey notes a certain squeamishness about scale in the debates about contemporary commons, “to avoid the implication that some sort of nested hierarchical arrangements might be necessary, the question of how to manage the commons at large as opposed to small scales … tends to be evaded.”
In her groundbreaking book *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*, Elinor Ostrom recognizes that commons cannot be free-for-alls, exist without clear boundaries, decision-making structures and modes of regulation. Ostrom here identifies some key principles:

1. Clearly defined boundaries
2. Congruence between appropriation and provision rules and local conditions
3. Collective-choice arrangements allowing for the participation of most of the appropriators in the decision-making process.
4. Effective monitoring by monitors who are part of or accountable to the appropriators
5. Graduated sanctions for appropriators who do not respect community rules
6. Conflict-resolution mechanisms which are cheap and easy of access
7. Minimal recognition of rights to organize (e.g. by the government)
8. In case of larger CPRs: Organisation in the form of multiple layers of nested enterprises, with small, local CPRs at their bases.

Notable here is the need for the clarity of who is inside and outside the commons, clear rules and their regulation with sanctions, and recognition of the commons from other forms of larger scale government forms. Through these principles Harvey sees Ostrom as indicating – if not entirely delivering – a way of navigating the exclusion of commons and with larger-scale constituencies:

“The ‘rich mix’ of instrumentalities’ that Elinor Ostrom begins to identify – not only public and private, but collective and association-al, nested, hierarchical and horizontal, exclusionary and open – will all have a key role to play in finding ways to organize production, distribution, exchange, and consumption to meet human wants and needs on an anti-capitalist basis.”

This debate lays the way for approaches in museums governance where commons, managed by a community with exclusionary *use* of rival
resources, might be interrelated with public forms of open, inclusive, non-rival information and access-orientated modes of management.

**Restaging Publics and Commons**

My desire to understand better the differences between public and participatory political forms comes from having worked on co-production projects in and with museums. My first chance to fully explore the genealogies and potentials of the differences came through a recent participation research project. Between 2013 and 2015 I was part of a collaboratively designed and implemented research project ‘How should heritage decisions be made?’ which involved a team of us – including researchers, practitioners, funders and community activists – working together to explore participatory approaches to heritage and its governance. One of our strands of work was based at the Science Museum in the UK – coordinated by Tim Boon, Head of Research and Public History – and focused on how decisions about what to collect can be made collectively

At the Science Museum a group of curators, researchers, musicians, composers and fans gathered to advise the museum on how to expand their electronic music collection. Yet the discussion always came back to the question: What is the purpose of collecting if it means the instruments stop being used for their intended purpose – to make music?
with knowledgeable communities. In conceiving the project we hoped we could use a relatively practical task, exploring what the Science Museum should collect in order to enhance its electronic music collection, as a way of also exploring the conceptual dynamics of the task. To do this we worked with a group of composers, musicians, researchers and fans: Jean-Phillipe Calvin, Composer and Researcher; Richard Courtney, a researcher based in Management Studies, University of Leicester; David Robinson, Technical Editor and Musician; John Stanley, Writer and Electronic Musician and Martin Swan, Musician and Educator.

As we started to explore the ostensible question – what is already in the Science Museum collections and what might be added – the discussion led very quickly to a more fundamental discussion, with the group questioning the purpose of collecting and ‘preservation’. As John Stanley, one of the group put it in our final project booklet:

“I ended up feeling very strongly that some of the objects in the Science Museum stores, particularly the rarer synthesizers, needed to be powered on again. The longer they sit in the dark with the capacitors slowly failing, the less likely they were to ever make sound again, and ultimately, the less meaning could be assigned to them.”

We explored the arguments – introduced above – that the Science Museums has tended to make against turning the synths on and letting them be played. The old ‘public good’ argument that if everyone is not able to touch it without significant damage then no one should and that use of the object now should not prevent access to people in the future. To put it another way, in the context of museum collections, the logic of scarcity that Hardt and Negri are keen to relegate to past forms of production still very much persists.

While the idea of ‘commons’ has only rarely been actively applied in a museum and heritage context, it is of course the case that the word ‘community’ – especially in the context of participatory practice – has been widely deployed for many decades now. Yet while now in very common usage in job titles and as a descriptor for projects and programmes, the full implications of the political differences between
‘community’ and ‘public’ are not always apparent. The etymology of community share a root with ‘common’ and ‘commons’. In Latin the words community / commons / common land / in common derives from communis. Communis is made up of com, which means ‘together’ and munis, which means ‘under obligation’. Specifically – in the case of community – this means being together in a way which draws those included into an obligation to each other.

It is therefore worth noting how different the political form of community is from other very widely used terms in museum practice such as Visitor, Audience and Public. To draw out the differences. Visitor, tends to evoke the idea of people who are welcome to come as long as they eventually leave. It is not their place to make ‘home’ or to actively use anything without permission. Audience, is the term often used for people watching or visiting a show. There is a strong sense of a shared moment – you are an audience with others – yet the shared moment is often imagined as ending with the performance. The idea of a public in Michael Warner’s terms, public is never specific people but rather a necessarily abstract idea, it is a “social totality” and a “relation between strangers.” None of these terms – visitors, audience, nor public – imply a sense of holding something in common. Nor do they imply a thoroughgoing sense of obligation to each other (beyond the usual obligations of use of public space). Rather you can see the deployment of ideas of publics, audiences and visitors as the social imaginaries that have enabled museums to produce themselves as quasi-public goods. The collections can only be public goods if people agree to see themselves as members of the public and as visitors. This is why the turn towards ‘community participatory’ has both been so desired – many people do not want to be treated as visitors to their own cultures and heritages – but also why seeking to practice community participation has been no simple or straightforward political task for museums.

The urgency of this challenge for museums – to find better ways of relating communities and publics – was beautifully articulated during the Science Museum co-collecting project. Another of the co-collecting team Martin Swan, who is a musician and educator, suggested that what the museum needed was ‘a community’ around the electronic music collec-
tion which could put “a curatorial head on” and would actively ‘look for’ items for the collections. As with John’s immediate feeling that the synths should be powered on, Martin shows that the very possibilities of developing a community around the collection depended on a more flexible approach to conservation. Martin argued that the problem is that

“as soon as you stop playing them, synths start to decay. They become less and less the thing that made them worth collecting. As they become less and less viable as instruments, they also become less and less interesting to the geeks, the very people who would want to enthuse about the objects to other people. And these are also the people who could maintain them and could get them going again.”

Here Martin offers a very full evocation of the common in Hardt and Negri’s terms – social processes of culture and heritage – but this is intrinsically linked to the need to use material, rival resources. At the same time Martin’s words indicate that if you add ideas of ‘community’ to ideas of ‘conservation’ some quite different political potentials are offered. While it is true that dictionary definitions of conservation often fall back on the idea of preservation as ‘keeping unaltered’ in their explanations, etymologies of conservation also contain other meanings: ‘to limit how much of a resource you use’, ‘wise use’ [not no use; wise use] and ‘to keep something from running out’.

In his comments quoted above Martin pointed to the ways it might be possible to reimagine what it might be for something to be ‘preserved’: specifically questioning what is the ‘it’ being sustained. The synths were collected for a specific reason (they are electronic musical instruments) which the methods of their preservation (by no longer being used) itself degrades. Also, more powerfully, the very community that enthuses about the collections themselves lose interest as the objects are no longer allowed to be what originally gave them purpose. This brings out the different nuances offered by the richer connotations of ‘conservation’, not as ‘keeping unaltered’ but as ‘not running out’. Martin comments reframes ‘running out’. Instead of conservation meaning the work of preventing running out materially – as in being broken or degraded –
conservation could mean the prevention of running out framed both materially and socially, using the collections enough to prevent damage but also enough to prevent a *running out of* people’s interest. This material-social practice seems like a very good description of what ideas of commons might offer to museums.

Community participation in a commons requires exclusions. The synths cannot be on open display in the gallery — being banged and played — without being ruined, in Hardin’s sense. If they were to be on display they would need to be made into quasi-public goods using the usual means of glass cases and regulation of touch. Yet these exclusions can create more meaningful boundaried inclusions for communities of people to actively use collections, people who have something to bring and to share. What we need to do in order to *conserve well* — to stop things running out *materially-socially* — is some kind of mix between use and management of collections by groups of people that are the collection’s community *with* some form of accountability to a wider public. To describe this in terms of my feelings as I was standing in the Science Museum’s stores with the musicians, composers and fans; I don’t need to use or play the synths, I am happy to be ‘a visitor’ with only *use-as-access* to the Science Museum’s electronic music collection. However, it is also very clear that exhibitions and programmes about electronic music for the wider public as visitors will be much better if they are generated by those for whom those things are *in use* vibrant and active parts of their lives. A public purpose of access for anyone can be renewed through the necessarily exclusive nature of commons use.

**Constructing a rich mix: Directions for museum practice**

Ostrom indicates the need for a ‘rich mix’ of instrumentalities in governance of commons. As discussed above her principles include a clear consistency, boundaries of resources, decision-making structures to agree use and regulations of use. To develop this thinking a bit further, when thinking of museums and collections we might think of a specific community of people who take on the responsibility of managing the collection and in return have the right to put that collection to use (powering on the synthesizers). This could be thought of like any membership or-
ganization (co-operatives/ clubs) where people have to join and play an active role in the maintenance of the community. The rights to use might be regulated through collectively agreed rules (the class Annual General Meeting would for a membership organization be a way of doing this) and monitored by the group. As part of the collective decision-making process, a method for addressing conflict would need to be built in. One of Ostrom’s principles – the seventh – is: ‘minimal recognition of rights to organize’. I think this is where the public dimensions of the political form and governance form of museums needs to be brought in. The museum – in making a commitment to a participatory and community-led management of collections as commons – would need to recognize the rights to organise of the commons community. Yet, in turn, one of the conditions of the community and commons would need to be a commitment to public access to the objects and to the new knowledge and means of interpretation generated. As part of this governance, the museum structures might need to play a role in supporting any conflict resolution that arises and might, at times, need to assert public rights to access as part of the decision-making processes.

What I have offered here is a very simple sketching of a ‘nested form’ of governance for museums, one which enables active participation in collections as commons and renews museums’ status as a ‘public goods’. Achieving this requires a shift which sees the material and the social as fully interconnected in the processes of heritage. Part of this is a re-reading the aims of ‘conservation’ materially-socially to enable ‘wise use’ and ‘not-running-out’, as we have here. In a museums context, commons might be read as precisely this material-social form.

When I have shared these ideas in presentations I’m very often asked about how it might be ensured that the participatory commons do not become too closed? Or whose responsibility it is to calibrate the relationship between exclusive and inclusive forms? While some of this can be sketched out on the page, through the delineation of political logics, much of this will be down to how such ideas are enacted and reformed through practice and experimentation. There are many experiments underway. From enthusiasts working with museums to keep industrial collections working to figuring art galleries as new places for exchange.
To close with Harvey once more: “This rich mix is not given, but has to be constructed.”
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