Challenges and dilemmas of cultural institutionality in Brazil

Desafios e dilemas da institucionalidade cultural no Brasil

ANTONIO ALBINO CANELAS RUBIM[a]
Universidade Federal da Bahia, Programa Multidisciplinar de Pós-Graduação em Cultura e Sociedade. Salvador – BA, Brazil.

RESUMO
O texto desenvolve um percurso histórico da institucionalidade cultural no Brasil, apontando seus desafios e dilemas. A institucionalidade comporta múltiplas dimensões, dentre elas, administrativas, gerenciais, financeiras, legislativas, organizacionais e trabalhistas. Como o estudo recorre à bibliografia existente, algumas dimensões foram priorizadas, inclusive devido à fragilidade das informações disponíveis. A proposição do estudo é que o procedimento histórico pode contribuir para elucidar avanços, retrocessos e impasses da institucionalidade da cultura no Brasil.
Palavras-chave: Institucionalidade da cultura, políticas culturais, Brasil

[a] Researcher at CNPq and Centro de Estudos Multidisciplinares da Cultura (CULT) and professor at the Multidisciplinary Program of Graduate Program in Culture and Society (Post-Culture), Universidade Federal da Bahia (UFBA). E-mail: albino.rubim@gmail.com

ABSTRACT
The article presents a historical itinerary of culture institutionality in Brazil, pointing out its challenges and dilemmas. Institutionality comprises multiple dimensions, including administrative, managerial, financial, legislative, organizational and occupational aspects. Since the study relies on current bibliography, some dimensions were prioritized due to fragility of available information. The study proposition is that the historical method may contribute to explain advances, setbacks and dilemmas of the culture institutionality in Brazil.
Keywords: Institutionality of culture, cultural policies, Brazil

INTRODUCTION

RECENT FACTS SHOWED today's challenges and dilemmas of culture institutionality in Brazil. The extinction of the Ministry of Culture, a major symbol of the country's cultural institutionality by acting President Temer, and its return after protests defending its maintenance, with an unprecedented victory in the country and perhaps worldwide, put the theme in perspective and included it in the mobilization against the government. To understand the strength acquired by the theme, besides the current circumstance, a historical analysis of the complex development of culture institutionality in the country is required (Rubim, 2010b; Rubim; Barbalho, 2007; Souza, 2000). This historical analysis to be presented in this article also addresses absences, authoritarianism, and instabilities (Rubim, 2007). This impaired history makes it difficult, but not impossible, to monitor and analyze the impasses experienced by culture institutionality in the country. Therefore, an initial effort should be dedicated to it, which can contribute to explain the challenges and dilemmas related to culture in Brazil.

The historical procedure presented here and its limitations as an article make it impossible to discuss in detail the concept of cultural institutionality, supported by authors and theories that address this theme. However, it is necessary to briefly set the boundaries when using cultural institutionality in this article. It should not be considered merely as the constitution of an articulated set of institutional organizations, but it also requires a much broader and denser structure. It involves many other dimensions, such as legal norms, administrative routines, financial resources, specialized personnel, specific studies, among other aspects to be taken into account. This study seeks, to the best possible extent, to address these aspects, aiming to present the course of culture institutionality in Brazil, its challenges and dilemmas. Some challenges should be considered in this satisfactory incursion: the scarce bibliography in Brazil on some of the topics, such as: cultural legislation, funding and promotion of culture, training in cultural organization, functional bodies and culture professionals.

PROBLEMATIC ORIGINS

Culture and its institutionality do not present an exemplary history in Brazil. Although officially the Brazilian culture has been predominantly considered, since the 1930s, a result of the miscegenation of white western, indigenous and black cultures, culture institutionality has not yet expressed such mixture.

Primitive cultures and groups have almost always survived in environments of repression. It killed millions of indigenous people and persecuted languages and cultures of primitive people. Today's 900,000 indigenous people, with their over 240 ethnic groups and almost 200 languages remain without proper institutional attention.

Black cultures resulting from the cruel transformation of Africans from different nations, with estimated five million slaves forcedly brought to Brazil, did not have a different treatment. They survived in environments of violence. Only in 1988, in the centenary of the late slavery abolition in Brazil and with the end of the military dictatorship (1964-1985), the first institution focused on black cultures, the Palmares Cultural Foundation, was created by the national government.

The persistence of these manifestations in Brazilian cultures derives more from the ability to resist and to create mechanisms of symbolic affirmation than from any cultural institutionality and support.

The white western culture had a differential treatment. Its Catholic Portuguese segment organized a colonial enterprise based on an ideological dimension, even with tensions resulting, for example, from conflicts between Jesuits and Bandeirantes (explorers) on the enslavement of indigenous groups. The destruction of Guarani/Jesuit missions became a sign of barbarism by the Bandeirantes of the state of São Paulo.

However, cultural development has always been limited by the strict control and censorship of the Portuguese monarchy. In colonial Brazil, libraries, bookstores, presses, newspapers, universities and other cultural devices were not allowed. When Brazil became independent in 1822 there was no university in Portuguese America, a remarkable contrast with more than 30 universities in Spanish America. The democratic currents of white European culture suffered heavy persecution in Brazil. French ideas, the ideological stimulus of some rebellions against the Portuguese domain, such as the *Inconfidência Mineira* in Minas Gerais, and the *Revolta dos Búzios* in Bahia, were harshly repressed.

The independence promoted by Dom Pedro I, the Portuguese prince and then Emperor of Brazil, did not change the scene. The most relevant change in culture institutionality occurred as a result of a unique event in the history of European colonialism: the arrival of the Royal Family in 1808 in Brazil, fleeing Napoleon's troops, who had invaded Portugal. The migration of the Royal Family and the Portuguese aristocracy originated cultural demands, which were previously impossible due to colonial prohibitions. Cultural institutions and movements are seen in Salvador and, in particular, Rio de Janeiro, such as

the National Library, higher education in Medicine, Law and Fine Arts, and the French Artistic Mission.

The creation of institutions in the independent country was reduced and linked with the ornamental culture (Coutinho, 2000) and as "ideas out of place" (Schwarz, 1978), as they were not linked with the social life. The 19th century brought libraries, *pasquins*, museums, historical and geographical institutes, romantic literature, which elevated the indigenous people as a national symbol, and experienced initiatives of enlightened despot of Dom Pedro II. Nothing with enough power to change the ornamental culture, repression to subaltern cultures and fragile cultural institutionality.

The Republic, proclaimed by a military man close to the monarchy, in one more transition above the power without significant disruption and without relevant participation of the popular sectors, did not change the poor culture institutionality of the country. Even the Modern Art Week of 1922, which marked the beginning of Modernism in Brazil, and the initiatives in the heritage area, which took place before 1930, were unable to change this situation, since, although with nuances, the inferiority of indigenous and black cultures remained. They persisted without any relevant institutionality in the Brazilian State.

BEGINNING OF CULTURAL POLICIES AND INSTITUTIONALITY

In the 1930s, important political, economic and cultural changes took place in Brazil. The so-called "Brazilian Revolution of 1930" promotes another transition above the power without major disruptions. The new regime represents a commitment involving the emerging industrial bourgeoisie, the old agrarian oligarchies, and other social segments, including the military. Middle classes and the working class emerge in the political scene as more substantive actors than before. Industrialization; urbanization; cultural modernism, and the centralized national State are beginning in the country, which is said to be modern.

The second generation of modernists reveals important artists and intellectuals who seek to express a modern Brazil. Two simultaneous experiences originate cultural policies and create a new institutionality of culture: Mário de Andrade as the head of the Department of Culture in the City of São Paulo (1935-1938), a term that was interrupted with the Estado Novo dictatorship (1937-1945), and Gustavo Capanema as the head of the Ministry of Education and Health (1934-1945).

It is surprising that a municipal administration was one of the drivers of cultural transformations in Brazil. Its actions, with its practices and ideals, greatly transcended the borders of the city of São Paulo. Without depleting his

contributions, Mário de Andrade innovated as he (i) established systematic interventions covering different areas of culture; (ii) considered culture as something "as vital as bread"; (iii) proposed a broad definition of culture that goes beyond the fine arts, without disregarding them, and which includes popular cultures, among others; (iv) assumed heritage not only as material and associated with the elites, but also as intangible and related to different segments of the society; (v) sponsored an ethnographic mission to the Amazon region and the Northeast region to study and document their rich cultural collections; and (vi) strengthened cultural institutionality through the creation of bodies and procedures. The project developed by Mário de Andrade had limitations, but received broad recognition, even in the international scenario (Abdanur, 1993; Barbato Jr., 2004; Raffaini, 1999; Schelling, 1991).

Another pioneering movement took place nationwide; it was driven by Minister Gustavo Capanema (Badaró, 2000, Gomes, 2000, Williams, 2000). Aesthetically modernist and politically conservative, he embraced intellectuals and progressive artists, such as Carlos Drummond de Andrade, his chief cabinet secretary, Candido Portinari and Oscar Niemeyer (Velloso, 1987). For the first time, the national State promoted a number of interventions in the area of culture, which combined negative actions – oppression, repression and censorship, as in all dictatorships – with positive attitudes through the development of new formulations, practices, standards and institutions, including legislations for cinema, broadcasting, arts, cultural professions, and the creation of cultural organizations, such as the National Institute of Educational Cinema (1936), Educational Broadcasting Service (1936), Service of National Historical and Artistic Heritage (1937), National Theater Service (1937), National Book Institute (1937), and National Council of Culture (1938). Nationalism, *Brazilianity*, harmony among social classes, apology to work, and recognition of mixed races were the main aspects of the ministry administration.

Not even the creation of these devices or the modernization promoted by Getúlio Vargas' administration with the creation of the Administrative Department of the Public Service, in 1937/1938, was able to change the poor culture institutionality, also because of its continuity and instability. The cultural management, for example, from its start and until the 1980s, was dominated by political and family designations, far from adopting better criteria for qualified cultural administration.

But it had some exceptions, such as the National Historical and Artistic Heritage Service, an emblematic entity of the national cultural policies. Created in 1937, it welcomed modernists, starting with its almost eternal leader: Rodrigo Melo Franco de Andrade (1937-1967). Until the 1970s, the Service, which later

D became the Institute (Iphan) or Secretariat, opted for the preservation of stone and lime monuments, of white culture and baroque aesthetics; in general: Catholic churches, forts and palaces of the colonial period. This way, Iphan delimited its scope of action, eliminated controversies, developed technical competence and professionalized its personnel. Its "institutional insulation," as defined by Sergio Miceli, guaranteed some independence from political intervention, differentiated management, administrative continuity, including its leader, and reinforced institutionality (Miceli, 2001: 362). Paradoxically, its strength was also its weakness. The elitist option, with a strong classist bias; the lack of interaction with the audiences from the preserved sites, and immobility due to its longtime institutional stability, prevented Iphan from keeping up with the progress in the heritage area (Miceli, 2001; Gonçalves, 1996).

Capanema's management attempted to overcome one of the sad traditions in cultural policies in Brazil: absences. At the same time, it created another problematic tradition: the close relationship between authoritarian governments and national cultural policies, although some of the initiatives took place in the period before the Estado Novo dictatorship. This tradition, invented in the Vargas era, would be reinstated later by the military dictatorship in 1964.

The democratic interval from 1945 to 1964 reaffirmed the sad traditions of absences and authoritarianism. A splendid development of Brazilian culture took place in practically all areas, except in culture institutionality and cultural policies in the country, which, except for Iphan, were almost inexistent.

Punctual interventions characterized the democratic period: the creation of the Ministry of Education and Culture in 1953, without strengthening culture institutionality, as it did not promote any new structure; the expansion of public (national) universities; the Folklore Defense Campaign, and the creation of the Higher Institute of Brazilian Studies (Iseb).

The military dictatorship in 1964 reinforced the sad tradition of the link between cultural policies and authoritarianism. The military repressed, censored, persecuted, arrested, murdered, exiled culture, intellectuals, artists, scientists and popular creators, and at the same time created an agenda of *achievements*. Three different moments marked the relationship between the military government and culture.

In the first moment, from 1964 to 1968, the dictatorship persecuted, in particular, popular sectors and militants linked with these segments. Despite the repression, there were political protests against the regime, especially promoted by the middle sectors, and there was a significant "late bloom" of the culture from previous years, predominantly left-wing, but restricted to the middle classes, as pointed out by Roberto Schwarz (1978).

The dictatorship stimulated the predominance of the mediated culture (Rubim; Rubim, 2004). The telecommunications infrastructure development; the creation of Telebrás and Embratel and the beginning of a cultural industry were achievements promoted by the military, who controlled the audiovisual media channels in an attempt to symbolically promote a nationwide integration through the bias of implementing a *national security* policy, with the support from media vehicles. Contrary to that, "traditional" intellectuals, as highlighted by Gramsci (1972, 1978a, 1978b), allies of the regime and covered by the recently created Federal Council of Culture (1966), expressed concern about the impact of television on regional and popular cultures, based on a conservative perspective (Ortiz, 1986). They encouraged culture institutionality by promoting the creation of councils and secretariats in some Brazilian states.

The second moment (late 1968-1974), the most violent of the dictatorship, had frequent cases of torture, murder and systematic censorship, blocking a significant part of the cultural dynamics, especially more critical and progressive sectors. That was the period of so-called *cultural void*, frustrated by the hippie and *marginal* countercultures; the period of imposed media culture, technically sophisticated and faithful reproducing the official ideology.

The end of the dictatorship at the 1974 legislative elections originated the third moment, which ended in 1985, with the removal of the military regime. To conduct the transition, the country assigned cultural professionals (Ortiz, 1986: 85) by increasing investments, including institutional investments, in this area. For the first time, the country had a National Culture Policy (1975). Several cultural institutions were created (Miceli, 1984), such as the National Arts Foundation (1975), National Center of Cultural Reference (1975), National Council of Cinema (1976), Radiobrás (1976), and Pro-Memory Foundation (1979).

Here, two facts should be highlighted: first, the creation of the National Arts Foundation (Funarte), an emblematic institution, based on the experience of the Cultural Action Plan (1973). Funarte, initially a project funding agency, was consolidated due to innovative interventions; a qualified technical body, whose members came from cultural areas; and the attempt to overcome the physiological logic of support in the cultural field, by means of project merit analysis (Botelho, 2001). Subsequent changes eliminated this innovative character of Funarte.

The second significant movement was associated with Aloísio Magalhães. In his short period of action and until his death in 1982, Aloísio, an administrative intellectual (Ortiz, 1986: 124), with his dynamism, creativity and relationships with military sectors, created or changed bodies such as the National Center of

Cultural Reference (1975); Iphan (1979); Sphan and Pro-Memory (1979), and the Secretariat of Culture of the Ministry of Education and Culture (1981). His new vision of heritage; his *anthropological* conception of culture; his attention to popular knowledge, crafts and traditional technologies (Magalhães, 1985) promoted changes, though limited by the dictatorial context.

The exceptional but isolated experiences of Iphan and Funarte were not enough to change the Brazilian scenario of culture institutionality. The three predominant sad traditions in the history of cultural policies in the country – absences, authoritarianism and instabilities – did not allow greater attention and care to cultural institutionality. It remained immersed in amateurism, fragility, patronage, physiologism, patrimonialism, and instability.

MINISTRY OF CULTURE AND THE DILEMMAS OF INSTITUTIONALITY

The Brazilian Ministry of Culture has a recent history. It was created in 1985 with the end of dictatorship. From 1930 to 1953, culture was subordinated to the Ministry of Education and Health, and starting in 1953, to the Ministry of Education and Culture. Only 32 years later culture received a specific ministry. With the end of dictatorship, for many reasons, the creation of the Ministry of Culture became almost inevitable, but it involved controversy and trouble.

During the presidential administrations of José Sarney (1985-1989), Fernando Collor (1990-1992), and Itamar Franco (1992-1994), the tradition of instability is significant in the area of culture. The ministry was created in 1985, destroyed and changed into a mere secretariat in 1990, and recreated in 1993. Collor extinguished the ministry, reduced culture to a secretariat and extinguished several bodies, such as the National Arts Foundation; the Brazilian Film Company (Embrafilme); the Pro-Memory Foundation (Pró-Memória); the National Foundation of the Performing Arts (Fundacen), and the National Council of Cinema (Concine). Its first secretary, Ipojuca Pontes, developed a ferocious neoliberal program for culture (Pontes, 1991).

Besides institutional discontinuity, ten leaders were responsible for the management of national cultural bodies during these three administrations (1985-1994). No matter how brilliant they were, which was not always true, the average of less than one year in office created corrosive administrative instability for a body in implementation process.

Ambiguities did not come only from institutional and administrative discontinuity. In 1986, the so-called *Lei Sarney* (Sarney Law) was introduced, the first Brazilian tax incentive law to fund cultural projects (Sarney, 2000). It caused a paradoxical movement. The government created several bodies:

Secretariats to Support Cultural Production (1986); the National Foundation for Performing Arts (1987); Foundation of Brazilian Cinema (1987); National Pro-Reading Foundation, which joined the National Library and the National Book Institute (1987); and the Palmares Cultural Foundation (1988). The law contradicted all these investments, since it introduced a radical disruption in the current way to support culture. The Sarney Law extinction during Collor's administration originated a new incentive law, the *Lei Rouanet* (Rouanet Law). Revised in Fernando Henrique Cardoso's administration, it became more effective and remains in force until today.

In the 1980s, a "perverse convergence," as noted by Evelina Dagnino (2005), occurred in Brazil, because the end of the dictatorship and the beginning of democracy coexist in a tragic way with the global neoliberalism and its penetration in the country, which resulted in the administration of Fernando Collor (1990-1992), and then Fernando Henrique Cardoso (1995-2002). In this circumstance, changes happened in the relations between the State and culture, in the development of cultural policies, management and institutionality in the country (Bastos, 2004; Olivieri, 2004).

With President Fernando Henrique Cardoso, the market took the place of the State in national cultural policies. José Castello (2002), in the unsuspicious book *A Era FHC* (The FHC Era), noted that the incentive laws acted as cultural policies. From incentive, they became almost the only form of funding and, even worse, they became the true *cultural policy* of the federal government. The booklet titled *Cultura é um bom negócio* (Culture is a good business) is a symbol of this partnership (Brasil, 1995).

Incentive laws, in their Brazilian version, transfer to the companies the decision on culture, which remains supported by public resources, almost in its entirety. The State renounces an active role in the cultural field. Criticisms to tax incentive in culture funding in Brazil address many aspects: (i) nowadays, almost all the resources come from the State; (ii) the power of decision support culture with public resources is transferred from the State to the companies; (iii) the supported works and events depend almost exclusively on the visibility of the attractions and cultural actions in places with consumers of the products and services from the sponsoring companies; (iv) high funding concentration in certain regions, projects and cultural areas (Dória, 2003; Sarkovas, 2005). In spite of these and other negative aspects, tax incentives contributed to the development of the country's culture and enabled culture institutionality through the legalization of cultural intermediaries or producers starting in the 1990s, as they are usually called in Brazil. These professionals design projects, capture resources, manage activities, build events etc.; that is, they organize culture (Rubim, 2004).

Few initiatives were not funded by incentive laws in the FHC administration. Some exceptions should be remembered: the unsuccessful attempt to provide all municipalities with at least one library; the Monumenta Program, focused on material heritage, strangely conducted outside Iphan; and the National Program for Intangible Heritage (2000). The eight-year administration stability contributed little to the institutional consolidation of the ministry.

The absence of national policies in the FHC administration confirmed the inability of democracy in Brazil to operate in the area of culture, detected by one of the main mentors of the Ministry of Culture from that government, Professor José Álvaro Moisés. In his article *Estrutura institucional do setor cultural no Brasil* (Institutional structure of the cultural sector in Brazil) (Moisés, 2001), he recognized the unusual relationship between authoritarianism and cultural policies in the country and stated that the great challenge would be to reverse this historical trend.

CULTURAL POLICIES AND INSTITUTIONALITY IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF LULA AND DILMA

In his ministry program speech in 2003, the first year of the administration, Minister Gilberto Gil (Gil, 2003) addressed two subjects that were opposed to the tradition of absences. He emphasized the active role of the State, criticized its omission in the cultural field, and poetically proposed that "formulating cultural policies means producing culture." Besides this speech, ministers Gil (2003-2008) and Juca Ferreira (2008-2010) showed an active attitude of the State in the area of culture (Rubim, 2010a; Rubim, 2011).

Gilberto Gil criticized the term of Francisco Weffort, minister of the FHC administration, highlighting the absent State and the power granted to companies through the incentive laws. According to a document issued by the Ministry of Culture, in 18 years of the Rouanet Law, of the eight billion *reais* (BRL) invested, more than seven billion were public resources (Brasil, 2010a). In a problematic way, the change in promoting culture has not become a reality until today. The reformulated funding policy, called now *Pró-Cultura* (Pro-Culture), was only submitted to the National Congress in 2010, the last year of Lula's administration. It is now being discussed by the parliament. If not approved, it will impact a redefinition of the role of the State and its relationship with the policies of cultural diversity implemented since 2003.

The ministry did not ensure high priority to the debate on the democratic State in the field of culture, after the complicated experiences with the almighty State of the dictatorship and the neoliberal minimal State. Despite the debate

fragility and the persistent funding policy, the government was able to develop public cultural policies, in a dialogue with the society and cultural communities.

This dialogue opened paths to address another sad tradition: authoritarianism. The challenge to formulate and implement cultural policies in democratic circumstances was inserted in the agenda of the ministry.

Interaction with the society was achieved by developing public policies. They emerged as a characteristic of Lula's administration and the ministerial managements of Gil and Juca. Countless gatherings were promoted: seminars; sectoral chambers; public consultations; councils; the National Council of Cultural Policies; collegiate meetings; working groups; conferences; culminating in the national conferences of culture held in 2005 and 2010. Through these devices, the society participated in the discussion, influenced the deliberation and built, with the State, public cultural policies.

The ministry also had to deal with the structural authoritarianism that permeates the Brazilian society due to socioeconomic, cultural and power inequalities. It is expressed in attitudes against poor people; women; black people; indigenous groups; older people; LGBT communities; the disabled; immigrants, and different groups. The adoption of the expanded concept of culture allowed a fight against the structural authoritarianism. This *anthropological* attitude expanded the actions of the ministry beyond (material) heritage and (consolidated) arts, allowing the participation of other cultures: popular; Afro-Brazilian; indigenous; ethnic; age-based; gender-based; sexual orientation; periphery; audiovisual; digital technology and networks, and other groups. Convergence between the policies of cultural diversity and those of social diversity implemented by the government was remarkable. The resulting programs and speeches allowed this contact (President Lula, 2006; Brasil, 2007).

In some cases, the Ministry of Culture assumed an inaugural attitude, for instance, paying attention to the cultures of the primitive groups. The Secretariat of Cultural Identity and Diversity recognized indigenous cultures, developed policies and supported manifestations of these groups, still in a tenuous manner. The Sectoral Plan for Indigenous Cultures, approved in December 2010 by the Sectoral Coordination of Indigenous Cultures, linked with the National Council of Cultural Policies, supports this movement (Brasil, 2012a). Also important was the approval of the Sectoral Plan for Popular Cultures (Brasil, 2012b).

Brazil, through its Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Culture, had a decisive participation in the approval of the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions in October 2005 in Paris, France. Consistent with this international commitment, the ministry implemented cultural diversity policies, disseminating the Convention and the Universal

Declaration of Cultural Diversity, both of UNESCO, and the Ibero-American Cultural Charter, approved at a meeting of the Ministers of Culture from the Ibero-American countries in 2006.

The broad idea of culture allowed the Audiovisual Secretariat (SAv) and the National Film Agency (Ancine) to design innovative projects. They developed policies and transformed themselves. Several bodies related to audiovisual activities worked together with SAv: Ancine, Audiovisual Technical Center and Cinemateca Brasileira. They used to be linked with the Civil Cabinet, Funarte and Iphan, respectively. With a stronger institutional structure, the audiovisual sector implemented the program called *Brasil um País de Todas as Telas* (Brazil, a country of all screens), to address the audiovisual area, involving all its aspects. DOC-TV was developed in the production sector. This program joined the ministry and public television channels of all kinds. It foresaw the co-production of documentaries in different regions of the country to be disseminated throughout Brazil. The success of the program was visible in its various editions and in its expansion to Ibero-America and the Community of Portuguese Speaking Countries (CPLP). Another exemplary program was *Revelando Brasis*, which showed cities with up to 20,000 inhabitants.

The Ministry of Culture was sensitive to the contemporary connections between culture and communication, since the media vehicles are currently vital producers of symbolic assets. With its broader conception of culture, the actions by the ministry intended to incorporate the media. The electronic game RFPs and the programs aforementioned are examples of this development. But its most ambitious projects in the area were changing Ancine into the National Agency of Cinema and Audiovisual (Ancinav) and the construction of Public Television in Brazil. These projects had strong opposition from the conservative sectors, especially those linked with the mainstream media, which are against any social regulation and democratization of communication in the country. Ancinav was barred and the government partially concluded the public television construction, with the implementation of Empresa Brasileira de Comunicação (Ferreira, 2004).

The Cultura Viva Program was one of most important actions of the ministry, having received attention in Brazil and abroad. It became known through its Pontos de Cultura project. The program, created in 2004, aims to stimulate cultural points in the most diverse cultural areas throughout the country. Two important characteristics of this problem should be highlighted: its nationwide character, considering the ministry used to focus its main locations in cities such as Rio de Janeiro, Brasília, and São Paulo, and its cultural diversity coverage. It expresses the radical novelty of the program: the State opening to cultural

communities and modalities, previously systematically excluded from the relationship with the Brazilian national State. The cultural points welcomed and recognized new actors and cultural communities.

The Cultura Viva Program showed this exclusion character and reported the serious inadequate relation between the State and the society. The cultural points demanded a reformulated State, in a democratic and republican perspective. Being consistent with the program above all means not forgetting its innovative trait, not losing its potentially subversive character. The utopia of another State and another world should be assumed as fully possible.

In this sense, it has become one of the most innovative activities of the cultural policies developed by the administrations of Lula and Dilma. Its societal impact can be measured by the dimension it gained in the ministry and government, by the extension of its devices to other sectors of the ministry, through the Mais Cultura Program, by the growing number of cultural points also supported by state and municipal governments; due to its visibility, its national and international impact, and the approval by the National Congress of a specific law for the program and the creation of a broad and new social base for the actions of the Ministry of Culture.

The conceptual and practical opening meant the elitist and discriminatory view of culture was left behind. It represented a counterpoint to structural authoritarianism embedded in the Brazilian history of culture. This change in focus and perspective was expressed in the statements of Gil and Juca reinforcing that the ministry's priority audience is the Brazilian society, and not just cultural producers.

The process to eliminate instability involved measures to strengthen institutionality. The ministry organization was expanded through the organization of the Federal Culture System, political and administrative reforms, and the development of new structures. The creation of the Brazilian Institute of Museums (Ibram) crowned the work conducted under the museum policy, the National Museum System and the broadened international cooperation such as the Ibermuseus. The new organizational structures of copyright and international relations of the ministry should be noted, such as the creation of the International Relations Office in 2008. Despite this progress, the new forged institutionality still does not fulfill the needs of the ministry and the field of culture in Brazil.

NEW POSSIBLE LEVEL OF CULTURE INSTITUTIONALITY IN BRAZIL

The challenges in the administrations of Lula and Dilma were not only related to overcoming the neoliberal cultural policies of the FHC administration; but also

to addressing the three sad traditions – absences, authoritarianism and instabilities – that hindered the development of active, democratic and sustainable cultural policies and more significant gains in cultural institutionality in the country.

The culture management in Brazil has a strong tradition of discontinuity. Three movements, started by Lula and developed by Dilma, were central to overcome this sad institutional tradition and develop State policies. These are the National Culture Plan (PNC), the National Culture System (SNC), and the Proposed Amendment to the Constitution (PEC), which provides a budget for culture. Such initiatives are not the best and do not receive the highest amount from the ministry. They do not have the same impact or visibility as, for example, the Cultura Viva program and its Pontos de Cultura. But they allow, considering the political and institutional architecture, the development of State policies; that is, long-term policies in the field of culture.

The PEC has been discussed by the National Congress for more than ten years, without a reasonable prospect of approval, especially in the new national context, in which existing budgets for education and health are restrained by the acting government and its political allies. It proposes to amend the Federal Constitution to ensure the allocation of at least 2% of the national budget to culture, with 1% allocated to states and municipalities, and foreseeing that states allocate at least 1.5% of their budgets to culture, and municipalities at least 1% of the budget. The constitutional budget determination is critical to eliminate traditional instabilities, for in addition to increasing the funds for culture, it ensures continuous and stable resource allocation, allowing viable planning and positive impacts for culture development. The fact that the PEC has not advanced in the National Congress does not allow further analysis at the moment. However, it should be noted that the political scenario of the country and the National Congress are quite contrary to its approval.

The National Culture Plan and the National Culture System are in very different situations. They have progressed since 2003, but at a pace that is far from the ideal speed required by the implementation processes and cultural communities. In 2010, the National Congress approved the law that created the National Culture Plan (PNC) (Brasil, 2010b). It was preceded by the Federal Constitution amendment no. 48 of August 10, 2005. In 2012, amendment no. 71 included the National Culture System (SNC) in the Brazilian Federal Constitution. The PNC and the SNC are structural policies that should deeply change the cultural institutionality in Brazil, since they require long-term State policies.

The approval by the National Congress of the constitutional amendment and the subsequent development of the National Culture Plan, in a partnership between the Ministry of Culture and the Chamber of Deputies, provided a

ten-year plan (Brasil, 2008). This plan joins the ministry, the National Congress and the civil society, given its public policy character, conducted in hearings, conferences, debates and seminars. But its high number of guidelines, actions and priorities, registered in the PNC, make it difficult to ensure a significant improvement when compared with the situation in 2010 (Rubim, 2009). In 2011, the Ministry of Culture dedicated efforts to turn around 250 actions into 53 goals, seeking to enable a viable, monitored and evaluated PNC. The National Council of Cultural Policies approved the goals, which were later disseminated in states and municipalities, because the effectiveness of many of them depends on the collaborative action of federative entities. The PNC set a planning perspective in the national cultural area and imposed its adoption at the state and municipal levels, since it implies state and municipal cultural plans.

The development of the National Culture System has been conducted by the Ministry in partnership with states, municipalities and the civil society (Brasil, 2016). It is crucial for the consolidation of primary and complementary policies and structures that enable medium- or long-term cultural programs; then not subjected to political instabilities (Meira, 2016; Rubim, 2016).

SNC seeks to voluntarily articulate the federal entities – the Union, the states and the municipalities – in collaborative and complementary work. The SNC voluntary adhesion terms foresee that each federative entity should create a specific culture management body (specific secretariat, shared secretariat, foundation, board, department etc.); a culture council, based on democratic models, and a fund to support culture to encourage the development of culture and receive allocated resources.

The SNC implementation strengthens structures and flows from the field of culture and significantly increases culture institutionality. The adherence to the SNC requires the construction of state and municipal systems of culture. Besides the collaborative work developed by the federative entities, SNC also foresees the integration or creation, as appropriate, of subsystems such as the National System of Museums or other similar structures.

Systems articulate actors, rationalize resources, allow collaborative work, facilitate exchanges, enable innovative initiatives, broaden the scope of interventions, require more qualified management and professionals, demand norms and routines, enable federative connections, ensure more consistent institutional structure, and finally, consolidate more permanent and long-term policies.

Components of the SNC are, at the Union, state and municipality levels: management bodies, conferences, councils, plans, funding systems, sectoral systems, information systems and indicators, inter-managerial committees, and training program in the area of culture (Brasil, 2011).

D

The development of the SNC, initially proposed in the document *A Imaginação a Serviço do Brasil* (Partidos dos Trabalhadores, 2002), was incisively assumed by the Secretariat of Institutional Articulation of the Ministry of Culture, in the administration of Márcio Meira. At the end of 2005, the SNC was officially recognized at the 1st National Conference of Culture and already had the adhesion of almost all the states and more than one thousand municipalities. With the departure of Márcio Meira, the SNC development was delayed and resumed in 2009, with the arrival of José Roberto Peixe as the Ministry of Culture, and strengthened in March 2010 with the 2nd National Conference of Culture.

Restarting that work involved reactivating the agreements with states and municipalities, including today all 26 states, the Federal District and around 2,000 municipalities, detailing the legal framework of the SNC and developing activities to start ensuring SNC effectiveness. Among these actions, a pilot project was conducted in Salvador to provide a culture management course developed by a committee of experts to begin the personnel training process, as required in the SNC. After this initial course, many other experiences have been conducted, beginning a Culture Training Program, as part of the SNC (Rubim; Rubim, 2012; Rubim; Rubim, 2014; Costa, 2011; Costa, 2014).

At the same time, another project mapped the country's experiences related to training in cultural policies, management and production. This study developed a diagnosis of the culture training scenario in undergraduate, graduate, or even in extension training programs (Rubim; Barbalho; Costa, 2012). The mapping suggested that the Ministry of Culture should start developing a Culture Training Network, associated with the SNC, joining the ministry and territorially distributed qualified institutions to design training programs in culture. The development of this cooperation network will provide the state with more permanent policies in the field of training. However, this network has not been developed yet.

Governing bodies, collectives, committees, systems and other foreseen bodies involve (qualified) personnel, in particular, dedicated to public management in the field of culture. The attention to cultural management is constantly highlighted in ministry's documents, especially those related to the PNC and the SNC. A ministerial document stated:

> The training of personnel in cultural policy and management is strategic for the implementation and management of the National Culture System, as it is an area that lacks professionals with knowledge and skills in the field of public policy management. (Brasil, 2011: 49-50)

The text, after this evidence, broadened its qualification spectrum to include private sector managers and cultural advisers.

At the three national culture conferences (2005, 2010 and 2013) and at sectoral, state, territorial and municipal conferences, the theme of training, qualification and education has been one of the main demands of cultural communities. Such attitudes put training in perspective, which is an essential component for culture institutionality.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The possibility of overcoming absences, authoritarianism and instabilities depends mostly on the existence, articulation, and alignment of the SNC and the PNC. But this relationship between them has not been so fluid in the ministry, starting with their locations in separate secretariats until 2016: the SNC is in the Secretariat of Institutional Articulation, and the PNC in the Department of Cultural Policies. The differentiated rhythms assumed by these processes as a result of the ministry's own performance also interfere in the connection between the PNC and the SNC: an intense rhythm of the SNC until 2005, and a strong rhythm for the PNC starting in 2007. Only in 2009 the rhythm seemed to be more articulated between these two components of State policies for the field of culture.

The existence of such dilemmas in the articulation and serious issue of culture funding, still to be resolved in an appropriate way, does not make it impossible for the National Culture Plan and the National Culture System, when they become a reality, to represent the possibility of a new and more solid level of culture institutionality in Brazil. But the consolidation of the PNC and the SNC requires continuous public policies of culture, which started during the administrations of Lula and Dilma (Rubim; Barbalho, Calabre, 2015), and the resolution of crucial issues, such as SNC funding, follow-up and evaluation of the first plan, and collective development of the second PNC, to be in force from 2020 to 2030.

The threat posed by the acting administration, derived from the media/legal/parliamentary coup, involving the extinction of the Ministry of Culture shows the current political moment in Brazil is very serious, with impact on all the policies that have been implemented in the country since 2003, including the cultural ones. When disregarding all the work conducted towards culture institutionality, the acting government showed its animosity with culture and cultural policies in force. Most artists, intellectuals, professionals and militants of the culture had already protested against the coup and in defense of democracy in the country before the departure of President Dilma.

With the new federal administration and its proposal to extinguish the ministry, the cultural field movement has expanded. Headquarters of the Ministry and its bodies have been occupied throughout the country, protests have grown, famous people from the field of culture were spoken, six expressive female cultural personalities did not accept the invitation to take over the management of the Culture Secretariat created to replace the Ministry. Then, the government was forced to go back and quickly recreate the Ministry of Culture, setting its first major defeat. However, the important victory of keeping the Ministry does not mean the maintenance of the cultural policies in progress. Soon afterwards, new turbulences, created within the government, affected the MINC with the resignation and replacement of the minister. The struggle for culture institutionality is still a current theme in contemporary Brazil.

REFERENCES

ABDANUR, E. F. *Os "Ilustrados" e a política cultural em São Paulo*: o Departamento de Cultura na gestão Mário de Andrade (1935-1938). 1992. 183 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em História) – Instituto de Filosofia e Ciências Humanas, Unicamp, Campinas, 1993.

BADARÓ, M. *Gustavo Capanema*: a revolução na cultura. Rio de Janeiro: Nova Fronteira, 2000.

BARBATO JUNIOR, R. *Missionários de uma utopia nacional-popular*: os intelectuais e o Departamento de Cultura de São Paulo. São Paulo: Annablume; Fapesp, 2004.

BASTOS, M. R. *O espelho da nação*: a cultura como objeto de política no governo Fernando Henrique Cardoso. 2004. 324 f. Tese (Doutorado em Sociologia) – Faculdade de Filosofia e Ciências Humanas, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, 2004.

BOTELHO, I. *Romance de formação*: Funarte e política cultural 1976-1990. Rio de Janeiro: Edições Casa de Rui Barbosa, 2001.

BRASIL. Ministério da Cultura. *Cultura é um bom negócio.* Brasília, DF, 1995.

_____. Presidência da República. Secretaria de Imprensa. *Discurso do presidente Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva na cerimônia de lançamento do Programa Mais Cultura.* Brasília, DF, 04 out. 2007. Disponível em: <https://goo.gl/huRHZi>. Acesso em: 23 fev. 2010.

_____. Ministério da Cultura e Câmara dos Deputados. *Plano Nacional de Cultura.* Brasília, DF, 2008.

_____. *Nova lei da cultura.* Brasília, DF: Ministério da Cultura, 2010a.

_____. Lei nº 12.343, de 2 de dezembro de 2010. Institui o Plano Nacional de Cultura – PNC e cria o sistema nacional de informações e indicadores culturais – SNIIC e dá outras providências. *Diário Oficial da União*, *Poder Legislativo*. Brasília, DF, 3 out. 2010b. Seção 1, p. 1.

_____. *Estruturação, institucionalização e implementação do sistema nacional de cultura*. Brasília, DF: Ministério da Cultura, 2011.

_____. *Plano setorial para as culturas indígenas*. Brasília, DF: Ministério da Cultura, 2012a.

_____. *Plano setorial para as culturas populares.* Brasília, DF: Ministério da Cultura, 2012b.

_____. *Seminário internacional sistemas de cultura: política e gestão cultural descentralizada e participativa.* Brasília, DF: Ministério da Cultura; Rio de Janeiro: Fundação Casa de Rui Barbosa, 2016.

CASTELLO, J. Cultura. In: LAMOUNIER, B.; FIGUEIREDO, R. (Orgs.). *A era FHC*: um balanço. São Paulo: Cultura Editores Associados, p. 627-656, 2002.

COSTA, L. F. *Profissionalização da organização da cultura no Brasil*: uma análise da formação em produção, gestão e políticas culturais. 2011. 239 f. Tese (Doutorado em Cultura e Sociedade) – Faculdade de Comunicação, Universidade Federal da Bahia, Salvador, 2011.

COUTINHO, C. N. *Cultura e sociedade no Brasil*: ensaios sobre ideias e formas. Rio de Janeiro: DP&A, 2000.

DAGNINO, E. Políticas culturais, democracia e o projeto neoliberal. *Revista Rio de Janeiro*, Rio de Janeiro, n. 15, p. 45-65, jan./abr. 2005.

DÓRIA, C. A. *Os federais da cultura.* São Paulo: Biruta, 2003.

FERREIRA, J. Ancinav: Omissão ou missão? *Teoria e Debate*, São Paulo, n. 60, p. 64-67, 2004.

GIL, G. *Discursos do Ministro da Cultura Gilberto Gil*. Brasília, DF: Ministério da Cultura, 2003.

GOMES, A. C. (Org.). *Capanema*: o ministro e seu ministério. Rio de Janeiro: FGV, 2000.

GONÇALVES, J. R. S. *A retórica da perda*: os discursos do patrimônio cultural no Brasil. Rio de Janeiro: UFRJ; Iphan, 1996.

GRAMSCI, A. *A formação dos intelectuais*. Venda Nova: M. Rodrigues Xavier, 1972.

_____. *Os intelectuais e a organização da cultura*. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1978a.

_____. *Literatura e vida nacional*. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1978b.

LULA PRESIDENTE. *Brasil*: cultivar a memória, inventar o futuro. Programa Setorial de Cultura. Brasil, 2006.MAGALHÃES, A. *E triunfo? A questão dos*

bens culturais no Brasil. Rio de Janeiro: Nova Fronteira; Fundação Nacional Pró-Memória, 1985.

MEIRA, M. Sistema nacional de cultura: uma construção permanente. In: BRASIL. Ministério da Cultura. *Seminário internacional sistemas de cultura*: Política e Gestão Cultural Descentralizada e Participativa. Brasília, DF: Ministério da Cultura; Rio de Janeiro: Fundação Casa de Rui Barbosa, 2016. p. 133-143.

MICELI, S. (Org.). *Estado e cultura no Brasil*. São Paulo: Difel, 1984.

_____. *Intelectuais à brasileira*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2001.

MOISÉS, J. Á. Estrutura institucional do setor cultural no Brasil. In: MOISÉS, J. Á. et al. *Cultura e democracia*. Rio de Janeiro: Edições Fundão Nacional de Cultura, 2001. v. 1, p. 13-55. (Cadernos do nosso tempo).

OLIVIERI, C. G. *Cultura neoliberal*: leis de incentivo como política pública de cultura. São Paulo: Escrituras; Instituto Pensarte, 2004.

ORTIZ, R. *Cultura brasileira e identidade nacional*. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1986.

PARTIDO DOS TRABALHADORES. *A imaginação a serviço do Brasil*. São Paulo: Comitê Lula Presidente, 2002. Disponível em: <https://goo.gl/yD-mrZU>. Acesso em: 29 maio 2017.

PONTES, I. *Cultura e modernidade*. Brasília, DF: Secretaria da Cultura, 1991.

RAFFAINI, P. T. *Esculpindo a cultura na forma Brasil*: o Departamento de Cultura de São Paulo (1935-1938). 1999. 113 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em História) – Faculdade de Filosofia, Letras e Ciências Humanas, Universidade de São Paulo, 1999.

RUBIM, A. A. C. Políticas culturais no Brasil: tristes tradições, enormes desafios. In: RUBIM, A. A. C.; BARBALHO, A. *Políticas culturais no Brasil*. Salvador: UFBA, 2007. p. 11-36.

_____. Discussão sobre o Plano Nacional de Cultura. *Teoria & Debate*. São Paulo, n. 81, p. 48-51, 2009.

_____.(Org.). *Políticas culturais no governo Lula*. Salvador: UFBA, 2010a.

_____. Políticas culturais no Brasil: itinerários e atualidade. In: BOLAÑO, C.; GOLIN, C.; BRITTOS, V. (Orgs.). *Economia da arte e da cultura*. São Paulo: Observatório Itaú Cultural, 2010b. p. 51-71.

_____. *As políticas culturais e o governo Lula*. São Paulo: Fundação Perseu Abramo, 2011.

_____. Uma agenda para a estruturação do SNC: acúmulo, desafios e perspectivas. In: BRASIL. Ministério da Cultura; Fundação Casa de Rui Barbosa *Seminário Internacional Sistemas de Cultura:* Política e Gestão Cultural Descentralizada e Participativa. Brasília, DF: Ministério da Cultura; Rio de Janeiro: Fundação Casa de Rui Barbosa, 2016. p. 17-24.

RUBIM, A. A. C.; BARBALHO, A. *Políticas culturais no Brasil*. Salvador: Edufba, 2007.

RUBIM, A. A. C.; BARBALHO, A.; COSTA, L. Formação em organização da cultura: a situação latino-americana. *PragMatizes*, Rio de Janeiro, v. 2, n. 2, p. 125-149, mar. 2012.

RUBIM, A. A. C.; BARBALHO, A.; CALABRE, L. (Orgs.). *Políticas culturais no governo Dilma*. Salvador: UFBA, 2015.

RUBIM, A. A. C.; RUBIM, L. S. O. Televisão e políticas culturais no Brasil. *Revista USP*, São Paulo, n. 61, p. 16-28, 2004.

_____. Organizadores da cultura: delimitação e formação. In: OROZCO, J. L. M. (Coord.). *Profesionalización de gestores culturales en Latinoamérica*. Guadalajara: Universidad de Guadalajara, 2012. p. 33-42.

_____. Dilemas da organização da cultura no Brasil. In: CANAL, C. Y. (Org.). *Emergencias de la gestión cultural en América Latina*. Manizeles: Universidad Nacional da Colombia, 2014. p. 145-156.

RUBIM, L. Produção cultural. In: RUBIM, L. (Org.). *Organização e produção da cultura*. Salvador: UFBA, 2005. p. 13-31.

SARKOVAS, Y. O incentivo fiscal no Brasil. *Teoria & Debate*. São Paulo, n. 62, p. 58-62, 2005.

SARNEY, J. Incentivo à cultura e sociedade industrial. In: JELÍN, E. et al. *Cultura e desenvolvimento*. Rio de Janeiro: Fundo Nacional de Cultura, 2000. p. 27-44.

SCHELLING, V. *A presença do povo na cultura brasileira*. Ensaio sobre o pensamento de Mário de Andrade e Paulo Freire. Campinas: Unicamp, 1991.

SCHWARZ, R. Cultura e política: 1964-1969. In: _____. *O pai de família e outros estudos*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1978. p. 61-92.

_____. As ideias fora do lugar. In: _____. *Ao vencedor as batatas*. São Paulo: Livraria Duas Cidades, 1977. p. 13-28.

SOUZA, M. *Fascínio e repulsa.* Estado, cultura e sociedade no Brasil. Rio de Janeiro: Edições do Fundo Nacional de Cultura, 2000. (Cadernos de Nosso Tempo n. 2).

VELLOSO, M. P. *Os intelectuais e a política cultural do Estado Novo*. Rio de Janeiro: Centro de Pesquisa e Documentação de História Contemporânea do Brasil – FGV, 1987.

WILLIAMS, D. Gustavo Capanema. Ministro da Cultura. In: GOMES, Â. C. (Org.) *Capanema*: o ministro e seu ministério. Rio de Janeiro: FGV, 2000. p. 251-269.