Bulletin of Latin American Research
JOURNAL of the SOCIETY for LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES

Bulletin of Latin American Research, 2017 DOI:10.1111/blar.12637

Cultura Viva, a Challenge to the Creative Economy Policy Discourse in Brazil

MAXIMILIANO VILA SEOANE
Center for Development Research, ZEFA, Germany

During the last decade, Brazil has experimented with two different cultural policy discourses. The creative economy policy was inspired by international experiences and places emphasis on the commercialisation of culture, while, by contrast, the 'Cultura Viva' initiative is an autochthonous policy discourse that stimulates access to the cultural consumption and production of lower-income sectors of the population. Both cultural policy discourses speak of the contributions of culture to 'development'. However, this shibboleth delineates different projects. This article shows the different connections these two policy discourses make with 'development' and describes a number of disparities between them.

Keywords: Brazil, creative economy, creative industries, Cultura Viva, cultural policies, development.

How can cultural policies contribute to development? During the last few decades, the concept of the creative industries has emerged as a possible solution to such a question, though this notion is not without its critics. On the one hand, authors remark on its potential contribution to economic growth and its connection with the knowledge economy (Hartley, 2005; Flew and Cunningham, 2010). On the other hand, they stress it is a vague concept that represents particular interests oriented specifically towards extending intellectual property rights (IPR) that undermine the objective of access to culture (Garnham, 2005; Schlesinger, 2007). Despite these discussions, the policy discourse addressing the creative industries has spread around the world to countries such as Australia, Brazil, China, Colombia, Singapore and Tanzania, among others (Wang, 2004; Prince, 2010; Hornidge, 2011). Based on the UK government's experience, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) has disseminated worldwide the concept of the 'creative economy', with the creative industries at its heart, as a feasible development option. However, much less has been said about other recent cultural policy discourses that connect culture and development in a different way, thereby challenging the creative economy and the creative industries policy discourse.

To address this gap, this paper compares the main features of two policy discourses in Brazil, the concept of the creative economy and that of *Cultura Viva* (Living Culture), both of which use culture for development in contrasting ways. The article adopts a post-development perspective, which understands that 'development' is a contested concept, a buzzword or an empty signifier at the hands of diverse and very often

contradictory political projects (Escobar, 1995; Cornwall, 2007). Thus, this article analyses the specific uses of culture for development that the two policy discourses suggest in the context of Brazil. On the one hand, I compare the commercially oriented policies aimed at promoting the creative economy that the Brazilian government adopted at the national level in 2011. On the other hand, during the first years of Lula da Silva's presidency, the government initiated a different approach to cultural policy through the creation of the aforementioned Cultura Viva programme. Its objective was to stimulate access to the cultural consumption and production of lower-income sectors of the population, in tune with the broader concerns of Lula's government to reduce poverty through 'economic stability with social inclusion policies' (Lula da Silva, 2006). The programme aimed to revalue cultural expressions previously ignored by commercial cultural markets, such as those of indigenous, rural and maroon communities, among others. (In Brazil, 'maroon' refers to escaped African slaves and their descendants who built their own independent settlements.) To accomplish these objectives, the government stimulated the use of ICT and different intellectual property schemes beyond copyright, to widen access to tools by lower-income groups. These and other features contrast with the creative economy policy discourse and offer an alternative way to design and implement cultural policies attuned to tackling the inequality challenges faced by Latin American countries.

The structure of the article is as follows. The next section delineates the approach taken to studying the main features of the policy discourses. The following three sections examine the main features of the creative economy according to UNCTAD, its translation to the Brazilian stage and the Cultura Viva policy discourses, respectively. The sixth section compares and discusses the different features of the discourses, followed by conclusions in the final section.

Method and Data

To compare the two policy discourses I used the 'sociology of knowledge approach to discourse' (SKAD) (Keller, 2013), which synthesises ideas from Foucault and the sociology of knowledge tradition (Berger and Luckmann, 1966). SKAD offers guidelines for an interpretative discourse analysis, based on statements, practices, apparatuses and meaning structures, among others, which shape symbolic orders in institutionalised fields of society (Keller, 2013). In particular, my interest in this research is on 'what objects, relationships, properties, subject positions and so on are claimed by discourses to be "real"' (Keller, 2013: 78). In this way the researcher can unveil the concepts and material structures defined by a discourse to stimulate practices, leading to particular power effects. To apply this approach, I gathered a corpus database composed of official documents published by different international and national organisations in Brazil, press articles and personal interviews with current and ex-policymakers and practitioners who were involved in the expansion and implementation of the different policy discourses. In particular, the contrast between what the documents state and the importance given to certain topics by the coordinators of the respective reports and programmes was a way to detect the focus of the policy discourses. This is important, specifically in the reports of international organisations, which use ambiguous language open to interpretation but which are not exempt from particular orientations. Following SKAD's suggestions, the method of analysis consisted in coding the material in the database by borrowing techniques from grounded theory, and then extracting the main contrasting features of what

I interpreted as different policy discourses. Among them, in this paper, I concentrate on the contents of the discourses, their objectives and key differences in the way they define objects of interest, for instance their understanding of development and culture and the role of IPR.

The Creative Economy and the Creative Industries

In a post-industrial context in the UK, the New Labour government introduced in 1998 the creative industries as a concept in cultural policy (Flew and Cunningham, 2010). It was defined as 'those industries which have their origin in individual creativity, skill and talent and which have a potential for wealth and job creation through the generation and exploitation of intellectual property' (DCMS, 1998). This concept can be understood as a connection between culture and the 'knowledge economy', with the creative industries portraying convergence between 'individual talent', cultural industries, ICT and new consumer-producer relations (Hartley, 2005; Flew and Cunningham, 2010). Based on this UK experience, UNCTAD redefined the creative industries as:

> The cycles of creation, production and distribution of goods and services that use creativity and intellectual capital as primary inputs; constitute a set of knowledge-based activities, focused on but not limited to arts, potentially generating revenues from trade and intellectual property rights. (UNCTAD and UNDP, 2008: 13)

These creative industries are considered the heart of the creative economy, defined as:

> […] an evolving concept based on creative assets potentially generating economic growth and development; it can foster income-generation, job creation and export earnings while promoting social inclusion, cultural diversity and human development; […] at the heart of the creative economy are the creative industries. (UNCTAD and UNDP, 2008: 15)

These definitions show that UNCTAD's creative economy policy discourse retains many of the dimensions that characterise the creative industries, for instance, the connection with the knowledge economy, as the following words of the programme coordinator illustrate: 'We are in the era of the creative economy, in which, through knowledge, education and technology, ideas are transformed into products or services' (dos Santos-Duisenberg, 2011, author's translation). Moreover, UNCTAD's policy approach stresses 'the importance of the creative economy for generating revenues, employment and trade' (UNCTAD and UNDP, 2008: 209), linked with other objectives, such as social inclusion, cultural diversity and human development. Despite these connections related to broader concerns, the language used is associated mostly with the terminology of economics: for example, the recipients of this policy discourse are industries and so-called 'creative entrepreneurs', the former consisting of an arbitrary list of economic activities, disregarding the argument that all industries are to a certain point cultural (Mato, 2009), whereas the latter are small- and medium-sized (SME) firms that produce products or services in these creative industries.

UNCTAD suggests a battery of potential interventions to implement the creative economy as a 'feasible development option', and out of fourteen recommended policy options, nine include words that make reference to the commercialisation of culture:

business, branding, copyright, market strategies, value chain, creative clusters and joint ventures: for example, the need to offer 'financial and fiscal support, business skills training, tools for start-up businesses and market strategies' (UNCTAD and UNDP, 2010: 262) in order to help SMEs and creative entrepreneurs. These practices and actors play a relevant role in UNCTAD's discourse, because 'in an increasingly flexible structure peculiar to the creative economy, independent artists and creators are becoming much more autonomous and are compelled to deal with business aspects in order to be able to survive from the commercial activities resulting from their creations' (UNCTAD and UNDP, 2010: 263). In contrast to the UK government's original definition, UNCTAD uses more ambiguous vocabulary when referring to IPR that even varies between reports. For instance, the 2008 version emphasised the state enforcement of IPR regimes (UNCTAD and UNDP, 2008: 206), whereas the 2010 version acknowledged the need to review and adapt contemporary regimes in the face of challenges introduced by ICTs (UNCTAD and UNDP, 2010: 254). Apart from the economic policy options, UNCTAD recommends elaborating statistics about the creative economy, a device which supports its argument that the creative industries contribute considerably to economic growth, employment and exports, highlighting their economic contribution and the need for further policies to support them. Furthermore, two other notions suggest the stimulation of interconnections among state departments and other interfaces within the creative industries and with other economic sectors. Finally, only one policy objective seeks to 'promote cultural diversity and social inclusion policies, particularly tailored for the youth and women' (UNCTAD and UNDP, 2010: 262), which suggests these are not the main priority of the discourse.

Despite its claim to be a feasible development option, research casts doubt on the claims of the creative industries, and thus of the creative economy project. First, the creative industries concept emerged from a particular context in the UK that connected culture with the knowledge economy, with a shift towards commercially oriented cultural policies (Garnham, 2005). This is problematic, though, because it undermines the argument for the public support of culture to guarantee access (Galloway and Dunlop, 2007), which can in turn increase inequality (Booyens, 2012). Second, the stress on intellectual property rights is dubious given that there is no conclusive evidence to show their positive effects on creativity (Towse, 2010), and the literature offers cases where copyright did not play an important role. An example is the case of Nollywood, the Nigerian film industry that grew thanks to weak copyright protection (Lobato, 2010). Besides, the emphasis on copyrights ignores other mechanisms for cultural distribution, such as creative commons. Third, besides the arbitrary definition of what constitutes cultural industry, the definition of 'creative workers' is also problematic, because in theory they are self-sufficient, oriented towards projects, innovative, flexible and mobile (Vötsch and Weiskopf, 2009: 300). However, in practice, these images of an almost ideal free and nomadic artist hide precarious working conditions, long working hours and a lack of union representation that may lead to strained emotional states (Gill and Pratt, 2008; Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2008). Therefore, these empirical results challenge the assumed quality of the jobs that the creative industries can offer.

To summarise, this policy discourse shapes a specific way of dealing with cultural policies. First, the aim is to foster economic growth above anything else. Second, it is directed at industrial and commercial cultural production. Third, it defines a specific type of worker and a specific subject position, the 'creative entrepreneur', and fourth, it demands the measurement of the economic and trade effects of these industries,

thus reinforcing the connection with culture and economic growth to the detriment of other objectives. Fifth, the role of the state is to provide the required infrastructure for these entrepreneurs to flourish, such as funding, training to diffuse entrepreneurial practices, new legal frameworks, etc. These points reveal the association between culture and development within this discourse, where culture is just another factor that contributes mostly to economic growth. Turning around the association, mainly cultural expressions that contribute to economic growth seem to be the ones that matter, thereby undermining the rest. Therefore, UNCTAD maintains a commercial approach to culture, which is understandable given the objective of this international organisation, but it sidelines instruments that could contribute more directly to social and environmental objectives through cultural policies. This is precisely the most problematic aspect of the idea of this policy discourse in the context of countries, such as Brazil, with huge social inequalities.

The Creative Economy in Brazil

UNCTAD and the British Council have been active in expanding the creative industries and creative economy policy discourses to Brazil, by organising conferences and workshops discussing the virtues of the creative economy. For instance, in 2004, UNCTAD organised the first international conference on creative industries in Brazil (UNCTAD, 2004). This event established UNCTAD's mandate to work on the topic; however, the concept was not immediately adopted as a national policy in Brazil. Another example is the Transform programme of the British Council which, as part of its range of activities, arranged workshops to promote business skills for creative entrepreneurs (British Council, 2013). Industrial associations adopted these concepts, such as the reports of the Industry Federation of the State of Rio de Janeiro (SISTEMA FIRJAN, 2012) and the website of the Federation of Industries of the State of São Paulo (FIESP, 2012). In both cases, these federations, in tandem with national and international private consultants, advocate the creative industries as a fast-growing economic sector, mostly in cities which could contribute considerably to national GDP, employment and exports.

As recently as 2011, under Roussef's presidency, the national Ministry of Culture created the Secretary for the Creative Economy position – a major move in introducing and legitimising the policy discourse advocated by international organisations. After its founding, the Secretary elaborated on a national creative economy plan with guidelines for implementing the strategy at all policy levels (Ministério da Cultura, 2011). This pushed the policy discourse into the mainstream, both in terms of events organised across the country to discuss the creative economy and the appearance of the term in the mass media.

The translation of the policy discourse to Brazil resembled elements of UNCTAD's proposal, such as considering culture as an axis of development (Ministério da Cultura, 2011: 5). Furthermore, the plan expressed challenges in Brazil, in relation to the application of the creative economy strategy, similar to those identified by UNCTAD (Ministério da Cultura, 2011: 36). First, the plan detects a lack of data about the creative economy, while second, it highlights the lack of funding for creative entrepreneurs. Third, the plan mentions the lack of training and skills required to become a creative entrepreneur, and fourth, it recognises the lack of infrastructure for the creation, distribution and consumption of creative goods and services. Finally, it acknowledges

the lack of legal frameworks for the creative economy. Besides synchronicity in terms of challenges, it is important to highlight that the report uses terminology detecting a 'lack of', which immediately suggests the need for a particular top-down intervention by the state. In spite of these similarities, there are also slight discursive modifications in the Brazilian plan, one of the most evident of which is the stronger focus on the nation's four guiding principles: cultural diversity, sustainability, innovation and social inclusion (Ministério da Cultura, 2011: 33). These broad concepts show an attempt to shift the focus from purely commercial objectives towards others more in tune with addressing inequality issues, thus reversing the order of priorities in UNCTAD's version.

Although the guiding principles to which the national plan alludes are hard to question, in practice the Ministry of Culture, by the end of 2013, had only implemented two policy initiatives: the stimulation of creative entrepreneurs and the mapping of the creative economy (SEC/MinC, 2013b). As regards the former, Brazil launched public tenders to support incubators for creative entrepreneurs and free training programmes in the creative sectors (SEC/MinC, 2013a). The national government opened a public tender to invest R$5 million (approximately US$2.2 million dollars) to fund twenty incubator projects in public or private non-profit organisations, with the aim of helping new projects to emerge. Furthermore, the creative economy programme funded training courses for creative entrepreneurs in diverse creative sectors, which were directed at already established organisations that had experience in at least one of them. One prerequisite was that the selected institutions should offer free spaces for participants, selected on the basis of public tender, with the intention of disseminating knowledge about the sectors. However, only eleven training projects were funded. Besides this, in collaboration with the British Council and NESTA, several training workshops were organised across large cities in Brazil, such as Brasília, Porto Alegre, Salvador, São Paulo, Recife and Rio de Janeiro, to diffuse the skills necessary to becoming a creative entrepreneur (British Council, 2013). One of their aims was to learn how to prepare a business plan by following the 'Creative Enterprise Toolkit' developed by NESTA, a UK charity dedicated to stimulating innovation (Mini, 2014). As regards measuring the creative economy, the Ministry of Culture funded eight creative economy observatories in distinct large cities, such as Rio de Janeiro, Brasília and Manaus, among others. Their aim was to collect data and provide information about the creative sectors in different Brazilian states. From a discourse analysis perspective, this was a way to institutionalise the policy discourse, as if the creative economy was something 'real'.

Despite the grandiose claims of the creative economy as a feasible development option, in Brazil the national policy has been reduced to stimulating creative entrepreneurs, a small amount of training and observatories to reinforce the policy discourse. Thus, in practice, the objectives have been far more restricted than those appearing in official policy statements. The major success has been institutionalising the idea of the creative economy as a new objective for public policies, but this hides the failure to address most of the issues declared as objectives, which suggests the notion of development is still just restricted to 'economic growth'. The Ministry of Culture of Brazil at the time even stated that the creative economy was a 'beautiful theoretical project that never got off the ground' (de Hollanda, 2013). Although this may be true, this utterance hides the conflicts that the translation of the policy discourse had with previous cultural policies initiated during Lula's government, specifically the Cultura Viva programme, which offered a different approach to cultural policy and 'development'.

Cultura Viva

During the 1990s, a key instrument of cultural policies in Brazil was the Rouanet Law, which allowed firms to donate to cultural projects in order to enjoy tax exemptions. This law concentrated resources heavily in large cities such as Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo, where firms could gain higher returns from cultural investments, besides selecting what sort of projects to fund (Rubim, 2007). In 2004, the Ministry of Culture of Brazil, under Lula, initiated the Cultura Viva (Living Culture) programme in order to reorient the work of the institution towards those who had been excluded in previous cultural policies (Gil and Ferreira, 2013: 106). This change tried to depart from commercially oriented cultural policies of the 1990s, during which the slogan of the Ministry of Culture was *cultura é um bom negocio* (culture is good business). Conversely, the new Minister of Culture during his inauguration speech said that:

> […] the market is not everything, it will never be. We know very well that in matters of culture, as well as of health and education, we must examine and correct distortions inherent in the logic of the market which is always governed, ultimately, by the law of the strongest. (Gil and Ferreira, 2013: 231, author's trans.)

As a first step towards implementing this vision, the Ministry of Culture recognised the importance of culture's contribution to sustainable development (Ministério da Cultura, 2005: 10) and opened up the concept across three dimensions: as the production of a variety of symbols, as a right and citizenship, and as economics (Ministério da Cultura, 2005: 8). The symbolic dimension refers to the symbols of each community in Brazil contributing to identity construction and to cultural diversity, beyond just the concerns of an elite artistic class. The second dimension relates to how culture is a right for all Brazilians that contributes to their realisation of citizenship and surpasses social exclusion, whereas the economic dimension involves how culture can contribute to generating employment and wealth (Gil and Ferreira, 2013: 239). What is important to highlight here is not only the appearance of concepts related to social concerns, but also the order of priority of each dimension. Cultura Viva acknowledges the importance of the economic dimension of culture, but it is the last of the three priorities. This orientation is evident in the original objective of the programme, which was to 'promote access to means of cultural fruition, production and diffusion, as well as to enhance social and cultural energies, aiming at the construction of new values of co-operation and solidarity' (Ministério da Cultura, 2005: 47, author's translation). The keyword here is access, which refers to the inclusion of different actors besides firms. Specifically, the Cultura Viva programme was intended for: low-income populations; elementary school students; indigenous, rural and maroon communities; cultural agents, artists, among others combatting social and cultural exclusion (Ministério da Cultura, 2005). Furthermore, tenders have been aimed at areas of the population with low incomes, living not only in large urban centres, but also in small towns and rural areas (Ministério da Cultura, 2005: 54). In addition, they have considered other minorities usually ignored by public policies, such as the LGBT group (Ministério da Cultura, 2005: 54). Not included directly in this list are private firms. Thus, the programme aims at strengthening connections between the state and non-profit organisations.

The implementation of Cultura Viva had different elements, among which were the *pontos de cultura* (points of culture) and *cultura digital* (digital culture). The first initiative consisted in the state supporting projects run by pre-existing non-profit organisations. In contrast to the creative economy discourses, this support was not restricted to predefined sectors or industries selected by policy-makers; instead, it was open to a variety of cultural projects performed by the addressees of the policy (Ministério da Cultura, 2005: 20), for example, cineclubs, theatre groups, puppeteering, hip-hop, sculpture, design and percussion, amongst others. During the 2004–2005 tenders, the state funded each project with up to 185,000 Reais (around US$65,000), distributed across six semesters. Moreover, they were officially recognised as a point of culture, thus legitimising their cultural activities. Additionally, the state has funded the creation of networks of 'points of culture', for instance by supporting projects running at least ten other projects (Ministério da Cultura, 2005: 63) or by supporting events gathering together 'points of culture' focused on specific themes, such as those related to indigenous communities or the free media. In sum, this initiative aimed at stimulating a diverse range of cultural projects, and the creation of networks among them, with themes proposed by these non-for profit organisations. For this reason, the coordinator of the programme claimed it was a bottom-up and participatory construction process (Turino, 2010: 127), because the state was not stipulating what sort of projects could be classified as culture but was instead concentrating on already existing projects of civil society organisations that recognised themselves as such.

Cultura Viva ideally identifies the 'points of culture' with three concepts: autonomy, participation and empowerment, each of which has specific connotations. First, autonomy departs from the idea of workers in the creative industries being independent from the state, just surviving in markets and in many cases under precarious conditions. Instead, Cultura Viva speaks of the autonomy of the 'points of culture' to put forward cultural projects that respect the local dynamics in which they operate, albeit in collaboration with other 'points of culture' and the state (Ministério da Cultura, 2005: 33; Turino, 2010: 68). The second concept, participation, refers to the programme's objective of considering all types of cultural expressions produced by different actors in Brazil, and not just those elaborated by an elite. In this way, it questions class division in cultural production (Ministério da Cultura, 2005: 34). As regards the third concept, empowerment, this refers to the state finally supporting organisations and actors on which previous cultural policies focused and private firms mostly ignored, for instance, maroon projects that not only preserve Afro-descendant cultural practices, but which also increase their legitimacy in the midst of struggles to keep hold of their land (Ministério da Cultura, 2005: 35).

The second main instrument of the Cultura Viva programme was *cultura digital*, closely connected with the points of culture, because it aimed to stimulate the use of digital technologies in supported non-profit projects. Although it started out as an experimental initiative, it soon became central to the ministry's new cultural policy, due to its potential to give resource-scarce actors the tools to register and disseminate their cultural output (Ministério da Cultura, 2005: 24). In practice, the action consisted in delivering a multimedia kit to every point of culture. This included a video camera, a soundboard and three PCs for video editing and running free software (Turino, 2010: 91). The latter was chosen not only for financial reasons, but also to take a position with respect to the changes that digital technologies have introduced in knowledge sharing, challenging restricted copyrights. The Cultura Viva programme 'develops the exercise of collaborative and more generous intellectual practices' (Ministério da Cultura, 2005: 26), and

as a consequence of this decision, a community of free software developers spurred on by the needs of the points of culture. This action went together with the mainstreaming of digital technologies, free software and other types of licences, such as creative commons, which were pioneered by the Brazilian Culture Minister, Gilberto Gil, and recognised internationally (LaMonica, 2007).

Between 2004 and 2011, under the Cultura Viva programme, the government funded more than 2000 projects that took into account a variety of schemes and recipients (Pierro, 2011). An example was a project involving indigenous communities filming videos about their villages (Vídeo Nas Aldeias, 2009). Another addressee were certain communities that received financial support to foster their Afro-cultural practices and the opportunity to explain and disseminate their projects online (Quilombo da Fazenda, 2013). Furthermore, the programme funded projects at the intersection of digital culture and traditional culture, for instance the support of puppeteers and the dissemination of such popular cultural practices through the internet. An assessment of the programme in 2010 showed that the Cultura Viva programme had helped to expand the activities of the 'points of culture' examined in the report, and had brought to fruition local public policies aiming at democratising cultural access and production (Barbosa da Silva and Araujo, 2010). By contrast, the programme faced administrative challenges in applying its participatory approach between civil society organisations and the state, due to the lack of adequate instruments that would allow the state to facilitate interaction with community organisations (Barbosa da Silva and Araujo, 2010). One such example was Law 8666, which regulates tenders and contracts between the state and other organisations, mostly firms and large NGOs. However, it imposes administrative requirements that are very difficult to fulfil by resource-scarce organisations. As a consequence of these challenges, once Dilma Roussef became president the programme suffered a restructuration and its funds were reduced. According to the ex-coordinator of the programme, this was caused by a new orientation in the national government that privileged the bureaucracy and limited the funding of experimental programmes that did not match traditional top-down policies (Turino, 2013). Although this might be true, the Cultura Viva programme had also been facing criticism for not producing the conditions for its sustainability, or, in other words, for not stimulating the commercial side of culture (Cultura Viva, 2013). As a way of tackling the perceived shortcomings of Cultura Viva, the new regime in the Ministry of Culture introduced the creative economy policy discourse, which by contrast stressed the economic dimension of culture above others. This set the stage for antagonism between the two policy discourses, which I shall synthesise in the next section.

Discussion

Based on the analysis of the corpus database, in Table 1 I summarise the most important disparities among the three policy discourses discussed above. This covers UNCTAD's creative economy discourse, the slight adaptation that took place in Brazil, and the differences between these and the Cultura Viva programme. These reveal how policy documents and interviewees conceptualise cultural policies in different ways, stimulating some practices over others and having particular power effects. The first difference is the use of culture that each discourse adopts (Yúdice, 2003). The two variations of the creative economy discourse shown in the table consider culture mostly as a resource for economic growth, whereas Cultura Viva prioritises the production of a variety of

Table 1. Main Differences between Cultural Policy Discourses

	Creative economy UNCTAD	Creative economy in Brazil	Cultura Viva in Brazil
Addressees	- Small- and medium sized entrepreneurs - Creative industries - Individual artists	- Small- and medium-sized entrepreneurs - Creative sectors	- Low-income populations - Communities - Cultural agents
Use of culture	As an economic resource to elaborate products and services	As an economic resource to elaborate products and services	Culture understood in three dimensions: symbolic, citizenship and economic
Objectives	Generate revenues, employment and trade from specific 'creative industries'	To increase cultural participation in sustainable socio-economic development through 'cultural sectors'	Promote access to means of cultural fruition, production and dissemination
Subject position	Creative entrepreneur	- Creative worker - Creative entrepreneur	- Point of culture - Networks
Intellectual property	Sides with copyrights but also acknowledges the need to update intellectual property rights regimes	Acknowledges need to discuss intellectual property rights regimes	Commons but not excluding economic value of culture
Public policies	Focus on 'lack of' and top-down policies	Focus on 'lack of' and top-down policies	Focus on potentialities and bottom-up policies

Source: Elaborated by the author.

symbols and contributes to citizenship, leaving the economic dimension until last. This difference is evident in their objectives, as both creative economy discourses emphasise the economic benefits to be derived from culture. Thus, UNCTAD highlights its contribution to revenues, employment and trade, whereas in Brazil they speak of 'sustainable socio-economic development'. By contrast, the Cultura Viva aims at cultural fruition, production and distribution from a variety of projects. These divergences result in differences in the constituencies each discourse addresses. Creative economy discourses focus on formal economic actors, such as medium and small enterprises and large firms from diverse 'creative industries', but they ignore resource-scarce groups. Conversely, the Cultura Viva programme specifically aims its initiatives at these groups, which is evident in the subjective positions offered by the discourses: for instance, the creative economy aims at creating 'creative entrepreneurs' working in 'creative clusters', thereby emulating concepts used in the knowledge economy. By contrast, Cultura Viva speaks of 'points of culture' and networks among them, distributed across the country and in previously ignored rural and peripheral urban areas.

As regards IPR, within the context of WTO discussions, UNCTAD's report remarks that 'one of the critical issues for the cultural and creative industries is copyrights and

neighboring rights, in particular the need to reinforce domestic copyright legislation and institutions' (UNCTAD and UNDP, 2010: 241). Nevertheless, the report also takes an opposite position, stating that 'the time has come for governments to review the limitations of current IPR regimes and adapt them to new realities by ensuring a competitive environment in the context of multilateral discourse' (UNCTAD and UNDP, 2010: 254). In a similar vein, the creative economy in Brazil acknowledges the need to discuss and adapt IPR regimes to the specificities of Brazilian creative workers (Ministério da Cultura, 2011: 37), albeit without making reference to multilateral negotiation commitments. However, after this policy discourse expanded to the national level, the previous support of creative commons ceased (O Globo, 2011). By contrast, the Cultura Viva policy discourse speaks of creative commons, copyleft and other ways of sharing cultural productions that oppose the original strong statement exploiting the intellectual property of the creative industries.

A final dimension differentiating the two discourses is their approach to state policies, in that creative economy discourses follow the practice of establishing an ideal, detecting deficiencies to reach it and implementing measures to close the gap in a top-down approach. For example, the logic of UNCTAD's report establishes the importance of the creative economy as a 'feasible development option' with a set of suggested policy instruments for 'developing countries' to follow. Likewise, the Secretary of the Creative Economy uses the same rhetoric at the national level in Brazil, by declaring the creative economy as an axis of the development of the country, replete with a set of instruments to apply in order to attain the ideal. By contrast, the Cultura Viva, at least during its initial years, did not follow such a top-down strategy. On the contrary, it aimed at unleashing a bottom-up process by establishing channels of communications with and amongst the 'points of culture', and by funding already existing projects proposed by non-profit organisations (Turino, 2010). This approach clearly differs from the creative economy policy discourse, where the design and implementation of cultural policies was based on ideal structures in the heads of planners and international consultants, irrespective of what non-profit cultural organisations and resource scarce groups thought about them.

Both policy discourses speak of culture for development, but their specific ways of speaking and enabling concepts and initiatives lead to different connections between development and culture. On the one hand, the creative economy discourse, with its focus on industries, stresses IPR, and the notion of entrepreneurs generating income and trade, which supports the commercialisation of culture and the benefits of cultural exports. This discourse delineates a way to administer cultural policies as if it were just another industry, a part of the knowledge economy, where the key seems to be to create entrepreneurs, to make them learn how to write and execute business plans and then export their products and services. Therefore, for UNCTAD, development links to economic growth through trade, and it assumes this will also contribute to further social objectives. Although this former connection might be true, the latter link is weaker and lacks empirical evidence to support it. Conversely, critics of the creative industries have already highlighted several negative consequences in terms of autonomous work, precariousness, etc., which from the outset have been ignored in the creative economy discourses. Furthermore, the conceptualisation of all cultural expressions as 'industries' performed by 'creative entrepreneurs' ignores the unequal distribution of resources in industrialising countries which excludes large sectors of the population from experiencing training in cultural production. Thus, creative economy discourses can mainly be understood as a strategy to foster the economic dimension of culture, which will possibly benefit industries and a small number of entrepreneurs with enough resources (capital,

training, networks, etc.), albeit with dubious contributions to social and environmental issues or, even worse, reinforce existing inequalities by plainly ignoring them.

On the other hand, the Cultura Viva policy discourse addresses directly sectors that have been previously ignored in cultural policies. It distributes resources for their cultural projects, thereby extending support beyond just the 'cultural' or 'creative' industries. Furthermore, culture is considered as a right and part of a process of citizenship construction. The conceptualisation of development emphasises these dimensions first, and ultimately it also includes concerns for the economic dimension of culture. However, the focus has not been on a commercial perspective oriented to exports but instead on developing a 'solidarity economy' that aims at generating resources within communities where 'points of culture' are located (Ministério da Cultura, 2005: 24). Thus, the concept of development mainly connects with social inclusion aims, an association which has been undermined in a creative economy approach that considers international cultural commerce above all other social objectives.

Commercial culture and the stimulation of cultural industries is an essential element that cannot be ignored in the cultural policies of industrialising countries. However, in the context of huge social inequalities caused by particular historical factors, as in the case of Brazil, I think the structure of the creative economy discourse overemphasises the commercial approach to cultural policies, turning them into unfeasible strategies that cannot possibly meet all the broad development promises they claim to be able to address. At best, it can contribute to trade and economic growth, mostly through the contributions of firms and already established artists, by exploiting existing resource inequalities in Brazil. On the contrary, the Cultura Viva programme has not made such grandiloquent claims, and at least it is more specific and focused on addressing issues of social inequality through cultural policies, by concentrating on resource-scarce recipients ignored by previous policies, and by transferring resources to non-profit cultural projects in different parts of Brazil. The programme is directed precisely at stimulating access to culture and towards those actors in need, and not to the vague figure of the creative entrepreneur. For these reasons, the conceptualisation of development in this policy discourse offers better prospects of tackling a number of social issues, which explains the expansion of the policy discourse to other countries facing similar inequality challenges, such as Argentina, Bolivia and Ecuador, among others. Despite these benefits, it is also true that the economic dimension remains a challenge within this perspective.

Conclusion

Over the last decade, the Brazilian government has experimented with two different cultural policy discourses: the creative economy policy and the Cultura Viva programme. Both portray the shibboleth of development in different ways, and each has its own particular advantages and disadvantages in meeting its stated aims.

The creative economy discourse emerged based on the UK experience of stimulating the so-called creative industries, and UNCTAD disseminated it worldwide as a feasible development option. Brazil adopted and adapted a version of this policy at the national level. Although the government introduced changes after its translation, such as fewer restrictions on copyright and an explicit concern for social inclusion issues, in practice the focus is still mostly on commercial culture. The implemented initiatives aim to stimulate medium- and small-sized enterprises to generate economic

growth, trade and employment, for instance through the creation of business incubators for creative economy projects. Nevertheless, these have not tackled directly social or environmental issues. Besides, this policy orientation overlooks criticisms that emerged based on empirical evidence from the UK, pointing especially to the precarious nature of the jobs created by so-called creative entrepreneurs. Consequently, in Brazil the creative economy discourse understands development as an increase in economic growth, but social and environmental concerns are not explicitly addressed either in how objects of interest within the discourse are defined or in policy implementations. For these reasons, I think the creative economy is just a façade to continue promoting commercial cultural policies, irrespective of their negative social and environmental consequences.

By contrast, the Cultura Viva programme starts from different objectives and directly addresses the concerns of resource-scarce sectors of Brazilian society. It supports non-profit cultural projects mostly ignored by the creative industries. Thus, there is concern regarding access to culture, because it distributes tools for cultural production and distribution, such as the use of ICT and the promotion of non-proprietary licences such as copyleft and creative commons. Furthermore, this policy discourse focuses on relations between non-profit organisations and the state, through the funding of community culture projects and their associated networks, in a bottom-up and participatory way. This refers to the original policy experiment that funded unconventional projects that could not be so easily classified as creative industries or sectors. Unlike the creative economy policy discourse, the notion of development in this case goes beyond purely economic objectives, and instead includes issues of access to culture and the right to culture as its main priority, as a way to reinforce the sense of citizenship of previously marginalised sectors in Brazil. Nonetheless, Cultura Viva has fallen short in promoting the economic dimension of culture, and this is one of its major shortcomings.

To conclude, there is a need to attempt to synthesise both policy discourses, with broader actors and instruments that consider the two uses of culture that these policies, during different periods, have implemented: access vs. commercialisation. This would avoid potentially detrimental polarisation between the two positions, which seems to be taking place in Brazil and other Latin American countries where the policies have expanded, such as Argentina and Peru. However, I think that in countries with significant social inequalities, a programme like Cultura Viva should take priority over other approaches in the new policy initiatives, because it is a way to tackle historical inequalities of access to resources which a commercial approach seems to reinforce. Next, only a subset of these broader sectors involved in cultural production should contribute to the commercial dimension, instead of considering all culture to be commercial, as the creative economy seems to imply; otherwise, just those sectors of society with enough access to resources will end up profiting from the policies promoting the 'creative industries'. In this sense, I think that international organisations, development and cultural policy researchers need to start thinking laterally, in order to include practices from all over the world that challenge and expand mainstream cultural policies for development, thus unveiling the multiple and diverging projects that this shibboleth hides. The Cultura Viva initiative is just one example of a different cultural policy discourse with a meaning structure aimed at tackling inequality issues. This and other similar examples could offer fertile ground for research that advances beyond discussions focusing purely on the creative industries. Instead such research should be aimed at generating an understanding of the contributions that different cultural policies can make.

References

Barbosa da Silva, F. and Araujo, H. E. (2010) *Cultura viva: avaliação do programa arte educação e cidadania*. Instituto de Pesquisa Econômica Aplicada: Brasilia.

Berger, P. and Luckmann, T. (1966) *The Social Construction of Reality*. Penguin: London.

Booyens, I. (2012) 'Creative Industries, Inequality and Social Development: Developments, Impacts and Challenges in Cape Town'. *Urban Forum* **23**(1): 43–60.

British Council (2013) *Treinamento nesta para empreendedores criativos*. [WWW document]. URL http://transform.britishcouncil.org.br/pt-br/nesta [accessed 20 February 2015].

Cornwall, A. (2007) 'Buzzwords and Fuzzwords: Deconstructing Development Discourse'. *Development in Practice* **17**(4): 471–484.

Cultura Viva (2013) *Reunião entre pontos de cultura e Marta Suplicy*. [WWW document]. URL http://www.overmundo.com.br/overblog/reuniao-entre-pontos-de-cultura-e-marta-suplicy [accessed 23 February 2015].

DCMS (1998) *Creative Industries Mapping Document*. Department of Culture, Media and Sport: London.

Escobar, A. (1995) *Encountering Development. The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton University Press: Princeton.

FIESP (2012) *Economia criativa*. [WWW document]. URL http://www.fiesp.com.br/economia-criativa/ [accessed 20 February 2015].

Flew, T. and Cunningham, S. (2010) 'Creative Industries after the First Decade of Debate'. *The Information Society* **26**(2): 113–123.

Galloway, S. and Dunlop, S. (2007) 'A Critique of Definitions of the Cultural and Creative Industries in Public Policy'. *International Journal of Cultural Policy* **13**(1): 17–31.

Garnham, N. (2005) 'From Cultural to Creative Industries'. *International Journal of Cultural Policy* **11**(1): 15–29.

Gil, G. and Ferreira, J. (2013) *Cultura pela palavra. Coletânea de artigos, entrevistas e discursos dos ministros da cultura 2003–2010*. Versal: Rio de Janeiro.

Gill, R. and Pratt, A. (2008) 'Precarity and Cultural Work in the Social Factory? Immaterial Labour, Precariousness and Cultural Work'. *Theory, Culture and Society* **25**(7–8): 1–30.

Hartley, J. (2005) *Creative Industries*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd: Oxford.

Hesmondhalgh, D. and Baker, S. (2008) 'Creative Work and Emotional Labour in the Television Industry'. *Theory, Culture and Society* **25**(7–8): 97–118.

de Hollanda, A. (2013) *Economia criativa: um belo projeto que não saiu do papel*. [WWW document]. URL http://www.ocafezinho.com/2013/08/10/economia-criativa-um-belo-projeto-que-nao-saiu-do-papel/ [accessed 20 February 2015].

Hornidge, A.-K. (2011) '"Creative Industries": Economic Programme and Boundary Concept'. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* **42**(2): 253–279.

Keller, R. (2013) *Doing Discourse Research. An Introduction for Social Scientists*. Sage Publications Ltd: London.

LaMonica, M. (2007) *Brazil´s Minister of Culture Calls for Free Digital Society*. [WWW document]. URL http://www.cnet.com/news/brazils-minister-of-culture-calls-for-free-digital-society/ [accessed 23 February 2015].

Lobato, R. (2010) 'Creative Industries and Informal Economies: Lessons from Nollywood'. *International Journal of Cultural Studies* **13**(4): 337–354.

Lula da Silva, L. I. (2006) *General Debate of the 61st Session of the United Nations General Assembly*. [WWW document]. URL http://www.un.org/webcast/ga/61/pdfs/brasil-e.pdf [accessed 20 March 2015].

Mato, D. (2009) 'All Industries are Cultural. A Critique of the Idea of "Cultural Industries" and New Possibilities for Research'. *Cultural Studies* **23**(1): 70–87.

Mini, G. (2014) *O que eu aprendi no treinamento Nesta/British Council para empreendedores criativos*. [WWW document]. URL http://www.oesquema.com.br/conector/2014/

03/31/o-que-eu-aprendi-no-treinamento-nestabritish-council-para-empreendedores-criativos/ [accessed 23 January 2015].

Ministério da Cultura (2005) *Cultura Viva. Programa nacional de arte, educação, cidadania e economia solidária*. Ministério da Cultura: Brasília.

Ministério da Cultura (2011) *Plano da Secretaria da economia criativa: políticas, diretrizes e ações*. Ministério da Cultura: Brasília.

O Globo (2011) 'Em audiência no Senado, Ministra Ana de Hollanda nega relação com o ECAD e confunde natureza do creative commons'. O Globo. [WWW document]. URL http://oglobo.globo.com/cultura/em-audiencia-no-senado-ministra-ana-de-hollanda-nega-relacao-com-ecad-confunde-natureza-do-creative-commons-2799612 [accessed 24 January 2015].

Pierro, B. (2011) *Célio Turino e os pontos de cultura*. [WWW document]. URL http://jornalggn.com.br/blog/luisnassif/celio-turino-e-os-pontos-de-cultura [accessed 29 October 2014].

Prince, R. (2010) 'Globalizing the Creative Industries Concept: Travelling Policy and Transnational Policy Communities'. *Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society* **40**(2): 119–139.

Quilombo da Fazenda (2013) *Quilombo da Fazenda*. [WWW document]. URL http://quilombodafazenda.org.br/ [accessed 10 January 2014].

Rubim, A. A. C. (2007) 'Políticas culturais no Brasil: tristes tradições'. *Revista Galáxia* **13**: 101–113.

dos Santos-Duisenberg, E. (2011) *UNCTAD: temos muito mais a oferecer do que café, suco e minério*. [WWW document]. URL http://economia.ig.com.br/empresas/unctad-temos-muito-mais-a-oferecer-do-que-cafe-suco-e-minerio/n1597039670251.html [accessed 20 March 2015].

Schlesinger, P. (2007) 'Creativity: from Discourse to Doctrine?'. *Screen* **48**(3): 387–399.

SEC/MinC (2013a) *Edital de fomento a incubadoras de empreendimentos da economia criativa*. [WWW document]. URL http://www.cultura.gov.br/documents/10913/942617/Edital+de+Fomento/1954125e-bd42-4f00-96d3-6dc8f8ac465e [accessed 20 February 2015].

SEC/MinC (2013b) *Secretaria de economia criativa – SEC: Relatório de gestão*. Ministério da Cultura: Brasília.

SISTEMA FIRJAN (2012) *Indústria criativa. Mapeamento da indústria criativa no Brasil*. Federação das Indústrias do Estado do Rio de Janeiro: Rio de Janeiro.

Towse, R. (2010) 'Creativity, Copyright and the Creative Industries Paradigm'. *Kyklos* **63**(3): 461–478.

Turino, C. (2010) *Ponto de cultura. O Brasil de baixo para cima*. Anita Ltda: São Paulo.

Turino, C. (2013) *O desmonte do programa Cultura Viva e dos pontos de cultura sob o governo Dilma*. [WWW document]. URL www.revistaforum.com.br/brasilvivo/2013/07/07/o-desmonte-do-programa-cultura-viva-e-dos-pontos-de-cultura-sob-o-governo-dilma/ [accessed 29 October 2014].

UNCTAD (2004) *Creative Industries and Development: UNCTAD XI High-Level Panel on Creative Industries and Development*. 13 June 2004. United Nations: São Paulo.

UNCTAD and UNDP (2008) *Creative Economy, Report 2008. The Challenge of Assessing the Creative Economy: Towards Informed Policy-Making*. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development & United Nations Development Programme: Geneva.

UNCTAD and UNDP (2010) *Creative Economy: A Feasible Development Option*. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development & United Nations Development Programme: Geneva.

Vídeo Nas Aldeias (2009) *Vídeo Nas Aldeias*. [WWW document]. URL http://www.videonasaldeias.org.br/2009/ [accessed 29 October 2014].

Vötsch, M. and Weiskopf, R. (2009) '"Thank you for Your Creativity!": "Arbeit" und "Kreativität" im Diskurs der Creative Industries' in R. Diaz-Bone and G. Krell (eds.) *Diskurs und Ökonomie*. VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften: Wiesbaden, 293–316.
Wang, J. (2004) 'The Global Reach of a New Discourse: How Far Can "Creative Industries" Travel?'. *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 7(1): 9–19.
Yúdice, G. (2003) *The Expediency of Culture: Uses of Culture in the Global Era*. Duke University Press: Durham and London.