

ECAS 2013

5th European Conference on African Studies (Lisbon)

June
27-29



African Dynamics in a Multipolar World

ISCTE - Lisbon University Institute

ECAS 2013

5th European Conference on African Studies

African Dynamics in a Multipolar World

©2014 Centro de Estudos Internacionais do Instituto Universitário de Lisboa (ISCTE-IUL)

ISBN: 978-989-732-364-5

THE CULTURE AND DEVELOPMENT AGENDA IN LUSOPHONE

AFRICA

Raquel Freitas

Researcher at Centre for Research and Studies in Sociology
University Institute of Lisbon (CIES, ISCTE-IUL)

Raquel.freitas@eui.eu

Abstract

The international discourse around development aid proposes the instrumentalisation of culture based on a positively valued utilitarian objective that is social and economic development. A public policy approach would expect this to be consensual among observers, but it is not, as there are potential negative impacts of such instrumentalisation and discussion is polarized. The interest of this paper is on what model, if any, of cultural policy is being diffused to developing countries and what leeway for policy choice is contained in such agenda. I propose to explore how the link between culture and development is framed in the interaction between international partners such as UNESCO and the EU, and three lusophone African countries: Angola, Mozambique and Cape Verde.

Keywords: Development; culture; donors; Angola; Mozambique; Cape Verde

1. Introduction

There is a growing notion that the twenty-first century is to be dominated by creativity, where culture plays a role beyond entertainment and heritage preservation (Bradford 2010: 12). The increasing international interest over the issue-area of culture in general stems from the acknowledgement that the focus on industrial production of material goods as a source of economic development is beginning to shift to areas more related to creativity and knowledge. These areas normally include what are termed the cultural and creative industries, a notion that encompasses several conceptual and policy tensions (Hesmondhalgh and Pratt 2005).

This notion and interest is also being translated into development aid policies, where attention is turning to how culture contributes to development in different dimensions. The United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) created a set of indicators (Culture and Development Indicator Suite, CDIS) to assess performance in the implementation of activities in this issue-area, which is supported by bilateral donors such as Spain and China, as well as the European Commission (EC) among several other donors. As presented, the indicators take a holistic approach, which does not exclude a range of different perspectives on culture, from an emphasis on economic development to heritage protection or peace and identity issues. Just as most policy configurations developed by large bureaucracies, the culture-development agenda tends to be shielded in the political neutrality of the technical-bureaucratic jargon of efficiency, results, sustainability etc. At the same time these bureaucracies, acting as agents of interested donors, impose their worldviews and policies on a global scale (Stoczkowski 2009).

The aim of this paper is to contribute to the discussion on the policies linking culture and development by juxtaposing the worldview and policies that are proposed to operationalise the

link at the international level, with the policies being adopted by partner countries. Due to its complexity, the holistic approach of international bureaucracies makes it difficult to isolate potential attribution or even contribution of the international policy agenda in terms of policy diffusion. However, an interpretive assessment of the priorities and worldviews framed in developing countries' policy documents is relevant in order to highlight convergences or divergences between international and local models for operationalising such link, which is the main aim of this paper.

Neither public policy nor critical theories are monolithic blocs with one position on these issues. However, they represent sufficiently contrasting perspectives on international policy-making, resulting in important distinct contributions to analysing practice and policies, which will inform the present analysis.

The paper will start with a brief description of the context for the emergence of the link between culture and development in the international agenda and a reflection on its conceptual implications, to provide guidance and set the problem for the research. The following section will analyse relevant theoretical propositions that provide reference points to understanding and interpreting the problem. This will be followed by an analysis of the specific institutional positions of a few relevant donors concerning this link, in order to define the general benchmarks against which the analysis of the cases will be done.

The paper follows a methodology based on document analysis to assess two different dimensions: the extent to which there is a model for culture-development or several models conceived by international partners, and to what extent these correspond to the models adopted by the countries under analysis. The hypothesis under scrutiny is that international bureaucracies propose different options within a bureaucratic holism menu that enables policy-making a la

carte. This may be useful in order to adjust the global model to the national context while also enabling decision-makers to avoid specific political commitments in less critical areas. Critical theories nevertheless point to these international models as political instruments of a neo-colonial type (Tomlinson 2012) or neo-liberal type that don't leave much actual leeway for alternative policy choices to national governments and mostly to the citizens. From the public policy contributions on policy diffusion (Dolowitz and Marsh 2000) I extract different systems of understanding policy-diffusion and also propositions of instruments through which such diffusion is done, in particular social construction, coercion, competition and learning (Simmons, Dobbin, and Garrett 2007).

The paper takes an interpretive account of policy choice as reflected in three types of policy documents in the selected countries: government plans, general budget documents, poverty reduction strategies and specific programme documents, where relevant. The countries of interest to this paper are three lusophone African countries: Angola, Cape Verde and Mozambique.

The three countries are covered by one common EC programme, the Indicative Regional Programme for the PALOP (PIR-PALOP) that includes a sub-programme dedicated to culture.¹ They also share a common language and a significant part of their government administration has benefited from technical assistance from the same donors, namely Portugal. These countries have a number of historical and cultural aspects in common that they inherited from the colonial period, and also from active interactions between the member-states of the Community of Portuguese Speaking Countries (CPLP), where articulation of activities in the cultural area is a

¹ Programme for the Support of Cultural Initiatives in PALOP countries. PALOP stands for the Portuguese-Speaking African Countries and includes Angola, Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique and São Tomé and Príncipe.

regular practice. In most other areas they differ immensely and are not used as comparable cases, rather as case-studies within a specific geo-political configuration.

2. Context and conceptual implications of linking culture and development

Culture and development are traditionally two distinct policy areas although the argument is often made that one contributes to the other (UNESCO 2009). However, because culture was not previously classified in industrial terms it was difficult to measure the link and the contribution of culture to development has not always been acknowledged. Since the rise of what is designated as the cultural industries, culture's contribution to economic performance, growth and employment, has been gaining recognition. This is happening through a process of commodification and marketisation, including by international organisations and their statistical departments (Hesmondhalgh and Pratt 2005).

As the world's organisation mandated to address, among other areas, the protection of cultural diversity, UNESCO has a consolidated experience in areas such as the preservation of world heritage. UNESCO's mandate on culture was strengthened with the adoption of the Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity in 2001 and the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions in 2005. Through Article 13° of this instrument, governments commit to the integration of culture in sustainable development and in Article 14° several measures are set in place to assist developing countries to foster the emergence of a "dynamic cultural sector". The 2005 Convention can be seen as a normative frame for the protection of cultural diversity in the face of globalisation, and also against the pervasive effects of neo-liberalism that permeate policies through the WTO dispositions (Graber

2006). The intrinsic value of culture would therefore be in tension with its instrumental or economic value and legitimise protectionist measures by governments.

It can be argued that the Convention has a damage control objective, to protect valued cultural dimensions from the neo-liberal worldview that threatens such diversity. However, it should be pointed out that such is the very system that adopted the Convention. Such threat emerges through market liberalisation and access of goods and services to all markets often rendering domestic production uncompetitive. This double and ambivalent goal system penetrates the agenda that links culture to development making it relevant to enquire as to what is protected and what is subjected to the determinants of neo-liberalism in the policies promoted through this agenda.

The indicators proposed by UNESCO to operationalise the link between culture and development include seven dimensions: economy; education; heritage; communication; governance and institutionality; social participation; gender equality (UNESCO 2011a). The broad range of areas is reflective of a broad approach to culture, one that is open to adjustment of the weight of the different dimensions to the national social and economic contexts. We would call this approach bureaucratic holism, a tendency for bridging policy areas that has become fashionable in recent years in different policy areas, which strives to bring coherence to complementary but also often competing policy areas.² It is too early to assess if there is institutional and funding capacity to ensure all that is implied in this package of indicators, but it is not too late to highlight the question. Assuming that fulfilling the whole agenda is not possible, what is the prioritisation of issue-areas, and the criteria for such prioritisation? In a global context marked by the economic rationality notion, it is unlikely that essentialist views of

² The EU has examples of policy coherence for development (PCD) linking migrations and development, security and development, among others. Also responses to post-conflict situations are managed around integrated approaches in the UN system or even NATO's comprehensive approaches.

culture will take precedence. This would not be a problem in itself if this agenda had clear boundaries of what “culture” is, so that policies and funding mechanisms would be allocated separately and political/instrumental objectives kept separate from the mechanisms for protecting diversity and the intrinsic value of culture.

Indeed, the concept of culture, as encompassed in UNESCO’s culture-development agenda, remains very broad and difficult to circumscribe, namely inasmuch as the cultural and creative industries are concerned. These are the most obvious potential sources of economic growth and seem to be the main drivers underlying the whole effort, with the rest of the dimensions serving social-political purposes that are less clearly operationalisable and accounted for.

Debates around models for culture in society have typically revolved around the instrumental and the essentialist view of the role of culture. Existing models of cultural choices divide the so-called “cultural pessimism” of Adorno and Horkheimer (Adorno and Horkheimer 1997) concerning the negative effects of transformation of culture into a commodity and the contrasting perspective that celebrates such transformation in a non-critical manner as an element of construction and enhancement of social life, as is the case in most of the recent international discourse supporting the link between culture and development. Somewhere along this continuum is the perspective that sees such transformation as a contested zone of continued creation, complexity and ambivalence (Hesmondhalgh 2007).

While very few would argue that the two models are mutually exclusive, the mainstream will tend to disregard the tensions between them and the possibility that the concern over the protection of the intrinsic value of culture may be totally ignored in favour of the utilitarian or instrumentalisation role. This is reflected in the duality between the idea of culture as means of

living and enabler of economic activities (more rationalist version, linked to public policies) and as artistic work (more normative version about the value of culture for the completion of the community/individual).

This formulation suggests two contrasting worldviews that broadly reflect aggregates of contrasting dualities. Such dualities are structured around some of the following dyads: instrumental versus essentialist role of culture (means and ends); universalism versus cultural relativism; liberal versus communitarian approaches; right versus left ideologies; modernity versus tradition; urban versus rural; public versus private; role of state versus role of market.

Within the instrumentalisation perspective, culture is seen as a means to achieve objectives such as poverty reduction, social awareness and identity issues. It includes better economic living conditions and macro-economic gains for the state; social conditions (awareness raising concerning social/health/environmental problems); fulfils public policy role and benefits recipients of the educational information; political aspects (such as identity and peace). This instrumentalisation may also be geared towards exclusively internal objectives of the state, such as the consolidation of peace through an identitarian culture, or towards external objectives through the development of identitarian projection abroad or tourist economic sector.

It is important to focus on the role of the state, since culture is a sensitive area that on the one hand requires a certain degree of protection, on the other hand does not condone too much interference. How to reconcile these two requirements? The identitarian protectionism of the state may represent a temptation for an ideological orientation designed to instil a specific version of national identity through instrumentalisation of culture, or it may serve to maintain and nurture forms of identity based on the free artistic expression of its citizens. UNESCO also

uses the argument that mainstreaming culture in development will enable empowerment and informed choices by the citizens, thus increased ownership, social cohesion and inclusiveness.

3. Public policy and critical theories: interpreting policy transfer

Evidence of increasing phenomena of “policy contamination” at the global level has sparked public policy research on issues related to policy diffusion, policy transfer and lessons learning. Such research explores the factors that account for the success or failure of these processes (Prince 2010) and identifies relevant categories of transfer and their effects on public policies (Dolowitz and Marsh 2000; Simmons et al. 2007).

Simmons et al. (Simmons et al. 2007) point to the limitations in existing theorisations around policy diffusion and the mish mash of approaches that try to address the phenomenon, often not appropriately tested against one another. Despite its limitations (James and Lodge 2003), this line of research provides important analytical clues for the phenomenon of concern to this paper. Here I take the general definition for policy transfer processes provided by Dolowitz and Marsh (2000:5) as a “process in which knowledge about policies, administrative arrangements, institutions and ideas in one political setting (past or present) is used in the development of policies, administrative arrangements, institutions and ideas in another political setting.”.

Public policy approaches are typically grounded on rational and utilitarian strands of thought and are devoted to the analysis of processes through which the provision of public goods is made more efficient. In the case of the culture and development agenda this would mean protecting cultural diversity, promoting development and combating poverty. In the developed countries the instrumental turn on cultural planning has clearly taken place and is described in

Belfiore's analysis of New Public Management in cultural policy making in Britain (Belfiore 2004).

Public policy theories generally adjust to the surrounding policy environment, aiming at explaining policies and making them more efficient. Most sorts of public policy innovations spread around the globe are framed as tied to a project of political and economic liberalisation (Simmons et al. 2007). In the area of development policies these processes are instilled in developing countries through intense socialisation between donors and their partners, sometimes through direct imposition of conditions for certain policy outcomes. Development aid policies are thus seen as instruments either in improvement in efficiency and effectiveness of local policies (Hanson, Kararach, and Shaw 2012) or of enabling the process of political and economic liberalisation (Craig and Porter 2006). In the same manner, linking cultural policies to development may be seen as part of this instrumental perspective with a view to promoting development and poverty reduction.

Stevenson points to the differences in broad or restricted understanding of culture as sources of policy failure (Stevenson 2004). He argues that the broad understanding of culture creates instability and using cultural planning as an instrument for social inclusion serve essentially the purposes of economic accumulation. Pratt discusses the definitional problems around the Cultural and Creative Industries (CCIs) and around the perception of potential gains and risks. This means that the temptation to mimic what others do, needs to be cautioned with a focus on the social and political context to which the policy is being imported (Pratt 2009)

Criticisms to existing approaches to policy transfer have emerged from all sorts of theoretical backgrounds, but critical theories stand out as having a significantly different worldview and set of assumptions that are useful for this research. They focus on the negative

effects of the imposition of structural adjustment (Brown et al. 2013) and of governance indicators (Löwenheim 2008) on developing countries and on the effects of a dominant worldview based on market consumption and neo-liberalism (Craig and Porter 2006). They do not simply try to explain the phenomenon but also to understand the underlying assumptions on which it is grounded and expose the negative impacts.

Development studies criticise utilitarianism and top down agendas that favour an ideology which is induced in other countries' policy processes through different means (Blunt, Turner, and Hertz 2011; Mosse and Lewis 2005). Authors within this line also address critically the influence of donors in the project of political and economic liberalisation that is often not mindful of context and leaves the countries exposed to the markets and without sufficient capacity to face the challenges raised by such exposure (Munck and O'Hearn 1999). Development aid is seen as an instrument of such liberalisation through the conditionality or even direct influence of donors on the partner countries, while at the same time providing funding to address the negative consequences of liberalisation on the social sector (Easterly 2006).

In the cultural sector there is also much criticism of the exposure of culture to the liberalisation and marketisation process. According to Gray (Gray 2007), the process of commodification of cultural policy is related to a broader process of establishment and acceptance of a commodified conception of public policy. Cultural studies criticise the disregard for the intrinsic value of culture in some cultural policies and caution against the influence of globalisation and neo-liberalism in the possibility of preserving access to independent and intellectually autonomous cultural production (Garnham 2005).

An important question deriving from these contrasting perspectives is the extent to which the link between culture and development will contribute in a positive way to development while preserving the intrinsic value of culture. As this is a recent agenda and there is scarce evidence of such impact deriving from this agenda, the theories, in particular the critical theories, help us frame areas of caution, that may serve as reference for the refinement of the agenda and the formulation of future policies, more than presenting concrete results. Such is the use that this paper will do of such contributions throughout the next sections, in order to answer the question of what convergence or divergence with international models is identifiable in developing countries' cultural policy.

4. A model for culture-development?

The international agenda on culture and development has two main objectives. One is raising the proportion of international development funding for culture, which is around only 1.7% (UNESCO 2010). Another objective, not entirely disconnected from the previous, is to foster the development of cultural policies in developing countries with the aim of structuring intervention in areas that were previously not regarded as relevant policy areas and did not represent any sort of priority. Hence, with clear policies, more funding would be channelled more effectively with clear indicators that donors would be able to track through an instrument as the CDIS.

This section will analyse the policy utterances that establish the linkage between culture and development as framed by two international donors (UNESCO and EC) and identify which aspects of the previously discussed debates are valued.

UNESCO and global funding mechanisms

The Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions came into existence in 2005 largely in order to provide a cushion for the potential negative effects of globalisation and its tendency for cultural homogenisation as well as the failure of culture to become part of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). UNESCO has the mandate to oversee the application of the Convention, currently against a background of globalisation and of financial crisis in developed countries. While globalisation brings assets and threats to cultural diversity, the cultural sector is one of the most sacrificed in terms of funding due to the financial crisis (UNESCO 2009).

UNESCO has also been a lead agency in development activities, essentially through its mandate on education, which is directly tied to Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) for the achievement of universal access to primary education (MDG2) and gender equity in access to education (MDG3). It is an active agency within the UN country teams and participates in the joint programming efforts at country level such as UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF).³

With the enhanced mandate for cultural diversity, UNESCO has firmly embraced the link between culture and development. This discussion had been going on since the mid-1990s, with the report of the World Commission on Culture and Development in 1995, the 1998 Stockholm Conference on Cultural Policies for Development, and the 2004 UNDP Human Development Report *Cultural Liberty in Today's Diverse World*. Current efforts focus in particular on ensuring the institutional consolidation of the link and obtaining additional funding. This is being done through a strategy of argumentation around the contribution of culture to development (including

³ In developing countries UNESCO participates in the UN Development Assistance Framework, a process of coordination of the contribution of the different UN agencies present in the country that provides the main policy and operational orientations.

poverty eradication and the peace dimension, as enabler of development), and the creation of a set of indicators to assess performance in the link between culture and development (UNESCO 2011).

UNESCO has also actively been lobbying the discussions on the post-2015 global development framework and has successfully influenced towards the acknowledgement of the link between culture and development in the outcome document of the UN MDG Review Summit in 2010 and to the adoption of two relevant UN resolutions acknowledging the link in 2010 and 2011 (UN 2010); (UN 2011); (UNESCO 2011b). However, the recent report of the High Level Panel on the Post-2015 Development Agenda has not included any reference to culture in its proposed roadmap, which will be discussed at the 2013 UN General Assembly (UN 2013). UNESCO, with the support of China, also organised a major international congress in May 2013 in Hangzhou, China to discuss the inclusion of culture in future development goals (UNESCOPRESS 2013). In 2013 the theme of the UN Social and Economic Committee (ECOSOC)'s Annual Ministerial Review was the role of science, technology, innovation and culture in promoting sustainable development and the Millennium Development Goals. The report notes that "It is critical that a post-2015 framework integrates culture as a key element." and that "Because it is inherently a cross-cutting issue, a culture sensitive approach should be an overarching concern for all development initiatives" (UNSG 2013, p. 14), including poverty reduction.

Two global funding mechanisms, the International Fund for Cultural Diversity (IFCD) and the Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund (MDG-F) are of particular importance to implement the link between culture and development.

The IFCD is the funding mechanism for the Convention on Cultural Diversity and its contributions are fully eligible as Official Development Assistance (ODA). This is important to enable donor countries to allocate funding for culture and ensure it is accounted as part of the 0.7% GNI commitment that they have pledged to development aid at the 2003 Monterrey Conference. It should be noted that the rules on ODA eligibility explicitly exclude cultural diplomacy, and this may be problematic in terms of the definition of the boundaries of culture for development and for diplomacy. The emphasis of the IFCD is on promoting the emergence of “dynamic cultural sectors” in developing countries. The IFCD has the general objective of contributing to the emergence of a dynamic cultural sector in the developing countries that are party to the Convention. Its operational orientation specifically mentions investment in cultural industries, which is taking up around two thirds of total funding. After three funding appeals since the inception in 2009, the Fund had received in 2012 around USD 5.4 million. In a letter to governments, the Director-General of UNESCO clearly emphasised the link between the Fund and investment in creativity and the diversity of cultural expressions as “sources of employment, revenue and innovation”.⁴

The MDG-F is another global funding mechanism, supported by Spain and implemented through the UNDP with other agencies, since 2006. It includes the link between culture and development as one of its eight programme areas. Under this thematic window, it has allocated around US\$ 95 million and contributes to the MDG of halving the proportion of people whose income is less than US\$ 1 a day by 2015 by giving special attention to the participation of women in these efforts.⁵ The sectoral policy guidance highlights a two-track approach to MDG-F’s mission of providing support to countries in the design, implementation and evaluation of effective public

⁴ See http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CLT/pdf/Conv2005_IFCD_DGletter2013_en.pdf , accessed September, 15 2013.

⁵ See http://www.mdgfund.org/sites/default/files/Culture_Thematic%20Study.pdf, accessed September, 15 2013

policies: one track promoting social inclusion of minorities and disadvantaged and another promoting job creation, economic growth and poverty reduction. Cultural and creative industries are lumped together as “those which comprise the formation, production, commercialisation, and distribution of cultural goods and services resulting from human inspiration and imagination. They include, among others, printing and publishing, visual and performing arts, cultural tourism and related heritage industries, cinema, music, radio, television and online industries, arts, and design and crafts.”⁶

The European Commission (EC)/European Union (EU)

Besides UNESCO, the European Commission (EC) as a donor of development aid has also made the link, introducing culture in its cooperation agreements since 1984, with exponential increases in the volumes of funding for culture. A few member states have embraced the link at the bilateral level, foremost among them Spain, through its Millennium Development Goals Fund (MDG-F) as seen above. Other EU member states such as Denmark and Sweden have active strategies in this area.

The EC policy on culture and development also highlights the double track of contributing to human development and to economic growth. Although economic growth comes out first, aspects such as peace, tolerance, intercultural dialogue, human rights, prevention of conflicts and social inclusion are also listed in the dimensions underlying the link. Although there is no clear strategy, there is a marked insistence on including culture in social and political issues such as inclusion, tolerance, peace, human rights and human development in general rather than on economic development. Interestingly, however, the operationalisation of these

⁶

See http://www.mdgfund.org/sites/default/files/MDGFTOR_Culture_FinalVersion%2017May%202007_English.pdf p. 2, accessed September, 15 2013

policy utterances places an emphasis on economic aspects of culture, which contrasts with the anthropological and essentialist worldview present in the justification of the strategy pending towards an essentialist or at least anthropological worldview.⁷

The EC investment in culture has been increasing for intra-ACP and intraregional cooperation: the 10th European Development Fund (2008-2013) provides 30 million € under the ACP-EU Support Programme to ACP cultural sectors. This represents a significant increase compared to 14.33 million € provided by the 9th EDF (2000-2007). The stated aim is to reinforce the creation and production of cultural goods and services in ACP countries at intraregional level, in particular promote South-South cooperation, and support better access to local, regional (intra-ACP), European and international markets.

The EC also supports actions in the field of culture as part of its broad approach to human and social development through the thematic programme Investing in People, within the Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI). Under the heading "Access to local culture, protection and promotion of cultural diversity", 50 MEUR are allocated to the culture strand. The stated focus is on developing policies that allow better access to and preservation of local culture, offering opportunities for cultural exchange and international cooperation between cultural industries, promoting intercultural dialogue and preserving local and indigenous cultures and values.⁸

Culture is described by key EC officials in development, as “either a tool for dialogue and social inclusion or as a powerful driving economic force.”⁹ It is also portrayed in holistic terms: “This new approach would like to introduce the cultural dimension as a holistic element

⁷ See http://www.culture-dev.eu/pages/en/en_introduction_part2.html, accessed September, 15 2013

⁸ See http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-policy-development/culture-and-external-relations/culture-for-development_en.htm, accessed September, 15 2013

⁹ See Stefano Manservigi (former Director-General for DG Development), http://www.culture-dev.eu/pages/en/en_introduction_part1.html, accessed September, 15 2013

of the European development policy strategy, mainstreaming culture from the common trunk of development to all of its different branches.”¹⁰ The importance of the link between culture and development was acknowledged in 2009 with the organisation in Brussels of a Colloquium on Culture and Creation, factors of development. This initiative between the EU and countries of Africa, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) resulted in the Brussels Declaration by Artists and Cultural Professionals and Entrepreneurs.¹¹ However, none of the relevant EU documents in preparation of the discussions for the post-2015 development agenda so far refer anything on the integration of culture.¹²

The PALOP Regional Indicative Programme (RIP-PALOP) is a form of cooperation between the EC and the five PALOP countries to improve different areas of governance since 1992, to which East-Timor was later added. Under the 9th European Development Fund, 3 MEUR were allocated to a sub-project of the RIP-PALOP for the preservation, enhancement and safeguarding of the cultural heritage in the PALOP countries, in order to promote social, economic and human development.

5. Assessing the link between culture and development in lusophone African countries

This section will analyse the type of approach to culture in different policy documents of three lusophone African countries.¹³ This analysis will provide indications as to the extent to which the approach to culture in the cases under analysis converge with the international

¹⁰See Andris Piebalgs (European Commissioner for Development), http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/infopoint/publications/europeaid/documents/202a_en.pdf

¹¹ See <http://www.culture-dev.eu/www/www/website.php?lang=en>, accessed September, 15 2013

¹² See documents referred in this website: http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/what/millennium-development-goals/post-2015_en.htm, accessed September, 15 2013.

¹³ Where relevant excerpts of the documents will be used to illustrate findings and in those cases where there is no official English version available, translation will be the author's.

patterns, which as seen are not univocal, and allow for sufficient ambiguity to fit the bureaucratic holism concept.

The choice of lusophone African countries is justified by the fact that they have historical and language aspects in common, making culture a relevant area on which to focus. While it is not a comparative study, the fact that these countries share membership of the CPLP, an organisation that promotes language and culture that is shared among its members, makes them a relevant universe. Additionally, these countries are beneficiaries of common development programmes funded by the EC, such as the RIP-PALOP, which has provided funding for the development of the cultural sector.

The analysis is made on the basis of an analytical model that focuses on the instrumental/essentialist interpretations of the role of culture. The analysis is based on available data, namely most recent available government programme, PRSP, state budget, existing development cooperation programmes specific to culture.

4.1. Angola

Angola is a country in southern-central Africa, marked by a prolonged civil conflict that lasted until 2002, and by significant abundance in natural resources such as oil and diamonds. The economy has registered one of the highest growth rates in the past years, essentially due to the oil revenues, and continues growing despite the fluctuations in oil prices and the global economic crisis. Angola has a very centralised system of government, where the president is in power over the past decades, and there are strong concerns about freedom of expression.¹⁴

¹⁴ See <http://www.hrw.org/news/2013/02/15/hrw-submission-angola-un-human-rights-committee>, accessed September, 15 2013.

Ethnic diversity is one of the characteristics of Angolan society, partly fuelling the civil war, and there are huge disparities in income distribution.¹⁵

Due to the centralised system and lack of external dependency, Angola is quite autonomous in its policy-making process, compared to other developing countries. The Government of Angola (GoA) makes sure it takes the lead in developing its own strategies both in the economic and the social sphere, and only where expert technical assistance is required does it resort to international support. UN agencies are present in the country and assist with the implementation of a poverty reduction strategy that seems to be entirely of the government's ownership.

Angola has been developing a strong cultural strategy over the past few years and has been actively promoting culture in multilateral fora such as the CPLP.

The Programme of Government

The programme of the current GoA extends from 2012 to 2017.¹⁶ The analysis of how the cultural sector is framed in the programme of government shows that culture as a public policy is embedded in a logic of morality, through the idea of “retrieving moral and civic values”, involving an instrumental use of culture.

The GoA considers that generalised access to culture induces “respect for the usages and traditions that are conducive to development” (ref 22 p. 90), thus contributing to consolidate national identity, which the GoA identifies with cultural diversity.

According to the programme of government, cultural policy is based on broadening and improving available services, under the theme “Improving Angolan citizens' quality of life” but

¹⁵ See http://www.osisa.org/sites/default/files/sup_files/chapter_1_-_angola.pdf, accessed September, 15 2013.

¹⁶ <http://www.mpla.ao/imagem/ProGovMPLA.pdf>, accessed September, 15 2013.

not under the theme “Guaranteeing the basic conditions necessary for development”, or other economic areas, which means that the cultural policy is not closely associated with economic development. This is to be expected in a country that has a wealth of natural resources and where the priority is not empowerment of the poor through cultural activities as a source of revenue.

Cultural policy is operationalised along the following priorities: promotion of national languages and of the main international languages (not specified which); implementation of the national museum system for the diffusion of Angolan history; and cultural heritage as “mechanism of social inclusion and citizenship” (p. 91). Again here is identifiable the instrumental use of culture for domestic political purposes.

Culture is thus integrated in the solutions to the problems of housing (p. 64), and in the development of the communities located in areas of mineral extraction (p. 58), although this is not traceable in operational funding lines.

Indeed, this logic is expressed clearly in the following sentence on cultural priorities “to foster creativity towards the development of new processes of production and conservation of memories of social, ethnic and cultural diversity of the country.” P. 91. It is interesting to note the focus on cultural production to preserve diversity, in a context of centralisation of power and of wealth. The implementation of a system of cultural centres is another priority that again illustrates a concern for cultural diversity. This can be interpreted as a way of guaranteeing domestic stability, through the expression of diversity and existing frictions, by cultural means – here culture stands out as an instrument of conflict prevention.

Another priority in this area is the implementation of the national system of historical archives, including public and private sector. Archives are seen as a mechanism of support to culture. One of the objectives is to guarantee the creation of archives at the central level, which

shows the centralizing tendency of the government, including a measure of inspection to public and private archives, whose scope was not clarified in the analysed document and no additional explanation was found.

The implementation of the national system of libraries and of municipal cultural programmes also represents an opportunity to use culture in expressing cultural diversity. Ethnographic research is also foreseen to support the cultural strategy, which again shows a concern for attending to the cultural diversity specificities.

There is no association of culture with sports activities or with cultural and creative industries.

The 2013 Government Budget

In the government budget's introductory report where allocations are justified, culture is integrated in the human development policies (which also includes poverty reduction and reduction of social inequality). However, the topic of culture is not included in the operationalisation of the budget justification.¹⁷

The functional discrimination of the expenditure foreseen for culture in 2013 includes an item called "Recreation, culture and religion" with 1.24% of the budget, where religion receives 0.05%; cultural services 0.26%; recreational and sports activities 0.46% and publication and dissemination services 0.47%. This means that there is a strong emphasis on sports and on dissemination, instead of cultural services. Additionally, the dissemination function is likely to

¹⁷ See http://www.minfin.gv.ao/fsys/Rela_de_Fundamentacao_do_OGE13.pdf, p. 16, accessed September, 15 2013.

consist in activities to promote specific government ideas, although this hypothesis has not been confirmed by this research.¹⁸

The Poverty Reduction Strategy of 2005

The poverty reduction strategy underlines the importance of attending to the needs of all categories of population, as a strategic element in the consolidation of the peace process, since existing economic, social, political and cultural imbalances may lead to new conflicts or to the escalation of existing ones (p. 44). This is a way of ensuring the peace through diversity, consistent with the programme of government.

Additionally, cultural factors are included in the justification of the high fertility rates and HIV-AIDS prevalence. This reference seems derived from international agencies' concerns, but no indication was found of projects in the cultural sector being conceived to change these cultural practices.

National languages are to be introduced in the school curricula as factor of identity and socio-cultural development.

The preservation of the physical and cultural heritage is one of the domains that may be transferred from the central and local administration to traditional local institutions, which means there is an intention of empowering such structures. This may be connected with projects of decentralisation that the government had planned, to counterbalance for the strong centralisation tendency.

¹⁸ See http://www.minfin.gv.ao/fsys/Resumo_da_Despesa_Por_Funcao13.pdf, accessed September, 15 2013.

Other documents

In the UNDAF document no reference is made to culture, which shows little influence of UNESCO with UN partners and lack of influence of the UN in the cultural policy process.¹⁹

4.2. Cape Verde

Cape Verde recently graduated to middle income country, has a well-known musical and literary culture, which it exports worldwide, namely through its vast diaspora, and has very few natural resources, aside from the natural beauty that makes it well-suited for tourism. Its main sources of economic income are remittances and tourism.

Programme of Government

In the programme of the Government of Cape Verde (GoCV) for the period 2011-2016, culture has a two-pronged role, of high strategic value on both dimensions: economic and political.

At the political level, there is a vision of Cape Verde as a Global Nation (see p. 38 “A Global Nation Assertion”). Culture is seen throughout the document as a strategic resource to pursue this vision and there is a clear valuation of the need for a public policy on culture in order to “Transform our Culture into a strategic resource” (see box p.15).

At the economic level, the policy is conceived as a tool to promote high value-added tourism and as a basis for a new economic sector (p. 16). “The sectors of interest are the high value-added tourism, strongly rooted in our culture, finance and creative economies,” p. 9. These

¹⁹ See http://mirror.undp.org/angola/LinkRtf/UNDAF-AO-2009_2013-En.pdf, accessed September, 15 2013

products and services are to be consumed by tourists and nationals, and also exported to the rest of the world.

An additional factor that seems particular to CV is the value attributed to cultural capital and human capital in the cultural sector, by valuing the role of the diaspora. There is an instrumental view of the diaspora as fulfilling the potential of CV as Global Nation. The Cape-Verdean diaspora is thus included in the affirmation of identity and also in the potential for cultural internationalisation.

Creole, the national language, is credited with geo-political and strategic as well as economic value and contributes to “the projection and the Cape Verdean assertion” p. 16. This will be enhanced through the promotion of the handicraft sector for the creation of jobs. On p. 38 culture is also referred to as a tool to foster identity as part of the agenda of a global nation. This agenda is largely based on the migratory phenomenon that CV has experienced, and the Diaspora is called in to have an important role.

An emphasis is placed on the role of public-private partnerships to promote culture; promotion of cultural heritage sites. Through a network of “Places of Memory”, these sites have the double objective of being a pedagogical tool for youth and a tourist attraction.

The GoCV envisages the promotion of different types of cultural manifestations, starting with the creative industries, through a legal framework to protect creators and producers of culture from piracy and ensure copyrights. The creation of infra-structure is thus meant to boost the creative economy. This shows a distinction between the cultural sector and the creative economy, but where the cultural sector is an enabler of the creative economy.

The programme also favours the corporatisation of cultural players and show producers and the promotion of crafts as means to economic subsistence. An Autonomous Fund for Culture

Support is also foreseen, as well as a list of other incentives, from taxes to grants and cultural products exports. What remains to be seen is to what extent these mechanisms will have autonomous management and decision-making power, or will be guided by strategic instrumental orientations.

The role perceived by the government is that of a catalyst to enhance opportunities and remove obstacles for the development of the sector.

The government budget for 2013

Culture is framed as one of the social areas to be prioritised in order to contribute to qualification of human resources (human capital) and consequently to economic growth and increase in productivity. In the budget for 2013 culture is expected to receive 3.4% of the investments foreseen for that axis (p. 108)

The Poverty Reduction and Growth Strategy Paper (PRGSP) of 2008

The emphasis placed on culture by the GoCV is reflected in the structure of the PRGSP, where culture has multiple functions. It is an autonomous policy area but also framed as linked to development, part of the Strategic Objectives For The Medium And Long Terms under the Agenda for Change. Additionally it is framed together with education and citizenship as part of “Human Resources”, one of the strategic development pillars.

Culture as autonomous policy area emphasises identity through heritage (material and immaterial), and promotion and dissemination of culture abroad. On the other hand, culture is linked to development is an integral part of “The Vision” through an emphasis on technological and cultural development: “Sustainable development and a flourishing culture are

interdependent. Achieving harmony between culture and development, respect for cultural identities, gender equality and equity, tolerance for cultural differences within a framework of pluralistic democratic values and socioeconomic equality are some of the prerequisites. One of the principal objectives of human development is the social and cultural satisfaction of the individual. Development and cultural vitality must include support for artistic and cultural creation and dissemination as a dimension of the nation's daily life." P. 51. This is typical international jargon and mixes a notion of intrinsic value of culture linked to the cultural satisfaction of the individual that is not present or valued in the programme of government.

At the domestic level, culture is framed as one of the social policies to achieve social cohesion, p. 52 and conceived as parallel to education. Culture is also conceived as a new field of demand in context of growth of urban centres, and within the context of a coherent approach to the articulation between youth and development. Spaces for interaction of young artists, including diaspora are foreseen (p. 123-124).

However, this mix of domestic consolidation and international integration is pending towards an exposure to the international standards: "Policies must be adopted and procedures established to bring Cape Verde culture up to the requirements of an internationally competitive economy, and to make it possible to implement the strategy for the country's harmonious economic liberalization." P. 57 This very neo-liberal type of language is not present in the programme of government.

This operationalisation shows the extent to which culture is to be instrumentalised for internationalisation identity consolidation and tourism: "The challenges in the sector entail the following: (i) promotion of a cultural policy to strengthen the national identity and be receptive to modernization; (ii) focusing on culture in Cape Verde's planning; (iii) upgrading and

promotion of cultural products; and (iv) development and promotion of Cape Verde's cultural and historical heritage. A further challenge is to develop a cultural industry supported by and related to the sustained development of the tourism industry and poverty reduction.” P. 57. Again, this is not articulated in the same manner in the programme of government. The PRGSP highlights the importance of tourism and of ensuring that cultural policy serves the purposes of cultural tourism: “cultural policy to give tourism the required authenticity” p. 84. In a way it promotes policy coherence between tourism and culture: “a percentage return on tourism from cultural investments should be defined” p. 84. It also refers to tax incentives for tourism industry investing in cultural areas, although it doesn't specify which.

Consistently with the programme of government, the diaspora is clearly identified as vehicle for affirmation of Cape Verde culture throughout the world: p. 71

In the matrix of the PRGSP, the only concrete area referring to culture besides sectors integrating and benefiting from the cultural policy, is the number of mechanisms applied in favour of cultural tourism promotion (p. 129).

4.3. Mozambique

Similarly to Angola, Mozambique has also emerged from a decades-long civil war that left profound wounds. Despite significant progress and sustained donor support over the years, there are still significant problems in terms of poverty, which are not reduced by the recent rates of economic growth. The government is also very centralised, although donor dependency has led to strong external influence in policy-making.

The programme of government

In the Programme of the Government of Mozambique (GoM) for 2010-2014, culture is conceived as a dimension of the combat to poverty. Another aspect that is strongly emphasised is the promotion of a culture of work, social and human development.

In terms of priority actions for the area, the government proposes to “Promote cultural wealth that stems from the cultural diversity of the Mozambican people, thus contributing meaningfully to the reinforcement of national identity, including on the international arena.” P. 6. Although there is an international dimension, clearly the focus is on the domestic dimension of national identity.

Culture is also defined in instrumental terms towards objectives related to national identity and the “creation of a Patriotic Consciousness, reinforcement of National Unity, Upholding of “mozambicanity” and improvement of the quality of life of the citizen” p. 18. There is a clear emphasis on the identity issue, namely through the promotion of the concept of “mozambicanity”, operationalised as the “promotion, valorisation and preservation of Mozambique’s cultural heritage.” P. 18. It is not clear if this is for internal consumption or for the promotion of an image for tourism. This concept of “mozambicanity” is also promoted through the educational sector and the promotion of dialogue and inter-cultural understanding, along with regular cultural festivities.

Despite this emphasis on the identitarian issue, the first of four strategic objectives for culture is “Promote Culture and its contribution for the social and economic development of the country” p. 18 This axis identifies the priorities linked to the economic development of a commercial nature, namely promotion of cultural tourism and of the development of cultural and creative industries, although without developing the topic in much detail.

Analysis of the PRSP

In the latest PRSP, approved in May 2011 there are no references to culture. However, in the previous one, PARPA II (2006-2009), there are several references, namely to culture as an instrument in the training of individuals, development and poverty reduction, improving their quality of life: “Cultural diversity and creative activity in family and industrial contexts are important alternatives for earning the income that people need in order to support themselves. Similarly, cultural tourism represents a sustainable opportunity to improve living conditions in the communities. The emergence and advancement of the “culture industry” (books, audiovisuals, live shows, etc.) create specialized kinds of employment and also contribute to that end.” P. 87 Also in PARPA II we see the preservation of historical heritage tied to the struggle for national liberation (p. 99-100) and the construction of identity.

In PARPA II, culture is also extensively developed in the link with education, where culture stands highly as an instrument of “mozambicanity”, but also understood autonomously as a factor of development and job creation. Such measures are operationalised in the following terms: “promotion of culture as a component of patriotic education and vital to a lasting elevation of the quality of education, a source of income, and a factor in sustainable development. The rich cultural diversity should be reflected in the richness and diversity of the creative and innovative activities.” P. 102. The main objective is to promote culture as a factor that strengthens the Mozambican identity, as well as peace, national unity, and development. The specific objectives: (a) Promote a recognition of the value of Mozambican culture, and disseminate it; (b) Encourage the habit of finding pleasure in reading as a means of acquiring life skills; (c) Strengthen culture as a source of income; and (d) Expand and improve the national network of cultural

infrastructures.” These specific objectives exhibit a predominance of intrinsic value (a and b) and only in second line instrumental value (c).

Other documents

Joint Programme MDG-F:

Between 2008 and 2012 the MDG-F has implemented a joint programme (JP) on strengthening the Cultural and Creative Industries and Inclusive Policies in Mozambique. Several government ministries were involved in the project, working in partnership with six UN agencies (UNESCO, ITC, ILO, FAO, UNHCR, UNFPA) in an integrated approach to meet project goals. UNESCO was the coordinating agency providing overall program management and in-country coordination.

The Programme was implemented in select locations in three provinces: Maputo City, Inhambane city and its surroundings, the district of Zavala, Nampula city and the districts of Mossuril, and Mozambique Island. However, most important impacts seem to be at the level of central government institutional adaptation and on legislative adaptation.

There was a need to coordinate a high number of different institutions. This means there were different views of culture that had to be managed: “Another important aspect to take into consideration in terms of time is that the JP also aimed to change the mind-frame of its stakeholders in relation to what culture entails.”²⁰. The programme seems to have broadened the understanding of culture for most stakeholders, with the Evaluation concluding that the JP has helped all sectors, ranging from top government officials to final beneficiaries understand how

²⁰See <http://www.mdgfund.org/sites/default/files/Mozambique%20-%20Culture%20-%20Final%20Evaluation%20Report.pdf> p. 8, accessed September, 15 2013

vast the concept of culture is.²¹ Essentially the GoM had ignored the potential of the creative industries in generating economic gains. And there were difficulties in operationalising the contribution of these industries to economic growth and poverty alleviation without appropriate technical support: “There is no sufficient confidence that those who became more aware of the potential role of culture will be able to transfer this understanding within their own ministries and at the highest level to the extent necessary for it to become a national”²²

There was a curious result of this project, that is contrasting with the absence of provisions in the latest government PARP and very low emphasis on the programme of government on cultural and creative industries, which is the fact that a specific organ was created within the ministry of culture for the promotion of cultural industries. This was not even foreseen by the project, but seems to have stemmed from the process it generated. The evaluation of the programme points to low ownership on the part of the GoM, which may be partly explained by a lack of understanding of the role of the focal points in the programme, which at the political level translated into not being able to grasp the institutional/political interest or gain to be obtained from the project. This required that the JP take time to “change the mind-frame of its stakeholders”.²³

A broader understanding of culture is favourable to IOs and the following passage from the JP evaluation evidences the role of such projects in socialising for policy diffusion: “Even though the understanding of what is meant by culture is still limited at best and ambiguous at worst, through its inter-sectoral and holistic approach to culture and development, the JP contributed to culture being part of government plans. This should be further promoted in the

²¹ *Idem*, p. 12

²² *Idem* p. 102

²³ *Idem*, p. 8

future.”.²⁴ Despite this, culture penetrated the government plans through the instrumental value of creative industries and “[...] the two different aspects of the JP (the promotion of cultural/creative industries and the role of culture in human development) were not really integrated and coexisted as two separate conceptions of what culture is and what role it can play.”.²⁵

5. Conclusion

This paper looks at the how the development aid sector is operationalising the link between culture and development in lusophone African countries. It aims to provide clues to models of cultural policy that are being diffused and what leeway for policy definition and ownership from developing countries is contained in such models. The paper strove to ascertain the extent to which there is a model for linking culture and development and how they correspond to the models adopted by the countries under analysis, in order to assess the proposition that international bureaucracies propose different options within a bureaucratic holism menu that enables policy-making a la carte. In all three countries analysed the instrumental model predominated, albeit with differences in the weight of economic and political instrumentalisation.

Angola is a centralised political and economic system and the focus of the few cultural efforts is on consolidating domestic cultural diversity. However, externally it is keen on developing the cultural sector as a source of economic income.

²⁴ Idem. P. 15

²⁵ Idem, p. 16

Cape Verde, is very decentralised and fully immersed in the global markets and dynamics, has a vision for culture that is structured in a lot more detail and more geared towards the economic dimension of cultural internationalisation.

Unlike Angola, Mozambique is able to place more emphasis on a national identity, despite its cultural diversity and history of war. It speaks of “mozambicanity” and its framing of culture is essentially around that dimension.

The UN and international bureaucracies such as the EC adopt a holistic approach to culture to overcome the lack of clarity over what is meant by it. The broader the scope of the concept the easier it will be to integrate programme dimensions for funding. The only political line seems to be the identification of “the necessary conditions for diversity to become an asset, not a threat, a source of renewal for public policies in service to development, social cohesion and peace.”²⁶

References

- Adorno, Theodor W, and Max Horkheimer. 1997. *Dialectic of enlightenment*. Second Ed. Verso Books.
- Belfiore, Eleonora. 2004. “Auditing culture.” *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 10(2):183–202. Retrieved (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10286630042000255808>).
- Blunt, Peter, Mark Turner, and Jana Hertz. 2011. “The Meaning Of Development Assistance.” *Public Administration and Development* 31(3):172–187. Retrieved (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/pad.592>).
- Brown, Ed, Bob Milward, Giles Mohan, and Alfred B Zack-Williams. 2013. *Structural adjustment: theory, practice and impacts*. Routledge.
- Craig, D, and D Porter. 2006. *Development beyond neo-liberalism. Governance, poverty reduction and political economy*. London: Routledge.

²⁶ See <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/culture/resources/report/the-unesco-world-report-on-cultural-diversity>, accessed September, 15 2013.

- Dolowitz, David P, and David Marsh. 2000. "Learning from Abroad: The Role of Policy Transfer in Contemporary Policy-Making." *Governance* 13(1):5–23. Retrieved (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/0952-1895.00121>).
- Easterly, William. 2006. *The White Man's Burden: Why the West's Efforts to Aid the Rest Have Done so Much Ill and so Little Good*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Garnham, Nicholas. 2005. "From cultural to creative industries." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 11(1):15–29. Retrieved (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10286630500067606>).
- Graber, Christoph Beat. 2006. "The New UNESCO Convention on Cultural Diversity: A Counterbalance to the WTO?" *Journal of International Economic Law* 9 (3):553–574. Retrieved (<http://jiel.oxfordjournals.org/content/9/3/553.abstract>).
- Gray, Clive. 2007. "Commodification And Instrumentality In Cultural Policy." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 13(2):203–215. Retrieved (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10286630701342899>).
- Hanson, K. T., G. Kararach, and T. M. Shaw, eds. 2012. *Rethinking Development Challenges for Public Policy*. Palgrave M. Retrieved November 14, 2012 (http://www.google.pt/books?hl=pt-PT&lr=&id=GNdgWt0h4KQC&oi=fnd&pg=PA18&ots=FL6p2KFKFD&sig=mo95VixFTFZ5thKy3GL-IdwE4KI&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false).
- Hesmondhalgh, David. 2007. *The cultural industries*. Sage Londres.
- Hesmondhalgh, David, and Andy C Pratt. 2005. "Cultural industries and cultural policy." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 11(1):1–13. Retrieved (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10286630500067598>).
- James, Oliver, and Martin Lodge. 2003. "The Limitations of 'Policy Transfer' and 'Lesson Drawing' for Public Policy Research." *Political Studies Review* 1(2):179–193. Retrieved (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1478-9299.t01-1-00003>).
- Löwenheim, Oded. 2008. "Examining the State: a Foucauldian perspective on international 'governance indicators'." *Third World Quarterly* 29(2):255–274. Retrieved (<http://www.informaworld.com/10.1080/01436590701806814>).
- Mosse, David, and David Lewis. 2005. *The Aid Effect. Giving and Governing in International Development*. London: Pluto.
- Munck, R, and D O'Hearn. 1999. *Critical Development Theory: contributions to a new paradigm*. Zed Books Retrieved (http://www.google.com/books?hl=pt-PT&lr=lang_es|lang_fr|lang_en|lang_it|lang_pt&id=AU4Bc5WNHfIC&oi=fnd&pg=PR9&dq=aisan+tigers+model+development+imf&ots=UXyNBbPp9W&sig=TRhSFN1Hn-tW2GxM03cej7FR4YM#v=onepage&q&f=false).

- Pratt, Andy C. 2009. "Policy Transfer and the Field of the Cultural and Creative Industries: What Can Be Learned from Europe?" Pp. 9–23 in, vol. 98, edited by Lily Kong and Justin O'Connor. Springer Netherlands Retrieved (http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-9949-6_2).
- Prince, R. 2010. "Globalizing the Creative Industries Concept: Travelling Policy and Transnational Policy Communities." *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society* 40(2):119–139. Retrieved (<http://ruraleconomics.fib.ugm.ac.id/wp-content/uploads/3.-Russell-Prince-Globalizing-the-Creative-Industries-Concept-Traveling-Policy-and-Transnational-Policy-Communities.pdf>).
- Simmons, B, F Dobbin, and G Garrett. 2007. "The Global Diffusion of Public Policies: Social Construction, Coercion, Competition or Learning?" *Annual Review of Sociology* 33:449–472. Retrieved (http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1517972##).
- Stevenson, Deborah. 2004. "'CIVIC GOLD' RUSH." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 10(1):119–131. Retrieved (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1028663042000212364>).
- Stoczkowski, Wiktor. 2009. "UNESCO's doctrine of human diversity: A secular soteriology?" *Anthropology Today* 25(3):7–11. Retrieved (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8322.2009.00666.x>).
- Tomlinson, John. 2012. "Cultural Imperialism." in *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Globalization*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd Retrieved (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9780470670590.wbeog129>).
- UNESCO. 2009. *UNESCO World Report: Investing in Cultural Diversity and Intercultural Dialogue*. Unesco.
- UNESCO. 2010. *Proceedings of the Symposium on Funding Culture, Managing the Risk*. Retrieved (<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001893/189381e.pdf>).
- UNESCO. 2011a. *Analytical Framework*. Accessed September 15, 2013 in UNESCO web site http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CLT/pdf/Conv2005_CDindicato rs_Analytical_en.pdf
- UNESCO. 2011b. *Report of the Director-General of UNESCO on Culture and Development*, A/66/187, of 26 July 2011, Accessed September 15, 2013 in website: http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CLT/pdf/Conv2005_CDindicato rs_SG-ReportC+D_en.pdf
- UNESCOPRESS. 2013. *UNESCO and China lead drive to include culture in the post-2015 development agenda*, Accessed September 15, 2013 in website: http://www.unesco.org/new/en/media-services/single-view/news/unesco_and_china_lead_drive_to_include_culture_in_the_post_2015_developm ent_agenda/#.UjbUxsZjuSo

- UNSG. 2013. *United Nations Secretary-General's Report for the 2013 Annual Ministerial Review*, of April 2013, Accessed September 15, 2013 in website
http://www.un.org/en/ecosoc/docs/adv2013/13_amr_sg_report.pdf
- UN. 2010. *Keeping the promise: united to achieve the Millenium Development Goals, Outcome Document of the UN MDG Summit*, A/65/L.1, of 17 September 2010, Accessed September 15, 2013 in website:
<http://www.un.org/en/mdg/summit2010/pdf/mdg%20outcome%20document.pdf>;
- UN. 2011. *Resolution on Culture and Development*, adopted by the General Assembly, A/RES/65/166, of 28 February 2011, Accessed September 15, 2013 in website:
http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/FIELD/Brussels/pdf/Resolution_culture_and_development.pdf;
- UN. 2013. *A New Global Partnership: Eradicate Poverty And Transform Economies Through Sustainable Development*, Report of the High Level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda, Accessed September 15, 2013 in website:
<http://www.post2015hlp.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/UN-Report.pdf>

Web References (all accessed 15 September 2013):

- http://www.mf.gov.mz/c/document_library/get_file?p_1_id=11402&folderId=64771&name=DLFE-5601.pdf
- http://www.portaldogoverno.gov.mz/docs_gov/programa/
- http://www.minfin.gv.ao/fsys/Projecto_d_Lei2013_AN2.pdf
- http://www.governo.cv/documents/DECRP_II.pdf
- <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/scr/2011/cr11132.pdf>
- <http://www.paic-paloptl.eu/index.php/quem-somos/enquadramento>
- http://196.3.99.68/cultura/images/stories/doc_pdf/comunicado_final_i_encontro_gestores_palop.pdf
- <http://cooperacao.palop-tl.eu/>

http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CLT/pdf/Conv2005_IFCD_DGletter2013_en.pdf

http://www.mdgfund.org/sites/default/files/Culture_Thematic%20Study.pdf,

http://www.mdgfund.org/sites/default/files/MDGFTOR_Culture_FinalVersion%2017May%202007_English.pdf

http://www.culture-dev.eu/pages/en/en_introduction_part2.html

http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-policy-development/culture-and-external-relations/culture-for-development_en.htm

http://www.culture-dev.eu/pages/en/en_introduction_part1.html,

http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/infopoint/publications/europeaid/documents/202a_en.pdf

<http://www.culture-dev.eu/www/www/website.php?lang=en>,

http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/what/millennium-development-goals/post-2015_en.htm,

<http://www.hrw.org/news/2013/02/15/hrw-submission-angola-un-human-rights-committee>,

http://www.osisa.org/sites/default/files/sup_files/chapter_1_-_angola.pdf,

<http://www.mpla.ao/imagem/ProGovMPLA.pdf>,

http://www.minfin.gv.ao/fsys/Rela_de_Fundamentacao_do_OGE13.pdf,

http://www.minfin.gv.ao/fsys/Resumo_da_Despesa_Por_Funcao13.pdf,

http://mirror.undp.org/angola/LinkRtf/UNDAF-AO-2009_2013-En.pdf,

<http://www.mdgfund.org/sites/default/files/Mozambique%20-%20Culture%20-%20Final%20Evaluation%20Report.pdf>

<http://www.unesco.org/new/en/culture/resources/report/the-unesco-world-report-on-cultural-diversity>,

<http://ddp-ext.worldbank.org/EdStats/CPVpub03.pdf>