

**Visit of 30 June - 2 July 1997**

- R. Nery (former Secretary of State for Culture)
- A. Furtado (former Principal Private Secretary to the Minister of Culture)

**Visit of 10 and 11 November 1997**

**Visit of 1-7 February 1998**

**LISBON**

- Manuel Maria Carrilho (Minister of Culture)
- Catarina Vaz Pinto (Secretary of State for Culture)
- Ana Marin Gaspar (Director, IPAE)
- Anabela Moutinho (ex-Deputy Director, IPACA)
- Paulo Jorge Pereira (Deputy Director, IPPAR)
- Paulo Henriques (Director, Museu Azulejo)
- João Brites (Cultural activities officer for EXPO '98)
- Teresa Ricõ (Director, Chapitô)
- Orlando Garcia (Prof. Univ. Cons. À Chapitô)

**OPORTO**

- Manuela Melo (Municipal cultural activities officer)
- Isabel Costa (Director, Municipal Theatre)
- Paula Aleixo (Municipal Director of Culture)
- João Fernandes (Artistic Director, Serralves Foundation)
- Louis Leger (Director of the Matosinhos Jazz Club)
- Júlio Moreira (Cultural Executive Director)

**GUIMARÃES**

- António Magalhães (Chairperson, Town Hall)
- Isable Sousa (Director, Public Library)
- Jorge Ginja (Regional Delegate for the North)

**CASTELO BRANCO**

- Joaquim Morão (Chairperson, Castelo Branco Town Hall)
- Maria Manuel Viana (Cultural officer, Castelo Branco Town Hall)
- Fernando Raposo (Cult., Castelo Branco Town Hall)
- Rui Gomes de Sena (GICC - Teatro das Beiras)
- Américo Rodrigues (Cultural activities organiser, Guarda)
- Maestro Luis Cipriano (Vocational Arts School of Beira Interior)
- Artur Meireles (Vocational Arts School of Beira Interior)
- Fernando Palouro Neves (Fundão newspaper)
- Joaquim Rafael ( Alcains Recreational and Cultural Association)
- Ayres de Sa (former cultural officer, Covilha)
- Lopes Marcelo (Writier)
- Celeste Capelo (Orfeão of Castelo Branco)
- Francisco Sousa Baptista (Chairperson, Idanha-a-Nova Town Hall)
- António Catana (Cultural officer, Idanha-a-Nova)
- Pedro Salvado (Director, Raiano Cultural Centre)
- António Marques (Cult. Belmonte Town Hall)
- Carlos Pinto (Chairperson, Covilhã Town Hall)
- Maria do Rosario Pinto da Rocha (Cultural officer, Covilhã)

## **ÉVORA**

- Abílio Fernandes (Chairperson, Evora Town Hall)
- Manual Branco (Cult., Evora Town Hall)
- Ana Maria de Mira Borges (Regional Delegate for Alentejo)
- Mário Barradas e Fernando Mora Ramos (CENDREV)
- Carlos Manuel Pinto de Sá (Chairperson, Montemor-o-Novo Town hall)
- Jorge Queiroz (Socio-cultural officer, Montemor-o-Novo Town Hall)

## **SINTRA**

- Ana Arbués Moreira (Director, Museu Brinquedo)
- Rui pereira (Cultural officer, Sintra Town Hall)
- Paula Marques (Cult., Sintra Town Hall)
- José Cardin Ribeiro (Director, Museu Arqueológica São Miguel Odrinhas)

## **Visit of 16 - 22 April 1998**

## **LISBON**

- Costa Cabral (Director, Belas Artes Department, Gulbenkian)
- Jorge Molder (Departmental Director, Centre for Modern Art)
- Vanda da Silva (Director, Institute of Dance)
- António Pinto Ribeiro (Artistic Director, Culturgest)

### **Round Tables**

- Pedro Calapez (Plastic Arts)
- Francisco Camacho (Dance)
- Isabel Carol (Deputy Director, ICA)
- André Gago (Theatre)
- Alexandre Melo (University Professor in the Sociology of Culture and the Arts)
- Joaquim Sapinho (Cinema)
- Mario Abreu (Assistant to the Secretary of State for Culture)
- Luis Capucha (University Professor in the Sociology of the Social Classes)
- Joaquim Mestre (Director, Beja Library)
- Américo Rodrigues (Cultural activities officer, Guarda Town Hall)
- José Rui Martins Henriques (Director, Acert Theatre, Tondela)
- João Carlos Alvim (Publishing)
- António Miguel Guimarães (Producer)
- António Henriques (Press)
- Fátima Ramos (Deputy Director, Culturgest)

## **CASCAIS**

- José Jorge Letria (Cultural officer, Cascais Town Hall)
- Clara Pavão Pereira (Historic Cultural Heritage Office)
- Conceição Robalo (Director, Cultural Department)

## **AZORES**

- Luis Fagundes Duarte (Regional Director of Cultural Affairs)
- Alamo Menezes (Regional Secretary for Education and Social Affairs)
- Francisco dos Reis Maduro Dias (Departmental Director of the Classified Area of Angra do Heroísmo)
- Carlos César (Chairperson of the Regional Government of the Azores)

## **MADEIRA**

- João Henrique Silva (Regional Director of Cultural Affairs)
- Luisa Clode (Director, Museu Arte Sacra)
- Amândio de Sousa e Teresa Pais (Director, Museu da Quinta das Cruzes)
- Francisco Clode de Soua (Museu de Arte Contemporânea)

# CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	p.11
<b>1. METHOD, RULES AND WORDS</b> .....	p.11
1.1. An impressionistic method .....	p.11
1.2. The rigorous respect of an ethics of evaluation.....	p.11
1.3. The words with which to say it .....	p.12
<b>2. CONTEXT, SUBJECT AND QUESTIONS</b> .....	p.14
2.1. Between land and sea, between dictatorship and freedom.....	p.14
2.2. Public cultural policy, a developing process .....	p.17
2.3. Cultural policy in questions.....	p.19
<b>3. THE PARADOXES AND THE ISSUES</b> .....	p.20
 <b>CHAPTER 1 : CULTURE AS POLICY</b>	
<b>Emergence, construction, symbolism and implementation</b>	
<b>of a public cultural policy</b> .....	p.22
 <b>1. A FULLY OPERATIONAL MINISTRY</b> .....	p.22
1.1. A different political will from October 1995 .....	p.22
1.2. An ambition reaffirmed by the Minister .....	p.23
 <b>2. ACTS AND SYMBOLS</b> .....	p.25
2.1 Administrative reform and new institutions .....	p.25
2.2 An example of a cultural sector: the plastic arts.....	p.27
2.3. Strength and limitations of symbols in cultural policy .....	p.29

## **CHAPTER 2: CULTURAL POLICY AS THE INDICATOR OF A STATE**

**Central Government, local authorities, civil society, cultural actors**

**faced with the state of culture..... p.32**

**1. ALL ASPECTS OF THE STATE OF CULTURE ..... p.32**

1.1. A developing central administrative apparatus..... p.33

1.2. An outline decentralisation..... p.34

**2. LOCAL POWER AND LOCALISED CULTURES..... p.35**

2.1. Cultural decentralisation in the broader debate ..... p.35

2.2. Cultural policies and local development ..... p.37

2.3. Potential imbalances in cultural development..... p.38

**3. STATE, MARKET, CULTURAL CONSUMPTION..... p.39**

3.1. The diversity of the Foundations..... p.39

3.2. The culture market and consumers..... p.40

**4. THE STATE, HERITAGE AND CREATION ..... p.42**

4.1. The State and heritage protection ..... p.42

4.2. Aid for artistic creation..... p.42

4.3. The artist's place in society ..... p.44

**5. THE CULTURAL STATE AND THE SOCIAL BOND ..... p.45**

5.1. The cultural fragmentation of civil society..... p.45

5.2. Socio-cultural organisation, a factor in the social bond..... p.46

**6. THE NEED FOR TRAINING ..... p.48**

6.1. Training cultural administrators and managers..... p.48

6.2. Training in cultural creative professions ..... p.49

6.3. Training the public..... p.50

**7. BEYOND THE FRONTIERS..... p.50**

7.1. The cultural Portuguese state in European integration..... p.51

7.2. The Portuguese-speaking world, multiculturalism and the global society ..... p.53

## **CHAPTER 3: THE CULTURAL DEBATE AS PRODUCT OF AN EVALUATION**

**Knowledge of the cultural sphere, interlocking cultural issues and strengthening the social bind by re-establishing the cultural binding ..... p.56**

**1. The importance of a national mechanism for assessing an evaluating cultural policies..... p.56**

**2. The effects of globalisation on Portuguese cultural identity ..... p.57**

**3. The closeness of relations between civil society, central government and local authorities ..... p.59**

**4. The complex relationships between strategists, actors and consumers ..... p.60**

**5. Culture as a political, social and democratic issue in Portugal and elsewhere ..... p.61**

# INTRODUCTION

## 1. METHOD, RULES AND WORDS

The evaluation of Portugal's cultural policy by a Council of Europe Panel of examiners started in June 1997 with a preliminary visit to Lisbon but only began in earnest in November of that year with an initial series of contacts with the members of the group of researchers responsible for drawing up the National Report.

The European examiners thought it necessary to make a number of preliminary remarks in an introduction that would set out the terms of reference of the report, at the same time endeavouring to describe its status.

The Panel of examiner's first visit took place from 31 January to February 1998, the second, from 11 to 19 April 1998. During their first visit, the Panel divided into three in order to learn about the situation in Portugal outside Lisbon. Two-day visits were made to Oporto, Castelo-Branco and Evora. The same method was applied during the second visit, when for two days the Panel of examiners divided itself between the azores and Madeira.

### 1.1 An impressionistic method

The mission to assess Portugal's cultural policy, which was effected in three visits to the country of unequal length, may be described as "impressionistic" in the literal sense of the term, ie the one directly derived from etymology, emphasising "the impression". In other words, knowing its evaluation could not be exhaustive, the European Panel of examiners does not claim to have sought to undertake a systematic, detailed examination of "culture" in Portugal. More modestly, whether in February or April 1998, during two visits, neither of which lasted more than about ten days, through individual contacts, hearings and round tables, various visits in sub-groups, in different parts of the country and in the autonomous regions of the Azores and Madeira, the examiners gradually gained "an impression" of a complex situation. In a sense, they looked beyond the figures, reports and attitudes in order to apprehend every aspect of the subject in all its layers of complexity.

The shadowy areas and subjective emphases that have resulted from this particular methodology may disappoint some people. It cannot be regarded as anything but a series of "outside views" or "intersecting views", with no other goal than the perhaps ambitious one, it must be said, of helping to develop a national debate on the meaning of cultural policy in a European country, Portugal.

### 1.2 The rigorous respect of an ethics of evaluation

The report of the European Panel of examiners has a particular status which needs to be set out in order to avoid any misunderstanding. The Portuguese Government has founded a special body, the *Observatorio das Actividades Culturais*, one of whose principal missions has been to examine the cultural policy developed in Portugal between 1985 and 1995. This body, which consists of researchers from the

*L'Observatorio das  
Actividades Culturais*  
regularly produces studies  
on specific sectors. The  
studies may be obtained  
from:

L'Observatorio das  
Actividades Culturais, Rua  
Gerrett, 80 1200 Lisbon  
Tel: 32 19 860  
Fax: 34 29 697  
E-mail:  
[Observatorio@ics.ul.pt](mailto:Observatorio@ics.ul.pt)

L'Observatorio is led by  
Professor Maria de Lourdes  
Lima dos Santos.

University of Lisbon and incorporates the work of Portugal's National Institute of Statistics, drew up a national report which is an extremely minute, detailed, precise inventory of all the elements involved in the various aspects of culture in Portugal.

While the work of the European Panel of examiners often refers to the data, comments and reflections of the Portuguese National Report by using an innovatory page lay-out - the reader of the European text will find a series of marginal notes that refer to the work of the *Observatorio* - it was conducted in such a way as scrupulously to respect a set of essential principles: an evaluation is not a "commission of inquiry", ie it does not in any way claim to "inquire" into a situation which can easily be seen; a Council of Europe report is not conducted through a "normative universalism" which claims to judge and examine a situation according to "convergence criteria" as subjective as they are ignorant of the historical, economic and social particularities of a given country: a European Panel of examiners is, by definition, multi-layered and complementary and sees itself as a crucible for freely expressed reflections and evaluations, without any desire to judge, but with no inhibitions as regards questioning. As Etienne Grosjean said in his report "*40 years of cultural co-operation - 1954 -1994*", it is a matter of reflecting "*the need for a common approach to evaluation, providing as objective a picture as possible of national cultural policies, so that these can be concerted more easily later*". In this respect, the ambition of the Panel of examiners is to contribute to the search for "transversality", including in relation to other, previous evaluations conducted in other Member States.

Armed with these founding principles, the European Panel of examiners resolutely rejected any inquisitorial approach; but their European experience also allowed them to bring "another viewpoint" to Portuguese cultural reality. The Panel therefore sought to avoid any normative judgment in its evaluation, at the same time keeping to the terms of its mission, which was itself conceived according to the meaning given to a number of words which must now be defined.

### **1.3 The words with which to say it**

If the replies that follow had to be brought under one question, it would be the following: "What are we talking about?" What is, the meaning, the sense, that the Panel of examiners wished to give to a number of words such as "culture", "public cultural policy", "art" or, again, "evaluation"?

Once again, in order to clarify the terms of the debate, we will try to give the meanings of the words so that the words used to express the Panel's view of Portuguese cultural policy may be better understood.

The word "culture" has been the subject of numerous definitions and the multiplicity of its usage in many European languages under almost identical phonemes, far from simplifying its acceptance and understanding has more generally favoured contradictory interpretations. As far as we are concerned, we shall consider the term in the sense given

in the *European Declaration on Cultural Objectives* (Resolution II of the 4th Conference of European Ministers responsible for Cultural Affairs, Berlin, 23-25 May 1984): "*those values which give purpose to the existence and actions of mankind*", considering that "*our European heritage consists of natural resources and human achievements, material assets as well as religious and spiritual values, knowledge and beliefs, hopes and fears, and ways of life whose very diversity provides the cultural richness which is the basis of progress towards European unity*".

In addition to the meaning we have given to the word "culture", the term "art" offers the same semiological plurality. We have no intention of discussing at length the definition of art, the work of art or the fine arts. We will, therefore, simply consider art as concerning "*the production by humanity through manual work and technology or intellectual work (particularly language) of works that intensely express human meanings*". At once "*anti-destiny*" (André Malraux) and "*primarily, and always above all, a game*" (Georges Bataille), art seems to us to correspond to that particular category of human creation in which the support a given society gives to culture is revealed. The cutting-edge of culture, art is, in short, the most affirmed or, at least, beneficent expression, of a form of recognition, although it is not necessarily broad and consensual in a particular society. It is a specific subject, as Jean Duvignaud puts it so well: "*(...) The territory in which human nomadism stops a while and dreams*".

By "public policy" we understand a "*supposedly consistent set of intentions and actions imputable to a public authority such as, for example, public health or town-planning policy*". The French word *politique* is feminine and has its equivalent in the English word "policy" as opposed to "politics". Therefore a public cultural policy will include everything concerning the cultural sphere as defined at a particular time which is the subject of intervention by a central or local political authority. The inclusion on the "political agenda" of certain cultural questions and the ways they are dealt with by the political authority as collective issues will contribute to the construction of the cultural debate by, in their turn, reorienting the development of public policies implemented in the same cultural sphere. In other words, our aim was purposely confined to analysing the implementation of public cultural policy in Portugal as it was important for us to present and understand the process in its strict political dimension. The report therefore deliberately ignores forms of culture as a product of civil society (literary and artistic trends, fashions, etc.) where they do not come under a particular political authority. But it never loses sight of the Final Declaration of the colloquy on *The Future of Cultural Development*, held in April 1972 with the participation of the Council of Europe: "*The underlying purpose of any cultural policy is to bring all possible means to bear in order to develop ways and means of expression and to ensure complete freedom in their use. Man's right to follow a meaningful way of life and to embrace meaningful social practices must be recognised*".

The purpose of this study is to evaluate a particular subject. In the human sciences the notion of "evaluation of public policies" has also undergone a clear change. Traditionally devoted to assessing objectives to be reached with respect to purposes defined in the development of intentions expressed in discourse, the evaluation of public policies has come increasingly to assess the quality of the means implemented to reach the stated goals. Thus, the financial dimension, the economic, social and environmental "cost" of a political decision has become part of the evaluation of that decision. As far as we are concerned, following from what we have already said, we understand evaluation to mean an "*action to measure the value of a reality*", understanding the term "value" in its primary sense of "force" or "vigour", as it was later defined in the word "valorous", ie not its "relevant", "valid", "positive" or "negative" nature, but rather its "impact", its "strength", purposely neutral terms that will reduce the scope of our normative evaluation, so that our evaluation will as far as possible put the situation in perspective or, if one prefers, seek to understand in the Weberian sociological sense.

## 2. CONTEXT, SUBJECT AND QUESTIONS

The history of a country like Portugal cannot be summarised in a few lines without reducing it to caricature. The reader will find here simply a brief reminder of the chronology to give the background. He will then better understand the subject of the report - Portuguese public cultural policy, before moving on to the central issues that concerned us.

### 2.1 Between land and sea, between dictatorship and freedom

Portugal is regarded as the oldest country in Europe, at least as far as its borders are concerned - 700 years ago it had more or less the same geographic configuration as it does today. A small country in terms of area (ninety thousand square kilometres), marked by an exceptional history that ranked it among the greatest world powers, present on every continent for more than four centuries, Portugal is, as Pequito Rebelo put it, "*Mediterranean by nature, Atlantic by location*".

While it was said that the British Empire was one "*on which the sun will never set*", this was true much earlier of Portugal, whose flag flew on land and sea from the time when Vasco da Gama opened the route to the Indies, reaching Calicut on 21 May 1498, and Pedro Alvares Cabral discovered Brazil by mistake two years later. From Recife to Goa, from Mozambique to Macao, from Cape Verde to Timor, Portugal left Europe and dropped anchor in every latitude. We will have occasion to refer to Portugal's maritime dimension many times in this report for a fundamental reason: here more than elsewhere the weight of the past, the wind on the high seas and the particularity of this astonishing empire, produce ever-renewed, constantly reproduced effects on Portuguese society, which is of mixed race, mobile, rooted in its land but constantly attracted by what lies over the horizon out to sea, authentically open to others, sometimes to the point of forgetting itself. Forever cultivating the

melancholy of the *saudade* and finding in it a constructive optimism, this "people with soles of wind" cries when it sings and sings when it suffers. Is this why its soul appears to be an unfathomable mystery?

It is not perhaps without significance either that the reconquest of the territory from the Moors in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and the resettlement of the country, was not achieved by the people of the nascent little kingdom alone, but was, as it were, the common achievement of the Christian nations, particularly the great military orders born of the Crusades. This period of Portuguese history thus drew it closer in quite an unexpected way to the history of the Germano-Baltic lands, a place of colonisation *par excellence* of the Teutonic Order where the contribution of the West, the Netherlands, the Czech and Austrian lands was considerable.

An imperial power in the full sense of the term, though in a category of its own, Portugal was also marked by a conservative dictatorship similar to the other European fascist régimes, but also specific, and not only because of its name: Salazarism. The régime of a single man, the *Estado Novo* which was established by the coup d'état of 28 May 1926 and enshrined in the 1933 Constitution, survived its founder, Oliveira Salazar, by four years and ended in the Carnation Revolution of 25 April 1974. The almost logical outcome of slow, steady demographic and economic decline throughout the nineteenth century, provoked by the paralysis of the First Republic between 1910 and 1928, Salazarism, which sought to be a political system founded upon the austerity of grandeur and a cult of memory of a bygone age, never won popular support such as that originally enjoyed by Mussolini and never had the violence and brutality of its Spanish neighbour. The régime was, nonetheless, a dictatorship, with its secret police, political prisons, and oppressive, burdensome system of control, informing, censorship and self-censorship. The characteristics of the Salazar dictatorship can essentially be expressed in three words: immobilism, conservation and isolation. Thus were maintained totally archaic social and economic structures based on a quasi-feudal form of agrarian capitalism, an ultra-conservative Catholic Church and the absolute inability to imagine a dignified end to colonisation, marked by 14 years of wars between 1960 and 1974 in Mozambique, Angola, Cape Verde and Guinea.

The régime fell like a ripe fruit, as its founder had died from a fall from an armchair. But, during those fifty years of dictatorship, Portugal had experienced considerable emigration which resulted in the 1960s in a negative demographic balance (minus 250,000 people) under the combined effect of economic poverty that turned Portugal into the manpower reservoir of Western Europe and political censorship which drove away intellectual and cultural élites.

It is not therefore surprising that 25 April 1974 corresponds to the year zero of contemporary Portugal or that it marked the beginning of a period of contradictory social and political experiments. For almost two years the country reinvented itself in an atmosphere of utopia, debate and

research. The model of a revolution for some, the archetype of anarchy for others, a social laboratory for everyone, the Portuguese Spring came within a hair's breadth of the abyss several times, but enabled the country to find its soul. Ten years later in January 1986, freed from its colonial wars, political taboos, economic uncertainties and social paternalism, Portugal became a full member of the European Community, for the first time in its history attaching itself firmly to a Continent which had hitherto boiled down to its frontiers, to the point that the Portuguese used the word to refer to their own country.

With a population of 9,871,200, in 1991, faced with unprecedented rural migration to the two metropolises Lisbon and Oporto have become, Portugal's social structure is increasingly similar to that of its European partners (11.6 per cent of the working population in agriculture, 33.2 per cent in the industrial sector and 55.2 per cent in services); the percentage of children in full-time primary education has increased considerably from 32.8 per cent in 1960 to 64.8 per cent in 1991; it has a low unemployment rate (7 per cent of the working population) compared to other Member States of the Union and is experiencing strong growth (3.8 per cent in 1998), Portugal nonetheless remains at the borderline between the centre and the periphery.

In many respects thoroughly modern, but still marked by a form of "rural virtuality", Portuguese society is discovering dualism in its internal development, establishing itself as an emerging power, being transformed into a permanent building-site, but is also aware of its special characteristics, its culture and multicultural wealth based on sharing, at the opposite pole from one-dimensional globalisation built upon crushing and negating differences.

In October 1995, having had thirteen governments since 1976 (there were six provisional governments between 1974 and 1976), the Portuguese elected a majority of members of parliament from the Socialist party, thus breaking with ten years of Social-Democratic government between 1985 and 1995. In January 1996, Jorge Sampaio, former Mayor of Lisbon, succeeded another socialist, Mario Soares, as President.

This is the context, and above all the historical development of Portugal, which will together comprise the background to the cultural policy implemented.

## **2.2 Public cultural policy, a developing process**

The Salazarist motto "*God, Fatherland, Family*" already itself represented a carefully developed form of cultural policy. Like any self-respecting fascist régime, Salazarism soon considered culture to be one of the pillars of the *Estado Novo*. As early as 1933, the Secretariat for National Propaganda (SNP) was set up. It was the place in which the official ideology was produced, it decreed the norm and dispensed two

of the foundation-stones of the régime: nationalism and historicism. In 1944 the SNP became the National Secretariat for Information and Culture, but this was simply a change of name: its action remained the same: it continued to manage censorship and devoted most of its time to adding forbidden authors and titles to the Index.

Parallel to this first body in charge of cultural surveillance, the National Education Council also dealt with culture in three of its sub-sections, controlling publishing policy, the organisation of conferences in Portugal, etc.

Faced with this extremely rigid state system, a private body was founded in 1956 which was to become the place for the expression of an open, independent culture. This was the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, established in Lisbon by the super-rich billionaire who owned 5 per cent of the profits of the Iraq Petroleum Company. Painting, sculpture, music, dance, contemporary art in all its forms, as well as a library and network of library buses criss-crossing the country - nothing is foreign to the Gulbenkian. The Gulbenkian Foundation, originally established in accordance with the wish of its founder, to pursue "artistic, educational, charitable and other goals", rapidly came to be thought of as the "Second Ministry of Culture", as the commonly accepted expression put it. Historical veracity requires one to say "Ministry of Culture *tout court*".

The primary objective of the Carnation Revolution of 25 April 1974 was the abolition of Censorship and Preliminary Examination (a new name specific to the régime of Salazar's successor, Marcelo Caetano, between 1968 and the fall of the régime). While culture was at the centre of post-revolutionary debates, it was also their mirror: shot through with contradictory currents and based on specific experiments, it expressed a composite, shattered reality. The successive provisional governments up to 1976 did not have time to make culture a priority. Culture was not the subject of a public policy either before or after the Revolution. It was civil society, and a few people within it who were passionate about culture and eager to develop the field among the population, that were to be the true cultural operators.

From 1976, in Portugal's twelve constitutional governments up to November 1995, public cultural policy was structured and enjoyed organic and institutional recognition, but was also subjected to constant administrative change as ministries were redefined, moving successively from the status of autonomous Secretariat of State to one attached to the Presidency of the Cabinet, to coming under a larger Ministry including Education, Communications, Science, etc. Since 1995, the Socialist Government has included a fully operational Ministry of Culture.

While administrative management remained constant between 1976 and 1995, there was naturally a problem resulting from ever-changing policies. Nonetheless, it would not be accurate to regard as negligible the actions taken under public cultural policies over almost

twenty years. Every cultural sphere was dealt with during this period; the attention given was uneven, but sometimes substantial, as was the case with public libraries, heritage conservation and encouraging patronage, for example.

The proportion of the Portuguese state budget devoted to culture has increased almost constantly over the last ten years (the trend has been upwards, despite a few periods when it fell, above all in 1994 and 1995), increasing from 0.24 per cent in 1985 to 0.6 per cent in 1996. Although this figure does not yet approach the mythical 1 per cent, recognition of cultural needs now seems clearly to be a state priority, in terms of finance, at least.

Reference should be made to the National Report drawn up by the *Observatorio das Actividades Culturais* for a detailed examination of all the statistical and budgetary elements showing the development over the last ten years. We should nevertheless note the increasing involvement of local government bodies, since in 1995 they accounted for more than half of public expenditure on culture (53.9 per cent, ie almost 42 billion escudos), while, with nearly 36 billion escudos, central government contributed only 46.1 per cent of total public expenditure on culture.

This situation now shows the dominant role of decentralised bodies in financing public cultural policy. It strongly emphasises the emergence of local power in Portugal, a phenomenon to which we will have reason to return.

### **2.3 Cultural policy in questions**

The plethora and abundance of questions we set ourselves about public cultural policy in Portugal is naturally in direct proportion to the interest of examining such a subject.

Among the many questions that might be mentioned, some may be formulated as follows, although the order in which they are presented should not be taken as suggesting any priorities or even the order in which we will answer them:

- to what extent has public cultural policy in Portugal been part of the debate between the state and Portuguese civil society?

- what are the various aspects of Portuguese public cultural policy?

- how is Portugal reacting to the global trend towards cultural standardisation present in all European States?

- what are the relationships between cultural actors (artists, producers, distributors, etc.) and the state as "strategist of cultural development"?

- what are the relations between the various levels of the Portuguese institutional apparatus (centre-periphery, for example) from

the point of view of the production of specific or complementary cultural policies?

- what is the situation regarding training in culture in Portugal from the point of view both of creation and consumption?

- how is artistic training organised and developed?

- how does the Portuguese political level in charge of defining cultural policy put in place administrative, technical and structural mechanisms that will produce genuine artistic education likely to give practical expression to a stated political will?

- how efficient are these mechanisms?

- what institutional practices with respect to culture fall outside central control (relations between periphery structures or between the periphery and supra-national level)?

This series of questions should be seen as so many lines of enquiry opened in a debate with many detours and an almost infinite number of contours. But for us, "outside observers", these questions were elements in the construction of the main set of issues in our report, constructed in a sense on the basis of the complete or incomplete answers we were able to gather to the questions we set ourselves.

### 3. THE PARADOXES AND THE ISSUES

Because it is by its very nature the *locus* of expression of the currents running right through civil society, the cultural sphere, in Portugal as elsewhere, though perhaps to a greater extent here than elsewhere, operates as an heuristic framework favouring the emergence of political, economic and social rationales and practices, mobilising elements of consensus or confrontation, showing the various tensions that exist within Portuguese civil society and in its relationship with the state or, conversely, underlining the main themes of the consensual medium specific to the Portuguese context.

It can be observed to differing degrees, but sufficiently strongly to be regarded as formative, that civil society is fully involved in the process of cultural development, but also that there is a real cleavage between the "base" and the "top", in other words, between the cultural actors on the ground (mainly volunteers and people working for associations) and the cultural development strategists in Lisbon (who appear in the organisation chart of the state cultural administration). Moreover, this vertical cleavage is accompanied by another, horizontal, cleavage dividing local and state levels.

At the local level, there is a clear differentiation between some regions and towns which have been able to carry out action in a network or in partnership with other European cities, thus going beyond the central state scale (either through their status as heritage towns - Oporto, Evora and Sintra, for example - or through their own political will, which is often linked with a history and ideology favourable to exchanges and twinnings - Montemor-o-Novo, for example) and other

local authorities in more anomic contexts, such as Castelo Branco and Guimaraes. This is one differentiation which strongly marks the local context and should lead us to conclude that there is no homogeneity of civil society and the local political space in Portugal in relation to culture.

The second dividing-line concerns the "top", in other the words, the state administrative apparatus in charge of public cultural policy. It has a dual nature - political, on the one hand, technical, on the other - and is clearly the result of a special history: culture was an important issue under Salazarism, not in its contemporary acceptance, but as a policy that shaped the social space and involved civil society in the political project of the *Estado Novo*; in other words, it was characterised by its propaganda and integrationist dimension. The Carnation Revolution generated a profound upheaval and caused a whole series of "alternative" practices to emerge which served as main themes in the cultural sphere from 1974 to 1976. Apart from a few significant, not unimportant experiments in the 1980s, it was not until the appointment of the present Minister of Culture that a will to have a public cultural policy developed. The newness of the phenomenon shows clearly a varying reality at the "top" connected with changes of the actors - decision-makers - technicians, setting up new procedures, and a growing, not yet fully achieved, awareness of the changes in progress.

This fragmentation leads us to regard the Portuguese cultural sphere as eminently paradoxical because it is characterised by a series of formative and dynamic contradictions such as "tradition / modernity", "structuring facilities / fragmented social reality", "cultural interventionism / *laissez-faire*", "professionalisation / voluntary involvement", "objective quality / subjective promotion", "centre / periphery", "multipolarity / monopolisation", "public institutions / private foundations".

From this series of paradoxes emerges an overall set of issues concerning Portuguese public cultural policy that may be formulated as follows:

**The product of a long, contradictory historical and political development, the cultural policy instituted in Portugal by a specific, recently constituted governmental structure corresponds in its present form more to a programmatic rationale than to an objective reality, although it would be wrong to see it only as a purely discursive, exclusively theoretical or purely ideological projection. In the cultural sphere, more than elsewhere, the function of words is part of the action, ie the political discourse already has a meaning and produces symbolic effects with tangible consequences. But we have also seen that some initial concrete reforms have already had their first effects with the dysfunctioning that inevitably appears.**

The National Report drawn up by the *Observatorio* falls into the thrust of our general remark: it is an observation rather than the

expression of a political will, which is contained only in the Minister of Culture's note in the Preamble to the report, though the report does very precisely assess the changes in progress.

On the basis of this general examination, we have divided our report into three chapters, each of which will be a stage in its development: culture as policy; cultural policy as indicator of a state; the cultural debate as the product of an evaluation.

\*

\*

\*

# CHAPTER 1

## CULTURE AS POLICY

**Emergence, construction,  
symbolism and implementation  
of a public cultural policy**

As we mentioned in the introduction, it was almost twenty years before an autonomous, fully operational Ministry of Culture appeared in the institutional and administrative fabric of Portugal. Before discussing the practical significance of this political, governmental decision, we must first discuss the current declared cultural policy. We will examine it first from the point of view of the political bases of the intentions and then from the point of view of what has been done in practice and symbolically.

### **1. A FULLY OPERATIONAL MINISTRY**

It is clearly not enough to examine political discourse alone, but it should not be ignored. When a government programme states priorities for action and when these are embodied in new administrative and institutional approaches, they need to be examined. When a Minister presents his philosophy and political ambition and conducts an initial evaluation half-way through a parliament, the principles set out need to be mentioned, if only in order identify one's starting-point.

#### **1.1 A different political will from October 1995**

When it succeeded three social-democrat governments in power between 1985 and 1995, the Socialist party wanted to differentiate itself from its predecessors by clearly stating its cultural objectives. Where mention is made of cultural policy in the government programmes presented during the decade 1985-1995, it revolves around three themes: heritage conservation, the affirmation of Portuguese identity and encouragement of creation, but as an adjunct rather than in a proactive fashion. The major aspect of cultural policy thus became encouraging the

establishment of "Foundations" to commit private capitalism to culture. This confirms a generally "liberal" political approach in accordance with the principle "Less Government - Better Government" specific to the questioning of the Welfare State and amounting to giving private initiative a major role in promoting cultural activities. The construction of the Belem Cultural Centre and the decision to hold Expo '98, the last great world exhibition before the year 2000, are also to be seen in the context of this approach.

Influence and prestige, but with state disengagement, did not prevent the realisation of some less "spectacular" actions that had significant effects as a result of the cultural development they provoked, as regards public reading in particular.

Parallel to this political position, the Secretariat of State for Culture experienced a significant change of status during the same period since it first, between November 1985 and August 1987, came under the Ministry of Education and Culture and was then attached to the Presidency of the Cabinet until October 1995. Two Secretaries of State held the ministerial post in this period: Ms Maria Teresa Pinto Basto Gouveia (November 1985 - January 1990) and Mr Pedro Miguel Santana Lopes (January 1990 - October 1995).

From October 1995, with the creation of an autonomous Ministry of Culture and the appointment to its head of Mr Manuel Maria Ferreira Carrilho, Professor of Philosophy at the New University of Lisbon, the political discourse on culture sought to break with the previous period. The Socialist Party programme published before the 1995 elections states that "*there are cultural spheres in which only the state is able to ensure the major infrastructure essential to cultural action*". In these conditions, it goes on, "*the Government will clearly shoulder its responsibilities in these spheres by guaranteeing the full stability of such infrastructure in institutional, financial, programmatic and operational terms*". The principle is clearly stated, based on "*the inalienable responsibility of the state in the cultural domain*".

## **1.2 An ambition reaffirmed by the Minister**

Since he has been in charge of Portuguese cultural policy, Manuel Maria Carrilho, Minister-Philosopher or Philosopher-Minister, but a politician "in the final resort", has constantly reaffirmed his attachment to the major lines of the programme put forward during the 1995 electoral campaign.

The present Minister of Culture clearly states his view of things in his note for the introduction to the *Observatorio's* National Report and is unsparing in his criticisms of his predecessors:

*"The anachronism to which we have referred resides in this ornamental, subsidiary conception of culture. Like many analysts and decision-makers today, we believe that culture should occupy a central place in the development of a country and that cultural policy should as*

*far as possible be conducted transversally. It is on the basis of these considerations that the Ministry of Culture was established in October 1995.*

*In establishing the Ministry of Culture, we sought, not only to give greater importance to cultural administration, but to strengthen the status of culture in the wider sphere of political projects and practices, as well as placing cultural policy at the highest possible level of discussion and giving it the best conditions for discussing and establishing co-operation with other ministries."*

In the interview he gave to the Panel of examiners on 6 February 1998, the Minister of Culture said that he intends to be present at the head of his Ministry: *"I have clearly adopted the idea that the Ministry must be clearly interventionist in its policy. This was even a precondition for my agreeing to be Minister. But, as a corollary, this implies great discernment in the Ministry's interventions"*.

But while he pleads clearly for a proactive public cultural policy, he expressed the view in an interview published in a major French daily newspaper on 12 November 1997 *"that a Ministry does not make culture, it supports the culture that is made"*.

On the basis of this political will, five major themes were determined as soon as he took office: democratisation; strengthening artistic education, in particular by reaffirming the cultural dimension of public service broadcasting; decentralisation; internationalisation; and professionalisation.

In his note for the National Report, the Minister repeats these five major themes: books and reading (the main innovation in the field being legislation on the price of books), heritage (with the completion in February 1998 of a new Bill), creation and support for the plastic arts (creation of the Institute for Contemporary Art, laying the foundation-stone of the Museum of Contemporary Art in Oporto), for the performing arts (new regulations on financial support for the theatre) and the cinema (creation of a new Institute for Cinema, Audiovisual Arts and Multimedia announced for 1998), decentralisation (the Rotas Programme) and internationalisation.

We must now move beyond the first phase - discourse - to present the content of cultural policy implemented in the context of its recent history and present situation, as well as in the production of the symbols to which it may refer.

## **2. ACTS AND SYMBOLS**

In the establishment of a new administrative organisation and in a number of specific sectorial policies and the use of a few symbols, culture may, like any public policy, be assessed as the product of government will.

## 2.1 Administrative reform and new institutions

Although a special department for culture was set up before the Socialist party came to power in October 1995, this date nonetheless represents a watershed from a strictly organisational point of view.

Cf. The list of the various bodies connected with the Ministry of Culture, *infra*, Chapter 2, § 1.1.

In the decade preceding the last elections a number of administrative structures were confirmed or created, such as the Regional Delegations (of which there are four: North, Centre, Alentejo and Algarve), the Cultural Development Funds, the Portuguese Institute for Cinematographic and Audiovisual Art, the Portuguese Institute for Performing Arts and the Higher Council for Libraries. This detail is not without interest since it shows that, independently of the political and partisan cleavages, the Portuguese state was able to provide itself with institutional frameworks for legal-rational purposes, including in the cultural sphere.

But, while the structures existed before the political change of 1995, the new Government undoubtedly saw them in a different way. A general reform of the organisation chart of the Ministry of Culture was effected, in particular by Decree-Act 42/96 of 7 May 1996. The new organisation is characterised, for example, by the creation (by changing the status or *ex nihilo*) of operational bodies, according to cultural sector, placed under the authority of the Ministry, but enjoying greater decision-making autonomy than the Ministry's central departments by being given a legal status that provides them with a "public law legal personality". A detailed description of the organic structure of the Ministry of Culture since 1995 will be found in the National Report.

Cf. "Cultural Policies in Portugal", National Report, Table III of Appendices, p. xi.

The purpose of the new organisation was, according to the Minister in his note for the National Report on the evaluation of Portuguese cultural policy, to "*try, through institutional reform, to improve stability and efficiency in the implementation of cultural policy, and also to introduce stability, justice and transparency in relations between cultural agents, the government and other partners*".

An initial analysis of the administration of the Ministry of Culture suggests an effectively dual structure with, on the one hand, the departments strictly coming under the Minister (Secretariat General, International Relations, General Inspectorate, Copyright and Regional Delegations as devolved departments) that are limited in number and, on the other, some twenty autonomous structures under the Minister's authority (all the sectorial Institutes - architectural heritage, archaeology, museums, contemporary art, photography, cinematographic and audiovisual art, publishing, the national library, the national archives, performing arts, etc - as well as the two National Theatres, the National Ballet Company, the National Orchestra of Oporto and the three great Portuguese Academies that enjoy "public law legal personality").

This phenomenon is not specific to Portugal. In many highly centralised European countries there is now a tendency to delegate some

state missions to private law bodies which, within a given legal framework, act with relative independence according to the British model of "administration at arm's length". That Portugal, which is quite close to the United Kingdom in some respects, has taken inspiration from such administrative traditions is not, therefore, surprising.#

But this dichotomy that may lead one to believe there is a sort of autonomy in the functioning of operational structures of the cultural policy defined by the Minister is more legal than political. One piece of evidence confirms this judgment: the systematic renewal of all the managements of the bodies concerned from 1996 as an expression of the wish to "*renew or form new managerial teams*", if one refers to the Minister of Culture's note which complemented the interview he gave the European examiners. In other words, the legal reform of the Ministry's organisation chart should be understood as a strengthening of the intervention mechanisms so that the decisions taken at political level take more account of the actual situation.

Thus, the Ministry of Culture as it has operated since Autumn 1995 does not seek to be "simply a ministry of mission or words", but has been organised, at least at structural level, as a genuine government department with its rules, hierarchies and legal procedures. This initial analysis is limited to the organisational frameworks. Everyone is aware that an organisation chart is worth only what the actors make of it. In the following chapters we will have to return to this analysis from a more sociological, rather than a purely legal and institutional, point of view.

## 2.2 An example of a cultural sector: the plastic arts

Cf. "Cultural Policies in Portugal", National Report, pp. 56-155

The second part of the report on cultural policy in Portugal drawn up by the *Observatorio das Actividades Culturais* examines in detail eight major cultural sectors: plastic arts, music, dance, theatre, cinema, television and radio, books and libraries, heritage and museums, and socio-cultural activities. It would be superfluous to repeat the material provided for each of these spheres in a diachronic description of the developments and trends recorded in 1985 and 1995.

In order to illustrate the debate, we will give in this report a single example, plastic arts, in order to assess in concrete terms the action taken. Other spheres, such as books and heritage, would also have enabled us to state past development and the present situation.

The plastic arts is one of the sectors that has received the least help from the Ministry of Culture since 1985, coming as it does second-to-last in terms of proportion of expenditure (1 per cent on average of

the Ministry's budget between 1985 and 1995, just above archaeology at 0.8 per cent), but nonetheless shows great creative vitality. The Gulbenkian Foundation has played a central role in the development of the plastic arts in Portugal since its inception in 1956, but still more clearly when the idea of a Centre bringing together the work of contemporary Portuguese artists was launched in 1977, and especially since the construction of the José de Azeredo Perdigão Centre for Modern Art in 1983.

Since 1985 the Portuguese Government has seemed to hesitate between a formative, decisive commitment in this sector and non-involvement guided by financial imperatives. The example of the construction of the Belem Cultural Centre in 1990 illustrates this quite well. Initially conceived as a major cultural centre, the BCC was to be managed and administered by the Discoveries Foundation, a body whose task was to attract private patronage that was then particularly sought after. While it was hoped that about fifty companies would be able to make a commitment to the project, the reality proved very different: only twelve made a financial contribution to the Foundation, and then only for a very short period (in practice, the year 1992). The Government found itself with an "empty shell": the Belem Cultural Centre that was originally intended to intervene when it wished, pulled out. The experience was not entirely useless: it was on this occasion that a new category appeared, *"the begging foundations"*, new forms of institutional beggars.

Other experiments were less negative, however. The case of Culturgest, established in 1992, is an example. The Culturgest Foundation is an entirely private body set up by a large financial and deposit institute that brings together some fifteen Portuguese banks and insurance companies and has become one of the flagships of contemporary Portuguese art with low management costs serving as an exhibition space.

Since October 1995 the Ministry of Culture has sought to increase significantly initiatives concerning the plastic arts. At the structural level first, Decree-Act 103/97 of 28 April 1997 set up the Institute of Contemporary Art (ICA) to *"support creation and contemporary creators, the organisers of contemporary arts events and the dissemination of Portuguese contemporary art in the country and abroad"*. It also established, through Decree-Act 160/97 of 25 June 1997, the Portuguese Centre for Photography (PCP), which play a similar role with respect to photography. The PCP has been set up in Oporto.

These two institutional initiatives have been accompanied by a practical will expressed in two decisions: the formation of a Collection of Portuguese and International Contemporary Art to establish a contemporary art section at the Belem Cultural Centre, thus giving the Centre a permanent, perennial dimension, and, above all, building (after almost ten years' reflection and debate) the National Museum for

Contemporary Art in Oporto, after signing a protocol with the City of Oporto and the Serralves Foundation.

However, the latter event resulted in the resurgence of the questions that had already arisen between 1985 and 1995 regarding the role of Foundations. The Government has been genuinely proactive but has again sought other partners, including by soliciting a Foundation.

Artists' and professionals' reactions vary and are divided about the cultural policy followed with respect to the plastic arts. For example, José de Guimaraes, an internationally renowned plastic artist, is calling for a grouping of artists and directly criticises a policy based on spectacular events, favouring a few individuals, rather than one that is transparent and open to cultural diversity. On the other hand, an academic like Alexandre Melo, who is a Professor of the Sociology of Culture and the Arts, an art critic and intimately familiar with the sector, considers *"that after rather an anarchic period, it has recently been decided to tidy up the programmes, thus giving the puzzle some coherence"*. But this is to emphasise more clearly the fact that *"there are very great regional differences in the plastic arts: a great number of art galleries are opening in Oporto, probably partly as a result of the National Museum of Contemporary Art, but also because a market is forming in the North of Portugal as it is wealthier than the rest of the country."*

The situation of plastic arts does not seem to be either isolated or specific. The observations made in this sector are also to be found in other spheres: performing arts (theatre and dance), music and cultural training.

### **2.3 Strength and limitations of symbols in cultural policy**

The use of symbols to show the political change under way following a change of government, is not only a matter of the strategy of political actors. The social actors themselves want symbolic representations that will strengthen them in their political judgment. In this sense, all local and national political authorities now understand fully that a public policy is not only the result of a certain "know-how", but also of an enhanced "making-known". Presentation, labelling and packaging are all part of making any political decision coherent.

As discourse is becoming ever more important in politics, one might say that "saying is existing". The legitimacy of political action has to be strengthened by words and gestures and by sending out a series of codes everyone can understand. This issue is perhaps still more important with respect to culture than other spheres.

The public cultural policy conducted by the various teams in power in Portugal since 1985 is no exception to this rule. Defending a certain conception of Portugal's cultural influence and prestige, the social-democrat majority in office between 1985 and 1995 built the

Belem Cultural Centre, thereby giving Lisbon a facility symbolically proportionate to the status of the capital of a Member State of the European Union. The question of the operation of such a facility, in view of the weight of the representations it contains, necessarily becomes a secondary question. One might be surprised when the container becomes more important than the content, but this simple reservation itself proves meaningless, since what counts is not the realisation (understood as a coherent whole, content and form together), but the symbol produced by the realisation: the size, occupation of space (on the banks of the Tagus, sign of the country's openness to the world) and inclusion in a history that is itself prestigious and influential (near the *Mosteiro dos Jeronimos*, the Belem Tower and even the Monument of Discoveries built during the Salazar period).

Symbols have also been used since 1995, though naturally in different forms, since change must be manifested by other signs of recognition. Here, it is not a question of prestigious monuments, but of fighting technological progress and a heightened cult of production that destroys memory and culture. The affair of the preservation of the site of the Palaeolithic engravings in the Vale do Côa is one illustration of the strength of symbols in the development of public policy. We are not suggesting that this specific example of protecting an item of archaeological heritage threatened with destruction by the construction of a hydroelectric dam is unimportant. What deserves attention here is the fact that the case has taken on a considerable symbolic dimension because through it the development of the whole new cultural policy might find its first reification. In other words, if a fully operational ministry was set up, if it was to correspond to the stated political priority, it had to show in a significant way, as a sort of initiation rite, that it was able to exist in the face of other political, economic, energy, etc wills.

The Minister of Culture did not underestimate the fact that the affair of the rock paintings and Palaeolithic engravings of the *Vale do Côa* was a "metaphoric case" which alone summed up the constraints, prospects and choices with which he was going to be faced when developing future cultural policy. It is in this sense that the decision taken (conservation, placing the site on the list of National Monuments and requesting its inclusion on UNESCO's World Heritage list) was of considerable symbolic importance: culture had triumphed over energy production. The political change following the election was real because a purely economic rationale (identified as on the right) was replaced by a different rationale based on quality and non-profitability (identified as on the left).

It nonetheless remains that in both these cases the symbols carry their own limitations: when a political team has produced a system of signs that can make its will understandable and bring discourse and action together (in the etymological sense of the word "symbol" -  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\beta\omicron\lambda\epsilon\iota\nu$  - "to join together"), what does it do next? How does it manage the inclusion of its programmatic ambition on the agenda of its political

action? It is then that the length and difficulty of the road ahead can be appreciated.

Seeing culture as the symbolic expression of public policy is now a classic figure of political action. This dimension is in a way consubstantial with political action itself since all power is also expressed in its relation to art, in the more or less happy search for "the beautiful" and, almost ontologically, in the production of an ornamentation which itself carries culture. This constant existed before the modern and contemporary invention of politics and, *a fortiori*, culture as declared products of a political will. Even in their archaic or traditional forms, states are developers of culture. By "developers", we mean both "producers" and "stimulators". Only the forms and scale of their commitment have changed, not without exposing them to the risk of a certain instrumentalisation.

This metamorphosis makes state engagement in the cultural sphere a major issue today. This is a central question for Portugal. Does not the will to construct an ambitious, interventionist, proactive public cultural policy that has been emerging since 1995 in sectors as varied and different as publishing, heritage conservation, support for the performing arts, the cinema, radio and television, the plastic arts, in support for training cultural actors and operators of culture, raise more problems than it solves? In other words, setting aside symbols and discourse, how can a response be made to the expectations of a society expressing its cultural demands all the more strongly as it imagines it will be heard and responded to positively in accordance with stated political principles.

The first step towards answering these questions is to describe the interactions constructed around cultural policy in the particular case of Portugal.

\*

\*

\*

## **CHAPTER 2**

# **CULTURAL POLICY AS THE INDICATOR OF A STATE**

### **Central Government, local authorities, civil society, cultural actors faced with the state of culture**

Because public cultural policy is a variable that can enable us to understand the plethora of interactions constructed in a given country, a description of the various relationships woven between all the cultural partners in Portugal (understood in the broad sense) would allow us to present the problem more fully. We will deal in turn with national and local levels, the relationship between the state and the cultural market, the training imperative and, lastly, the effects of globalisation on Portuguese cultural identity. This chapter should be read as a sort of descriptive table of the various problems identified, while the next chapter will list a series of recommendations likely to help solve these problems.

In this part of the evaluation, our approach takes the form of examining five points: what is the current situation of all the problems examined: the promotion of creativity, the dissemination of what exists, the conservation/transmission giving rise to work on preserving memory, of increasing responsibility, both initially and *ex post facto* among the actors and, lastly, the relationship with the external environment and its domestic effects. These questions will not be recalled explicitly under each heading, but they are the background to all the remarks that follow.

#### **1. ALL ASPECTS OF THE STATE OF CULTURE**

The organisational reform put in place in Portugal since 1995 following the establishment of a fully operational Ministry of Culture was described above. We must now go beyond the strictly institutional and legal framework in order to assess from a more sociological point of view the reality of the operation of the centralised and devolved state structures in the cultural sphere, as they appeared to us.

##### **1.1 A developing centralised administrative apparatus**

It is incontestable that the series of Decree-Acts published since 1995 and extending Decree-Act 42/96 of 7 May 1996 organising the Ministry of Culture has meaning and emphasises a political will to renew

administrative structures. The list of texts and bodies concerned is significant and underlines the comprehensive, systematic nature of the approach. A detailed list will be found opposite.

All these bodies have therefore been the subject of legislation since 1995 and only the legal status of the three great National Academies (Fine Arts, History and the International Academy for Portuguese Culture), which was set out in the 1980s, has not been modified. The essential part of the reform has been to give administrative autonomy to all the institutions listed and, in some cases, to accompany this measure with financial autonomy (this is the case of the Cultural Development Fund, the IPPA, the IPACA, the Cinemathèque, the National Ballet Company, the National Orchestra of Oporto and the two National Theatres.

We do not intend to study closely, and report in detail upon, each of these institutions. We will, however, stress that during the various hearings held by the Panel of examiners, we were able to question some directors of some of these bodies.

A varying impression emerged from these interviews that brought out quite clearly several operational problems common to the setting up of all new legal forms, but it also revealed a series of questions about the nature and scope of actions to be undertaken in each of the cultural sectors concerned. Similarly, we observed that the decision-makers responsible for these bodies seemed to be looking for stable forms of procedures and operating norms for organising their internal relations and also their external ones, ie with their interlocutors (cultural actors, cultural strategists, etc.). This difficulty appeared particularly clearly in the case of the Portuguese Institute for Performing arts which operates under "interim arrangements" under Order 23-A of 11 April 1996 (DR 16 May 1996) and is the only body under the authority of the Ministry of Culture whose legal status is yet to be finalised.

Therefore André Gago, actor and director and leader of the largest performing arts union, stressing this operational context which sometimes seems a little irrational, emphasised when he met us that *"improvisation and the lack of guidelines to enable those in the performing arts to programme their creations present a real problem in the theatre sector"* and also regretted the *"maintenance of a sort of casuistic relationship between the Ministry and people working in the performing arts"*.

Now in their new legal "costumes" that give them more autonomy and therefore greater decision-making power, but whose size has not perhaps been well-adjusted to the models, the strategic bodies charged with implementing public cultural policy in Portugal still seem to be developing, searching for consensual *modus operandi* accepted and adopted by all cultural actors in each sector.

This necessary approach seems to be the only one that will make it possible to escape a representation based on dysfunctioning that gives

substance to the idea that the allocation of public aid is determined by specific criteria that combine the perpetuation of existing income with the affective-rational dimension, which is a euphemism for cronyism and lobbying.

This is a priority because the lack of rationalisation of amounts to eliminating the political will to improve the professionalisation of cultural choices sought by increasing the autonomy of state cultural bodies from the Ministry which the texts published since October 1995 were to bring about.

## 1.2 An outline decentralisation

With four Regional Delegations (North, Centre, Alentejo and Algarve), the Portuguese Ministry of Culture is faced with a particular problem: how can the measures taken at the top become part of the reality on the ground? it must be said that there is a degree of dysfunctioning in the process of decentralising the Ministry of Culture's activities. There are several reasons for this.

Firstly, the territorial cover does not provide all the administrative rationalities that might be expected. The geographic division is not specific to culture and Portugal is now in a comprehensive phase of examining the division of all its territory, and the notion "administrative constituency" does not always cover a stable reality shared by all state sectors.

Secondly, the presence in the four Regional Delegations for Culture directly responsible to the Ministry of Culture, of Regional Delegations of the Portuguese Institute for Architectural Heritage (two of these bodies have, moreover, been established since 1995, in Castel-Branco [centre/interior of the country] and Vila Real [north of the country]) and Regional Offices of the Portuguese Institute for Archaeology (a new one was established in Crato, near Portalegre, in March 1998), that are in neither case co-ordinated by the Regional Delegations and are directly responsible to the National Heritage and Archaeology bodies, helps to weaken the role of the Minister's representatives on the ground.

*"We cannot do everything because our means are limited, so we have decided to deal with a particular sector concerning the conservation of small organs in our 'region'."* A Regional Delegate for Culture.

Thirdly, and we realised this when we met some of them in the field, the Regional Delegates have very limited ability to act. In other words, the low level of decentralised credits managed as near as possible to the ground, seems to result in "sprinkling" and makes it difficult to set up formative operations which would respond to the demands expressed by civil society in areas far from Lisbon. It is not therefore surprising that when local cultural actors are asked about the nature of their relations with their Regional Delegation, they almost systematically reply that they do not have "much to do with it". Only a few cultural actors in the regions will therefore have the opportunity of finding some resources

from, and an attentive ear in, the representatives of the cultural administration, according to the centres of interest of the Regional Delegates (music, publishing, public reading, plastic arts). All this is more a matter of chance than the result of a political will stated at the top and relayed on the ground.

It is not, therefore, surprising that cultural decentralisation seems to have little content and exhibits a form of atomisation of decentralised state structures that gives the outside observer a dual impression: far from the centre (the Ministry) and cut off from the local context (by a lack of clarity in the delegation of power, dilution of their responsibilities and lack of adequate means of intervention).

## **2. LOCAL POWER AND LOCALISED CULTURES**

Portugal is at present the arena for a general debate about the notion of local power and the question of decentralisation. This debate naturally concerns the cultural sphere, particularly as the diversity of local situations is not free from imbalances that will be increased or reduced according to the choices made.

### **2.1 Cultural decentralisation in the broader debate**

Portugal, which was a highly centralised country under Salazarism when Lisbon declared itself the capital of a vast empire, has now been reduced to its metropolitan scale, but still had a Jacobin tradition until recent months. Only two regions, geographically distant from the Continent, Madeira and the Azores, enjoy the status of "autonomous regions".

However, since 1996, the trend towards genuine recognition of local power has been clearly affirmed, and in early 1998 Parliament passed an Outline Act which confirms the constitutional principle establishing Administrative Regions. In late 1998, the Portuguese people will have to decide about this important institutional development in a referendum. While Portugal seems to be moving towards the establishment of a fully operational decentralised administrative level (the Region), it has already legislated on the question of local authorities (municipalities) in a series of important Acts: the granting of financial autonomy (1979), the Local Authorities Act (1984 and subsequently) and, lastly, the Local Finance Act (1989). The role of local authorities in the country's development is far from negligible. As delegates of the national Association of Portuguese Municipalities remarked at their Tenth Congress in 1998: *"With only 7 per cent of public spending, Portuguese local authorities provide 25 per cent of investment and 18 per cent of public employment. Decentralisation in Portugal will be meaningful only if it is associated with partnership and subsidiarity mechanisms"*.

The Local Authorities Act gives municipalities some responsibility for culture but associates this power with other spheres such as sport and leisure.

The general institutional political debate about decentralisation naturally concerns the question of the geographic division of the various administrative regions, but is not limited to this aspect alone. One of the essential points of the discussion is the timeliness of increasing the existing differences between the richest regions (Lisbon, the Tagus Valley and North of the country round Oporto) and regions clearly lagging behind, such as Centre, Alentejo and the coastal area between the country's two great metropolises. This is a general debate on regional planning which naturally, but not exclusively, concerns the cultural sphere, which may be summarised as follows: "In wishing to provide the regions with greater autonomy, is there not a risk of favouring the richest among them by not enabling the poorest to develop?"

If we look at the distribution of expenditure on culture among the regions, in Lisbon-Tagus Valley it is significantly concentrated in the sectors of music, performing arts and plastic arts. With the forthcoming opening of the National Museum for Contemporary Art and the presence of the National Theatre, Oporto confirms its second place. Although Oporto is on the periphery, its situation cannot be regarded as representing genuine cultural decentralisation as it is more a question of a type of "bipolarity" of the centre between Lisbon and Oporto, pushing other Portuguese cities and regions onto the periphery. Nonetheless, in other sectors - public reading, among others - significant efforts have been made in the areas most affected by illiteracy, Alentejo, Algarve and Centre enjoying the highest rate of increase in public credits for this purpose.

## 2.2 Cultural policies and local development

The evaluation differs considerably according to whether the relations between centre and periphery are considered in their entirety or if the reality of local cultural policies is looked at in detail.

It must first be stressed that Portuguese local authorities account for 54 per cent of total public spending on culture (ie nearly 42,000 billion escudos out of a total of nearly 78,000 billion escudos in 1995). The ratio of central government/local authority spending, which was 107 in favour of central government in 1990 and 140 in 1991 (essentially because of investment in the Belem Cultural Centre), decreased steadily until 1995, when it was 86.

*"What is important for culture is that the citizen has won the right to participate"*  
Mayor of Evora

If we now look at the different areas of Portugal, we see significant differences. In relation to the number of inhabitants, local public expenditure on culture in Portugal shows the considerable efforts made in Alentejo and Algarve in comparison to other regions, such as North

and Centre. Thus, between 1987 and 1995 1.7 billion escudos per 100,000 inhabitants were spent by local authorities in Alentejo, and 982 million in Algarve. During the same period, the local authorities of North and Centre spent respectively only 630 and 642 million escudos per 100,000 inhabitants.

The many visits made by the Panel of examiners to local authorities in different municipalities throughout the territory enabled us to assess the diversity of local cultural policies implemented. In some cases, with different origins and a barely comparable level of development, similar rationales are to be found.

Thus, the Mayor of Montemor-o-Novo, a town in the heart of Alentejo, a disadvantaged region, but one in which cultural identity is strongly rooted with a highly significant social history, considered that *"Culture occupies a strategic position in development and may have considerable economic effects insofar as it can be shown that it is worth living in Montemor. We understood this as long ago as 1974, although it was not very easy to make the people here understand that it was as necessary to build a public library as it was to take care to respond to elementary needs such as decontamination, and providing water and electricity. But with distance, we can say now that few people contest the choice made regarding culture as an integral part of regional development as a whole"*.

The Deputy-Mayor responsible for culture in Cascais-Estoril, a prestigious, wealthy seaside resort a few kilometres west of Lisbon, had a similar attitude: *"This is a town for tourism and leisure visited by wealthy people, but we also want to present a cultural dimension by exploiting an exciting history that saw the greatest intellectuals of this century pass through here, by offering people who come here something more than casinos, sun, beaches and a motor-racing course: the spiritual enrichment only culture can produce"*.

The importance of culture is also strongly present in the Azores. This autonomous region has for the last year been involved in a profound reappropriation of its cultural heritage, under the impetus of a new team aware of the richness of its culture, which is using modern means of communication to highlight its work. It is a thorough-going project that involves strengthening a common cultural identity in a composite, far-flung, sparsely populated archipelago.

Conversely, in other cases it seems difficult to remove a feeling of distance and isolation unfavourable to cultural development. This is the impression derived from some situations observed in the Centre, around Castelo-Branco, Belmonte and Covilha. A local cultural strategy has long been lacking in this area which is on the periphery of the periphery and cultivates a form of existential doubt as to the nature of its relations with the centre and government based on a need for assistance that is all the greater for being accompanied by a form of passivity.

There is one domain about which a generally positive report can be given as regards public aid for local development. It is incontestably the public reading sector, which has benefited from considerable assistance for many years and is without any doubt an excellent example of well-co-ordinated initiatives undertaken with central-local government co-operation insofar as the national reading network that has been set up is certainly an instrument, not only of cultural development but of development as a whole and concerns every region of Portugal, even the poorest and those furthest from the capital.

### **2.3 Potential imbalances in cultural development**

Aware of the risks of imbalances that might be accentuated by strengthening local powers, from 1998 the Ministry of Culture is making a genuine policy of decentralisation one of its priorities. This step is not, however, unambiguous or without uncertainties. It comes at a time when the government regionalisation project is far from completion and may give rise to some dysfunctional elements with respect to the overall reform planned.

The remarks made by a senior official in the Secretariat of State for Culture during a hearing held by the European Panel of examiners, tends to justify the step taken: *"We must of course act in accordance with what is being done more generally as regards regionalisation, but since what is being done at this level has not been precisely defined, something must be done immediately in the cultural sphere. In 1992 the Directorate for Decentralisation of the Central Administration of the Ministry of Culture was abolished. This was a mistake. The Ministry now regards a cultural dissemination project for the whole country as a priority"*.

It was in this context that the *Rotas* Programme was launched. It involves Ministry of Culture cinema, plastic arts, books and dance departments moving round the country. And it is for a similar purpose that in 1998 the Minister himself began a series of visits to the provinces of one week a month in order to make contact with the situation in the field and assess all locally expressed needs.

What seems to be at issue in these new cultural decentralisation initiatives is a clear expression of a will to decompartmentalise the various forms of cultural expression by trying to reduce present or future differences in development. But at the same time the approach reveals a quite chronic lack of intermediate levels between central government (ministerial) level and local (municipal) level able to relay in both directions political decisions and demands expressed by Portuguese civil society in its territorial and social diversity.

## **3. STATE, MARKET, CULTURAL CONSUMPTION**

In Portugal as elsewhere, the relationships formed between state and civil society are mediated by cultural actors, the most important of which are the Foundations. In their diversity they participate in the complex inter-relationships between the state and the cultural market which is developing between interventionism and *laissez-faire*.

*“The role of the Gulbenkian Foundation goes far beyond the artistic dimension alone. The foundation’s four main objectives are art (50 per cent of its activity), and education, assistance and science, which account for the other half of our activities.”*  
Manuel Costa-Cabral, Director of the Fine Arts Department of the Gulbenkian Foundation.

### 3.1 The diversity of the Foundations

The role of Foundations in cultural development in Portugal was mentioned above, but deserves special attention because it is complex and sometimes contradictory.

Two major types of Foundation must be distinguished in Portugal. The first, typified by the Gulbenkian Foundation and Culturgest, operate as genuine actors and strategists of cultural development. They come into the private sector in the strict sense of the term, rely on capitalist management of assets, but are not exclusively concerned with the notion of economic profitability. The second, which we shall purposely call "beggars", are at best para-public bodies, at worst "heavyweights" constantly looking to government to make up for the lack of private investors and being more of a millstone than vectors able to act in the cultural sphere.

This diversity of status naturally results in very different "fire-power". When the Culturgest Foundation devoted 93 per cent of its 1997 budget to cultural operations, limiting its management expenses as much as possible, this did not mean that it was operating only on the receipts of those same cultural operations. In the same year, 72 per cent of the Foundation’s operational costs were covered by subsidies from the group of banks and insurance companies that founded Culturgest, 28 per cent by receipts. This confirms the existence of an ambitious cultural project that goes way beyond the simple quest for capitalist profit.

Gulbenkian and Culturgest really seem to be partners in Portuguese public cultural strategy that cannot be ignored because of their history and antecedence (this is essentially the case of the former) or because of the resources they are able to mobilise as "cultural producers". The Ministry seems to understand this perfectly and knows how to use their potential when the need arises.

From the point of view of individuals, the Foundations also take part in structuring a professional market of cultural development strategists which is particularly active. There are innumerable culture executives (managers, producers, distributors, artists, etc) who organise their career paths within the triangle formed by three elements: the Ministry (central administration or bodies under its authority) - the Gulbenkian Foundation - the Culturgest Foundation. This circulation of cultural élites is essential; it naturally produces positive co-operation but carries a strong risk of self-repetition that in time would be detrimental to new,

*“The Gulbenkian is faced with a real challenge. Previously (above all, between its establishment and 1974), everything fell upon the Foundation because it was alone. That was how thirty years ago we put 150 lorries carrying books for loan on the*

innovative experiments. In other words, whether it originates in the public sector or the private sector formed by the Foundations, culture is not sheltered from the risk of institutionalisation when the same actors exchange among themselves the posts and the accumulated symbolic capital in the cultural sphere.

### 3.2 The culture market and consumers

The question of the organisation of the culture market is inseparable from that of the place of the state in the process of exchange of cultural goods. In this respect, there are two competing approaches in Portugal. The first, defended by the government teams in office between 1985 and 1995, is liberal, demanding state disengagement from the culture market. The second, embodied by the present Minister, finds its justification in the following declaration, made in November 1997 in a major French daily: *"The controversy about the cultural state? It is the history of the continuity of the ministry of culture which allows this type of criticism in France. In Portugal it would be a luxury even to pose the problem. We are at the beginning of everything. When Marc Fumaroli attacks the principle of the cultural state, and through it Jack Lang, he is not proposing any alternative"*.

On one side *laissez-faire*, on the other, interventionism then? Going beyond expressions of principle and beneath political speeches, the reality is not, perhaps, so clear-cut. It is true, a prominent Culturgest official may well have told us that *"the problem is that everything depends on Ministry subsidies and people are always expecting subsidies"*, adding, *"in the final analysis, it might not be so bad if the weight of the Ministry were a little lighter in the functioning of the arts"*. But during the same exchange, another speaker, a producer of musicals, regretted that *"politicians in Ministries have a very conservative, traditional conception of their role and do not understand where they should really intervene, as, for example, in aid for distribution, which barely exists"*.

Thus a central question in the debate about the culture market is posed - the place of the state and the relations with consumers of culture: what is the relevant level of public intervention? Should the state promote, regulate or fill the gaps? Should the state be a facilitator or a cultural promoter like any other?

It emerges from the few reflections noted here that the very notion of state intervention in the culture market is a rather vague one used by politicians which says nothing about the meaning of such intervention, its content or, above all, its operational dimension. In other words, the debate about "interventionism" versus "liberalism" may obscure another that might be summarised as follows: "what type of intervention versus what type of *laissez-faire*?".

A very interesting set of ideas about cultural receptivity, including precise statistical data, is to be found in the National Report, Part III Problem

How do consumers of culture behave when confronted with these ideological positions? Reading the National Report on Portuguese cultural policy is very instructive on this point and the reader may refer to it to obtain all the necessary details. While the report of the *Observatorio das Actividades Culturais* shows there to be a very low level of cultural consumption in Portugal, to the point of writing "*If one wished to characterise the predominant nature of Portuguese people's spare-time activities out of the home in a single image, one would say that it was far more likely to find them walking in shopping centres, or in a neighbourhood café chatting with friends, than deciding on cultural itineraries that require an investment of time and effort*", it also raises a real methodological question which is decisive when one is trying to make an evaluation: "*are not modes of cultural practices reduced to an intellectual definition of culture, to categories determined by political and media understanding?*".

This is closely akin to the remarks made by Luis Capucha, a researcher at the Sociology Centre of Social Classes, who has worked on forms of "popular culture" for many years, when he told us, "*There is a real cleavage between "culture" in the official sense and "popular cultures". The Ministry often has an attitude of avoidance or even confrontation with respect to "popular cultures", which is less the case of local authorities. But "popular culture" is almost systematically categorised as "Tourism" because it is considered a form of folklore of no great interest*".

The European Panel of examiners broadly confirms the tendency Luis Capucha mentions, as we will see in the paragraph of this chapter devoted to the cultural state and the social bond.

#### 4. THE STATE, HERITAGE AND CREATION

The place of art in Portugal may be considered from the triple point of view of the relations between state and heritage, between state and creation and, lastly, between society and artistic creation.

##### 4.1. The state and heritage protection

Contemporary Portugal has a rich, substantial artistic history. This is expressed in a policy to protect the artistic, architectural and archaeological heritage which alone absorbed almost a quarter of Ministry of Culture expenditure in 1995. This situation leads the authorities to continue the political action begun in the past, which has made the state a direct interlocutor of artists and their work.

The example of the protection of the religious heritage (essentially churches) shows this very clearly: through the Outline Act on Cultural

*"Despite the unanimously recognised tardiness, there are now 3000 listed buildings, which shows the considerable scale of this sphere (...) Act 13/85 of 6 July 1985 is of particular importance, particularly the proposal to broaden the classification context by forming special protection areas, hence the proposed typology: "monuments", "groupings" and "..."*

Heritage submitted to the Cabinet on 5 February 1998, the present government sought to settle a particularly delicate problem connected with the relations between state and Church, henceforth making the former responsible for listing, classifying and protecting buildings belonging to the latter.

#### **4.2 Aid for artistic creation**

The diversity of the various sectors of cultural creation (plastic arts, music, dance, theatre, cinema, radio-television and books) does not make it easy to describe and understand aid-for-creation mechanisms. All government aid to various creators seems to have been increasing significantly since 1996. The figures presented in the National Report are eloquent in this respect. This is the natural, logical effect of the increase in the budget of the Ministry of Culture since the change of government.

While it is essential to take into account the substantial increase in aid, it is not possible to ignore the mechanisms put in place to select particular projects that will receive aid for artistic creation to the detriment of others, or to fail to mention where the aid has gone.

On this point, the Panel of examiners was not able to form a particularly clear opinion. Although undeniable efforts have been made as regards selecting "subsidised" works and creations (particularly by holding "competitions" with more professional juries which are probably more expert than they were in the past), the procedures for granting aid remain quite opaque. The lack of transparency is particularly strong in a sector such as the theatre, for example, where, however, the wish to rationalise practices has improved things substantially. This is probably because there was still more to be done in this sector than in others.

In addition to the conditions for granting aid, there is another problem: the relevance of the forms of state intervention. In this connection, the argument of a music producer might be quoted (he produces in particular a Portuguese group that is very well-known in Europe) who believes it would be desirable to provide aid for the distribution and reproduction of cultural products - discs, for example - rather than concentrating financial aid on conservation. When he spoke to the examiners, he added, "*The way money is given needs to be changed. The ideal would be to give 25 per cent to creation, 25 per cent to production and above all 50 per cent to distribution*". Although these proportions are clearly linked with the witness's artistic activity (the music market), the demand for aid for distribution of works was made many times by people from other cultural sectors, such as books (publishing) and the performing arts.

Some European countries have for some years been setting up systems of support for creation through state commissions directly linked with state investment in spheres other than culture. This mechanism, which is known in France under the generic term "1 per cent for artistic

creation", consists of providing that every public investment will reserve 1 per cent of the total budget for the work to paying for works of art that will be displayed within the future public building. This system has the merit of maintaining the system of state commissions of works of art, although it does not avoid a form of "subsidising" that may sometimes result in developing a type of "academicism".

### 4.3 The artist's place in society

*"In a society like Portugal, the artist is the person who enables destiny to emerge in the cultural sphere". A manager of a voluntary body in Evora.*

Although artists are citizens, they are regarded as being apart. Is this because they live from their art and do not, in the final analysis, seem to be producers of goods or services? Or is it because they fall into the category of the superfluous or non-essential? This judgment seems insufficient once an art market has developed with its own rules, like any other market. In fact, what seems to be at issue is the very status of an individual who sees himself, or is seen as, an artist. There are several ways in: through specialised schools and institutes, the creator's individual path, or the self-taught artist. In all these cases the artist sees his work, positively or negatively, in relation to a specific social culture. He is at the centre of a complex interaction between a social reality and its representation. To paraphrase Claude Lévi-Strauss who, in the introduction to his book *"The Raw and the Cooked"*, saw music as the hyper-mediation between culture and nature, the artist is a "hyper-mediator" who places himself, or is placed, between the society and the culture that emanates from it.

Nonetheless, the social status of the artist, in Portugal as in many countries with a comparable level of development, often makes him more alone than others in society. This can be seen in the lack of organisation of artists' various professional and union bodies, the difficulty they have living from their art, etc.

In Portugal, the period of the dictatorship, the years that followed the Carnation Revolution and the present period, all in their way have naturally constructed artists in different structures. But whether they are in revolt or in agreement, artists are also "tracers" of culture in that they act as distributors of meaning in a given society, but this role is itself constantly affected by the development of that society. As Manuel de Oliveira, the doyen of European film-makers working today and a great Portuguese creator, recently put it: *"The development of the cinema is not isolated from social transformations and a whole set of influences that form the temperament of every director and give him his own creativity on which the techniques and the reflection of all the arts are moulded, when he is allowed to work freely"*. The director of *"The Valley of Abraham"* and *"Francisca"* added, *"Although the cinema has been made as industrial and commercial as possible, its essence and character are artistic and nothing else. Cinemas are living artistic temples, as are museums, theatres and libraries, completely independent of the commerce that may result from them"*.

It follows from the above that training remains an essential instrument for fostering cultural development. We will return to this point.

## 5. THE CULTURAL STATE AND THE SOCIAL BOND

The National Report presents a series of interesting statistics about the number of associations per 100,000 inhabitants resulting from a survey of cultural associations conducted by the National Institute of Statistics:

North: 56.8  
Centre: 111.6  
Lisbon, Tagus Valley: 56.6  
Alentejo: 83  
Algarve: 50.7  
A.R. Azores: 25.3  
A.R. Madeira: 99.2

Source: National Report, Annexes, p. xxxvi.

Following on from the above, strengthening the social bond gives the relations between the cultural state and society a special dimension. In the Portuguese case, the reality of civil society should be seen as a cultural platform and training in socio-cultural organisation as it is understood by the authorities.

### 5.1 The cultural fragmentation of civil society

One of the recurrent themes during the examiners' missions in the various meetings they had throughout Portugal, in the Azores and Madeira, was the extraordinary cultural density and vitality of Portuguese society. This was true of the meetings held in different parts of the country: they enabled us to hear a great variety of cultural actors, local, volunteers, militants of an authentic popular culture, often demanding high quality which always means substantial human investment. This phenomenon is accentuated in the rural areas because the social bond is still more strongly structured there, but this is not necessarily, however, transformed into a rapprochement between public cultural policy and civil society. This cleavage deserves attention.

Cultural initiatives emanating from civil society may be seen as proactive and often resulting from a process of mobilisation around convergent interests that bring together a few social actors who are passionate about a particular cause: theatre in school, safeguarding the musical tradition, teaching children to play a musical instrument, distribution of films in places previously deprived of them, strengthening reading for all, etc. They are soon faced with the question of the resources needed to implement their project. The local authorities are then seen as the direct interlocutors of "cultural entrepreneurs". They respond according to their means, will and the priorities of their own political agenda. But they are not the only ones who are approached: citizens also turn to the representatives of the Ministry of Culture which too often rejects applications because of limited resources.

Is this surprising? Of course not: there is nothing specific to Portugal in this situation which is to be found in every democratic society where civil society is able to act as a producer of cultural events. But it is nonetheless the case that the situation in Portugal displays a real cleavage that was expressed in all the meetings held with local cultural associations in the following terms: "*We can never obtain aid from the Ministry of Culture*", "*We're too far away*", "*What do you expect - no one's interested in our work, although we've been active in this sector for years*". This long litany of regrets and disillusion is perhaps part of

the usual ritual and the discourse that legitimates peripheral representations, but it also reflects a particular fragmentation of Portuguese civil society in its relationship with culture. It is as though each group must be responsible for its own promotion, its own search for resources, its specific cultural activity, managing and administering at the same time as it pursues the goals it has set itself.

It is particularly surprising to observe the lack of large bodies forming federations of the various cultural associations working in the different cultural sectors. This organisational lacuna is a serious problem that leads to systemic dysfunction which hardly fosters the practical implementation of a real public cultural policy. Every authority should have interlocutors who function as "porters" able to incorporate a diffuse, fragmented social demand. This is an essential dimension that determines the ability to register demands and deal with them rationally. The lack of cohesive structures in the cultural sphere, organised into a hierarchy and taking into account the various territorial levels of Portuguese society, makes it impossible to construct a public debate about culture. It leads to an atomisation which results in requests being treated on a case-by-case basis and in its turn fosters the fragmentation of public policy.

The authorities in charge of culture in Portugal should be attentive to all measures likely to foster the structuring of civil society. It is not in any way a question of here of institutionalising a voluntary sector which would be all the more artificial for being "official" and which would then have no function but to legitimise political decisions. It is a matter of fostering the emergence of independent, free, representative interlocutors, and in this way laying the foundations for a genuine citizen's debate about culture.

## **5.2 Socio-cultural organisation, a factor in the social bond**

If one believes the testimony of Americo Rodrigues, cultural officer of Guarda, "*at national level there is no training for cultural activities organisers*". Yet, if one refers to the *Observatorio's* report, in 1995 cultural activities organisers represented some 33.1 per cent of the 6,086 people working in culture in Portugal, ie more than 2000 people. They are the second largest group of professional culture workers, just after the audiovisual sector, which, moreover, includes several sub-sectors, such as cinema, television and radio. The recognition of this category of culture workers is, furthermore, quite recent since it has only appeared in Ministry of Employment statistics since 1994.

Just as the lack of federations of cultural associations on the ground is a problem, the lack of training for professionals charged with promoting and organising cultural action is prejudicial. Without envisaging an extremely normative, regulated programme which would not take into account local situations, the special characteristics of each cultural sector or more relevant modes of intervention, there is an urgent

need to fill this gap. The current professionalisation of cultural activities organisers is more the result of spontaneous action by local authorities than of a coherent, homogeneous programme of action. It is resulting in a form of deregulation of the sector in which anyone may become a "cultural activities organiser" without having any qualifications.

The risk of further atomisation, this time concerning the centre of the cultural sphere, seems even more clear than in the case mentioned above: state authorities will soon be faced with a veritable cacophony which will not even be able to express a particular request coherently. In addition to the lack of codes that can reasonably be understood by everyone, the discourse and cultural practices resulting from this lack of a common mode of expression or know-how will no longer correspond to intelligible rationales and will widen the cleavage between centre and periphery, between political decision-making and its practical outcomes.

While experiments in training cultural activities organisers are being conducted throughout Portugal, it is still more urgent to accelerate a process of certification which would lay down a number of regulations on the subject. According to José Ruis Martins, a cultural actor who has been very familiar with the sector for more than twenty years, *"training organisers is, it is true, beginning to be undertaken in vocational schools, but there is as yet no recognised training. There are some 2-year courses for cultural organisers in some state schools, but they do not provide training for the profession of cultural activities organiser and, furthermore, are under the authority of the Ministry of Education. There are 3-year higher education courses only in the private sector and this rather anarchic situation is increasingly worrying for the future of this activity which is essential for culture"*.

This reaction, which emerged at a meeting organised with the European Panel of examiners, again brings out the question of the place of the Ministry of Culture in training cultural actors, for which the Ministry of Education is at present responsible. It is important to emphasise here to what extent the organisation of cultural activities is an obvious social function: it contributes to structuring society, strengthens the social bond and enables social control to be exercised in a way directly linked with safeguarding the general interest. Far from being of residual or secondary importance, intervention in this strategic sector could only strengthen the cohesion of Portuguese society and, in addition, make public cultural policy more effective. In fact, this is part of a much wider problem that has arisen which we will now turn to: cultural training.

## **6. THE NEED FOR TRAINING**

Three complementary aspects of this must be dealt with: training cultural administrators and managers, training cultural creation professions (creators, organisers and technicians) and, lastly, training the public, indispensable actors if culture is to have any meaning.

## 6.1 Training cultural administrators and managers

Setting up new institutional structures to give practical expression to a series of political orientations is one thing, "peopling" such structures with competent actors able to give practical expression to a political will is another - and not necessarily easier.

In this respect, the administration of the Ministry of Culture, at least with respect to its senior technical executives, seems to require some structural adjustments in order to rationalise practices and make it more efficient. We saw that in some cases concerning pilot-schemes set up in 1997 in specific sectors such as decentralised performance arts, a certain lack of motivation on the part of executives charged with giving life to, and making operational, an interesting initiative removed the very substance from the projects.

This lack of training has already been mentioned above. It is not specific to the socio-cultural organisation sector and seems to be part of a broader phenomenon throughout the cultural sector. Moreover, it was awareness of this situation that led to the training programme set up at Culturgest by the Ministry of Culture in Spring 1998, which involves about fifteen cultural development actors, most of whom work for local authorities. This initiative, which is directed by Mr Pinto Ribeiro, one of the directors of the Foundation, is particularly interesting: it consists of training cultural managers recruited from local authorities on the basis of specific projects as they arise.

There is a need for more such training courses, which should include making state cultural actors aware of the notion of "cultural public service", for example. The policy is not merely a series of rather proactive declarations of principle, but also involves a series of technocratic stages marked by a legal and rational rationale and imbued with a certain ethics of responsibility, which is based on the meaning of their action. This dimension does not exist of itself, but is constructed by the training and the dissemination of norms accepted and shared by all those involved.

## 6.2 Training in cultural creation professions

As we said above in connection with training cultural activities organisers, it was clear that the question of training young creators (and we should also add "technicians of culture") requires serious thought.

From this point of view, it is obvious that artistic creation cannot be conceived of without taking into account its relations with the cultural policy in force, in particular as regards training young artists. The situation may surprise some people in view of the lack of any relations

*"More links need to be forged with the real country as regard training of artists. "Bridges" need to be built between society and schools like ours. For this purpose, we are anxious to enrich the nature of our relations with a*

between the Ministry of Culture and some higher education institutions for artistic professions.

This is the case of the Lisbon Higher Institute of Dance,. Established by a Ministry of Education Decree-Act published in 1983, the Higher Institute of Dance (ESD) opened its doors in 1986. It had some forty students the first year, about twelve of whom came from the Conservatory, and gives a *Bachalariato* after three years and a special higher diploma after two further years of training. The ESD is part of the Lisbon Polytechnic Institute and is the only institution of this level in Portugal. Many of its former pupils have joined the National Ballet or the Gulbenkian Foundation Ballet Company. The Chairperson of the Board of Governors of the Institute, Wanda Ribeiro da Silva, while happy with its work, regrets whenever she has the opportunity "*the lack of contact between the ESD and the Ministry of Culture*" as the Institute is exclusively under the authority of the Ministry of Education.

She believes that this situation is unfortunately not an exception and is the case of all artistic training: "*I don't understand why the Ministries of Education and Culture do not work together when it comes to training artists. I think the general effect of this is a lack of links with the real country with respect to recruitment and above all in post-diploma activities. I sometimes have the impression that there are a number of lobbies in the cultural sector and the institutions which do not favour the establishment of sustained contacts between the Ministry of Culture and institutions like ours... For example, you might think the Institute's Ballet Company would receive Ministry of Culture aid when it performs, but it doesn't*".

In the final analysis, this is a quite classic situation found in other countries comparable to Portugal, but the fact that the training bodies for young artists do not come within the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Culture is nonetheless regrettable. It is the expression of a vision that is more administrative than political in the way a country conceives its relationship with the artistic professions.

### 6.3 Training the public

The most recent work done to assess the cultural practice of the Portuguese was conducted by researchers from the Observatory of Cultural Activities. The figures bring out an interesting situation. The percentages of people doing the following "every day or almost" is as follows: watching television 91,9 %, listening to the radio 70,8 %, listening to

This is a far broader problem than simply the cultural training of the Portuguese public, indeed it is a general issue: the continuing education in the broadest sense that makes the citizen of a democracy at once a social, and political actor, an economic agent and a consumer of culture. How can a public that is not used to doing so be brought to open itself to different cultural forms? The debate is not clear-cut and should not be because it also refers to essential sociological questions such as "reproduction" and "distinction", which lead to an examination of the processes of domination within a particular society. Is there a "true" culture as opposed to a "non" culture? Or again, what is the distinction between "culture" and "popular cultures"?

What should be borne in mind is that all social actors in a society such as Portugal's must have access to the elementary instruments of cultural understanding. It must be remembered that in some regions of Portugal, such as Alentejo, but it is not the only part of the country concerned, the illiteracy rate was high for a long time. The result was a form of feudal social and economic domination in which the people were kept illiterate in order that they should not revolt. Today the illiteracy rate is identical to that in other European countries and since 1974 the state may be considered to have provided the Portuguese people with the opportunity to have access to the primary instruments of cultural consumption. If any evidence were needed, it would be sufficient to look at the extraordinary welcome the Portuguese people gave public libraries at local level.

Another stage now has to be reached, one which should be similar to the fundamental development that resulted from the "battle of reading", namely the installation, training in, and use of, the new communication technologies that will enable culture to be more widely disseminated in schools, to Portuguese youth and populations living in areas far from the major urban centres like Lisbon and Oporto. This will be the first response to the question of training the public and will, as it were, enable the various forms of cultural expression to find the audience they deserve.

## **7. BEYOND THE FRONTIERS**

As a European partner, Portugal has for more than ten years been part of a Community context it has no intention of going against. Its rather brilliant success in the examination to gain admittance to the European club is the most recent, most eloquent demonstration of this. European integration is, however, only one aspect of the state of Portugal's relations with the world around it. Two other levels need to be examined: the relationship with the Portuguese-speaking world and the dialectical link forming between a Portuguese identity and multiculturalism, all this against the background of globalisation, the development of new communication technologies and the potential for strengthening local autonomy favoured by the lowering of physical and communications frontiers.

### **7.1 The cultural Portuguese state in European integration**

Portugal's entry into what was then the European Community in January 1986 confirmed its integration in the continent of Europe. This was not the first time it had done so, however, since at the time of the Carnation Revolution in 1974 Portugal had become a member of the Council of Europe. This detail is not superfluous, but underlines the fact that one of the first forms of European co-operation Portugal apprehended found expression in the cultural and human rights sectors.

With the full benefit of European funds, Portugal is now in the INTERREG I and II Programmes which foster trans-frontier co-operation with Spain, an appreciable source of funding for the rehabilitation and renovation of historical and cultural heritage, since total European aid for these programmes should approach 45 billion escudos for the period 1991-1999. Under the terms of these cultural programmes linked with regional development, 35 monuments, buildings and historic sites have been rehabilitated and 8 centres with cultural facilities set up in the area of the frontier with Spain. Other European funds, such as FEDER, are constantly mobilised to invest in cultural development: here we can cite the Serralves Centre in Oporto, the operations to rebuild the town of Angra do Heroísmo on the island of Terceira in the Azores, which was destroyed by an earthquake on 1 January 1980, or again the Guimarães Cultural Centre.

Since its first experience conducted on the initiative of the Council of Europe in 1983 (*The Seventeenth Art, Science and Culture Exhibition*), Portugal has taken part in a whole series of major European cultural events. Among the most significant were *Europalia 91* in Brussels, *Lisbon 94 - European Cultural Capital* (on the initiative of the Council of Ministers of Culture of the EU), participation as a theme-country in the *Forty-Ninth Frankfurt International Book Fair* (October 1997) and, again as a theme-country, participation in the *Seventeenth International Art Fair of Madrid - ARCO 98* (February 1998).

Similarly, the holding of the last great world exhibition before the year 2000, *Expo 98 - The Oceans, a Heritage for the Future* - between May and September 1998, in Lisbon, is all the more striking for having attracted the largest number of countries ever assembled by such an exhibition and amounted to a veritable shop window for Portugal this year.

All this is part of a declared, European process, and of course a world process with respect to the last example. Such a policy of European cultural influence has not been limited to one political team: different governments have made similar choices in this respect. The example of *Expo 98* is a perfect illustration of this: the decision was taken by the political majority in power before 1995 and was maintained and amplified by the new team. This choice has, however, received some criticism. Regarded by some Portuguese intellectuals as "*a spectacular tree hiding a forest of deficiencies on the part of the Government with respect to supporting culture*", no one was entirely indifferent to *Expo 98*. According to whether one supports or criticises it, it is full of promise or a carrier of every sort of dysfunctioning.

João Brites, a street theatre artist who has worked in several European countries, is cultural activities officer for *Expo 98*. When in February 1998 he presented his plans to the European examiners on the actual site of the Exhibition, he did not fail to stress that the event was "*a locomotive able to reduce the cultural gulf between Portugal and the other European countries and generate new cultural needs to which a response will have to be made after the Expo*". The director of a public

library in Alentejo has the opposite opinion, believing that "*such flashy operations simply serve to justify the refusal to intervene in many sectors which are certainly less spectacular but would be far more thorough-going in their effects*".

The process of European integration is not confined to using European Union funds or holding a few major events to highlight Portuguese culture. It is generating a series of new forms of pan-European cultural co-operation which will multiply with the globalisation of trade. The most important of these concerns the direct relations that now exist between Portuguese local authorities and local authorities in other European countries and between these territorial units and the various European authorities.

This development is having obvious consequences: the state level may now be supplemented by supra-national ties; Portuguese public cultural policy is now part of a "cultural space" organised at European level, particularly by the opening of financial funds for which some cultural projects may be eligible, while others are not; the bilateral relations between Portuguese and European territorial authorities may increase the differences in internal development in Portugal since the wealthier areas will be able to conduct a "foreign policy" and thus obtain extra resources and influence while the more disadvantaged will remain isolated, unable to join the cultural networks of European cities.

There is no lack of examples to illustrate the internationalisation of cultural exchanges, including at local level. Oporto, Evora and Sintra, wholly or in part on UNESCO's World Heritage List, are now part of an international thematic network with cities like Quebec and Dakar, thus forging direct international relationships without going through central government. In another dimension we might also mention the multilateral cultural operations between Portuguese and other European towns, such as the one carried out on the initiative of the municipality of Montemor-o-Novo with Pontedera in Italy through the Luso-Italian Art and Culture Festival "*Seven Suns, Seven Moons*" which seeks to establish a cultural network among medium-sized towns in southern Europe. Here again, integrated, decentralised cultural co-operation is being constructed bypassing the traditional national framework and questions somewhat the classic "centre-periphery" pattern of relationships in favour of a new paradigm: "periphery-periphery".

## **7.2 The Portuguese-speaking world, multiculturalism and the global society**

Set up within the framework of the *Iniciativa Mosaico*, the *Terràvista* project, launched on 23 March 1997 by the Ministry of Culture, is the most concrete of recent decisions regarding the new communications technologies. It is intended to foster Portuguese presence on the Web and, in a little over a year, has had broadly positive results: twenty thousand users (60 per cent Portuguese, 30 per cent

Brazilian, the rest from throughout the world) with their own Internet pages are already involved in the project, for which the Ministry of Culture has provided expenditure of nearly 6 million escudos. There are an average of 700,000 visits per month to the sites supported by Terravista.

This isolated example demonstrates the importance of this new phase of "Discoveries" which is now offered to a country like Portugal. It is part of a long, historic international and planetary dimension which is reactivating the classic figures of the Portuguese-speaking world.

Of the 200 million people in the world who speak Portuguese, less than 5 per cent live in Portugal. It is essential to be aware of this if one is to understand fully the reality of the Portuguese-speaking world, which may be defined, as does Fernando Cristovao, as "*a system of linguistic and cultural communication in the Portuguese language or its linguistic, geographic and social varieties, belonging to different peoples for whom it is a maternal or official instrument of expression*". Structured and made official since 1996 in the Community of Countries with Portuguese as an Official Language (PALOP), the Portuguese-speaking world is still a cultural mosaic comprised of very diverse elements according to geographic and cultural situations. It remains the case, however, that this gives Portugal an extremely rich communications potential which places it among the countries most favoured in this respect. Questions may, however, be asked about the limited material resources allocated with respect to such potential.

The National Report reproduces the map of the "Portuguese language" in the world, p.234. Source: Camoes Institute.

Cultural Centres of the Camoes Institute began to be set up abroad in 1993, at first favouring Asian countries. In 1994 and 1995, interest turned to countries where Portuguese is an official language (with the exception of France, where the large Portuguese community justified opening a Centre). List of Cultural Centres abroad with their date of establishment:

Beijing - 1993  
Seoul - 1993  
New Delhi - 1993  
Tokyo - 1993  
Thailand - 1993  
Paris - 1994  
Bissau - 1994  
Maputo - 1994  
Sao-tome - 1994

The linguistic community naturally entails a co-operation policy based on a succession of public aids for development for the former Portuguese colonies, but should also have an effect on Portuguese cultural presence in the same countries through the Cultural Centres that come under the Camoes Institute established in 1992. By 1997, 12 Centres had been opened throughout the world. While the intention has been stated, the financial resources have sometimes been lacking and some observers stress that the limited resources allocated to the Camoes Institute since its establishment are resulting in a real problem of visibility of its action. This is all the more true because the superimposition of the Institute's competencies on those of other Portuguese government bodies, including the Ministry of Culture Cabinet for International Relations, hardly fosters a coherent international cultural strategy. It is not without interest to wonder whether, in order to rationalise practices and make the action of the Camoes Institute more effective, it could not in future come under the Ministry of Culture, rather than the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in order, to repeat the severe words of Eduardo Prado Coelho, "*to create a team of real cultural professionals at the Camoes Institute, thus avoiding its becoming a waiting-room for diplomats in transit from one post to another*". Of the 200 million people in the world who speak Portuguese, less than 5 per cent live in Portugal. It is essential to be aware of this if one is to understand fully the reality of the

Portuguese-speaking world, which may be defined, as does Fernando Cristovao, as "*a system of linguistic and cultural communication in the Portuguese language or its linguistic, geographic and social varieties, belonging to different peoples for whom it is a maternal or official instrument of expression*". Structured and made official since 1996 in the Community of Countries with Portuguese as an Official Language (PALOP), the Portuguese-speaking world is still a cultural mosaic comprised of very diverse elements according to geographic and cultural situations. It remains the case, however, that this gives Portugal an extremely rich communications potential which places it among the countries most favoured in this respect. Questions may, however, be asked about the limited material resources allocated with respect to such potential.

The Portuguese-speaking world, a bearer of development projects and a synonym of influence for Portuguese culture, finds in multiculturalism a fascinating dialectical complement. Portuguese culture has been greatly marked by a dual phenomenon: impregnation by exogenous influences and endogenous migratory movements. This situation has produced a unique cultural model which would seem to be the practical application of the famous aphorism of Antoine de Saint-Exupéry, who lived in Cascais for a short time during the Second World War: "*Stranger, far from being impoverished by our differences, they enrich me*". In other words, through the influx of a population from its former colonies in the 1970s and experiencing considerable external and internal migratory flows from the 1960s onwards (massive emigration from the 1950s onwards, rural migration starting in the 1980s) the Portuguese people have been strengthened by a constant process of cultural, social and demographic exchanges and intermingling which are factors in the diversification of Portuguese culture.

A public cultural policy cannot ignore or deny such a sociological reality. Everything done recently to institutionalise cultural exchanges with a country such as Brazil, for example, are a step in the right direction. Such actions should be multiplied and geographically diversified, taking into account the new means of communication that can give Portuguese culture the "vectors of projection" it has lacked up to now. The challenge of the next few years is just that: faced with a process of economic globalisation, the crushing of special characteristics and the imposition of a cultural model based on industrial and commercial power, a country such as Portugal (but it is not the only one) has a right to defend its specific identity and promote its own cultural contributions. This is the road on which it has set out. It must have the will to continue and remain aware of its own wealth.

\*

\*

\*

## CHAPTER 3

# THE CULTURAL DEBATE AS PRODUCT OF AN EVALUATION

### **Knowledge of the cultural sphere, interlocking cultural issues and strengthening the social bond by re-establishing the cultural binding**

Without in any way presuming to impose a series of formal approaches, the Council of Europe Panel of examiners will now set out a number of lines of thought arising from the observations it made in Portugal during the various evaluation missions. They are grouped around a series of interlocking issues resulting from an overall evaluation of Portuguese public cultural policy.

Five central features have been identified: the cognitive mechanisms connected with the evaluation; the effects of globalisation on culture in Portugal; the relations between central government, local authorities and civil society; the relations between the strategists of cultural development, culture workers and consumers; and culture as a political, social and ultimately democratic issue.

Each of these major headings will be the subject of a recommendation formulated on the responsibility of the European examiners alone, which may be broken down into several recommendations.

#### **1. The importance of a national mechanism for assessing and evaluating cultural policies**

No political authority, in whatever context, has the ability to evaluate the consequences of its choices and approaches. It is now essential to put in place a mechanism for obtaining information about cultural policy. This should not only be maintained, but above all strengthened by systematising evaluation procedures and providing them with their own resources. In this respect the *Observatorio das Actividades Culturais* is an instrument of the greatest possible interest which should be seen as an aid to government decision-making, while respecting its scientific independence, the only guarantor of its credibility.

The European Panel of examiners recommends:

- **continuing and strengthening the activities of the *Observatorio das Actividades Culturais*. The European Panel of examiners sees it as a particular way of putting a declared political will into practice with respect to cultural development.**
- **setting up a systematic principle for evaluating public policy actions which would correspond to a minimum percentage of the total amount of public aid allocated to a particular cultural operation. This mechanism would make it possible to finance evaluation actions that would themselves improve the rationality of decision-making.**
- **putting the *Observatorio das Actividades Culturais* in contact with similar bodies in other European countries through exchanges of researchers, who would receive research grants funded by the Portuguese Ministry of Culture.**

These three recommendations do not aim to establish a new, cumbersome, costly administrative body, but to develop an existing mechanism which, through the work it has done for the National Report and other scientific research, has won undeniable credibility, strengthened by the presence of many gifted young researchers.

## **2. The effects of globalisation on Portuguese cultural identity**

Whether it likes it or not, Portuguese public cultural policy is part of an integrating European and global context which threatens gradually to reduce the effects of the same national policy by substantially changing the stated rationales. Nonetheless, the policy seeks to safeguard a Portuguese identity based on a highly significant multi-faceted history and tradition in Portuguese civil society. This will to preserve is clearly expressed in some sectors: books, cinema, heritage, etc.

Work has been undertaken for a long time in the following cultural sectors: public reading, heritage conservation, etc. They have either been broadened or diversified and extended to other cultural sectors in the last three years: plastic arts, performing arts, etc.

A debate should be opened about the approaches that should be adopted in order to maintain the elements of a Portuguese cultural identity based on language, and the "migrations - immigrations - identity" dialectic, at the same time including the concept of "closure - openness", particularly in the recent challenge presented by the new communications technologies.

In this framework, the European examiners suggest a number of lines of thought:

- **there should be a comprehensive debate about the concept of the Portuguese-speaking world that would include heritage**

(associated with the dissemination of the language and Portuguese history), books (which will find in the Portuguese-speaking market the critical mass able to ensure its real economic development) and audiovisual arts (especially in the context of the European strategy with respect to the new communications technologies).

- in parallel to the concept of the Portuguese-speaking world, another category should be explored: the "Latinate". This would be broader and concern, not only the countries of southern Europe in the broad sense of the term, from the Atlantic (Portugal, Spain, France) to the Black Sea (Romania), but also a far more diversified area of co-operation at global level. Undertaken through occasional, localised operations (Montemor-o-Novo's experience with Italy, for example), co-operation inspired by the Portuguese Ministry of Culture could give meaning to a genuine cultural, linguistic and historical proximity.
- the question of multiculturalism based on internal and external migrations could be given special attention by involving the best Portuguese, Portuguese-speaking and European specialists in a general debate on Portuguese identity which would include the cultural intimacy peculiar to the Portuguese-speaking world, comparison with other situations (French-, English- and Spanish-speaking worlds) and a series of outside views of Portugal, or even a multidisciplinary approach (involving sociology, political science, demography, linguistics, communication sciences, history and philosophy).
- strengthening Portugal's contribution to international cultural development could be enriched by increasing significantly the resources of the Camoes Institute and increasing Ministry of Culture responsibility for it, thus demonstrating, not only symbolically, but very concretely, the will to give a cultural dimension to Portuguese influence beyond its borders.

These four lines of thought for a national Portuguese debate are the expression of an immediate and a long-term concern. In the short term, policy cannot remain detached from technology and must be able to regain the initiative so that the blind advance of the technological system does not result in loss of political legitimacy. In the long term, Portugal must be able to provide itself with the means necessary for preserving its own culture, not in a conservative sense or as a memorial, but as a living instrument in the service of a civil society governed by democratic rules.

### **3. The closeness of relations between civil society, central government and local authorities**

A debate should speedily be opened with all the parties concerned on the structural instruments to be put in place in order to develop and foster a cultural citizenship which would take into account both the relations between the state and civil society and the relations between central government and local authorities, or between local authorities and representatives of civil society.

The Panel of European examiners considers this a problem that goes far beyond the issue of institutional decentralisation, although this is part of the discussion. Nor can it be reduced to the institutional question without further increasing the trends towards fragmentation of the cultural sphere according to the different levels of development among Portuguese regions and local authorities.

With respect to decentralisation and setting up appropriate mechanisms to contribute to the emergence of a form of cultural citizenship, the Panel of examiners would like to note the following lines of thought:

- **the modernisation of Portuguese civil society is in many respects still marked by a close community culture of which all decisions should take account. For this purpose, the external services of the Ministry of Culture should be strengthened by giving them genuine devolved powers, redefining their specific fields of intervention and delegating real power to them and/or roles that cannot be ignored in the relations between local and central government;**
- **without waiting for comprehensive institutional reform to redefine the division of powers between central government and local authorities (already in existence or in preparation), it is desirable in the culture sector alone to prefigure decentralisation by giving incentives for pooling local authority resources for culture and thus favouring the development of co-operative cultural contracts which would result in a form of cultural inter-communality by establishing common working practices and greater structuring of the local area. Such a step would make it possible to avoid work towards regionalisation simply having the effect of transforming national centralism into regional centralism.**
- **aid for the formation of federating bodies for the numerous, varied cultural associations in Portuguese society should not be purely artificial. It should be done consciously and clearly, in other words, respecting the organic independence of these bodies. In order to put into practice its political will as regards culture, central government has everything to gain from having strong, responsible, organised partners, since the present fragmentation is more a handicap than a help for the Ministry of Culture.**

- **the development of public cultural policy also involves re-examining and re-evaluating the role and function of regional Cultural Centres which should not be regarded as "transplants" from the centre to the periphery, reproducing a modus operandi and cultural practice exported directly from the capital to the provinces. The regional Cultural Centres should be recognised and supported for their roots in local reality, inhabited by it in order to become instruments of development that respect the diversity of Portuguese society, which in no way prevents high-quality programming or harmonisation of the cultural strategies defined by the Government.**

The recommendations presented here are likely to foster awareness of what the Panel of examiners believed to be a real constraint on Portuguese cultural development: the distance and cleavage between centre and periphery.

#### **4. The complex relationships between strategists, actors and consumers**

Portugal's special character is certainly the result of both its modern and contemporary history. With respect to culture, more than other matters, the weight of more than 40 years' dictatorship has produced considerable effects which make it essential to define the terms of a genuine debate about the "culture of memory" and "the memory of culture".

Such a debate would put into perspective the complex relations, structured by contemporary history, between the strategists of cultural development (public and private), the cultural actors (creators, artists, producers and distributors) and the social actors, consumers of culture (from a holistic or individualist viewpoint).

The Panel of examiners therefore suggests the following elements:

- **it is essential to train cultural development executives in the public sector and also through voluntary sector networks, whether they are responsible for administrative, managerial or operational work in culture. Such training should *inter alia* emphasise the notion of "public service", the importance of cultural policy as an instrument of development as a whole, but also as a factor in structuring Portuguese society.**
- **developing the role of cultural organisation should be part of state reflection and expressed by identifying bodies that might be able to train cultural organisation executives.**
- **a comprehensive, sector-by-sector examination should be conducted between the Ministry of Culture, on the one hand,**

and the cultural actors themselves (artists, producers, distributors, organisers), on the other, in such a way that a number of operational regulations and mechanisms may be set up to ensure greater visibility of the criteria and procedures used at ministerial level and a greater sense of responsibility on the part of cultural actors, who receive public funds and should therefore be accountable to the public for their actions.

- the Ministry of Culture should be able to take greater account of the cultural and/or artistic education of children and young people, and also the education of culture professionals. Through a number of concrete cases (dance, for example) the Panel of examiners was able to assess the dysfunctioning that might result from the Ministry of Culture's lack of involvement in training mechanisms. For this reason, it would be desirable to strengthen the inter-ministerial relations between the Ministries of Culture, Education and Youth by setting up a co-operation body that would enable government officials responsible for these sectors to co-ordinate their actions.

The difficult issue of training is central as it determines the implementation of public cultural policy and it is in this sense that the European examiners saw it as a fundamental question for the future.

##### **5. Culture as a political, social and democratic issue in Portugal and elsewhere**

Portuguese society is experiencing profound change as it enters fully into social and economic modernity. Still more than elsewhere, culture can play a major role in adapting society to this unprecedented structural change. Thus cultural policy could become a formal instrument for maintaining the social bond when it is particularly loose, if not completely broken, contrary to what is happening in other European countries that are experiencing, or have experienced, such a change.

There should be a debate about the socio-political issue of culture in order to state more clearly the role and place of public policy in the current transformation process, as an instrument of education, learning about diversity and safeguarding multiculturalism, all qualities that are present in Portugal, so that the structural changes recomposing Portuguese society once and for all do bring in their wake forms of intolerance, exclusion, rejection and closure at the opposite pole from what constitutes the foundation of European culture, as they have elsewhere where these trends are already strongly rooted.

Following from this, the Panel of examiners makes two suggestions:

- the debate that has taken place in the *Observatorio das Actividades Culturais* and with the Panel of European examiners should be enriched by further national, regional or

sectorial debates so that the process of cultural democratisation is the subject of a vast exchange and enriched by reactions to the national and European reports.

- the question of the purpose of cultural development is inseparable from that of the development of Portuguese society as a whole for what it represents in the new, integrated Europe which it is helping to build, but also with respect to its history and its presence throughout the world. Portugal should therefore further strengthen the diversity of its partnerships at every level of its cultural ties by stressing co-operation more than influence. This might also concern its European neighbours, other Portuguese-speaking states, autonomous authorities and communities dispersed throughout the world to which it can bring help and assistance. By doing this, the social model based on tolerance and respect for the various cultures that enrich it, would find its full expression.

The question of the social bond through the cultural binding will probably become a central, formative issue in coming years. Portugal has major advantages in this respect. Its image, no longer encumbered by taboos and shady areas connected with certain aspects of its contemporary history, now places it at the head of the European project. It must be able to shoulder the responsibilities resulting from this new status and learn the necessary lessons at both domestic and international level. In other words, it should, by fully taking this dimension on board, give itself the means to move towards "New Discoveries" on the roads of culture which are none other than "roads to freedom". The work is done and is never finished, not only for itself, but for others in Europe and elsewhere.