

CultureWatchEurope **2011 Think Tank**

**Cultural Governance:
from challenges to changes**
Conference Reader

Bled, Slovenia
11-12 November 2011



COUNCIL OF EUROPE
CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

Cultural Governance: from challenges to changes

Conference Reader

Cultural Governance: from challenges to changes
CultureWatchEurope Think Tank

Bled, Slovénia, 10-12 November 2011

Editor's Note: 11.11.2011

The 11th day of the 11th month of the year 2011 was the symbolic date chosen to rethink the notion and practice of cultural governance. Twenty European cultural actors and policy thinkers gathered around an Alpine lake in Bled, Slovenia. It was a moment of reflection during times (or, as key-speaker, Slovenian philosopher, Slavoj Žižek has said, "in the end of times") when our society is being exposed to multiple challenges requiring policy makers to face an uncertain future and make difficult choices.

The event was hosted by the Ministry of Culture of Slovenia and was the third in a series of CultureWatchEurope conferences, building on previous work on cultural governance, in line with Council of Europe values and standards.

This publication summarises both the conclusions generated by the CultureWatchEurope event 2011 in the form of six fundamental principles for cultural policy and action; and individual contributions of the participants.

We hope this work will help inform and inspire others who are confronting the opportunities of re-thinking the challenges in a way that they bring important changes to the practice of cultural policy, including through the Council of Europe's mechanisms for international cultural co-operation.

We thank all those who contributed and invite all readers to combine these thoughts and experiences with their own and add to the sharing of insight and ideas.

Robert Palmer, Director of Democratic Governance, Culture and Diversity, Directorate General of Democracy (DGII), Council of Europe

Stojan Pelko, former State Secretary, Ministry of Culture, Republic of Slovenia, Programme Coordinator of the Bled 2011 Think Tank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. The conference output: reformation and reaffirmation	9
Introduction.....	9
Reflections on the crisis and renewal in European art and culture	9
Six fundamental principles.....	10
Brief clarifications to the six fundamental principles.....	11
II. Welcome and introductions	15
Danica Purg, Dean and President of IEDC – Bled School of Management	15
Boštjan Žekš, Acting Minister of Culture of Slovenia	16
Robert Palmer, Director of Democratic Governance, Culture and Diversity, Council of Europe... ..	17
Stojan Pelko, former State Secretary, Ministry of Culture, Republic of Slovenia, Programme Coordinator of the Bled 2011 Think Tank	19
III. Slavoj Žižek: There's a lot of work to be done in Europe	21
IV. Participants' reflections	31
A. From archives to access.....	31
Sergio Lopez-Figueroa: Change can happen in a very short time	31
Pia Areblad: Art is about changing mindsets	33
Elisabeth O. Sjaastad: On Sense and Sensibility.....	35
Chris Torch: Trees have roots, people have feet.....	40
B. From access to action	43
Asu Aksoy: Art has the potential to turn the table upside down	43
Shelagh Wright: Not finding new lands but seeing with new eyes	48

Milica Nikolić: To wake up the Sleepy Hollow.....	50
Sara Selwood: Museums can change attitudes.....	52
C. From Action to Policy	56
Mladen Dolar: The Closing of the European Mind.....	56
Nina Obuljen: Policy-makers need to make political decisions	60
Peter Inkei: A reflection on the times that we live in	62
Philippe Kern: Becoming visible, being heard	62
V. Reflections in an Alpine lake. A personal account by François Matarasso	67
VI. Those magic moments. Background Paper by Stojan Pelko	73
VII. Participant’s Curriculum Vitas.....	81
VIII. Organizer’s Curriculum Vitas	85
 Illustrations	
Reflections in a sparkling Alpine Lake, Bled, Slovenia (Photo by François Matarasso).....	7
Encounter in India (Photo by Sergio Lopez-Figueroa).....	29
Fantomat (Photo by Chris Torch).....	39
Me-We Neon (Photo by Sheleigh Wright).....	47
Reflections in a foggy Alpine lake, Bled, Slovenia (Photo by François Matarasso).....	65



Reflections in a sparkling Alpine Lake, Bled, Slovenia (Photo by François Matarasso)

I. The conference output: Reformation and reaffirmation

Introduction

At the Council of Europe's 2011 CultureWatchEurope meeting, held in Bled (Slovenia) on 11 and 12 November 2011, a small group of artists, philosophers, researchers and policy makers considered the position of European culture against the background of the economic crisis and falling governments in Greece and Italy.

While there was no consensus about the meaning of the crisis, the possible contribution of cultural ideas to its causes, or the appropriate responses, participants did agree on two things.

First, the crisis has deep practical, ethical and philosophical challenges for European culture and for those who work in, support and value it. Failure to respond is not acceptable; it would be an abdication of responsibility and a confession of irrelevance.

Secondly, if Europeans are to defend and renew their culture at this time, they need a simple and convincing statement of what it stands for. There is almost 3,000 years of writing about European culture, enough to fill every national library in the Union. We do not pretend to distil the work of millennia into pithy formulae; there is evidently more, infinitely more to this than can be expressed by six principles.

Reflections on the crisis and renewal in European art and culture

Europe is undergoing a profound economic crisis that threatens its democracy. In a connected, interdependent world, that crisis is affected by and affects similar problems elsewhere. It takes place as the seven billionth person is born and environmental change challenges the very basis of human life.

The economic crisis is not a tsunami or an earthquake: it is man-made. Its causes lie in decisions made collectively and individually, by governments, businesses and institutions: by people.

One of its incidental results is that many of those same people are now turning away from art, culture and heritage as irrelevant to the crisis. From Amsterdam to Athens, governments slash cultural budgets in symbolic gestures of austerity of no economic importance. This rejection of culture is like starting a search for a path out of a dark forest by blowing out the candle.

Culture, which articulates our values, our dreams and fears, the best and worst of us, cannot be separated from the crisis or its causes. In affirming the central importance of culture to human thought and action, we also accept the part that cultural institutions and actors have played in shaping this situation. We accept, as cultural professionals and citizens, a shared responsibility. Culture is not, cannot be, and does not seek to be, detached from other human concerns and fields of knowledge.

This crisis requires us all to look with honesty at how we have reached this point. Artists and cultural professionals cannot contribute to the creation of a more secure, just and stable Europe without a clear understanding of where we are now, and why.

European culture – the heritage of the past and the arts of today – is like a clear Alpine lake in whose reflection we can all, if we choose, see ourselves as we are. And, like a lake, it is a constantly replenished source, not just of refreshment but of life itself.

The economic crisis we face today and the social, political and environmental challenges we may face tomorrow will not be solved by culture. But nor will they be solved without culture's resources: its expression of the deep continuity of European values, its capacity to question assumptions and imagine new solutions, its humanistic, life affirming symbols, rituals and joys, and, not least, its restorative capacities.

And yet, if we accept that culture has, in its own way, failed alongside banking, business and politics, we, actors in the field, must also accept with humility the need for change. In renewing our values and our practice we can regain the attention of European citizens, institutions and politicians. We have, now, a vital task to perform.

Some of that change is already taking place. New information and communication technology is acting on European culture today as the Reformation did on its religious life 500 years ago. In democratising the creation, distribution and critique of contemporary art it challenges established authorities. Cultural policy in Europe, and the institutions and practices it supports, must learn from the past and respond to this democratisation with courage, creativity and imagination.

However, some of what we must change demands a reaffirmation of values that have shaped European culture since its earliest days, but that have been obscured by the uncertainties and misjudgements of the past decades. Community, freedom of inquiry, transcendence, humanism: from such ideas we can renew the foundations of our culture.

It is in this dual process of reformation and reaffirmation that we must find a renewal of European culture at the heart of a creative and confident European society. We must do so in the knowledge that culture is always a potential, never a given, and that its potential is not easily fulfilled without imagination, honesty and an open heart.

So we begin by reaffirming six fundamental principles of European culture on which all theory, policy and action must stand:

Six fundamental principles

- 1. Europe needs a culture that defends fundamental human rights and democracy.**
- 2. We need culture to do the creative and imaginative work that is its unique capacity.**
- 3. We need freedom of cultural inquiry, expression and circulation.**

- 4. We need a mixed economy for public, commercial, voluntary and informal culture.**
- 5. We need investment in cultural research and development at the heart of policy.**
- 6. We need artists and cultural actors to enact the ethical responsibilities of leadership.**

The Bled participants recognised the practical use of defining, in a few clear words, some non-negotiable principles that we believe all who value Europe's culture would defend. The rationale behind the principles is set out above. The following note adds some brief clarification to the principles themselves. They are a starting point, an expression of what must, on no account, be lost: there is so much more to gain.

Brief clarifications to six fundamental principles

1. Europe needs a culture that defends fundamental human rights and democracy

Culture is as diverse as human societies. It is what binds us and makes us different from one another and how we express those ties and distinctions. Europe's concepts of human rights and democracy begin in the culture of Classical Greece, expressed in the theatre, poetry, art and philosophy that continue to shape us today.

Human rights and democracy have developed since then. Today, they form the foundations of European law and society through national and multinational treaties. Europe's culture –in all its changing, life-enhancing diversity– grows from the same root. Culture cannot be separated from human rights, and live. The only time our culture has let us down (or we have let it down) has been when we have forgotten that connection, most notoriously under the 20th century's totalitarian regimes.

Culture is a discourse that enables democratic expression and the negotiation of competing interests. It is democracy's lifeblood because it allows things to be said that find no place in politics. It gives voice to those on the margins and to minorities.

None of this politicises culture, that would be an assault on this and other principles here. Rather, accepting George Orwell's view that '*the opinion that art should have nothing to do with politics is itself a political attitude*', it connects European culture to the protection of basic human rights and democracy without which there is no freedom to create culture.

2. We need culture to do the creative and imaginative work that is its unique capacity

Culture can connect with every part of public and private life because it influences how people go about their business. In recent years there has been a new recognition of culture's place in the economy, in social policy, education and health care, even in criminal justice, diplomacy and conflict resolution. The potential of art, heritage and other forms of cultural expression in all these fields is better understood than before. That is to be applauded and built on.

But in doing so, we must avoid subverting culture's unique capacity, to do for people what only it can do, by making it a means to another end. Culture allows human beings to define, shape and change their beliefs. It allows them to make sense of the world in ways that move them and make connections they do not control. It builds community in the true sense of the word; the shared values and beliefs of a group of people.

Culture is a source of delight, mystery, joy, confusion, comfort and ambiguity. It works its most important effects when we trust it, simply making space for it in our lives. Only culture can do what culture does, that is why it matters.

3. We need freedom of cultural inquiry, expression and circulation

Culture should not be controlled by states or corporations to the extent that artists and other creative practitioners are unable to pursue their vision freely. Whether professional or amateur, artists must be able to create without interference and to share the results with others. Interference in the cultural ecology not only risks infringing people's rights but also preventing culture from achieving its best results.

This is often understood simply as a matter of freedom of expression; certainly, notorious conflicts have arisen when one artist's vision offends some people's values. But it goes further than that. Artists should feel able to explore the ideas and forms that interest them, insofar as that does not erode the human rights of others; (and there is no right not to be offended.) They should be equally free to share and circulate the results, with a citizen's normal accountability for one's speech and actions.

Sometimes, this will be uncomfortable; sometimes it will offend, but anything less will place unjustifiable power into the hands of private corporations or state institutions – each with their own interests. Only by ensuring freedom of inquiry, expression and circulation can we protect democracy and our potential for creative innovation.

4. We need a mixed economy for public, commercial, voluntary and informal culture

Cultural diversity is not just the expression of minorities and people on the fringes of the social mainstream: it is also their protection. People who are denied a means of expression are easily denied other human and democratic rights. Cultural diversity is also vital as a resource from which new ideas, new expressions and new sensibilities can emerge. The richer the available range of culture, the greater the likelihood of innovation. Narrow, closed, restricted cultures have no future: they atrophy and die.

The cultural economy is equally diverse. It has room for blockbuster films and computer games, experimental dance and music performances, community theatre and traditional crafts, rappers, slammer and Sunday painters. Some of that cultural ecology is directly supported by state finance: major galleries and opera houses, orchestras and theatres and so on. The commercial sector is shaped by economic and competition policy and a raft of legislation that is not specific to cultural

activity. Amateur and informal cultural activity is affected by myriad regulations on NGOs, youth services, education and much more.

It is essential that states recognise the whole ecology of culture and the complex ways it interconnects in shaping policy and legislation. Above all, they need to find a balance that allows each part of cultural life to thrive on its own terms without harming any other.

Too much or not enough state investment in public culture will produce negative results not just in that part of the ecology but in the commercial and amateur sectors too. Similarly an unrestrained commercial market for cultural goods can be as damaging as one that is too regulated. Good cultural policy is sensitive to complex interaction of all parts of the cultural economy and recognises the contribution of each to the whole.

5. We need investment in cultural research and development at the heart of policy

Everyone is familiar with the saying that only dead fish swim with the stream. Nowhere is this more true than in the cultural sector, which depends on the contrary instincts of artists to go against prevailing currents and find new paths. Society changes all the time. Unless cultures are allowed – encouraged even – to change as well, they cease to be inspirational and become burdensome. Dead cultures demand to be carried; living ones carry us.

But experimentation and research in the arts and culture is rarely profitable in the short term, so we need a far-sighted understanding of future potential –not just in public culture but in the commercial and private sector as well. Research and development needs to be at the heart of cultural policy– but not just cultural policy.

The new ideas, practices and solutions that emerge from a creative culture have potential across the policy arena. It may be developing more creative, pupil-centred approaches to learning or designing out crime and fear in public spaces; it may be tackling youth unemployment through the creative industries or enriching the cultural lives of older people. Public policy faces huge social, economic and environmental challenges in the 21st century. It cannot afford to do so without the imagination and creativity developed within the cultural sector.

6. We need artists and cultural actors to enact the ethical responsibilities of leadership

It has already been argued, perhaps controversially, that cultural actors and institutions cannot hold themselves apart from the current crisis. This is not to compare them to junk bond traders but to acknowledge that the hubris of unending growth was not confined to bankers and politicians. There is shared responsibility here, if it was just accepting increased spending on culture – in both the public and private sectors – without questioning its source of sustainability. Contemporary art prides itself on being challenging. It has, at best, been highly selective about who and what it has chosen to challenge in the past 30 years.

If cultural actors and institutions, artists and those who support them, are to be credible when they make large claims for the importance of their work – claims that are also made here – they must enact the values they proclaim. Independence, criticality, humanism, nonmaterialism, empathy – these and other values that lie at the heart of European culture, at its best, must be evident in all we do, not just in what we say. Only then can we be trustworthy partners, advocates and critics in the renewal of our culture, our economy, our society and our continent.

II. Welcome and introductions

Danica Purg, Dean and President of IEDC – Bled School of Management: “A change agent and an inclination for reflection”

Welcome to IEDC – Bled School of Management. IEDC stands for International Executive Development Center. That was the name that we gave to our school 25 years ago. It was the first management school in Central and Eastern Europe. At that time, Yugoslavia was a socialist country, and management was considered a sort of technocratic manipulation of people. This is still true, of course, sometimes. If you take up critical management studies, you inevitably develop a critical attitude toward management. In order to avoid problems, I used the word "executive" to describe this school, rather than "management". Over these past 25 years, we have had more than 60,000 participants in our courses. These are primarily executives of Central and Eastern Europe. However, we have also hosted participants from Western Europe, Canada, Japan, Singapore, Malaysia, Korea, India, Pakistan, and the African countries. In Africa, our focus is on social entrepreneurship.

We consider ourselves a business meeting place in this part of the world and a centre of excellence in teaching management and leadership. We also represent a creative environment for the development of leaders. Besides, we wish to be a change agent. As you know, managers have a lot of power. They can do a lot of good, but also a lot of harm. Therefore, we started teaching business ethics 25 year ago. Then, 10 years ago, we introduced aesthetics in our curriculum. And we made Art and Leadership a required course in our Executive MBA, which lasts 100 full days. Eight of those days are devoted to Art and Leadership. Thus, we try to find parallels between art and leadership but we also use art as a tool for leadership development. For example, you can listen to a sonata by Beethoven and discover a pattern of change in the music. Then you can use that discovery to talk about change in leadership. Art also helps you acquire better listening skills. It can also teach you how to observe better. What we want to stimulate is an inclination for reflection. We are hurriedly running through life, not thinking much about who we are and what we are doing. Our Art and Leadership course generates a mood for reflection. This makes the participants reflect on their responsibility and everything else that they need to ponder in order to be successful and ethical leaders.

I believe that if we follow this path, it will enrich us and everybody else. I would appreciate your ideas about what we can do together. In all our initiatives, we subscribe to the philosophy that we should be international because Slovenia is too small for us to be isolated from the rest of the world. We realize how important international networking is, and we have become the most international management school in this part of the world. I am very happy that you are here and I am sure that you will enjoy our artistic atmosphere. It inspires us, and I hope that you will feel the same way. Thank you very much for being with us.

**Boštjan Žekš, Acting Minister of Culture of Slovenia:
“For Slovenia, the cake was culture and the cherry was the state”**

I would like to welcome you in my capacity as the acting Minister of Culture of the Republic of Slovenia. You can tell immediately that I do not come from the world of culture as I am wearing a tie. I apologize for that but after this meeting I am going to another one where I will need my tie.

I am glad that you are here to discuss cultural governance. You have probably chosen the best places for that, at the micro and macro levels. The micro level is the Bled School of Management, whereas the macro level is Slovenia. You have already heard why this school is a good place to discuss culture and art. I would add that this school is one of the rare higher education institutions that have successful international ambitions. But why Slovenia? Because for us culture is the basis of everything. We had a complete translation of the Bible in Slovene more than 400 years before we had a state. Our history, and I hope our future as well, is based on culture. For the first time in our history, and only 20 years ago, we got our own state. For us, the cake was culture and the cherry on it was the state. We did not have political or military power; culture was everything that we had. When we became a normal state, we set up a ministry of culture, a ministry of justice, a ministry of internal affairs, and so forth. Some people started thinking that the other activities were more important than the cultural ones. They forgot what our roots were. We are going to have elections very soon and the majority of parties claim that we do not need a ministry of culture. I think that this is terribly wrong. We must remember how we developed and what we owe our success to. We should continue along the same road.

I am looking forward to your ideas about how to measure culture and manage cultural institutions. I would also appreciate suggestions on intergovernmental cultural cooperation. As a ministry, we are very interested in this issue. We also believe that our active cooperation with the Council of Europe and the Directorate of Democratic Governance, Culture and Diversity is very important and should continue. Culture is important in these turbulent times. It may be more important than people realize. They tend to focus on financial problems and deemphasize the role of culture. I think we have to stress the significance of culture in whatever way we can. We have to emphasize the fact that culture can move things forward. Slovene history proves this.

Robert Palmer, Director of Democratic Governance, Culture and Diversity, Council of Europe: “A period of significant reset”

Before we start today’s debates, I would like to extend my welcome to all of you. We have come to experience a kind of creative alchemy, and we have come together in order to reflect on a few big questions. Of course, all of these CultureWatchEurope events are the result of key partnerships. I would like, first of all, to thank the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Slovenia. Thank you very much, Minister, for supporting this initiative. I would also like to thank the IEDC – Bled School of Management for the hospitality that it is offering us in this wonderful building.

Our key topic is “change”. People keep saying that we live in incredible times. The Council of Europe is trying within its own means to get to grips with how this change is managed. As far as culture is concerned, we have created an approach called "CultureWatchEurope". This platform hosts and organizes a number of events in order to reflect and add a few insights into some relevant questions.

A multiple discourse is going on, operating at different levels; it has become an active political discourse. Personally, I think we have gone beyond the neo-liberal approach to organizing a society. What we have is a kind of “post-neo-liberalism” or even a kind of what I might call “political primitivism” in some cases. This is what I detect in the way that governments are trying to address a number of the remarkably complex questions of the day, such as how to manage and perhaps re-order society. Another important discourse relates to the role of markets. The marketplace is often extremely selfish. Mostly it is not socially committed and is certainly not consistent. This market discourse is very powerful, affecting many of the ways in which we live our lives. The third parallel discourse I discern is about what some people call “civil society”. This is an extremely difficult term to define. Such a discourse is very fragmented, can even be divisive and has its own innate selfishness.

The result of the combination of these three discourses can be a huge confusion in terms of what we are talking about today and the questions we are trying to address at this discussion. The Council of Europe is looking at ways to analyze this dilemma. As an intergovernmental body, the Council of Europe believes in setting standards, in adopting conventions, declarations, and political statements, involving governments. The Council of Europe also organizes thematic conferences, and some of you may have attended them. We commission papers and try to launch debates between people who have different viewpoints.

However, today, we decided to do something a little different. The idea was to see if we could address a number of complex cultural questions in an extremely simple manner by getting roughly 20 people together in a beautiful place. We would select “ordinary” people, but those with a strong record of having remarkable insights. We would ask them to come together in an extraordinarily powerful place like Bled, because I believe that the spatial and spiritual dimensions of where we meet are crucial to the success for an event of this kind, in terms of generating energy and commitment. This is why Stojan Pelko, former state secretary of the Republic of Slovenia, suggested Bled. This is our attempted recipe for the next day and a half: 20 people in a beautiful place, with a lake and a castle on a rock towering above it, sharing important issues for a number of hours, so that maybe something

insightful might come out in the end. Our hope is as simple as that. This is not a huge pretentious exercise. It is simply an opportunity for a number of very nice people to exchange individual experiences and perceptions. Indeed, it could have been another 20 people but it happens to be us and we have this wonderful opportunity to share our perceptions of what is going on in the world and comment on them.

I think that we are in a period of significant “reset”. This is a resetting of the way that the world, and certainly Europe, sees itself. People talk a lot about the economic crisis, which refers to the need for an economic resetting. It has only just begun and so has the debate about it. However all economic transformations work within a context, a cultural context. This is what we will be exploring today: the way that this cultural context may also need to be reset. In a period of transformation, there is inevitably confusion, due to the incredible complexity that may not be easy to sort out. I think that our debate today may reflect a kind of collective confusion. But out of this confusion, I am confident that a number of insights will emerge. Some of them may even be contradictory. I feel more and more that the drive toward some sort of simplistic conceptual and totally consensual agreement is an immature hope; there is a need for a much more mature approach, by which I mean the recognition of accepting contradictory views in the same universe. In fact, I personally hope that we never reach consensus; consensus is always very cosy. We need more diversity in our definition of change and how we begin to address complex issues.

The previous Culture Watch Europe conferences focused mainly on challenges. This one will concentrate on change. What are we trying to change and why? How can society find ways to move toward a world in which most people hold the values that we share? And how can we better promote equity, human rights, and an ability to live with each other peacefully?

Stojan Pelko, former State Secretary, Ministry of Culture, Republic of Slovenia, Programme Coordinator of the Bled 2011 Think Tank: “Courage, absence and spirit”

I have only three words to add to what Robert Palmer has just said: courage, absence, and spirit. It takes courage to reduce the extremely complex topic of change to this small event near Lake Bled. We need to thank the Council of Europe for that but also all the local organizers and especially Majda Širca, member of the Slovene Parliament and former minister of culture, because this event would not have been possible without her support. Let us also thank Danica Purg for inviting us to her school, as well as Minister Boštjan Žekš, who believes that although his government is at the end of its term, this event is important.

Last night at 11:32 p.m., I received a mail from Professor Helmut Anheier. It said that there was “a situation that required his presence”. He hopes that we will understand that “the welfare of the institution that he is entrusted with must take priority”. This was a perfect example of the difficulty of the current situation. Sometimes we have to make tough decisions and choose between various commitments that we have made, between public institutions and private lives. I answered that we understood him completely and realized that the reason for his absence was fully justified. We have to deal with several more absences today. For example, the Montenegrin minister of Culture is absent because he is ill and Mr. Negri could not be with us because of the opening night of his theatre play in Paris. But we’ll go to the old Montenegrin capital of Cetinje via a documentary film while Mr. Negri’s message will be presented to us in the interpretation of one of the best Slovene theatre actors, Mr. Igor Samobor. So, in a way, all our absent friends will actually be present. This is a power of poetic discourse, the power of art.

You know, several decades ago, Bled was known as a space for poets and writers who gathered at the regular International Pen Club meetings. For a moment around the year 2000, Bled became a set for Bled Net with figures like Stephan Hessel, Michel Rocard and then Slovene president Milan Kučan, where global ethical dilemmas were discussed. More recently decision-makers are coming to Bled mainly for strategic choices inside the Bled Forum. So can we, gathered around this think-tank table today, at least try to be all three at once: poetic, ethical and strategic? Our goal should be not just to mix ethics with aesthetics but to come up with strategies for the implementation of our best thoughts into best practices.

As far as the powers of thought and the **spirit** are concerned, I am glad that we’ll start this conference with an address by professor Slavoj Žižek whose voice and presence is the tangible proof that the force of the spirit can be heard and echoed all over the world, from the Wall Street protesters to the Lake Bled reflections. With him, the ambition to have one’s words heard across the globe is today no longer idealistic or utopian, it has become concrete and material. Let such ambition lead our thoughts and words throughout our think tank. Let’s make a material tank out of our most idealistic thoughts.

III. Slavoj Žižek: There's a lot of work to be done in Europe

When Stojan Pelko invited me to this event, he asked me to be provocative. And I certainly will. We started with 40 minutes of self-congratulatory ritual introductions. Not a single thing was said that was not already known. I know that this is a ritual but perhaps the time has come to change the rituals. That is where culture and ideology are in unwritten rituals.

Let me bring up another issue. It is fashionable to speak of plurality of opinions and lack of full consensus. But I would say that we need dogmas, hard dogmas about non-negotiable issues. What do I mean by that? Is it another provocation? No. Here is an example. Would you like to live in a society where people openly debate whether rape is justifiable or not? Of course not. I would like to live in a society that bans the rape of women as an unconditional dogma. If somebody starts reflecting on this and wondering – *"Well, it depends... Suppose the woman is giving implicit signals..."* – he simply comes across as an idiot. You do not even need to argue about this. The moment you start arguing, things get lost.

I remember a wonderful incident involving president Ronald Reagan. He was accused of being tolerant of Holocaust deniers. He said, *"No, it is not true. Each time somebody at my dinner table claims there was no Holocaust, I always claim the opposite"*. But the question is what kind of guests he associated with in the first place. Why did he have to defend the view that the Holocaust occurred?

We need more dogmas

We need more dogmas. These are a condition of a living culture. However, we have a dogma of openness today: consensus is bad; let us have a debate and stay open. A catholic theologian said 100 years ago, *"An open mind is like an open mouth. You open it to close it on something firm"*. That is what we need today.

Let me provoke you a little bit more. There is a dogma called *Leitkultur*. I am going to defend this dogma but you need not be afraid. I am not a crazy right-winger. I claim that we have to be critical of liberalism. The liberal idea of multiculturalism, and the role of government as nothing more than a regulator of the co-existence of diverse cultures, simply does not work. I am coming back to the concept of unwritten rules. Multiculturalism presupposes that all parties that participate in it share a set of meta-rules which regulate the way that different cultures interact. It is noteworthy that these rules cannot be the law.

The moment you start discussing such rules, you get involved in political correctness. Of course, I am against racism and other types of discrimination. My problem with political correctness is of a different nature. It tries to legalize what should be part of a dogma and some unwritten rules in a positive sense.

The next thing that I would like to draw your attention to is the celebration of culture. I hope that you have noticed that this is a relatively recent phenomenon. It started some 30 or 40 years ago. Today

practically everything is culture. My problem is that this strong focus on culture comes at a heavy price. Perhaps the price is even too high to be paid. Problems that are inherently economical are presented as cultural problems.

Of course, we are all against sexism and racism. But have you noticed how we automatically translate these into a problem of cultural tolerance? To Martin Luther King it would have been an obscenity to hear that the suffering of the Blacks in the United States was a problem of tolerance. Did Blacks at that time ask Whites to be more tolerant? It is even more evident in the case of feminism. Should women ask men to be more tolerant? The fact that we experience sexism and racism is a problem of power and economics. We live in a world where the economy is increasingly viewed as some kind of machinery operated by technocrats that need not be debated by others. It is simply presented to us in the form "The experts say that we must do this". What remains are cultural conflicts. This is almost the only field in which we have a genuine political debate.

The price for all this is depolitization. This pre-eminence of culture goes together with a series of replacements. Culture is replacing art. Art is suspicious; it is elitist. People prefer to talk about culture. Have you also noticed that we prefer to say "knowledge" rather than "science"? If you say "science", it sounds like European cultural imperialism. You are brutally imposing your form of knowledge on others. Why should Western science be privileged? Aren't local superstitions also fully legitimate knowledge? I experienced something similar during a visit to India half a year ago. I mentioned castes and equality. I was immediately brutally attacked and told that castes are part of their culture. Who was I – a European imperialist – to tell them that they should dismantle their castes? Interestingly, the only people who were on the same wave length as me were the true victims – the untouchables.

Another thing is that we do not want to talk about love. It is replaced by whatever you call it: sex, emotional bonding, you name it. My good friend, Alain Badiou, a French philosopher, noticed that we are witnessing a return of the pre-modern strategy of arranged marriage. It is no longer relatives that arrange marriages but match-making agencies. I recently flew United Airlines and saw a wonderful ad in the in-flight magazine. The idea was that, since we outsource everything nowadays (and the United States even outsources torture), why not outsource your love life? Just provide your data and the agency will do the job for you. Besides, the ad said, "*We will enable you to be in love without a fall*". This is our narcissistic economy today. You want to be in love but without the authentic open contact. You want to domesticate love so that you do not get hurt. Make it safe and without risk. It is like beer without alcohol, coffee without caffeine and meat without fat.

Finally, instead of politics, we prefer to talk about governance. It is the same neutralizing mystification.

My fear concerning this meeting is that it can degenerate into another self-congratulatory ritual whose real goal is not to achieve something but to make you feel good. I heard the phrase "sustainable development". Are we aware of the mystifications that are associated with this idea? It is a wonderful way to enable the big industries to do nothing. Instead of really tackling ecological problems, we are talking about "way of life" ecology. Did you recycle your garbage? Did you dispose of your trash in separate containers? Of course, we should do these things. But I am afraid that once we get involved

in these everyday rituals, we think that we have done our duty and it makes us feel well. As a result, we forget about the big problems.

As far as I am concerned, the modern model of corporate responsibility is provided by Starbucks coffee. That company will tell you that their coffee is more expensive but one percent of the profits goes to some hungry children in Guatemala, another two percent goes to a water drilling project in the Sahara desert and so forth. It is a wonderful ideological operation. In the good old days of pure consumerist capitalism, you felt good and then you did something to appease your guilty consciousness. Now, the socially responsible activity is included in the price. You just pay a little more and you have been a responsible consumer. This is the logic of the chocolate laxative. Chocolate is usually associated with constipation but in the United States they have a laxative that looks like chocolate. In this sense, the poison is its own antidote.

Another example is organic fruit. I buy it, too. However, I suspect that we do not really believe in it. We buy it simply because it makes us feel good. I buy half-rotten apples, paying three times as much as I do for normal ones, and I feel so great because I have done something for Mother Earth. We are buying ideology. I am not saying we should not be doing this. I am just showing you how ideology works. You see a picture of a miserable black boy from Africa and an ad tells you that you can make a difference for the price of a cappuccino. But what is the real message behind this? The real message is, "*We know you feel bad because we exploited Africa but we can make you feel good for the price of a cappuccino*". This should not only deal with your sense of guilt but even make you feel that you have made a real contribution. This is how anti-racism and ecology turn into ideology.

We will never understand each other because we do not even understand ourselves

My next point is the cheap celebration of different cultures and the culture of understanding. I think this is cheap liberal blackmail. We will never understand each other because we do not even understand ourselves. People ask, "*When I discuss art with the Chinese, how do I know that we mean the same thing as we do in Europe?*" I will be brutal and tell you that there is a way to achieve instant communication. I will mention my own country – former Yugoslavia – as an example. Thirty years ago, we abandoned apparently racist jokes. Prior to that, we had jokes about each of the Yugoslav people. The Slovenes were misers and those of Gorenjska were the worst of all. There was even a joke that one of them was spending too much money; so they put him on a boat and sent him to Scotland. Montenegrins were viewed as lazy, whereas Bosnians were sex maniacs.

The funny thing was that these jokes were not perceived as racist. They were something that created authentic contact. This works everywhere: from Latin America to China. In China, I was once told an obscene joke about how a party secretary tried to flirt with a young girl; this is what broke the ice between us. To communicate successfully with another culture, you need a little bit of obscenity.

Also, remember the paradox of cultural misunderstandings as they can be productive. If you know the history of the West, you will notice an authentic phenomenon: culture. Then, it is appropriated by another country and there is a case of misunderstanding. In the most beautiful example of dialectical

reflection, this can have a creative influence on the original. For example, we have spaghetti westerns that retroactively influence the original ones. My point is that we do not need to be afraid that we do not really understand the other party. Nobody understands even himself properly.

There is another brutal rule that I would like to propose to you. I claim that the only thing that really works in education and culture is enlightened dictatorship. Let us imagine that you wish to set up a new university department or an art gallery in a particular country. If you have a large democratic network, you will experience envy and resentment. The only working formula that I know is this: you give the whole power and money to one person and you pray that he is not an idiot. We need democracy in politics. But it is not good in education and the arts in the sense that we know it: people getting together and debating things.

Now here is another rule, apparently the opposite of the previous one. A hierarchical system should not be based only on merit. That would be a catastrophe. We believe in egalitarian societies. If a hierarchy were based on merit, the situation would become explosive and violent. Suppose that a society could function in the way that John Rawls proposed in his "Theory of Justice": If I am rich, that is because I have earned it through my abilities and now your consolation is that some of my wealth will trickle down to those on the lowest step of the social ladder. Would people accept this?

Do you know what, in my view, makes unequal systems liveable? It is precisely the awareness that they are not just. Let us imagine that I am a failure and you are a success. If I believe that success depends on luck and not on merit, it is very easy for me to accept my failure. I will also believe that you are a bigger idiot than me but you are just lucky. Imagine how horrible I would feel if I accepted that you are above me because you are intrinsically better than me. This means that it is OK that we have democracy but we should not push it too much into meritocracy.

The general problem in Europe is what Immanuel Kant called "public use of reason". He opposed private and public use of reason in an absolutely paradoxical way. In his view, a private use of reason would be what we today would count as public policy: the things that you do so that the state can function properly. He saw this as private use of reason. A public use of reason, in Kant's view, occurs when we meet outside the domain of legalistic institutions. In that case, our reason is not subordinated in advance to the public good.

Real intellectuals should be able to ask the right questions

I am mentioning this because the ongoing reform in higher education in Europe is a big attack on the public use of reason. It is shocking that we are now getting the same output from Brussels as we got from the communist nomenclature of this country when I was young. We are again told that intellectuals should not live in their ivory towers. Our knowledge should have some specific use; we should be able to solve real problems. As a result, higher education is being transformed into a machinery producing experts. This is a catastrophe. This simply means the end of intellectual life. In true intellectual life, you do not just solve problems defined and proposed to you by others, for

example, those in power. The first step is to think of the very formulation of the problem. Are we formulating the problem properly? Is this really the problem?

The problem today is not just that we have big problems with the economy, ecology, and more. The problem is that we do not even know if we are asking the right questions. Quite often, the way that we formulate the problem is part of the problem. Just think of the example that I mentioned already: tolerance. The moment that you formulate sexism and racism as a problem of tolerance, you mystify it. Real intellectuals can help in a situation like this one because they should be able to ask the right questions.

As another exercise of the same type, I propose that we consider the current attack on neo-liberalism. The easiest thing is to inveigh against it. But it is first of all necessary to realize that neo-liberalism never existed. Even governments that preach it do not practice it. Look at the United States. Was there ever a state in the history of mankind with a stronger state apparatus? Did another state ever interfere so strongly in the economy? Neo-liberalism is simply an ideology proposed by some Western states to steer Third World nations but nobody really practices it.

My next provocation is associated with culture. Do not put too much hope into it. We like to say that politicians are crazy but poets can tell us the truth. Poets can indeed tell us many things. But never forget the symbolic fact that Radovan Karadžić, the leader of the Bosnian Serbs, was also a poet. It is easy to make fun of him now that his political career is finished and he is in prison. I remember the late 70s and early 80s when people did not know that Karadžić would become what he was going to become. He was taken quite seriously as a poet.

We live in secular times. The old patriotism is dead. Nevertheless, we have preserved our morality. I would find it a little difficult to gouge your eye with my knife. Do you see my point? The question is how to overcome this element of natural decency. You need something strong, like a national myth. This is where religion and poetry enter. Remember that there is a poet behind every ethnic cleansing. I checked this empirically. Do you remember the big slaughter in Rwanda? The name is Hassan Ngeze – the Karadžić of Rwanda. He was a journalist who systematically spread anti-Tutsi feelings and hatred among the Hutu majority for two decades until the carnage was actually unleashed.

I admit that conflict is the basis of our being human. But it can also be precisely the medium that enables people to do horrible things. The true horror is not that bad people do bad things. The true horror is that good people do horrible things thinking that they are doing something great. Unfortunately, you cannot do this without poetry or religion. I am not against poetry. I am just saying that we need to be very clear about how it works.

We will need new thinking in the new situation and culture can do a good job

We live in a critical period when intellectual and cultural work is needed more than ever. Why? Because it is obvious that the liberal capitalist way of life is slowly being eroded. The best argument in favour of capitalism was that, no matter what else it does, it eventually generates a demand for

democracy. But it seems that this marriage between capitalism and democracy is slowly falling apart. Is it not sad that the most efficient capitalist economies today – China, Singapore, and Korea – combine what we poetically call "Asian values" in their political order?

I do not like the protesters on Wall Street. But we must admit that our institutionalized democratic system cannot cope with the failing financial institutions. We have a problem here. The old 20th century solutions no longer work. The 20th century is over. We see the limits of the social-democratic welfare state. I am especially opposed to the idea of local self-management. It has very serious limitations. We are facing mega problems. Millions of people will have to move because of the global warming. We have to think of radically new solutions. How can we do this while preventing a new form of authoritarianism? I am not talking about "neo-fascism" like some leftists who use this term to describe the right-wing anti-immigration mood in Europe. This is called thinking by association. You do not understand what is going on and you just think what it reminds you of. This is a failure to think properly. We will need new thinking in the new situation and culture can do a good job.

Let me conclude with a wonderful anecdote. In mid-April 2011 the media reported that the Chinese government had passed a law prohibiting all public media from publishing any story about time travel and virtual reality. It is clear that they did not want people to think about alternatives. Nevertheless, this is a good omen for China. This can suggest to the Chinese what kind of things the powers are afraid of. In Europe we do not need that prohibition.

A colleague of mine, Alenka Zupančič, had an interesting idea. Have you noticed how strangely the "possible-impossible" pair works? In the sphere of economy and private pleasure almost everything is possible. We are told that we will be able to grow organs and cure all sorts of diseases through cloning and stem-cell research. We will practically live forever. We will be able to dine on the Moon.

Sometimes this goes totally haywire. A couple of months ago I met a New York surgeon who is specializing in splitting penises in two. As a result, you can have sex with two women at the same time. It seems that practically anything is possible. But if you have to raise taxes by one percent in order to boost the healthcare system, economists will tell you that it is totally impossible. You will lose competitiveness and the country will go down the drain. So, everything is possible outside the economy but when you start tackling economic problems, everything is impossible.

I think that we have to change our priorities. The best description of our situation is provided by an old apocryphal anecdote. In 1916, during the First World War, there was an exchange of telegrams between the Austrian and German headquarters: "*The situation here is serious but not catastrophic*". The answer was "*Here, the situation is catastrophic but not serious*". This is our predicament today. We all know that the situation is potentially catastrophic, yet we do not take it seriously. We know that ecological catastrophe is looming large, yet we expect things somehow to take care of themselves.

What is the problem here? Think of the violent riots in the United Kingdom a couple of months ago. Do you remember how people celebrated the end of ideology in 1990? We saw riots that were post-ideological in nature. They were just frustration-driven consumerist riots. They were a reaction to the

consumerist advertising. We want to consume and because we cannot do it legally, we will do it illegally. They did not have any demands, be they fundamentalist or pragmatic or anything else. This is the sad reality. The rioting people do not have an ideological vision.

We should be proud of European idea of radical egalitarianism and tolerance

I may be a Utopian but I think that Europe can do something in this respect. Perhaps the time has come for Europe to abandon its liberal leftist self-humiliation: Europe was horrible, Europe used slavery, Europe exploited the Third World, and so forth. There are also some great things in the European tradition, such as the idea of radical equality, the idea of a radically egalitarian community that nonetheless functions as a community. What is the idea of the Holy Spirit in Christianity? It is the idea of a community of believers outside the social hierarchy. Jesus said that unless you are ready to abandon your father and mother, you are not a real believer. This means that there is an authentic community outside the hierarchical social relationships. We should be proud of this idea of modern egalitarianism and democracy.

I think that the answer to right-wing claims that we have to defend Europe against Muslims is not to say, "*You are exaggerating*". The right answer is, "*Yes, you are right. The European legacy is under threat. But the threat comes from you*". These people are the real threat that we must fight in Europe.

Take anti-Semitism. Did you notice something very strange about Breivik? In my view this is the most dangerous shift in ideology. He is one of the first clear cases of anti-Semitic Zionism. On the one hand, he is a total Zionist: he believes that Israel is a bulwark against Islamism. But at the same time he embraces an anti-Semitic ideology with respect to the West. For example, he says that there are not too many Jews in Europe because Hitler took care of them. But in the United States, they have too many of them. Breivik is not a unique case. Look at Fox News – the big right-wing media network in the United States. One of their most popular commentators was fired because he was openly anti-Semitic while firmly supporting Zionism. I am afraid that the Israelis are accepting this game: practice your anti-Semitism in the United States as long as you allow us to practice our apartheid with respect to the Palestinians.

The discourse about Turkey's readiness or lack of readiness for the European Union is also worth mentioning. I am in favour of being tough on Turkey concerning its European Union membership. But consider this. This summer there was a big gay parade in Istanbul. It went very smoothly. Now, try to stage a gay parade in Croatia and Serbia and see what will happen. Do you know what happened in Split? Seven hundred paraded, protected by 2,000 police officers, surrounded by 10,000 Catholic demonstrators trying to attack them. The irony was that even the Croat government was not ready to unambiguously condemn the violence. They said that the demonstrators were also guilty because they provoked the local Catholic population. At the same time, a paedophilia scandal erupted in the Catholic Church and a gay man said, "*Oh, now we understand the Church. Its problem with homosexuality is that it involves only adults. If one of the sexual partners was 10 years old, then it would be OK for the Catholics*". This is an obscenity. I am not saying that there is no such thing as a

Muslim fundamentalist threat. I am in favour of a tough stance against it. But we should start the job by cleansing our own house. There is a lot of work to be done in Europe.

It appears that we are entering a world with only two possible models: Anglo-Saxon capitalism versus authoritarianism. I do not like that. I think that if we examine the European tradition and historical memory, we may be able to get enough inspiration for a third way. The current crisis is not just economic. It is fundamentally a crisis of culture and ideology. Until now the choice was either Brussels technocracy or right-wing populism. If these are the only choices, we are lost.

I claim that the concepts of radical egalitarianism and tolerance are inherently European. When Indians speak of tolerance, they do not have the same thing in mind. I claim that the egalitarian democratic tradition is something uniquely European. Philosophers call this "singular universality". In all traditional non-European cultures, the idea of justice is "each at his own proper place". In China, I asked people what they think of communism. They told me that it is an old term. Now they prefer to talk of a "harmonious society". This is Confucian nonsense. I asked them to define what they mean by that. They told me that this is a society where everybody does his duty. A wife is a good wife and a master is a good master. A worker is a good worker and a pupil is a good pupil. Then, I exploded: *"This is wonderful! It does not leave any room for cultural misunderstanding!"*

What I find great in Europe is the idea that the way an individual relates to universality is not only through his particular role. You have a direct role with universality. The idea of human rights is that human rights are not linked in any way to your personal characteristics. They provide a direct access to universality. This is something open to everyone to practice. This is what is so great about Europe. Yes, we should criticize European imperialism but let us not forget that the very tools for this criticism are again provided by European culture.

I should stop here or else I will never stop. Thank you very much.



Encounter in India (Photo by Sergio Lopez-Figueroa)

IV. Participants' reflections

A. From archives to access

Sergio Lopez-Figueroa: Change can happen in a very short time Connecting voices to create new visions of change

I am going to talk about what I subversively call "cultural social responsibility". I took the CSR acronym, which normally stands for corporate social responsibility, and replaced "corporate" with "cultural". I came up with this concept after the delivery of the project Delhi City Symphony, the output of a cultural leadership award from the British Council. I went to India with a model that I developed in the United Kingdom: using archival films as a learning tool and incorporating it into new production methods. Thanks to the intervention of the children that I was working with, I realized that change could happen in a very short time. We tend to think that change takes a long time but sometimes you just have to go for it and the result is there. However, I started thinking how this result could be sustained long-term.

I have worked as an intuitive artist all my life but I have also been interested in approaches that allow sustainability in business. Thus, cultural social responsibility emerged as a creative concept. I also participated in a program for the City of London which helped big companies develop corporate social responsibility. However, I didn't get the benefit to work with a mentor because they told me I ran a social enterprise. Eventually, the director of corporate social responsibility of a legal company was creating a network of civil society businesses and innovators and I worked with him for a year to develop this network called "Convergence". I felt that culture needed to be included because it is missing from the agenda of corporations, although they could make good use of it. We started investigating how this could be done and we worked together at the macro level beyond public and private partnerships. People and institutions working toward a common goal. But whatever corporate social responsibility achieves with respect to big problems, it is very short-term oriented. Most of the big companies are actually making a big fuss about small things. I think that having 630.000 of London's children and 44% of inner London's children living in poverty is a big issue. Therefore, I thought there was an opportunity to bring together the forces and competencies of social entrepreneurs, civil society, public authorities, and cultural organizations and discuss long-term social impact and what we understand by that. It is also important to think of how this can be done in such a way that the benefits accrue to society at large, not just to one single stakeholder.

In 2004, I was part of a creative business program. The Big-Bang Lab idea emerged out of the concept of the multiculturalism fallacy. Tony Blair was trying to sell multiculturalism as a reality, whereas the facts were different; we did not live in a harmonious society. I thought of creating a musical ensemble using traditional instruments. It would include players from different neighbourhoods of London representing those cultures. The music that we would create would be new. The problems that I ran into came from cultural institutions. They asked me what kind of music we were going to create. That made me realize the extent of the problem: there are many gate-keepers stopping talent

from expressing itself and growing. This idea was a failure in the sense that it did not get any further but the essence of it is still alive. As an entrepreneur, you have to try many times. But the core message is still there and I am moving on.

For the last three years, I have been trying to offer a service that fulfils a need. I do not want to depend on any grants. This takes significant courage. As a result of all the questions that I have been asking myself during these two years, I have set up a consultancy and I am now working as a consultant. However, I am not telling people what they should do. I am telling them that if they have the same goals, we should work together. One of my main ideas is that heritage as innovation, rather than preservation, is crucial to the development of cultural social responsibility. I got this idea as I worked in India with the head of the archive of the main broadcast television channel. I interviewed her and she shared some brilliant thoughts. She made me rethink my own practice. First, she said, "We are creating heritage right now". This means that heritage is not only something from the past; it is also something that is created currently. This also means that the inheritance from the past is combined with responsibility toward the future. This idea resonated with me very powerfully.

Thus, the idea of creating something new based on assets from the past, like archives or knowledge from old people, can be transferred into new content that can be commercially distributed and used to generate income. As a social entrepreneur, you must always try to find a solution to your own pain. As a composer facing rejection for years, I went to the best film schools in London but I was not good enough for the industry. Rather than complain, I decided to use the spiritual value of the music that has been denied by the industry, and have come to this new idea of sharing. In practical terms, this is where the copyright issue comes in but I will talk about that later. We produce silent films. There is no language barrier so that everybody in the world can understand what the film is about and have an emotional connection. This is the very simple idea of globalization while being local. The content is local and we use local resources and local talent.

There are different types of co-creativity. There is art that is produced without interaction with other creators. There are feature films made that way. I think "The Day in the Life" was one of them. It was a huge success. It was made without real interaction between the creators. On a given day, each of them would be shooting something different. Participatory art is quite different. It can be virtual as well as real. This is about people getting together, trying to question the present in order to change the future in a specific area. They need not come from the same community. I am actually interested in mixing people from different backgrounds so that they can question our world together.

The idea of collective copyright is very simple. Traditional copyright is about exploitation of the author and signing to a collecting society to manage the royalties on the author's behalf. I am trying to find a model whereby collective work is created by a community whilst the return of the creativity in forms of royalties is shared by the group, using a kind of co-operative management model. We are now trying to figure out how to use metadata associated with digital content in order to identify who did it and make sure that it is ethical and clean. Thus, the artist, or any other person in the community, would yield a percentage of the royalty voluntarily. This is what I am doing in London at the moment. I got a grant from the lottery as a starting point to create a digital archive in a housing estate, combining the

work of old and young people that lived on the same territory. It has been really difficult to find out why people are not talking to each other. Many of them simply have never had an opportunity to meet.

In this endeavour, the idea of collective copyright has taken second stage. The first goal is to create the database. The second stage would be to create music, for instance about your grandmother. This would be a reference to all grandmothers and all the stories that have been collected. I am not saying that this is the ultimate solution to piracy but eventually people will feel that although they were called pirates, now they are co-creators. As they would now be making money, they would have to decide if they should put it all in their pockets or leave a little to the community. In this way, you create a sense of long-term responsibility and ownership of what you are doing. This is based on economic factors.

Our methodology involves audio-visual media. We have done such interventions in cities and in small spaces. For instance, with a communication workshop in Las Palmas there was a discrepancy between what the city wanted and what the citizens could contribute towards a vision as a cultural city. People were not engaged in the consultation or decision making process to bid and become European City of Culture in 2016. The city project wasn't reaching out or engaging citizens effectively. In the course of three hours, six people who had never met became a team. They went to the local market on a Saturday and captured 40 minutes of information.

In London, I have been exploiting the idea of crowd-sourcing of creativity in the framework of public events or 'crowdversations.' I have created an on-line network that anybody can join. It is called the "Cultural Social Responsibility Network". I show films to trigger conversations that represent a real case study of a real project. We have been doing this for four months and have been very successful. People come together with passion and they like to share. There is no panel and no typical questions and answers session. Anybody in the audience can ask questions of anybody else. At the same time, the movie camera is floating around and a video can be shot on the spot. This is about freedom of speech in real time. We have proven that this methodology has a potential value. The quality of the information when you are working on a small scale is perfect, and we are looking forward to expand this work in the future.

To discuss culture, creativity and innovation for social change, join the network on:
<http://www.culturalsocialresponsibility.org>.

Pia Areblad: Art is about changing mindsets On the importance of creative clashes

I am a political scientist by education and I have worked as a dancer and a politician. In the 1990s, I did a lot of dancing and I tried to understand what kind of competence could be gained from the arts. I was also curious to find out how these competences could be used for the benefit of organizations and society at large. There were only two of us when we started our organization, called TILLT. Our goal was to explore how art and culture can cross-fertilize with other sectors. I am going to share some cases with you today and reflect on them.

I started to convince a petroleum company in the Western part of Sweden to work with us. It normally takes half a year or a whole year to get a company engaged on a long project. During one of our meetings, I was introduced to the management team and they decided to go for it. However, they said that they did not want a dancer but, preferably, some kind of visual art. Of course, that meant that we had to give them a dancer because it would challenge them. We gave them a choreographer/dancer who is also a very good listener.

The first part of a project is to listen to the organization. It took two months of listening to find out how they produce petroleum, how the marketing department works, how the forklifts function, and so forth. You have to read between the lines and find out what this company needs. Based on this two-month research, Veera, our dancer, discovered that there was a lack of communication between the administration, including the marketing department, and production. She designed different artistic activities for them that gave them new communication tools. One day, when she was on the production floor where trucks were driving around, she looked at the workers and said, "*You are dancing!*" That is how she saw them – as if they were dancing across the floor. She asked them if their work could be used to choreograph a ballet. They did it and that gave them another way to look at themselves and their organization. Finally, two years later, the company decided to stage that ballet out on the street. They performed at the big festival in the centre of Gothenburg. It is interesting that this was not Veera's idea. She and the workers came to this idea together. It was a real challenge for a forklift driver to be in this kind of setting as they had never performed. They had never been to the theatre either. Of course, we had a lot of media and the performers were interviewed by many journalists. A truck ballet is not a revolutionary idea. But it is normally professionals that do that sort of thing. In our case, the performers were the real workers.

Here is another example. Barbara Ekstrom is a textile artist. She worked for a year in a water-purification plant in a small municipality about 100 kilometres outside Gothenburg. There were 15-17 men working there. Again, she spent the first few months finding out how they purify water. Based on that, she used her knowledge as an artist to help the workers show in an artistic way how much water they purify in a year. She also discovered that these workers were something like water sommeliers; they could tell which sample of water came from which water purification plant. They decided to have a water-tasting contest. It turned out that the best water was the one that was used to market the municipality at various seminars and conferences.

As you can imagine, there is always a clash in this kind of project between the values of the corporation and the artist. Therefore, we need to provide an airbag in between. This helps us understand how important the conflict is and how important it is to let it be and continue to rely on the process. The men at this purification plant turned out to be very creative. They suggested that the municipality change its logo. That is not something that you can do easily. Finally, the municipality decided to use both logos on the water bottles. It is a very simple example of what sort of creativity can be unleashed in this kind of project.

I would like to stress what we do in a European project called "Creative Clash". We are gaining an increasingly better understanding of the importance of conflict and the value of finding support for this

process so that conflict can be used for the benefit of an organization. People ask me what kind of organizations engage in our projects. We have done projects in all kinds of sectors. About half of them were private; the remaining ones were public. The only thing that they have in common is that somebody on the management team has courage. It takes real courage to decide to do something outside the box and act upon it. They all understand that art is not about buying a ticket to a show or hanging a painting on the wall. It is about changing mindsets. I need to emphasize the fact that these projects are not about us bringing ballet to the production floor or helping the workers create a new logo. We do not start these projects with a prefabricated idea about what we are going to do. Our partners have to participate in this so that we have a sort of co-creation. The artists should not give the company what it is asking for. They should give it something else. This means that they have to be very self-assured but they should also be very interested in social processes.

Elisabeth O. Sjaastad: On Sense and Sensibility To impact the world we live in

My presentation is inspired by the provocation this morning and is a reaction to it. For that reason I cannot guarantee its coherence; I have not had time to polish it. Also, I admit that the only thing that has to do with archives in my presentation is the fact that I went into my own archive to use an example from a project I worked on in 2008.

I was really inspired by the background paper. I remember the presentation in Brussels and the imagery of the castle has stayed with me. I wondered what my "castle event" might be and I thought that it is actually a palace event. In 2008 a colleague of mine and I worked on a project in Ras Al Khaimah, which is one of the seven United Arab Emirates. It is a little known emirate in the shadow of its big brothers Dubai, which is known for its shopping festivals, and Abu Dhabi, with its franchising of the Guggenheim and Louvre museums. The Emirates are something like the Scandinavia of the Arab world. It is interesting to see their relationship with modern art and art institutions in the process of their nation building. Of course, some of this comes across as conspicuous consumption rather than a genuine recognition of the importance of art and culture.

So, there we were in Ras Al Khaimah. My colleague Eirin Gjørvi had previously made another film in that Emirate following the Norwegian architects Snøhetta who had been commissioned to make an impressive building, symbolizing this emirate's new future. It was a tall building of course, like all other buildings in the Emirates. It looks like a snake in the desert. We wanted to do a follow-up film and I came on board as a producer. This was just before the beginning of the financial crisis and there was a feeling that anything was possible. The Emirates were seen as the new China and a great place for investment. There were crowds of venture capitalists, seeking an audience with His Highness Sheikh Saud bin Saqr Al Quasimi, Crown Prince and Deputy Ruler. We were there in order to do research for our film through which we aimed to capture the process of profound change that was underway. We spent two weeks in the Palace freely coming and going at our leisure. We were usually hanging around in the waiting hall and when Sheikh Saud would have a free minute we would go into the office and chit-chat. We talked about many different things in between his meetings and we wanted to know

what he was listening to on his iPod. While standing there in his office, as he put on his favourite music by Pachelbel, I saw in the Sheikh a lonely man looking out the Palace window to his country, wondering how to fulfil his responsibilities as the leader of his nation, and then tears started rolling down my cheeks. I felt like a complete idiot but it was a sublime moment. It was because of art, because of the excuse of being there with a camera, that a social contract was created, whereby two Norwegian girls found themselves in a palace with an Arab sheikh, listening to classical music, talking about politics, life, love, traditions and cultural differences. That was a moment that I will always carry with me.

Of all fundamental human activities that Stojan Pelko mentioned, I think that arts and politics are two sides of the same coin. Sheikh Saud said that he wanted his country to be relevant. His family has ruled Ras Al Khaimah for 400 years and he has all these great plans for developing the country. But as his Emirate does not have oil, he needed to find a new way to create value and move forward. One of the questions he was asking himself was why the Arab world is not at the forefront of innovation anymore. Iraq was the cradle of civilization; its people invented numbers, writing, and so many other things. Why is it that the Arab countries are not as innovative today? How can he foster this mindset among his people?

I thought you might be interested in knowing what Sheikh Saud was reading in his office. Some of the titles in his bookshelf were: *A World Transformed*, *Repositioning Nutrition as Central to Development*, *The Shia Revival*, *Tourism, Globalization and Development*, and *The Wealth and Poverty of Nations*. Besides, every self-respecting sheikh in the Emirates writes love poems. We were treated to some of that poetry, as he recited it to us in the Palace.

Being Western women, we were able to move between the two worlds of an Arab society: the segregated worlds of men and women. Not far from the Palace lived a typical Ras Al Kaimah middle class family whom we got to know. Ahlam, the oldest daughter in the house, had been given a camera by her father as a birthday present. She had practiced taking pictures of her younger siblings and showed us a picture of her sister with a newspaper wrapped around her head like a hijab. A western person is likely to interpret it as an illustration of how Arab women are oppressed. However, that was not how Ahlam herself viewed it. She did not feel oppressed, but protected by the patriarchal society she lives in; to her this symbolized how the media stigmatizes women as being oppressed, without asking their own point of view. A camera, even in the hands of an untrained but talented young girl has the power to challenge our cultural prejudices.

When we talk about culture, art and politics, I sometimes wonder how these things are actually defined. According to Wikipedia, **politics** is Greek for, "of, for, or relating to citizens". It is a process by which groups make collective decisions and consists of social relations involving authority or power.

Art is the product or process of deliberately arranging items, often with symbolic significance, in a way that influences and affects one or more of the senses, as well as the intellect. Generally, art is made with the intention of stimulating thoughts and emotions.

I think that to be an artist is to be political, whether or not you make political art. The French writer Emile Zola defined a work of art as a “*corner of reality seen through a temperament*”. For me art is a way of engaging with society. Law is another kind of temperament. As far as I am concerned, asking about the role of art or culture is as meaningless as asking what is the role of law. We know that it is a way of seeing the world; it is a set of concepts. Debating whether culture and art are important or not is a very strange debate in my view. In the same vein, I find the debate about the intrinsic versus instrumental value of culture also to be a false debate. The reason that I went into art is that I would like to have an impact on the world that I live in. Artists can do this in a positive or negative way. Politics should be about enabling all people to make a positive impact; otherwise they will make a negative one as seen in the UK riots this summer.

I will conclude with a note on the horrible tragedy that happened in Norway in July. I browsed through this 1,500 page manifest that was released within the first night of the attacks. The reason I wanted to read it was the chilling title “A European Declaration of Independence”. This title clearly refers to the American Declaration of Independence, which is most famous for championing each man’s right to “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness”. But less known is that it also says that if the United States does not have a government that provides opportunities for that, the citizens have the right – even a duty to – abolish that government. The twisted logic of Breivik, the perpetrator, was that his government had failed to protect traditional European values from the onslaught of Islamization. Therefore, he targeted the Norwegian government, not the immigrant community. I found it extremely unsettling that a historical text that is celebrated and romanticized with a comfortable distance of a few hundred years can be held to its own words in such a concrete way. But as Slavoj Žižek stated: “*Behind every ethnic cleansing there is a poet.*” So not only politicians, but also artists must take some responsibility for what thoughts and emotions they seek to influence.

With all the current talk about the economic crisis and how we can correct things, I wonder how Europe will respond to this challenge. What is the European equivalent to the slogan “*life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness*”? I can only think of the Five Freedoms and “Smart, sustainable and inclusive growth” from the EU2020 Strategy. But why are we pandering to economics and its language? For me, the fact that a privileged white male, aged 30, killed all those people despite the fact that he had every opportunity to do something positive with his life, shows that economic progress is not the solution to everything. It is all too easy to dismiss him as a deranged individual.

The social psychologist Erich Fromm talks about “group narcissism”. He says that the misery, monotony, dullness, and powerlessness that exist in large sections of the population may not go away simply by improving material conditions. So the question we must ask is: What will lift people out of this condition? Access to art and participation in cultural expressions can stimulate a sense of self worth and enhance our sensibility towards the world around us. Surely this is part of the answer.



Fantomat (Photo by Chris Torch)

Chris Torch: Trees have roots, people have feet On mobility and intercultural competencies

In Sweden there is an expression: "to swear in the church". If I am now in the Church of cultural governance and policy, amongst all of you, I must curse softly: It seems to me that we create too many policy papers and too little cultural action. There is a lot of thinking in think tanks, beautiful buzzwords and broad statements. These are not just fabricated by us; they are heard throughout the world: how art meets people and how culture brings change. But to achieve these things, we need concrete projects.

I founded Intercult, where I am now Senior Associate, in 1996 in Stockholm, Sweden. We focus partly on the creation of large-scale artistic projects. While developing such multilateral and international alliances, I am often confronted with questions by policymakers and funders: "*Why must it be transnational? Aren't we clever enough in our own region? We have many good artists here. People go to the local theatres and concert halls; they're happy. Why must we be international?*" And I need to provide arguments to convince them that an international element provides useful intercultural insight. As someone said this morning, we learn a lot about ourselves by dealing with others. In the intensely intercultural world of Sweden, this idea of international outlook is an essential part of our argumentation.

In terms of action, there are several areas where the arts and culture can become essential instruments of socio-political change, in any of our European countries. One of these areas is Arts and Foreign Policy, or cultural diplomacy. The Directorate General for External Relations of the European Union last year found 50 million Euros for work on culture and diplomacy as well as culture and development in the rest of the world. And still, the Swedish government cannot understand why we should be investing in internationalism: "*We have an ambassador in each country. He takes care of things. Every now and then we invite a Slovene pianist to perform. We invite a lot of other people who love Sweden. That is internationalism.*" No. We have to go farther in our definition of international relations and how arts/culture are actually part of the pioneer stage, opening doors.

A number of people today mentioned **migration**. It is surely the greatest cultural factor in our world today. And it will continue to be what changes us, cultivates us, transforms us. It gives us multiple languages. It gives us import/export of goods and ideas. For you who believe that you live in a small, homogenous country and that this intercultural issue is secondary: believe me, globalization is going to crush you in the coming 10 or 15 years. Any small country in Europe – in fact ANY country in Europe – that is not dealing with interculturalism now will face serious problems with globalization later. A lost population. We will not have language skills, we will not have negotiating skills and we will lack intercultural competence. Can arts and culture solve all of this? Maybe ...

We need to cultivate flexibility. We must increase our collective intercultural competence, starting with the children in our schools. We need ethics. Art is never produced solely for its own sake. We cannot

do anything for "its own sake" any longer. We need to launch an ethical project. We need transnational collaboration and constructive relations with other peoples.

How can we do this? Sergio mentioned co-production rather than short-term hosting. He spoke of **collaborating** and co-creating things. It is an exercise that we do. When Peter Brook started his first international company in France years ago, he stated that he wanted to make culture in the meaning that yoghurt is culture, a bacteria that transforms the milky substance of our society into something rich, thick and healthy. The idea of co-production is that with a micro-cosmos of 15 people not speaking the same language but trying to work out an idea together, it becomes an exercise that communicates finally to hundreds of thousands of people, the macro-cosmos. Culture is the essential model for us today.

Another essential key to our ethical project is **continuity** rather than events and spectacles. This whole cultural thing has become what brands our region: a theatre or dance festival, a folk festival, a fireworks display. Sometimes great experiences as platforms where artists meet each other and audiences meet them. But we have to be careful about continuity. We need functioning community centres. We need intercultural meeting places. We need participatory cultural work – in the community, in the neighbourhood. All year round. Otherwise, culture becomes a Sunday afternoon routine, dressing up and going to Grandma's home to eat lunch, and then don't think about it anymore. Culture needs to be integrated into our daily lives.

I would now like to give you a few examples. One of our projects was called SEAS. Over four years (2007-2010), over 20 project commissions were realized, reaching over 80,000 spectators at harbour cities throughout the Black Sea and North Sea regions. There were also smaller productions co-created with local artists. The works were exhibited in unconventional or public spaces. SEAS was participatory, collaborative and public.

One of the SEAS artworks involved a series of films, seen in the eyes of 7 Fantomats, sculptured androids that stood in public places. In the eighth Fantomat, the artist who had built them sat hidden behind a tree. When a spectator came up and looked the Fantomat in the eyes, he would speak through a microphone: "*Hi, how are you?*". And a philosophical conversation begin with the Fantomat, who wished to know what he should do to become a human being. He asked: "*What do I lack? Why are you human and I am not?*" A kind of essential question at this point in time.

Finally, we embarked on an expedition which we called SEAS X 2010. We took 45 artists in a bus from Istanbul, Turkey to Batumi, Georgia, stopping in 8 small towns along the Black Sea coast. We presented artworks but we also had opportunities to meet audiences in towns without cinemas or theatres or community centres. There was no official culture, not even a cultural department. Still, we met the most open, generous and enthusiastic audiences that I have ever come in contact with. Their outreach, their desire to confront people speaking strange languages and coming from afar, inspired a continuous love affair.

This caused us to enter another collaboration beginning in 2011: a platform called CORNERS. It has the same motivation as the SEAS expedition along the Black Sea coast. This time we are doing four expeditions, in different "corners" of Europe. Two of them are already completed, one to the far north of Norway and Sweden and another one to the Caucasus where we travelled in a bus with 32 people from Batumi, Georgia, to Baku, Azerbaijan. This time, we had no finished artworks with us. Rather we intervened in the public space, more or less spontaneously. Each artist did as s/he wished, for exactly 90 minutes. We passed out leaflets with questions, such as "Who are you?", "What is art?", "Why do I dance?", "Why don't I sing", and "Why am I so afraid?" Through these interventions, we tried to understand what a real function of art might be at the edges of Europe. Not the National Theatre; there is a parallel life that is also beautiful and important. What is expected of an artist? Our artists were shocked to find out how well people understood them. In fact we had chosen very active artists. But the simplicity and depth of the communication was still a surprise.

In Tskaltubo, Georgia, we stayed at a huge hotel in a spa complex built during Stalinism and expanded later. Since 1992 it has housed 9,000 refugees from Abkhazia. An exceptional contrast between Soviet times and contemporary Georgia. To work closely with those refugees sometime in the future would be a privilege beyond description. Such rich experience, such hopelessness, such vibrant dream, such protracted nightmare.

We face difficult challenges in our world, as you all know: a growing lack of citizenship and engagement. Every year there are elections in the Western world, yet the number of voters dwindles. There is a serious threat to the sustainability of our Earth. There are the challenges of global migration and urban disintegration. International relations are stressed. If Americans had a developed intercultural competence, another choice might have been possible in Iraq and Afghanistan. War was not the appropriate response. How can we get this across to the next generation?

My final reflection is about innovation, research and education. Education is an essential factor. Our technological progress has not been balanced by an equal social or psychological development. This is one function of the arts. They give us social skills to balance the incredible technological capacity that we have, but are not able to exploit, because we do not possess the creative capacity.

I call all this the Necessity of Culture. As necessary as food, clean water, shelter or sex and love. This necessity is something that we have to get across to our policy makers and we have to do this very soon. We have to stop asking for an increase of the cultural budget from one third of one percent to seven tenths of one percent. We have to say: "*Culture, education, research, and universities need 25-30 percent of our public budget*". If not, we deny our children a future. It is that simple. If we want Europe to survive, we have to make that kind of public investment.

As a postscript, I want to respond to this idea of "roots" that was brought up earlier today. I am reminded of a Jewish song that says, "*Trees have roots, people have feet. Tonight I am your guest. People have feet, trees have roots. Tomorrow you may be my guest.*" **Mobility** is the most exciting driving force that we possess. It is that mobility that we need to cultivate: the capacity to change when

we meet the Other, rather than be rooted someplace. The only real home that we have is our own body, and it is immensely temporary.

B. From access to action

Asu Aksoy: Art has the potential to turn the table upside down On cities and multiculturalism

I am doing work on cities as well as migrant communities and that is what I was supposed to talk about. But as I listened to the other presentations, I decided to add another theme: cultural policy. As a researcher, curator and a teacher, I am split between these fields. I live in these three worlds that seem to be disconnected. They have different constituencies and do not talk to each other easily. Some people sometimes even attack me for "getting into our field". This talk aims to bring these different strands together and get us to think about the implications for cultural policy. I am going to juggle these three headings and see how they can be connected to one another. The first one is the city work that I am doing. The second one is the crisis of multiculturalism. The third ball is cultural policy. I am going to talk about these three and see how they link up.

You may have guessed that the joining element is the city. They are the spaces that require and generate concrete interventions for concrete results. The cities also provide us with ideas that we can then test in more universal terms. Cities are the seats of multiculturalism, it is cities that people are migrating to and performing their identities. We tend to think that the crisis of multiculturalism resides outside the city. However, this we cannot take for granted anymore, as cities carry the danger of feeding the problem of living together now that they are losing their public character. Cities are becoming collections of fragmented and fragmentary islands where public spaces and spheres take on a very different role like city marketing.

Let us first try then to look at the crisis of multiculturalism from the angle of a city. What have cities been doing to address their multicultural issues? There is a good article by Jude Bloomfield where she talks about how the cultural policy of Berlin is split between the local cultural politics of promoting the city and the foreign affairs commissioner who is in charge of talking about the culturally diverse population. Thus, the city is split in its discourse on how to address its multicultural mix. The job is delegated to the foreign affairs commissioner. On the other hand local policy promotes Berlin as a multicultural, cosmopolitan place that is open to the world.

If you look at the urban cultural policy of the last two decades, you will notice that it has been greatly influenced by the economic prerogatives of growth and competitiveness. There is a lot of talk about culture-led regeneration and culture's role in urban marketing and branding. Culture is supposed to boost the city's competitiveness and economic growth. This is expected to happen through various mega projects, attracting investment and tourism. In this discourse, multiculturalism becomes a matter of exoticism. It is a spectacle that is part of the marketing strategy. Look at how London uses the

Notting Hill Carnival. This is an example of something that comes from the citizens and is subsequently used by the authorities to promote the city.

We tend to think that the crisis of multiculturalism has nothing to do with cities. We think that it is a national affair. And indeed the political discourses are to blame as they keep circulating the idea of the incommensurability of cultures. Politicians are caught up in the national identity mentality. At the national level, this is actually a political crisis. At the local level, people are finding ways of living together but the political circles are unable to drop the concept of culture as a bounded phenomena, what Thomas Hylland Eriksen characterized as the '*archipelago concept of culture*'.

I have become influenced by Ulrich Beck who has been talking about cosmopolitanization from the bottom up. He has a very nice concept called "inner globalization". He says that we live in multiple worlds and that the "here and now" is about multiplicity and networking. It is about mixture, reflexivity, and choice. Inner globalization consists of various layers that are partly dogmas, partly ideologies, partly community formations, partly to do with multiplicity and trans-national mixtures. He also sets forth the idea that the centre of the modern society and its social order is the individual. It is ultimately the individual that must make choices and there is no other authority that can validate or legitimize these choices. It is individuals with 'endless multitudes inside' that forms the basis of cultural orders today.

I would like to conclude this part of my talk by saying that multiculturalism, in the sense of treating people equally while recognizing their difference, has not been practiced satisfactorily. We are talking about the failure of multiculturalism because perhaps we have never actually tried it out in its true form. What has been practiced only fuels identity politics. And in cities too the story is not different. The culture-led urban revitalisation strategies do not lead to the empowerment of the migrant communities, and do not contribute to inter-culturalism at the city level. Migrants remain in their sink neighbourhoods. Also, the prevalent policies have been blind to the post-ethnic creativity that is around us. For years, the German-Turkish film-makers have been telling Germans that they do not wish to be pigeon-holed and called German Turks. Now that they have gained enough self-confidence they want to be called simply artists – they are artists with endless multitudes within them. Cultural policies toward multiculturalism need to start out by dropping the word "culture". I know that this is hard but we can look for other words. I prefer the word "repertoire" to "culture". We need emancipatory policies in our language as to how we refer to the issue of migration and migrants. In terms of cultural policies, we should use the trans-national connections in order to make value out of them. On the other hand, it is not all about connections and trans-nationalism. It is also about where I live, where I work, where I meet other people. Why is it that I never feel part of London when I live in London? Because it is impossible for me to inscribe my history into the history of that city. This is true for many people in many cities today. It is also impossible for people from different origins to inscribe their heritage into the German context and the ongoing debate on national identity.

This brings me to my second juggling ball, which is the **city**. I am curating a project in Istanbul which is about making a local municipality rethink its role in the area that it is governing. It is a district that provides drinking water to the whole city. It has agricultural land and forests and is under huge

pressure from the city of Istanbul. My job is to help them think about their assets and resources in an integrative fashion.

We are now in the process of remaking cities all over the world. If you take a long-term vision, looking from 1300 to 2011, you will notice a tremendous increase in urbanization in recent years. A revolution of unprecedented proportions is going on as we speak: 70 percent of mankind will be living in cities in a couple of decades. Already half of the world's population lives in cities. The number of rural migrants who are leaving their villages is staggering. We have to come up with all sorts of new solutions regarding the environment, social justice, morality, or simply how we talk to each other. These issues will have to be solved in the city, by thinking about the city. We must take into account this new social phenomenon and pay special attention to the city. The Turkish prime minister understands this well and likes to be seen as a politician who is doing something big for Istanbul. As the city is being re-made this has major implications for our cultural orders. Istanbul is now losing its informal characteristic of development, what a historian called its 'self-service city' characteristic where poor people managed to find accommodation in the city life for them. Now there is a massive purification, gentrification and *corporatization* process going on. It is a familiar story that has taken place in other cities before.

There is currently rich reflection about city-making. People are thinking about this issue and doing research. Interestingly, artists and culture-managers are absent in this process. They are totally absent. If they are introduced at all, this is done as an afterthought. But there are attempts all over the world to find new concepts about city-making. The planners are now instituting site management governance models. This implies a transversal government structure. From water experts to sociologists, everybody has to sit down and talk about particular territories.

The second very interesting development is called "research by design". In the urban planning world, architects, just like artists, used to come at the end of the planning process. Urban planners would come up with something and then they would invite the architects, saying, "Design this for us". Now it is the other way around. It is architects, graphic designers and information designers that launch ideas. The idea is to use their vision and mix it with the transversal methodology. However, I am afraid, that there are still very few artists that are involved in this process. There does not seem to be a way to put artists into this equation.

Artists need to be freed of instrumental logic that we are familiar with. Yet, at the same time, they need to be involved in the search for solutions to the big challenges of our world. They really need to participate in the design of cities as emancipation machines that will provide solutions to the questions of sustainability. The question is how cities can be transformed from monsters to problem-solvers: cities as the shapers of our cultural orders to come and cities as the pre-eminent site of multiplicity.

I want to use my experience from my curatorial work in city making. As soon as I start thinking about this work, I want to involve an artistic vision. I want to introduce something that will turn the table upside down. Art has the potential to do that. I read a book by an Italian urban farming activist and a thinker named Antonio Magnani. It is called "The Urban Village; A Charter for Democracy and

Self-Sustainability". He talks about the territory, the soil, the topography, the trees, the landscape, the rivers, the smell of the land. Each time I visit the project site in Istanbul, I feel the air and see the vistas around me – the things that landscape designers talk about in their own languages. I keep telling people at the local municipality that they need to communicate the value of this place to the citizens. Antonio Magnani made me realize the importance of sensitivity towards the particular, the local. This takes me back to my point about rootedness. The modern city develops like a concrete carpet taking over the landscape and all the memories that have been there. Modern city making is oblivious to the particular. There is a destruction of local particularities and identities going on everywhere. It is only now, through the slow food movement, that people are beginning to think and talk about the local identities and the stories of the places they inhabit. They are beginning to realize that it is not just topography to be levelled.

This is why I wanted artists in my urban project. I wanted them to make people think: "This is what you have here". By evaluating this, you will achieve some sort of awareness and identity through which you will perhaps think of the city in a different way. The challenge is double: rediscovering the value of the local and the particular and at the same time inserting the local in the trans-local through the mobile gaze and multiplicity of attachments of its inhabitants. The local becomes the site of celebration of how change and heritage shape one another in all the multiplicities that globalization entails.

Finally, I would like to bring these thoughts together, that will be my third juggling element: the cultural policy direction. I find it exasperating knocking on the doors of policy makers. I find it exhausting that it takes so many trips and knocks on doors to bring all the stakeholders to talk to one another and formulate their common issues and challenges. It seems clear to me that what is being meant by mainstreaming cultural policy is that the cultural decision makers in local authorities, and also in other stakeholder organisations should be working on joint projects with the city planners, architects, engineers and conservation specialists. Here is where I think that we've got the balls back in our hands. The world of cultural policy needs to open itself to inter-disciplinarity and trans-versality. I think this will be the move necessary to make arts more integral to the work on broadening our horizons.



Me-We Neon (Photo by Shelagh Wright)

Shelagh Wright: Not finding new lands but seeing with new eyes

Re.think and Re.volution

We are all here because we know that things have to change and we need to act very fast to invent a new economic and social paradigm in order to make our world more liveable. I think that we are also here because we believe that arts and culture are an integral part of that process. We may not be able to save the world but we must absolutely be part of the process.

We know that the potential of arts and culture to help us respond to what is beginning to be called in various places "the bigger-than-self" problems of our age – decline of resources, climate change, and social injustice – is unrehearsed and unrealized. In addition, many of our arts and culture organizations – certainly in the United Kingdom but, in my experience, also across Europe and the rest of the world – are overextended and undercapitalized. They are trying to do too much with too little and all too often on their own and in isolation. This lack of resilience in the sector produces huge stress and makes us poor stewards of the future.

Fundamentally, Mission Model's Money is trying to create two practical responses and build the alliances that can help us make the transition to a more liveable world. One of them is Re.volution, aimed at system change in the arts and culture ecology in the United Kingdom and, hopefully, internationally. Secondly, Re.think is aimed at articulating art and culture's contribution to the wider global system change that we need to see.

Re.volution is just starting to get up and running. It is an experiment based on a peer learning network designed to stimulate the collective intelligence and other resources that are locked up in the arts and culture sector rather just bringing in external, and often expensive, people to help us. The idea is to assist sustainable development, help organizations renew their mission, reconfigure their business and organizational model, and revise their approaches to money: where they get it from and where they put it. It is supported by a Re.source library, offering a range of tools designed for the three MMMs that we work around. We are trying to share this model internationally.

Re.think is a complex program. It is a global platform designed to help all those working with arts and culture in order to make the world more liveable. We propose that there are three primary dynamics that are inherent in art and culture, when combined, they have the capacity to affect change and help us achieve a more liveable world. Firstly, there is a possibility for collective engagement: bringing people together to share emotions, and imagine and rehearse possible futures. Secondly, art and culture can challenge the status quo, question those in power, and disrupt the existing state of affairs and our perceptions. Thirdly, we can create space and the specifics for developing discussions, and begin to design responses for sustainable and meaningful livelihoods.

The platform that we are trying to construct is built around three ideas. The first is a **seed bank** of existing practice, projects and things that are happening in arts and culture all across the world that might feed our ideas for development. The second is a **growing community** of people from very different disciplines and countries. They are collaborating on a series of projects that I will describe in

a moment. Third, we are trying to develop what we are thinking of as **policy acupunctures**: little prods into the energy of the system in order to give different stories to decision-makers in politics, economics, and environment development so that they start thinking differently about the potential of art and culture to help us through this period.

Art and culture are among the most participative dynamics and social forms of human behaviour. Because of their potential to generate empathy, disrupt reality, and create dialogue, they can be powerful vehicles in communicating and shaping our cultural values. There is evidence that cultural values have a profound shaping influence on our motivation to engage with bigger-than-self problems. For those of you who have not seen the work of the civil society group Common Cause: the case for working with cultural values, is well worth a look.

The values that we are talking about are commonly held across cultures and include empathy toward those who are facing humanitarian disaster, concern for future generations, and recognition that human prosperity resides in relationships, both with each other and with the natural world. These values have been weakened and often derided in modern culture. We need to find ways to reengage with them as we move forward. These cultural values underpin ways of thinking and being that are essential to the creation of the next phase of development around several concepts. The first is collective well-being: a fulfilling and happy life for individuals and communities. The second is democracy: the capacity of groups of people to take shared decisions about their future. The third is the development of sustainable livelihoods: a means of living where the assets, including material, social and intangible resources, create value for the common as well as for the private. Again, we are creating a body of evidence to demonstrate how culture is associated with these concepts and find out whether and how participation in artistic and cultural activities affects people's values in terms of the goals that they care about.

Our biggest planned project is researching how participation in artistic and cultural activities affects people's intrinsic values over time. This was built in collaboration with the Common Cause work on cultural values. We are going to try a new impact and evaluation methodology with three projects in the United Kingdom. One is the Happy Museums Group, looking at the role of museums as cultural centres for the development of the well-being of communities. The second is Farnham Maltings, an artistic activity centre in England that provides a place for people of all types and ages to make work. The third is the Cape Farewell project in the Scottish islands, looking at stewardship, heritage and the future.

Another project we are developing will explore the role of culture in the post-industrial growth economy. In the high-wellbeing future that we need to create we will need new foundations for economic models. We believe that art and culture's potential in this respect is twofold. First, it has a capacity to enhance the cultural vitality of communities and support wellbeing. Second, it has a potential to offer different models and diverse roots for sustainable livelihoods that are largely dematerialized and therefore do not cost the Earth. We are working with the New Economics Foundation to search different data sources and develop that narrative.

The third project, inspired by Mohamed Ali's shortest poem: "Me. We", we hope will actively commission actors and other projects that we think exemplify the kind of narrative that we are trying to build in order to evidence and communicate. Our plan is for the first of these to be around the Festival of Transition for 20th anniversary of the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro in June next year.

A fourth project will look at how we can cross-pollinate with others in other sectors who are already on this road. The idea is to explore with them how artists and cultural organizations might offer new and more nuanced and subtle methods for approaching and communicating our shared values. That includes non-government organizations, the civil society community, and a group of innovative advertising agencies that are interested in renewing their relationship to campaigning and development.

Marcel Proust memorably said that the act of discovery does not consist in finding new lands but in seeing with new eyes. That is what we are trying to do with these two programs. We are trying to look at the experience of engaging with arts and culture with new eyes and propose some practical action that might help us revolutionize our own sector and rethink our collective future.

Milica Nikolić: To wake up the Sleepy Hollow On creative moves in Cetinje, the capital of Montenegro

I am sure that many of you know something about the history of Montenegro. But in case you do not, for centuries Montenegro was the only free country in the Balkans. Cetinje, its royal capital, has always been known in this part of Europe for its freedom and cosmopolitanism. This is the key of our identity. However, in the 20th century, we lost our independence to the kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. Cetinje lost its sovereignty and its development ground to a halt. It became a Sleepy Hollow of sorts.

After the Second World War, Montenegro was the smallest republic of former Yugoslavia. During the industrialization effort, some factories were built in the republic. Now some of these factories are empty and collapsing. Today, Cetinje has 25,000 inhabitants. It is a small town without much going on in the economy. There is huge unemployment and other economic problems. But it has a magnificent culture and is very important for our national identity. Montenegro is trying to promote Cetinje at the national level by creating an atmosphere for people who live there. We have a law on the cultural capital of Cetinje. A lot of cultural events are now moving to that town. There is a Higher School of Arts, a State Institute of Culture, a National Theatre, and more. Most importantly, the Ministry of Culture was moved to Cetinje a year ago. This is how we are promoting Cetinje at the national and then at the international level. Also, the government has started an initiative called "Cetinje, City of Culture", involving a multi-million euro budget. It involves a lot of different events, as well as reconstruction of important buildings. We are trying to establish two management centres. One is for the management of cultural heritage. We are working on this project together with UNESCO. The other one is about management of international cooperation.

Another idea is to transform the abandoned refrigerator factory Obod into a cultural centre to house Marina Abramović Community Centre Obod (MACCO). It is supposed to host diverse activities as the space seems ideal for that. All stakeholders that can produce interesting projects will come together in this place. This project was presented at a Venice Biennale 2011. The Supporting Committee for the project can be defined as an international body that will find donors and create a special atmosphere for the whole Centre. The best way to anticipate this atmosphere is to listen to the words of its creative soul, performing artist Marina Abramović, when she speaks on the future of performance art and her two legacies.

"There is a point in an artist's life when he has to start thinking about leaving. It is not necessary to stop working but it is more about what will stay as his legacy in relation to his works and beliefs. For me, the education of young artists was always included as a part of my work. I wanted to give unconditional experience to the younger generation. It is also that creating dialogue with this generation can give me the sense of the spirit of the time we are living in, and keep me in touch with reality. I always saw this has a fair exchange. When I started my work as a performance artist in former Yugoslavia, nobody even thought at that time that it was art. A completely new language and a new system of rules had to be created. It took more than 35 years to get to the position to create the ground to transform the alternative form of art as a performance into mainstream art.

My generation of performance artists stopped performing by the end of the 1970's. Only a few of us are still here. To continue performance work is so emotionally and physically demanding and it is not easy to continue for a long period of time. At the moment, all my attention is to form a certain legacy that permits performance art to continue to grow and develop. Performance art is a time-based art, but its character is immaterial. And because of its nature it is so difficult to be understood or collected. My legacy will be to establish two performance centres on two continents simultaneously, one in Cetinje, Montenegro in Europe, and one in Hudson, New York, in the USA. Recently the new Prime Minister of Montenegro and the Minister of Culture decided to transform the old refrigerator factory Obod in Cetinje, built during Tito's communist regime, into the Marina Abramovic Community Center Obod (MACCO). This place will be a place of production, presentation, distribution and development of different art forms like performance art, dance, theatre, opera, film, video, music, as well as a space of interest in architecture, science, and new technologies. Obod was founded to produce refrigerators for all of former Yugoslavia, and remains a perfectly preserved example of the ideals of communism, industrialism, and modernism that were so circumspectly situated next to the centuries old libraries, palaces, monastery, and mountains that make Montenegro such a compelling geographic location. The entire factory occupies 140,000 sq. meters and is in the middle of Cetinje, which was the capital of the old kingdom of Montenegro.

In the Venice Biennale, the Montenegro pavilion presented the model of the factory and the future plans of its functions. I see MACCO as a sister organization to the Marina Abramović Institute for the Preservation of Performance Art (MAI) in Hudson which I am developing at the moment. The Hudson institute has a space of more than 21,000 square meters and the main goal is to develop and present performances of long duration, in the fields of dance, theatre, music, and film. This will be a unique centre of its kind in the world. Eventually the works that each of these centres produce will be able to

tour to venues through the world, after they are work-shopped and premiered in their respective arts centres. In this way, I hope that my legacy will keep performance and the time-based arts an always living, changing, and transforming art form." (first published in Flash Art Magazine, May/June issue, 2011; reprinted in the Catalogue for the Presentation of Montenegro at the 54th International Art Exhibition – la Biennale di Venezia, 2011, "The Fridge Factory and Clear Waters")

Sara Selwood: Museums can change attitudes Speaking the unspoken

I'm going to talk about England rather than Europe. More specifically, I am going to focus on museums funded by the Department of Culture, Media, and Sport. I'm dividing what I have to say into three sections – where we were yesterday; where we are today, and where we might be tomorrow.

Yesterday

Before coming to power in the 1997 election, New Labour described culture as of fundamental importance to the incoming government and associated it with our capacity to promote a common purpose, re-establish a sense of community, identity, and civic pride – the undermining of which had so damaged our society. This touches on what we have been discussing.

The cultural sector had previously been at arm's length from Government. But that changed radically when New Labour established its Department of Culture, Media, and Sport. The Department reclaimed responsibility for cultural policy, and issued an unprecedented number of policy directives, which were closely linked to government policies in general. Over Labour's 13 years in power, these remained consistent and explicitly focused on the supposed instrumental effects of cultural provision delivering on government objectives.

Labour's objectives for the cultural sector included access for many, not just a few. It talked about pursuing excellence and innovation, nurturing educational opportunities, and realizing its sector's economic contribution. It assumed that increased public investment could determine particular outcomes, i.e., the more money invested, the more effective the outcomes.

Against a steady growth of public spending in general, Labour's support for the cultural sector rose exponentially. Between 1998 and 2010, the Department increased its funding to the sector by 98 percent. Support for museums went up around 95 percent. Moreover, since 1994, Heritage Lottery Fund alone invested 1.42 billion pounds into museums and galleries.

It was hardly surprising, then, that on one of his valedictory speeches, Tony Blair claimed to have created a golden age for the arts in our country. Since museums received so much funding, they were largely responsible for delivering the government's policies. Like any other organizations directly funded by government, the nationals had to agree to targets that were specified through a series of

linked agreements cascading down from the Treasury. Museums found themselves unprecedentedly accountable.

Free admission to government-sponsored museums was iconic of Labour's policies. It targeted three priority groups in particular: people with disabilities, minority ethnic communities, and people in the lower socio-economic groups, all of whom engage less in subsidized cultural activities than more advantaged social groups. Since the introduction of universal free admission in December 2001, visits to museums that used to charge admission fees have gone up more than 100 percent.

Today

Since May 2010 we have had a Conservative and Liberal Democrat coalition government. In stark contrast with New Labour, it has barely articulated any cultural policy. The present government's focus remains on the national debt. Funding to museums by the Department of Culture, Media, and Sport has been cut by about 15 percent. Local authority income has been reduced by an average of 28 percent over four years. Since local government supporting museums is non-statutory, the sector is particularly vulnerable. Museums are also affected by a decline in funding from charitable foundations and corporate sponsorship.

For its part, the Department has sought to cut back by abolishing various of its agencies, including the Museums, Libraries and Archives Council. It has cut its own administrative costs, including 50 percent of its staff. Like previous conservative administrations, the coalition wants to reduce cultural organizations' dependency on government funding. Any proposed increases to the cultural sector in the future must come from other sources.

Even after performance measures had been introduced and become standard, successive New Labour Secretaries of State for Culture acknowledged the shortcomings of a performance measurement regime. It was necessary to go beyond targets to best capture the value of culture. The Department tried to address this by running pilots which judged quality rather than measuring output. But, this initiative coincided with the beginning of the recession, was costly and it never got off the ground.

Coming from a completely different perspective, the current Prime Minister, David Cameron, has acknowledged that gross domestic product is an incomplete way to measure the country's progress. He asked the National Statistics Office to develop measures around well-being with a view to measuring our progress as a country, not just by growth in the economy but by our quality of life. The sector has been lobbying for the public's participation in museums to be acknowledged as contributing to national well-being. Indeed, the most conspicuous example of that is probably the Happy Museum project, which Shelagh touched on earlier today.

All this might suggest that museums find themselves operating in a more sympathetic climate. Evidence suggests that the number of visits to museums sponsored by the Department is still growing. But on close inspection, the rate of that increase is slowing down. The number of visits to regional

museums is levelling off, or falling. Despite the continuation of free admission to sponsored museums, the number of attendances by people from priority groups is definitely declining. They already account for a smaller percentage of visits to museums than they did previously.

Without the same level of investment and consistent top-down policies, the profile of museum visitors is visibly reverting to what it was before. It is more white, middle class, and less diverse. As the recession bites deeper, even the traditional museum audience is likely to be affected. Quite apart from admission fees, the cost of visiting is becoming prohibitive. This is particularly the case for baby-boomers and retired people living on diminishing incomes. The cost of travel and refreshments alone is becoming a real barrier.

So, what will keep people going to museums?

Tomorrow

Over the years, museums have tended to account for themselves in terms of their educational, social and economic impacts. But, we have little, if any, robust evidence to support claims for these as long-term effects. Driven by political agendas, such politically desirable outcomes distracted attention away from the difference that museums make to their audiences personally. Museum professionals tend to emphasize the importance of the 'authentic' experience they offer. Authenticity is also often used to refer to the essence of theatre performance. But recent research found that cinema audiences for the National Theatre's NT Live streaming reported higher levels of emotional engagement with the play, than that of their peers in the theatre itself.

The phenomenal success of *A History of the World in 100 Objects* suggests that there's more to it than either of these suggest. The *100 Objects* partnership between the British Museum and the BBC produced a history of humanity. Its stories connected us with people who had shaped the world before us, and enabled us to understand the significance of the objects they left behind. Sometimes the narratives rival each other; sometimes they articulate non-written histories. By now, the BM will have issued well over half a million *History of the World* guides. Initial evaluation suggested that 24% of the UK population (14.8 million people) listened to at least one episode – on air, online or via podcasts. In 2010 alone, the podcasts were downloaded over 18 million times worldwide, and the entire series is still available online. The project also involved a whole host of other BBC platforms. By the end of the series, over 500 museums were participating in the project. Together with members of the public, they had uploaded 5,000 objects onto the website. Their descriptions of significant objects were posted online, and some were broadcast. They also participated by suggesting what the 100th object should be.

There are a whole host of exhibitions which we think of as having changed attitudes. The Treasures of Tutankhamen, first shown at the British Museum in 1972, is one. Another is *'The Destruction of the Country House'* at the V&A in 1974, which effectively stopped the demolition of many historic, British country houses. Edward Steichen's *Family of Man* at MoMA, NY, 1995, was seen by 9 million people in 38 countries. Its themes of human relations – birth, death, love, oppression and longing, touched

people of all cultures. Despite being criticized for representing US cultural diplomacy post-McCarthy and during the Cold War period, it conveyed an expression of humanism which was both courageous and provocative for the time.

Last year I wrote about the cultural impact of museums for National Museums Directors' Conference. It was based on the assumption that museums make a real difference to people's lives. But, the truth is that the sector knows very little about its impact on our culture – how far reaching it is, who it affects and how. It's hardly surprising. New Labour's expectations of cultural policy were so highly determined that it leaves little space to think about such things. The dominant orthodoxy was that a series of instrumental effects were produced as a result of "cultural" value. Museum programmes were justified in the context of a target culture, and subject to quantitative performance measures. Economic value dominated in a field, often characterised by its market failure.

Not much has changed. Dave O'Brien's recent report to Department for Culture, Media and Sport, *Measuring the value of culture*, concluded that the economic valuation techniques supported by the Treasury's Green Book should be those used by the cultural sector in articulating its value to central government. Even the notion of subjective well-being as an indicator of cultural value, is being monetized by econometrics.

Over the past couple of years, the UK Film Council and the British Film Institute (BFI) have been exploring the cultural impact of film. One of the great things about their new report, *Opening our Eyes*, is that it moves forward the debate about "well-being". In stark contrast to the advocacy culture we've got used to, it's neither positive nor affirmative. It acknowledges that much of film's appeal lies in what's unsettling, what takes viewers out of their comfort zones, and leads them to see, if not appreciate, other's circumstances. All this coincides with the single most important findings of my report – museum visitor's will to **empathize**.

Despite approaching museum's cultural impact with a completely different methodology to the BFI's researchers, my findings complement theirs. At base, museum audiences responded to programmes:

- which spoke the unspoken – articulated and explored sensitive and difficult issues within an institutional context;
- which generated a sense of belonging and integration;
- which opened the way to different attitudes and perceptions – prompting visitors to revisit their own experiences, and discover their own potential; and
- which inspired them to reconsider affiliations and associations – at both personal and other levels.

To rephrase the American writer, Mark Slouka, museums could be said to be "*the crucible within which our evolving notions of what it means to be fully human are put to the test; they teach us,*

incrementally, endlessly, not what to do but how to be. Their method is confrontational, their domain unlimited, their 'product' not truth but the reasoned search for truth..."

In a future, in which museums have fewer resources, need to focus more on their collections and have a narrower, if not more dedicated, group of visitors, they may have no option but to be more single-minded. I'd hope that they'll be doing what several of them already do best – capturing audiences' imaginations with humanitarian content.

C. From Action to Policy

Mladen Dolar: The Closing of the European Mind The Dutch Case

I will be speaking about a particular experience, indeed a personal experience, but which has the value of a test-case or of a certain paradigm to be imposed as a model, a show-case of a tendency which may well prove to be prevailing. This is a particular case which has the value of a symptom.

It is a bit by coincidence that I started to be involved in collaboration with an institution which is called Jan van Eyck Academie, situated in Maastricht, in Holland. Maastricht is the probable birthplace of Jan van Eyck, hence its name, but nowadays it invokes a far more conspicuous birthplace, the birthplace of the present shape of the European Union, famously based on the Maastricht Treaty. There is a trajectory encapsulated in this place, encompassing five centuries, from one of the great formidable landmarks in European cultural history, the miraculous and luminous work of Jan van Eyck in the fifteenth century, and on the other hand the all in all far less inspiring political gathering in 1992, laying down the foundations of the new Europe, for the better or worse, enabling its expansion, not without some run-of-the-mill compromises, mutual blackmail, hidden assumptions and paradoxes. There is a question implied in this shortcut, in this juxtaposition of an artist of the highest stature and the current political agenda: one may well ask how would Jan van Eyck fare in today's Europe, and more to the point, how does the current European framework, with its cultural policies and all, cater for or enable the emergence and the formation of art of such stature. Or one could rephrase the question: not what Jan van Eyck is for us – he has a secure place in the history and the galleries, but how would the Maastricht agenda look in the eyes of someone like Jan van Eyck?

I have to say something about the nature of this institution. I am partial to it, I have been attached to it in the past two years, holding the position of an advising researcher, and with each visit to this place I attended to it with a growing enthusiasm. The cultural and educational landscape of Europe is now largely haunted by the ominous sounding names of very beautiful European cities, Bologna, Lisbon, Pisa, and the Jan van Eyck Academy presents something of an exception to the rule. It is one of the rare places which maintain the high standards of courageous research and free spirit, to use this very old-fashioned parlance, beyond the boundaries of disciplines, evaluations, grades, utility and measurement. There is the happy circumstance that the institution is defined as post-academic, its title

being 'post-academic institute for research in art, design and theory', so that it is placed from the outset outside the framework of university and education.

The institution provides fellowships, grants, to 48 young people in these three areas, people from all around the world who have finished their university education, many of them with a PhD, people standing at the beginning of their careers. They are given mostly two-year stipends to freely pursue their research in these three areas, trying out new paths and directions, based solely on the interest and the innovative value of their projects. Nobody has to pass exams or write dissertations, nobody makes a career there, everybody is there for a limited time, which creates a climate and a framework where everybody devotes his or her time and energy to the thing itself, to new research and reflection, without the usual institutional pathologies. The institution is international, indeed cosmopolitan by its habitus, inter- and transdisciplinary by its practice and experimental by its nature. There is a long string of renowned guests, some of the best people in these fields, Jacques Rancière a month ago, Slavoj Žižek a week ago, to name the most recent, all of them invariably very much taken by the place. Maybe the shortest description of its spirit would be that this is an institution which has kept the rare capacity of inspiring enthusiasm and commitment, a capacity that universities around the world have mostly and sadly lost, ridden as they are with catering for mass-produced marketable knowledge, to make it quick. And finally, last but not least, there is the happy circumstance of the generous support of the Dutch government which after WWII established a network of post-academic institutions as the breeding ground of the ideas and practices for the future. All this sounds quite utopian, and indeed it was too good to last.

Holland is not a country that one would hear a lot about. From afar it looks like a well-ordered state where there is a reign of welfare, with high social and cultural standards, and if one doesn't hear about it, this may be a good sign. The alarming rumours that one began to hear over the past couple of years didn't quite get the attention they deserved. It is namely so that Holland in my view is one of the most alarming cases politically, in the EU, many alarms should sound but they don't. Briefly, after the election in June last year there is now a right-wing government, with the usual rather depressing neo-liberal agenda, but the essential part for its current political outfit is the fact that this is a minority government which, to function properly, depends on a parliamentary majority provided by the extreme right populist party of Geert Wilders. Geert Wilders is the icon of the new era politics. When the Norwegian shooter Breivik published his internet manifesto, he highly praised one role model, the only one in Europe he would espouse, and he found it in Wilders. This is a politician pushing anti-immigrant and anti-Islamic rhetoric, of the kind that one wouldn't quite imagine possible in public discourse. The trouble in Europe is allegedly caused by all these hordes of Muslims that will swamp us, the enemy comes from outside and is lurking in our midst, we should expel it if we are to retain the values of European culture; and much more along these lines. There is a larger problem of Islamophobia sharing the structural features with anti-Semitism. His rhetoric is so outrageous that he was denied entry into Great Britain some years ago. There was a lawsuit raised against him in the Dutch court of law, but he was acquitted last June in the name of freedom of speech. His party won over 15% of the vote in the last elections (June 2010), with 24 seats out of 150, and over 20% on some local elections. The election results were such that no side could obtain a parliamentary majority, and since it still seems indecent to make this kind of politician part of the government, a deal was finally struck that the

government can count on his support in the parliament. So this man found himself in the ideal position where he can blackmail everyone, but the most troubling part is that his rhetoric, his type of discourse and argument suddenly became acceptable in the public domain, a general topic of conversation. A man with whom no politician of any stature would sit at the same table a few years ago has suddenly become *salonfähig*, and the injurious speech has become omnipresent.

So with the right-wing government helplessly reliant on the extreme right's support, it didn't take long to come to the point of radical austerity measures. The state secretary for culture and education, Halbe Zijlstra, has come up with a government bill of drastic cuts, concerning the whole field of culture. The bill proposes to cut the funding of all post-academic institutions, of almost all cultural magazines, artist's grants, a long string of cultural institutions, the cuts all in all amounting to 200 million Euros. The document bears the tell-tale title 'Beyond quality', the man cannot be accused of not being sincere, and he even takes pride in not being an art connoisseur. But this is only the part of the austerity measures concerning culture, there are drastic cuts in social structures, social support, healthcare, the introduction of university fees, etc. With the money thus saved there would be thousand of new jobs for policemen, investments in new armament, etc. All this in a country which is economically doing rather well, being far less affected by the crisis than most of the EU. The cuts are such that in June there were tens of thousands of protesters parading in Hague, one day the artists, next day the nurses, etc., but of course to no avail.

I can evoke an anecdote. Last year the Ministry of Culture organized a meeting of the heads of Dutch cultural institutions about the cultural infrastructure and to their great surprise the four speakers at the meeting were: the head of an amusement park, the head of a woman's magazine, the director of the Dutch hockey association and the head of a big hospital. The message of the meeting was clear: the one infrastructure that the culture really needs, and the only real one, is the market. Make an effort, ladies and gentlemen, to sell your services, make them such that they would embellish the entertainment parks and provide additional entertainment at the hockey matches, make the theory appropriated to the readership of women's magazines and entertain the patients. The state is not going to pay any more for your expensive hobbies. There is something emblematic in this gathering and its crude assumptions, it enacts the spirit of the time in a caricatural way and the most troubling thing is how easy it is to vividly imagine it.

Holland is not a country like any other. It has embodied through the last centuries the spirit of liberties, of tolerance and of cosmopolitan openness, of intellectual and artistic research. It has a long libertarian tradition stretching back to the 17th century. Let me quote some Spinoza, his *Tractatus theologico-politicus* (1670), one of the most explosive books of the 17th century. This is the first serious work that undertook a philological scrutiny of the Bible, analyzing the way it is pieced together from various quarters, how some parts are contradictory and in many respects questionable, and finally it proposed to scrutinize its claims, subjecting them to an impartial philosophical judgment.

One can imagine that this was a highly risky enterprise. In the conclusion Spinoza makes some reflections on the social and political conditions that made his work possible and he says the following:

“Let me put forth the city of Amsterdam as the model sufficient for my purpose, where the fruits of this liberty of thought and opinion are seen in its wonderful increase, and testified to by the admiration of every people. In this most flourishing republic and noble city, men of every nation, and creed, and sect live together in the utmost harmony; [...] there is never a question of religion or creed, ... and here there is no sect, however odious and despised, whose ministers ... do not find countenance and protection from the magistrate.”

Spinoza was an outcast and what he is saying there is that there is a city, Amsterdam, and a country, Holland, where the outcast can find his homeland, that there is a free spirit enabling courageous intellectual research, where the outcast can find his country, in the 17th century. It is precisely against this spirit of Dutch history that we now have the rise of the political agenda which thrives in producing the outcasts, and ironically introducing precisely the question of religion and creed as the discriminating factor. Dutch libertarian identity is being dismantled in the name of protection of Dutch identity, and no doubt one can be easily content with the identity of tulips and windmills, it's very picturesque. But it is precisely because of what Holland has historically represented as the harbinger of liberties (not without contradictions, with which every tradition is ridden, say of colonialism) that the austerity measures of the present government in its alliance with the extreme right present the test case, the symptom, the probing stone, a paradigmatic scenario. Allan Bloom has once launched the slogan of the closing of the American mind; so there is a process where what is at stake is not merely the closing of the Dutch mind, but the closing of the European mind.

There is something obscene in the austerity measures, particularly in a country which is doing fairly well. Precisely the politics whose policies largely brought about the present crisis, this same politic is now presenting itself as the saviour which will save those from the consequences that it has caused in the first place. And it doesn't shy away from using drastic methods of alliance with the xenophobic populist right, thus giving this option credibility and currency. So the state is solving its self-inflicted financial turmoil by state measures which aim at dismantling what makes the state the state. And the cost of the crisis is relegated to the cuts that will affect all the areas which made Holland a model. It is possible to imagine that Holland, which served as the model of bourgeois liberties may yet again serve as the model of a new politics, based on austerity, where the neo-liberal policies which have met their breakdown can be saved only by reliance on populism and xenophobia.

The Jan van Eyck Academy is a very small part of this pattern, yet alarming and disheartening. The Academy will put up a struggle as best it can, and go down with flying colours. There is a call for a general assembly in February 2012, on precisely the 20th anniversary of the Maastricht treaty. It seems that in a condensed period of time and place the question of what is the European agenda, and what is to be done with the legacy of Jan van Eyck, is to be symbolically contested and decided in Maastricht.

Nina Obuljen: Policy-makers need to make political decisions Is it possible to stay in one place and discover a lot?

After Mladen's presentation, I cannot help thinking about what caused such a fundamental shift in public opinion. After all, the European populations are the same as those a decade ago. The only answer that I have is "fear". People are really afraid. This fear is the perfect environment for all kinds of extremist thinking, including populism. The economic crisis is just the tip of the iceberg. Beneath it is the fundamental crisis of the system. For decades people thought that they were building a perfect society but now we are in deep trouble. What has caused this tremendous shift?

This reminds me of another question that was brought up. Who is going to come up with a new vision and strategy? How will we change the paradigm when we are only dealing with problems? The policy-makers are caught up in their bureaucracies and the political spectrum is divided. The public discourse is ultimately technocratic and we cannot find many individuals who had sufficient time or competence to design a global vision in the times when our leaders are losing sight of the priorities. I talked to Majda Širca, this morning, after Slavoj Žižek's presentation. She told me that she had only one regret concerning her service as minister of culture of Slovenia: she should have been more authoritarian, having the courage to do things that met with opposition.

This morning we debated the question of whether democracy is really the best system for making progress in the arts. Or should policy-makers have the courage to impose some decisions if they believed that they were right? This brings up another issue for me: reconciling governance and social responsibility. Policy-makers need to make political decisions. What justifies such a decision? The first thing should be ideology. But this morning some speakers questioned the existence of ideology. A policy-maker's space for manoeuvre is strictly limited today. The second thing that can suggest a decision is your own vision. But then, again, you run into the complexities of the system. You start out with your vision but then you are confronted with reality: budgets, regulations, national and international standards, your strategy versus the general strategy of the government.

The third possible justification could be that you are responding to requests and needs. You listen to the artistic community and its lobbyists. They articulate their needs and you try to transform them into a consistent policy.

The upshot of all this is that you have to be pragmatic and set up some achievable goals. At the same time, you have to be open to strategic thinking. Otherwise, you would be just keeping up the routine. The routine is not necessarily bad but that is a different issue.

Now, I am coming to the example of Cetinje. I was there this summer and I talked to the minister of culture of Montenegro. I was in a state of total shock when I saw what was happening there. It is not only the Marina Abramović Center; the whole town is being rebuilt. It is a small town but it is extremely important to Montenegro. The minister of culture moved the ministry to Cetinje and said, "*Now we have to travel 45 minutes every day and be enthusiastic about that*". If he had followed real democratic

procedures – convening arts councils and suchlike – this would have never happened. If he was not such a good friend of the president and the prime minister, it would never have been possible. So, one could say *by coincidence*, he is doing something good he created space for courageous arts interventions. However, it could have easily been the other way around: a man with the same energy, bypassing procedures and consultation procedures, commissioning somebody who would make the most tasteless thing in the world.

My previous boss, the minister of culture of Croatia did something similar, although a little more structured. I just want to give you an example of how individual vision, coupled with courage, can make things happen. When UNESCO drew up its list of intangible heritage, there was a first round of proposals. My boss got together with various culture experts and said, "*I want 15 nominations from Croatia*". Being a former UNESCO bureaucrat, I said, "*We can't do that; we can't have so many nominations.*" But he did not listen to me. He said there was no rule that stipulated how many nominations could be made. To make a long story short, there were China, Japan, and Croatia with 10 nominations each for the Intangible Heritage list. The following year, UNESCO figured out that there were other people like him and now there is a rule that says you can make up to two nominations a year. But we were already in! This is important not only for the image of Croatia but because people from 10 communities in Croatia who have been for generations preserving these phenomena are now feeling proud and important.

In the past two years, I have been so involved in my legal work in Croatia that I have not been travelling much. I do not know if the European Union still has this habit of inventing a theme for the presidency but, when I was still travelling a lot, I found it really bizarre that a new priority and/or theme should be invented every six months if the one of the former presidency has not been successfully closed yet. Now, I am going to talk like somebody coming from the field of research. Is it not also our fault that we are confusing policy-makers? How can the European Union's priority change every six months? This is the result of the mania for new solutions, new dynamics, new policies. ... We do not stick to anything important long enough. Instead we are asking for new challenges, approaches, priorities, it seems to me that we are often just running around, creating major confusion. Somebody this morning mentioned a person aged 104. I have a grandmother who is 103. She has never travelled or lived outside my hometown of Dubrovnik. Yet, she has lived in five states: the Austro-Hungarian empire, the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, independent Croatia, Yugoslavia, and now Croatia once again. She has also lived through three wars. What I mean is that it is possible to stay in one place and experience and discover a lot. Don't we have to have more appreciation for time in all its meanings, forms and ideas?

I like to say that I am in my position by accident. I am in politics without being a politician. I accepted this position because I thought I could do something good and useful for my country. Now at the end of my mandate, I am not sure if I have achieved anything. The agenda is becoming so complex, burdened with too many ideas, priorities, and directions that it is very difficult to deal with it anymore. However, making a number of smaller improvements can still make a difference.

Peter Inkei: A reflection on the times that we live in On Hungarian and other European foxes

We have been targeting politicians all too often. But they are not stupid or mad. The reality is such that the actions of politicians are a reflection of the period that we live in. That is a sad thing. As Nina Obuljen said, the current times are characterized by anxiety and fear. In this context, politicians cannot find room for culture and we are not helping them enough. The emphasis on culture that some of the speakers mentioned happened 20 years ago. Today, it is very difficult to find a school of politicians that would pursue the same policies.

Last week there was a meeting of media researchers at our institution – the Central European University. I was extremely depressed by what they had found. They had studied media in various countries in Europe and repeatedly used the word "foxization". I thought this was a typical Hungarian issue but it turns out that it is present in many European countries: more and more media are adopting this attitude. They had also found that the general level of the media had been steadily falling, getting more commercial.

Decades ago, public policy had a greater role in the public offer. The current diversification of offers diminishes the role of the politicians. They no longer think that they should shape the thinking of people through culture. This is the situation that we are facing today. In the United Kingdom, New Labour had an ideological agenda. But nowadays ideology in the arts is less important. Also, nationalism had a much stronger presence in the agenda for the state-building process of many East European countries than it does now. As Slavoj Žižek put it, instead of a fluid ideology we need just a few dogmas.

When we are looking at the role of culture as an agent of change, this means at least two things. The first is how to find our role in the process. Can we sell culture as a catalyst? Should we use it as an instrument in a positive sense? Or are we looking for the end of the change-agent role?

Philippe Kern: Becoming visible, being heard Learning from lobbying experience

Peter Inkei reminded me of something interesting. Nobody spoke about the environment 20 years ago. But now, it is a hot topic for politicians and society at large. Culture needs to be in the same strong position as the environment. It was said in the previous presentations that we need to make policy-makers look ahead. I want to share my experience as a cultural activist in Brussels. This may be useful as it can lead to some interesting ideas tomorrow that can be presented to policy makers. We did different research projects for the European Commission on what is called "mainstreaming culture" in different policy fields. This is mentioned in the Council of Europe documentation. Our research projects show how much culture can contribute in different ways to the economy and well being.

A year and a half ago, the Commission organized a conference on design. They invited some technology companies. There was a lobbyist from Cisco, making a presentation on smart sustainability and growth. He was talking about how Cisco would contribute to the European Union's 2020 strategy. He had incorporated all the words that policy makers wish to hear. This was a great lesson to me. We keep talking to ourselves about the value of culture but we forget that we need to give something to policy makers as they have to focus on practical objectives (jobs, security, growth). Look at the European Union's 2020 strategy. You can put culture everywhere in this policy document. Culture is actually there but we are not visible. We have not convinced policy-makers that culture contributes to smartness, competitiveness, societal knowledge, innovation and social inclusion.

KEA wrote a study of the impact of culture on creativity. We drew an analogy between creativity in art and technology innovation. This is a buzzword nowadays: "*We need to emphasize innovation; Countries are required to spend 3 percent of GDP on innovation and research, and so forth.*" However, innovation is always discussed in terms of research and development in science and technology. The idea is to produce more and better scientists so as to be able to compete against the Chinese and the Americans. But the cultural sector is also a fantastic resource for innovators and creativity. Culture should be part of this innovation mantra. We built our argumentation by saying that if you want to support innovation you need to consider other forms of non technological innovation. Doing so, you would include artists, designers and architects because they can also make a contribution through disruptive thinking. Apple for instance is a cultural product as much as a technological product. Steve Jobs criticized Microsoft for being too technological and unable to produce a cultural product. In contrast, Apple is producing well designed gadgets that carry emotions through music, apps and entertainment. We have to emphasize that artists are good at building bridges between different disciplines: engineering, innovation, and creativity. Creativity strives for singularity and there is a lot of singularity in Europe because of the different territories, languages and cultures. These are assets that we are ignoring. We are aware of our environmental resources but not of our cultural ones. The European Union is spending 153 billion Euros on research and development and only 7 billion on culture. If we can make the argument that culture stimulates innovation at all levels, we will stand a chance of getting more political attention.

The second opportunity is the economic crisis in Europe. Culture and artists can help politicians develop another narrative on meanings and values. Nobody is interested in the European project anymore. People are only interested in whether Greece will collapse, the euro will disappear and Berlusconi will be replaced. The sense of solidarity which underpins the European project is non-existent. How do you create solidarity if people ignore each other's cultures? Culture can bring a new perspective here because it is about transcending the nation state and the traditional industrial organization of society. This is where culture can also make a difference. Artists are always the first ones to work internationally. They are also the first to stand up against populism and nationalism.

In sum, we need to change our rhetoric: we need to influence the citizens, not just the politicians. A grass-roots approach can be fruitful because we have diverse media at our disposal and we know how to use them. We also have the content to make our message attractive. Then, we need to build capacity. We are in like-minded company now, convinced that we are right. But the cultural sector is

extremely fragmented in different chapels. There are many different stories in different areas. As a result, whoever works in cinema has a different viewpoint and different priorities compared to somebody in publishing. How can a policy maker reach a decision if he is faced with 20 different demands? I have always been amazed at how good the different subsectors are at fighting each other instead of working together for the good of culture and art. I understand that there are all kinds of reasons for this but we need to reach at least some consensus, so that we can be heard by policy makers and influence thinking on societal development.



Reflections in a foggy Alpine lake, Bled, Slovenia (Photo by François Matarasso)

V. Reflections in an Alpine lake. **A personal account by François Matarasso**

The Chorus gathers

Thursday, 11 November 2011: Armistice Day. Across the European continent, sombre groups of veterans and relatives gather with politicians in front of monuments on which are inscribed the names of some, just some, of the millions of war dead. Military bands play; wreaths are laid. Then, after a minute's silence, life resumes. Other politicians meet in palaces and parliaments to shore up Europe's economy against predatory markets exploiting the flaws in the current system. The outliers, Ireland, Portugal, then Greece, have been attacked in turn: now it's Italy – and then? Unthinkable. The speed and devastation of financial transactions today makes blitzkrieg look leisurely, but after three years of instability and recurrent crises, protecting the European ideal feels more like trench warfare: a kind of lethal stasis.

Beside Lake Bled, occasional playground of the powerful for centuries past, a small group of artists, cultural analysts, researchers and policymakers is gathered for the annual CultureWatchEurope think tank. In the modern halls of the IEDC Business School, under the auspices of the Council of Europe, they are to discuss 'enhancing the responsible governance of the cultural sector'. In Classical Greek drama, the Chorus stands outside of the scene, unable to intervene in the action except by the force of its words, its poetry. Its role is to reflect, advise, warn, comment and ultimately make sense of what results from the actors' decisions. Lacking power – the ability to shape events – the Chorus has authority instead, the right to author the story, to find its meaning and therefore to shape how what has happened is understood. And that, in turn, will shape what happens next.

The Chorus is an apt metaphor of Europe's culture. Comprising citizens at the edges of the stage's common space, it can only observe, describe and interpret the actions of the presidents, millionaires and bandits who occupy the centre, strutting and orating, spending, taking and killing.

Lake Bled is wreathed in mist, its waters still but opaque. The island church is just an outline, the castle hidden from view. A muffled bell tolls the hour. The cultural experts gathered here are cut off from the action now unfolding in council chambers and on trading floors, in war zones and rioting cities. But they can hear; they can reflect. And they can speak.

Living in the end times

Is this picture fanciful, just the overdone rhetoric of cultural discourse? After all, the Greeks invented rhetoric as well as democracy and drama. For Slavoj Žižek, whose presentation opened the substantive part of the meeting, the foregoing lines are, if anything, an understatement. His latest book, after all, is *Living in the End of Times*. His analysis of the current state of politics, the economy, the environment and of culture's relationship with each of them was a profound and challenging start to discussion.

'The problem today is not just that we have big problems with the economy, ecology, and more. The problem is that we do not even know if we are asking the right questions. Quite often, the way that we formulate the problem is part of the problem.'

He argued that culture had been conscripted as a cover to diffuse and defuse real, political arguments about power and resources. For example, where the position of black people in the 1960s was clearly defined as a matter of civil rights, it is now clouded in a discourse about multiculturalism. He described how corporations had developed a sophisticated cultural discourse to gain a commercial edge, for instance by associating themselves with environmental responsibility. He could also have given similar examples from the cultural sector, where the semblance of change can also be used to protect against its implementation. In his exposure of the ideological basis of much culture discourse – and the cultural rhetoric of much business – he implicitly questioned whether cultural activists' claims of independence and moral authority could be substantiated. Especially now.

Žižek highlighted art's dangers by exploring the poetic career of Radovan Karadžić. He spoke of poetry's power to motivate people to do things that basic decency would otherwise restrain them from doing, by heightening an ideological discourse. *'The true horror is not that bad people do bad things. The true horror is that good people do horrible things thinking that they are doing something great.'* There have been – there still are – enough artistically-inclined dictators and murderers to encourage humility among cultural experts tempted to tell the world that culture is the answer to its problems.

Finally, Žižek called for less consensus and more dogma: more certainty, more willingness to say that one thing is bad and intolerable and another is good and worth defending. His penchant for benevolent authoritarianism in culture was subsequently picked up rather admiringly by one or two people. It took Nina Obuljen to remind them later of its dangers. Governance structures have to be designed for the worst times and the worst people, not the best, who may not even need them. Power corrupts no less in culture than in any other human activity. As democracy struggles and Italy appoints a government of elected technocrats, it is important to remember how the weakness of the Weimar Republic was used to justify turning to a strong man. It is enough to empower people with expertise and judgement to make independent decisions on behalf of the collective only as long as they remain democratically accountable for those decisions. Despite his warnings about its dangers and misuse, Slavoj Žižek maintained that 'we live in a critical period when intellectual and cultural work is needed more than ever'. He said that we need huge changes, but asked how to achieve that without creating new authoritarianisms. According to him, *'new thinking will be possible and here art and culture can do its job.'* One might fairly ask, however, if there might be less consensus about this dogmatic position beyond the present circle of cultural agents and intellectuals.

Cultural responses

Slavoj Žižek's conclusion, if not always the road that took him there, did establish a ground where there was unsurprising consensus: that culture has an important role to play in bringing about change

in the critical situation that has been created. However, the specific cultural responses proposed by the participants in their presentations were widely different. For clarity, they are grouped into themes below.

More freedom of action for artists

The first, and perhaps most consensual idea round the table, was that artists needed more freedom, which also, for some, equated with more money, since they need it to do their work. Artists challenge existing norms, went this argument, and help people see things differently. Examples were given from places as different as Armenia, the United Arab Emirates, the UK and India to illustrate this disruptive role and its potential to reshape how things are seen and done.

However, given the fear created by the existing crisis, perhaps further disruption of existing norms is not what most people are looking for. Sara Selwood spoke eloquently about the place of museums in strengthening people's sense of shared identity and affirming values that might be under threat. Perhaps this is an idea cultural experts and professionals would do well to think more about in these uncertain times. Can the cultural sector offer some reassurance that stable, humanistic and ethical values exist?

Culture should create new connections

Culture was also seen to have a role in responding to the reality of multiculturalism, although the debate is divided on whether this has failed or whether it is the concept itself that was misguided. Chris Torch affirmed art's importance in strengthening intercultural competencies, which were essential in a rapidly globalising world. He was most concerned about small countries that would struggle to maintain a sense of self without these and argued for a huge increase in public funding for culture. Sergio Lopez-Figuero showed how this might be done in practice, for example using silent film as a medium for a genuinely global form of communication.

Asu Aksoy also touched on these questions, but connected her ideas more closely to Slavoj Žižek's reframing of the issues in political terms, arguing for the cultural rights of 'post-migrants' to be seen as democratic and individual rather than representing an archipelago of disconnected cultures rooted in ethnicity. But underlying these and other contributions in this theme, was a belief that culture was a territory of interaction and art a means to redefine it.

Shelagh Wright gave some account of why this might be when she spoke about the dynamics of culture and particularly its capacity to make space for collective engagement. Again, Sara Selwood's comments about museums also suggested that these might be territories where common ground and shared values could be important.

Culture should raise environmental consciousness

Shelagh Wright's work with Mission, Models, Money presented a very ambitious agenda, that aimed both to challenge cultural institutions to reform themselves and to rethink some of the big challenges that face us all. This programme was distinctive, among other things, for its recognition of a cultural dimension to the crisis and of the failures of the cultural sector itself.

This was the only perspective really to engage with environmental change, considering both how cultural governance needed to address change within the sector and culture's capacity to sensitise people, to develop understanding and build the empathy that had been central to Jeremy Rifkin's thesis presented at the 2010 CultureWatchEurope meeting in Brussels.

Culture should create new *narratives*

It was proposed that culture can step in at a time when optimism and hope is lacking and the narratives that have underpinned political discourse for so long are failing. Philippe Kern suggested that the cultural sector could reimagine European narratives for politicians but also gave the example of how cultural institutions in Flanders are challenging the nationalistic narratives being developed by them.

In a very different context, Milica Nikolić described how the Montenegrin Minister of Culture aims to revitalise the ancient capital of Cetinje through the Marina Abramović Community Centre being built in the old factory of Obod. Although the circumstances are very special this might be seen as a continuation of the idea of culture creating new narratives, symbolic lives and economic prosperity for post industrial cities.

The Chorus speaks

Next morning, the fog has cleared. Not being ancient Greeks, the participants attribute the sunshine to meteorology rather than divine intervention, but the symbolism is appreciated nonetheless. There is a spring in the step as they walk along the lake to the final session and consider what, if anything, should be drawn from the previous day's discussion.

At the start of the meeting, Bob Palmer had set out a clear but demanding agenda, saying that, where in the past such events had concentrated on challenges, this one must concentrate on change. 'What are we trying to change and why?', he asked. That question guided the reflections I presented to the participants as a possible conclusion.

The other guiding idea was drawn from Stojan Pelko's background paper for the meeting, in which he cites Žižek, citing Hegel: '*It's a modern folly to alter a corrupt ethical system, its constitution and legislation, without changing the religion, to have a revolution without reformation*'.

Absences

Reflecting on the previous day's presentations in the light of these two challenges, I was struck by what wasn't said. First, large aspects of cultural practice – amateur and informal work, the commercial cultural industries – were hardly mentioned. The focus of attention was on the cultural supply of state and other public institutions. Even, there were important gaps such as heritage, libraries and archaeology. The meeting discussed a culture not much wider than publicly subsidised arts: the rest was rarely considered, beyond some critical perspectives on commercial culture.

Another gap was the profound changes in the creation, distribution and interpretation of art and culture being enabled by new information and communication technology. This has the potential to have effects as profound as those that followed the introduction of moveable type to European printing – an apparently minor technical change that laid the foundations of the Reformation and all that flowed from it. While there are philosophical and ethical debates about the democratisation of culture there is an urgent issue about the governance of virtual spaces. Will this be democratic and accountable, an extension of European concepts of the public realm, or will it be a free market consumer space, like an unlimited shopping mall controlled by supranational corporations? About this, perhaps the most important and urgent question of 'the responsible governance of the cultural sector', nothing was said.

Finally, I was struck how few of the following speakers responded to Žižek's analysis, or his implication of the cultural sector in shared responsibility for the situation reported in that analysis. Was it too apocalyptic, too vast or too challenging to fit into a discussion about cultural governance? Or are we, as cultural agents and experts, just too introspective – concerned, like other professional groups, with our own interests and rules and unable, despite our claims to universal relevance, to pay real attention to those of others? I hope not; I believe not. But the doubt remains.

A statement

The statement I presented to the think tank participants reflected both what I had heard and these absences, while responding to the two questions: what do we want to change and why, and what reformation may be needed in this time of economic, social and political revolutions. It formed the subject of debate on the second and final morning of the Bled meeting. It would be too much to suggest there was consensus about every part of its diagnosis or its proposed remedy, but there was agreement that it was a good basis for further thought, debate and action.

On the other hand, I share Slavoj Žižek's concern with the limitations of consensus, especially when it is built on positions over which no one disagrees. A clear statement of position – even if it is not elevated into a dogma – is sometimes a better way to test our beliefs, our commitments and our alliances. The Bled statement is written in that spirit. Like the utterances of a Greek Chorus, its words may seem obvious, even banal. It certainly shares with the Chorus the intention to describe what has happened and advise on what should happen as a result. But language has the power to bring reality into being: that's why we often don't know what we think until we say it, or write it. The Chorus of European culture needs to find its voice again, to re-establish its authority through its ethical

standards, its intellectual rigour and its poetic eloquence. Then it will be worth hearing. And then it might be listened to.

Coda

A character in Julian Barnes' 2011 novel, *The Sense of an Ending*, quotes a French historian as saying that 'History is that certainty produced at the point where the imperfections of memory meet the inadequacies of documentation'. It's an elegant exposition of the rapporteur's dilemma. That Patrick Lagrange, the historian in question, is as fictional as the character citing him, is also apposite. The Chorus creates realities as it speaks: but they must always be questioned.

VI. Those magic moments. Background Paper by Stojan Pelko

“During the shooting of David Lean’s Doctor Zhivago in a Madrid suburb in 1964, a crowd of Spanish extras had to sing the “Internationale” in a scene involving a mass demonstration. The movie team was astonished to discover that they all knew the song and were singing it with such a passion that the Francoist police intervened, thinking that they were dealing with a real political manifestation. Even more, when, late in the evening (the scene was to take place in darkness), people living in the nearby houses heard the echoes of the song, they opened up bottles and started to dance in the street, wrongly presuming that Franco had died and the Socialists had taken power.

This book is dedicated to those magic moments of illusory freedom (which, in a way, were precisely not simply illusory) and to the hopes thwarted by the return to “normal” reality.”¹

In a historical moment when we’re again facing people dancing in the street, there’s a slight, magic chance that we dedicate our autumnal think-tank to try to re-think the possible ways of returning to normal reality without thwarting all our hopes. Our normal, everyday reality is a certain privilege of creating the possibilities for something that used to be known as cultural life. Since most of us are in one way or another in a position to govern these possibilities – whether by creating the concepts, leading the teams, making the decisions or analyzing their consequences – we dare to name our activity cultural governance, having in mind that we not only want to **govern the action** but also to act in accordance with some basic ethical and aesthetical standards, thus **act culturally**. By governing culture, we’re not only enabling artists to create and people to consume, but are also **creating the culture**.

Is there a way to create and govern culture in harsh, radical times without falling into a false dilemma between radical cuts and illusory moments of freedom? Can we, out of this challenge, open an opportunity for change, can we **create the radical moment of freedom** without forgetting that “the process of liberation already has to practice the freedom”².

This could be the real starting point of our debate on cultural governance: how the radical outbursts of creativity, linked with serious social changes, were later, *post festum* transformed into institutional *dispositifs* without diminishing their emancipatory potential and liberating energy. Because what we’re looking for now are no longer the ways of preventing the crisis (late, too late) nor the ways of getting out of it (exit strategies) – because it has already thrown us out. No, we’re on the ground zero *already* and we’re asking ourselves **what to do next**, which way to choose: to dig the hole or to build an even higher skyscraper, to open the museum or to put our names in marble, to gather people or to think alone. We’re forced, if you wish, **to choose between tank and think**. In a rare moment of creative *folie* we might even consider suspending all strategic considerations based on a hope for a better future and follow Napoleon’s slogan “*on attaque, et puis, on le verra*”. But we’ll attack with thoughts, not tanks.

1. Slavoj Žižek, Introduction (*An Encounter, Not a Dialogue*) to **Organs without Bodies. Deleuze and Consequences**, Routledge, New York – London, 2004, p. xi.

2. Žižek, *Organs without bodies*, p. 202

We're gathered here, at peaceful Bled, **to see the clear reflections on the lake and to reflect on what we've brought with us.** Each of us: radical thinker and radical minister, NGO-activist turned state secretary and state secretary turned street-activist, school teacher who became film director and a professor on whose ideas the movies are being made ... and many more. *Because we are more.*

We will, during this think-tank, respect the brief of our 2010 Brussels conference as a "*process in which **how** debate and reflection occur will be as important as **what** is discussed*" (François Matarasso). We will **not** simply promote particular national cases or present particular cultural practices. Because *if we want to reach the universal, we should always have to look for the singular, not the particular.* Never can universal come out as the sum of the particularities: it is in the dark dialectic tension between the most singular and the most universal that we have the chance of finding some flashes of truth, it is in the radical gap between those two that we can search for our survival.

The incredible event at the Ljubljana Castle

Exactly two years ago, in November 2009, there was a conference in Ljubljana, on cultural heritage. There was a reception at the castle on Friday evening and, before leaving the venue, I wanted to show to my colleagues a newly adapted room that has a great view of the city. The legend of the room is connected with the view: it is said that a sad lady was known to be sitting there for long hours contemplating the city. Once in the room, you can sit on her bench, embody her point of view, become her – and thus see her view! So the room is all about becoming the other by taking the other's point of view. If the empathy, like professor Rifkin defines it, means "to feel and experience another's situation as if it were one's own", this castle's camera obscura was an "empathy room" par excellence.

All usual suspects were there: Mr. Robert Palmer, the minister of culture of Montenegro Branislav Mičunović, state secretary for culture from Croatia, Nina Obuljen and myself, then state secretary at the Ministry of culture of Slovenia. At a certain moment, Mr. Mičunović, not only minister of culture, but also well-known theatre director, started to recite Hamlet by heart – and almost in the same breath explaining that he would never put Shakespeare on stage because it can be too dangerous for a sensible theatre director like him. He said it could be fatal for him. All dimensions of what we usually call "culture" got together in this cell: reconstructed architectural heritage and a view to the urban landscape; artistic text as a memory, live performance and doomed destiny; actor and director; cinematographic combination of camera obscura and edited point-of-views, science and art, love and politics.

It was like we were all caught, as Gilles Deleuze would say, in a "flagrant delit de legender". It was more powerful than all daily strategies, heard before during the conference, so powerful that I had to report on this event the next morning, during the "civil society" session. It was a short moment of eternity in this dark autumn night.³

3. Stojan Pelko, *Keynote Speech 2*, CultureWatchEurope Conference 2010 Reader, Council of Europe, p. 119-120.

When discussing big culture-political strategic changes, we should not forget or neglect the mysterious dimension of such singular events. Because art might teach and inspire us more by creating and providing such “moments of truth” than by systematic paradigm-shifts.

Slavoj Žižek concludes his already quoted book on Deleuze with a chapter on politics entitled “*Plea for a cultural revolution*.” Here he confronts big strategic political acts with radical “suicidal” gestures of pure self-destructive ethical insistence with apparently no political goal:

*“The point is not simply that, once we are thoroughly engaged in a political project, we are ready to risk everything for it, inclusive of our lives, but, more precisely, that only such an ‘impossible’ gesture of pure expenditure can change the very coordinates of what is strategically possible within a historical constellation.”*⁴

Žižek suggests two different ways of “changing the very coordinates of what is strategically possible”: the first one is Hegel’s “changing the religion” (while the second is the retroactive change of destiny that we could for the time being call “the Terminator” way).

In Hegel’s Encyclopaedia of philosophical sciences Žižek found a very contemporary lecture:

*“It’s a modern folly to alter a corrupt ethical system, its constitution and legislation, without changing the religion, to have a revolution without reformation.”*⁵

So, the cultural revolution would be the condition of the successful social revolution: people should not only realize their old dreams, but they have to *reinvent their very modes of dreaming*. If this Enlightenment formula was about “inserting a new possibility into the future”, the information society with its high-tech time-machines pushes the thought into the opposite direction: to inserting a new possibility into the past. This is how Žižek ends his small “red book” *Living in the End of Times*, edited for the Shanghai EXPO 2010:

*“(W)e have to accept that, at the level of possibilities, our future is doomed, the catastrophe will take place, it is our destiny – and then, on the background of this acceptance, we should mobilize ourselves to perform the act which will change destiny itself and thereby insert a new possibility into the past.”*⁶

So, on one side our daily work is structured into four-year mandates, five-year plans and decade-long strategies, we are meeting famous conductors and opera divas booked for three years in advance and architects travelling from one biennale to another. But on the other side – do we really know which street will burst in anger and in what town people will dance in the street? This simultaneous situation when everything is so meticulously planned and radically open at the same time, when sometimes, as Slavoj Žižek would say, “*it’s easier to think the apocalypse than simple social change*,” is the perfect time to reflect and to react, to debate and to create. But the more we’re trying **to change the aesthetics**, the more we’re touching **the ethics of change**.

4. *Op. cit.*, p. 205.

5. *Op. cit.*, p. 211.

6. Slavoj Žižek, *Living in the End of Times*, Shanghai EXPO 2010, p. 57.

The process of truth

The more we watch the pictures and try to learn from them – from *They Live to Doctor Zhivago*, from *The House of my friend to Copie conforme* – the closer we're to the central plane of every cultural landscape, which is the plane of *ethics* or (to be faithful to the concept from Alan Badiou's book *Ethics*) *ethics of truths*.

The chain of concepts goes like this: the **situation** is what there is. It's a kind of zero level of reality. But then something happens that cannot be reduced to the usual inscription into "what there is". This irreducible singularity is an **event**. It forces us to decide for the new mode of being – and it goes the same for all four fundamental fields of human achievements: science, art, politics and love. The key question now is how to be *faithful to such an event* – because to think its radical novelty demands invention. **Truth** is the name of this process of being faithful to a certain event, it is in fact what this *fidelity* produces in the situation. Truth is "*the material trace of this event(u)al supplement to the situation.*" Therefore the truth is always the immanent cut, break of the situation – and it is in this break where the **subject** is born: *the process of truth introduces the subject*. Not the psychological, reflexive or transcendental subject, but *the subject as the result of this process*: the Two as the subject of love process, the revolutionary subject as the subject of the political process, the art-subject of the art process (not the particular "genius" artist nor the artwork alone, but the two together).

If we try to summarize the process of truth as Badiou does it, events are irreducible singularities, a kind of "out-laws" of given situations. Processes of truth are immanent cuts, invented every time anew. Subjects are local appearances of the process of truth, singular and incomparable "points" of truth. The key question is: *can we insist* in this breaking point? Can we live in it, can we make it last? That's the ethics of truth: "*Do everything that you can in order to maintain what went beyond your bare existence. Insist in the break. Embody in your being what has gotten you and broken you.*"

Why is this philosophical excursion so important for our subject of changing the cultural governance? Because in this "royal quartet" of four fundamental human activities, of *processes of truth*, art is on the same level with science, politics and love. "*What will I do out of the fact that one evening I've met the eternal Hamlet*" – this question is for Badiou at the same level as the invention of the world once you watch it side-by-side with your loved one, or the feeling that you can move the workers in front of the factory with your words.

How will we endure in those conditions that go beyond our "normal reality?" How will we think this material trace of truthful event without conceding to common-sense opinions that will necessarily lead us to communication instead of to creation? Because, as Badiou would say, "*la vérité ne se communique pas.*" You don't communicate the truth, you meet it – and then you should *never forget what you've met*. Love meeting; the sudden feeling that this song is *addressed* to you; incredible beauty of the scientific truth that opens new horizons; the brutal understanding of a political circumstance – all these are singular moments when you're literary "struck by truth". The ethics of the truth is not the ethics of the communication or of cultural studies, it's the ethics of the Real.

Isn't it also what we're doing here: trying to let some fresh air in the opinion-guided politics? Trying to move from action to policy, from words to *Real-Politik*, to influence the Real, to insert a new possibility into our future – and past! Didn't we recently discover that we have *mirror-neurons* all the way from the beginning but we just didn't know it? And weren't we bombarded a few days ago with the "discovery" of fragments travelling faster than light i.e. faster than everything we used to know? But were we really ignorant to such fragments? Aren't our thoughts such *neu(t)rons*, such supra-light travellers – and the right question again is whether we should close them into sub-terranean tunnels or *open* for them artistic black boxes and *camera obscura* and thus create **sub-terranean solidarities** that Susan Buck-Morss writes about:

*"Rather than giving multiple, distinct cultures equal due, whereby people are recognized as part of humanity indirectly through the mediation of collective cultural identities, human universality emerges in the historical event at the point of rupture. It is in the discontinuities of history that people whose culture has been strained to the breaking point give expression to a humanity that goes beyond cultural limits. And it is our emphatic identification with this raw, free, and vulnerable state that we have a chance of understanding what they say. Common humanity exists in spite of culture and its differences. A person's non-identity with the collective allows for subterranean solidarities that have a chance of appealing to universal, moral sentiment, the source today of enthusiasm and hope."*⁷

In his text on the French Revolution (*The Conflict of the Faculties*) Immanuel Kant is offering his theory of a participative democracy, so close not only to today's "spectacle society" but also to Buck-Morss description of "our emphatic identification". In his view, the social revolution is as *much* in the eyes of the enthusiastic observer as it is in the often bloody reality in the streets:

*"The recent Revolution of a people which is rich in spirit, may well either fail or succeed, accumulate misery and atrocity, it nevertheless arouses in the heart of all spectators (who are not themselves caught up in it) a taking of sides according to desires which borders on enthusiasm and which, since its very expression was not without danger, can only have been caused by a moral disposition within the human race."*⁸

When Alain Badiou is elaborating the *process of truth*, he is claiming exactly the same: one couldn't know in advance that he or she is capable of belonging to the situation and breaking into an event that would materialize the trace of truth. Inscribing this experience into duration means *thinking it and conceptualizing it*, means inscribing a singularity into the universal – or, if you wish, means to *make such magic moments of our own time a moment of eternity*.

And here's where our thought and enthusiasm has to turn not only into event(u)al action but also into long-lasting policy. In turning thoughts into action and action into policy, there'll be conflicts – inherent, necessary conflicts. So, in order to understand the change we need to study the conflict. Michael Hardt and Toni Negri, co-authors of *Empire, Multitude and Commonwealth*, can be of great help – especially with the concept of **conflict** as it is elaborated in their last book, *Commonwealth* (2009).

7. Susan Buck-Morss, *Hegel, Haiti and the Universal History*, University of Pittsburgh Press, 2009, p. 133.

8. Quoted in: Slavoj Žižek, *First as Tragedy, then as Farce*, Verso, p. 106.

The two authors distinguish between two traditions, major and minor: the majority line takes *the social contract* as the basis of institutions, while the minority line sees the basis in the *social conflict*. If the majority line would, in order to keep the society homogenous, try to chase the conflict out (once you are “under contract” your right to conflict is consummated), the minority line understands the conflict as an inherent and permanent basis of society. The development of social institutions is democratic *only if it stays open* for the conflict that constitutes it. The strategy here is double: first, not to reduce the conflict only to the usual movement vs. institution, but to recognize it as the *internal to the multitude itself*; and second, to understand that the institutionalization is not necessarily the way to kill every initiative but could *consolidate the revolt* without denying its original power of break and strength.

Here, art process is one of the best lessons: because of its double nature of cutting the tissue of stereotypes and clichés – and being able to articulate it with the content that maintains and even consolidates the inherent conflict. To cut and to create new – like in the famous D. H. Lawrence umbrella episode, where we stretch our opinions like umbrellas against the chaos. But the artists and the philosophers cut this umbrella to let the fresh air of chaos in, to break the reality with the Real. Later, imitators try to fill the gaps with colours and common-sense opinions, but the real art is already somewhere else. It’s exactly because art is such a process of singular separation, *isolation*, and common re-creation of the universal, that it is a laboratory of new social trends. By insisting on inherent conflicts, by making it visible, it can move people into movements, transform singular islands into continents, create common wealth.

Immediate steps – and a step forward

If we want to answer François Matarasso’s question before the Brussels 2010 conference “*what immediate steps should governments and public bodies take to protect the creativity, vitality and diversity of European cultural life in the next three years?*” we could not do it out of space nor out of our time. If in those particular post-crisis times of ours we see the role of culture as the main supplier of **the tools for perception, the ethics for thought and the ways to express the change**, we might humbly try to create the possibilities to teach people how they see the world, how they think of it and what ways they have to change it.

If we’re reducing the first question to science, the second to philosophy and the third one to technology, than we’re closing the art into the cell of “beaux arts” or chasing it to bazaar, only to decorate our reality or to be sold on the market like fruit and vegetables.

But if we’re able to maintain this triple dialectics of art being *at the same time*, **thinker, mover and teacher**, we might have the chance to avoid the apocalypse.

In practice – and in Bled agenda – we will therefore:

- a. **ask Mr. Žižek** and all the rest around his table how culture can become **food for thought**: by introducing reflection on works of art as an integral part of their reception and a way to influence creativity (public debates, community workshops, specialized magazines, TV-programs ...).
- b. **ask Mr. Mičunović** and all the rest around his table how with radically different products – and producers! – culture can **move things** and at the same time stay aware of the social struggles without becoming only a “sedative” for a pacified information society: how can it be a catalyst of emancipatory politics, “the reformation of the revolution”?
- c. **ask Mr Anheier** and all the rest around this table how socially sensible and culturally reasonable government can invest in art and culture without falling into the trap of thinking only through “return-on-investment” logic, but consider **social investment** as the generator of social change and therefore the most profitable long term added-value.

The further cultural policy reaches from the government cells to the civil society landscape, the more chance it has to not be a sad lady passively looking through the window of the castle but to **embody the experience, to consolidate the revolt, to institutionalize the action.**

We hope that in the reflections on the lake or in the black box of ideas some break-throughs of the situation will be created, singular moments of truth touched and some subterranean solidarities born. What more can we dream of?

VII. Participant's Curriculum Vitas

Asu Aksoy Robins, Assoc. Prof., Istanbul Bilgi University/Director, KPY – Cultural Policy and Management Research Centre/ Kültür Politikaları ve Yönetimi Araştırma Merkezi

Teaches in the Cultural Management Programme at Istanbul Bilgi University, She was involved in the setting up of Santralistanbul, a new cultural complex at the site of Istanbul's first electricity power plant. Asu Aksoy was also centrally involved in Istanbul's successful bid to become a European Capital of Culture in 2010. She has recently completed a major project, *Cultural Economy Compendium: Istanbul 2010*, for the Turkish Ministry of Culture and Tourism. She is presently involved with the 5th International Architecture Biennale Rotterdam, managing a project in Istanbul. Asu Aksoy writes about urban and cultural policy in Turkey, and in the past she has worked extensively on the changing media consumption practices in Europe of Turkish-speaking migrants, and has authored and co-authored many articles on this topic.

Pia Areblad, Director of TillT, Sweden

Has a bachelor of arts from the University College of Dance in Stockholm as well as a diploma in political science. After several years as an active politician, dance-pedagogue and a dancer she decided in 1997 to focus on the role of art and culture in society and business. She is now Creative Director at the organisation TillT. Pia has been responsible for the development of the organisation TillT since 2001. During this period TillT has doubled its turnover. The organisation has carried out over 80 year-long projects where artists have been mirroring the life of a business organisation with the aim of strengthening creativity and innovation in working life.

Mladen Dolar, Senior Research Fellow, Department of Philosophy, University of Ljubljana, cultural theorist, film critic, author, Slovenia

Slovenian philosopher, cultural theorist, film critic and expert in psychoanalysis. Dolar was born in Maribor, the son of literary critic, Jaro Dolar. In 1978 he graduated in Philosophy and French language at the University of Ljubljana, under the supervision of the renowned philosopher Božidar Debenjak. He later studied at the University of Paris VII and the University of Westminster. Dolar was the co-founder, together with Slavoj Žižek and Rastko Močnik, of the Ljubljana school of psychoanalysis, whose main goal is to achieve a synthesis between Lacanian psychoanalysis and the philosophy of German idealism. Dolar has taught at the University of Ljubljana since 1982. In 2010, Dolar began his tenure as an Advising Researcher in theory at the Jan Van Eyck Academie, Maastricht, The Netherlands. His main fields of expertise are the philosophy of G. W. F. Hegel (on which he has written several books, including a two-volume interpretation of Hegel's Phenomenology of Mind) and French structuralism. He is also a music theoretician and film critic.

Peter Inkei, Director of the Budapest Observatory: Regional Observatory on Financing Culture in East-Central Europe

Has done consultancy in various fields of cultural policy, among others for the Council of Europe, was a stakeholders' representative on the LabforCulture board, is author of the Hungarian entry of the Compendium of cultural policies, and has been speaker at various international conferences. Previously, he has held various positions in the civil service, including deputy state secretary for culture. Péter has also worked in publishing – actually with Central European University Press – and was founding director of the Budapest International Book Festival (1994).

Philippe Kern, Founder and managing Director, KEA European Affairs, Brussels

KEA is a research centre and advisory company to institutions, NGO's, and industries active in the culture and creative sectors, including sport. Philippe has led a range of research and strategy programs at international and European level, notably for the European Commission and the European Parliament in the field of culture and creative industries (CCI). KEA is currently involved in the KIICS project (DG Research) on Art and Science and on Creative partnerships initiatives (artistic intervention in enterprises). Philippe was former Director of Public and Legal Affairs of PolyGram and head of the IFPI Brussels office. He is the founder of the European Film Companies Alliance (EFCA) and of the Independent Music Companies Association (IMPALA) that network European cultural companies. Founder of Untitled (Sans Titre) a forum for enabling the expression of artist's point of view on societal issues and to contribute to lateral thinking in policy circles. He contributes to the KEA blog (www.keablog.com) and Creative Europe social networks (on LinkedIn and Facebook). He graduated in law from the universities of Strasbourg and Paris as well as the College of Europe in Bruges. By training he is a lawyer specializing in copyright, anti-trust and trade law.

Sergio Lopez-Figueroa, Founder, Big Bang Lab, Spain

Spanish creative producer, composer, disruptive innovator and cultural activist working as an international community development consultant involved in the design and implementation of interdisciplinary programmes across film, music, digital media, heritage, and creative learning. Based in London, he is the founder and Director of Big Bang Lab, a cultural social enterprise specialized in the application of co-creativity, the revitalization of audiovisual heritage and the use of crowd sourced methodologies to collect and re-use narratives, memories and wisdom using participatory audio and video processes. He is the creator of the Cultural Social Responsibility framework, a model for socio-economic change in complex ecosystems based on the dissemination of intergenerational knowledge, collective creative expressions and co-production applying new collective copyright management systems to achieve long term social impact from intangible inputs to tangible outcomes.

Nina Obuljen, Secretary of State for Culture, Ministry of Culture of Croatia

Holds a master's degree in Political Science from the University of Zagreb. Until her appointment as Assistant Minister of Culture in 2006, she worked as a research fellow at the Institute for International Relations in Zagreb. Nina Obuljen is the author of many articles in the field of cultural policy. In 2004 she won the European Cultural Policy Research Award for her research on the impact of the EU enlargement on cultural policies which was published in the book "Why we need European Cultural Policies: impact of EU enlargement on countries in transition," Amsterdam, 2006. In collaboration with Joost Smiers, she edited a book entitled "UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions: Making it Work," Zagreb 2006. Nina Obuljen was responsible for the working groups on culture and education as well as for media and information society in the Croatian Negotiating Team for the Accession to the EU.

Sara Selwood, Independent cultural analyst, visiting professor at City University of London, editor of "Cultural Trends," U.K.

An independent cultural analyst, researcher and writer. She is Honorary Professor at both City University and University College London. She has written extensively on the relationship between the expectations of policy and the public's experience of cultural provision. She wrote the recent review of Renaissance in the Regions, a £300m government initiative, and was a co-author of this year's external evaluation of UNESCO's delivery of its strategic programme objectives related to intangible heritage. Sara is currently a member of the Mayor of London's Cultural Strategy Group and Chair of its Cultural Policy Reference Group.

Elisabeth Sjaastad, CEO, Federation of European Film Directors, Norway

Born in Oslo, Norway (1977), studied directing at the Beijing Film Academy and the Central Academy of Drama (1998-2000). From 2000 – 2002 Elisabeth worked as Promotion Manager at Virgin Records/EMI. In 2002 she directed and produced the Amanda-nominated (Norway's national film award) feature documentary *Shiny Stars, Rusty Red* (China) which was invited to film festivals worldwide. Through her production companies Screen Stories and Directors at Work AS, she has also produced films from South Africa (also as director), Peru and the United Arab Emirates. Elisabeth was Vice President of the Norwegian Film Makers' Association and a FERA delegate from 2005 – 2009. Elisabeth was appointed Chief Executive of FERA, Federation of European Film Directors, in December 2009.

Chris Torch, Director, Intercult/Vice President, Culture Action Europe, Sweden

Senior Associate at *Intercult*, a production and resource unit focused on culture, ideas and the arts. Founded in 1996, it is a publically-financed institution, based in Stockholm, and a designated *Europe*

Direct office, managed within the institution's European Resource Centre for Culture, since 2009. Intercult focuses to a large degree on international exchange and co-production with the European Neighbourhood, reflected in the project CORNERS, launched in May 2011. (www.intercult.se/corners). Apart from large-scale project design, Torch plays a role in developing intercultural politics. He lectures regularly and is currently on the Board of Trustees for The European Museum Forum, a Board member of the River//Cities Platform and an member of the Steering Group for the Platform for Intercultural Europe.

Shelagh Wright, Co-director, Mission Models Money, U.K.

Has worked extensively with government and the public, charitable and private sectors on creativity, social enterprise, investment and innovation agendas and is an associate of the think tank Demos. She is co-leading the re.think program with Clare Cooper for Mission Models Money (MMM). Her publications include 'After the Crunch – the creative economy in recession'; 'So.What Do You Do? A new question for policy in the Creative Age', 'Making Good Work' and 'Design for Learning'; in addition to articles and papers on creative enterprise, creative clusters, skills and investment policy. Shelagh has led programs of work with the British Council, Creative and Cultural Sector Skills Council, Screen England, Arts Council England, Creative Partnerships, was a contributor to the Creative Britain strategy and a member of the EU Expert Working Group on the Creative Industries.

VIII. Organizer's Curriculum Vitas

Kimmo Aulake, Chair of the CWE Task Force, Special Government Adviser, Deputy Head of Unit, Cultural Exports Unit, Arts Division, Ministry of Education and Culture, Finland

MA in Political Science, University of Helsinki. Previous positions include special advisor at the Ministry of Education (International Affairs); policy advisor at the Council of Europe (Cultural Policy and Action Division); special advisor at the European Commission (DG X); secretary-general of the State Committee on Audiovisual Integration; and project manager at the AV Eureka Center. His professional memberships and international activity include, to name a few: the Council of Europe Steering Committee for Culture (CDCULT), Chairman 2006-2008, Vice-Chairman 2004-2006, member since 2002; Interministerial Working Group on Cultural Exports Strategy (Secretary General 2005-2007); Interministerial Steering Group for Cultural Exports (Secretary General 2007 – present).

François Matarasso, Cultural Researcher and consultant, U. K.

Writer interested in how people create, receive and interact with culture. His latest work, "Regular Marvels", is a series of creative explorations on the margins of contemporary cultural life (<http://regularmarvels.com>). He has worked with cultural organisations in 35 countries and undertaken influential practice-led research. He holds Honorary Professorships at Robert Gordon University (Scotland) and Griffith University (Australia) and is a Council Member of Arts Council England. <http://web.me.com/matarasso>

Christine M. Merkel, Head of the Division of Culture, Memory of the World at the German Commission for UNESCO; Executive Co-ordinator, Federal Coalition for Cultural Diversity; Chair, Steering Committee for Culture, Council of Europe.

Historian, psychologist and expert in international relations in arts and culture. Her areas of focus are the organisational development of foundations and public organisations, capacity building of civil society leaders and young experts. She is a seasoned designer and convenor of strategic multi-stakeholder policy dialogues and has published widely, including contributions to a legal commentary on the 2005 UNESCO Convention on the diversity of cultural expression (in print). Professional proficiency in English, French, Spanish, Dutch, Italian; basic knowledge of Modern Standard Arabic.

Kathrin Merkle, Head of Cultural Policy, Diversity and Intercultural Dialogue Division, Directorate of Democratic Governance, Culture and Diversity, Council of Europe, France

Oversees a number of Council of Europe projects in the cultural field including Policy Reviews, the "CultureWatchEurope" initiative, the Compendium information and monitoring system and the Roma Academic Network. She currently leads the Cultural Policy Reviews of Turkey and the Russian

Federation. She is editor of several Council of Europe publications on cultural policies including a reference work on everyday manifestations of culture. Kathrin has a Masters in Sociology, Political Science and Education Science from the University of Heidelberg and teaches European cultural policy for a cultural management course at the University of Strasbourg. Before joining the CoE in 1993, she worked for a number of years with UNESCO on cultural and science/technology statistics.

Robert Palmer, Director of Democratic Governance, Culture and Diversity, Council of Europe, France

Responsible for the Council's work across sectors that include cultural policy and action, cultural diversity, intercultural dialogue and conflict prevention, and the monitoring of cultural and heritage policies in the Council of Europe's 47 member states. Prior to that, international advisor on culture. Director of both Glasgow (1990) and Brussels (2000) as European Capitals of Culture and author of a detailed study of Cultural Capitals for the European Commission. Board member of various arts institutions and international festivals, and Chair of European arts juries.

Stojan Pelko, former Secretary of state at the Ministry of Culture of Slovenia, communication consultant and film scholar

MA in philosophy at the University of Ljubljana, *diplome des etudes approfondies (DEA)* in audio-visual research at *Université de la Sorbonne Nouvelle – Paris III*, PhD in sociology (*The Image of Thought*) at the University of Ljubljana under the guidance of Slavoj Žižek. Writes on film history and theory, teaches in the department of Sociology of culture, at the Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana. Has published several books on film theory and translated major French authors (Lacan, Baudrillard, Deleuze, Badiou) into Slovene. His latest book: *The Image of Thought* (2007). Founded communication consulting company Korpus in 2000 and in over the past eight years has been involved in major public awareness campaigns and political marketing campaigns for parliamentary, presidential and municipal elections. Between 2008 and 2011 he was State Secretary at the Slovene Ministry of Culture. In the autumn of 2011 he returned to Korpus to work as programme and political consultant for *Positive Slovenia*.

