

Soares, Ana Lorym; Vasconcelos, Eduardo Henrique Barbosa de. *Folklore and Cultural Policy in Brazil During the Military Dictatorship in the 1960s and 1970s*

Folklore and Cultural Policy in Brazil During the Military Dictatorship in the 1960s and 1970s

Ana Lorym Soares¹

Eduardo Henrique Barbosa de Vasconcelos²

Abstract

This article analyzes the relationship between political and intellectual action of a group of folklorists associated with the Brazilian Folkloric Movement, and the development and implementation of cultural policies within the context of the military dictatorship in the 1960s and 1970s in Brazil. The article focuses on a comparative analysis of these policies based on documents from the military government as well as material created by folklorists, particularly material found in the Revista Brasileira de Folclore. The mobilization around folklore and its consequences in the field of cultural policy confirms the contemporary relevance of the subject in Brazil. The article concludes that although few scholars in the cultural sector currently identify as folklorists, and that the term folklore is often avoided, the legacy of the Brazilian Folkloric Movement is still very influential in contemporary government cultural policies.

Resumo

Este artigo analisa a relação entre ação política e intelectual de um grupo associado ao Movimento Folclórico Brasileiro e o desenvolvimento e implementação de políticas culturais no contexto da ditadura militar nas décadas de 1960 e 1970 no Brasil. O artigo concentra-se em uma análise comparativa dessas políticas, com base em documentos do governo militar e em materiais criados por folcloristas, particularmente o material encontrado na Revista Brasileira de Folclore. A mobilização em torno do folclore e suas consequências no campo da política cultural confirmam a relevância contemporânea do assunto no Brasil. O artigo conclui que, embora atualmente poucos estudiosos do setor cultural se identifiquem como folcloristas e que o termo folclore seja frequentemente evitado, o legado do Movimento Folclórico Brasileiro ainda é muito influente nas políticas culturais do governo contemporâneo.

¹ Professora da Universidade Federal de Goiás.

² Professor da Universidade Estadual de Goiás.

Increasingly, the action of the state in the area of culture has attracted the attention of researchers from a variety of areas including history, museum studies, communications, and the social sciences. In this context, questions related to the development and implementation of cultural policy gain prominence. However, there is still a glaring lack of research that focuses on the history of cultural policies in Brazil. This includes their relationship to popular cultures, their direct impact of on the lives of “subaltern groups,” or through the discourses of intellectuals who speak in the name of these groups.

Folklore and folklorists had a prominent role in the cultural and intellectual scene during the Brazilian military dictatorship in the second half of the twentieth century.³ However, this prominence remains, in large part, unknown to the majority of professionals in the area and even to those who are interested in this period in Brazilian history. This article does not intend to definitely reverse this state of affairs, but instead intends to raise new questions by mapping and understanding the actions of folklorists with the military government. It will do so by examining the work of the folklorists in converting a specific intellectual discourse into a practice supported by the state and the results of these efforts.

It is important to note that the term “folklore” is being used in this article in two different ways. First is lower-case folklore, which refers to popular cultural phenomena commonly associated with traditional and rural themes, and which, to a certain extent, is interchangeable with popular culture. The second is upper-case Folklore and is defined as a field of study created in Europe in the middle of the nineteenth century that deals with phenomena whose characteristics are consistent with the previous definition. Likewise, it is important to point out that in this article a folklorist is not necessarily a professional, since the field has not been institutionalized in Brazil to the point of being able to produce what could be considered a professional folklorist. The type of folklorist being referred to in this

³ In this work our goal is not to know how, when and why certain researchers (self-titled folklorists) determined specific elements of their reality, of their region and called or not these as folk practices. We will focus here on the mobilization and actions of this different folklorists (possessed of different concepts, practices and realities, varying according to different geographic regions of Brazil), that during this moment left momentarily their specific practices and their theoretical divergences behind to mobilize, creating and keep the Brazilian folkloric movement to defend the Brazilian folklore and the inclusion (social, political and economic) of all Brazilian folklorists throughout the Brazilian federal administration.

article is a scholar who, notwithstanding their training or professional experience, chooses folklore as an object of study and intellectual pursuit.

The concept of cultural policy being used in this article is similar to that proposed by Coelho Neto (1997: 292), for whom cultural policy is a program of interventions by the state, civic institutions, private entities, and community groups with the objective of satisfying cultural needs of a population as well as to promote the development of its symbolic representations. From this perspective cultural policy is not understood of as an exclusive domain of the state, but rather, several actors participate in defining, planning, and implementing cultural policy. Furthermore, for Teixeira Coelho cultural policy can also be understood to reach a specific objective – the development of the symbolic representations and cultural needs of a population – and not as an end in itself.

Cultural policies in Brazil in the 1960s and 1970s

In the past decade there has been an increased concern by the state, especially at the federal level, with issues related to culture. This is exemplified by the implementation of the 2006 National Cultural Plan [Plano Nacional de Cultura] (BRASIL, 2008), which was approved during Gilberto Gil's tenure as the Minister of Culture and which promoted a plural notion of culture that sought to champion and foster efforts related to popular cultures (BRASIL, 2010). This was not the first time, however, that the federal government formalized a plan to guide policy in regard to culture.

During the military regime established in 1964, the government identified the need to create a document that would formalize government policy in the area of culture. According to Lia Calabre, the Federal Council of Culture [Conselho Federal de Cultura or CFC], which was created in 1966, presented proposals in 1968, 1969, and 1973, although none of them would be ultimately be approved (Calabre, 2005: 12). In 1973, during the government of president Médici (1969-1974), for a brief period a document titled Guidelines for a National Policy on Culture [Diretrizes Para Uma Política Nacional de Cultura] was distributed. It was quickly withdrawn from circulation, most likely, according to Gabriel Cohn, because it proposed the creation of a separate ministry devoted to culture, which would have generated divisions within the Ministry of Education and Culture [Ministério da Educação e Cultura or MEC] (Cohn, 1984: p. 88).

In order to replace the Guidelines for a National Policy on Culture, that same year the Cultural Action Program [Programa de Ação Cultural or PAC] was created and it would be in effect for two years between 1973 and 1974. PAC led to the creation of the Department of Cultural Action [Departamento de Ação Cultural or DAC], the executive body within the Ministry of Education and Culture that dealt with culture. The PAC created criteria for the distribution of financial resources in areas ranging from historical preservation to artistic and cultural presentations. It even included the training of personnel. Nevertheless, the press presented it at the time as a project to finance events since one of its objectives was to create an active cultural events calendar that included music, theatre, television, cinema, and folklore (Calabre, 2005: 12; Miceli, 1984: 56).

Only by the end of 1975, during the administration of president Geisel (1974-1978), was the first National Cultural Policy [Política Nacional de Cultura or PNC] drafted. It was officially launched in January of 1976. It formalized guidelines to manage activities in the area of culture and sanctioned the coordination of the MEC in this field (Cohn, 1984: 88-89). More specifically, the PNC outlined the legal foundations of government action in the area of culture. It explained the forms of these actions, stated the principles that would guide the work of the MEC, listed the objectives of the policies, outlined program ideas, and in the process effectively explained the concept of Brazilian culture and cultural policies that guided the crafting of the document (Brasil, 1975: 5).

According to Minister Ney Braga, who was MEC's responsible at the time, "A true cultural policy" should be guided by national interests (Brasil, 1975: 12). The Minister stated:

Starting from the idea of national policy as the art of establishing national objectives through the interpretation of national aspirations as well as guiding the fulfilment or preservation of those objectives, it becomes possible to establish the basic concept of cultural policy . . . It is the set of government initiatives coordinated by the necessity to foster creativity which is diminished, distorted, and threatened by control mechanisms triggered by mass communications and the rationalization of industrial society (BRASIL, 1975: 12).

Furthermore, for the Minister the PNC was:

A set of guidelines that direct and constrain government action, not dirigisme, but rather an instrument of encouragement and training. The state respects freedom of creation and

attempts to incentivize and support the development of culture by boosting the means and instruments that stimulate its different manifestations (BRASIL, 1975: 24).

It is important to note that the path to institutionalization through rules and guidelines was accompanied by an intense supervision by the government, which was characteristic of the military dictatorship at the time. This is apparent in the introduction of the PNC, which states that the intervention of the state was to guarantee the preservation of an “identity founded on genuine, traditional social and spiritual values that were unique to the Brazilian man, who is a democrat by training, who has a Christian spirit, and who is a lover of liberty and autonomy” (Brasil, 1975: 8). At the same time, this intervention was justified by guaranteeing the quality of what was being produced. Thus, the PNC explicitly states that the state would support diversity, but only if it met the requirements imposed by the regime in terms of what was considered good or bad by its leaders. Thus, for the government:

The problem of quality is a priority because it is responsible for the level of development. It is the responsibility of the state to stimulate quality competition among various sources of production. In order to have quality it is necessary to guard against certain evils, such as the cult of novelty (Brasil, 1975: 13)

The concept of Brazilian culture, that emerged from this document also contained contradictions. It expressed the regime's need to create a sense of national unity, although one that was marked by cultural diversity:

Brazilian culture is that which is created or results from the acculturation shared and spread by the national community. What we call Brazilian culture is a product of relationships among human groups in Brazil that come from diverse origins. It comes from true syncretism and a surge of cultural creativity that led to different expressions that today we can identify as characteristically Brazilian, and that while national still have regional peculiarities. In fact, due to the extension of our territory, during human occupation regional differences emerged. On the one hand, this occurred due to the greater influence of one of the groups in an area and, on the other hand, it was related to the way in which occupation took place in a given region . . . There is a sense of pluralism that is evident in some regions. This pluralism will dilute over time in the face of syncretism, and will give way to a characteristically Brazilian identity, which will be our mark. Thus, we see regional diversity as contributing to national unity (Brasil, 1975: 16).

Although the text acknowledged the need to stimulate difference, diversity, and pluralism in terms of cultural production, culture itself was understood as an aggregate that resulted in a uniform and harmonic entity. Ultimately, this conclusion effectively eliminated cultural differences by reducing them to a single, harmonious national identity. From this perspective, regional diversity was only considered in terms of its relationship to the preservation of national identity. As the historian Alexandre Barbalho noted, the ideal would be to have an “essentially homogenous culture that is diversified by contributions, is in constant transformation, and, at the same time, is faithful and loyal to the past” (Barbalho, 1998: 52).

Indeed, the documents that formalize the institutionalization of culture in the 1960s and 1970s in Brazil were explicit about their own ambiguities and incoherencies given the context in which they were drafted. This is true in regard to both the configuration of the institutions and to the forms of institutional action, as well as to the very concept of culture that was elaborated. However, the interest in this area demonstrates the importance that, at least in some form, the cultural field represented to the military government and which can be further seen in its subsequent interest in folklore.

Culture, folklore and national identity in the 1960s and 1970s

Obviously, the relationship with folklore and folklorists was not the only action in the field of culture during the 60s and 70s that Brazilian militaries conducted. Mass communications: radio, television, cinema, propaganda and even communicator satellite caught the attention of the military. Thus, according to Jacira França:

... from the idea that culture was central to disseminate and instil the ideology of government, through the flag to keep the "national security", the military governments implemented a modernizing policy in telecommunications. In 1965 Embratel (Brazilian telecommunications company) and Brazil joined Intelsat (International Satellite System), in 1967 the Ministry of Communications was created. In 1968 are the first broadcaster's frequency modulated (FM) and is the AERP (Special Advisor for Public Relations) that reinforced the need to propagate blood proud and nationalist ideals and was a way to organize the ideological attack the state created. In 1969 the country integrates into owned

company that financed the Brazilian film production - global satellite communications system and is Embrafilme created (França, 2009).

However, unlike the mass communication system that is widely studied in Brazil (Arruda, 2004; Festa, 1986; Michalsky, 1985), folklore has not received the same attention. This situation hampers broad understanding of this communication system in Brazil, since many of which was released in mass communication on the Brazilian people, defining and characterization, was made by mass communication system supported by folklorists and their folklore studies that embraced the cultural practices of disadvantaged social groups against an elitist conception of culture arising from dominant groups inspired by practices that come from other countries and cultures.

So, focusing on folkloric aspects this topic became integrated more systematically into the Brazilian cultural scene in the mid-twentieth century because of the spotlight placed on it by folklorists associated with the Brazilian Folklore Movement [Movimento Folclórico Brasileiro](Vilhena, 1997). This movement started at the end of the 1940s with the creation of the National Folklore Commission [Comissão Nacional de Folclore or CNFL] within the Brazilian Education, Science, and Culture Institute [Instituto Brasileiro de Educação, Ciência e Cultura or IBECC], which is the representative body of United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization – UNESCO in Brazil. In the following decade the number of members in the country was considerable. Many were associated via state-level folklore commissions that connected hundreds of men and women who studied folklore via the national network (Vilhena, 1997; Soares, 2010). The “headquarters” of the movement was in the city of Rio de Janeiro and it was headed by the Bahian folklorist and musicologist Renato Almeida, who had lived in the city since his childhood.

Renato Almeida, the most dynamic figure of the movement, was flanked by others who were no less dedicated and who united their voices at countless congresses, seminars, and festivals in favour of the appreciation folklore.⁴ This appreciation would lead to the institutionalization of the field, both through the creation of an institute for topics related to “traditional popular culture,” as well as through the inclusion of folklore in the university curriculum as either an independent subject or an auxiliary subject alongside other social

⁴ Other folklorists include Edison Carneiro, Luís da Câmara Cascudo, Cecília Meireles, Rossini Tavares de Lima, Oneyda Alvarenga, Manuel Diegues Júnior, Joaquim Ribeiro, Heloísa Alberto Torres, and Luis da Câmara Cascudo.

sciences. Folklorists witnessed the partial success of their goals in 1958 when a presidential decree by Juscelino Kubitschek (1956-1961) created the Campaign to Defend Brazilian Folklore [Campanha de Defesa do Folclore Brasileiro or CDFB], which had originally been promised by Kubitschek's predecessor Getúlio Vargas.⁵

The Campaign, while it did not have the institutional format originally desired by the folklorists, did lead to the implementation of a number of projects related to cultural policies connected to folklore. Its objective on the national level was:

- I – Promote registries, research and surveys, training and specialization courses, expositions, publications, festivals;
- II – Protect folkloric patrimony, the arts, popular festivals;
- III – Organize museums, libraries, film libraries, and archives;
- IV – Maintain exchanges with similar institutions;
- V – Spread Brazilian folklore.⁶

The development of such an intense agenda can be followed through the pages of the *Brazilian Folklore Magazine* [Revista Brasileira de Folclore or RBF], which was intended to encourage and publicize events involving folklore. According to Edison Carneiro, it was also to serve as a “mirror of our growing understanding of the reality of Brazilian popular life” (Carneiro, 1961: 3).⁷ For the folklorists in question, the cultural reality of the people was threatened by the corrosive effect of modern times and the intermittent intrusion of mass culture. Therefore, the intervention of well-intentioned men, preferably along with state support, was needed to guarantee that traditional, folkloric culture would survive. For the folklorists, culture in its folkloric form was the most authentically national because it resulted from the interactions of the three principle cultural lineages (namely, Portuguese,

⁵ The CDFB, a department within the Ministry of Education and Culture (MEC) was created by president Juscelino Kubitschek through executive decree 43.178 of February 5, 1958, which was published in the *Diário Oficial da União* on February 7, 1958. However, the CDFB did not start its activities until August of that year. Available at: <<http://www6.senado.gov.br/sicon/ListaReferencias.action?codigoBase=2&codigoDocumento=174182>>. Accessed on August 23, 2013.

⁶ Information printed on the back covers of the *Brazilian Folklore Magazine* [Revista Brasileira de Folclore], which publicized the CDFB and that circulated between 1961 and 1976.

⁷ Edison Carneiro was one of the most important members of the folklore movement and he was the second director of the CDFB. He was dismissed by the military regime in 1964 for being a communist militant.

Indigenous, and African). So, Brazil should be represented by the culture of the majority of its population and not by cultural forms arising from Europe or the United States. The threat of an imminent loss of the characteristics that provided folklore the authenticity capable of cementing a national identity permeated the discourse of the folklorists. They positioned themselves as the individuals who were able to prevent such an identity loss. It was in this tone that Renato Almeida wrote to Rachel de Queiroz in order to invite her to a national folklore congress:

You may have already become aware of the ongoing effort in favour of our folklore, which entails preserving, studying, and understanding popular culture in order to prevent its regression under the impact of modern civilization. If we do not defend the national character of our folklore we will end up with a folklore of Coca-Cola and plastic (since folklore does not die, but rather people create and adapt it incessantly). It is necessary to take seriously the revival of our traditional festivals, many of which you certainly remember fondly . . . We have done considerable work and with hope of at least some success . . . I am certain that you completely agree with us and because of that I have come to ask for your support by adding your prestigious voice to ours . . . I would greatly appreciate it if you would attend and participate in our congress (Almeida, 1951).

This same concern of progressive loss can be seen in the discourse of folklorist Edison Carneiro in an article published in 1966 in the RBF:

The Christmas folk stories that in the past were told throughout Brazil now have a precarious and challenging existence. Only in Alagoas and Pernambuco do they still have vitality. Lately in Rio de Janeiro there has been but one group that presented the tales whereas at the beginning of the century there were various groups that would publicly compete for prizes and titles at the Praça Sete and Praça das Nações. Only sporadically in this or that city are they still performed if there happens to be a performer and girls simple enough to be enthusiastic about the spectacle. It has been about forty years since the Christmas folk stories have been declining precipitously in terms of popular interest (Carneiro, 1966: 277).

In both the letter sent from Renato Almeida to Rachel de Queiroz and in the article written by Edison Carneiro for the RBF, the fear of the loss of defining elements of popular folk culture due to modern society's impact is directly linked to the urgent nature that guided the actions of the folklorists. They defined themselves as the individuals whose mission it was to protect, study, and understand popular culture so that it would not disappear in its traditional forms (Almeida, 1974a: 21).

It is interesting to note that the constant threat of destruction and identity loss is doubly ambiguous in this situation. The threat is seen as negative because it corrodes what is most precious in the national culture – the traditional component. On the other hand, this same corrosive action creates the occasion in which folklore was desired and, thus, needed to be preserved. Therefore, there is a direct link between the imminent threat of destruction or substitution of folklore by a homogenized culture and its recognition as cultural heritage that should be preserved. It is precisely the “beauty of death” described by Michel de Certeau, Dominique Julia, and Jacques Revel (1995: 55-85) that enthralled these intellectuals and raised the need for protective action that would be preferably recognized and financed by the state.

This “rhetoric of loss” (Gonçalves, 2002) is even evident in the name of the agency that was created with the goal of institutionalizing folklore, the Campaign to Defend Brazilian Folklore. Moreover, the department in the CDFB that was responsible for the highest number of initiatives was also named with this concern in mind – the Division of Folklore Protection [Divisão de Proteção ao Folclore]. Thus, from a folklore perspective the institutionalization of culture should be guided by the conservation of the traditional elements that most define the cultural unity of the nation extolling the culture and cultural practices of subaltern groups against international cultural threats that were supported by the ruling elites of Brazil. Therefore, actions should be taken to avoid the debasement of folklore and to advance its spread as a means of promoting the understanding that folklore is a privileged symbol of Brazilian national identity. It is precisely from this perspective that the interests of the folklorists intersected with the authoritarian state (Soares, 2010).

Intersections: folklore and cultural policy in the 1960s and 1970s

Given these initial observations it is possible to make a connection between historical material about the Brazilian Folklore Movement and the military regime in terms of their involvement in the area of culture. On the one hand, the military government took care to establish instructions for state intervention in the cultural sphere in the 1960s and 1970s. Thus, the Brazilian military dictatorship was inspired by cultural interventions-initiated years before, successfully, during the government of Getúlio Vargas (Williams, 2001). On the other hand, the folklorists inserted themselves into this context using a discourse about the defence of folklore. The folklorists also employed the personal and political relationships

of the movement's leaders, such as Renato Almeida and Manuel Diégues Júnior,⁸ the latter of whom was a leading figure in the field of cultural policy during this period. The intersection between folklore and cultural policies during the military regime can be viewed from various perspectives.

One example would be from the perspective of tourism and the organization of large events, which were considered important outcomes of cultural policies. However, an interesting example relates that the military administration wanted to enhance the representation within the country of all Brazilian people as peaceful, calm and faithful defenders of hierarchies they were seeking in folklore studies the arguments to prove the calm and tranquillity of the people of Brazil. Because of this, all people of Brazil should accept the orders of the military regime without question and without trying to fight for another administrative political form. It is clear that this representation of the Brazilian snubbed the specific of each group in each region of Brazil to make way for Brazilian ideal type represented as a worshiper of beach, soccer and carnival, in other words a non-political individual.

On the other hand, as already mentioned, the folklorist tried to institutionalize their field of study and for this government support was of fundamental importance even if it they had to leave their internal differences aside regarding the best method, the best way to research and study object (specific to each area or reality) to join forces and plead with the government the academic field of folklore even if it they had to submit to military interests to propagate and mention an abstract Brazilian culture quite broad to cover all inhabitants of the country.

The convergence of the interests of the military regime and the folklorists is perceptible in the pages of the *Revista Brasileira de Folclore* where the launch of the PAC was repeatedly hailed:

The PAC . . . brought to folklore the incentive for which it was waiting. In accordance with the established program, we had a presentation by a Grupo Maracatu Indiano from Recife in Brasília. There was a presentation of Danças Gaúchas in Belém do Pará and one by the

⁸ Manoel Diégues Júnior was a folklorist and sociologist who became a member of the folklore movement at the beginning. He became increasingly important when he joined the CFC and even more so when he became the director of the DAC, the department responsible for cultural policies within the MEC.

group "Postais da Bahia" during the inauguration of the folklore banners exposition and the launching of the commemorative stamp of the 1st National Folklore Festival. Folklore will continue with its schedule such that it will be shown throughout Brazil in all of its expressive forms. Thus, exhibitions of Bumbas-meu-boi, Cavalhadas, Mouros e Cristãos, Caboclinhos, etc. will continue in various cities across the country and it will all conclude in Brasília with a large festival. Additionally, demonstrations of art, music, theatre, cinema, dance and other manifestations will be taken to all corners of our national territory in an effort to reveal art and culture throughout the country.

Also included in the PAC program is The National Folklore Festival, which will be held in the month of January in 1974 in Brasília, and which will include the 7th Brazilian Folklore Congress, the Exposition of Popular and Technical Arts, and the Folklore Festival (Campanha de defesa do folclore brasileiro, 1973).

As reported in the RBF, the PAC represented "one of the most important events in Brazilian culture and was conducted by the MEC," as well as the "living and eloquent testament of the federal government's interest in incentivizing Brazilian culture through the arts" (Campanha de defesa do folclore brasileiro, 1973: 67) From the program's perspective, culture should be disseminated, displayed, and exhibited through artistic performances throughout the country, and in this way it would serve as a regional unifier.

These folklore events had already frequently occurred for some time and were even anticipated in the plans of the CDFB in its first years of operation by its Festivals Department. However, the federal government strengthened these events through legislation and earmarking. For example, Castelo Branco's presidential decree number 56.747 of August 17th, 1965 declared August 22 National Folklore Day. The day would be observed nation-wide with celebrations:

Whereas the Government wants to ensure the broadest protection of expressions of popular creation not only by fostering research and study, but also by defending their survival in popular festivals and arts as a valiant link of Brazilian tradition, it is declared: Article 1: August 22 will be celebrated annually, nation-wide as National Folklore Day; Article 2: The Campaign for the Defence of Brazilian Folklore of the Ministry of Education and Culture and the National Folklore Commission of the Brazilian Institute of Education, Science, and Culture are the state entities that should commemorate National Folklore Day and they will collaborate with other official or private initiatives and will encourage celebration in primary, secondary, and post-secondary schools that highlight the importance of folklore in the cultural formation of the country (Brasil, 1965).

This initiative by the president intensified the commemorations led by the CDFB, the CNFL, and similar institutions since they were now undertaken in a coordinated fashion. It was at this point that celebratory parades, festivals, and events were recognized as a component of the federal government's cultural policy.

Sérgio Miceli notes that these actions by the PAC reflected the markedly executive posture that characterized the government's cultural policies of the period. This executive outlook contrasted with the patrimonialism position that sought to channel funds for projects to restore monuments and works of art (Micelli, 1984: 76). Events, which are fleeting spectacles that do not intend to leave a completed and permanent work, are the antithesis of historical and cultural preservation initiatives preferred by the patrimonialists. In this way, the ministry gradually converted "the MEC into a powerful and 'modern' business specializing in events, which, in turn, opened new fronts in the cultural labour market" (Micelli, 1984: 69-70)

One of the topics advanced by executives was tourism. This was an area that received a considerable amount of attention from the federal government since the Castelo Branco administration when a national policy was developed that led to the creation of National Tourist Board and the National Tourism System under the official name Embratur. His administration also held several meetings and seminars related to the topic (Ortiz, 2005: 86). Once again, these events were a gateway for folklore to be included in the government's cultural policy.

During the Folklore and Cultural Tourism Symposium held in São Paulo between August 23rd and 28th in 1970 the folklorist Renato Almeida emphasized the importance of linking tourism and folklore. He justified the relationship by highlighting the point that the national folklore archive includes cultural goods that are of great significance and value. However, he was also reticent about the relationship because he was concerned about tourism's potential to exploit folklore for economic gain and how this might threaten the folklore itself (Almeida, 1970:199).

Two years later RBF published in its Documentary Section a contribution by the CDFB about what the National Program of Tourism and Folklore would be [Programa Nacional de Turismo e Folclore]. This was a document prepared in partnership with Embratur at the Official Meeting of Tourism [Reunião Oficial de Turismo] that took place

in June 1972 in Brasília. In the guidelines created by the CDFB folklore appeared as an element meant to attract tourism, especially through popular festivals and crafts. According to the document, popular festivals like the *congada*, the *bumba*, and the *maracatu* should be presented in an authentic form in the way that they have been traditionally practiced. In terms of crafts, the key would be to find artists whose work was an authentic representation of popular expression. The job of the folklorist in this context would be to preserve the authenticity of products and to prepare effective marketing, particularly through festivals and craft fairs (Campanha de defesa do folclore brasileiro, 1972: 207-210).

The guidelines of the program were:

1. Ensure the recognition of traditional elements and their fidelity to Brazilian folklore.
2. Incentivize and protect the authenticity of artists, folklore festivals, and crafts.
3. Through the development of tourism, establish an integrated schedule with a promotional calendar capable of organizing folkloric events (Campanha de defesa do folclore brasileiro, 1972: 211).

While there was clearly a vision to defend folklore that was guided by the rhetoric of loss that is associated with notions of tradition and authenticity as legitimate components of folklore, the CDFB simultaneously appears to commodify popular culture and even used the terms “product” and “sales” to refer to folklore. The authenticity that was to be preserved served to make the folkloric product more enjoyable, and therefore more economically lucrative for the tourist market (Almeida, 1973: 57-60; CAMPANHA DE DEFESA DO FOLCLORE BRASILEIRO, 1973: 77-81; RIBEIRO, 1973: 61-65). Indeed, the commodification of folklore was one of the issues that emerged in the relatively tense period of the 1960s and 1970s in Brazil.

However, even with the support, sometimes implicit and sometimes explicit the Brazilian military to folklorist and the desire of both to build a zoomed image of Brazil and the Brazilian people as a quiet, passive and accepting the established orders nor folklorist were able to institute Brazilian folklore as an area of academic study nor the military were able to control the representations of Brazil, the Brazilian and the big international cultural influences such rock and roll, movies and the development of Brazilian consumer society.

Additionally, the link between folklore and civics would also become more important, particularly for the military regime, but that is a topic that is beyond the scope of this article.⁹

While currently there is a consensus that the folklorists' initiatives were anachronistic and arguably prejudiced in terms of the way they treated culture, their actions marked an important point in the cultural policies of the country. Therefore, even though their theoretical positioning toward the concept of culture is quite different from the one that is most dominant today, the work of the folklorists deserves studies that consider its historical context and meaning. Whether from academic institutions or the government bureaucracy, many of the folklorists were lettered men who united in the name of Brazilian folklore. They produced images and narratives whose function and uses mainly in Brazilian television and films, in many cases, was to exalt the social reality that they considered to be folklore to imbue it with an identity-generating element. This elevation of folklore, in turn, justified their efforts to defend it. In this sense, their goal was to convert identity-generating folklore into the base of cultural policy in such a way that would guarantee folklore's defence and dissemination and would also be beneficial in helping them secure jobs and obtaining federal and state government recognition.

The mobilization around folklore and its consequences in the field of cultural policy confirms the timeliness and relevance of the subject to the ongoing discussion in Brazil. Although few scholars in the cultural sector currently identify as folklorists, and even though the term folklore is avoided in discourses and texts in the field in Brazil, we cannot deny that there is a certain folklorist legacy in terms of government policy. The avoidance of the term folklore thus coexists with continued practices associated with the folklorist movement.

Nowadays even without the importance obtained in 1960 and 1970 the folklore studies, reworked to new standards, still maintains influence in important Institutions as The National Centre for Folklore and Popular Culture [Centro Nacional de Folclore e Cultura Popular or CNFCP], which works with topics related to traditional popular culture and which is institutionally linked to the National Historical and Artistic Patrimony Institute [Instituto do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional or IPHAN], is nothing more

⁹ To see a broad discussion of this point, see Soares (2010).

than the former Campaign for the Defence of Folklore that was created at the end of the 1950s by the folklorists.¹⁰ Despite the name change, it still continues in the same line of work. The CNFCP's Edison Carneiro Museum and Amadeu Amaral Library, which specialize in folklore, as well as the Sílvio Romero prize, which lauds academic works about themes related to popular culture and folklore, are a direct legacy of the folklorists.

The current initiatives to both appreciate and foster popular culture production in Brazil are even further testimony to the ongoing legacy. In an attempt to link the idea of popular culture to the notion of constructing citizenship, the administration of president Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva (2003-2010), employed a broad notion of culture in which popular culture was highlighted.¹¹ In 2005, for example, the First National Seminar for Public Policy for Popular Cultures [Seminário Nacional de Políticas Públicas] was held in response to concerns from grassroots representatives, intellectuals, and others interested in cultural initiatives to discuss and ensure the appreciation of the sector. On this occasion principles, recommendations, and guidelines were created in order to direct the actions of the government in terms of culture policy. This culminated in the drafting of the Charter of Popular Cultures [Carta das Culturas Populares] (BRASIL, 2005). Created with the intent to champion popular cultures, the Popular Culture Prize recognizes and lauds the work of individuals, groups, and communities responsible for initiatives that involve Brazilian popular culture. It honours projects that recuperate popular practices that are being forgotten as well as those that spread popular culture beyond the limits of its original communities. This encompasses a wide array of cultural practices including:

Religion; rituals and popular festivals; popular art; myths, stories, and other oral narratives; popular forms of sharing knowledge; popular medicine; food and popular culinary art; paintings, designs, graphics, and other forms of crafts and arts; writings; dance; audiovisual; among other (Brasil, 2012).

From this perspective, it becomes possible to see how important the folklorists' commitment was in valuing and preserving the popular sector practices known as folklore.

¹⁰ The CDFB's name was changed in 1980 to the National Folklore Institute [Instituto Nacional de Folclore or INF], which later had its name changed to the National Center for Folklore and Popular Culture [Centro Nacional de Folclore e Cultura Popular or CNFCP].

¹¹ This policy had been maintained until the government of the former president of Brazil, Dilma Rousseff

Even if they are not recognized or mentioned with great frequency, the efforts of the members of the Brazilian Folklore Movement in the area of national cultural policy should not be overlooked by scholars. Rather, they should be diligently analysed in order to reflect on progress, setbacks, and the current needs in the realm of national cultural policy in Brazil.

Works cited

- Abreu, Regina; chagas, Mário de Souza; santos, Myrian Sepúlveda dos, (Orgs.). (2007) *Museus, coleções e patrimônios: narrativas polifônicas*. Rio de Janeiro: Garamond, MinC/Iphan/Demu.
- Abreu, Vanessa Kern de. (2008) *A Educação Moral e Cívica: Disciplina Escolar e Doutrina Disciplinar - Minas Gerais (1969-1993)*. Uberlândia - MG. MA dissertation. Universidade Federal de Uberlândia. Available at: <<https://repositorio.ufu.br/handle/123456789/13751>>. Accessed July 7, 2016.
- Almeida, Renato. (1974a) *A Inteligência do Folclore*. 2ª ed.- Rio de Janeiro: Companhia Editora Americana/Instituto Nacional do Livro/MEC.
- _____. Carta de Renato Almeida para Rachel de Queiroz. (1951) In: *Acervos Digitais. Correspondência das Comissões de Folclore. Comissão Nacional de Folclore. Assuntos Gerais. Expedidas e Recebidas*.
- Arruda, Maria Arminda. (2004) *A embalagem do sistema: a publicidade no capitalismo brasileiro*. 2ª ed. São Paulo, EDUSC.
- Biblioteca Amadeu Amaral; Centro Nacional de Folclore e Cultura Popular/Iphan/MinC.
- _____. (1970) Folclore e Turismo Cultural. In: *Revista Brasileira de Folclore*. Rio de Janeiro: CDFB/MEC, v.10, nº 28, mai/ago, p. 199.
- _____. (1973) Folclore e Turismo. In: *Revista Brasileira de Folclore*. Rio de Janeiro: CDFB/MEC, v.13, nº 36, mai/ago, p. 57-60.
- Barbalho, Alexandre. (1998) *Relações entre estado e cultura no Brasil*. Ijuí: Ed. UNIJUÍ.
- Botelho, Isaura. (2000) *Romance de formação: Funarte e política cultural, 1976-1990*. Rio de Janeiro: Edições Casa de Rui Barbosa.
- Brasil. (1965) Decreto nº 56.747, de 17 de agosto de 1965. *Institui o Dia do Folclore*. Brasília, DF,. Available at: < <<http://domtotal.com/direito//pagina/detalhe/6166/decreto-n-56.747-de-17-de-agosto-de-1965./newsletter.html/index.php/print>>. Accessed July 14, 2016.
- _____. (1975) *Política Nacional de Cultura*. Brasília: MEC.

- _____. (2005) *Seminário Nacional de Políticas Públicas para as Culturas Populares*. São Paulo: Instituto Pólis; Brasília: Ministério da Cultura. Available at: <<http://www.polis.org.br/uploads/979/979.pdf>>. Accessed November 10, 2016.
- _____. (2008) *Plano Nacional de Cultura: diretrizes gerais*. 2ª ed. Brasília: Ministério da Educação.
- _____. (2010) *Sistema Nacional de Cultura: estruturação, institucionalização e implementação do Sistema Nacional de Cultura*. Brasília: Ministério da Cultura. Available at: <http://blogs.cultura.gov.br/snc/files/2009/07/DOCUMENTO_B%C3%81SICO_SNC_16DEZ_2010.pdf>. Accessed March 17, 2016.
- _____. (2012) *Prêmio Culturas Populares*. Ministério da Cultura. Available at: <<http://www.cultura.gov.br/culturaviva/premio-culturas-populares-2012/>>. Accessed November 10, 2016.
- _____. *Lista de Referência de Ações do Governo*. S/D Available at: <<http://www6.senado.gov.br/sicon/ListaReferencias.action?codigoBase=2&codigoDocumento=174182>>. Accessed on August 23, 2016.
- Calabre, Lia (org.). (2005) *Políticas culturais: diálogo indispensável*. Rio de Janeiro: Edições Casa de Rui Barbosa. (vol. I)
- _____. (2008) Políticas e Conselhos: um estudo do conselho federal de cultura. In: CALABRE, Lia (Org.). *Políticas culturais: diálogo indispensável*. Rio de Janeiro: Edições Casa de Rui Barbosa. (vol. II)
- Campanha de Defesa do Folclore Brasileiro. (1973) Declaração de Princípios. In: *Revista Brasileira de Folclore*. Rio de Janeiro: CDFB/MEC, v.13, nº 36, mai./ago., p. 77-81.
- _____. (1972) Elementos para um Programa Nacional de Turismo e Folclore. In: *Revista Brasileira de Folclore*. Rio de Janeiro: CDFB/MEC, v.12, nº 33, mai./ago., p. 207-210.
- _____. (1973) Noticiário. In: *Revista Brasileira de Folclore*. Rio de Janeiro: CDFB/MEC, v.13, nº 36, mai./ago., p. 114.
- Carneiro, Edison. (1961) Apresentação. In: Campanha de Defesa do Folclore Brasileiro. *Revista Brasileira de Folclore*. Rio de Janeiro: CDFB/MEC, v.1, nº 1, set./dez., p. 3.
- _____. (1966) As Pastoras do Natal. In: *Revista Brasileira de Folclore*. Rio de Janeiro: CDFB/MEC, v. 6, nº 16, set./dez., p. 277.
- Certeau, Michel de; Julia, Dominique; Revel, Jacques. (1995) A Beleza do Morto. In: *A Cultura no Plural*. Campinas-SP: Papirus.
- Coelho Neto, José Teixeira. (1997) *Dicionário Crítico de Política Cultural: cultura e imaginário*. São Paulo: Iluminuras.
- Cohn, Gabriel. (1984) A Concepção oficial da política cultural nos anos 70. In: MICELI, Sérgio. *Estado e Cultura no Brasil*. São Paulo: Difel/Idesp.

- Diegues Júnior, Manuel. (1980) *Etnias e Culturas no Brasil*. 2ª ed. Rio de Janeiro: Biblioteca do Exército.
- França, Jacira Silva de. (2009) Indústria Cultural e Ditadura Militar no Brasil dos anos 70. In: *Sumaré: revista acadêmica eletrônica*. Available at: <www.sumare.edu.br/Arquivos/1/raes/02/raesed02_artigo08.pdf>. Accessed on August 15, 2016.
- Festa, Regina. (1986) *Movimentos sociais, comunicação popular e alternativa*. In: FESTA, Regina & SILVA, Carlos Eduardo Lins (orgs.) *Comunicação Popular e Alternativa no Brasil*. São Paulo: Paulinas.
- Gonçalves, José Reginaldo dos Santos. (2002) *A Retórica da Perda: os discursos do patrimônio cultural no Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora UFRJ; Iphan.
- Miceli, Sérgio (org.). (1984) *Estado e Cultura no Brasil*. São Paulo: Difel/Idesp.
- Michalski, Yan. (1985) *O Teatro sob Pressão*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar.
- Ortiz, Renato. (2005) *Cultura Brasileira e Identidade Nacional*. São Paulo: Brasiliense.
- Rama, Angel. (1985) *A cidade das Letras*. São Paulo: Editora Brasiliense.
- Ribeiro, Joaquim. (1977) *Os Brasileiros*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Pallas/MEC.
- Ribeiro, Maria de Lourdes Borges. (1973) Turismo, Folclore e Religião. In: *Revista Brasileira de Folclore*. Rio de Janeiro: CDFB/MEC, v. 13, nº 36, Mai./ago., p. 61-65.
- Soares, Ana Lorym. *Revista Brasileira de Folclore: intelectuais, folclore e políticas culturais (1961-1976)*. Rio de Janeiro, 2010. 216p. MA dissertation. Departamento de História, Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro.
- Vilhena, Luís Rodolfo. (1997) *Projeto e Missão: o movimento folclórico brasileiro (1947-1964)*. Rio de Janeiro: Funarte: FGV.
- Williams, Daryle. (2001) *Culture Wars in Brazil: The First Vargas Regime, 1930-1945*. Durham: Duke University Press.