

CULTURAL POLICIES OF THE LULA GOVERNMENT*

Antonio Albino Canelas Rubim

Federal University of Bahia, Brasil

Abstract: In order to be evaluated, the administrations of Gilberto Gil (2003-2008) and Juca Ferreira (from 2008 on) on Brazil's Ministry of Culture shouldn't just be compared with the administration of Francisco Weffort (1995-2002). A rigorous study requires them to be confronted with the three sad traditions that mark national cultural policies: absence, authoritarianism, and instability. This paper analyzes the cultural policies developed by the Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva Government with this focus.

Keywords: Cultural Policies in Brazil. Cultural Policies. Gilberto Gil administration. Juca Ferreira Administration. Lula Government. Contemporary Brazil. contemporâneo.

**To do politics is to always expand the frontiers of the possible.
To make culture is to always fight in the frontiers of the impossible.**
Jorge Furtado

A rigorous evaluation of the cultural policies developed by President Lula and ministers Gilberto Gil and Juca Ferreira demands, first of all, a revision of the traditions that historically have been built by the trajectory of cultural policies in Brazil and not only a critical analysis of the immediately previous government (Fernando Henrique Cardoso) and its cultural management (Francisco Weffort). The challenges to be faced, certainly, have fully emerged during the long FHC/ Weffort administration, but already had sad traditions.

The existing bibliography on cultural policies in the country (available at www.cult.ufba.br), disperse in many disciplinary areas, does not yet contemplate a systematic historical study on the matter. In a previous book, the elaboration of an at least panoramic vision of cultural policies was sketched (Rubim, 2007). It serves as substrate and makes possible to distinguish and weave the axis of analysis of this text. Besides it, there are two attempts of a broader vision as lined by Márcio de Sousa (2000) and José Álvaro Moises (2001).

The itinerary of cultural policies, undoubtedly, has produced sad traditions and, consequently, huge challenges. These sad traditions can be emblematically synthesized in three words: absences, authoritarianisms and instabilities. It is our role, in sequence, to

* **Translation:** Belmira Coutinho

visit such signs, which in reasonable measure resume the damaged life, to recall Adorno, of the cultural policies of the Brazilian nation..

1. Absences

An ancient figure, it is present among us since the days of the colony. Which are the policies for the development of culture that could cope with the colonial period? The contempt and persecution of indigenous and African cultures; the blocking of Western culture, especially those that were progressive at the time, such as the French, with: the prohibition of installation of presses; controlling the circulation of books and the lack of higher education and universities. All of them sides of this obscurantism. It is worth remembering that other colonialisms - all reprehensible - did not trigger such measures. For example, "between 1538 and 1812 thirty universities were created in all of the Hispano-American colonial space" (Buchbinder, 2005, p.13).

Brazilian independence did not change this picture. The State remained not too sensitive to culture. It was treated as a privilege, in a society of high social exclusion, or as an ornament (Coutinho, 2000). The personalized cultural attitudes of Dom Pedro II, strictly speaking, cannot be thought of as an effective policy for culture. To stimulate the inauguration of the Historical and Geographical Institutes; to assume a posture of patrons with some cultural creators and to be himself, an occasional creator (in photography) does not constitute a new attitude by the Brazilian government towards culture, as is supposed by Márcio de Souza and José Álvaro Moisés.

The Republic also continued the Empire's tradition of absence. The sporadic actions in the heritage area cannot be taken as a new attitude of the State in the cultural field. Similarly, the privileged moment of the development of culture in Brazil, which happened on the "democratic" years from 1945 to 1964, was not characterized by greater State intervention in the field of culture. The use of the term culture in 1953 to secondarily describe a ministry, Education and Culture, and the creation of the Superior Institute for Brazilian Studies (ISEB), besides other smaller measures, do not suggest an essential mutation to this persistent absence of cultural policies in Brazil.

The "New Republic" introduces a new type of absence with its ambiguous cultural policies investees. It expands the State in the context of culture, but at the same time introduces a mechanism that largely undermines a more consistent cultural performance by the State. The Sarney Law and the subsequent laws to encourage culture, through tax exemption, remove the decision-making power of the State, even though the funds used were mostly public, and place the decision in the hands of private enterprise. In this perverse form of absence, the State is only present as a

funding source. The cultural policy, in what deliberations, choices and priorities are implied, is the property of companies and their marketing managements.

It was during the FHC / Francisco Weffort administration that this new modality reached its climax. Now culture is above all "a good deal", as pointed out by the best known manual published by the Ministry. In a text published in the unsuspected book titled "The FHC Age", José Castello notes this new absence of the State. Incentive laws - now designated as Rouanet and of the Audiovisual - take the place of State policies (CASTELLO, 2002) and the market takes the role of the State.

This absence in the FHC administration paradoxically confirms the failure of democracy in Brazil to work in the field of culture, detected by one of the main mentors of the Ministry of Culture in that government, Professor José Álvaro Moises. He had recognized another sad Brazilian tradition: the intimate and unusual relationship between culture and authoritarianism in the country. He stated:

“...the great challenge of our times, in the area of culture, which is to reverse the Brazilian historical trend, whereby the large institutional sector advances were made in authoritarian periods” (Moises, 2001, p.46).

2. Authoritarisms

First observation: it was only during times of authoritarian that Brazil met more systematic cultural policies, in which the State took a more active role and, therefore, eclipsed the tradition of absence. The dictatorships of the Estado Novo (1937-1945) and of the military (1964-1985), besides censorship, repression, fear, imprisonments, torture, killings, exiles inherent to any authoritarian regime, made a powerful intervention in the cultural field. Surely such actions aimed to instrumentalize culture; tame its criticality; submit it to authoritarian interests; seek its use as a factor in legitimizing dictatorships and sometimes as a means for shaping of an imaginary of nationality. This greater attention meant, to put it simply, huge risks for culture. But, in a contradictory way, this "appreciation" also ended up creating a cultural dynamic that trod the possible borders of dictatorships, when not overstepping its boundaries.

The Getúlio Vargas / Capanema administration inaugurated the systematic action of the State in culture. Among other procedures, there is the creation of laws for film, broadcasting, the arts, cultural professions etc and the creation of numerous cultural organizations, such as: the Superintendence of Musical and Artistic Education, the National Institute of Educational Cinema (1936); the Educational Broadcasting Service (1936); the National Historical and Artistic Heritage Service (1937); the National Theatre Service (1937); the National Book Institute (1937) and the National Council of

Culture (1938). Moreover, the "modernist" Capanema, Minister of Education and Health (1934-1945), although a conservative, welcomed many progressive intellectuals and artists in his ministry, during the Estado Novo dictatorship, starting with the poet Carlos Drummond de Andrade, his chief of staff, and others such as Oscar Niemeyer, Candido Portinari, etc. For the first time, one can effectively speak of cultural policies of the Brazilian government. Simultaneously, national cultural policies and the tradition of its problematic connection with authoritarianism are inaugurated.

The civic-military coup of 1964, once more, reaffirmed this sad tradition of the relation between culture and authoritarianism. The military not only repressed, censored, persecuted, arrested, murdered, exiled culture, intellectuals, artists, scientists and popular creators, but at the same time, constituted a not inconsiderable agenda of "achievements" for the (re)configuration of the field of culture in Brazil. The dictatorship invested strongly and deliberately in the development of cultural industries in the country, constituting all socio-technological infrastructure essential to mediatized culture. The early-phase dictatorship was able to get along, not without tensions, with a national-popular culture of leftist hegemony in certain social sectors (Schwarz, 1978), while developing and controlling the cultural industries with an iron fist. Anyway, while seeking to accomplish its project to replace the "hegemony" of the school-university circuit - despite its huge limitations in a country marked by social exclusion - for the prominence of a circuit formed by cultural industries, rigidly subject to military rule (Rubim and Rubim, 2004).

Besides inducing this brutal mutation in the shaping of culture in Brazil, with the whole complex set of problems this raises, the military dictatorship, just like the Estado Novo, also outlined cultural laws and created numerous organizations in the cultural field. The Federal Council of Culture (1966), the National Film Institute (1966), the Brazilian Film Company - EMBRAFILME (1969), the National Foundation for the Arts - FUNARTE (1975), the National Center for Cultural Reference (1975); the RADIOBRÁS (1976), the National Film Board (1976) etc.. Some, like the FUNARTE, had great performances on behalf of Brazilian culture (Botelho, 2001). It's symptomatic that the first National Culture Plan formulated in the country has been drafted in 1975, during the military dictatorship (Miceli, 1984).

But the relationship between authoritarianism and culture is not restricted to dictatorial regimes. As many authors have pointed, in different interpretations, authoritarianism is steeped in Brazilian society, given its social inequality (Fernandes, 1975; Coutinho, 2000 and Chauí, 2000). This elitism is expressed, in a macro-social level, through ignorance, persecution and annihilation of cultures and through the

cultural exclusion to which a significant part of the population is subject. It is ingrained in almost every pore of Brazilian society. For example, in the visions of culture underlying the cultural policies that have been undertaken.

The trajectory and the guidelines of the Institute of Historical and Artistic Heritage (Instituto do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional - IPHAN), a body established in 1937 under the Vargas /Capanema administration, are emblematic in this regard. The IPHAN has been one of the most persistent and relevant bodies of cultural policies of the Brazilian state, even acquiring an international reputation. During a significant portion of his itinerary, it favored the western, white, catholic, baroque and monumental culture. Only were listed and preserved: palaces, churches and fortresses (Miceli, 2001 and Gonçalves, 1996).

The popular, indigenous, african-Brazilian and even media cultures were hardly covered by the national cultural policies, when they existed. Certainly, these manifestations were considered unworthy of being recognized and treated as culture, when there were not simply repressed and silenced. Neither more consistent policies nor institutions were deployed to the popular cultures, despite some protests, which took place in the democratic period from 1945 to 1964, such as the National Campaign of Folklore and Popular Culture Movement, formed by the governments of Arraes in Recife and Pernambuco. On the contrary, such demonstrations were suppressed. Indigenous culture was disregarded, if not systematically annihilated. The african-Brazilian culture, always persecuted, only began to earn some respect from the national State in the post military dictatorship period, with the creation of the Palmares Foundation in 1988, a result of pressure from organized black movement and the climate created by the democratization of the country.

Radio and television have always been despised by the Ministry of Culture, even though they are the most present cultural facilities in Brazilian territory and have a vital cultural role for the majority of Brazilian population, especially after they began to constitute themselves as the hegemonic cultural circuit in the country. The media culture has never been regarded as something worthy of ministerial action. The gap between these forms of culture experienced by the Brazilian population - even with all their problems of standardization and submission to the commercial logic of cultural industries - and the universe serviced by the intervention of the Ministry of Culture, certainly, is one of the most glaring contrasts of the cultural policies of the Brazilian government. It denotes elitism and authoritarianism.

The choice of a narrow understanding of culture, which only includes the expressions most recognized by the elite, expresses with extreme fidelity the authoritarian and exclusionary view of the national State intervention in the cultural field, forming the second of its sad traditions.

3. Instabilities

The combination of absence and authoritarianism produces instabilities, the third sad tradition inscribed in national cultural policies. It has an immediate institutional facet. Many created cultural institutions have strong institutional instability that derives from a complex set of factors: weakness; lack of more persistent policies; administrative discontinuities; neglect; aggressions by authoritarian situations etc. The Vargas administration creates institutions, but destroys relevant political and cultural experiences as lived by Mário de Andrade in the Department of Culture of the Municipality of São Paulo (1935-1938). The military dictatorship closes the ISEB in 1964; the Centers for Popular Culture of the National Union of Students and the Popular Culture Movement, where Paulo Freire appears. The neoliberal eagerness of Collor dismounts, like a barbarian, almost all of the cultural institutions of the country. Just to name a few dramatic moments.

One of the few national institutions that were able to evade the fate of instability was the IPHAN / SPHAN, flagship organization of the cultural policy in the country until the late '60s and early following decade. Created from a proposal commissioned by Gustavo Capanema to Mário de Andrade, but not fully accepted (Miceli, 2001, p.360; Chagas, 2003 and Falcão, 1984, p.29), the SPHAN welcomed modernists, starting with its almost eternal leader: Rodrigo de Melo Franco (1937 until his death in the '60s). The Service, later Office or Secretariat, opted for the preservation of the stone and lime heritage, of white culture, baroque aesthetic and monumental content. In general: catholic churches, forts and palaces of the colonial period. With this, the IPHAN confined its area of operations, diluted possible controversy, developed its technical skilled expertise and professionalized its staff. Such attitudes, in conjunction with the "institutional insulation", guarantee the independence and impressive organizational and administrative continuity of the entity and of its leader (Micele, 2001, p.362) and transform SPHAN into something exemplary for cultural policies in Brazil and in many other countries.

The culture sector was part of the Ministry of Education and Health (1930) until it went on to compose the new Ministry of Education and Culture, in 1953. It took another 32 years for the independence and autonomy of culture in a specific ministry (1985). Its

implementation was indeed complicated. Legitimate pressure by intellectuals, artists and state secretaries of culture, many belonging to governments that opposed the Military Dictatorship, the creation of the ministry became almost inevitable with the return of democracy in 1985. However, this observation cannot forget an essential theme, noted by some scholars such as Isaura Botelho: the existence or non-existence of institutional maturity and of the cultural agents for the creation of the ministry.

Its troubled implementation in the Sarney, Collor and Itamar administrations is one of the most striking examples of this tradition of instability of the cultural field. It is created in 1985, dismantled by Collor and turned into office in 1990; rebuilt again in 1993 by Itamar Franco. The cultural field, besides these comings and goings of the ministry in its early years, had the unbelievable number of ten leaders accountable for the national bodies of culture in nine years (1985-1994): five ministers (José Aparecido, Aloísio Pimenta, Celso Furtado, Hugo Napoleão and José Aparecido again) in the five Sarney years (1985-1990), two secretaries (Ipojuca Pontes and Sérgio Paulo Rouanet) during Collor (1990-1992) and three ministers (Antonio Houaiss, Jerônimo Moscardo, Luiz Roberto Nascimento de Silva) in Itamar Franco's administration (1992-1995). The average stay of less than one officer per year, for sure, created a very serious institutional instability, especially for an organization that was in the process of installation.

The radical difference between the instability of these tumultuous early years and the stability of President FHC and Minister Francisco Weffort's following eight years did not lead to the full overcoming of this tradition of instability. Certainly, the ministry was not subjected to the previous institutional turmoil, but this did not mean a corresponding increase in the institutionality of the Ministry of Culture, as this process depends not only upon stability, but requires a complex array of other procedures that were not effected in the long FHC – Weffort administration.

Certainly, the allocation of only 0.14% of the Union's budget for culture in 2002, FHC – Weffort's last year, can never be taken as a factor of institutional strengthening of the ministry. Rather the contrary, it is a sharp indicator of the discredit of the cultural field in that government. Moreover, the continuing situation of precarious budgets - with few historical exceptions, such as FUNARTE's initial phase - presents itself as another not inconsiderable component of the tradition of instability in the national field of culture. A dignified budget is, undoubtedly, a vital indicator of political and institutional importance given by the federal government to the Ministry of Culture and a concrete factor of stability.

Other variables are key to greater institutionality of the ministry and, therefore, to the overcoming of the tradition of instability. Among them, one can mention: the amount and location of its cultural facilities; the quantitative and qualitative dimensions of its staff and the existence or not of public policies and / or State (not just government) that allow the continuity of the ministry's actions.

The institutional itinerary of culture has not been prodigal in any of these variables. The creation of the ministry in 1985 did not result in a decentralization and nationalization of equipments and, therefore, of the action of the body. It remained as a ministry that operates in a very localized and patchy way. Attempts to reverse this situation were always occasional and did not result in its effective decentralization and nationalization. The ministry revolves around Rio de Janeiro, mainly, and Brasília and São Paulo. Almost all of his organs and facilities are located in these regions. The exception is, again, the IPHAN, in particular, since Aloisio Magalhães' mandate, who, in 1979/1980, created IPHAN regional representations in various regions of the country. Thus, there has always been an institutional difficulty on the national presence of the ministry, which makes his performance fragile and unstable.

The functional body has been a contributing component to this tradition of instability. With the exception, once more, of IPHAN and, partly, of FUNARTE, at times, the body of ministry officials has been precarious, wanting and non-professionalized. In its trajectory tenders for new jobs did not exist, despite the aging of the servers and strong pressures for retirement such as those that occurred during the Collor administration. At this time the staff has been reduced from 4371 to 2796. That is, 1575 employees (Pontes, 1991, 27). "Forgetting" policies of upgrading and qualification has been a hallmark of virtually all cultural policies developed by national governments. Such absence draws attention. It becomes obvious by comparing the situation in Brazil with that of other countries, of similar size, such as Mexico, where CONACULTA develops a broad and sustained program of staff training in the area of culture. This is, undoubtedly, one of the most blatant and serious absences of Brazilian policies and one of the most eminent factors for the tradition of instability of national State action in culture.

Finally, the instability stems from the inability of rulers to develop cultural policies that transcend boundaries of their governments and become State policies, as in other areas of the federal administration, such as: Education, Health, Science and Technology and Foreign Affairs. Policies, therefore, that require a continuity that is independent of the

governments in power, because they are grounded in strategic interests socially agreed through deadline initiatives, medium-term and long-term.

The authoritarian tradition of more active national cultural policies has prevented, as well, that they may be discussed and negotiated with the civil society, particularly with those sectors interested in culture, and consequently translated into public cultural policies. That is, policies that may emanate from the government, but that, subject to the scrutiny of critical debate and of deliberation with the civil society, become public cultural policies. Such policies, given its democratic and agreed upon character, hold more possibility of transcending this compromising tradition of instability.

4. Confrontations

Having outlined this historical digression focused by the synthesis-notions of traditions, it is now possible to analyze how and whether or not the Lula administration faces such challenges. Again, absence could be the starting point. In the collection of the "programmatic" discourses pronounced in his first year in office, Gilberto Gil favored two themes that struck head-on with the tradition of absences. Within a perspective, he continually emphasized the State's active role in the formulation of cultural policies. He wove a poetic relationship between cultural policies and culture. The minister artist proposed that "to formulate cultural policies is to make culture" (Gil, 2003, p.11). Within another perspective, complementary to the previous one, these speeches made a scathing critique to the FHC / Weffort administration in what it meant the greater expression of the new modality of absence of the State, with its replacement and submission to the market, through incentive laws (Gil, 2003, p. 23, 49, 50, 51, 52 and 53).

The State's active role has resulted in numerous cultural areas. Indeed, Gil himself said that the mark of his administration would be comprehensiveness, against all recommendations of politicians and political marketers who saw this as a political danger. Beyond the comprehensiveness of records, the new active role of the State was made in connection with society. He repeatedly stated that the ministry's public were not only the cultural creators and producers, but Brazilian society. Thus, the dialogue with society gave substance to the active character, opening paths to face authoritarianism. That is, the challenge of inaugurating cultural policies in democratic circumstances was clearly placed on the ministry's agenda.

Another of the emphasis of the programmatic addresses finds a fine-tuning with the idea of power struggle against authoritarianism and elitism: the broadening of the concept of culture (GIL, 2003, p.10, 22, 44, 45). The insistence by the amplitude

translates into the option for a comprehensive concept of culture, said "anthropological." The assimilation of this broad notion allows the ministry to no longer be confined to the educated culture (in general: arts and heritage) and to open its borders to other types of cultures: popular, African-Brazilian, indigenous, of gender, of sexual orientation, of the media, of computer networks, of the peripheries, etc.

Comprehensiveness, as we have already said, has become a feature of the Gil management, quite opposed to the itinerary of the national culture field, for it was only in certain phases that it sought to interact with such modalities. One can remember, from among these moments: Aloisio Magalhães' initiatives (1985); FUNARTE's initiatives (Botelho, 2001) and those of Eduardo Portela's period, through the views of Pedro Demo (1982).

In some cases, the performance of the Ministry of Culture becomes even inaugurating, as per the example of the attention and support given to indigenous cultures (Ministry of Culture, 2006, 26). The national state had never related to indigenous peoples in a cultural perspective. The whole relationship between State and indigenous peoples occurred through the Ministry of Justice, with its National Indian Foundation. In other cases, if it is not inaugural, it undoubtedly reveals a differential of the investment in relation to previous situations. This is what happens in popular cultures (Ministry of Culture, 2005), those of sexual assertiveness, digital culture and even in audiovisual media culture. Power-examples of this performance: ANCINE's institutional shift to the Ministry of Culture, the attempt to transform ANCINE in ANCINAV; the DOC-TV project, which associates the ministry to the public television network to produce documentaries all over the country; the struggle for Public Television; the program Unveiling the Brazils, which supports the audiovisual production in cities of up to 20 thousand inhabitants; the edict for electronic games; support to the gay parades; the national seminars of popular cultures etc.

The conceptual and performance opening means not only the abandonment of a discriminating and elitist view of culture, but represents a counterpoint to authoritarianism and the pursuit of democratization of cultural policies. The intense option to build public policies, because it was in a situation of debate and deliberation with society, emerges as another hallmark of the Gil and Juca managements. Thus, seminars proliferate, as well as sectoral chambers; conferences, culminating at the National Conference of Culture and debates on topics of cultural policies. The challenge of building political culture in a democratic environment is not addressed in any way, but through the activation of the civil society and of cultural agents in the shaping of public policies and democratic culture.

Public policies provide democratic substrate for the viability of State policies that transcend governments and therefore can give more permanent national policies to the cultural field. In this perspective, investments, still preliminary, by the ministry in the area of culture economy and creative economy and its action by the IBGE in order to produce series of cultural information acquire remarkable functionality and already showcase their first results (IBGE, 2006).

But two other movements take a central place in the building of State policies in the cultural field: the implementation and development of the National Culture System (SNC) and the National Culture Plan (NCP).

The construction that has been carried out by the ministry, in partnership with states, municipalities and the civil society, of a National Culture System is vital for the consolidation of structures and policies, agreed upon and complementary, that enable the existence and persistence of medium term and long term cultural programs, therefore not subjected to conjunctural tempest. Such a system must be associated and contain other (sub)systems that have been forming, such as the National System of Museums (Ministry of Culture, 2006, 22).

The approval by the National Congress (Constitutional Amendment number 48/2005) and subsequent elaboration of the National Plan of Culture and its approval by the National Congress in 2010 emerges as another favorable factor to the overcoming of the tradition of instability and discontinuity that has torn the State's action in the cultural field. All in all, the possibility of overcoming this sad tradition depends largely on the existence, articulation and fine tuning between SNC and PNC.

The institutionalization of the ministry is consolidating itself with its increasingly national operations, through numerous projects, highlighting the Culture Points, which have already reached somewhere around four thousand nationwide. The decentralization of ministry activities also stems from the administrative reform carried out early in the administration, which sought to overcome the shading areas and to give more operability to the ministry and its associated bodies (Meira, 2004); from the expansion of IPHAN to almost all Brazilian states and from the revitalization and expansion of regional offices of the Ministry.

The completion of the "first tender in the history of the ministry" since its opening in 1985 (Ministry of Culture, 2006, 18) undoubtedly brings auspicious prospects for the institutional strengthening of the Ministry, through the incorporation of new servers, besides the signaling that it provides and the symbology that it triggers, indicating an attention to culture.

Two other factors have crucial significance for the institutional building of the ministry. The first is the expansion of resources devoted to culture through tax breaks and the ministry's budget (0.14% in 2003 to around 1.00%), although this has not fully met the goal of ministers Gilberto Gil and Juca Ferreira, of one percent of the national budget for culture. The second is the permanence of the same team ahead of the Ministry in the second term of President Lula, even with the replacement of minister Gilberto Gil by Juca Ferreira, his Executive Secretary since the beginning of the administration. This maintenance should be interpreted as a commitment to the continuity of undertaken policies. The national and international dimension acquired by the Ministry has also contributed to the search for the overcoming of the sad traditions found in this text: absence, authoritarianism and instability. instabilidade.

Constraints and challenges

Cabe It is now time to analyze the challenges posed by this new level of national cultural policies in Brazil, after having revisited the sad traditions and its confrontation with the managements of ministers Gilberto Gil and Juca Ferreira. The different analysis, evoking multiple aspects of undertaken cultural policies, point to the new horizon of national cultural policies in the country. They are now effectively existent, inhabit a democratic environment and have good possibilities of becoming more permanent. That is, a new and promising level of national cultural policies was achieved in Brazil.

The scope of this new level, however, is not determined, because the process is ongoing, with many variables that can decisively affect its trajectory and evaluation. For example, if the projects pertaining to the Ministry of Culture that are currently processed in Congress are approved in their entirety, we will live in Brazil a radically different historical circumstance for the development of national cultural policies. We could even speak of a revolutionary moment that inaugurates a scenario of unprecedented potential. At the opposite border, the disapproval of many or even all of these instruments, which express and legally consolidate policies, greatly depresses the horizon of possibilities and blocks a truly qualitative and quantitative leap of national cultural policies.

It's not only the future potential that is in danger with the disapproval of some of these measures. In some situations, tensions can tear apart even policies in process. The risk of this happening is far from negligible, given the fragility of the cultural field, even after the experiments propitiated by the Lula administration.

The example of the policy of culture financing becomes emblematic for reporting this tension today. Without a radical reversal in the funding policy, policies of cultural and regional diversity of the Ministry are placed in check, because the (gigantic) predominance of incentive laws does not constitute the appropriate manner to ensure such policies. The conflict between implemented policies and funding methods is evident. It tends to corrode and hinder the development of such policies, which today are the identifying mark of the Ministry. To replace financing policies as subordinate to implemented cultural policies becomes an imperative attitude for the shaping of a new level of public cultural policies in Brazil. If this reversal does not happen, this will substantially undermine the redefinition of the role of the State in relation to cultural politics, because until today the major modality of culture financing in the country continues to be incentive laws, and, therefore, the power in decision making remains in the hands of companies at the expense of the state.

The rigorous redefinition of the role of the state is another vital challenge to the contemporary moment. It is urgent to implement democratic, broad debate, which must be qualified to better illuminate the complex role of the state today, including in the cultural field, in Brazil and worldwide. This political debate must be accompanied by the process of building a radically democratic state. Neither the authoritarian state, nor the neoliberal state realize the complexity of the current cultural circumstance. The democratic state must increasingly improve its participation devices, such as conferences, boards and councils, and those of construction, together with society, of public policies, including cultural ones. The collaborative work between state and society appears as one of the most consistent alternatives to democratize the state; create clear boundaries and consistent barriers to the contemporary investees of companies, especially global, which assume an almighty role today and persistently seek to depress and capture the state.

Two other definitions are equally urgent. On one hand, we need a better definition of the action field of the Ministry in order to give consistency to its action and reflection, even improving its transversal interaction with other similar social areas. Thus, a reflexion both theoretical-conceptual and political about the concept and field of activity of the Ministry becomes imperative. The expansion of the concept of culture was vital to overcome the present authoritarianism in society and in cultural policies in the country, but it already reveals itself to be inadequate and problematic for the current moment. A qualified and democratic debate on the subject imposes itself as vital to the consolidation of a new dynamic performance by the Ministry of Culture.

On the other hand, another not inconsiderable difficulty relates to the theme of the creators. The correct shift of the Ministry's gaze for society requires the building of a specific policy for creators as an essential complement, which defines clearly, with justice and relevance, the new place to be occupied, especially by artists, scientists and intellectuals, in the scenario of culture and mainly of executed cultural policies. It does not appear that this has been well worked out by the Ministry, as the continuous changes in the direction of the National Endowment for the Arts (FUNARTE) during the Lula administration made believe. The collaborative construction of this policy, with the involvement of creators, emerges as another key challenge for national cultural policies of the post-Lula.

This question is intrinsically linked to the issue of the conformation of the social base of support for policies implemented by the Ministry. In the previous scenario, the fields of heritage and arts constituted this community of dialogue and support. In the new circumstance, there happens to be a relevant displacement, since the notion of culture and magnified cultural politics require a broad social base for the Ministry. In reasonable measure, the Living Culture Program, with its national reach, made possible, at least in part, the framework of this new basis of legitimacy for the Ministry, despite the problems of management and adequacy for a state not yet democratized enough to adequately interact with these new cultural communities welcomed by the program. Surely, this base of legitimacy cannot do without professionalized cultural communities, but this greater coverage becomes essential to establish a fine tune with this new scene. The current crisis of the Living Culture Program emerges as very worrying not only because it strikes one of the most notorious programs of the Gil and Juca administration, that has even been replicated in other countries due to its success and innovative character, but also because it calls into question one flagship program in terms of giving range to the necessary social basis for this new stage of the Ministry's life. The result of this misunderstanding is a problematic attitude.

The satisfying implementation of the PNC, with well defined and feasible goals and priorities, albeit at demanding levels, sets another key challenge. The PNC inaugurates, in the field of Brazilian public cultural policies, a quite significant horizon of social and institutional planning and articulation. But the PNC requires, for its qualified implementation, that the SNC and the Constitutional Amendment Project (PEC) 150, which sets minimum percentages budget for the Union, States and Municipalities, are also approved by Congress and installed as state policies. Without an increase in cultural institutionality and without more financial resources, liable to be triggered by federal entities in a complementary way, PNC runs accented risks of remaining only as

a beautiful document. The always renewed dilemma, unfortunately, of the insufficient budget and budget cuts in the culture field, emerges as a substantive threat to a greater stability and maturity of policies in the sphere of culture.

The topics of training and qualification in culture and even the organization of the cultural field should also be entered in the panorama of contemporary challenges of national cultural policies in Brazil. They imply a strengthening of cultural institutions, which is a vital requirement for the satisfactory resolution of policies in this new national moment. The implementation of the PNC and SNC requires more skilled culture professionals and a more organized and active cultural community.

Besides these laws that are underway in Congress, there are others which also have a relevant place in contemporary context, Brazilian and international. The draft bill of copyright law, which updates the backward Brazilian legislation in the area, for example, plays a central role. In a contemporary society, in which wealth is increasingly dependent on the production of knowledge, intellectual property and copyright acquire a not inconsiderable status for economic, social, environmental, political and cultural development.

The challenges of the new environment are enormous. They are in line with the level reached by the political and cultural circumstances. It remains to be known whether the Ministry of Culture, the cultural community and Brazilian society will know how to face them in a democratic and consistent way..

Referências bibliográficas

ABDANUR, Elizabeth França. Os “Ilustrados” e a política cultural em São Paulo. O Departamento de Cultura na Gestão Mário de Andrade (1935-1938). Campinas, UNICAMP (História), 1992 (dissertação de mestrado).

BADARÓ, Murilo. Gustavo Capanema. A revolução na cultura. Rio de Janeiro, Nova Fronteira, 2000.

BARBALHO, Alexandre. Relações entre Estado e cultura no Brasil. Ijuí, Editora UNIJUÍ, 1998.

BARBATO JR., Roberto. Missionários de uma utopia nacional-popular. Os intelectuais e o Departamento de Cultura de São Paulo. São Paulo, Annablume / Fapesp, 2004.

BARCELOS, Jalusa. CPC-UNE. Uma história de paixão e consciência. Rio de Janeiro, Nova Fronteira, 1994.

- BASTOS, Mônica Rugai. O espelho da nação: a cultura como objeto de política no governo Fernando Henrique Cardoso. São Paulo, Faculdade de Filosofia e Ciências Humanas da Universidade de São Paulo, 2004 (Tese de doutoramento)
- BERLINK, Manoel T. Centro Popular de Cultura da UNE. Campinas, Papyrus, 1984.
- BOTELHO, Isaura. Romance de formação: FUNARTE e política cultural 1976-1990. Rio de Janeiro, Casa de Rui Barbosa, 2001.
- BOTELHO, Isaura. Dimensões da cultura e políticas públicas. In: São Paulo em Perspectiva. São Paulo, 15(2): 73-83, abril / junho de 2001.
- BUCHBINDER, Pablo. Historia de las universidades argentinas. Buenos Aires, Editorial Sudamerica, 2005.
- CASTELLO, José. Cultura. In: LAMOUNIER, Bolívar e FIGUEIREDO, Rubens (orgs.) A Era FHC: um balanço. São Paulo, Cultura, 2002, p. 627-656.
- CHAGAS, Mário. O pai de Macunaíma e o patrimônio espiritual. In: ABREU, Regina e CHAGAS, Mário (orgs.). Memória e patrimônio: ensaios contemporâneos. Rio de Janeiro, FAPERJ / DP&A / UNI-RIO, 2003, p. 95-108.
- CHAUÍ, Marilena. Brasil. Mito fundador e sociedade autoritária. São Paulo, Fundação Perseu Abramo, 2000.
- CHAUÍ, Marilena. O nacional e o popular na cultura brasileira. Seminários. São Paulo, Brasiliense, 1983.
- COUTINHO, Carlos Nelson. Cultura e sociedade na Brasil. Rio de Janeiro, DP&A, 2000.
- DEMO, Pedro. Dimensão cultural da política social. Recife, Massangana, 1982.
- DÓRIA, Carlos Alberto. Os federais da cultura. São Paulo, Biruta, 2003.
- FERNANDES, Florestan. A revolução burguesa no Brasil. Rio de Janeiro, Zahar, 1975.
- FERREIRA, Juca. ANCINAV: omissão ou missão? In: Teoria e Debate. São Paulo, (60): 64-67, novembro / dezembro de 2004.
- FUNDAÇÃO JOÃO PINHEIRO. A indústria cultural no quadro da economia brasileira. Brasília, MINC, 1987.

GIL, Gilberto. Discursos do Ministro da Cultura Gilberto Gil. Brasília, Ministério da Cultura, 2003.

GOMES, Ângela de Castro (org.). Capanema: o ministro e o ministério. Rio de Janeiro, Fundação Getúlio Vargas, 2000.

GONÇALVES, José Reginaldo Santos. A retórica da perda. Os discursos do patrimônio cultural no Brasil. Rio de Janeiro, Editora da UFRJ / IPHAN, 1996.

INSTITUTO BRASILEIRO DE GEOGRAFIA E ESTATÍSTICA. Sistema de informações e indicadores culturais 2003. Rio de Janeiro, IBGE, 2006.

LULA PRESIDENTE. Brasil: cultivar a memória, inventar o futuro. Programa Setorial de Cultura. Brasil, 2006.

MAGALHÃES, Aloísio. E Triunfo? A questão dos bens culturais no Brasil. Rio de Janeiro / Brasília, Nova Fronteira / Fundação Nacional Pró-Memória, 1985.

MEIRA, Márcio. Uma política republicana. In: Teoria e Debate. São Paulo, (58): 60-65, maio /junho de 2004.

MICELI, Sérgio (org.) Estado e cultura no Brasil. São Paulo, Difel, 1984.

MICELI, Sérgio. Intelectuais à brasileira. São Paulo, Companhia das Letras, 2001.

MINISTÉRIO DA CULTURA. Cultura é um bom negócio. Brasília, MINC, 1995.

MINISTÉRIO DA CULTURA. Seminário Nacional de Políticas Públicas para as Culturas Populares. Brasília, MINC, 2005.

MINISTÉRIO DA CULTURA. Programa cultural para o desenvolvimento do Brasil. Brasília, Ministério da Cultura, 2006.

MOISÉS, José Álvaro. Estrutura institucional do setor cultural no Brasil. In: MOISÉS, José Álvaro e outros. Cultura e democracia. Volume I. Rio de Janeiro, Edições Fundação Nacional de Cultura, 2001, p.13-55.

OLIVIERI, Cristiane Garcia. Cultura neoliberal. Leis de incentivo como política pública de cultura. São Paulo, Escrituras / Instituto Pensarte, 2004.

ORTIZ, Renato. Cultura brasileira e identidade nacional. São Paulo, Brasiliense, 1985.

ORTIZ, Renato. A moderna tradição brasileira. Cultura brasileira e indústria cultural. São Paulo, Brasiliense, 1989.

PARTIDO DOS TRABALHADORES. A imaginação a serviço do Brasil. São Paulo, PT, 2003.

PONTES, Ipojuca. Cultura e modernidade. Brasília, Secretaria de Cultura, 1991.

RAFFAINI, Patrícia Tavares. Esculpindo a cultura na forma Brasil: o Departamento de Cultura de São Paulo (1935-1938). São Paulo, Humanitas, 2001 (Dissertação de mestrado em História - Faculdade de Filosofia, Letras e Ciências Humanas da Universidade de São Paulo, 1999).

RAMÍREZ NIETO, Jorge. El discurso Vargas Capanema y la arquitectura moderna en Brasil. Bogotá, Universidad Nacional de Colômbia, 2000.

RUBIM, Antonio Albino Canelas. As políticas culturais e o governo Lula. São Paulo, Editora da Fundação Perseu Abramo, 2011.

RUBIM, Antonio Albino Canelas (org.). Políticas culturais no Governo Lula. Salvador, EDUFBA, 2010.

RUBIM, Antonio Albino Canelas. Políticas culturais no Brasil: itinerários e atualidade. In: BOLAÑO, César; GOLIN, Cida e BRITTOS, Valério (orgs.). Economia da arte e da cultura. São Paulo, Observatório do Itaú Cultural, 2010, p.51-71.

RUBIM, Antonio Albino Canelas. Discussão sobre o Plano Nacional de Cultura. In: Teoria e Debate. São Paulo, (81):48-51, março-abril de 2009.

RUBIM, Antonio Albino Canelas e BARBALHO, Alexandre (orgs). Políticas culturais no Brasil. Salvador: EDUFBA, 2007.

RUBIM, Antonio Albino Canelas. Políticas culturais entre o possível e o impossível. Texto apresentado no II Encontro de Estudos Multidisciplinares em Cultura. Salvador, 2006.

RUBIM, Antonio Albino Canelas e RUBIM, Lindinalva. Televisão e políticas culturais no Brasil. In: Revista USP. São Paulo, (61): 16-28, março / abril / maio de 2004.

SARCOVAS, Yacoff. O incentivo fiscal no Brasil. In: Teoria & Debate. São Paulo, (62)58-62, abril / maio de 2005.

SARNEY, José. Incentivo à cultura e sociedade industrial. In: JELÍN, Elizabth e outros. Cultura e desenvolvimento. Rio de Janeiro, Fundo Nacional de Cultura, 2000, p. 27-44.

SCHELLING, Vivian. A presença do povo na cultura brasileira. Ensaio sobre o pensamento de Mário de Andrade e Paulo Freire. Campinas, Editora da UNICAMP, 1991.

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

SOUZA, Márcio. Fascínio e repulsa. Estado, cultura e sociedade no Brasil. Rio de Janeiro, Edições Fundo Nacional de Cultura, 2000 (Cadernos de Nosso Tempo número 02).

TOLEDO, Caio Navarro de. ISEB: fábrica de ideologias. São Paulo, Ática, 1977.

VELLOSO, Mônica Pimenta. Os intelectuais e a política cultural do Estado Novo. Rio de Janeiro, Centro de Pesquisa e Documentação de História Contemporânea do Brasil – Fundação Getúlio Vargas, 1987.

WILLIAMS, Daryle. Gustavo Capanema. Ministro da Cultura. In: GOMES, Ângela de Castro (org.) Capanema: o ministro e seu ministério. Rio de Janeiro, Editora FGV, 2000, p.251-269.

Albino Rubim is a Professor at the Professor Milton Santos Institute of Humanities, Arts and Sciences at the Federal University of Bahia. Teacher on the Multidisciplinary Graduate Program in Culture and Society. Researcher at the Center for Multidisciplinary Studies in Culture. I-A Researcher at CNPq. Current Secretary of Culture of the State of Bahia.