

5.4. Isolation: towards the politics of new music: reflections on the momentum of new music in Portuguese cultural policy

Gil Fesch¹

Abstract

The increasing gap between musicians and publics has, in the last decades, been raising questions about the artistic significance of contemporary high art music. Recent literature points out the necessity of enriching the debate with particular cases, in order to build up guidelines and recommendations for future educational and state policies. The present work aims at contributing to a better understanding of current trends in cultural policies, with special focus on those concerning music. We shall start by twigging recent transformations in Portugal, as means of grasping inner specificities, but also common grounds. The overarching goal, then, is to reflect on the momentum of *new music* within the context of Portuguese cultural policy, starting from a general portrayal of public support to musical creation. Such an analysis, due to obvious formal limitations, can only come as a partial contribution, yet we seek to cater an early base for forthcoming discussions.

Keywords: new music contemporary cultural policy.

Introduction

Cultural policy, though a recent area of public policy-making in Western European states, suffered significant transformations in the last decades. Conceived in the post-war context, most cultural policy programs, in their genesis, reified the opposition between legitimate and non-legitimate art forms, most generally consisting of a tripartite core of action, including "historical heritage, support of professional artists, and traditional cultural institutions" (Dubois, 2014: 5). Public debates later came to question hierarchical conceptions of art and culture, claiming for the promotion of diversity in contemporary public policies. Thus being, cultural policy regimes progressively started to encompass a wide array of activities in which youth and local cultures — among others — play a major role, intertwining art and entertainment, as creative industries take the lead (Silva *et al.*, 2012). Underlying such changes are different notions of culture itself, with concrete implications. As a widespread tendency, Donnat (2003) mentions a move towards non-cultural purposes in cultural policies from 1980 onwards, namely social integration and economic development. Public expenditure on culture, therefore, becomes all the more defined according to economic rather than aesthetic rationales, i.e. cultural institutions are envisioned qua investments with economic impacts. Far from meaning the end of legitimist approaches, such shift points to a growing complexity in contemporary policy practices, in which contradictory logics and objectives coexist (Gomes &

¹ Institute of Sociology - University of Porto, Portugal.

Lourenço, 2009). In times of severe financial crisis, it is with no surprise that the public funding of elite culture manifestations — especially contemporary high art music and experimental music² — ends up facing critiques for hardly meeting the demands of general audiences (Dubois, 2011).

An outlook of Portuguese cultural policy

The Portuguese case matches, in general terms, the evolution of Western European cultural policy, though a handful of idiosyncrasies can be found. Culture was, at a faster or slower pace, the driving force of complex structural changes in the Portuguese society — most of these transformations happening with a lag of decades, yet in a flaming manner. The strict notion of culture that underlay the trilogy of early cultural policy goals — decentralization, democratization and education for art (Anico, 2009) — later gave place to a wider understanding, as alternative forms were legitimized, but also crossover manifestations (Gomes & Lourenço, 2009). New modes of appropriation and cultural participation came into being, "associated to the processes of schooling, tertiarisation, urbanisation and reduction of inequalities between men and women" (Silva *et al.*, 2012: 14), resulting in a broader, heterogeneous demand for culture. Portuguese cultural policy, thus, developed around a complex pattern of action, in which national and local strategies intertwine, i.e. a process of decentralization of cultural institutions and a concomitant concentration of power.

Since the establishment of democracy in Portugal, cultural policy-making embraced the Malrucian project (Dubois, 2011).³ Despite slight differences in the way it was regarded, democratization was a crosscutting goal in the numerous government programs. Be they left or right-winged, Portuguese political parties seem to consider culture to be an essential area of public policies. One need not say, however, that inherent strategies, priorities and scopes of action tend to follow social and economic backdrops, but facts point to a general consensus as to the importance of cultural policy. All things considered, this may have to do with fund allocations to culture — usually below 1% of the overall budget — being insufficient, leaving few space for ambitious policy-making (Gomes & Lourenço, 2009). The accent on cultural infrastructures was particularly evident in the late 1980s, coinciding with the country's adherence to the European Economic Community and consequent access to designated funding opportunities. Together with the activity of the municipalities, this boosted territorial spreading of public cultural facilities in Portugal (Silva *et al.*, 2012).

From the mid-1990s onwards, though, there was a clear shift. After the Ministry of Culture was created,⁴ public strategies towards cultural matters started taking advantage of massive events and celebrations — e.g. *Expo '98* and the European Capitals of Culture (Lisbon, in 1994, and Porto, 2001) —, side by side with the professionalization of private and independent

² Such classifications, to a certain extent, perpetuate hierarchical distinctions that we seek to overcome. For the remainder of the present work, we shall adhere to the term new music.

³ For the purposes of the present analysis, we shall overlook what could be regarded as the first public strategies concerning culture, dating from the decades of fascism. It might be important simply to notice that culture responded to the regime's ideological interests.

⁴ Manuel Maria Carrilho (member of the Socialist Party) served as Minister of Culture, during the XIII Constitutional Government (1995-1999).

spheres of culture.⁵ This meant, for the first time, looking at culture in terms of its economic revenue and transferring symbolic rationales to the economic field. In other words, culture and creativity became central to economic growth and international reputation (Santos, 2003). Due differences aside, there is an obvious parallelism with Lang's *médiatico-spectaculaire* agenda (Donnat, 2003: 8). To sum it up, the first stage of Portuguese cultural policy had to do with the democratization of *supply*, via territorial distribution of cultural infrastructures, support to itinerancy, as well as popular culture, amateurship and cultural advertisement in the media. Later, democratization strategies meant acting on the realm of *demand*, through education programs⁶ — among others —, as means of widening cultural participation to lower social strata (Gomes & Lourenço, 2009). This does not mean, again, that early strategies were discontinued, but rather complemented by somehow more inclusive policy programs, in which culture was assessed in its multiple dimensions. Notwithstanding, there is still a considerable gap between the goals mentioned in the various government programs and tangible policy-making. In fact, the very reiteration of such priorities suggests an endless postponing of effective solutions. Despite obvious transformations, the widening of (informed) cultural fruition is, for the time being, still far from accomplished (Gomes & Lourenço, 2009).

The role of municipalities

Until now, we have stressed the (delayed) correspondence between the Portuguese case and other Western European cultural policy regimes, more specifically those concerning France. We could not, however, go without mentioning its distinctive features as well — the unambiguous importance of local action, namely the role of municipalities. Since the adherence to the (now-called) European Union, culture became a nuclear concern for local decision-makers, leading to a close articulation and interdependency between national and local policy levels (Silva, 2007). Far from being an exclusive feature, authors (e.g. Dubois, 2014) refer to such functional differentiation as a widespread tendency, yet this seems to be particularly conspicuous in the Portuguese case, partially due to the "excessive dispersion that characterises the administrative organisation of Portugal" (Silva *et al.*, 2012: 6). With no regional level of organization, state institutions tend to focus on the aesthetic concerns of elite cultural forms, whereas local authorities intervene within the domain of popular manifestations. If one thing becomes clear, it is the impossibility of analyzing Portuguese cultural policy without assessing the structures of the local political system.

Likewise the national level, facts point to an overall consensus in terms of local cultural policy. Though minor divergences in political discourse can be found, local action does not seem to vary considerably. If right-winged municipalities tend to stress the importance of culture as local identity marker, and left-winged ones more likely highlight cultural diversity and the need for infrastructures, that does not end up overruling the relative homogeneity in local strategies (Silva *et al.*, 2012; Gomes & Lourenço, 2009).

Local political players, it follows, seem to focus on short-term policy-making, often by complying with the logics of the electoral competition, i.e. a need to advertise the deeds of

⁵ Lima dos Santos (2007) mentions the strong transformations at work in the cultural field, from 1991 to 2001, though still far from EU standards. Employment in the cultural sector, for instance, increased 34% and featured the highest education rate, in national terms.

⁶ Implies some degree of articulation between the Ministries of Culture and Education (Lima dos Santos, 2007).

municipalities, namely those concerning infrastructures, as means of earning public recognition and political trust. Long-term action and bottom-up strategies — via collaboration with, and endowment of, local institutions and relevant cultural agents —, thus, find little space at the local level of cultural policy (Silva *et al.*, 2012).

Although there are numerous cases of innovative approaches to local policy-making — appealing to younger, more educated audiences, taking advantage of creative industries, and eager to explore complicitous, but also scathing relationships between cultural spheres —, the administrative structure of Portugal, along with the economic frailty that characterizes most of the municipalities, seems to be "hampering the activity of a critical mass to implement cultural policies that extend beyond the small world of each local environment, and of the rules of legitimacy and political competition within these environments" (Silva *et al.*, 2012: 6).

Often serving as mere recipients of national decision-making, local authorities, nevertheless, play a decisive role in the context of Portuguese cultural policy. Far from contradictory, these two levels intertwine and complement one another, so as to enhance political action — the municipalities intervening in areas of activity where the state fails to provide for (Silva *et al.*, 2012).

In a context of "weakening of public policies and improvement of markets, entrepreneurship and civil society" (Silva *et al.*, 2012: 15), the changes in cultural policy-making become all the more significant. As the *creative-economy* reasoning — reified in concepts such as 'creativity' and 'innovation' — colonizes the political *status quo* in the EU context, small and medium-sized countries, Portugal included, struggle to reconcile economic competitiveness and cultural participation, in the quest for a full citizenship (Lima dos Santos, 2007). If the welfare state initially held sway over elite cultural forms, namely the aforementioned trilogy of early goals, governance issues now force states to readjust public strategies towards culture. The critical point, however, is the extent to which these transformations mirror "defence strategies", by fitting to new realities, or simply veil liberal rhetoric for the "denial or decrease" of its role (Silva *et al.*, 2012).

The political context

In a context of severe financial crisis, such as ours, cultural policy inevitably comes under the spotlight. Due to present constraints, but also because of neoliberal tendencies, a shift in cultural policy-making seems to be at work. The ever-present impetus of democratization that guided recent developments became now a clear sign of governmental backdown, making European cultural policy regimes come closer to the U.S. model — of partnership between state cultural institutions and the private sector. Though far from meaning the eclipse of European cultural policies, these are strong changes that can only be analyzed within the overall context of redefinition of the welfare state (Dubois, 2014).

For this reason, it is vital to look at current instruments of support to artistic creation, production and promotion. As austerity measures became the standard response to the European crisis, it is decisive to trace ensuing impacts on the funding of cultural activities, by thoroughly examining the extent to which such imposition of economic rationales affected public investment in art and culture. Did government withdrawal lead to a closer articulation with private institutions? What kind of transformations in terms of politico-aesthetic programs came into being? And did recent transformations produce changes in the nature of cooperation strategies between the state and local authorities?

In order to grasp the current state of affairs, our choice was to analyze a chief instrument of support to art and culture — *Apoio às Artes*, managed by the *Direção-Geral das Artes*⁷ — and, so, draw conclusions on decision-making processes at the national level. Accordingly, a time frame ranging from 2009 until present days was defined, thus making use of the considerable amount of data at hand. But, most importantly, the choice had to do with two relevant aspects, one being the time period of the last state legislatures, encompassing the political action of both Portuguese governments involved in the EU/IMF financial assistance program, as well as the entry into force of the decree-law 196/2008 and subsequent changes in regulatory framework of the supports granted by the Ministry of Culture.

But let us start by looking at both government programs. Though recognizing the limitations of a simple reading of these documents, they nevertheless serve as an interpretive guide by giving valuable hints on the patterns of political action. These two do exactly so. The political guidelines of the XVIII Constitutional Government,⁸ for instance, mention three overarching goals, in terms of cultural policy: 1) reinforcing the operational budget for culture; 2) promoting the articulation of state institutions relevant to cultural matters; and 3) diversifying cultural participation, by supporting creation and education for art, as means of valuing the contribution of contemporary artistic creation to the country's development.

Here, we find traces of a cultural policy-making akin to late cultural policy regimes, i.e. combining classic protection of 'spiritual assets' with support to creative and culture industries. On one side, there is an obvious will to build education programs for to sensitize young audiences to culture, together with a focus on the professionalization of the artistic field, by reviewing legal frameworks and recognizing the need to protect certain areas from the logic of the markets. On the other, we can also find a clear-cut purpose of promoting the internationalization of Portuguese culture, rethinking copyright laws, and a strategy of close articulation between national and local levels of action.

If, as mentioned above, culture seemed to be one of the main priorities, featuring as the second area of political action, among eight in the government program, the case appears to be different in the present legislature. Although some goals are shared, the current government program reveals a sharp turn in the way culture was regarded. To start with, the Ministry of Culture was transformed into a Secretary of State, decisively reducing its scope of action — expressed in the will to reorganize and simplify its structure in the name of public interest. By itself, such symbolic shrinkage would be meaningful, but, again, let us look at the political guidelines.

Culture, then, shows up in the last pages of the government program. Among the strategic goals mentioned, there is a clear inclination towards the reassessment of the state's role in cultural life — the 'freeing' of artistic creation, given that the state is not a producer of culture. The will to support digital business platforms, the strengthening of copyright laws,⁹ a focus on the sustainability and economic value of creative industries, among others, stand out from the political program. For instance, public support to cinema, it is stated, should take into account box-office figures of applicants, as means of promoting communication with the audiences.

⁷ Here forth referred to as DGA.

⁸ Gabriela Canavilhas served as Minister of Culture during the XVIII Constitutional Government of Portugal (2009-2011).

⁹ For instance, by suggesting the need to increase the number of courts dedicated to intellectual property.

Even when education for art is mentioned, it implies collaboration between public and private institutions.

The combination of cultural and non-cultural purposes in public policies during the two years of the previous government was, thus, replaced by a strategy more clearly based on the latter ones. Subsequent to it was the belief that state intervention in culture should be reduced to a minimum, emphasizing its role as lever of development, employment and quality of life — leading to the country's international prestige. So understood, cultural policy-making takes a decisive step in the process of redefinition of the welfare state, changing from "intrinsic" (at least partially) to "instrumental" (Orr, 2008 *apud* Dubois, 2014: 14).

Thus being, the decree-law 196/2008¹⁰ and the ordinance 58/2012 refer to each of these moments and point to the different political strategies. The former, in general terms, consisted of a regulatory framework of public support to artistic creation, production and promotion, but also of the strategies concerning networks of cultural infrastructures. The goal was to capitalize recent improvements in infrastructures and, so, promote cultural decentralization, via regular programming with emphasis on education and artistic residencies. For to do so, new policy instruments were defined, namely the tripartite agreements — aiming at a close articulation between the Ministry of Culture, the municipalities and cultural institutions — but also protocols between the Ministry and the private sector.

The latter, in its turn, and in accordance with the government program, emphasized innovation, entrepreneurship and the internationalization of Portuguese economy, as means of widening artistic markets. So being, a new form of public support was created, specifically directed at the internationalization of Portuguese artists and cultural institutions.

This is how the big picture can be described, as a brief look at DGA's website¹¹ will readily confirm. Its main program of support to art and culture, thus, seeks to promote cultural activities that project creativity and artistic innovation, both at the national and international levels, while developing sensibility and critical thinking among the population — i.e. highlighting social cohesion and economic development as the utmost objectives.

General remarks on the support to art and culture

With this political background in mind, it is time to take a first glance at the data. Contrary to the previous government program, namely the goal of reinforcing national endowment for culture, DGA's funding decreased significantly. Starting from 2009, a clear reduction in the total amount of support to the arts can be identified — especially until 2012 —, though, as a general tendency, the number of subsidies increased (table 1). Given the economic backdrop, this seems to point to a strategy of attributing smaller payments and, so, being able to support a wider number of institutions or artists, possibly as means of encouraging collaboration with the private sector in the funding of cultural activities.

¹⁰ Combined with the ordinance 1189-A/2010.

¹¹ DGA (<http://www.dgartes.pt>) - visited on June 15th, 2014.

Year	Amount	Subsidies
2009	20.793.978,59 €	210
2010	20.702.716,24 €	235
2011	16.646.569,80 €	251
2012	11.774.808,64 €	202
2013	14.516.375,69 €	249 (3) ¹²
2014	11.336.670,92 € ¹³	145

Table 1 - Total amount of support and number of subsidies per year

Source: DGA.

From 2013 onwards, however, there is a somewhat paradoxical budget increase, all the more if we bear in mind the political guidelines of the XIX Constitutional Government, and its clear focus on austerity measures. In fact, and even if we consider the new emphasis on the funding of internationalization processes, the results of 2012 show a substantial decrease. All things considered, this may have to do — we dare to speculate — with a channeling of structural supports to the realm of DGA, as we will have chance to analyze later on.

By looking at the figures of DGA's endowment per region, the image of a highly unbalanced country, in cultural terms, springs up (table 2). In some cases, the region of Lisbon and Tagus Valley, by itself, gets — it should be emphasized — roughly the same amount of support as all the other regions together. Though recognizing the functional differentiation between the state and local authorities, and the known role of the latter in attenuating concentration of cultural activities, it becomes clear that few steps were taken in the process of decentralization that accompanied cultural policy-making since its early stages.

By the same token, the support distribution per artistic area shows accentuated differences, a situation that does not seem to vary significantly along the years (table 3). Among the areas endorsed the most, theater stands out — by far with the biggest percentage —, as well as cross-disciplinary cultural activities, music and dance — with more or less equivalent amounts. On the opposite side, we find plastic arts and photography — significantly less supported —, but also architecture, design and digital arts — these last three not always showing up in DGA's data.

Once this brief outline of the artistic areas covered by DGA's support to art and culture was done, we are now in conditions to proceed to a more detailed approach of the data concerning music.

¹² In 2013, DGA anticipated 3 payments of pluri-annual agreements — a total amount of 32.746,08 €.

¹³ The amount showed here does not include ongoing application processes. According to DGA, the total amount of supports granted in 2014 will come close to 15.025 million euros.

Region	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Lisbon & T.V.	10.355.960	10.380.805	8.595.154	5.967.729	6.033.400	5.330.790
North	4.230.292	4.135.774	3.381.365	2.135.230	3.848.662	3.151.708
Center	3.552.975	3.511.635	2.654.603	1.742.435	2.279.757	1.684.084
Alentejo	2.073.290	2.090.958	1.522.533	1.027.926	826.782	834.978
Algarve	581.461	583.544	492.914	313.351	937.785	335.110
International	-	-	-	588.136	589.990	-

Table 2 - Amount of support per region

Source: DGA.

Areas	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Theater	12.000.437	11.644.166	9.359.830	6.862.758	6.106.188	5.838.513
Cross-disc.	4.035.259	3.931.032	3.116.708	2.315.164	2.968.672	2.654.916
Music	2.191.127	2.466.628	1.896.240	1.254.535	3.188.456*	1.348.218
Dance	2.148.379	2.116.456	1.653.792	1.134.625	1.524.536	1.239.962
Plastic Arts	209.734	42.694	430.144	107.942	334.254	150.693
Photography	145.429	93.757	86.086	36.426	185.161	93.740
Architecture	-	50.000	27.886	23.252	159.109	10.630
Digital Arts	30.000	30.000	15.000	-	50.000	-
Design	33.612	27.984	60.885	40.107	-	-

Table 3 - Amount of support per artistic area

Source: DGA.

The music case

For to make sense of the available data, a typology of musical activities was designed, based on the assumptions developed along the present paper. It goes without saying, given the lack of important information, that such a process involves taking considerable risks, making it more of a speculative exercise. There is no way, for instance, of knowing, according to DGA's data, the exact purpose of a given support, or, more commonly, certain supports can easily fit into more than one category. Surely the type of institution/artist subsidized provides hints on the kind of cultural activity at stake, but the error margin is, nonetheless, significant. Regardless of such obstacles, the results achieved provide a valid base for forthcoming discussions.

The choice, then, was to go for a typology consisting of seven areas of musical activity: 1) music conservatories, academies and other education services; 2) cultural associations, support to popular/traditional music, wind orchestras and amateurship; 3) production of events, cultural animation and competitions; 4) orchestras, choirs and chamber music groups; 5) jazz, creative industries and intermediate cultural forms; 6) contemporary and experimental music; 7) libraries and music publishing; and 8) others.

The first results, despite minor incongruences, are consistent with the theoretical background. On one hand, there is a highly centralized pattern of state action, favoring elite musical forms, i.e. supporting orchestras, choirs and chamber music groups, as well as contemporary and experimental music ensembles, with a clear focus on musical education and training. On the other, we find areas of support that typically fall within the realm of local authorities, especially the municipalities — such as traditional and amateur music, wind orchestras and cultural associations, but also the production of events, cultural animation and intermediate forms —, with considerably less state support (table 4).

Here, too, there is evidence of a strong governmental backdown in late years. If we take into consideration the period between 2009 and 2012, the decrease in DGA's endowment for all the areas of musical activity becomes plain. In 2013, however, there was a surprising increase in support to orchestras, choirs and chamber music groups (table 4). Given the political guidelines of the current government, this can only be seen as a somewhat paradoxical situation. By analyzing the data, though, it becomes clear that such an increase had to do with three abnormal payments to the regional orchestras,¹⁴ implying a possible change in strategy. One can only speculate that this may be due to a channeling of structural funds for regional orchestras — typically managed by other state institutions — to DGA's scope of action, meaning that no actual increase in public funding came into being. This is consistent with 2014's data, in which public endowment for regional orchestras was, then, separated from the list of supports to music.

Likewise, if we look at the average amount of support, namely the time frame ranging from 2009 until 2012, a strong decrease in nearly every area of musical activity can be confirmed, as the average value went down roughly 30 %. From then on, there was an obvious shift in DGA's strategy of support to art and culture — though recognizing the incompleteness of the data concerning 2014 (table 5). Due to our formal limitations, we cannot go as far as to dissect this apparent budget increase, but it should be signaled that further work on the subject is of the utmost pertinence.

¹⁴ Associação Norte Cultural, 411.873,42 €; Associação Musical das Beiras, 498.570,96 €; Associação Musical do Algarve, 562.674,58 €.

Music. Activity	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Conserv/Acad/Educ	607.702	539.527	440.333	334.386	301.193	296.764
Assoc/Trad/Amateur	215.333	255.336	175.308	89.660	351.002	208.703
Events/Anim/Compet	175.000	207.338	178.426	72.446	215.538	182.308
Orch/Choir/Chamber	498.136	662.107	419.213	291.798	1.888.872*	343.469
Jazz/Intermediate Forms	159.165	189.092	185.148	106.066	152.668	100.861
Contemp/Experiment	444.109	501.911	442.248	309.808	209.285	167.602
Libraries/Publishing	37.102	15.787	12.484	10.052	10.576	10.576
Others	54.580	95.530	43.081	40.318	59.320	37.926

Table 4 - Amount of support per musical activity

Source: DGA.

Music. Activity	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Conserv/Acad/Educ	50.642	49.048	33.872	30.399	27.381	37.095
Assoc/Trad/Amateur	30.762	25.534	19.479	14.943	31.909	69.568
Events/Anim/Compet	35.000	29.620	29.738	36.223	43.108	60.769
Orch/Chamber/Choir	55.348	82.763	41.921	41.686	125.925	68.694
Jazz/Intermediate Forms	39.791	37.818	37.030	35.355	38.167	50.431
Contemp/Experiment	74.018	83.652	55.281	61.962	41.857	55.867
Libraries/Publishing	18.551	15.787	12.484	10.052	10.576	10.576
Others	27.290	23.883	21.541	13.439	19.773	37.926
Overall	46.620	46.541	35.116	33.014	57.972	51.855

Table 5 - Average amount of support per musical activity

Source: DGA.

The momentum of new music

Given our starting point, we could not help but feel struck by the percentage of support granted by DGA to contemporary and experimental music. Contrary to our early expectations, available data points to a significant support, in comparative terms, and a steady featuring among the top three areas of musical activity with the largest endowments — again, if we dismiss the last two years (table 6).

Regardless of the decrease in public expenditure on culture, the percentage of support given to *new music* grew consistently in the first four years — ranging from 20.27 %, in 2009, and 24.70 % of the total amount of support to music, in 2012. In fact, *new music* was the area of musical activity to receive the largest overall endowment, in 2011, surpassing both support to education and high art music-making (table 6).

From 2013 onwards, however, the more or less stable pattern of support changes, mostly due to the said payments to regional orchestras, as public endowment to orchestras, choirs and chamber music groups raised up to nearly 60 % of DGA's budget for music. Still, and even considering the ongoing application process, it becomes clear that the majority of areas kept an equivalent percentage of support — if we compare 2012 with 2014 —, whereas *new music* gets reduced to half the percentage (table 6).

Although an early analysis may lead to the idea that contemporary music is significantly supported, such numbers should be deconstructed and rather taken as a sign of its precarious, unstable situation. Contrary to other areas of musical activity, *new music*, lacks a structure of state-controlled cultural institutions¹⁵ — the indispensable base for every cultural activity, with DGA, then, working as the main instrument of support.

But let us now turn to the territorial distribution of the supports (table 7). The image of a centralized country is, again, clear-cut. The region of Lisbon and Tagus Valley received, by far, the biggest number of supports — being the only region with regular support —, followed by the North of Portugal. Alentejo benefited from three one-time supports, with minimal endowments, and a two-year support, while the Center region received a mere one-time support. Algarve received no funding at all during this period (table 7).

Music. Activity	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Conserv/Acad/Educ	27.73	21.87	23.22	26.65	9.45	22.01
Assoc/Trad/Amateur	9.83	10.35	9.25	7.15	11.01	15.48
Events/Anim/Compet	7.99	8.41	9.41	5.77	6.76	13.52
Orch/Choir/Chamber	22.74	26.84	21.11	23.26	59.24	25.48
Jazz/Intermediate Forms	7.26	7.67	9.76	8.45	4.79	7.48
Contemp/Experiment	20.27	20.35	23.32	24.70	6.56	12.43
Libraries/Publishing	1.69	0.64	0.66	0.80	0.33	0.78
Others	2.49	3.87	2.27	3.23	1.86	2.81

Table 6 - Percentage of support per area musical activity

Source: DGA.

In addition, it should be emphasized that two endowments were attributed to the Northern region (in 2011 and 2013), though the cultural institutions belong to Lisbon, possibly due to a support to artistic itinerancy — accentuating the uneven territorial distribution.

Such an unbalanced situation is also clear if we confront the total amount of support per region of the country (table 8). Regardless of the year, the region of Lisbon and Tagus Valley received more than all other areas together.

¹⁵ Though established in close articulation between the state and the private sector, Casa da Música, namely the work of the Remix Ensemble, could be seen as an exception to the situation, by assuming an important role within the national context.

But more: if we look at the amount of support given to each project, it becomes clear that, in at least 3 years,¹⁶ the cultural institution receiving the largest endowment of all areas of musical activity was *Miso Music Portugal*, known for its important work in the field of contemporary and experimental music — emphasizing the idea that DGA's support, in this case, might be of structural significance.

Region	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Lisbon & T.V.	4	4	5	4	2	2
North	1	1	2 (1*)	1	1*	-
Center	-	-	-	-	1	-
Alentejo	1	1	1	-	1	1
Algarve	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 7 - Number of supports to contemporary and experimental music per region

Source: DGA.

Region	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Lisbon & T.V.	360.506	419.144	347.126	259.551	143.524	140.492
North	73.603	72.767	75.122	48.257	30.295	-
Center	-	-	-	-	15.000	-
Alentejo	10.000	10.000	20.000	-	20.466	27.109
Algarve	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 8 - Total amount of support to contemporary and experimental music per region

Source: DGA.

Final considerations

Portuguese cultural policy, ergo, seems to be at a turning point. The relative balance between cultural and non-cultural purposes in public policy-making decisively shifted towards the latter, making the Portuguese case come closer to a model of partnership with the private sector, as shown by recent government programs. In this overall process of readjustment of the welfare state, the municipalities assumed an important role, leading to a close articulation and interdependency between national and local policy levels — seeking to overcome the problems of the administrative organization in Portugal. Though some overlapping can be identified, state-controlled institutions tend to focus on elite culture, whereas local authorities more likely intervene for the promotion of traditional and popular cultural forms.

While looking at DGA's support to art and culture, it is possible to find a match with the pattern of Portuguese cultural policy, as defined at the national level, i.e. functional

¹⁶ If we dismiss the support given to the regional orchestras, Miso Music Portugal would be the cultural institution with the largest endowment of DGA's budget for music in 2013 as well.

differentiation and uneven territorial distribution. This is particularly evident in the budget for music: 1) orchestras, choirs and chamber music groups, 2) contemporary music ensembles, and 3) musical education, then, seem to be the main areas of support, while favoring primarily the region of Lisbon and Tagus Valley, followed by the northern area. Given our starting point, we were somehow surprised by the relative allowance of *new music* within the context of DGA's program. Though we could not go as far as to aptly dissect the issue — due to said formal limitations, but also because of the known insufficiencies in available data —, this should be taken as a sign of its precarious situation, especially if we compare with public support to orchestras.

Lastly, it should be emphasized that our aim was never to draw definite conclusions, but rather to cater an early base for debate and, thus, promote a better understanding of contemporary cultural policy-making, namely the momentum of *new music*. So being, the present paper is no more than a partial contribution, hoping to be scrutinized in the near future. If we bear in mind the upcoming changes in public strategies towards culture,¹⁷ it becomes even more pertinent to ensue thorough assessment of the current state of affairs in Portuguese cultural policy.

Funding: This work was supported by the Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology, under Grant [SFRH/BD/98258/2013](#).

References

- Anico, M. (2009). Políticas da cultura em Portugal e Espanha. *Pasos Revista de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural*, Vol. 7(1), 57-71.
- Bennett, T. (2011). Culture, choice, necessity: A political critique of Bourdieu's aesthetic. *Poetics*, Vol. 39, 530-546.
- Dubois, V. (2011). Lowbrow culture and French cultural policy: The socio - political logics of a changing and paradoxical relationship. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 17(4), 394-404. DOI: 10.1080/10286632.2010.549563.
- Dubois, V. (2014). Cultural policy in Western Europe. *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*. 2nd Edition. Elsevier.
- Donnat, O. (2003). La question de la démocratisation dans la politique culturelle française. *Modern & Contemporary France*, Vol. 11 (1), 9-20. DOI: 10.1080/0963948032000067418.
- Gomes, R. T.; LOURENÇO, V. (2009). Democratização cultural e formação de públicos: Inquérito aos "serviços educativos" em Portugal. *OBS Pesquisas*. Lisboa: Observatório das Atividades Culturais.
- Lima dos Santos, M. L. (2007). *Políticas culturais em Portugal*. Paper presented at the V Campus Euroamericano de Cooperação Cultural, Almada.
- Santos, H. (2003). A propósito dos públicos culturais: Uma reflexão ilustrada para um caso português. *Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais*, No. 67, 75-97.
- Silva, A. S. (2007). Como abordar as políticas culturais autárquicas? Uma hipótese de roteiro. *Sociologia, Problemas e Práticas*, No. 54, 11-33.
- Silva, A. S.; BABO, E. P.; GUERRA, P. (2012). Cultural policies and local development: The Portuguese case. *VII International Conference on Cultural Policy Research*, 9-12 July.
- Soares Neves, J. (1998). Despesa pública em música entre 1985 e 1995. *OBS*. No. 4, 14-18.

¹⁷ E.g. Programa Cultura 2020 — promoted by J. Barreto Xavier, current Secretary of State for Culture.

Sources

Decree-law no. 196/2008 of October 6. Retrieved from: www.dgartes.pt/documentacao/decretolei196_2008de6deoutubro.pdf.

DGA's support to art 2009. Retrieved from: www.dgartes.pt/apoios/listagens_2009/indice.pdf.

DGA's support to art 2010. Retrieved from: www.dgartes.pt/apoios/listagens_2010/indice.pdf.

DGA's support to art 2011. Retrieved from: www.dgartes.pt/apoios/listagens_dezembro2011/indice.pdf.

DGA's support to art 2012. Retrieved from: www.dgartes.pt/documentacao/apoios2012_indice.pdf.

DGA's support to art 2013. Retrieved from www.dgartes.pt/apoios/listagens_dezembro2013/indice.pdf.

DGA's support to art 2014. Retrieved from: www.dgartes.pt/apoios/listagens2014/indice.pdf

Ordinance no. 1189-A/2010, of November 17. Retrieved from: www.dgartes.pt/documentacao/portaria1189a_2010de17denovembro.pdf.

Ordinance no. 58/2012, of March 13. Retrieved from: www.dgartes.pt/documentacao/portaria_apoio_internacionalizacao.pdf.

Program of Portugal's XVIII Constitutional Government. Retrieved from: www.cleanvehicle.eu/fileadmin/downloads/Portugal/Portugal/Programa_GC18.pdf.

Program of Portugal's XIX Constitutional Government. Retrieved from: www.portugal.gov.pt/media/130538/programa_gc19.pdf.