



FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ACTIONS FOR THE CREATIVE TERRITORIES DEVELOPMENT IN BRAZILIAN CONTEXT

Magnus Luiz Emmendoerfer¹
Alexandre Sette Abrantes Fioravante²
Joaquim Filipe Ferraz Esteves de Araújo³

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to analyze the organizational structure and the actions promoted by the Brazilian Federal Government for the development of territories through the Creative Economy. In Brazil, the creation and the development of creative territories is part of a National State public cultural politics. As methods, bibliographical and documentary researches were applied and in a complementary manner, in-depth interviews targeting the actions of the Ministry of Culture were essentially performed, which obtained data using the thematic content analysis technique. It was found that the Brazilian government has recognized the potential multiplier embedded in the creative segments, actively positioning itself through the formulation and implementation of recent policies, transversely structured between the spheres of government. However, after three years since the establishment of the Secretariat, it is now evident that a structural organization still incipient to foster creative sectors in Brazil, in which

Recebimento: 23/1/2017 • Aceite: 22/1/2017

¹ Doutor em Sociologia e Política pela Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais. Professor da Universidade Federal de Viçosa, Viçosa, MG, Brasil. E-mail: magnus.emmendoerfer@gmail.com

² Doutorando em Desenvolvimento Econômico (UNICAMP). Professor do Centro Universitário Senac, SP, Brasil. E-mail: alexandresettefioravante@gmail.com

³ Professor Associado com Agregação em Ciências da Administração do Departamento de Relações Internacionais e Administração Pública da Universidade do Minho, Portugal. E-mail: jfilipe@eeg.uminho.pt

dispersed advancements have been perceived. It is worth noting that there is much discussion around the concept of the creative economy to be worked nationally, this is important, but the discussion needs to go beyond the conceptual and gain a practical field.

Keywords: Public Politics; Creative Economy; Territorial Development; Culture Sector; Public Management.

AÇÕES GOVERNAMENTAIS PARA O DESENVOLVIMENTO DE TERRITÓRIOS CRIATIVOS NO CONTEXTO BRASILEIRO

Resumo

O objetivo deste artigo é analisar a estruturação organizacional e as ações promovidas pelo Governo Federal brasileiro para o desenvolvimento de territórios por meio da Economia Criativa. Em termos metodológicos, realizaram-se essencialmente pesquisas documentais e bibliográficas e, de modo complementar, entrevista em profundidade, tendo como alvo as ações do Ministério da Cultura, com destaque para a Secretaria de Economia Criativa, cujos dados obtidos foram tratados pela técnica de análise de conteúdo temática. Constatou-se que o Governo brasileiro tem reconhecido o potencial multiplicador embutido nos segmentos criativos, posicionando-se de forma ativa por meio da formulação e da implantação de políticas recentes, estruturadas de forma transversal entre as esferas de governo. No entanto, desde a criação da SEC, evidencia-se atualmente uma organização estrutural ainda “incipiente” para fomentar setores criativos no Brasil, em que se observam avanços dispersos. Ressalta-se, ainda, que muito se discute em torno do conceito de economia criativa a ser trabalhado nacionalmente, isto é importante, mas a discussão precisa ir mais além da esfera conceitual e ganhar o campo prático.

Palavras-chave: Políticas Públicas; Economia Criativa; Desenvolvimento Territorial; Setor Cultural; Gestão Pública.

Introduction

The Creative Economy (CE) has been highlighted and fostered in international public agenda as in the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD, 2012) and at United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 2013), in public policies, and national development plan of several countries (CUNNINGHAM, 2009; MADEIRA, 2014), having culture and creativity's indication and articulation as contributive resources to local and regional development (FURTADO, 1981; FLORIDA, 2014). These resources have enabled to employ an intelligent expertise aiming to make those territories more attractive in cultural, social, economic terms, through the possibility of generating new and innovative jobs, products, and services opportunities; as well as helping to create new abilities and skills.

CE amalgamates sectors of which resources are renewed and multiplied as they are used; they are, therefore, an activity of strong economic performance and social interaction, environmentally correct and it strengthens values, differences, and companies and communities credibility. According to UNCTAD (2012), CE is responsible for more than 10% of global GDP, and creative services and products grow in average rate of 8.7%, four times more than commodities' industry.

The Creative Economy Report 2010, published by UNCTAD (2012) highlights the need of dedicating growing importance to segments of the CE, due to its socio-economic return, which are significant in global and local scale on differentiated territories' constitution; they are also called as creative.

To leverage this thriving growth and development strategy based on creative sectors, it has been important to formulate policies not limited to "classical" cultural policies perspectives, focusing on the fostering, distribution, and on consumption, essentially, in material of cultural, artistic, and intellectual goods (MULCAHY, 2006). On the context of CE, public policies could, hence, focus on organizing and inserting cultural goods and services beyond the classical activities, in such a way that national economy could be more dynamic with products and experiences of high added value, through immaterial work of different (and new) professional occupations, valuing cultural diversity.

Focusing on public policies on the CE context has been visible according to Madeira (2014) in countries like Australia, United Kingdom, the United States, Germany, Italy, Switzerland, South Africa, India, and China have indicated economic growth allied to sustained

development, through job and income generation in creative industries.

However, despite being one BRIC's countries and having a recognized international image due to its diversity, creativity's input, as De Marchi (2014) points, Brazil is not mentioned on the list of the main creative goods and services' producers and exporters, even with its contribution around US\$ 33 billion or 2.84% of its GDP in 2010 (BRASIL, 2011).

That is this paper's challenge, starting from the assumption that Brazil has, oppositely of what happens on the worldwide scenery, a recent institutionalization of the CE. Although, there is mounting evidence that governmental actions in local, regional, and national level directed to creative sectors on the last 35 years. It is valid to reinforce that this paper will focus on governmental actions to creative territory development lately in Brazil, hereby understood as the last 12 years (from 2003 to 2014).

In this context, it is relevant to investigate those actions configurations in developing countries from Latin America such as Brazil, in order to understand how the government has taken a stand to promoting national development of CE. Thereby, the main objective of this paper is to analyze the organizational structure and the actions promoted by the Brazilian Federal Government for the development of territories through the CE.

There is a set of approaches and concepts about both the terminology territory and territorial development (PECQUEUR, 2004). On the other hand, there are not debates of what is territorial development based on creativity or, as we are going to address in this paper, creative territories. Whence, two propositions were adopted aiming to make this paper's reading and discussion even more instigating, starting from a study about Brazil, which is likely to be object of future surveys of compared perspective with other countries: 1) emphasis on CE development is more city-centered or in municipalities grouping; 2) there is no broad nor any adequate definition of what is creative territories, that can be discussed and applied on the empirical context of culture and economical public policies.

Creative Territory Development

The CE, in this paper, is a consequence of specialization for territorial development by creativity, as well as the promotion of the soft power mechanism (NYE, 2004) to attract and retain people in

the territories. The territorial expertise for the CE has its imbricated base on individuals and organizations of certain productive sectors, where creativity and management are key elements of the process of goods and service production, and enables consumers to participate, experience or co-produce this process, adding to it new perceptions and feelings from this experience (PINE; GILMORE, 1999).

According to Hartley (2005), the main sectors or industries that have creativity as the basis of its production process are: advertising, architecture, design, interactive software, film, television, music, literature and performing arts. For UNESCO (2013), the sectors that make up the creative industry are: crafts and folk art, design, film, gastronomy, literature, media arts and music. However, individuals and organizations in these productive sectors are potentially included in the context of the CE, and will be legitimate or recognized as "creative" if they manage creativity and promote experiences and learning for people interested in their products and results.

It is observed that the CE focuses on marketing aspects, but can also incorporate activities related to social development through participation, promotion of local identity, cultural heritage and the creative process aimed at mitigation of community problems (PECQUEUR, 2004) such as degradation, crime and vandalism of public and private spaces.

It is noteworthy that urban renewal of public spaces through the CE and the involvement of the local community allow the rescue and development of a sense of belonging and affection of the population throughout the territory. Thus, the mobilization of actors can lead to building a strategy to adapt to the outer limits, based on a collective identification (PECQUEUR, 2004), which allows territories to be distinguished from each other by means of the CE, thus enhancing the diversity and plurality of existing cultural expressions in any city.

When organizations in the context of a CE have a plan that integrates the local territorial development, with the participation of the state, but coordinated by practices and structures of governance (PIERRE; PETERS, 2000) have the ability to create and institutionalize creative territories.

Based on studies of Florida (2014), but attempting to analyze and validate criteria for distinguishing competitive tourist destinations in the context of the CE, Ashton, Emmendoerfer and Tomazzoni (2014) indicated that a creative territory is the space that has expressed elements and indicators in Chart 1.

Chart 1: Elements and indicators of creative territories

Elements	Indicators
Technology and Innovation	Amount of intellectual property per capita Wide access, easy and fast internet in public places Number of revitalized degraded areas Presence of creative clusters for its artistic and cultural production Existence of investment policies in technological innovation
Talent	Number of residents with degrees in higher education courses Number of immigrant and migrant residents Number of resident artists Existence of public policy for culture and leisure
Tolerance	Existence of policies fighting inequality and violence Respect for diversity and differences of people (ethnicity, race, gender, age, physical abilities, social class and sexual orientation) Training activities for citizenship Meeting the UN Millennium Development Goals
Connections	Amount of local clusters Existence of active public council managers Acting agencies of local development Number of cultural and art organizations in the city

Source: Elaborated by the authors with data collected from Ashton, Emmendoerfer and Tomazzoni (2014).

According to Emmendoerfer and Ashton (2014) there are three levels of creative territories that contemplate different spaces: 1) micro-territorial (street, avenue, neighborhood, village and district); 2) meso-territorial (set of neighborhoods, zoning, city and municipality); and 3) macro-territorial (set of cities, municipalities, regions, provinces, federal units). So, when considering this range of scales for defining creative territories, one would avoid the danger of being technically inaccurate and possibly exaggerated, to institutionalize a municipality as a creative city from a small territory as a neighborhood, which has structural requirements that qualifies as creative. This is a practice that occurs in the context of UNESCO to designate a city as creative. According to Emmendoerfer and Ashton (2014), it would be more appropriate in a public policy of development of creative territories to address the different levels of scales that exist in the spatial planning policy of each country, in order to respect the diversity of existing socio-cultural capital in these spaces.

Research methods

It is interesting on this study to focus on creative territories, since they are recognized, due to State's intervention, as *loci* spaces

directed to creation, production, trade, creative activity flow, thus, it is one of the expected outcomes of public policies to CE development.

On this sense, this study has two analytical foundations extracted essentially from bibliographic resources (books, theses, and papers from journals) and governmental documentation (acts, action plan, norms, minutes, projects, and agendas) of public domain, cited on the references of this paper. To complement and understand the government actions being studied, a profound interview was carried out, having no structured script, and been led in an informal way with two active professionals on the federal and state government on the fields of culture, tourism, and CE, in order to collect data about the object in analysis. The accessibility and typicality of the interviewees were fundamental to their participation on the survey, since these women have more than 30 years of experience on the sector, besides their intertwined work to CE. Furthermore, those people interviewed act on the governmental sphere of culture, showing themselves as key players to the understanding and validation of the actions indicated by the federal government.

All of the data collected was analyzed through content analysis, specifically by the thematic technical analysis, allowing titles and subsequent topic content to be composed, in terms of description, analysis, and reflection regarding organizational structuring and governmental actions to creative territories' development (BARDIN, 2013).

The Creative Economy's Institutionalization and Territorial Development in Brazil

The Brazilian federal government by the Ministry of Culture (MinC) led the organizing structure to the CE development. Throughout 2003 and 2010 initiatives and discussions to place on the ambit of public policies culminating in a favorable environment, so that cultural politics would have a national character in a more participative and ample manner (DE MARCHI, 2014; MADEIRA, 2014).

By the State initiative, the dialogue among the three government level (municipal, state, and federal) was retaken in Brazil and civil society, through the first National Culture Conference, in 2005 and 2010 respectively. It is valid to mention that international bodies as UNCTAD, cultural organization of the third sector, and Brazilian universities took stands on the dialogues (conferences, forums, seminars, public interest meetings) on this period in order to

stimulate and to debate the theme “Creative Industries and Economy”, in big cities Brazilian urban centers, mainly on the Northeast and Southeast regions. The first book organized and published with academic researchers’ viewpoint about different regions in Brazil, this was a work organized by Bendassolli, Wood Jr., Kirschbaum and Cunha (2009), containing different cases of creative sectors existing in the National Brazilian territory.

It is valid to highlight that the public conferences organized by the State also occurred in local and regional levels; moreover, they were the base for institutionalization of the National Culture Plan (Plano Nacional de Cultura-PNC-In Portuguese), Federal Law number 12.343/2010, and to the monitoring of cultural public policies from 2011-2020. Besides, according to Madeira (2014) it was the first time the term “creative economy” was ever mentioned in a governmental national plan as an inducing axis, starting from the establishment of goals, a development of strategy, associated to elements as “culture financing, productive chain sustainability, and jobs and income generation.” (MADEIRA, 2014, p.194).

Thereby, culture has become a State policy, enabling the planning of the Secretariat of Creative Economy – SCE (*Secretaria da Economia Criativa – SEC*, in Portuguese) in 2011, being institutionalized by the Decree number 7.743/2012, as a MinC’s body and the main responsible by the fostering and following up of the creative sectors in Brazil. Such responsibility is associated to the National Culture Plan’s strategy (NCP) aiming to “amplify culture participation on the sustainable socio-economic development” (BRASIL, 2013b, p.7).

It is valid to mention that on the XX century, mainly after the 30’s, important events and legal frameworks took place toward culture institutionalization through public policies in Brazil. Hence, such discussion will not be retaken in this paper, since the governmental actions evidence toward national development of creative public economy in Brazil, were only approached on the XXI century. Furthermore, there are studies dedicated with adequacy to the evolution of cultural policies in Brazil as Calabre (2009) and De Marchi (2014) studies.

In their reflections about culture and creativity, Furtado (1981) wanted to Foster Brazilian creative processes as a strategy to overcome underdevelopment. Furtado (1981) pointed out actions to assure development that would be translated in culture’s enriching in all of its dimensions, having creativity as a way of preserving identity. This theoretical framework was one of the main guidelines from SCE,

including its governmental plan, focusing on the development of creative territories on the cultural arena. SCE's Institutionalization and its action planning signaled an expressive way to the Brazilian society, a more anthropological notion of conceiving and coping with culture from the citizen, symbolic, and economic dimensions.

This demanded from SCE in Brazil, the non-reproduction of international CE concepts happening in countries possessing divergent political, economical, cultural, and social realities. The CE foundations in Brazil were guided by social inclusion, sustainability, innovation, and cultural diversity principles (BRASIL, 2011).

On SCE's perspective, a simple translation of CE from English speaking countries was feared, since lots of times there are semantic misunderstandings due to cultural differences, mainly if the common association made in Brazil between "industry" and high scale production activities, massified, and serialized. Then, to conceptual definition of what is "*The Authentic Creative Economy Made in Brazil*" to propose public policies, federal government adopted the term "creative sectors", as representative of diverse organizations acting in sector groups, called as "fields", instead of creative industries (CAVES, 2000; HARTLEY, 2005).

The CE in Brazil (2011), therefore, is composed by five fields: (1) property: material and/or immaterial property, archives, and museums; (2) cultural expressions: handcraft, popular, Brazilian native, and afro-Brazilian cultures, visual and digital arts; (3) spectacle arts: dance, music, circus, and theater; (4) audiovisual, book, reading, and literature: cinema and video, publishing, and printed media; and (5) cultural and functional creations: fashion, design, and architecture.

All of these economic sectors would be the initial reference base to denomination, articulation, and development of creative territories in Brazil. It is valid to emphasize that these sectors are included on the CE field because in their activities, individuals in their occupations have creativity as the base of the creative process of their services being embedded on the symbolic dimension, which the value is aggregated by the consumers, on the contrary of other business areas that insert in their products, key elements such as preferences, life style, status quo, consumption standard, among others.

Thus, goods and services originated from productive sectors from in the CE are not valued exclusively by its materiality and practical usage, existing in commodities and industrial products of low aggregated value. Thereby, creativity and culture turned to be important elements (CAVES, 2000; HARTLEY, 2005) on the establishment of commercial affairs, competition, and global socio-

economy insertion, in need to be planned in a territorial development plan.

Moreover, Brazilian position on CE encompasses, beyond creative industries, the relationship and impact of its goods and services in other sectors and processes and the connection established among them according to Hartley (2005), provoking and embodying deep social, organizational, and educational changes when elaborating and managing culture public policies.

On this sense, SCE's plan (2011-2014) forebodes a Creative Brazil in which it was elaborated based on two drivers or central vectors, so that the governmental action could execute its 16 skills, that will be mentioned here as objectives of this public organization. Having one macroeconomic vector (directed to structuring, development, and monitoring) of CE, and another microeconomic vector (directed to entrepreneurship, management, and innovation).

According to SCE's Management Report Brazil (2013b, p.20-21), the macroeconomic vector has axis of action aiming to generate conditions to the CE to be developed, involving "institutionalization processes of creative territories [districts, productive regions, cities, and creative basins], articulation and performance of studies and researches, beyond the debate's promotion and of the elaboration of adequacy proposals of legal frameworks". Acting axis of the microeconomic vector are directed to the "fostering of incubators and services bureaus, financing to creative and innovative skills training, and support to formation of collective chains" of professional on the creative sectors.

Out of the 16 goals concerning to SCE on the CE development, there is one which aimed to Foster "identification, creation and development of regions, cities, and creative territories to generate and potentialize new investments, jobs, and income on the creative sectors". It is observed that this goal is a synthesis integrating the two central vectors of governmental action in Brazil.

In order to make CNP's (Culture National Plan – *Plano Nacional de Cultura*, in Portuguese) strategies feasible, as well as action vectors operation and action axes toward CE development, federal government passed the Ministry of Culture's Internal Norm and its executive bodies (Directory number 40, April 30, 2013, published in May 06, 2013) in which the skills were predicted, the organizing structure and the directors attributions, besides positions tied to SCE.

SCE's organizing structure was organized based on central action vectors, composed by 17 work units, and divided in 3 hierarchic

levels. On this structure, the Directory encharged by the macroeconomic vector was composed by two General Coordinations. One is the Action Structuring General Coordination, which had 8 main tasks, two of them are directly related to creative territories, and they can be summarized by the scope of identifying, planning, and supervising program and projects “promoting the creation and development of existing creative territories or that could be optimized to the development of creative investments” (BRASIL, 2013b, p.15).

In order to operate this task, there is a work unit under its supervision called Creative Territory Coordination, responsible for stimulus activities to creative territory institutionalization, and worked as follow up of its institutionalized chain by the Ministry of Culture.

The other General Coordination was the Integrated Project Development one, responsible for planning management, SCE’s budget, and for the elaboration of convene instruments and program articulation, and transversal projects with other SCE units. These articulation instruments also aimed to involve external SCE’s organizations, as financial institutions, public companies, “S”⁴ Systems organization, and research and creation agencies, aiming to obtain shared financing of the public actions.

Organizational structure and governmental actions to creative territory development in Brazil

Due to the needed transversality actions to the CE development in Brazil, SCE’s organizing structure used to have certain autonomy, requiring partnerships, intersectorial articulation, and actions integrated to planning of other governmental and international bodies, so that the results toward a Creative Brazil would be attainable from 2011 to 2020 (MADEIRA, 2014).

SCE’s plan (Brasil, 2011) in international level predicts partnership with organizations such as Unesco, United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), and Organization of Ibero-American States (OEI), focusing on education, management, studies, CE creation. On the representation level and national acting, contemplates partnership on the federal government to policies execution and those public actions integrated with four secretariats

⁴ “S” System Organization are those of professional and economic interest categories, established by the Brazilian Federal Constitutions, aiming professional development and workers social welfare improvement. These organizations are mainly sustained by compulsory contributions instituted by the Federal Government.

related to the Republic Presidency (strategic issues, social communication, policies to women, and micro and small-sized companies) and with 14 out of the 24 existing ministry, those are: Ministry of Social Development – MSD; Ministry of Labor and Job – MLJ; Ministry of Education – MEC; Ministry of Sports – MS; Ministry of Industry Development and International Trade – MIDIT; Ministry of Science and Technology – MST; Ministry of International Affairs – MAF; Ministry of Communications – MC; Ministry of the Cities – MCities; Ministry of Tourism – Mtur; Ministry of Environment – ME; Ministry of Justice – MJ; Ministry of Agricultural Development – MAD; Ministry of National Reserve; MNR (BRASIL, 2011, p. 56-57).

Specifically to make it feasible the focused axis on the creative territory development, SCE's plan pointed out the articulation need, and governmental partnership with 6 ministries, according to Chart 2.

Chart 2: Ministry partnerships and governmental actions to creative territories development in Brazil

Ministry Partners	Governmental Actions
Sports	Qualification of the territories actions development on the World Cup and Olympics host cities
Industry Development and International Trade	Identification and creation of Local Productive Arrangements of creative sectors; Mapping of regional vocations on the World Cup host cities and spaces qualification via urban design
Science and Technology	Creative territories institutionalization articulated with Intelligent Cities Project
Communications	National Broadband Plan Implementation on the sense of qualifying infrastructure of the creative territories; Creative territories institutionalization articulated with Digital Cities' project.
Cities Tourism	Articulating creative territories' institutionalization In convergence with Communitarian Tourism and Tourism Cities projects, articulating and promoting creative territories' institutionalization.

Source: Elaborated by the authors with data collected from Brasil (2011).

It is important to mention that all of the partnerships were pointed out not only to make it SCE's feasible, but also to help on the 53 NCP (2011-2020) goals' achievements. From them, 16 goals are toward CE development (BRASIL, 2013a) and they are pointed out at the NCP's webpage (<http://pnc.culturadigital.br/tema/economia-criativa/>). Anybody in Brazil or abroad may follow up government actions on culture via this webpage, which is periodically updated by MinC, allowing one to know all of the goals (current situation and action outcomes of the actions coordinated by the federal government along with partners) to culture development in Brazil.

There is NCP goal of which is exclusively to creative territories, so the Federal government searches "recognizing 110

territories with requirements to be qualified as creative ones”. It is seen that this goal is related to the macroeconomic action axis of SCE’s plan. On the document “The goals to the National Culture Plan” this goal is mentioned creative territories’ definition adopted by MinC:

Creative territories are districts, cities, or regions presenting creative cultural potential capable to promote integral and sustainable development, allying preservation and promotion of their environmental and cultural values. [...] creative economy is the strategic and dynamic sector, as much on the economic as on the social perspective: their activities generate works, jobs, income, and social inclusion. **A territory is legitimated by the Ministry of Culture (MinC) as creative territory via a certification (label).** Having that, a governance system can be created with public authority and civil society participation. After this recognition, MinC will give resources to those development plan formulation having creative economy as strategy. (BRASIL, 2013a, p.40-41, **our emphasis**).

It is observed that Brazil has adopted by the first time a more comprehensive definition of the creative territories in terms of territorial scale level, encompassing districts, cities, and regions as spaces to CE development. This definition is broader than the one of UNESCO (2013), which defines CE center in the cities; or rather, UNESCO does not use creative territories term, only the expression “creative cities”.

Despite the comprehensiveness demonstrated on the creative territories definition made by the Federal government in Brazil is limited, since it encompasses few types of territories that can be developed on the CE context. Corroborating with Emmendoerfer and Ashton (2014), it would be more adequate in public policies of creative territories’ development to contemplate diverse scale levels existing on politics of territorial order of each country, as a manner of respect to diversity of the existing socio-cultural capital on these spaces.

To Emmendoerfer and Ashton (2014), There are three creative territories levels that contemplate different spaces: 1) micro-territorial (street, avenue, district, village, neighborhood); 2) meso-territorial (district’s grouping, borough, cities, and municipalities); and 3) macro-

territorial (districts' grouping, councilor groups, regions, provinces, and states) Thereby, when considering this scale diversity to creative territory definition, it would be avoided the risk of being technically inaccurate and possibly exaggerated, when institutionalizing a municipality as a creative city starting from a territory with small dimension as a district, which possess structural requirements qualified as creative. This practice happens when on UNESCO's context a city is designated as creative.

When analyzing the current situation of this goal and how it is measured on NCP' webpage, Brazil (2015), it is observed a MinC inclination in identifying creative territories, via a macro-territorial scale, based on the "amount of basins and creative cities recognized by the Ministry of Culture after 2011". To fulfill this goal, MinC still recognizes that more than articulation with federal ambit with the ministries, specially, the Ministry of the Development (MSD) and the Ministry of International Trade (MITID), and the Ministry of the Cities (MCities), it is necessary:

[...] that convenes are made altogether with municipal and state governments, academic institutions [and financial], civil society, labor and patron entities' representation, among others, to identify and recognize creative territories. (BRASIL, 2013B, p. 41, our emphasis).

These articulations and partnerships treated as convene by MinC Brasil (2011, p.68) aim to create creative poles (array of creative investments geographically close to each other and subscribed in a territory of small dimension) and creative basins (geographical basins formed by diverse territories with common cultural identity), reiterating the emphasis in a development of the CE in a macro-territorial scale (EMMENDOERFER; ASHTON, 2014).

Nonetheless, MinC has up to now pointing out its NCP webpage on the Internet, Brazil (2015), "is elaborating the methodology to the identification and creative territories recognition", what certainly depends on the amplification of the Brazilian databank on information about creative fields and about the cultural sector as a whole. This is an antique critical point on the country, affecting directly the formulation and implementation of public policies to culture. So, there was neither any creative territory institutionalized nor disclosed by the Brazilian federal government until 2014, despite of the fact that two

cities on the South region of Brazil, conquered on that year, UNESCO's Creative City designation (2015), those are: Curitiba – the capital of design, and Florianópolis – the capital of the gastronomy.

It is valid to mention that it is indicated on NCP economic dimension Brazil (2013a, p.20) that in 2020, it is expected “that lots of creative territories will have been recognized and the local cultural production will have support to its economic sustainability”. However, this recognition a priori is not happening by the federal government stimulus, but via global bodies as UNESCO (2015). As it is also valid to mention the insertion in 2014 of two Brazilian municipalities at UNESCO creative city network may make the Brazilian Network of Creative Cities – BNCC (*Rede Brasileira de Cidades Criativas - RBCC* – in Portuguese) constitution in something indicated to the expected outcome at SCE's plan (BRASIL, 2011, p.68).

All of this articulation move can be seen in actions and policies fostered by MinC via SCE of which was complemented with National Observatory of Creative Economy – NOCE (*Observatório Brasileiro de Economia Criativa - OBEC* – in Portuguese) institutionalization and on Creative Bureau.

MinC instituted the National Observatory of Creative Economy – NOCE of which institutes an instrument of quantitative and qualitative information production and diffusion on Brazilian CE. This Observatory predicts partnerships with regional research institutes and universities aiming to produce information, knowledge about experiences and local, regional, and national CE experiments. NOCE's creation reveals the overcoming attempt one of the biggest problems investments on this sector face, which is information and data absence, and produced and systemized analyses.

To articulate federal along with state and municipal levels, Creative Bureau was created. The initiative consists on fixed offices implementation and/or itinerant ones directed to care and support professionals and entrepreneurs, aiming to promote and strengthening productive arrangements and chains on the Brazilian creative sectors. States in which Creative Bureau implementation took place a set of imposed demands made by the Ministry of Culture toward the physical structure implementation to its operation. These space features consist on:

[...] having a place where an auditorium could exist [...] to promote training courses, having a cyber café where the creative entrepreneur could have conviviality with others and use

Internet process, with meeting rooms so people could develop their works in this space of creative economy, having part of the computers used to think about public notice, **hence a set of commitments that the states has to fulfill to obtain, then, the creative. [...]** **the project also works with the consultancy part, so that the creative entrepreneur search on this space their demands**, such as elaborating cultural project, then, creative bureau will have a determined number of courses to offer so the project's elaboration may happen [...] there is a set of cultural artistic demand where they do not know where to search [...] Individual starts to have a support and auxiliary place. That's why one of creative bureau' intention is to create a set of action to be performed, which is why **creative economy observatory** was created by the ministry [...] because **one of the creative bureau's action is mapping who they are, who we are**, as we are going to deal with a public that we have no idea of their amount, where they are located, and they work. (verbal information, **our emphasis**).

Creative Bureaus translate a sort of public policies promoted by the federal Government, aiming to reach new state and municipal governments through partnerships. In 2014, Creative Bureaus in state level were working in 13 out of the 27 Brazilian states, and they become renowned as incubators, forming Creative Brazil Incubators' Network (<http://culturadigital.br/brasilcriativo/>).

It is observed in spite of this structuring policy comes from federal government it was not imposed (SABATIER, 1986; SECCHI, 2013), and it is adapted on the regional interests and peculiarities, giving this initiative a differential factor:

[...] the ministry clarify that **it does not bring a ready product, the bureau creative of each state is going to be constituted in accordance with each state's need [...]**. The process of creative economy passes by a total systemic vision (...) on this process there is a huge need of being organized in such a way that cultures allied to technology and innovation

may become creativity's pillars [...]. **It would be easy to the secretariat of creative economy to create a model and send it to the states, every state has its manner, though [...] these actions been promoted has to do with state's voting as well as state vocation [...] that creative economy came to treat all of differences differently, she illustrates it very well [...] "it wouldn't help to receive it all closes, because it is not closed" [...]. (Verbal information, our emphasis)**

Planned public event organizations, institutionally organization (among ministries and bodies), intersectors (creative sectors), and generators of non-imposed policies is one of the crucial action instruments as Barbosa (2011) mentions. These organized interventions allow strategic investments realization by public and private agents, valuing and developing institutions, equipments, and human resources.

This articulation between federal government on Brazilian states and municipalities to stimulate, raising and organizing data about CE context in Brazil on the period from 2011 to 2013, with organizing structure and SCE's publishing contributed to an ambit creation, culminating on the production of an intersector socio-economic development plan called Brazil Creative Plan, contemplating something beyond creative incubators.

Brazil's Creative Plan mentioned by De Marchi (2014) and Madeira (2014) was not even launched and implemented, but it was elaborated with the scope of being an integrated development plan between the social projects of the federal government, executed since 2003, with an industrial development proposal in Brazil to the new presidency tenure (2015-2018).

The question is how long this CE shadowing is going to take on federal government's stand, in which is observed including on social media and on MinC's webpage, having little published data about SCE and its actions that were in execution because of Culture National Plan (2011-2020). Furthermore, up to now, no SCE's management plan was disclosed (2015-2018). Such remarks are relevant because SCE was a dialogic locus and of intense information exchange from 2011 to 2013, provoking according to Chapman (2002), multiple collective and institutional lessons regarding culture and creativity, as well as about the way of formulating and implementing culture public policies, with

society's participation and diverse sectors' agents of cultural and creativity in national and international levels.

Reflections about cultural public policies on the creative territories' development context

Despite the existence of few studies concerning public policies and CE in Brazil and Latin America, it can be expected that all of this federal government movement to foster on this area, in spite of being less intense at the moment, it may stimulate several studies on culture public policies, involving institutions, chains, and ideas to the next years.

On the organizing structure exhibition and on the governmental actions to creative territories' development in Brazil, it is observed existing evidence of congruence in terms of territorial scale employed as much by Brazilian federal government as by UNESCO. Such congruence shows the analysis compared likelihood about creative sector development in different cities around the world. On the other hand, the challenge generates challenge to the population and local government managers in cities outside metropolitan regions, of analyzing creative economic possibilities in their municipal directive plan and on territorial development.

On this sense, considering the limitation showed in this paper about the creative territory notions, based on Emmendoerfer and Ashton (2014), it was opted in contributing with this terminology debate in order to amplify the understanding regarding creative territories. Thereby, it is proposed that the creative territories should be perceived as multi-scale spaces, constructed out of a formative process adopted by a group of people in a determined time, aiming to offer authentic and singular cultural products, resulting from dynamic and creative actions, these are attractive and valued mainly by its subjective interpretation of a (co)created meaning by their inhabitants and by travelers experiencing these products on these spaces.

Thus, a creative territory, is potentially competitive, being able to promote good quality of life levels, cooperating to welfare elevation of its population, in such a way that this is entailed from the sustainable development, being able to encompass all of its dimensions – economic, social, environmental, and cultural. Cultural dimension mains due to its diversity is very peculiar and demands, hence, cultural policies beyond the traditional ones, but also new cultural policies, more adequate and aligned with each territories' reality.

New cultural policies work supporting cultural and creative companies, articulating subsidy and incentives with co-financing mechanism (private and public), stimulating culture's usage as a regional identity element and a factor on territorial base competitive differentiation.

On this sense, creative territory is the space in which people are capable of stimulating and attracting talents, respect, and innovate from diversity and enabling conditions so that economic value may be aggregated. Such value allows business generation and stimulates connections among social actors, as governments, entrepreneurs and business people, institutions, schools and universities, making it possible to develop a structure that can be called as intelligent, bringing benefits and opportunities to all with more equality. When uniting the tangible and intangible, the creative territory enables a policy to development, making use of cultural and creative sectors, to generate jobs, income, and social inclusion, favoring territorial sustainable development.

According to Pecqueur (2004), the issue of territorial development is tied up to the way the State acts on the national space, which means, how public policies are articulated in every organization's administrative scale. With the discussion of the data performed in this article, it was observed on the Brazilian case that the State's importance of not being absent so that social development could receive its deserved attention and not only creative economic sectors.

It was observed in Brazil, transversal governmental actions, needing a dialogue to avoid duplicity or action diffusions in short term, being MinC a national policies development hub (DE MARCHI, 2014). MinC's articulation via SCE with different government sectors reveals changes on the CE recognition as a means of territorial innovation. Then, it is necessary to stimulate CE investments.

Excepting the basic educational public policy, federal government authority's concentration characterizes federative relations on the federative affairs on politic management, since it is the government duty to be the main financer, as well as creating guidelines, and coordination with inter-governmental affairs. The management format concentrating authority on the federal government presents advantages to coordinate political public targets on national territory, since it allows reducing the risk that different governmental levels imposes conflict among programs and implementation costs raise, which the occurrence is more likely in Federative States (WEAVER; ROCKMAN, 1993). Nonetheless, talking about CE, thematic involving a very singular aspect with regional

specific traits, those action axes combining interdependence and autonomy of sub-national units to federal sphere should be followed. Thus, top-down public politics on the CE context would not lead to any positive effects wished through time. This is a relevant evidence for a multi-level public governance in this context.

On this perspective, it is important to highlight one of the greatest challenges to foster CE on developing country which is the articulation of a social, economic, and political pact with civil society. It is up to the government guidelines to inter-governing, as pointed by Radin (2010), in CE in different territories in Brazil, requiring according to Madeira (2014), the aligning of the sector of politics, the institution of regulatory and juridical framework sustaining CE and active participation in international negotiations, fostering an environment that could recognize creativity economic value, beyond a presidential political term, into something that was being constructed by SCE in MinC, on the period from 2011 to 2013 in Brazil.

Becoming relevant; thus, on the perspectives of local development generated by creativity foster via cognitive and cultural diversity, creating individual and collective investments. Fostering income generation out of creativity, of which potential is as business usually neglected, it is fundamental to the world and Brazilian economy once that it is established progressively job position's saturation on the manufacturing and conventional industry, and run out of such traditional forms of income generation.

Even with the existing cultural diversity and creative potential in Brazil, the country still lacks public politics of fostering on this field on municipalities, thereby; the institutionalization of the Secretariat of Creative Economy (SCE) at the Ministry of Culture inserted the theme linked with culture on the country governmental agenda, repositioning culture as an important axis to be developed by the Brazilian state. SCE's creation represents an important step, since the document ritualizes and inaugurates on the federal government MinC's commitment, as well as a register to new politics leaderships, in dialoguing with people inserted and interested on creative sectors, aiming to formulate, implementing, and monitoring public politics towards a new development. These things according Gray and Wingfield (2011) it is representing the new value of the Governmental Culture Departments in Brazilian case.

Conclusions

CE institutionalization process via the Secretariat of Creative Economy (SCE) symbolizes a differential of the Brazilian government to achieve territorial development, evinced by the transversality of their politics and actions with public organizations and society. This is an institutional framework to transpose cultural and creative dimension of the ideological plan to practical dimension in terms of territorial development. This generates expectation of a possible Creative Brazil plan retaking, even with shadowing evidence by MinC itself, a visible inclination to slow down SCE's actions and information since 2014, something that can be observed in its governmental website (<http://www.cultura.gov.br/secretaria-da-economia-criativa-sec>).

Regardless of the emerge and likely, but not wished, SCE's action reduction, it is agreed with Madeira (2014, p.263) that CE institutionalization in Brazil is still "very recent to predict scaffoldings and possible outcomes, what should not impair affected public bodies to incorporate them in their policies and action lines". It is also agreed with De Marchi's (2014) stand that the Brazilian governors bring culture from the margin to the center of the political and economic thinkings, but not all of them are prepared, or rather, want to be prepared to this new way of conceiving culture in Brazil.

Fostering actions of CE in Brazil can be seen as a form of culture and creativity valuing of the individuals and not as actions that can lead to cultural essence loss. On the contrary, it is observed this new dynamic is searching to allow conditions so that culture and creativity could be sustained and permit, then, territory development, through local artistic and popular vocations.

The Secretariat of the Creative Economy, NOCE and Creative Bureau Institutionalizations reveal structuring a context development of CE in Brazil, more complex, transcending public organization structure creation. Those are evidence that the Brazilian government has multiplier recognized potential embedded on creative segments, being positioned in an active way on this context. On this sense, it is highlighted that politic formulation and implementation on this area are not characterized by an imposing and standardized model, but are rather by flexibility on the characteristics and peculiarities of the CE of each location or region in every state in Brazil.

Thereby, when this paper focuses its debate on governmental actions to creative territory development, it allowed evincing and contributing with discussions about intelligent specialization

territories. Added to that, it allowed delimit territories in analyses and development with the proposal of a broader definition to creative territories. It is broadly discussed in Brazil around a concept of CE to be worked, this discussion is essential; however, it must go further than the conceptual and encompass the practical field. The focus on the cultural diversity is important, but as CE addresses much more than this, we have to go beyond cultural politics, redistribution, inclusion, and, then, emphasizing on integrated policies with industries and infrastructure.

However, a broader campaign about CE and creative territory development needs to be done to stimulate the population, since it is suspected that most of them in Brazil do not know this international term yet. Considering it, only after 2010 is that CE theme came to discussion and more effective disclosing on the governmental ambit, even though it is found information gap and absence of solidified theory and applied studies. MinC's actions through SCE have been demonstrated positive actions in order to raise, unite, and disseminate CE, so that it may subside public politic formulation aiming to promote territories' development and sustainable growth, including more creative ones in Brazil.

Finally, it is observed that creative territories' theme remain incipient in studies about planned studies, territorial order and development, especially on the context of management and public policies, bring the emerge potential of new interdisciplinary agendas on research and teaching, along with international cooperation. It is important to assess what has advanced in relation to structural barriers limiting the effective development of creative territories. In fact, the creation of the *Authentic Creative Economy Made in Brazil* is conditioned to those barriers overcome.

References

- ASHTON, Mary Sandra Guerra; TOMAZZONI, Edegar Luis; EMMENDOERFER, Magnus Luiz. Elementos para a validação de cidades criativas como destinos turísticos competitivos. *TURYDES*, v. 7, n. 17, 2014. Available at: <http://www.eumed.net/rev/turydes/17/cidades-criativas.html>. Accessed 5 April 2016.
- BARBOSA, Frederico. *Economia Criativa: Políticas Públicas em Construção*. Brasília: Ministério da Cultura, 2011. Available at: <http://www.cultura.gov.br/site/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/livro-portuguesweb.pdf>. Accessed 15 May 2015.

BARDIN, Laurance. *L'analyse de contenu*, 2nd.ed. Paris: PUF, 2013.

Bendassolli, Pedro F.; WOOD JR, Thomaz; Kirschbaum, Charles.; Cunha, Miguel P. (Coord.). *Indústrias Criativas no Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro: FGV, 2009.

BRASIL. Ministério da Cultura. *Plano da Secretaria da Economia Criativa: políticas, diretrizes e ações 2011 – 2014*. Brasília, 2011. Available at: <http://www.cultura.gov.br/site/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/livro-portuguesweb.pdf>. Accessed 5 April 2015.

_____. Ministério da Cultura. *As metas do Plano Nacional de Cultura*. 3th. ed., Brasília: Ministério da Cultura, 2013a. Available at: http://pnc.culturadigital.br/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/As-metas-do-Plano-Nacional-de-Cultura_3%C2%AA-ed_espelhado_3.pdf. Accessed 8 June 2015.

_____. Secretaria de Economia Criativa - *Relatório de Gestão*. Ministério da Cultura: Brasília, 2013b. Available at: <https://contas.tcu.gov.br/econtrole/ObterDocumentoSisdoc?codArqCatalogado=7268279&seAbrirDocNoBrowser=1>. Accessed 5 April 2015.

CALABRE, Lia. *Políticas culturais no Brasil: dos anos 1930 ao século XXI*. Rio de Janeiro: FGV, 2009.

CAVES, Richard. *Creative Industries*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2000.

CHAPMAN, Jake. *System failure: why governments must learn to think differently*. London: Demos, 2004.

CUNNINGHAM, Suart. D. Trojan horse or Rorschach blot? Creative industries discourse around the world. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, vol. 15, n. 4, pp. 375-86, 2009.

DE MARCHI, Leonardo. Analysis of the Secretariat of the Creative Economy Plan and the transformations in the relation of State and culture in Brazil. *Intercom-Revista Brasileira de Ciências da Comunicação*, vol.37, n.1, pp.193-215, 2014. Available at: <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=69831538010>. Accessed 30 April 2016.

EMMENDOERFER, Magnus L.; ASHTON, Mary S. Territórios Criativos e suas Relações com o Turismo. *Revista Turismo & Desenvolvimento*, vol.4, n. 21/22, pp.459-68, 2014.

FURTADO, Celso. *Créativité et dépendance*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1981.

FLORIDA, Richard. *The Rise of the Creative Class revisited: revised and expanded*. New York: Basic books, 2014.

GRAY, Clive; WINGFIELD, Melvin. Are Governmental Culture Departments Important?: An Empirical Investigation. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, vol.17, pp.590-604, 2011.

HARTLEY, John. *Creative Industries*. London: Blackwell, 2005.

MADEIRA, Mariana G. *Economia criativa: implicações e desafios para a política externa Brasileira*. Brasília: FUNAG, 2014. Available at: <http://funag.gov.br/loja/download/1096-economia-criativa.pdf>. Accessed 5 April 2015.

MULCAHY, Kevin V. Cultural policy: Definitions and theoretical approaches. *Journal of arts management, law, and society*, vol. 35, n.4, pp.319-30, 2006.

NYE, Joseph S. *Soft power: The means to success in world politics*. PublicAffairs, 2004.

PECQUEUR, Bernard. *Le développement territorial: une nouvelle approche des processus de développement pour les économies du Sud*. Grenoble: Institut de Géographie Alpine, 2004.

PIERRE, Jon; PETERS, B. Guy. *Governance, politics and the state*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000.

PINE, B. Joseph; GILMORE, James H. *The experience economy: work is theatre & every business a stage*. Harvard Business Press, 1999.

RADIN, B. A. Os instrumentos da gestão intergovernamental. In: PETERS, B. G.; PIERRE, J. *Administração Pública: Coletânea*. São Paulo: Editora UNESP; Brasília, DF: ENAP, 2010 p. 597-618.

SABATIER, Paul A. Top down e bottom-up approaches to implementation research: a critical analysis and suggested synthesis. *Journal of Public Policy*, vol. 6, pp. 21-48, 1986.

SECCHI, Leonardo. *Políticas públicas: conceitos, esquemas de análise, casos práticos*. 2nd. ed. São Paulo: Cengage Learning, 2013.

UNCTAD. United Nation Conference on Trade and Development. *Creative Economy Report 2010: A Feasible Development Option*, 2012.

Available at: http://unctad.org/en/Docs/ditctab20103_en.pdf. Accessed 5 April 2015.

UNESCO. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. *Creative Economy Report 2013 Special Edition: widening local development pathways*. 2013. Available at: <http://www.unesco.org/culture/pdf/creative-economy-report-2013-en.pdf>. Accessed 5 April 2015.

_____. *Creative Cities Network*. 2015. Available at: <http://en.unesco.org/creative-cities/home>. Accessed 30 April 2016.

WEAVER, Kent R; ROCKMAN, Bert A. *Do institutions matter?*. Washington, DC.: