

The Cultural Management Philosophy

Winston Licona Calpe

Principal Teacher
Universidad del Rosario.

Rodrigo Velez B.

Teacher
Universidad del Rosario

Winston Licona Calpe, PhD on Economics, Praga, is Principal Teacher, researcher and consultant in Cultural administration and intercultural Issues at University Universidad del Rosario. Administration Faculty.

Rodrigo Velez B. is Philosopher, Magister in Administration, Colombia. University Universidad del Rosario. He is Director of Researches at the Administration Faculty; Teacher, researcher and consultant in Cultural Administration and Intercultural Issues.

Abstract

In this paper the epistemic elements of the cultural management are developed as new discipline characterized by its deep sense of transversality with relation to the economic activity in general and to the activities, behaviors and social and cultural expressions. It shows the strategic importance of the subject in the world of negotiations as a factor of competitive differentiation and field of managerial application in order to contribute in the everlasting of the nations. In synthesis, it defines the cultural administration or management and justify it as disciplinary field for the research, the tuition and the extension.

Keywords

Cultural management, strategic thinking, management, contexts, global, local.

Introduction: Theoretical Perspectives

The philosophical reflection in its epistemological dimension is useful to establish the lost paradigms of administration and culture at present. In this way a critical position is assumed about the simple way of how these themes have been discussed and the pragmatic consideration of administration and culture topics.

Through conceptual revision of administration and cultural empirical studies; relations are established between these two aspects. To foresee the strategic character of the cultural administration to globalization times, negotiation and competitive differentiation.

Speeches and administration cultural applications are compared. Based on this, a process to generate research, knowledge and build a human capital training process at post-graduated level is generated, to organizations and cultural companies intervene in their construction of cultural products with branding country.

This paper is integral part of the project: Strategic Analysis of the Cultural Sector for a Strategic Administration of the Culture.

1. The Meaning of the Cultural Administration

The cultural administration is a disciplinary field of vital importance for the countries, their organizations, institutions, communities and persons.

The acknowledgment of the discipline of the administration as field of the knowledge and of the social action is a characteristic fact in the history of the XX century, because of its contribution in the structurization and increase of the prosperity of the nations. Its importance is based on the power it confers to a nation, organization, community or individual, to relate itself in a global and local way; therefore, the social competitiveness, economic and cultural, depends in great measure of the capacity of the public and private organizations to direct themselves and to manage themselves. The administration means competition to guide itself as a project, guaranteeing the efficiency in the usage of the resources available. This concept that integrates the strategic thinking and the management guided to the improvement of the persons, the organizations, the communities and the nations.

In the field of the culture, this discipline has been integrated for the reflection and construction of policies and strategies, since that the culture as field of action entrepreneurially organized is an economic field of activity that demands its research and academic process of professional training. This means, the need and the possibility of the disciplinary consolidation of the cultural administration that allows the human and intellectual capital able to prospect the strategic sceneries to efficiently administrate the cultural resource of the countries in contexts of regulated interculturality.

A brief history: From Robert Owen (1813) until Edward Deming (1982) Europe and Northamerica have worked intensively and interestedly to develop an administrative knowledge able of supporting the achievement of the projects of nation and of society in their cycles of de-re construction; by means of the integration of the scientific ideal to the work and to the enterprise (F.W Taylor 1890 and Fayol in 1906) as social means of everlasting sense and of growth (P. Drucker, 2004) in frames of quality, competition (M. Porter, 2004) and civility (A. Cortina, 1995); and in changing sociocultural environments of diverse social formations of strategic emergency (H. Mintzberg, 2003) that request a recreation and transformation of the disciplinary paradigms of the productivity and the boarding of a creative thinking, imaginative and strategic.

The management became characteristic or cultural trace of the northamerican life, instrument and social competition in their productive systems, object of the system of educational market of post gradual level as it is seen in the long tradition of the MBA programs and recently of the PhD programs, the continued courses, plus the great projects of problems and fields of the disciplinary research of the consultancy related with this knowledge. In the same way, the scope of this discipline was reflected in Europe, Asia and India; lately it came to the countries of the third world, as an indispensable tool for the purposes of progress.

The administration as a discipline is taken as important academical field for the national development, for the prosperity, for the economic permanence and preeminence; it is also

assumed as a factor of competitiveness of country and constituted by associated states to a strategy of expansion and world leadership. It is also the same for those countries, enterprises, institutions and multiple associations as a sure way in the improvement of the standards of life, of progress, of going out of the backwardness, and social reculturization, specially commercial and economic.

The concept of management came from the imaginary and pragmatic cosmovision or northamerican origin, european and asiatic specially along the history of the world wars of the XX century, which theoretical and methodological ideals answer to the need of the useful as justificative argument of their pretensions. This had the meaning, nevertheless, of a profit for mankind as long as it is evident the roll of the strategic and managerial thinking as of principal importance into the socio economic political and cultural reconstruction; a social achievement in the search for the ideals of the economic and administrative rationality, of the democracy and of the freedom of action in function of the quality of life.

In this sense, administration had the meaning of management which function in itself consisted in surveying for the productivity, the efficiency and the improvement; the function of direction and strategic action is a disciplinary field which appearance is given from the second half of the XX century. In the northamerican tradition, the management was linked to the idea of managerial administration as an exclusive action to guarantee the results specially of economical kind in games of yields and going far from the non economic results and with vision of the short-term and speculative usage of the entrepreneurial resources.

“the concept of development only associated to the presumptions of the economic thinking reduced to the logics of the present market is unsustainable. The logic of the modern capitalism has as fundamental premise the acculturation, the change and the cultural manipulation. The contemporary capitalism –that of the treaties and agendas negotiated for the commercial interaction, keeps its differences with the modern liberal pattern. Nowadays the societies are regulated by the market, not only by the logics of the capital, the communities of consumers with their big organizations establish game rules to protect their interests, at last, it is the culture the decisive center of the transactional interactions. The culture is now a strategic tool of the market, as the heterogeneity and the appearance of identity claims increase considerably the niches of market; acculturating and unculturizing generates potential of yield, turning any human demand into potential product of usage and consumption.

The comprehension of the culture as cross relation of integral development, supposes the corresponsibility and the autonomy of the civil society and all their communities and organizations to get culturally empowered and to overcome the assistencialism and the marginality as it appears in the reiterated recommendations of forums and world conferences that deal on the creative diversity (1996), to the cultural policies for the development (1998), the protocolary statements of good intentions of the heads of states and regions (2000-2004). The effect of this matrixial conception of culture allows the articulation of cultural policies, social and economic policies harmonized in function of the systemic integral development sustainable, that are concreted in cultural sectors in chains holders of the Gross Internal Product –PIB- and Cult Internal Product –PIC-. Of economic and social utility or profit.

This leads to an intervention of the cultural sector that allows a reconversion not only economic-industrial, but politic-socio-cultural from the organizations in which all the agents cooperate and the social actors of culture country-city-community-individual-region. The

cultural activities have not a dispersed sense, isolated, forgotten, intervened-manipulated; these are in chain into a strategic purpose that integrate persons, enterprises, governments, markets. Strategic purpose that is the integral for the utopy of the happiness or for the so longed sustainable increase of the quality of life.

In the cultural administration there is the possibility of the societies for the development of the social capital (Kliksberg) which is in itself the value culture has which connotation keeps direct relation with the affairs of human rights, of tolerance, of fatherland, of identity; which is equal to the construction of relations for a common language not as uniformity but as understanding and comprehension, being figurative, it is construction of love. It is the power of brand and relation of the culture it is branding country.

2. The Administration or Management for the New Contexts: from the Concept of Management to the Cultural Administration in the Intercultures

An integral definition of the administration includes the formation in direction and strategic thinking plus the management of the productivity of the organizations and enterprises of the sector of the culture.

The administration is one of the cultural competitions more important of the advanced societies and so called industrialized and post industrialized. As strategic know how for the survival is so ancient as the mankind itself; as management is a proper invention of the societies that set themselves to incorporate this subject in their agendas of project; already entered the modern world which temporary limits are established between the renaissance and our days, in Europe and America, the management found a place to constitute itself in social organ in charged of guaranteeing the productivity and the prosperity necessary to deal with leadership in an economy every time more competitive and complex.

The administration is one of the fundamental tools of such development of the historic spirit of the nations in their way to survival, expansion, dominion, and competition, cooperation and association. It can be seen in the historic cronicas of the administrative social science at the end of the XIX century and along the XX century.

Today, in the times of the glocal economy given through the dynamic of the negotiations is the culture a cross axe in the agendas of the negotiation assuming the form of branding country, economic block, territory, locality, identity, possibility and need of difference, condition of any interaction and transaction; establishing thus a necessary relation with the administrative capacity of a country with respect to its culture, since it is strategic resource of difference for the negotiated exchange and agreed as general rule of the game. The present age can be characterized in general terms like the age of the cultural administration, it means, not only of the service of the ad-ministraere, function of serving, but also and primly of being the instrument of the projects of individual lives, familiar, groupals, communitary, nationals, internationals, regionals, globals, and then of course glocals.

The culture as expressive symbolic dimension (Bell, 1989), as it is included in the explicative speech of the new dynamic of the capitalism, since the years 60's, it is the contradictor motor of the separated environments of the societies before their complements like the technoeconomy and the politics, by that of the hedonism assumed as modern creed (selfrealization of the I), it has broken its comprehension to be not only sciencetechno of

the societies, but also a new reconfiguring reading, systemic, transversal or factor that becomes in the base of the strategic thinking and the management of the sustainable productivity. The culture generates aggregate value in the societies and therefore as Yudice says (2002)¹, the culture in the contemporaneity is resource and therefore, object of transaction, we would say, object that becomes in economic dynamic acknowledged that requires challenges of administration. For instance, the faculties of administration, business and management, dealt with the cultural sector, only until well passed the years 70's, showing their ignorance as economic contributing activity of aggregate value and as transcendent social resource in the logic of the glocal competitiveness.

The administrative rationality of the massive consumption and the ideal of the enterprise become object of reconstruction in the cultural activity. Since the cultural includes particularly a complex framework of expressions and demonstrations that go from the creation until the consumption of goods and services that result to be in each of their components, of great importance in the ensemble of the economies and the social developments. For an illustration the following map identifies the complexity of the sector, according with the classification of Alfons Martinel ², and allows to illustrate the field of professional formation related with the cultural activity, thus as the dimension of the entrepreneurial design and of administration of such activities.

Table 1

Sectors, Environments and Fields of Action of the Cultural Management	
Sector of patrimony:	museums, files, libraries, hemeroteques, filmoteques, phonoteques, etc
Sector of the scenic Arts:	Theaters, opera, dance, circus.
Sector of the Plastic Arts:	Galleries, Expositions, Criticism, museums, handicrafts
Sector of Music and phonographics:	Auditoriums, festivals, circuits, phonographic industry, specialized rooms.
Sector of Literature and the edition:	Festivals, awards, editorials, spreading and sale
Sector of the Audiovisual Arts:	Radios, Television, audiovisual production.
Fields of the territorial cultural management of generalized character:	Municipal management, cultural centers, civic centers, local programs, general services, social participation.
Fields of the cultural management in enterprises of rendering generalist services:	Enterprises of infrastructure, deputed management, rendering special services.
Field of cultural management in the sector of participation popular culture and traditional culture:	Popular feasts: Folk-lore, traditional associationism.
Field of emergent sectors that have relation with culture:	Tourism, Employment, Territorial development, social cohesion, Multiculturality.
Fields of relations and the international cultural cooperation:	Euroamerican projects, International cooperation, Internationalization of projects.
Responsibles of administrative, economical and labor projects:	Administrative and Economic Directors of Cultural services, Administrative managers of big cultural institutions, Specialists on commercialization and management of incomes, Responsible of human resources of big cultural organizations.

Sectors, Environments and Fields of Action of the Cultural Management	
Responsibles of image, communication and marketing:	Responsibles for image, publications and diffusion campaigns: Public relations and press, Services of Care to the public, programs to special groups, Sales of entrances and commercialization of products.
Responsibles of big thematic institutions:	Directors of big institutions; museums, theaters, artistical centers, Responsibles of centers of production and research, Artistical directors with responsibility of management.
Programmer – Planifier of cultural events:	Sectorial responsibles, Responsibles for campaigns and programs, Responsibles for equipments and artistical projects, Managers of middle size organizations.
Generalists technicians of cultural management:	Cultural responsibles of small and middle size municipalities, Responsibles for polyvalent equipments, Managers of diverse programs and services.
Technicians, animators of programs and cultural services:	Technical responsible of actions of an equipment, program or service, Responsible for projects of territorial action, Responsible of the dinamization of specific collectives.
High executives of the big cultural policies:	Directors and High executives of the service of culture of big public administrations, Managers of organisms and autonomous consortiums of culture, High executives of Foundations and cultural enterprises.
Source: Alfons Martinel, 1996	

The culture as a complex expressive activity is concreted in the diversity of products and from multiple interrelated sectors that compose it and that go related in each of the components of the productive chain: creation, production, distribution, circulation and consumption. The cultural administration is a field of intellectual work, it is to say a field for the research in the scientific and pedagogic fields of the development of social capital and human, from the culture as a fundament. It not only includes the study of the subject but also integrates, the formation of professional administrators of the culture with interdisciplinary focus, strategists and entrepreneurs of the cultural activity as key of the development, able to administrate strategically the wealth and the cultural and social capital (Kliksberg, 2000). Administration means strategic thinking and productive management and entrepreneurial under fields of creativity.

The strategic thinking in the cultural administration is invested of great importance in times of innovation, the transformation of the knowledge and the unpredictable changes are accelerated. Where the innovation does not consist in entering into the ideologic boom and consumerist of the moment, but in the appropriation of the accumulated and a contextualized knowledge and pertinent. The knowledge as theoretical as the epistemic and political pretensions of the same, as the practical knowledge that feeds the experience, constitute basic elements of the administrative thinking. Their strategic character derives from the comprehension of the historic times and the social spaces to which its performance is focused as lasting process and not as temporary event and efimerous of its structuring force of the social.

The productivity and the entrepreneuring are one, concepts or variables more problematic of the economic social system and above all cultural, by the game of interests on the results obtained and the investment of the resources for different intentionalities. It is to be

part of the circuits generators of symbolic value, of value of usage and of change, where there is a generation of products for the market of the interculturalities as different experiences and besides an application of an apprenticeship and generation of knowledge or expertise accumulated that dinamizes the cycles of the productive apparatus and of the social interrelation as object of the management it directs, organizes and executes the different resources, it is not only in the sense of generation of product with its profit incorporated; it is also the function that aggregates cultural and economic value to the social relations among the nations in an environment of interculturality, despite the fact of being asymmetric.

3. The Culture as Field of Action of Strategic Character for the Countries

The strategic study of the cultural sector as transversal variable or cross variable of the socio economic and politic activity, is factor of construction of advantage for the negotiation in the agendas of exchange and social interaction in todays world; in which the interactions and the human relations are regulated in high degree as it appears in the national constitutions, the regional agreements, the international conventions, the statements and bi multilateral agreements under local and global scale. In these sceneries the culture emerges as patters of intervention for the construction of the integral development that relates the political, the economical and the social, and of course the cultural in itself; at the same time that it establishes as instrument of protection of the national and international interests.

A strategic focus of the culture and of the development for the sustainable integrity, implies for all the actors:

- Generation of knowledge on the contextual configurative situation of the sector and the cultural subsectors that allows the identification and administration of the competitive potential of these.
- Construction of the micro from the chaining of the organizations, enterprises and actors of the cultural activity to dinamize the managerial competencies required beyond the quantifications and generic classifications and internationally required and accepted (CIIU, sectorial national studies that establish the participation of the culture in the constitution of the PIB)
- Retrofeeding of experiences and refining of modes and models of social construction of the culture and of the integral development.

A strategic focus of the culture and development may be understood at the light of an equation in which it is integrated the relation of the culture and the development, with the sense of the human happiness, reflected in the growing increment of the equitative quality of life, as follows:

Culture Development = increment growing level of quality of life --- equitative sustainable

Where:

Culture = persons + community + locality + city + region + state + globalization

Development = political freedom + services economic services+social opportunities + guarantees of transparence + protector security (Amartya Sen)

Growing level of quality of life = satisfaction of the needs + country productivity + welfare

Equitative sustainable = redistribution of equitative of the wealth + level of happiness + investment and re investment + integral viability.

The culture as field of socioeconomic activity of strategic order not only guarantees the construction of the Gross Internal Product but also assures the Cultural Internal Product in personal sense, community, local, of citizenship, regional, national, worldly. Necessary condition in the interaction among countries.

4. The Imaginaries and Horizons of Action of the Culture in Contexts of Global Administration

An agenda of work for the cultural managers that try for the integral development thus conceived, it is possible by means of actions allowing the reflection on the strategic potential of the cultural activity holder of the difference sense to the economic production itself. Its sectorial reconfiguration.

The culture is a matter of national security, is critical theme in the economic blocks and of the societies of treaties and negotiated agreements and it is present in times of conflict within the commercial wars. As spirit it is development and this as culture itself is strategy that meand beyond the survival and the imaginable socioeconomic growth. The culture as strategic variable of the countries beyond the globalization has influences that transcend conjuncture of the geopolitical-cultural architecture of the planet.

The characteristics of the societies and economies in a context of global administration find in the cultural arguments and products that give power of negotiation to the countries and their communities, enterprises and organizations. Before this, the administration provides imaginaries and horizons that build sceneries of specific transactions of strategic development of the sectors of cultural activity as the most important factor of the life of nations, on one side, and it forms strategist professionals of the cultural (constructors of policies = strategic thinking), productive managers of the activity intra-multi-sectorial of the cultures as economic activity that generates wealth and contributes to the quality of life and the lasting of the nations on the other side.

The competitive advantages of the nations have in the culture administration an affair of internal agenda and external agenda for the metric in the politics, in the economics and in the management of the social life and of course in the cultural in the game of the symbolic asymmetric and hegemonisant markets; for instance “in the United States of North America, the industry of the entertainment is which exports the most after the aerospace industry. According to the newspaper the Economist, the growth at long term, due in part to the liberalization of the radio and of the television, as well as the commercialisation of the institutions of the cultural sector at world scale, it will be kept around the 10% yearly, it means higher than in many other industrial sectors and commercial sectors” Unesco. 1996)³.

The disbalance among conceptualizers and negotiators before the actors and promoters of the culture is visible, before which the State and the social organizations develop initiatives and processes of several magnitudes and scopes that impact the strategic assumption of the culture as holder of branding country.

In an exploration of the concept of branding country, for instance, we can outline a Natural Uruguay. This branding country besides being supported by the government in a decree or law and as a scenery that it is not only a private enterprise but above all a construction of public home, summons all the national efforts in a project of State at the manner of Daniel Bell (1989). Then Uruguay is denominated Natural Uruguay expressed in logo and seal. Argentina in past july launched its branding country promoted by its president Kirshner as means to encourage the moral sense of this society before the debates and social economic catastrophic happenings, and product of recommendations of the international organizations. Despite its apparent novelty, the term is old as it is reflected in Spain, Italy, France; at this respect it is good to outline the way as catalans have sold themselves in Barcelona, who constituted in several autonomies, are able to integrate themselves under the branding country Spain, that experience has nevertheless contradictory points and weak points that must be explained in the construction of this case, as it must be considered the comprehension of the local historic context and its political process and cultural for the definition of their autonomies, territories and expressions.

The branding country is a theme of the cultural administration in its dimension of the market, though it does not appear explicit the cultural sector as mediator of this power, the branding country indicates an ideologic sublimity; very charged towards the commercial, wishing to generate self estimation from the consumption. It is assumed as an instrument for even it is taken as generator means of self estimation of the state of the process of economic and social recovering, it highs the moral tone of the societies with their public private organizations, and community organizations, expressed in their esteem. The branding country involves the competitive advantages and the comparative ones, as far as the local ⁴, becomes element of strategic production for the improvement of the quality of life and the appropriation of what one is, of what one has, of what one owes, one can do and one expects.

The cultural administration is also an economic branding, branding country, from the facts that are expressive of the nations that reflect identity, appurtenance, and pertinence, not only from the commercial brand, but capacity of accomplishing the promise of searching for the happiness, it is to say, quality of life of the interaction and interculturality as rules of the game of the confidence and the internal enjoyment and external, individual and collective. It is like a key or code of entrance that allows the interlocution and the valid interaction by the meaningful, at the time it generates aggregate value shared among those who enjoy and those who offer.

The administration of the culture includes the strategic direction and the management of the branding country, includes the identification and valoration of the power of the brands of the transable goods in the economy; in this sense any economic activity is middled by the own cultural traces contributing of the aggregate value ethos which goes beyond the simple value of usage and the value of exchange and goes into the fields of symbolic values generators of confidence and intercultural frames towards the social realization of economies in the symbolic consumption. It is dialogic ethics of the satisfaction in the transaction for the collective self realization based on the agreement and on the search for an including economy.

In the game of the transactions of this economy, the branding country play a roll in the normative way asymmetric for these may include an agenda of products and services of a country or a region or a sector or an entrepreneurial organization or institutional; an example is given with the andean countries producers key actors in the raw materials of the

called black market of the narcotraffic, the systems of preferences that are renewed and postponed they coexist with estigmatizations and discriminations that operate as para fiscal barriers in social sense and cultural sense. The culture imposed and the other cultures suffer also the effects of this asymmetry based on the regulation of the treaties of human rights in global environment and with local scope.

The cultural management is an emergent discipline in the sense of the new field of administrative disciplinary work, not delimited clearly, it precises of factors that are key factor for achieving a dynamic service and integral of the products and cultural resources being offered globally.” (Licona & Velez, 2005)

5. Conclusions

- Administration is a discipline with conceptual character and high theoretical sense. It is contraire to what was stated at the XX century tradition. This tradition determined an instrumental and reductive character.
- Culture is the strategic variable of nations. Its power stays in its capacity to provide differentiation, identity and build social net inside nations.
- Culture demands management, due to, it is the base of human development, the valid exchange and the sustainable competitiveness.
- Branding country are the key of the economies and societies longevity.
- The cultural sectors and their strategic studies constitute a variable of political and administrative intervention.
- The sectors of the culture get into groups today beyond those of the arts and the encyclopedic knowledge, that is clear in all the sceneries of academical debate on the cultural, it is accepted throughout the world that the science and the technology are consubstantial part of the culture as accumulated elaborations and applied of the knowledge. The management of the science and the technology can only be economic aggregate if the activity of the societies like an institutional exercise is understood and collective integrator and constructor of the social tissue.
- The cultural sectors as manifestation of the social behavior, whether from the individual or the collective are keys of the globalizing competitiveness, determined in three great variables that mark paradigmatic tendencies as they are the science and the technology with economical and social purposes, the culture and the esthetics as builders of the individual and collectivity, and at the end the administration and the entrepreneuring as means for the interactive strategic thinking, bases of the creativity.
- “The free trade agreements and the regional integrations perform as Marc Abeles says, on the European Union the roll of a symptom in which we project our deceivings of the modern adventures and the hopes of what we could find in that called globalization. Not even in the more integral agreements and planified of unification, as the european, the negative effects are solved (unemployment), nor one comes to lasting arrangements in social questions and market questions. Even more difficult is to organize zones of free

trade where it is done like it is not necessary to harmonize the policies of employment, migratory, and the intercultural relations (TLC) or the economic negotiation is hurried without time to compatibilize the social systems or political systems (Mercosur) (...) ¿how to get situated in respect of the discrepant theories of the globalization? Under the lack of confidence already mentioned towards the generalist theories and the inexistence of universal consent on any of them, it is added the difficulty of including in one only system explicative system the varied dimensions intervening in these processes, even the economists, business men and politicians that try to have a speech harder speech and precise on globalization, they are in the need of using metaphors to describe it (...)” (Garcia Canclini, 1999:49)

Challenges of the Cultural Administration

- The challenge of the cultures is the need of forming for the thinking and for the cultural action generator and mediator of the transition between the know-know and the how to know. To know how to be and to know how to start things, congruent with the creation of the different branding country with their logosymbols of multiple expressions and products circulating in the market that are related in social and cultural constructions; from a car to an online software, the artistical expressions, the intellectual production with popular know how, the geogastronomy and the ideological speeches, the social representations of consumption and the classifications of the social distinction of the same are in themselves necessary in a cultural globalization not hegemonic; or in its lack a world attempt of the culture in the way as Renato Ortiz and the french political theory of the field of the culture that with their concept of cultural industries contrasting with the industry of the entertainment in the USA way of it. The culture is object of administration; she must strategically be intervened and managed for its lasting time in environments of intense inter-multi cultural activity, where it is indispensable a positioning of public home as condition of existence.
- The cultural administration is a challenge, fruit of the learned in the XX century, not only for the patrimonial preservation that is today substantive product of the local and world economies through the internal and external tourism, now called cultural tourism, but also as theoretical practical instrument of the great developments of the cultures that are today called cybercultures. The cultural administration becomes a yield individual service and social that has as ground to facilitate through the service the construction and performance of the organizations that reproduce and spread with all the technological assymetric imaginary advances that circulate in the cyber space or in imaginary ones that remain in the small local circuits without possibility of development by the lack of the administration. It is also a challenge of the culture, to decide whether it remains in the game of the exclusion or if it gets the challenge of becoming a vehicle of inclusion for the sustainability of the projects of the individual and social life. (Licona & Velez, 2004).
- The cultural administration is the necessary social organ for the present times in the countries of the region, which age in which the economy of the world is constituted by the symbolic transactions in systems of entrance and way out, concaves, connexes and complementary, of offer and demand, of negotiated agreement of the interaction and the transaction. The societies interact from agreements supported on the culture of the branding country with barriers and assymetries; for this duty the cultural administration is an inter disciplinary competition. Country that does not administrate its cultures, is a country subject to the hegemonic imposition, is a country that does not establishes the

power of branding, is a weak country in the negotiated exchanges, it is a country without basic differentiation” (Licona & Velez, 2005).

Notes

- ¹. See George Yudice in his book *El Recurso de la Cultura*
- ². See notes on cultural management, author: Alfons Martinel. Documents of work, University Universidad del Rosario 1996).
- ³. World report of the world commission of culture and development: *Nuestra Diversidad Creativa* 1996)
- ⁴. Beach, wind and sea, rum and sound, salsa and rock, industry geocultogastronomic, patrimonial tourism, ecologic tourism, entertainment USA, industries of leisure and the ancient civilizations, until the tourism in the modern cosmopolitan cities.

References

- Bauman, Z. 2002. *La Cultura como Praxis*. Barcelona: Paidós.
- Bell, D. 1989. *Las Contradicciones Culturales del Capitalismo*. Alianza editorial. 3a. edición. Madrid-España.
- Cortina, A. 1992. *Ética de Empresa*, Madrid: Editorial Trotta.
- Drucker, P. F. 1999. *Los Desafíos de la Gerencia para el Siglo XXI*. Bogotá
- Fayol, H. 1972. *Administración Industrial y General*. Buenos Aires, Editorial El Ateneo. 5ª. Edición
- García-Canclini, N. 1995. *Consumidores y Ciudadanos*. México, D.F.: Grijalbo.
- García-Canclini, N. 1999. *La Globalización Imaginada*. Barcelona : Gedisa.
- García-Canclini, N. 2004. *Diferentes, Desiguales y Desconectados*. Buenos Aires: Paidós
- Mintzberg, H., J. B Quinn and S. Ghoshal. 1999. *El Proceso Estratégico*. México: Prentice Hall.
- Klitsberg, B. and Tomasino Luciano. 2000. *Capital Social y Cultura: Claves Estratégicas para el Desarrollo*. Fondo de Cultura Económica. México. D.F.
- Krugman, P. 1991. *La Era de las Expectativas Limitadas*. Barcelona : Editorial Ariel.
- Licona, W. 2002. "Hacia una Economía Política de la Cultura en Colombia." *Revista del Cenes*, Volumen XXI, No.33, I semestre 2002, Escuela de Economía, UPTC, Tunja, Boyacá, Colombia.
- Licona Winston y Vélez Rodrigo (2004). "Cultura y Desarrollo Integral: Viejos Ideales... Nuevas Estrategias." *Revista Universidad y Empresa*. No.6. Facultad de Administración. Universidad del Rosario
- Licona, W. and R. Vélez. 2005. *Las Marcas País en la Administración Cultural: Variable Estratégica en La Sociedad Global de las Negociaciones*, Working paper. Facultad de Administración. Universidad del Rosario.
- Porter, M. 1991. *Estrategia Competitiva*. México: Compañía editorial continental.
- Porter, M. 1982. *Estrategia Competitiva*. México: CECSA.
- Restrepo Puerta, L. F. 2004. *Estrategia y Competitividad*. Bogotá D.C.: Ediciones U. Externado de Colombia.
- Sen, A. 2000. *Desarrollo y Libertad*. Bogotá, D.C.: Editorial Planeta.
- Taylor, F. W. 1973. *Principios de la Administración Científica*, Buenos Aires, Editorial El Ateneo. 5ª. Edición
- Throsby, D. 2001. *Economía y Cultura*. Madrid: Cambridge University Press.
- UNESCO, (1997). *Nuestra Diversidad Creativa: Informe de la Comisión Mundial de Cultura y Desarrollo*. Madrid: Ediciones UNESCO.
- Vélez, R. 2004. "La Administración, la Disciplina del Siglo." *Revista Nova et Vetera*. Universidad del Rosario. Bogotá, D.C. Colombia.
- Yúdice, G. 2002. *El Recurso de la Cultura: Usos de la Cultura en la Era Global*. Barcelona: Gedisa editorial.