AUGUSTO SANTOS SILVA
Universidade do Porto

Cultural networking: Rhetoric, policy and practice in Portugal

ABSTRACT

The article examines the content and functionality of the concept of cultural networking, considering the context of dense social and institutional processes and recurring to available empirical data. The assumption is that fruitful sociological comparison needs the consideration of real and specific cases, if one wants to avoid the mimesis of administrative jargon or the ritual repetition of empty generalities. For this test, an interesting case can be found in Portugal. It points out a balance between two main uses of the concept and method of networking. One refers to 'macro-policies', defined and implemented, in a rather top-down paradigm, by national authorities. The other one relates to meso- or micro-practices and to bottom-up strategies, whose protagonists are mainly local authorities, cultural institutions and artists. In both ways, networking proves to be an efficient tool both for policy and to cultural agency.

KEYWORDS

culture
cultural policy
cultural networks
social processes
institutional processes
networking

INTRODUCTION: NETWORK AS A CONCEPT AND A GUIDELINE

A 'network' is a rather recent concept. Its general use dates from the 1990s onwards, especially with the publication of *The Network Society* (Castells 1996). It may be the outcome of convergent developments in both the organizational theory and sociology. It stands in opposition to hierarchy, closeness and

rigidity, and this is perhaps the main reason for its fortune, both in analytical as in normative terms.

Network can be defined as a structure: the pattern of configuration and evolution of a given system. It proposes a less vertical description of the power and communication relations that constitute such a system, pointing out the horizontal interactions that crosscut hierarchy and eventually transform it in a non-hierarchical form of managing people and coordinating resources and activities. Indeed, critical to the concept of network is the idea that exchanges can be facilitated and coordination can be guaranteed by players situated at the crossroad of multiple interactions – the nodes – and not necessarily located in the formal apex of a pyramid; and the idea that the multifaceted ties between elements – the connections – are more relevant for the system's structuring and performance than the formal distribution of resources and authority.

Openness is the second key feature of this model of organizations and social systems. Network is an accurate term to characterize them whenever they do not require a strict delimitation of time-space and a univocal definition of borders, clearly separating the internal and the external, that is, the given system and its environment. It suggests that an evolutionary move, a dynamic and adaptive force and plasticity are basic organizational ingredients.

Flexibility is another trait assumed by the network model, for obvious reasons. If hierarchy is not a necessary condition for coordination and supervision, and if formalization is not a necessary condition for stability and continuity, then the patterns of structuring can change quite often and quite rapidly, according to the needs and goals at stake, and allowing multiple forms of adjustment between the players and their context. The size and shape can vary, network organizations being flexible enough to face in the most efficient ways physical, technological, economic or social transformations, endogenously or exogenously driven.

Such structures do exist, and late modernity typically fosters their emergence. Horizontal, open, flexible forms of coordinating human beings and human agency have proven well in the field of firms and markets, communities and territories, cities and states – hence the current 'network society'. Network is a pertinent concept helping to describe and explain this new reality.

Additionally, it is a sort of device to implement it. By networking one enunciates not only the procedural dimension of network (networks-in-the-making), but also the strategy to build and maintain networks: the set of techniques put in practice to design the configuration of a given organization, whatever its scale, as a reticular, open and flexible social structure. The normative joins the analytical.

Network and networking are keywords in current cultural policies, both as realities to describe and goals to achieve. It is worthwhile to reflect on their meaning. To be useful, the reflection should respect three stages: (1) the descriptive content of those concepts; (2) the evaluative assumptions; and (3) the programmatic orientation associated to them.

Describing a cultural entity as a network, one generally emphasizes all or some of the following characteristics. The first one is territorial dissemination: network suggests some kind of spread throughout a territory and some sort of anchorage in that territory. It opposes centralism, that is, the concentration of resources in a single, central institution, having an approach based in more flexible geographies, that allows various nodes, connections and forms of interaction. So, we speak of heritage sites network, or we identify the

networking of theatre companies, to signal the multipolar territorial inscription of such cultural facilities and assets.

The second characteristic is expansion: a network is a non-finite structure that can include new elements, or lose other ones, permanently or episodically, preserving meanwhile its logic and potential. It opposes the conventional way of launching an administrative structure by legislation and formal, homogeneous, one-shot implementation, practising the alternative method of gradually consolidating an ensemble of elements that adhere and participate at different times and with different rhythms, thus progressing in the making. A regional network of museums, for example, can begin by a few of them, cooperating for a common objective, or sharing resources, or articulating collections and exhibitions, and then include other covenants, in a quite flexible and dynamic movement.

Third, multi-level coordination is a key component of networks, as they aim to describe cultural realities. Instead of a circle, whose graphic representation indicates the clear existence of a single centre, that irradiates its energy through a bi-dimensional space and can progress through successive concentric circles, the image of a network suggests, not only multiple centres (the first characteristic) and dynamic spacing (the second one), but also the cross-section of different sources, paths and directions of energy. It underlines the interplay of multiple agents, at multiple levels of organization and activity: for instance, the co-presence of national government, regional bodies and local authorities in the design and implementation of cultural policies; or the convergence of the institutional focus on heritage preservation and the economic approach to urban heritage as a driver for touristic development.

Closely linked to this characteristic is the fourth one: partnership. It adds to the coordination a share of responsibilities, costs and benefits in governance. Therefore, network stands in the opposite position to the pyramid, the hierarchical configuration that distributes agents into clearly defined levels of status and power, the upper ones overseeing making decisions, planning and assigning tasks, and supervising the operations. Alternatively, the network governance takes advantage of the existence and articulation of different partners, such as national or local bodies, or cultural administration and artists, or cultural and urban development departments, and the like. Partnership means that ones will not be seen as the decision-makers and the others as the practitioners or the ones as the providers and the others as the clients, but that all represent stakeholders and players whose interests and activities must be globally considered.

Two last characteristics are also relevant for this analysis. Informality is more easily associated to network configurations than to hierarchies and close systems. Whenever one observes the key role played by informal interaction between the members of a given system, or between these members and their counterparts in the respective environment, one tends to apply, *ceteris paribus*, to that system the concept of network. Networks are, of course, institutions, as they are sets of rules and forms of consolidating and reproducing those rules. But they are less formal institutions than the average ones, since they open space for the plasticity and vividness of informal communication and mutual adjustment of agents, in Henry Mintzberg's (1979) sense. Agency tends to predominate over institution.

The organizational and practical consequences can be very important. Networks constitute, virtually or effectively, collective actors. Their internal configuration as a complex of individuals, groups, routines, devices and

institutions, may be 'translated' into practices and strategies that really influence social structures and processes. Howard S. Becker's (1982) description of the cooperative, multi-professional nature of an 'art world' was already an insightful interpretation of such mechanisms.

Considering these six characteristics that are generally attributed to networks – territorialization, openness, cooperation, partnership, informality and collective action –the frequent positive evaluation of networking and networks should not surprise. They are assumed as more 'friendly' structures (than the conventional, hierarchical and formal ones) regarding creativity and innovation. Ideas germinate, grow and circulate more easily through them. Procedures by trial and error are more feasible, exploring experimentation, assessment, rectification and gradual generalization. Norms can be less strict and appeal to voluntary adhesion, instead of establishing orders and sanctions. In such an environment, it is more plausible to identify opportunities as soon as they occur, to admit different kinds of players and interplays, to discover new protagonists and to respond very quickly to unexpected events. Flexibility improves systemic adaptation. Heterogeneity increases the amount of available assets. And informal, horizontal relationship fosters the development and dissemination of that crucial resource for communities and organizations that we name as social capital.

My purpose here is not to discuss the validity of these assumptions, but only to alert the reader to their evaluative character. As such, they are important ingredients of cultural practices. But they cannot be considered as ontological or logical certitudes. Unfortunately, the confusion of advocacy and analysis is a rather common trait of cultural research. Therefore, it is important to keep in mind that attributes like innovation, creativity or ingeniousness, far from being inherent to any network society or organization because of their 'nature', are *possibilities* that can or cannot be found in empirical realities – and that is a matter of empirical research to find them.

The same goes for the last stage of our preliminary reflection on the application of the concept of network to cultural domains, that is, its links with policy guidelines. In that context, and as it has been used in Continental Europe throughout the last decade of the last century and the first two decades of the current one, the insistence in networking is tied to the explicit or implicit laud of the Anglo-Saxon paradigm of cultural policies. Following the typology proposed by Chartrand and McCaughey (1989) and excluding, for its irrelevance in democratic Europe, the engineer state, this conveys the idea that the classic French-like model of the architect state should give more space to the indirect, less centralized, less formal mechanisms of the patron state, as in the United Kingdom, and of the facilitator state, as in the United States. Or, in the terms of Cummings Jr. and Katz (1987), networking would be more akin to the indirect administration of Anglo-Saxon countries than to the direct administration of Continental Europe. Cultural policy and cultural management could benefit from a move towards the network approach, precisely when the general trend seems to be the weakening of national governments, the permanence of budget constraints, the decrease in state funding of arts and the blatant need for cooperation and partnership between the various levels of public administration and with civil society (see Bell and Oakley 2015: 109–40).

Again, this is a quite different approach, compared to the analytical framework provided by sociology and organizational theory. Here network becomes an argument, a rhetorical and logical means to justify a structural change in

political paradigms. This does not mean any depreciation: rhetoric is really a vital component of the democratic debate. But one should not blur the boundaries between analytical and normative discourse, and should not treat moral or political assumptions as if they were straight logical or empirical evidence.

The sociologist's duty is not to forget the intersection of knowledge and action, nor to ignore the ideological devices embedded in action. However, he or she must not take these devices for their apparent value, considering them as well-established principles or concepts. Network is both a conceptual tool and a political motto; as a motto, it must be submitted to theoretical and empirical analyses. It should not be taken for granted, but critically scrutinized. What does it mean, in the political and artistic discourse? How does it constitute a guideline for cultural policy and administration, and how this guideline effectively influences real policies and real management? As a Weberian ideal-type, how can it help to understand different processes of social organization? Which conditions foster a network pattern of social and organizational structures, which strategies put it in practice, which outcomes may be pointed out?

To summarize in a single sentence: if networking does matter in current cultural policies, practices and discourses, it must be addressed as an issue of research.

THE PORTUGUESE CASE, 1987–2000: NETWORKING AS A DEVICE FOR NATIONAL CULTURAL POLICY

The purpose of this article is then to examine the content and functionality of the concept of cultural networking, considering the context of dense social and institutional processes and recurring to available empirical data. The assumption is that fruitful sociological comparison needs the consideration of real and specific cases, if one wants to avoid the mimesis of administrative jargon or the ritual repetition of empty generalities.

For this test, an interesting case can be found in Portugal. As in other countries, the idea of network and networking has been critical there, since the 1980s, to the definition and implementation of cultural policy. The accumulation of three characteristics gave it a certain singularity. First, in 1986 Portugal joined the European Communities, and this was a turning point for public policies, both in terms of guidelines and financial resources. Cultural facilities were also qualified to benefit from European funds; and eventually, in 2000, an entire programme dedicated to cultural investment was designed. Second, after a period in which the main concern had been the response to basic needs such as water and energy-supply or urban infrastructures, the municipal authorities (democratically elected since 1976) could turn their attention to educational and cultural affairs. Their role as partners for cultural policies gradually increased, and we can speak of a qualitative change from the late 1980s onwards (Silva et al. 2013). Third, the national government saw in this new role of the municipalities and in the developmental prospects associated to European integration the possibility to undertake a systematic coverage of the territory with public facilities like theatres, libraries and museums.

The consequence of these facts was the centrality, in action as well as in discourse, of the concept of networking and network. The meaning was quite conspicuous. A 'cultural network' would be: a set of facilities disseminated throughout the territory; according to a common broad framework, translated into some rules of construction, equipment, activity and maintenance. The rules were defined by national departments and according to

professional and technical patterns. Critical to the implementation of networks was; the cooperation between national and local authorities, based on voluntary adherence and the share of legal and financial responsibilities.

So, the networking strategy pointed to territorialization, partnership, technical regulation and variable-geometry. And this was really the guideline for the first national programme, launched by the government in 1987, and called the National Network of Public Libraries. The libraries, to be constructed or rehabilitated, were owned and managed by the municipalities. The national normative framework adapted UNESCO's rules, determining the requisites to be complied with, regarding size, content, professional staff and public services. The application of the programme was voluntary, and municipalities could benefit from a state funding covering a maximum of 50 per cent of the total construction costs. The responsibility to coordinate the network, assessing the compliance to rules, providing training, circulating information and launching additional incentives to content development and computerization, was assumed by a national department. According to its site, in June 2015, 209 of the 278 municipalities of Continental Portugal have public libraries belonging to the national network (www.rcbp.dglb.pt; the Autonomous Regions of Azores and Madeira have their own programmes).

The Public Libraries Network quickly became the benchmark for a new generation of cultural policies appealing to multi-level public administration, aiming to cover the whole territory, based on voluntary participation and cooperation, and implementing a soft national regulation, referred to international standards and investing in knowledge, training and the dissemination of best practices. Successive programmes follow this inspiration, in the inter-century transition. Closely linked to it is the National Network of School Libraries, launched by the Ministries of Education and Culture in 1996, and developed by the former. From 1987 until 2008, it has integrated 2077 pre-primary, primary and secondary schools (Costa 2010: 47–48).

Meanwhile, the most ambitious programme has been, since the year 2000, the Portuguese Museums Network. It was preceded and prepared, in 1998, by the first extensive survey ever undertaken in Portugal. The survey revealed that only 29 per cent of the total amount of 530 entities claiming to be museums complied with a minimal technical standard (and only 9 per cent observed the full set of the museological criteria, see Santos 2000: 156–59). Consequently, the launching of the national network was closely linked to an exhaustive programme of accreditation, this double nature defining the singularity of the Portuguese experience, in international terms (Camacho 2014a: 226–31; 2014b: 55–56).

Differently from the Public Libraries Network, the Museums Network was not primarily concerned with physical construction and equipment, but instead with the professional management of the collections and exhibitions, and with the range and quality of the services supplied to visitors. The existence of educational departments, of curators and other professionals, the public access to collections and in accordance with museographic norms were among the preconditions for participation in the network. Adherence was, of course, voluntary, and there was no distinction due to the property or nature of the museum: the 142 museums currently members of the network include public and private entities, be them classified as national, regional or local, or being under the responsibility of national government, autonomous bodies like regions and universities, or municipalities. The dissemination of information and the supply of training courses and materials are also crucial to the

network. Its coordination is assured by the Heritage National Department, but this does not mean any kind of formal authority over the members that do not belong to the state.

The articulation of networking and accreditation was indeed the very key for the success of the early stages in the network's development. The horizontal, voluntary, cooperative and incremental framework repelled rigid hierarchies and the bureaucratic tendency to treat formally and equally very different and plastic realities; and it allowed for interactive practices of sharing problems and resources and of reciprocal learning, with the technical support and professional leadership of well-known and respected museologists. In a context of conspicuous political engagement, this provided the conditions for both a quite rapid expansion of the network and a qualitative jump, in a short lapse of time. In 2002, a new survey would indicate a notorious progress of the standards of Portuguese museums: 56% already met the minimal standard (they were only 29%, four years earlier), and 22% met the full set of rules (9% in 1998) (Neves 2005b: 64–66). Of course, this progress is not a direct outcome of the Museums Network, whose implementation was at the very beginning; but it is an outcome of a broader political push of which the network was a crucial element.

The comprehensive nature of cultural networking, as a public policy, is also to be found in the failed experiences. The obvious one was the so-called National Network of Theatres (not to be confused with the national theatres managed by national government). After a first attempt at the early 1990s, it was launched in 1998 by the Ministry of Culture. It got its inspiration from the basic principles of the former Libraries Network: cooperation between the state and the municipalities, to rehabilitate existing facilities or to build new ones, throughout the territory, aiming to provide a set of appropriated venues for music, drama and dance, as well as to cinema. The ministry funded until 50 per cent of the construction works, the local authorities being responsible for the other part, both with the support of private sponsorship and European funds. The ministry also funded the first season of each theatre. Subsequent management and programming responsibilities would belong to municipalities, the legal owners of the venues (Centeno 2010: 118).

Several theatres were built or rehabilitated in the context of this policy, in the 1990s and 2000s, increasing substantially the scope and rhythm of earlier attempts to regenerate the Portuguese assets in this domain (29 new or rehabilitated theatres, in the first stage and the two lines of the programme, see Vargas 2011: 3–4).

Yet, unlike the inspiring model, no common set of rules was previously defined, concerning physical structures, professional management, services to audiences and guidelines for season planning (Vargas 2011). On the other hand, the variable costs, namely due to the production and presentation of shows, concerts and plays, are much heavier than in libraries and museums, whose activity depends mainly upon collections, estates and other permanent resources. Regarding performing arts, the critical dimension of networking is not the training and compliance with professional standards, and the mutual exchange of experience and information, but the circulation of companies, artists and works, as well as the practices of co-production and other strategies to obtain scale economies. There is the core where the cooperative nature of networking can prove the best, and its aggregate effects can impact over the whole territory.

In 2000–02, the Ministry of Culture launched a new programme, named Diffusion Programme in Performing Arts, addressing this issue. Again, it was a networking strategy, involving the joined effort of the state and municipalities. A platform was constituted, under the auspices of the National Department for Performing Arts, collecting the contacts and proposals of artists and companies wishing to publicize their services, in a strict voluntary basis. On the other hand, the interested municipalities registered their requests in the same platform. An intermediation was then put in practice, trying to match supply and demand, considering agendas and prices, and profiting from the possibility to organize itinerancies through several local theatres to cut costs for the buyer and to maximize advantages for the supplier. The national authorities also co-funded part of the costs of each show that should exceed the 50 per cent necessarily assumed by the concerned municipality. The logic of this co-funding was regressive, that is, the part committed to the ministry would gradually decrease along the programme.

This was really a network: voluntary adherence, decentralization of decisions, coordination and dissemination of information, soft regulation, interactions between multiple agents and in different directions, territorial coverage, partnerships and variable-geometry. According to the evaluation commissioned by the ministry (Santos 2004), this was indeed a well-succeeded methodology. But it did not survive to the huge budget constraints of the first years of the new century. It would eventually reappear, in 2006, under the same philosophy but in a smaller dimension, as a new programme 'Territory-Arts' (Centeno 2010: 333–34). Consequently, without the commitment to a common standard, with no organism invested in regulatory and coordination responsibilities and without a strong funding system to support programming and itinerancies, the Theatres Network did not achieve to constitute a network, despite its name and purpose (Centeno 2010: 333–37, based on her analysis of twelve theatres).

As both a rhetorical label and a methodological tool, networking has achieved a pivotal position in the array of instruments used by public cultural policies, in Portugal as in many other countries, from the 1980s onwards. Besides libraries, museums and theatres, it was put in practice in other domains concerning heritage and arts (Silva 2004; Garcia 2014: 15–17). There is a Municipal Archives Network, initiated in 1998, very similar to the libraries' paradigm.[1] There are several thematic networks of monuments and sites, like the Romanesque Route, comprehending mediaeval churches and monasteries, or the Cistercian Route, encompassing the various Benedictine monasteries, or the Jewries Route, and so on. A new public regional orchestras programme, launched in the 1990s, was also based on joint initiatives of several municipalities in each region, and the partnership between them and the state. It intended to cover the territory with independent, yet articulated institutions.

However, the three main cases that were analysed, concerning libraries, museums and theatres, seem to demonstrate the possibilities and limits of networking as a national policy in a quite eloquent way. It was an effective step ahead in the 'multi-level governance of cultural policies' (Bonet and Négrier 2010: 50), inaugurating a fruitful partnership between national government and local municipalities, and eventually evolving to additional specific cooperation between municipalities belonging to the same region. It generated important scale economies, enabling the promoters to reach new and important sources of funding – namely, European funds and private patronage – and improving the cost-effectiveness and territorial range of public investments in

Year	The Libraries Network, launched in 1987	The Museums Network, launched in 2000
1990	7	-
1995	54	-
2000	87	-
2001	106	64
2003	119	114
2011	194	131
2015	209	142

Sources: Neves (2013); Silva (2004); www.rcbp.dglb; www.patrimoniocultural.pt.

Table 1: The evolution of the number of institutions participating in the National Public Libraries Network and the Portuguese Museums Network, 1987–2015.

% of museums complying with:	1998	2002	2006	2009
Minimal museological standards	29	56	62	58
Full museological standards	9	22	22	-

Sources: Neves (2005b, 2013).

Table 2: The evolution of the museums, 1998–2009 (per cent).

cultural facilities. It compelled the national authorities (headed by a minister of culture in 1995–2011 and by a secretary of state in 1987–95 and 2011–15) to move towards more flexible and inductive regulation (therefore less vertical, rigid and bureaucratic). It pressured institutions and agents to invest in qualification and compliance with higher technical standards. The overall effect is notoriously positive.

As other strategies, networking can use more productively the available resources and mobilize more easily the stakeholders. But it cannot make up for their absence or failure. When the budget cuts dramatically hit cultural policies and departments, networking could in fact soften, but not *eliminate* their impact. There was also a fatigue during implementation, the pace of expansion slowing down through the years, because of the declining marginal gains, the supervening cutbacks and because of the discursive saturation of such a labelling (see the evolution of the Museums Network in Table 1, and the evolution of compliance with museological standards in Table 2). The turning points occurred when, in the context of financial austerity, the government's appeal to public–public and to public–private partnerships and the implementation of principles derived from New Public Management were viewed, especially by artists, as tricky arguments for reducing public expenditure, downsizing public administration, privatizing cultural services and de-prioritizing cultural policy. Networks, which emerged in Portuguese cultural policy, in the 1980s and 1990s, as fruitful mechanisms to multiply and articulate participants and to improve efficiency and impact, turned then to be sometimes denounced as a screen disguising sub-investment and privatization.

THE PORTUGUESE CASE, 2000–15: NETWORKING AS A STRATEGY FOR CULTURAL RESILIENCE IN HARD TIMES

The implementation and evolution of national networks of cultural institutions, in Portugal, documents in a rather sound way the ambivalence of such a tool for public policies. It has initiated a new form of articulating national and local policies, stressing the very entrance of municipalities as key players in the field of cultural policies. From the middle 1990s onwards, they would represent the main source of public expenditure in this domain (Neves 2005a). The networking discourse has also been a powerful impulse to motivate institutions, professionals and the administration to fully engage in communication and cooperation, jointly addressing modern and international standards of quality and efficacy. The networking strategy reformed traditionally rigid practices of central administration, improving more flexible and supportive regulatory actions. It was the main instrument to promote decentralization and territorial coverage, and, in that sense, it can be related to the policies of 'devolution' of powers to territories that emerged in the Great Britain and Continental Europe, during the 1990s. However, networking is mostly a methodology: it is concerned with the way of doing things. As such, it can maximize opportunities and resources, but it cannot replace them. So, when the upward trend of cultural policies stopped, in the first years of the twenty-first century, after a very short period of expansion, and Portugal returned to rather mediocre levels of symbolic, political and financial investment in culture, the functionality of the networking slogan to justify public retraction and push privatization became also apparent. As an emblem for progressive and ambitious national cultural policies, networking lost a great part of its previous charm.

But the story does not end here. The need to find a way through hard times of financial austerity and political periphery compelled many agents to revisit the inspirational and branding effect of networks and to act according to networking rules. These agents include public and private ones, artistic and political, central or peripheral in their respective fields. If one uses the useful model proposed by Bonet and Négrier (2010: 42–44), distinguishing four types of agents influencing cultural policies – institutions, markets, the non-profit cultural sector and the political sphere – and reading these policies along the dialectic standardization/differentiation and legitimacy/efficiency, the renewal of networking discourse and practice, in recent years, can be easily interpreted.

First, several political and managerial initiatives to reduce costs by rescaling activities and organizations could be and in fact have been conceptually presented as 'networking'. The initiatives included, among others ingredients: the formal cooperation, or even fusion, between big public institutions, as national theatres or companies, or central management bodies; the orientation towards multi-level public partnerships, involving for instance cultural and touristic departments, or national, regional and local authorities; the incentive to public/private partnership, shifting for example the legal nature of public services to foundational or other non-exclusively public regimes. This defensive or adaptive strategy, trying to compensate the fiscal restrictions with resource-sharing, is one of the current procedures, noticeable at the political, administrative and institutional level.

Second, the outcomes of precedent interventions, that upgraded the available public cultural facilities, mainly theatres and concert-halls, but also museums, galleries and multidisciplinary complexes, and the training and

certification, by arts schools, colleges and universities, of a younger and wider group of cultural professionals, like interpreters, directors, choreographers, managers, curators, technicians, or other sorts of artists, agents and mediators, set up new conditions for programming, producing and performing. One of the ways to develop such a work in a hostile financial context was exploring the possibilities of mutual communication, information exchange and partnership. The attempt to establish a scale of production and circulation of works and performances that could be more efficient and profitable, and the routinization of joint efforts – involving, in the field of performing or fine arts, co-productions of plays, concerts or exhibitions and their itinerancy throughout multiple locations – logically led to the gradual configuration of common platforms, that is, networks. In these two first decades of the twenty-first century, one can identify these networks, in Portugal, in the field of heritage, fine arts, music, drama and dance.

Three traits differentiate them from the centrally promoted national networks of the 1980s and 1990s. One is their bottom-up nature, designed as they are by the increasing practices of cooperation put in action by the institutions themselves – as it is the case with the co-production networks joining one or two state theatres, municipal venues and independent companies of various cities in the country – or by municipalities belonging to the same region, some of them already used to convergence in other domains. The second distinctive feature is the predominance of horizontal cooperation, along a 'branch' of the world of art or a regional space, over the precedent hegemonic relationship between a municipality or agent and the central public administration. And the third difference lies in the context, now being a context of difficulties and survival, and not one of development and expansion.

The fact is that, methodologically, networking also proves well in this new circumstance. Some examples can be considered. The first one is Artemrede – Teatros Associados (Art-in-Network – Associated Theatres). Subsequently to the conclusion of the rehabilitation or construction of a certain number of venues, the regional development department of the Lisbon Region (a government body) proposed to several municipalities a cooperative scheme to improve the planning of the activities of the new theatres. In 2005, an association was formally constituted, currently including thirteen municipalities. Its role is being an interface in the supply–demand chain between these theatres and the artistic milieu, assuring coherence, cost-effectiveness and scale economy to the theatres' programming. Thus, Artemrede provides annually a catalogue of plays, concerts and other artistic shows, to be performed in at least three venues. Besides this function, it also commands artists for specific productions and participates in co-productions with other partners. It organizes training for municipal and theatre staff, and cares for local education services and communitarian projects involving amateur dramatics or other forms of popular engagement. So, a small technical staff guarantees the coordination of the management and programming tasks of several independent municipal theatres, acting as 'cultural mediators' (in their own words), facilitating contacts between theatres, between theatres and artists and between theatres and schools, associations and/or local institutions. Simultaneously, the scale constituted by the reunion of thirteen different municipalities represents an asset regarding applications of European funds (one of the main sources of revenue of Artemrede, the other being the contributions of the associates). This is rightly conceived as networking.[2]

Similar to this model is 5 Sentidos (Five Senses). This network was launched, in 2009, by five 'cultural structures', that is theatres and art centres, summing up nowadays eleven entities. According to them, the aim is 'to promote networking in cultural programming and artistic production'. The main outputs are, on the one hand, co-productions of plays and performances and artistic residences and workshops, and, on the other hand, 'presentation circuits', meaning the itinerancy of works through the network's members. Two differences distinguish 5 Sentidos from Artemrede: its nodes are theatres of various natures – state-owned, municipal or independent structures – and not the municipalities as such; and it is a thematic, not a regional network, ranging from Lisbon and Porto to North, Centre and Alentejo Regions and even including the Azores Islands.[3] In a rather different scale, as it comprehends five very small municipalities of the Northern Portugal and, as a participant and the main sponsor, a local private energy utility, the Comédias do Minho (River Minho Comedies) has another distinct feature: in this case, the municipalities joined together to create, in 2003, a new professional theatre company (Silva et al. 2015).

If one moves to heritage, another resource of cultural networking will be noticeable: its linkage to economic activities, especially tourism. Take, for instance, the Romanesque Route. In 1998, the six municipalities of Vale do Sousa, a sub-region in the north-west, began to plan the joint exploration of their rich heritage in mediaeval churches, chapels, monasteries, towers and bridges built in Romanesque style. The formal launching of a professional team to coordinate the network occurred in 2006. Three years later, it was admitted in Transromanica, the Romanesque Route of European Heritage, an international network headquartered in Germany. In 2010, six other municipalities from a neighbouring sub-region joined the Route. Meanwhile, it was qualified for European and national funds, financing the rehabilitation and preservation works in several monuments, as well as the production of information and touristic materials. 'Cultural and landscape touring' is an explicit target of this inter-municipal initiative, and the services provided include visits to the monuments and sites, information on local history, folklore and gastronomy, roadmaps and practical tips for open-air activities, and the indispensable aide to tourists.[4]

Other similar historical routes are being established, taking advantage of the richness of Portuguese heritage. Normally, municipalities act as protagonists, in partnership with the property-owners (generally the Catholic Church, when it is not the state), with other levels of the cultural administration, with schools and universities and with official departments and private entrepreneurs in the appropriate segment of tourism market. Archaeological sites, military defence lines and fortresses or groups of monuments territorially disperse, but assembled by style or historical background, are examples of this strategy. Within the Museums Network, several regional networks were also established (Neves 2013: 27–29; Camacho 2014b). Again, network is an adequate classifier, used by promoters as a concept and an emblem: horizontal cooperation, joint efforts, a minimal common structure and soft regulation, multi-partner governance, openness and flexibility, technical benchmarking and scale economies.

At this level of cultural policies – regional and local policies put in practice by multiple social and political actors, in a quite bottom-up manner – networking resisted to a certain exhaustion of its former use as a key instrument of national, comprehensive and expanding cultural policies. Furthermore, it

resurged as a pertinent micro-meso strategy to foster cooperation and gain critical mass. One of the terrains in which this resurgence is clearly observable, and in a positive outlook, is urban cultural policy (Bell and Oakley 2015: 76–108). It concerns the governance of cultural 'districts' or 'quarters', assembling arts and creative industries in urban environments, and putting together, usually under the umbrella of a common brand and with the support of local authorities, individual artists and creative entrepreneurs, professional and economic associations, and public departments and policies. The two main cities, Lisbon and Porto, are the centres of such 'creative networks'; but they are spreading, in recent years, throughout the chain of middle cities (Costa 2008; Silva et al. 2013).

CONCLUDING REMARKS: NETWORKING AND COLLECTIVE CULTURAL ACTION

The analysis of the Portuguese situation points out a balance between two main uses of the concept and method of networking. Adapting the terms of Valentina Montalto (2010), this is a balance between 'macro-policies' and meso/'micro-practices', between predominantly top-down and predominantly bottom-up strategies.

In the national networks launched by the government since 1987, municipalities and local cultural institutions were invited to join partnership, in a win-win interplay framed by national and international standards. Territorial coverage, institutional consolidation and national regulation based on cooperation were the key goals. In the regional and/or thematic networks that emerged or became more visible in the shadowy years of the twenty-first century, the protagonists are either local political bodies and facilities, or specific cultural and artistic agents (individual or collective, coming from the institutional sphere, the non-profit sector or even from the cultural or touristic market). In many cases these two kinds of players do cooperate, ones with the others and all with the national authorities. Territories, themes and/or personal relationships are the most important links that structure the networking. This qualitative rescaling is felt to be necessary to adapt to the current critical circumstances and indeed to survive the huge financial cuts and the general retraction of state and patrons regarding heritage and arts. At the same time, because of its flexibility and gradualism, networking appears as an effective way of sharing assets, diminishing costs, maximizing social impact and political lobbying, and organizing cooperation. Additionally, it seems to be the most appropriate governance to improve and manage the urban 'creative industries'.

This is a matter of discourse. The rhetorical might of words like network and networking is not negligible. They are fashionable, suggesting familiarity with the trendy ideology of information technologies, connectivity, social networks, digital economy and online politics. They anticipate the promised land of individual autonomy, horizontal relations, informality, cooperation and creativity. There is a fresh manner to exhort people to join and act together. They annul spatial friction, allowing for close contact and interaction even when people are physically distant. None of these discursive effects should be depreciated, since argument and debate are at the very core of democracy. But one must not assume them as necessary characteristics that exist whenever the 'network society' is at stake. They must be put in relation with many other dimensions of social action and structure,

such as empowerment, dominance, hegemony, inequality, hierarchy, tension and conflict (Castells 2007). And the resultant complex of social factors and outcomes must be investigated in concrete empirical figurations (in Norbert Elias' sense of the word [see 1978]).

Meanwhile, being an emblem, networking is more than a simple rhetorical device. It also defines a policy: it is a guideline and tool to implement a certain kind of public policies. Whatever the level from which originates, it distinctively attempts to articulate multi-level governance and to implement flexible organizational forms, generally territorially anchored. As such, it really constitutes a fruitful methodology for cultural public policies, in times of expansion as in times of severe restrictions. Its richness lies in the possibility of combining distinct political players – state, regions and cities; administrative bodies and institutions; market and non-profit sectors – and to cope in a more elastic way with the dialectic centre/periphery and standardization/differentiation that so strongly informs cultural policy (Bonet and Négrier 2010).

Networking is also a practice. Conceptually, this is indeed its crucial element: a form of collective action based on flexible links and common goals. This action is distinctively embodied in a structure that opposes the classic pattern of hierarchical, closed systems – well defined and delimited from the external environment, and led by clearly established instances of decision (the pyramid's apex) – valuing the alternative pattern of open systems of social relations that crosscut vertical with horizontal fluxes, and allow for simultaneous and conflictive directions in the allocation of resources and authority, the communication flows and the exercise of influence and power. (Please note that network is not the absence of power, but a specific 'geometry' of power relations.) These are, of course, Weberian ideal-types, the real situations being more or less far from the abstract, general description, and usually combining the two models in hybrid mixes. But all the analytical and normative comparison of network and hierarchy turns around this point: what is the most favourable framework for collective action and what is the most adequate governance to structure it?

Governance is therefore a key issue (Stoker 1998). At the minimum, a network may only be a way to connect people, allowing communication between them. It is one of its basic functions, and one can easily see this in the increasing number of European and international networks, linking artists, art institutions and cultural agents (Minichbauer and Mitterdorfer 2000: 2–4). It would be fastidious to detail the obvious and numerous examples. Second, a network may be an organizational platform – a locus for contact, resource pooling and sharing, information exchange, reciprocal learning, and continuous and wide-range cooperation, in the activities of fund-raising, artistic and technical production, economic management or in the circulation and distribution of goods and services.

But a network can also be an alternative way – alternative to the hegemonic institutional arenas – of constituting and developing a 'coalition' of cultural agents and cultural forms. In this sense, networking contributes to move peripheries towards the centre or to transform peripheries into new centres. It may better preserve differentiation and diversity from standardization inputs, and counterbalance hegemony with strong social and territorial anchorages.[5] In this case, the network tends to act as a *specific* player – not as if it were an individual, uniform subject, but as what it really is: an internally plural, heterogeneous, variable, still coherent entity or movement. Both as a concept and a guideline for action, the networking idea proposes a form of

structuring and a model of governance that draws from plurality and diversity the energy to propel collective praxis. That is why it deserves detailed empirical analysis and careful theoretical elaboration.

REFERENCES

Becker, H. S. (1982), *Art Worlds*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Bell, D. and Oakley, K. (2015), *Cultural Policy*, London: Routledge.

Bonet, L. and Négrier, E. (2010), 'Cultural policy in Spain: Processes and dialectics', *Cultural Trends*, 19:1&2, pp. 41–52.

Camacho, C. F. (2014a), 'Credenciação, sistemas e redes nacionais de museus: Uma panorâmica europeia contemporânea' ('Accreditation, national museums systems and newtorks: A European overview'), Ph.D. thesis, Évora: Universidade de Évora.

—— (2014b), 'Na senda das redes: Caminhos e descaminhos da museologia no Portugal democrático' ('In the networks path: Museological advances and retrocessions in Portuguese democracy'), *Revista da Faculdade de Letras – ciências e técnicas do património*, 13, pp. 249–59.

Castells, M. (1996), *The Rise of the Network Society*, Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

—— (2007), 'Communication, power and counter-power in the Network Society', *International Journal of Communication*, 1, pp. 238–66.

Centeno, M. J. (2010), 'As organizações culturais e o espaço público: A experiência da Rede Nacional de Teatros e Cineteatros' ('Cultural organisations and the public sphere: The case of the National Theatre Network'), Ph.D. thesis, Lisbon: Faculdade de Ciências Sociais e Humanas da Universidade Nova de Lisboa.

Chartrand, H. H. and McCaughey, C. (1989), 'The arm's length principle and the arts: An international perspective – past, present and future', in M. C. Cummings Jr and J. M. D. Schuster (eds), *Who's to Pay for the Arts? The International Search for Models of Arts Support*, Washington, DC: American Council for the Arts.

Costa, A. F. da (ed.) (2010), *Avaliação do Programa Rede de Bibliotecas Escolares* (*An Assessment of the School Libraries Network*), Lisbon: Rede de Bibliotecas Escolares – Ministério da Educação.

Costa, P. (2008), 'Creativity, innovation and territorial agglomeration in cultural activities: The roots of the creative city', in P. Cooke and L. Lazzeretti (eds), *Creative Cities, Cultural Cluster and Local Economic Development*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 183–210.

Cummings Jr., M. C. and Katz, R. S. (eds) (1987), 'Government and the arts: An overview', in *The Patron State. Government and the Arts in Europe, North America and Japan*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Delfin, M. (2012), 'The promise of cultural networks in Latin America: Towards a research framework for the study of region-specific cultural network ecosystems', *Cultural Trends*, 21:3, pp. 239–48.

Elias, N. (1978), *What is Sociology?*, London: Hutchinson.

Garcia, J. L. (ed.) (2014), *Mapear os Recursos: Levantamento da Legislação, Caracterização Dos Atores, Comparação Internacional* (*Mapping Cultural Resources*), Lisbon: ICS-UL.

Minichbauer, R. and Mitterdorfer, E. (2000), *European Cultural Networks and Networking in Central and Eastern Europe*, Vienna: IG Kultur Osterrreich.

Mintzberg, H. (1979), *The Structuring of Organizations: A Synthesis of the Research*, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Montalto, V. (2010), 'Decentralization and devolution in Italian cultural policies: How micro-practices should inspire macro-policies', *Cultural Trends*, 19:1&2, pp. 15–25.

Neves, J. S. (2005a), *Despesas dos Municípios com Cultura (1986–2003)* (*Council Spending on Culture*), Lisbon: Observatório das Atividades Culturais.

—— (ed.) (2005b), *O Panorama Museológico em Portugal (2000–2003)* (*Museums in Portugal*), Lisbon: Observatório das Atividades Culturais and Instituto Português de Museus.

—— (ed.) (2013), *O Panorama Museológico em Portugal: Os Museus e a Rede Portuguesa de Museus na Primeira Década do Século XXI* (*Museums in Portugal: Museums and the Portuguese Museums Network in the First Decade of the 21st Century*), Lisbon: Direção-Geral do Património Cultural.

Santos, M. de L. L. dos (ed.) (2000), *Inquérito aos Museus em Portugal* (*Survey of Portuguese Museums*), Lisbon: Instituto Português de Museus and Observatório das Atividades Culturais.

—— (ed.) (2004), *Políticas Culturais e Descentralização: Impactos do Programa Difusão das Artes do Espectáculo* (*Cultural Policies and Decentralization: The Effects of the Diffusion Programme in Performing Arts*), Lisbon: Observatório das Atividades Culturais.

Silva, A. S. (2004), 'As redes culturais: Balanço e perspectivas da experiência portuguesa, 1987–2003' ('Cultural networks: The Portuguese experience'), in M. L. L. Santos (ed.), *Públicos da Cultura* (*Culture Audiences*), Lisbon: Observatório das Atividades Culturais, pp. 241–83.

Silva, A. S., Babo, E. P. and Guerra, P. (2013), 'Cultural policies and local development: The Portuguese case', *Portuguese Journal of Social Science*, 12:2, pp. 113–31.

Silva, A. S., Santos, H., Ramalho, J. and Moreira, R. (2015), 'Theatre and the sustainable territorial communities: A case study in Northern Portugal', paper, *Culture(s) in Sustainable Futures: Theories, Policies, Practices*, University of Jyvaskyla and COST, European Cooperation in Science and Technology, Helsinki, 6–8 May.

Stoker, G. (1998), 'Governance as theory: Five propositions', *International Social Science Journal*, 155, pp. 17–28.

Vargas, C. (2011), 'Construir teatros e cineteatros em Portugal: Novos palcos para os artistas, novos espectáculos para o público' ('Building theatres in Portugal: New stages for artists, new shows for the public'), working paper 2, Lisbon: Observatório Político, www.observatoriopolitico.pt/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/wp-2.pdf. Accessed 3 August 2017.

SUGGESTED CITATION

CONTRIBUTOR DETAILS

Augusto Santos Silva has a Ph.D. in sociology. He is a full professor in the Faculty of Economics of the University of Porto and a researcher at the Instituto de Sociologia at the University of Porto. Since November 2015 he has been Portuguese Foreign Minister. His most recent publications include: *As Palavras do Punk: Uma Viagem fora dos Trilhos pelo Portugal Contemporâneo*, with Paula Guerra (Lisbon: Alêtheia, 2015); 'Políticas culturais locais: Contributos para um

modelo de análise', with Elisa Pérez Babo and Paula Guerra (2015), *Sociologia, Problemas e Práticas* (78, pp. 105–24); and 'Music and more than music: The approach to difference and identity in Portuguese punk', with Paula Guerra (2015), *European Journal of Cultural Studies* (18:2, pp. 207–23).

Contact: Faculdade de Economia, Secção Autónoma de Ciências Sociais, Universidade do Porto, R. Dr. Roberto Frias, 4200-464 Porto, Portugal.
E-mail: asilva@fep.up.pt

Citizenship Teaching and Learning

Aims and Scope

Citizenship Teaching and Learning is global in scope, exploring issues of social and moral responsibility, community involvement and political literacy. It advances academic and professional understandings within a broad characterization of education, focusing on a wide range of issues including identity, diversity, equality and social justice within social, moral, political and cultural contexts.

Call for Papers

The journal publishes scholarly and research-based articles on a wide range of citizenship topics. It is a platform for exploration of conceptual issues, discussion on policy matters, reporting on experiments, surveys or evaluations. The journal also includes descriptions and analyses of examples of practice. For submission guidelines please see www.intellectbooks.com. Questions may be addressed to the editor.

Editor
Ian Davies
University of York
ian.davies@york.ac.uk

Handling Editor
Andrew Peterson
University of South Australia
andrew.peterson@unisa.edu.au

Associate Editors
Alan Sears
University of New Brunswick
asears@unb.ca

Marta Fulop
Institute of Cognitive Neuroscience
and Psychology, Hungarian Academy
of Sciences
fmarta@mtapi.hu