

Creative Europe 2014-2020: A New Programme - A New Cultural Policy As Well?

Bruell, Cornelia

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Forschungsbericht / research report

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Bruell, C. (2013). *Creative Europe 2014-2020: A New Programme - A New Cultural Policy As Well?* (2. überarb. Aufl.) (ifa Edition Culture and Foreign Policy). Stuttgart: ifa (Institut für Auslandsbeziehungen). <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-54757-2>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

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

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/deed.de>

Terms of use:

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

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0>



ifa-Edition Culture and Foreign Policy

Creative Europe 2014–2020

**A new programme – a new cultural
policy as well?**

Cornelia Bruell

ifa-Edition Culture and Foreign Policy

Creative Europe 2014–2020

A new programme – a new cultural policy as well?

Cornelia Bruell

Imprint

This publication was created within the framework of ifa's Research Programme "Culture and Foreign Policy" and appears in the ifa-Edition Culture and Foreign Policy. The Research Programme is funded by the Federal Foreign Office.

Publisher

Institut für Auslandsbeziehungen e. V.
(ifa, Institute for Foreign Cultural Relations)
Stuttgart and Berlin

Author

Cornelia Bruell
E-Mail: office@bruell.eu

Editing and copy-editing

Mirjam Schneider
Odila Triebel
Sarah Widmaier
Dorothea Grassmann

English translation

Katharine A. Schmidt

Picture

LaurMG, Wikimedia Commons

Setting and Design

Andreas Mayer, Stuttgart

Institute for Foreign Cultural Relations

Charlottenplatz 17
70173 Stuttgart, Germany
P.O. Box 10 24 63
70020 Stuttgart, Germany

info@ifa.de

www.ifa.de

© ifa 2013

ISBN 978-3-921970-78-2

2nd Edition.

CONTENTS

	Foreword	4
	Summary	6
1.	Introduction	8
1.1	Current developments	9
1.2	Goal and method of the study	10
2.	The old and new support programme	11
2.1	The institutional background	12
2.2	The support programme “Creative Europe” in comparison with the current programme	13
2.3	Summary of the changes	17
2.4	The innovative aspects	19
3.	The language of the programme: creative “business” and co.	21
4.	Discourses concerning EU cultural policy	24
4.1	The political discourse	25
4.2	The public discourse	31
4.3	The discourse in civil society	34
5.	Recommendations for action	43
6.	Counteracting an overall trend...	46
	References	50
	Appendix	54
	About the author	60

FOREWORD

Fragmented markets, digitisation and globalisation – the draft of the new European Commission Framework Programme “Creative Europe (2014–2020)” aims to tackle these challenges in the various cultural sectors.

The choice of vocabulary used in the draft programme sparked a debate throughout Europe in 2011, since terms such as “competitiveness”, “service”, and “added value” suggested that not only a new support programme was being presented, but at the same time, a new concept of culture was being manifested, which measures the value of culture in terms of market mechanisms.

With the present study, the ifa (Institute for Foreign Cultural Relations), as a centre of excellence for foreign cultural and educational policy, would like to contribute to this discourse. In doing so, we do not want to further polarise the discussion, but rather, to provide space for an examination of the various positions: with the comparison of the old and new cultural support programmes as a backdrop, the positions of the European Council, the European Parliament, and civil-society actors from Germany, France, Great Britain and Italy are addressed, and the vocabulary that is used is subjected to a critical analysis as well. In analyses of this topic to date, the input of civil-society stakeholders has hardly been taken into account, and the critical commentary on the vocabulary that is used has not been subjected to a critical scholarly analysis. The present study takes this deficit into account, and presents proposals for adjustments to the programme – proposals that do justice to the goal of all concerned: to adequately meet the future challenges in this sector.

The study was written within the framework of ifa’s Research Programme “Culture and Foreign Policy”. Experts have been doing research on current topics in foreign cultural and educational policy since 2010, with the goal of connecting research, practical experience, policy, and the public sphere.

At this juncture I would like to express my sincere thanks to Cornelia Bruell, the author of the study, for her outstanding work and her dedication. At the same time, I would like to thank my colleagues in the Research Programme, including Odila Triebel, the head of the programme, and Sarah Widmaier and Dorothea Grassmann, who supported the planning and editing of the project; and also I would like to thank the Federal Foreign Office for its financial support for the realisation of the study.

“Creative Europe” will be adopted in autumn 2013. We look forward with keen interest to that moment, and hope that with this study, we have succeeded in providing an impetus for the process of making adjustments to the programme.

Sincerely,

Ronald Grätz
Secretary General of the ifa
(Institute for Foreign Cultural Relations)

SUMMARY

In 2011 the European Commission developed a proposal for a regulation for the new framework programme for the cultural and creative sector for the 2014–2020 Financial Framework. The present programmes “Culture” (2007–2013), MEDIA for the audio-visual sector (2007–2013), and MEDIA Mundus for cooperation with professionals from third countries in the audio-visual area (2011–2013) are thereby to be brought together under a common framework and a new facility for providing financing (guarantee fund) is to be created.

This study provides an overview of central changes in cultural support beginning in 2014, discusses the positions of the European Council and the European Parliament concerning the Commission's proposal, and presents criticisms put forth by civil-society stakeholders and members of the public. For this purpose, publicly stated positions and newspaper opinion pieces have been examined in an analysis of content and discourse, and individual voices from civil society have been surveyed via semi-structured interviews.

Central points of criticism from the public, civil society and the European Parliament are, among others, the economic style of the programme, with its emphasis on competition, employment and the strategic development of audiences. Furthermore, the idea of culture in the new programme has been criticised, since it describes culture solely as a good and service, and the non-commercial value of culture is not expressed.

1.

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Current developments

In 2011 the European Commission developed a proposal for a regulation for the new support programme for the cultural and creative sector within the 2014–2020 Financial Framework. The primary objective thereby is to bring together the present programmes “Culture” (2007–2013), MEDIA for the audio-visual sector (2007–2013) and MEDIA Mundus for cooperation with professionals from third countries in the audio-visual area (2011–2013) under a common framework, and to create a new facility for providing financing (guarantee fund).

For the concrete drafting of the programme, the European Parliament (EP) presented a draft on October 8, 2012, in which the Commission’s proposal had been reworked in detail. Out of the 676 suggested changes, a compromise version was adopted on December 18, 2012 in the Culture and Education Committee of the European Parliament, with a vote of 25 for and two against. In this connection, a report by EP rapporteur Silvia Costa on the legislative procedure in the first reading of January 14, 2013 is available (European Parliament, Report (in first reading), 14/1/2013). The Irish Presidency of the Council (first half of the year 2013) has declared the programme “Creative Europe” to be one of its central priorities. At the moment, the Council Presidency, the European Parliament and the Commission are negotiating in the so-called “trilogue” on a final text version of the programme.

On March 13, 2013, however, the European Parliament by a vote of 506 rejected the 2014–2020 Multiannual Financial Framework that had been proposed by the European Council. In this regard, the European Council had reached an agreement on February 8, 2013 that the maximum budget would be limited to one per cent of gross national income as stated in the EU Budget. The European Parlia-

ment stated that this could send the EU budget into the deficit zone. Thus, a new round of negotiations will be necessary in the coming months. The European Parliament would like to postpone these negotiations until spring 2014, following the EU elections. As a result, it is not yet possible to plan the budget for the programme “Creative Europe”. Doris Pack, chairman of the Committee for Culture and Education in the European Parliament, has already realised that it will be very difficult to secure the ambitious funding levels that have been set for the programme:

“I doubt that we will get as much as we want, but I am sure that we will get more than at present because of the additional activities planned in the new Creative Europe programme” (Doris Pack, *Screendaily*, 26/3/2013).

According to insider information published by *Screendaily*, if the budget proposal by the European Council becomes final, the budget for the programme would be about 1.3 billion euros instead of the 1.8 billion euros that were originally proposed by the Commission. This would amount to an increase of twelve per cent in comparison with the programme for 2007–2013. The negotiations in the Council working groups will play a central role here.

A joint agreement concerning the Multiannual Financial Framework and the draft programme could be reached by the summer break. The goal would be to have the regulation passed at the meeting of the Council of Ministers in November, 2013.

The name “Creative Europe” could change in the meantime, since a thinktank with the same name has existed in France since 2011, and it could potentially seek financial compensation.

Thus Doris Pack proposes:

“We would not pay, but decide instead to use a different name. So, let’s start thinking about the possibilities for another name as I don’t remember people being so delighted about the name [Creative Europe] in any case” (Doris Pack, *Screendaily*, 26/3/2013).

1.2 Goal and method of the study

The following study analyses and provides critical comments on the content-related and discursive aspects of the EU cultural support programme “Creative Europe”. It poses the following questions: Will EU cultural policy in general be altered by the consolidation and adjustment of cultural support programmes? Is the vocabulary used in the draft programme being changed? What ramifications does such a shift in discourse have, and in which context does it take place? How is the new support programme being perceived by public and civil-society actors?

The study thus provides an overview of central changes in cultural support starting in 2014, it discusses the positions of the European Council and the EU Parliament concerning the Commission’s proposal, and it elicits critical commentary from members of civil society and the public. The approach is partly content-related, and partly discursive. The analysis of public statements and newspaper opinion articles does not claim to be exhaustive, but rather shall provide an impression of several national perspectives (from Germany, France, Great Britain and Italy). Individual voices from within civil society were compiled with the help of semi-structured interviews (see appendix for the questionnaires and list of interviewees).

To date there has been a range of studies on the subject of “the culture industry” and “the creative city” (for example, in the magazine “The International Journal of Cultural Policy”), but the changes and ramifications of the Commission’s new draft programme have mainly been criticised in commentaries (for example, Kämpf 2012; Sievers/Wingert 2012) and articles by civil-society actors (for example, advocacy groups). The European Parliament has commissioned studies concerning the funding lines for “Culture” and MEDIA in the new draft programme (the thematic papers regarding the field of action “Culture”, and MEDIA: IMO 2012 and KEA 2012). To date, there has been neither a critical analysis of the vocabulary, nor have interviews been conducted with civil-society actors – that deficit is to be remedied here.

2.

THE OLD AND NEW SUPPORT PROGRAMMES

2.1 The institutional background

Culture as a real field of action for European policy was not incorporated into the treaties of the European Communities until very late. It was not until the adoption of the Article on Culture (Art. 128) in the Maastricht Treaty that a legal basis was created for cultural activities in the European Union (cf. Sievers/Wingert 2012:36). This article was incorporated into the Lisbon Treaty as Article 167. Therein the European Union pledges to contribute “to the development of the cultures of the Member States”. It is a matter here of the dissemination of culture and history, conservation of cultural heritage, non-commercial cultural exchange, and artistic and literary endeavours. In other areas as well, “cultural aspects shall be taken into account”, particularly “in order to respect and promote the diversity of its cultures” (the so-called “cultural compatibility clause”, Paragraph 4 of Article 167, ABl C 83). Thus, here is the source of that phrasing that finds its way into all areas of policy where cultural aspects are to be taken into account.

Since 1996 there have been various community programmes that support cultural cooperation between the member states, and between various institutions and organisations (for example, the programmes “Kaleidoscope”, “Ariane”, “Raphael”, “Culture 2000”, “Culture”). Major goals in this respect have been the promotion of cultural exchanges, mobility of creative artists, and the creation of long-term networks, as well as the development of innovative methods of expression and working (cf. Sievers/Wingert 2012:37). Businesses could take part in projects, but only if they were not seeking to make a profit.

Among the institutions and persons central to the development and the resolutions concerning the programmes “Culture” and MEDIA are the following:

- the EU Council of Culture Ministers, meets in May and November in Brussels;
- the EU Commissioner for Education, Culture, Multilingualism and Youth (2010-14): Androulla Vassiliou (Cyprus);
- European Parliament, Committee for Culture and Education (2009-14): Chairman Doris Pack (Germany).

The collaboration with national government agencies is organised in accordance with the so-called open method of coordination (OMC), which means that national agencies choose persons who contribute to EU-wide expert groups on this issue.

At this time there are OMC working groups for the following focus areas:

- cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue/ accessible and integrative culture;
- cultural and creative industries;
- skills acquisition and mobility of creative artists;
- cultural heritage (including mobility of art collections).

The sessions of the Council are prepared in the sessions of the so-called Council working groups for culture and media, which meet about every two weeks in Brussels. Here representatives of the councillorships come together under the leadership of the presidency and in the presence of the Commission. In addition, there are also so-called programme committees, through which the Member States can contribute to the implementation of individual programmes. Furthermore, there are also “trilogue” meetings, in which the Council Presidency, the European Parliament and the Commission negotiate on a common text version for the

Commission’s proposal.

Furthermore there are platforms that work on political recommendations, with the involvement of European associations and networks – for instance, the platform for an intercultural Europe, the platform for access to culture, the platform for the cultural and creative industries, as well as the documents of civil-society platforms, which keep on hand recommendations of the cultural and creative industries. Every two years a European Culture Forum takes place. For the decision concerning the programme the co-decision procedure will be used – unanimity in the Council of Ministers is not necessary. However, an agreement on the Multiannual Financial Framework for 2014–2020 is a precondition.

2.2 The support programme “Creative Europe” in comparison with the current programme

The new programme shall, according to the Commission’s proposal, build on the experiences gained in the programmes “Culture”, MEDIA and MEDIA Mundus, as well as with the promotion of the Capitals of Culture (2007–2019) and the European Cultural Heritage Seal. In the Commission’s proposal an increase of the budget for the “cultural and creative industries” to a total of 1.801 billion Euros is planned. This would amount to an increase of 37 per cent. The proposal positions itself within the framework of the goals of the Europe 2020 Strategy, to promote “smart, sustainable and inclusive growth”. The programme is decidedly understood as a contribution to “high employment, high productivity, and high social cohesion”. Incentives for knowledge-based businesses and improved access to financing shall be created. The programme supports “only actions and activities presenting a potential European added value and contributing to the

achievement of the Europe 2020 Strategy objectives and to its flagship initiatives” (Article 3).

The Commission feels obligated to undertake such a programme because new challenges are convulsing the industry: a fragmented market, digitisation and globalisation, problems with financing, and the lack of comparable data. National and language barriers lead to “limited choice for the consumer” (European Commission COM (2011) 785:11).

“In this respect, the Union, where necessary, supports and supplements Member States’ actions to respect cultural and linguistic diversity, strengthen the competitiveness of the European cultural and creative sectors and facilitate adaptation to industrial changes, in particular through vocational training” (ibid:9).

The pilot project “European Creative Industries Alliance” as a cross-sector policy initiative has the objective of

“leveraging additional funds for creative industries and stimulating the demand for creative industries’ services by other industries and sectors” (ibid).

Although the style of the intentions described here and the goals of the programme are thus unambiguously economic in nature, in the definition of the regulation it is stated that “cultural and creative sectors” means all sectors “whose activities are based on cultural values and/or artistic and creative expressions, whether these activities are market- or non-market oriented”. In the next sentence, however, only goods and services are referred to, also in connection with cultural heritage, festivals, performing and fine arts and music. A “service” is, however, by definition an activity that “is offered with the goal of meeting the needs or desires of consumers in a market” (Onpulson Economic Lexicon).

A “professional, an organisation, a business or an institution” in the cultural or creative sector are all considered to be actors. A professional is a person who has successfully completed a commercial, business or other course of professional study, and thus, a technical definition such as this will not include all artists. The administrative tasks shall continue to be performed by the existing executive agency Education, Audio-visual and Culture (which has been entrusted with this task since 2009).

“Culture”

The focus of the support measures in this area lies in the establishment of networks, cooperative projects and the “impact-broadening activities of organisations”. European cultural prizes shall continue to be financed, along with the European Cultural Heritage Seal and the initiative European Capitals of Culture.

In sharp contrast to the new support programme, with the programme “Culture” through 2013 there was no discussion of growth, employment or competitiveness. The three most important objectives here were referred to as “cross-border mobility”, “transnational circulation”, and “intercultural dialogue”. The areas of action were “cultural projects”, “cultural institutions on the European level”, and “analysis and dissemination actions”.

In 2008 the overall objective of fostering the creation of a “European citizenry” through the expansion of cooperative activities was still being retained. The aspect of a European citizenry is no longer discussed in the new programme. At the same time, the flexibility regarding the personal circumstances of those being affected, which still played a role in the draft of the old programme, is no longer addressed. And so it states in the official journal (2008/C 141/13):

“The programme is based on a flexible, interdisciplinary approach, and is focused on the needs expressed by cultural operators during the public consultations leading up to its design.”

In the new programme this is reformulated to say that the “real needs of persons operating projects, including small and medium-sized enterprises (SME) in the cultural and creative sectors” shall be taken into account. Here, too, there is no discussion of social components that should be kept in mind in keeping with the reference to personal circumstances, but rather only “real needs”, the meaning of which is not clear.

The expression “microenterprise” is mentioned exactly one time in the Commission’s “Proposal for a Regulation”; the definition of SMEs in use since 2003, which includes microenterprises with fewer than 10 employees, is not mentioned anywhere.¹ This leads to misunderstandings.

The number of calls for proposals shall be reduced from nine to four. “Actions lacking critical mass, a long-term perspective, or which are over-subscribed due to their design will be discontinued” (European Commission COM 2011 786:5). It should be noted here that in the old programme “Culture”, only those cultural actors who were working in culture on a non-profit basis were designated as being eligible for grants.

The operating grants are being discontinued, since they are not sufficiently results-oriented, and according to the Commission, they were too complicated for applicants. They are to be replaced by project grants, this however poses difficulties for particularly those institutions that do not always work on a project basis (for example, the European Music Council).

¹ See http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/files/sme_definition/sme.user.guide.en.pdf

The current annual call for proposals with a changing country focus will be abandoned, and instead increasingly projects from acceding and candidate countries, countries from the European neighbourhood, and from the European Economic Area will be financed.

MEDIA

Digital technologies, transnational circulation, and capacity-building are the priorities of the MEDIA field of action. Here marketing, distribution and the expansion of classes of audiences are central concerns. Only networks of European cinema operators who show a significant proportion of non-national European films are supported.

The MEDIA Programme 2007–2013 pursues the following primary objectives: to reinforce the European audio-visual sector, above all in relation to European cultural identity and cultural heritage; to support the circulation of audio-visual works; to strengthen the competitiveness of the sector. In the monitoring and evaluation of the programme it is a matter of the quantitative success of the support measures: for example, the industry's share of employment and gross national product; the percentage of persons who make recourse to European cultural works; the number of learning experiences that were made possible; the number of project sponsorships; the number of visitors; the percentage of European audio-visual works; the number of financial institutions for the creative sector, the number of loans. The following adjustments to the MEDIA Programme shall be undertaken:

“a focus on structuring actions with a maximum systemic impact; creation of a financial facility to progressively replace direct grants where possible; increasing the leverage of EU funds; streamlining of the international dimension

previously covered in the separate MEDIA Mundus Programme within the single legal basis; a cross-cutting value chain approach which supports a number of film projects with high commercial and circulation potential ('champions') throughout the value chain, from training to distribution; transversal projects covering several segments and players of the value chain; and support to sales agents with broad market reach and a global market approach” (European Commission COM (2011) 786:5).

Right at the first glance it becomes clear that the style of the MEDIA Programme has been applied to the whole “Creative Europe” programme. Apart from the emphasis on competition, addressing new target groups, and employment, the MEDIA Programme also had a production guarantee fund (launched in 2010).

MEDIA Mundus

Media Mundus was established in 2009 with a budget of 15 million euros for the period from 2011–2013, to strengthen cultural and commercial relationships between the European film industry and filmmakers from third countries. In this area, as well, challenges such as globalisation and new technologies are referred to. The predecessor programme was called MEDIA International (2008–2010) and had a budget of 8 million euros. MEDIA Mundus will now be wholly merged into the MEDIA Programme.

Financial Facility

A facility for the cultural and creative industry will be introduced within a cross-sector field of action, which will be operated within the framework of a European Union debt instrument for SMEs. Loans

shall thus be made more available to SMEs. The period of the guarantees can run for up to ten years. With this fund, the existing barriers to access to capital, above all for SMEs in the culture and creative sectors, are to be bypassed. Access is difficult in this sector first and foremost because the sector is characterised by the production of immaterial goods, and also because of the generally low level of willingness within the sector to invest, and additionally, because of risk aversion on the part of financial institutes.

Already during the submission of proposals in the “Culture” Programme from 2007–2013, there was a requirement in the fields of action “Multi-Annual Cooperation Projects”, “Smaller Cooperation Measures”, “Literary Translation”, and “Cooperation Projects with Third Countries” that applicants take on 50 per cent of the total eligible cost. In the fields of action “Support to European Cultural Festivals” and “European Capitals of Culture” it was 40 per cent. This will not be changed in the current programme. That means that only institutions, organisations and networks with a pre-existing capital reserve can apply for assistance. The guarantee fund that has now been set up is expected to constitute a support here. It will be administered by the European Investment Fund, will be provided with 201 million euros in funding, and is expected to generate up to 1 billion euros in the form of loans.

The promotion of transnational political cooperation represents, aside from the guarantee fund, another component of the cross-sector support measures. This part remains the least precisely defined of all.

2.3 Summary of the changes

	OLD PROGRAMME (2007–2013)	NEW PROGRAMME (2014–2020)
OBJECTIVES	<p>“Culture”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - cross-border mobility - transnational circulation - intercultural dialogue - European citizenship <p>MEDIA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - strengthening the audio-visual sector - distribution of audiovisual works - competitiveness of the sector <p>MEDIA Mundus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - cultural and commercial relationships between the European film industry and third countries 	<p>Overall programme objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - cultural and linguistic diversity - strengthening competitiveness <p>“Culture”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - capacity-building: know-how, new business models, adapting to digitisation, expansion of classes of audiences, international careers - transnational circulation: literature, touring shows, events, exhibitions, audience groups <p>MEDIA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - capacity-building: digital technologies, adaptation to market developments, distribution and co-production, access to markets - transnational circulation: marketing, distribution, new audience groups, new business models

FIELDS OF ACTION	<p>“Culture”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - cultural projects/literary translation - analyses, collection and distribution of information - culture festivals 	<p>“Culture”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - cross-border cooperation projects - activities of European entities, European networks - circulation of artists and works - literary translation - culture prizes, Cultural Heritage Seal, Capitals of Culture
	<p>MEDIA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - professional support of those working in the area - development of projects and businesses - distribution of motion pictures and audio-visual programmes (including film festivals) - new technologies: pilot projects, video on demand, and digital cinema <p>MEDIA Mundus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - upgrading skills of those working in the area - access to the international market - distribution of European works in non-European markets and vice-versa 	<p>MEDIA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - acquisition of skills, knowledge, networking - European audio-visual works with circulation potential - European and international co-productions - commercial AV events, online instruments - circulation - network of European cinema owners - diversity, new audience groups, new business models <p>Cross-sectoral area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - guarantee fund - transnational political cooperation
FUNDING	<p>Total funding: 1.17 billion</p> <p>Culture: 400 million MEDIA: 750 million</p> <p>MEDIA Mundus (2011–2013): 15 million</p>	<p>Total funding: 1.8 billion, which represents an increase of 37 percent</p> <p>Culture: 487 million (30 per cent) MEDIA: 950 million (55 per cent)</p> <p>Cross-sectoral area: 286 million (15 per cent), of which: 211 million for the guarantee fund, 75 million for transnational political cooperation</p>
STRUCTURAL CHANGES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - operating grants - direct financial support - MEDIA Mundus for projects with third countries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - no operating grants, only project grants - no direct financial support - MEDIA Mundus shall be wholly merged into the MEDIA Programme - guarantee fund

2.4 The innovative aspects

The unification of the administrative machinery represents an innovation that shall above all yield savings for the programme. These savings can in turn be put to use in an increased number of projects. There has been criticism from many quarters however on this point, since, the theory goes, the number of proposals will not change, and thus, just as many staff members will be needed as in the preceding period. Aside from that, the consolidation runs the risk of reinforcing the monopolisation tendencies within the cultural and creative industries.

The guarantee fund that has been established is depicted as being particularly innovative and up to date. It is intended to enable above all financially weak cultural operators to apply for support through the programme, since in most of the action areas, assumptions of 50 per cent of the total eligible cost by the applicant is customary. An increase in the total volume of the programme is thus unavoidable, since without such an increase, but with the guarantee fund, the budget for the other areas would de facto shrink.

The way that the guarantee fund is now designed, however, it appears to be primarily an extension of the existing MEDIA Production Guarantee Fund (MPGF).

One can namely assume that primarily market-oriented SMEs (that is to say, the area of the commercial creative industry that focuses on audio-visual media) will be able to convince banks that they will be able to repay a loan (cf. IMO 2012:29). Especially for smaller cultural operators, who were supposed to be helped with the assistance of this instrument, it will be nearly impossible to do this.

The IMO (Institute for International Relations, Croatia) study on the area of culture in the new programme has levelled another criticism: that the participation of the EU in the guarantee fund has not been made transparent, and that it is still very much unclear what consequences the guarantee fund will have for the EU budget. In terms of structure and planning, much about the guarantee fund remains untold. Moreover, there is a lack of ties to culture programmes in the Structural Funds (cf. *ibid*). In addition, the fund will have a mainly positive impact on the larger Member States, since they also have the greatest economic share in the cultural and creative sector (Great Britain, Germany, France, Italy and Spain, KEA 2006:66). Thus, the fund could bring about a geographical imbalance.

The focus on “strategic audience-building by cultural institutions through cultural marketing, visitor research, target-group positioning and cultural transmission” is a new element in the programme. Thereby it is above all the consumption of culture that becomes a central concern. In contrast, in the programme up until 2013, the focus was on mobility of cultural operators and cultural works, as well as intercultural dialogue. Here the development of the programme in the direction of economic and market-oriented objectives becomes clear. The focus on audience development can on the one hand be seen as an innovation, above all with an eye to recent economic developments and crises, but it can of course also be regarded as a trend in opposition to a concept of art and culture that exists independent of considerations of yield and profit.

In the European Parliament, it is precisely the lack of innovation in the programme that is being criticised. Legal aspects such as copyright or acquisition of licences are hardly being discussed. Precisely in the MEDIA area, the Parliament is calling for the following adjustments:

“keeping ‘to an absolute minimum’ obstacles to licensing, including cross border licensing, in order to allow the emergence of new business models with a view to ensuring completion of the digital single market; and support for audio-visual operators ‘to develop European audio-visual works with enhanced cross-border circulation potential, including digital games as stand-alone audio-visual works’”(Screen International, 12/11/2012).

In the area of audio-visual works, but also with other artistic projects, the draft programme neglects to react to current developments. It would be desirable especially here to hold a debate on new financing models, such as, for example, mixed financing under a crowd-funding system.² Given the existing concerns regarding the willingness of banks to invest in the cultural and creative sector, the plan for a support programme should not ignore the subject of private pre-financing. Selected projects that had been initiated with swarm financing could be co-financed with EU funds. In the meantime, even businesses are participating in crowd-funding with large sums of money. Here, especially in the area of art and culture, caution is warranted – questions regarding the power to make decisions (can a minority of Internet users make decisions about public aid grants?) and the relationship of marketing and culture must be asked. The reality of these financing methods cannot, however, be ignored.

² With crowd-funding or swarm funding, Internet users become investors through a suitable platform (for example, Kickstarter).

3.

THE LANGUAGE OF THE PROGRAMME: CREATIVE “BUSINESS” AND CO.

The language of EU cultural policy has been greatly changed in the new programme. The former cultural sector is now called the “cultural and creative sector”. It is doubtful as to whether those working in culture in non-profit organisations or those in the public areas can identify with these terms.

The linguistic innovations are, however, dependent on the (national) language being used. Thus, while in German there has been a change from “*Kultursektor*” to “*Kultur- und Kreativbranche*”, nothing has changed in the English-language draft, in which the term “cultural and creative sectors”³ has stayed the same. The same thing is true for the Romance languages: in Italian, “*i settori culturali e creative*”, and in French, “*secteurs de la culture et de la création*”.

In order to ascertain a shift in content, it is especially important to consider the contextualisation of the terminology used. Thus cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue are indeed to be promoted, but in the same sentence it is made clear that “culture as a catalyser for creativity” is understood as existing “within the framework for growth and employment”. Hence, culture is clearly framed as not existing apart from the orientation towards markets, and requirements for growth.

In the Commission’s communication regarding the programme, it is noted that the cultural sector shall optimise its “potential for economic growth, jobcreation, and social inclusion” (European Commission COM (2011) 786:7). In the communication the existing programmes are also acknowledged mainly for their economic successes and improvements.

The “cultural and creative industries” (“*Kultur- und Kreativwirtschaft*”) is one of the most popular lexical creations in the German draft of the programme. According to economic data, this sector is growing faster than the rest of the economy in the 27 EU Member States, and contributes 3.3 per cent of GDP (European Commission COM (2012) 537:2). When in this regard “challenges” are referred to, which mostly amounts to using an euphemism for a problem situation, then the likewise popular terms “new technologies” and “globalisation” are also used. When difficulties in this sector are referred to, it is first and foremost with a view to financeability, which in times of “financial crisis” has become all the more problematic.

In the proposal for the resolution there is mostly talk of cultural- and creative-sector goods and services, as is the case with cultural heritage, festivals, the performing and fine arts, and music. Are art and culture to be understood merely as a need on the part of consumers?

As Sievers and Wingert remark, the style in the “European Agenda for Culture 2007” was indeed different, but here also the instrumental view was already being applied to the European cultural sector. As early as that time, a strategic role was being assigned to cultural policy:

“There is also acknowledgement that culture is an indispensable feature to achieve the EU’s strategic objectives of prosperity, solidarity and security, while ensuring a stronger presence on the international scene.” (European Commission COM (2007) 242:3).

However, in the new programme, the aspect of intercultural dialogue has greatly diminished in importance. Cultural diversity and identity are considered in light of international competitiveness. And so projects that are not profit-oriented or that do

³ However, in the impact assessment for the draft programme, which is only available in English, the term “cultural and creative industries” is used, and it is explicitly noted that this is identical in meaning to the term “cultural and creative sectors”, which is used in the document (European Commission 2011c).

not promote competitiveness are left to the Member States, in accordance with the principle of subsidiarity (cf. Sievers/Wingert 2012:38).

The operators in the cultural sector are now to be subsumed under the term “cultural and creative sector”. The focus is now not on the businesses in this sector, but on the artists themselves, who emerge as producers and are expected to distribute their works as widely as possible, in order to make more profits: with the objective of “more trade within the internal market, more international trade and increased revenues for the sector” (European Commission COM (2011) 786:7).

And thus it is also a central objective of the Commission to expand classes of audiences (see on this topic also the conference “European Audiences: 2020 and Beyond”). Together with the funding institutions, project applicants become operators who attempt to reach new audience groups. There is a common goal.

The terms “cultural diversity” and “intercultural dialogue” appear in a very unspecific and hardly authentic way. The potential contribution of the cultural and creative sector to the struggle against discrimination, racism and xenophobia sounds similarly vague. If one wishes to avoid empty phrases here, such relationships must be spelled out in detail and elaborated upon.

In contrast, the term “creativity” holds a prominent place in the new programme. Creativity can now be regarded as a constant that has been decoupled from the individual. Herewith the subjectivity has been removed from culture, and it has been objectivised and made quantifiable through the use of the term “creativity”, which can compete with others. Creativity and “capacity-building/-

reinforcement” enter into a symbiosis here.⁴ The term is also generally associated with the term “growth”.

Not only does the vocabulary related to culture follow a certain logic, but also regarding the action area MEDIA it is possible to question the one-sided emphasis on economic logic. Even though film production is a heavily mercantilised area, it is questionable whether a European culture programme may consider the making and marketing of films purely from a market-oriented perspective. If film and other audio-visual areas contribute to Europe’s cultural heritage, then the concentration on vocabulary such as “high commercial and circulation potential”, “value chain”, “large market range”, and “worldwide marketing approach” cannot be sufficient.

4 In the proposal for the resolution, the word “capacity”, partly in combination with -build up or -reinforcement, appears a total of ten times, and the whole document fills only 19 pages. “Creative sector” appears 55 times, while “diversity” is mentioned only 13 times, although the promotion of the cultural and creative sector is put on an equal footing with the safeguarding and promotion of cultural diversity as an objective of the programme.

4.

DISCOURSES CONCERNING EU CULTURAL POLICY

4.1 The political discourse

In all, it is possible to ascertain three leading discourses on the political stage: 1.) the Commission's justification discourse for the draft of the new programme; 2.) the critical commentary of the European Parliament under the leadership of the Italian Member Silvia Costa; 3.) the official national statements and the "partial overall orientation" of the Council.

European Commission

The Commission's discourse disaggregates into the official style of the programme on the one hand, and on the other hand, into verbal reassurances at conferences and other events. At a Commission's "information session" at the beginning of 2012, employees in the department of Media and Culture asserted that not much would change in practice in the awarding of funds; there would at the very most be improvements, but however the style of the programme would have to be adapted to the 2020 objectives. Had the department not conformed to the pressure to adapt, in accordance with the wishes in particular of Commission President José Manuel Barroso, there would have been a risk of an overall reduction in or elimination of European support for culture (cf. Kämpf 2012).

The criticism concerning the abolishment of operating grants has been unofficially countered as well by the Commission, in that it is pointed out that not much will change in practice. In the new procedures the project funding is laid out over several years and does not require partners; thus it covers the operating costs of networks *de facto*.

The Commission attempts to legitimise the new style, which is arguably partly imposed from outside, in that it declares a changed approach to the audience to be necessary. Numerous of statements and conferences confirm that the aspect of "audience development" has moved to center stage. A new relationship shall be entered into with the "audience", which is portrayed as a malleable mass. There is talk of "increasing, widening, deepening, diversifying". The changed approach to the audience is justified above all by the "challenges of our time", "digital shift", "new technologies", and "economic growth".

Here, the Commission depicts culture and the public in a manner that suggests a divided relationship. Culture is still something from a higher sphere that must be brought to the attention of average citizens, since they do not participate in culture to begin with. This is expressed in the speeches of the Commissioner for Education and Culture, Androulla Vassiliou:

"We need to do more to engage the public with European culture and to protect diversity. To do this effectively, we need to help artists and other professionals to build new audiences, in their home countries and beyond, to re-assess their relationship with existing audiences and to diversify audiences. If we want to introduce younger audiences to culture, we need to think afresh about how best to do this. If we don't look at this issue seriously, we risk undermining our cultural diversity and its benefits for the economy and social inclusion" (European Union News, 15/10/2012).

The members of the public increasingly become consumers, in that above all, the aspect of demand is to be satisfied. The capitalist logic of desire to be intertwined with the sphere of culture.

At the beginning of the year 2013, the European Commission awarded contracts to Ecorys NL (see “The discourse in civil society”) and IDEA Consult to carry out an online survey that first and foremost is to collect data on financial needs in the cultural and creative sector (<http://eu-for-creativity.eu>). The results of the survey will be published along with a broad-based study at the end of July, 2013.

European Parliament (EP)

The European Parliament has a very critical view of the Commission’s draft. The changes proposed by the Committee for Culture and Education under the leadership of Silvia Costa proposed deep-seated changes. On December 18, 2012, the Parliament agreed on a compromise draft of the proposed changes. Proposed changes have also come from Lothar Bisky (Member of the EP, *Die Linke*) who has insisted on the dual nature of the concept of culture: “In the future, there should be a clear distinction between the non-profit and market-oriented areas.”⁵

The critical commentary on the part of the Parliament concerns primarily the positioning of economic aspects of “cultural production” and the central significance of competition-based development strategies. If one casts a glance at the Parliament’s draft report, it becomes immediately clear that the non-commercial side of cultural activities and developments is to receive special emphasis. Whole sections that were not in the Commission’s original version are to be inserted, for example, Article 5a concerning cultural heritage. In section 5, the Parliament’s proposal inserts an article concerning the dual function of cultural activities: the economic aspect, but also that of *ars gratia artis* and its significance for the development of identities, meanings and values. It is to be explicitly recorded that

these aspects may not be interpreted in a commercial way. At the same time, the Parliament does not at all neglect to make clear the significance of the cultural and creative industry.

The separation of the concept of culture from purely economic factors is also to be achieved by deleting the reference to the European Union’s membership in the World Trade Organisation (WTO) and to the obligations that arise therewith. Likewise, the guideline that the new programme must be in line with the 2020 objectives shall be deleted.

The draft report of the Committee for Culture and Education also includes other studies and reports, such as the one by the rapporteur for the Budget Committee, Barbara Matera (EPP). Her article focuses on the MEDIA action area, and first and foremost urges an improvement in the cross-linkage of the programme with other funding frameworks, such as the Structural and Regional Funds. Aside from that, Matera charges that the Media Mundus Programme is not sufficiently represented in the new draft, and calls for a mention of global opportunities for cooperation in the draft legislation (Screen International, 5/10/ 2012).

The Committee on Employment and Social Affairs calls above all for microenterprises to be given their due regard:

“according to European Commission data, 99% of all EU enterprises are SMEs, and 90% of them are actually micro-enterprises (having less than 10 employees, in fact employing five people on average). These micro enterprises employ 53% of the workforce in Europe; therefore, they are essential for our economies” (Screen International, 2/10/2012).

⁵ http://www.lotharbisky.de/kat_dokumentarisches_detail.php?v=334

In financial terms, the Parliament demands that while there must indeed be a common framework programme, one should very well continue to speak of two independent programmes – an audio-visual area, and that of the former Culture programme. One desired change that has been regarded with criticism across the board is the demand that the following passage be incorporated: “tackle the under-representation of creative women and female artists.”

The Commission’s new focus on audience development has likewise been regarded with criticism. Silvia Costa, for example, does not speak of the public in the singular, but rather of “*i pubblici*”.⁶ And Lothar Bisky (2012) criticises the one-sided interpretation of “audience development”:

“A further priority of the new programme proposal is so called ‘audience building’. The main argument lies in a new demand-oriented policy, which completely dismisses the unforeseeable demand for cultural goods, and also leaves basic problems of access to, participation in, and the exclusion from culture unaccounted for. The objective of the new programme should not be increases in market share, but rather to create and promote integrative and identification functions of culture, as well as the creation of a European public, and among other things, to raise people’s awareness of European film in all of its diversity.”

The Education, Youth and Culture Council of the European Union

As early as in the first agreement of the EU culture and education ministers on a “first general policy approach” in May, 2012 it was recorded that “the intrinsic value of culture and art” should be more heavily emphasised, and that thus the non-profit sector should be taken into greater account. It was said to be important to strike a balance between cultural diversity and economic aspects. It was stressed that above all, smaller operators and non-profit-oriented initiatives must be taken into greater account. Aside from that, in the evaluation process not only quantitative factors should be drawn on, but qualitative standards should be developed.

On November 26 and 27, 2012, the culture ministers met again; however, this was with the knowledge that the negotiations for the overall budget had been postponed. So again, it was possible only to reach an agreement on a “partial overall approach”. Again it was recorded:

“Culture with its inherent elements of creativity and innovation is a value in itself. It has a significant public value and contributes to the achievement of smart, sustainable and inclusive growth as set out in Europe 2020 strategy and its flagship initiatives” (Council conclusions on Cultural Governance, 26–27/11/2012).

The approaches of the Commission and the Parliament favour a dichotomous concept of culture. Culture and art are seen as Janus-headed, with an economic side (products of the cultural industries), as well as a purely cultural side that serves as an end in itself (cultural goods). The question must, however, be asked as to whether there ever was such a “purified” concept of art and culture, and above all, the hard question must be asked as to whether such a dichotomy makes sense in this day and age.

6 Interview with Silvia Costa: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MUTesnO2LCE>

The Council's conclusions are somewhat different here, and it becomes apparent that those working in the field of culture in the various nation states are very much able to exert influence on national positions. Point 5 of the "partial general approach" can be regarded as an attempt to establish a suitable, alternative concept of culture. Here it is emphasised that a holistic approach to cultural governance shall be found:

"that powerful dynamics take place at the borderlines between cultural and creative sectors and that significant benefits result from establishing links and partnerships across sectors; therefore there is a need to adopt holistic approaches to cultural governance" (Council Conclusions on Cultural Governance, 26–27/11/2012).

The approach to cultural governance is to continue to develop in two directions: (1) cultural policy shall have an evidence-based orientation (among its successes is the ESSnet Culture Project),⁷ and (2) synergies and integrative strategies shall be promoted, in order to connect cultural policy to other policy areas. Above all, civil society shall be involved to a greater extent in decisions on cultural policy.

This would be desirable above all because while the cultural initiatives, professional associations and interest groups that are surveyed during the OMC do indeed contribute their positions, they have not yet seen their suggestions realised in sufficient measure. These civil-society actors are in the meantime levelling criticism at the OMC, because among other reasons, only ministerial officials subject to directives are involved.

Germany

The German federal government wants to see EU total expenditures rise by no more than one per cent, that is to say, that the increase in the budget for culture is to be achieved through reallocation, even if the German government itself would rather see a complete reshuffling of the budget.

In Germany there is growing criticism from many sides. The upper house of Parliament (*Bundesrat*), in a critical comment regarding the programme proposal, said that it is a matter here of a paradigm shift away from the support of culture to private financing. In addition, the *Bundesrat* criticised that the EU programme was in the past called a "decision", whereas with the programme "Creative Europe", there is talk as of now of a "regulation". This is said to be not acceptable: "Regulations are in all parts legally binding, without the requirement of acts of transposition by the Member States."⁸

The Committee for Culture and Media in the lower house of Parliament (*Bundestag*), has recommended to the federal government that in further negotiations, it should advocate above all for the principle of subsidiarity, and to maintain the strict separation of the state from art, culture and media. In the programme the area of culture is not to become less important under pressure from the media area.

⁷ *Statistische Erhebungen zum Thema Kultur- und Kreativwirtschaft 2009–2011.*

⁸ Deutscher Bundesrat, Drucksache 766/1/11

“The federal government shall oppose a primarily economic view of European cultural support, and ensure that in the culture strand only those projects that are not profit-oriented will be supported. In monitoring, what matters in addition to quantitative aspects is to use qualitative criteria for evaluation” (Deutscher Bundestag, Drucksache 17/11/07, 19/10/2012).⁹

Bernd Neumann, Minister of State to the federal chancellor and head of delegation of the German Culture Ministry in Brussels, gave a detailed explanation of the German position in an article in the magazine *“Politik und Kultur”*. Among other things, according to Neumann, it was possible to incorporate the following points at a meeting of the Culture and Media ministers in May, 2012:

“The affective value and the dual nature of cultural goods are now more prominent. Also, we have incorporated cultural education for the younger generation and new, hitherto under-represented target groups.[...] The programme evaluation now refers to qualitative criteria. Before, there were only quantitative criteria, that is to say that only the largest number of viewers and participants was supposed to be the measuring stick of success” (Neumann 2012:11).

Neumann, however, still finds shortcomings in the draft text following these negotiations:

“The draft for ‘Creative Europe’ on the contrary allows for profit-oriented projects; in the text to date it says that ‘predominantly’ non-profit projects shall be supported. The danger of commercialisation therefore remains” (ibid.).

In addition, Lukrezia Jochimsen, a member of the party *Die Linke* in the *Bundestag*, refers in a speech in January, 2013 to a paradigm shift:

“The programme at hand, ‘Creative Europe’, does not speak the language of culture. It puts into effect a clear paradigm shift in EU funding policy. Because the existing objective has shifted dramatically from cultural promotion to the promotion of economic activity.[...] The programme ‘Creative Europe’ in this way mashes up very different things, namely, an economic support programme for the cultural and creative industry on the one hand, and an instrument for promoting cultural cooperation in Europe on the other hand” (Jochimsen, 17/1/2013).

The federal government’s proposal to allow in the future not only legal persons, but also individual (natural) persons to submit proposals has not yet been incorporated, since there is too little support for this on the part of other Member States. Furthermore, the German federal government wants to advocate for the incorporation of qualitative factors in the evaluation and monitoring of projects.

France

The official position in France concerning the draft programme is very positive. The guarantee fund, too, is regarded as a great opportunity; however the Ministry for Culture and Communication has called for more precision concerning financial accommodation, and concrete proposals on this topic have been delivered.¹⁰

9 The resolution was adopted with the votes of the *CDU/CSU* and the *FDP* parliamentary groups, with the *SPD*, *Die Linke* and *Bündnis 90/Die Grünen* voting against it.

10 *Note des autorités françaises sur l’instrument financier*, mai 2012.

Great Britain

The United Kingdom has reduced its budget for cultural expenditures by 30 per cent since 2010; in Scotland the amount was 5 per cent. In March, 2012, the EU Subcommittee G of the British Parliament declared its opposition to a rise in the EU budget for culture, although in 2011, the United Kingdom had received the largest share of cultural promotion funds, namely, 5.7 million euros. National support funds have been meanwhile cut (from 2011 to 2015 probably by 15 per cent).

The EU Subcommittee G, for Social Policy and Consumer Protection, of the Upper House of the British Parliament, was dissolved in May 2012, and the area of culture was assigned to Committee E for Law, Institutions and Consumer Protection. The cuts with respect to the number of committees, then, hit the area of social policy and culture first of all. The British change of course seems thus to correspond to the European change of course.

The British government advocates in general for a reduction in the EU budget, and in so doing, rigorously pursues its course. In Parliament, too, this becomes perceptible when, for example, the British Conservative Member of Parliament Emma McClarkin makes clear that she is:

“for the deletion of the proposed Guarantee Facility from the regulation text, justifying her amendment by stating that ‘it is not clear why a new sector specific instrument is required. The Commission proposal does not provide enough detail as to the exact nature of the financial instrument’. In addition, she submits an amendment reducing the financial envelope for Creative Europe from the EC’s proposal of (EURO) 1.8bn to (EURO) 1.15bn” (Screen International, 12/11/2012).

The Committee for the European Union in the House of Lords, however, has supported both the guarantee fund and a rise in the budget (House of Lords, 27/3/2012). The basis for justification here, however, also consists mainly of economic and profit-oriented factors, such as the large contribution made by the cultural and creative industries to economic performance.

Italy

Italy, too, is constantly under threat of cuts in the area of culture. The situation of cultural property that is to be preserved is particularly precarious – many essential restoration plans (such as, for example, in Pompeii or at the Colosseum in Rome) cannot be realised. Culture Minister Lorenzo Ornaghi in the government of Mario Monti has come in here for particular criticism, since he has dealt with the subject of cultural subsidies in an extremely passive way. After the strict policy of cutbacks under the government of Silvio Berlusconi and rigid cuts in the area of culture, there were great hopes that the Monti government would again provide greater support to the cultural and creative sector. These hopes could not be fulfilled.

Ornaghi adopted a very positive position regarding the programme “Creative Europe”: he welcomed the increase in funding, and the guarantee fund. In May 2012 he guaranteed on the part of the Monti government not to cut national funding for culture, and to maintain it at least at the current level (Agenzia Stampa, 10/5/2012). This promise had a short life – for the year 2013, the minister announced a cut of 50 million euros. Now it is above all up to businesses to provide private financing.

On November 15, 2012, a conference on the subject of “The General Condition of Culture” took place in Rome, with members of the government, Presi-

dent Giorgio Napolitano, and people engaged in the cultural sector participating. The minister for economic development, Corrado Passera, pointed readily to the creative sector, which he said is so important for the economy, but enjoys little support in Italy. Above all, he said, it is a matter of new financing instruments (Il Sole 24 Ore, 15/11/2012).

The audio-visual sector and above all, cinema, constitute in general a top priority for Italian cultural policy. With respect to the EU funding, the Commissioner for Industry and Entrepreneurship, Antonio Tajani, noted that in the audio-visual area, most of the proposals come from Italy, but only a very few of them succeed in obtaining funding. (Agenzia Stampa, 16/4/2012).

4.2 The public discourse

In international media it has been criticised that the expenditures for the cultural sector represent only 0.1 per cent of the EU budget. This is a smaller share than a country such as Estonia expends in one year for culture; Germany spends 9 billion euros a year. But even this small amount is of great importance for European projects (EU-ObsERVER, 25/10/2012). Doris Pack remarked in this regard: “It is ridiculous to make such a mess from such a small programme. I think it should survive” (EU-ObsERVER, 25/10/2012).

Germany

In Germany a number of interest groups are involved in a public debate on the programme proposal. The critical commentary of the German Cultural Council (*Deutscher Kulturrat*) plays an important role, and has been adopted by and distributed through the media:

“With ‘Creative Europe’ the EU Commission is effecting a paradigm shift from the creation of a European cultural area, as proposed in the current EU programme ‘Culture 2007’, to an economic programme. The potential that lies within a European cultural area and in a European identity is thereby wholly undervalued, and at the same time, the economic impact is overestimated. Likewise it is not recognised that Europe cannot be strengthened only through the creation of new jobs, but first and foremost through an actively supported European citizenship and the involvement of a diverse civil society” (kultur blog münchen, 2/2/2012).

Sabine Bornemann from Cultural Contact Point Germany recommends that the separate advice centres for the cultural and media areas be retained:

“Independent programmes within a framework programme that are designed for entirely different target groups and have entirely different financing instruments and an entirely different funding logic, and are subject in varying degrees to the principle of subsidiarity, deserve to have separate contact points, especially when the latter have proved themselves over the course of 15–20 years” (Hearing at the European Parliament, 17/10/2012).

She reports on the concern expressed to her by many cultural operators, who fear there is too great an emphasis on economic aspects of culture in the programme:

“With great concern the cultural sector has taken notice of the new focus of the proposed culture programme, which in the future shall be mainly economically oriented and defined, which would represent a paradigm shift. If competition takes priority, this will be at the expense of the motivation for cooperation and European integration. Above all, here there is a danger that the core area of cultural support, the non-profit area, will come under great pressure” (Hearing in the Bundestag Committee for Culture and Media, 21/3/2012).

The guarantee fund has been widely welcomed. Thus a spokeswoman for the Frankfurt Book Fair points out:

“In the future there will no longer be only outright subsidies, but rather the EU will be liable as a guarantor for loans from private banks to artists. Creative individuals are to be declared credit-worthy” (dapd Nachrichtenagentur, 9/10/2012)

In the national press, however, there has been hardly any debate on this issue.

France

As in Italy, above all support for cinema plays an important role. This topic is accordingly the focus of an article about the programme “Creative Europe”:

“France is worried about the reform projects for the promotion of cinema: the Vice President of the European Commission and European Commissioner for Competition, Joaquin Almunia, will inform the ministers about the state of the discussions on the Commission’s draft communication on state aid for cinematographical works and other audio-visual works. This is being done at the request of France, which, in its concern over the proposals that have been made, arranged for this item to be placed on the agenda. The draft was published on March 14, 2012, and since then it has been the subject of a public consultation” (La Correspondance de la Presse, 25/11/2012, French translated into German by the author).

The Forum D’Avignon is particularly active in the area of creative cultural support. In October 2012, it issued a proposal for new financing models: “*Le Forum D’Avignon appelle à mobiliser les ambitions européennes sur la culture.*”¹¹ Therein it calls for more creativity in terms of financing models in the cultural and creative sector. Culture, it says, creates value and should not merely be seen as being expensive; public and private investment do not rule each other out, but the primary responsibility must remain with the public sector.

¹¹ <http://www.forum-avignon.org/fr/proposition-exclusive-du-forum-davignon-mobiliser-les-ambitions-europeennes-sur-la-culture>

Great Britain

The British public in particular has an extremely critical view of the programme “Creative Europe” and the increase in the budget that is associated with it:

“Eurocrats have sparked fury by demanding £1.5 BILLION to push European art and film. They want to swell their budget for things like translating books and promoting foreign language movies by a whopping 56 per cent. Their cash grab for a sprawling new ‘Creative Europe’ cultural programme comes as several EU economies teeter on the brink of collapse and a staggering 26 MILLION Europeans are out of work. But Brussels bosses insist it will boost jobs and growth” (The Sun, 16/12/2012).

In the United Kingdom it has indeed been noticed that the creative industry in the country contributes the greatest share worldwide to gross national product (The Guardian, 26/3/2012). The greatest concern that is being discussed in the media is whether the United Kingdom, in view of the economic collapses in Europe, should not rather turn its attention toward a market outside the EU, in order to continue to be successful in the area of the creative industries. All the same, the extent to which the British creative sector profits from participation in EU programmes has been pointed out:

“One of the key beneficiaries of European funding from the EU’s media programme, which supports audio-visual businesses, has been the UK’s TV and film industry. With the success of recent dramas such as *Downton Abbey*, the sector has become the market leader in Europe and it generates about £3.3bn each year in revenue from European markets” (The Guardian, 26/3/2012).

Italy

The discourse in the Italian public is shaped by the prominent Member of the European Parliament Silvia Costa, who is the author of the EP’s proposed changes. She is often quoted, and her dedication is appreciated. What is more, the Media Desk and Cultural Contact Point Italy support Silvia Costa’s position. Overall, however, the Cultural Contact Point seldom takes a stance on this topic, let alone gives out comprehensive information. The audio-visual area here is better connected to European networks, and thus the Media Desk Italy supplies most of the information on the programme.

In general, there have been many events focused on the topic of “*Europa creativa*”, and in particular regarding the “cultural and creative industry”, which is the preferred term for the sector there. In May 2012, for example, Silvia Costa organised a conference with representatives from the worlds of academia and culture, on the topic of “Creative Europe: Presentation of the Programme 2014–2020” in Florence. In November 2012, there was an event devoted to the topic of “The Cultural and Creative Industry: Convergences 2014–2020” with Silvia Costa and in cooperation with the Cultural Contact Point and other organisations and projects in Genoa.

Costa’s proposed changes have been vigorously taken up by the Italian media. The desire to maintain the action areas “Culture” and “Media” as separate brands, and to administer separate budgets for them, has in particular been emphasised. The cross-sectoral area and the guarantee fund, on the other hand, are welcomed, but it is said that these parts of the programme need to be described with more precision. Also, it is argued that structural minorities such as women and young people should be taken into greater account (Giornale dello spettacolo, 8/10/2012).

The concept of culture is deeply rooted in Italy, and there is much less fear of the possibility that culture could be economised. Here the focus is much more on the issue of making an adequate connection to technologisation and digitisation. Thus, cinema is also a focus of Italian cultural initiatives. There is a concern that Italy might not adapt to conditions quickly enough. Thus, for example, Luca Dal Pozzolo, Director of the Culture Observatorium Piemonte, comments in a newspaper article:

“Indeed it is true that cultural funding from 2014–2020 will be tailored to projects with a very high degree of complexity, high level of efficiency, local influence, and which have selected their candidates only on the basis of the highest qualifications and future business prospects. In Italy we are not ready for this, since the creative area is already segmented, with businesses that have low levels of capitalization” (Il Giornale delle Fondazioni, 4/1/2013, Italian translated into German by the author).

This fear and the perception of the Italian cultural scene as antiquated and unable to integrate new media and technologies has been expressed in many quarters:

“The impression has arisen that there is an unlimited cultural backwardness, unable to free itself from corners and prejudices, together with an inability to imagine another kind of production, and thereby, to establish a new Italian style” (Agora Vox Italia, 29/3/2011, Italian translated into German by the author).

4.3 The discourse in civil society

People working in the field of culture, interest groups/lobby groups, experts

Between 2008 and 2010, a range of experts were consulted within the framework of the OMC for the preparation of the proposal for the new framework programme. In its communication, the Commission also mentions that the members drew on independent studies in the development of the proposal. In addition, in 2010 the Commission conducted an online consultation regarding the new programme as of 2014.¹²

Several studies and documents that were ordered were central to the development of the proposal. The concept of the cultural and creative industry is based above all on the KEA report for the Commission, titled “The Economy of Culture in Europe” (2006), and the Green Paper “Unlocking the potential of cultural and creative industries” (2010). More recent viewpoints have emerged from a working group of experts on the cultural and creative industry from the Member States (OMC), which has issued a strategy handbook for the European Agenda for Culture (Work Plan for Culture 2011–2014).

In the impact assessment for the programme “Creative Europe” (European Commission 2011c), it is possible to find out who participated in the consultation process, and in which manner. For example, Ecorys UK Limited was awarded a contract as an external consultancy firm to prepare an impact assessment report (“The impact assessment of the future programme on Culture”). The fact that all of the employees of this company are from the United Kingdom does not necessarily contribute to diversity

¹² http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions/consultation-on-the-future-culture-program_de.htm

in the formation of opinions, when one considers that in this country, the cultural and creative sector has the largest share of economic output worldwide, and when one also considers that access to this sector is traditionally very economically oriented (see the chapter Public discourse: Great Britain).

A number of positions of organisations and individuals working in the cultural and creative sector were incorporated into the 2010 Green Paper.¹³ Afterwards, those actors who had been involved asked for the cultural and creative sector to be better linked to the Europe 2020 Strategy, which contains primarily economic objectives. In the current critical commentary, it is precisely the link between the promotion programme and the economically oriented Europe 2020 Strategy that is considered to be problematic.

A public consultation took place from September 15 to December 15, 2010, which with the help of a questionnaire yielded 589 individual responses and 376 responses from organisations and public administrations. In addition, 27 organisations submitted position papers.¹⁴ Hence, the survey boasts a great diversity of viewpoints. In particular European, national and local cultural organisations and interest groups are well represented. The situation with statements from individuals is more problematic. The great majority came from France, followed by Belgium, Germany, Italy, Spain and the United Kingdom. It was not possible to arrive at a balanced geographical distribution here.

Here, also, there was a call for increased coordination with the objectives of the Europe 2020 Strategy, but the advocacy for the safeguarding and promotion of linguistic and cultural diversity

was just as intense. The inclusion of disadvantaged groups was another central concern. Representatives of public agencies pointed out the need above all for support for microenterprises. In hindsight, the effectiveness of this consultation process must be called into question: the programme does indeed hew to the line of the Europe 2020 Strategy, but the Strategy is referred to in only one place in the document. The safeguarding of cultural and linguistic diversity is in fact often cited, but should not be referred to in close connection with the “strengthening of the competitiveness of the cultural and creative sector”. The microenterprises are, to be sure, included within the definition of SMEs, but it is extremely bewildering if, as in Article 5, the only explicit reference is to strengthening small and medium-sized businesses. At this point more attention should be paid to the official definition.

There has been much criticism of the open method of coordination (for example, regarding tendencies toward centralism, the loss of political competition, the loss of subsidiarity, bypassing of the Parliament), but what is particularly critical in this case is the question of the participating actors. Especially in the area of cultural support, it makes a big difference if only well established and stabilised cultural operators are granted a voice, or if a voice is also given to those who are in a precarious initial situation. Mostly it is only those who are either already well established in the networks of the European cultural landscape, or even beneficiaries of the programmes, who are involved. The voices of artists and smaller associations that have few resources and little international or strategic knowledge are rarely incorporated.

When it comes to the participation of civil-society actors, such as the platforms and the European Culture Forum, one should not overlook the fact that this is a case of networks that have been partly financed by the EU Culture Programme, and thus

13 http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-policy-development/cultural-and-creative-industries/green-paper_de.htm

14 http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions-consultation-on-the-future-culture-programme_en.htm

they exist in a reality much different from that of cultural operators that are not as well networked.

In the course of the public hearing on the subject of “Creative Europe” in the European Parliament (April 2012), a number of European filmmakers delivered a declaration of support for an increase in financial resources.¹⁵ Within the MEDIA area the increase in funding is mostly appreciated, and the criticism concerning structural changes is limited. After all, the unification of structures will hardly have a negative impact, but rather a positive one for this area.

Audience Development

Many of the Commission’s current focal points were shaped by the objections and demands of people working in the field of culture, and their representatives. The central importance of the needs of the audience, for example, was emphasised in a public hearing by David Hesmondhalgh (Media Industries Research Centre, University of Leeds) as early as April, 2012. The prominent European Expert Network (EENC), which was established by the Commission in 2010, published a study in 2012 on the aspect of audience development within the programme “Creative Europe”. In this study, 28 case studies in twelve member states were compiled with regard to their contribution to the development of a European audience. In the process, the network emphasises the use of the holistic term “audience development” rather than the narrower term “audience building”, and the Network’s phrasing has in the meantime been adopted into the language the Commission uses. This term was defined by the Arts Council England.

Crisis management and social cohesion

In February 2012, the Danish Culture Minister Uffe Elbæk (Danish Council Presidency 2011/2012) assembled a team of twelve outstanding cultural professionals, who were asked to devote themselves until June, 2012 to the question of what role befits art and culture in times of crisis. In this connection, the minister stated:

“Art and culture have a special ability to foster new ideas and new hope in a time of crisis. We are now embarking on a search for examples of European creativity that are making a difference in society at the moment. What can art, culture and the creative industries do right now? How can we make the most of the innovative power of art and culture to stimulate new ideas in terms of identity, community and economic growth?”

At the “Team Culture 2012” conference, one of the participants (a cultural professional and politician) formulated an interesting sentence:

“You have to help us politicians setting up this new narrative in order to discuss not only economics and money, but also discuss how to solve the cultural crisis.”

Apparently the relevant actors (here indeed an employee of the Commission) are well aware that it is a question of an economic narrative, which, having been adapted to reality, must be accepted in order to preserve funding for culture at all. Other actors are to help provide a basis for a counter-narrative that cherishes the value of culture for areas beyond the economy. The conference’s report speaks here of a “new cultural narrative” (Summary: Team Culture 2012). Here, also, a dichotomous concept of art and culture is used: “Yes, creative industries are important and yes, cultural innovation arises

¹⁵ http://www.europa-distribution.org/files/2012_TRIB-UNE_EUROPEENNE_SUR_L-AVENIR_DU_PROGRAMME_MEDIA_230412.PDF

in the midst of a free creative process absent from economic concerns” (ibid.).

In a press release signed by cultural professionals, the Center for Fine Arts in Brussels proclaimed:

“Let us reaffirm the role of culture as a mediator, making its citizens more aware of their past and future and making it easier for them to grasp the complexity of the present. Our common destiny that will forge this unique project, ‘Europe’, depends on this” (EurAktiv 21/2/2012).

Also, in the campaign “We are more” (www.wearemore.eu), launched by Culture Action Europe and the European Cultural Foundation, the focus is on the integrative and stabilising factor of culture. Thus, in a letter to the heads of government regarding the budget negotiations on November 22 and 23, 2012, it was argued:

“Culture, education and the arts, citizens’ participation, equality and freedom for all, democracy and the rule of law, balanced regional development, environmental protection and social justice are the necessary foundations on which to build a sustainable Europe and to recover from the current crisis. They are investments in our common future and must be protected from financial cuts.”

The campaign also warns of the consequences of postponing the decision on the programme:

“A late adoption of the 2014–2020 Framework Programme, and the subsequent delay in the implementation of its operating schemes, would only create a funding gap in 2014 endangering the subsistence and operating capacity of many cultural organisations and scaling down their potential contribution to Europe’s recovery from the crisis. At a time of growing

mistrust between European institutions, member states and citizens, delays that are not strongly justified would also result in a further blow to the European project” (Culture Action Europe, 8/11/2012).

Individual voices

In the course of this research project a survey was conducted that was addressed to those working in the field of culture, civil-society actors, and scholars (see the appendix for the questionnaire). This survey has showed that views of the programme “Creative Europe” vary considerably, but at the same time, a change of style in the programme is evident to all.

The new vocabulary

The evident change in the style of the programme has been for the most part rejected, but here and there it has also been welcomed:

“This development functions as part of a Europe-wide shifting process in cultural policy, that [...] shall ‘depoliticize’ the state-supported production of art: Away with the remains of cultural production as dissent, as opposition and as the creation of public spheres, bring on the creative industry as a most unadulterated and affirmative function of economy and the machinery of the state; accordingly, there is a movement in the terminology of programmes within cultural policy away from emancipatory and socio-critical elements to issues of social integration and the creative industry. The fog machines of creativity – ‘creative economy’, ‘creative class’, ‘cultural entrepreneurs’, and ‘creative industries’ – were and are in this process essential propaganda tools” (Gerald Raunig, professor, Zurich University of the Arts, Zurich, Switzerland).

“We consider that to be a very dangerous development, because it is naturally absurd to reduce culture to economy or economic effects – which it certainly has, but that is not the only thing. And so, as it stands, one does not see anything else in the whole text. Naturally, it is a matter here of a trend, which we in the German Cultural Council have tracked with suspicion all along” (Andreas Kämpf, State Working Group of the Cultural Initiatives and Socio-Cultural Centres in Baden-Wuerttemberg, Germany).

“I fear that with the terminology an understanding could be established that takes account of an exclusively economically motivated understanding of culture. It would seem better to me to speak of a ‘sector of creative cultural professionals’ instead of a ‘creative economy’” (Mathias Fuchs, artist, musician, media critic and professor, Leuphana University Luneburg, Germany).

“It is understandable that in times of crisis the economic arguments rise to the surface. We all need to think of ways to cut budgets. However, it is impossible to put a price tag on everything, especially when it comes to culture. Think about the economic value of the works of Vincent van Gogh when he was still alive compared to now. Van Gogh died as a poor man” (Marietje Schaake, Member of the European Parliament).

There are also positive opinions concerning the Commission’s changed style:

“My evaluation of the European Commission’s new language in the draft for the promotional programme ‘Creative Europe’ is very positive. The language is appropriate. It intermingles the cultural and creative economy, goes into various levels of analysis, and emphasises not only

economic aspects, but also artistic and competitive aspects. In my view, it represents a great step forward for creative Europe not to be seen too unilaterally” (Friedrich Schneider, professor, Department of Economics, Johannes Kepler University, Linz, Austria).

“I am in complete agreement with the European Commission’s new direction: culture benefits the economy and fosters employment, and inevitably, this fact is associated with an appreciation of the cultural assets and cultural activities in every country. (Luigi Ratclif, GAI – Associazione Circuito Giovani Artisti Italiani, Turin, Italy, Italian translated into German by the author).¹⁶

The dual nature of culture

The insistence on the dual nature of culture is seen either as outmoded or, on the other hand, endorsed as a political necessity:

“In my opinion, it is not a matter of whether the dual nature is meaningful (this is simply a fact), but of how one deals with it. If someone speaks of the dual nature, unfortunately it is mostly the economy that is meant” (Harald Knill, new academic press.org).

“If the two aspects were to be considered apart from each other, however, there would be the risk of a de-politicisation of the concept of culture. *L’art pour l’art* then suggests a never-to-be-found autonomy and neutrality in the face of other societal aspects. The needs of the field of culture should, however, be linked to democratic- and socio-political areas such as educa-

¹⁶ “Concordo pienamente con questo indirizzo dalla Commissione europea: la cultura genera economia e occupazione e ciò avviene inevitabilmente attraverso la valorizzazione dei beni e delle attività culturali di ciascun paese” (Luigi Ratclif).

tion, cultural exchange, and emancipation, and be able to be addressed free of economic constraints” (Therese Kaufmann, European Institute for Progressive Cultural Policies, University of Music and Performing Arts, Vienna, Austria).

That means, then, that the establishment of a new vocabulary not only has an effect on the cultural sector, but that as a result, political consequences emerge, which are associated with a change in ideology:

“This dichotomy corresponds to the reigning paradigms in the area of neoliberal cultural policy, which unduly cut short the debates in this area. The entire complex of questions concerning the social relevance of art beyond its economic significance is thereby excluded. [...] What is missing in particular in this bipolar observation is the democratic-political relevance of art and culture – for example, the possibility of widening horizons, and of empowerment through art and culture, but also, for instance, the potentially excluding and/or devaluing function of the invocation of cultural values/cultural heritage, etc.” (Monika Mokre, Austrian Academy of Sciences, Institute of Culture Studies and Theatre History, Vienna, Austria).

However, the distinction can absolutely be politically useful:

“The emphasis on the dual nature is politically unavoidable. In an early stage of the adoption procedure for ‘Creative Europe’, there was also a debate on massive cuts. The fact that these proposals have to date not been realised is because Androulla Vassiliou has from time to time taken up a position against them, and it can surely also be attributed to the economic framing of the concept of culture” (Christian

Potschka, Centre for Digital Cultures, Leuphana University Luneburg, Germany).

Here, there are scattered respondents who do not at all find such a dichotomy explicitly expressed in the new drafts:

“Art and economy today are no longer seen in opposition to each other, as in the times of the critical analysis of the cultural industry by Adorno and Horkheimer, and that is good, because art and culture are the ‘transformative power’ of the creative economy; the potential and the significance of art, culture and creative economy is finally being recognised” (Veronika Ratzenböck, director of Austrian Cultural Documentation, International Archive for Cultural Analyses Vienna, Austria).

The relationship of culture to economy

The need for the continuation of European support for culture is generally justified by the strong economic performance of the cultural and creative industry. It is precisely this point that is very critically regarded by civil-society actors:

“At the same time that the creative economy is celebrated as a rising economic profit zone, a grotesque expansion of the area of the creative industries emerges on the drawing boards of the creative consultants, so that now this area includes viticulture, as well as software, organisational consulting, and also carpentry. With the help of empirical studies and ‘creative economy reports’, agencies and state administrations construct an economic zone that in the largest European countries is praised to the skies as the second- or third-largest ‘industry’” (Gerald Raunig).

Some are less bothered by the economic vocabulary, and are much more concerned that in the Commission there are few concrete ideas of the necessary framework conditions for the relationship between culture and economy:

“On the one hand, new business models that are particularly important for distribution are repeatedly invoked, but on the other hand, no framework conditions for the emergence of such models are being created (cue: amendment of copyright law). Otherwise, I don’t find the economic terms very threatening – the autonomy of the art world is a chimera. I find that a peculiar dichotomy is being established here, which never really existed like that, in order to defend a bourgeois concept of culture. [...] Art, culture, and especially the cultural and creative economy are phenomena that exist within a context, but here they are being considered in isolation” (Elisabeth Mayerhofer, IG Kultur Österreich, Vienna, Austria).

Creativity

The unremitting emphasis on creativity in connection with the support programme is criticised in many quarters. It is here a matter of an odd historical coincidence, because the term “cultural industries” first caught on in the 1990s, and was imported from the United Kingdom. There the term was used first and foremost in order to create a distance from the concept of culture that was too “Europe”-oriented:

“The creativity concept of cognitive capitalism relates not only to economic processes, design, etc., but also fits in well with the neoliberal idea of always needing to reinvent oneself under conditions of job insecurity, and not trusting any more in social security, etc.” (Therese Kaufmann).

There are also ideas as to how one could conceptualise an alternative concept of creativity. It would

“speak for equal educational opportunities, for working conditions that promote creative thinking and action, for a material security that makes creativity possible – thus, taken as a whole, for a number of policy interventions in the sense of a just society” (Monika Mokre).

“I would anyway avoid speaking all too often of ‘creativity’. Rather of innovative cultural production, of cultural transformation processes or of socially relevant cultural work” (Mathias Fuchs).

Content-related criticisms

Some also criticise the priorities of the programme: thus, they say, the heavy emphasis on cultural heritage comes at the expense of contemporary art:

“Contemporary art and culture must be valued more highly, alongside cultural heritage; likewise the transversal area, small festivals, and cultural initiatives will have few if any opportunities!” (Veronika Ratzenböck)

Particularly the abolishment of the operating grants is causing an uproar across the board:

“The network financing is totally absurd. In the ‘Creative Europe’ text it says there will be no more funding for networks, there will only be project grants, because this is more continuous – that is pure cynicism! We all know what project grants mean” (Andreas Kämpf).

The guarantee fund is being welcomed in general

“The loan guarantee system is an important tool to help change the focus of the entire cultural sector from a dependence on subsidies to a more entrepreneurial mentality. Beyond that the guarantee system has a multiplier effect on the amount of EU money that can be spent on culture, because the money serves only as a guarantee in case certain loans are not repaid. This way the same amount of money can be used to guarantee funding for many more cultural projects than when the money would be spent on direct grants” (Marietje Schaake).

Monitoring and evaluation

Quality control is also seen partly as problematic by civil-society actors and people working in the field of culture:

“Here it is a matter of the basic question: What shall be supported, for which audience, and why? Taking these questions as a guide, indicators could be developed that would in turn play a role in funding practice. Thus far, the aspect focuses too much on quantitative criteria (How many people will be reached?); thus ‘Creative Europe’ is a logical continuation of the existing logic of support” (Elisabeth Mayerhofer).

“Especially today it is important not to think in quantitative dimensions, but rather to look out for the quality of the proposals and the impact at the local level or within a larger radius of impact” (Luigi Ratclif, Italian translated into German by the author).¹⁷

Others in turn are of the opinion that the complex monitoring and the evaluation are an indication of a “basic distrust”:

“I have always said, with all of the applications and the many proof-of-use documents afterward, that expresses a basic distrust. That the same thing is asked again and again – this attempts to create security through quantification, but you will never have that in the area of culture. A large part of that which is achieved by cultural work is simply not quantifiable. And so I can indeed say, there were 120 people yesterday at our theatre presentation, but whether or not they emerged smarter than when they went in, that’s something I can’t quantify. [...] This inclination toward quantification is not something that has to do just with the EU, but also with certain trends: to quantify everything, to measure, and that is certainly something that should be called into question. Culture is not measurable” (Andreas Kämpf).

But qualitative evaluation criteria could also lead to problems:

“While we can underline the importance of the intrinsic value of culture or creativity, it becomes more difficult if we would use artistic quality as a benchmark for evaluation. Who would decide and uphold these qualitative standards? Particularly when it comes to cultural and artistic expressions, the difference between poor and high quality is subjective and often disputed. The EU should not act as an art critic, politics should not decide on the content of art. However, we can create the conditions for a flourishing European cultural and creative sector, both artistically and economically” (Marietje Schaake).

¹⁷ “Oggi in particolar modo è importante ragionare non per dimensioni ma per qualità delle proposte e delle ricadute che queste hanno sia localmente sia su un più ampio raggio di azione” (Luigi Ratclif).

Suggestions and criticism concerning administration

“In any case, the following applies: more transparency and simplification of the funding structures, a reduction in administrative complexity so that small players have the same opportunities as big companies, improvement of the operational structures and modalities, etc.” (Veronika Ratzenböck).

“In general, thought should be given to the allocation structure, since on account of the size of the European Union, it is not possible to create relationships of trust with people working in the field of culture. A greater proximity to the applicants would be desirable” (Andreas Kämpf).

The consolidation of the MEDIA and culture areas is met in general with skepticism:

“The MEDIA area is certainly better suited to being economically framed, and has been understood accordingly for a much longer time now than the culture area. The consolidation thus leads inevitably to an economisation of the area of culture. Whereas convergences within the area of media and communication – among radio, telecommunication and the internet – inevitably call for convergent forms of regulation, I cannot detect any development of this sort between media and culture that would make the consolidation of the two areas unavoidable” (Christian Potschka).

Concerning the Commission’s rhetoric

“I was at the Commission’s informational event on the ‘Creative Europe’ Programme in January. There I very clearly communicated the position of the Cultural Council, and the Commission’s position then was: everything that’s on paper is not so important, we’ll do something different later on anyway, and everything will be fantastic. In the end, what is decisive is what the implementing provisions and the concrete organisation look like when they are implemented. [...] The former director for culture and media at the Directorate General for Education and Culture at the European Commission, Vladimir Sucha, said plainly and simply at this event that they had only written this text of ‘Creative Europe’ because Barroso had threatened that if they did not subsume culture under economy, there would not be any more cultural support at all. That is also a way to make cultural policy” (Andreas Kämpf).

5.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

Simplified administration, yes – monopolisation, no

The simplification of the administrative and financing process is certainly a positive aspect of the proposed programme, but it brings with it the risk of an asymmetric competition. It is precisely the Culture part of the programme that is much too vaguely formulated, and if profit-oriented projects are supported under this rubric, then there is a risk that they will dominate, since they are better positioned in competition with other public or non-profit-oriented cultural activities. Here it would be useful to incorporate a number of the changes proposed by the European Parliament (Culture Committee under the leadership of Doris Pack). Above all the consolidation of the Cultural Contact Points and the Media Desks could lead to the smaller area of cultural promotion suffering under the weight of the dominant media area.

The dual “nature” of the concept of culture

In December, 2006, the European Commission became a signatory to the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions. Therein the intrinsic value of culture apart from commercial benefit has been stipulated, with equal standing alongside culture as a good. This is of central significance for the legitimisation of cultural promotion. With the current reading of the new programme, the Commission shifts this dual nature of cultural production over to the profit-oriented side. Objections concerning a loss in the importance of culture without commercial benefit and the increased support instead for economically more productive projects, above all audio-visual art and culture, could be eliminated by the establishment of two different financing instruments, as proposed by Sievers and Wingert (2012), among others: a funding area for cultural and creative economic activities with the easing of access to loans and credit, and a funding area for non-commercial cultural exchange. The voices of experience in the cultural and creative sector themselves,

however, argue against this, because they see such a separation as artificial and not sustainable (see the questionnaire). The question is whether the retention of this logic is politically necessary, or if, in the best case, a new innovative concept of culture can be developed.

Additional concrete quality criteria

Evaluation and monitoring shall also and above all be assessed according to qualitative criteria, not only quantitative ones. These qualitative aspects must be developed in cooperation with the relevant scene (for example, see Elisabeth Mayerhofer).

Breaking through the project-oriented logic

The replacement of the operating grants with strictly project-oriented funding is highly questionable. Even if this project funding is supposed to run for several years, a whispered assurance by the Commission that nothing is going to change with respect to the current allocation procedures simply cannot suffice. Above all, process-oriented initiatives (for example, Eurozine as a distribution platform for European cultural magazines) would lose out under project-output criteria.

Involvement of civil society

The involvement of civil-society actors should also be reflected in the documents, as promised. Aside from that, in cooperation with cultural operators, a debate should be held on a modern concept of creativity and culture, adapted to reality, in order to counteract the fears that arise because of the vagueness of the programme proposal.

More specificity on the guarantee fund

The Programme Guide must get much more specific concerning the guarantee fund. In order to encourage a willingness among banks to invest in the cultural and creative sector, a comprehensive information policy and more research studies are needed. The independence of the logic of subsidies from the logic of investment should also be more explicitly highlighted, so that not only competitive and profit-oriented projects get funding.

Mixed financing

A possible relationship linking public moneys, capital-market investments, and private donors (for example, crowd-funding) should be discussed, in order to do justice to the reality of those working in the cultural area.

6.

COUNTERACTING AN OVERALL TREND...

The thesis can be proposed that the new funding programme parallels the establishment of a new European ideology: through austerity policy, analyses of requirements (in the cultural area as well), statistics and centralism (a reduction in the number of national advisory agencies, unification of management) the political system and cultural promotion are to be made more efficient. The European Union does not, thereby, emerge as a potential partner in a critical perspective and analysis of the financial crisis, and of processes that are bringing about a loss of democracy.

In general, support for the cultural economy should not be seen in a negative light, but rather must be welcomed especially within the framework of European cultural promotion, for example, in the promotion of film. However, cultural policy takes a very one-sided view if every cultural activity by civil-society organisations, and likewise, by publicly financed institutions, is interpreted in the context of a value economy. This discursive articulation of culture and cultural promotion corresponds indeed to the economic logic that transcends ever deeper into all areas of society, but thereby does away with the idea of culture as a non-commercial intrinsic value. With this logic that is oriented strictly towards profit and added value, creative potential will in particular not be promoted, but will lose innovative force.

It is clear that the reformulations through the new support programme have to do with an accommodation to an overall economic discourse. Although this new style is in part distasteful to those responsible for it, it must be adopted so that the support budget is not called into question. The value of culture must be calculated in economic categories, or else its function will be challenged. The central question is now, however, as follows: If this new form of discursive articulation of culture is criticised from within national-political, civil-society

and cultural-professional quarters, then who will receive a favour, or be accommodated? It looks as if a discourse is being established here that extends economic vocabulary to all areas of society without any political deliberation having taken place. This discourse brings forth a counter-discourse, which presents art and culture in a simplifying manner, and suggests that there is a kind of purified concept of culture that is autonomous and an end in itself. This can be interpreted as a reflex. Thereby, however, a dichotomy is established that is not beneficial to any party. A glance must be cast precisely at the interfaces, at synergy effects, at transversal processes. Here is where the real bargaining between actors takes place, and policy should take this into account.

In the area of film, as well, not only projects that are supported by a vast market reach, worldwide marketing approach and a maximal, systemically relevant impact should be supported. Here one can by all means ask along with the philosopher Jacques Rancière if the technologisation or material changes in the media have any influence at all on the content of art and culture. In policy, this is generally presumed, under bywords such as “globalisation”, “digitisation”, or “technologisation”.

Following France’s expression of doubts concerning the unification of the audio-visual sector within the framework of the free-trade talks, Commissioner Vassiliou recently asserted:

“Culture is not a ‘product’ like any other: culture has an intrinsic value in itself and, in many cases, it also has an economic value. (...) We understand this and will take account of this specific dual nature” (Screendaily, 22/3/2013).

The concentration of EU cultural policy on quantitative aspects of the cultural sector has become evident through numbers presented time and again, which shall serve to legitimise support policy:

creative-sector employment rates, the growth in European film productions and the marketing of them. However, especially a cultural and political community such as the European Union should not conduct a purely market-oriented cultural economy, but rather support precisely those areas that are qualitatively of cultural importance, and have little funding available to them. The emphasis on “audience development” also indicates that the priority in the willingness to provide support is a carefully targeted plan that is oriented above all to sales and consumption. Cultural added value and output shall be/become predictable.

Moreover, the focus on so-called “audience development” presents a peculiar understanding of cultural reception and participation. Rancière (2010) calls this concept “the pedagogical model of the efficacy of art”. He advises especially that the distance between the art object and the viewer/listener, which is so essential to the impact of art, be maintained, and the assumed passivity be left untouched, since even the pure act of seeing represents an action. Are not then the viewers/listeners disempowered by the assumption of their plasticity on the part of policy, instead of being “engendered” and “empowered”, as is always asserted?

It is not only a purely economic or purely “cultural” understanding of culture that is problematic, but also a purely regulatory understanding of policy. And so Androulla Vassiliou did indeed stress at the first international cultural summit meeting in Edinburgh (August 2012):

“Many of us would agree that markets alone cannot deliver everything that a civilised society demands in the field of culture and the arts”,

but she also says that policy serves to regulate cultural quality:

“But when we come to culture, the question is whether we truly desire endless choice above all else, especially when we appear to lose quality in the process” (States News Service, 13/8/2012).

European cultural support, then, becomes not a factor enabling cultural diversity, but rather an instrument of regulation and selection for cultural streamlining. EU policy decides which art and which culture is worthwhile.

Unfortunately, the Commission’s assurance that in practice things will at most get somewhat better, but otherwise will not change much, cannot be of help. Because once something has become entrenched in the language, it has long since become reality. The echo of the statement “it really isn’t meant like that” dies down very quickly in the heads of those conducting negotiations. For in the symbolic-linguistic and institutional system, this interpretation has no place. Silvia Costa, with her insistence on particular linguistic formulations, which some would discount as persnickiness, is entirely right. Language constitutes our reality. As a consequence, exactitude is indicated, especially in an area where various actors with different cultural backgrounds come together and must interpret these texts. The deficiency in the translation into German of the terms “creative sector” (“*Kreativbranche*”) or “-economy” (“*-wirtschaft*”) is thus a grievous one that must be addressed. The German federal government has also asserted that it would advocate for the use of the term “cultural and creative sector” (“*Kultur- und Kreativsektor*”):

“In order to avoid misunderstandings, the federal government takes the stand that in the German translation – just as in the English original version – the reference should be to ‘the cultural and creative sector’ rather than to the ‘cultural and creative industry’” (Deutscher Bundestag, Drucksache 17/9282, 2012).

The concept of creativity must likewise be rethought. Creativity is not only a characteristic referring to innovative thought and action on the part of individual persons, but also, something that is socially embedded and dependent on local conditions. It is dependent on creative networks, all the way through to “creative publics”. Cultural support must also adapt to this fact:

“Regulations, policies and measures which support artistic creativity can be considered ‘successful’ when they guarantee that new and innovative ideas or visions are generated and that they are managed and distributed, not only effectively but also in an innovative manner. In other words, when developing ‘creativity policies’ there is a need to balance on the one hand basic support for the production of new ideas and visions and, on the other, the channels of distribution for these visions and ideas to be put into the public sphere and be recognised” (Creative Europe Report 2002).

Ars gratia artis is certainly a chimera and even in the past, was never a reality. Especially in a globally networked communication society, in which all areas of life are wholly permeated by optimisation, acceleration and contingent participation, the simplifying dichotomy between *l’art pour l’art* and art as a good can certainly be challenged, as Walter Benjamin has already done. He refers to the

“[...] doctrine of *l’art pour l’art*, which is a theology of art. From this, furthermore, a negative theology in the form of the idea of a ‘pure’ art has emerged outright, which rejects not only any social function but also any regulation, by means of an objective reproach” (Benjamin 1996:17).

However, in order to be able to take a political stand, and creating breathing space for art and culture outside of economic relationships, it can be helpful to once again place on the table the opposite of a competition- and profit-oriented cultural production. The independence of art and culture and their central contribution to the common weal must also for this reason be made explicit in the support programme. When it is quietly pointed out that the new economic style on the part of the Commission must be accepted in order to avoid cuts in the budget for culture, then an accommodation like this will not help. Once this has been put into writing, even generations to come will orient themselves according to this interpretation and these objectives. A different concept of culture will thus pass into oblivion. The cultural production scene, however, presents enough potential on which to base innovative cultural concepts, and could, if it is integrated appropriately, make a contribution to a new EU cultural policy.

REFERENCES

- AbI. C 83 (30/3/2010): Konsolidierte Fassung des Vertrags über die Europäische Union und des Vertrags über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union, Amtsblatt der Europäischen Union C 83.
- Agenzia Stampa (16/4/2012): Cinema: Tajani, è motore economia, Italia faccia die più.
- Agenzia Stampa (10/5/2012): Cultura: UE, sfide comuni tra ornaghi e eurodeputati italiani.
- Agora Vox Italia (29/3/2011): Una politica culturale per rilanciare l'Italia.
- Benjamin, Walter (1996): Das Kunstwerk im Zeitalter der technischen Reproduzierbarkeit, Frankfurt a. M.
- Bisky, Lothar, MEP Prof. Dr. (2012): Vom Sender zum Empfänger – zum neuem EU-Förderprogramm ‚Kreatives Europa – 2013–2020‘. Marktkonzentration in der Kultur?, Ausschuss für Kultur und Bildung zum Programm ‚Kreatives Europa‘. In: Politik & Kultur, Ausgabe 4/12, p. 13.
- Bornemann, Sabine (17/10/2012): Anhörung der SPD Fraktion im Europäischen Parlament, http://www.ccp-deutschland.de/fileadmin/user_upload/1_Foerderprogramme_der_EU/1_KULTUR_Programm/EP-Kontaktstellen_Okt-2012.pdf (accessed on 13/3/2013)
- Bornemann, Sabine (21/3/2012): Ausschuss für Kultur und Medien des Deutschen Bundestags: Anhörung von Experten – zum Programmwurf ‚Kreatives Europa‘, http://www.ccp-deutschland.de/fileadmin/user_upload/1_Foerderprogramme_der_EU/1_KULTUR_Programm/Statement_CCP_fuer_Website.pdf (accessed on 13/3/2013)
- Bruell, Cornelia (2012a): Interview mit Andreas Kämpf über „Kreatives Europa“. In: kulturrisse, Heft 4/2012, p. 4-6.
- Bruell, Cornelia (2012b): EU-Kulturpolitik reloaded, Kommentar zum Programm „Kreatives Europa“. In: kulturrisse, Heft 4/2012, p. 7.
- Council Meeting Education, Youth, Culture and Sport (26-27/11/2012): Council Conclusions on Cultural Governance, Brussels.
- Creative Europe Report. On Governance and Management of Artistic Creativity in Europe (2002): An ERI-Carts Report to the NEF, prepared by: Danielle Cliche, Ritva Mitchell, Andreas Wiesand in co-operation with Ilka Heiskanen (FinnEkvit) and Luca Dal Pozzolo (Fondazione Fitzcarraldo), <http://www.creativeeurope.info> (accessed on 15/11/2012).
- Culture Action Europe (8/11/2012): Culture Action Europe values Ms Silvia Costa's report on Creative Europe and calls on the EU institutions to support the proposed budget increase and to reach a first-reading agreement.
- dapd Nachrichtenagentur (9/10/2012): EU-Kulturkommissarin für breitere Förderung von Kreativen.
- Daily Variety (International) (21/3/2011): Euro subsidy shift; Programs may merge but coin not cut.
- Deutscher Bundestag (2012): Beschlussempfehlung und Bericht des Ausschusses für Kultur und Medien zu dem Vorschlag für eine Verordnung des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates zur Einrichtung des Programms Kreatives Europa, Drucksache 17/11107, 19/10/2012.
- Deutscher Bundestag (2012): Antwort der Bundesregierung auf die Kleine Anfrage der Abgeordneten Ulla Schmidt (Aachen), Martin Dörmann, Siegmund Ehrmann, weiterer Abgeordneter und der Fraktion der SPD, Drucksache 17/9282.
- Deutscher Bundesrat (2011): Drucksache 766/1/11, Empfehlungen der Ausschüsse zum Vorschlag für eine Verordnung des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates zur Einrichtung des Programms Kreatives Europa, 30/1/2012.

Ecorys (2010): Interim Evaluation of the Culture Programme 2007–2010, on behalf of the European Commission DG Education and Culture, final report.

EU-Observer (25/10/2012): EU culture budget: small and likely to get smaller.

EurAktiv (21/2/2012): The urgent need for dialogue between culture and European politics, Centre for Fine Arts Brussels, <http://www.euraktiv.com/culture/urgent-need-dialogue-culture-eur-analysis-510931> (accessed on 15/11/2012).

European Commission (2007): Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: on a European agenda for culture in a globalizing world, Brussels, 10/5/2007, COM(2007) 242 final.

European Commission (2011a): Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on establishing the Creative Europe Programme, Brussels, 23/11/2011, COM(2011) 785 final.

European Commission (2011b): Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: Creative Europe - A new framework programme for the cultural and creative sectors (2014–2020), Brussels, 23/11/2011, COM(2011) 786 final.

European Commission (2011c): Commission Staff Working Paper. Impact Assessment accompanying the document „Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a Creative Europe Framework Programme“, Brussels, 23/11/2011, SEC 1400 final.

European Commission (2012): Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: Promoting cultural and creative sectors for growth and jobs in the EU, Brussels, 26/9/2012, COM(2012) 537 final.

European Parliament (17/9/2012): DRAFT REPORT on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on establishing the Creative Europe Programme, (COM(2011)0785 – C7-0435/2011 – 2011/0370(COD)), Committee on Culture and Education, Rapporteur: Silvia Costa, Brüssel.

Europäisches Parlament (14/1/2013): Bericht (in erster Lesung) über den Vorschlag für eine Verordnung des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates zur Einrichtung des Programms Kreatives Europa, Plenarsitzungsdokument, A7-0011/2013, Brüssel.

Forum D'Avignon (10/2/2012): Le Forum D'Avignon appelle à mobiliser les ambitions européennes sur la culture.

Giornale dello Spettacolo (8/10/2012): Europa Creativa: le proposte della relatrice Silvia Costa.

Hesmondhalgh, David (26/4/2012): Presentation at the Public hearing on Defining the Future EU Culture and Media Programmes, European Parliament, Brussels, <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/document/activities/cont/201205/20120507ATT44555/20120507ATT44555EN.pdf> (accessed on 15/11/2012)

House of Lords, Letter from Lord Roper, Chairman to the House of Lords EU Select Committee (27/3/2012), <http://www.parliament.uk/documents/lords-committees/eu-sub-com-g/17575and17186270312.pdf> (accessed on 15/11/2012)

Il Giornale delle Fondazioni (4/1/2013): Europa Creativa 2014–2020: le sfide delle industrie culturali e creative per gli operatori culturali.

Il Sole 24 Ore (15/11/2012): Passera: usare die più il fisco per dare risorse alla cultura.

IMO – Institut für Auslandsbeziehungen (2012): Der Aktionsbereich Kultur des Programms 'Kreatives Europa 2014–2020', Themenpapier im Auftrag des Ausschusses für Kultur und Bildung des Europäischen Parlaments.

Kämpf, Andreas (2012): Und alle Fragen offen.

Die Europäische Kommission stellt ein neues Kulturförderprogramm vor, In: Politik und Kultur (März–April 2012) 2, p. 9.

KEA European Affairs (2006): The Economy of Culture in Europe, Studie im Auftrag der Europäischen Kommission, http://ec.europa.eu/culture/key-documents/doc873_en.htm (accessed on 8/1/2013).

KEA European Affairs (2012): Der Aktionsbereich Media des Programms 'Kreatives Europa 2014–2020', Themenpapier im Auftrag des Ausschusses für Kultur und Bildung des Europäischen Parlaments.

kultur blog münchen (2/2/2012): Deutscher Kulturrat kritisiert EU Rahmenprogramm „Kreatives Europa“.

La Correspondance de la Presse (25/11/2012): Les ministres européens de la Culture et de l'Audiovisuel débattent de la sécurité des enfants sur internet.

Onpulson Wirtschaftslexikon, www.onpulson.de

Rancière, Jacques (2010): Der emanzipierte Zuschauer, herausgegeben von Peter Engelmann; aus dem Französischen von Richard Steurer, Wien.

Screendaily (22/3/2013): EU's Vassiliou seeks to allay French free trade talk fears.

Screendaily (26/2/2013): EU pledges \$5.6m to digital distribution, by Martin Blaney.

Screen International (12/11/2012): Creative Europe faces 470+ amendments.

Screen International (5/10/2012): Leading European players contribute to 'critical assessment' of EC's Creative Europe MEDIA strand.

Screen International (2/10/2012): European Parliament drafts 197 amendments to EC's Creative Europe programme.

Sievers, Norbert/Wingert, Christine (2012): Von der Kulturverträglichkeit zur Wirtschaftsverträglichkeit? Wohin geht die EU-Kulturpolitik?, Kulturpolitische Mitteilungen, Nr. 136, I/2012, p. 35-39.

Stadtkultur Hamburg (23/4/2012): Medienwirtschaft statt Kultur: Kritik an geplante EU-Förderprogramm „Kreatives Europa“.

States News Service, Androulla Vassiliou, Member of the European Commission responsible for education, culture, multilingualism and youth (13/8/2012): Culture's Role in the European Union's External Relations, First international culture summit, Edinburgh.

Summary (6/6/2012): Team Culture 2012, Konferenz der dänischen Kulturministerin Uffe Elbæk im Zuge der Dänischen Ratspräsidentschaft in Brüssel, http://kum.dk/Documents/Temaer/Team%20Culture%202012/Team%20Culture_summary%20final.pdf (accessed on 16/11/2012)

The Sun (England) (16/12/2012): EU in £1.5bn arts demand.

Appendix

Excerpts from the proposed changes that were approved by the Parliament in a report on the first reading (14/1/2013): (in the left column text that was deleted by the EP is in bold italics; in the right column, text that was inserted by the EP is in bold italics).

<p>Proposal for a regulation Recital 1 Text proposed by the Commission (1) The Treaty aims at an ever closer union among the people of Europe and confers on the Union the task, inter alia, of contributing to the flowering of cultures of Member States, while respecting their national and regional diversity <i>and at the same time ensuring that the conditions necessary for the competitiveness of the Union's industry exist.</i> In this respect, the Union, where necessary supports and supplements Member States' actions to respect cultural and linguistic diversity, <i>strengthen the competitiveness of the European cultural and creative sectors and facilitate adaptation to industrial changes, in particular through vocational training.</i></p>	<p>Amendment (1) The Treaty aims at an ever closer union among the people of Europe and confers on the Union the task, inter alia, of contributing to the flowering of cultures of Member States, while respecting their national and regional diversity. In this respect, the Union, where necessary supports and supplements Member States' actions to respect cultural and linguistic diversity <i>in accordance with Article 167 of the Treaty and the 2005 UNESCO Convention on the Protection and the Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, and to safeguard and enhance Europe's tangible and intangible cultural heritage. It should also foster culture as an element of freedom of expression, inclusion, social cohesion, intercultural dialogue and attention to minorities.</i></p>
	<p>Amendment 3 Proposal for a Regulation Recital 1 a (new) Amendment <i>(1a) The Treaty requires the Union and the Member States to ensure that the conditions necessary for the competitiveness of the Union's industry, including equality between men and women in the labour market, exist. In this respect, the Union, where necessary, supports and supplements Member States' actions to strengthen the competitiveness of its cultural and creative sectors, especially the audio-visual sector, as well as actions to facilitate adaptation to ongoing changes, such as digitisation, in particular through vocational training.</i></p>

<p>Amendment 8 Proposal for a Regulation Recital 5 Text proposed by the Commission (5) The UNESCO Convention on the Protection and the Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions which entered into force on 18 March 2007, and to which the Union is a party, aims at strengthening international cooperation, including international co-production and co-distribution agreements, and solidarity so as to favour the cultural expression of all countries.</p>	<p>Amendment (5) The UNESCO Convention on the Protection and the Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions which entered into force on 18 March 2007, and which <i>is part of the acquis communautaire, underlines that cultural activities, goods and services have both an economic and a cultural nature, because they convey identities, values and meanings, and must not, therefore, be treated as solely having commercial value. That Convention</i> aims at strengthening international cooperation, including international co-production and co-distribution agreements, and solidarity so as to favour the cultural expression of all countries <i>and individuals. In that regard, the Convention also states that due attention should be paid to the special circumstances and needs of various social groups, including persons belonging to minorities.</i></p>
---	---

Interviewees

Prof Dr Mathias Fuchs,

Leuphana University Luneburg, Germany.
Artist, musician, media critic.

Dr Elisabeth Großegger,

Austrian Academy of Sciences, Institute of Culture
Studies and Theatre History, Vienna, Austria.

Andreas Kämpf,

State Working Group of the Cultural Initiatives
and Socio-Cultural Centres in Baden-Wuerttem-
berg, Germany

(The interview with Andreas Kämpf was
published in: kulturrisse, Heft 4/2012, p.4).

Therese Kaufmann,

European Institute for Progressive Cultural
Policies, University of Music and Performing Arts,
Vienna, Austria.

Dr Harald Knill,

new academic press og.

Elisabeth Mayerhofer,

IG Kultur Österreich, Vienna, Austria.

Dr Monika Mokre,

Austrian Academy of Sciences, Institute of Culture
Studies and Theatre History, Vienna, Austria.

Dr Christian Potschka,

Centre for Digital Cultures, Leuphana University
Luneburg, Germany.

Luigi Ratclif,

GAi – Associazione Circuito Giovani Artisti
Italiani, Turin, Italy.

Veronika Ratzenböck,

Director of Austrian Cultural Documentation.
International Archive for Cultural Analyses,
Vienna, Austria.

Prof Dr Gerald Raunig,

Zurich University of the Arts, Zurich, Switzerland.

Marietje Schaake,

Member of the European Paliament for D66 and
the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe.

Prof Dr Friedrich Schneider,

Department of Economics, Johannes Kepler Uni-
versity Linz, Austria.

Fragebogen auf Deutsch

Fragebogen zur Erstellung eines Dossiers über das neue Förderprogramm der Europäischen Kommission „Kreatives Europa (2014–2020)“.

Forschungsprojekt am ifa (Institut für Auslandsbeziehungen), Stuttgart, Deutschland
Email: bruell@ifa.de, www.ifa.de

Bitte beantworten Sie die Fragen in der Ihnen als adäquat erscheinenden Länge:

Name:

Institution:

1.

Wie bewerten Sie die neue Sprache der Europäischen Kommission im Entwurf zum Förderprogramm „Kreatives Europa“, mit der Verwendung von Termini wie Kultur- und Kreativwirtschaft, Kulturindustrie, Kulturökonomie und die damit einhergehende Betonung von wirtschaftlichem Wachstum und Wettbewerb in Bezug auf Kultur?

2.

Was halten Sie von dem betonten Doppelcharakter von Kultur: als Wirtschaftsfaktor und im Sinne von *l'art pour l'art*? Ist diese Dichotomie sinnvoll oder sollten neue alternative Denkmodelle zur Definition von Kultur und Kunst entworfen werden?

3.

Kann Kreativität, wie manchmal in den Dokumenten zur EU-Kulturpolitik gelesen, als eine vom Menschen losgelöste objektive Konstante oder Ware verstanden werden? In welchen Kontext würden Sie „Kreativität“ einbetten?

4.

Sollten Kleinstunternehmen und Einpersonenernehmen bei der Mittelvergabe gleich berücksichtigt werden wie kleine und mittlere Betriebe?

5.

Sollten beim Monitoring und der Evaluierung der Programme statt ausschließlich quantitativer Erfolge auch qualitative Aspekte eine Rolle spielen?

6.

Was halten Sie von der geplanten Zusammenlegung der Media Desks und Cultural Contact Points?

Questionnaire – English version

Questionnaire for a dossier on the new funding programme of the European Commission “Creative Europe (2014–2020)”.

Research project carried out by Dr Cornelia Bruell, ifa (Institute for Foreign Cultural Relations), Stuttgart, Germany
email: bruell@ifa.de
www.ifa.de

Please feel free to elaborate on the following questions as extensively as you wish:

Name:

Institution:

1.
What do you think about the new language used by the European Commission to frame EU cultural policy, e. g. terms like “culture industry” and “cultural economy” and the emphasis on economic growth and competitiveness?
2.
Do you think the emphasis on the dual character of culture, as economically productive and as *l’art pour l’art*, is useful or should alternative notions of culture be invented, adequate to recent developments?
3.
How would you conceptualise the notion of “creativity”? Do you think it is possible to frame it more or less exclusively, as the European Commission does, in terms of objectivity or goods?
4.
Should micro sized enterprises considered for funding in the same way as small and medium sized enterprises?
5.
Do you think it is enough to consider mere quantitative aspects in the monitoring and evaluation system of the programme or should also qualitative parameters be included?
6.
What do you think about the intended merging of cultural contact points and media desks?
7.
Further comments you like to make on the “Creative Europe” Programme:

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Dr Cornelia Bruell is a political scientist whose dissertation was on the topic of “European Identity”. She was a research associate on the EU project “Euro-sphere”, on the subject of a European public and diversity (2008/2009), as well as a research fellow at the Institute for European Integration Research at the Austrian Academy of Sciences in Austria (2005–2007).

Cornelia Bruell is an instructor in political theory at Comenius University in Bratislava and in cultural theory at the University of Music and Performing Arts in Vienna. In addition, she is a staff writer for the magazine *kulturrisse*.



Institut für
Auslandsbeziehungen e. V.

Charlottenplatz 17	P.O. Box 10 24 63
70173 Stuttgart	70020 Stuttgart
Germany	Germany
Tel. +49/711 2225-0	Fax +49/711 2 26 43 46
www.ifa.de	info@ifa.de