

CULTURAL POLICY AS A GOVERNMENTAL FIELD: ENTREPRENEUR ARTISTS

Sharine Machado C. Melo
National Foundation of the Arts, Brazil

ABSTRACT

This article presents some aspects of the work of the British researcher Tony Bennett (1988, 1998, 2008, 2011) about cultural policy and artistic field. The author adopts Foucault's (2016) concept on governmentality and suggests the encounter between post-Kantian aesthetics and liberal thought at the end of the eighteenth century allowed for the arts and cultures to be understood as a governmental field. This trend can be seen in the development of cultural policies, particularly those starting from the middle of the twentieth century, and, more recently, in the spread of the concept of creative economy. We further elaborate on Foucault's thought, especially on entrepreneurship and human capital. The hypothesis is that one of the factors that transforms art circuits into a matter of concern in contemporary society is the manner how artists invest their own life into artistic production. Interest groups are multiplied and struggle for better work conditions and public policies. On the other hand, networks run the risk of limiting themselves to their own circuits, thus fragmenting the cultural field. The challenge is to turn art and culture into a common good, which is part of the population's daily life.

KEYWORDS

governmentality; entrepreneurship; art; culture; cultural policy

AS POLÍTICAS CULTURAIS COMO UM CAMPO DE GOVERNO: ARTISTAS EMPREENDEDORES DE SI

RESUMO

Este artigo apresenta alguns aspectos da obra do pesquisador inglês Tony Bennett (1988, 1998, 2008, 2011) sobre as políticas culturais e os circuitos artísticos. O autor adota o conceito de governamentalidade, proposto por Foucault (2016), e sugere que o encontro da estética pós-kantiana com o pensamento liberal, no final do século XVIII, criou condições para que as artes e a cultura passassem a ser vistas como um campo de governo. Essa tendência é visível no desenvolvimento das políticas culturais, especialmente a partir de meados do século XX e, mais recentemente, na difusão do conceito de economia criativa. Em seguida, a proposta é avançar sobre o pensamento de Foucault (2008), especialmente sobre as noções de empreendedorismo e capital humano. A hipótese é que um dos fatores que faz dos circuitos da arte um foco de interesses na sociedade atual é a maneira como os artistas investem a própria vida na criação de suas obras. Com isso, multiplicam-se grupos de interesse, que lutam por melhores condições de trabalho e políticas públicas. Por outro lado, corre-se o risco de que as redes se fechem em seus próprios circuitos, fragmentando o campo cultural. O desafio é fazer com que as artes e a cultura se transformem, de fato, em um bem comum, que faça parte do cotidiano da população.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE

governamentalidade; empreendedorismo; arte; cultura; políticas culturais

INTRODUCTION

Recent events, such as the extinction and re-creation of the Ministry of Culture during Michel Temer's government and changes in the Incentive Law (Law No. 8.313/1991) made culture and arts gain more visibility in Brazilian media, although the news are not always positive: budget cuts and lack of heritage preservation are some of the problems. At the same time, terms such as "creative economy" or "cultural economics" are repeated by managers, researchers and economists. Aside from partisan political actions, (even when there is pessimism and a certain nostalgic tone) arts and culture still draw the public's attention in contemporary societies somehow.

At the launch of the first two volumes of the *Atlas Econômico da Cultura Brasileira* [*Economic Atlas of Brazilian Culture*], in April 2017, Brazil's Minister of Culture, Roberto Freire, stressed that culture is responsible for 4% of Brazil's GDP (Gross Domestic Product) according to a study published in 2010 by UNCTAD (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development) (Bocchini, 2017). In addition to its economic side, in the first decade of the 2000s, the proliferation of tenders and awards for artistic languages also contributed to the work of artists and collectives in the country, especially in large cities such as São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro. For these and other reasons, a consensus seems to be reached that the incentive to the arts and culture is important – and indeed, it is essential in present times.

However, according to Foucault, not everything can be thought of at all times. The arts as we know them are a relatively modern invention, a little over two centuries old. For the historian Larry Shiner (2001), they emerge from the encounter of institutions (museums, galleries, libraries, theaters, academies), ideas (such as the various aesthetic currents) and power relations. It was not until the late eighteenth century, with the decline of absolutist monarchies and the development of the market, that this set of practices and statements asserted itself as an autonomous field pertinent to economics and politics – or, more precisely, as a confrontational space permeated by ambivalent relations of force and power, always in search of an internal coherence or something that differentiates it from other aspects of society.

As described by Bourdieu (1998), the daily struggle of a generation is what contributed to the artistic languages and their circles becoming self-referential in the nineteenth century. However, there are many circles of art, as well as many differences, connections, divergences and juxtapositions between culture, politics and economy: from predominantly commercial proposals to political protests and the denial of the market by experimental currents. More than circles, there exist networks of artists, investors, critics, and entrepreneurs who are interested in certain subjects or languages, adopt similar lifestyles, and share codes of conduct.

Numerous approaches are also possible to this field. English researcher Tony Bennett (1998, 2011) has chosen to look at the aesthetic tradition that, based on the European experience, has settled in much of the West since the late eighteenth century. The author approached the concept of governmentality, proposed by Foucault (2016), to investigate how art and culture became not only a focus of interest, but mostly something that needs to be managed. If what is understood today as art was built, not without conflict, by the efforts of artists and other professionals, the need to outline public policies for culture¹ is not evident either: it emerges from specific historical conditions, such as the growth of cultural industries, but also from human freedom to act. Therefore, commitment of governments, private initiatives and society in general is required for it.

This article aims to present some aspects of Bennett's work. The author constantly mentions England, not because it is his homeland, but to dialogue with Cultural Studies and because the country was one of the cradles of economic liberalism. Bennett (2008) believes that the meeting between liberal thought and the aesthetic regime is what led the management of the arts and culture to be thought of in the still utilitarian British lands even before the growth of cultural industries. After presenting some topics of the author's work, we intend to advance on the concepts of entrepreneurship and human capital, also studied by Foucault (2008). Our hypothesis is that the way artists now invest their lives in the daily struggle to create their works is one of the factors that illuminate the circuits of art and make them a focus of interest.

FOUCAULT AND STUDIES ON CULTURE

Bennett was not the first researcher in his field to dialogue with Foucault. In the 1960s, the founders of Cultural Studies, including Raymond Williams (1967) and Stuart Hall (1980), sought to differentiate two concepts of culture: the first, related to the autonomous field of Fine Arts, refers to a certain "ideal of perfection"; the second, adopted by the researchers, is broader and refers to the "act of attributing and receiving meanings". The authors suggested that, after a period dominated by the aesthetic tradition, culture would become ordinary, everyday life, and proposed that this term – so difficult to define—must be rethought within the context of power relations. For them, culture is a complex space in which different influences combine and conflict. This line of research has grown and fragmented, but to this day some common questions prevail around the *representations, identity, subjectivity* and *authority* of statements that stand out in multiple social groups: "who is the one talking?" (Hesmondhalgh, 2013).

The interest in the present and the relations between power and knowledge, essential to Foucault, are visible in these formulations. However, the theoretical references were distinct. While Williams (1967) and his colleagues were grounded on Marxist motivations, such as the desire to give voice to the working classes, revealing the multiplicity of their artistic and cultural manifestations, the French thinker strove to show power relations are always bilateral. Power, be it political, religious or social, is not localized, not situated only

¹ Set of government actions that focus on the artistic and cultural practices of the population.

in the State, in the capital, or in a ruling class. It spreads throughout society. This was the main point of divergence between both proposals: Foucault was criticized for “not understanding how the economic relations of capitalism would constitute a unified principle of social formation”. That is, the philosopher was scolded in England precisely because of his unique work: his conception of the microphysics of power could not form the basis for a wider struggle of society with “revolutionary potential” (Bennett, 1998, p. 63).

The prevailing concept among researchers in Cultural Studies at the time was that of hegemony, proposed by the Marxist philosopher Antonio Gramsci. If, for Foucault, power is dispersed, for Gramsci (quoted in Bennett, 1998), it has a unified origin. His theory states that the low income class strive for support and active participation in the projects of the ruling classes. Thus, a consensus would form in which hegemonic and counter-hegemonic forces are at stake. The role of researchers would be to analyze these forces in order to fight against the processes of domination.

Bennett (1998) notes that, in his reading of the romantic tradition, Williams criticized not only the elitism of the definition of culture but also its practical difficulties: how to propose modes of resistance starting from a totalizing concept? He also sought to distance himself from intellectuals who said that engagement with existing forms of public policy was not necessary, moving away from abstract and transcendent cultural criticism. The author even collaborated with cultural institutions after World War II and acknowledged the importance of Keynes, the architect of the Arts Council, for his “open spirit”. However, Bennett (1998) also states that, despite Williams’ engagement for a long time, public policy issues were virtually absent from the debates proposed by Cultural Studies. By adopting the concept of hegemony that permeates society as a whole, many researchers failed to look at practical issues. Moreover, in opposing the romantic notion of culture, Williams and his colleagues failed to realize that, despite the relevance of their work, they were not the only ones concerned with diversity. After all, the development of this field of research coincides with the extension of popular, mass and everyday culture even by government agencies.

Indeed, after World War II, with the emancipation of European colonies in Africa and Asia and the growth of migratory movements, the lifestyles of various social groups became the center of attention for governments seeking strategies to absorb this population into society. Bennett cites as an example teaching methods in English public schools that, for the first time, dealt with students who did not have access to European cultural standards. Teachers, psychologists and educators started valuing the habits and cultural artifacts of their students’ places of origin to approach children and adolescents. In addition, the communication media evolved and the cultural industries grew, especially in the United States, which started to export movies and music all over the world.

Other countries’ governments also turned their eyes to the arts during this same period. The prime example of this is France, which created the *Ministère d’État chargé des Affaires Culturelles* in 1959, known as the world’s first Ministry of Culture how we know it. Actions to promote artists, heritage preservation and cultural democratization were the pillars of the ministry during André Malraux’s management (Poirrier, 2012).

However, cultural diversity and the mass media quickly came into the picture. In a pamphlet written in 1968, Jean Dubuffet opposed the notion of diversity to the state's centralization in the cultural field: "in this field, everything that tends toward hierarchization, selection, concentration is harmful because the result is sterilizing the vast, uncountable and abundant breeding ground of multitudes" (Dubuffet, 2012, p. 69).

These matters had international effect. Despite the libertarian ambiance of the events of May 1968, in the following years debates on the role of the State in the cultural field intensified. In 1970, the "Intergovernmental Conference on the Institutional, Administrative and Financial Aspects of Cultural Policies" was held in Venice. The creation of state policies for culture and the strengthening of national identities were among the recommendations of the final report, especially in former colonies in Asia and Africa, which would have traditional habits and customs threatened by cultural industries. Brazil, still during the military dictatorship, even presented a project at the conference, which would become the Cultural Action Plan (PAC), launched in 1973 to fund activities in the areas of music, folklore, circus, theater and cinema. In 1975, the Brazilian government created the National Foundation of the Arts (Funarte). Still under a military regime, for the first time, a national structured cultural policy was formulated in the country.

In 1981, a new change came from France: the Ministry of Culture was renamed the *Ministère de la Culture et de la Communication* and its mission was changed: individual creativity took the place of art democratization, and respect for regional and international cultures acquired emphasis (Poirrier, 2012). Assuming this direction, in the 1980s, focus on multiculturalism increased, and the then French Minister of Culture Jack Lang became internationally known for extending policies to previously "excluded" genres such as rock and hip-hop. In Brazil, the Ministry of Culture was transformed into an autonomous section in 1985, with the broader proposal to foster creativity. In his opening speech, the economist Celso Furtado states:

we live in a rapidly changing civilization. At a time of revolution in communication technologies. Culture is not just the heritage we have received from the past. Regardless of the importance of defending cultural heritage, we cannot ignore that the essence of humankind as a creator of culture lies in its creativity, in being able to break with the past while feeding on it (...). Creating conditions for creativity to be fully exercised – this is the essence of what we call democracy. (Furtado, 2012, pp. 52-53)

The trend would strengthen, especially in Anglo-Saxon countries, from the 1990s onwards: culture, now based on the concept of creativity, was now seen as one of the drives of the economy. In 1994, Australia was declared a Creative Nation, and in 1997 Tony Blair formed a team to map the UK's creative industries while increasing the arts subsidy. It was not long before the idea spread around the world. In 2005, the Brazilian government signed the "Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions", promoted by Unesco. In this document, culture assumed the role of "strategic element" for "sustainable development" and became a "source of material

and immaterial wealth”, capable of contributing to the “eradication of poverty”, the protection of “traditional” knowledge, the improvement in the “women’s conditions”, among other topics. The objectives would be achieved through “free circulation of ideas”, “constant exchanges” and “interaction between cultures”. Globalization was cited as an opportunity, but also as a risk of “imbalances between rich and poor countries”. Given this context, some researchers (belonging to a generation that Hesmondhalgh, 2013, calls quasi-Foucaultian since it deviates from its initial purposes) turned their attention to new forms of public policy, which aimed to expand the economic role of industries now called creative industries. In a mix of technological optimism and postmodernism, authors such as John Hartley (quoted in Hesmondhalgh, 2013) ended up increasingly turning to practical and administrative aspects and moving away from criticism against power relations.

This scenario of creative explosion eventually generated negative repercussions. Some authors argue that aesthetic issues are left in the background when innovation is at stake, in marketing terms. Indeed, the concept of creative economics was built on the rising value of intellectual property and the growth of activities such as design, software production, advertising, performing arts, publishing, and the art market. But Thomas Osborne (2003, p. 508) points out that while it appears to be merely ideological (as a response to the needs of capitalism), to say that the constant appeal for creativity simply responds to structural needs would be to “ignore the fact that the creative explosion is also a product of human action”, of “experts’ machination” and “intellectual workers”. Creativity is not just something you expect to find. Psychologists, managers and human resources professionals, among others, do not cease to seek conditions for its production. This makes creativity a problem not only of ideology, but especially of governmentality, to use the term coined by Foucault (2016). Precisely the breaking of paradigms, originality and creation are among the main points of modern and contemporary artistic movements. For this reason, the arts are certainly situated in this way of managing life that, in some way, was already present even before Cultural Studies were founded, intensifying dramatically from the 1980s onwards.

A GOVERNMENTAL FIELD

Considering the increasing articulation in the field of government between the arts (expanded by the concept of cultural diversity), the economy and the creative industries, Bennett (1998) suggested studying Foucault’s work from a different viewpoint than that previously adopted by the British, especially the representatives of Cultural Studies. Still in the 1980s, the author joined a research group on the history of the present, which analyzed the composition and operation of modern forms of government in various fields, such as economics, education, psychoanalysis, ethics, citizenship, and culture.

Studies on liberalism, which also gained momentum in the 1980s, were central to Bennett’s research (1998), which once again referred to Foucault (2016). As for the latter, in the liberal regime that emerged in the late eighteenth century, the idea prevailed that

a society is made up of free citizens, who articulate themselves to achieve heterogeneous interests. However, to enable these free citizens to be able to integrate into society as “normal” individuals, they must follow certain codes of conduct and pay attention to their own behavior. The so-called *disciplinary societies*, which comprised the same period (from the late eighteenth to the mid-twentieth centuries), had as their main feature the enclosure of bodies in institutions such as schools, hospitals and prisons. Influenced by these ideas, researchers such as Jeffrey Minson (quoted in Bennett, 1988) attributed a similar meaning to cultural equipment. And indeed, influential authors of the nineteenth century, such as the economist William Stanley Jevons, bet on the utilitarian character of these spaces:

the main *raison d'être* of public and free libraries, as well as museums, art galleries, parks, buildings, clocks, and many other types of public places, is the enormous increase in utility the community acquires for negligible cost. If a beautiful painting is hung in the dining room of a private home, it may be seen by a few guests once or twice a year. Its real usefulness often lies in its contribution to its owner's selfish pride. If it is exhibited at the National Gallery, it will be admired by hundreds of thousands of people whose glances, needless to say, tend not to deviate from the picture. (quoted in Bennett, 1998, p. 108)

The “principle of marginal utility”, coined by Jevons (quoted in Bennett, 1998, p. 108), states that museums and other cultural institutions can be used as tools for public instruction, which brings them closer to educational, statistical and health programs. However, Bennett (1988) suggests that, although they have enclosed artwork within their walls, museums and other cultural facilities have opened their doors to much of the population. One example is the South Kensington Museum (London, England), which was conceived as a centralized depot where artistic objects could circulate to the provinces to spread the positive influences of culture across English territory. Analyzing this and other examples, Bennett (1998) perceives a complex relationship between surveillance strategies and spectacle techniques. Museums and other cultural facilities, as well as hospitals, schools and prisons, would indeed be an answer to the problem of public order. But the drive to foster culture involves something beyond “discipline and training of bodies”: the conquest of “hearts and minds” (Bennett, 1998, p. 76).

Bennett (1998) concludes that the effort to multiply the circles of art is driven by a governmental logic: rather than representing power, art is itself seen as a form of power in the service of a program whose purpose is not exactly the dominance over the population, but rather the development of their capabilities. Once again, it is Foucault the author refers to. For the French philosopher, a society is full of fields of knowledge and power. In the first, statements that are according to the speeches of lay people or experts conveyed in the media or in official reports, dispersed in everyday conversation or from any other source, produce “historical truths” that serve as reference for a period. The second is the domain of practices, of the “governance of behaviors”, which guides ways

of life and is permeated by relations of force and power. Actions exerted over individuals, either by themselves or by institutions, lie in this field. The intertwining between these two dimensions results in the way in which each one acts upon themselves, governing their own acts and thoughts (Costa, 2014, pp. 118-119). What the various forms of liberal government propose is that people have autonomy to lead their own lives, being guided by ethical values that incline them to follow certain behavioral patterns. Some examples are the increase or decrease in consumption, the adoption of healthy habits, and even the frequency of access to cultural facilities.

The contact with a work of art, according to Bennett (2011), is thus understood as an exercise that can make people turn to themselves, either to behave “properly” in cultural spaces (not running, talking in a low voice, not eating or drinking, not touching objects), even during the act of contemplation itself. The author resorts to philosophy to support his argument, placing the discourse of aesthetics (particularly Kantian) within the set of technologies in the liberal government, which acts by a particular mode of “guided freedom”. For the English researcher, aesthetics – which arises with the Enlightenment – would be one of many ethical processes, more concerned with inducing individuals to shape their behavior through particular modes of self-government than by prescribing moral codes.

The Enlightenment is very precisely defined: not akin to the age of reason, which postmodernism would oppose to, but as a particular way of thinking and acting in which we are still immersed, marked by the constant questioning of the present itself and by the incessant search for truths (plural) that manifest themselves in science or society. This attitude, according to Osborne (1998), aims to, among other aspects, build rational processes that can promote freedom. It turns out that “being free” also has a precise meaning, which Bennett (2011) and Osborne (1998) derive from Kant’s work: the independence both of external coercion as well as inner emotions and feelings. Human beings are not free when they act without moral values, but when they subject their actions to ethical values they chose to follow. The issue becomes more complex when one thinks of individuals in society.

In the article “Answer to the question: what is the Enlightenment?”, Kant (1784, p. 35, quoted in Bennett, 2011) dedicates himself to the subject based on two concepts: the private and the public uses of reason. The first refers to our activity as “employees”, “when we are components of a society or government whose principles and goals are those of the collective good” (Kant, 1784, p. 35, quoted in Bennett, 2011, n. p.). The latter is the activity produced out of our own understanding and faculties as we position ourselves as a universal subject. The challenge Enlightenment faces would be to make a public use of reason, to think for oneself, without someone else’s tutelage. But the philosopher’s proposal is not the complete substitution of private use for the public use of reason. What the German thinker suggests is a proportional division between the two uses, since it is the public use of reason – in which there are neither tutors nor authoritative relations – that regulates the spheres in which private use is exercised. That is, freedom

of thought leads to the conclusion that obeying certain codes of conduct is essential for the integration of individuals into the community and the construction of the commons.

Foucault (2013) dedicated the first classes of his course “The government of self and others” to this subject, stating that Kant’s article was one of the first modern texts dealing with present itself and the governance of conduct. Bennett (2011), in turn, resorted to another philosopher, Deleuze, to relate these ideas to the multiplication of artistic circles. For the authors, Kant’s aesthetics is associated with the disinterested and free pleasure of conceptual judgment, and thus opens the way to produce a universality space, in which the principles of public use of reason could be freely exercised. Under this bias, aesthetics would operate as a technology of self. Without political or religious restrictions, art would be the field of a potentially unlimited but at the same time unreachable freedom.

Even today these notions are recurrent. When Rancière (quoted in Bennett, 2011), for instance, proposes the aesthetic regime, he goes back to Kant’s work, which disconnects art from interested activities. The author refers to a “partage du sensible” (sharing of the sensitive), which allows works from different times and places to share the same space, acquire new meanings and be part of new compositions. According to Bennett (2011), even researchers such as Bourdieu are closer to these ideas than they seem to be. For the French sociologist, art is both historical – for it is the result of a particular set of social circumstances and cultural relations – and transhistorical – for it is the way the work is conditioned by social relations that allow it to break free of temporal limits and to transcend them to reach their value as a source of knowledge. Understanding the historical processes that led to the development of the artistic field allows artists to continue to fight for their autonomy, threatened mainly by commercial factors, and to make efforts to give more people access to pieces of art (Bourdieu, 1998).

If, for Bourdieu (quoted in Bennett, 2011), the redistribution of freedom by social classes is achieved by equal access to the cultural field, for Rancière (quoted in Bennett, 2011), the aesthetic regime of art allows for a redistribution of the sensible, ensures the right to speech, and weakens the distinction between voice and noise in the name of equality. What Bennett (2011) suggests with these approaches is that, despite the different perspectives, Bourdieu and Rancière, among many other authors, are products of a technology of government that seeks to produce and distribute freedom. These matters are not just theoretical. From the effort to distribute the works of the South Kensington Museum up to the concern with multiculturalism in British public schools, these matters concern particular ways of governing the conduct being discussed. Bennett does not mean that all cultural equipment was built for the same purpose or that no other aesthetics exist. His assumption is that, consciously or not, much of the work of managers, researchers, and other cultural professionals emerges from the desire to open this field of freedoms, which becomes possible when individuals turn to themselves and conduct their lives ethically.

Far from being mere utopia or a certain naive ideology, these goals are consistent with liberal thinking, which, on the other hand, does not mean that they are corrupted by

capitalism or that the concern of so many professionals is not authentic. Bennett (1998, 2011) considers the commitment of all who seek to expand the reach of the arts to be essential, and therefore strives to show that this particular way of understanding cultural policies is not a natural one, but rather built from particular statements and events. More than that, the author proposes that instead of discussing only ideological issues, specific government techniques that act directly on individual conduct should be analyzed. Examples include actions that can broaden the audience of a theater or strategies to ensure access to national films. After all, when one realizes the “multiplicity of everyday issues in the field of cultural administration” (Bennett, 1998, p. 82) and recognizes that culture is ordinary in this sense, it is easier to understand, as in any other area of activity, that its future depends on how practical matters are formulated and resolved. In other words, it is the understanding of everyday forces – and the techniques used in conduct governance – that makes the struggle for public policies and other actions of collective interest possible.

ENTREPRENEURS OF SELF

Bennett (1998, 2011) revolves around the concept of governmentality, emphasizing post-Kantian aesthetics, but there are other aspects of Foucault’s (2008) work that may contribute to the study of cultural policies and the dynamics of the artistic field: human capital and entrepreneurship. In general, Foucault (1998) noticed a difference between nineteenth-century liberalism and neoliberalism that became stronger in the second half of the twentieth century: in the latter, work ceased to be understood only as a productive force and came to be seen as the result of investing in factors such as education and culture that employees offer in exchange for a salary. What characterizes the neoliberal regime is thus not the free market, but the business logic, competition: when labor becomes a capital, human capital, each worker becomes a small business unit.

The entrepreneur profile is essential in this environment. In the 1940s, the economist Joseph Schumpeter (1947) already defined wealth as a function of the innovative breakthrough of economic routines. For him, the invention comes from society’s power of creation, and it is the entrepreneur who appropriates this force to insert it into the economic process as innovation. However, according to Foucault (2008), the boldness of capitalism and permanent competition are not enough to explain economic growth. If people discover new forms of productivity, or make technological inventions, it is due to the income originated from human capital or the “set of investments that have been made in man himself” (Foucault, 2008, pp. 317-318). With the expansion of communication, this form of work is no longer restricted to factories and offices. If we are always connected and networked, and if we cannot stop thinking, we are always working, even in times of rest and leisure. For Foucault, the power exerted to this particular life, which consists of constant investments similar to those of capital, is characterized as biopolitics, namely politics over life.

For the researcher Peter Pelbart (2013), it is no coincidence that the thematic of governmentality, liberalism and entrepreneurship appears in Foucault’s work at the same

time that the author investigates “self-care”. Power is thought of as “action upon action” or “conduct upon conduct” and, as such, includes the prerequisite of the subject’s freedom: “the government conceived as ‘structuring the eventual field of action of others’ presupposes a respective subject, that is, a correlate, or one who resists it” (Pelbart, 2013, p. 60). The figure of the entrepreneur, gifted with invention and self-confidence, is therefore perfectly consistent with neoliberal society. Identity issues and disputes over meaning also emerge in the most diverse social groups through the relations between power and freedom, as well as between government techniques and processes of subjectivation.

Traditionally, it is the figure of the artist (as constructed since the eighteenth century in Western culture) who turns to oneself and uses one’s own processes of subjectivation as one’s own. However, we no longer handle with the Kantian genius nor the construction of a universality environment, although such matters do not cease to exist. The aesthetic concern resists and finds new ways, but the arts also circulate elsewhere, giving voice to different social groups: from researchers investigating experimental languages to young people protesting through hip-hop; from the members of the municipal bands and the traveling circuses to the musicians who dedicate themselves to the formal perfection of the concert pieces; from the more commercial producers to artists who turn into dance, theater, performance, visual arts or literature gender, social and racial issues. The lives of these artists have certainly been invested in their work. Because of this, they claim their place in artistic and cultural circles, dedicating themselves daily to the execution of their projects, joining political parties or fighting for public policies. Their interests sometimes intersect, sometimes conflict in this terrain where aesthetics, economics, politics and, above all, affect are at stake.

Some Brazilian examples help to give substance to this theoretical question: in the 2000s, civil movements intensified, directly affecting the course of cultural policies. In São Paulo, the articulation of artists and culture professionals contributed to the creation and implementation of various actions, such as the Municipal Program for the Promotion of Theater (Law No. 13,278/2002), the Municipal Program for the Promotion of Dance (Law No. 14,071/2005) and the Program for the Appreciation of Cultural Initiatives - VAI (Law No. 13,540/2003). More recently, social and racial issues have come to focus more strongly on the claims of an important portion of the artistic class. The Periphery Culture Promotion Program (Law 16,496/2016) illustrates some of the results obtained. However, the matter is not restricted to public promotion, but extends to the whole of society. An example is the increase in the museum public in 2019. According to the website G1, visits increased 61% in the first half of the year: among the main reasons are exhibitions that highlight minorities or previously underrepresented groups (Matos, 2019). These aspects demonstrate the daily life of various social groups, their affects and perceptions, their anxieties and desires, life itself invested in art. On the other hand, its dynamics can lead to a competitive environment, a dispute for support or funds, which can end up hampering the development of arts and culture policies.

More than techniques aimed at producing and distributing freedom through aesthetic contemplation, it is the artists’ own freedom, the ways in which they conduct their

lives and create their works, that draw attention to cultural administration – not only that of the politics of State, but mainly those spread by private initiatives, non-governmental organizations and other institutions. As a result, another more practical aspect of entrepreneurship also appears. Artists must learn to write projects, make financial projections, get in touch with the press or marketing departments, i.e. they are required to manage their work according to a clearly entrepreneurial dynamic. The growth of cultural industries, the appeals to the creative economy, the financial logic that is often visible in public tenders and awards, the tax incentive laws, all of them reinforce this way of thinking and acting. Thus, adopting the research method suggested by Bennett allows us to see that, today, more than the production of freedom, what is governed is the artist's life as self-entrepreneur.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

In a society in which a certain corporate and entrepreneurial logic predominates, and in which life itself is transformed into an object of government, there is naturally competition. If speaking of a universal aesthetic space is not possible, but several interest groups multiply, public policies or private initiatives tend to fragment. It is important and legitimate that the artistic and social currents be strengthened and create mechanisms of continuity if, in most cases, culture is not understood as a priority, neither by the state nor by the population in general. However, it is worth recalling Bourdieu's (1998) still current call for artists to fight for their autonomy, particularly in relation to commercial interests. Bennett's proposal (1998, 2011) of understanding the government techniques of conduct affecting artistic circles is also essential.

Since Bourdieu (1998) emphasizes autonomy, he does not propose that the field of the arts be enclosed within itself, ignore social and cultural issues, or be used as a way of distinguishing between classes. His research denounces some of these trends, and so the author expects the opposite: he expects that more and more people can participate in artistic circles and that they have enough freedom not to be determined by political and economic forces, despite the exchanges and relations between fields being necessary and inevitable. However, Bourdieu (1998) also draws attention to the historical character of art and shows only when one strives for common goals, such as increasing the budget for culture and building comprehensive public policies, does one have the strength to propose effective actions. This is not about fighting for a universal art that probably never existed. But understanding that, when individuals and groups are able to integrate their power and their affects, there is also room for the multiplicity of knowledge, artistic expressions, and ways of life.

On the other hand, it is necessary to look closely at the present, as Foucault states, to understand the forces that constitute it. If knowledge and communication are essential for today's economy, and if even consumer goods are sold as ideologies and images, then the existence of interest in culture and creative activities is clear. The spaces where this interest is focused also need to be verified; in the cultural industries and marketing

departments, no doubt, but not only there. As the attention given to the creative economy demonstrates, power today lies in the ability of each artist to undertake and generate wealth – and within this context, autonomy can gain another meaning, leading to isolated actions and networks that close themselves. If the power of invention exists and is more than ever present in society, how can it be transformed into a common good? Bennett's message is clear: getting involved in practical issues, knowing the cultural proposals of municipalities, states and country, mapping the actions and people involved, addressing laws and edicts, but, above all, seeking solutions that extend to as much of the population as possible. This way, the arts and culture can actually enter people's daily lives, which in turn will give strength to interest groups to coexist and assert their own power.

Translation: Thiago Masato Costa Sueto

REFERENCES

- Bennett, T. (1988). The exhibitionary complex. *New formations*, 4, 73-101.
- Bennett, T. (1998). *Culture. A reformer's science*. Londres: Sage.
- Bennett, T. (2008). Aesthetics, government, freedom. *Key Words: A Journal of cultural materialism*, 6, 76-91. Retrieved from <https://raymondwilliamssociety.files.wordpress.com/2017/10/key-words-6.pdf>
- Bennett, T. (2011). Guided freedom: aesthetics, tutelage, and the interpretation of art. *Tate papers*, 15. Retrieved from <https://www.tate.org.uk/research/publications/tate-papers/15/guided-freedom-aesthetics-tutelage-and-the-interpretation-of-art>
- Bocchini, B. (2017, May 4). Ministério estima que cultura é responsável por 4% do PIB. *EBC. Agência Brasil*. Retrieved from <http://agenciabrasil.ebc.com.br/cultura/noticia/2017-04/ministerio-estima-que-cultura-e-responsavel-por-4-do-pib>
- Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Les règles de l'art. Genèse et structure du champ littéraire*. Lonrai: Éditions du Seuil.
- Costa, R. (2014). A biopolítica nos estudos sobre pessoas com deficiência. *Diálogo (bio)político: sobre alguns desafios da construção da Rede de Cuidados à Saúde da Pessoa com Deficiência do SUS*. Brasília: Ministério da Saúde.
- Dubuffet, J. (2012). Asfixiante Cultura. In G. Gentil, P. Poirrier & T. Coelho (Eds.), *Cultura e Estado: a política cultural na França, 1955-2005* (pp. 69-71). São Paulo: Iluminuras.
- Foucault, M. (2008). *Nascimento da biopolítica: curso dado no Collège de France (1978-1979)*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes.
- Foucault, M. (2013). *O governo de si e dos outros*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes.
- Foucault, M. (2016). *Microfísica do poder*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra.
- Furtado, C. (2012). Discurso de posse. In Furtado, C. (Ed.), *Ensaio sobre cultura e o Ministério da Cultura*. Rio de Janeiro: Contraponto.
- Hall, S. (1980). Cultural studies: two paradigms. *Media Culture Society*, 2(1), 57-72. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016344378000200106>

- Hesmondhalgh, D. (2013). *The Cultural Industries*. Londres: Sage.
- Lei nº 8.313/1991, December 23, República Federativa do Brasil.
- Lei 13.278/2002, January 8, Prefeitura do Município de São Paulo, República Federativa do Brasil.
- Lei 13.540/2003, March 24, Prefeitura do Município de São Paulo, República Federativa do Brasil.
- Lei 14.071/2005, October 18, Prefeitura do Município de São Paulo, República Federativa do Brasil.
- Lei nº 16.496/2016, July 20, Prefeitura do Município de São Paulo, República Federativa do Brasil.
- Matos, T. (2019, August 12). Museus em alta: 1º semestre de 2019 tem recordes de público pelo Brasil. G1. Retrieved from <https://g1.globo.com/pop-arte/noticia/2019/08/12/museus-em-alta-10-semester-de-2019-tem-recordes-de-publico-pelo-brasil.ghtml>
- Osborne, T. (1998). *Aspects of Enlightenment. Social theory and the ethics of truth*. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield. Retrieved from <https://www.kobo.com/us/en/ebook/aspects-of-enlightenment-2>
- Osborne, T. (2003). Against 'creativity': a philistine rant. *Economy and society*, 32(4), 507-525. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0308514032000141684>
- Pelbart, P. (2013). Foucault versus Agamben? *Revista Eopolítica*, 5, 50-64.
- Poirrier, P. (2012). Introdução. In G. Gentil, P. Poirrier & T. Coelho (Eds.), *Cultura e Estado: a política cultural na França, 1955-2005* (pp. 17-39). São Paulo: Iluminuras.
- Schumpeter, J. (1947). The creative response in economic history. *The Journal of Economic History*, 7(2), 149-159.
- Shiner, L. (2001). *The invention of art: a cultural history*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Unesco (1970, 24 de agosto a 2 de setembro). *Conferencia Intergubernamental sobre los Aspectos Institucionales, Administrativos y Financieros de las Políticas Culturales*. Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org>
- Unesco (2005). *Convenção sobre a Proteção e Promoção da Diversidade das Expressões Culturais*. Retrieved from <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000149742>
- Williams, R. (1967). *Culture and Society*. Londres: Chatto & Windus. Retrieved from <https://www.kobo.com/br/pt/ebook/culture-and-society>

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Sharine Machado C. Melo is graduated in Social Communication and qualified in Publicity and Advertisement at Escola Superior de Propaganda e Marketing (2005). With a Master (2010) and a doctoral degree (2015) in Communication and Semiotics from Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo, was visitor student at University of Leeds (UK). Was supervised by Rogério da Costa, Kate Oakley and David Hesmondhalgh. She wrote the thesis *Artistas e empreendedores: um estudo sobre o trabalho criativo na economia do imaterial* [*Artists and entrepreneurs: a study on creative labour at immaterial economy*]. Currently, she works as cultural manager at Brazilian National Foundation for the Arts

(Funarte). In 2017, she developed, in partnership with Ester Moreira, the site Vozes da Funarte SP (<http://sites.funarte.gov.br/vozessp>), which presents historical research and interviews on Brazilian cultural policies.

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3160-1151>

Email: sharinemelo@gmail.com

Address: Funarte, Complexo Cultural Funarte SP - Alameda Nothmann, 1058, Campos Elíseos, São Paulo – SP, Brazil

Submitted: 15.05.2019

Accepted: 23.09.2019