

“New Models of Cultural Policy in Latin America: A comparative analysis (2000- 2014)”

Luis Emilio Cecchi

Hamburg University, Hamburg, Germany

luis.emilio.cecchi@studium.uni-hamburg.de

Área temática: Administración pública y políticas públicas

Trabajo preparado para su presentación en el VIII Congreso Latinoamericano de Ciencia Política, organizado por la Asociación Latinoamericana de Ciencia Política (ALACIP).
Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, Lima, 22 al 24 de julio de 2015.

Abstract

The first decade of the 21st century has shown a significant trend towards the consolidation of the cultural field in Latin America.

In the last decade, Cultural Public policies in Latin America developed in a context of economic growth and broad policy changes. These changes involved political, economic and social aspects and were fundamentally rooted in different views on the interpretation and management of the democratic system. Venezuela, Bolivia and Ecuador moved on major constitutional reforms, while Chile, Brazil or Argentina, advanced through legislative innovation acts or by the implementation of different governmental programs.

This paper enhances a double ambition: On the one hand, the attempt to evidence this process of consolidation and institutionalization of the cultural sector in Latin America and, on the other hand, to develop an innovative approach from a historical and comparative perspective to identify and categorize the various models of cultural policy in Latin American countries.

Keywords: Cultural Policy, Culture, Latin America, Comparative politics, Public Policy

Table of contents

Introduction

Part 1. *Consolidation Process of Cultural Sector in Latin America.*

1. Economic dimension.

Table 1. Economic Indicators.

1.1. Cultural Budget

Table 2. Cultural Budget bis a bis Total Budget. 2000, 2005 and 2010 respectively.

1.2. Cultural Satellite Accounts (CSA) or Cultural GNP.

Table 3. Cultural Gross Domestic Product, 2005.

2. Institutional dimension

Table 4. Cultural Institutions

3. International and Regional dimension.

Table 5. Historic international and regional Cultural Acts highlights.

Graphic 1. International Organizations with Specific Areas on Education, Culture and Science Areas.

Part 2. *Towards a Latin American Cultural Policy Model.*

1. International Experiences.

2. An initial approach to Latin American Cultural Policy Models.

3. Conclusion

Introduction

In the last decade, Cultural Public policies in Latin America developed in a context of economic growth and broad policy changes. These changes involved political, economic and social aspects and were fundamentally rooted in different views on the interpretation and management of the democratic system. Venezuela, Bolivia and Ecuador moved on major constitutional reforms, while Chile, Brasil or Argentina, advanced through legislative innovation acts or by the implementation of different governmental programs. These different paths had an inevitable impact in cultural policy design and implementation.

The Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) states that the region has experienced a combined growth of almost 5% of its Gross Domestic Product (GDP) between 2003 and 2008. At the same time, the Public Debt has been reduced 15 points in relation to GDP in average (ECLAC 2012). Taking into account this good economic performance, the ECLAC (2012) also notes that “Latin American countries have the opportunity to design and implement public policies with long-term development goals and also reduce some medium and short- term risks”.

At the same time, existing data shows that the cultural sector participation in economic development has been increasing significantly during the mentioned period worldwide besides more traditional activities. Cultural industries, for example, are becoming one of the most dynamic sectors of the world economy, estimating its contribution to global GDP by 7.3% (Howkins, 2001) and the average growth rate of international trade in about 8.7% for the period 2000-2005 (UNCTAD, 2008).

In this context, the first decade of the 21st century has shown a significant trend towards the autonomization, institutionalization and consolidation of the cultural field in Latin America. These processes can be reflected in at least three dimensions: 1) Economic. Reflected in the increase in public funding for cultural policies; 2) Institutional. Through the creation of state specific agencies for cultural policy implementation; 3) International and Regional Acts. Various pronouncements and enunciations acts took place in regional and international organizations that defined important principles and guidelines related to cultural development.

This situation evidences the importance and need of developing a multidimensional study, based on a thorough analysis of various aspects. This paper enhances a double ambition: On the one hand, the attempt to evidence this process of consolidation and institutionalization of the cultural sector in Latin America analyzing the above mentioned dimensions and, on the other hand, to present an exploratory development of a research design that, from a historical and comparative perspective aims to identify and categorize the various models of cultural policy in Latin American countries. It is important to state, that the main objective of the second part of the article is not to give answers to fundamental questions but to shed light on a topic that has not been addressed by the academic community and to state some important phenomena that will guide our future research development.

In the first part of the article we will analyze the Consolidation Process of Cultural Sector in Latin America. In particular the Economic, Institutional and International Acts dimensions

respectively. In the second part, we will introduce some international classification of cultural policy models applied to European cases. Then we will present an exploratory approach towards identifying the main guidelines of Latin American Cultural Policy Models.

Part 1. Consolidation Process of Cultural Sector in Latin America.

1. Economic Dimension

The first aspect of what we have called the consolidation process of cultural sector in Latin America has a lot to do with the economic importance this sector has gained progressively in the last decade. We will analyze general economic information, cultural budgets in relation to total budgets, and the Cultural Satellite Accounts (CSA) also called “Cultural GNP”.

In Table 1, we can observe some general economic data of Latin American countries based on the World Bank Atlas Method. In the table we can observe that despite of Bolivia and Paraguay which are classified as “Medium Low” Economies, the rest of the countries are classified as “Medium High”, a situation that has changed in a positive way compared to the previous decades. The GINI Coefficient shows that inequality is still important in the Region with Uruguay, Venezuela and Argentina having the best rates and Colombia, Bolivia, Brasil and Chile being the most unequal.

Table 1. General economic data.			
Country	GNP (USD) (2010)	Economies classified by GNP	GINI Coefficient (2006-2011)
ARGENTINA	9.124	Medium High	45,8
BOLIVIA	1.993	Medium Low	57,3
BRAZIL	10.710	Medium High	53,9
CHILE	11.888	Medium High	52,1
COLOMBIA	6.255	Medium High	58,5
ECUADOR	4.073	Medium High	49
PARAGUAY	2.862	Medium Low	52
PERÚ	5.291	Medium High	48
URUGUAY	11.996	Medium High	42,4
VENEZUELA	13.451	Medium High	43,5

Source. World Bank Atlas, 2010 and CNCA (2012).

This general data shows some of the consequences of the last decades of economic growth in Latin American countries. Despite this, the GINI coefficient makes us remember that one of the most important challenges in Latin American administrations is the building of more equal societies. This is why culture is so important, as it has definitely a lot to contribute to this process.

1.1. Cultural Budget

The second topic we will address is the evolution of the relation between the cultural budget the different countries allocate, bis a bis their total budgets. The first thing we can state after taking a look to Table 2 is that the availability of systematic cultural information is something that has evolved in the last decade. In the year 2000 only Chile, Brasil and Colombia had made their data available. Part of this process will be mentioned when we analyze the creation of CSAs in the Region and the agreements reached in different International and Regional acts. We can also see in the Table that, although there is in fact a general growing tendency, all cultural budgets are under the 1% recommended by UNESCO.

Table 2. Cultural Budget bis a bis Total Budget. 2000, 2005 and 2010 respectively.

Country	Cultural Budget/Total Budget		
	2000	2005	2010
Argentina	N/A	0,203%	0,235%
Bolivia	N/A	N/A	0,057%
Brazil	0,231%	0,186%	0,277%
Chile	0,200%	0,269%	0,387%
Colombia	0,110%	0,100%	0,129%
Ecuador	N/A	0,350%	0,393%
Peru	N/A	0,205%	0,621%
Paraguay	N/A	N/A	0,067%
Uruguay	N/A	0,295%	0,384%
Venezuela	N/A	0,535%	N/A

Source: Own elaboration based in SICSUR www.sicsur.org

In the Table we can see that Perú, with 0,62%, appears first when analyzing it's cultural budget versus the total budget. Ecuador, Chile and Uruguay (with almost 0,4%) are the closest followers. Surprisingly, Brasil and Argentina allocate less than 0,3% of their budget to culture. Paraguay and Bolivia are the countries with less cultural investment, we will enlarge on this topic later.¹ The Latin American average cultural budget expenditure in relation to total budgets was 0,14%, in 2000. Since then, it has been increasing until reaching 0,26% in 2005. After some decreases in the next years the percentage raised again and in 2014 got to 0,24% (SICSUR, 2014).

In the last years, most of Latin American States have advanced in new cultural institutional arrangements and have increased their cultural budgets. For example, after the creation of the Popular Power for Culture Ministry in 2002, Venezuela increased it's budget in a 111%. Paraguay in 2010 also duplicated it's cultural budget. The Culture Ministry in Ecuador, after its creation in 2007, increased 143% its budget. Cases as Paraguay or Bolivia, that have economies classified as "Medium Low", also gave more importance to culture by advancing

¹ This data serves as a general reference to picture three specific moments of cultural relative expenditures. It is necessary to analyze the temporal series and the complete process in each country.

innovations in their institutional arrangements and increasing their cultural budget. This shows that the decision of allocating resources and creating cultural institutions is at the same time a new but broad strategical tendency in the Region and that it is not directly linked to the level of income of the country.

At this point, we can state that nowadays we can have access to comparative data about the cultural sector in Latin America. This was impossible one decade ago. We can also say that the cultural budget has been increasing in all the countries of the region, although they are still relatively low (they does not reach the 1% expenditure recommendation from UNESCO). At the same time, it is interesting to remark that countries as Bolivia, Ecuador and Venezuela have increased their cultural budget significantly and conceive cultural investments as a central instrument of their governments.

In the next section, we will analyze the Cultural Satellite Accounts as they represent another feature of the same process of cultural consolidation in the region.

1.2. Cultural Satellite Accounts (CSA) or Cultural GNP.

For a long time, cultural industries as an economic phenomenon were not a subject of special research interest. By the end of the 1990s, results of research conducted in developed countries showed that cultural and creative industries generate a high growth rate of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) as well as Gross Value Added (GVA) and employment. Potentially they have the characteristics of a leading sector that can generate growth of the overall economy; some of their sectors (e.g. design) can provide spill over effects for the economy and they can attract a high-quality workforce, business and investment, and spur creativity and innovation across all sectors of the economy. All of this has prompted a very intense economic, political and academic debate on the contribution of cultural industries in terms of economic development, and led to a reinvestigation of their role in the structural development and changes of the economy. The growing interest in cultural industries and their rapid acceptance as a fairly general model for addressing development problems at the economic and political level, have contributed to the fact that cultural industries became a key component in the formulation of economic policy and strategic development planning. In this regard, there is a growing tendency in several countries to include different aspects (production capacity, creative class, cultural amenities, etc.) of cultural industries in measuring national developmental performances. (UNESCO, 2008).

In the last decades, the Latin American cultural sector, in occasion of the Bicentennial commemorations of Independence, has given a strong process of rethinking the different national identities within a regional context. Construction of citizenship, cultural rights, social inclusion and widening the access to cultural goods and services were strong ideas that had to be introduced in state cultural actions. In this sense, the predominant patrimonial view of culture related to conservation started to give place to a more active and diverse view that relates in new ways with its own traditions. At the same time, the cultural industries development and new technologies create new dilemmas as technology does not resolve by itself inequality, instead, proposes new scopes of exchange.

The Cultural GDP or CSA² are statistical frameworks for measuring the economic contribution of culture. In Latin America, the countries of MERCOSUR began to work on measuring the economic contribution of cultural industries at the end of the 1990s. Within the framework of the Convenio Andrés Bello (CAB), the "Economy and Culture" project was developed. As part of this project, studies were carried out in Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Venezuela, and efforts were made to implement an economic information system in culture (Ministry of Culture, Republic of Colombia, 2007). Regional cooperation was also strengthened to standardize measuring methodologies, which should facilitate comparability between countries (UNESCO, 2008). Since 2006, the development of systematic cultural information in the Region has made great improvements and allows to measure the economic contribution of culture in an specific economy and in a comparative way. Since 2009, the Cultural Information System of MERCOSUR (SICSUR) has centralized all cultural information in relation to MERCOSUR countries³.

Table 3 presents the cultural GDP for the different latin american countries in 2006. As with the information about Cultural Budget, in 2000 the statistical information about the CSA and the Cultural GDP was inexistent or were still in their first steps of development towards an agreement among the different countries involved. Today, almost every nation has a National System of Cultural Information but this was a gradual process, very recent in some cases. For example, Colombia created its own System (SINIC) in 2011. Brazil launched the "National System of Cultural Information and Indicators", in 2012. Ecuador and Uruguay started their first experiences with Cultural GDP in 2012 (SICSUR, 2012) and Paraguay, the SICPY, in 2014.

If we look at the table we observe that the cultural sector has the most important contribution to the national economy in Bolivia and Argentina. The majority of the other cases oscillate between 1 and 2 percent with Uruguay, Colombia and Venezuela at the lead. According to SICSUR (2012) in 2012, the Cultural GDP in the Region was between 2% and 4% showing

² The concept of CSA in Latin America is based on the "cultural field", which is defined "as a group of activities and products whose raison d'être is to create, express, interpret, conserve and transmit symbolic contents" (Convenio Andrés Bello, 2008:33). In the pragmatic sense, the cultural field is a broad and dynamic concept which includes not only activities that produce goods and services with symbolic meaning and value, but also transversal domains such as artistic training, because these can play a role in the generation of symbolic content. This definition of the cultural field was established in accordance with UNESCO and Eurostat standards, as well as with several national definitions. It encompasses a broad scope of cultural activities, ranging from strictly artistic and cultural activities to those that can be considered as entertainment (e.g. film, radio and television). In the Latin American CSA, the cultural domains are divided into 12 sectors and several sub-sectors, as follows: i) artistic creation (literary, drama, music, etc.); ii) performing arts (theatre, dance, live music, etc.); iii) visual arts (photography, sculpture, graphic arts, industrial arts, etc.); iv) books and publishing (books, periodicals, other publications, etc.); v) audio-visual (film and video, radio and television, video games, etc.); vi) music (music publishing and music recording); vii) design (architectural, industrial, graphic, textile, fashion, accessories and jewellery, etc.); viii) games and toys; ix) tangible heritage (museums, libraries, heritage institutes, etc.); x) natural heritage (botanical gardens and zoos, natural reserves, etc.); xi) intangible heritage (festivals and fairs, local languages, cuisine and local culinary traditions, etc.); and xii) artistic training. (UNESCO, 2008)

³ The SICSUR was approved by the Culture Ministers of the MERCOSUR in December 2008 and established as a Program in November 2009, during the XXIX Meeting of Culture Ministers of the MERCOSUR, in Montevideo.

Table 3. CSA or Cultural GDP, 2006.	
Country	Cultural GDP 2006
Argentina	3,12%
Bolivia	4,27%
Brazil	1,26%
Chile	1,32%
Colombia	1,78%
Ecuador	1,01%
Peru	0,60%
Paraguay	N/A
Uruguay	1,93%
Venezuela	1,58%

Source. Own elaboration based on SICSUR.
www.sicsur.org. Peru's information is from 2005 and Venezuela's from 2003.

an important increase in the relevance of the contribution of the cultural sector to Latin American economies.

2. Institutional dimension

Some years ago in Latin America, culture was understood as a branch of education. Although Uruguay still has that institutional structure, today that conceptual consideration seems part of the past.

The broad economic and political changes that took place in the last decade had important consequences in the cultural sector. If we take a look to Table 4 we can see that eight of the ten countries made institutional changes in their cultural public policy structures after the year 2000 and from those eight, six did them after 2005. These processes that started decades ago, have materialized in the last years in the necessity of giving the cultural sector the same institutional hierarchy as other areas of government and the allocation of more economic, symbolic and institutional resources. Seven countries have today Ministries of Culture (Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Perú, Venezuela and Argentina), Paraguay has a National Secretary, Uruguay a National Direction and Chile, a National Council.

In this same general trend, we can identify two main ways of advancing in this institutional reforms. On the one hand, countries as Bolivia, Ecuador and Venezuela modified their Constitutions towards a pluricultural basis. On the other hand, cases as Chile or Paraguay made changes inside the same structure or Brasil and Colombia advanced in specific initiatives. The case of Argentina is the most recent experience, transforming the Secretary of Culture into a Ministry in 2014.

Venezuela, Colombia, Chile, Paraguay, Peru and Brasil (in 1985), created their Culture Ministries by law. Argentina, Bolivia and Ecuador did it by presidential decree.

Table 4. Cultural Institutions			
Country	Type of Institution	Institutional Authority	Creation date
Argentina	Ministry	Ministry	May 2014
Bolivia	Ministry of the cultures of the Bolivian Plurinational State	Ministry	February 2009
Brazil	Ministry	Ministry	March 1985
Chile	Council	Ministry	August 2003
Colombia	Ministry	Ministry	August 1997
Ecuador	Ministry	Ministry	January 2007
Paraguay	Secretary	Ministry	April 2007
Peru	Ministry	Ministry	July 2010
Uruguay	National Direction	National Director	July 2007
Venezuela	Popular Power for Culture Ministry	Ministry	July 2008

Source: CNCA, 2012

The new hierarchy of the Cultural Ministries also consolidated new scopes of action for them. One relevant issue to note is the incorporation of the concept of cultural diversity. This idea promoted by UNESCO as a basic principle of cultural public policy has an special meaning in Latin American societies. The ethnic dimension of cultural diversity aims to defend the coexistence of different cultures in national territories. This is a central issue in countries such as Bolivia, Ecuador, Perú, Paraguay or Brasil. At the same time, countries such as Colombia, Venezuela and Argentina have programs and specific policies that focus on this topic too.

The concept of cultural diversity has also other components such gender, sexual orientation, social segments, young and elder population, popular or urban culture, etc. These others aspects are also addressed by specific programs in countries as Brasil, Argentina, Uruguay and Colombia.

This institutional consolidation process in cultural public institutions are showing other parallel processes of actualization of concepts and ideas developing in society and in public bureaucracies. Ideas of exclusive dedication to arts or taking care of patrimony had led space to the conviction that public cultural policies must also be a tool for social inclusion and integration, to guarantee cultural rights of all citizens with a particular focus in social vulnerable groups, promote new technologies and cultural industries to create jobs and continue with the regional and international cooperation actions.

Countries as Bolivia or Ecuador have located culture in the center of their development strategies in order to recover collective memory, promote social coexistence and to work hard in the area of material and inmaterial patrimony.

So far, we have identified the existence of a clear process of institutional strengthening of cultural public structures. Historically, culture was a governmental sector strongly dependent from the personal decisions of the functionary in charge of the Cultural Agency. Nowadays, the mentioned institutional strengthening process, along with the increasing allocation of economic resources in the sector and the growth of the cultural GDP have been changing that situation. The nature of Strategic Programs or National Cultural Plans, or the mechanisms used to create the cultural institutions, are interesting points for further analysis in order to identify the existence of long term policy initiatives that survive government and authority changes. In the next section, we will introduce the international and regional dimension of the consolidation of cultural sector in Latin America.

3. International and Regional dimension.

At the end of the 70's and beginning of the 80's, cultural institutions in various Latin American countries had acquired certain maturity and aimed to be independent from the Education Ministries where they belonged. This trend was reinforced by some influential positions in cultural debate at that time. On the one hand, the intention to broaden democracy assuming each country's cultural diversity and, on the other, the application of decentralizing policies (Nivón, 2006).

There are other factors that had influenced the institutional changes in public entities structures. The effects of globalization and the increase of goods' exchange has triggered the Regional Cooperation. At the same time, the development of cultural industries demanded more interaction between the design, legislation, policies, and private sector, among others.

As we have seen, cultural institutions suffered diverse modifications. Bolivia, Venezuela and Ecuador, advanced towards constitutional reforms. Other countries made changes inside the existing structures or changed them by decree or other institutional mechanisms. However, some common points of transversal work were shared. In particular the will of strengthening regional cooperation. Some analysts state that this will be the key for the success of cultural policies in a globalized complex context.

Scholars as Garretón (2000, 2006), state that the cultural integration between countries is, in fact, more advanced than the institutionalization of some specific public policies. In this sense, they remark that the State conduction of integration processes among Latin American countries is crucial.

In this regard, Table 5 shows a reduced list of some of the most important International and Regional Acts that influenced in a direct way the process of consolidation of Cultural Sector in Latin America.

Mondiacult Conference in Mexico, in 1982, started a profound debate about the regional identity. On the one hand, the areas of conventional competence of cultural institutions continued their maturation. On the other hand, an institutional critic about cultural policies was starting and continues until today. In the last three decades, Latin American States where "reconstructed", they recognized themselves in their multiethnicity, pluriculturality, plurinationality and intercultural identities (Mejía Arango, 2009).

Table 5. Historic international and regional Cultural Acts highlights		
Year	Important milestones	Thematic
1982	World Conference of Cultural Policies (Mondiacult), Mexico, July 26th to August 6th.	Cultural Policies
1996	Signing of the Cultural Integration Protocol that creates the Mercosur Cultural, which has facilitated the circulation of cultural services and goods between member States (Argentina, Paraguay, Uruguay and Brazil) and associated States (Chile and Bolivia).	Latin American Cultural Cooperation
2001	Universal UNESCO Declaration on Cultural Diversity.	Cultural Diversity
2002	First Interamerican Meeting of Ministries and High Authorities of Culture, Colombia, Cartagena de Indias, July. The Interamerican Commission of Culture (OAS) was created.	Latin American Cultural Cooperation
2005	Protection and promotion of cultural expressions diversity (UNESCO)	Cultural Diversity
2010	XXXI Meeting of Cultural Mercosur Ministries. It ratifies the Cultural Mercosur Found creation with the objective of financing programs and projects that promote the creation, circulation, promotion, protection and difusión of cultural goods and services and the respect of cultural expressions diversity between Mercosur countries.	Latin American Cultural Cooperation
Source. CNCA, 2012		

We can identify two other major international milestones in this process: The recognition of the existence of cultural rights as a foundational step and the Protection and Promotion of Cultural Expressions Diversity in 2005 UNESCO Convention which is based on the Universal Declaration of Cultural Diversity that took place in 2001. The latter was a turning point both, in terms of the processes and dimensions outlined above, and for the implementation of cultural public policies at a global and regional scale.

On the regional scope, the process of creation of the MERCOSUR Cultural from 1996 onwards is a strategic institutional instrument for regional cooperation and the development of coordinated information and agreements about policy implementation.

In Graphic 1 we can observe the different international organizations that have specific dependencies that work in the Education, Culture and Science Areas in the Region. Also, which countries take part in each of them. Firstly, we can say that the cultural area is present in all these institutions. Bodies with a more “political” function (CELAC, OEA or Mercosur) or based mostly in Economic Topics (ALBA, the Alianza Pacifico, CARICOM, the CAN), all of them have created an specific area for cultural issues. Secondly, we can observe that almost the same countries participate in many Institutions at the same time. This superposition of international bodies offers important opportunities for cultural policy advances but at the same time can present problems. Each international body has its own rules and bureaucracies and can generate continuous and duplicated agendas that are implemented by the same national agencies.

Graphic 1. International Organizations with Specific Areas on Education, Culture and Science Areas.



Source. SICSUR, 2014

We can conclude from this section, that important advances have been made in the international and regional cultural arenas and that these spaces are central to define declamatory objectives and moral basis for the implementation of cultural policies. On the other hand, in order to get more efficient results from cultural integration programs among countries seems central to advance in simpler mechanisms that are useful and can adapt to the different realities and necessities of Latin American countries. As an example, in these bodies participate at the same time countries with 4 million inhabitants and others with 249 million. This has consequences not only regarding the necessities of those countries, but also in relation to their capacity of implementing the objectives defined at the regional level.

Part 2. Towards a Latin American Cultural Policy Model.

1. International Experiences.

In this section we will analyze several attempts to create a classification of different cultural models present in the academic literature. Villanova (2003), focused in European countries, states that the institutional aspects of cultural policy and cultural administrations can be classified in an scale that measures the qualitative variables of “subsidiarity” and “centralization”, locating them at both ends of the mentioned scale. The states that delegate broadly cultural competences to almost autonomous councils, as Great Britain, are classified as a “Subsidiarity Model”. On the other end of the scale, the author locates countries in which the cultural competences are concentrated in the State agencies. The ideal example of this “Centralized model” is France. At the same time, the author identifies mixed models which apply to Federal States (Germany, Belgium and Austria) and countries with decentralized structures (Netherlands, Denmark, Sweden, Finland and Italy).

The “Subsidiarity model” is based in the principle of helping organizations, associations, private groups, artists and groups by autonomous councils which act as intermediaries. These councils receive governmental funds and private donations and adopt their own cultural decisions with independence from public agencies. The ultimate responsibility for the British Cultural policy is on the private sector, although cooperation among public and private sector exists. Matarasso (2008) also states that one of the basic principles related to British cultural policy is the concept of cultural diversity and that this model reflects that idea in the diverse social groups that identify themselves among the “British” denomination.

In France, the heart of the cultural policy implementation takes place at the State level. From its creation in 1959, the Ministry of Culture has been incrementing its budget progressively. The Ministry has a broad administrative network and implement in a direct way diverse aspects of cultural policy, from Patrimony conservation to subsidies distribution. The French case is special because it combines the political will, the economic resources and the administrative structure necessary to have a preponderant role in the definition and implementation of cultural policies. Although there are other cases of centralized structures, in general they do not have those three characteristics at the same time and that weakens the policies’ impact.

Villanova also states that, although the mentioned Ministry has broad competences and resources, other Ministries take part in the conservation of patrimony by the maintenance of historic buildings under their areas of competence. At the same time the Ministry of Education has intervention in formative activities and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs defines the cultural actions abroad. The municipal governments also develop cultural local activities. Summing up all these actions, the cultural budget is almost 2% of the total budget.

The role of patronage is interesting to see some differences between the British and the French models of public intervention. In Great Britain, private donations represent a fundamental source of resources. Many British museums, including the National Gallery, have been created and depend almost totally of private patronage. In France, the first experiences of patronage appeared in 1979 and nowadays represents approximately 5% of the Ministry of Culture’s budget.

Authors as Hillman, Chartrand y McCaughey (1989) have defined four models of cultural policy based on the different schemes of public support towards arts and culture adopted by States.

Cultural policies and Cultural Institutions in Latin America have taken as reference the two models we described before (Mejía, 2009; Querejazu, 2007): Some countries implemented systems similar to the French centralized state oriented model, and others followed the British cultural model, also known as “arms length”. Mejía refers to them as “direct” and “indirect” models respectively. It is important to say that many Latin American experiences adopt a hybrid form that combines the role of the Cultural Ministry and the figure of a Council. There is a consensus stating that the formulation of policy should be developed by a collective body (for example, a council) and implemented by an executive entity (for example, a Ministry or a Council President).

As we have seen in table 4, most countries adopted a ministerial institutional structure but some of them combined that with the existence of collective bodies. For example, Colombia created the Cultural Ministry in 1997 accompanied by the National Council of Culture. Argentina, in 2014 transformed the previous Secretary of Culture into a Ministry but also works in coordination with the National Cultural Council: a collective arena where each provincial cultural authority and the National representatives discuss the principal guidelines of cultural policy.⁴ On the other hand, Chile followed the British Council Model with the creation of the National Culture and Arts Chilean Council (CNCA). This council has eleven members: A Council president, with Minister rank designed directly by the National President, the Foreign Affairs and Education Ministers, five cultural personalities, two academic representatives and the winner of the national price.

The different attempts to classify and conceptualize the international experiences show there is still a long way to go in this process. The above mentioned works from Villanova or Hillman, Chartrand and Mc Caughey show different ways of trying to classify cultural policy models in developed countries. These attempts have focus mainly in only one variable or dimension. Mejía or Querejazu, two Latin American thinkers classify the regional cases taking into account the typology designed for developed countries. At some point this is inevitable because, in effect, Latin American countries took into account the European management experiences.

But times have changed. In a context of ongoing constitutional innovation and attempts to find more autonomous paths towards development in Latin America, we consider it is necessary to create a multidimensional analysis that comprises the new processes being held in the region from a Latin American approach. In order to do that, we will present the main factors that we consider should be taken into account in the next section.

2. An initial approach towards a Latin American Cultural Policy Model/s.

Cultural policy is a space that works on the material and symbolic construction of the real World. It is a mediation of complex cultural processes. Political decisions and the different ways of implementing cultural policies, can then lead to the “mercantilization” of culture with massive and spectacular goals, or, conversely, can mean the opening to initiatives from marginalized sectors, creating opportunities to build bridges between different social groups, for social inclusion and mutual recognition, and finally also extending the margins of citizenship.

In this sense, cultural policy involves facing challenges that inevitably affect the society in which it is intervening and on the different groups in society that seek to obtain certain forms of recognition. It also involves giving these groups visibility or not, and the possibility to legitimate, dignify or deny them (Bayardo: 2004).

The dimensions analyzed in this article serve as a base from where to begin the analysis and characterization of the different types of cultural policy models in Latin America and will enable us to establish different comparative patterns. The rector intuitions that motivated this

⁴ In this space, a project of a national cultural law is being discussed in order to formalize different cultural practices and reinforce the laboral rights of workers in the sector.

article are related first, to the existence of an overall context of autonomization, institutionalization and consolidation of the cultural field. As we have seen, every country in Latin America has increased at the same time the institutional relevance of the cultural public agencies by the creation of specialized Ministries, and the allocation of resources on the cultural sector. Second, the recent processes of constitutional reforms in some Latin American countries such as Venezuela, Bolivia and Ecuador, reverberated in the terms and conditions of implementation of cultural policies. In consequence, we expect to identify at least two patterns of cultural policy in the region: one present in the countries that suffered reforms and another in those who did not. Those who did, present a strong public and centralized pattern of cultural policy with a strong multi-ethnic state vision. The other category of countries who have not advanced in constitutional changes also must be analyzed in detail in order to systematize the differences they present. In third place, in the last decades there has been an international and regional trend towards cooperation that cannot be ignored and where potentially we can identify the main guidelines of something similar to a Latin American Cultural Policy Model. As we already mentioned, although there are operational difficulties, different analysts state that regional cooperation and agreements will be the key for the success of cultural policies in a globalized complex context as today's.

This article is a first step. In order to advance in the identification and definition of the different models, we consider we have to continue deepening the diagnostic stage about the different cases at the National scope. In this sense, we must advance in the detailed comparison of the institutional structures of cultural sector of each country, their programs, objectives and specific policies; the administrative mechanisms that governments apply to cultural sector (subsidies, patronage, etc.); and the economic indicators, such as cultural budget, workers employed in the sector, Culture Satellite Accounts, among others.

A second dimension we are particularly interested in advancing, is the identification and analysis of policies that involve and related culture with: a) Infrastructure and equipment, b) New technologies policies, c) Urban policies, and d) Social, accessibility and inclusion policies.

The aforementioned dimension is central. We understand cultural policy as an instrument towards social inclusion and social transformation. The central challenges the cultural sector will have to face in the near future will be deeply related with the above mentioned areas. The way governmental authorities and the private sector deal with them will be determinant in the social and cultural impact of cultural policy in each country.

In the last decades the new technologies have been, and continue to, transform the way individuals interact in all senses. This is a great opportunity for the democratization of knowledge, in general, and culture, in particular. But this opportunity also implies great risks in relation to the digital divide. In this sense, public authorities have the responsibility and challenge of designing and implementing innovative policies that provide universal access to new technologies and how to use them.

In particular for the cultural sector, new technologies imply a new possibility to reach and create new audiences and active participants, as observers or potential new managers. We find particularly interesting and inspiring some recent public initiatives that link infrastructure and technological equipment with cultural policies. This is the case of

“Igualdad Cultural” program in Argentina, where the Federal Planning and Investment Ministry and The Ministry of Culture work together in order to distribute cultural contents as live festivals, movies, theater plays, through different platforms (TV, Cellphones, 3D Cinemas) and through the public Fiber Optic Network that is being installed and will give access to internet service to the different provinces of the country. Other example is the “Plano Nacional de Banda Larga”, an initiative from the Brazilian government to provide broadband Internet access throughout the country to individuals, governmental institutions, businesses and civil societies that do not have access to this service yet.

Regarding new technologies, is also important to analyze how policies such as “One netbook per child” relate with cultural initiatives. The “Plan Conectar Igualdad” in Argentina, the “Plan Ceibal” in Uruguay, are only some examples of policies we will focus on.

Respecting to Urban policies and Culture, initiatives as “Parques Biblioteca” in Medellín, Colombia, are really important examples of how urban interventions combined with cultural objectives can have a great transforming effect. Numerous authors analyzed european urban transformation processes in the XX century. Different initiatives as “Project for Public Spaces” or the “UN Habitat programs” show the grey potential this type of initiatives have.

The social inclusive policies point has to do with the actions and results of policies that allow access to this new technologies and how extended they are. We will use surveys to get this information.

A third dimension, focuses in national and international, new or in process of approval, cultural legislation. The objective is to identify which debates and issues are being motorized and considered central for the near future by public authorities.

Finally, it will be important to make a diagnosis of the private cultural sector in every country. Although the public initiatives can promote social participation in cultural production, there is a two way relation in which both spheres influence each other.

The methodological strategy that we will use in order to advance in this analysis is based on the QCA (Qualitative Comparative Method). Most of the analysis of cultural models focus in only one main variable, such as the type of government system, institutional aspects or the type of instruments the state uses to promote the cultural sector, and lack of a systematic approach. Instead, we propose an innovative approach from a historical and comparative perspective that aims to apply political science methods to an area in general relegated in the discipline as is the cultural sector policy.

3. Conclusion

Throughout the article we have gone through the consolidation process of cultural sector in Latin America. Although cultural budgets are still in average less than 0,4%, and far from UNESCO’s 1% recommendation, there is a sustained growing tendency in all cases. The importance of the Cultural sector in local economies has also been increasing progressively. The second dimension showed the broad institutional changes that have been taking place. Eight countries, of the ten considered, have increased the institutional relevance of their Cultural agencies (Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Perú, Venezuela, Argentina and Chile). The international dimension, meanwhile, has presented the most important highlights of international and regional historical acts that accompanied the analyzed processes in this

paper. This point also showed the transnational bodies that have created specific areas for cultural affairs, and placed a warning regarding the necessity of avoiding the duplication of agendas and improving the effective implementation results of the agreements.

Finally, in the second part of the paper, we have analyzed the European experiences that influenced the institutional structural decisions in Latin America and an attempt to present some of the dimensions we consider are necessary to take under consideration in order to create a Latin American Cultural Policy Model. The objective of developing a typology of Latin American Cultural Policy Models intends to have reliable information to advance in a more broad and comprehensive analysis of the results and impact of cultural policies in the different countries of the region. We consider this central in the process of positioning culture as an instrument for social change. A truly democratic cultural policy must try to open spaces in order to allow the excluded social identities to represent themselves and participate in the public sphere as real actors. In this sense, it is important to identify which theoretical, institutional and practical tools that cultural policies have been implementing in the last decades and also to have a map of which necessities and cultural actions have been developing in civil society. With those two diagnostics we will be able to identify what can be improved in the process of achieving a more active role of culture and advancing towards more inclusive societies in Latin America.

Bibliography

- Bayardo, R. (2004) “Gestión Cultural, economía de la cultura y políticas culturales ante la diversidad cultural” in Bobbio, D. (comp) (2008): *Tensiones. Selección de conferencias del Programa de Formación en Gestión Cultural*. Córdoba: Centro Cultural de España.
- Brunner, J. J. (1988a) “La cultura como objeto de políticas” in J. J. Brunner, *Un espejo trizado: ensayos sobre cultura y políticas culturales*. Santiago de Chile: FLACSO, 391-406.
- Brunner, J. J. (1988b) “La mano visible y la mano invisible” in J. J. Brunner, *Un espejo trizado: ensayos sobre cultura y políticas culturales*. Santiago de Chile: FLACSO, 261-318.
- Caves (2000). *Creative industries: Contracts between art and commerce*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Colombes, A., 1991, Manual del promotor cultural, Humanitas y Colihue, Buenos Aires.
- CNCA (2012) Consejo Nacional de la Cultura y las Artes. “Los Estados de la cultura. Estudio sobre la institucionalidad cultural pública de los países del SICSUR”.
- Convenio Andrés Bello, 2008; Olarte-Lopez, 2006; Ministry of Culture, Republic of Colombia, 2007.
- ECLAC (2012) (Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean). “Latin American Economic Outlook 2012: Transforming the State for Development”. <http://www.oecd.org/dev/americas/48965859.pdf>
- Evans, G. (2001): *Cultural planning and urban renaissance?* London: Rutledge.
- Experian (2007). “How linked are the UK’s creative industries to the wider economy?: An input-output analysis”. Experian working paper for NESTA, London.
- García Canclini, N. (2004) *Diferentes, desiguales y desconectados: mapas de la interculturalidad*. Buenos Aires: Gedisa.
- García Canclini, N. (1995). *Consumidores y Ciudadanos. Conflictos multiculturales de la globalización*. México D.F., Grijalbo.
- García Canclini, N. et. Al. (1991) *Públicos de arte y política cultural: un estudio del II Festival de la Ciudad de México*. México D.F: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana.
- García Canclini, N. (ed.) (1987) *Políticas culturales en América Latina*. México DF: Grijalbo.

Garretón, Manuel Antonio (2000): *La sociedad en que vivi (re) mos introducción sociológica al cambio de siglo*, Santiago, LOM Ediciones.

Garretón, M, Barbero, J., Cavarozzi, M., García Canclini, N., Ruiz-Giménez, G. and Stavenhagen, R. (2003): *El espacio cultural latinoamericano. Bases para una política de integración*, Santiago, Convenio Andrés Bello / Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Harvey, E. “Estructuras Institucionales de Financiamiento Público de la Cultura y las Artes (Análisis Comparado)”, en: http://repositoriorecursos-download.educ.ar/repositorio/Download/file?file_id=56f682a2-7a0a-11e1-806f-ed15e3c494af

Hesmondhalgh, D. (2002): *The cultural industries*. London: SAGE.

Hillman, H. and McCaughey, C. (1989): “The Arms Length Principle and the Arts: An International Perspective- Past, Present and Future”, en M. C. Cummings, J.M.D. Schuster (eds.), *Who’s to Pay for the Arts? The International Search for Models of Arts Support*, Consejo Americano de las Artes, Nueva York.

Howkins, J. (2001): *The creative economy. How people make money from ideas*. Penguin Global. Accessed in December 2013.

Matarasso, François (2008) “Politiques culturelles et diversité au Royaume-Uni”, en Lluís Bonet y Emmanuel Négrier, *La fin des cultures nationales?*, La Découverte, París, p. 97-111.

Matarasso, F. and Landry, C. (1999): “*Balancing Act: Twenty-One Strategic Dilemmas in Cultural Policy*”, Cultural Policies Research and Development Unit, Policy. Note No. 4, Ediciones del Consejo de Europa, Bélgica.

Mejía Arango, Juan Luis (2009) “Apuntes sobre las políticas culturales en América Latina, 1987-2009”, *Pensamiento Iberoamericano*, 4, Madrid, p. 110.

Nivón Bolán, E. (2006): *La política cultural. Temas, problemas y oportunidades*, México, CONACULTA.

Nivón Bolán, E. (2006): *Políticas Culturales 2006-2020. Hacia un Plan Estratégico de Desarrollo Cultural, México, Universidad de Guadalajara- Miguel Ángel Porrúa Editores*.

Potts and Cunningham (2008): “Four models of the creative industries” in *International Journal of Cultural Policy*. Vol 14 (3): 217-232.

Pratt, A. (2005). “Cultural industries and public policy: an oxymoron”. *The international journal of cultural*. Vol 11 N.1, 31-44.

- Querejazu Layton, P. (2007), Seminario sobre políticas de gestión cultural del Mercosur, La Paz, Bolivia. <http://www.unesco.org.uy/cultura/fileadmin/templates/cultura/cultura-mercosur/archivos/GC-Querejazu.pdf>
- SICSUR (2014) Sistema de Información Cultural del MERCOSUR. Enclave Cultural. Año 4 No 3 - Mayo 2014.
- SICSUR (2012) Sistema de Información Cultural del MERCOSUR. Enclave Cultural. “Nuestro norte es el sur. Integración regional, relevancia económica y acceso a la cultura”. Año 2 - No 2 - Septiembre 2012.
- SICSUR (2011) Sistema de Información Cultural del MERCOSUR. Enclave Cultural. “Ahora es cuando. El SICSUR trabaja en la integración cultural”. Año 1 No1- Noviembre 2011.
- SICSUR Cultural Information System of the MERCOSUR. www.sicsur.org/estadisticas/index.php
- Throsby, D. (2010). Economics of Cultural Policy. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Throsby, D. (2008a). “Modelling the Cultural Industries”. International Journal of Cultural Policy , Vol. 14, No. 3:217-232.
- Throsby, D. (2008b). “The concentric circles model of the cultural industries” . Cultural Trends , Vol. 17, No. 3:147-164.
- Throsby, D. (2006). “An Artistic Production Function: Theory and an Application to Australian Visual Artists”. Journal of Cultural Economics, 30: 1-14.
- UNDP/UNCTAD (2008). Creative Economy Report 2008: The Challenge of Assessing the Creative Economy: Towards Informed Policy-making. New York: UN. Accessed in June 2011. http://unctad.org/en/docs/ditc20082cer_en.pdf
- UNESCO (2012). Measuring the economic contribution of cultural industries. A review and assessment of current methodological approaches. Montreal: UNESCO Institute for Statistics.
- UNESCO (2005). Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO (2009) Framework for cultural statistics Handbook No. 1. “Measuring the economic contribution of cultural industries. A review and assessment of current methodological approaches”. Montreal: UNESCO Institute for Statistics.
- UNESCO (2003). Workshop on Culture and Development in NEPADS’s Programme of Action. Final draft report, UNESCO. Accessed in december 203. http://ocpa.irmo.hr/resources/docs/NEPAD_Draft_Final_Reporten.pdf

- UNESCO (2001). Declaración Universal para la Diversidad Cultural: http://portal.unesco.org/es/ev.php-URL_ID=13179&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html
- UNESCO (2000). Cultural Diversity, Conflicts and Pluralism. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO (1998). Culture, Creativity and Markets. Paris: UNESCO.
- Villanova, A. (2003). *Marcos institucionales y fundamentos de política cultural*. Barcelona: Universidad de Barcelona Virtual
- Williams, R. (2000) *Palabras claves: un vocabulario de la cultura y la sociedad*. Buenos Aires: Nueva Visión.
- Zukin, S. (1995). *The Cultures of Cities*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Zukin, S. (1989): *Loved living culture and capital in urban change*. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.