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Introduction

The term ‘Public Value’ was coined by the Harvard Professor Mark Moore in his seminal book of 1995 Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government.\(^1\) It is a work that deals with the principles of public administration, and is in some ways a response to the failings of the technocratic, target-driven practices of New Public Management that can lead to unintended consequences, rigid bureaucracies and rule-driven decision-making. Dissatisfaction with this political economy has driven much of the work listed in this bibliography. Essentially, Moore argued that public administration could be humanized and improved if bureaucrats had as their goal the increase of Public Value; this they could achieve through more flexible, sensitive and autonomous decision-making, guided by an attitude of public service. Because Moore was writing in English and addressing Anglo-Saxon governance systems, much of the subsequent literature has appeared in English, and although the Public Value discourse has been taken up and subjected to scrutiny in other European countries – and beyond -, the greater part of the following bibliography contains works from the U.K.

The Public Value theme was taken up in Britain by the Prime Minister’s Strategy Unit in 2002, and most notably adopted in the U.K. cultural sphere by the BBC and later, by the Heritage Lottery Fund and Arts Council England. All of these organizations and others changed their practices and procedures and began to establish a deeper dialogue with their publics.

As part of the Public Value discourse there emerged, simultaneously on both sides of the Atlantic, a debate about the value of culture to society and the rationale for funding culture. In the UK in 2003 the centre-left think-tank Demos held an event called Valuing Culture (significantly instigated not by theorists or government but by practitioners) that spawned a rush of publications in the mid-2000s. Demos’ Holden and Hewison explored the meaning of the term ‘Cultural Value’ in a series of pamphlets and other think tanks, organizations, and politicians joined in. The debate began as an argument between two key policy concepts: Instrumental value (when culture is funded by governments primarily because of its economic and social benefits) and Intrinsic Value (when culture is funded as a public good in its own right). In the U.S. the Rand Corporation sparked a similar debate using identical terms. The exploration of these value concepts and the introduction of a third, ‘Institutional Value’, that proposed the notion of Public Value as a management tool to improve the way in which cultural organizations served their publics, created a great deal of interest in Europe, Asia, Australia and Canada. From a narrow focus of the meaning of

value in cultural policy, the debate raised questions about social justice, the management of cultural organizations, the responsibilities of governments, economic valuations of culture, measurement, how to account for intangible values, artistic quality and expertise, and the relationship between the arts and creative industries.

The term Intrinsic Value is now used to mean a number of different things: the primary meaning of intrinsic is ‘essential to’, or ‘of the essence of’, and hence Intrinsic value refers to the unique value of individual artforms: dance is dance, sculpture is sculpture and each provides specific means of communication and expression. As an extension, Intrinsic Value is an appeal to fund culture for its own sake, because it has a value in its own right. But Intrinsic Value is also used as a shorthand for the way that culture affects each of us individually and subjectively in intangible and hard-to-measure ways. Intrinsic Value provides a means to talk about the emotional and spiritual affects of culture. Finally, Intrinsic Value is used by some to denote quality and excellence in the art itself, sometimes to the exclusion of other values.

By contrast Instrumental Value refers to the ways in which the arts and culture generate objective measurable benefits. These can be economic (such as urban regeneration caused by a new gallery opening; culture-led tourism; direct job creation etc) or social (as when, for example patient recovery times are improved through art therapy; or the exam results and behaviour of children are improved through contact with artists in the classroom). More recently, economists have also sought to develop ways of measuring intrinsic value, for example through assessments of well-being. This has drawn on systems of valuation deployed in other areas in which issues such as performance and impact have proved difficult to measure, primarily health and the environment. However, there remains a debate about how these measurements are used as governments seek to express these measures in monetized units that can be applied instrumentally within systems of public management.

Since the economic recession of 2007 many governments have been retrenching their cultural spending, and the arts and culture are once again being judged by their ability to generate growth and create jobs. A ‘new instrumentalism’ is emerging in cultural policy, and a debate is restarting between, simply put, on the one hand, those who believe that economics can tell the whole story of cultural value, or that economic arguments are the only means of persuading governments of the worth of the arts and culture and, on the other hand, those who believe that some aspects of cultural value can only be explained using a multidisciplinary approach. At the level of practice however, many organizations have been fundamentally changed by adopting new practices of public engagement prompted by the Public Value and Cultural Value discourses.

Finally, and as institutional change demonstrates, the cultural value discourse also represents an attempt by policy-makers, practitioners and thinkers to take into account the impact of social and technological change in the sector. Concepts of what should be
valued and what constitutes cultural excellence are more contestable than in the past. Thanks to new technology, the public has become more active in its production, participation and consumption of culture. As a result, the aims and ends of cultural activity are less clear-cut and the nature of cultural provision has had to evolve. Public opinion as to what to fund and why has now to be taken into greater account. To this end, the public and cultural value debates have not only sought to make policy-makers more accountable to the public, but also to create value through the public’s participation in the decision-making process.

This literature review aims to describe and analyse academic literature and research reports addressing the public value of culture, which should allow the European Commission’s Directorate General for Education and Culture (DG EAC) to identify relevant experts in this field. The analysis places emphasis on publications made over the past five years within the EU but also includes references from other countries or regions as well as earlier publications which can be relevant to current debates in Europe.

The paper has been prepared following a request presented by DG EAC to the European Expert Network on Culture (EENC) in December 2011. It is intended to assist in the preparations for Cyprus’ Presidency of the EU (July – December 2012), which has cultural governance as one priority in the cultural field. A separate literature review on cultural governance is being submitted to DG EAC in parallel to this.
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**Details about the author:**
Name: Hasan Bakhshi
Gender: Male
Country: U.K.
Institution NESTA (National Endowment for Science, Technology and the Arts)

This provocation paper, takes an economic approach to the idea of intrinsic value. It proposes that a set of established and well-known economic techniques that have been deployed in other areas, such as the environment, can be used to measure value in the cultural sphere and so can be used in decision-making at policy-level. These include measures of contingent valuation and willingness to pay. The paper also looks at relationship between cultural policy-making and economics in the public management system of the UK and argues that there are entrenched misunderstandings between economists and arts policymakers, leaders and funders. The authors suggest that more sophisticated economic methodologies, such as contingent valuation, would provide a means of articulating intrinsic as well as instrumental values that would have greater voice within Treasury calculations and be more easily considered in relation to other calls on the public purse. They believe that an attitudinal resistance to economic methods on the part of the cultural sector has hindered rather than helped the case for the arts.


This report proposes a framework for understanding innovation in cultural and arts organizations, with one of the focuses being value creation. Innovation is discussed in relation to both practice (the techniques used in presenting work) and content or form (new playwrights or artists, and kinds of work). The paper addresses the impact of new and digital technologies in reaching different audiences and providing different kinds of cultural offer. It is based on detailed case studies of two of the UK’s leading cultural organizations, the National Theatre and Tate, and uses audience surveys and econometric analysis to
examine the effects of innovative practice in each. Specifically with regard to value creation, the authors use a multi-disciplinary approach to combine econometric measures of willingness-to-pay with surveys of cultural-value related questions. Recognizing that some of the audience’s cultural experience is not picked up in purely economic valuations, the report discusses how the qualitative findings of the research differ according to artform (qv the more specific approach taken by Selwood).


Details about the authors:
Name: Oliver Bennett
Gender: Male
Country: U.K.
Institution: University of Warwick

Name: Eleonora Belfiore
Gender: Female
Country: UK / Italy
Institution: University of Warwick

This book offers a taxonomy of the impact of the arts, both positive and negative, with a view to establishing an appropriate conceptual basis for the discussion and investigation of what the social impact of the arts might mean. It provides an intellectual history of the subject and attempts to reconnect that history to contemporary policy debates, from which it is argued that these debates have become detached. It is suggested that the impacts of the arts cannot be properly understood, measured or evaluated without reference to this history. It focuses on the cognitive, psychological and socio-cultural dynamics that govern the aesthetic experience and postulates that a better grasp of the interaction between the individual and the work of art is the necessary foundation for a genuine understanding of how the arts can affect people. Through a critique of philosophical and empirical attempts to capture the main features of the aesthetic encounter, the book draws attention to the gaps in our current understanding of the responses to art. It proposes a classification and exploration of the factors - social, cultural and psychological - that contribute to shaping the aesthetic experience, thus determining the possibility of impact. The ‘determinants of impact’ identified are distinguished into three groups: those that are inherent to the individual who interacts with the artwork; those that are inherent to the artwork; and ‘environmental factors’, which are extrinsic to both the individual and the artwork. The paper concludes that any meaningful attempt to assess the impact of the arts would need...
to take these ‘determinants of impact’ into account, in order to capture the multidimensional and subjective nature of the aesthetic experience. In some ways all of this is a necessary preliminary to grappling with the practical problems of cultural policy and management, but the book was criticized for failing to connect with the ‘real world’. The Times Higher Education Supplement for example, commented:

‘In the conclusion to their compact survey of the purpose of art, Eleonora Belfiore and Oliver Bennett state that their aim was neither to explain current debates nor to "direct us towards a better future". To which my response is: "Why not?" What is the point of writing a book if you are not going to at least try to cast some light on a problem or fire up your audience? That's the trouble with so much academic writing: it lacks ambition.’

---


**Details about the authors:**

Name: Simona Bodo  
Gender: Female  
Country: Italy  
Institution: Independent researcher

Name: Cristina Da Milano  
Gender: Female  
Country: Italy  
Institution: European Centre for Cultural Organisation and Management (ECCOM)

Name: Silvia Mascheroni  
Gender: Female  
Country: Italy  
Institution: Independent researcher

On the basis of a detailed analysis of case studies from Italy, Spain and the UK and a review of recent European literature addressing the social impact of cultural institutions and other related issues (access and participation in culture, cultural democracy, social and economic effects of culture, intrinsic value of cultural institutions, etc.), this report aimed to present recommendations for Fondazione Cariplo to develop new schemes...
supporting innovation in theatres, museums and libraries, to increase the social relevance of these organisations.

Even though the main emphasis is placed on social inclusion and the social impact of cultural participation particularly for disadvantaged groups, the text also refers to the intrinsic meaning of cultural institutions and presents a complex approach to the subject matter. In this respect, specific attention is also paid to the evaluation of outputs, results and impacts at individual, community and institutional level, thus identifying a wide range of areas of public interest which have links with cultural development.

The authors have long experience in cultural policy and cultural management analysis, particularly in the field of museums and cultural heritage. Social inclusion, intercultural relations and audience development have been addressed in a number of individual or joint publications in recent years.


Details about the authors:
Name: Steffen Bohm
Gender: Male
Country: U.K.
Institution: University of Essex

Name: Chris Land
Gender: Male
Country: U.K.
Institution: University of Essex

This paper explores articulations of the value of investment in culture and the arts through a critical discourse analysis of policy documents, reports and academic commentary since 1997. It argues that in this period, discourses around the value of culture have moved from a focus on the direct economic contributions of the culture industries to their indirect economic benefits. These indirect benefits are discussed here under three main headings: creativity and innovation, employability, and social inclusion. These are in turn analyzed in terms of three forms of capital: human, social and cultural. The paper concludes with an analysis of this discursive shift through the lens of autonomist Marxist concerns with the labour of social reproduction. It is the authors’ argument that, in contemporary policy discourses on culture and the arts, the government in the UK is increasingly concerned
with the use of culture to form the social in the image of capital. As such, attention should be turned beyond the walls of the factory in order to understand the contemporary capitalist production of value and resistance to it.


Details about the author:
Name: Alan Brown
Gender: Male
Country: U.S.
Institution: Wolf, Brown

Assessing the Intrinsic Impacts of a Live Performance attempts to define and measure how audiences are transformed by a live performance. The study’s research design consisted of a pair of questionnaires – one administered in-venue just prior to curtain, and the other sent home with the respondent and mailed back. The first questionnaire collected information about the audiences’ mental and emotional preparedness for the performance. The second questionnaire, related to the first by a control number, investigated a range of reactions to the specific performance, including captivation, intellectual stimulation, emotional resonance, spiritual value, aesthetic growth and social bonding. Between January and May 2006, six presenters surveyed audiences at a total of 19 performances representing a cross-section of music, dance and theatre presentations. This report builds on recent literature to address several hypotheses: 1) that the intrinsic impacts derived from attending a live performance can be measured, 2) that different types of performances create different sets of impacts, and 3) that an audience member’s ‘readiness-to-receive’ the art affects the impacts received. The study develops a simple measurement tool to assess impact, provides an analytical frame- work for considering the results, and suggests how performing arts presenters might begin to use this information to select programs that create specific benefits for their constituents.
An Architecture of Value proposes a framework for articulating thirty benefits that accrue from the arts, clustered into five spheres of Personal Development, Human Interaction, Economic and Social Benefits, Communal Meaning and Imprint of the Arts Experience.


Details about the author:
Name: Catherine Bunting
Gender: Female
Country: U.K.
Institution: Arts Council England

In 2006 Arts Council England launched ‘the Arts Debate’, its first-ever public value inquiry. This publication explains the methodology they employed and the conclusions they reached. The exercise involved a large-scale programme of qualitative and quantitative research and consultation, and its purpose was to engage a wide range of people in a debate about the value of the arts and the role of public funding. In particular, the arts debate sought to explore how public value was then created by the arts and what it would mean for Arts Council England and the individuals and organizations it funds to create greater public value.

The report concluded that: ‘the ultimate end of public funding for the arts should indeed be the creation of ‘public value’ in terms of …strengthening capacity for and experience of life in a wide range of contexts.’ They also concluded that ‘to a certain extent it should be taken as given that this sort of value will be created naturally if as many people as possible experience arts that excite, enlighten, move, stimulate and challenge. As such, they would like the public funding system to focus on enabling widespread quality of artistic experience. The twin priorities of artistic excellence and public engagement become critical means of achieving this overarching ambition. And artistic excellence and public engagement will themselves be achieved if the public funding system abides by a number of core principles: risk-taking, innovation, development of artistic practice, fairness, inclusiveness, access and variety in terms of the artistic opportunities and experiences available to people.’


**Details about the author:**
Name: Kate Clark
Gender: Female
Country: U.K. and Australia
Institution: Heritage Lottery Fund and National Historic Houses Trust

Kate Clark’s work on Public Value relates specifically to the heritage sector, but has a theoretical background that is much wider. She organized the Public Value of Heritage conference in London in 2006, attended by 400 people, and the first publication listed above is a digest of the conference presentations. In the introduction, Clark argues that ‘Ultimately, public value challenges the conventional ‘market failure’ rationale for government action. Instead of simply providing goods and services that the market does not, public value suggests that people have a more subjective, values-based approach to what they want from government.

Public value is often criticized as being based simply on a crude understanding of what the public wants; it is important that in applying it, service-providers are responsible to what is valued but do not just pander to ill-informed preferences. While it certainly creates a greater role for citizens in helping to shape what an organization does, this is something that needs to be mediated or refined. The process of engagement is not just about collecting data but deliberation and education. And ultimately there are checks in place through the press and the democratic process that should prevent leaders from seeking to impose views that cut against the grain of popular opinion.’
The first article arises in the context of the Slovenian Ministry of Culture’s setting up of a task force for the modernisation of public institutions in the field of culture, of which the author was a member.

The text considers the elements of change that should lead from a bureaucratic, Weberian model of public organisation towards a more responsive, democratic model, whilst preventing the risks implicit in ‘marketization’ processes. Among the pre-conditions that should be met to make managerialism culturally sustainable is the reaffirmation of the public value of culture, by clarifying that the modernisation of the public cultural sector is motivated by a cultural, not economic rationale. ‘The focal point of the whole idea of modernization … should be the reaffirmation of the public value of culture’ (p. 14).

Once this and other preconditions have been met (the reinvention of civil society, distinction between public and commercial cultural organisations, etc.), a number of changes in organisational and policymaking models should be introduced, including funding by objectives instead of traditional line-item funding and raising the level of argument in the field of cultural policy. The author argues that this will probably entail the re-politicization of the cultural sector, because it involves the articulation of value, and considers that it is ‘of critical importance for democratic cultural policies to put public administration of culture into the broader political, cultural and societal context.’ (p. 19).

Even though the article derives from a reflection in the Slovenian context, its arguments may possibly be valid in other EU member states, particularly in Central and Eastern Europe. The text can be seen as an interesting example of applying the notion of public value of culture to specific administrative models at national level.

The second paper, which builds on the evidence collected by Čopič, V. and Zagreb’s Institute of International Relations (IMO) in a study on private investment in culture...
conducted on behalf of the European Parliament in 2010-11, presents arguments for quantifying the ‘non-use values’ of culture. The latter are seen as an argument for showing the public nature of cultural events or measures and as the economic justification of public support to private investment in culture. The paper draws on a wide range of resources mostly from the economic field.

The author is a member of the EENC and has written and lectured extensively on the subjects of cultural policy in Slovenia and Europe, cultural legislation and cultural statistics, among others.


Details about the author:
Name: Culture and Sports Evidence Programme
Gender: Governmental Body
Country: U.K.
Institution: Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS)

This report was commissioned by the UK’s Department for Culture, Media and Sport and was designed to address the problem of how to value the benefits of cultural participation and engagement within the specific econometric context of UK policy-making. It is based on Taking Part, the government's comprehensive dataset on participation in the DCMS' domain, and so also covers heritage and sports participation. It looks at both short-term individual value – the improvement in subjective well-being associated with engagement in culture and sport, and the monetary value of these impacts – and long-term economic value to society. Specifically the healthcare costs saved and improved health-related quality of life generated by doing sport. Using techniques that are at the cutting edge of analysis across government, the research establishes a statistically significant relationship between sports and arts engagement and increased subjective well-being. This allows for comparisons with other domains, such as health and employment. The paper also assesses gains associated with sport by using agreed statistical analysis for estimating the
health costs saved by doing sport. The paper is presented by the DCMS as a model for applying the kind of analysis used for other domains in which cultural and sporting participation and engagement have impacts, such as mental health and education. The use of the original Taking Part dataset means that the findings apply only to the definitions of culture, heritage and sport used therein.


Details about the author:
Name: Peter Duelund
Gender: Male
Country: Denmark
Institution: Nordic Cultural Institute / University of Copenhagen

Even though the notion of public value or the intrinsic value of culture are not explicitly addressed in these articles, the author presents a set of arguments and questions concerning recent developments in Nordic and European cultural policy which address their ultimate meaning and underpinning aims. Contributions made in this respect should be understood as a broad, in-depth understanding of cultural policy.

The earliest article results from a broad project analysing contemporary trends in Nordic cultural policies conducted between 1998 and 2004 by several authors and institutions. Taking the work of Jürgen Habermas as a conceptual background, Duelund argues that ‘cultural policy in democratic societies [results] from debates about which values to promote in society, and this discussion necessarily includes the aesthetic rationality of the arts’. Cultural policies could thus ‘counteract the colonizing processes of the economic media and further the values embedded in the life world’ (pp. 4-5) – that is, where the communicative actions of arts and other aesthetic and symbolic modes prevail.

On the basis of this conceptual framework, the author examines developments in Nordic countries since 1960, arguing that following a phase of economic instrumentalism (1985-
1995), recent years have witnessed a resurgence of political colonisation in cultural policy, which has lately led to ‘a massive reawakening of the national dimension in official cultural policy’ (p. 15).

The latter point is taken up again in 2011’s paper, prepared on behalf of the Council of Europe, which broadens the scope both geographically (to all of Europe) and thematically, by addressing migration policy and broader public debates on migration and diversity in addition to more traditional actions in cultural policy (e.g. the introduction of ‘national cultural canons’ in some countries). Here Duelund highlights the tensions existing between the paradigm of pluralism, diversity and human rights and the rise of cultural policy conceptualised as identity policy, which entails the replacement of equal social and political rights and opportunities with culturalism, collective stigmatisation and identity formation.

Whilst taking a broad view on the notion of public value, over these texts the author attests to a profound concern with the public role and social significance of cultural policy.


**Details about the author:**
Name: Adrian Ellis
Gender: Male
Country: U.K. / U.S.
Institution: AEA Consulting

Adrian Ellis, a leading cultural consultant, wrote this paper for the 2003 Valuing Conference organized by Demos. It provides a particularly lucid account of the way in which cultural policy need to rebalance between ‘Intrinsic and Instrumental values’. As Ellis said: ‘The argument runs that British public policy with respect to the arts has become lopsided. Specifically, the very strong emphasis in current policy on the actual and potential contribution of arts organizations to wider social and economic goals leaves under-articulated and, given an environment where there is a strong bias towards the quantifiable, undervalued the intrinsic worth of these organizations and their activities. Further, many of the broadly instrumental arguments in support of public expenditure are themselves neither soundly constructed nor empirically well-supported – cultural organizations are blunt and often unproven instruments of social and economic policy. It is therefore, the proposition runs, in the interests of both effective, well-grounded public policy and of the long-term vitality of the arts that cultural policy is rooted in a more
balanced and more secure understanding of arts organizations' roles and responsibilities – and their reasonable limits. This is not a naïve attempt to reground cultural policy, and the significant expenditure it entails, on some narrow, ineffable aesthetic premise. Although nor is it to deny that the ‘poetics of wonderment’ ought to have a place at the funding table somewhere. Rather, it is an attempt to place economic and social arguments in a wider context and to ensure that those arguments are examined and demonstrated rather than simply asserted.


**Details about the author:**
- **Name:** Bruno Frey
- **Gender:** Male
- **Country:** Switzerland
- **Institution:** University of Zurich

Written by a leading political economist, alongside those of David Throsby (qv) this text is one of the most comprehensive treatments of the phenomena relating to artistic activities in the field. The author draws a distinction between the material and monetary aspects of art and the application of economic or rational choice methodology to art to focus on the latter. The text provides a systematic study of the interaction between the behaviour of individuals and institutions, taken to mean individual organizations and systems, including markets. It discusses a range of examples of how different economic methodologies have been applied to artistic and cultural activity, using empirical evidence to break down the pros and cons of each. There is also discussion of the tensions between neo-classical economic points of view and the anomalies apparent in people’s behaviour in relation to the arts and culture, and discusses the impact of public subsidy on artistic and cultural creativity. The author also makes the economic case for the direct participation of citizens in making decisions about public support for the arts being beneficial. As well as providing an economic overview, like Bakhshi et al (qv) the book also argues how misconceptions on the part of economists in relation to cultural behaviours, and on the part of the cultural sector and others in relation to economic ideas and terminology, have resulted in a certain disregard for the advantages that economic assessment in the sector might bring.
Details about the author:
Name: Max Fuchs
Gender: Male
Country: Germany
Institution: Akademie Remscheid

Drawing on previous lectures in several German universities as well as presentations made in a number of contexts, the author aims to provide clarity to the notions of ‘culture’ existing in contemporary debates, including those that prevail in cultural policy, cultural studies and cultural education. Of particular interest for the present literature review is chapter 7, which analyses the rationales that have served to justify cultural policies and cultural education over recent decades, including the values or principles that underpin them.

To this end, Fuchs collects and analyses a wide range of contributions from past and contemporary authors as well as relevant public policy documents. The analysis of recent developments addresses, inter alia, the implications of the UNESCO Convention on the Diversity of Cultural Expressions for cultural policy and the functions and legitimacy bases of cultural and creative education.

The author, who chairs the German Cultural Council (Deutscher Kulturrat) and is the director of the Remscheid Akademie, has written and lectured extensively on the subjects of cultural education, youth and cultural policy, including its raison d’être. Several other texts are available on http://www.akademieremscheid.de/publikationen/publikationen_fuchs.php.

**Details about the author:**
Name: Jerzy Hausner  
Gender: Male  
Country: Poland  
Institution: Krakow University of Economics

The text was presented in the context of a conference marking 20 years since the end of Communism in Central and Eastern Europe. The author, an academic who has held senior posts in the Polish government in the 1990s and 2000s, discusses social developments in Poland and the broader region in this period. In his view, progress has been marked at individual level, but the public sphere of collective action has seriously lagged behind. ‘The public domain is in a terrible mess… We based our development on human capital, but our social capital is at an extremely low ebb.’ (p. 28).

In the institutional context, bodies have been set up but have failed to evolve in interaction with society. Neither have they been able to respond to complex issues, operating horizontally rather than through the more traditional sectoral approaches. This is also valid for the cultural sector – which, on the other hand, has the potential to provide the missing link to modify this type of ‘molecular’ development and replacing it with ‘modular’ development: ‘This type of development definitely requires culture not only as an area of individual activity and creativity but also as a domain of collective communication, discourse, cooperation and innovation.’ (p. 30).

The author, who had recently been involved in two reports regarding the financing of culture in Poland, goes on to argue that changes within the governance of culture as a sector are necessary for it to become, first, an economic resource and, later, an arena of communication and social cooperation.

The article somehow brings together the arguments for a recognition of the economic potential of culture with a broader view which emphasises the social and public relevance of culture and the arts. Its main arguments, whilst focusing on the Polish case, may well be valid in other neighbouring countries.

**Details about the author:**
Name: Robert Hewison  
Gender: Male  
Country: U.K.  
Institution: City University, London

Whereas two previous Demos pamphlets, *Capturing Cultural Value* and *Cultural Value and the Crisis of Legitimacy* by John Holden (see below) showed how the many different valuations that are placed on Culture can be expressed within the over-arching concept of Cultural Value, this essay focuses on the value created by institutions through their relationship with the public: Institutional Value. Beginning with the ruling ideas of Creativity, Continuity and Care, a new evaluative matrix is developed as a critical tool to help cultural institutions assess their organizational capacity, their creative drive, their ethical stance, and their environmental responsibilities. Ultimately, however, it is not institutions that change things, it is the people within them. This essay set out a challenge to cultural leaders, and to the members of the organizations they lead to focus on the creation of value for all of their stakeholders, principally their audiences, staff and funders.
In these four publications, Holden has sought to explain the meaning of Cultural Value, the place of culture in contemporary society, and the relationship between culture and politics. He sees ‘high art’, commercial culture and what he calls ‘homemade’ culture as increasingly integrated, and argues that we are witnessing a revolution in culture caused by the new ability for everyone to participate in culture through the internet, and to share and monetize their cultural production. The results of this revolution can be seen in the big increases in GDP accounted for by the cultural and creative industries, the growing importance of culture in self-identity and in the construction of international relations, and the destruction of old business models in music, film and publishing. Holden proposed a multi-disciplinary framework to account for cultural value that embraces intrinsic, instrumental and institutional values. His conclusion is that cultural organizations must maximize their value to the public, and because the public has become more interested in cultural participation, organizations need to forge a new dialogic relationship with their communities, rather than seeing themselves as ‘delivering’ culture to audiences. The work of Demos and Holden was praised by the current UK Minister for the Arts Ed Vaizey in a debate in the House of Commons in 2007.
Ivey, B. (2008), *Arts Inc.: How Greed and Neglect have destroyed our Cultural Rights*. Berkeley: University of California Press (342 pp)

**Details about the author:**
Name: Bill Ivey  
Gender: Male  
Country: U.S.  
Institution: Curb Centre, Vanderbilt University  

This book assesses the state of the arts in America and establishes the idea of ‘expressive life’. This is people’s right to participate in cultural life through finding their ‘voice’, in their engagement in the arts and other cultural forms, and by engaging with ‘heritage’: the network of ideas and influences that arises through expression of the past. Using this framework, the book examines influences on the cultural life of America including the arts industries, government policy and the expanding control of copyright and its implications on people’s freedom of expression. The book proposes a department for cultural affairs that will protect people’s expressive life. It also raises the prospect of a new cultural divide in which people with the benefit of technological knowhow and adequate resources of time and money have the opportunity to choose, are separated from those who are reliant on market-driven hegemonies or are less fleet of foot in the expressive world. The book describes the spectre of a new cultural inequality, examining the full threat to society that it poses and identifying the different ways in which it is apparent.


**Details about the author:**
Name: Samuel Jones  
Gender: Male  
Country: U.K.  
Institution: Demos  

A collection of essays written in response to Bill Ivey (qv)’s idea of the ‘expressive life’, as laid out in a provocation chapter in the publication. The essays are written by the leaders of major cultural organizations in the UK, the spokespeople on culture from the leading political parties, academics and specialists in new media. Together, the essays present a
broad view of cultural activity, arguing that it is an essential part of society and human life. By looking at ‘expression’ in the arts, as it occurs in people’s creative activity online, and in the expression of the past, heritage, the collection asks that politicians rethink the importance attached to cultural policy. It suggests that the choices people make in the cultural sphere have relevance across all areas of government. As a result, cultural professionals can make their case to policy-makers beyond the department in charge of culture. The introductory essay also looks at the growing importance of cultural activity as people can create and encounter cultural expression in new ways and with greater frequency than ever before. It argues that because culture will be so important a factor in the future, cultural policy should focus on providing people with the opportunities to participate in and be confident in dealing with culture.


Developing on the ideas of Expressive Lives (qv), this extended essay was written during a year’s independent fellowship at the UK’s Department for Culture, Media and Sport. It is based on analysis of available data from the evidence base developed by the department, including that of the Culture and Sports Evidence Programme (qv) and also insight from the cultural sector. The essay proposes a new rationale for cultural policy, based not on the form that culture takes, but on the role that it plays in society. It argues that cultural policy currently focuses more on specific kinds of culture, and that this means that it is peripheralized in both public and political views of its importance. The essay establishes the idea of the ‘cultural realm’, meaning the nexus of cultural and heritage activity that defines society, and argues that the importance and value of cultural forms – institutions, activities and so on – should be considered on the basis of the opportunities that they provide people within it. Taking a capabilities approach derived from political philosophers like Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum, it argues that greater prominence should be given to culture and people’s cultural opportunities across policy. It also suggests that, as well as assessing the efficacy of delivering these opportunities, measurement and evidence should be gathered with a view to informing policy-makers of the state of the nation.

Details about the author:
Name: Tessa Jowell
Gender: Female
Country: U.K.
Institution: Member of Parliament

Tessa Jowell wrote this pamphlet when she was the UK Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport. It was however not a government document but a personal essay. She was prompted to write it after having listened to the speeches at Demos’s 2003 Valuing Culture conference (see entries for Ellis, Hewison, Holden and Jones). The essay argues that culture provides a means of overcoming ‘poverty of aspiration’. She argues that ‘Complex cultural activity is not just a pleasurable hinterland for the public, a fall back after the important things – work and paying tax – are done. It is at the heart of what it means to be a fully developed human being. Government should be concerned that so few aspire to it, and has a responsibility to do what it reasonably can to raise the quantity and quality of that aspiration.’ Essentially the pamphlet recognizes the complexity of accounting for cultural value, and the difficulties of articulating the case for public subsidy of the arts. It sets out a challenge to the cultural sector, which elicited a wide response: ‘How, in going beyond targets do we best capture the value of culture?’


Details about the author:
Name: Emily Keaney
Gender: Female
Country: U.K.
Institution: Institute of Public Policy Research

This pamphlet explores the contribution that cultural participation makes to communal and civic life. Written in the context of the then UK government’s wider concern with ‘social
capital’, it looks at data from a range of sources to examine the relationship between civic and cultural participation in the UK and concludes that cultural participation fosters social networks and active citizenship. The report also looks at demographic patterns of cultural participation and argues the need for cultural institutions and policy to do more to bring the social advantages of cultural participation to bear across the community: it suggests that targets be established that will encourage this. The author also recommends steps to encourage volunteering in the cultural sector as a means of drawing out community benefits.


**Details about the authors:**
Name: John Knell  
Gender: Male  
Country: U.K.  
Institution: Royal Society of Arts

Name: Matthew Taylor  
Gender: Male  
Country: U.K.  
Institution: Royal Society of Arts

This pamphlet was published to mark the second *State of the Arts* conference hosted by Arts Council England and the Royal Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce. It was written in the context of austerity measures being taken by the UK government, and argues that the sector has been too focused on ‘arts for art’s sake’ arguments, and that policy-makers place too great a store on measures of impact. The authors propose that arguments for public subsidy of culture should in the future be based on a ‘public good instrumentalism’ that will be necessary as greater scrutiny is brought to bear on public expenditure. The paper calls for a clear and evidenced narrative on the social value of the arts and, at the same time, a clearer and more confident consciousness on the part of arts practitioners of working for the public benefit. Taking a pragmatic view the authors also argue for a more systematic measurement of intrinsic values, fearing that difficult to measure benefits – such as the aesthetic, spiritual or social – will continue to be under-emphasized in policymakers’ cost-benefit calculus. They also make the point that measurement should be of the arts as an ecology, including activity that is not publicly
funded, in order that a comprehensive picture of the value of artistic activity is developed.


Details about the author:
Name: Jean-Michel Lucas
Gender: Male
Country: France
Institution: Université Rennes 2 Haute-Bretagne

Jean-Michel Lucas, a lecturer and cultural activist, has written extensively on cultural policy in France, including national and local cultural policies, the contribution of culture to local development, civil society participation in culture and cultural policy evaluation.

This text starts by addressing the set of performance indicators used by the French Ministry of Culture and Communication in the context of the national financial law (LOLF). The author argues that despite the statutory duty to evaluate public policies, the actual implementation of indicators proves the Ministry’s reluctance to engage in an in-depth evaluation. This might be the result, according to Lucas, of the failure to publicly recognise and embrace the actual, universal values on which cultural policy is based – which should indeed be explicitly affirmed.

A more explicit rationale for cultural policy based on universal values should revolve around the notion of the universal value of art (which contributes to building collective images and enables citizens to forge their own views), freedom of expression and cultural rights. By affirming these principles cultural policy and cultural practitioners should escape the risks implicit both in formal, non-cultural evaluation and in policy transversality, as the latter generally leads to culture becoming secondary and a tool for the achievement of external objectives.

**Details about the author:**
Name: Birgit Mandel
Gender: Female
Country: Germany
Institution: Institut für Kulturpolitik, Universität Hildesheim

This article resulted from a European project launched by a number of universities and cultural agencies in the context of the European Network of Cultural Administration Training Centres (ENCATC). Their ‘European Arts Management Programme’ (EAM) aimed to develop new vocational training tools in the field of cultural management, on the basis of the need for cultural professionals to be increasingly active with regards to broader social developments.

Dr. Mandel’s article focuses on the skills needed by cultural managers to better serve specific segments of the public, with a particular emphasis on those sectors that have traditionally shown lesser participation in the arts and on the notion of ‘cultural mediation’. The article is based on a number of consultation exercises in Germany, involving both cultural managers (regarding their perceptions of the aims of cultural management and the skills needed to respond to broader public objectives) and with members of the public at large (concerning their perception of the cultural scene). It also compares the prevailing notions of culture and the arts in Germany with those in the UK, with the latter seen as being more open to fostering cultural participation and people-focused cultural management.

Several recommendations for the enhancement of cultural management training derive from the analysis, including the promotion of a reflection on models of cultural managers vis-à-vis the societal context in which they operate, cooperation with cultural institutions within the training context and the placing of cultural management students in unusual contexts which should force them to invent unusual working frameworks.

The author is a member of the University of Hildesheim’s Institute for Cultural Policy, which provides research and training in a number of fields including cultural mediation, cultural policy and culture in international development.

**Details about the author:**
Name: Kevin McCarthy (et al.)
Gender: Male
Country: U.S.
Institution: Rand Corporation

This important report started a debate in the US about intrinsic vs. instrumental value. Although it came out a little later than the work that was being done in the UK, it is clear that practitioners and policy makers on both sides of the Atlantic were having similar concerns and expressing them in similar language. The report’s summary says that: ‘Faced with intense competition for audiences and financial support, as well as adverse political fallout from the “culture wars” of the early 1990s, arts advocates have increasingly sought to make a case for the arts in terms of their instrumental benefits to individuals and communities. In this report documenting the most comprehensive study of its kind, the authors evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of these instrumental arguments and make the case that a new approach to understanding the benefits of the arts is needed. Critical of what they view as an overemphasis on instrumental benefits, the authors call for a greater recognition of the intrinsic benefits of the arts experience, provide a more comprehensive framework for assessing the private and public value of both intrinsic and instrumental benefits, and link the realization of those benefits to the nature of arts involvement. In particular, they underscore the importance of sustained involvement in the arts to the achievement of both instrumental and intrinsic benefits.’ Like the work of Demos in the UK, the Rand report was the starting point for a wider debate about how the value of culture to society could best be expressed.

**Details about the author:**
Name: Brian McMaster
Gender: Male
Country: U.K.
Institution: Department for Culture Media and Sport (independent review)

This report was commissioned by government from an eminent arts leader, and the terms of reference were to answer the questions of how the system of public sector support for the arts can encourage excellence, risk-taking and innovation; how artistic excellence can encourage wider and deeper engagement with the arts by audiences; and how to establish a light touch and non-bureaucratic method to judge the quality of the arts in the future. These questions were themselves a response to the ongoing debate about how governments could take a less instrumental approach to cultural policy. The report was welcomed by many as an attempt to restore qualitative factors into cultural decision-making (the report's subtitle, From Measurement to Judgment, is significant), but it was critiqued in academic literature and the arts press for failing to define terms adequately: in particular, what is meant by 'excellence'? The cultural commentator Francois Matarasso put it succinctly when he wrote that 'Perhaps, in the end, what really needs to be excellent is the conversation we have about culture.'


**Details about the author:**
Name: Munira Mirza
Gender: Female
Country: U.K.
Institution: London Mayor's Office / Policy Exchange

A collection of essays published by a centre-right think tank, featuring contributions by UK academics and commentators. Written in the context of debates about 'art for art's sake',
the essays address movements in policy to demonstrate externalities in the arts and valuation by means of their contribution to the economy, urban regeneration and social inclusion and the success of arts organizations in meeting governmental targets in these and other areas. The collection suggests that such political pressures damage the integrity of the arts and questions the claims made for the impact of the arts in these areas.


**Details about the author:**
Name: Kate Oakley (et al.)
Gender: Female
Country: U.K.
Institution: Leeds University

The aim of this article is to examine the adoption and use of the term ‘public value’ in both the broadcasting and the wider cultural arena. It examines the ideas, tensions and contradictions that exist in such a notion, asking whether it is simply empty rhetoric, or whether it tells us something more. Essentially it concludes that term does not have a sufficiently well-defined meaning to be useful. It argues that the term stands as an example of a failed approach to policy-making, being neither successfully technocratic, offering a clear methodology for assessing value, nor successfully rhetorical in the way that ‘the public good’, or ‘public service broadcasting’ can be deemed to have been. It also explores the means by which certain policy ideas are transmitted, briefly flourish and then dissipate, arguing that this may be at the cost to a longer-term more sustainable mode of cultural policy-making. What it does not do is acknowledge the ways in which organizations such as the BBC and the Heritage Lottery Fund changed their procedures, metrics and methodologies of public consultation in response to the Public Value discourse.

**Details about the author:**
Name: David O’Brien  
Gender: Male  
Country: U.K.  
Institution: City University  

Commissioned by the UK’s Department of Culture, Media and Sport and jointly sponsored by the research councils for Arts and Humanities and Economic and Social Sciences respectively this essay provides a comprehensive literature review of debates about and techniques used in measuring cultural value in the UK. With a specific focus on econometric methods, it also draws on techniques used in measurement in other areas of policy, particularly health and the environment. The paper is written for the UK Government, and therefore focuses on the context of public management in that country and, particularly, Her Majesty’s Treasury use of the ‘Green Book’, which stipulates that insofar as it is possible, value should be expressed in monetized terms, which allows comparison between different areas of policy based on cost-benefit analysis. The report concludes by calling for a clear set of guidelines, agreed by policy-makers and consistent and communicated throughout the cultural sector. It also recommends that policy-makers work with economists to establish more efficient methods of collecting data that will provide for economic assessment of cultural value that is more pragmatic within the context of UK policy.

**Details about the author:**
Name: Toni Puig  
Gender: Male  
Country: Spain  
Institution: City Council of Barcelona / independent consultant

A collection of commented essays derived from seminars and training sessions held in Spain and Latin America in recent years, Toni Puig argues that cultural policies should be reinvented through citizen engagement and the promotion of social responsibility in culture. The author presents a critical, provocative analysis of developments in local and national cultural policies in Europe and Latin America since the end of World War II and deplores their contribution to establishing an abstract discourse, which seldom relates to everyday lives.

On the basis of this, he identifies a range of values, including those that relate to ethics and human rights, diversity, solidarity, co-existence and transparency, which should allow cultural policies to regain their constructive, facilitating role and to reengage with citizens. This also entails a change in the organisational models of public bodies dealing with culture, which should be more eager to talk to citizens, foster their participation and reach out to certain segments of the population. The current economic context makes the shift towards increased social responsibility in culture even more urgent.

A highly personal book, it draws on the author’s experience in local cultural and educational policymaking and as a local activist, trainer and consultant since the 1970s.


**Details about the author:**

Name: Diane Ragsdale  
Gender: Female  
Country: U.S.  
Institution: Erasmus University, Rotterdam

Diane Ragsdale is currently attending Erasmus University in Rotterdam, where she is researching the impact of economic forces on US nonprofit regional theaters since the 80’s and working towards a PhD in cultural economics. Before moving to Europe, she worked in the Performing Arts program at The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, where she had primary responsibility for theater, dance, and technology-related strategies and grants.

Diane is a frequent panelist, provocateur, or keynote speaker at arts conferences within and outside of the US (notable addresses include Surviving the Culture Change and The Excellence Barrier) and has contributed articles to several publications, including Recreating Fine Arts Institutions, which was published in the fall 2009 issue of the Stanford Social Innovation Review.

**Details about the author:**
Name: Dan-Eugen Ratiu  
Gender: Male  
Country: Romania  
Institution: Babes-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca

The article presents an analysis of the development of national cultural policies in Romania over the past two decades, on the basis of both official discourses and actual policy priorities.

Even though the author argues that the justifications for the public support of culture have rarely been explicitly formulated, four types of rationales can be identified: national interest and prestige (which may be the prevailing discourse, and one which has led to an emphasis on heritage and traditional culture), the social and economic benefits of culture, an ethical justification based on the need to correct market inequities and an intrinsic argument which highlights culture’s contribution to the public welfare. In practice, these arguments have shown fluctuations and discontinuities over the years.

Ratiu builds on European cultural policy literature, including Council of Europe’s reports and Philippe Urfalino’s *L’invention de la politique culturelle*, to draw a distinction between the intrinsic and instrumental values attributed to cultural policy in Romania. In each case, he seeks to analyse policy implications in terms of the prevailing definition of culture and the arts, the feasibility of evaluating policy impacts and the strengths and weaknesses of the approach taken. Overall, this results in a critical but exhaustive overview of cultural policy developments in the country and points to the remaining challenges, including the need for the state to take a less interventionist role and for a more comprehensive cultural policy to be designed, which should embrace diverse forms, disciplines and agents and overcome current limitations.

The author has written a few other articles addressing contemporary developments in Romanian cultural policy.

**Details about the author:**
Name: Joaquim Rius Uldemolins
Gender: Male
Country: Spain
Institution: University of Barcelona

This policy report presents the use of ‘performance contracts’ or ‘funding agreements’ (*contractes programa*) in the management of public cultural facilities in Catalonia as an example which partly derives from the affirmation of the public value of culture.

The author uses literature from new public management, public policy analysis and cultural policy to explain how this form of contract can respond to the need for cultural policy to find a new legitimacy, generating cultural value and developing new governance models which render the social and economic impacts of cultural organisations more transparent. This tool also allows public cultural facilities to become less dependent on policy options and increase their autonomy. The report presents a detailed description of the implementation of this model and the evaluation methodologies that relate to it.

The document was produced in the context of the Cultural Facilities Plan of Catalonia (PECCAT 2010-2020), the design of which was based, among others, on the citizens’ right to access culture. The development of the report involved consultations with a number of cultural managers at local and regional level as well as some academic experts. The author, who was an officer within the Government of Catalonia at the time, is currently based at the University of Barcelona.

**Details about the author:**
Name: Sara Selwood  
Gender: Female  
Country: U.K.  
Institution: Sara Selwood Associates

This paper was commissioned by the National Museum Directors’ Conference, the consortium of the leading UK museums. It was developed on the basis of a qualitative survey and interviews with members about the impact of their institutions. The purpose of the paper is to demonstrate that institutions create value in specific ways, determined by a range of factors spanning from their location and social environment to the balance of their funding and the kind of visitor they attract. It focuses on museums’ contribution to sustaining and changing British national and regional identities, and how museums have, and are, reflecting the changing face of British communities. The paper also includes a comprehensive review of approaches to discussing public and cultural value and, using case studies, examines how this is created in specific examples.


**Details about the author:**
Name: Deborah Stevenson (et al.)  
Gender: Female  
Country: Australia  
Institution: University of Western Sydney

It is increasingly the case that cultural policy at all levels of governance is expected to address a suite of concerns much broader than those traditionally associated with the arts and creative practice. Indeed, in many nations, including most notably Britain, the concerns of cultural policy now embrace the economic and the social, as well as the cultural. In Britain, this convergence is occurring as part of a broader policy concern to ameliorate social exclusion by providing people with opportunities to participate in the
Creative economy. Drawing on the findings of a major study of the factors shaping cultural policy internationally, this article identifies and maps the priorities, key intersections, and convergences associated with these priorities in British cultural policy. The article argues that, in spite of taking different forms and having varying emphases depending on the constituency and the level of governance involved, the convergence agenda currently dominating British cultural policy is nevertheless remarkably consistent in terms of the discourses surrounding culture, the remit of the cultural sphere, and strategic policy implementation.


**Details about the authors:**

Name: Joan Subirats  
Gender: Male  
Country: Spain  
Institution: Institut de Govern i Politiques Públiques, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

Name: Xavier Fina  
Gender: Male  
Country: Spain  
Institution: Institut de Govern i Politiques Públiques, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona
The initial report, published in 2008, was commissioned by the Government of Catalonia’s then Ministry of Culture and the Media with the aim of analysing recent trends and literature addressing the social impact of culture in a number of countries in Europe, North America and Australasia (UK, Netherlands, France, US, Canada, Australia, etc.). Among its findings was the shift from a traditional approach of ‘social impact’, where the emphasis was placed on the ‘externalities’ of culture, towards one of ‘public value’, where the transversal benefits of cultural policy for citizens were stressed.

Whereas the former model stressed the monitoring of developments in other policy fields (education, health, environment, etc.), the latter leads to the identification of a number of axes or cluster areas of relevance for the public value of culture, including collective identities and engagement, social capital (social cohesion, citizen participation, etc.), conflict recognition and management, reassessment of the ‘non-productive classes’, personal development and creativity, transformation of urban spaces, new urban centralities and the reinterpretation of the landscape. Each of these issues is examined on the basis of evidence collected in several countries and some indicators for measuring the public value of culture within them are suggested, mainly by drawing on existing academic literature and policy reports.

Recent articles published by this research team have expanded on the conclusions of the initial report. Subirats, Barbieri and Partal’s article of 2010 (the title of which explicitly refers to the ‘public value of culture’) was the lead text within a thematic issue addressing the social impact of culture, published by the Government of Catalonia’s Ministry of Social Welfare and Citizenship, and was accompanied by several case studies.

The latter article, published in a sociological studies journal in 2011, focuses in particular on the methodological difficulties related to the design of indicators for evaluating the public value of culture.
The research team comprises one of the leading academics in the field of public policy analysis and evaluation in Spain, Joan Subirats, as well as cultural policy consultant and lecturer, Xavier Fina, and younger researchers Nicolás Barbieri, Adriana Partal and Eva Merino.


**Details about the author:**
Name: David Throsby  
Gender: Male  
Country: Australia  
Institution: Macquarie University, Sydney

The Australian Professor David Throsby is arguably the foremost cultural economist and he has explored the relationship between economics and culture, and the limits of economic methodologies in a large number of books and articles. His latest work, *Beyond Price*, asks the question ‘how do we place a value on a painting, or a piece of music, or a traditional ritual? The market can determine a price in monetary terms for a variety of cultural phenomena, but how much does that tell us about the real value of these things? ’ The book explores the tensions between economic and cultural value from a range of disciplinary viewpoints and provides many insights into how value is constructed in contemporary society. As Ragsdale (see above) comments: ‘This work is distinguished from other studies on the topic by its scope (it approaches value in the arts from diverse theoretical and historical perspectives and across a range of artistic disciplines); its commitment to moving beyond the rigid disciplinary confines within which scholars often work; and its encouragement of interdisciplinary communication and dialogue.’

In *The Economics of Cultural Policy*, Throsby gives a clear explanation of why cultural policy has become of such great significance for governments. He then goes on to analyze the process of cultural policy-making from a broad economic perspective.

**Details about the author:**
Name: John Tusa  
Gender: Male  
Country: U.K.  
Institution: University of the Arts and Clore Leadership Programme

Tusa writes that ‘the arts matter because they embrace, express and define the soul of a civilization. A nation without the arts would be a nation that had stopped talking to itself, stopped dreaming and had lost interest in the past and lacked curiosity about the future.’ As an enthusiast for the arts he has been an advocate for government support, not just in monetary terms, but attitudinally, and he criticized the previous Labour government in the UK for giving the impression of favouring popular culture over the arts (he sees a clear distinction between the two). Tusa writes from the perspective of a cultural leader (he used to be Director of London’s Barbican Centre) but is also a well-known broadcaster.


**Details about the author:**
Name: Kees Vuyk  
Gender: Male  
Country: The Netherlands  
Institution: Department of Media and Culture Studies, University of Utrecht

Following an introduction which briefly describes the model of Dutch cultural policy after World War II, the article outlines the present debate on the public funding for culture and the arts in the Netherlands. Although the main lines of contention between political parties refer to the degree of political interference in cultural funding and the level of funding, the author argues that the foremost issue should be the position that the arts occupy in society: ‘Shouldn’t there first be an intrinsic debate on the role the arts play in society, before a debate on the sense, or lack thereof, of government interference? Politics often avoids the intrinsic questions and replaces them with management problems.’ (p. 7).

Vuyk warns that the autonomy of the arts has gone too far and has made it difficult to make general judgements on values. In this respect, he believes that contemporary cultural policies call for increasing interference and the affirmation of interdependence. It is
then that the values embedded in the arts can provide responses to present societal challenges, via ‘harmonies, visions, stories and productions’ (p. 9). The concluding section presents a number of recommendations for re-structuring the forms of public support for culture and the arts in the Netherlands, based on diversity, pluriformity and connection.

The article can be seen as an original approach to the affirmation of the intrinsic value of culture which, as opposed to the more widespread reasoning based on the limitations of the economic arguments, emerges from a critical approach to the traditional arguments held by the arts community as regards the autonomy of culture and the arts.

Kees Vuyk has written extensively on a number of subjects, including cultural philosophy, the performing arts and the value of the arts for society, the latter being one of his current research interests.


**Details about the authors:**

Name: Martin Smatlak  
Gender: Male  
Country: Slovakia  
Institution: Academy of Performing Arts, Bratislava

Name: Kristina Paulenova  
Gender: Female  
Country: Slovakia  
Institution: Foundation – Center for Contemporary Arts, Bratislava

Name: Bohdana Hromadkova  
Gender: Female  
Country: Slovakia  
Institution: Foundation – Center for Contemporary Arts, Bratislava
This cultural policy strategy for the Žilina region, Slovakia, was one of the final results of a broad partnership project organized by Bratislava’s Foundation – Center of Contemporary Arts in cooperation with the Department of Culture of the Žilina Self-Governing Region (ZSK) involving the European Cultural Foundation (ECF) and the Ministry of Culture of the Slovak Republic. Martin Smatlak was the main author of the concept and the contents of the strategy and currently serves as one of the two Slovak correspondents for the Compendium on Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe. On the other hand, Kristina Paulenova and Bohdana Hromadkova were among those who initiated the project.

Among the objectives of the document, which involved a broad and long-term participative process, was to contribute to the implementation of a cultural policy that should set the conditions for the development of culture and cultural values, not only at regional level but also in a national and international context. In fact, some of the reflections are relevant to the broader framework of new EU member states in Central and Eastern Europe.

The document stresses the changes experienced in the local perception of culture in recent times (transformation of contents, institutions, interests surrounding culture, as well as of the activities, forms of support and types of cultural participation) and reflects on the prevailing view of culture as a luxury, as opposed to its being understood as a ‘living system of values’. In this respect, it makes the case for a change of attitudes towards culture and its place in social life, which should entail the understanding of culture’s benefits in several areas of public interest, including the prevention of crime, community integration, the quality of local planning processes, social and economic growth, educational and human resource development, improved care of the countryside, etc. Several fundamental principles for policy development are stated, including partnership, territorial cooperation, solidarity, public interest in the area of culture and cultural, historical and social continuity. Ultimately, this should create the conditions for people ‘to be more fully aware of their own culture and other cultures’ and to enable them to ‘[identify] themselves with the world of cultural values’ (p. 11).

The book can be seen as an interesting example of the practical implications of the public value of culture, which through dialogue merges with the instrumental notion of culture in the public space.