"GESTION/GESTOR" CULTURAL AS MANAGEMENT/MANAGER IN LATIN-AMERICAN. POSSIBILITIES AND LIMITS IN THE TRANSLATION OF THE CONCEPT.

DRA. MARCELA A. PAÍS ANDRADE
UBA/CONICET

Sociologist and has a PHD on Social Anthropology (University of Buenos Aires -UBA); member of CONICET. Since 2004 she teaches in the Social Sciences School of the UBA, as well as in various undergraduate and graduate seminars. Since 2010, she conducted several research projects in cultural policies and management.

ABSTRACT.

In this paper, from a theoretical perspective, I focus on the difficulty of translating the meaning of the notion "Cultural manager" into what, in Latin America, is understood by "Gestor Cultural". In our countries the concept of "gestión" (management/administration) is strongly associated to administrative and business maters. The concept of "gestor" expresses many connotations, theoretical perspectives about culture, and areas of practice, all of them quite different to the ones implied in the concept of management. The unification of all these tasks under one concept obscures many of the many different ways in which the "gestión cultural" develops at local levels, as well as the different, and sometimes contradictious, cultural meanings that managers give to the term in their daily work.

Keys words: Manager/ Management; Local/Global; Translation of terms.

INTRODUCTION

From a Cultural Studies perspective, this work is part of a larger research that seeks to analyze the different manners in which the notions of cultural management and cultural community are constructed, in the City of Buenos Aires (Argentina). We compare the experiences of cultural management in contemporary Xalapa (Veracruz, Mexico), to track the purposes cultural development policies in Latin America.
In this paper, I focus on the difficulty of translating the meaning "Cultural manager" to what we in Spanish understand by "Gestor Cultural". In Latin-American countries the concept of "gestión" (management/ administration) is strongly associated to administrative and business maters. The concept of "gestor" expresses many connotations, theoretical perspectives about culture, and areas of practice, all of them quite different to the ones implied in the concept of management. The unification of all these tasks under one concept obscures many the many different ways in which the "gestión cultural" develops at local levels, as well as the different, and sometimes contradictious, cultural meanings that managers give to the term in their daily work.
We need to reconsider the possibilities and limits implied in a quasi-literal translation of the notion of "cultural management", in order to set the foundations for a genuine and profound dialogue in this subject with English speaking countries. In other words, we aim to describe and think about the relationship between the global and the local in this matter.
Cultural studies appear as an encouraging field from where to produce theoretical, empirical and political

knowledge, around what we understand by "gestión cultural" (cultural management) and "gestor cultural" (cultural manager) in the different countries. The imagery around the notion of "gestión cultural"- "cultural management" as a field to be developed, discussed, theorized and problematize, turns it into a promising field from where to produce flexible theoretical legitimacy. Cultural Studies provided us with many flexible theoretical and methodological perspectives, but also present many difficulties in use.

We organized this paper around three lines of inquiry. In the first part, we critically describe the "homogenizing" trend we find in international speeches. Even when a large amount of academic work exist today discussing and proposing maps and territories of cultural management in the region (that give greater or lesser value to certain theoretical and territorial references), we need to enable a discussion from our own realities and particular structural conditions. That is why, when aiming to present to the world the different models of "gestión cultural" in Latin America, we cannot easily and directly translate it to "cultural management".

In other words, in recent years, cultural management in Latin America initiated the long and problematic journey of revealing the different (French, English, Spanish and American, among others) and theoretical models of Management imbricate in it. It is, therefore, necessary to characterize these models and see the various ways in which they affected the realities of Latin America. Our hypothesis is that the "Latin American model" is the result of a combination of these hegemonic approaches and debates, producing a notion of cultural management that hides the regional specificities.

The second part describes the different and diverse actors (cultural managers, and management, cultural policy, cultural administration, cultural activism, cultural participants, organizers, promoters, marketer, at local/community level, etc.) involved in cultural management in the region today. The description allows us to consider the influence of invisible international actors present in Latin Americans´ cultural management.

The third parts takes into consideration the need to understand cultural management in Latin America in terms of its purpose and its targets: Who develops cultural management? For whom? With what intentions and serving which interests? And, finally, How?

Given the different values and requests set upon culture and its possibilities, as well as the different historical and social conditions and contexts in which culture has developed, and the meanings gave to it by the different involved locals actors, our conclusion questions the idea of a "sole" definition of cultural management in Latin America.

Stating that definitions of culture include and exclude, implies the idea that groups both see the world and act in it, according to their definition of culture and, in consequence, also the actions/activities/notions they aim to deal with.

Taking into account that Cultural Studies are traversed by disputes and tensions, we need to explore the definitions of cultural management, considering different contexts and perspectives, in order to define what we believe should belong to the radio of cultural management.

Speeches international. Global Cultural Policies for Development: homogeneity.

Development policies that emerge in the late 40s, during the transition towards an economic model of import substitutions, encouraged international organizations in Latin America to promote development trough infrastructure investments. In this period the link between "economic development" and social and political interventions began to be the characteristic of the Latin American states. This period is also characterized by a combination of increasing economic indebtedness and strong state authoritarism in the form of dictatorial governments. These governments were responsible of running several policies focused on economic development. However, in the early 80s, the "third world" showed a widening gap in social and economic inequality that illuminated the inefficiency of these National States to solve their own social problems. In the frame of the capital accumulation crisis begun a new phase, characterized by

increasing market share and new ways of looking at culture as a possible path.
This new ideological basis allowed market liberalization, as well as a State disengagement in matters of economic interventions and investments to boost the development of the most "backward" nations. The hegemonic neoliberal socioeconomic policies that characterize the region[1] in the 90´, was a gradual result of this actions. In this context the last decade of the twentieth century enroll in profound economicist visions of culture, where "cultural"[2] phenomenon began to be seen as priority issues in global political agendas.
At the 26th meeting of the General Conference of UNESCO, held in 1991, an independent World Commission -whose primary objective was to reflect on the binomial development/culture- was created. Its purpose was to search for answers to the cultural needs in a context of global economic development. By the end of the Cold War (which implied strong hegemonic group identities) a new "unified"[3] world emerged. This "unified" world, paradoxically, showed a proliferation of forms of cultural resistance and protection that had been developing for decades by the peoples of the world, and now appear to threaten the social order and global peace[4]. Mere tolerance didn´t seem the right way to solve such situations. The need to build an ethic and certain code of values that form popular daily behavior patterns was agreed. In other words, it was only possible to engage with cultural pluralism under the existence of a close relation between equality and dignity. And this had to be the product of respect for the diversity and multifaceted forces, and the social and cultural developments of the different peoples.
In correspondence to what has been said up to here, a report from the UNESCO[5] (1993) called the "Our Creative Diversity", affirmed the need to think about certain notions: a) sustainable pluralism (referring to the new demands of equality, freedom and recognition, of the exacerbation of national identity and increasing xenophobia, in a context of tension between citizens and migration), b) the need for a culture of peace; c) the absence of a "political economy of dignity "; d) the increasingly strength of the notion of diversity in a context of emerging ethnicities e) appreciation of diversity policies (creating a new global ethic - democracy and protection of minorities as condition for the efficiency of institutions, "social stability" and "peace"), f) multiculturalism valued as "a matter of culture" rather than policy; g) cultural diversity between public and private life; h) public diversity and its linkage with the states.
Therefore, during most of the 90s and early in this century, culture has been seen in terms of production, meaning that (cultural) goods function as a material answer of cultural practice, answering to a new logic on how to understand the culture. This logic is represented in tangible and / or symbolic goods, to be re- signified as a resource (Yúdice, 2002) to achieve certain purposes: citizenship, material access and development, among others.
In this way "managing" culture "for everyone" turns into a responsibility not only of those who know about art, but also about administration and execution of resources. Thus, the notion of "Manager" (administrator, director, manager, meaning the person who manages a company or business, who is responsible for solving the affairs of another person) begins to be used, in our region, to name all those activities responsible for recreating and promoting culture. This hides other characteristics and functions owned by those who promote "cultural democratization" in our countries. The "Promotor Cultural" of the 80 and 90 was synonymous of manager but also of founder, developer, producer; sponsor, developer of a cultural project, etc. In short, he/she was the one who professionally promoted the work of others.

1 In Argentina this period consolidates during the two consecutive presidential periods of Carlos Saúl Menem, between 1989 and 1999. The first difficulty this government faced was an economic crisis with hyperinflation, and decides to introduce several neo-liberal reforms, including the law that authorized the president to privatize state enterprises, all of it according to the Washington Consensus. In the case of Uruguay the dictatorship continued until 1985, and the neo-liberal reforms were held by Julio María Sanguinetti.
2 By "cultural" phenomena we refer to every good, service and/or practice that is (re) produced in/from culture.
3 The fall of Berlins Wall on November 9th of 1989 represent the fall of the communist regimes of Eastern Europe, and with them the bipolar world.
4 In this matter it is interesting to consider Hannah Arendts´ work "*La decadencia de la Nación- Estado y el final de los derechos del hombre en Los orígenes del totalitarismo*" (1981).
5 We reccomend the reading of Susan Wrights´paper "The politization of cultura" (1998).

In this context, during the 90s, the social actor begins to be called "Gestor Cultural" (Cultural Manager) or directly by the English term "Manager". This terms encloses and disguise many different traditions and ways of considering and developing the culture in Latin America[6]. Simultaneously, it is mainly associated to economic and political dimensions, over other fields where the profession is exercised.
Some of the activities and models hidden by the use of the terms "gestor cultural"[7] and "manager" are those related to the socio-cultural and educational recreation, which specifically separate the meanings of "animador" "promotor" and a person managing culture.
It is important to stress that the term "Gestión Cultural" (Cultural Management) began to be used in Latin America in the 80s, as a result of certain experiences in neighborhoods, community groups, governmental and non-governmental organizations, among others, that began to be perceived as cultural activities for the peoples.
It is in this period that the so-called socio-cultural Animadores y Promotores emerge. They came from different disciplines and professions and begin to specialize within the cultural field. A new "cultural worker", whose profile is very determined, and who is not required a specific training, proliferates. Yet, the beginning of the professionalization of this cultural worker can be traced through non-formal education[8] instances, as well as in the strong rise of the cultural promotion work in nongovernmental areas *"In these spaces the figure of the independent cultural promoter, with tasks as diverse as artistic initiation, community work and patrimonial rescue, started to be recognized"* (Molina Roldán, 2010).[9]
We can state that Cultural Management and Socio-cultural animation emerge in the same process of cultural democratization, each of them with its specificities, even when in economic processes and multicultural local cultural policies; they are often mistaken with one another.

CULTURAL INTEGRATION FOR DEVELOPMENT. POLICY/POLICIES: DIVERSITY.

Globalization of economic processes and urban multiculturalism are, indeed, significant factors in the development of "culture" in our contemporary cities. While advances in technological processes are articulated with social remote processes such as work, play, consumption, and so on, the globalized economy has concentrate both the management and its economic benefits in few hands:

6 The strong influence of the notion of Paulo Freires popular education had in Latin America (specially in South America), as well as models that struggle for liberation through pedagogy and leisure, as in Joffre Dumazedier proposal in relation self-affirmation of the subject, and its need of a cultural revolution in terms of the activities developed in spare time, are absolutely disguised under the concept of "manager".

7 Karina Benito (2011) states that cultural management is such a recent discipline as the spaces designated to enjoy cultural proposes in spaces especially designed for it. That is why this contemporary forms of access and contemplation of artistic productions are commonly historized in the form of museums, cultural centres, theaters, cinemas, etc. (Benito, 2011)

8 We understand non formal education as an integrated educational (non lucrative) space where cultural animator and recreation experts produce with a strong influence of popular education. Socio-cultural recreation is conceived as a process in which a community takes a leading role in their own cultural and social development, from a diversity of spheres, including associations, entities and physical persons who use it as an instrument of work for their development form fields such as teaching, research and intervention. In many Latin American states it is held under a number of denominations: sociocultural promotion, spare time and recreation, popular education and community development, among others. Sociocultural recreation is an analytical model of reality which develops methods and techniques for social, cultural and personal change. It is opposed to the American perspective known as "recreacionism", which has pleasure and fun as the main purpose of the ludic and/or cultural activity, and in that ways works as ratification of conformism (Waichman, 1999).

9 *"En estos espacios se comenzaron a visibilizar la figura del promotor cultural independiente, quien tenía como cometido objetivos tan diversos como: la iniciación artística, el trabajo comunitario y el rescate patrimonial, entre sus principales tareas."*(Molina Roldan, 2010)

"*The link between technology, economy, society and urban space is an open, interactive and variable process, because in society of knowledge the global conditions the local, and the electronic flows structure the economy through relations between spatially distant units. Moreover, communication - located as a base of cultural expressions of society and the imagination of individuals- is increasingly globalized from emerging multimedia system, financially and technically controlled by large multinational groups, even when their products are diversified to specific market segments. In this perspective, territorial base cultures tend to seek ways of relating, generally subordinate, with powerful globalized media that make up a communication and symbolic interaction hypertext."* (Graham and Marvin, 1996: 68-69)[10]

In this sense, the "local" acquires specific characteristics as a strategic manager of the "global", in an economic system where productivity and competition come into play in the socio-cultural integration of Latin American cities and in the representation and management of public policies.
Thus, cultural integration in contemporary cities presents different challenges to local institutions. On the one hand, modern democratic society must combine different identities that coexist in the same space-territory and on the other, hold, develop or create a local identity:

"The existence of a political-cultural denominator that brings together the local community is necessary to avoid fragmentation into individuals and family units that compete with each other, and locate partially against global flows of power and wealth. The large conurbation, the main form of settlements in the immediate future, brings together individuals and groups with diverse cultural references and behavior patterns. Consequently, if a system of social and cultural integration, that respects differences and establish codes of communication between different cultures, is not promoted, tribalism will emerge as the counterpart of local universalis" (Delgado, 1999: 24)[11]

Given this, issues regarding the representation and management of local politics, which have been strengthened at the expense of legitimate institutions and representations of the nation state during the 90s, are of fundamental interest. Being that administrative and financial dependence of local governments to national states is strong, it is also true that their power and resources to control global economy and politic are very limited. If the '90s were signed by the "incorporation" of the populations to massive consumption, the current decade is characterized by the "culturalization" of that consumption.
In this new scenario, cultural policies turn into areas of consideration and action in relation to other social rights. It is precisely in this relationship where inequality is produced. This tension reflects both the need of a regional constitution, as well as the need to respect and ensure the citizens' rights, in a social space characterized by its cultural diversity embodied in the current globalization process (Bayardo and

10 *"La articulación entre tecnología, economía, sociedad y espacio urbano constituye un proceso abierto, variable e interactivo, porque en la sociedad del conocimiento lo global condiciona lo local y los flujos electrónicos estructuran la economía a partir de relaciones entre unidades espacialmente distantes. Más aún, la comunicación – ubicada como base de las expresiones culturales de la sociedad y el imaginario de los individuos- está crecientemente globalizada a partir del emergente sistema multimedia controlado financiera y técnicamente por grandes grupos multinacionales, a pesar de que sus productos se diversifiquen para segmentos específicos del mercado. En esa perspectiva, las culturas de base territorial tienden a buscar formas de relación, generalmente subordinadas, con potentes medios de comunicación globalizados que configuran un Hipertexto de la comunicación y la interacción simbólica.(Graham and Marvin, 1996:68-69)*

11 *"(...) es pertinente la existencia de un denominador político-cultural que aglutine a la sociedad local para no fragmentarse en individuos y unidades familiares que compitan entre sí y se sitúen de forma parcial frente a los flujos globales del poder y la riqueza. La gran aglomeración urbana, forma predominante de los asentamientos en un futuro inmediato, congrega individuos y grupos con muy diversos referentes culturales y patrones de comportamiento. En consecuencia, si no se promueve un sistema de integración social y cultural que respete las diferencias y establezca códigos de comunicación entre las distintas culturas, el tribalismo local será la contrapartida del universalismo local." (Delgado, 1999:24)*

Lacarrieu, 1995).
What we have previously stated implies the production of new social actors. Argentina's National Constitutional Reform (1994), incorporated the International Civil and Political Rights Covenant (1966) and the International Economic, Social and Cultural Rights Covenant (1966). In these Covenants, cultural policies are explicitly manifested as part of human rights, based on the State's obligation to ensure access and participation of all citizens in culture, obliging it to provide opportunities for all to enjoy the moral and material benefits that involve the artistic, scientific and intellectual developments.[12]
In other words, we are seeing cultural policies as public policies designed to build culture as a political and symbolic resource. In other words, that aims to produce discourses that legitimate forms of political action and citizenship, in a scenario where "culture" has become an economic resource for our cities. George Yúdice (1999) argues that, in a globalized world, policies and cultural practices are the arena of permanent negotiation between the original or traditional identities, and those shaped by trans-nationality, which has as a result some new, autonomous and flexible forms of cultural identity . Currently,

"(...) there are numerous definitions of "culture," starting with the high arts, through the heritage of a nation, spreading to the production and distribution industry, printed or electronically mediated, entertainment and all kinds of international communications, to the most abstract and inclusive anthropological description, meaning all practices and institutions that contribute formally or informally, through symbolic representation or reprocessing of material structures, to the creation of meaning and also the configuration of beliefs, values , ideas and social arrangements. It should be added that the processes of globalization have highlighted the value of culture, in every sense here mentioned, not only as consolidation of a national identity, or as guard of status ("gatekeeping"), but as one of the main economic and social development resource. Globalization consists in local alterations (...) that redesign the symbolic geography of a city or region, as well as the nation they belong to, with implications for the social, political and even economic spheres. (Yúdice, 1999: 2)[13]

In other words, hegemonic perspectives on the link between development and culture have been designed and implemented from cultural policies for worldwide development. In different spaces and territories these perspectives have tensed, designing certain characteristics and specific ways of execution, expected "results", as well as various ways of understanding the figure of the "gestor" (manager) and "gestión cultural" (cultural management).
Therefore, the different and diverse actors currently involved in cultural management in the region (Cultural management, cultural policy, cultural administration, cultural activism, cultural participator, organizers, promoters, marketer, etc.), need to be identified and named. This description allows us to show that Latin American cultural management perspective includes "invisible" international actors.

12 International Pact on Civil and Political rights: available in http://www2.ohchr.org/spanish/law/ccpr.htm International Pact on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights: available in http://www2.ohchr.org/spanish/law/cescr.htm

13 ...*existen numerosas definiciones de "cultura," empezando por las artes cultas, pasando por el patrimonio de una nación, extendiéndose a la producción y distribución industrial, impresa o electrónicamente mediatizada, de entretenimiento y todo tipo de internacionales. comunicaciones, hasta la más abstracta e inclusiva descripción antropológica que atañe a todas las prácticas e instituciones que formal o informalmente contribuyen, mediante la representación simbólica o la reelaboración de estructuras materiales, a la creación del sentido y a la vez a la configuración de creencias, valores, ideas y arreglos sociales. Habría que añadir que los procesos de globalización han puesto de relieve el valor de la cultura, en todas las acepciones glosadas aquí, ya no sólo para la consolidación de una identidad nacional, o para custodiar la posición social ("gatekeeping"), sino como uno de los recursos principales del desarrollo económico y social. La globalización consiste en alteraciones a nivel local (...) que redibujan la geografía simbólica de una ciudad o región y de la nación a que pertenecen, con repercusiones en las dimensiones sociales, políticas y hasta económicas.* (Yúdice, 1999: 2)

WHO? FOR WHOM? WHAT FOR? AND, HOW?

In continuity with the challenge in the creation of the World Commission on Culture and Development in 2005[14], in its 33rd session, the General Conference of UNESCO presents 10 keys to protect and promote diversity in/of cultural expressions. The Commission failed, however, to consider certain relevant issues that become visible when managing cultural diversity: What diversity are we discussing about? Who speaks of diversity? Who needs diversity?

In previous work (Molina Roldan and País Andrade, 2011, 2013) we have seen how, already in the 1993 Report of the World Commission on Culture and Development entitled: Our Creative Diversity (which is still an important document in the Latin American cultural discourse), the complexity in the term "development" was already highlighted. Also in regards to that document, many different voices proclaimed that this concept could not only stick to economic progress, but should also ensure the dignity and welfare of all human beings. However, since approximately the year 2000, Latin American context starts to criticize these "idealizations" of the UNESCO, which resulted in different cultural policies for our peoples. At national level these guidelines started to be challenged, by the creation of different ways of understanding and managing cultural development (from existing models), as well as its links with cultural diversity or cultural pluralism[15].

The most relevant aspects of the Latin American debates focus on a number of questions: Who is understanding the development? How? For whom? Who displays it? Who should developed it? And anyway, how? And, whose interest is served in understanding development in Latin America from the international homogeneous perspective of cultural diversity.

It is at this point when, once again, we have to reconsider the role of the "Gestión cultural" (Cultural Management) and its actors: Where are they trained? Whom by? What for? What should they know? What is the purpose?

The research cited above (Molina Roldán and País Andrade, 2013), shows that the training of cultural managers in Latin America, have as common denominator, a disconnection between speech and practices in regards to the notion of development, the idea of culture for development, and the concept of cultural development. In this sense studies analyzing training programs, interviews, etc., show the tension between managers practices and their ignorance and poor consideration on laws, documents and cultural policies, all of them key tools in there own daily tasks, as well as in their models for transmitting culture to which they stick or not. And yet it is clear the need to use these tools when presenting their own projects, justify their work, etc. Simultaneously, from different academic centers in Latin America and with different perspectives, there is an increasingly number of case studies whose object is to reveal the invisible power relations linking diversity, inequality, culture, development, management, access, and public space. At the same time they try to question the role played by our states in this complex web which seems to blur the power dynamics "from above", and the possibilities and limits we find when it comes to the models they want to "impose". What is the reason for this? Do we agree or disagree? And above all, what is we reproduce and, in the

14As a standard generator the *UNESCO has established various international legal instruments related to the four areas of cultural diversity: cultural and natural patrimony, mobile cultural property, intangible cultural patrimony, and contemporary creativity. There has been seven conventions: 1. Universal Convention on Authors rights (1952, reviewed in 1971); 2. Convention on Protection of Cultural Patrimony, the case of armed conflict (1954) (first protocol in 1954, second protocols in 1999); 3. Convention on Means to forbid the illicit importation, exportation and transference of properties and goods. ; 4. Convention on Cultural and Natural world Patrimony Protection (1972); 5. Convention on subaquatic patrimony protection (2001); 6. Convention of Protection of immaterial cultural Patrimony (2003); 7. Convention on Protection and Promotion of Diversity of Cultural Expressions (2005).*

15Understanding cultural diversity as a coplex and tense concept that should be displayed in a contextual and relational way.

best of cases, what is it we, as social scientists, promote from our own spaces?
It is worth mentioning that in this context, the cultural manager ends up working with the "emergency" of / in specific situations, taking hand of the training that certain available institutions, that have not yet (trans)form or adapt, and reproduce "imported" knowledge and management models (from the U.S., Spain, France, etc.), without criticize, and without any local knowledge production. For that reason, the stresses between nations and prevailing models of culture and cultural policies often occur "outside" the field of cultural management.
The need to "manage" culture is a response to the neoliberal policies of the last decades, and in that sense, the term of "gestor cultural" (cultural manager) is a product of this same phenomenon. Knowing this, should each professional intervening on cultural matters explicit his o her position and assumptions of the task, o could he o her develop this activity uncritically? The complexity lies precisely in the multiple dimensions that challenge the cultural field. However, we believe that at this point there are other macro social problems that reveal the need to (re) consider the "gestores" (managers) as part of a socio-political process: what are the reasons of each nation / region / state for developing "gestores culturales" (cultural managers)?, what is expected from them?, who pays their salaries and projects?, who do they depend on?, is this training looking for an "elitisation" or "democratization" of culture?
Finally, we add the issues and challenges that represent the construction of the adequate categories, methods and ethics to research the cultural phenomena. It is precisely this embedded social network that allows us to observe, reflect and explain cultural management from specific positions, and understand the social complexities in which it is immersed. It is therefore impossible to speak of "gestores culturales" (literal translation of cultural managers) as a homogeneous group. It is necessary to observe their heterogeneity, their places of study, of daily work, as well as their individual training, the meaning they give to their actions, their models and the interests that come into play among many more.
We have examined the possible variants developed to manage culture in Latin America, as well as a number of perspectives that reflect the actions implied in this "management". We can´t speak of a single model of cultural management in Latin America, and, in these sense, it seems that the literal translation from the English term "Cultural Management" will disguise all the discussions and tensions that have displayed in this work.

AS A CONCLUSION

This theoretical reflection questions the idea the there is "one" Latin America that shares fully a working definition of cultural management. Given the different historical, social, conditions and contexts in which culture has developed, as well as the meanings given to culture by the different involved locals' actors, and the different values and requests set upon culture and its possibilities, this could never be true.
The definitions of cultural can include or exclude different areas, activities, actions, etc., with consequences to groups of cultural diversity. For that reason we urge to identify the notions of "cultural" phenomena used by the different social actors.
We need to explore definitions of "gestión cultural" (cultural management) from different perspectives, and decide what aspects; activities and phenomena we consider are included in the radio of cultural management.
The focus of Cultural Studies is constantly challenged by their many disputes and tensions within their own field of action, as well as from the outside.

REFERENCES

Arizpe, L. (coord.). 2006. Retos culturales de México frente a la Globalización. México: Cámara de Diputados y Miguel Ángel Porrúa.

García Canclini, N. 2005. Todos tienen cultura. ¿Quiénes pueden desarrollarla? Washington: Conferencia para el Seminario sobre Cultura y Desarrollo en el Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo.

Grossberg, L. 2009. "El corazón de los estudios culturales. Contextualidad, construccionismo y complejidad". Tabula Rasa, no10, p. 13-48.

Grossberg, L. 2010. "Pecados de los estudios culturales". Estudios culturales. Teoría, política y práctica. Valencia: Letra capital, p. 55-105.

Hall, Stuart. [1992] 2010. "Estudios culturales y sus legados teóricos". Sin garantías. Trayectorias y problemáticas en estudios culturales. Popayán-Lima-Quito: Envión Editores-IEP- Instituto Pensar- Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar, p. 51-72.

Jiménez, L. 2006. Políticas culturales en transición. Retos y escenarios de la gestión cultural en México. México. CONACULTA. Fondo Regional para la Cultura y las Artes Zona Sur. Col. Intersecciones no 12.

Mariscal Orozco, J. L. 2010. "Emergencia de la formación universitaria en gestión cultural: conceptos, modelos y retos". Tercer Encuentro Nacional de Difusión Cultural (ENDICU). Universidad del Claustro de Sor Juana.

Mato, D. 2003. "Actores sociales transnacionales, organizaciones indígenas, antropólogos y otros profesionales en la producción de representaciones de "cultura y desarrollo". Políticas de identidades y diferencias sociales en tiempos de globalización, Daniel Mato (coord.). Caracas: FACES.

Molina Roldán, Ahtziri. 2010. "La Gestión Cultural en América Latina Motivos y realidades." Negrón, Bárbara y María Inés Silva (Editoras) Políticas Culturales: Contingencia y Desafíos Santiago, Observatorio de Políticas Culturales/LOM Ediciones. Colección de Observatorio de Políticas Culturales. no 1. p. 177-184
Ochoa, A. M. 2005. "Arte, cultura, violencia: las políticas de la supervivencia". Diversidad Cultural y Desarrollo Urbano, Organización: Mónica Allende Serra, San Pablo, Brasil: Iluminuras-Arte Sem Fronteiras.

País Andrade, M. 2011. Cultura, Juventud, Identidad: una mirada socioantropológica del Programa Cultural en Barrios. - 1a ed. - Buenos Aires: Estudios Sociológicos Editora.

País Andrade, M. y Molina Roldán, A. (Comp.). 2013. Cultura y desarrollo en América latina. Actores, estrategias, formación y prácticas. 1° edición, Buenos Aires, Argentina: Ediciones Cooperativas.

Romero Cevallos, R. 2005. "¿Cultura y Desarrollo? ¿Desarrollo y Cultura? Propuestas para un debate abierto". Cuadernos PNUD, Serie Desarrollo Humano Nro. 9. Lima: PNUD.
Waichman, P. 1999. Tiempo libre y Recreación: un desafío pedagógico. Buenos Aires: Ediciones PW. Wright, S. 1998. "La Politización de la cultura". BOIVIN, M.; A. ROSATO y V. ARRIBAS Constructores de otredad. Antropofagia, Buenos Aires, p. 128-141.

Yáñez, C. 2011. Enfoques y Tendencias de la Gestión Cultural en América Latina, Inédito.

Yúdice, G. 2002. El Recurso de la Cultura. Usos de la cultura en la era global, Barcelona, España: Gedisa Editorial.