

Institutional models and artistic policies in Romania and Chile (1970s-1990s)

Preda, Caterina

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Preda, C. (2008). Institutional models and artistic policies in Romania and Chile (1970s-1990s). *Studia Politica: Romanian Political Science Review*, 8(3), 641-676. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-56007-4>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY-NC-ND Lizenz (Namensnennung-Nicht-kommerziell-Keine Bearbeitung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/1.0/deed.de>

Terms of use:

This document is made available under a CC BY-NC-ND Licence (Attribution-Non Commercial-NoDerivatives). For more information see:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/1.0>

Institutional Models and Artistic Policies in Romania and Chile (1970s-1990s)

CATERINA PREDA

This article discusses the institutional models and artistic policies of two modern dictatorships: Romania and Chile. I consider them as extreme cases in so much as they represent the poles between which the imaginable approaches of a modern state can be placed, matching for dictatorial regimes, the paradigmatic models of democratic institutionalism (also two extreme cases), the French state dominated model and the United States market articulated model.

I use the term of modern dictatorship so as to emphasize the common traits of these two regimes, along their largely acknowledged differences. Modern dictatorships designate than the variety of modern non-democratic regimes (Linz) dominated by a powerful central figure and that have as a defining element the personalization of power; I regard them as variables on a line of intensity from authoritarian to totalitarian forms (with varying degrees and stages) (Aron, Sartori).

I argue that a modern dictatorship entails a varying process of centralization and control upon the society: milder or stronger depending on the distance it displays to the authoritarian or totalitarian poles. Thus, cultural activities are also affected both in the sense that artistic freedom disappears but also in the sense that the political power imposes an exclusive discourse. Hence, a modern dictatorship imposes an official art – an official vision on art. So as to ensure its predominance, it entails a process of centralization of all cultural activities, both ideologically (centralization of discourses that emanate from the political power personified by the dictator) and institutionally. This process also includes extension, diffusion of this official version to which artists must comply to. To enforce it, regulations and norms are imagined, institutions are set in place, and mass-communication means are activated. To express this view artistic education is also used – so as to create and disseminate the new ideology on art.

The Chilean and Romanian cases are than two opposed ideological models that lead to two different institutional models (a privileged state-intervention model and a market privileged model) conforming to two visions of art at the antipodes (art *must* be political and art *must* be apolitical). However, I affirm that though these are different regimes politically their intention is the same: control, direct and safeguard. Therefore, the aim and strategy of a dictatorial regime seems to be the same in the words of Goebbels "La liberté de l'art mais dans les limites circonscrites par l'État"¹. Moreover, the institutional framework responds to specific

¹ Quoted in Lionel RICHARD, *Le Nazisme et la Culture*, Editions Complexe, Bruxelles, 1988, p. 195

policies. I understand these policies as "positive cultural polic[ies], in the sense of planning, subsidizing or generating cultural production"¹.

In order to understand the roles the state plays (can play) in the artistic sphere I will briefly recall at this point the paradigmatic types of artistic institutionalism in both democratic regimes and totalitarian (and authoritarian) regimes. I present democratic institutional models because I argue the two dictatorial regimes analyzed here mirror the two paradigmatic institutional models of democratic institutionalism: the state is the main articulator and the market is given preeminence. Moreover, the article looks at the evolution of the institutions and policies in the two countries both before and after the regimes of Ceaușescu and Pinochet.

PARADIGMATIC MODELS OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONALISM: THE FRENCH AND US MODELS

Essentially the main question regards the role the state plays or should play in the formation of a cultural policy. The debate lingers on the issue if an appeal to the state should or should not be made in what concerns culture. In this sense, art, as a part of the "cultural field", benefits, especially in the second half of the 20th century of an increasing tendency towards institutionalization and professionalization (cultural/arts policies are a relatively recent topic as governments began to intervene in this specific area after the Second World War)².

As Navarro Ceardi recalls, there are several "models of support a state can provide to the arts and culture: facilitator, sponsor, architect [or] engineer"³. The role of facilitator – assumed by the United States – is seen in the "financing of arts through the reduction of taxes according to the desires of individuals and donator corporations"⁴. The sponsor state (the United Kingdom) "finances the arts through autonomous arts councils" and leads to the promotion of elitism⁵. France best portrays the state as architect by its financial support through a ministry or culture department "as part of the general objectives of social well-being"⁶. Finally, the engineer role of a state is best seen in the case of the USSR where "the state is patron of all means of artistic production [and] which finances only art that achieves the levels of political excellence"⁷. This last role of the state could largely be seen as the characteristic of totalitarian regimes as described by Igor Golomstock.

¹ Toby MILLER, George YÚDICE, *Cultural policy*, SAGE publications, London. Thousand Oaks, New Delhi, 2002, p. 142.

² The right to culture was proclaimed by the United Nations in 1948 and reinforced by the 1970' UNESCO declaration. <http://www.wvcd.org/policy/policy.html#MEANS> (accessed October 23, 2008).

³ Harry HILLMAN CHARTRAND, Claire McCAUGHEY, "The Arm's Length Principle and the Arts: An International Perspective – Past, Present and Future. Who's to Pay for the Arts?", in Milton C. CUMMINGS Jr., Mark J. DAVIDSON SCHUSTER (eds.), *The International Search for Models of Arts Support*, ACA Books New York, 1989 quoted by Arturo Navarro CEARDI, *Cultura: ¿quién paga? Gestión, infraestructura y audiencias en el modelo chileno de desarrollo cultural*, RiL editores, Santiago, 2006, p. 26.

⁴ Arturo Navarro CEARDI, *Cultura: ¿quién paga? ...cit*, p. 29.

⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 30.

⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 32.

⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 33.

Thus, the approach of a democratic regime of the artistic sphere can range from the French model to the North American version, the "paradigmatic democratic models of cultural institutionalism". I state that, likewise, the approach of a modern dictatorship can vary from the Romanian to the Chilean model (from a totalitarian to an authoritarian modern dictatorship). The two sets of cases conform to the two models of cultural/artistic institutionalism: one in which the state prevails and another in which the market (private interests) reigns. I thus consider the Romanian case to be an "exacerbation" of the French model – the state becomes the only articulator – and the Chilean case to be closest to the North American model of cultural articulation – the market is in control.

Therefore, on the axis of types of approaches of democratic governments, *the French case* is found at the end which designates an elaborated state-policy for cultural affairs with the state accomplishing several roles. Pierre Moulinier describes the French cultural policy model in the terms of analysis of public policy of Theodore Lowi. Lowi had put forth a policy taxonomy, departing from the "assumption that *policies determine politics*" and even more importantly, that government coerces¹. Though Lowi does not apply his scheme of public policy to the cultural or artistic field (as it does not apply to the American case), this type of separation into four distinct directions could be useful in discerning which tasks are/can be assumed by a government. Departing from the theory of Lowi on the roles of a State and the distinction he makes between four types of public policy, Moulinier applies it to the French model of cultural institutionalism². Thus, the state accomplishes four functions in what concerns the artistic developments: a regulating policy is deployed by the state (in this case the Ministry of Culture) encompassing laws and regulations, a distributing policy (provide services), a redistributing policy (transfer of revenues to citizens), and constituent policies (territorial arrangement, infrastructure).

We have thus a state that is the guardian of laws deploying a role of police, control and sanction and establishing constraints. The state is furthermore, an administrator (manager) and through the administration it provides of public establishments it is also a service provider. Thirdly, the state also redistributes; besides its distributive function as an administrator, the state also allocates subventions to the private sector (associations, cultural industries, independent artists). Finally, the state acts as an animator providing the infrastructure (paramount for its role of extension "everywhere and for everybody"), defining the priorities and nominating the managers and ensuring a favorable environment³.

Another type of approach of the artistic field, at the opposite end on the axis of possible approaches is that of the United States of America in which the private initiative and the free market prevail. The *North American model* is based on "the primacy of the private sector in cultural affairs [which was] institutionalized early in the 20th century"⁴. The "anti-policy argument" that dominated the US scenery,

¹ Theodore J. LOWI, "Four Systems of Policy, Politics and Choice", *Public Administration Review*, vol. 32, no.4, 1972, p. 299.

² Pierre MOULINIER, *Les politiques publiques de la culture en France*, PUF – Que sais-je? (3^e éd.), Paris, 2006, p. 52 .

³ *Ibidem*, pp. 52-58.

⁴ Don ADAMS, Arlene GOLDBARD, *Cultural Policy in US history*, 1986, 1995. Available at <http://www.wvcd.org/policy/US/UShistory.html#FINIS> (accessed October 23, 2008).

that is best illustrated by the affirmation "The countries that have cultural policies are, of course, totalitarian countries..."¹ saw to ensure that the state played but "a relatively passive role" and followed private initiatives².

The American model is thus one in which private persons contributed to the establishment of artistic institutions and to the funding of arts (patronage). Moreover, the Federal government sought to encourage this type of initiatives providing an indirect involvement by the deduction of taxes it granted by the passing of the 1913 (income) and 1917 (heritage) laws³. Furthermore, the role of the Federal government is to recognize arts at the national level, to support experimentation, to preserve art in danger or deteriorated; to provide institutional stability (augment the state financial base), to ensure cultural diversity and availability and appreciation of arts (to increase access to)⁴. Despite several initiatives of enlarging the role played by the state in the cultural domain, of which the New Deal represents the most important one, the American model had enshrined private initiative. Additionally, private participation and philanthropic foundations were accompanied in the 1960s by the creation of a federal agency dedicated to the support of artistic creations. Thus, in 1965 was created the National Endowment for the Arts as a part of the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities as a direct engagement of the American government for the support of arts⁵.

Thus, the North American model is one in which works of art are products that can be exchanged, their value being determined by offer and demand (the preferences of consumers (ratings), the receipts of the box office). Conformingly to the market ideology, any proposition to restraint the choice artificially is regarded as an unfounded denial of liberty⁶.

TOTALITARIAN AND AUTHORITARIAN ART?

The other variable that I take into account so as to situate my two case studies, the Romanian and Chilean cases, is totalitarian art as portrayed by Igor Golomstock. Additionally I enquire into the existence of "authoritarian art" that would be a specific type of art supported by authoritarian regimes.

Totalitarian art, as analyzed by Igor Golomstock, refers to the art supported by the Nazi, Soviet, Fascist and Chinese regimes. The Russian author identified, departing from these cases, five instances that are deployed by totalitarian regimes in the process of imposing totalitarian art:

¹ "Librarian of Congress Daniel Boorstin restated this supposition in a policy roundtable in 1981" quoted in Don ADAMS, Arlene GOLDBARD, *Cultural policy...cit.*

² Miller and Yúdice argue that in fact, contrary to the general opinion, the US "the principal exporter [of culture]...claims to be free of any policy on the matter" and in fact has developed an array of interventionist policies. Toby MILLER, George YÚDICE, *Cultural policy...cit.*, p. 35.

³ Richard C. SWAIM, "The Arts and Government: Public Policy Questions", *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, vol. 12, no. 4, 1978, p. 43; Francis S.M. HODSOLL, "Supporting the Arts in the Eighties: The View from the National Endowment for the Arts", *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, no. 471, Jan. 1984, p. 86.

⁴ Francis S.M. HODSOLL, "Supporting the Arts...cit.", p. 86.

⁵ Richard C. SWAIM, "The Arts and Government...cit", p. 43.

⁶ Thelma McCORMACK, "Culture and the State", *Canadian Public Policy – Analyse des Politiques*, vol. X, no. 3, 1984, p. 271.

"(1)The state declares art (and culture as a whole) to be an ideological weapon and a means of struggle of power; (2) the state acquires a monopoly over all manifestations of the country's artistic life; (3) the state constructs an all-embracing apparatus for the control and direction of art; (4) from the multiplicity of artistic movements then in existence, the state selects one movement, always the most conservative, which most nearly answers its needs and declares it to be official and obligatory; (5) finally the state declares war to death against all styles and movements other than the official ones, declaring them to be reactionary and hostile to class, race, people, Party or State, to humanity, to social or artistic progress etc.¹".

In what refers to the official art promoted by authoritarian regimes, such as the Franco regime in Spain (1939-1975) or the Salazar regime (1932-1974) in Portugal, no thorough comparative studies have been developed on the topic. There is a general agreement that no such thing as an official art developed. My approach is rather different as I attempt to study official art understood as policies and institutions specifically developed to support the official version of art. In this sense, similarities can be traced between these two regimes and the Latin American cases.

In a first stance, the delegation to the market of the roles attributed to the state apparatus in the totalitarian variants is seen, before the Chilean experiment, in the actions undertaken by the Franco regime. As such, as Tío Bellido wrote, the Franco regime set out "legislation and regulations that were [...] those of control, centralization and state intervention" and although there was not what could be called a Francoist aesthetic, the regime developed a role of "'sentinel' that safeguards or maintains the reins of this State" "through the exertion of censorship, coercion, repression, that is, through the evident control of the cultural apparatus"². What is more, Bellido notes the "Spanish paradox" which made the "state disengage from its cultural responsibilities – and often educational – and delegate to the private sector"³

In a second stance, I argue artistic policies of modern dictatorships can be placed in a continuum, on an axis placing them farther or closer to the totalitarian or authoritarian poles. Thus, in a totalitarian regime we witness the promotion of an official version of art while its predominance is also ensured through negative mechanisms meant to discourage and repress any alternative/opposing artistic manifestations. I argue that this framework applies to either authoritarian or totalitarian modern dictatorships: they all try to control their societies and what varies in between them is the degree of control they intend and achieve.

I than use the same framework of analysis as Golomstock when he wrote:

"The artistic life of these countries [Germany and USSR in the period 1932-1937]...was now entirely determined by Hannah Arendt's three main characteristics of totalitarianism: ideology, organization and terror"⁴.

¹ Igor GOLOMSTOCK, *Totalitarian Art in the Soviet Union, the Third Reich, Fascist Italy and the People's Republic of China*, Collins Harvill, London, 1990, p. Xiii.

² Ramón TIÓ BELLIDO, *L'art et les expositions en Espagne pendant le franquisme*, Isthme éditions, Paris, 2005, pp. 82, 23.

³ *Ibidem*, p. 75.

⁴ Igor GOLOMSTOCK, *Totalitarian Art...cit*, p. 82.

Thus, modern dictatorships – whether authoritarian or totalitarian – impose an official vision of art (ideology) and convey an institutionalization of this official art through institutions (organization) ensuring that no alternative projects can contest their monopoly (terror).

Nonetheless, it is question here to discuss only the second variable of this triple process: the question of organization. Organization translates here as artistic policies supported by a set of institutions understood as affirmative mechanisms, meant to support the official vision on art.

A MODEL TO STUDY ARTISTIC INSTITUTIONALISM

Hence, departing from the above description of the roles a state can attain in cultural affairs – in democratic governments and within modern dictatorships authoritarian or totalitarian – I can advance a framework of analysis of the two extreme cases of the Ceaușescu and Pinochet regimes always in the sense of positive cultural policy (Miller and Yúdice). The institutional framework designates in this case both state institutions and other private entities. A dictatorial regime can express its political projects through the means of the state, through specifically designed establishments that enforce policies. But it can also choose to *delegate* certain tasks to private entities as it can be seen in the Chilean case (drawing on the North American model and following the Franco example).

First, let me advance a model of possible roles for a state in what regards institutions dedicated to support the arts¹. Thus the state can play a role at different levels. It regulates (laws and regulations²), administrates and promotes the red of public institutions (from theaters to museums), safeguards the national patrimony and encourages artistic creations. Totalitarian regimes (the role of engineer of cultural policies) extend to the maximum the role the state beholds in cultural affairs by a monopolization of artistic means of production and the construction of an all-encompassing apparatus (Golomstock).

The *regulating policy* concerns in a democratic regime, such as the French case, two aspects. First, the issue of the development of a certain sector and this includes the patronage, the buying of works of art (donations) and the laws of budgetary organization (concerning museums or the patrimony). Secondly, there is the issue of constraints and interdictions (author's rights, age limitations etc.). In a dictatorial regime the area of limitations (regulations – laws and rules) is the most important. The series of interdictions and constraints placed on the artist need not to be announced, prescribed, they can be deduced from the direct actions of the state. What is more, a dictatorial regime also formally establishes a specific art as official and this needs to be "enforced" through official policies.

¹ As I shall show below the Chilean regime delegates most of its traditional roles to the market, to private interests.

² Garretón makes a distinction between two aspects of cultural institutionalism: the organizational (structures and apparatus of the state) and normative (laws and dispositions including budgetary allocations). Manuel Antonio GARRETÓN, "Estado y política cultural. Fundamentos de una nueva institucionalidad", in *Seminario sobre políticas culturales en Chile*, División de Cultura Ministerio de Educación, Santiago, 1992, pp. 65-75/p. 67.

Moreover, the state also has a role of *diffusion* / distribution (extends access to) of the cultural products, but before that there need to be production and the cultural production concerns the two traditional faces of public cultural action: the protection, enrichment and valorization of the *patrimony*; and *the support to creation* in all artistic disciplines¹.

Furthermore, at yet another level, the state participates through the *educational* programs at encouraging the extension of access to the arts. What is manifest then is that the issues of *democratization* (art as a right) and education (for professionalization and for the extension of access) arise in the case of the French model (architect). While, the market model tends to create a more elitist artistic space by providing access only to those that have the financial resources – both for having access to the education that facilitates the appreciation of artistic messages and for the obtaining of artworks².

Table 1

The Roles of the State

Regulator & Administrator	norms, constraints and interdictions institutions
Diffusion	production – support artistic development – promote cultural industries safeguard of patrimony
Democratization (art as a right) – official vision of art transmitted	education (artistic education but also general education – increase the capacity to appreciate art) extension

Hence this framework of the roles a state assumes/can assume in the cultural field can help us discern which functions the regimes of Ceaușescu and Pinochet assumed and which institutions achieved each of these. The modern dictatorship can choose to follow the steps delineated by Golomstock (for totalitarian regimes) and it is the case of the regime of Ceaușescu or, can choose a model that assigns preeminence to the market while safeguarding only the role of diffusion of “officialized art” (Chile under Pinochet).

¹ Pierre MOULINIER, *Les politiques publiques...*cit, p. 19.

² “The welfare [French] model is based on social need rather than the free enterprise market model [United States]. Art is regarded as a public resource, and access to it is a social right belonging to everyone [democratization]. Class structures, however, have created cultural disparities which enlightened social polity must address. First, there is the question of access [...] and, second, the question of education for the less-privileged whose sovereign choice is between one form of commercial art and another [...] In the welfare model subsidies favor public art – murals on public buildings, concerts in parks – with fewer incentives for private collectors. Full employment is not assured, but there is a built-in type of employment through teaching since art education is, like other forms of literacy, a designated right.” Thelma McCORMACK, “Culture...cit”, p. 271.

ROMANIA AND CHILE: BETWEEN AN OMNIPRESENT STATE AND AN OMNI-POWERFUL MARKET¹

The Arts in Modern Chile and Romania

The models of artistic institutionalism consecrated during the regimes of Pinochet and Ceaușescu correspond to the extremes on an axis that displays the role assumed by the state: at one end is seen the Romanian case where the state has the monopoly, and at the other end, the Chilean case with its delegation to the market. There are nonetheless limits to this oversimplified consideration. Furthermore, the models adopted by the two regimes can be seen as exacerbations of the previous models of artistic institutionalism.

As such, Romania had, since the beginning of the modern epoch, adopted an interventionist model of cultural articulation with the state playing an important part in both supporting artistic creation and diffusion of these artistic works. Whereas, the approach of the Pinochet regime commonly seen as one that rejected the previous state-privileged model conforms in fact to the Chilean previous tradition. In reality, the Chilean institutional architecture had never been a centralized one. Specific areas were privileged and institutions had developed since the 19th century but no Ministry of Culture/the Arts subsisted. Thus, before the military coup, Chile had no Ministry of Culture, this specific institution dedicated to the support and preservation of artistic creation was created only recently in 2003, under the Ricardo Lagos government. Nonetheless, a certain cultural institutionalism existed prior to the violent rupture of 1973; the Chilean state had become more and more involved in cultural affairs prior to the military intervention.

Institutionally, in Romania, art was included since 1862 in the sphere of activity of the then Ministry of Cults (and Public Works), which became in 1920 the Ministry of Arts and Cults². Artistic education was also gradually supported by the state. Two dates (prior to 1948) are important in this sense for Romanian artistic development: 1864 and 1931. The first one, 1864, signals a series of decrees emitted by Alexandru I. Cuza that established National Art Schools (The National School of Fine Arts, the Conservatory of Music and dramatic declamation and the School of Bridges, Roads, Mines and Architecture) and recognized artistic institutions such as the Grand Theater created in 1852 (thereafter National Theater)³. The second important date, 1931, represents the year in which the Law of high education is approved and which transforms the art schools into academies: the Academy of Belle Arte (1931-42)⁴, the Royal Academy of Music and Dramatic Art, the Academy of Architecture (1931-1938). Previously, in 1921 the National Opera⁵ had

¹ See Annex no. 1 for an overview of the roles performed inside the regimes of Ceaușescu and Pinochet by the different instances.

² See Annex no. 2 for an overview of the evolution of Romanian artistic institutionalism.

³ National theaters were also established in Iași (1840) and Craiova (1850). www.unmb.ro, www.unaim.ro, www.unarte.ro, www.tnb.ro, www.teatrulnationaliasi.ro, <http://tnc.icnet.ro/> (accessed October 23, 2008).

⁴ Between 1942 and 1948 it was transformed into the Superior School of arts of Bucharest.

⁵ The Lyric Society, founded in 1919 became a state institution in 1921. www.operanb.ro (accessed October 23, 2008).

become a state institution. Along with the National Theater, several independent companies (since the middle of the 19th century) had developed such as the Theater Comedy (1911) or the Eforie Theater (Carol cel Mare) etc.

The role of the universities is paramount in Chile if one thinks about the development of culture and of artistic expressions. As such, since its foundation in 1842 the University of Chile was designed so as to oversee the "formation of creators and the creation of entities of cultural diffusion such as museums, an orchestra, a ballet, a theater company and further on a film library"¹. Very soon two instances were created in its fore: a School of Fine Arts (1849) and a Conservatory (1850). Later on, the University of Chile included a broad array of institutions: the Faculty of Fine Arts created in 1929 and which included the National Conservatory of Music (a reform of the School of Fine Arts) and the School of Decorative Arts; the Museum of Contemporary Art (1947) was also created under the auspices of the Faculty. In 1940 the Faculty created also an Institute of Musical Extension (IEM); moreover, this institute created four important institutions: the Symphonic Orchestra of Chile (1941), the Experimental Theater (1941), the National Chilean Ballet (1945) and the Chorus of the University of Chile (1945)². Moreover, The Institute of Latin American Art was created in 1970 as an institution depending on the Faculty of Fine Arts of the University of Chile by the University Decree No. 15843³.

Another milestone in the design of a cultural institutionalism was attained by the 1929 establishment of the DIBAM (Direction of Libraries, Archives and Museums) created under the government of general Carlos Ibáñez del Campo, and which was in charge of the development and administration of libraries, national and local museums and the development of national archives. For Navarro the institutional design was one in which the state gained more weight through the DIBAM which was in charge of the safeguard of the patrimony whilst the University of Chile was responsible for the development/support of creation⁴.

Moreover, besides this state-university direction – and the safeguard of patrimony–, the Chilean state also created another network at the level of municipalities which acted in the sphere of cultural diffusion and stimulation of amateur creations and sometimes by establishing stable artistic ensembles. For example, one of the most important municipality, that of Santiago, created in 1955 a Philharmonic Orchestra, a Municipal Ballet of Modern Art (1959) and a Philharmonic Chorus of the Municipality (1962)⁵. The *Teatro Municipal* created in 1857, and administered by the Cultural Corporation of Santiago since 1957 is one of the most important institutions used by the Pinochet regime as a channel of transmission of its official vision.

¹The Law of the University of Chile was sent to Congress in 1842. Arturo Navarro CEARDI, *Cultura: ¿quién paga?...cit*, p. 43.

²Maria José CIFUENTES, *Historia social de la danza en Chile. Visiones, escuelas y discursos 1940-1990*, LOM Ediciones, Santiago, 2007, p. 59; Anny RIVERA, *Transformaciones culturales y movimiento artístico en el orden autoritario*, CENECA, Santiago, 1983, p. 11.

³Milan IVELIC, Gaspar GALAZ, *Chile, arte actual*, Ediciones Universitarias de Valparaíso, Valparaíso, 1988, p. 255.

⁴Arturo Navarro CEARDI, *Cultura: ¿quién paga?...cit*, p. 45.

⁵Anny RIVERA, *Transformaciones...cit*, p. 14; <http://www.municipal.cl/>. (accessed October 23, 2008).

Communism and Socialism Models

So, artistic development in pre-communist Romania was realized with a growing support of the state. It is with the arrival of the soviet tanks that the then party-state will steadily gain complete control over artistic expressions, their creation and diffusion. The new soviet-inspired model of artistic institutionalism in which the state exerted the monopoly on all artistic means (Golomstock) was accomplished through several means: nationalization of all means of creation and diffusion of artistic works (largely accomplished by 1948), and the imposition of new norms and institutions (mainly terminated by 1950), all placed under the demands of the new mandatory ideology – socialist realism. The mandatory centralization of artists into professional organizations dominated by the state was also accomplished in this period¹. Artistic education was also reformed, by first establishing an all-encompassing Art Institute (1948) that included the Faculty of Theater and Music, Choreography and Visual Arts, Decorative Arts and Art History²; and then, by creating specific institutes. Thus, in 1950 were established the Institute of Cinematographic Art and the Theater Institute I.L. Caragiale that merged in 1954 into the Institute of Theatrical and Cinematographic Art (IATC)³. In 1950 was established the Institute of Visual Arts Nicolae Grigorescu. The Conservatory Ciprian Porumbescu with two faculties replaced the Royal Academy of Music and Dramatic Art. The architecture school followed a more sinuous path only to gain its definitive form (until 1990) of University of Architecture and Urbanism "Ion Mincu" in 1952⁴. Cinematography was especially privileged by communist leaders and thus new institutions specifically designed for its development were created⁵.

¹ Union of Romanian Writers (USR) (1949), Union of Composers and Musicologists of Romania (UCRM) (1949), Union of Visual Artists (UAP) (1950), Union of Architects of RPR/RSR (UARPR/UARSR) (1948-1952). At a later date, musicians, filmmakers and theater people were organized inside the Association of theater and music people and The Association of Filmmakers of Romania (1963) (www.ucin.ro). (accessed October 23, 2008).

² <http://www.unarte.ro/unarte/newunarteTST/home.php?l=ro&p=istoric> (accessed October 23, 2008).

³ http://www.unatc.ro/index.php?lang=ro&dir=/PREZENTARE&subf=1_istoric/ (accessed October 23, 2008).

⁴ In 1948 the Faculty of Architecture was detached from the Polytechnic (to which it belonged since 1938) and became the Institute of Architecture, then in 1949 it was placed under the control of the new Constructions Institute under the name of Faculty of Architecture, <http://www.iaim.ro/universitatea/despre> (accessed October 23, 2008).

⁵ Thus, the National Cinematographic Office (created in 1934) was dismantled in 1948 and replaced by a Committee of Cinematography created alongside the Council of Ministers. Several institutions were established for creation of the "new cinema". New film studios: the "Alexandru Sahia" Studio (1949) (for journals and documentaries), the Bucharest Cinematographic Studios (1950) (for artistic films and animation), a specific studio for animation "Animafilm" opened in 1964. Most importantly the Center of cinematographic production (Buftea Studios) was built on the outskirts of Bucharest and inaugurated in 1951 (and completely achieved in 1959); finally the National Archive of Films was founded in 1957. Anne JÄCKEL, "France and Romanian Cinema 1896-1999", *French Cultural Studies*, no. 11, 2000, pp. 409-424/p. 143; Valerian SAVA, *Istoria critică a filmului românesc contemporan*, vol. I, Ed. Meridiane, București, 1999, p. 170; Marian ȚUȚUI, "Istoria filmului românesc în 7000 de cuvinte", Centrul național al cinematografeiei (<http://www.ccinema.abt.ro/ANFaspx>). (accessed October 23, 2008).

Furthermore, the Popular Unity government (1970-1973) created new institutional actors. As such, in 1972 was established the Museum of Solidarity which in spite of the dictatorship, when it had to develop in exile (*Museo de la Resistencia*) exists even today (*Museo de la Solidaridad Salvador Allende*). Another paramount institution created under the Allende government was the *Editorial Nacional Quimantú*. By nationalizing the Zig-Zag publishing house in 1971, the socialist government had a powerful tool so as to transmit its official message and as such one of the directions followed by the publications of Quimantú was the publication of ideological, social and economic texts. The Quimantú publishing house is still remembered as a moment of glory because one of its primary goals was to make the book available to all and as such fundamental literary texts but not only were on sale in every kiosk at a price equivalent to that of a cigarette pack¹. After the *golpe* Quimantú was closed down and the following year it was renamed *Editora Gabriela Mistral*, placed under the control of CORFO.

Thus, the Chilean institutional geography concerning the arts was dispersed until recently (2004). This was not a heritage of authoritarianism. Chile did not have a cultural ministry or a similar institution. Nonetheless as I recalled above the artistic evolution of the country had seen a constant participation of the state in artistic affairs. In parallel the other driving force institutions were in Chile the universities, especially the University of Chile and the Catholic University of Chile. The other red developed by the Chilean state was that of municipalities to which was delegated a part of the tasks of cultural diffusion; the Municipality of Santiago being the best example². The Pinochet regime safeguarded the *state-university* and *state-municipality system* introduced by the Welfare State (since the 1930s-1940s) but altered their functioning so as to suit its political goals. To this organizational drawing was added the "private" network – the corporations for the support of the development and artistic diffusion – that the regime promotes.

The regime of Gheorghe Gheorghiu Dej laid thus the new framework in which art had to develop: a soviet-styled model of artistic institutionalism. New norms and institutions, new criteria of excellence – such as the state prizes created, following the Soviet model, since 1949 – were forcibly established. The Ceaușescu regime finds then the setting altered and only intervened so as to ensure its complete control.

What is manifest then is that the two modern dictatorships only bent the system they found to its extremes: Pinochet tried to restrict the roles of the state to a minimal and delegate certain of its functions to the market while Ceaușescu exacerbated the bureaucratic control. A strong state and a minimal state are the two models we are confronted to. What do they do in these opposite situations? Which are the policies adopted and which are the institutional frameworks that apply them?

Regulation and Administration: Norms and Institutions

During the regimes of Ceaușescu and Pinochet a common deficit of transparency can be discerned. To read their institutional structure is a difficult task; decisions

¹ Arturo Navarro CEARDI, *Cultura: ¿quién paga? ...cit*, p. 53.

² Anny RIVERA, *Transformaciones ...cit*, p 14.

seem to be imparted between multiple instances. If one looks at the institutional framework of the Ceaușescu regime, at least in what concerns the artistic domain one is dazzled: an array of institutions overlap. There is thus, apparent centralization but in fact diffusion and overlapping of tasks as in the Chilean case – the institutional framework is difficultly legible.

The *norms and regulations* that govern arts under the Ceaușescu regime are laid down in the programs of the Party Congresses and increasingly in the leader's own speeches thereafter adopted as official documents¹. In this sense, the "1971 July Theses"² enounced by Nicolae Ceaușescu testified of both an institutional restructuring and a reaffirmation of the instrumental role of art (utilitarian, propagandistic and educational conception of art). During the Pinochet regime the norms ruling the artistic domain are codified by a limited series of documents: the Cultural Program of the Junta (1975) and the Project of a National Plan of Cultural Development (1988). Moreover, they can be deciphered by a look at the actions undertaken by the regime although not specifically codified.

In what relates to *institutions* the Romanian model displays a high degree of centralization. As of the July 1971 Theses, the coordinating institution established was the Council of Culture and Socialist Education (CSCE) directly submitted to the Central Committee of the PCR. Furthermore, the CC (presided by Ceaușescu since 1982) participated to cultural affairs also through its Cultural and Press and Ideology sections. There is thus apparently extreme centralization and superposition of state and party organs but also diffusion of tasks (as we will see for the Chilean case) the CSCE and the distinct divisions of the CC of the PCR register the competition between these different instances of power³.

Beside the "coordinating" institution – CSCE – other institutions intervened in cultural affairs. A document entitled "Cultural Policy in Romania" signed by Dodu Bălan, and published by the UNESCO in 1974 retraces the institutional cultural framework. As such, the Grand National Assembly (MAN) "as supreme organ of the state exerts its control on all the other state instances". The "Commission for education, culture and science also deals with problems assigned to the CSCE". The document does not mention to which instance this commission belongs to. Furthermore the State Council, subordinated to the MAN oversees the application of laws and the Council of Ministers "directs, coordinates and controls" also cultural affairs. The next institution in the scale of powers is the CSCE and immediately following it the Creative Unions (USR, UCRM, UAP and the Union of Archivists) under the direction of the PCR; follow the Association of filmmakers (ACIN), the Association of members of theatrical and musical institutions (ATM), the Association of photographers (AAF) and the Association of librarians. Follow

¹ This article only discusses positive policies of the regimes, meant to support and enforce a specific vision on art. There are nonetheless other types of policies, negative ones that deny and mutilate such as censorship techniques.

² Nicolae CEAUȘESCU, *Propuneri de măsuri pentru îmbunătățirea activității politico-ideologice, de educare marxist-leninistă a membrilor de partid, a tuturor oamenilor muncii*, 6 iulie 1971, Editura Politică, București, 1971.

³ Mary Ellen Fischer also noted how increasingly Ceaușescu had "also used the stated goal of efficiency to justify unification of Party and state offices in one individual at many levels within the political structure" leading to the creation of "large number of Party-state organs". Mary Ellen FISCHER, *Nicolae Ceaușescu. A Study in Political Leadership*, Lynne Rienner Publishers, Boulder & London, 1989, pp. 226-227.

the Romanian Radio-Television, the General Union of syndicates that "coordinates the press organs and the vast red of cultural houses and clubs [and]...the amateur artistic organizations". The Union of Communist Youth (UTC) equally participates through its members. Several ministries are also important: the Ministry of Education and Teaching which, besides educational programs, oversees the network of "libraries, museums and cultural houses and clubs that belong to students"; the Ministry of Tourism as an organizer of "cultural and artistic activities, museum and monuments visits"; the Ministry of National Defense and the Ministry of Interior "direct the cultural houses known as *the Army house* as well as professional artistic formations". The Central Union of Crafts Cooperatives (UCECOM) and the Central Union of Consumption Cooperatives (CENTROCOOP) equally own cultural houses. Finally, the district, municipal and commune popular councils exercise cultural activities. All these institutions send their delegates to the CSCE so as to ensure the coordination of cultural activities and the "democratization" of the cultural process as the regime denominates it¹.

In Chile at the level of cultural institutionalism several instances shared the tasks of administration. As such, the first step taken by the Pinochet regime in this sense was to nominate a Cultural Counselor of the Junta in the first month after the *golpe*². Only one counselor was nominated, Enrique Campos Menéndez (1973-1976) and he worked through the Cultural Department of the General Secretary of the Government and the Cultural Advisory Office of the Junta. This decision is to be thought inside the national-authoritarian tendency that argued for a centralization of cultural activities in the form of a Ministry of Culture as it is inscribed in the Cultural Program of the Junta of 1975. This tendency was further on manifest in the articulation of a plan of cultural centralization toward the end of the Pinochet regime, in 1988. The institutions this plan laid down were largely included in the institutional architecture of culture after the fall of the regime.

At the level of government, along the Cultural Advisory Office of the Junta, the General Secretary of the Government included three distinct unities dedicated to cultural affairs: the Cultural Department already mentioned, a National Secretary for Culture (along with the other three secretaries for Women, Syndicates and Youth), a Secretary for Cultural Relations and the Direction of Communication that also undertook cultural actions. I must specify that given the high opacity of the regime and, as Garretón observed, the fact that the Junta destroyed a large part of its internal documents before leaving power, the exact dates of establishment and duration of these different departments remain unknown. Moreover, Subercaseaux also mentions a National Foundation for Culture but I did not retrieve any other information relating to this foundation.

Furthermore, one of the most important institutions of the cultural field is during the Pinochet regime the Department of Cultural Extension³ of the Ministry of

¹ Ion Dodu BĂLAN, *La politique culturelle en Roumanie*, Les Presses de l'Unesco, Paris, 1974, pp. 23-24.

² Luis ERRÁZURIZ HERNÁN, "Política cultural del regimen militar chileno (1973-1976)", *Aisthesis*, no. 40, 2006, pp. 62-78/p. 69. This nomination was later on confirmed by the Decree-Law No. 804 (December 10th 1974).

³ The Ministry of Education oversaw also the National Commission of Scientific and Technological Investigation (CONICYT), the Bureau of International Relations and the Department of extracurricular education that also accomplished tasks in the cultural domain. The Ministry was reformed in 1978 and since on, called Ministry of Education and Culture.

Education¹. This department enacted the policies of diffusion of artistic works. The Ministry of Education also oversaw the DIBAM dedicated to the safeguard and promotion of the patrimony². Additionally, a Commission of Patrimony functioned inside the Ministry of Public Works³. The Direction of Cultural Affairs of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (DINEX) participated as well to the tasks of diffusion of the "officialized art". Other ministries participated to the "cultural sphere": the Ministry of National Defense had a General Direction of Sport and Recreation and the Ministry of Economy, Development and Reconstruction supervised the National Tourism Service (SERNATUR) – cultural tourism.

Additional institutions also accomplished cultural tasks: the Institute of Chile (1964), National Television of Chile, the National Radio of Chile, the Corporation for the Development of Production (CORFO), and CEMA Chile⁴. Along the central red of institutions, the activities of the municipalities were at the local level the most important actors along with the private corporations⁵. Finally, the Committee for Cinematographic Qualification (CCC) oversaw cinema censorship. Universities and their cultural divisions were also reactivated after being purged of people belonging or being suspected of belonging to the left parties. Private corporations also played an important part in the support of artistic creation and diffusion of art (*Sociedad Amigos del Arte* [1976], *Sociedad Chilena de Amigos de la Opera*).

Diffusion and Democratization

If in Chile the support of artistic creation is assumed by the private companies and corporations, the diffusion of artistic works is (selectively) safeguarded by the state which assumes also the task of democratization (extending access to the cultural products officially sanctioned). Likewise, cultural industries develop in the market configuration but with the ideological limitations imposed by the regime (punitive taxes for books and cinema or direct control as for television). In Romania the support of artistic creation is institutionalized and several mechanisms are specifically dedicated to this assignment: creative unions and the mandatory "inclusion in the working force" of artists. Nonetheless only artistic works that are validated by the center could gain public support. Cultural industries are monopolized by the state and the only medium that is not entirely exploited is television.

The extension of the red of cultural institutions (cinemas, theaters but also cultural centers/houses) is desired by both regimes but the Romanian regime

¹ Anny RIVERA, *Transformaciones...cit.*, p 105.

² Also under the supervision of the Ministry of Education existed (since 1925) a Council of National Monuments. In 1982 was created also (as a sub-department of the Museum Department of the DIBAM) a National Center of Conservation and Restoration.

³ Furthermore a Bureau of National Monuments existed inside the Direction of Architecture of the same Ministry of Public Works (that also coordinated the activities of the Metropolitan Park).

⁴ The foundation "Graciela Letelier de Ibáñez CEMA Chile" (Centers of Mothers) was founded during the presidency of Ibáñez (1952-1958) and overseen by his wife and thereafter by all the wives of Chilean presidents and thus by Pinochet's wife. Ozren AGNIC, *Pinochet. S. A. La base de la fortuna*, RIL editores, Santiago, 2006.

⁵ Unpublished manuscript: *Proyecto de Plan Nacional de Desarrollo Cultural*, Santiago de Chile, 1988, pp. 20-21.

accentuates it whereas in Chile there is insufficient data to assess the degree of influence of the decision taken to create cultural institutes in each municipality. The itinerant programs (in Chile) and the festival *Cântarea României* are examples of the intention of democratization and decentralization of cultural activities always under the strict surveillance of the regimes. Democratization means also, in both cases, the promotion of amateur artists as a means of subvert professional artists (de-professionalization, limit their influence).

Support of Artistic Creativity and Diffusion

During the Pinochet regime, the state withdrew from the cultural field, giving away its role, and safeguarding only what could not be assumed by the market (for example cinema which by its high production costs tends to disappear¹). This retraction of the state is congruent with the need to dismantle the institutionalism "infected by Marxism" but most importantly with the Chicago Boys ideology established after 1975. The subsidiary state is seen in the reduction of the capacity of state intervention in economic life and the safeguard of those cultural activities that cannot be assumed by private economic agents, the direct financial support of cultural activities is reduced (at the university and municipality level) and they have to auto-finance themselves (through publicity, ticket sales and private aid); the state safeguards nonetheless the role of extension but the programs it promotes (ballet and opera especially) remain accessible to an elite².

Thus, the support and diffusion of artistic creations that pertained to the universities (autonomous but financially supported by the state) was during the regime of Pinochet assigned exclusively to the state red and the private red. As the state reduced its involvement to a minimum (extension) and detached itself from the "patronage and promotion" of art it assumed a punitive policy in which taxes were imposed, subventions were removed and censorship (along with "persecution, exclusion and exile") was menacing³.

Hence, the Pinochet regime first deactivated the university network in order to sanitize it (for the first six months all universities are closed and then militaries are nominated as rectors, chief of departments etc.); and thereafter universities were reactivated but only for accomplishing marginal activities. The collaboration with universities is preferably realized with the Catholic University (PUC) in spite of the traditional University of Chile (UC) which had an all-encompassing "artistic infrastructure". The dismantlement of the universities' cultural institutionalism and their control through the militaries intervention is followed by the privatization of education (in 1980 through the high-education reform). Artistic education (specifically) is restricted, discouraged (the high fees imposed rendering it difficult to access) and punished (state support is reduced to a minimum)⁴. Nonetheless, an institutional restructuring was favored by the 1980 education reform and new universities were created. This is the case of the University of Arts

¹ Anny RIVERA, *Transformaciones...cit*, p. 37.

² *Ibidem*, pp. 37-39, 49.

³ Pablo OYARZÚN, *Arte, visualidad e historia*, Ed. La Blanca Montaña, Santiago, 1999, p. 213.

⁴ Anny RIVERA, *Transformaciones...cit*, p. 40; Robert AUSTIN, "Armed Forces, Market Forces: Intellectuals and Higher Education in Chile 1973-1989", *Latin American Perspectives*, vol. 24, no. 5, 1997, pp. 26-58/p. 39.

and Social Sciences (ARCIS) created in 1982 by "academics dismissed from their university posts" and that "began as a private company and institute offering classes in media and journalism"¹.

In Romania, as I recalled above, the establishment of the communist regime was accompanied by the imposition of new forms of artistic education – the institutes (the Institute of Visual Arts Nicolae Grigorescu, the Institute of Theatrical and Cinematographic Art – IATC), the Conservatory Ciprian Porumbescu and the University of Architecture and Urbanism Ion Mincu. After having tried to impose a School of Literature (1950-1955), literary studies were given by the Faculties of Letters in the big cities.

The increase in student numbers in high artistic education was praised by the communist authorities. Thus, in the panoramic view of Romanian cultural policy signed by Ion Dodu Bălan (1974) a table evokes the increase in education number of students; artistic education inexistent (according to the table presented) in 1938/9 reached a number of 26 2111 students in 1972/3 of which 3 065 in the high education system². I must remark that the document in question when referring to the state financing of artistic development and support does not refer to art schools but to popular art schools and popular universities. In fact, intensively the policy of the Ceaușescu regime was one that punished art schools and professional artists promoting amateur art and artists and popular schools. This phenomenon is officially conceived as a "measure of democratization" extending access to art education to the entire population but also as a means of replacing art by a politically sanctioned form considering "true art as that done by the people"³. Moreover, artistic education was considered, as for all other forms of education, as a means of "eliminating the accidental" ensuring that students find a place "in production" afterwards (Bălan 1974), this task being usually devoted to the unions of creation.

Arte privado, arte-empresa: *High Art*

Private support of art was thus encouraged by the Chilean regime. Private companies assumed the promotion of art especially in the period 1976-1982 (starting from 1974 if we are to believe the official documents⁴). This new role assumed by private entities was favored by the so-called "economic boom"; when this terminated in 1982, the "panorama was desolating" as the state was still absent, and the universities were affected also by the 1980 Reform⁵. Private initiatives would be resumed after 1986 but not at the same level and would focus on certain galleries or cultural centers.

One of the most active private association is the *Sociedad Amigos del Arte* (Society Friends of the Art – SAA) which concentrated on visual arts' support (although

¹ Robert AUSTIN, "Armed Forces...cit", p. 37.

² Ion Dodu BĂLAN, *La politique...*cit, Table 1, p. 7, p. 63.

³ Magda CĂRNECI, *Artele plastice în România 1945-1989*, Editura Meridiane, București, 2001, p. 133.

⁴ See in this sense: Sonia QUINTANA, María Olga DEL PIANO, Pilar VERGARA, Braulio ARENAS, *Resumen de 6 años de actividad artística en Chile 1974-1979*, Departamento de Extensión Cultural del Ministerio de Educación, Santiago, 1978, p. 17.

⁵ One sign of this downturn is given by the documents of the Sociedad Amigos del Arte which in 1981 granted the highest number of scholarships for artists, 50, while in 1983 this had fallen to only 6. César L. SEPÚLVEDA (ed.), *20 años en el arte*, Cochrane Marinetti, Santiago, 1996, pp. 60, 65.

it had several departments: music, visual arts, theater and MNBA) but participated also in the organization and management of the state-ordered programs of the Ministry of Education (through the DEC). The society was created in 1976 by a group of entrepreneurs and had as sponsors Chile's most important private companies. The intention of the SAA was "to unite art and culture to the private enterprises" and this involvement also meant "coercing" companies into donating for the different programs. As Jaime Meneses, the nowadays director of the association, recalls, the first president of SAA, César Sepúlveda would telephone the "visionary entrepreneurs" to remind them they had to make their donation¹. The vision of Sepúlveda (vice-president of the BHC-Vial Group), one of the most important mecena of the Pinochet regime (Rivera) is evocative of the vision the private companies had of art, an investment/product as any other:

"The state has a role to accomplish but we believe we must help it...*Art is a product that has to be sold and not given away*. Why one pays for a pair of shoes and not for a Beethoven sonata? In the second place, art had to be managed with the same 'marketing' techniques used to sell a refrigerator or a blender...If the Municipal Theater, for example, passes through a period when it has only half of the auditorium full it should do a market study and discover where is the fault...Museums, the Municipal Theater and all the state entities cannot dispose of their money. If they save in an item they cannot spend it on another; if they have a profit with a work or an exhibition these go to fiscal coffers...They should have independent juridical personality and be able to associate with private individuals"².

Furthermore, as the institution's documents evoke, the strategy of SAA was also meant as a corporative marketing strategy – the companies' responsibilities in society also included supporting art and education and this helped the company's public image³. The view of private companies was congruent with that of the state agencies; in the words of Sonia Quintana, chief of the cultural area of the Ministry of Education:

"Considering that the world of today is ruled by the laws of offer and demand, I think that cultural activity has no alternative but to learn these rules and play with them. Even if the concept of auto-financing has two sides, it is convenient to educate the actual generation in the sense that it learns to give culture the value it has. From this point of view it is important to replace the concept of 'free culture' with the one of 'paid culture'"⁴.

The SAA organized exhibitions, contests such as the Encounter of Young Art (1979-1981) and offered annual scholarships to visual artists (since 1978 and until the present day) and musicians; it furthermore organized concerts, exhibitions, and festivals (Festival of Bellavista 1985-6), and sponsored the renewal of the MNBA. It also participated to the programs of Itinerant Theater of the DEC in the

¹ Interview with Jaime Meneses in Santiago de Chile, July 10, 2007.

² *El Mercurio*, 5 August 1979 quoted in Anny RIVERA, *Transformaciones...cit*, p. 43 (our transl.).

³ César L. SEPÚLVEDA (ed.), *20 años...cit*, p. 147.

⁴ Sonia QUINTANA, *Revista Cal*, no. 3, 1979 quoted in José Joaquín BRUNNER, *La cultura autoritaria en Chile*, FLACSO, Santiago, 1981, p. 91 (our transl.).

period 1983-84. Like the DEC (see above) SAA also argued it did not discriminate artists based on their political beliefs and it only judged the contestants based upon artistic criteria¹. SAA continues its activities in the present but its impact is marginal because of the "monopoly exerted since the 1990s by a small group of persons in the cultural area" if we were to believe the nowadays director of the association, Jaime Meneses. Meneses sees the reduction of influence of the association "as a form of revenge" of those people that represented "the opposition to the military regime" and that now occupy the cultural space's privileged places.

Private support was also involved in promoting on one side "high culture" (opera, ballet and learned music) and on the other side, commercial, popular consumption shows (café concert and musical comedies). High culture was on display at the Municipal Theater of Santiago which passes from municipal management to a private corporation (*Corporación del Teatro Municipal*).

The Chilean state preserved the extension task and replaced the university with the private enterprises. It also promoted "high culture", nationalist and elitist through the official channels, especially the Department of Cultural Extension (DEC) of the Ministry of Education in partnership with private corporations. The DEC organized itinerant exhibitions (retrospectives especially, since 1977), dance representations (National Folkloric Ballet – BAFONA) and concerts (learned music, since 1978) as well as theater representations (Company of Itinerant Theater, 1978) all impregnated by classical and national expressions and that travel all throughout Chile.

Moreover, in the period 1978-81 the municipalities (congruent with the decentralization policy imposed also through the new administrative reform started in 1974) – especially those with higher resources – form private corporations and play a more and more important role in the promotion of artistic activities by organizing visual arts exhibitions, music concerts and dance representations².

Amateur Art and its Supreme Consecration: Cântarea României

The tendency to increase from year to year, from congress to congress (all types of congresses) the numbers, to always "produce more" is seen also in the official documents concerning cultural affairs of the Ceaușescu regime. This is valid for all sorts of artistic institutions and their "products". Thus, the red of cultural centers, houses and clubs (administered by the Union of Syndicates and the local sub-divisions of the CSCE) that covered the entire Romanian territory (with a communal cultural center in each commune) continued to develop. Hence, if in 1974 there were 8 006 such centers³, in 1976 there were 2 700 communal cultural centers⁴ and 700 cultural centers and clubs; in 1982 they had risen to 8 500⁵. The data is

¹ Interview with Jaime Meneses in Santiago de Chile, July 10, 2007.

² Anny RIVERA, *Transformaciones...* cit, p. 120.

³ Ion Dodu BĂLAN, *La politique...* cit, p. 53

⁴ Nicolae CEAUȘESCU, "Cuvântare la încheierea lucrărilor Congresului, 4 iunie 1976", in IDEM, *Expunere cu privire la activitatea politico-ideologică și cultural-educativă de formare a omului nou, constructor conștient și devotat al societății socialiste multilateral dezvoltate și al comunismului în România, prezentată la Congresul educației politice și al culturii socialiste, 2 iunie 1976*, Editura Politică, București, 1976, p. 27.

⁵ According to the Report of the 2nd Congress of Political Education and Socialist Culture (24-25 June 1982) in *Congresul al II-lea al Educației politice și culturii socialiste*, Editura Politică, București, 1982, p. 164.

incongruous because the number of 8 500 given for 1982 is contradicted a few pages later when it is said that in the period 1976-1982, "373 cultural houses, centers and clubs" more were created¹. These cultural centers (along with the workers' clubs and the scientific brigades) developed both cultural activities – amateur formations – and political education tasks, holding symposia, debates and conferences each month. They were also the sceneries where cinema festivals and literary contests etc were organized. The cultural centers also hosted the Popular Universities which were also extended each year so as to cover the entire territory².

Amateur formations underwent an impressive evolution during the period of the Ceaușescu regime and most especially in the framework of the *Cântarea României* Festival launched in 1976 (by the First Congress of Political Education and Socialist Culture). In 1982 the Congress of political education and socialist culture evoked the existence of "175 000 artistic formations and circles with 3.8 millions of interpreters"³. They were 20 000/22 000 amateur formations in 1974⁴ and 30 000 "choral, theatrical, dance and recitation formations" in 1976⁵. Vast panoply of contests and festivals was dedicated to amateur art before the centralization of all these activities by the *Cântarea României* Festival. Contests of music and dance formations, Popular republican art exhibitions, Amateur theater festival (with 14 stable amateur theaters), Amateur filmmakers festival, Regional contests of choral and fanfares, Popular costumes and chant festival, Puppet theater festival etc.⁶. Additionally, *popular art schools* meant "to stimulate the amateur art movement [...] and preserve popular traditions" completed the scenery. They were 30/36 in 1973 and had 800 professors that formed annually around 12 000 amateur "interpreters, directors, conductors and choreographers" and teaching over 40 (!) disciplines⁷.

Besides increasing the instances that deployed popular art classes, *cultural democratization* was seen in the extension of the red of artistic institutions, the maintenance of accessible prices for tickets and the edition of cheap collections of books. The number of artistic institutions was constantly increasing: there were 43⁸ theaters in 1974⁹ (instead of 16 in 1948), around 7 000 cinemas (6 170 – 615 in cities and

¹ *Ibidem*, p. 183.

² They were 302 in 1970-1971 (401 in 1971-2) and 1 000 in 1976. Popular universities developed also in the rural area after 1968-9 constantly increasing their number: from 56 in 1969-70 to 212 in 1973. The popular universities offered classes in all disciplines, from social sciences, economy and natural sciences, to art and literature, foreign languages etc. and they were imagined as open "to all those that desired to enrich their knowledge". The classes were taught by "more than 25 000 intellectuals [...] that for the most part were voluntaries" which means they were assigned to these tasks. Ion Dodu BĂLAN, *La politique...*cit, pp. 55-56; Nicolae CEAUȘESCU, "Cuvântare la...cit", p. 27.

³ *Congresul al II-lea...*cit, p. 185.

⁴ Ion Dodu BĂLAN, *La politique...*cit, p. 53.

⁵ Nicolae CEAUȘESCU, "Cuvântare la...cit", p. 28.

⁶ Ion Dodu BĂLAN, *La politique...*cit, p. 57.

⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 64.

⁸ Along with the 43/4 theaters, communal centers, factory clubs, also promoted theatrical representations by amateur formations (14 popular theaters in 1974). The repertoires (essentially classical and apolitical texts) of theaters were submitted to the "workers' committees" a soft name for censorship. Ion Dodu BĂLAN, *La politique...*cit, p. 38.

⁹ In 1979, a new theater is inaugurated in Bucharest, the Very Small Theater (*Teatrul Foarte Mic*) as an experimental annex of the Small Theater (*Teatrul Mic*) and having as a director Dinu Săraru, Nicu Ceaușescu's protégé. Aneli Ute GABANYI, *Cultul lui Ceaușescu*, preface by J.F. BROWN, foreword by Dan BERINDEI, Romanian transl. by I. Vamanu, Polirom, Iași, 2003, p. 100.

5 555 in villages in 1973), over 20 000 public libraries¹ (7 939 in 1973 instead of 3 100 in 1938), museums² (331 instead of 83)³.

The increased numbers of spectators to artistic shows (theater, cinema, musical) is also acknowledged as a result of the "democratizing" cultural policy. The numbers given must be taken nonetheless with a certain reserve as the policies of "mandatory participation" applied also to artistic activities: people were also "encouraged" by the syndicates of their working places to go together to shows organized by the party direction.

The consecration of the privilege accorded by the Ceaușescu regime to amateur cultural expressions was accomplished by the Festival *Cântarea României*. As several authors recall, the festival was:

"A form of cultural enrolment to which theoretically the entire population had to participate and which, in fact, supported primarily, through important official means, amateur art, considered as the true art 'of the people' in the detriment of professional, learned art"⁴.

The first edition of the festival began in 1976 and ended in the summer of 1977. As Petrescu recalls, 1977 was a "promising" year as it encompassed numerous celebrations: "The centenary of Romanian state independence, seven decades since the 1907 peasant revolt, 55 years since the creation of the Communist Youth Union"⁵. The length of the festival was explained by the fact that there were several stages in the development of the festival:

"The mass stage (October 1976-February 1977), the department and the sectors of Bucharest stage (March-September 1977), inter-department stage (May 1977), the republican stage (last ten days of May 1977) and the galas of amateur and professional laureate artists (first ten days of June 1977)"⁶.

The Festival had as a purpose to promote the official version of art imbued by the Party principles; it furthermore was meant to glorify the leader of the nation in all imaginable forms and by all Romanians, as amateur art was the main articulator.

¹ The state network of public libraries was extended by the communist regime and in 1973 these reached a total number of 22 500 divided in state public libraries (8 000), syndicates and other mass organizations libraries (4 807), school libraries (10 300) and national libraries (Academy Library and State Central Library). Ion Dodu BĂLAN, *La politique...* cit, p. 54. Publishing houses edited affordable collections such as the "Library for all" collection (an identical policy was deployed as I recalled already during the UP government by the nationalized Quimantú publishing house).

² The network of museums was extended from a territorial point of view (extended to other cities than Bucharest) from a numerical point of view (331 museums) and from a thematically point of view. Art museums were among the most numerous (61) and included the Museum of art of the RSR (1950) which had received the patrimony of the Museums Toma Stelian and Simu, the Museum of art of the Romanian Academy, the Museum of modern art of Galați and the Museum of decorative art of Buzău (the Museum of Romanian Literature (1950)).

³ Ion Dodu BĂLAN, *La politique...* cit, p. 17.

⁴ Magda CĂRNECI, *Artele...* cit, p. 133 (our transl.).

⁵ Dragoș PETRESCU, "400 de spirite creatoare: 'Cântarea României' sau stalinismul național în festival", in Lucian BOIA (ed.), *Miturile comunismului românesc*, Nemira, București, 1998, pp. 239-251/p. 244 (our transl.).

⁶ *Ibidem* (our transl.).

The promotion of "popular creators" as the only veritable creators and the definitive establishment of their creations instead of "cultivated art" was the main reason for the creation of the festival¹

Cultural Industries

Cultural industries offer a diverse panorama as they are both owned and used by the state and dominated by private interests in Chile, and exclusively state-dominated in Romania. Chilean television and radio are state-owned, as is cinema in a first period; artisanship is also seen to develop at the "local-base level"² through the state network (especially through CEMA). Books and press are market dominated but officially controlled through censorship and the imposition of the TAV of 20% on any edition. Private interests dominate also music and publicity which develops unrestrained in congruence with television. Whereas in Romania, completely submitted to state control, they benefited nonetheless of a higher or less important budget according to the fact that they were either auto-financed or partially funded by the state.

Book Industry

The official approach of the publishing industry was in Romania, as for all other sub-domains, a quantitative approach underlining the constantly growing numbers of volumes edited, the number of imprints of each volume, the numbers again of sold books... For example "in 1973, 4 200 titles were published with more than 72 millions exemplars" and, even more impressing, the collection "Library for all" published in the period 1950-1970, 55 millions exemplars (!)³. Additionally, 53 cultural and artistic magazines were published in Romania in 1973 and there were "24 publishing-houses aside the printing offices of ministries, research institutes, cultural establishments and journals"⁴. There was even a "self-publishing" editing house, "The Letter" (*Litera*) which, as Lucia Dragomir observed was re-founded in 1970 after being dismantled in 1948⁵. The limitations of the publishing house, directed by Marin Preda, were evident if we take into consideration the fact that it was placed under the patronage of the USSR. Additionally, the "editing system was reorganized in 1969, it was diversified" and thus specialized publishing houses were created⁶. For instance, visual arts benefited of at least two publishing houses, the main state publishing house, ESPLA (*Editura de Stat pentru Literatură și Artă*) which included a section on visual arts and the art specialized

¹ Eugen NEGRICI, *Literatura română sub comunism. Proza*, Editura Fundației Pro, București, 2006, p. 55.

² Carlos CATALÁN, Giselle MUÑIZAGA, *Políticas culturales estatales bajo el autoritarismo en Chile*, CENECA, Santiago, 1986, p. 28.

³ Ion Dodu BĂLAN, *La politique...* cit, pp. 27, 29.

⁴ *Ibidem*, pp. 26-27, 29.

⁵ Lucia DRAGOMIR, *L'Union des Écrivains. Une institution transnationale à l'Est*, Belin, Paris, 2007, p. 175.

⁶ Ion Dodu BĂLAN, *La politique...* cit, p. 27.

publishing house created in 1960, Meridiane¹. Apparently the Romanian state granted important resources to publications of all sorts and in all fields but the access to publication was marked by several obstacles: the limits on imprints evoked by the authorities as a motive for non-publishing whereas Ceaușescu's works were published in thousands of volumes, translated in dozens of languages etc.

Chilean Press was curtailed by the military regime and the written word was controlled by the government. Immediately after the *coup d'État* all newspapers and magazines related to the left are closed down. If in 1973 there were 52 newspapers in the country (of which 11 were published in Santiago) in a first period of the Pinochet regime there were only six newspapers – three pertaining to the same company (El Mercurio SAP) –, and in 1987 two additional newspapers that belonged to the opposition, were published in Santiago². Likewise, in 1987 6 weekly magazines of political information were published, of which two were official while the other 4 belonged to the opposition³.

Distribution of books was also affected in the first years of the regime as several bookstores were shut down or changed their profile (34 between 1973 and 1981) while "some bookstores were frequently controlled having to auto-censor themselves and classify their stocks into 3 categories: sellable, reserved and destroyable"⁴. Additionally, imports were also controlled and between 1971 and 1979 they had fallen dramatically only to recuperate their values of 1971 in 1983⁵.

But the most important change brought about by the dictatorship was the introduction of the "promotional book" as part of the new massive culture promoted by televised programs. Bernardo Subercaseaux explains this new phenomenon by the "deterioration of the traditional profile of the industry and the displacing of interests from the formative aspects linked to the enlightened culture (the book) to the entertaining aspects linked to the mass culture (television, Festival of Viña etc)"⁶. In this context, privilege is given to bestsellers and long sellers or to "sub-products of other means of communication" (as television), the "selection of titles and editing projects is governed by market variations rather than artistic criteria" and a new chain of distribution appears: kiosks, supermarkets and lastly bookstores⁷.

As such, "the book market had acquired a completely new physiognomy", television being also the main articulator – as a promoter of books or as a publisher⁸. New products are introduced to the market, the "'promotional books' – those books or fascicules – that accompany the selling of magazines through kiosks and which are promoted essentially through television"⁹. This "phenome-

¹ Magda CÂRNECI, *Artele...*cit, p. 21.

² José Joaquín BRUNNER, Carlos CATALÁN, *Industria y Mercado Culturales en Chile: Descripción y cuantificación*, Documento de Trabajo, Programa FLACSO, no. 359, Noviembre 1987, pp. 23-26.

³ *Ibidem*, p. 28.

⁴ Bernardo SUBERCASEAUX, *Historia del libro en Chile*, LOM Ediciones, Santiago, 2000, pp. 159, 168.

⁵ José Joaquín BRUNNER, Carlos CATALÁN, *Industria...*cit, p. 34.

⁶ Bernardo SUBERCASEAUX, *Historia del libro...*cit, p. 167.

⁷ *Ibidem*.

⁸ José Joaquín BRUNNER, Carlos CATALÁN, *Industria...*cit, pp. 35, 37; Bernardo SUBERCASEAUX, *Historia del libro...*cit, p. 171.

⁹ José Joaquín BRUNNER, Carlos CATALÁN, *Industria...*cit, p. 35 (our transl.).

non [was] initiated by the magazine *Ercilla* and [expanded] afterwards to other mediums (*Qué pasa, Vanidades, Hoy, Cosas* and occasionally *Clan*)”¹. This meant that “in September 1984 there were being distributed all throughout the country when buying a magazine – more than 1 200 000 books. This number acquires certain relevance if we think that in the period 1975-1985 book production (not the selling) only reached an annual mean of 1 500 000 exemplars” and “the selling of imported and national books through bookstores did not surpass, in 1985, all throughout Chile, a means of 80 000 monthly books”².

Audiovisual

Both television and radio were state owned in Chile. The situation was particularly interesting for television because “the particular trait of Chilean television is that the law [of 1970] reserves the management of channels to universities and the State”³. By the university “intervention” the Pinochet regime assumed total control of television which belonged exclusively to the state from 1973 on⁴. With the arrival of the Pinochet regime, imports were liberated (by a lowering of customs tariffs) and a massive import of television sets and of “ready-made” foreign programs flooded the country⁵. This had as a consequence that by 1983 “almost 95% of Chileans had a TV set” and the main television channel, “covered almost 90% of Chile by 1975”⁶. The majority of programs of the television were entertaining programs, shows and contests (61% were dedicated to entertainment reaching in 1977 a monthly mean of around 145 hours of telenovelas)⁷. Moreover, since 1982, the government reaffirmed its control of mass means of communication and “for the first time there [was] an attempt to directly manage the recreational contents; in the National Channel a new executive is appointed that tries to induce *positive* contents for the regime in the telenovelas”⁸.

The private companies participate to the television development by the constant growth of publicity which attains 10% of the total time of programs in 1985⁹. Brunner considers “the centrality of the television” in Chile under Pinochet as one of the main traits of the cultural program of the government leading to a new

¹ Bernardo SUBERCASEAUX, *Historia del libro...cit*, p. 176 (our transl.).

² *Ibidem*: “In 1984 there were delivered in the 4 500 kiosks of Santiago 600 000 books monthly and there were sold additionally 300 000; while in the bookstores the selling hardly surpassed 40 000 books”, José Joaquín BRUNNER, Carlos CATALÁN, *Industria...cit*, p. 37 (our transl.).

³ Established experimentally in 1956 with transmissions from the Catholic Universities of Santiago and Valparaíso and with a first transmission of the University of Chile in 1960, the public National Channel of Television (TVN) is established in 1968. There are two channels of television, Canal 13 and TVN. José Joaquín BRUNNER, Carlos CATALÁN, *Industria...cit*, pp. 16, 17.

⁴ In October 1973 a decree suppressed the directorate of the national television (TVN) and all its faculties were given to a general director designated by the chief of the *junta*. In 1974 another decree established that the TVN was no longer under the supervision of the Ministry of Education but depended directly of the General Secretary of Government. Eugenio TIRONI, *El regimen autoritario. Para una sociología de Pinochet*, Dolmen Ediciones, Santiago, 1998, p. 99.

⁵ Anny RIVERA, *Transformaciones...cit*, p. 44.

⁶ José Joaquín BRUNNER, Carlos CATALÁN, *Industria...cit*, p. 17.

⁷ José Joaquín BRUNNER, *La cultura autoritaria en Chile*, FLACSO, Santiago, 1981, p. 94.

⁸ Carlos CATALÁN, Giselle MUÑIZAGA, *Políticas culturales...cit*, p. 37.

⁹ José Joaquín BRUNNER, Carlos CATALÁN, *Industria...cit*, p. 58.

privatized society, easier to control. Moreover, according to Tironi the Pinochet regime created in 1974 The National Chilean Radio (*Radio Nacional de Chile*) as a means of propagation of official ideas¹.

Romanian television began emitting in 1956 with a second channel inaugurated in 1968 only to be suspended in 1985 due to electricity restrictions. In accordance with the austerity policies which affected Romanian lives in the 1980s, Romanian television also suffered of the same restrictions being limited to only two hours of daily program during week days and around four hours in weekend days². Week-days television program was identical: it started with 5 minutes of cartoons (usually the very popular series "Mihaela") followed by half an hour of the Evening News ("Telejurnal") which had few favored themes: the evocation of the evolutions in production, the visits of Ceaușescu inside our outside the country; news were followed by a program of patriotic music or a patriotic film. Reduced television programs were synonym in Romania of Ceaușescu's omnipresence. Television programs of the communist countries that shared a frontier with Romania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Hungary, replaced nonexistent Romanian programs. Furthermore, *video recorders* also helped fill out the gap of television entertainment. Though no statistics exist on the subject, "video culture" developed especially in the second half of the 1980s with people reuniting in their homes to watch films brought by friends that had access to "the outside world", drivers, air stewards, etc. Comparatively, Romanian National Radio emitted interruptedly and Romanians could also listen to the programs broadcasted by the Munich-based Radio Free Europe (RFE).

Cinema

The Chilean regime dismantled or reduced the national supported cinema system. Both production (cinema studies, Chile Films and the 1967 law for the protection of national cinema) and distribution (reduction of cinema halls) were affected. The regime furthermore recuperated "technical teams and infrastructure" so as to use them in the television³. In spite of an initial desire to create a nationalist cinema expressing the view of the regime, the lack of filmmakers (for their most part supporters of the left) that would support the official imaginary led to an abandonment of this artistic expression by the regime⁴. Cinema realized inside Chile during the Pinochet regime is absent, only 13 films being produced in the period 1973-1989 compared to the important number realized by the exiled filmmakers (178 films were made in the period 1973-1983, the majority of which were documentaries⁵).

¹ Eugenio TIRONI, *El regimen...*cit, p. 99.

² The program of television was of two hours per day (19.30-22.00) with the exception of the weekend: Saturday 13-15 and 19-22.30 and Sunday – idem with one additional hour (11.30-12.30) of program for children http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Televiziunea_Romana. (accessed October 23, 2008)

³ Maria de la LUZ HURTADO, *La industria cinematográfica en Chile: límites y posibilidades de su democratización*, CENECA, Santiago, 1985, p. 13.

⁴ *Ibidem*, p.12.

⁵ David VALJALO, Zuzana M. PICK, *10 años de cine chileno*, Número especial de la Revista *Literatura chilena*, Ediciones de la Frontera, Los Angeles, 1984.

Cinema was several ways curtailed. Cinema studies were dismantled or reduced beginning in 1973. Production of film and the support brought about by the state were also truncated. Chile Films (the state company created in 1942) was requisitioned by the regime with the nomination of the retired general René Cabrera as its director¹ and then passed to the state television (Canal 7 – TVN). With the derogation in 1975 of the 1967 Law of protection of cinema (tax exemption for cinema tickets and production) and the imposition of the Law Decree no. 825 of 1974 that established the TAV for cinema, all state support was taken away². The infrastructure was also affected by the reduction of the number of cinema halls³.

The initial intent of the regime to create "its own culture" by using the infrastructure of Chile Films was rapidly abandoned. As Cavallo et al. note, immediately after the requisition of Chile Films a project to film "The one thousand days" was set in place inspired by the recently released "White Papers" that "narrated the political vicissitude leading to the *golpe*" and the script was entrusted to German Becker but the project was never realized⁴. In 1975 another project was proposed in the framework of the co-production agreement signed with the Franco regime; an adaptation of the biography of the Nobel winner Gabriela Mistral signed by Campos Menendez, the cultural counselor of the *junta*⁵. Chile Films was apparently also imagined as "a producing company at the service of the government with the order to realize propaganda documentaries that were to be distributed through embassies"⁶. All these aborted projects were annulled by the selling of Chile Films in 1975 and though it returned to official control in 1977 (when it was placed under the control of the National Radio) Chile Films never produced films according to the official ideological principles⁷.

Though national cinema inside Chile was missing in the period 1973-1989, new forms were adopted by the ex-filmmakers that dedicated themselves to the new medium of publicity and musical video production. As such, "in 1984 there were 57 agencies of cinema and video production in Santiago [...] creating around 200 videos between 1980 and 1984"⁸. This new type of support will be adopted by the opposition and will in fact help the change of the regime as it seen in the televised campaign for the NO to the 1988 plebiscite.

As I said above, Romanian cinema was advantaged by the communist establishment. A solid infrastructure was built, new film studios (A. Sahia 1949, Bucharest 1950, Animafilm 1964) and a center of film production opened on the outskirts of Bucharest, in Buftea (1959). Romania Film Central, placed under the direction of

¹ Ascanio CAVALLO, Manuel SALAZAR, Oscar SEPÚLVEDA, *La Historia oculta del Régimen Militar. Memoria de una época 1973-1988*, Mito Bolsillo, Grijalbo Mondadori, Santiago, 2001, p. 238.

² Jacqueline MOUESCA, *El documental chileno*, LOM Ediciones, Santiago, 2005, p. 100; David VALJALO, Zuzana PICK, *10 años...cit*, p. 32.

³ From 325 cinema halls in 1973 these passed to only 161 in 1983; in Santiago they were reduced by half, passing from 99 to only 48 in the same period. Maria de la LUZ HURTADO, *La industria...cit*, p. 80.

⁴ Ascanio CAVALLO et al., *La Historia...cit*, p. 239.

⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 240.

⁶ David VALJALO, Zuzana PICK, *10 años...cit*, 32.

⁷ Ascanio CAVALLO et al., *La historia...cit*, p. 240; David VALJALO, Zuzana PICK, *10 años...cit*, p. 32.

⁸ José Joaquín BRUNNER, Carlos CATALÁN, *Industria...cit*, p. 41.

the CSCA and thereafter CSCE, oversaw cinematographic production, distribution and archive. The network of distribution was important with around 7 000 cinemas¹ (in communes also); in the period 1976-1982 alone, 42 more cinemas were created². Film production was also important with a means of 30 movies per year and "with around 74 millions of spectators"³, a total of "232 films were produced in the period 1949-1973"⁴. Film production was, accordingly to one of the most appreciated Romanian filmmakers of today, Cristian Mungiu, completely controlled by the four "film houses that functioned on the basis of screenplays contests, the film that won was thereafter filmed by the directors of each film house"⁵. Cinema films were furthermore, very accessible, the cost of a cinema ticket was proclaimed as "the cheapest in the world" and is meant to signal the "educational function" assigned to it⁶. Even more, the Central Romania Film was said to orient its production through periodical surveys thus the participation of viewers to the future film productions was proclaimed⁷ but there is no way to verify this information that seems propagandistic.

Music

Chilean "official consecrated music" included three diverse and quite contradictory tendencies: the learned music direction, the television promotion of international music correlated with the Festival of International Song of Viña del Mar and the "elitist version of folkloric music". In the mass circuit, television was one of the preferred "show cases" of the regime. In the period of the "economic boom" numerous international stars were invited to Chilean television shows. Additionally, the Festival of Viña del Mar

"created in 1959 was particularly privileged by the regime which allocated budgets of millions and an intense publicity coverage...transforming it in a window of the country to the world...a trademark of officialism, transmitted by TVN, it was the most important event of those years"⁸.

The so called "Andean boom" of 1976 was in a first stage also recuperated by the regime which presented groups as Illapu in its TV shows before their departure for exile following their association with the Nueva Canción movement⁹. In fact, after 1981, Nueva Canción replaced international singers (too expensive) in

¹ Nowadays, there are only 35 cinema halls left all throughout Romania. Alexandra OLIVOTTO, "Mungiu își plimbă filmul prin cămine culturale sătești", *Cotidianul*, 16 August 2007.

² *Congresul al II-lea...*cit, p. 183.

³ *Ibidem*, p. 186.

⁴ Ion Dodu BĂLAN, *La politique...*cit, p. 43.

⁵ Cristian Mungiu interviewed by Ramona Mitrică, <http://romaniaculturalcentre.org.uk/interviews/2006/09/cristian-mungiu> (accessed June 1st, 2008).

⁶ Ion Dodu BĂLAN, *La politique...*cit, p. 43.

⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 44.

⁸ Rodrigo TORRES, "Música en el Chile autoritario (1973-1990): Crónica de una convivencia conflictiva" in Manuel Antonio GARRETÓN, Saúl SOSNOWSKI, Bernardo SUBERCASEAUX, *Cultura, autoritarismo y redemocratización en Chile*, Fondo de Cultura Económica, Santiago, 1993, pp. 197-220, p. 203 (our transl.).

⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 204.

the television programs following the economic recession¹. Finally the regime also promoted "a bourgeois type of folklore symbolized by *Los Cuatro Huasos* and afterwards by *Los Huasos Quincheros*, strong adherents of the pinochetist regime"². In the words of González, by the "creation of a mass-mediated folklore, rural music...coming from the central valley, a land where the country was founded and owned by the social elite" and its imposition "as an emblem of identity of the entire nation, social elites were able to maintain their cultural influence on Chilean society"³. Thus, both learned music and televised popular music were supported by famous foreign artists invited to play and benefiting of the initial economic reforms' success. An elitist vision of Chilean folklore completes the scenery of officialized music.

Learned music was supported by the Romanian regime although it was not the preferred means of transmitting official messages. Bălan recalls the important increase in stable ensembles with 15 philharmonic and symphonic orchestras, 5 lyric and ballet theaters, 4 theaters with opera, ballet and operetta shows, a theater of operetta and 9 theaters of variétés, several chorals⁴; the Romanian National Chamber Choir, Madrigal (1963) was very popular, "performing Renaissance works, 20th century avant-garde compositions, and Romanian folksongs and carols"⁵. Additionally, the Enescu Festival, organized every three years since 1955-58, offered classical music concerts and the contests for young artists a chance to affirmation. *National patriotic* music was highly important especially in the public manifestations – on stadiums, theaters etc – centered on Nicolae and Elena Ceaușescu's central figures and in the framework of the *Cântarea României* festivities. The Union of composers and musicologists ordered compositions, bought songs and organized contests⁶. *Popular* music was among the most favored genres as it suited the official directions and along the above-quoted artistic formations participating to the *Cântarea României*, 43 folkloric ensembles and formations existed in 1973⁷. *Soft pop* music was also supported by the official channels as it seen in the organization of a festival dedicated exclusively to this genre, the Mamaia Festival (1963-64)⁸.

One of the most important Romanian phenomena of the period was the "*Cenaclul Flacăra*". *Flacăra* Magazine was edited since 1952 by the Front of Socialist Unity, the Radio-cenacle weekly show was aired between 1979 and 1985, and the television shows in the period 1977-1981⁹. But the most important component of

¹ Nancy MORRIS, "Canto Porque es Necesario Cantar: The New Song Movement in Chile, 1973-1983", *Latin American Research Review*, vol. 21, no. 2, 1986, pp. 117-136/p. 132.

² Patricia VILCHES, "De Violeta Parra a Víctor Jarra y los Prisoneros: Recuperación de la memoria colectiva e identidad cultural a través de la música comprometida", *Latin American Music Review*, vol. 25, no. 2, 2004, pp. 195-215/p. 200.

³ Juan Pablo GONZÁLEZ, "The Making of a Social History of Popular Music in Chile: Problems, Methods, and Results", *Latin American Music Review*, vol. 26, no. 2, 2005, pp. 248-272/p. 262 (our transl.).

⁴ Ion Dodu BĂLAN, *La politique...* cit, p. 40.

⁵ Sabina PĂUȚA PIESLAK, "Romania's Madrigal Choir and the Politics of Prestige", *Journal of Musicological Research*, vol. 26, no. 2-3, 2007, pp. 215-240.

⁶ Ion Dodu BĂLAN, *La politique...* cit, p. 42.

⁷ *Ibidem*.

⁸ Dumitru POPESCU, *Cronos autodevorându-se. Memorii III Artele în mecenatul etatist*, Curtea Veche, București, 2006, p. 13.

⁹ The titles of the television shows were: "The antenna belongs to you", "The Cenaclul Flacăra Antenna", "The discovery of Romania", "The rediscovery of Romania". Lucia DRAGOMIR, *L'Union des...* cit, p. 271.

the *Flacăra* phenomenon was the itinerant shows directed by Adrian Păunescu to which the direction was confided in 1973 by the CC of the UTC¹ and which he organized until 1985 when the shows were forbidden. In the period 1976-1985 the Cenacle was placed under the auspices of the National Festival "*Cântarea României*"². The festival traveled throughout Romania and accordingly to Păunescu 1 615 shows were organized until 1985³. The show mixed folk music with poetry readings and it benefited of the centrality of the flamboyant personality of Păunescu. The euphoria of these manifestations led participants to consider *Flacăra* "as an oasis of liberty" although the festival "intended to make of each spectator an admirer of substantial art, of committed art and to promote a 'true art' conceived for the people, a profoundly militant civic and patriotic art"⁴. Dragoş Petrescu considers the regime astutely recuperated a manifestation apparently bereft of any official ideological message and used it to explicitly inculcate the desired principles in the young minds.

Artisanship

In Chile *artisanship* was promoted through the ateliers of creation inside the official red of state institutions (cultural centers and Juntas de Vecinos). CEMA Chile, the organization managed by the wife of Pinochet, recuperated these products and sold them inside the country and abroad⁵. For Catalán and Muñizaga one of the circuits of development of the official approach was the "local base circuit" which sought to recuperate and then replace the red of popular organizations developed at the local level especially under the UP government⁶. This network was imagined as a modality to "configure new social collectivities" through such state institutions as the National Secretariat of the Woman, the National Secretariat of Youth, the National Secretariat of Gremios, the Juntas de Vecinos, CEMA Chile, and Digeder and

"which terminal instances in the territorial plan [were] the communal cultural institutes. Together all these constitute the material base for what is in this period an active program of song festivals, folkloric meetings and theatre meetings, sports competitions; for the implementation of workshops of artisanship,

¹ Lucia DRAGOMIR, *L'Union des...*cit, pp. 265-266.

² Paul CERNAT, "Îmblânzitorul României Socialiste", in Paul CERNAT, Ion MANOLESCU, Angelo MITCHIEVICI, Ioan STANOMIR, *Explorări în comunismul românesc 1*, Polirom, Iaşi, 2004, pp. 340-379/p. 341.

³ Quoted in Lucia DRAGOMIR, *L'Union des...*cit, p. 266.

⁴ Traian STOICA, *Flacăra*, no 42, 44 and 46, 1975, quoted in Lucia DRAGOMIR, *L'Union des...*cit, p. 266.

⁵ "Doña Lucía had the sufficient ability to organize a first order commercial structure under the appearance of granting help to the women affiliated to the entity [CEMA]. The artisanship works, the embroideries, garments and others elaborated by the enthusiastic women of *po-blaciones* were entrusted and paid by CEMA to be sold in the red of commercialization created in the country – as the elegant selling point of the Paseo Las Palmas in Providencia as in the local of the international airport – and also outside of it. Of course, the price paid to artisans had no relation with the final price of commercialization. The articles of best quality were sent by doña María Lucía in a shop opened in Miami...supervised directly by the daughter Inés Lucía Pinochet Hiriart". Ozren AGNIC, *Pinochet SA...*cit, pp. 106-107.

⁶ Carlos CATALÁN, Giselle MUÑIZAGA, *Políticas culturales...*cit, p. 28.

instructional, domestic and expressive and very specially to receive an entire activity of extension that emanates from the diffusion agents of the high culture circuit"¹.

Artisanship was one of the most favored cultural industries by the Ceaușescu regime as it matched quite well the "amateur twist" imprinted on Romanian culture more intensively after the 1971 Theses and quite definitively by the promotion of the *Cântarea României* Festival since 1976. Folklore in all its forms was officially promoted and safeguarded by the Institute of ethnography and folklore which acted as a preserver of folkloric traditions but "oriented also the development of popular culture"².

Safeguard of Patrimony

The safeguard of the patrimony was discursively declared as important by the Romanian regime as it seen also in the adoption of the Law no 63 of cultural patrimony of 1974³. Gabanyi considers nonetheless that this law served the

"central organs of the party and state in their attempts to evaluate (and sometimes to take into possession) the goods that pertained to the Church, to the cultural institutions of the minorities or to private persons: but it did not determine an improvement of the activity of conservation and restoration"⁴.

This administrative centralization was even followed by a dismantlement of the Direction of the National Cultural Patrimony (DPCN), merged with the economic direction of the CSCE⁵. In the same movement of centralization-decentralization, "the responsibility for the protection of these objectives was passed to the CSCE...the results [being] disastrous" because local resources for "restoration and conservation of historical and architectonic monuments" were not increased but remained limited⁶.

The policy of patrimony preservation was in fact selective during the period of the Ceaușescu regime accordingly to the political goals. One fifth of Bucharest historical buildings⁷ disappeared after 1977 while archeological sites like that of Sarmisegetuza were endorsed as they agreed with the "glorious past" promotion policy.

The institutional infrastructure dedicated to the conservation of architectonic and monumental patrimony was thus silenced in 1977 as it was an obstacle by its opposition to the demolition of historical monuments. As Ioana Iosa recalls, the

¹ *Ibidem* (our transl.).

² Ion Dodu BĂLAN, *La politique...* cit, pp. 42, 58.

³ *Buletinul Oficial*, no 137, November 2nd 1974.

⁴ Aneli Ute GABANYI, *Cultul lui...* cit, p. 133 (our transl.).

⁵ *Ibidem*.

⁶ Gabanyi quotes a report by Suzana Gâdea at the Congress of Culture and Socialist Education (1982) that stated how the tasks of restoration could not be accomplished only at the local level. *Ibidem*.

⁷ Ioana IOSA, *L'héritage urbain de Ceausescu: fardeau ou saut en avant? Le centre civique de Bucarest*, L'Harmattan, Paris, 2006, p. 66.

Commission of Historical Monuments (CHM) created in 1882 was reorganized several times during the period 1948-1989¹. At first, 1950-52 the CHM was replaced by the Scientific Commission for museums, historical and artistic monuments of the RPR Academy and Art Committee (the Committee for cultural establishments and museums and monuments services). Then, between 1952 and 1958, a General Direction of historical monuments was organized inside the State committee for architecture and constructions (CSAC), thereafter transformed into the Department of architecture and urbanism dedicated to the safeguard of historical monuments. Between 1959 and 1974 the CSAC became the State committee for constructions, architecture and planification (and then State committee for culture and art) and inside it there was a Direction of historical and artistic monuments. In the period 1975-1977, a Direction of national cultural patrimony was created in the new Council for socialist culture and education (CSCE). And since 1978 and until 1989, the CSCE granted the "symbolic role" of protection of historical monuments to the Economic and cultural patrimony direction. In fact, since 1981 the direction was blocked because all the necessary funds for patrimony safeguard were absent.

"The irremediable losses of archeological sites, churches, castles, valuable libraries" is deplored by Gabanyi who gives two illustrative examples: the interdiction to visit the historical monasteries of Moldova and the inconsideration for specialized conservations as it seen in the fact that "the collections of the Library of the Romanian Academy [were] deposited all over Bucharest in former stables and small factories"². Thus,

"despite the fact that patriotism and the care for the cultural heritage are among the basic propagandistic slogans of the 'Ceaușescu doctrine', these grand sentiments frequently proclaimed are not, unfortunately, put in practice in what regards conservation and restoration of Romania's cultural goods"³.

This is even truer if we refer to the *systematization project* more clearly set in place after the March 1977 earthquake that harshly affected Bucharest⁴. The project to reorganize Bucharest but also centralize villages into communes was already laid down at the PCR National Conference of 1972 ("Directives regarding systematization of territory of cities and villages for their economic and social development") and a law had been adopted in 1974⁵. The 1977 earthquake favorably provided the occasion to accelerate the plans of systematization – that is the destruction of historical sites and their replacing with the new architectonic project imagined by Ceaușescu.

The safeguard and promotion of patrimony, another task safeguarded by the *Chilean* state is important in the sense of the recuperation of the national essence promoted by the regime (see the Cultural program of 1975). Since 1975

"an active policy of recovery of the national patrimony (saving and restoration of national monuments, organization of historical archives and a policy

¹ *Ibidem*, p. 127.

² Aneli Ute GABANYI, *Cultura lui...cit*, pp. 133-134 (our transl.).

³ *Ibidem*, pp. 132-133 (our transl.).

⁴ The earthquake left behind 1 400 dead and 10 000 victims with more than 250 000 buildings affected. Ioana IOSA, *L'héritage urbain de...cit*, n. 29, p. 47.

⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 21.

of foundation of libraries) is registered and that contrasts with the growing transnational orientation of the mass means of communication"¹.

The policy of the DEC described above also included an active policy of valorization of patrimony in all its activities but most especially by the editing of the "Collections of the DEC" concerning national art. Institutionally, two ministries oversaw the recovery and safeguard of patrimony. The Ministry of Education with the DIBAM (Direction of Libraries, Archives and Museums) and the Council of National Monuments (created in 1925 and reinforced by the Law of national monuments of 1970); in 1982 was created also (as a sub-department of the Museum Department of the DIBAM) a National Center of Conservation and Restoration (helped by private aid of the Foundation Andes since 1988). The Ministry of Public Works comprised the Commission of Patrimony and a Bureau of National Monuments existed inside the Direction of Architecture of the same ministry.

Brief Overview of Post-89 Institutional Developments

Not by any means denying the break brought about by the (re)turn to democracy in 1990 registered in both these countries (and the (re)instatement of the freedom of speech), I am trying at this point to underline the way in which the processes of democratic transition and consolidation should be regarded rather in a continuum with the dictatorial immediate past and not as a definitive break. I argue then there are continuities at least in the institutional realm (not only human related permanencies but also structural ones).

The reform of the Chilean institutional architecture for culture at large lasted over 15 years after the end of the Pinochet regime. The projects of reformulation of the role the state should assume in the national artistic space were imagined by two presidential advisory commissions: the Garretón Commission (1990-1991) and the Ivelic Commission (1996-1998)². Both commissions advanced a proposal imagining a centralized reuniting institution (National Council of Culture and the National Direction of Arts and Culture). In the end, in 2003 (Law 19 891 of June 2003) was established the National Council of Culture and the Arts (CNCA) as a coordinating institution subordinated to the president directing the four specialized councils (National Fund for Cultural and Artistic Development – Fondart, the National Council of Book and Reading, the Council of Development of Music, and the Council for audiovisual development) and acting as a supporter of artistic development and cultural diffusion. What is interesting to acknowledge is the fact that the final institutional project adopted by the Lagos government continues the landmarks advanced by the Pinochet regime. As such, in 1988 a

¹ Anny RIVERA, *Transformaciones...* cit, 108 (our transl.).

² Norma MUÑOZ DEL CAMPO, "La culture...une politique publique? Le cas chilien: La création d'un appareil institutionnel dans un contexte d'après-dictature", *Mémoire de DEA, IHEAL*, Paris, 2005, pp. 12, 37.

commission formed of members of the cultural establishment of the Pinochet regime had advanced a proposal (*Proyecto de Plan Nacional de Desarrollo Cultural*) of cultural centralization that *grossomodo* is safeguarded by the democratic reforms. Most importantly the main institution articulating the post-89 policies of support of artistic creation, Fondart (created in 1992) continues the institution imagined by the 1988 project, FONDEC (National Fund of Culture, 1988-1990). Both institutions rely on the granting of funds to artists for specific projects; the financial support is made possible by financial assignments in the state budget and through private donations¹. What this institution signals is that, although apparently invalidating the previous authoritarian logic (lack of support to artistic activities), the post-89 institutional evolutions only continue to support the same logic always closer to the North American model of artistic articulation. Moreover, the safeguard (protection, conservation and highlighting) of the patrimony has remained under the supervision of the Ministry of Education (and its DIBAM as it has been since 1929).

Romania continued in the 1990s to display an institutional architecture centered on a Ministry of Culture (and Cults since 2000). The ministry supervises all the areas described above: ensure the support of artistic creation, diffusion and extension of the access to culture (through the still important red of public cultural institutions), the safeguard of patrimony and the development of cultural industries (for example the Studio of Cinematographic creation of Bucharest remains under its supervision). Moreover the professional artists' organizations (unions of creation) were transformed after 1990. Thus, by the Law-Decree no. 27 (January 14 1990) these were granted the right to become economically autonomous. These NGOs were declared in 2000 institutions of public utility (OGR no. 26 of 30/01/2000 modified by the Law no 246/2005) that benefit of financial resources granted by the state or local budgets. Thus, although auto-declared as autonomous, non-governmental organizations, the creative unions of artists still rely on public funds for their survival and enjoy an immobile patrimony inherited from the communist state.

¹ Thus, one of the first decisions of the Patricio Aylwin government in 1990 was to promulgate the Law of cultural donations (in fact article 8 of the Law no 18 985 of Fiscal reform of May 1990) better known as "Valdés Law" (honoring its initiator the Christian-Democrat senator Gabriel Valdés). This law guarantees a tax deduction of 50% (reform of 2001) for the donors that support cultural and artistic projects. This law of fiscal exemption has as models the North American laws of 1913 and 1917 (Revenue Act) on revenues and inheritances that had stimulated donations to cultural and artistic projects transforming private persons in active participants to the artistic development of the country. But, even more important, the Valdés Law is situated in the continuation of the measures taken by the Pinochet regime so as to stimulate private donations. Thus, art. 47 of the Law of Municipal Revenues, modified by art. 83 of the Law 18 842 (December 1985) and regulated by the DFL no. 2 (July 1986) authorized contributors to deduct as expenses the donations made to the institutions of support of artistic activities up to 10% of their revenues. The Valdés Law established that the percentage be of 2% of the revenue and 50% of this revenue be exempted of taxes (the remaining 50% being considered as expenses). Luis CATALÁN TORRES, "Ley de Donaciones con fines culturales en Chile: Historia, Hechos y perfil de una tensión no resuelta entre sociedad, tercer sector y Estado", III Encuentro de la Red Latinoamericana y del Caribe de la Sociedad Internacional de Investigación del Tercer Sector: "Perspectivas latinoamericanas sobre el tercer sector", September 2001, Buenos Aires (<http://www.lasociedadcivil.org/uploads/ciberteca/catalan.pdf>), pp. 1, 12-13. (accessed October 23, 3008).

CONCLUSIONS

This article advanced a framework of analysis for studying artistic policies and institutions in modern dictatorships. For this purpose I compared democratic institutions to authoritarian and totalitarian variants so as to underline both their differences and commonalities. In a first stance an appeal to the main characteristics of artistic policies in France and the United States was made so as to situate the poles of this type of action undertaken by a democratic regime. I thereafter briefly presented the model adopted by totalitarian regimes and offered an argument for a future inquiry into authoritarian models of cultural institutionalism. My line of argument continued with the advancement of a framework of analysis so as to decipher the approaches of the regimes of Ceaușescu and Pinochet. Subsequently I presented the historical evolution of the two state architectures of artistic policies.

Moreover, I emphasized the two opposed models of institutionalism: the interventionist model versus the limited role assumed by the state; and I argued that the dictatorial regimes only exacerbated the consecrated national models of cultural institutionalism. The contours of the Romanian artistic institutional model were established by the Dej regime, but in fact the Romanian model had always been a state-interventionist model; the communist regime exacerbated to the maximum an already present tendency. In the same vein, the Pinochet regime did not alter a configuration dominated by a powerful state acting as a privileged actor on the scene of cultural actions. The Chilean model had never seen the centralization of cultural actions but had developed three privileged networks: the state-university and state-municipality system for artistic diffusion and extension and the DIBAM for the safeguard and protection of patrimony. The Pinochet regime delegated parts of the tasks assumed by the first two systems to the market.

The four roles assumed by the state (regulation and administration; diffusion and democratization) were thereafter separated and analyzed comparatively in both contexts. I found that extreme institutional centralization was joined, in the Romanian case, with a diffusion of tasks between multiple overlapping state structures. Additionally a comprehensive red of diffusion institutions was also state-controlled and increasingly concerned with the promotion of amateur art according to the principle of "art for the masses by the masses". For the Chilean case I demonstrated there was a state-articulated institutional structure for the diffusion of artistic activities. The analysis of cultural industries promoted by the two regimes showed the privileged granted to mass-mediated culture whether in the form of televised programs in Chile or in that of cinema and music in Romania. A paradox was found in the manner the Ceaușescu regime proclaimed the safeguard of patrimony and, in practice, disregarded it completely (as the "systematization project" testifies).

Finally, I briefly signaled the paradox of the post-dictatorial state architecture incipient during the Pinochet regime. The Romanian post-89 institutional architecture was but momentarily touched upon, only as an opening for a future in-depth analysis of post-dictatorial practices.

ANNEXES

Annex 1

Roles of the State¹

		Pinochet regime	Ceaușescu regime
Regulator (norms and constraints)		Junta Program Constitution	MAN + Party Congresses' Programs
Administrator (institutions)		Laws on dispenses for donations DE – Ministry of Education; DIBAM (ME); Asesoria Cultural de la Junta; Departamento Cultural de la SGG; DAC (MAE); Secretaria Nacional de Cultura; Comision de Patrimonio; CCC; Fondec (1988)	MAN and its commissions; State Council; Council of Ministers; CSCE; Unions of creation & Associations; Radio-TV; General Union of Syndicates; Ministry of Education and teaching; UTC; Ministry of Tourism; Ministry of defense & Ministry of Interior; UCECOM & CENTROCOOP; Popular Councils of territorial subdivisions
Diffusion/ extension	Production support artistic development – education	1 private domain 1 (modified and restrained)	1 1 (modified and restrained)
	promote cultural industries Books & magazines Cinema Music Artisanship/amateur Radio Television	1 private 0 1 1 0 state owned 1 state owned	1 1 1 1 0
&	Safeguard of patrimony	1 Important DIBAM	1 declared but in fact destroyed and dismantled
Democratization (access) and democracy (cultural diversity – mass and popular)	Promotion of amateur art amateur art schools	0/1	1
	Extension Museums Public theaters & cinemas Public libraries Cultural centers	0/1 private 1 1 1	1extended 1 extended the red 1extended 1 extended

¹ 0 – the regime does nothing; 1 – the regime modifies in some way.

Annex 2

Romanian Evolution of Cultural Institutions¹

Period	Ministry of (when not a ministry I specify)	Persons in charge
1862 -1868	Cults – since 1859 [+ Public Works]	
1868 -1920	Cults and Public Education	
1920 -1930	Cults and Arts (detached from the Ministry of Public Education)	
1932 -1934	Public Education, Cults and Arts	Dimitrie Gusti (and others)
1934-1940	Cults and Arts [+ Public Education (National Education in 1937)]	
1940-1944	Education, cults and arts (National Culture and cults 1941)	Ion Antonescu (1941-1943)
1944-1945	Cults and Arts	
1945-1948	Arts	Mihail Ralea (1945-1946) Ion Pas (1946-1948)
1948-1949	Arts and Informations	Octav Livezeanu (1948-1949)
1949-1950	Arts [Decree no 218 – 23 May 1949]	Eduard Mezincescu (1949-1950)
1950	Committee for Art	Eduard Mezincescu (1950-1952) Nicolae P. Doreanu (1952-1953)
01-10 1953	Committee for Art Committee for Cinematography	Nicolae Bellu; Nicolae Popescu; Doreanu; Nicolae Bădescu
1953-1957	Culture: 5 committees [Cinematography; Art; Radio; Architecture and Constructions; Cultural establishments] & The General Direction of Publishing Houses, Polygraphic Industry, and Book Diffusion of the Council of Ministers	Constanța Crăciun (1953-1957)
1957-1962	Culture and Education	Athanase Joja (1957-1960) Ilie Murgulescu (1960 -?)
Monuments		
1948-9 Superior Commission of Public Monuments		
1950-2 Scientific commission for museums, historical and artistic monuments		
Direction of conservation of monuments (Ministry of Public Works)		
1952 –8 State Committee for Architecture and Constructions (CSAC) – General direction of historical monuments		
1959 – 74 State Committee for Constructions, architecture and systematization		
1975 –7 Direction of national cultural patrimony inside the CSCE		
1978 – 89 Economic and cultural patrimony direction of the CSCE		

¹ The data is incomplete due to a lack of materials. The presented data was collected from different sources, including: Stelian NEAGOE, *Istoria guvernelor României*, Machiavelli, București, 1995; Ion ALEXANDRESCU, Stan STOICA, *România după 1989. Mică enciclopedie*, Ed. Meronia, București, 2005.

1962-1971	State Committee for Culture and Art - Council of Arts (subdivision) + M. of Education	Constanța Crăciun (1962-1965) Pompiliu Macovei (1965-1971) Dumitru Popescu (07.09.1971)
1971-1989	Council for Culture and Socialist Education (president) – + secretary of the CC for ideology and propaganda	Dumitru Popescu (1971-1976) Miu Dobrescu (1976-1979) Suzana Gâdea (1979-1989)
1990-2000	Culture – reorganization of the CSCE (of Cults in 1990 – provisional government)	Andrei Pleșu (1989–1991) Ludovic Spiess (1991-1992) Mihail Golu (1992-1993) Petre Sălcudeanu (1993) Liviu Maior (interim 1993) Marin Sorescu (1993-1995) Viorel Mărginean (1995-1996) Grigore Zanc (1996) Ion Caramitru (1996-2000)
2000-present	Culture and the cults	Răzvan Theodorescu (2000-2004) Adrian Iorgulescu (since 2005)