

# 9

## Cultural policy between and beyond nation-states: the case of *lusofonia* and the *Comunidade dos Países de Língua Portuguesa*

Carla Figueira

### Introduction

This chapter analyses a particular case of cultural policy-making beyond and between nation-states, that of *lusofonia*, a postcolonial politico-linguistic bloc of Portuguese-language countries and peoples, in one of its institutional forms, the Community of Portuguese Language Countries (in Portuguese, *Comunidade dos Países de Língua Portuguesa*, CPLP). The purpose is to demonstrate how cultural policy can be conceptualised and practised outside of the usual framework of a single state and developed multilaterally to potentially impact different national public spheres, by connecting cultural policy and cultural diplomacy. The countries that are part of *lusofonia* – Portugal, Brazil, five African countries (Angola, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Mozambique and São Tomé and Príncipe) and Timor-Leste (all former colonies of Portugal) – institutionalised their relationship in 1996 through the Community of Portuguese Language Countries and have as recently as 2014 welcomed into this organisation Equatorial Guinea.

*Lusofonia*, similar to other linguistic-cultural-political realities, can be seen as a new site for the development of cultural policies for collective identity building by an association of states, which in a traditional cultural diplomacy reading also allows for a particular representation of their unity in the international society. The sharing of language and culture between countries has been an important factor in the creation of political organisations geared towards their defence and promotion, such as *la francophonie* or the Arab League. A situation easily understood as “(t)hose who speak the same language not only can make themselves understood to each other; the capacity of being able to make oneself understood also founds a feeling of belonging and belonging together” (Weiß and Schwietring 2006, p. 3). However, language is only one of the aggregate elements of culture, and we must look, among other factors, at the importance of the political engineering of culture through public policies to understand the building of collective identities, as well as other increasingly important instrumental uses of culture particularly appreciated in our neo-liberal world, such as the development of the cultural and creative industries. This analysis shows the Community of Portuguese Language Countries as developing within *lusofonia* a (tentative) multilateral cultural policy, which can impact in the ways of imagining, narrating and enacting belonging to that particular transnational social/cultural space.

The chapter includes a background discussion on the links between cultural policy and cultural relations/diplomacy, which attempts to establish a framework for the understanding of the internal/external boundaries of cultural policy as public policy and its connection with foreign policy. The bulk of the chapter critically analyses why and how cultural policies are developed between and beyond the nation-states engaged in building *lusofonia*, looking specifically at the implicit and explicit cultural policies and activity of its most important governmental institution, the *Comunidade dos Países de Língua Portuguesa* (hereafter CPLP). The setting up of CPLP in 1996 marked the constitution of this ‘geocultural’ area or space as a political actor in international relations, becoming thus a sphere of responsibility, interaction and coexistence (Tardif 2004). The other major political organisation of *lusofonia* is the International Institute of Portuguese Language (*Instituto Internacional da Língua Portuguesa*, IILP), which will not be a focus for this chapter. The research for this chapter is based on the critical analysis of documentary sources and interviews, within a theoretical framework combining elements from cultural policy and international relations.

## Cultural policy beyond and between nation-states

Most often the research and study of cultural policy focuses on the arts and related public policy processes and practices within the domestic realm of the state: national/internal cultural policy. However, international cultural policy is a growing field encompassing global issues such as the trade and regulation of cultural products and labour, involving a multiplicity of actors at international, supranational, subnational levels (e.g. UNESCO, EU, regions and cities), and venturing into cultural diplomacy and exchange, as for example recently sketched in Bell and Oakley (2015). It is this last aspect, the links between cultural policy, cultural diplomacy and foreign policy, that we would like to further analyse to establish a clear theoretical basis for the analysis of transnational cultural policies within CPLP.

Despite the lack of an uncontested definition, cultural diplomacy is often understood as the use of culture by governments to achieve their foreign policy goals and a prime activity for achieving 'soft power' (Nye 2004) as a relational outcome. This thinking clearly positions cultural diplomacy in the discipline of international relations, highlighting the main role of state actors, and resting on the assumption that "art, language, and education are among the most significant entry points into a culture" (Goff 2013, pp. 419–420), which links it directly to cultural policy. Here the author must reiterate her positioning: like others, she does not conceive of cultural diplomacy in the absence of state involvement (*ibid.* explores well the nuances of the debate surrounding what can be cultural diplomacy), preferring to use for those situations the label cultural relations (Mitchell 1986, Arndt 2005).

The analysis of cultural policies and practices beyond the national framework is a necessary consequence of cultural globalisation. This broader space of analysis, to include the global, international, transnational, regional and local, allows for a more complex understanding of cultural policy and practice. As DeVereaux and Griffin (2006, p. 3) highlight:

What is clear, then, is that the flow of culture into, out of, and even within countries has a lot to do with how we understand these terms. Because global, international, transnational, and the underlying framework of "nation" itself define the territory on which cultural activity can take place, the very meaning of "culture" and the identities we construct both individually and collectively depend acutely on the territory-and the possibilities – these terms delimit and define.

It is no longer possible to frame a national cultural policy within methodological nationalism, the pervasive assumption that the nation-state is the natural unit of analysis in modernity (according to the 1974 original concept of Herminio Martins and A. D. Smith's 1979 interpretation in Chernillo 2006). However, as noted by MacNeill and Reynolds (2013, p. 19), "when a government is framing a 'national' cultural policy, the impact of this explicit framing is that the opportunity to think transnationally is mediated, and ... constrained by the imperative to think nationally". To overcome this implicit boundary and think transnationally beyond the nation-state and transcend nationalism is a difficult task. This is an opportunity and a challenge for *lusofonia* as it develops a layer of identity uniting peoples of different countries, potentially set in transnationalism, here viewed ideally as emphasising the value of increased openness or fluidity of barriers to facilitate cultural exchanges within the cultural community (DeVereaux and Griffin 2006, p. 5).

The concept of transnational cultural policy connects with cultural relations/diplomacy and foreign policy. For example, Ahearne (2009) understands that, although under different denominations, both cultural policy and cultural/public diplomacy – which we can define as the use of culture in the relations between governments and foreign publics – deal with the same reality. Thus in his view cultural/public diplomacy can qualify as implicit cultural policy – i.e. government policy not labelled as such. Other cultural policy authors acknowledge this same connection but add caveats. Bell and Oakley (2015, p. 162) link cultural diplomacy (which they choose to frame in the discourse of exchange and understanding) and cultural policy more cautiously: "The degree to which it [cultural diplomacy] is a cultural policy *per se* – a chance to develop artistic reputations, ideas and new markets – or an element of foreign policy is disputed ...; the answer is probably both". However, in his book *International Cultural Relations*, Mitchell (1986, p. 9) clearly brings together the different elements of the cultural policy and cultural diplomacy puzzle:

The motive force behind *international cultural relations* work, whether of the responsible ministry or of non-governmental organisations, is expressed in *external cultural policy*. ...Clearly, external cultural policy cannot be practised in abstraction: its validity will depend on the vitality of the domestic scene, on *internal cultural policy*. The two should ideally interlock. (Our emphasis in italics.)

He (*ibid.*, p. 82 and 84) notes that the connections between external and internal cultural policy are often obscured by the traditional division of powers between foreign ministries overseeing the former and ministries with domestic remit (often ministries of culture) overseeing the latter, which also works in detriment of collaboration. The integration between the two areas is also affected by the fact that external cultural policy is often seen as an intrinsic aspect of foreign policy, which results in the reinforcement of one-way, outward concepts connected with national self-projection (*ibid.*, p. 67/8 and 120). However, Mitchell (*ibid.*, p. 120) notes the development of the principle of mutual benefit in bilateral relations and questions: “If the principle of mutual benefit were to be fully developed, might it not be considered more appropriate to broaden the scope of mutuality more extensively into the multilateral dimension?” Interestingly, Ang, Isar and Mar (2015) try to reconcile the tension between national interest and common interest in cultural diplomacy concluding that going beyond the national interest, by developing processes of dialogue and collaboration (i.e. focusing on cultural relations), “*is in the national interest*” (*ibid.*, p. 378). This is the case of CPLP.

Globalisation has created new spaces for policy formation where different levels of agency coexist – multilateral spaces in which nation-states cooperate according to mutually beneficial principles are one of those levels. CPLP embodies such a particular instance of agency: it is an international actor participating in complex policy networks, which can be defined as “clusters of policy actors, agencies, institutions and organisations whose work is aimed at generating and implementing policies via transnational agreements, policy advisory, philanthropy and conditionality” (Ozga 2005 in Fimyar 2010, p. 12).

In the next section, the author argues that CPLP, as an international actor and space, is a potential agent and site for the development of mutually beneficial cultural policy at transnational level – often articulated in CPLP’s official discourse as cultural cooperation, although explicit mentions to a common cultural policy have also been identified. The chapter is developed on the assumption that cultural policy-making is “a dynamic process in which the nation state exerts power and deploys resources in conjunction with regional, local and even institutional agencies” in the area of culture (the wording is borrowed from Bell and Stevenson’s 2006, p. 4, clear definition of educational policy). In the case of CPLP, albeit with different degrees of investment and involvement, different countries pool resources to consensually implement agreed-upon projects to reach common and mutually beneficial aims and objectives pertaining to culture and the arts.

## **CPLP as a an agent and site for *lusofonia*’s multilateral cultural policy**

The discourse of *lusofonia* and its political incarnation, the CPLP, can be seen as an embodiment of a complex web of experienced and fabricated feelings and intellectual constructions of belonging, where the imagination is key – both in Appadurai’s (1996, p. 48) sense of an organised field of social practice contributing to the interactive construction of the ethnoscapes of group identity and Anderson’s (1991) conception of building narratives of the ‘national’ community.

*Lusofonia*, a compound word combining the Latin term *luso*, the inhabitant of *Lusitânia*, an area roughly corresponding to modern Portugal, and *fonia* from the Ancient Greek meaning voice (in English *Lusophone*) permanently refers this postcolonial notion to the former colonial master’s language. This stress on Portuguese language as a symbol of a ‘community’ of countries and peoples is often the target of critique. Mainly because not all the inhabitants of the countries that are part of *lusofonia*/CPLP speak the Portuguese language and those who do speak it have different levels of fluency – although the countries will have Portuguese language as their implicit or explicit official language. Also problematic is presenting *lusofonia* as a cultural community, which may often be no more than wishful thinking (as the author explored elsewhere, Figueira 2013). Language builds particular solidarities (Anderson 1991) that, along with other elements – in the case of *lusofonia*, a shared colonial past that has fostered persons and cultural exchanges as well as fed similarities in administrative structures and other

connections/dependencies too complex to examine here-can be politically used to foster alliances, from which the different members can extract political, social, economic and cultural benefits (Figueira 2013).

The creation of the CPLP in 1996 was a major step in the institutionalisation of *lusofonia*. However, the organisation, more than representing an actual community, has been a political and ideological strategic plan that has been rather slow in being implemented by its member states. At the time of writing, February 2016, CPLP prepares to celebrate in July its 20th anniversary and has been perceived for most of its life as not very active, focused more on institutional matters than promoting a closeness with and among its peoples. A lack of resources (financial and human) and divergences regarding objectives (and their implementation) between its member states are at the source of CPLP's problems (for detailed examination and a range of views on *lusofonia* and the CPLP see for example Lourenço 1999, Chacon 2002, Santos 2003, Cristóvão 2008, Pinto 2009, Maciel 2015).

Culture has not been a priority for CPLP, although culture and language are posited as the community's building blocks, and the organisation has worked more as political and diplomatic forum. The dissemination and promotion of Portuguese language undertaken by CPLP has not been matched by a similar level of activities in the broad area of culture, or specifically the arts. However, from being not much more than a talking shop for politically correct discourse around political, economic, social and cultural cooperation, the still young organisation (and less financially endowed than for example the International Organisation of *La Francophonie* created in 1970 and the modern Commonwealth of Nations created in 1949) has recently shown signs of having a strategic vision for culture – as we examine later – that may be the key for it to represent an actual site for cultural affiliation respectfully and actively fostering the diversity of expressions of its peoples.

It should be noted that many of the countries that are part of *lusofonia* possess affiliations with other international politico linguistic blocs, such as the ones named above, which denotes a practical approach from the countries to using these as opportunities to make their voices heard and participate more actively in international society. *Lusofonia* as a collective identity cannot (should not) obscure the individual and group multiple identities, which result in multiple diverse arrangements (Figueira 2013). CPLP countries also demonstrate different levels of engagement with the organisation. This is a situation far too complex to examine here, so we will simply highlight two of the challenges in this area and make a brief critical comment to the policy context. Firstly, the member states have different levels of development and different financial capacity to contribute to the organisation, which, to an extent, is a limitation to the possibility of taking part and shaping the direction of the organisation – even if decisions are consensual (Art. 23 of the CPLP Statutes) and there are common funds for projects. Secondly, the political priority countries place on their active participation in the organisation may be influenced by regional affiliations and commitments that take precedence over those of the territorially discontinued *lusofonia* (e.g. Mozambique with the Southern African Development Community). Finally, in terms of context for the development of a multilateral cultural policy, Brazil and Portugal are the two countries with greater interest and capacity to act in this area. Brazil has an interest in the export of its cultural products, and Portugal can use language as a symbolic and 'harmless' continuation of empire. It is, thus, not surprising, for example, to find that Portugal's external cultural strategy aligns so well with that of the CPLP: some of the measures indicated in the Portuguese Government programme for 2015–2019 (Governo de Portugal 2015, p. 254) mirror perfectly some of the CPLP's projects in the area of culture (which we examine later), and it is telling that CPLP's headquarters are in Lisbon.

CPLP operates in a complex context, and the development of policy and practice in the area of culture presents significant challenges but also important opportunities. Cooperation in the domain of culture is one of the objectives of CPLP. In the 1996 CPLP Constitutional Declaration (CPLP 1996), the Heads of State and Government stated as one of the objectives of the organisation the fostering of cultural exchange within a framework of international cooperation; this is also being explicitly mentioned under article 4 of the CPLP Statutes. The general CPLP cooperation agreement<sup>1</sup> of 1999 encapsulates the wish of the member states to develop a mutually advantageous cooperation anchored in shared linguistic, cultural, political and historic communalities. However, if the different member states have significant different development levels and if some countries, as suggested above, have particular vetted interests, would this mean that a mutually advantageous cultural cooperation/policy within CPLP is by definition not possible? We propose to view the activities developed within CPLP as a kind of asymmetrical cooperation (assuming a certain hegemonic leadership by Portugal, as previously

mentioned), thus linking cooperation to (a certain degree of) hegemony – under the assumption that they are not antithetical as suggested by Keohane (1984, p. 49). He defines cooperation by the requirement that “the actions of separate individuals or organizations-which are not in pre-existent harmony – be brought into conformity with one another through a process of negotiation, which is often referred to as ‘policy coordination’” (Keohane 1984, p. 51). So, we would say that CPLP can be viewed as a setting for processes of policy coordination, in the case we are interested in, resulting in a multilateral cultural policy.

This analysis of CPLP as a potential site for cultural policy starts by looking at texts contained in three documents that marked important anniversaries of the organisation: the first celebrating the 10th anniversary of the organisation entitled *Pensar, comunicar, actuar em língua portuguesa/Thinking, communicating and acting in Portuguese* (CPLP 2006); a second published on the occasion of the 12th anniversary entitled *Construindo a Comunidade/Building the Community* (CPLP 2008) and a third marking the 18th anniversary: *Os Desafios do Futuro/The Challenges of the Future* (CPLP 2014b).

In the 2006 publication *Pensar, comunicar, actuar em língua portuguesa*, it is acknowledged that the CPLP objectives remain unfulfilled. The then Executive Secretary, Ambassador Luis Fonseca, advances as justification for the situation the lack of resources and the lack of consensus between the member states regarding strategic plans (CPLP 2006, p. 13). ‘Cultural cooperation’ is reiterated in the document as a main objective of CPLP and its substance consists of projects with governmental institutions and civil societies of the member states as well as international organisations and the development of several agreements (CPLP 2006, p. 113). Mention is made to projects of relevance privileging film, audio-visual and museums (*ibid.*) – these still remain key areas. The executive secretary’s efforts to facilitate the contact between cultural institutions are highlighted as a way to foster intercultural (institutional) dialogue (*ibid.*, p. 114).

In 2008, in the 12th anniversary publication *Construindo a Comunidade/Building the Community* (CPLP 2008), the 2004–2008 Executive Secretary Ambassador Luis de Matos Monteiro da Fonseca argues that CPLP has reached the end of a cycle and is now ready to develop as a community (CPLP 2008, p. 11). In this document, cultural activities are framed as promoting cultural diversity and as efforts for the development of the mutual knowledge of the different cultures within CPLP (*ibid.*, p. 105). The first CPLP Cultural Week that took place between 3 and 11 May 2008 in Lisbon is also mentioned and presented as a reflection space on aims and themes of common agendas (*ibid.*, p. 118). In this document the then Director General of CPLP, Helder Vaz Lopes, presents a vision for the future of CPLP, advancing ten key areas, of which only one pertains directly to culture: “Reinforcement, promotion and conservation of the common cultural heritage” (*ibid.*, p. 141). Heritage is a consistent focus for CPLP.

The 2014 publication celebrating the 18th anniversary of the organisation refers to ‘cultural action’, and under this heading a diversity of initiatives is mentioned: the Day of Portuguese Language and of Culture in the CPLP (*Dia da Língua Portuguesa e da Cultura na CPLP*) celebrated for the first time on 5 May 2010; the DOCTV CPLP programme, which encourages audio-visual production and dissemination, took place in 2009, sponsored by Brazil and Portugal, and was inspired by a similar Brazilian and South American programme; the strengthening/revitalisation of the CPLP museums network that meet in 2012 after an interruption of 11 years; the CPLP Games; and the film festival *Festival de Cinema Itinerante da Língua Portuguesa* (FESTin) taking place since 2010, with the objective of celebrating and strengthening lusophone culture. There is also a general mention promoting the diversity of cultural expressions through exhibitions, seminars and other events (2014b, p. 112).

Most importantly, the above documents include explicit mentions of a cultural policy of the CPLP in relation to the contribution of the CPLP Groups/*Grupos CPLP* to “the promotion of a common cultural policy of the Community”<sup>2</sup> (CPLP 2014b, p. 116, but also in CPLP 2008 and CPLP 2006). Created in 2005, these groups, of at least three representatives of CPLP countries, accredited with foreign governments or international organisations represent the community and work together to promote it. An example of good practice provided by the organisation is the coordination of cultural events for the commemoration of the Day of Portuguese Language and of Culture in the CPLP, celebrated on 5 May (*ibid.*). This event attempts to display to the world a united front in terms of narrative and action.

The three documents above indicate a concern with heritage/museums and with film/audio-visual. Thus we could say that CPLP's cultural policy tries to balance its commitments between traditional and contemporary cultural policy frameworks. The author believes contemporary frameworks of cultural policy, namely, those related to creative and cultural industries and the creative economy, are the way forward in what should be CPLP's focus. Bissau-Guinean development economist Carlos Lopes (CPLP 2006, p. 141) suggests that the advancement of CPLP rests in the development and support of cultural policies in close consultation with civil societies and stresses the importance of the cultural and creative industries. He says:

You can feel the CPLP when a group of citizens of the lusophone countries find common reference points. Not when you organise a formal meeting of politico-diplomatic concertation. To strengthen the basis of the relation we have to translate the friendship in a set of concrete actions. In my view **it is mostly in the area of culture and of the creative industries that new possibilities reside**. Without that lever the Community will be no different from other groupings which we only remember when it's convenient'.<sup>3</sup> [Our emphasis]

So, what is currently the policy and practice of CPLP in relation to culture? Since 2000 the CPLP ministers of culture have been meeting and issuing common declarations that constitute a loose basis of the organisation's cultural policy. This body of texts substantiates common concerns and projects that in 2014 finally came together under a strategy and plan of action – this has been described by the CPLP Secretariat as a way to highlight the importance of culture for the consolidation of CPLP's objectives (CPLP 2014d).

In 2014 the *Strategic Plan for Multilateral Cultural Cooperation of the CPLP and respective Action Plan (2014–2020)* was approved by the IX Meeting of the Ministers of Culture in Maputo, Mozambique. The development of this strategy and action plan was prompted by a 2009 resolution, *Cooperation in the CPLP – A Strategic Vision for Cooperation post Bissau*, that recommended the draft of sectorial cooperation strategies with the aim of improving the performance of the organisation in terms of cooperation for development guided by a results-based strategy (CPLP 2009, p. 2). CPLP's 2014 multilateral cultural cooperation strategy and action plan is an important turning point for the organisation that can be read as a multilateral cultural policy document, representing a common cultural policy, albeit one that it is still in its very early stages. As we shall see, the rationales are not always well developed, and because resources for implementation are an issue, one can question whether this exercise is simply a tidier framework in which to develop cooperation that will remain punctual and haphazard.

The preamble of the CPLP's 2014 strategy and action plan sets as its foundational basis for action the need to protect, promote and disseminate the historical, cultural and linguistic legacy composed of tangible and intangible heritage built through the shared history of the peoples of the CPLP (2014c, p. 3). Heritage, in both its communality and diversity, is seen as a factor for the deepening of the relationships of the CPLP peoples and also for increasing CPLP's international visibility (*"afirmação da CPLP no mundo"* in the Portuguese original, *ibid.*). This reveals a strong concern with the use of culture, and particularly heritage, for prestige and international visibility. This emphasises heritage as a value in itself, although there are remarks in the preamble to the enrichment of cultural life and to the strengthening of the development of the member states through culture.

In the 2014 strategy and action plan, we can also see how CPLP relates to particular meta-narratives in cultural policy. The document presents the development of multilateral cultural cooperation as based around a series of judgements regarding culture's conceptualisation (human rights, diversity of cultural expressions), functions (mutual knowledge and understanding, building of collective identities, knowledge transfer, economic and social development), and enactment (harmonious cooperation, accessibility and participation of all) (2014c, p. 2). This represents a mediation of global policy agendas to the level of this community of countries. Policy transfer is an area in which the organisation could have an important role. CPLP Groups can be very active within the international organisations in which they exist; they follow, for example, policy developments at UNESCO for the protection of cultural heritage in the CPLP countries.

The stated aim of the strategy and action plan is the reinforcement of cultural cooperation between its member states, under the principle of multilateralism, with the following general objectives: strengthening their

development through culture; contributing to closer relations among the peoples; and increasing the visibility of CPLP in the world (2014c, p. 4 and 5). These high-level objectives are further unpacked in a series of specific objectives, a few of which are very focused (facilitate knowledge exchange between cultural operators by ensuring conditions for their mobility and for the circulation of cultural products; provide tools to support cultural professionals in the development and safeguard of their creations; promote artistic and cultural education activities targeting a range of audiences), but most, one could say, remain quite fuzzy and/or general (undertaking joint activities benefitting the populations; establish mechanisms for the communication and transmission of information; encourage the internationalisation of CPLP through culture; structure and strengthen cultural heritage cooperation) (2014c, p. 5). The author sees these specific objectives as constituting basic tenets of the multilateral cultural policy being developed by CPLP.

The objectives, and the priority axes of its implementation that we are going to examine now, implicitly position the organisation in relation to certain cultural policy frameworks (Matarasso and Landry 1999) – although one cannot interpret these frameworks as either/or poles as we shall see, for example, in relation to CPLP's focus on heritage and also on the contemporary through film and the audio-visual. The multilateral cultural cooperation strategy and action plan outlines five strategic axes: cultural industries and creative economy in CPLP; diversity of cultural expressions in the CPLP; internationalisation of the CPLP in the domain of culture; cultural heritage and historical memory of the CPLP; and human resources development (2014c).

The first axis, cultural industries and creative economy in CPLP, covers three main objectives. Firstly, encouraging the production, distribution and circulation of cultural goods and services within the CPLP area as well as its internationalisation – the priority action identified in this area is the development of a mechanism for the temporary export/import of goods. Secondly, supporting the mobility of cultural agents, by disseminating information on and creating opportunities for mobility (such as artistic residencies), as well as drafting a status of the artist, based on UNESCO's guidelines. Thirdly, to foster exchange of information regarding cultural policies and activities and the cultural economy, as well as collate and consolidate cultural information and statistics, (e.g. copyright laws).

Within the second axis, diversity of cultural expressions in the CPLP, three areas are sketched. One is promoting culture for sustainable development, by subscribing to the UN 2015 resolution on this matter and promoting traditional knowledge. Another area is promoting Portuguese language and the cultural and linguistic diversity of the peoples of the CPLP, for example through the celebration on the 5th of May of the Day of Portuguese Language and of Culture in the CPLP (*Dia da Língua Portuguesa e da Cultura na CPLP*). And a final area is promoting cultural and arts education, focusing particularly on primary/secondary age children.

The third axis, internationalisation of the CPLP in the domain of culture, includes three main dimensions: the development of relations with international and regional organisations – e.g. UN, UNESCO, WIPO, OEI, AU, EU – with the objective of raising CPLP's profile and promoting the culture of its members, accessing funding and development opportunities, participating in international debates/projects and being part of related agreements; fostering politico-diplomatic consultations for concerted action in the area of culture between the CPLP member states; developing the international visibility of culture in the CPLP through the creation of an e-Portal (*Portal da Cultura da CPLP*).

As part of the fourth axis, cultural heritage and historical memory of the CPLP, there are three areas of intervention: conservation, digitisation and development of the accessibility of the heritage of the member states; here a lot of emphasis is given to historical archives and museums; capacity-building of professionals and organisations; and promoting the visibility of the cultural heritage of the CPLP's members.

The fifth and final axis, human resources development, is aimed at capacity building of governmental and civil society cultural operators. The foreseen activities include training of professionals and trainers in cultural management and other relevant areas.

Priority actions have been identified for each of the areas of the five axes outlined above. From different projects matching the diverse priority actions, seven projects were prioritised by the CPLP ministers of Culture meeting in Maputo (CPLP 2014a) and of these, five were developed by CPLP Secretariat and by the Focal Points for

Culture/*Pontos Focais de Cultura* (which ensure the permanent coordination of cultural cooperation between the member states and CPLP), for implementation in the first two years of the 2014–2020 action plan, no doubt having in mind the limited human and financial capacity of the organisation to implement them.

The first action proposed by the ministers of culture was the submission of the UN proposed resolution on “Culture and sustainable development in the post-2015 development agenda” for consideration to the *XIX Reunião Ordinária do Conselho de Ministros da CPLP*. This meeting took place three months later, in July 2014, and it recommended the Secretariat to follow the debates and promote a concerted position for the CPLP members, as well as encourage the member states to integrate culture and the creative economy in development (2014e). The ministers also commissioned the CPLP Executive Secretariat to develop a status of the artist for CPLP in line with the UNESCO’s recommendations (CPLP 2014a) – this second action, a policy transfer activity, was not selected for immediate development. These two first actions both reveal a concern of CPLP, aligning its policy with dominant political meta-narratives, namely with the UN agencies.

A third action selected by CPLP’s ministers of culture consisted of mandating the organisation’s Secretariat to prepare a comparative study of their countries’ legislation regarding copyright and related rights as an information gathering exercise and in preparation for negotiations with the World Intellectual Property Organization (Secretariado Executivo da CPLP 2014b). In August 2015 the Secretariat was about to launch the commissioning of the study, which is part of strategic axis one *Creative Industries and Creative Economy*. This demonstrates an alignment and a concern with this important current policy area, particularly with the thematic of intellectual rights, and it is a step forward in raising awareness and creating an ambitious network and database on copyright and related rights within the CPLP.

Reinforcing the visibility of the culture in the CPLP seems to be a driver for the **ministers of culture**, as they propose that the presiding member state hosts simultaneously the CPLP’s Capital of Culture and Book Fair. The author interprets this as an economy of scales and an attempt to accumulate synergies from the different events to enable a maximisation of impact with some decrease of investment. Both activities, which are part of strategic axis two *Diversity of Cultural Expressions in the CPLP*, have had detailed proposals developed by the Secretariat during 2014/5 (Secretariado Executivo da CPLP 2014a and 2014d). The CPLP Book Fair is not a new activity; the first *CPLP Feira do Livro* took place in Luanda, Angola, in 2013 and the second took place in Dili, Timor-Leste, in July 2015. Book fairs fall under a very traditional way of engaging in international cultural relations, in this way quite different from the proposal of a CPLP Capital of Culture, situated in more contemporary modes of developing cultural engagement, where urban cultural policy and place branding meet. The project *Capital da Cultura da CPLP* has yet to come to life and the Secretariat has instead developed a less ambitious project for axis two, that of a CPLP Children’s Song Festival (Secretariado Executivo da CPLP 2014c).

A concern with visibility and the building of a common narrative for identity is also associated with the proposal of the ministers of culture for the development of a Common CPLP Historical Collections Platform. Concerns with conservation and access are no doubt included, but a few of the proposals under strategic axis four *Cultural Heritage and Historical Memory of CPLP*, which incidentally have not been developed in a first phase by the Secretariat – are geared towards creating a sense of communality (note for example also the proposal for a Common Historical Archive for the Colonial and Liberation Period of the African Countries having Portuguese as Official Language, CPLP 2014c, p. 23).

The choice of projects by the CPLP ministers of culture in Maputo (2014a) reveals some concern with the development of the cultural milieu of the different countries, although this seems to be restricted to official, or at least institutional, stakeholders – thus leaving out of scope civil society/culture at the grass roots level. This interpretation is based on the fact that – although there is an increasing number of civil society activities related to *lusofonia* and that CPLP itself has civil society organisations as consulting observer members (in Portuguese *Observador Consultivo*) – the initiatives proposed within the remit of CPLP are quite limited, only including: regular training seminars for senior officials (*Altos Quadros* in the Portuguese original) in the area of cultural policies and creative industries of CPLP; and the organisation of an event gathering the member states Film and Audio-visual Authorities (Secretariado Executivo da CPLP 2014e). The positive note for axis five *Human Resources*



*Development* activities is that an activity has actually happened: the CPLP Forum of Film and Audio-Visual Authorities took place in Lisbon in November 2014.

The above limited and relatively safe choice of activities reveals an organisation taking little steps. More than strategic choices backed up by strong rationales and substantial resources by committed member states, CPLP (or more precisely its Executive Secretary and the Secretariat) continue to do what is possible to move the organisation forward in the area of culture according to a diversified range of commitments by the different member states.

CPLP, and specifically its cultural policy and practice, is weakened by being under resourced and under staffed. The Cultural Action Directorate/*Direção de Ação Cultural*, created in 2011, was an answer to increasing demands in this area allowing for more strategic planning and an increase in staffing (albeit limited from 1 person to 2), replacing a modus operandi in which member states would work on different areas according to their own interests (Vieira, personal interview 2015). Meagre funds to implement the projects are an endemic concern for CPLP, and the global economic crisis is acknowledged to have had a negative impact in the organisation. In 2012, the then director for CPLP Cultural Action and Portuguese Language/*Acção Cultural e Língua Portuguesa*, Luís Kandjimbo, stated that, during the 16-year existence of the organisation, the multilateral cooperation in the cultural sector had not been as productive as anticipated due to the inexistence of a structure within the Secretariat to ensure and monitor the implementation of the deliberations of the ministries of culture (ANGOP 2012). Having a strategy and an action plan as well as an organisation structure (the *Direção de Ação Cultural* and the *Pontos Focais de Cultura*) is a step forward to be able to construct and develop a multilateral cultural policy that can benefit each individual country and the collective identity represented by CPLP.

The above developments indicating support for culture within CPLP must take into account other less-supportive signs that the arts component may not be a priority for CPLP. Executive Secretary Murade Murargy, interviewed in 2015 (CEO Lusófono 2015, p. 17), stated that mobility was fundamental for the development of the community and that governments needed to develop the necessary conditions and mechanisms for the freedom of movement. The secretary said CPLP was approaching the matter by groups: i.e. business people, students, teachers and researchers were the priority group and then, if this were successful, the second group would include artists and journalists. Surely mutual understanding and circulation of information would be most advanced if priority were given to the arts and media: you would want to learn and do business with those that arouse your curiosity and interest you. Trade no longer follows the flag, as advocated by the 19th century imperialist maxim; it is more likely that it follows cultural interactions.

These contradictory signs are not surprising. CPLP countries and their agents operate in complex and dynamic environments, where conflicting priorities shape policies. Nevertheless, the recent developments have confirmed that CPLP has become an agent and a site for policy formation and coordination resulting – in the case we are concerned with – in the development, within lusofonia, of a multilateral cultural policy. The CPLP groups, created in 2005, contributing to the promotion of an (implicit) common cultural policy, are good examples of this new level of agency. However, the turning point for CPLP's cultural policy is the 2014 multilateral cultural cooperation strategy and action plan. Here the common interests in cultural policy are made explicit and developed through cultural relations/diplomacy processes of dialogue and collaboration (ministers of culture meetings, CPLP Secretariat and Focal Points for Culture) and implemented utilising (albeit meagre) common resources.

## **The challenges and limits of interstitial cultural policy in the CPLP**

Our globalised societies need to be able to link with different levels and approaches to cultural policy. UNESCO, considering “[t]he new socio-cultural fabric of our societies combined with global interconnectedness necessitates new governance systems” (2011, p. 11) proposes a new cultural policy vision requiring “thinking outside the box, reinforcing and inventing reliable inter-ministerial approaches, and embracing the broad range of actors playing a role in taking the culture and development agenda forward” (2011, p. 20). CPLP is a site for cultural policy development, but how much that role will be developed is still uncertain and ultimately depends on the will (and resources) of the member states.

CPLP is developing (transnational, multilateral) cultural policy, within its territorial definition, insofar as its activities (including policy discourse and sponsoring of activities) influence/impact the conditions of the cultural producers and operators, the production of cultural goods and services and their distribution to users/participants, as well as the management of cultural resources (Bennett and Mercer 1998). One has observed that the activities developed are still limited and their impact probably, in many cases, negligible – but this is something that has not been ascertained in context, and one imagines that in the case of the ‘less developed’ member states even a small impact can be very important for development. CPLP should better articulate this connection between culture and development, which is played out at different levels: development of the cultural milieu in each member state; development of a ‘lusophone’ identity; cultural industries development; development of cultural diversity.

Indeed, the development of a common/multilateral cultural policy and practice poses opportunities and challenges, which recent developments are only starting to explore. For example, besides the challenge of deciding where to prioritise investment in the development of a common cultural policy, another important challenge is the articulation of this common policy with the different national cultural policies of the Member States – an area outside the scope of this chapter. Carefully curated nodes of interaction between the national and transnational spheres of cultural policy and practice can represent major opportunities by bringing added value and creating spill-over effects for cultural agents and operators.

One of these nodes could be the cultural economy. The cultural and creative industries could be a successful way to link culture and development, for the profit of states and peoples, securing the sustainable diversity of cultural expressions and enabling a recognisable role for the organisation. If, as defended by Executive Secretary Murade Murargy (Exame 2014), the organisation should focus on economic diplomacy, perhaps the focus on the creative economy is not far fetched.

The further development and recognition of a common transnational cultural policy could be seen as a sign of maturity of this community project, leaving behind years of debate of what it means to be part of *lusofonia*. And although the CPLP structure is created top-down, the author sees it as an encouragement of bottom-up initiatives, resulting in mutually structuring influences, as in a symbiotic relation (Maciel 2015, p. 388).

This chapter analysed a conceptualisation and practice of cultural policy at multilateral levels seeking to reinforce the study of cultural policy beyond the domestic realm of a state (the often default level of analysis of cultural policy research) and thus challenging methodological nationalism and also the conceptual divide between cultural diplomacy and cultural policy. The CPLP case study demonstrated that it is relevant to the understanding of contemporary cultural policy to examine units of analysis beyond the nation-state and that the concept of a transnational cultural policy bridges the concepts of cultural relations/diplomacy and foreign policy.

This chapter needs to be complemented by further research. At a general level by the examination of transnational cultural policy through multiple disciplinary analysis that include cultural diplomacy/foreign policy (and the implicit reverse: cultural diplomacy being analysed with the input of cultural policy thinking), and at a specific level, through further research on the operation of transnational levels of policy (examination of the role of particular individuals, bureaucracies and networks) and its connections with both the national level (in this case researching the links with the national cultural policies, practices and agents/operators of each CPLP member state) and other international spheres (for example regarding the adoption and transfer of meta-narratives from UNESCO).

By restricting this chapter to the analysis of the CPLP, the author missed other important strands of the construction of the lusophone community, such as the bilateral relations between the countries, the work of important organisations operating at other levels of governments (e.g. UCCLA at the local level) or the Camoes Institute at the national level. Also not covered are the important networks of cultural professionals, i.e. museum networks, and other fundamental links of civil society, such as those embodied and practiced by artists and cultural professionals: curators, writers, musicians and visual artists. The focus on CPLP, an intergovernmental institutional structure, was intended to investigate how important that structuring role is for the cultural construction of the community and its display. There is still a lot of work to be done, and thus the author is in agreement with Carlos Lopes’ words written 10 years ago and still valid: “Even with buckets of friendship, the

reality of the discontinuity will impose itself dramatically and with no escape. Unless one seriously invests in a set of singular factors<sup>4</sup> (CPLP 2006, p. 140). The future will tell what singular factors the member states choose to develop.

In July 2016, Brazil assumed CPLP's presidency for two years, and the Brazilian minister of culture, Juca Ferreira, has already voiced his interest in increasing the organisation's activity in the area of culture, even advancing some specific projects such as a conference on Portuguese language having culture as a reference point or the potential for policy/practice transfer of the Brazilian cultural policy initiative *Pontos de Cultura* (Ministério da Cultura do Brasil, 2015). Perhaps 2016, the year the organisation commemorated 20 years, will be seen as the start of a new impetus in CPLP's multilateral cultural policy.

## Bibliography

- Ahearne, J. (2009) Cultural policy explicit and implicit: a distinction and some uses. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 15(2), 141–153.
- Anderson, B. (1991) *Imagined Communities: Reflection on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. Revised Edition. London: Verso.
- ANGOP Agencia Angola Press (2012) Responsável considera pouco produtiva cooperação multilateral cultural na CPLP – 03 Abril de 2012 15h16. Available at: [http://www.angop.ao/angola/pt\\_pt/noticias/lazer-e-cultura/2012/3/14/Responsavel-considera-pouco-produtiva-cooperacao-multilateral-cultural-CPLP,adb6e718-b348-42c6-8d88-3281e26624b1.html](http://www.angop.ao/angola/pt_pt/noticias/lazer-e-cultura/2012/3/14/Responsavel-considera-pouco-produtiva-cooperacao-multilateral-cultural-CPLP,adb6e718-b348-42c6-8d88-3281e26624b1.html) (Accessed 20 February 2016).
- Ang, I., Isar, Y.R., and Mar, P. (2015) Cultural diplomacy: beyond the national interest? *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 21(4), 365–381. doi:10.1080/10286632.2015.1042474.
- Appadurai, A. (1996) *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Arndt, R.T. (2005) *The First Resort of Kings: American Cultural Diplomacy in the Twentieth Century*. Washington, DC: Potomac Books.
- Barreiras Duarte, F. (2014) *Os Acordos Internacionais da CPLP*. Lisboa: Âncora Editora.
- Bell, D. and Oakley, K. (2015) *Cultural Policy*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Bell, L. and Stevenson, H. (2006) *Language Policy: Process, Themes and Impact*. London: Routledge.
- Bennett, T. and Mercer, C. (1998) Improving research and international cooperation for cultural policy. UNESCO. Available at: <http://www.culturalpolicies.net/web/files/137/en/bennet-mercet.pdf> (Accessed 20 February 2016).
- CEO Lusófono (2015) Murade Murargy: Dar mais energia as pontes lusófonas in CEO Lusófono: Decisores da Lusofonia em Dialógo para a Ação, N.61, Abr/Mai/Jun 2015, pp. 14–18.
- Chacon, V. (2002) *O Futuro Político da Lusofonia*. Lisbon: Verbo.

- Chernillo, D. (2006) Social theory's methodological nationalism: myth and reality. *European Journal of social Theory*, 9(1), 5–22.
- CPLP (1996) Declaração Constitutiva da CPLP. Available at: <http://www.cplp.org/Files/Filer/Documentos%20Essenciais/DeclaraoConstitutivaCPLP.pdf> (Accessed 12 January 2016).
- CPLP (2006) Pensar, comunicar, actuar em língua portuguesa: 10 anos da CPLP. Comunidade dos Países de Língua Portuguesa.
- CPLP (2008) Construindo a Comunidade: 12 Anos de Vitalidade e Dinamismo. Comunidade dos Países de Língua Portuguesa.
- CPLP (2009) XIV Reunião Ordinária do Conselho de Ministros da CPLP, Cidade da Praia, 20 de julho de 2009: Resolução sobre a “Cooperação na CPLP-Uma visão Estratégica de Cooperação pós Bissau”. Available at: [www.cplp.org](http://www.cplp.org) (Accessed 12 January 2016).
- CPLP (2014a) Declaração de Maputo. Declaração Final da IX Reunião de Ministros da Cultura da Comunidade dos Países de Língua Portuguesa (CPLP), na cidade de Maputo, Moçambique, nos dias 10 e 11 de Abril de 2014. Available at: <http://www.cplp.org/Files/Billeder/cplp/Declarao-Final-IX-Reunio-CPLP.pdf> (Accessed 12 January 2016).
- CPLP (2014b) Os Desafios do Futuro: 18 Anos CPLP. Comunidade dos Países de Língua Portuguesa.
- CPLP (2014c) Plano Estratégico de Cooperação Cultural Multilateral da CPLP e respetivo Plano de Ação (2014–2020), 11 de Abril de 2014. (VIII Reunião de Ministros da Cultura da CPLP, 2 e 3 de abril de 2012, e Declaração de Maputo, IX Conferencia de Chefes de Estado e de Governo da CPLP, 20 de Julho de 2012).
- CPLP (2014d) Nota Informativa: CPLP reforça cooperação na Cultura. Available at: <http://www.cplp.org/id-4447.aspx?Action=1&NewsId=3425&M=NewsV2&PID=10872> (Accessed 12 January 2016).
- CPLP (2014e) XIXa Reuniao do Conselho de Ministros – Dili, Timor-Leste, 22 de Julho de 2014 link entitled Resolução sobre a Cultura na Agenda para o Desenvolvimento Pós 2015. Available at: <http://www.cplp.org/id-4447.aspx?Action=1&NewsId=3463&M=NewsV2&PID=10872> (Accessed 12 January 2016).
- Cristovão, F. (2008) *Da Lusitanidade à Lusofonia*. Coimbra: Almedina.
- DeVereaux, C. and Griffin, M. (2006) International, global, transnational: Just a matter of words? In Eurozine, published 11 October 2006. The article was originally presented in Vienna at the 4th International Conference on Cultural Policy Research, iccpr 2006. Available at <http://www.eurozine.com/articles/2006-10-11-devereauxgriffin-en.html>.
- Exame (2014) CPLP: Um Sonho Sempre Adiado in Revista Exame, N.20, March 2014, Mozambique Edition, pp. 20–30.

- Figueira, C. (2013) *Languages at War: External Language Spread Policies in Lusophone Africa: Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau at the Turn of the 21st Century*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. ISBN: 978-3-631-64436-2 hb.
- Goff, P.M. (2013) *Cultural Diplomacy. The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, pp. 419–435.
- Governo de Portugal (2015) Programa do XXI Governo de Portugal 2015–2019. Available at <http://www.portugal.gov.pt/media/18268168/programa-do-xxi-governo.pdf> (Accessed 12 January 2016).
- Keohane, R.O. (1984) *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Lourenço, E. (1999) *A Nau de Ícaro e Imagem e Miragem da Lusofonia*. Lisboa: Gradiva.
- Maciel, C. (2015) *A Construção da Comunidade Lusófona a partir do antigo centro: Micro-comunidades e praticas da lusofonia*. Lisbon: Camões – Instituto da Cooperação e da Língua.
- MacNeill, K. and Reynolds, S. (2013) Imagining transnational cultural policy. *Asia Pacific Journal of Arts and Cultural Management*, 10(1), 15–24.
- Matarasso, F. and Landry, C. (1999) *Balancing Act: Twenty-One Strategic Dilemmas in Cultural Policy*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Ministério da Cultura do Brasil (2015) Brasil e CPLP vão intensificar cooperação na área da cultura – Notícias em destaque 7.7.2015 18:38. Available at: [http://www.cultura.gov.br/noticias-destaques/-/asset\\_publisher/OiKX3xIR9iTn/content/brasil-e-cplp-vaio-intensificar-cooperacao-na-area-de-cultura/10883](http://www.cultura.gov.br/noticias-destaques/-/asset_publisher/OiKX3xIR9iTn/content/brasil-e-cplp-vaio-intensificar-cooperacao-na-area-de-cultura/10883) (Accessed 20 February 2016).
- Mitchell, J.M. (1986) *International Cultural Relations*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Nye, J.S. (2004) *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. New York: Public Affairs.
- Pinto, J.F. (2009) *Estrategias da ou para a Lusofonia: O Futuro da Língua Portuguesa*. Lisbon: Prefacio.
- Santos, L.A. (2003) Portugal and the CPLP: heightened expectations, unfounded disillusion. Universidade do Minho. Available at: [http://repositorium.sdum.uminho.pt/bitstream/1822/3079/1/lantos\\_CPLP\\_2003.pdf](http://repositorium.sdum.uminho.pt/bitstream/1822/3079/1/lantos_CPLP_2003.pdf) (Accessed 12 January 2016).
- Secretariado Executivo da CPLP (2014a) Documento de Projeto: Capital da Cultura da CPLP, proposto pela Direção para Ação Cultural e Língua Portuguesa (Cultura) da CPLP em 18/11/2014. Lisbon: CPLP.
- Secretariado Executivo da CPLP (2014b) Documento de Projeto: Estudo Comparado da Legislação dos Países de Língua Portuguesa sobre Direitos Autorais e Direitos Conexos, proposto pela Direção para Ação Cultural e Língua Portuguesa (Cultura) da CPLP em 18/11/2014. Lisbon: CPLP.

Secretariado Executivo da CPLP (2014c) Documento de Projeto: Festival da Canção Infantil da CPLP, proposto pela Direção para Ação Cultural e Língua Portuguesa (Cultura) da CPLP em 18/11/2014. Lisbon: CPLP.

Secretariado Executivo da CPLP (2014d) Documento de Projeto: II Feira do Livro da CPLP, proposto pela Direção para Ação Cultural e Língua Portuguesa (Cultura) da CPLP em 18/11/2014. Lisbon: CPLP.

Secretariado Executivo da CPLP (2014e) Documento de Projeto: Seminário sobre Políticas Culturais e Indústrias Criativas da CPLP destinado a Altos Quadros ao Nível Institucional e Estratégico, proposto pela Direção para Ação Cultural e Língua Portuguesa (Cultura) da CPLP em 18/11/2014. Lisbon: CPLP.

Tardif, J. (2004) Globalization and Culture. Permanent Forum on Cultural Pluralism. Available at: <http://www.other-news.info/2004/12/globalization-and-culture/> (Accessed 12 January 2016).

UNESCO (2011) *A New Cultural Policy Agenda for Development and Mutual Understanding: Key Arguments for a Strong Commitment to Cultural Diversity and Intercultural Dialogue*. Paris: UNESCO.

Vieira, V. (2015) Personal Interview. Senior Official at Direção para Ação Cultural e Língua Portuguesa, CPLP, Lisbon, August 2015.

Weiβ, J. and Schwietring, T. (2006) The Power of Language: A Philosophical-Sociological Reflection. Available at: <http://www.goethe.de/lhr/prj/mac/msp/en1253450.htm> (Accessed 12 January 2016).

---

<sup>1</sup> For convenience, the author refers to the text of this agreement as well as other CPLP agreements, unless otherwise stated, as published in Barreiras Duarte (2014).

<sup>2</sup> In the Portuguese original: “a promoção de uma política cultural comum da Comunidade”.

<sup>3</sup> In the Portuguese original “A CPLP sente-se quando um grupo de cidadãos de países lusófonos encontram pontos de referência comuns. Não quando se organiza uma reunião formal de concertação político-diplomática. Para fortalecer a base do relacionamento pode-se traduzir amizade num conjunto de ações concretas. A meu ver **são sobretudo na área cultural e nas indústrias criativas que se abrem novas potencialidades**. Sem essa alavanca a Comunidade não será muito diferente de outros agrupamentos que nos lembramos apenas ‘quando dá jeito’.”

<sup>4</sup> In the Portuguese original: “Mesmo com carradas de amizade a realidade da descontinuidade acabará por impôr-se de forma dramática e sem hesitações. A não ser que se invista seriamente num conjunto de factores que sejam singulares”.