

A Cultural Dimension to the EU's External Policies - from Policy Statements to Practice and Potential

Rod Fisher

International Intelligence on Culture

A m s t e r d a m 2 0 0 7

B o e k m a n s t u d i e s

C o n t e n t s

Preface by Kathinka Dittrich -Van Weringh

Introduction to and Aims of this Research Paper

Methodology and Limitations

T h e m e t h o d o l o g i c a l a p p r o a c h

D e f i n i n g t e r m s

Executive Summary

International Cultural Co-operation Policies and Priorities in Six EU States

R e c e n t p o l i c y s h i f t s a n d s t r u c t u r a l
c h a n g e s
G e o g r a p h i c a l p r i o r i t i e s
C o n t e n t p r i o r i t i e s
K e y c h a l l e n g e s a n d o b s t a c l e s

Strengthening Culture in EU External Policies: the Commission view

I n t r o d u c t i o n
T h e c u l t u r a l d i m e n s i o n o f c u r r e n t
E U g l o b a l r e l a t i o n s
C o m p l e x o r g a n i s a t i o n a l a r r a n g e m e n t s
A s t r a t e g y f o r c u l t u r e i n E u r o p e a n -
l e d d e v e l o p m e n t p o l i c y ?
A d d e d V a l u e ? E U D e l e g a t i o n s a n d
c u l t u r a l a c t i o n
T h e v i e w f r o m B r u s s e l s

Are Governments Ready for European Cultural Co-operation Beyond the EU?

I n t r o d u c t i o n
P o s i t i v e a t t i t u d e s t o a c u l t u r a l
d i m e n s i o n t o E U e x t e r n a l p o l i c i e s
C o n d i t i o n a l s u p p o r t
R e s e r v a t i o n s
A n e w m e c h a n i s m f o r E u r o p e a n c o -
o p e r a t i o n ?
A s u c c e s s f u l e x t e r n a l p o l i c y
r e q u i r e s a s t r o n g i n t e r n a l o n e

Towards a Framework for EU Action on Culture in its External Policies

A s o l i d m e s s a g e t o c o n v e y
K e y r e s e a r c h f i n d i n g s
G u i d i n g p r i n c i p l e s f o r c u l t u r a l
a c t i o n i n E U e x t e r n a l p o l i c i e s
A p r e l i m i n a r y l o o k a t t h e f u t u r e
a c t i o n a g e n d a
P o s s i b l e i n s t r u m e n t s t o i m p l e m e n t
E U a c t i o n s
T h e n e e d f o r f u r t h e r r e s e a r c h

N o t e s

Annexes

- 1 Denmark profile
- 2 France profile
- 3 Latvia profile
- 4 Poland profile
- 5 Portugal profile
- 6 UK profile
- 7 The European Union National Institutes for Culture (EUNIC)
- 8 Draft Strategy on Culture in the European Development Policy
- 9 Biographies of researchers

Preface

With the signing of the Treaty of Maastricht, 1992, endorsed by the Treaty of Amsterdam 1997, the decision-making EU Member States endowed the EU for the first time in the history of the European Community with legally binding cultural competences. These competences also apply to the relationship with Third countries. The Community should not only “contribute to the flowering of cultures of the Member States, while respecting their national and regional diversity and at the same time bringing the cultural heritage to the fore” (§151,1). It should also “foster cultural co-operation between Member States and Third countries and competent international organisations, in particular the Council of Europe”(§151.3). In addition it should “take cultural aspects into account in its actions under other provisions of the Treaty, in particular to respect and promote the diversity of cultures”.

The phrasing of this article is so general that the Community has enough room to support, complement and co-ordinate cultural actions of Member States not only within the EU, but also beyond it and even to take initiatives “in order to achieve these objectives” (§151), as long as it is not violating the principle of subsidiarity (§151).

By introducing this cultural component – restricted though as it is - into the EU’s internal and external policy, the Member States acknowledged that the EU is more than an economic instrument, more than a security fortress, let alone a possible threat to the world; it is also a social and cultural project in progress. This so-called “soft power” claims to embody and convey to others certain norms and values, such as the acknowledgement of cultural diversity and respect for other cultures worldwide; a liberal-democratic social order, the unrestricted rule of law, the protection of human rights; in other words a multilateral rather than a unilateral approach to the world.

Culture and the arts play an important role in this process as trust-building measures. A cultural policy for Europe, strengthening the inner EU cohesion, and a cultural component of the emerging EU foreign policy, complementing the efforts of the Member States, to pay respect and build trust worldwide, are two sides of one and the same coin.¹ This was demonstrated once again in dramatic fashion, by the so-called “cartoon battle”,² with negative political, economical, social and cultural consequences. This once more raised the question:

What do we know about the “others”, “the aliens”, their code of behaviour, their unwritten laws of dealing with each other, their traditions, histories, languages, and artistic expressions?

And what do they know about “us” in all our ‘diversity in unity’? Do we think in mutuality terms (in contrast to the practice of export-oriented cultural diplomacy)?

So far, a stringent cultural component is not pursued as an integral part of the emerging foreign policy of the EU, complementing the respective efforts of the Member States. Neither did the Member

States – and it is up to them to and not “Brussels” - decide on a corresponding strategic policy framework. There is, however, an increasing awareness that no Member State can survive alone in today’s borderless, digitalised, competitive and conflict-filled world.

Would the Member States agree or disagree that such a cultural component of the Union’s external relations could be a desirable added European value? Is there a political will on their part to co-operate more closely among themselves and with the Commission to further develop this intercultural dialogue with the world, step by step? Do their different priorities, geographically speaking and in terms of content, leave room enough for joint European action? In terms of preferences and priorities, where can common ground be identified?

These were the basic questions of an extensive literature and web based mapping on the EU Member States’ foreign policies³ as a first step towards a feasibility study into the possible adoption of a more enhanced cultural component as an integral part of EU foreign policy. In Spring 2004 the European Cultural Foundation (in the framework of the LabforCulture project) commissioned the Boekman Foundation to undertake this survey. The relevant official policy papers of all the 25 Member States and background literature revealed that there is quite a lot of common ground between the Member States and no serious objection to this more enhanced cultural component. But neither was there a particular focus on such a potential extension of the EU’s role.

The survey suggested that the Member States would be likely to support a more co-ordinated cultural policy approach by the EU in five areas: To meet security concerns through intercultural dialogue; to enhance visibility, especially of smaller members through joint European cultural actions: to promote diversity; to stimulate economic development by developing wider markets for Member State’s cultural heritage and creative industries, and, finally, to share costs.⁴

These initial findings are cautiously encouraging; however, the extent to which policy statements are followed through in reality, remained to be seen. It was therefore proposed to link theory and practice in this second research step towards the already mentioned feasibility study. To do a “reality check”!

Kathinka Dittrich-Van Weringh
European Cultural Foundation/LabforCulture
December 2006

Introduction to and aims of this research paper

This is the second part of a preliminary examination to discover whether there is sufficient interest in Member States and if the preconditions exist for the introduction of a coherent cultural component to the external policies of the European Union, rather than the somewhat limited and ad hoc cultural actions currently in place.

The initial and thorough literature survey of Dodd, Lyklema and Van Weringh, with its factual analysis of international cultural policies in all 25 EU Member States, provided a solid and informative introduction to the nature of national approaches to cultural co-operation in and beyond the EU. However, it was recognised that the survey was based on official documentation and this would not necessarily indicate whether there were unexpressed or ‘hidden’ concerns on the part of national foreign and /or cultural ministries to a wider cultural dimension to EU external policies. So, do the cautiously encouraging conclusions that emerged from the initial research hold true in practice? That was the basic question this follow up sought to address.

This current study – in effect a ‘reality check’ - was intended to ascertain:

- That the key priorities of each government’s policy on international cultural co-operation were those identified in the literature survey;

- Whether any changes were the result of recent policy shifts and, if so what was the nature of the changes;
- What were considered to be the key challenges to their international cultural co-operation policy;
- Whether there were any potentially conflicting priorities in the international cultural co-operation policies of foreign and cultural ministries that could suggest there would be difficulties in reaching consensus on a cultural component of EU external policies;
- Whether the apparent openness to European co-operation explicit or implicit in the official statements of policy was borne out or limited in practice;
- If there was to be a cultural dimension to the EU's external policies, whether Member States could envisage ways this might complement (rather than compete with) their own actions and whether such an extension of the EU's role was likely to present any challenges or difficulties for the country;
- Whether the experience of cultural practitioners of their government's international cultural co-operation policies and actions corresponded with the declared objectives set out in such policies.
- To what extent these policies meet practitioners' international needs and aspirations;
- Whether they have any direct experience of participating in an EU initiated or supported cultural event or programme;
- How cultural initiatives promoted by the EU with countries outside EU borders might make a difference (if any) to their practice.

Therefore, in addition to verifying the validity of the analysis contained in the literature study, it was hoped that the new research would yield criteria for the development of a 'framework for action' for a more integrated cultural component in external relations policies including development policy. For example, where and in what ways could the EU develop support mechanisms for cultural activities; how could the EU balance the international cultural co-operation needs of large and small, and / or financially weaker, Member States; does current practice suggest areas where an EU role would provide added value?

It is important to emphasise that this new research is intended to signpost areas of investigation for future research. It is not the feasibility study itself, for such research would be pointless if there was no practical will to at least give the concept serious consideration.

The European Cultural Foundation in the framework of the LabforCulture project commissioned me to undertake this follow-up research. It has been a fascinating exercise, but one that would not have been possible without the help and co-operation of a number of people. I should like to express my grateful thanks to Sue Harrison who undertook the UK investigation and participated with me in the interviews of European Commission officials. My thanks also to Francisco Motta Veiga, Alain Sancerni, Dr Roberts Kilis, Magda Kopczynska, Bent-Erik Rasmussen and Christian Have, all of whom undertook the national investigations within a very short timeframe of about six weeks. My appreciation is also due to the following European Commission officials who generously gave their time to see Sue Harrison and I (in some instances when they were about to relocate to offices in different buildings and were surrounded by packing cases!): Denis Baresch (DG Development), Harold Hartung (DG Education and Culture), Krzysztof Kania (DG Education and Culture), Ulrick Kneuppel (DG External Relations) Abdul Aziz M'Baye (DG External Relations), Francois Nizery (DG Europe Aid), Sara Wilmet (DG Education and Culture), and Richard Wright (DG External Relations). Jorge Barretto Xavier in Lisbon also gave helpful advice and Felicia Schwartz in China provided useful information on the Europe Street project in Beijing. Special thanks to Ernst Schürmann for his many suggestions and, especially, to Kathinka Dittrich -Van Weringh, whose encouragement and enthusiasm for the project was infectious, and for her confidence in me and patience when a close family bereavement necessitated a later than planned start to the research and other work delayed

its completion. She also kept me in check when my instinct was to write a book not a paper! Finally, I must express my thanks to my colleague, Ledy Leyssen, who assisted me with the administration of the project and who had the unenviable task of typing the text from my script. My colleague Ruth Hill also lent a hand.

Rod Fisher

Methodology and limitations

T h e m e t h o d o l o g i c a l a p p r o a c h

It was not possible within the timeframe and budgetary framework to examine actual practice and interrogate attitudes in all 25 EU Member States. Accordingly a decision was taken at the outset to focus on six countries that would provide as representative sample as possible in terms of geographical spread, population size, history (including the legacy of empires), length of EU membership, economic resources and attitudes towards the Union.

Two of the largest EU nations, France and the UK, were crucial to the study. Both have been colonial powers and remain important players on the world political stage. They operate, however, with rather different political vision as far as the role of the State, its language and culture are concerned, which might influence their foreign cultural policy. Each has a global network of national cultural institutes involved in cultural co-operation and both have major world languages – though, in the case of France, maintaining the international status of French is proving a struggle. Public perceptions –notwithstanding the vote in France on the EU constitution - are that the two countries stand, politically and publically, at different ends of the spectrum in terms of attitudes to the European Project.

Although considerably smaller, Portugal is also a former colonial power with a global diaspora and continuing special links to the Portuguese speaking countries including Brazil, the largest country in Latin America. The first study suggested Portugal's international cultural co-operation objectives were ambitious, but not matched by resources.

Poland is the largest of the 10 new countries that acceded to the EU in 2004 and the literature survey indicated that it seeks a more leading role in and beyond the Union.

Latvia, on the other hand, is one of the smallest of the new EU Member States, but the preceding research suggested that, in common with several other small EU nations, it finds it is difficult to commit sufficient resources to meet its international cultural aspirations and desire to build its national identity.

Finally, an older EU Member State, Denmark, was chosen in preference to other Nordic countries, because of its perceived Eurosceptical attitude and because of the antagonism generated in parts of the Muslim world as a result of the 'cartoons' saga. It was felt this episode might have a bearing on the foreign cultural policy of the Danish Government.

The research work was undertaken by national correspondents in the six chosen countries (see biographies in Annex 9) and their findings were written up in national reports (see Annexes 1-6):

The research in most countries took place between late April and the beginning of June 2006 (in the UK until the beginning of July). This tight time frame imposed certain limitations on the depth of the research and who was available for interview. Moreover, political change and structural re-organisation in Poland and Portugal and ministerial changes in the UK posed their own difficulties. Nevertheless, a sufficient a number of key people were interviewed for readers to be reasonably confident the responses broadly reflect the reality in each country.

The work was undertaken by the national correspondents on the basis of face to face meetings, telephone or written surveys and, where appropriate, focus groups. A preliminary meeting with most of the country researchers was held in Amsterdam. Target interviewees in each country were

ministers (or deputies) of foreign and cultural affairs; civil servants in foreign affairs and culture; senior staff in national cultural institutes and funding agencies where they exist, as well as practitioners and organisations involved in international cultural co-operation. Country researchers were given a framework of questions that sought to address the current policy situation on international cultural co-operation, future ambitions, the needs of the cultural sectors, and attitudes towards the EU's role in practice and its theoretical development.

Following the completion of the national reports, a series of meetings was arranged in Brussels in early July with European Commission officials in the Directorates of Education & Culture, Development, External Relations and Europe Aid to verify the extent to which culture/cultural co-operation is employed as an instrument of EU external policies and their attitude to an enhanced cultural component of co-ordinated EU relations with so-called Third countries in the future.

D e f i n i n g t e r m s

Before the study commenced, the territory to be researched was variously described as an "EU foreign cultural policy" and an "EU cultural foreign policy". The former suggests an international (i.e. beyond the EU) cultural policy; the meaning of the latter could be construed as a culturally influenced EU foreign policy. Although no doubt attractive to many in the cultural sector, the latter may be contentious, not least because Member States have yet to agree a common foreign policy. However, while the notion of a foreign cultural policy seemed more appropriate, it did imply the exclusion of cultural actions that were a tool to meet non-cultural objectives, e.g. when applied in development processes. Consequently, the focus of this study has been on the potential and environment for a cultural dimension to EU external policies, to embrace the areas of foreign affairs, security, development support and other relations with countries outside the Union.

Executive summary

This is the second part of a preliminary examination to ascertain whether there is sufficient interest in Member States, and if the preconditions exist, for the development of a coherent cultural dimension to EU external policies. It builds on an initial literature and web based survey conducted by the Boekman Foundation. Its tasks has been to verify whether the reasonably encouraging findings that emerged from the first study were true in practice, by interrogating stakeholders in six diverse EU counties: Denmark, France, Latvia, Poland, Portugal and the UK.

This new study broadly endorses the conclusions of the first survey and provides some insights of its own about attitudes to, and the potential for, a cultural dimension to the EU's external policies. The consensus of this latest study suggests there is no significant overt opposition towards the idea of the EU having a cultural component to its relations with the wider world; indeed, there is evidence of real support for the idea in some countries. True, support was sometimes qualified, but this was to be expected. It is also evident that the concept was novel to a number of interviewees and this may account for any uncertainty or indifference sometimes encountered.

On the basis of this survey, there seems to be room for possible EU actions in most of the world, although the EU Neighbourhood Policy countries of Central and Eastern Europe, the Mediterranean Rim nations and Asia were especially favoured. It was striking how Member States geographical priorities for cultural relations coincide with the fast growing markets for international trade: China, India and, to some extent, Brazil.

Significantly, only one country surveyed specifically indicated cultural sectors – broadcasting and language – it considered should remain a national prerogative.

It is also clear from this sample survey that countries are more open to cultural engagement with other EU nations in the delivery of their international objectives.

If EU framework policy is to be developed in this area it should be guided by the following principles:

- EU action should complement, not compete with, the actions of Member States;
- EU initiatives should provide 'added value';
- While presenting the unity of purpose of the EU, actions must reflect Europe's rich cultural diversity.
- There should be no hierarchies related to population, size, culture or language in the pursuit of EU actions;
- Capacity building is needed for European Commission delegations to equip them with appropriate skills;
- Any policy needs to be underpinned with adequate funds;
- The EU role should be primarily as a facilitator or initiator, not an organiser of cultural action;
- Evaluation mechanisms should be built into all EU initiatives;
- It is important for Member States to recognise that the primary objective of actions to promote culture in development is to facilitate the local populace to develop markets etc, for their own cultural goods;
- A policy framework for the EU's external cultural role must be coherent to avoid current shortcomings with ad hoc events;
- Member States and stakeholders in Europe's cultural sector should be fully engaged in the process of elaborating an appropriate cultural policy and strategy for EU external relations.

There are at least six areas where collective and co-ordinated action would have beneficial impacts on the global presence of the EU:

- Building sustainable cultural co-operation with countries beyond the EU;
- Strengthening understanding between peoples through intercultural dialogue;
- Disseminating information and promoting EU and Member States visibility;
- Promoting trade in Europe's cultural industries;
- Promoting Europe's expertise in heritage;
- Embedding culture in development.

Finally, the research suggests sufficient political will now exists for further, more detailed, research to be commissioned on the nature and development of a cultural component to the EU's external policies.

International cultural co-operation politics and priorities in six EU states

R e c e n t p o l i c y s h i f t s a n d s t r u c t u r a l
c h a n g e s

There have been policy and/or structural changes in the area of foreign cultural policy and international co-operation in five of the six countries surveyed since the information conveyed in the first research phase survey conducted early in 2005. Only in Denmark has there been no material

change. The most significant policy developments have occurred in the UK and Latvia. It is too early to say what their impact will be. However, neither here nor in the other countries, do the changes imply negative reactions to the basic question of this follow-up study: Are these Member States in practice opposed to the adoption of a more enhanced cultural component in the EU's external policies, including the emerging foreign and security policy?

United Kingdom

A major review of cultural diplomacy was chaired by Lord Carter of Coles in the UK on behalf of the Foreign & Commonwealth Office and reported in 2005. It is evident that cultural diplomacy actions will continue to be part of the Government's international agenda and, in their delivery, will be obliged to support government foreign policy objectives. This is clear from the draft International Strategy produced by the Government's Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) due for publication before the end of 2006. This indicates how DCMS will seek, through the work of the agencies and organisations it funds, to meet the Government's new foreign policy priorities.¹ The strategy has five international goals: excellence, opportunity, economy, diversity and sustainability.

Arts Council England launched its own International Policy in June 2005 and an interim review will be conducted in Autumn 2006.² Internationalism is one of the Council's six priorities for the period 2006 – 2008. A new international strategy has also been announced by the Scottish Arts Council, in conjunction with British Council Scotland.

Latvia

The New Strategic Guidelines of Cultural Policy –entitled National State and adopted by the Cabinet of Ministers in April 2006 – include the objective to facilitate dialogue and understanding among cultures and nations and enrich the cultural life of Latvia by actively participating in international cultural processes and co-operation networks. The document indicates key problems with Latvia's external cultural policy and proposes directions for future actions. The document also sets specific ambitions for the recognition of Latvia's cultural products and services, and suggests an increase of State funds for external cultural activities. Priorities implicit in the Guidelines are: the need to evaluate the effectiveness of existing bilateral cultural agreements (a concern shared by several EU states as witnessed in the first study); offering the expertise of Latvia's cultural practitioners to non – EU countries; and paying particular attention to collaboration in the Baltic Sea region. The division of responsibilities between the Ministries of Culture and of Foreign Affairs are set out in the Guidelines, including the joint development of an External Cultural Relations programme.

Another strategic policy document, Latvia's Participation in the EU – key principles, goals, priorities and actions for the period 2007-2013, was issued in draft form in June 2006 by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. On the use of culture as a tool in foreign relations, the key direction is to be creating and managing the State image. This emphasis on the 'branding' of a nation is shared by other EU Member States, as the previous research revealed and is especially strong in the ex-communist states that joined the Union in 2004.

Poland

Poland is also a country where the issue of international branding is important. A report, Marka dla Polski (Brand for Poland) was published in May 2006 suggesting potential opportunities to promote Poland through, among other things, its artistic achievements.

Its origins are the appointment of a Government team for the Promotion of the Republic of Poland, established to achieve better co-ordination of international cultural co-operation. A strategy will follow in the second half of 2006 focussed on the period 2007-2013 to coincide, no doubt, with the revision of the EU's new funding programme cycle. An imminent structural change of note is the proposal to shift part of the responsibilities hitherto administered by the Adam Mickiewicz Institute

to other organisations. Legislation is in preparation to transform the Institute from one responsible for artistic co-operation into an agency responsible for cultural diplomacy in conjunction with the Polish Institutes abroad.

France

The principal change in France has been the creation in May 2006 of CulturesFrance, as a result of the merger of L'AFAA (the French Association of Artistic Action) with the much smaller ADPF (The Association of the Dissemination of French Thought). This new agency brings together artistic co-operation and distribution, the book and audiovisual sectors to form a single body for international cultural co-operation. Its aims are: encouraging reciprocity of exchanges in France and in international networks; developing a European dimension to exchanges; and solidarity with other world cultures to contribute to their development. The regrouping does not fundamentally change the capacity of L'AFAA, but should enable it to develop its actions in areas where it was not active before. The new body is in line with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' recent policy direction of outsourcing its actions, by using external players. The Ministry hopes a single operator will provide greater visibility and be more effective while, at the same time, reducing costs.

Portugal

In Portugal, structural changes were announced in 2006 that confirm the trend of closer co-operation between the actors in international co-operation. The previously separate Office of International Cultural Relations of the Ministry of Culture has been integrated into the Office of Planning Strategy, Evaluation and International Relations, and the Ministry itself will share responsibility in future with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for the Instituto Camões. Within Foreign Affairs, the Institute for Development Support recently announced "A Strategic Vision for Portuguese Co-operation" embedding cultural exchange, cultural diversity and multiculturalism within objectives to foster sustainable development – a preoccupation currently.

G e o g r a p h i c a l P r i o r i t i e s

Cultural relations with other EU States was seen as a priority in all of the six countries examined, which was in line with the findings of the first study - though the Polish response was somewhat equivocal on this, suggesting that as the goal of co-operation had now been largely achieved within EU Europe, more attention could be paid to the wider world. In addition, the six countries also indicate that at least some of the neighbouring countries to the North, East or South of the EU boundaries are important. Neighbouring states to the East of the EU are priority areas for cultural relations: for Latvia and Poland (for fairly obvious geo-strategic reasons) and for France. Both Latvia and Poland mention relations with the Ukraine. In addition, Moldova and the Caucasus are identified by Latvia as important culturally, while Poland specifically refers to Belarus and to Romania, which, of course, will join the EU in 2007. Currently, both Latvia and Poland seem to have certain difficulties in their cultural relations with Russia, influenced, no doubt, by their recent past. However, Russia is seen by the UK, Portugal, France, and Denmark as a priority country for building cultural relations (as it is for some countries surveyed in the first phase research, e.g. Finland, Germany and Austria).

Denmark's interest in Iceland and Norway is not only historical, but because they are partners in cultural co-operation within the Nordic Council.

France and Portugal specifically indicate that cultural relations with Mediterranean Rim countries have some importance, though in the case of Portugal such relations are described as 'timid' and principally focussed on Morocco. The Polish response suggests that it considers itself a potential broker in EU relations with Turkey and Arabic States because of its lack of colonial baggage, and it also indicates that cultural relations with Israel are important. The "ring of friends" that border

the EU to the East and South are also important to the UK, which is the only country in the Union that maintains cultural institutes in all the neighbouring nations.³ As the countries surveyed are in agreement with the EU's Neighbourhood Policy, there appear to be no obstacles for joint actions between the Commission and the respective countries.

Economic and trade interests are clearly a key driver in the building of cultural relations with China (cited by all the countries), Japan (cited by all countries except Denmark) and India (cited by the UK, France, Poland and Latvia). However, it is necessary to insert a caveat at this juncture, because Latvia's cultural interests in India and China appears more aspirational than a reality, as is Portugal's cultural relations with China. Moreover, Latvia's cultural engagement with Japan has been driven primarily by the City Council of its capital, Riga. The relationship with another economic powerhouse, the USA was also cited as a priority by all the countries, though resources to pursue cultural (as opposed to political and trade) engagement are not always evident, and it is interesting that France does not maintain offices of the Institut Français there.

The potential of new market opportunities for the cultural industries are a factor in the French and UK's interest in Brazil, whereas Portugal's cultural relationship with that country is obviously related to its colonial past. Such historical legacies clearly influence Portugal's relationship with its other ex colonies in sub-Saharan Africa, and Asia, and France's continuing cultural interests in its former Francophonie empire in Africa, West Indies and Asia. In the main, the UK does not privilege cultural relations with its former empire in this way, except in relation to South Africa and in the case already cited of India (where there are obvious trade interests) as well as other countries with UK significant resident /descended population, such as the West Indies, Bangladesh and Pakistan.

The UK's Department of Culture, Media & Sport identifies a range of geographical priorities including states optimistically described as "post conflict" (Iraq, Afghanistan and Angola), key Islamic nations (Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Indonesia and Iran, in addition to Pakistan already mentioned) and Sub-Saharan Africa. Of course, the importance of deepening intercultural dialogue with the Arabic world is shared by many EU countries that were not interrogated in this new research phase.

Other countries beyond the EU known to be given some priority include Canada, cited by both Latvia and France (whose relationship is especially focused on Quebec for obvious linguistic and historic reasons), and Korea, which was mentioned by Poland, Only Poland specifically mentioned the Community of South East Asian nations (ASEAN).

Finally, the Portuguese response points out that although, the first research was correct in identifying the countries with which Portugal has cultural relations, the reality is that in many instances, the bilateral cultural agreements are not acted on in practice (an issue inferred in some of the other reports).

Geographical priorities of member states surveyed

	P O L A N D	D E N M A R K	F R A N C E	P O R T U G A L	L A T V I A	U K
Other EU States	√	√	√	√	√	√
EU neighbouring countries:						
1. Eastern Europe		√	√ (1)	√ (2)		√
2. Mediterranean Rim		√		See 'other countries'	√ (3)	√
3. Nordic (Non EU)	√					
USA	√	√	√	√	√	√
JAPAN		√	√ (4)	√	√	√

CHINA	√	√	√ (5)	√	√ (5)	√
INDIA	√		√ (5)	√		√
BRAZIL		√			√	√
RUSSIA		√			√	√
Former colonies (other than those already mentioned)		√			√	√ (6)
Other countries		Canada	Canada S.E. Asia (5) Central Asia(5)	Turkey Israel Korea		Iran, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Indonesia,Iraq, Afghanistan, Angola (7)

Notes:

- (1) Especially Moldova, Ukraine, Belarus and Georgia.
- (2) Especially Ukraine and Belarus.
- (3) In principle more than practice, though Morocco is cited.
- (4) Relations led by Riga City Council with the city of Kobe.
- (5) Aspirational more than actual.
- (6) South Africa, West Indies, Pakistan, Bangladesh specifically, and Arts Council England also mentions Singapore.
- (7) Scottish Arts Council country priorities include Malawi. Although Iran and Egypt historically have been at some stage under British control, they are not regarded as former colonies.

C o n t e n t P r i o r i t i e s

Surprisingly, content and sectoral priorities were little mentioned in most of the reports. Generally speaking, no country surveyed, except France, indicated there were cultural sectors or issues that were considered as exclusively national “territory” or sacrosanct. This is consistent with the first research phase and suggests there is an opportunity for closer co-operation between Member States and the EU. The only sectors which the French Government would not wish to share with Brussels were language and broadcasting (see key research findings, p.43-4), though it was not averse to a role for the EU in translation and wider distribution of TV and radio programmes of French origin.

K e y c h a l l e n g e s a n d o b s t a c l e s

Introduction

Interviewees in all the countries surveyed were honest enough to admit they faced challenges in the pursuit of their international cultural relations. Whether these represent real obstacles to the inclusion of a cultural component in the EU’s external policies seems unlikely, though the absence of clear policies does not help. Key issues are summarised here.

Absence of clear policies

Both the Latvian and Portuguese reports refer to the lack of clearly formulated policies for external cultural relations. In Latvia, it was recognised that it was impossible to plan to maximise the cultural input to foreign policies without a strategy. At the same time, the New Strategic Guidelines of Cultural Policy (National State) at least has set a direction for action in foreign relations.

Resource constraints

Portugal, France and Latvia cited cutbacks in financial and/or human resources as causing difficulties in realising policies – a concern echoed in many of the EU countries in the first research phase. Budget cutbacks had resulted in substantial reductions in Portuguese Embassy staff, and was

identified as a significant contributing factor in limiting Portugal's international strategy. Although the French Ministry of Culture has access to considerable expertise and technical resources, it has insufficient financial means to maximise their deployment at an international level in a systematic way. In the case of Latvia, the Ministry of Culture has had difficulty in convincing the Finance Ministry to allocate additional resources to enable cultural programmes to be an integral part of the State's foreign policy.

Lack of recognition

One cause of insufficient resources is likely to be the result of a failure to fully recognise the value of culture as an instrument in fostering foreign relations, as is the case in Latvia. The Latvian Ministry of Culture conceded that without the support of top political figures, such as the President or Prime Minister, it was difficult to implement major international cultural initiatives.

Inappropriate instruments and failures in co-ordination

A lack of 'joined up' thinking and co-ordination between government departments and between government, and the cultural sector was seen as an issue in several of the countries surveyed, especially Portugal. This confirms the findings in many EU countries in the previous research. In some instances, as in Poland, it was suggested that the tools for delivering international cultural co-operation were weak and / or needed re-examination to ensure they were fit for purpose. Even where the instruments have been adapted and refined, they may still not be adequate to meet new challenges in transnational engagement. At least that appears to be the case in France, where the concentration of instruments through the merger of institutions and positions had not prevented the fragmentation of services and actions between and within ministries. There was a lack of communication between services, between sectors and between actions. A competition over territory had occurred as a consequence, and there was little opportunity for developing cross-sectoral synergies. Problems of co-operation in the development of external cultural policies were clearly revealed in Latvia. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Culture appear to blame each other for lack of guidance on geographical priorities. The inability of the Ministries of Culture, Education, Foreign Affairs and Finance to agree a co-ordinated position with regard to inter-state agreements is seen as a weakness.

The need to 'mend fences'

It was hardly surprising that Denmark and especially the UK should refer to the role of culture in repairing diplomatic relations and rebuilding trust. The UK Government's foreign policy has been redefined in the light of its role in Iraq and Afghanistan and the terrorist attacks on public transport in London in 2005. Given the political and public backlash that ensued in the Moslem world following the publication by the Danish newspaper Jyllands-Posten of the cartoons of the prophet Mohamed, it was logical that the report from Denmark should note a desire to intensify international cultural collaboration, though this does not appear to have translated into foreign cultural policy measures yet.

Safeguarding national identity

Given the inexorable growth of globalisation processes and the international competition for profile, it might have been imagined that several of the smaller countries surveyed would have drawn attention to this as a key policy issue. In fact, in only one report –that of Latvia- was the issue referred to specifically. A particularly interesting point made in the Latvian report is that its Baltic neighbours, Estonia and Lithuania, are seen as Latvia's main competitors. It was suggested that this reality affected pan-Baltic cultural co-operation.

Do policies meet their objectives and the needs of practitioners?

Establishing whether the declared international cultural co-operation policies of governments or their agencies meet their objectives (and whether this has any bearing on EU cultural action in the wider world) in such a short research time frame, and on the basis of interrogating some of these responsible for implementing such policies, was always going to be problematic, inviting as it does, self-criticism. Nevertheless, a few national reports are refreshingly frank on their problems. The French report, for example, suggests that despite its resources and ambitions, it is under-achieving in the implementation of its international policy, except in relation to language and the cultural industries.

How are the current international cultural co-operation policies of governments or their agencies perceived by practitioners? The reports from Portugal, Poland and Latvia were more forthcoming on this than the others. Practitioners in Portugal appear very critical of the absence of coherent Government strategies relevant to their aspirations. Better articulation between departments, good communication and advance planning by government to enable cultural organisations in turn to plan ahead, were regarded as more significant issues even than money. Government communication with the sector was regarded as inadequate – a complaint which surfaced in the Polish, Latvian and, to some extent, French reports as well.

There was also criticism in Latvia of the lack of a consistent policy on financing cultural operators to network internationally – a complaint made by practitioners in many European countries and so it was surprising that it was not raised more often in this study. This suggests there could be space for more joint actions between the EU, Member States and civil society.

Strengthening culture in EU external policies: the commission view

I n t r o d u c t i o n

To determine whether the climate of opinion is conducive to an expanded cultural dimension in EU external policies, it was obviously desirable to take account of the views of European Commission officials. But first, it might be useful to summarise and update the current scope of EU relations with Third countries outlined in more depth in the first research phase.

T h e c u l t u r a l d i m e n s i o n o f c u r r e n t E U g l o b a l r e l a t i o n s

EU bilateral relations with countries beyond its borders often include a cultural dimension, albeit a modest one. Relationships with non-EU countries in geographical proximity are developed through action plans for the European Neighbourhood Policy for countries on its Eastern borders and associated agreements with Mediterranean Rim nations in North Africa and the Middle East.

However, neighbours in the West Balkans do not currently enjoy a cultural dimension in their EU relations and there is increasing recognition in the Commission and in some Member States (e.g. Austria) that this should be addressed. The new Culture 2007 programme should provide a modest platform for the participation of West Balkans countries and, by the time of the mid term review, culture may have a higher profile in EU relations with that part of Europe, subject to ratification of Association and Stabilisation Agreements. The present situation is illogical.

Cultural co-operation with Russia - regarded as a priority by several countries in the initial research and confirmed in this current study - may be enhanced as the result of the Finnish Presidency of the EU giving priority to strengthening EU-Russia relations. Road maps, including one for culture, have been developed and were discussed by ministers in Karelia in September 2006. Partnership and co-operation agreements exist with Russia's Central Asia neighbours (including Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan), but the cultural dimension is very limited.

Article 27 of the Cotonou Agreement governing EU actions in ACP (African, Caribbean & Pacific) nations provides a mandate for support for “national heritage conservation and development” projects, including the organisation of festivals and other cultural events. Calls for proposals are also invited in the audio-visual sector and cultural industries. The preservation of Africa’s cultural and linguistic heritage and the integration of the cultural dimension in development are written into the EU Strategy for Africa: Towards a Euro-African pact to accelerate Africa’s development.⁴

Cultural co-operation is also incorporated within the framework for ASEM (Asia-Europe Meeting), whose Ministers of Culture met for the second time in Paris in 2005.⁵ ASEM also supports the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF) to promote dialogue through cultural, intellectual and people to people exchanges and ASEF is developing an online portal, Culture 360, to facilitate cultural co-operation between Asian and European cultural practitioners.⁶ ASEM Member States reaffirmed their support for ASEF at the ASEM Summit in Helsinki in September 2006 but, in an implied criticism, they emphasised the importance of ASEF flagship programmes being further aligned with ASEM priorities. A Memorandum of understanding between the EU and India is in preparation and the Commission is endeavouring to include a cultural dimension. India, along with Pakistan and Mongolia, will be joining the ASEM family of nations in 2008.

There is a cultural dimension to EU relations with Latin America, but some Commission officials and practitioners from South and Central America have suggested during this research that more would happen if Spain, in particular, adopted a more relaxed attitude to its continuing desire to be a gatekeeper.

C o m p l e x o r g a n i s a t i o n a l a r r a n g e m e n t s
The initial research indicated the responsibilities the various European Commission Directorates have for culture in the EU’s external relations. This current study questioned Commission officials about how the functions operated in practice.

Prime responsibilities for maintaining EU relations with the wider world falls to the DG for External Relations (or RELEX, as it is more familiarly known). Its role is to pursue “an effective and coherent external relations policy for the European Union so as to enable the EU to assert its identity on the international scene” (my emphasis). So, while this role involves building and maintaining political, diplomatic, economic and social relations, it is also very much about positioning the EU in the global arena. Culture is a component of such relations and is used both in terms of cultural relations and as an information tool or a way of ‘branding’ the EU. However, RELEX’s mandate does not extend to the 77 ACP (African, Caribbean and Pacific) countries and the 20 overseas countries and territories of the UK, France and the Netherlands. These are the remit of the DG for Development, which employs culture as a tool to improve the economic conditions and lives of people in the poorest regions of the world.

Differences of opinion are evident in relation to the purposes of culture in development, both within the Commission and some Member States. So, although the cultural industries might be supported as part of economic development, there is a view within the Commission that this is a means, not the objective – the principal aim is to support human development. This reinforces a perception that sometimes there is confusion between objectives and means.

The DG for Education and Culture (DG EAC) has responsibility for cultural co-operation directly, but this is primarily focussed on Europe. It is RELEX that has specific budgetary envelopes for cultural relations beyond the EU, and DG EAC is required to work with and advise it in relation to cultural co-operation. The latter readily admits that it sometimes ‘piggy-backs’ on RELEX initiatives, e.g. the Japan Year of People to People Exchange. The EU Year of Intercultural Dialogue 2008 is a priority within DG EAC, which is endeavouring to bring in countries from the EU’s Neighbourhood Policy to engage with the initiative. It has also been working with RELEX and DG Development to

promote the UNESCO Convention on Cultural Diversity at the ASEM VI Summit and with ACP countries respectively.

As other DGs, e.g. Trade, Enlargement, EuropeAid etc, have roles in policies that involve culture or culture in development, it will be evident that the organisational arrangements within the Commission are somewhat complex. Policy development, implementation and administration of external relations are dealt with by different departments. The need for internal co-ordination is obvious. Fortunately, there appears to have been improvements in recent years as a result of the creation of inter-service groups. Thus, the evolution of a strategy for culture in development policy (see next paragraph) has been led by DG Development and includes DG RELEX, DG Education and Culture, DG Trade, DG Information Society and EuropeAid. The Year of Intercultural Dialogue is led by DG Education and Culture and involves DG RELEX, DG Development and DG Justice and Law, etc. Despite this, there are tensions and overlaps in the RELEX 'family' and policy lines and responsibilities are not always clear.

A strategy for culture in European led development policy?

While there is increasing agreement at international level on the importance of integrating culture in development strategies and in aid programmes, what the EU has not had hitherto is an overall policy framework for cultural actions in developing countries. It was, therefore, encouraging to note that the Commission had issued a Draft Strategy on Culture in the European Development Policy in 2006 that sets out guiding principles and priorities for EU cultural action to ensure culture is 'mainstreamed' in all aspects of development co-operation – not an easy task at this time given the fact that developing countries may have other priorities. The Commission has been engaged in a consultative process with Member States and with a range of stakeholders on the content of the draft.

Key actions foreseen in the document are preserving, stimulating and promoting cultural diversity, promoting intercultural dialogue, supporting cultural industries, and developing a solid local market for cultural activities, goods and services. In the case of the latter, the document recognises that access to culture depends on education and the development of the cultural infrastructure, including facilities and financially viable intermediaries in the production chain. Promoting access to foreign markets for cultural goods and services through trade co-operation instruments is also envisaged.

The strategy sets out a number of principles for EU cultural action. The first of these - the need for countries to take ownership of their culture - proved to be contentious at a consultative stakeholders' workshop, held in Brussels on 30 May 2006. The Commission document emphasises that the object of EU action was to support the cultural activities, goods and services of the developing countries themselves, not those of EU Member States. This is not always appreciated in the latter.

The principal areas for co-operation in cultural action programming at national and regional levels in developing countries are set out in the Commission document (reprinted in Annex 8 of this study). The appearance of the document is a positive sign for our research, though whether the core messages will be picked up by the DG External Relations and Member States remains to be seen.

Added value? EU Delegations and cultural action

EU Delegations currently initiate or co-ordinate, on an ad hoc basis, a range of European cultural events in Third countries, most commonly European film festivals, but also theatre or dance festivals, the occasional exhibition or promotional events with some cultural content. Such events may be organised with the best of intentions to promote the diversity of Europe's cultures and, by association, the image of the EU itself, but the approach does not appear to be underpinned by any

strategic policy. They may be held to commemorate an anniversary (e.g. the 30th anniversary of EU-China relations) or to celebrate Europe Day on 9th May, for which Delegations have small budgets for cultural activity. At other times they give the impression of being entirely random, originating either from an idea or enthusiasm within the Delegation office (e.g. a Dance Festival in Madagascar), or in response to a proposal put to it by the host country or by one or more of the national cultural institutes of Member States. The Commission DG for Education & Culture has no direct involvement with the Delegations, which are the responsibility of the DG for External Relations.

The nature of these events was criticised in this research by the UK and French responses in particular. The latter says that French cultural institutes do not work often or systematically with EU Delegations. Citing the Director of the British Council in Bangkok, which has the largest representation of the national cultural institutes in Thailand, the UK report suggests current arrangements for EU cultural events are unsustainable, based as they frequently are on EU Delegations making project proposals and asking EU Member States, through their cultural institutes or embassies, to contribute financially to them. One difficulty EU Delegations face is that, unlike national cultural institutes, the policy line is they are not allowed to raise business sponsorship for events. In some instances when Commission Delegations have no budgetary provision, it is sometimes left entirely to the cultural institutes or host country to cover the costs - money they feel is not always wisely spent. Certainly there are often complaints about the absence of clear objectives, the lack of targeted promotion, and the confused messages which the EU seems to be conveying in the events it organises.

During the UK Presidency in 2005, 16 EU Member States represented in Thailand drew up a strategy for enhancing the profile of the EU and Member States in that country and establishing the EU as a leading cultural relations provider.

This set out the following key aims:

- To celebrate the cultural diversity, common values and unity of the EU;
- To showcase innovation, imagination and talent within the EU to promote cultural understanding, tolerance and collaboration with Thailand;
- To demonstrate flexible and sensitive approaches towards co-operation between the EU and Thailand that builds sustainable cultural developments;
- To broaden awareness and understanding of the cultural background, achievements and skill of EU Member States and Thailand;
- To showcase the EU as a contemporary and vibrant community of arts;
- To achieve greater impact and influence through the collaborative actions of Member States;
- To achieve a high degree of reciprocity and cultural interchange.

An event in China is illustrative both of the potential for raising the profile of the EU and Member States through cultural activities and of the problems associated with such initiatives. Europe Street was the culminating event in a series of activities to mark 30 years of EU-China diplomatic relations. It was initiated by the EU Delegation in Beijing and held in that city's largest park over two days in September 2005. The event was devised to promote interest in the EU and awareness of its cultural diversity and indirectly to promote Europe as a destination for travel, education and business. The budget totalled Euros 145,000, including an enhanced component specially obtained from Brussels to complement the modest resources of the Delegation. This was used for the infrastructure costs, while Member States were expected to provide the content according to their judgement and means. To deliver the project, the Delegation co-operated with the British Council in Beijing under the umbrella of the UK Presidency.

The event comprised three elements: information booths, which each Member State was invited to decorate to promote their culture, education, tourism and trade/technology; music, dance and street theatre performances; and a series of national food booths reflecting the diversity of Europe's cuisine. The EU had its own information booth. All six countries in our survey actively participated, with Denmark sharing an information booth with Sweden. More than 33,000 visitors attended, quite a lot of media coverage was obtained and audience feedback was generally positive. However, a number of areas for improvement were noted for the future. The scale had been underestimated from a human resource and planning perspective. It was recognised there was a need for: greater consideration at an early stage of what facets of Europe should be represented; a larger budget was needed for promotion; more coherence and quality control of the cultural events was called for; earlier notification of the cultural input was necessary for promotional purposes; and greater involvement required of the host authorities.

T h e v i e w f r o m B r u s s e l s

Asked for their opinions on the potential for a more extensive cultural component in EU external policies, the reactions of European Commission officials were positive, but tempered with realism. There was general agreement that the EU had a strong message to convey and that culture was an appropriate instrument to disseminate it. The way the EU had managed reconciliation in Europe for example, was admired by countries such as Japan and Korea and it was suggested that this might be a theme that the cultural sector could take up.

That culture was an important tool to underpin EU social and economic relations with other countries was increasingly recognised. One official considered culture could be useful in building subtle political linkages but, on the other hand, he thought it may not be easy for the EU to communicate core principles through it.

There was a general recognition of the need for a more strategic approach on the part of the Commission. The key here was the attitude of Member States. Smaller nations could appreciate EU actions more readily than larger countries. There was a need for coherence between what Member States do, what the EU does and what the latter wants to do. The Commission was ready to act if it had the resources.

The absence of sufficient tools for international cultural co-operation was recognised. Brazil, India and China for instance are requesting opportunities to culturally engage with the EU, but the Commission does not have the instruments with which to respond (this should not be confused with instruments for promoting culture in development).

It was suggested that the difficulty with Treaty of Amsterdam Article 151 was that it promoted culture primarily inside the EU and encouraged 'Eurocentrism'. It was necessary to persuade EU Member States to be more open to other cultures. Moreover, politicians in the EU have tended to concentrate on Western culture, forgetting that culture crosses frontiers. Culture and memory were key issues in cultural development and it was important not to overlook the effect of Arabic and Muslim cultures on memory and identity in the West.

Internal co-operation between Directorates had improved, but the difficulty, politically, of achieving integrated EU policies in areas of public sector governance such as security, demonstrates that culture will not achieve this overnight.

Are governments ready for European cultural co-operation actions beyond EU borders?

I n t r o d u c t i o n

In the main, attitudes to an extension of the role of culture in EU External policies were much more positive than negative. At the same time, support was frequently tempered with caveats or pre-conditions.

When reservations were expressed, especially on the part of politicians and civil servants, they often stemmed from a lack of perceivable advantages to the Member States themselves. When asked to consider the concept of a policy-led cultural dimension to EU external relations, almost invariably politicians and civil servants thought of it first in terms of the benefits to their own nation and its culture; only subsequently (if at all) did they think in terms of the wider European advantages. Practitioners, on the other hand, thought of the idea more in terms of their practice and the financial, partnership and other opportunities that might accrue. In itself, this is hardly surprising. Altruism is not at the top of most political agendas and cultural actors are primarily concerned with developing their work in the most favourable environment. What is significant is that quite a lot of interviewees could imagine broader European benefits as a result of EU external policies having a cultural component (despite the admission by interviewees in some countries that this was the first time that any thought had been given to the concept). Indeed the research revealed gaps in awareness of the EU's role in culture beyond knowledge of the Culture 2000 programme, or except in relation to intra-European co-operation. A general lack of interest in the European Commission on the part of some actors involved in international cultural co-operation was also noted.

P o s i t i v e a t t i t u d e s t o a c u l t u r a l d i m e n s i o n t o E U e x t e r n a l p o l i c i e s

Advantages for Member States

On the basis of the research findings the main benefits that a cultural dimension to EU external policies would bring to Member States can be broadly categorised as: better visibility internationally; sharing the workload and expenditure of governments; sustainability; and creating a stronger case for culture in the hierarchy of domestic financial commitments. Some of these are in line with the first study, but some are new.

Enhanced visibility for Member States' culture and presence in the international arena was seen as a potential outcome by several Member States confirming the findings in the first phase research. In the case of Portugal, the possibility of linking the image (especially a more contemporary one) of that country with Europe was seen as very positive and likely to facilitate new market opportunities. No fears were expressed that this might lead to Portuguese culture and identity being 'submerged'. In almost all the countries surveyed there were interviewees who considered that their country could play an important role in a cultural policy for EU external relations, bringing to the table their nation's specific areas of expertise (e.g. Poland and its relations with neighbouring Eastern European countries and its potential as a cultural mediator with Russia and as an initiator of co-operation with Turkey or, in the case of Portugal, its special cultural relations with Brazil and nations in Africa and the Mediterranean).

The French and Portuguese responses both note the potential for Member States to reduce costs and personnel time through the co-ordination of joint programmes at EU level and also, where appropriate, the sharing of overseas premises by national cultural institutes when a presence is required. These are findings with which the UK is also known to be sympathetic and were identified as such in the first study.

It was considered that the EU could facilitate sustainable relations and partnership building with cultural bodies outside the Union, especially if the European Commission enlarged and simplified its programmes to ease the involvement of non-EU organisations. The failure of European Commission programmes to support long term commitments was criticised by practitioners explicitly (e.g. Portugal) or implicitly in some reports.

There was also a belief, registered in the Latvian report in particular, that a cultural component in EU external policies complementing national policy would make domestic civil servants more attentive to the need to financially support culture by emphasising its importance in the hierarchy of government concerns. However, it was recognised that strong statements or other inducements must come from Brussels to underpin the significance which the EU attaches to the issue and encourage civil servants to accept culture as part of “serious policymaking”. The French response considered the European Parliament should have a role in legitimising such a policy.

There were other advantages specific to individual Member States. An EU external cultural policy was seen as providing new development opportunities for Poland, which, in turn, would strengthen civil society and Polish democracy and legitimise Poland’s European credentials. These are strong assertions as the Polish report seems to acknowledge by drawing attention to how Polish beliefs were actually shaped in recent times by grass roots social movements.

One somewhat intriguing benefit – referred to this time in the French response – was that a cultural component of European external policy would have the effect of enabling the Nation to act more as a European player in a new European reality of 25 States. It wanted to maintain its current international cultural relationships, but also to be integrated into European co-operation inside and outside the EU. This would be of benefit to both Europe and France, as the French report rightly points out, even if the impression given is that Europe might benefit more!

Advantages for Europe

Is Europe greater than the sum of its parts? That question, posed in the UK response, seems particularly apposite in the context of the advantages a cultural dimension to EU external policies might bring to Europe as a whole. The perceived benefits can be broadly defined as: reinforcing cultural dialogue with the outside world; spreading European values; enhancing capacity; strengthening European integration and cohesion; promoting and defending the diversity of Europe’s cultural economy; providing critical mass and presenting an image or label that was an assurance of quality.

The role that the EU could play in developing cultural relations through dialogue with Third countries was referred to in several country reports. It could reinforce cultural or intercultural dialogue, counteract the negative images certain European Member States have in the wider world for reason of history or recent circumstances (as suggested in the French report) or to overcome alleged national ‘particularisms’ or biases in the EU’s ad-hoc approaches hitherto (a Polish view) or be an instrument in conflict resolution. The UK report notes that the EU is a strong advocate of human rights and culture could play a role in addressing border conflicts or post war situations and, by way of example, the French report cites Israel and Palestine.

The need for Europe to have a stronger presence in the world through the dissemination of its cultures and common value systems (such as respect for freedom and diversity and acceptance of other cultures) was specifically mentioned in the UK, Portuguese, French and Danish reports and inferred in others. Cultural action was said to be a crucial part of the EU’s security policy by promoting peace, harmony and co-existence on the basis of cultural values, thus endorsing the findings of the first study.

The potential for strengthening cultural capacity figured prominently in the Portuguese, French and Polish reports. Interviewees in Portugal thought an extended EU role could provide added value by building a space for creativity, networking and new partnerships with Third countries. Such countries, as noted in the Polish report, often demonstrated high levels of commitment to international engagement, but lacked cultural co-operation experience, technical wherewithal, infrastructure and resources. The French report reflected widely held views about the importance which the EU should attach to the mobility of artists and practitioners, not only in EU Europe, but in

neighbouring countries and beyond. The aim, as the Portuguese response noted, should be the sharing of experiences and knowledge and the enlargement of goals and horizons. It was suggested that the EU could have a central role in opening up contacts and supporting European cultural networks as instruments for information dissemination. Networks were considered in the French report, to be “driving forces of decisive communication and integration and factors of sustainable development”, and their importance in cultural co-operation at intra and extra European level was noted in other reports.

A cultural dimension to the EU’s external relations was seen in the French response as a potentially important factor in building European cohesion and the integration of Member States, especially the newer ones. The Danish reply emphasised the importance not only for the European project, but also for the EU’s global profile. Indeed it went further, suggesting that in the wider world the EU should be seen culturally as a coherent region, and as Danish culture is increasingly a product of European cultural collaboration, Europe is the basis for Danish culture. Cultural co-operation was also said by one Polish interviewee to be of “unprecedented importance” in respect of countries that aspire to future EU membership, but for whom political integration with the EU is currently out of the question.

A case for the EU to lead in its external policies on the promotion of Europe’s cultural industries was made in the French, Portuguese and UK responses. A number of interviewees in the latter considered there should be a consensus on economic policies for all areas of culture, in recognition of the importance of this evolving area of the economy of many Member States. The EU, it was felt, could establish some broad policies and principles and guidance on impact measures to ensure the diversity of Europe’s cultural products is protected. According to the French reply, intervention by the EU could come ‘upstream’ in the capacities and methods of production, and ‘downstream’ on promotion, distribution and sale. Such initiatives could be strengthened if the EU installed a network of cultural (trade) attachés and promotion offices in Delegations in key target countries. Moreover, the Portuguese response suggests that EU initiatives to support European co-productions in the audiovisual and performing arts sectors would not only benefit Europe’s cultural industries, but could help to strengthen cultural structures in partner countries outside the EU, thus contributing to sustainable relations. According to the Danish response, the development by the EU of a policy in this area should also define the borders between commercial sectors where Member State assistance is inadmissible and public provision where state aid is vital.

This issue of the cultural economy, which was also noted in the first study, does raise questions about the ability of some Member States’ cultural industries to compete in a global environment. The EU could provide the critical mass to tap new emerging markets such as China and India – countries who may consider their interests are better served in many instances by dealing at European rather than national level. Indeed, as both the Polish and French replies point out, the involvement of the EU could be of particular benefit in relation to countries such as China, with whom cultural co-operation can be complex, and it could assist Member States who, for reasons of size, capacity or history, may encounter difficulties in bilateral relations with such countries. The consensus reached by Member States on a common position towards the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions demonstrates that the EU can have more influence by its Members working collectively.

What the EU can also provide – at least symbolically - through its support mechanisms, allied to agreed standards, is a ‘European’ label which endows projects with quality assurance recognised inside Europe and in the wider world. The French reply thought this was especially important in the context of the global heritage where European skills in restoration and preservation techniques could make, or continue to make, a major contribution to the built heritage of developing countries and, in the process, promote cultural dialogue, enhance cultural tourism, and strengthen positive images of both Europe and the recipient countries. Such heritage sites – presumably if suitably

managed – could also be the meeting ground for young European volunteers and platforms for a range of other cultural activities according to some French interviewees. The Portuguese response also favoured EU action on heritage as strengthening the intra and extra European initiatives of Member States.

The French Ministry of Culture was also attracted to the idea of more systematic and strategic EU support for major platforms for European culture, such as festivals and book fora at intra and extra European level.

Finally, the Danish report takes the pragmatic view that, as the EU is a fact, the only realistic response is to include a cultural dimension as the Institution grows in significance. While this may not be described as whole-hearted endorsement, it reflects a noticeable attitudinal change from a decade ago.

C o n d i t i o n a l s u p p o r t

Although the majority view in all the countries surveyed was to endorse, in principle, the concept of culture being firmly embedded in EU external policies, a number of pre-conditions were expressed.

It was considered in the UK response that the EU needed to be clear why it should embark upon developing a cultural dimension to its external relations and what it will endeavour to promote about the culture and values of Member States. But, as inferred in the first research study, it is important that the EU sees itself primarily as a facilitator, not an organiser.

The need for clarity was also called for in the French response which, reflecting the views of government services, insisted that any cultural dimension to external policies developed by the EU must be distinguished from support programmes for culture within EU external development aid, which are part of the European Commission's bilateral policies and, therefore, the responsibility of the partner states involved, not an aspect of EU foreign relations. This is an important point, which needs further examination. As indicated in Chapter 5, the European Commission initiated a process of discussions with Member States on a strategic policy framework for culture in European development policy⁷ but, at the same time, has accepted the importance of integrating culture in the "full range" of EU external policies. This suggests that some synergy between the two areas – culture in development aid and in external foreign relations - must at least be considered.

The need for any EU external cultural policy to respect the principle of subsidiarity was explicit in the Danish, French and UK responses and implicit in the others. EU actions should complement and supplement Member States' endeavours (though it has to be said that cultural practitioners in the UK questioned the relevance of subsidiarity, seeing it merely as an obstacle to European cultural co-operation).

Respect and understanding of the individual cultures of each Member State, and the need to reflect the mosaic of European culture was seen as a *sine qua non*. EU external cultural policy should reflect, in the words of the French response, "the capacity of harmonising... differences without erasing them...". In the views of the Danish response, the EU would need to draw on the rich pluralistic basis of European Culture and have its roots in Member State's own cultural environments. A single European hegemony in culture had to be avoided, as the UK report notes.

The French and Portuguese responses were adamant that there should be no hierarchies based on population, size, culture or language in the representation by the EU of European culture. The European 'message' in policy terms should treat all States equally. Indeed, France and Latvia saw an external cultural policy as an opportunity to better integrate new EU Members and smaller EU States' European cultural actions and the European 'brand'.

No doubt reflecting the different interests of interviewees, the Polish response relays contradictory concerns about how policy is devised, on the one hand suggesting that decisions should reflect the equal contribution of all Member States and not be weighted in favour of the larger

ones (a view shared with Portugal) but, on the other hand, expressing some anxiety that the need for European consensus could delay the implementation of policy.

For France it was of importance to clarify the functional relations between the EU and Member States. The EU should not attempt in its actions to substitute its understanding of European values for those of individual Member States, even if they are shared values. In other words, the EU should not presume to speak for Member States. A formula needs to be found to enable each Member State to continue to promote their own cultural foreign policy interests that is complemented by the European Commission representing common European values. Not an easy task in itself and certainly a factor that would circumscribe EU action.

A number of responses (e.g. France and Latvia) considered that any new EU external cultural strategy needed underpinning with appropriate financial resources. The response from practitioners in the UK, while hesitant about the benefits any EU policy might bring to cultural organisations, also agreed the importance of proper budgetary commitments.

Serious concerns were expressed about the capacity of EU officials to implement any new policy, something which the French considered to be a crippling disadvantage. Both it and the Polish response thought that their might be a role for the cultural attachés of Member States to help bridge the expertise gap, providing they had sufficient knowledge of Europe and, as far as the French reply was concerned, they were not based in those countries deemed as priorities in French external cultural policy. The French and UK responses foresaw a possible role for national cultural institutes – not, it should be emphasised, by transforming them into European cultural centres, for which they are not equipped, but by enabling them to become supporters or partners in European projects. A new network of such institutes may strengthen this argument (see ‘A new mechanism for European co-operation?’-next page).

There was a suggestion in the UK response that an independent body could be mandated by the EU to manage a budget for cultural actions beyond the EU within agreed policy guidelines to avoid central bureaucracy. However, the French response was forthright in stating that no new structures should be set up and, echoing the findings of the first study, it is likely that governments in most of the countries surveyed would have similar reservations.

There was a call in the Portuguese report – no doubt shared by practitioners in the other countries – that cultural actors should be closely involved in the decision-making process.

Although supportive of a European foreign cultural initiative, the French report did not consider it was possible to achieve it without ‘transforming’ the operating modes of institutions, both in its country and in other Member States, as well as the EU itself.

Finally, it is clear that there are sensitivities to address before any cultural component to EU external policies could be developed. For example, the Polish response said there is a need for a broad European debate on the Continent’s heritage and the history of individual Member States. Understanding the goals of Member States’ foreign policies and the context that determines their actions was considered an essential precursor to planning joint projects acceptable to all partners. This was important in the Polish view, not least so that the EU (and presumably other Member States) could understand the aims of Polish foreign policy and the factors that govern it. Prevailing attitudes to relationships with Russia were cited as an illustration of how the Polish (and to some extent Latvian) position differs from that of the EU in general and that of individual states, such as France, in particular. There are concerns in Poland that it is unjustly stereotyped as a consequence of misunderstanding of the orientation of its foreign policies. Although not so explicit in the reports of the other countries surveyed, it is conceivable that sensitivities of a different nature underlie their foreign policy relations as well. The key issue is to what extent these will inhibit the elaboration by the EU of an external cultural dimension.

It is plain that the attitudes of some Member States and practitioners towards the EU have been coloured to some extent by negative experiences of the Culture 2000 programme and by what some regard as the contradictions between EU goals and the real efficacy of such programmes. It was suggested that financial and geographical problems had led to inequalities in the operation of this and other programmes. For instance, a Polish interviewee noted that because the programme regulations in Culture 2000 rules as inadmissible the costs of cultural organisations participating from countries outside the 30 or so agreed European nations, this discouraged such partnerships with Third countries. As another illustration, the geographical position of peripheral countries such as Portugal inevitably increased the costs of their organisations participating in European projects and, in the view of some Portuguese practitioners, made a case for positive discrimination to stimulate greater interest. There were some concerns that any wider EU role would not change these realities.

However, the concern that was echoed most in the countries examined was that EU actions in culture, were already prone to bureaucracy, bottlenecks and unwieldiness and the danger was this would simply be repeated in activities beyond the EU. Scepticism was expressed in both the Latvian and UK reports about EU delegations in Third countries possessing the requisite skills to administer new cultural actions successfully. The experience of at least one interviewee was that good ideas lead to poor policies and worse practical actions. In relation to such actions, the point was made that European film festivals do not, in themselves, contribute to sustainable cultural dialogue with Third countries. However, organising associated seminars and education programmes as part of such events could do so.

Doubts were expressed in Portugal about the EU's ability to reflect the considerable diversity of Europe's cultures in a European external policy. Indeed, it was noted in several of the country reports, that rather than present a uniform image of Europe, any external policy must reflect the mosaic of different cultures. In part, such reservations stemmed from concerns among practitioners that EU officials were too remote from culture and, therefore, not in the best position to determine what actions were appropriate of the local circumstances.

Concerns were registered in Latvia that in a joint enterprise to promote cultural actions in EU external policies, there was a danger that the contribution of smaller Member States would go unnoticed. Only the larger States would benefit.

Some interviewees (e.g. in the UK) were concerned that the EU would use culture as a simplistic public relations tool for the Union, using the very limited Commission budgets for education and culture in the process.

A n e w m e c h a n i s m f o r E u r o p e a n c o - o p e r a t i o n ?

In recent years, there has been evidence of changes in the policies and operations of some of the institutes that promote their nation's culture and languages internationally – not large seismic changes it should be underlined – but shifts that are discernible nonetheless. So, while their principal objectives remain the promotion of cultural and intellectual exchange and language, there has been greater willingness among a number of the national institutes to collaborate rather than compete with each other where common ground can be found. This co-operation has been most evident on issues such as cultural diversity, intercultural dialogue, immigrant communities, young people and other projects that have a European dimension.⁸ Collaboration also extends to the sharing of premises. The motivation for such modest, but nonetheless symbolically significant, co-operation has been both force of circumstances with reductions in budgets, but also, in some instances, a wish to demonstrate their 'European credentials'.

At the same time, there is also evidence of multinational co-operation that is driven less by an interest in promoting Europe than in assisting the cultural operators of the host country. An

illustration of this is the collaboration between the British Council, Goethe Institut and Alliance Francaise in the Thailand New Media Art Festival, which assisted local artists in an area where there is little support from the Thai Government. Another interesting illustration of cultural co-operation in international relations is that between the British Council and the Ministries of Culture and of Foreign Affairs in France, who signed a Memorandum of Understanding in 2004 agreeing to co-operate on building cultural capacity in Third countries.

In 1997, seven national cultural institutes with offices in Brussels established CICEB (Consociato Institutorium Culturalium Europaeorum inter Belgas), a network for co-operation on issues of shared interest, involving collaboration on joint projects and tenders for European Commission funds. By 2006 this had grown to 12 members.

On the initiative of some of the larger cultural institutes, such as the British Council and Goethe Institut, a more extensive mechanism for co-operation between the national institutes was conceived in 2005. This new network, known as the European Union National Institutes for Culture (EUNIC) was being formally established during the course of this study. Its mission is to create effective partnerships between the cultural institutes with the objective of improving and promoting cultural diversity and understanding within European societies and strengthening international dialogue and cultural co-operation beyond Europe (see Annex 7 for more details).

At the time of writing, EUNIC has a membership of 19 institutes or agencies based in EU Member States and engaged in international activities. It has ambitions to have representation from all EU States, including those countries without a cultural institute, In May 2006, the heads of many of the founding members met in Prague to agree the constitutional, organisational and administrative arrangements for the new network.

EUNIC was conceived as a reaction to the rejection of the proposed EU Convention on the Future of Europe by voters in France and the Netherlands, and the lack of support for a common EU foreign policy by the UK and some other Member States. It was considered that at least the national cultural institutes could advance European cultural co-operation through partnerships including, for example, mobilising national networks of European cultural institutions.

The intention of EUNIC is to provide a forum to discuss issues of common interest. It will seek to share best practice and disseminate information through a dedicated website, and an e-zine. It will work on delivering joint projects, whether initiated and financed by EUNIC members themselves or on behalf of the European Commission (i.e. it will tender for EU contracts). The benefit of transnational collaboration will be demonstrated, for example, by support for initiatives of the EUNIC Member State holding the EU Presidency. Staff exchanges between EUNIC members will be encouraged. A key dimension will be advocacy on behalf of the EU national cultural institutes to the European Commission and systematic engagement as a consulting partner to the Commission: CICEB in Brussels, is to become EUNIC Brussels and have the task of liaising with the Commission and disseminating information to EUNIC members on new EU policies and strategies related to culture.

There is no question that EUNIC has the potential to be an important player, both in the European arena and in countries beyond. It appears supportive of the strengthening of the EU's cultural role, providing the European Commission works with Member States and existing cultural co-operation instruments and does not seek to lead on its own initiatives.

A s u c c e s s f u l e x t e r n a l p o l i c y
r e q u i r e s a s t r o n g i n t e r n a l o n e

Finally, in relation to the attitudinal environment for a cultural dimension to EU external policies, the French and Portuguese reports explicitly, and the Danish response implicitly make the valid point that for the EU to develop an effective cultural policy externally, it needs to have more coherent cultural actions internally. This view is also expressed in the first study. So, for the successful mobility of European based artists beyond the EU a precondition is extensive mobility within the 25

States, 27 States from January 2007 on. Similarly, networks cannot be strengthened to engage beyond the EU if their work is not consolidated within the Union. As the French reply memorably expresses it: “a Europe of the outside has no meaning and no foundation without (a) Europe of the inside”.

Towards a framework for EU action on culture in its external policies

A s o l i d m e s s a g e t o c o n v e y

“ ... g l o b a l i s a t i o n a f f e c t s m o r e t h a n j u s t t r a d e d g o o d s a n d s e r v i c e s . I t a l s o a f f e c t s o u r s e n s e o f w h o w e a r e . Q u e s t i o n s o f i d e n t i t y u n d e r l i e m a n y o f t h e c o n t e m p o r a r y i s s u e s a f f e c t i n g t h e l e g i t i m a c y o f t h e E U . T h e E u r o p e a n U n i o n p r o v i d e s a n e w f r a m e w o r k i n w h i c h t o u p h o l d n a t i o n s t a t e s a n d n a t i o n a l i d e n t i t i e s w h i l e a t t h e s a m e t i m e s y m b o l i s i n g a n d e n c o m p a s s i n g c o m m o n E u r o p e a n i d e a s a n d v a l u e s . . . S o i n t h e m o n t h s a n d y e a r s a h e a d t h e E U m u s t c o n f i d e n t l y a s s e r t i t s o w n i d e n t i t y a s n e i t h e r a n a t i o n s t a t e n o r a s u p e r - s t a t e b u t a d i s t i n c t i v e i n s t i t u t i o n t h a t a d d s v a l u e t o t h e l i v e s o f i t s c i t i z e n s ” ⁹

This observation in Europe in a Global Age, made by Douglas Alexander, then Minister for Europe at the UK's Foreign & Commonwealth Office at the time of its publication in 2005, encapsulates an increasingly held view in Europe today that the EU has a good story to tell and needs to assert it more forcefully. Culture could be an integral dimension of that story. Its gratifying that there is increased recognition politically of the potential of culture to advance EU external policies in intercultural dialogue, the creative industries, cultural diversity and identity. Notwithstanding this increasing recognition of its value, currently the cultural dimension is only implemented via limited and closed EU programmes, or ad hoc actions that are often of questionable impact. A number of major countries are keen to engage in cultural co-operation with the EU, but the European Commission does not have the instruments to respond.

Despite the legitimisation granted by the Maastricht/Amsterdam Treaty for EU action on culture to complement the actions of Member States, culture remains a sensitive area and has yet to find a significant place on the political agenda at European level. However, without some common efforts at cultural underpinning inside Europe, it is difficult to see how the positive messages of the 'European Project' can be disseminated convincingly outside. And surely our cultural aspirations for EU Europe and its place in the world go beyond the financing of a modest programme for cultural co-operation – Culture 2000 and its successor – or soft loans for Europe's audiovisual sector? The fact is the EU is unloved, and its role in the Member States is widely misunderstood. But misconceptions are not confined to Europe. In the global arena, the role and achievements of the Union in a continent previously so often at war with itself are also frequently not understood or appreciated. The EU needs to elaborate some core messages that will not only explain what it is, why it does what it does, in the way that it does it, but also what values this unique collection of States represents.

K e y r e s e a r c h f i n d i n g s

So, what does this study reveal? The first thing to emphasise is that in the six countries surveyed there was no outright antagonism towards the idea of the EU having a cultural dimension in its external policies. Neither was their universal enthusiasm. However, there was evidence of genuine interest and, in several instances (e.g. Portugal and France), real support for the idea. True, support was sometimes qualified, but this was only to be expected. Even in what is acknowledged by the Danes themselves to be one of the most sceptical of EU Member States, positions seem to be shifting from negative to more accepting. This was summed up very aptly by the observation in the Danish report that prevailing attitudes to the EU and its cultural role might not be classified as a 'love affair', but "more of a practical attitude" - given that the EU is here to stay, culture must not be overlooked.

Where there was some indifference (whether on the part of public officials or cultural practitioners), it was often because the issue was being considered for the first time. Indeed, it was evident, in a number of instances, that neither the concept nor the consequences had been sufficiently thought through. Another factor which clearly influenced some interviewees' apparent indifference was the association (especially in the minds of cultural practitioners) of the EU with excessive bureaucracy.

Another important finding that emerged from the study was that, on the whole, few territories were "off limits" to possible EU action. There seems to be room for the EU to have a presence in relations with most of the world, although several of the surveyed countries suggested where priorities might lie, e.g. the Neighbourhood Policy countries of Eastern Europe, the Mediterranean rim and Asia. In this connection, it was striking how most of the surveyed Member States indicated that their geographical priorities for culture were those countries with the fastest growing markets for trade, China and India, as well as the economic powerhouse of Japan. In the case of Latin America, Brazil was cited most frequently as a priority, which in each instance (except most obviously Portugal) was connected, presumably, to its emerging economic potential. For the smaller countries in our survey, whose cultural relations with such nations was more aspirational than firmly established, the idea of an EU presence was regarded as potentially helpful for their own visibility, thus reinforcing the conclusions of the first study. Even the larger EU countries examined did not see EU activity as particularly threatening to their own interests, though France seems to have reservations about EU initiatives in its key target countries. Similar reservations of course may exist in some of the 19 EU States we did not question in this exercise - the example of Spain and its relations with Latin America springs to mind. Perhaps a point to emphasise is that several Member States are already competing with one another in their cultural relations beyond the EU, so providing the European Union has a distinctive and complementary message, there need not be too much anxiety about its wider cultural role.

When it came to content priorities, only the French response indicated sectors (language and broadcasting) that were considered to be "out of bounds" to EU action. The French response was also the only one that indicated in any depth those sectors which the EU could prioritise.

Since the information gathered in the first study, there had been policy or structural developments in all the countries except one. For example, a new agency to deliver international cultural co-operation has emerged in France. The most significant changes though were in the UK and Latvia, where new policies and objectives have been developed. In the case of the UK, they appear to reinforce the message that cultural relations' actions should accord with Foreign Office priorities. Political changes in Poland and Portugal have also produced some uncertainties. Nevertheless, none of the changes in themselves suggest a greater reluctance of these Member States to entertain the idea of an enhanced cultural role in the EU's relations with the wider world.

Given the global media and political impact of the ‘cartoons’ episode, perhaps it is surprising that no policy shifts were evident in Denmark. The demonstrations, whether spontaneous or manufactured, against Denmark became, in several instances, antagonism towards the West in general and Europe in particular. The need for a co-ordinated cultural response by the EU to counter and even help prevent similar incidents in the future could hardly seem clearer.

The question of ‘damage limitation’ is not confined to Denmark of course. The sensitive issue of repairing relations with countries or communities outside the EU is a challenge recognised by the foreign and international cultural policies of the UK. Other challenges that were most evident from the surveyed countries were cultural identity in the face of globalisation, insufficient financial resources, reductions in staff levels, a lack of appropriate instruments and the absence of clear policies. Although these factors may have an adverse impact in the effective implementation of international cultural co-operation actions, they need to be addressed nationally. At the same time, some problems, such as the absence of coherent policies or strategies, are not a conducive environment for collective action on culture at European level, as any EU role needs the co-operation and input of Member States.

Conflicting agendas or at least misunderstandings between foreign and cultural ministries were most evident in Latvia and, to some extent, France. On the whole though, such differences were less conspicuous than might have been expected, which suggests there are now more attempts at co-ordination and communication between these government departments than in the past. It is also conceivable of course that tensions remain that have not been articulated.

Finally, it is encouraging that Member States – at least the ones surveyed – appear more open today to cultural co-operation with other EU countries in the delivery of their international objectives. This may simply be driven by the need to share costs, but evidence suggests other factors, such as the potential for greater impact, may also be justifications. This is particularly evident at the level of national cultural institutes, as also indicated by other studies.¹⁰ Of course, cultural actors readily engage with their counterparts in other countries where their artistic ambitions converge and resources allow.

Overall then, this new research ‘on the ground’ has broadly endorsed the findings of the first study and expands it with some insights of its own about attitudes to, and the potential for, a cultural dimension to the EU’s external policies.

G u i d i n g p r i n c i p l e s f o r c u l t u r a l a c t i o n i n E U e x t e r n a l p o l i c i e s

On the presumption that there is sufficient political will to facilitate the elaboration of a cultural dimension in EU external relations, what guiding principles might be appropriate in any framework policy? The following seem especially relevant.

The over-riding principle is that EU action should complement the actions of Member States and not seek to compete with them or duplicate their efforts. There has to be mutual benefit both to the EU and to the cultural, foreign, or trade interests of Member States.

The logical consequence of this, and our second principle, is that EU action should provide ‘added value’. This is somewhat of a slippery term and needs further examination, but for the purposes of this report ‘added value’ is considered to be actions that can most appropriately be carried out at European level, i.e. when there is a European or EU message that needs to be presented. Such initiatives should represent the collective action or involvement of several Member States and their cultural actors.

Thirdly, actions while seeking to present the unity of purpose of the EU must also reflect and embrace its rich cultural diversity. A single European hegemony in culture should be avoided.

Similarly, it is important to reflect the totality of EU Member States and, thus, policy should treat all countries equally, even if, for practical reasons, the contribution of larger states to cultural action

at European level is likely to be greater. There should be no hierarchies related to population size, culture or language.

The fifth principle is that actions should be targeted with a light touch. It is important to avoid the creation of new structures and heavy bureaucracy to implement cultural actions in external policies. Wherever possible, existing institutions and organisations should be employed.

At the same time, it is crucial to recognise the current limitations in the expertise of EU delegations, and so another important principle is the need for capacity building so that European Commission delegations have sufficient skills to co-operate with other public or private sector players, and to call on professional advice when appropriate.

Of course, this will have inevitable consequences for the human resources of the EU and a crucial principle in the development of any policy is that it is underpinned with adequate funds. Frankly, there is no point implementing a policy, that will be completely dependent on financial inputs of Member States' national cultural institutes or embassies.

The next principle is that the EU should see its role primarily as a facilitator or initiator, calling on the cultural expertise of governments and, especially, the cultural sector itself. It should not regard itself as an organiser of cultural action.

The ninth principle is the need for quality control. This extends from the cultural input that could be presented under the EU banner, to the evaluation mechanisms that should be built into EU actions so that their impact can be measured.

Tenth, in actions to encourage culture in development it should be accepted that the primary objective is to work with local people to explore their own cultures and develop markets for their cultural goods, rather than for EU Member States to promote their culture.

The penultimate principle is that it is essential for any extension of the EU's cultural role in its external relations to be framed in a coherent and integrated policy, to avoid the shortcomings evident in the current ad hoc actions.

The twelfth and final governing principle is the necessity for Member States or their representative agencies and Europe's cultural sector to be engaged in a consultation process to enable the EU to devise the most appropriate policy and strategy for its relations, - be they cultural, foreign, trade or promotional - with the wider world.

A p r e l i m i n a r y l o o k a t a f u t u r e a c t i o n a g e n d a

What actions might be foreseen if the EU is to develop a policy? This will depend, of course, on what purposes cultural actions are intended to serve, as well as more detailed research. Nevertheless, we can signpost some areas that deserve examination.

The research to date suggests at least six areas where collective and co-ordinated cultural action by the EU, Member States and the cultural sector could have beneficial impacts on the global presence of the EU.

Building sustainable cultural co-operation with countries beyond the EU

The need for sustainability in projects that seek to build or cement cultural relations was underlined on numerous occasions during this research. The cultural sector, through trial and error, understands that partnerships evolve; they don't happen overnight. Unfortunately, one-off project funding, inadequate resources, a lack of appropriate skills and short-term political expediency can adversely impact on such partnerships at an early stage, when they are most vulnerable. The EU is its Member States, but smaller nations often find it difficult to maintain an external profile in the inevitable competition with dominant larger states. They need more visibility. Moreover, opportunities are not always taken by the EU to develop cultural co-operation with Third countries because of a lack of instruments. These issues might be addressed by:

Objective	Action
• Capacity building	> Support for training for cultural sector, especially newer Member States
• Balancing needs of small EU states	> Introduction of an adjustment fund with larger ones to assist and support the participation in EU initiatives of smaller nations
• Responding to countries eager to engage in cultural co-operation with the EU	> Introduction of new instruments to facilitate engagement

Strengthening understanding between peoples through intercultural dialogue
Europe's security appears threatened from without and within, but the nature of this threat is new and calls for imaginative responses. The EU can be a force for good in the world, but relations with Third countries are not always harmonious. Trade or economic relations with other countries do not, on their own, build confidence and understanding between peoples. 'Soft' power, as Joseph Nye and others have pointed out, can be an effective instrument in dispelling ignorance and restoring trust¹¹. The importance of intercultural dialogue is recognised by the EU in as much as 2008 has been designated Year of Intercultural Dialogue, but while this may be symbolically important it is questionable whether that a single year focus will have a lasting impact. Intercultural measures need to be supported more systematically as a dimension of the external relations of the EU and its Member States. One measure that might be considered is:

Objective	Action
• Build trust in the EU's relations with the rest of the world	>

Disseminating information and promoting EU visibility
Commissioner Wallström has acknowledged that the EU faces many problems internally in legitimising its governance in the eyes of its citizens and is focussing more on communicating with them¹². However, it is not only internal images of the EU that need to be addressed. The EU remains profoundly misunderstood beyond its borders as others have noted¹³. The need seems obvious for the EU to turn its attention to developing effective communication strategies to address its image – not for superficial public relations purposes, but to convey clearer impressions of what lies at the heart of the 'European Project'. If, as many believe, the EU is more than a major trading bloc; if it represents a certain value system, then serious attempts should be made to demystify the Institution. At the same time, it needs to recognise this value system as multi-layered and avoid the temptation to

reduce its great diversity to a set of basic principles that are allegedly common to us all as Europeans. Culture has an integral role in this process. The EU could:

- | Objective | Action |
|--|---|
| • Convey information about the EU system and its Members | > |
| • Promote the democratic and other values that underpin EU nations | |
| • Promote the EU as a contemporary and dynamic cultural community | > Showcasing the artistic and creative talent of Member States |
| • Capacity building | > Build capacity of EU delegations through appropriate cultural training. |

Promoting trade in Europe's cultural industries

There has been acknowledgement by the EU and Member States that the cultural and creative industries represent an important sector for employment growth and knowledge development and thus contribute to the Lisbon agenda. This recognition of the value of the sector is also evident from the EU support for the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions. In the production chain, EU support could come 'upstream' in the capacities and methods of production and 'downstream' in promotion and sale. Trade is one of the pillars of the EU's existence and the cultural dimension of this needs to be reflected in an external relations' agenda. One are that might be considered for EU action is:

- | Objective | Action |
|--|--------|
| • Promoting international trade in the cultural industries of EU Member States | > |

Promoting Europe's expertise in heritage

The cultural heritage is a key component of the multiple identities that shape Europe. Intra-European co-operation has helped promote awareness of the vast heritage - built and moveable - of our continent. Specialists in European countries have developed particular skills in the protection, conservation, restoration and development of this heritage. Some Member States are active in promoting this expertise world-wide, but not all. There is a need for this expertise internationally, especially in developing countries and this is an area where the EU could be more active. Drawing on such technical assistance collectively might build intercultural dialogue and help demonstrate to other nations that Europe's interest in their heritage is not confined to its museum collections!

- | Objective | Action |
|---|--|
| • European expertise in the heritage

unaided | > Develop assistance programmes to provide European expertise to countries that cannot sustain their

heritage |

Embedding culture in development

The preparation of a Draft Strategy on Culture in the European Development Policy was interesting in indicating how culture and development can be addressed as a transversal issue involving co-operation between a number of Commission Directorates. This area is also one which can sometimes lead to confusion if Member States forget that the emphasis must be on supporting the culture of the developing country concerned, not that of the Member State. Culture here is both an instrument and an end product. It is likely to be some time before culture can be 'mainstreamed' into development policy as the paper suggests it should be, but areas for action (or continuation of existing actions through frameworks such as the ACP programme) might include.

- | Objective | Action |
|---|--------|
| • Build capacity | > |
| • Support cultural industries in the developing country | > |
| • Promote cultural diversity | > |

Possible instruments to implement EU actions

If we accept that the EU's role in external cultural actions should be primarily that of a facilitator rather than a direct organiser, what instruments might it call on to help it implement cultural initiatives? This will be dependent, of course, on the nature of the activity – for example intercultural and trade initiatives may require different skills. Nevertheless, the following organisations and areas (listed in random order) are potentially key players.

The fledgling EUNIC, with a mandate to stimulate co-operation between national cultural institutes on projects and the promotion and strengthening of intra and extra European dialogue, seems an obvious candidate. Commission officials have been in discussions with directors of the national cultural institutes (as well as civil servants responsible for international cultural co-operation in ministries of foreign affairs) for some time on how to take collaboration forward. EUNIC and Commission staff representatives met in Berlin in June 2006 and agreed to put 'bones on the flesh' of their relationship. Commission staff from DG Education & Culture appear enthusiastic about the emergence of the EUNIC platform and see a promising future in their relationship.

Europe's cultural networks are also instruments that could help deliver EU external cultural objectives. They have extensive experience in bringing actors from the cultural sector together and several of them are already active beyond EU borders, e.g. the Informal European Theatre Meeting in Asia. They also have the advantage of having the possibility of circumventing any difficulties that might be encountered at national level in foreign relations with particular countries.

A third instrument that could be employed by the Commission to assist the delivery of EU objectives are foundations. A number of these are very active at European level (including the European Cultural Foundation itself of course) and support co-operation with Neighbourhood Policy and Mediterranean Rim countries. Such expertise will be invaluable. Some are members of NEF (the Network of European Foundations for innovation) which might provide a co-ordinating mechanism for joint initiatives.

In the field of development, there are a raft of European agencies already working internationally, such as SIDA. Similarly, there are specialist trade bodies. Then, of course, there is the cultural sector itself and the many organisations engaged internationally, and the government ministries with responsibilities for external development, trade, culture and foreign affairs. Partnerships such as these will be key to the effective delivery of EU external policies with a cultural component.

T h e n e e d f o r f u r t h e r r e s e a r c h

What this study has endeavoured to do is verify the findings of the literature survey and analysis, and establish whether the environment at national level is sufficiently fertile for the EU to develop more of a cultural dimension to its external policies. The need for further detailed research was foreseen at the outset, for it would have been pointless to have commissioned such a study in advance of being reasonably confident that there are no significant obstacles likely to prevent EU action.

Of course those of us in the cultural sector may be convinced that a cultural dimension should be integral to the EU's external relations, but we need to know more concretely how culture can make a difference to the EU achieving its goals internationally, and what added value it can bring to the EU's agenda. Culture's potential contribution to the EU's security, trade, global relations and development interests need investigation. We need to know what the potential consequences – social, political and economic – are likely to be of the development of cultural components in EU external policies and how such components can be elaborated. Further examination needs to be given to the role of culture in presenting images (positive where possible, but also truthful) of the EU family of States; and in developing relations that are built on trust. It is necessary to establish the most effective ways of achieving coherence in EU action and greater co-operation with Member States. These and other areas for investigation suggest the need to identify good practice where it exists, whether at European or national levels, and examine how they might be developed. These and several other areas revealed in this study deserve more extensive consideration. So, if there is to be a Phase Two of this enquiry it should build on the evidence provided in these first two studies.

The initiative "A Soul for Europe" reminds us of the importance of applying culture as a strategic factor in Europe's development. Culture, it notes, "is becoming increasingly more important as a means of bringing Europeans together while determining to an even greater degree the ability of the EU to act in its dealings with neighbouring states and the rest of the world".¹⁴ Of course, it may still take time before national pride yields to a more pragmatic approach to culture on the part of Member States. There may be need for prudence and patience. Nevertheless, at this stage, the signs are more encouraging than some of us might have expected for the EU to develop a framework for the strategic deployment of culture in its external policies. Indeed as the Portugal report puts it: "...the greatest concern is that it might not happen".

Notes

- 1 DCMS Draft International Strategy 2006, London
- 2 Arts Council England, 2005, International Policy, London;
Arts Council England, 2006, Internationalism: from policy to delivery, London
- 3 The 'ring of friends' was the term used by Jose Manuel Barroso, President of the European Commission.
- 4 European Commission Communication COM (2005) 489.
- 5 ASEM comprises the 25 EU states, the 10 ASEAN nations plus China, Japan and Korea. At the ASEM VI Summit held in Helsinki in September 2006, Member States agreed to admit five more countries – Bulgaria, Romania, India, Pakistan and Mongolia, plus the ASEAN Secretariat.
- 6 Cultural Partnership Mapping exercises were conducted in Europe (by Rod Fisher) and Asia (by Consuelo V. Zapata) in 2005, that revealed a significant information imbalance between the two regions. Since then a co-ordinated audit of Asian cultural

- resources has been conducted as part of the content development strategy of the proposed Culture 360 web portal. The Informal European Theatre Meeting and Visiting Arts have been among the European advisers.
- 7 Draft Strategy on Culture in the European Development Policy, unpublished working paper 2006.
 - 8 More information on this can be found in Fisher, Rod (2005) *La Co-operazione Culturale in un' Europa in transizione* (Cultural Co-operation in a Europe in Transition), Bologna, 'Economia della Cultura', Vol. 15, No. 1 /2005, Il Mulino. A section on cultural co-operation in Europe involving national cultural institutes also written by Rod Fisher can be found in EFAH/Interarts (2003), *Study on Cultural Co-operation in Europe for the European Commission*, http://europa.eu.int/comm/culture/eac/sources_info/pdf
 - 9 *Europe in a Global Age*, Foreign Policy Centre, London 2005
 - 10 See Fisher, Rod (2005), *La Co-operazione Culturale in un' Europa in transizione*, and EFAH/Interarts (2003), op cit.
 - 11 See for example Nye, Joseph (2004), *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*, New York, The Perseus Press.
 - 12 Wallström, M (2005), *Slow progress on Communication Strategy due to Commission's internal problems*. Interview see <http://www.euroactive.com/Article?tchuri=tcm:29-137597-16&type=Interview>.
 - 13 See for example de Gouveia, Ph.F & Plumridge, H. (2005), *European Infopolitik: Developing EU Public Strategy*, London, Foreign Policy Centre.
 - 14 'A Soul of Europe' (Europa eine Seele geben). See website: www.berlinerkonferenz.net.

I Introduction - The research frame and conditions

The research in Denmark aims to verify whether or not the conclusions of the first study of the Boekman Foundation resembled the reality on the ground. The method included four phases:

- Forming the interview panel consisting of key persons covering the different layers of the cultural environment in Denmark
- Establishing a questionnaire covering the main interesting EU questions connected to EU/Denmark relations
- Performing the research
- Extracting and concluding trends and attitudes from the interviews and answers.

T h e k e y p e r s o n s p a n e l

The key persons panel was based in four areas covering the cultural environment in Denmark:

- 1 State administration (three persons including the Minister of Culture)
- 2 Politicians (four culture spokespersons from key political parties)
- 3 National culture institutions (five persons representing significant institutions)

4 Artists, institutions and organisations (ten individuals and organisation representatives)

It must be underlined that the research was defined with a short timeframe and the key persons cannot be regarded as a wholly representatively chosen panel in the ordinary sense. But the researchers believe that the panel can be regarded as significant and, under the circumstances, an indicator of the situation in Denmark.

T h e q u e s t i o n n a i r e

In order to maintain a consistency in the research, a questionnaire covering the most interesting areas – viewed from a Danish viewpoint – was established. The questionnaire covered the following areas:

- 1 The EU as a European culture factor
- 2 Under what terms should the EU be active in the culture area?
- 3 The importance of EU and international collaboration in general
- 4 Denmark's position and function in EU culture activities
- 5 EU activities vs. other international culture activities
- 6 Are the different EU countries of different importance?
- 7 Have you changed your opinion on EU culture activities?

Approximately half of the interviews were performed as personal interviews. The remaining part were performed as telephone interviews. The interview persons always received the questionnaire beforehand.

II Summary and conclusions

The aim of this research project is to provide a 'reality check' on the exact position as to EU and culture policy and focusing on EU external policy, based on an examination of actual practice and interrogation of key person's attitudes. The research project is based on a general questionnaire functioning as interview guide and was conducted in Denmark in May 2006. A key person's panel was formed consisting of 22 key persons from the Danish culture environment.

B a c k g r o u n d

As is well known, Denmark has been an EU member since 1972 and public support for membership has been tested several times, showing continuous support for the Union but, at the same time, the sceptical viewpoints have constantly been very clear and visible, especially with the result of the four exceptions following the referendum in 1992. On this basis it is obvious that Denmark and the Danes have a somewhat restricted attitude to EU institutions, an attitude which has also influenced discussions focusing on the EU and culture.

An analysis of the Danish involvement in EU culture programmes in 2005 showed that Denmark – and Danish culture institutions – in general have not been very active in EU culture programmes. Even Norway – a non-EU member – was shown to be a more active participant in the culture programmes! Therefore the results of this research project must be analysed and understood against this background.

A number of general conclusions can be drawn from the research analysis of the panel member's responses and the conclusions on the seven research areas are the following:

The EU as a European culture factor

In general the key person's panel – with a few distinct exceptions – finds that the EU should be active in the culture area. This is a positive response demonstrating a general change in attitude from what would have been the response 10 – 15 years ago. It cannot be interpreted as a very positive factor in

favour of EU per se – but the positive response is based on the viewpoint that the EU is a fact – as it is for the culture area – and the only practical and realistic response to that de facto situation is to include the culture areas in this growing and, in some areas, dominating factor.

But when asked ‘under what terms should the EU be active in the culture area?’, the answers are differentiated. The general viewpoint is that EU should have a culture policy in order to include culture as an important factor in the general EU project – this would also profile EU globally.

A majority of the panel thus expresses a wish to include the culture dimension in order to support the humanistic aspects of the EU externally with especial regard to the global aspects, it is considered as essential that the culture dimension is improved in order to support the European identity and profile in the different aspects of coexistence with the other global centres. But when it comes to visions about how to handle this EU culture dimension, it is very clear that the majority of key persons find it essential that the EU should not try to establish a specific and strong EU culture activity or culture administration above (and over-ruling) the existing national culture administrations. And it is very clear that the Danish key persons find it essential that an EU policy should specifically define the culture area as one initiated and administrated entirely on the national or regional level. Several key persons point out that the pluralism aspect of the European culture is crucial, and it is a very strong wish that an EU dimension should work from this rich pluralistic basis, and not try to establish a narrower and ‘pseudo’ European ‘EU culture’.

On the more practical side, several key people’ point out that the EU needs a culture policy in order to define the borders between commercial areas (where national financial support is forbidden) and culture areas (where national financial support is vital). The borders between commercial art and non-commercial culture activities are challenged today in several ways and without the culture dimension the EU lacks a forum for solving this kind of question.

The importance of EU- and international collaboration in general
In general, the key person’s panel – with a few exceptions – finds and expects a strongly positive effect related to culture projects, both as to national profile and the effect on the culture environment and the institutions.

All of the key person’s panel involved in institutional culture management find that international collaboration between the institutions, combined with the opportunity to operate outside Denmark, improves quality and organisational identity. The problem with this kind of activity is that the work load is very big, and many organisations are not of sufficient capacity for this kind of activity.

Denmark’s position and function in EU culture activities
When asked what kind of role or profile Denmark should have within EU culture dimension activities, the general attitude is that Denmark should be active and have an initiating attitude – and be (more) prepared for collaboration projects.

Danish foreign policy in the culture area has followed different – and conflicting – policies over the last ten years reflecting different attitudes from ministers of culture. The attitudes have moved from passive ad hoc cultural exchange, to active and almost aggressive culture export (profiling Denmark as a nation), to more commercial oriented support to the export oriented art and culture areas and to a present cost benefit focused investment-based orientation, where culture export and culture collaboration is regarded as a natural aspect of the national branding.

The Danish Culture Institute has been supported in establishing centres in China and the Middle East parallel to the development of European centres. This would not have been the case five to eight years ago. This activity is regarded as important in initiating and improving international connections and can be viewed as a parallel to more internationally oriented Danish foreign policy activities. In this context, the culture platforms are regarded as important means of communication and connection.

EU activities vs. other international culture activities

When confronted with the question of the importance of collaborating with other EU countries or institutions vs. collaborating with non EU partners, collaboration with institutions and partners from other EU countries is regarded as important – and in many cases the most important collaboration partners. But most of those interviewed also point out that in the global world new possibilities and areas are very – and equally - important.

Are the different EU countries regarded as being of different importance as collaboration partners?

The general attitude is that the new EU countries are interesting collaboration partners – but the political interest in integrating them in the EU should not be implied in cultural collaboration activities. In general, collaboration projects are taking place as a collaboration ‘institution to institution’ and not ‘country to country’, and therefore the country aspect is of less importance, and stressing that kind of collaboration will very easily be interpreted as political pressure.

Have opinions on EU culture activities changed?

In general, those interviewed do not feel a change, but they feel more confident in their own position and, as stated earlier, the majority of the key person’s panel were positive about an increase in an EU culture focus. So the change of attitudes over the past five years is not significant – but if there has been a change it has grown in a positive direction. Nevertheless, this should also be understood in the context of traditional Danish scepticism. In this perspective, the attitude towards the establishment of an EU culture dimension – with an external focus – seems to have changed from a negative to a positive position. It might not be ‘a love affair’, but more of a practical attitude: the EU is here to stay and, given that reality, culture should not be forgotten – on the contrary.

The cartoon case – and the global responses to it – has not changed the viewpoints significantly in Denmark. The response, in general, is that those who believe in developing international understanding through culture interaction activities have reinforced their viewpoint – and so have those who do not believe that culture activity has a significant effect outside the network of people directly involved. Nevertheless, a majority of the key person’s panel find it important to intensify cultural collaboration in order to improve understanding between different culture environments on a global level. The responses can be summarised in the following ways:

- Based on the key persons’ panel the general opinion is that the EU should have a formulated culture policy. This is important because without a culture dimension the EU lacks an important activity dimension or perspective of European identity. And the EU cannot profile itself globally without its important culture dimension. The culture dimension is also regarded as important in order to define the EU as initiating and supporting cultural diversity, and it is important in order to avoid conflicts between commercial and culture areas.
- It can also be regarded as a general opinion that the EU should use culture in the global profiling of the EU and Europe, and initiate and support collaboration projects between culture institutions, culture operators and artists. But the EU should not initiate a strong ‘culture layer’ and initiate projects without roots in the Member States’ own culture environments. Diversity is the keyword and the EU tendency to harmonize and generalise is a danger.
- It is crucial that centralisation and bureaucracy should be avoided and artistic, cultural and regional diversity supported. ‘The arm’s length’ principle should also be used on the EU level and a strong EU culture unit should be avoided.
- Cultural collaboration is in general regarded as a quality driving activity as well as a bridge to mutual understanding and integration. In general, all institutions involved in international projects experience a positive input on their quality profile and artistic and organisational development activities.

- Personal differences were obvious between the attitudes of the different panel members, but there does not seem to be any significant difference in the general responses from the four panel groups – or social/administrative layers – ranging from culture manager to ministry level.

III The seven research areas and responses

In the following section the seven parts of the questionnaire are analysed and conclusions drawn.

1 The EU as a European culture factor

The initial question of the questionnaire focused on the general view of EU and culture stating:

a. should the EU be active in the culture area?

On the questionnaire scale 5 = 'agree' and 1 = 'do not agree' the answers have an average of 4.2 indicating that the basic attitude of the panel is that EU should include culture in the EU activities.

The reasons for this generally very positive attitude are formed from different opinions and viewpoints. Some of the comments on this question reveal the scope of differences:

- The EU is a political power factor and should therefore both motivate and stimulate the cultural processes if the political project is to succeed
- In order to create a more coherent Europe (culture understood as a very broad concept) the EU should include culture in its integration work, but the EU should only be active on a high level – not as a practitioner.
- The EU should be the region that culturally – in a global world – is seen as a coherent region. Danish culture is a product of European cultural collaboration and, therefore, Europe is the basis for Danish culture
- The EU as a superior culture factor is important – especially where commercial and culture overlaps as in the film industry and public service media.

A representative of the negative opinion gave this answer:

- NO! EU should focus on existing tasks and areas, which already seem to be difficult enough.

C o n c l u s i o n 1 : The general conclusion based on the key persons' panel – with a few distinct exceptions – is that the EU should be active on a high level in the culture area.

2 . U n d e r w h a t t e r m s s h o u l d t h e E U b e a c t i v e i n t h e c u l t u r e a r e a ?

In order to test the panel's views on what ways the EU can or should be active in the cultural area, and trying to trace the attitude towards different well known EU strategies, two main questions focussed on this point.

I. Should the EU support culture projects or should it initiate its own culture projects?

II. Should the EU formulate a general culture policy?

The first question was formulated as two questions that resulted in very different answers.

- Should the EU support and motivate bilateral and multilateral collaboration projects in the EU countries?

The answers have an average of 4.63 indicating that the panel in general strongly agree that EU should support and motivate bilateral and multilateral projects.

This positive attitude compares with the attitude to the second question proposing EU as an independent project initiator.

- Should the EU support and initiate its own EU culture projects?

The answers here have an average of 3.1, indicating that the panel in general has a much lower acceptance of EU initiated projects.

The comments highlight the reasons for this distinct difference:

- The EU as an operator will be, in the best cases, a supporting factor and in the worst cases a very negative bureaucratic factor, which has been learned from experience.
- Such projects are in general used as EU PR political stunts. And the problem is that such projects do not necessarily reflect a culture need and lack of quality can also become a problem, as has been seen.

C o n c l u s i o n 2 a : The key persons' panel strongly recommends culture projects to be rooted in existing national organisations in order to ensure relevance, vitality, and quality.

The third question in this group focused on the key person's panel attitudes towards an independent EU culture policy. The question was:

- The EU should declare a general culture policy

The answers have an average of 3.1 indicating that the panel attitudes in general are very mixed on this question. The comments demonstrate the differences in attitudes.

- Regarding the culture industries the EU already has policies and recommendations – and that will grow. But the subsidiarity principles are important and an EU culture policy must focus on supporting diversity and not seek conformity.
- Culture policy as ideology production does not function and therefore the EU should focus on securing and supporting an active and visual frame for European culture production. The EU's role in this work should be formulated but, in general, the EU should let the work in this area be a matter of national initiative.
- The EU should operate on a high level only in order to position the EU globally based on the long European cultural history. An EU culture policy must be based on this cultural history and be more ideology than practical. Globally it is important to formulate EU standpoints on culture.

C o n c l u s i o n 2 b : The comments in general reflect three main viewpoints:

- a. The EU should have a culture policy in order to include culture as an important factor in the general EU project – this would also profile EU globally

- b. BUT the EU should not establish a specific EU culture activity or practical administration above the national culture administrations. Moreover, an EU policy should specifically define the culture area as one initiated and administrated entirely on the national or regional level
- c. The EU should have a culture policy in order to define the borders between commercial areas (national financial support forbidden) and culture areas (national financial support vital).

3 . T h e i m p o r t a n c e o f E U a n d i n t e r n a t i o n a l c o l l a b o r a t i o n i n g e n e r a l

Six questions profile the key persons attitude on different aspects and possible effects of EU and international collaboration in general.

- Cultural collaboration projects within EU are important for Denmark's international profile

The answers have an average of 4.1 indicating that the panel, in general, believe in a strong positive effect on Denmark's international profile caused by cultural collaboration projects.

- Culture collaboration projects including other EU Member Countries are important for Danish culture life and culture institutions.

To this question the answers have an average of 4.3 indicating that the panel, in general, believe in a strong positive effect on Danish culture life and culture institutions.

- What effect would a general culture activity within the EU have on Danish culture life in general?

To this question the answers have an average of 4.5 indicating that the panel generally believe in a strongly positive effect on Danish culture life in general.

- Culture collaboration projects within the EU are important for improving the Danes' perspective and knowledge as to the other countries.

To this question the answers have an average of 4.3 indicating that the panel, in general, believe in a strongly positive effect on Danish perspectives and knowledge as to the other countries.

- Culture collaboration projects within the EU are important for improving the other countries' perspective and knowledge as to Denmark

The answers have an average of 4.3 indicating that the panel generally believe in a strongly positive effect on improving the other countries' perspectives and knowledge of Denmark.

- What effect might an EU culture project have on your institution?

This question is only relevant to groups III and IV in the panel (national culture institutions and artists, institutions and organisations) and the quoted results hence refer to these groups only.

The total average of this group of six important attitude questions have an average of 4.5 indicating that the panel in general believe in a strongly positive effect on Danish culture institutions as a result of EU culture projects.

Comments to these questions vary. An important general comment was that:

Questions focussing on a national effect are missing the point because culture projects are not national projects but institution to institution projects, and hence a broader effect depends very much on the PR and communication activity around the projects.

C o n c l u s i o n 3 : In general the key persons' panel – with a few exceptions – find and expect a strongly positive effect related to EU culture projects, both as to national profile and the culture environment and institutions.

4 . D e n m a r k ' s p o s i t i o n a n d f u n c t i o n i n E U c u l t u r e a c t i v i t i e s

As the attitudes in Denmark towards international culture projects have changed over the years, it was relevant to ask the panel what attitude or functional profile Denmark should have towards the EU culture collaboration environment. This refers both to 'internal' European projects and 'external' global projects. Three typical attitudes were tested:

What attitude should Denmark have in the EU collaboration environment?

- I. Passive (1)
- II. Ad hoc (3)
- III. Initiator (5)

The answers have an average of 4.3 indicating that the panel in general find that Denmark should be moderately active depending on the projects' concepts. One comment covers the general attitude:

Denmark must be active, but recognise the country's size. It is important to be in front and ready to be active when opportunities appear.

C o n c l u s i o n 4 : The panel found that Denmark should have an active profile regarding international culture projects, and be open to EU collaboration projects.

5 . E U a c t i v i t i e s v s . o t h e r i n t e r n a t i o n a l c u l t u r e a c t i v i t i e s

Many answers underline the difference and the interaction of 'the Global', the European' and 'The National' levels and profiles, and therefore the sixth question or statement was this:

The EU countries are the most important collaboration partners for the Danish culture environment

The answers have an average of 3.1 indicating that the panel is quite mixed on this question. Many point out that EU – or European countries – are the natural collaboration partners in many cases, but others also very strongly point out that in the global reality the other global 'regions' – USA, China and others - are of similar interest and importance for cultural development.

C o n c l u s i o n 5 : Collaboration with institutions from other EU countries is important – and European countries are in many cases the most important collaboration partners. But in the global world new possibilities and areas are very – and equally - important.

6 . A r e t h e d i f f e r e n t E U c o u n t r i e s o f d i f f e r e n t i m p o r t a n c e ?

The enlargement of the EU is an issue of high political importance. But is it of importance in cultural collaboration? This question was addressed with the following statement.

It is more important to collaborate with the new EU countries than the old EU countries.

The answers have an average of 2.7 indicating that the panel does not find the distinction 'old' and 'new' EU countries relevant in this context.

C o n c l u s i o n 6 : The new EU countries are interesting collaboration partners – but the political interest in integrating them in the EU should not be implicit in culture collaboration activities.

7 . P e r s o n a l o p i n i o n s o n E U c u l t u r e a c t i v i t i e s ?

This research was defined in order to 'test' possible changes in attitudes, and therefore three questions focused on the key person's own attitudes.

- Have you changed your opinion on the EU as a culture factor over the past five years?

The answers indicate that, in general, the personal opinions have changed very little – but in some cases the personal attitude has grown more positive.

- Has the reactions to the Mohamed cartoons influenced your viewpoint on international culture collaboration?

In general the answers indicate that the international response to the cartoon case has not really changed the viewpoints – but it has clarified the necessity of cultural understanding. The views of those that find that international interaction – also regarding culture activities – is important have been reinforced by the reactions from Islamic countries societies and countries.

- The reactions on the Mohamed cartoons have indicated that it is important to intensify cultural collaboration

C o n c l u s i o n 7 : Changes of attitudes over the past five years are not significant – but if there has been a change it has been a growing positive attitude. The cartoon case – and the global responses to it – has not changed the viewpoints significantly – but nevertheless a majority of the key person's panel find it important to intensify cultural collaboration in order to improve understanding between different culture environments.

IV Final remarks

The research project was met by positive interest. And when asked if the questionnaire had covered all aspects they wanted to express – they all answered that they felt it had covered their opinions.

The report was deliberately kept very objective – in order to avoid too much interpretation, which is crucial when dealing with very sensitive political areas, which definitely is the case when analysing EU orientations. We feel that part succeeded, and we hope that the report will fulfil the need for a reality check in this area.

T h e r e s e a r c h p a n e l

State administration

Poul Bache, Director, Danish Arts Agency

Erik Farsø Madsen, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, communication department

Brian Mikkelsen, Culture Minister (not included due to illness)

Politicians

Mogens Jensen, Cultural spokesperson – Social Democratic Party

Ellen Thrane Nørby, Cultural spokesperson – Liberal Party

Ole Sohn, Cultural spokesperson – Socialist Peoples Party

Jakob Axel Nielsen, Cultural spokesperson – The Conservative Peoples Party

National culture institutions

Finn Andersen, Secretary General, The Danish Cultural Institute

Michael Christiansen, Head of Theatre, The Royal Danish Theatre

Allis Helleland, Director, National Museum for Art

Bodil Busk Lauersen, Director, Danish Museum of Art & Design

Per Erik Veng, Choir and Orchestra Chief, DR Radio Symphony Orchestra

Artists, institutions and organisations

Jesper Bay, Marketing Director, International Federation of the Phonographic Industry (IFPI), Denmark

Susanne Dogherty, Director of the culture centre 'Huset i Magstræde'

H.C. Gimble, Communications Co-ordinator, Copenhagen International Theatre

Litten Hansen, Director, Copy Dan

Mogens Holm, Chairman, FAST – Union of Small Theatres

Claus Christian Koch, Programme Head, Event House – Culture & Sport, Odense

Per Kofoed, General manager – publishing house 'Per Kofoed'

Bjørn Nørgaard, sculptor

Henrik Oschner, Head of Administration, Århus Festival

Peter Schaufuss, Head of Schaufuss Ballet

I Context

A s t r o n g c u l t u r a l e n g a g e m e n t o f F r a n c e

France is characterised by an old, strong and systematic cultural policy: both inside and outside. Its Ministry of Culture is certainly the most developed in Europe, and makes culture a significant field and instrument of the public utility.

The foreign policy of France reproduces this passion for culture. It started from the end of the 19th century, at the time of the European imperial competitions and colonisations: if it has lost the original spirit, it has preserved some (in its modern evolutions) of the forms and the missions.

The running of the external cultural policy of France is ensured almost exclusively by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs (MAE) and its internal or closely associated networks: it is a general and centralised action which leaves little place for the other institutions concerned (Ministry of Culture, the local communities or the independent operators). It is spread primarily in two dimensions: diffusion of French culture abroad and cultural co-operation with Third or, more recently, the emerging countries.

D i f f u s i o n a n d p r o m o t i o n p o l i c y

The dissemination externally consists in addressing an image of France, its culture, its values, its civilisation and its cultural productions. To develop them and, if necessary, to sell them: the political impact had certainly more weight at the beginning than it does today where the economic dimension prevails. It comprises two strong thrusts: on the one hand dissemination of the French language in the world, on the other hand the promotion of French cultural products on the outside: thought, performing arts, heritage, literature, visual arts, fashion, etc

If the thrust of the language is universal, and is addressed to the whole world, with opportunist preferences according to historical contexts, the thrust of the diffusion of cultural products is more naturally directed towards the main purchaser countries i.e., outside of Europe (which remains the first market and prime objective for France), the United States and Japan and, increasingly today, China, India, Brazil and emerging countries. The most recent evolution moves the contents of the traditional productions towards cultural industries: cinema, publishing, music, etc.

C o - o p e r a t i o n p o l i c y

Co-operation concerns initially the policy of colonial valorisation of France which, indeed, had stressed the valorisation of its colonies and of its colonial model in general (Colonial Exhibition, 1931), and more particularly the valorisation of the cultures and the traditions of its Empire. It thus encouraged the research (ethnology, oral traditions), the cultural expression, the creation and the development of the artistic and technical capacities, as regards theatre arts, literature, visual arts, craft industry or cinema, in the countries which today form part of the ACP group (Africa, the Caribbean, the Pacific) and, to a lesser extent, of the Mediterranean area.

This policy evolved to the broader themes, largely shared by Europe, of the dialogue of cultures, national or local identities and (sustainable) development.

E u r o p e a n a n d i n t e r n a t i o n a l c o n v e r g e n c e

Today, France is no longer a major power, but as it took part in the European adventure in the context of the globalisation of exchanges, its policy adapted and became integrated, while preserving

its basic characteristics, in the new conditions, the new stakes and the new themes: cultural diversity, intercultural and social dialogue, the development of societies, the European Neighbourhood policy, international and multilateral co-operation.

E u r o p e a n p o l i c y a n d F r a n c e

France testifies, at the political level, but also in its public opinion, to a strong and constant commitment in favour of Europe: as a founder and organiser country on the one hand, and as a country which became, on the other hand, a medium size power and, as such, subject to the necessity to find a durable political, economic and strategic environment. The formal and initial answer to the question posed can thus be clearly formulated: yes, France wishes for a European external cultural policy.

II The cultural policy of France: objectives and implementation

M a j o r o b j e c t i v e s

France's priorities remain the dissemination of language, creation and markets, cultural industries and a university presence. This diffusion is more balanced than is apparent in official documents. Music, for a long time the poor relative, has been part of this policy landscape since the end of the 1990s with the creation, under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, of the Office of Musical Industries. The approach became more sophisticated and modernised by, for example, Years of France in partner countries. In parallel, or reciprocally, France accommodates Years of partner countries (e.g. Brazil and India). This is within the framework of the increasingly present dimension of cultural exchanges and intercultural dialogue, of which the basis can be economic (China) or political (the Mediterranean), or part of major world issues (bio-ethics, environment, the peace making process).

The third priority, cultural co-operation, is hugely related to the old countries of influence in Africa or in Asia, to the Francophonie and, by extension, the ACP and under developed countries: it is a matter of exchanging with these countries and of developing their heritage and creativity, performing arts, visual arts and cinema. It also seeks to reinforce their institutional capacities, but is far from the model of EU cultural co-operation, which endeavours to lie within the scope of the Millennium Development Goals. Today, the whole of this policy is reflected in the issue of cultural diversity, which fully summarises and nourishes the aspirations of France to maintain its position, to strengthen bonds of exchange and partnership, and to be integrated in European and international co-operation.

T h e c u r r e n t i n s t i t u t i o n a l o r g a n i s a t i o n

French external policy is led by its Ministries, mainly by Foreign Affairs. The Ministry for Culture plays a secondary part, and the regions, the local authorities, associations, foundations and private sector have a marginal role.

a) The Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Ministère des Affaires Etrangères – MAE):

The MAE constitutes a huge system, which leaves little place for other types of institution. It defines the policy of France and its priorities, organises the methods of execution, and implements it while drawing on a few bodies closely related to its actions (French Cultural Centres and Institutes, the Alliances Françaises, Culturesfrance, formerly French Association of Artistic Action – AFAA, etc).

It has at its own disposal an extremely developed diplomatic cultural network of high quality, of which the Cultural Attachés up to now have usually come from the Ministry for Education (language, schools), more rarely from the Ministry of Culture, and increasingly today from the Ministry of

Foreign Affairs itself: this evolution, which 'diplomatise' the function while de-professionalizing it, is neither without significance, nor without risk.

The MAE and its attachés draw on the strong French Cultural Centres and Institutes network, whose central role is cultural dissemination, library and cultural exchanges, local traditions and the arts. The Alliances Françaises, spread throughout the world, supplement this system, and follow French interests abroad. With very great flexibility as regards their organisation and policy, they adapt to all socio-political situations. Their first mission remains the teaching of the French, their second, the diffusion of cultural activity. Currently, they are expanding especially in China and in the European neighbourhood (e.g. Ukraine). In recent years, they have engaged resolutely in the dialogue of cultures on broad global topics: diversity, environment, bio-ethics, etc. They also support a local policy of partnership and sponsoring, to compensate for the reduction in French financing.

The associative MAE, Culturesfrance carries out, through local operators, the programmes of the Ministry: foreign countries' 'Years in France' or 'Years of France Abroad', exhibitions, projects of 'Africa in Creation', and soon the 'Caribbean in Creation', in the fields of: visual arts, performing arts and architecture. AFAA, now amalgamated (2006) with the Association for the Diffusion of the French Thought (ADPF), under the new name of Culturesfrance, is a major agency for cultural exchanges, and ambitions, inter alia, to develop its European dimension (as opposed to national orientation) as regards cultural exchanges.

The general tendency since the end of the 1990s, and which especially seems to reflect the reduction of financial resources as well as the considerable reduction in the number of external experts, has been a concentration of means: absorption of the Ministry for Co-operation by that of Foreign Affairs, merger of positions (cultural attachés / directors of cultural centres), merger of institutions (cultural centres / Alliances Françaises, or suppression of one of both), creation of Culturesfrance, etc. Whatever the advantages or disadvantages, this concentration reinforces the centralisation of the French system. Perhaps it gives more coherence, but it may also contribute to its isolation and its rigidity.

b) The Ministry of Culture:

The Ministry of Culture focuses its foreign relations on the export countries as regards markets for art, cultural industries and exhibitions: the USA, Japan and China. With its institutions and diverse partners it has access to an expertise and know-how at a very high level in all the cultural fields (heritage, cultural industries, legal frameworks, etc), but has limited means of its own to maximise and to deploy at an international level these human and technical resources. Exemplary and effective actions are carried out in the fields of books and publishing, audio-visual and the cinema. The integration of a publishing sector in Culturesfrance (from "ADPF") worries the Ministry of Culture. The Heritage National Institute (INP), in spite of its technical capabilities, is weakly positioned internationally, and little supported by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Generally, caught between the omnipresence of the MAE in French external cultural policy and the stakes or risks of globalisation, the Ministry of Culture welcomes with enthusiasm the prospect of a cultural component of the European foreign policy.

c) Local communities, civil society:

The whole of the French decentralised system has little weight in French external cultural policy: the regions have little political consistency and few means. The MAE does not turn naturally to civil society and the local communities. Private foundations, associations and private companies are not as developed as they are in some countries elsewhere in Europe. They are not very integrated in cultural networks. They lack the experience and even the culture for this and a number of setbacks in the implementation of European Commission Programmes have sometimes dampened their local

expectations. Culturesfrance, which could play the interface between the MAE and the local communities, does not provide this link.

E f f e c t i v e n e s s o f t h e i m p l e m e n t a t i o n

As regards effectiveness and results, France offers a contrasted landscape. It has considerable assets: its long tradition and the concentration of its means, its global system which ensures it a proximity presence everywhere in the world, its high level human, institutional and technological expertise, and its image which remains strong in this field.

France obtains convincing results in several fields including the French language, which constitutes a good vector for diffusion and exchanges, being able to adapt and modernise its approach. Other areas include the cultural industries, where some of its models are fully recognised; cultural exchanges with the Alliance Françaises (e.g. the reciprocal 'Years of France'), among others.

But despite everything, France is under-achieving, considering its resources as well as its ambitions: the reduction of its means in terms of personnel and financing is not compensated by other resources, provided by international funds or the private sector.

Its cultural co-operation instruments have been adapted and refined, but they are of another age and insufficient to fully meet the new logics and challenges of international co-operation: an enlarging EU Europe, sustainable development and multilateral approaches. Their concentration does not prevent the fragmentation of services and actions: institutional fragmentation between the Ministries, compartmentalisation within the Ministries (fine arts, cinema, heritage, etc), which results in competition over territories and which leave little place for more cross-sectoral actions, synergies and mutual benefit. Communication is not made from one service to another, from one sector to another, from one action to another. This fragmentation, heavy in terms of costs of transaction, leaves to the individuals a disproportionate degree of initiative to interpret the general direction and logic of national policy.

Even more problematic, the vertical communication seems very difficult from one level to another, particularly within the MAE: the strong and sound political message which is delivered at the highest level (ministerial or director) does not filter down, or not entirely. The Services do not entirely translate this message into corresponding programmes: for lack of commitment or prospects, perhaps, because of the division of institutional responsibilities or the competition which it induces. Two consequences are the relative opposition to progress of the Ministry and the significant isolation of French policy.

France, through its own actions, seems unaware of the multilateral field, and especially of the European dimension, in which it does not actually take part – especially the further down the hierarchy of responsibilities for delivery: its system, traditionally focused on bilateral action and effects of dissemination, does not present a European façade. It meets difficulties in opening to new approaches. The cultural centres at best, show only an embryonic and sporadic interest in the European Commission, which they generally do not know. Hitherto l'AFFA has been very focused on its own action and its constraints and which remains tied by an exclusive bond with the MAE. It has approached Europe step by step in search of opportunist and specific financing. This random approach is costly in energy and it deprives it of long-term European prospects: the question is now to see whether the new agency, Culturesfrance, will be able to answer its new and very laudable ambitions.

C o n c l u s i o n

This 'absence' of Europe is unanimously recognised within the French services. A European foreign policy as regards culture is highly desired for France. It would have the side, but essential, effect of

getting France “used” to Europe, which would be a benefit for both, and would put at the service of Europe an authentic and great tradition.

III France and Europe: which reservations?

The reservations that France may voice about such a European policy vary according to the institutions, the sectors and the levels of government. There are certainly actual limits, which come from the situation and the constraints of France (see 2.3). These limitations include technical bottlenecks, to which are added a certain number of difficulties produced by the European Commission itself and its management. In the positive proposals of the definition of a European policy, thematic and fundamental reservations arise and are expressed which are linked to the principles of sovereignty, subsidiarity and specificity, but which does not call into question the overall commitment of France.

T e c h n i c a l r e s e r v a t i o n s

The majority of the EU countries have encountered constraints with the Commission, much as France has, and from the weight of their systems or their past. Many of these countries have a vision of cultural policy, which, if not negative, is at least very limited, sometimes does not concern the public sector, or which is lost entirely in the field of European subsidiarity. Germany or Belgium run up against linguistic or regional devolution. The new European countries do not have access to cultural industries, and concentrate on the heritage, the fine arts and the visual arts. EU Europe does not proceed from only one step; its interests are diverse, and the implementation of a common policy can be a shared desire: it is not an obvious practical necessity.

To work together with several European States is not an innovation, but it has often proved to be difficult, despite the best intentions. Co-ordination with several countries implies harmonisation of actions, responsibilities, calendars, procedures, etc, and is heavy and complex, not necessarily producing economic benefit and synergy.

The decentralised French operators are wary of Europe, which they know through the European Commission: they often met with unwieldiness and slowness disproportionate to the financial stakes. Concerns about European bureaucracy are also shared by the French governmental institutions (Culturesfrance, Ministries) - perhaps even more so as it is multiplied by the ignorance of EU procedures.

Moreover, the European administration itself does not grant to culture the place, which it claims to give it. The European Commission integrates little with Member States’ policies and the European population in the implementation of its policy. It functions in isolation and in a too bureaucratic way, at headquarters as well as in the field. Culture remains a ‘negative priority’: strongly asserted as a dimension of European foreign policy (diversity, intercultural dialogue, cultural identities, cultural industries, etc), but only suggested in specific, stereotyped and closed programmes. The Commission does not have sufficient staff trained for external cultural actions, nor a service specifically organised to this end, either in Brussels or in the Delegations.

In other words, if France strongly supports the initiative of a European foreign cultural policy, it does not consider it possible without a transformation of the operating modes of the EU and Member States’ institutions.

T h e m a t i c r e s e r v a t i o n s

There are few sectors in France where the principle of subsidiarity and its sovereignty would limit the sphere of activity of Europe. Broadly, subsidiarity remains the regulating principle. Upstream, it is a question of establishing the functional relation between Europe and the Member States. The EU

should not substitute its values, even if shared, for France's own. Under a common policy, the European countries will continue their national policy, and will integrate common values characteristic of the European level: diversity in unity, the dialogue of cultures, the culture of peace, human rights, etc. It is not a matter of amalgamating or dissociating, but of articulating and supplementing. Downstream, France estimates that the majority of the sectors are appropriate for external Community action: heritage, visual arts, performing arts, cultural industries, cinema, etc. Two areas only are considered as outside European Union competence:

a) Language and linguistic policy:

The MAE and the Alliance Française consider that this field does not give any place for sharing with the EU, as policy in this area is most closely related to the interests of Member States.

b) Radio and television:

The French opinion is almost unanimous: the audio-visual, radio and television sectors should not enter within the European framework. Organisations like RFI, the BBC or DW, have a national identity too strongly established to give up to Europe. Through these instruments, France, United Kingdom, Germany, etc. carry their national image, not universally, but in areas where their presence and their interests are important. Admittedly, common programmes exist, but they remain symbolic and superficial. The Ministry of Culture considers, however, that if the bodies (RFI, BBC, DW, etc) must develop their own policy in a distinct and national way, a European action could usefully support and promote outside Europe 'European contents' (films and TV series, documentaries, programmes), in particular, as regards television, by supporting translation and dissemination.

IV Europe: which role according to France?

E u r o p e a n a d d i t i o n a l v a l u e s

France wants each EU country to be able to follow its own policy under its own colours, and that the EU intervenes at the same time in a complementary (complémentaire) way and in an additional (supplémentaire) way by adding values that only Europe as a whole can carry: 'diversity in unity', the capacity of dialogue and conflict resolution and the capacity of harmonising differences without erasing them or diverting them, etc. The Ministry of Culture insists on this characteristic of Europe: its capacity of meeting the 'Other', of knowing and recognising the 'Other', and of assimilating its culture and not having a closed off identity. A capacity of 'otherness' (altérité) qualifies Europe in a very strong way and should constitute a major and constructive topic of its foreign policy.

Europe must also 'equalise' its image on the outside, i.e. in terms of representation, without taking account of the differences in size, all the nations and the cultures which it gathers: it is also one of the functions of its external cultural policy to carry all Europe at the same time.

Finally, the EU can make it possible to escape the too particular and sometimes negative relationship of European countries with other countries or areas of the world: for reasons of history or circumstances, some of the countries have a negative image, or an embarrassing familiarity. Europe can then propose itself, especially through culture, as a more neutral, more attractive and non-conflictual vehicle.

C o m p l e m e n t a r y v a l u e o f E u r o p e

At all levels, Europe is needed for the complementary financing that it brings (under the conditions of "European" projects) to the Member States: in order to 'Europeanise' such cultural projects in their dimension and standards, to allow them broader circulation and impact, to endow them with a 'European' quality (label), and also to support the integration of small or new Member States in shared programmes. The EU, in a role of regulation, could ensure co-ordination of joint programmes, producing savings in costs of transactions and time. It would thus obtain a better overall visibility.

The EU would not limit itself to support or make visible small or new Member States: it would have also the invaluable capacity to attenuate with the outside world the bilateral difficulties encountered by some of its Member States, and so to contribute to solving, by the means of its cultural policy, particular conflicts. By the means of its multiple relations and alliances, it would help some of its external partners to reduce their own conflicts (e.g. Israel/Palestine).

It is not simply financial resource or logistic benefits: France (MAE, Ministry of Culture) is conscious of the quality and of the exemplarity of a certain number of its own models and good practices, just as there are good models elsewhere in Europe. Book and publishing policy, cinema, audio-visual and, more recently, the musical industry: these models could be adopted by the EU, and adapted to its general policy. France has shown itself very attentive to this question.

The action of Europe, in this same spirit, is also wished by the local communities and the private operators in France: the EU can stimulate the emergence of local actors in international co-operation who, without it, would remain at micro level and without means. This could be achieved by bringing them together, supporting them more systematically, more specifically and more efficiently.

The French services stress that the foreign policy of Europe as regards culture must be quite distinct and well dissociated from the support programmes for culture within the framework of external development aid: these programmes are part of the bilateral policy of the European Commission, and come under the policies of partner states, not under EU foreign policy.

S u g g e s t e d M e a s u r e s

The proposals and expressed wishes or the outlined prospects referred to here come from the various ministries, organisations and operators that have been interviewed: it does not form an action plan for France as a whole, but it provides a landscape for all the points of view which emerged from the talks. The Ministry for Culture, it should be noted, has a great capacity for proposals, but also a tendency not to have the institutional and financial means of a substantial policy.

a) European cultural system and support to the cultural industries and the arts market:
Europe must support European productions and cultural industries in the world, i.e. primarily in the buyer countries (the United States, Japan, China, etc). For that, it must install a targeted network of Cultural Attachés and Offices for Promotion such as the EMO (European Music Office) in New York, which is an excellent success model. The concerned fields are the visual arts, the performing arts, the book and publishing, the music and, of course, the cinema, including TV programmes. The USA organises a powerful lobbying of Brussels in the field of cinema. Europe must accompany the European productions by a systematic programme of translation: cinema, book, theatre and performing arts (opera, etc), using new technologies. The Ministry of Culture gives special attention to opera, as the European art par excellence, as it gathers multinational technical and artistic competences in its performances.

b) Mobility of artists and operators:
All the French organisations insist on the importance of the mobility of artists and operators: certainly in Europe, but also at the borders of Europe, in and with the neighbourhood countries (Central and Eastern Europe and the Mediterranean), then in the rest of the world. Mobility makes it possible to associate European partners with those outside and to facilitate multiple exchanges.

c) Networks
France is weak in the European networks. It favourably considers the reinforcement of the cultural networks in Europe, not only because they have become, thanks to new technologies, the ideal

support for co-ordination and knowledge (through websites and forums): they are also relays of action and of information, driving forces of decisive communication and integration, and factors of sustainable development. Networks could finally play a complementary role supporting most of the initiatives taken by the EU: co-ordinating promotion offices, the mobility programmes, etc.

The creation of a new form of 'European sponsorship', based on European values, which would be accompanied by tax incentives and legal facilities, and which would include the new Member States in particular, is part of this reflection on the necessary co-ordination and 're-dimensioning' of the partnerships and the networks.

d) Heritage:

Europe, because of its history, its situation and its experience, should play a major part in the world as regards conservation, restoration and development of the heritage. There are sites of high value everywhere in the world that the concerned States do not have the means of restoring nor developing (e.g. Angkor Wat). Europe could give itself the mission of doing this, thus favouring the dialogue of cultures and cultural diversity, supporting the identities of the countries' partners, and reinforcing their image with its own. It would support local and international employment (research, restoration sites), as well as the association of European competences and expertise (restoration, development, technologies, etc).

It would also create the conditions for cultural tourism; i.e. of an industry strongly creative of diversified employment and additional resources, carrying technologies, capacities and innovation, and which is itself based on the dialogue of cultures.

Heritage building sites can be opportunities to gather young Europeans: excavations, restoration and installations, animation and cultural platforms. Once restored and arranged, they are places of meetings, where traditional or modern performances (dance, concerts, performances, etc) can take place combining the richness of the past with new technologies. Europe could create a 'European label' of the sites and restorations in the world.

e) Platforms of the major European festivals and cultural events:

Principal festivals in Europe should or could become - if organised in networks and within the framework of EU foreign policy - European platforms of promotion and dissemination. The Festival of Avignon is already such a platform. It receives and presents celebrated European names and carries out international meetings and forums, which the EU could still develop and systematise. The greatest European events in the various cultural fields could be the object of this policy.

The support already brought to the European book forums and stands could also be reinforced as part of a more methodical strategy, including a constant policy of translation and co-editions for external destinations.

f) Support to combined actions:

France is generally favourable to the support of combined actions of several countries of Europe, including the smaller ones and/or new Member States. However, the MAE and its network are cautious: they fear the unwieldiness of such actions and local competitions between countries or institutions for visibility. On the other hand, the local communities and the decentralised operators show themselves much more enthusiastic about projects that would reinforce European links, while allowing them an action of a greater scale outside Europe. Such initiatives could make it possible in particular to establish bridges between the European local communities, the decentralised operators, the regions, and thus to reduce the weight of the centralised agencies and policies.

g) Support to the European local initiatives and populations:

European support to communities and local operators would be much welcome. In France, they are not taken into consideration in institutional co-operation. Their technical or financial capacity does not enable them to access sufficiently or regularly European or international programmes. More systematic and well targeted support would enable them to develop long term action, and would facilitate the instigation of a dialogue (to date very sporadic although necessary) between populations, and between European regions and regions of the world.

M e t h o d o l o g y a n d f o r m s o f
i n t e r v e n t i o n o f E u r o p e

a) To avoid the bureaucratic obstructions:

France, at its various levels, fears European bureaucracy, the obstructive procedures and the delays that go with it, and wishes to avoid them. It does not consider that the quasi-monopoly exerted by the Commission is the best or the only solution. In the field of culture, it considers that the European Commission is doing a work of “co-operation”, not of “foreign policy”: the programmes in favour of the ACP countries, for example, reflect the cultural policy of the ACP countries, not that of Europe.

France does not wish for central organisation alone: nor new structures added to existing ones and leading to duplication. This would add confusion and opacity to the EC heaviness, and would ignore national or European systems that have proved reliable.

It would be advisable to reduce the procedures, to associate as much as possible the Member States (in particular the new ones), as well as the decentralised communities and operators, so that they feel committed individually to the European policy.

The model generally preferred is that of financing directly allotted to programmes or projects which would meet “European” criteria: in terms of objectives, contents territorial scope (i.e. the number of associated European countries). In order to avoid complications (expensive in time and resources) related to modes of organisation, the Ministry of Culture proposes the model of the PESC (SCEP): a country, an institution or an operator are appointed among the partners, as the leader, and it ensures the co-ordination by using the capacities of all.

b) Logic of the sectors and the institutions:

The cultural centres and national institutes of the Member States can be useful relays: but it is not a question of transforming them into “European cultural centres”, for which they do not have the vocation nor ability: they could more effectively become supporters of shared projects and contents, partners on common and occasional actions.

Similarly in the field of musical industries (Office of Musical Industries, MAE), it would be absurd from a commercial point of view to mix on the same record singers of different European countries. The intervention of Europe must come upstream, on the capacities and the methods of production, and downstream on promotion, distribution and sale of the labels. These are two examples, which show that the conjugation of Europe should not be done without coherence and prudence.

It must also be done with suitable human resources: to date the European Commission has not managed to obtain a body of civil servants, even in a limited number, which would be able to deal with cultural policy and projects: to identify and to formulate, to negotiate with EC external partners, to set up and to follow up programmes. The EC Delegations do not have the type of personnel, i.e. cultural attachés or advisers, in the way it has economic or trade, political or development advisers. This is a serious and even crippling deficiency for the implementation of a foreign policy as regards culture. France considers that the Cultural Attachés of the Member States could contribute to fill this gap (except for France’s target countries such as the United States and Japan, etc), and on the condition that the cultural attachés of these Member States have a sufficient knowledge of Europe.

c) Political dimension:

Three aspects of a political nature crop up in the conversations:

- The small and new Member States must be systematically integrated in European projects. The cultural dimension for them is the means of having a dialogue on the same level with the large or founder EU States. Their resources do not enable them to act directly to a significant degree, whereas their contribution to the image and the values of Europe is essential from now on.
- The European Parliament has a representativeness, which it seems necessary to associate with the European cultural policy (i.e. a policy needs legitimacy).
- The EC Neighbourhood Policy is completely associated with European thought and culture, and must be with its actions. The surrounding countries of Mediterranean and Eastern Europe must be able to take part to the projects of mobility, of archaeological and restoration sites (heritage, youth, etc), as with the various European combined actions.

d) To build an inner dimension:

The EU foreign cultural policy cannot do without its interior dimension for reasons due to the European conscience and its solidarity, but also, and perhaps more essentially, for practical and strategic reasons. The mobility of artists cannot be carried out outside successfully if it does not exist massively inside, and if the movement does not include both together. The same applies to the networks: Europe cannot consolidate the networks outside if they are not inside. Europe of the outside has no meaning and no foundation without a Europe of the inside.

The case of cultural industries is even more obvious: the indispensable condition for the promotion of the European cultural productions outside is the existence of a strong and developed domestic market, in the fields of the cinema, visual arts, tourism, books and music, and other performing arts. The American cinema dominates the European market and, in what remains in Europe of its own market, the national markets leave a marginal place for the other European countries. The European market should be the first market of the European countries, if Europe still wants to maintain hope of widening its audience in the world. Domestic markets and external markets are, in fact, the two indissociable faces of the same coin, and the political leaders must take heed of it, if they intend to move away from the logic (or the absence of logic) of ad hoc projects. It is thus quite essential to establish between these two dimensions – interior and exterior - an articulated solidarity.

v Examples of european projects

France has little experience of large European projects, which would be used as models. Until now, AFAA was satisfied to knock at the door of the European Commission, often at the wrong moment, to collect or not from it specific financing for external relations projects, e.g. the Biennial of the Photography of Bamako or African Choreographies. The European Commission intervenes for the Film Festival of Ouagadougou (Burkina Faso), to support it financially and give a European Prize, but there is no 'European' dimension nor impact without the involvement of the Member States. The only European visibility is the EC logo. Examples of this type are numerous.

The French Cultural Centres and Institutes do not work often or systematically with the EC Delegations. The small European Film Festivals that they organise here and there do not constitute European film policy.

The EMO (European Music Office) of New York is mentioned several times like an excellent initiative and a model of success.

The Anna Lindh Euro-Mediterranean Foundation raises hopes, or raised them, but gives an uncertain image: the idea appears good, but the means available and the weight of the Foundation are insufficient, and its organisation and its functioning remain problematic.

The programme '25 plus plus', co-ordinated by Culturesfrance, is also presented as a success: it avoids heaviness of procedure and joins together all European competences around a project of mobility of artworks and artists in support of the neighbouring countries of Eastern Europe. Culturesfrance proposes another project with a properly European dimension: an exhibition of old photos from Arab countries. Europe would be used as a common façade for the Member States which, individually, may have a difficult or dubious relationship with the Arab world. The project, starting from the relatively neutral photographic medium, would encourage intercultural dialogue between Europe and the Arab world. The form of the exhibition would provide a practical support for circulation and exchanges.

Lastly, French decentralised operators often have only a limited European experience, even though financing is European. The projects, which they have led are not significant as models for a European policy, even if the acquired experiences are very favourably received on the whole.

Introduction

The report reflects upon the results of interviews conducted with various senior policy makers and practitioners in the fields of foreign relations and cultural policy. In the preparation of this work, additional study of policy documents and results of a discussion group meeting were used. The key aim of the report was to provide a contextualized review of how Latvian key players in the above mentioned field relate to the idea/proposal - to add a cultural component to the EU foreign relations. The study is the second stage of the research programme. The first stage comprised a document survey of all 25 EU Member States.

Methodologically, there were several common issues raised in all seven case studies and three questions to be answered specifically about Latvia. To the extent possible, the report attempts to answer them and adds some country specific considerations. The report begins with describing those changes that have taken place at the level of policy documents since the end of the last year. There are two main developments – the adoption of New Strategic Guidelines of Cultural Policy (entitled National State) and the Strategy of Latvia's Participation in the EU. Since the national level documents have been accepted by the Cabinet of Ministers (on April 18th 2006 and expected June 2006 respectively) and they were developed through a wide range of consultations with social partners (experts, cultural organizations, representatives of other ministries, NGOs), they reflect the current state of the art thinking in this field rather well. The second part of the report portrays various views of the key players in the field of cultural policy, expressed in one to one interviews¹ and one group discussion. The last – third – part of the report summarises the key points in the form of the answers to the main research questions.²

1 Changes in the cultural policies and or foreign relations policy documents

M i n i s t r y o f C u l t u r e

Since the completion of the first stage of the document study, a number of quite important changes have happened in the researched fields. Most of them relate to the elaboration and publication of national level development strategies.

First, A Memorandum, Culture 2010, was signed in August 2005 by the Prime Minister of the Republic of Latvia and the Minister of Culture on the one hand, and by all heads of the cultural and artistic associations on the other. The Memorandum expresses the commitment to collaborate in the implementation of the strategic aims of cultural policy as formulated in the other strategic document on the state cultural policy for the period 2006 till 2015 (National State). This document was prepared by the Ministry of Culture (MofC) and now, de jure, substitutes the former national programme for 'culture' (analysed during the first stage of this report).

The Strategic Guidelines has, as one of seven key aims, the intention to facilitate dialogue and understanding among cultures and nations and enrich the cultural life of Latvia by actively participating in international cultural processes and co-operation networks.

There is a special section of this document devoted to external cultural policy. This describes the key problems and possible directions for action as well as specific tasks. The main problems identified:

- There is an absence of clearly formulated national interests in developing a cultural component in external relations. External cultural policy refers to ad hoc type activities and is based on bilateral treaties.
- The Ministry of Culture is not co-ordinating activities with cultural organizations efficiently; and the mechanisms to implement foreign cultural policy are weak and fragmented.

- There is a lack of co-operation among all the parties involved (state and municipalities, NGOs, private sector) to develop a co-ordinated external cultural policy. There is also weak co-ordination with the foreign cultural institutions and organizations operating in Latvia.
- In the documents that formulate national interests in the international field, including economic interests and visibility of the 'National Brand', culture is not recognised as an important factor. Therefore cultural products and services (and consequently their recognisability) are not purposefully created, financed and implemented.
- The State does not recognise the interests of the actors of the cultural field who are well recognised internationally.
- Issues of cultural policies are not raised to the level of the EU; willingness to influence EU decisions regarding cultural policy is almost non-existent and there is rather low interest to use the financial instruments of the EU and other Member States to advance cultural processes.
- Adopting international agreements that impact on cultural policies is not done with due care and thought; there is very weak co-ordination among state institutions regarding the ratifications and implementation of international documents touching on cultural policy matters.
- The role of culture in fostering international relations is not recognised in society, the impact of cultural collaboration in regional development is not given due attention.
- Finally, there is a rather simplistic mechanism of financing international cultural projects that slows down mobility. Pre-financing, co-financing and PPP schemes of financing are very embryonic.

D i r e c t i o n s o f a c t i o n

In co-operation with all interested parties to develop a sound, balanced and effective state external cultural policy.

- To foster a long-term cultural co-operation system based on co-production.
- To enable 'producers' of culture to develop their professionalism in the context of international competition.
- To intensify, at a high speed, the involvement of Latvia in the EU and worldwide cultural processes.
- Finally, to educate and inform Latvia's society about external cultural co-operation and opportunities provided. More specific aims are the recognisability of Latvia's cultural products and services, the increase of State financing of external cultural activities, support of the participation in international multiparty projects, the increase of the level of understanding and tolerance of other cultures in Latvia's society.

The Guidelines comprise quite detailed action points and responsibility distribution among state institutions, most notably the Ministry of Culture and Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MofFA). From the perspective of the eventual contribution of a cultural dimension to the EU foreign policy or external relations, some of the action points need to be stressed.

The Guidelines imply as priorities:

- The need to evaluate the success and effectiveness of existing bilateral agreements in the field of culture – both within and outside of the EU;
- Offer the expertise of Latvia's cultural practitioners to Third countries;
- Pay special attention to collaboration in the Baltic Sea region and develop a special cultural programme aimed at facilitating regional unity (period 2007-2010);
- Extend and develop cultural ties with the USA;
- On the basis of PPP, create and develop cultural exchange and media democratization mechanisms with the CIS countries, especially Moldova, Georgia, Byelorussia, the Ukraine;

- Increase the use of EU and UNESCO internet projects (MINERVA, AGENORE, MICHAEL) to improve the recognisability of Latvia's culture;
- In co-operation with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, to develop a separate External Cultural Relations programme and specifically include sections devoted to collaborations with Third countries.

M i n i s t r y o f F o r e i g n A f f a i r s

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, on June 1st 2006, released its draft strategic document Latvia's Participation in the EU – key principles, goals, priorities and actions for the period 2007-2013. The official release of the documents at the Council of State Secretaries means that it should be accepted by the Cabinet of Ministers in the near future. Section 3.6 of this document, entitled Fostering of National Identity and Cultural Values³, contain two subsections – development of cultural policy and the implementation of audiovisual policy. The sections stress that Latvia's cultural policy should be geared towards fostering national identity, maintaining cultural heritage and keeping alive historical memory. The key goal of cultural policy is to strengthen a creative and culturally rich society in Latvia. As to the use of culture in the context of foreign relations, the key direction is creating and managing the State image or 'National Brand', and strengthening of a modern and international competitive audiovisual sector at home. The Section also re-asserts that the sphere of culture is not subject to strict regulations in the EU. Yet, the possibilities to use various financing mechanisms available in the EU are considered to be a positive factor.

C u l t u r a l C a p i t a l E n d o w m e n t

One more significant player in the implementation of external cultural policy (as well as internal) is the Cultural Capital Endowment of Latvia. The new Strategic Guidelines of the Ministry of Culture repeatedly stress the need to develop target programmes under which financing could be increased to support international cultural co-operation and activities. Currently, the Statutes of the Endowment have a vague clause for financing projects – support of participation in international and intercultural projects without any further specification. The review of the expenditures for 2005 show that the Foundation has supported a few international projects⁴ and has spent approximately 5% of its total budget on supporting international travel of Latvia's culture representatives to various fairs, seminars and conferences worldwide.

II Views of the key players in the cultural policy field of Latvia

M i n i s t r y o f F o r e i g n A f f a i r s

The Senior civil servant from the Ministry of Foreign affairs (Head of the European Union Department) stressed the importance of a cultural component in initiating and maintaining external relations, yet immediately admitted that so far there have not been serious attempts to formulate policy in this respect. In fact, recently the Department of External Cultural Policy was eliminated from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Also, the new Strategic Guidelines of Latvia's participation in the EU do not have any explicit formulation of active foreign cultural policy.

In creating such policy, he suggests to use the experience of countries such as Norway and especially concentrate on building and promoting the 'National Image' or 'Brand' of Latvia. This senior servant agreed that a culture export is the cheapest PR for such a small country as Latvia, and that the media and communication coverage of cultural events is the greatest. However, in the majority of the cases, the presence or absence of cultural programmes and events is a result of the activities of enthusiastic individuals, not a planned and co-ordinated work. In fact, the Ministry of

Foreign Affairs, according to this civil servant, so far have not had any guidance from the Ministry of Culture as to which geographical priorities to work upon when advancing cultural programmes.

Reflecting on the past, this senior civil servant (Head of the European Affairs Department) mentioned that so far it has been the Embassies who organised cultural events and managed programmes. This task is part of the job description of the diplomats. Yet, the events organised have sporadic and ad hoc character due to lack of specially marked financing for this purpose. Therefore, the intensity of cultural programmes in foreign countries, to a large extent, hinges upon the enthusiasm of the Embassy representatives – to establish networks in a host country, generate sponsorship for events and manage the administration.

Ideally, there should be a policy adopted by the Government that would define geographical priorities, the division of labour and tasks among the Ministry of Culture and Foreign Affairs, and the Embassies would be used as the central points in the chain of management. In addition, there is a very urgent task to officially set the principles of promoting the 'National Image' or 'Brand of Latvia' in other countries, thus co-ordinating activities also with the Latvian Agency of Investment and Development. To put it simply, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs would see the schema in the following way: the Ministry of Culture defines and Government approves a strategy of foreign cultural policy. Then the Ministry of Foreign Affairs joins together with the Latvian Agency of Investment and Development in preparing the action plans. These action plans are then used by the respective Embassies to organise events. No doubt, certain centrally allocated funds are available for such activities. As the best example, when culture has been used as the central focus for various liaisons in economics, politics, trade, tourism and city co-operation, he cited the Festival Surprising Latvia – that was organised in November 2005 in several French cities, including Paris with multiple cultural events. In fact, this Festival as a best case was mentioned by several of the interviewees.

Reflecting on the most feasible geographical priorities, first and foremost it is the neighbouring countries, then other countries within the EU, then USA and Canada, and finally, former CIS countries, especially the Ukraine, Moldova and Caucasus states. The relations with Russia are at a standstill. No serious government supported cultural policy is coming before the treaty on borders is signed. There was no mention of collaboration with countries where there are exiles or a new diaspora of Latvians.

M i n i s t r y o f C u l t u r e

The State Secretary of the Ministry of Culture openly admitted that so far there has not been any clear position developed in relation to foreign cultural policy. Such strategy does not exist. On the other hand, there have been a series of attempts to work in this direction. Where the Secretary sees the importance of the link between culture and foreign policy is in relation to the promotion and advancement of national interests and the Brand of Latvia. On the other hand, he noted that in the new strategic policy document National State 2007-2015, there are certain foreign relations priorities set, as well as direction of action. Summer 2006, according to him, is the time when more specific action plans will be prepared.

The issue of foreign cultural policy has been on the agenda of the Ministry for some time already, not least due to the fact all kinds of ad hoc type cultural projects in foreign countries have been going on since regaining independence. The notion of foreign cultural policy is widely accepted yet, according to the Secretary, there is a lack of understanding of the principles of 'cultural diplomacy' among the civil servants in the Ministry of Culture. There is also a strong tendency among civil servants to view, as their key duty, preservation of Latvia's cultural heritage and organisation of cultural life 'inside' the country. In order to formulate a clear stance of the Ministry to this issue, several discussion groups were organised and the issue of the establishment of a new state agency considered (akin to the British Council) that would have as its prime task to co-ordinate and promote Latvia's culture in other countries, as well as organise and manage cultural exchanges⁵. As one of the key problems in energising and activating a cultural component in foreign relations, the Secretary

saw the inability of the Ministries concerned (Education, Economic, and Foreign Affairs) to come to a co-ordinated stance with regard to interstate agreements. Also, he would welcome the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to formulate what could be the directions of foreign policy in the light of the national interests of Latvia. Such a position would help the Ministry of Culture to develop a more coherent strategy of foreign cultural policy.

Ideally, the Ministry of Culture sees its task as to support the so called cultural operators in their own endeavours in other countries. The support would be bent towards strategically defined geographical priorities, which outside the EU, according to him, are Russia, CIS countries and China and India.

Equally important, he sees the potential to offer cultural content to the participants of big international gatherings in Latvia, such as NATO summit in autumn 2006.

The Secretary also expressed his dissatisfaction that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has not been active in establishing at least one embassy in Arabic countries. Latvian organizations have already a strong interest in co-operation with, for example, Egypt. There is a research group working on a pyramid site and the National Library has close links of co-operation with the Library in Alexandria. Yet all these activities take place without diplomatic support.

He was quite concerned with the lack of work in developing a positive image of Latvia in the world. Such a positive image could be quite successfully created and promoted via cultural exchange programmes.

Finally, the Secretary was rather convinced that not only is there a great value in co-operative European cultural projects aimed at supplementing EU foreign policy activities, but also that Latvia could play an active part in co-ordination work. As an example he mentioned the New Theatre Institute in Riga that has taken a Pan European function and is now co-ordinating cultural projects with the Balkan states which are not yet EU members. He was mildly sceptical about the future role of the ARS Baltica project and stressed the current need to reorient cultural activities towards Latvia's neighbours in the East. Notwithstanding, close relationships with Latvia's neighbours Estonia and Lithuania, according to the Secretary they are, at the same time, the greatest competitors. Such a competitive setting makes the Pan Baltic co-operation less efficient.

Another senior civil servant – the Head of the European Union Department at the MofC - in a rather similar way described the current state policy with regard to the use of culture in foreign affairs. She pointed to the differences between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' and the Ministry of Culture's views on the matter. MoFA considers the use of culture primarily for building the 'Brand of Latvia', whereas MofC views the issue much wider, including the aspects of cultural diplomacy.

Co-operation between the two ministries, according to her, is that occasionally and quite suddenly, the MofFA demands the activities of the people from the cultural field, e.g. concerts, artists, performances, exhibitions etc. The organisation of such 'exercises' usually is ad hoc. In general, culture, according to her, is not viewed seriously as a component of systematic foreign relations by top-level policy makers in other Ministries. MofC has difficulty convincing the Ministry of Finance to allocate additional finance to run planned activities and programmes as part of the State's foreign policy. There is also nothing said about the need to foster culture as part of building foreign relations in the Governments Declaration⁶.

She, as many others, praised the organisation of the Festival Surprising Latvia, putting it forward as an example of institutional collaboration inside Latvia and with the French side. Yet, as she remarked, the driving force of the co-ordination was the purposeful activities on the part of the President of Latvia. She concluded that without the support of very high standing political figures (e.g. President, Prime Minister) the Ministry of Culture is not able to implement serious steps for intensifying the cultural component of Latvia's external affairs. She looks at the possibility of co-ordinated EU policy initiatives to use culture for the purposes of foreign policy as a good one for two reasons. First, the eventual programmes and financing would support the existing cultural operators

to be more active in the international field, thus culturally opening up Latvia itself. Secondly, regulations coming from Brussels would force civil servants in other Ministries to respect culture as part of 'serious policy making'.

In the context, on the one hand, of a widely recognised need to have sound and systematic external cultural policy and, on the other hand, general confusion over how this policy should be formulated, it was enlightening to get acquainted with the views of the civil servants and culture practitioners expressed in a brainstorm type discussion. The discussion theme was 'Foreign cultural policy'. Its aim was to analyse:

- what has been done over the last 15 years in foreign cultural policy;
- what such a policy may mean for Latvia;
- what are the key or most important directions now Latvia has joined the EU;
- How such a foreign cultural policy may work both outside and inside Latvia (dialogue and understanding among various cultural groups in Latvia itself).

The discussion was organised by the Ministry of Culture and the stated purpose was to formulate some common ground or commonly agreed upon principles with regard to the set themes. The results of the discussion are largely incorporated into the new Strategic Guidelines of Culture Policy (see above).

ARS Baltica – a Collaboration Programme of Nordic and Baltic Sea countries.

Most recent developments have mainly been in the field of the film industry. In February of 2005 three Baltic States at the level of the Ministries of Culture agreed to co-operate in the production, promotion and distribution of films and established an organisation, Baltic Films. An agreement was also concluded between Baltic Films and Scandinavian Films. The projects included the creation of a Baltic Film and Media School, film co-production, and eventual establishment of a Special Co-production Fund. Yet, as it turns out from the interviews with the Ministry of Culture civil servants, the efficiency and productivity of the whole ARS Baltica programme is under serious consideration. The key consideration is that ARS Baltic should invite a qualitatively new approach since it is no longer the leading mechanism of cultural co-operation and exchange. For the programme to continue, it needs new aims, management and financing mechanism. The Regional co-operation policy should be oriented towards Latvia's neighbours – Byelorussia, the Ukraine and Moldova. If the ARS Baltica programme is continued, its primary focus could be on strengthening the regional identity of Baltic Sea countries and co-operation in the matters of cultural heritage.⁷

A recent successful example of foreign cultural policy projects.

In the eyes of all involved parties, the most successful international cultural project in recent years has been a festival, Surprising Latvia, that took place in autumn 2005. The Festival comprised a number of events and happenings in four cities of France. The idea and initial concept of the Festival was developed by the President of Latvia, Dr Vike Freiberga, in discussion with the President of France, Mr Chirac. The Festival from the Latvian side was prepared and executed by the Ministries of Culture, Foreign Affairs, Economy, Direction of Concerts, Investment and Development Agency, the Latvian Embassy in France, City Council of Riga and Agency for Tourism Development. From the French side the key counterparts were the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Culture and Communication, AFAA, French Embassy in Latvia and a few regional and municipal institutions. Amongst several cultural programmes, there were seminars on economic co-operation. In terms of foreign political relations there was an official visit of the President of Latvia to France, the participation of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Minister of Culture, the Minister of Transport and Communication, the Minister of Economy as well as the Mayor of Riga in various official events. There was also a wide range of publicity events and activities – e.g. an exhibition, Talking Stones, in

the centre of Paris, websites, printed materials, and publications. Also, the public in Latvia was kept well informed about the festival. The Cabinet of Ministers evaluated the festival as a whole to be a great success. According to the officials from the Ministries of Culture, Economy and Foreign Affairs, the organisation of the Festival with its multiparty involvement across borders is now being considered and used as a template for planning large scale international events where culture is used to promote the image of Latvia.

M i n i s t r y o f E c o n o m y

The Head of the European Union Department at the Ministry stated that the issue of culture being used to promote Latvia's interests abroad has been high on the Ministry's agenda. She admitted some degree of co-operation with the Ministry of Culture and much more with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The only two fields where she has seen some collaborative interest to somehow join the forces have been the topic of tourism and the amount of cultural tourism in particular. The other issue has been that of Latvia's branding and the activities surrounding its formulation and development. Yet, both issues have been mostly of ad hoc type without even a medium term view on policy formulation.

Her view as to the feasibility of a cultural component to EU foreign policy is that the civil servants at the respective ministries would begin to consider the idea seriously only after they received strong statements or encouragements from Brussels. The key obstacle is that Latvia has not yet formulated its foreign cultural policy in the first place.

T h e P r e s i d e n t ' s C h a n c e l l e r y

The Constitution of Latvia gives rather substantial powers to the President to shape the state's foreign policy and relations (in co-operation with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs). The current President Ms. Vike-Freiberga has been very active in the international arena. Through personal contacts and official state visits, her activities have, to a great extent, shaped the foreign policy of the state. On her official visits, a great number of the representatives from the field of business, education and culture accompany her with the purpose of creating relations and networks of exchange. Thus the stance of the President's Chancellery – her Bureau – has always been taken seriously when deciding about foreign policy matters.

The Senior Advisor to the President and the Head of the Strategic Analysis Commission – a think tank set up by the President's office - had the most sceptical attitude towards the success of the idea of a cultural component being added to the foreign policy of the EU. Her scepticism arose from the experience of working with the Delegation of the EU prior to Latvia's accession. As she put it, very good ideas result in rather bad policies and even worse practical deeds. She also has some reservations about putting certain strategic principles on paper that would guide actions for years and give less room for flexibility and manoeuvre for such a small country as Latvia.

Reflecting on how prepared Latvia's representatives and cultural operators might be to actively engage in collaborative and foreign oriented projects, she noted a deep seated tendency amongst the Latvians to concentrate most on their own internal matters, stressing the vulnerability of national identity and that they tend to close to the international competitive arena. The defensive (against external threat to national identity) motives in Latvia's cultural policy still dominate. Yet, it is precisely the state institutions, not the cultural operators and/or individuals, which would be able to generate more consistent exploitation of culture for the purposes of external relation building. The state institutions, according to the adviser, should primarily focus on financing and co-ordinating operators in their networks. However, there is no consistent strategy or policy in this respect; such a policy is badly needed for Latvia in the first place. Only after such a policy is adopted, would there be time to consider collaborative projects with other European countries to use culture for EU foreign

policy aims. She also expressed concern over the risk that in such co-operative projects Latvia's contribution might go unnoticed and the beneficiaries of the collaborative endeavours might turn out to be the 'bigger states'.

As to geographical priorities, the advisor mentioned the Ukraine and the Caucasus states. China and India would be regions where some presence could be beneficial yet not a priority. This would guarantee that Latvia closely follows the developments in this part of the world and is informed about the opportunities there.⁸

The Chief of the Chancellery who is directly involved in organising the President's visits, programmes, management, and invitation of people expressed his dissatisfaction with the activities of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as to the use of culture in Latvia's foreign policy. He referred to several potential openings of co-operation with other countries outside Latvia that were made possible by the President's efforts involving culture presentations and exchange projects, yet these were not further utilised by the MofFA. He argued that the Chancellery is clearly aware of the importance of culture in foreign relations. Yet, since there is neither a strategy nor formulated policy, there is no way one could plan more optimal use of culture for the purposes of external affairs. The speed with which contacts are established and state visits organised nowadays makes it quite difficult to organise activities involving culture in a strategic way. He also remarked that his lengthy experience of co-operation with the Embassies of Latvia gives him reason not to estimate the marketing capabilities of Embassies very highly.

C u l t u r a l C a p i t a l E n d o w m e n t o f L a t v i a

The Endowment is a state agency that operates under the auspices of the Ministry of Culture although having substantial independence. The Endowment is the main source of financing of all initiatives and projects of the cultural milieu in Latvia. In other words, financially, it is the Endowment that, together with the Ministry of Culture, maintains cultural life in the country.⁹ Yet, according to the Executive Director of the Endowment, the only two clauses in the statutes that regulate the decision making in relation to international activities, is the statement that the Endowment supports participation of Latvia's artists in international and intercultural projects and that it finances important international and national events. Decisions on financing are made on a case by case basis and depend on a consensus among the experts represented in the Council. Since the composition of the Council is rather fluid and changes annually, the absence of clear priorities (artistic, geographical) lead to an ad hoc type support policy. The Executive Director points in the direction of the Ministry of Culture as needing to formulate such priorities and then the Endowment would be at ease to support much more intensive international cultural activities.

One of the problems related to increasing financial support was seen as the lack of arguments to ground the case that culture should not be viewed simply as expenditure, but more as contributing to the wellbeing and economy of the country. In this light, the Executive Director saw one clear advantage to Latvia stemming from a common cultural policy of the EU complementing foreign affairs. Namely, it would make Latvia's civil servants in various ministries, especially the Ministry of Finance, more interested in allocating funds to cultural initiatives. In other words, the European wide stance would emphasise the importance of culture in the eyes of local administrators. Yet, the other advantage would be the optimisation of financing mechanisms and administration of funds in the Endowment. The formulated priorities and clear objective of common EU projects should increase the efficiency of support. In short, the Executive Director of the Cultural Capital Endowment was one of the few civil servants who were very supportive of the idea of a common foreign cultural policy. Yet, he was also somewhat concerned with the risk of unification that such policy might bring. As one of the key geographical priorities he mentioned the countries of the former USSR.

R i g a C i t y C o u n c i l

The capital city of Latvia, Riga, has rather a unique position in the context of Latvia's foreign policy. The size of it – more than one-third of the country's population live in the Greater Riga area - as well as a concentration of businesses and administrative offices, gives additional power to its impact upon even the external relations of Latvia.¹⁰ The Head of the Cultural Department of the City Council remarked that Riga indeed has an advantage over the Government in implementing and running cultural programmes with foreign partners, yet on the city level. In fact, there has not been any serious project of inter-city co-operation not involving culture. It is culture and history that promotes the city - business, communication, public goods projects come after, says the Head. The Department is also more flexible in setting aims and targets for its activities in the field. The format that generates the largest foreign co-operation effect, according to her, is the network of metropolis, especially (although not exclusively) around the Baltic Sea. Such networks may circumvent the problems of foreign relations existing at a national level (especially in relation to Russia). The other advantageous feature of the networks is that for a particular purpose only some of the members may get involved and there is no need to always collaborate with all the members. This, as she sees it, could be a format for cultural activities supporting EU foreign policy. Moreover, since the experience of working with foreign partners on collaborative projects is a mundane task for the employees of the Cultural Department, such expertise could be of value and use at a national level. The potential area in which the activities of Riga City Council might also accord with the activities of the State is the use of Riga as the setting for representation purposes (state visits, big international events), as well as Riga's image as part of Latvia's image or brand. Currently, the Riga City Council is preparing a mid-term cultural policy strategy and the aspects of foreign cultural relations will be given due attention and should incorporate all the insights mentioned above.

The geographical priorities, as seen by the Head of the Cultural Department, are still and mostly European cities. Yet, as a heritage from the Soviet times, there are quite active contacts with Kobe City in Japan. In the light of the fact that Latvia until recently did not have an Embassy in this country, Riga-Kobe contacts were instrumental for supporting interstate relations. To a lesser extent this also applies to the contacts with Suzhou in China.

B r i t i s h C o u n c i l L a t v i a

Amongst the key players that influence Latvia's cultural policy, the British Council is viewed as an organisation that provides very substantial aid in the internationalisation of cultural projects. The Council provides knowledge, contacts, the BC network support, and finance; quite often the Ministry of Culture and municipalities turn to the BC for aid in advancing their co-operation with English speaking countries. Given the fact that the British Council has operated in Latvia for 14 years, its views are well grounded. The Director and Chief Officer of Cultural and Arts Programmes stressed a number of features characterising foreign cultural policy? They think that almost nobody in Latvia could clearly answer the question: what could be the gains for Latvia from a common EU foreign cultural policy. This is because Latvia has not found its solid place in a European cultural setting – it is still searching. Secondly, Latvia has not defined its core values, which should be a prerequisite for successful and efficient co-operation. Also, according to the representatives of the BC, Latvia's cultural policy players have been much concerned with internal issues rather than external. The BC has seen much interest and activity to internationalise cultural projects coming from individuals, NGOs, municipalities, businesses, but not from State institutions. Like others interviewed, the BC staff stated that the critical factor of a success of international cultural projects, are highly motivated and stubborn single-minded persons – managers who get things done. State institutions and even the majority of higher education institutions are very reactive and passive.

As to the geographical priorities, in ideal circumstances Latvia would benefit from co-operation with the countries of Central Asia using its advantage as a former USSR republic. Looking further

eastwards (i.e. India, China, South East Asia), Latvia would be better off by collaborating with other countries or even using the already established networks in these countries (e.g. British Council).

As a conclusion, the Head and the Chief Officer of Arts and Cultural Programmes at the British Council Latvia observed that there is not much resistance to the idea of a common cultural component complementing EU foreign policy. Yet, this is due to the inability to formulate a clear perspective in principle to this issue. Basically, almost nobody among the key players in cultural policy has seriously considered such matters. Therefore, the expected reaction to such proposals would be reactive from the state institutions, not proactive.

III Consolidated answers to the research questions

The Government has approved the new Strategic Guidelines of Culture Policy entitled National State. The Guidelines, as well as the key representatives of the Ministries of Culture and Foreign Affairs, recognise that a systematic, sound and effective foreign cultural policy currently does not exist. Its development is a primary task and stated both by the Ministry of Culture and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. On the other hand, individuals and organizations are very active in establishing and maintaining international cultural co-operation. Nevertheless, there is a lack of co-operation among all the parties involved on Latvia's side. Co-operative projects are the result of ad hoc activities and established personal and organisational contacts. The Ministry of Culture is the most active player in the development of foreign cultural policy, whereas the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has taken a rather reserved stance, stressing the importance of culture heritage, national identity and historical memory. The two Ministries have different views on the role of culture in Latvia's foreign policy. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs according to documents and civil servants' statements, views culture as part of the national image whereas the Ministry of Culture considers a wider spectrum of activities. The Ministry of Economics, apart from a rather marginal interest in tourism, has not been giving any serious attention to the use of culture in fostering international relations with other countries. The President's Chancellery is fully aware of the importance of culture in fostering international relations, yet does not possess sufficient policy instruments to substantially influence the Government's views on this matter.

The Ministry of Culture has formulated a number of directions for further action which, as part of the Strategic Guidelines, has been approved by the Government, and according to the highest level civil servants, by summer 2006 the Ministry will have formulated more detailed plans of actions. The key aims are increasing recognisability of Latvia's cultural products and services, the increase of State financing of external cultural activities, support of participation in international multiparty projects, are increasing the level of understanding and tolerance of other cultures in Latvian society.

Co-operation with other EU Member States is still the main emphasis of international cultural policy. Yet geographical priorities outside the EU, as recognised in documents (Guidelines) as well as by the key players, are the USA and CIS countries, most notably the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Moldova and Georgia. Despite very active cultural contacts with Russia that exist at the level of private and business cultural operators, the Government has abstained from deepening such contacts due to politically complicated relations with Russia. There is some recognition that Latvia should also develop cultural connection with the Arabic world and Asian countries – most notably Central Asian countries, China and India due to the growing number of tourists and some organisational initiatives in the field of science and culture. It has been reflected by discussions to open the Embassy in Egypt and signing a treaty of cultural co-operation with India. The key cultural players have either negative or no views on any co-operation with African and Latin American countries, with the exception of the President's Chancellery where some interest was expressed to intensify cultural co-operation with

the USA's neighbours – Canada and Mexico. The issue of co-operation with the exile communities - both old and new - was not seriously considered by any of the key players and is not very high either on the level of cultural or foreign relations.

The potential of Riga is recognised to foster and intensify cultural co-operation through the network of Baltic Sea metropolis network, thus involving Latvia in cultural exchanges not only with the neighbours - EU Member States - but also Russia (St Petersburg).

There is a mostly positive, yet not clearly formulated, attitude towards eventual co-operation at the EU level to add a cultural component to EU foreign relations. It seemed that all policy makers and practitioners interviewed confronted the issue for the first time. The key advantages of such a project in the eyes of Latvia's culture policy makers is the pressure on the civil servants at home to consider the value of culture (both domestically and internationally) more seriously than before. Such considerations would force the State institutions to clearly formulate priorities for Latvia's cultural foreign policy, and also might make the allocation and use of available financial and administrative resources more efficient. The eventual programmes and financing would support the existing cultural operators to be more active in the international field, thus culturally opening up Latvia itself. One more advantage mentioned is the possible use of already established networks (by other EU Member States) in the countries and regions where Latvia could not afford to establish its presence on its own. As potential dangers of a common international cultural policy of the EU, policy makers mention the threat of unification, the loss of Latvia's independent recognisability and a danger of bureaucratisation of such policy.

N a m e s a n d d e s i g n a t i o n s o f t h e
p e r s o n s i n t e r v i e w e d , c o r r e c t a t t h e
t i m e
o f e n q u i r y .

Daniels Pavluts, State Secretary of the Ministry of Culture.

Una Sedleniece, Head of the European Union Department, Ministry of Culture.

Diana Cive, Head of the Culture Department, Riga City Council.

Dace Duze, Advisor to the President of Latvia.

Martins Bondars, Director of the Chancellery of the President of Latvia.

Zaneta Ozolina, Head of the President's Strategic Analysis Commission.

Normunds Popens, Head of the European Union Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Rota S'nuka, Head of the European Union Department, Ministry of Economy.

Agita Kalvina, Director of the British Council Latvia.

Daina Ostrovska, Chief Officer of Arts and Culture Programmes, British Council Latvia.

Edgars Verpe, Executive Director of the Cultural Capital Endowment Latvia.

Ojars Kalnins, Director of the Institute of Latvia.

L i s t o f d o c u m e n t s u s e d

State Strategic Guidelines of Culture Policy 2006-2015 National State,

<http://www.km.gov.lv/UI/main.asp?id=20206>

Memorandum Culture 2010, <http://www.km.gov.lv/UI/main.asp?id=20206>

Latvia in the European Union strategy, <http://www.mfa.gov.lv/en/eu/EuStrategy/>.

Protocol, Expert Discussion, Foreign Culture Policy, Ministry of Culture.

- 1 All interviews were conducted in person, note recorded, lasted between 45 minutes (shortest) to 90 minutes (longest). They were pre-arranged and the purposes as well as the questions to be tackled during the interview were communicated in advance. The names of the persons interviewed are listed in the appendices
- 2 The report has not been shown to anyone interviewed.
- 3 This is one of seven key priorities of Latvia's participation in the EU.
- 4 In the context of this report the relevant ones being the participation of Latvia in the St Petersburg Book Fair and the exhibition Scandinavian design beyond myth.
- 5 It is still just an idea.
- 6 In Latvia, each government, when it is formed, creates a special declaration that delineates the scope and directions of work the coalition parties have agreed upon.
- 7 Speech of the State Secretary of Latvia's Ministry of Culture Mr. Daniels Pavluts at the 7th conference of the Baltic Sea States' Ministers of Culture, September 26th, 2005.
- 8 At the time of writing the Minister of Culture of the Republic of Latvia has signed the contract with the Minister of Tourism of the Republic of India on closer co-operation – the first such document signed between the two states.
- 9 Private financing and sponsorship is a minor share of all financing.
- 10 In the late 1990s and early 2000s Riga City Council was controlled by the opposition to the national government coalition. The Government's policy towards Russia was quite inactive whereas Riga City Council actively co-operated with the big Russian cities of Moscow and St Petersburg. This was considered by the Government as a certain clash of policies even at a national level. In addition, the Riga City Cultural Affairs Department is the second biggest financing body of culture in the whole country (after Cultural Capital Endowment) and quite often viewed as an alternative source of funding.

I Main findings of the report:

S t r a t e g y , g o a l s a n d t h e p r o c e s s o f
i n t e r n a t i o n a l c u l t u r a l c o - o p e r a t i o n
i n P o l a n d

In order to define the contemporary condition and priorities of Poland's international cultural co-operation actions, we must have regard to the professionalisation of such activities and to the enlargement of the territorial area of this co-operation.

The Government's current policy is based on the drive towards strengthening Poland's international status through co-operation within and to the benefit of the EU. Therefore, solutions favourable to a better co-ordination of activities within international cultural co-operation have been adopted. To accomplish this, the Team for Promotion of the Republic of Poland was created in 2004; its members are the representatives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and, among others, Ministries of Culture and National Heritage, Science, Higher Education, Public Finance and Tourism. The team creates a forum for dialogue and exchange of information. Its responsibilities include defining guidelines for medium and long-term strategies for the promotion of Poland and suggesting mechanisms of co-operation with non-governmental organizations, entrepreneurs, artistic communities, Polish communities abroad, churches and religious associations.

The product of the First stage of the Team's activities is the report entitled *Marka dla Polski* ("Brand for Poland"), published on 11 May 2006 by the National Chamber of Commerce and the Polish Brand Institute. This presents possibilities for Poland's promotion based, for example, on existing scientific, artistic, economical or technological achievements. The slogan 'Creative tension' was adopted to reflect the dynamics of changes in Poland and their potential.

Within the Second stage (May-December 2006), the Team is preparing the Strategy for Promotion of Poland 2007-2013, on the basis of which detailed strategies for science, culture and tourism are to be developed. The introduction of a seven year strategy is to help make use of financial support for the foreign promotion of Poland and deliberately coincides with the new cycle of EU programmes.

In the evolution of Poland's international cultural co-operation we should also have regard to two important phenomena that are currently shaping the dimension of this co-operation. First of all, a visible tendency to replace bilateral co-operation with multilateral agreements, and to shape the image of Poland as an important participant of multinational EU projects. Furthermore, specialization is taking place in this field. Aside from the Adam Mickiewicz Institute, there are other entities responsible for the promotion of Polish culture, such as the Polish Film Institute.

A t t i t u d e t o a c o m p l e m e n t a r y
c u l t u r a l c o m p o n e n t t o t h e E U ' s
e x t e r n a l p o l i c i e s

According to all the respondents, the EU's involvement in international cultural projects would have a positive dimension and it would serve the creation of a mutual foreign policy. This would facilitate overcoming national particularisms still present in many of the EU's internal activities.

However, as stressed many times, before undertaking any actions at the EU level, there is a need to hold a broad debate on Europe's cultural heritage and the history of individual states. To understand the goals of foreign policies of the EU countries and factors determining their individual actions is essential for the planning of joint projects and acceptance by all the partners.

There were also interviewees in the study that favoured broad cultural co-operation in Europe, especially with Third countries. According to this group of respondents, wider co-operation will enable verification and redefining of the role of cultural organizations' networks and the objectives of cultural projects. It has been pointed out that only co-operation with Third party countries will allow the citizens of the previous 15 EU Member States to understand the idea of the EU enlargement in 2004.

As regards Central Europe, it must be stressed that it is not Poland's aim to achieve the role of a leader in the region. Nevertheless, Poland's current involvement in cultural initiatives carried out within the Central and Eastern European space reflects its interest in this area. It is enough to mention Poland's active involvement at the forum of the Visegrad Group, the Ars Baltica, the Platform "Culture – Central Europe", the European Network "Remembrance and Solidarity" or the "Gaude Polinia" programme.

Consequently, for Poland, the EU's involvement could have a significant and positive dimension, primarily in reference to co-operation with Russia and, on a broader scale, in reference to the whole of Eastern Europe. However, an essential factor of such an involvement should be using the potential of Poland as a mediator in the meeting of the EU's objectives.

Simultaneously, as Poland rises in international status, the number of international cultural co-operation partners grows. The list of Poland's geographical priorities must now be extended by China, India, the countries of Africa and South America, where, according to the respondents, the involvement of the EU would be of particularly positive significance.

II Answers to the key questions – general part

W h a t a r e t h e k e y e l e m e n t s o f t h e
g o v e r n m e n t ' s / a g e n c y ' s c u r r e n t
p o l i c y o n i n t e r n a t i o n a l c u l t u r a l c o -
o p e r a t i o n ?

The priorities of Poland's international cultural co-operation include:

- Promotion of Poland as a dynamically developing country;
- Popularisation of the idea of solidarity and human rights;
- Popularisation of clear information concerning Poland's cultural heritage as well as the protection of this heritage;
- Promotion of contemporary artists.

The key issues of the international cultural co-operation can be also observed in the currently implemented and planned projects which not only indicate priorities (subjects) within the promotion of Polish culture, but also specify the main geographical areas of such activities.

Such tasks include:

- “Polish-Ukrainian Year” – this project, motto “Poland and Ukraine – Together in Europe”, ran from 30 March 2004 to May 2006 and its purpose was to strengthen the many years’ tradition of cultural co-operation maintained between individual cities, such as Kiev and Krakow, Odessa and Gdansk, Lvov and Lublin or Charkov and Poznan.
- “Polish - German Year” – this project, from May 2005 to May 2006, involved about 40 political and cultural events and actions whose subjects were various aspects of Polish-German relations in the European context; cultural, social and political phenomena in Poland, etc.
- “The Year of Krzysztof Kieslowski”¹ - this project commemorated the tenth anniversary of the director’s death. It was inaugurated in March 2006 and involved the organisation of showing of his film production in Europe and all over the world.
- “The Year of Jerzy Giedroyc 2006” – this project related to the commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Director of the Institute of Literature in Paris, the editor and publisher of the *Kultura* monthly, and was organised under the auspices of UNESCO and carried out in co-operation with Russia, Ukraine, Belarus and France. The project was launched in January 2006 and its completion is scheduled for December 2006. The main celebrations will be held from 26 to 27 July.
- “Poznan ‘56”² – the commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the “Poznan events” is planned for 2006; the activities are being carried out in co-operation with Hungary.³
- “The Year of Laski”⁴ – this project, approved by the Polish Sejm in 2006, is connected with the commemoration of the 500th anniversary of the Laski’s Statutes Enactment, and aimed at the Polish community in the USA.
- “The Year of Joseph Conrad” – the project has been planned for 2007 in connection with the 150th anniversary of the writer’s birth. The project is to be carried out in co-operation with the United Kingdom and Ukraine. The majority of cultural events are to take place in Poland, though special celebrations are planned also in Berdyczów, Ukraine, the writer’s birthplace.
- “Polish Days in India” – this is also to take place in 2007.
- “The Year of Poland in Israel” and “The Year of Israel in Poland” - planned for 2008.
- “The Year of Poland in the United Kingdom” - planned for 2009.

W h a t a r e t h e g e o g r a p h i c a l p r i o r i t i e s
(i f a n y) ?

For the majority of the interlocutors, a natural and essential element of Poland’s international cultural co-operation is strengthening its relationships with its immediate surroundings, that is to say with the EU Member States and those bordering Poland which are beyond the EU. Particular significance is attached to cultural relationships with Germany, the countries of the Visegrad Group and the *Ars Baltica* (mainly with Lithuania), Russia and Ukraine are also important.

In one of the respondents’ opinion, attention must be paid to the planned resumption of co-operation with the Polish community in the USA and Israel, which is where a lot of Polish emigrés born in the Second Republic of Poland (before WWII) live; to accomplish that, among other things, the “Polish-Israeli Year” is to be organised in 2008.

There were minority views that in the years to come, the issue of establishing cultural co-operation with Turkey and Iran may also become significant. A foundation for the two-way relations with Iran could be a mutual interest in the culture, language and tradition, as well as good contacts hammered out before the turning point in 1989, for example the Polish archaeologists’ missions. When it comes to Turkey, a traditional area for co-operation could be the reference to history, for example the old-Polish culture of the 17th and 18th centuries.⁵

Owing to the economisation of Poland's foreign policy, more attention is attached also to co-operation with India and China. In these countries, one-person attaché offices are to be strengthened to three-person offices, and, in future, they will be replaced by Polish Cultural Institutes.

The geographical priorities of Poland's international cultural co-operation have been also confirmed by the decisions relating to the choice of projects to be financially supported from the Operational Programme of the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage "Promotion of Polish Culture Abroad".⁶ So far, the greatest support has been granted to the projects carried out in the EU countries, Russia and Ukraine. The year 2005 saw a marked increase in spending for projects carried out in China.

W h a t a r e t h e k e y c h a l l e n g e s t o t h i s p o l i c y ?

The key challenges to the contemporary foreign policy of Poland include:

- A developmental leap of the country due to the economic growth resulting from EU membership;
- The increased importance of Poland within the EU, and, in effect, in the international context;
- Participation in the processes of the Western institutions, particularly NATO, as well as counteracting global threats such as terrorism;
- Supporting the processes of democratisation of Ukraine and Belarus, as well as building up relationships based on partnerships with Russia;
- Supporting modernisation in the Broad Middle East;
- Economisation of Poland's foreign policy understood as searching for new niches for economic co-operation; the areas in the centre of Poland's attention are the ASEAN group countries and China;

Speaking about the key challenges to Poland's foreign policy, the respondents paid attention to a real and high importance of the cultural co-operation with Germany, France, the Visegrad Group countries, the Ars Baltica countries, the U.S.A., Israel and also Japan.

A quite significant, yet understandable, difference of standpoints could be observed among the respondents. The representatives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs seem to perceive a real benefit from cultural co-operation in reference to a smaller number of countries than the representatives of the sector of culture and the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage. The latter are inclined to include, first of all, China, India, the countries of Africa and South America into the list of priority areas for the international co-operation.

H a v e t h e r e b e e n a n y r e c e n t p o l i c y s h i f t s , o r a r e a n y p o l i c y c h a n g e s f o r e s e e n ?

There have been no significant international policy changes in Poland since the end of the 1980s. All the interlocutors however, have stressed a significant evolution in the activities carried out before the accession to the European Union and after 1st May 2004. This difference has been observed both in reference to the priorities of Polish foreign policy and the rules of carrying out international cultural projects.

In Poland's foreign policy, in the first years after transformation, attention was paid primarily to the improvement of the country's safety. The endeavours for Poland's accession to NATO and later the European Union served this purpose. Currently, and reflecting a qualitative change of priorities, one of the key tasks of foreign policy is economisation of activities. In order to achieve this goal, the areas of foreign policy's activities are to be expanded where, aside from the traditional zones such as the EU or the USA, new territories have been added, for example the Middle East and Asia. However,

an element which is constantly present in Polish foreign policy is issues related to co-operation with Ukraine and Belarus.

As regards Poland's international cultural policy, we can observe a similar evolution of attitudes. In the period prior to the accession to the EU, Poland's promotion was set on presenting, in the Member States, Polish achievements in art, humanities and science which had not been promoted and were little known. This was to be accomplished by organising cultural events aimed at the largest possible group of people. The priority was given to the number of implemented projects, not to their internal cohesion or specific subject matter.

The ensuing large scale of contacts offered favourable conditions for establishing lasting relations and the foundations for co-operation between the institutions from Poland and EU countries. According to the majority of interlocutors, this goal has been achieved in Europe. Therefore, the involvement of the country's foreign policy aimed at the facilitation of cultural co-operation with other countries within the continent is not a priority at the moment. Thus, it is possible to initiate and enhance Poland's cultural relationships outside the EU.

In the evolution of Poland's cultural co-operation, attention must be paid also to two important processes presently shaping the dimension of this co-operation. First of all, a visible tendency to replace bilateral co-operation with multilateral agreements, and to shape the image of Poland as an important participant of multinational EU projects and those aimed at Third party countries (for example co-operation within the Platform "Culture - Central Europe").

Furthermore, an obvious drive towards professionalisation and specialisation becomes evident in Poland's cultural policy and in international activities. The realisation of these intentions is made easier both by introducing the Operational Programme of the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage (Promotion of the Polish Culture Abroad)⁷ and the Strategy for Promotion of Poland in the Years 2007-2013 (in preparation), which are to enable long-term actions being part of international cultural co-operation, instead of decisions made a year or six months in advance.

Specialisation in foreign cultural policy has been confirmed by shifting a part of the responsibilities, so far lying exclusively with the Adam Mickiewicz Institute (AMI), to other entities.

Currently, the Polish Film Institute created under the resolution of the Polish Sejm of 18 May 2005, deals with the promotion of Polish film and, among other things, co-ordinates the "Year of Krzysztof Kieslowski". An entity responsible for the promotion of theatre is the Zbigniew Raszewski Theatre Institute created in June 2003, and the popularisation of Polish literature in the world falls within the responsibilities of the Book Institute, established in January 2004.

Presently, the Polish Sejm is preparing the AMI act, which is to transform the Institute Adam Mickiewicz into an entity responsible for cultural diplomacy realised in co-operation with the posts of the Foreign Affairs Ministry (The Polish Institutes) and not merely for the co-ordination of individual artistic projects.

I f t h e r e w a s t o b e a c o m p l e m e n t a r y
c u l t u r a l c o m p o n e n t t o t h e E U ' s
e x t e r n a l p o l i c i e s :

- In what ways could this complement the State's own actions (i.e. what would be the added value?)

According to all the interlocutors, the EU's involvement in international cultural projects would have a positive dimension and it would serve the creation of a joint foreign policy. Such actions could also help overcome national particularisms still present in many of the EU's external activities.

For Poland, the EU's involvement could have a significant and positive dimension, primarily in reference to co-operation with Russia and, on a broader scale, in reference to the whole of Eastern Europe. However, an essential factor of such an involvement should be using the potential of Poland

as a mediator in the meeting of the EU's objectives. The involvement of Poland as a promoter of European ideas in the East is justified by Poland's familiarity with cultural codes specific for this part of Europe, the knowledge of language and culture and "everyday contacts"

It should also be noted that Poland is trying to achieve the role of EU's mediator for actions aimed at the Eastern European countries. Similarly, Poland could play the role of mediator and initiator of the co-operation of the EU with Turkey and the Arabic countries. Poland's asset in this area is its non-colonial past and a turbulent history, in which its citizens face many difficulties in the past. These shared experiences could provide a basis of relationships, the expression of empathy and mutual understanding of attitudes, which is what the contemporary Arabs expect from the world.

- What could the EU do that your country would have difficulty doing alone? (e.g. are there specific issues, cultural sectors or geographical areas that the EU should prioritise?)

First of all, it must be noted that only mutual cultural and security policies can guarantee the fulfilment of the strategic objectives by the EU. From the point of view of Poland's interests, the EU should support its policy towards Russia.

The involvement of the European Union may also be of great importance in the countries where there are more complex problems connected with cultural co-operation. China is an example here; the involvement of the EU would provide the joint support of all the Member States and strengthen their individual actions.

An example of an effective collaboration of the Member States working for the promotion of Europe's cultural heritage was the "2005 – EU Year of Japan People-to-People Exchange". According to the Polish politicians and practitioners of the sector of culture, such projects should be continued in the future, for example in reference to the countries of Asia or Africa. Joint actions in these regions will be more noticeable and, as a consequence, bring about better effects.

- Would this present any challenges or difficulties to your government's/ Institution's own policy?

An answer to this question is a sensitive matter. Poland is not a fully understood country in the dialogue inside the EU; still unjust and negative stereotypes prevail (such as that Poles are 'Russophobes'), even though this situation is gradually and permanently changing. In this context, there is a need to hold a broad historical debate on the complete and multifaceted unification of Europe. Therefore, prior to taking actions complementary to Poland's foreign cultural policy, the EU should gain a very good understanding of the objectives of the Polish foreign policy and of the factors that are the basis of its specific standpoints or actions. This situation can be explained in relation to its attitudes to Russia. The EU, as an organisation, has adopted a standpoint that Russia must be given help (with regard to development, stabilisation and democratisation of the country). France stated individually that President Putin should be supported. Poland, on the other hand, pointed out that Russia must be supported selectively, and negative phenomena, such as interfering by Russia in Ukraine's internal affairs, must be condemned.

According to one of the interlocutors, an essential factor for harmonious implementation of joint actions is a dialogue with Poland, which is to precede the implementation of international actions. This is because the co-ordination of projects at EU level without earlier agreement could be exaggerated by populist parties in Poland and, as a result, it could lead to the destabilisation of the situation in the country, which would not reflect actual public feeling.

- What advantages might accrue to both your Member State and the EU?

No doubt, an enhanced co-operation within international cultural policy could be beneficial both to Poland and the European Union. Poland, based on the same values as the Western European countries (such as observance of the rule of law and democracy), may add to European cultural co-

operation a new dimension or even a new quality resulting from a different historical experience of the second half of the 20th century.

The attitude of Poles can be related to the three fundamental beliefs. First, it is a belief that history is to be actively shaped by the grass roots social movements. After all, such a movement in the 1980s was Solidarity. Similarly, the attitude of the major group of Poles is shaped by their uncompromising nature in the fight against evil. The third characteristics of contemporary Poland, in particular ambitious young Poles, is a big charge of optimism and faith in the development of Poland and the European Community. The latter factor makes Poland stand out from the relatively prevalent sense of decadence and stagnation among the citizens of the former 15 Member States.

Poland can add a great deal of cultural dynamics and readiness to act in the name of the EU to the joint international cultural actions. The younger generation, in particular, identifies strongly with the European Union.

On the other hand, the EU by including Poland to its activities more than before will create new development opportunities for Poland and thus it will facilitate a 'civilising' leap in the community. Such actions, though primarily in a symbolic dimension, will be the legitimisation of Poland's Europeanism and Polish democracy. It will be yet another confirmation of Poland and its culture's presence in Europe's cultural traditions of 15th, 16th, 17th and 21st centuries.

III Answers to the key questions – Country Specific Contexts

I s t h i s a i m f o r c u l t u r a l l e a d e r s h i p
m a n i f e s t i n p r a c t i c e a n d i f y e s ,
h o w ?

First of all, it must be noted (in accordance with the answers given by all the interlocutors) that it is not Poland's aim to become the leader in Central Europe in the field of cultural and artistic activities. Indeed it frequently limits its activeness so that it will not be misinterpreted by our partners. This attitude has developed from the awareness of historical connotations. The once powerful Republic of Poland ended up being partitioned in the 18th century. In the period of the Second Republic of Poland (1918-1939), the national imperialistic policy did not bring any good either. Therefore, an internal imperative of the Third Republic of Poland is not to revive this tradition.

This coalition approach is reflected in Poland's activities at the forum of the Visegrad Group, the Ars Baltica, the Platform "Culture-Central Europe" or the European network "Remembrance and Solidarity". Poland did not accept the function of a leader in any of the above assemblies, in spite of the fact that it treats the objectives of these organisations responsibly and makes every effort to initiate new joint actions. An example of such an approach is the meeting of the Visegrad Group Ministers of Culture on 1-2 June 2006 in Krakow, initiated by the Polish government. The meeting will be also attended by the Ukrainian Minister of Culture. The meeting participants will discuss friendly relations within Central Europe and issues related to the possibility of establishing wider cultural co-operation with Ukraine and non-governmental organisations from Belarus. Poland's intention is to gain partners from the Visegrad Group to provide an active support for democratic processes in Belarus and Ukraine.

The proof of Poland's ability to establish and maintain co-operation based on partnerships are also the activities of the Baltic Sea Culture Centre (BSCC) at the forum of Ars Baltica. The Secretariat of the organisation has been functioning in the institution's head office in Gdansk since 2004. According to the Ars Baltica's statutes, Poland's term of office would terminate in 31 December 2006. However, at the Organising Committee Meeting in Oslo in November 2005, it was agreed the

secretariat in Gdansk is to be extended by another three years until 31 December 2009, which is a clear confirmation of the acceptance and support for how the BSCC functions and the results of its activities.

Another example of the Polish side's openness to getting involved in Central European initiatives and to shaping the space for intercultural dialogue is the European Network "Remembrance and Solidarity". The originator of the undertaking was Ms. Christina Weiss, German Minister of Culture. In response to her proposal, in April 2004 and then in February 2005, Warsaw was the place of meetings whose effect was adopting the declaration on creating the European Network "Remembrance and Solidarity" by Ministers of Culture from Germany, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia. The main purpose of the network's activity is to analyse, document and popularise the knowledge about the history of the 20th century. According to the terms and conditions of the declaration, the network's secretariat was created in Poland at the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage. From the statements of the respondents from Poland, it must be assumed that the role of the network will gradually strengthen, along with the declared will to deepen a historical dialogue in the EU and to show history as also a cultural experience.

It is also worth noting Platform "Culture – Central Europe", which provides an example of a purposeful and integrated cultural promotion carried out by six EU countries, i.e. Austria, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Poland and Slovenia. Co-operation within the Platform involves the organisation of cultural events in the capital cities of the countries which hold the presidency of the European Commission at the time. What these events have in common is that they are held under the same aegis of the Platform "Culture – Central Europe", and that they share the same slogan and promotion materials (showing, for example, the development of classical music in six Central European countries). As a consequence, each artist participating in the project promotes themselves and their country, but also the other five country members. Each time one of the platform members takes responsibility for the organisation of the events; e.g. Poland was responsible for preparing the "City of Poets" project carried out in Dublin 2004. Artists from Poland participated also in the project carried out in 2005 in China (participation in Beijing's International Music Festival), where Austria played the role of co-ordinator.

An interesting example of Poland's involvement in Central and Eastern Europe is also the "Gaude Polonia" programme pursued since 2003 by the National Centre for Culture. The programme aimed at young creators and artists from the former Soviet Union, complements the scholarships offered by the Polish Government. So far, 84 artists from Ukraine, Belarus, Bulgaria and Albania have been granted scholarships in Poland. The essence of the programme is establishing artistic relationships in Poland by scholarship holders. Thanks to "Gaude Polonia", local artistic projects to which Polish partners are invited, have been carried out in Belarus and Ukraine.

Also the "Polish – Ukrainian Youth Exchange" programme, which is currently in preparation, is to serve the building of lasting social ties of co-operation. It will be aimed at people aged 13-18. Approximately 1,000 people are estimated to participate in the pilot programme. As part of projects carried out together they will get to know the local history and the region's culture, as well as similarities and differences in the Polish and Ukrainian languages.⁸

To sum up, according to what one of the interlocutors stated, it should be also emphasised that along with the enlargement of the European Union and an inevitable regionalisation of the Community's activities, the role of Poland as one of the potential leaders will increase, especially in relation to the EU's policy towards Eastern Europe.

A r e t h e r e t h e m e s a n d g e o g r a p h i c a l
p r i o r i t i e s i n P o l a n d ' s e x t e r n a l
c u l t u r a l r e l a t i o n s ?

Attention must be paid to the significant themes present in Poland's current international cultural co-operation and those planned for future years. Among the issues indicated by the interlocutors was a clear emphasis on the historical dialogue inside the EU. The following issues have been highlighted:

- Demonstrating Polish examples of integration, especially the idea of the Polish-Lithuanian Union of 14th century,
- Demonstrating, in a broader sense, the issue of Solidarity, the movement embracing employees, workers and the intelligentsia, but also the organisation dominated by the ability to co-operate with commitment and to win allies which are so necessary for EU citizens for the further development of Europe;
- Demonstrating the tragedy of WWII also as the tragedy of the Polish nation;
- Demonstrating the successes of the transformation of the past 17 years and strengthening democracy in Poland.

IV Answers to the key questions – practitioners:

B a s e d o n y o u r e x p e r i e n c e , d o e s t h e
d e c l a r e d I n t e r n a t i o n a l c u l t u r a l
c o - o p e r a t i o n p o l i c y o f y o u r
g o v e r n m e n t a p p e a r t o m e e t i t s
o b j e c t i v e s ?

Yes, according to the practitioners of the sector of culture, the objectives of international cultural co-operation declared by the Government are met, not least because a number of the specified objectives are all embracing within the sector of culture.

The extent to which the declared objectives are met varies and depends on the current political interests of the state, finances and, equally important, results from the interest of the country at which the individual artistic actions are aimed.

According to some of the interlocutors, attention must be also paid to the methodology of cultural policy implementation. Sometimes, the element of the dialogue with artistic communities or non-governmental organisations are sidelined in Government activities. This is the case when the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage selects an entity and commissions it to carry out the Ministry's own proposals without including this institution or its partners' own projects into the programme. Most frequently, such a situation takes place in reference to the implementation of significant projects for which a very short time was allowed for preparations.

T o w h a t e x t e n t d o e s t h a t p o l i c y
m e e t t h e i n t e r n a t i o n a l n e e d s a n d
a s p i r a t i o n s o f y o u r / y o u r
o r g a n i s a t i o n ' s w o r k ?

In fact, all the practitioners have stated that the tasks performed by their institutions / organisations comply with the objectives of international cultural co-operation specified in the policy of the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage or the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. At the same time, the majority of interlocutors pointed out that their institutions perform tasks within their specified domain in a broader scope than that indicated in the government's policy. This is not surprising since the interlocutors represent entities with a distinctly defined profile of expert or artistic activities. None of the interlocutors stated that their organisation carries out activities that are not in conformity with the directions of the government's policy.

H a v e y o u e v e r b e e n i n v o l v e d i n a n
E U i n i t i a t e d o r s u p p o r t e d p r o j e c t /
p r o g r a m m e (e . g . a f e s t i v a l o r
e x h i b i t i o n) i n a c o u n t r y / c o u n t r i e s
b e y o n d t h e E U ?
I f s o , w h a t w a s y o u r e x p e r i e n c e o f
t h i s ?

Answers to this question given by the interlocutors were characterised by a specific discrepancy. A great majority of the representatives of large national institutions have not used any EU funds while carrying out their projects. It may be concluded that the funds obtained from the national budget or from sponsors were sufficient to realise their main intentions. Things are different in reference to non-governmental organizations or smaller cultural institutions. In this group, the EU funds are the main source of financial support for artistic activities.

As regards the experience of co-operation with Third countries, the following observations are worth mentioning:

- Co-operation with Third country partners usually proceeds very well and the entities demonstrate high commitment;
- The problem is the lack of support for such undertakings on the part of the local authorities, sponsors or mass media, which makes it difficult to publicise a project;
- The addressees of the implemented tasks are very open to international projects, even if the subject matter of such tasks touches upon such difficult issues as international dialogue, acceptance of diversity or cultural 'otherness';

However, partners from Third countries have limited experience in conducting international projects and there is common lack of infrastructure that would enable the delivery of projects. So, when the project is a long-lasting one, the presence of experts from the EU countries is a crucial factor, which may assure the final success.

According to one of the interlocutors, the limits and reservations in co-operation with Third countries originate from the logic and guidelines of the EU's cultural programmes. For example, the MediaPlus programme requires co-operation among European film institutions and promotes such co-operation by co-funding. So, if the producer wants to enlarge the number of partners beyond the EU boundaries and invite representatives, e.g. from Russia, he has to find additional sources of financing it.

H o w d o y o u c o n s i d e r c u l t u r a l
i n i t i a t i v e s b e t w e e n t h e E u r o p e a n
U n i o n a n d c o u n t r i e s o u t s i d e E U
b o r d e r s m i g h t m a k e a d i f f e r e n c e t o
y o u r p r a c t i c e ?

All the interlocutors have firmly stated that EU's involvement in cultural co-operation with Third countries would create vital new opportunities for their activities.

Their answers contained various geographical areas for such co-operation. However, they all opted for locating activities within the Central and Eastern European space. The reason for such a choice was the weakening of co-operation with those countries after 1989. The following countries have been highlighted: Romania, Bulgaria, Turkey, Ukraine, Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Other noteworthy opinions were that there is a need for a broad cultural co-operation in Europe, especially with the countries beyond the EU, which would make it possible to overcome a certain

stagnation or maybe discouragement prevailing in the Member States. Broader co-operation would enable verification and redefining of the role of cultural organisations, networks and the objectives of cultural activities. It has been noted that only the co-operation with the countries outside EU will allow citizens of the former 15 Member States to understand what the purpose of the EU enlargement in 2004 really was.

L i s t o f r e s p o n d e n t s :

Ministry of Foreign Affairs:

Jaroslaw Bratkiewicz, Director of the Department of Strategy and Foreign Policy Planning;
Joanna Stachyra, Head of the Division of Territorial Affairs, Department of Public Diplomacy;
Jaroslaw Szczepankiewicz, Head of the General Promotion Division, Department of Public Diplomacy;
Leszek Hensel, Independent Post for Multilateral Co-operation, former Ambassador of Poland to Slovenia;

Ministry of Culture and National Heritage:

Krzysztof Olendzki, Under-Secretary of State, responsible for international co-operation and EU funds;
Anna Niewiadomska, Director of International Co-operation Department;
Jacek Miller, Director of the Department for the Polish Cultural Heritage Abroad;
Elzbieta Nowak, Department for International Co-operation;

Cultural practitioners:

Bogdan Bernaczyk – Slonski, Director of the Adam Mickiewicz Institute (AMI);
Dorota Keller, Manager of the Project Division, Co-ordinator of the Polish-German Year, AMI;
Wladyslaw Serwatowski, Co-ordinator of the Polish-Spanish Year, AMI;
Bogumila Berdychowska, Manager of the Scholarship Programmes Division, National Centre for Culture, Co-ordinator of the “Gaude Polonia” programme (scholarships and co-operation with artistic communities in Central and Eastern Europe);
Lidia Makowska, the Baltic Sea Culture Centre, in charge of the Ars Baltica secretariat;
Bozena Szreder, Co-ordinator of international projects (for example former Yugoslavia), the Borderland Foundation;
Miroslaw Warowicki, International Programme Director, Foundation in Support of Local Democracy;
Anna Sienkiewicz – Rogowska, Summer Film Festival, Main Producer;
Adam Mazur, International Exhibitions, Centre for Contemporary Art Ujazdowski Castle;

Notes

- 1 For example, as part of the “Year of Krzysztof Kie’slowski” ten parts of Krzysztof Kie’slowski’s Dekalog [“Decalogue”] were shown at the British Film Institute in London and at the International Film Festivals in Calcutta and Sao Paolo. Moreover, the director’s early works, such as Spokój [“Peace”], Pierwsza Miłość [“First Love”], Personel [“Personnel”] were shown in three cities in Switzerland.
- 2 On 28 June 1956, in Poznań, a march of Polish workers turned into mass riots under the economic, national and liberation banners; they were brutally suppressed by the troops of militia.
- 3 In 1956, Hungary saw an attempted overthrow of the communist system. Hungary’s withdrawal from the Warsaw Pact was proclaimed. However, the revolution was suppressed by the Soviet troops.
- 4 LASKI JAN (1456-1531) Grand Chancellor of the Crown, diplomat active during the reigns of the Jagiellonian dynasty. A trusted partner of Aleksander Jagiellończyk, King of Poland and Grand Duke of Lithuania, fought to incorporate Pomerania and Mazovia into Poland. At Laski’s initiative, in 1506, a collection of statutes and privileges, the so called “Laski Statutes”, was prepared.
- 5 The foundation for the contemporary relations could be the old-Polish culture, a phenomenon occurring in Poland from the 16th century until the middle of the 18th century, which was characterized by the orientalizing of the noblemen’s clothes, but it also

affected architecture, sculpture and painting of the period. The said trend was based on the mythical concept which identified the Polish noblemen with Sarmatians, a nomadic and pastoral tribe which in the middle of the 1st century BC. inhabited the lower Volga area. In practice, the Polish nobility culture contributed to the increased trade relations with Turkey.

- 6 The members of the Programme's Steering team are the representatives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Ministry of Culture and National Heritage who decide jointly about the choice of projects to be supported financially. Thus, the programme reflects the Polish Government's priorities in international cultural policy.
- 7 The Operational Programme of the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage "Promotion of Polish Culture Abroad", complies with the National Strategy for the Development of Culture in 2004-2013 adopted under the resolution of the Council of Ministers of 21 September 2004. The programme's budget for 2005 was PLN 10.7 million (Euro 2.75 million); in 2006 PLN 8 million (EUR 2.05 million) was allocated for the activities within the programme.
The objectives of the "Promotion of Polish Culture Abroad" programme include promoting a positive image of Poland abroad and international cultural co-operation under international and departmental agreements and contracts. Entities that may apply for financial support include government and local government cultural institutions, non-governmental organisations, churches and religious associations.
- 8 The National Centre for Culture will be responsible for the realisation of the prepared programme.

I The context and the policy and structural shifts

The main lines about Portugal that come out from the desk-research on official documents seem not very far from reality. The “positive attitude to co-operation with other European countries vis-à-vis the rest of the world” is certainly true. The absolute priority is the Portuguese speaking countries (the five sub-Saharan African countries Angola, Mozambique, Cape Verde Islands, São Tomé and Príncipe Islands and Guinea-Bissau, plus Brazil in South America and East Timor in South-East Asia) forming the CPLP and, consequently, a great attention to the teaching of Portuguese language is also quite accurate. “With the language goes the culture” expresses what seems to be (still) one of the main lines of the Portuguese policy, but evolving into broader approaches.

Other aspects of the first research document though are not so connected with reality, like the many cultural agreements that have been signed with countries all over the World but, in fact, are not actioned, or the “special attention to reinforce cultural relations” with countries with whom Portugal has special historical links including Morocco, Japan, China and other Asian countries, with still modest initiatives and results.

Although, as said, the main lines of the first study are true, it’s also a fact that reality is progressing inside the Government itself – not only in terms of policy focus and goals, but also in the crucial aspect of articulation between departments – and that other public and private actors already play an important role and will be key partners in a possible cultural component to EU external policies.

During recent years a significant shift in policy targets has occurred, with (outside the EU) a larger attention to the United States of America, Russia and (only in intentions for now) China – following a closer relationship between the Ministries of Culture and Trade – but also a stronger approach to Brazil inside the Portuguese speaking countries, and a still very timid look at the Mediterranean area.

Another relevant aspect on how things are evolving is the clear concern with the promotion of a contemporary Portugal, European and cosmopolitan, thus deviating from its more traditional, post-colonial image. This motivates many of the actions inside (mostly) and outside the EU, and partially explains the renewed attention towards the United States of America and Brazil.

A structural reform of State departments and ministries was recently announced and will introduce important changes also in the departments responsible for cultural foreign affairs. Among many measures of rationalization of the State, the PRACE (Programme for Reestructuration of the Central Administration of the State) intends to terminate 187 structures of the existing 518. This should happen during 2006, as will a clear definition of the responsibilities of each department.

In the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Instituto Camões (IC) will remain an “operational department” although, as announced, the Ministry of Culture will have a joint responsibility in defining its action in what concerns the external cultural policy.

In the Ministry of Culture, the Office of International Cultural Relations (GRCI) is integrated in another structure, the Office of Planning, Strategy, Evaluation and International Relations (GPEAR), defined as a “support department” with, it seems, mostly advisory functions.

Several departments of the Ministry of Culture develop international contacts or actions by themselves, mostly technical and training support, mainly with the Portuguese speaking countries, but also regions formerly under the dominion of Portugal such as Goa in India and Macao in China, where Portuguese cultural centres have been established in recent years. The Institute of Cinema and the Arts Institute also has relations in different countries, according to specific goals or opportunities.

Recent budget restrictions have introduced some changes in the presence abroad of Cultural Attachés (among several other representatives appointed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs), reducing substantially the number of civil servants in some embassies.

It is also worth mentioning that inside the Ministry of Foreign Affairs the action of the Portuguese Institute for Development Support (IPAD) recently made public “A strategic vision for Portuguese co-operation”, where concepts like cultural exchange, cultural diversity and multiculturalism are well integrated with the objectives of fostering sustainable development. Its main geographic focus is, again, on the Portuguese speaking countries of Africa and East Timor in South-East Asia. IPAD is very keen to structure its action around the idea of “clusters” of co-operation, putting together for the same objective different partners from a wide range of sectors including the cultural one. Several cultural initiatives (heritage, performing arts, cinema etc.) have been supported by IPAD.

Because of the importance that private or public (but relatively independent) foundations and cultural institutions have in the external projection of Portugal and Portuguese culture, their activities deserve to be considered also when looking at the general panorama. Above all the Gulbenkian Foundation, but to some extent also the Oriente Foundation and the Luso-American Foundation, dedicate important resources and attention to the international scene outside the EU. In this research the questionnaire used for the interviews with the Presidents of these foundations (and of some other cultural institutions) was mainly the same one as that for civil servants, but with elements of the questionnaire for practitioners.

II About the EU role: added value

All interviewees agreed that the EU could have a positive role – important or very important – in complementing and enlarging goals and horizons on international cultural action. They all also agreed that European culture and European values need to have a much stronger presence and visibility outside the EU. Naturally the vision of how important and how it could be done differs very much, as do concerns about what should be the limits of the EU’s role.

In general terms, all departments related to the Ministry of Culture, in consonance with the Minister herself, look at the EU role as very useful and do not fear “absorption” in a more extended EU presence. Phrases like “if its good for the EU its good for Portugal” or “our image is made of quality, having the others at our side doesn’t harm us” illustrates the very positive attitude. At the same time, connecting the European “label” to an action of Portugal is seen as an “upgrade” that helps gather good visibility and a positive approach, mainly in the “new markets” where Portugal wants to be present (in cultural terms but not only). This goes along with the concern to promote a contemporary Portugal that works also as a window to “export” contemporary creators and artists.

The importance of the EU is also (and especially) stressed when thinking about sustainability and long-term commitments - two key issues that crossed all sectors of interviewees. These seem to be very important goals – for civil servants as for practitioners – and have been identified as the

main fragilities of the Portuguese cultural initiatives. For instance, in relation to the built heritage, where nowadays strategies look at sustainability and long-term commitments as basic goals, a joint action of the EU in that aspect of the national heritage which can be classed as European is seen as an important step for preservation, but even more for a strategic use in cultural projects and initiatives.

Directly related with long-term commitments is the need for multiplying co-productions (cinema, performing arts etc.) – a domain where EU initiatives may be crucial – involving partners from outside the EU, thus helping to strengthen the cultural structures and industries in those countries and contributing to create permanent relations, complicity and a very positive and dynamic image of the EU.

In the Foreign Affairs departments, where the promotion of language is a stronger concern, the EU role is seen as a potentially positive one – including under some conditions, sharing spaces, costs etc. with other countries – although it seems less obvious how it could be implemented. Also, the lack of infrastructures for cultural activities in many poor or less developed countries is an important concern where a joint EU strategy is seen as very helpful.

For the main Foundations active in the cultural field and with a strong international activity, things can be put the other way around: what could be the added value for the EU of a structured strategy that would be able to profit from their activities? If we take into account, for instance, what the Gulbenkian Foundation has been doing in more than 70 countries over the years, with very significant investments, the places where the Oriente Foundation is active in Asia, the work of the Luso-American Foundation with several United States institutions, or of the Serralves Foundation in some of its international co-productions, it seems that there is here, to some extent, a potential that would be useful if co-ordinated with a possible EU strategy. All seem to agree that the EU could have a very positive role in many different ways: helping to structure the action of foundations and universities, among others, in the cultural field (following a “Europe in the World” example), helping to disseminate information etc. and helping to create and disseminate a clear view of “European values”.

The central role of the EU in promoting partnerships and networks, in opening “windows” that allow easy contacts and promote creativity, was also seen as a zone where the added value can be very strong. In this respect there is a total coincidence with practitioners’ views.

In fact, for several practitioners, what comes out after all the experience of many years of intra-EU programmes, is the importance of networks, of permanent relations, of building together, of giving and receiving, of allowing people to contact and know each other, of fostering synergies, of allowing the space and the time for emotions. This implies that the EU must be mostly a facilitator and that those involved in this international dialogue tend to build long-term commitments. Also that great importance should be given to build outside the EU solid, sustainable structures and critical mass. Enlarging (and simplifying dramatically) some of the actual programmes to partners outside of the EU, has been mentioned as an easy step forward. For several interviewees (not only practitioners) an “Erasmus for Culture” comes out as a good example of an efficient way to approach people, build synergies and sow the seeds of good projects.

Another key issue where the EU’s added role was very clearly stressed deserves mentioning: the importance of bringing into the EU the cultures and creators from countries outside the EU, not as ‘exotic’ products in festivals and exhibitions, but with the aim of working together, sharing experiences and knowledge, growing together and building partnerships.

III About the EU role: concerns

As already mentioned concerns about a possible cultural component to EU External Policies are very small. Probably the greatest concern is that it might not happen!

Although at the Ministry of Culture there were no special concerns, at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, on the other hand, while stressing the importance of the visibility of European culture and European values, concerns about further steps came out much more clearly. The need for consensus in any decision, the fear that there might be, in practical terms, a contradiction between the rich diversity of the many cultures of Europe and a joint external cultural policy, and doubts about the legal framework for such a policy were pointed out.

At the civil servants level it worked the other way around: there were more concerns from the cultural side than from foreign affairs. Some pre-conditions for any action were underlined: no hierarchies between the different cultures or motivated by the amount of speakers of each language; no transposition of the EU structure of votes; recognition of an equal contribution of each country.

For the various national institutes, cultural institutions and practitioners the problems are of a different kind: interviewees were mostly concerned with the efficiency of such policies and future programmes, about a more equal access of all countries – not repeating the mistakes of Culture 2000 and other programmes mainly used by the larger and richer countries. Many are suspicious of the Commission as “too bureaucratic” and “not consistent enough” or “shortsighted” in initiatives, both at national and European level.

The need for a different culture in the way programmes are designed, going beyond a logic of subsidies and, instead, helping to build the space for creativity and partnerships, was repeatedly suggested.

It was also stressed that much more should be done inside the EU to have a clearer view of what is and could be its cultural component, and how it could be effective abroad.

IV About the EU role: a broader view

Some interviewees have looked to the theme of this research in a broader approach, going beyond a national perspective into a more European perspective. It seemed worthwhile to take a short note of these broader views, away from considerations of added value and concerns.

“European culture unites much more than divides”: the phrase might be a good starting point to look for what the cultural dimension of EU could be. In a more general approach the statements were as follows:

- “Cultural action is a crucial part of the Foreign and Security policy. Peace and balance have to be achieved with cultural values”;
- “The EU needs to be a strong protagonist...based, above all, in its cultural creativity, in its ability to innovate, and in the capacity to use them as weapons to fight inequalities, finding forms of co-operation that build more equal societies”;
- “The common values of the European civilization – freedom, initiative, creation, etc. – are much beyond the culture products, but express themselves also through art”;
- “This is not the classical subsidiarity. A greater visibility of a Cultural Europe, less limited to each of its Members, would be useful to all Members”;
- “The past, the present and the future of Europe need to achieve a coherent visibility, if it’s true that Europe is above all cultural”;
- “Europeans are leaders in creativity. The European civilizational model is the most avant-garde experience of the 20th century. But we need to prove that it is a visionary one.”

In a more specific approach:

- “People are suspicious about ‘Eurocentrism’ in culture. Competition between cultural institutes is a mistake. Co-operation is essential to assert that our cultures are open to the others”;

- “Co-operation of EU countries acts mostly in parallel, but not jointly. This means in many cases poor results. On heritage it might prevent, for instance, a UNESCO classification”;
- “Much more efficient than giving a block image of the EU is building long standing relations with partners outside, showing the mosaic of different cultures as a point of departure”;
- “If we (EU countries) start working together efficiently outside, communicate and share much more, we will also reinforce cohesion and knowledge inside Europe. We will end up knowing and loving ourselves much more”;
- “The EU strategy must be of an immense variety, of an immense richness. A unified cultural policy is the end of Europe. It’s the mosaic that we have to preserve”;
- “If Europe can export something it’s our knowledge on how to build interrelations, a notion of civil society, of the responsibilities of citizens. It’s the culture inside us”.

v About practical examples

Although Portugal has hosted major international events, e.g. Lisbon 94 European Capital of Culture, the World Fair of Lisbon-Expo 98, Oporto 2001 European Capital of Culture and has been a guest country in European and international events (e.g. Europalia 1991 in Brussels and participation in major book fairs), very few practical examples of Portuguese-European cultural co-operation emerged during the interviews. This reflects partially the reality of the weak involvement of Portugal with the general European programmes, and the unequal access, in practical terms, to these instruments; and if this is true inside Europe, it is naturally much more significant outside Europe.

Bureaucracy, the complexity of all mechanisms – from getting information to involving many partners – and timings were some of the preventive reasons mentioned. Some practitioners were linked to events with EU support seen as “a distant element of subsidy, not distinguishable from other sponsors”. An example that worked well outside the EU was experienced by Associação Alkantara (former Danças na Cidade) that developed in Mozambique, Cape Verde and in Europe (2001/2002) a Festival, including workshops, research and creation residencies in Africa, supported by PAMCE (the Programme for support of ACP cultural events in Europe). Two essential elements were very positive for the organisation: only one structure responsible for the whole operation (and not three or five as in Culture 2000) and 80% of the subsidy was given with the signature of the contract, thus allowing the project to move forward without too many constraints.

Another illustration is the Biennial of Young Creators of Portuguese Speaking Expression, an intergovernmental initiative in Mozambique, most recently in 2006.

vi Practitioner concerns

Concerns expressed by practitioners can be divided into three different areas: Portuguese external cultural policy, EU practice and some basic principles to illuminate cultural initiatives. Not surprisingly, practitioners are very critical about the Portuguese external cultural policy. Critics go from what they see as a “lack of a clear strategy” to initiatives that seem to have little connection with the cultural reality. Money is certainly not the first concern. Articulation between departments, a clear strategy, good communication and planning several years ahead are referred to as much more important issues.

EU practice, in general, is seen as “too distant from cultural actors needs” and designed for “very heavily organized structures”. “The small don’t enter Europe”, observed one interviewee. This tends to leave out of programmes and actions, some of the more creative people and ideas. This also tends to “export” a more closed, one way view of the reality, a more negative logic, without leaving any

productive and sustainable results. For that very reason, there is a concern about the designing of new actions in areas where culture can have very positive effects and is a very sensitive matter.

What principles then should illuminate EU cultural initiatives? Let's have some practitioner's direct quotes:

- "Simplicity in procedures and a great effort to ensure that understandable information will reach all potential partners".
- "Let cultural actors take the lead", "let them contact, know each other, create complicity, and build programmes bottom-up".
- "Exchange is a central issue, if things are not built together they fall apart".
- "Building together means also training, workshops, working together, thinking about the sustainability of our partners".
- "Long-term commitments, partnerships, co-productions, continuous relations, that's what can achieve solid results".

VII About Portugal's needs and its possible role

Naturally the main needs of Portugal in what concerns its external cultural actions and objectives have very different interpretations and priorities at the different interviewee levels. At a government level, the budget was always referred to first. Budget restrictions were indicated as the main limitation of a more enlarged strategy and as the reason for dedicating to the promotion of the language – "the first priority" – a very high percentage of the resources. For that same reason (but not only), there is a very open attitude towards co-operation with other countries in several domains, and a stronger EU support is welcome. As a second main issue, the difficulties of articulation between departments and the need for a clear joint strategy was underlined (including not only Foreign Affairs and Culture, but also Trade and Tourism). A third issue pointed out by members of government was the need to show a more contemporary image of Portugal, promoting its culture and its creators and artists. In this area, linking strongly the images of Europe and Portugal is seen as very positive, and an important element to get the right attention, to enter easily in some countries and to achieve better results.

For civil servants, better budgets and especially a better use of the existing ones were obviously also important. However a stronger relevance was put on the articulation and co-operation between the various actors, in the planning and in defining clear strategies, and in more persistent and continuous actions. Those can be identified as the issues that were consistently underlined by practically all interviewees.

Other needs clearly defined were having or accessing the necessary cultural infrastructures in several countries - something that is seen as "a natural territory for EU countries to share". The need for a "great effort to ensure that understandable information will reach all potential partners", already mentioned above, and also creating mechanisms to help cultural actors in complying with all the technical and financial needs, was referred to by several practitioners, and seems to be a real problem in Portugal and has prevented many participating in EU programmes. This is seen as a serious contradiction between the goals and the real achievements of such programmes: "if in fact each culture, the creativity of each country, its special characteristics and capacities are necessary to the overall mosaic of the EU, then something was probably lost". This links directly to a vision of what could be the role of Portugal in an external cultural policy of the EU and the added value for the EU, mentioned by some interviewees of cultural institutions and practitioners.

Discussing what could be Portugal's strategy during the interview with the President of one of the cultural institutions, a very interesting concept emerged: acquiring visibility and acting as a "soft

power” (a concept taken from Joseph Nye’s book *Bound to Lead: the Changing Nature of American Power*, NY, 1990; curiously the same expression used about Europe by sociologist Tzvetan Todorov in *Die verhinderte Weltmacht – Reflexionen eines Europäers*, Munich, 2003 and quoted in Kathinka Dittrich van Weringh and Ernst Schürmann’s study *Does Europe Need a Foreign Cultural Policy?*). “Soft power”, in this particular view, expresses a special characteristic that comes from being a small country with a very rich history, what is seen as an advantage to easily create complicity with countries that react to the “hard power” of others. In his view, the “soft power” helps building networks, partnerships and very balanced relations.

The role of Portugal and its added value to the EU, was also mentioned several times in relation to Brazil and Africa, where not only language, but also a deep knowledge accumulated by the Portuguese for many years can be very useful. The need to concentrate very strongly on the Mediterranean came out, both as a Portugal need and a zone where Portugal’s attributes can be of high use to the EU. “In the Mediterranean we don’t come as colonizers; instead our culture creates bridges very easily”, which could give the Portuguese a useful active role in several domains, including migration problems. This comes also from “the amazing miscegenation that the Portuguese did all over the World, because, in the first place, they were not rich enough to impose themselves”. This capacity for the mixing of races is seen as an important characteristic that all EU action abroad should take into consideration. “We need to create cells with a human scale, to exchange, to experiment and create partnerships.”

VIII Key points

I n s i d e E u r o p e

- Linking strongly the images of Europe and Portugal is seen as very positive.
- Clear concerns with the promotion of a contemporary Portugal, European and cosmopolitan, thus deviating from its more traditional, post-colonial image.
- Articulation between departments, a clear strategy, good communication and planning several years ahead are referred as probably the most critical issues in Portugal.

O u t s i d e E u r o p e

- The importance of the EU is especially stressed when thinking about sustainability and long-term commitments, two key issues that crossed all sectors of interviewees.
- The need for multiplying co-productions involving partners from outside the EU, thus helping to strengthen the cultural structures and industries in those countries and contributing to create permanent relations, complicity and a very positive and dynamic image of the EU, is also considered crucial.
- The central role of the EU in promoting partnerships, in opening “windows” that allow easy contacts and promote creativity was also seen as a zone where the added value can be very strong.
- The importance of networks, of permanent relations, of building together, of giving and receiving, of allowing people to contact and know each other, of fostering synergies, of allowing the space and the time for emotions.
- The EU must be mostly a facilitator
- Great importance in building outside the EU solid, sustainable structures, critical mass.

P r o g r a m m e s & A c t i o n s

- A more equal access of all countries – not repeating the mistakes of Culture 2000 and other programmes mainly used by the larger and richer countries – seems essential.

- Building programmes bottom-up, simplicity in procedures and a great effort to ensure that understandable information will reach all potential partners.
- Programmes and actions designed for “very heavily organized structures” tend to leave out some of the more creative people and ideas and to “export” a more closed, one way view of the reality, a more negative logic, too often without real exchange, without leaving any results behind that are capable of replication.
- Creating mechanisms to help cultural actors in complying with all the technical and financial needs seems to be a real problem in Portugal and has prevented many participating in EU programmes.
- Enlarging (and simplifying dramatically) some of the actual programmes to partners outside of the EU, seems an easy step forward.
- An “Erasmus for Culture” comes out as a good example of an efficient way to approach people, build synergies and sow the seeds of good projects.

M i s c e g e n a t i o n

- The role of Portugal and its added value to EU, was also mentioned several times in relation to Brazil and Africa, where not only language, but also a deep knowledge can be very useful.
- The need to concentrate very strongly on the Mediterranean emerged both as a Portuguese need and a zone where Portugal’s attributes can be of high use to the EU.
- The capacity for miscegenation is seen as an important characteristic that all EU action abroad should take in consideration.

L i s t o f i n t e r v i e w e e s

Members of Government

Isabel Pires de Lima, Minister of Culture

Fernando Neves, Secretary of State for European Affairs

Civil Servants

Simonetta Luz Afonso, President, Camões Institute (Instituto Camões), Ministry of Foreign Affairs; former Director, Portuguese Institute of Museums

Luísa Bastos de Almeida, Vice-President Camões Institute (Instituto Camões), Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Patrícia Salvação Barreto, President, Office of International Cultural Relations (GRCI), Ministry of Culture

Jorge Vaz de Carvalho, President, Arts Institute (IA), Ministry of Culture; former Director Oporto National Orchestra

José Pedro Ribeiro, President, Institute for Cinema, Audiovisual and Multimedia (ICAM), Ministry of Culture

Elíseo Sumavielle, President, Architectural Heritage Institute (IPPAR), Ministry of Culture

Cultural Institutions

Rui Vilar, President, Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation

Rui Machete, President, Luso-American Foundation

Carlos Monjardino, President, Oriente Foundation

António Gomes de Pinho, President, Serralves Foundation

José Sasportes, President, Portuguese Commission of UNESCO; former Minister of Culture; former Cultural Attaché in several countries

Maria de Lourdes Lima dos Santos, President, Observatory for Cultural Affairs
Guilherme d'Oliveira Martins, President, Centro Nacional de Cultura and National Committee
European Cultural Foundation; former Minister of Finance and Minister of Education.

Practitioners

Miguel Abreu, Artistic Director, Cassefaz, theatre producer

Miguel Lobo Antunes, Artistic Director, Culturgest Foundation; former Artistic Director of Belém Cultural Centre

Luis Correia, Film Producer; former Artistic Director - DocLisboa Festival

Mark Deputter, Artistic Director, Alkantara

Rui Horta, Artistic Director, "O Espaço do Tempo", choreographer

Catarina Vaz Pinto, Consultant, Gulbenkian Foundation; former Secretary of State for Culture

António Pinto Ribeiro, Consultant, Gulbenkian Foundation; former Artistic Director, Culturgest Foundation

Delfim Sardo, Independent Curator; former Visual Arts Director of Belém Cultural Center

Cláudio Torres, Director, Archeological Center of Mértola (CAM); Head of Portuguese network of

Anna Lindh Euro-Mediterranean Foundation for the Dialogue Between Cultures.

I Summary

- Since the Boekman Foundation report in 2005 there has been significant changes in the number of UK organisations involved in developing international cultural policies;
- The new White Paper – “Active Diplomacy for a Changing World” will impact on all UK organisations involved in international activity involving cultural diplomacy;
- The UK Government is anxious that its departments should work more closely together and avoid duplication of effort;
- The Carter Review identified that the UK spent around £600 million on public diplomacy. The Public Diplomacy Board and its associated advisory group will be charged with bringing coherence, value for money and accountability to government foreign policy;

- The UK now sees the EU as a vital partner in helping to deliver elements of foreign policy;
- Virtually all respondents felt that the EU was overly bureaucratic, poor at communicating its policies, unclear of what it meant by cultural policy, and lacking a clear messages about its intentions in this field inside the EU, let alone elsewhere;
- Interviewees generally favoured the EU having a cultural competence if it could be clear about why it was doing it and was able to set clear values and broad policies
- Ideas about ways this could be delivered showed that there were opportunities in several areas of external policy. Practitioners felt that such work should be left to experts to develop and preferably practising artists with only a light touch from EU officials;
- Money should be found to deliver this cultural competence. It was not appropriate for individual Member States to foot the bill, as this would leave the wealthier states doing the work at the expense of smaller states;
- The EU should consider an external agency to deliver such work as this would avoid unnecessary competition and bureaucracy. Arts and artists should be at the centre of this organisation in order to make it work appropriately for culture and avoid instrumentalism.

II UK cultural and foreign policy development

There has been an important shift in a number of areas of the UK's international activity since the desk research carried out by the Boekman Foundation in 2005. There is a revised foreign policy led by the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO), preparations for an international policy by the Department for Culture Media and Sport (DCMS) and efforts to draw together a Cultural Foreign Policy, jointly led by DCMS and FCO. Arts Council England has published its international policy and Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland all have policies in draft or at revision stage.

The background to these changes is the need to redefine UK foreign policy following the UK's role as a leading coalition member in Iraq and Afghanistan, the failure in helping to resolve the Palestine/Israel conflict and the terrorist attacks in London in June 2005. The DCMS as a mainly domestic department in the past has needed to come to terms with its role in the EU and the increasing internationalisation of the organisations it funds through the government grant.

In May 2006, during the research there was a ministerial reshuffle. The Foreign Secretary is now Margaret Beckett replacing Jack Straw, Geoff Hoon has replaced Douglas Alexander as the new Minister for Europe. The Secretary of State for Culture, Tessa Jowell and her ministerial team, remain unaffected by the reshuffle.

In preparation for a new foreign policy, the Foreign and Commonwealth Office undertook a review of cultural diplomacy, led by Lord Carter of Coles in 2004/5. He recommended a revised definition for public diplomacy, subsequently accepted by government, as "working to inform and engage individuals and organisations overseas in order to improve understanding of and influence for the UK in a manner consistent with governmental medium and long term goals".

The recommendations were submitted to a parliamentary select committee and, following on from this, new guidance was agreed for the British Council and the BBC World Service.

A white paper on foreign policy was launched in late May 2006 at the same time as the ministerial changes. The main points of the policy are set out below:

III Active Diplomacy for a Changing World: The UK's International Priorities

- Making the world safer from global terrorism and weapons of mass destruction
- Reducing the harm to the UK from international crime, including drug trafficking, people smuggling and money laundering
- Preventing and resolving conflict through a strong international system
- Building an effective and globally competitive EU in a secure neighbourhood
- Supporting the UK economy and business through an open and expanding global economy, science and innovation and secure energy supplies
- Promoting sustainable development and poverty reduction underpinned by human rights, democracy, good governance and protection of the environment
- Managing migration and combating illegal immigration
- Delivering high-quality support for British nationals abroad, in normal times and in crises
- Ensuring the security and good governance of the UK's Overseas Territories

The policy places heavy emphasis on partnership and, as seen from the extract below, the EU is seen to be an essential player in supporting the UK to meet its international aspirations.

IV Working with others

"No country can tackle this agenda alone. So, we have to work with others in the UN, the EU, the G8, NATO, the Commonwealth and other groups. We must work to reform international institutions in the face of new challenges. Our most important partnerships will remain within the EU, and with the United States. We will also need to build on our strategic relationships with China, India, Japan, Russia and others. Relations between these major and developing actors will influence the international system for the next decade and beyond and set the context in which we will promote our interests and values."

The focus on 50 countries mentioned in the previous FCO policy has disappeared, but there are clearly countries where the UK will be placing greater emphasis. China is a significant partner, not least because of the relationship that must be established for the Olympics in China in 2008 and in London in 2012.

There is no mention of culture within the white paper. British Council and the BBC World Service have responsibility for delivery of an international programme of cultural diplomacy and engagement; the arts are one element of this programme. The Carter Review of Public Diplomacy, which included the FCO, DCMS, British Council and the BBC World service, set out a number of recommendations, but the arts were in large left alone. Suffice to say they will need, in their delivery, to meet government objectives. It was agreed that the BBC World Service would continue to have editorial independence to protect its impartiality in news broadcasting particularly.

v Working with Europe

"Europe in a Global Age" is a publication by the Foreign Policy Centre in the UK. It was launched in October 2005 and written by Douglas Alexander MP, Minister for Europe at the FCO. In this publication the EU perspective and role is eloquently argued. Alexander raises important issues about culture and European identity.

" globalisation affects more than just traded goods and services. It also affects our sense of who we are. Questions of identity underlie many of the contemporary issues affecting the legitimacy of the EU. The European Union provides a new framework in which to uphold nation states and national identities while at the same time symbolising and encompassing common European ideas and values. It also makes it easier for regional political identities to develop in a way which does not threaten national and regional identities. In other words, the European, national and regional identities are not a zero-sum game. So in the months and years ahead the EU must confidently assert its own identity as neither a nation state nor a super-state but a distinctive institution that adds value to the lives of its citizens."

He goes on to argue that:

" The Union is founded on the principles of liberty and democracy, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms and the rule of law, principles of which are common to the Member States. These are the values of democracy in practice, of the accountable division of power, the checks and balance between the Executive, Parliament and the courts, the respect for law and due process, the defence of fundamental human rights and freedoms, fair and efficient public services; universal education, equal opportunity and social mobility."

And finally, he reinforces the opinion of the majority of the people interviewed in this research:

“ T h e r e i s a l a c k o f v o c a b u l a r y t h a t e x p l a i n s s i m p l y w h a t E u r o p e i s a n d w h a t E u r o p e d o e s . ”

This last point is supported by many of the people interviewed and notably by Baroness Kennedy, Baroness Young and DCMS.

VI How is the delivery of international policy progressing in relation to policy/ambitions/objectives?

A t g o v e r n m e n t l e v e l

As reported above, the Department of Culture, Media and Sport has been preparing its own international policy for a number of years. Reasons for the delay are mainly due to the changes in FCO policy and the UK winning the Olympics for 2012. One of the problems facing this department of state is that money passes through it to the arts, sports, museums and heritage organisations and little is retained to assist in the delivery of such policy.

The DCMS outline statement for the arts in its international policy is set out below. How this aspiration will be delivered is still a matter for conjecture.

D C M S i n t e r n a t i o n a l A r t s P o l i c y

The UK's membership of international organisations offers the chance to:

- Promote British arts and culture overseas
- Secure national interests in cultural negotiations
- Share experiences and policies on the arts with other countries

By talking to each other about arts issues, governments can contribute to creating an environment in which the arts can flourish and develop.

We liaise closely with colleagues in the national administrations of Northern Ireland, Wales and Scotland to ensure that we reflect the needs of the whole of the cultural sector. We also exchange experience with other countries, in particular our principal European partners.

The Council of Europe, UNESCO and the World Bank all support the arts. Our key message to these international organisations is that whether it be through the pursuit of artistic excellence, the encouragement of social inclusion, or the use of cultural wealth to create economic opportunities, the arts and other creative industries should be at the heart of our society.

To meet the UK government's international priorities, DCMS has five goals:

E x c e l l e n c e : The cultural, sporting and creative sectors are recognised as world-class leaders in their fields. This expertise is used to create international partnerships.

O p p o r t u n i t y : Unique international opportunities are provided. UK cultural, sporting and creative activity helps to address global challenges such as security, justice and prosperity.

E c o n o m y : The cultural and creative sectors generate a significant contribution to the UK economy through the development of international markets and audiences. The UK negotiates and competes successfully at international level.

D i v e r s i t y : the cultural and creative sectors support and showcase cultural diversity in the UK and overseas. They build vital links between communities here and overseas.

S u s t a i n a b i l i t y : International activity supports sustainable development. The DCMS international strategy lists international country priorities for each of these goals:

E x c e l l e n c e : China, India, Japan, USA and European states

O p p o r t u n i t y : Sub-Saharan Africa, China, Iraq and the Middle East and post Soviet states.

E c o n o m y : European states, Brazil, India, Russia, China, Japan and USA.

D i v e r s i t y : Key Islamic countries (e.g. Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Pakistan, Indonesia), Key countries with a UK resident or descended population (e.g. Bangladesh, India, West Indies, Africa).

S u s t a i n a b i l i t y : Brazil, Russia, India, China and post conflict states (e.g. Iraq, Afghanistan, Angola).

A t q u a s i - g o v e r n m e n t a l l e v e l

Arts Council England (ACE) published its international strategy in 2005. In May 2006, it reported on its achievements to date. The organisation feels that through its policy and actions it has expanded opportunities for artists and arts organisations to work internationally. It has also enabled them to contribute to the objectives of its partners – British Council, FCO and DCMS.

The international arts policy has three main objectives:

- Working in partnership and encouraging international dialogue and debate;
- Empowering the arts community to work internationally; supporting the artists right to roam and supporting diversity;
- Building knowledge and expertise through increasing the capacity of their staff and bringing world class events to the UK;

There will be a review of this policy in the autumn of 2006. Already it appears that the current focus beyond the EU on artists' exchanges with China may be redirected to Brazil. Meanwhile, ACE has signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the National Arts Council, Singapore, which supports the exchange of staff and sharing of best practice.

Wales and Scotland, as devolved administrations, have adopted their own international policies. An International Arts Strategy has been jointly produced by the Scottish Arts Council and British Council Scotland since the Boekman Foundation study. The purpose is to “establish Scotland as an internationally recognised centre of excellence for the arts and arts-related education and community work across all sectors and creative industries”.

Wales has links to areas such as Catalonia, reflecting minority cultures and language. Scotland has been more ambitious targeting China, Germany, Finland, India, the EU accession states, the USA and Malawi. There are efforts to refine these policies to become more focussed. The impetus for these policies are primarily trade/economic and are driven by the Welsh Assembly and the Scottish Executive. Northern Ireland has not yet developed as far as Wales and Scotland, but does work closely with the Republic of Ireland. It has, in the past, worked on projects with countries such as Cyprus and Malta. In other words, almost all activity is bi-lateral, not multilateral or focussed on showing or taking part in European or EU sponsored events as part of their own internationalism.

There is little evidence of dialogue at the policy level amongst these bodies. The British Council, which is funded by government to deliver international cultural activity, has a Memorandum of Understanding with Arts Council England and funds joint international posts with the Arts Councils in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. None of these policies make reference to FCO objectives other than to reflect country priorities.

The agencies supporting museums, galleries and heritage in the UK have nascent international policies. They are currently responsive to requests from international partners, particularly in Europe, and are actively engaged in European networks. However, the large institutions such as the British Library, British Museum and the Victoria & Albert Museum all work internationally. The British Museum is extremely active in Africa and China at present and was one of the leading museums along with the Louvre Museum in Paris and the Metropolitan Museum in New York who worked together in Iraq to prevent further damage and looting of the museums there.

The British Council has taken on issues of multilateralism by regionalising its international network into thirteen regions. This is similar to the Goethe Institut, with whom it has signed a memorandum of co-operation. This, as yet, fails to manifest itself in anything other than sharing of premises in some countries, sharing the lessons learned about regionalisation and a number of one-off projects. However, this, and the relationship with the French Ministry of Culture described below, have the potential to develop more fully within an EU context.

VII Perceptions of the EU having a role in culture

There was a singular lack of knowledge by UK arts practitioners about the EU and its policies towards culture. Most interviewees were aware of Culture 2000 and there was a vague awareness of other funds that may support culture. This level of ignorance of the EU was not driven by any political motives; people found information about EU programmes impenetrable. One interviewee said "Thank goodness EU communications are in English, otherwise we would know even less!"

There was awareness of the subsidiarity principle to protect individual cultures of Member States, but most interviewees were unmoved by this and had no idea what benefit accrued to the UK from this stance. Large, resource-hungry events such as the European Cities of Culture programme were not particularly well received. There certainly were challenges about the sustainability of the projects that came out of such events.

As far as EU collaborations with Third countries was concerned, most people were unclear of the benefits of such collaborations, but had no problem if such initiatives were funded properly and were sustainable.

A number of people who had been involved in EU projects commented on the weight of bureaucracy for what were small amounts of money, which dissuaded people from applying in the first place.

VIII Concerns about the EU having complementary or extended role.

None of the people interviewed in the UK showed any concern about the possibility of an EU competence in culture. In fact, most people began to discuss what it might be and how it might be different from an individual Member State's international policy. When this discussion was developed further it transpired that where an EU cultural competence might be linked to other policies such as development or trade there was support for the idea. Where policies would directly affect the UK managing its own international cultural or foreign policy, people were more cautious. The DCMS were particularly strong on maintaining the principle of subsidiarity in the field of culture. The FCO and British Council were committed to greater partnership with other EU Member States rather than the Commission in the field of cultural diplomacy.

In several East/South East Asian countries, such as Thailand, Malaysia and Japan, there have been EU arts events involving collaboration between national cultural institutes. However in Thailand, the British Council Director felt strongly that the current situation for them was not sustainable. The EU Delegation office in Thailand is an example where proposals and ideas for cultural projects are developed and then Member States are asked to adopt the ideas and contribute financially to the events. The EU office has insufficient funds and seeks resources from Member States, several of whom feel that EU money is spent inappropriately. The requests for funding pose problems for the Member States represented in Thailand, as they are accountable to their head office for the money spent. It was considered that the events are often unfocussed and not targeted to Thai audiences, who are confused about what message the EU is promoting.

The British Council Director in one Asian country stated that:

“ The reality in terms of culture is woefully inadequate and a triumph for the breed of international civil servants who have little empathy for Member States’ concerns and for the countries they are resident within. There is no passion or ownership, the language used is impenetrable and exclusive. The EU is acting as leaders, not servants who could facilitate the best from the collaborations of Member States ” .

It was reported that similar problems have occurred elsewhere.

IX How to take this idea forward

It was felt by interviewees that the EU needed to be clearer why it is embarking upon any cultural programme and what it is trying to promote about the values of the EU. This clarity would leave cultural projects to interpret these values in their own way. The idea that there would be control from the EU on how messages about the EU were to be presented was not welcomed. Artists believed they should be left to do it their way.

Several interviewees suggested that there should be an independent body, or an organisation outsourced by the EU that would hold a cultural budget for such activity to avoid the bureaucracy of the EU. It would require a strong EU policy for culture and geographic priorities. It should be mandated to move swiftly with good evaluation strategies and without overbearing bureaucracy.

The Member States in Thailand, during the UK presidency of the Union, established a strategy for promoting the EU with clear objectives and criteria. This strategy has been welcomed by the 16 Member States represented in Thailand, but the EU office has been less than enthusiastic. The aim agreed by the Member States is to enhance the profile of the EU and Member States within Thailand and establish the EU as a leading cultural relations provider in Thailand.

The purpose is:

- To celebrate the cultural diversity, the common values and unity of the European Union;

- To showcase innovation, imagination and talent within the EU so as to promote cultural understanding, tolerance and collaboration with Thailand;
- To demonstrate flexible and sensitive approaches towards collaboration between the EU and Thailand that builds sustainable cultural developments;
- To broaden awareness and understanding of the cultural background, achievements and skills of all the Member States and Thailand;
- To showcase the EU as a contemporary and vibrant community of arts;
- To achieve greater impact and influence through the collaborative actions of Member States;
- To achieve a high degree of reciprocity and cultural interchange in all areas of activity.

Baroness Helena Kennedy was passionate about what the EU could achieve with a cultural competence linked to external relations. She was clear that the basis of the value system for the EU was its freedoms and diversity, unique to the Union, and that these should form the core of any future policy and actions.

The British Council felt that the major question is whether Europe is greater than the sum of its parts. On the whole, cultural policy has emphasised the bi-lateral rather than multilateral, and relationships in Europe have been competitive rather than co-operative as far as European institutions are concerned. The new accession countries understand an international approach better than the old European powers. The Council considered the future of Europe lies in imagination and creativity, and any cultural co-operation should include both the commercial and the cultural.

It is important to note that generally people felt that Europe worked well at the dialogue level rather than the policy level. Networks flourish although financially pressed and have good ideas. These ideas and proposals are often ignored or subjected to EU bureaucracy that dampens the innovation; decisions are often taken within a cultural policy vacuum.

Creativity produces new ideas, but there is no hybrid dialogue and discussion. EU film festivals etc don't in themselves create dialogue, but seminars and education programmes surrounding them could do, e.g. British Council Germany ran a season of films from Europe looking at European migration. The seminar programme attached to the event was well attended.

With potential new markets such as the US and Canada, China and India there is a challenge as to whether these large countries want to know about individual countries in Europe. The reasonable question is whether it would be more appropriate to build the relationship with and through the EU?

x Examples of projects already happening

There were few examples of European projects quoted by interviewees, but one stands out:

The British Council and the Ministry of Culture in France signed a Memorandum of Understanding agreeing to co-operate. The intention in the projects that have been designed and led by Visiting Arts and representatives from the French Ministry of Culture are to build capacity in Third countries. So far, there have been three projects, two concerning professional development and the third, a collaboration between promoters.

The first programme involved creative industry managers from Central and Eastern Europe, who were invited by the French Ministry to attend a professional development programme in Paris for a period of three weeks, followed by one week's training in the UK. The second programme was organised by Visiting Arts and involved cultural managers from China, who came to the UK for a training and placement programme for three weeks. This was followed by a week in France where similar opportunities for orientation and placements were offered.

The third programme, again organised by Visiting Arts, took a group of promoters from South East England and Northern France to the Zanzibar International Film Festival, where there is also a

fringe music programme. This provided an opportunity for promoters to work together on ideas and to begin to understand how each partner operated. Since returning from the visit the French and English groups have met again and are planning further collaborations with Africa.

XI Practitioner's attitudes and needs

S o m e c o n c e r n s

Some people felt that there is a danger of the EU hi-jacking culture from Member States and using it as a simplistic PR tool utilising the DG Education and Culture budgets for this purpose.

EU Commissioners must recognise the complexity and multi-layered nature of culture. It is not only manifested in the European Baroque Orchestra or European Opera, but in many other more subtle and exiting ways reflecting minority or migrant cultures in Europe.

One practitioner felt that film and broadcasting are good examples of EU co-operation. The one factor that encouraged this co-operation was the dominance of the US industries. There was a need to combat this to protect EU film and broadcasting industries and to counter the 'Americanisation' of EU Member State cultures. This dominance affects countries outside the EU and strategies we have adopted could serve as useful examples. The EU also needs to boost the exports of the Member States in this field.

A number of people felt that there should be a consensus around cultural economic policies for all areas of culture. The EU should be responsible for this by adopting broad brush statements about policy and underlying principles.

Broader areas of EU policy, such as cultural diversity, should encompass culture within it and, again, establish general principles. The differences in understanding terms such as this are stumbling blocks within the EU. There must be an open debate on definition, approach and content of EU policies in such areas.

Arguably, the most important distinction between the EU and other large economic trade blocks such as the US and China is the diversity of its cultures and the commonality of its heritage. The EU must encourage indigenous cultures and avoid a single hegemony in cultural development. There is a lack of coherence about what the EU does in culture. There is poor communication at all levels. Networks worry about their own viability, growth and sustainability, failing to address issues such as access and diversity, nor is it clear whether the EU listens to the professionals in these networks and acts upon their recommendations.

If the EU were to adopt a cultural component in external policies it must first put its own house in order and then provide facilitation across national boundaries. The EU must avoid repeating old colonial relationships particularly with the US and re-think why the EU is there and what it must achieve for the greater good of its Member States. There must be a diaspora consciousness within any policy and be led by new, not old, relationships.

O p p o r t u n i t i e s

Any EU cultural policy should be based upon respect and understanding of individual Member State's cultures. There should be EU support for minority cultures creating interlocking spheres of cultural identities.

Conflict resolution - post war as well border conflicts - is an area where culture can play an important role. The EU is strong in the advocacy of human rights, which could be explored and communicated through artistic interventions. There is a theoretical understanding of cultural diversity and the EU has the rhetoric. The Year of Intercultural Dialogue would be a good platform to launch interventions and actions by artists.

Migration would also be an excellent area for common action shifting the understanding of migrating people and sharing this with other parts of the world. A project, run by British Council in Brussels – “New Young Europeans”, explored new understandings of cultural diversity and migration moving from city to city in Europe. Such an initiative could be developed further.

Other areas where the EU could co-ordinate or lead on initiatives might include:

C u l t u r a l D i p l o m a c y - advocating human rights and promoting European diversity

C u l t u r a l E x p l o r a t i o n - this could be issues based and/or thematic

C o l l a b o r a t i o n s - a programme of testing ideas between cultures moving away from big iconic promotions to a more people based interaction.

C u l t u r a l E c o n o m y - using practice in Europe as models for economic regeneration with other countries

C u l t u r a l L e a d e r s h i p a n d C a p a c i t y
B u i l d i n g - Looking at wealth creation through culture, public-private partnerships, risk taking and team building.

Enshrined in the EU Treaty is an understanding that the EU will contribute to the flowering of cultures. There is a misunderstanding of what this means, it should be clarified more fully before further action is taken to smooth the route for a cultural component.

One arts practitioner summed up the frustration of others towards Brussels, by suggesting that “culture should be taken out of the hands of amateurs and handled properly and with integrity within the EU”.

I n t e r v i e w s

Ministers of Parliament and Members of the House of Lords:

Baroness Lola Young. Adviser to Department of Culture Media and Sport (DCMS) and Chair of British Council's Arts Advisory Committee

Baroness Helena Kennedy QC. Ex Chair of British Council, Board member of Arts and Business and London International Festival of Theatre.

Gordon Conway. Adviser to Department for International Development, Board member of the Royal Society for Arts, Chair of Visiting Arts

The office of Douglas Alexander MP, ex Minister for Europe

Civil servants and personnel from national cultural institutions:

Michael Helston, Head of International Affairs, DCMS

Bruce Hellman, Policy Development Officer for “A Cultural Foreign Policy”, DCMS

Alan Davey, Director of Arts, DCMS

Andrew Scattergood, Policy Development officer for “A Cultural Foreign Policy”, FCO

Yvette Vaughan Jones, Director of Visiting Arts

Kate Board, Director Europe, Middle East and the Americas, British Council

Leigh Gibson, Director of Arts, British Council

Peter Upton, Director British Council Thailand

Kim Evans, Director of Arts, Arts Council England

Elizabeth Addlington, Head of Touring and International Policy, Arts Council England

Mark Taylor – Director, Museums Association

Chris Batt – CEO, Museums, Libraries and Archives Council
Norah Campbell, Scottish Arts Council

Senior arts practitioners:

Val Bourne, Director of Dance Umbrella

Jude Kelly, Director of Arts, South Bank; Chair of Olympics Culture Committee and Board of British Council

Stephen Deuchar, Director of TATE Britain

Ken Bartlett, Director of the Foundation for Community Dance

Andrew Dixon, Director of the World Summit on Culture, 2006

I Constitutional, organisational and administrative arrangements for EUNIC

P u r p o s e o f E U N I C

EUNIC aims to create effective partnerships and networks between EU National Institutes for Culture in order to improve and promote cultural diversity and understanding between European societies and to strengthen international dialogue and cultural co-operation with countries outside Europe.

This will be done through:

- discussing issues of common interest
- sharing best practice
- collaborating on joint projects that promote a better understanding of European culture in its diversity - both in Europe and outside Europe
- acting as a partner of the European Commission in defining and implementing European cultural policy
- undertaking joint research that will be of value to the European Commission and to other organisations (e.g. the Council of Europe) in furthering understanding of European wide cultural issues
- acting as an advocate of the value of cultural relations in promoting better international understanding and, as part of this, argue for a strong and independent voice for the cultural sector.

P a r t i c i p a t i n g o r g a n i s a t i o n s i n E U N I C

These should be organisations that:

- are national bodies based in EU Member States
- are engaged in activities beyond their national borders
- have a degree of autonomy from their national governments.

EUNIC undertakes to maintain communication with national institutes of culture in all EU Member States and with relevant organisations in those Member States that do not have national cultural institutes and are therefore not formally part of the EUNIC network.

G o v e r n i n g c o n s t i t u t i o n

EUNIC should operate on three different complimentary levels:

EUNIC Heads

There will be a President and two Vice Presidents. The President and two Vice Presidents will be elected by the Heads of the EUNIC member organisations.¹

EUNIC Brussels

This is composed of the current CICEB members plus new members such as EU cultural institutes that do not have a representative office in Brussels. EUNIC Brussels is governed by its own constitution. It has an important role in providing the EUNIC Heads with intelligence and information about policy and project developments in the cultural sector in the European Institutions. The President of EUNIC Brussels will participate in meetings of the EUNIC Heads.

EUNIC National Networks

EUNIC networks can be established in any country where at least three member state cultural institutions or local representatives agree to meet formally and collaborate on joint activities. In order to formally use the title EUNIC, the network must agree to notify the EUNIC Heads Executive of its existence and to abide by any rulings from the Executive relating to any overall activities and branding established by EUNIC. National EUNIC governing constitutions will be established locally.

EUNIC is currently not a legal entity but this may need to be explored further if EUNIC is to bid for work funded by other organisations such as the European Commission.

F u n d i n g o f E U N I C

It is agreed that an annual membership fee should be paid by all EUNIC members. This will provide a fund for the creation and running of a EUNIC website (to be maintained by the President's Executive Office) and for the local costs of annual Heads' meetings. The annual membership will be Euros 3,000 for large organisations (1,000 staff and over) and 1,000 Euros for smaller organisations (under 1,000 staff).²

E U N I C M e e t i n g s w i t h t h e E u r o p e a n C o m m i s s i o n

The President and the two Vice Presidents will undertake to meet senior officials in the European Commission at least twice a year to discuss issues of mutual interest and to communicate the results of these meetings to all EUNIC Heads within 5 working days of the meetings.³

II EUNIC activities

The following is a list of agreed EUNIC activities.

F o r u m f o r d i s c u s s i o n

EUNIC will provide opportunities for EUNIC members to discuss issues of shared interest and concern, both in terms of working together, but also as regards EU and national cultural policies and strategies. There will be at least one annual meeting of all EUNIC Heads organised by the EUNIC member holding the Presidency. National EUNIC networks will meet on a more frequent basis.

S h a r i n g o f b e s t p r a c t i c e

EUNIC members – both at Heads and national network levels - will share best practice and ideas on projects, research, organisational and administrative issues. This can involve all members, but any grouping of members is free to share best practice and ideas as deemed appropriate. The website and the intranet will be one of the tools available for the sharing of best practice (see Para 3). Meetings and placements/visits will be another way in which this can be done.

There is an obligation on all EUNIC members to ensure that at least 2 examples of best practice are shared with other members during the year.

P l a t f o r m s f o r c l o s e r c o l l a b o r a t i o n
EUNIC will encourage closer platform collaboration in the following ways:

- establishing a website to provide public information about its activities and an intranet for use by members. This will be set up and maintained by the President's Executive. The website will provide information on all EUNIC member organisations, contact details, programmes and activities. The intranet will provide a secure area where confidential documents can be stored;
- seeking to share physical premises for cultural centre activities where this is desirable and feasible. This can range from using each other's facilities for seminars, exhibitions, and arts events through to sharing common premises and office space. In addition national cultural institutions could use each others' facilities for the teaching of languages;
- a newsletter (e-zine) will be produced by the Presidency. Frequency and format to be agreed;
- EUNIC members will support the EUNIC member state holding the EU Presidency through innovative partnerships that demonstrate the value of cross-European working and the diversity of European cultures.

A c t i v a t e n e t w o r k s f o r j o i n t p r o j e c t s
a n d r e s e a r c h

EUNIC will encourage the creation of national networks of European cultural institutions in order to carry out joint projects financed by EUNIC members or through co-financing from the European Commission and other European organisations. In addition, EUNIC will support research projects that relate to European cultural issues. Again these may be totally funded by EUNIC members or may be co-funded with the European Commission and other European organisations. Where networks of national institutes for culture currently exist in countries they should be encouraged to adopt the EUNIC brand and name. Local flexibility on membership is permissible.

C r e a t e o p p o r t u n i t i e s f o r s t a f f
e x c h a n g e s

EUNIC Heads will actively seek to promote and support the exchange of staff in order to increase both an understanding of each others' institutions and practical co-operation between each others' institutions. These staff exchanges could range from short working visits of one to five days to more substantial placements lasting up to a year. The financial implications of these visits will need to be agreed by the institutions participating in the staff exchange visits and will not be regulated by EUNIC.

P a r t n e r f o r t h e E u r o p e a n C o m m i s s i o n
i n h e l p i n g t o d e f i n e a n d i m p l e m e n t
E u r o p e a n c u l t u r a l p o l i c i e s

EUNIC Heads will ensure that there is a clear strategy in place for engagement with the European Commission. This strategy will define how EUNIC will work with the Commission as a partner in helping to define and implement European cultural policies. This will include ensuring that EUNIC comments, as requested, on Commission cultural policies at the appropriate consultation stage. The EUNIC Heads, represented by the three Presidents, will commit to meeting with the European Commission (DG, Education and Culture) at least twice a year for formal discussions and an exchange of views on both cultural developments in Europe and the promotion of European culture. The EUNIC Heads will also agree with EUNIC Brussels how best to use the Brussels EUNIC network to support the relationship with the Commission.

A c t a s a n a d v o c a t e o f E U n a t i o n a l
i n s t i t u t e s f o r c u l t u r e t o t h e
E u r o p e a n C o m m i s s i o n

EUNIC needs to make sure that it maintains a strong profile with the European Commission and that it acts as an advocate of the EU National Institutes for Culture to the European Commission. The EUNIC Presidency undertakes therefore to represent the interests of all participating members in its discussions with the Commission.

Notes

- 1 This text has been shortened.
- 2 This text has been shortened.
- 3 This text has been shortened.

I Introduction

There has been a growing recognition from both developing countries and donors, of the importance of the cultural dimension in external relations, including development

co-operation. This growing attention devoted to culture has culminated in the adoption, in October 2005, of the UNESCO Convention on the protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions, which contains a specific chapter on development. As a result, there is today a broad consensus at international level on the necessity to integrate culture in development strategies and aid programmes as a key element in their success.

The European Commission and European Union (EU) Member States are in the process of ratifying the UNESCO Convention. Furthermore, the “European Consensus on Development” adopted by Council on 22 November 2005¹ identifies culture as being part of the European Community’s (EC) human development policy framework. This is in line with Article 151.4 of the EC Treaty, which states that cultural aspects have to be taken into account in all other EC policies, including the external dimension of EC action. There is so far no overall EC policy framework for cultural actions in developing countries. . However, there are specific arrangements for different world regions:

- Regarding ACP countries, the EC has a clear mandate under Article 27 of the Cotonou Agreement on “Cultural development”. EC actions in ACP countries include: support to national heritage conservation and development projects, including the organisation of festivals and other cultural events with a regional or international dimension, and the financing of programmes of support to decentralised cultural initiatives. In addition, programmes based on calls for proposals benefit the whole ACP region in the field of audiovisual and cultural industries.
- Cultural actions in the Mediterranean region are based on Chapter III “Partnership in social, cultural and human affairs” of the 1995 Declaration on the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership. On this basis, several programmes have been launched: Euromed Heritage, Euromed Audiovisual and Euromed Youth. The Euro-Mediterranean Partnership also established the Anna Lindh Foundation² in Alexandria, Egypt, with the aim of bringing people and organisations from both shores of the Mediterranean closer to each other. In addition, the Action Plans that have been agreed or are under discussion with a number of countries under the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) also contain a section on cultural co-operation.
- The cultural dimension is addressed by several aid projects in Asia and Latin America. Furthermore, the issue of culture has been recently integrated into the policy dialogue in the framework of Asia-Europe meetings (ASEM) and EU-Latin America, Caribbean (LAC) summits. Cultural co-operation is specifically foreseen with India.

- Culture is also covered in the EU Strategy for Africa.³ This document emphasises the preservation of Africa's cultural and linguistic heritage, the integration of the cultural dimension in development processes and the promotion of local, national, regional and continental inter-cultural dialogue.

These specific arrangements reflect the importance already accorded by the EC to culture in its external relations. However, an overall EC policy framework covering all developing countries and regions is needed to ensure the coherence and efficiency of EC action in this important domain.

Creating such framework is the aim of the present strategy. It will set key principles and priorities for EC cultural action at country, regional and international level, thus allowing the Commission to renew and amplify its commitment to strengthening the cultural dimension in its relations with developing countries. It will also set the basis for a common EU vision with the Member States.

The EC strategy for culture in the development policy will be implemented through differentiated EC approaches in each region and country, according to the priorities expressed by partners, in line with the principle of ownership by government and other stakeholders.

While the present strategy addresses culture specifically in the context of the development policy, the Commission remains aware of the importance of integrating culture in the full range of the EC's external relations.

II Addressing culture in development

This first chapter will review the main issues related to addressing culture in development. These are issues of a general nature which are not specific to the EC's approach.

T h e d u a l n a t u r e o f c u l t u r e

There is no single definition of culture. The most appropriate approach in the context of development, is to define culture as a system of shared aspirations, beliefs, values, customs, behaviours, symbolic meanings, languages and artefacts used by human beings to relate to the external world and with one another, and to assert their individual and collective identity. Culture is transmitted from generation to generation through socialisation.

It follows from this definition that culture pervades all aspects of human life, and determines the functioning of societies and economies. This has important implications in the field of development. In particular, it implies that the efficiency and impact of development aid depends on its integration into the cultural context and values of the recipient country and its people. Conversely, culture is not fixed once and for all, and is influenced by the evolution of societies and economies. Thus, exogenous factors, including those related to development aid, may affect local cultures. This interaction between development aid and culture must be fully integrated in the design and implementation of development programmes.

Another striking element of the above definition is that culture relates to both immaterial components (e.g. beliefs, values, customs, etc.), and tangible components (e.g. languages, artefacts, etc.). Furthermore, immaterial components can themselves be made tangible through codification and transmission, whether in oral, written or artistic forms. This tangible dimension implies that culture can be the object of culture-specific actions, aimed for instance at preserving a cultural heritage, promoting cultural diversity or stimulating inter-cultural dialogue. Thus, beyond its horizontal nature, culture is also an issue in its own right calling for specific actions in development co-operation based on dedicated instruments and financing.

R e f l e c t i n g t h e h o r i z o n t a l n a t u r e o f
c u l t u r e i n d e v e l o p m e n t

The integration of the horizontal nature of culture in all aspects of development co-operation – a process also referred to as “mainstreaming” – has so far tended to be neglected by donors, including the EC. Yet the international community’s new approach to development co-operation, of which the Commission is a major proponent, should make it easier to reverse this trend. Indeed, the principles of ownership and participation of relevant stakeholders – as defined in section 3.1. – if properly applied, should ensure that development actions are congruent with the cultural reality of partner countries. These principles also imply that much of the responsibility for taking culture into consideration in development co-operation lies with partner countries’ governments and civil society representatives.

The growing use of general and sector budget support as an aid modality should, in principle, facilitate the integration of aid into the partner country’s institutional, economic, social and cultural reality. This being said, one can not simply assume that the cultural dimension will be automatically integrated in budget support operations.

At the same time, much development aid is still provided in the form of projects. A project’s integration into the cultural context in which it is implemented can be a complex process requiring considerable attention. Yet this effort may be necessary to ensure a maximisation of the project’s outcomes. This may be the case for projects in particular cultural contexts, where local populations may have difficulties accepting or understanding foreign aid, or perceive foreign aid as external intrusion into local affairs.

At the end of the day, due attention must be paid to the cultural dimension in all aid operations. In reality, mainstreaming can only be the result of a intensive dialogue with the partner government and other stakeholders. Particular emphasis on culture will be needed in relation to human and social development, where attitudes, beliefs, behavioural patterns and prejudices may play a fundamental role in determining outcomes.

C u l t u r e a s a t h e m e i n i t s o w n r i g h t
i n d e v e l o p m e n t

Beyond its horizontal nature, culture is an issue its own right calling for a multiplicity of culture-specific actions.

Preserving, stimulating and promoting cultural diversity

Preserving, stimulating and promoting cultural diversity must be the first focus of cultural action. Cultural diversity refers to the manifold ways in which the culture of groups and societies find expression, whether material or immaterial. The value of cultural diversity is emphasised by UNESCO’s Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity⁴ of 2 November 2001, which states that “cultural diversity is as necessary for humankind as biodiversity is for nature” and that it “is the common heritage of humanity and should be recognised and affirmed for the benefit of present and future generations”.

Actions pertaining to the preservation, stimulation and promotion of cultural diversity will thus be of direct benefit to individuals in each concerned societal group, community, nation and civilisation, as well as to humankind as a whole. In relation to these actions, culture must be considered in its entirety, as a living and evolving entity, which at the same time is firmly rooted in the past. Thus, development action related to cultural diversity must cover, on the one hand the preservation and the promotion of the cultural heritage, and on the other the stimulation and promotion of the living components of culture. Particular attention must naturally be paid to endangered cultures and cultural artefacts.

Promoting inter-cultural dialogue

Cultural diversity is of particular importance in the context of globalisation. On the one hand, the forces of globalisation are often perceived as a threat to cultural diversity, leading to an erosion of cultural specificities and to a uniformity of lifestyles and values across the world. On the other hand, migratory fluxes result in a growing diversity of cultures in destination countries that is perceived by some as undermining social cohesion, national identity, ethnic homogeneity and societal values. At the same time, minority cultures, whether migrants or indigenous populations, often feel threatened by the pressure of the majority.

Common to all these perceptions is fear – whether of difference, change or processes that are beyond one’s control – which is a direct product of lack of knowledge and understanding. Fear leads to prejudices, stereotypes and stigmatisation, which ultimately lead to rejection of and discrimination towards the “other”. The only answer to this situation is for people to learn about each other and to live together, something that can only be achieved through the intensification of intercultural dialogue. The promotion of intercultural dialogue at local, regional and global level must therefore be considered an essential means to preserve, stimulate and promote cultural diversity.

Supporting cultural industries

A particular facet of culture is its contribution to economic growth and employment through the production and marketing of cultural activities, goods and services. The concept of “cultural industries” should be understood broadly, as encompassing literature, music, dance, plastic arts, handicrafts, theatre, audiovisual, cinema, multimedia, tourism and the media. This being said, culture cannot be reduced to a mere merchandise: cultural activities, goods and services convey cultural expressions irrespective of their commercial value.

The growth potential of cultural activities, goods and services is enormous. This is illustrated by the USA, the world’s leading provider of cultural goods and services, where the core copyright industries amounted to an estimated 6% of the gross domestic product and 4% of the workforce in 2002, and experienced an annual growth rate of 3.5% compared to 2.4% for the economy as a whole between 1997 and 2002.⁵ Currently, trade in cultural goods remains dominated by a small group of countries (mainly USA, Japan, UK, Germany, France and China) which command the lion’s share of imports and exports of cultural goods (respectively 53% and 57% in 1998).⁶

The North-South gap in terms of shares of the culture market is largely a result of capacity discrepancies, which concern the entire cultural market chain, from production to distribution. A core issue in helping developing countries exploit the potential of culture in terms of economic growth and employment will therefore be the need to strengthen the full range of local capacities. This requires actions aimed at promoting professional training, supporting investment, as well as stimulating private sector partnerships with counterparts in economically more-advanced countries (the latter acting as associates and not competitors) to help build strong local players, including through transfer of technologies and know-how.

Supporting people’s access to cultural activities, goods and services

The development of a solid local market base for cultural activities, goods and services is a key requirement for local cultural industries to thrive in developing countries.

Developing a local market requires that the interest of local publics in their own culture and that of others is stimulated. Local publics’ interest for cultural activities, goods and services largely depends on the elevation of the level of education, as well as the development of structures at local level that offers access to culture, for instance museums, public libraries, theatres, cinemas, cultural centres, etc. The development of such access structures also requires the emergence of autonomous and financially viable intermediary structures, for instance publishers, film producers, festival and

event organisers, etc, that invest in the production and dissemination of cultural activities, good and services.

Promoting market access

The development of a strong local culture industry does not in itself provide a guarantee of expansion of foreign markets. Much depends in this respect on the regulatory conditions governing access to foreign markets. Promoting access to foreign markets for cultural activities, goods and services of developing countries can be achieved through a number of trade co-operation instruments such as preferential market access for cultural goods and services, including particular sectors such as audiovisual. Trade-related assistance measures can also be envisaged in this respect, for instance with the aim of creating export promotion structures or to develop capacity to comply with international requirements (technological standards, copyright legislation, content limitations, etc), or to ensure the enforcement of intellectual property rights (IPR) at local level.

As far as trade is concerned, due account should be taken of the provisions of the UNESCO Convention on cultural diversity in this respect, particularly regarding the double nature – economic and cultural – of cultural activities, goods and services, and the granting of preferential treatment to cultural goods and services from developing countries.

III Orientations for an ec strategy

G u i d i n g p r i n c i p l e s o f E C c u l t u r a l a c t i o n i n d e v e l o p m e n t

Ownership

The EC's development policy is based on the principle of ownership by all major stakeholders, and thus responds to partner countries' own developmental needs and priorities. One key implication in the field of culture is that the object of EC action must be to support the cultural activities, goods and services of developing countries themselves rather than supporting those of Europe. Another implication is that partner countries are free to decide to place culture amongst their top priorities, and even possibly as the main priority for their bilateral co-operation with the EC. A final implication is that the EC will be ready to support all forms of cultural expression, the only limit being that EC action will under no circumstances infringe human rights and fundamental freedoms as enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights or guaranteed by international law.

To ensure genuine ownership, the identification of the EC's actions in the field of culture will be based on an in-depth policy dialogue with the partner country, including government and relevant stakeholders, in particular local authorities, leading cultural actors (whether public or private), and representatives of civil society (NGOs, trade unions, associations, etc). Where genuine ownership cannot be assured, the EC may contribute to the emergence or strengthening of the full range of cultural interlocutors. Ownership must also be reflected in the outcome of EC development co-operation in the field of culture. In particular, the EC should contribute to strengthening the ownership by local populations in partner countries of their own material and immaterial cultural heritage.

Differentiation

Another implication of the focus on the needs and priorities of partner countries is differentiation. EC co-operation in the field of culture must reflect the particular situation of each partner country or region, particularly their cultural and linguistic specificity, their socio-economic context, their state of development as well as their particular assets and difficulties. This will translate into a mix of aid modalities and objectives unique to each country or region.

Beyond differentiation, the coherence of the EC's approach will be secured across countries and regions based on the implementation of the core EC principles as set out in the present Strategy, and the identification of EC means of action as described below.

Reflecting the dual nature of culture

The EC development policy must reflect the dual nature of culture, as pinpointed above.

The horizontal nature of culture calls for the systematic integration of culture in all aspects of the development policy, regardless of the specific field of action and instrument. The mainstreaming of culture will take place in the framework of the country or regional strategy, as well as in the context of specific programmes and projects whose success depends, to varying degrees, on their integration into the local cultural context. Particular attention will have to be paid to actions in the field of human and social development, where cultural factors such as identity, mentality, values, behaviours, etc., play a determinant role. This particularly concerns the areas of education and training, health, gender equality, the environment and sustainable development. Comprehensive guidelines will be developed to ensure an optimal mainstreaming of culture. In addition, specific training will be offered to EC officials, particularly targeted at staff posted in delegations.

At the same time, culture is a self-standing issue for which partner countries or regions may wish to receive EC support. As indicated above, the Commission will be ready to respond to this demand.

Building on past experience and specific strengths

The Commission does not start from scratch in responding to partner countries' demand for EC support in the field of culture. It has accumulated considerable experience and expertise regarding culture in development co-operation over the last two decades through the co-financing of numerous cultural projects and programmes, primarily in the ACP and Mediterranean regions, but also in Asia and Latin America.

To draw lessons from the past, the Commission will launch an in-depth inventory of all EC actions in the field of culture in developing countries. The inventory will examine the validity of existing approaches and instruments, the extent to which they should be improved, complemented or replaced by new ones, and whether they can be extrapolated to other world regions and under which conditions. Attention will have to be devoted to new segments of cultural industries, in particular software, video games, electronics and the Internet, both in relation to their growth potential and as a vector of cultural expression.

At the same time, the Commission must draw upon its specific strengths. This concerns those areas where the EC has a unique added value linked to its particular nature, competencies, capacities and expertise. For example, the Commission could draw on its exclusive competence in the field of trade. The fact that it is itself a multicultural institution, also gives the Commission a unique capacity and legitimacy regarding the promotion of intercultural dialogue. Furthermore, the Commission must promote harmonisation with Member States and make the EU's distinctive voice heard at international level in the field of culture. To this end, the Commission intends to carry out an in-depth review of EC policies and instruments to identify those that could be activated to support the cultural dimension in its development policy.

It is planned to complete the inventory and the review by 2008. Necessary funding will be provided from the cultural envelope of the thematic programme on "Investing in people" under the financial perspectives 2007-2013, which includes a specific section on culture.⁷

C u l t u r a l a c t i o n a t n a t i o n a l l e v e l

The EC prioritises action at country level on the basis of the Country Strategy Paper (CSP) elaborated bilaterally with partner countries. The aim is to ensure an efficient channeling of development aid in

support of country-owned policies and priorities on the basis of a dialogue with government and relevant stakeholders. For countries that have already completed their CSP at the time of the adoption of the present strategy, full use will be made of existing margins of manoeuvre as well as upcoming reviews to translate the present document's orientations into concrete actions. Against this background, the main areas of culture co-operation in country programming can be highlighted as follows:

- Integration of the cultural dimension into the bilateral policy dialogue as well as in all programmes and projects (mainstreaming).
- Provision of expert support to the elaboration and implementation of national cultural policies and legislation.
- Conservation and promotion of the national cultural heritage for the benefit of local populations, neighbouring countries and foreign tourists. This could include support to actions aimed at showcasing the partner country's culture in Europe.
- Promotion of cultural diversity at local and national level, including the protection of endangered cultures, cultural minorities and indigenous people. This dimension is related to good governance and conflict prevention. Of particular relevance is the fact that an ethnic majority in any given part of a country may be a minority in other parts of the same country, and that the way minorities are treated locally may be a source of tension or conflict.
- Encouraging intercultural dialogue between communities inside the partner country, or between the partner country and other partner countries as well as with the EC.
- Fostering the emergence of local markets for partner countries' cultural activities, goods and services. This would be based on the stimulation of access to, and ownership by local publics of their own culture, as well as the strengthening of the capacity of local cultural actors, including creators and intermediaries.
- Providing the partner country with trade-related assistance in relation to cultural activities, goods and services.

C u l t u r a l a c t i o n a t r e g i o n a l l e v e l

Action at regional level must be complementary to country programming, where and when appropriate. The regional dimension, including the Intra-ACP dimension, is particularly relevant in the case of culture, as cultures often cross national boundaries. Similarly, the regional dimension is often essential in addressing tensions or conflicts between countries that share borders. Last but not least, the EC itself is a region which, beyond its great diversity, shares a common cultural heritage and common values and aspirations on which it bases its regional integration. This makes the Commission a valid partner in any inter-regional cultural dialogue.

Regional co-operation will be based on an appropriate Regional Strategy Paper (RSP). For regions that have already completed their RSP at the time of the adoption of the present strategy, full use will be made of existing margins of manoeuvre and upcoming reviews to translate the present document's orientations into concrete actions. With this in mind, the main areas of culture co-operation in regional programming can be highlighted as follows:

- Integration of the cultural dimension into the regional policy dialogue with relevant organisations such as the Africa Union, and relevant fora, for instance Asia-Europe meetings (ASEM) and EU-Latin America, Caribbean (LAC) summits, as well as in all programmes and projects (mainstreaming).

- Conservation and promotion of the shared cultural heritage in the direction of local populations, neighbouring countries and foreign tourists. This could include support to actions aimed at showcasing the region's culture in Europe.
- Encouraging intercultural dialogue as well as common cultural activities between individual countries, groups of countries or regions, as well as between a group of partner countries or a region and the EC.
- Promoting and strengthening links between cultural stakeholders, particularly museums and national cultural bodies, as well as with their counterparts in Europe.
- Strengthening the capacity of cultural actors at regional level, particularly intermediaries, thus encouraging the emergence of regional stakeholders, who may progressively attain the critical size needed to reap the benefits of the global economy.
- Encouraging trade in cultural activities, goods and services at regional and international level, through the provision of assistance and expertise, including by integrating the cultural dimension in the Commission's Export Helpdesk for developing countries, and where appropriate trade arrangements. The trade dimension is of immediate relevance to the ACP countries, as the Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA) negotiating mandate specifically requires that EPAs between the EC and six regional groupings of ACP countries provide the latter with better access for their cultural goods and services to the EC market.

A s t r o n g E u r o p e a n v o i c e o n c u l t u r e a t i n t e r n a t i o n a l l e v e l

EC action at international level will complement geographical programming, where it has a genuine added value, or where action at national or regional level is not sufficient to reach the desired goals. Complementary EC actions at international level will be based on the new thematic programme on "Investing in people". This will be largely focused on promoting the intercultural dialogue, both South-South and between the EC and its developing partners.

In addition, the Commission, in close collaboration with EU Member States, will become a more active partner in relevant international fora. The negotiations on the UNESCO Convention on cultural diversity were one of the first opportunities for the Commission to appear as an interlocutor on cultural issues at international level. A more systematic representation of the Commission in relevant international fora will contribute to strengthening Europe's distinctive voice at international level.

C o o r d i n a t i o n a n d h a r m o n i s a t i o n

A key dimension in the EU context is the coordination and harmonisation between the Commission and the Member States. The Commission plays a particular role in this respect, based on its unique capacity to act as a broker and a facilitator with Member States. Regular meetings of Member State culture experts will be held to increase EU-wide coordination and harmonisation on cultural matters in relation to development co-operation.

Coordination and harmonisation between the EC and other donors is also essential to increase the efficiency of development aid, reduce transaction costs, avoid overlaps and duplications. EC action in this field will be based on the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, the additional EU commitments in this respect, and the practical implementation arrangements between the Commission and Member States.

IV Conclusion

Culture has always been an issue on the EC's development agenda. At a time of worldwide recognition of the importance of culture in development, both as an issue in its own right and as a key factor in the success of development aid, the present policy framework marks the EC's renewed and amplified commitment to culture in its development co-operation.

The new policy framework for cultural action in the EC's development policy will ensure coherence amongst EC actions at country and regional and international level through key principles, priorities and lines of actions for all developing countries. Building on the EC's extensive past experience and its own multicultural nature, the Commission will harness and expand its actions in the field of culture. At the same time, the new framework for culture in the development policy allows for a high level of flexibility necessary to accommodate the specificities and different priorities of partner countries. Finally, the EC's new policy framework will set the basis for a more powerful European voice on culture at the global level.

Notes

- 1 Joint Statement by the Council and the Representatives of the governments of the Member States meeting within the Council, the European Parliament and the Commission of 20 December 2005.
- 2 See the Foundation's web site: <http://www.euromedalex.org/en/aboutus.htm>
- 3 Commission Communication on an "EU strategy for Africa: Towards a Euro-African pact to accelerate Africa's development" – COM(2005)489.
- 4 See: http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13066&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html
- 5 "Copyright industries in the US economy, The 2004 Report," International Intellectual Property Alliance (IIPA). (See http://www.iipa.com/pdf/2004_SIWEK_FULL.pdf). Core copyright industries as defined by the World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO) include press and literature; music, theatrical production and operas; motion picture and video; photography; software and databases; visual and graphic arts; advertising services; and copyright collecting societies.
- 6 Study on "International flows of cultural goods, 1980-98", Paris, UNESCO, 2000. Concerns annual world trade of printed matter, literature, music, visual arts, cinema, photography, radio, television, games and sporting goods.
- 7 Communication on the thematic programme for human and social development and the financial perspectives for 2007-2013 of 25 January 2006 – COM(2006)18.

R o d F i s h e r

Rod Fisher is Director of International Intelligence on Culture (formerly The International Arts Bureau), an independent company specialising in international consultancy, research, information, policy advice and project management, which he set up in 1994. He is also Hon Senior Research Fellow at City University, London, Director of the UK National Committee of the European Cultural Foundation and a Fellow of the Institute of Leisure and Amenity Management. Rod co-founded the CIRCLE (Cultural Information and Research Centres Liaison in Europe) network and was its Chairman from 1985-94. He leads international cultural policy modules at City University, London, and Goldsmith's College, University of London. Rod previously worked in various capacities at the Arts Council of Great Britain, latterly as International Affairs Manager. Prior to this he was responsible for arts programmes, festivals and cultural facilities in city governments. Rod chaired the European Task Force, which produced *In from the Margins*, a major report on culture and development for the Council of Europe (1994/96). He also chaired the evaluation team reviewing cultural policy in Finland (1994) and evaluated the Finnish Arts Council system (2003). He has conducted research or lectured in 27 countries worldwide. He has written, co-authored or edited more than 20 books, reports or directories on such issues as the European institutions, arts management, cultural employment, comparative cultural policies and expenditure in different countries.

S u e H a r r i s o n

Sue is a freelance consultant specialising in arts policy and planning, international cultural relations and change management. She is an experienced trainer and facilitator. For 2005 she was temporarily appointed Acting Director of Visiting Arts, an organisation committed to strengthening intercultural understanding through the arts, and until 2004 she worked as Director of Arts for the British Council, overseeing the Council's global arts programme from policy and strategy development through to implementation and evaluation. Between 1995 and 2000 Sue was Chief Executive of North West Arts Board. She has a wide range of experience working across the arts and in the regions of the UK, most notably the North West, Yorkshire and Humberside and the West Midlands. She trained as a dancer and teacher and has 18 years of teaching service. Alongside 10 years experience of arts funding and development, Sue was involved in the development of cultural policies through her work with local authorities in the UK and international policy and planning on behalf of the British Council. Sue is currently chair of the Foundation for Community Dance, a member of the board of CAPE (Creative

Arts Partnerships in Education), the International Committee for the Globe Theatre and the European Cultural Foundation (UK Committee).

C h r i s t i a n H a v e

Christian Have is one of the most prominent Danish experts in cultural communication at home and abroad. Handling and promoting film, theatre, music, art, literature and entertainment events, Christian has worked not only in Denmark, but also in the Scandinavian countries, in Russia, the USA and Asia, as well as most European countries. Among other things, he has worked as a consultant creating concepts and strategies for the centenary for Norway as a democratic state, and for Stavanger as European Capital 2008. Christian is also Adjunct Professor in Creative Industries Economy at The Institute of Communication, University of Aalborg, Denmark.

R o b e r t s K i l i s

Roberts Kilis has been Associate Professor at the Stockholm School of Economics in Riga since 1999, and before that Assistant Professor. During his academic career, he has been teaching logic, philosophy and economic anthropology, as well as conducting research. This included a study in 2005 on 'the potential of creative industries in Latvia' for the British Council and Latvian Ministry of Culture, and one in the same year, on 'The Socio-Psychological Profile of Latvia's Civil Servants' for the State Chancellery. He was commissioned to write a chapter on globalisation and Latvia for the annual Human Development Report for UNDP (1999), and co-authored the chapter on Latvia in Countries and Their Culture (Macmillan 2001). He has been a consultant to the World Bank (2001, 2003, and 2004) and a strategy consultant for Banks in Latvia. Roberts Kilis has a PhD from Cambridge University.

M a g d a l e n a K o p c z y n s k a

Magdalena Kopczynska is Manager of the Department of Education of the Adam Mickiewicz Institute (previously National Centre for Culture), where she has worked since 2003. She has also been senior specialist for projects on cultural heritage and cultural projects there. She is co-author of training courses on cultural project preparation and management with a special focus on EU funding opportunities, and editor of Polish Regions in the European Space – a periodical on EU cultural policy. She also lectures at Warsaw University on cultural management and cultural policies in Europe. Prior to this she was curatorial assistant at the Centre for Contemporary Art, Ujazdowski Castle and consultant to the Prince of Wales Business Leaders Forum. She has a European Master's degree in Business Administration from the University of Bradford.

F r a n c i s c o M o t t a V e i g a

Francisco Motta Veiga is a freelance consultant and managing partner of TerraCulta, an organisation specialising in consultancy, cultural production and management. He was appointed to the team created by the Portuguese Cultural Observatory (Observatório das Actividades Culturais), which in 2005 conducted research with the aim of defining government strategy and planning for the next European funding period (2007-2013). He is vice-president of MultiCulti, a non-governmental organization dedicated to cultural co-operation in the Mediterranean area and a member of the Portuguese network of the "Anna Lindh Euro-Mediterranean Foundation for dialogue between Cultures". From 2004 to 2005, he was engaged as a consultant by the Municipal Council of Loures and devised the "Cultural Strategy for the Loures Municipality". During the same period he was the Artistic Director of the Teatro Municipal de Faro. He was also Director of Cultural Programming and a member of the board of the Belém Cultural Centre Foundation (2001-2004). Between 1997-2001

he was Cultural Affairs Adviser for the Prime Minister, Antonio Gutierres. Francisco Motta Veiga holds a Degree in Human and Social Sciences from the New University of Lisbon.

B e n t - E r i k R a s m u s s e n

Bent-Erik Rasmussen is founder (2002) and general manager of ICCM (International Culture & Media Management) in Lundby, Denmark, where his work involves strategic analysis, organisational design, process and organisational development and benchmarking in media and culture organisations. Prior to this he was General Manager of music production for the National Danish Broadcasting Corporation, as well as Executive Editor and Producer of TV music production and programming (1998-2002). From 1996-99, he was Deputy Head of Channel 2 Radio and Editor of the Danish music magazine, Classical Music. Among other positions, he has been General Manager for the National Danish Broadcasting Concert Orchestra and Chairman of the music group of Copenhagen City of Culture organisations. His reports cover areas such as measuring public service, financial and management accounting, and international marketing. He has an Executive Master of Business Administration from Copenhagen Business School.

A l a i n S a n c e r n i

Alain Sancerni has extensive experience in cultural relations, intercultural dialogue, culture in development, heritage, the cultural industries, cultural rights and cultural diversity, etc. Since 2005, he has been Correspondent on Education and Research for France Co-operation Internationale, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. He is also head of courses at the Institute of European Studies, University of Paris VIII. From 2001-2005, he was a national attached expert at the European Commission, working in the EuropeAid Co-operation Office for ACP countries-social sector (Education and Culture). Between 1999-2001, he was Permanent Consultant at the Agence Intergouvernementale de la Francophonie, Paris. Among his positions before this, were as Director of l'Alliance Française in Accra, Ghana. He has also been an adviser to UNESCO and the World Bank, and is currently President of the Ballet d'Europe and on the Board of Advisers for the World Cultural Forum. Alain has a DEA in Literature et Communication from the University of Lille and a Master of Philosophy (Aesthetics / cinema) from the University of Paris I.

@ Rod Fisher/Boekmanstudies, LabforCulture.org

All authors of the national reports, annexes 1-6, remain fully responsible for their contributions.

Boekmanstudies
Projects & publications on arts, culture and related policy
Herengracht 415
NL - 1017 BP Amsterdam
T +31-(0)20-6243736
F +31-(0)20-6385239
secretariaat@boekman.nl
www.boekman.nl

LabforCulture.org
Sharing Culture across Europe
Roemer Visserstraat 18
NL-1054 EX Amsterdam
T +31-(0)20-4121017
F +31-(0)20-4122468
www.labforculture.org

Final editing by: Cas Smithuijsen

Design cover and lay out: Joseph Plateau Grafisch Ontwerpers, Amsterdam
Printed by: Hooiberg, Epe

Some rights reserved

The work is protected by copyright. Any use of the work other than authorized for the online version,
published on www.labforculture.org under the Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 2.5
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.5/> License is prohibited.

ISBN/EAN:978-90-6650-087-7

Amsterdam 2007