



# **Creative Ways Forward: A seminar on culture in the 21<sup>st</sup> century**

Report of a seminar held in London

20 November 2007

**Philip Hensher**

With thanks to  **ARGENT**

and the **Gagosian Gallery**

**The Author**

Philip Hensher is a novelist and journalist for The Independent.

**The FBC thanks the Steering Group for this seminar:**

**Maurice Fraser, Belinda Thomson and Sue Hoyle**

Franco-British Council  
British Section  
Victoria Chambers  
16-18 Strutton Ground  
London SW1P 2HP

Telephone: 020 7976 8380

Fax: 020 7976 8131

Email: [info@francobritishcouncil.org.uk](mailto:info@francobritishcouncil.org.uk)

[http:// www.francobritishcouncil.org.uk](http://www.francobritishcouncil.org.uk)

<http://www.conseilfrancobritannique.info>

© Franco-British Council British Section 2008

The front cover shows *Walk on Water* by Tim Noble and Sue Webster.  
Copyright Tim Noble and Sue Webster, image used courtesy of the  
Gagosian Gallery.

printed in Britain by TKO Print

ISBN 978-0-9555131-3-8

# **CONTENTS**

---

<b>Introduction by Belinda Thomson</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Report</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>The role of today's cultural institutions in creating the art of tomorrow</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Engaging the public/finding new audiences</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Cultural economy: how can we create a more sustainable arts and cultural sector?</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	
<b>i Speech by Rt Hon Lord Smith of Finsbury</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>ii Statistics</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>iii Committing to Culture</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>iv British Participants</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>v French Participants</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>vi Agenda</b>	<b>inside cover</b>

# Introduction

---

by Belinda Thomson, FBC member

This seminar was the long-planned follow-up to the report, *Committing to Culture*, drawn up in 2000 by Graham Devlin and **Sue Hoyle** (Deputy Director, Clore Leadership Programme), which found a growing convergence between Britain's and France's systems of arts funding. The purpose, seven years on, was to examine to what extent the overall picture of arts funding and arts provision had changed and to look at future developments.

The seminar's central questions were searching and wide-ranging. They looked at the role being played by major public institutions in promoting creativity, at the responsibilities of cultural providers towards their changing audiences, and at how the cultural economy could be made more sustainable. Subsumed within these topics were other themes and questions: whether the political objectives of access, outreach and inclusion were being met; whether such instrumental attitudes would forever be at odds with ideas of culture's intrinsic value and aspirations towards excellence. Certain speakers spoke to the comparative tables relating to the cultural economy and cultural activities in the two countries [see Appendix ii, page 18]. Contrary to the old self-deprecating British assumption that "they manage these things better in France" the statistics appeared to show greater public involvement and public investment in the creative industries in Britain.

Following the lead set by the two chairmen **Nicholas Kenyon** (Director of the Barbican Centre) and **Philippe Meyer** (Journalist), delegates showed an admirable willingness to address fundamental questions about the value of culture to society and the individual. As well as acknowledgment of the perennial antagonism between the avant-garde and the popular, of the lamentable gulf between the cultural offer and the take-up, of the successes and failures of cultural democratization, there was unembarrassed discussion (and not just from the French) of the importance of the pleasure principle and the relationship of culture to happiness and spiritual value (Philippe Meyer intriguingly suggesting that in our relationship to the work of art there had been a movement away from a kind of Catholic High Mass event to a more individualised Protestant experience).

The setting for this seminar, the fast-changing area around Kings Cross, was chosen both to celebrate the opening of Eurostar's St Pancras terminal and to demonstrate one of the seminar's themes, the way the arts can foster urban regeneration. The evening reception preceding the seminar was hosted by the Gagosian Gallery, pioneering flagship of London's vibrant contemporary art scene whose recently opened premises had transformed a former garage in Britannia Street. Then Arts Minister, **James Purnell**, clearly relished the striking backdrop of the gallery's historic Pop Art exhibition as he spoke of his own cultural education in France and of Labour's ongoing commitment to culture.

The delegates, predominantly arts administrators, represented a wide range of organisations from the most established, metropolitan and governmental to the regional, non-aligned and grass roots. Session I, 'The role of today's cultural institutions in creating the art of tomorrow', was introduced by **Neil MacGregor**

(Director of the British Museum). Mindful, perhaps, of his imminent designation as global cultural ambassador he argued that in our multicultural, cyberspace world, the thinking now should be not be of national cultures but of a single global culture, free and accessible for all. His opposite number, **Marin de Viry** (literary critic), presented a more pessimistic picture of cultural progress, arguing that regrettably those who have the most time to devote to cultural activities are the least able or willing to take them up. His remedy for growing new audiences, particularly for theatre, sounded oddly British: to encourage more amateur involvement at school and community level. **Neil MacGregor's** radical challenge was scarcely picked up in the formal discussions and its problematic nature emerged when **Chris Smith** (Former Minister of Culture) spoke eloquently of the vital role of different cultures in conferring a sense of national and communal identity. He also assured us that the conflict between the instrumental /intrinsic value of the arts had become, at least as far as he was concerned, a 'non'-debate.

In Session II, 'Engaging the public/Finding new audiences', **Maryvonne de Saint Pulgent** (Président, Opéra Comique) gave a historical overview of French cultural policy and the variable fortunes of its attempts to reach outwards. This was offset by a practical account from **Helen Marriage** (Director, Artichoke Productions) of a Franco-British success story: bringing a magical piece of street theatre, *The Sultan's Elephant*, from Nantes to central London. Session III, on 'Cultural economy', offered another Franco-British theory-practice contrast: **Andrew Dixon** (Chief Executive, Newcastle/Gateshead Initiative) explained how the arts had been central to long-term social regeneration in the North East. **Anne Gombault** (Professor, BEM-Bordeaux Management School) mapped France's changing arts funding picture, increasingly privatized and market-driven, with both decentralization and international expansionism playing a part.

Addressing the whole gamut of arts provision and funding, *Creative Ways Forward* was an ambitious seminar which opened up wide-ranging debates. It became clear that both countries' governments now pay serious attention to the arts not just because of the part they can play in international diplomacy but because of their manifest contribution to GDP, tourism and employment (doubtless helped by their rebranding as 'creative industries!'). However questions remained. Has Britain's recent cultural confidence not been as much to do with international investment and the City's buoyancy as with government support, and could the bubble burst? The fact that **James Purnell** has already been moved on to the more 'weighty' remit of work and pensions raises the suspicion that in British political terms culture is still, lamentably, regarded as a marginal area, a short-term career stepping stone. The French seemed aware that their top-down, heavily state-subsidized approach to the arts was looking increasingly outdated, and were anxious about future funding levels, not surprisingly given the messages coming from their new government. In the new era of public/private sponsorship can they sustain their traditional national role as tone-setters in the arts? Is leasing out their precious *patrimoine* the answer? Further Franco-British Council seminars on cultural topics are clearly called for, which might profitably focus on common issues facing just one or two of the arts sectors.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Much of the debate, as far as English policy is concerned, was put in a historic context by two events since the conference. The first was the Arts Council's announcement that, despite an increased financial settlement, it proposed cutting the grants to some 200 organizations from April. The slogan here was "more for fewer", and it raised considerable outrage from the supporters of smaller arts organisations. The second was the publication of the McMaster report, which proposed a shift towards excellence as a basis for funding and away from rigid notions of access and diversity.

# Report

---

**Nicholas Kenyon** began by saying that the United Kingdom and France were frequently characterised, in their different approaches to the public status of cultural life, by clichés. In this view, the United Kingdom tended to look out towards the rest of the world for its cultural mixture while France preferred to devote its energy to the funding of *grands projets*. In addition, the United Kingdom was often characterised as being sceptical towards many cultural propensities and ambitions.

The recent opening of the rebuilt St Pancras railway station indicated how limited these accounts were, although it must be agreed that the United Kingdom's conversion to the funding of such ambitious projects had come somewhat late in the day. On the French side, aside from the sequence of *grands projets*, such accounts left out, for instance, the fact that France was a notable generator of innovation in music.

Overall, the terms of the public cultural debate had shifted, and the old debate between a box-ticking assessment and one based on notions of excellence had moved on. The key debates to be had now were on the two subjects of diversity and participation. Diversity referred to the garnering of varied and mixed audiences, rather than to the workers in the arts sector. Participation was a key issue. It would lead from ensuring access to excellence on the part of audiences, to their active participation in creating excellence.

Co-president of the conference, **Philippe Meyer**, said the word "culture" had changed its meaning. Previously, it had elitist associations of magic, of induced reverence. In the past, policy had focused on opening up access to culture. This intention and interest in democratic access had broken down, and the old definition of culture had to some degree been lost. The concern that Hannah Arendt voiced, that individuals are all trapped in a prison of their own experience from which culture might free them, was no longer applicable.

Instead, culture was primarily valued for its place as an economic activity. The old definitions had slipped away without much comment.

In France, the role of television had been undervalued. It was considered as a household art, which intellectuals only made use of when promoting themselves. Most intellectuals regarded it as essentially simplifying, or as a pedagogic force without any expressive potential of its own. It could only be the means of transmitting, for instance, opera or theatre.

The structure of the television industry had lost credibility, due to its politicisation, and the absence of its respect for the law and for its own commitments. TFI had committed to broadcasting 28 operas a year. Although television was not originally made to broadcast opera, it could successfully produce the medium itself. However, this promise was not adhered to.

It could be argued that culture had been invaded by barbarians. Religious and secular structures had broken down, and the historic roles of the clergy and judges taken over by the media. The media were happy to pass judgment, but regarded themselves as immune from criticism. When privatisation of television took place, senior administrators had no particular role. Culture replaced the safe refuge which public bodies had previously offered.

## Session I: The role of today's cultural institutions in creating the art of tomorrow

**Neil Macgregor** spoke of the visual arts and of museums. As a demonstration of how the rest of the world had grown closer, and culture less nationally-determined, he referred to a highly successful exhibition recently mounted by the British Museum of Islamic calligraphy, its practitioners based here with some relation to both British and French culture, but by no means within the historic definitions of either of them. Traditions external to Europe were being carried out within Europe; this art is no longer made elsewhere, it is made here.

The question arose as to whose culture, whose future and whose creativity was under discussion. In a world of highly permeable populations, it became sensible to deny notions of national culture in the traditional sense. Populations in Europe were no longer separate from the rest of the world. It was no longer possible to separate British and French cultures. Historically 'national' institutions now enabled visitors to make global explorations. The priority should no longer be defending *le patrimoine*, but instead enabling people to see the best of the whole world.

Young people in particular could be led to think about how the whole world had enabled its various cultures through the collection. However, the collection would invariably have strengths and weaknesses. In institutions in which the richest collections were of European art, should these dictate the priorities of institutional policy? In Britain, for instance, there was widespread weakness in the field of design, and it was impossible to see the achievement in design which had taken place over the last fifty years.

Other questions should be faced. For instance, what was the correct language in which to label and talk about the collection? How should the collections be best displayed? In the case of the Islamic calligraphy exhibition, an aspect of the thought of the Middle East was brought to light far from the geographical region. Internet access to the exhibition, however, enabled students from Ramallah in Palestine to see it electronically.

**Neil Macgregor** said that the principle of free admission must be upheld. It was crucial, for instance, to foster creativity in a new generation of artists. The Louvre, which had free admission until 1920, was a vital resource for an artist like Picasso, who could visit it and study the work without limitation. The main possibilities of propagating culture were no longer through television but through the internet. Any hope of protecting the visual copyright of objects in public collections was misguided and the battle lost. Institutions would do well to take charge of free electronic reproduction in the interests of quality, making sure that high resolution reproductions are available. If they did not, poor quality images would take their place. We are no longer talking about cultures but one culture to which everyone has access. Cultural institutions such as the British Museum were originally set up in order to challenge power; the way to challenge power now is through the internet.

**Marin de Viry** said that the general panorama of French cultural policy was too large to address, and he proposed to limit himself to specific areas. He started with cultural practices. Addressing the failure of the state's programme of cultural democracy he pointed out that the audiences for cultural phenomena in France across the board remained very low. Even fewer people in France participated directly in culture. The figures [outlined in Appendix iii, page 20] were slightly better in the United Kingdom, but were still very low. This was a sign of social failure. Specific questions might lead to still greater pessimism. Women now

had limited time, and their time for leisure had diminished. The result was a disastrous gap. Those who had most time to spare for culture were, in general, those least well prepared for it and least likely to take it up. The better educated had no time to spare.

What could the State do to address this situation? The policy of democratising culture had clearly failed. Previous objectives of cultural ministers, notably Malraux, had included a vision of the mystic union of public and artistic work; an encouragement of amateurism<sup>2</sup> and the aim of pleasing an audience, to content public opinion. The dominant ideology, over time, had shifted towards the last of these objectives.

The public support of crowd-pleasing culture had achieved nothing at all, compared to what practise and cultural discipline could achieve. It encouraged a two-speed cultural economy. Cultural engagement at an amateur level in the United Kingdom had a valuable role in creating potential audiences. The French Ministry of Culture and Ministry of Education need to do more work together to promote amateurism. Public bodies had the power to present works of culture, and an opinion of their worth, to the larger public. However the explanations were often offered at an obscure level.

The Manichaeian debate between progressive and conservative forces was a false one. The positions this debate tended to solidify into, between one in which 100% of support was offered to projects of uncertain intelligibility, and one in which the people's interests were betrayed by the artificial preservation of the avant-garde, was not just one of caricature but the wrong debate. The State at present did not discriminate, and its critical grid was too open. The final criterion must be one of mediation between creator and audience.

**Nicholas Kenyon** made a link between educational activity and creativity. Was the question of access in part a geographical one? He also made the point that the compilation of cultural activities from the Eurostat figures rested on declarations of those surveyed. Cultural practices had changed somewhat, and embassies no longer acted as defenders of national proponents.

**Maryvonne de Saint-Pulgent** said that the figures relating to cultural employment presented might be questioned [see appendix ii, page 18], as making distinctions between cultural and non-cultural jobs and sectors open to debate. The United Kingdom seemed to have figures which were somewhat higher than France. Different criteria might be being used. **Marin de Viry** had taken negative criteria. In reality, there was probably not as much of a gap as this table seemed to show. The important thing was the general tendency of the statistics. They might be questioned, since respondents often offered "aspirational" answers. People, especially in France, wanted to be seen as cultured. A better question might be simply "How do you spend your time?", which would produce more reliable figures, leading to more pessimistic conclusions.

**Catherine Tasca** (Former Minister of Culture), said television had its own importance, and the cultural intentions of the mass media should be examined. Responding to **Neil MacGregor** she said that institutions had a responsibility to their own culture. What were the reactions from different publics to this super-national policy? Popular education and support for amateurism should be pursued.

---

<sup>2</sup> The term 'amateur' can potentially lead to Franco-British misunderstandings as it means 'lovers of art, collectors, patrons' in French and, in English the definition is 'a person who engages in art as a pastime rather than for financial benefit or professional reasons'.

The mass media tended only to satisfy public opinion. There was much more local than state funding in France. Support for amateurism would encourage art outside the institutions, such as street theatre and plastic works. Institutions should recognise their own desire to institutionalize culture. Could, in fact, the state make cultural choices, or should choice be delegated to the directors of institutions?

**David Looseley** (Professor of Contemporary French Culture, Leeds University), said that in Britain, the launch of BBC 4 had been seen as a good achievement. Perhaps this debate was a matter of language, since in Britain “amateur” was something of a derogatory word. The question, rather, was what institutions could do for culture overall. It was important to reevaluate the role of the amateur, and recognize that there was no qualitative distinction between a musical amateur and a lover of music.

**Philippe Meyer** said that it was important to break the idea that it was enough to go before a work of art, and to absorb its values, as it were, through dialysis. Akin to attendance at a Catholic High mass, the principle of universal and direct individualized access to culture might be a Protestant one in origin. The lover of art was not the one who exalted narcissism in culture.

**Neil McGregor** said that the mystical response to culture required the intervention of an interpreter. The iPod and the presence of libraries and museums on the internet had altered culture permanently.

**Anwar Akhtar** (CEO CIDA), said that institutions did not create, but rather enabled creators. Global institutions had global responsibilities. The aims of access and excellence were not contradictory; indeed, the more people, the better the culture. A failure in this respect had been the Royal Academy’s recent exhibition of Turkish culture, which had made no attempt to open the exhibition and its themes to East End Muslims. One difficulty in addressing these questions was in determining the status of voices from different communities.

**Anne Gombault** said there was a deficit of understanding of what an audience wanted. There were different motives for the audience of culture; the search for new experience, the purely hedonistic, which must be taken into account in making culture available to the public. Marketing to demand should be examined. There was considerable competition primarily for the attention of young people.

**Francine Mariani-Ducray** (Director, musées de France) said museum websites had encouraged the growth of visits to museums. The power of the state should be varied rather than monolithic, representing diverse interests. There was a lack of reference points and of criteria for editing work for quality. Amateurs could be encouraged, too, as people who might ultimately donate private collections.

**Andrew Dixon** said national statistics hid a spread of regional variation. In the North-East of England, 15 years ago, levels of attendance were the lowest nationally in all sectors due to a lack of opportunity. New technologies were changing that, including such phenomena as Youtube and self-publishing. National institutions were increasingly taking their work outside London.

## Session II: Engaging the public/finding new audiences

**Maryvonne de Saint-Pulgent** opened the session by saying that a comment might be made on the relations between culture and pleasure. The French composer/conductor Pierre Boulez had said that those claiming to take pleasure in music were impostors. Berlioz, on the other hand, suspected that the objective of the listener was to find pleasure. It was perhaps worth noting that Berlioz had failed in his task to please French audiences, and had to raise money by conducting concerts in Germany.

Culture was today opening up to new publics. These were not just different publics, but novice publics. One might ask what the public was at the Opera Bastille. Some of it was new. Mostly, it was a traditional audience. The *nouveaux riches* were conspicuous. Internet millionaires, for instance, found the Opera a good place to meet new clients.

Rousseau's comments on art in the *Encyclopedie* maintained that the fine arts must reach the humble, and that to ensure this was the duty of the state. The task was taken up late in the Revolution. The collective cultural education of people in the 1840s or thereabouts was a philanthropic endeavor. Military musicians often took part in this movement, which ended in 1914.

Other populist cultural movements included the *Theatre du Peuple*, involving Romain Rolland and Jean Jaurès. This aimed to move people away from popular melodrama towards theatre manufactured for the people's interests. The *Opera Comique* undertook tours in the suburbs. The result was initially only an audience of the bourgeoisie, although later it began to recruit a more varied audience.

These enterprises were taken up by the State. In 1936, the Front Populaire adopted a policy for training people in culture. In 1946, the ambition of access for all replaced a commitment to freedom of art, in which the state would organize access. In 1959 André Malraux created the ministry, and cemented the aim of access for all. Subsequently, the policy of democratization became a non-controversial topic of complete political consensus. The debate subsequently was only over the means by which this would be achieved.

Statistics since 1973 showed a total lack of change in participation. The numbers increased, but only in proportion to population change. Whether this represented a failure of democratization was now a very old debate. It could be said that it was useless to have any cultural policy if education had failed.

There had been accusations in 1968 of a failure to propagate popular culture. In response, Duhamel in the mid 1970s introduced a concept of cultural democracy. This meant that practices of the non-educated had parity with those of the educated, and were recognized as having the same nature. The problem was solved.

It could be contested that this concept demonstrated the failure of democratization, or that democratization was even possible to achieve. Debates subsequently were doctrinal in nature. First, between the cultural offer and the demand for it. For the offer, the problem of access was a physical one, of ensuring that cultural sites were well-distributed, for instance in the regions, supplying access to cinemas and to regional theatre. For the demand, the question was of the desire of the public actually to go and see any of these products. This was a general policy question of presentation.

Secondly, there was a debate between formal access to culture, in terms of price, and real (intellectual) access. An enthusiast might be too poor to attend. A person who could afford a ticket might not be able to understand the show. Could

the public be trained like a pet dog? The *Opera Comique* had experimented in both areas. Experts on mediation were employed at the tax-payers' expense to prepare audiences for works which were proposed to be inflicted upon them. Adolescents from the suburbs proved particularly conservative in their likes and dislikes. Another area to be addressed concerned potential audience members who could not afford to attend. Under-25s had part of their tickets subsidized, up to 50 euros. This plan was limited to 1000 places.

**Helen Marriage** spoke as a practitioner and a cultural entrepreneur, who had brought the giant street-theatre puppet show *The Sultan's Elephant* to London. In France, where it had originated, it had been supported by the French government and by local authorities. The United Kingdom's record in street theatre was poor. This exercise would demonstrate that high quality work was possible. It would break down barriers in a show of high quality, and show that theatrical magic was possible in unexpected locations.

The planning represented five years of persuasion. The French authorities had been relatively amenable, accepting the proposition that life should be lived on the streets. In Britain, the authorities had a history of accepting that street life could be disrupted by ceremonials, state occasions, political events and protests and even sport. When the England team won the Rugby world cup, the whole of central London was closed down in short order to permit a victory parade. They were less enthusiastic about the idea that the same might be done for a cultural event.

She suggested that some might see such large-scale events which readily closed down London as fundamentally male events of self-aggrandisement.

The authorities were ready with the suggestion that the event take place in a park, missing the idea that the point of the whole event was to disrupt the economic life of the city in a benevolent purpose. It gave the city licence to look at itself in a spirit of joy. Present-day life was dominated by the tyranny of technology. There was a great unsatiated hunger for the real, and for the live event. Access via the internet could, however, be used as a marketing tool.

The practical difficulties were immense. Traffic planning took two years to conclude. The authorities were finally persuaded by experiencing the event in a different city. They, too, fell in love with something real. In a larger sense, one could note the phenomena of the increasing desire for self-publication, publicity and fame among the general public. This, too, at a deeper level, was a desire for reality.

After the event, the Arts Council was overwhelmed by the immense volume of phone calls offering congratulation and enthusiasm. The event was hugely popular, but unimagined in advance. The public discovered that they didn't know they wanted a work of art until they were given it. The event escaped the distinction between habitual and new consumers of culture. Lessons could be learnt by institutions; it is difficult for a new user to enter an institution. In this exercise, nobody owned the territory. Street theatre of this type offers an experience akin to ceremonial, acted out in public-owned spaces.

The event took place without any marketing, over three days, at a cost of £1.5m. Instead, enabled by modern technology such as the internet, mobile phones and SMS, word of mouth created huge crowds very quickly. Within 24 hours of the end of the project, 76,000 photographs had been posted on Flickr, the internet photo-sharing website.

The project demonstrated that popular art need not be lowbrow, and there was no intellectual problem that too many people liked the work. It was made

possible by 30 years of French investment in culture. No commercial return was sought or made. It was worth noting, too, that the immense audience for events like this made no impact on recorded statistics.

**Mark Jones** (Director, Victoria and Albert Museum), said that there was clearly a tension between notions of excellence and the ideal of wide access in culture today. The aim of democratization of the arts had been in place for a century and a half, but it had to be asked what progress had been made. It could be compared, in that respect, to social mobility. Public response to specific cultural events could often be characterized as angry or anxious. An example was the exhibition devoted to the clothes of Kylie Minogue which the Victoria and Albert Museum mounted.

Cultural consumption was characterized at present as being dictated by conscious strategies. The rich indulged in conspicuous consumption of culture. Some art was valued purely because it was expensive, or because it was difficult to appreciate - for instance, the painting of Jackson Pollock. Institutions often found a difficulty in being both culturally esteemed and popular, although there was such a phenomenon of collective conspicuous consumption.

Museums, essentially, were "palaces of the people," forced into existence after the revolutions of 1848. The challenge now was to identify excellence and to overcome the apparent tension between the agents of excellence and those of inclusion. Consumers of culture evidently enjoyed what was truly excellent.

**David Looseley** said that it might be asked whether institutions should have as a primary objective to try to content the public. Could institutions or the public identify excellence best? There was a difference in fundamental nature between the familiar, and the surprising. One could argue, too, that some artistic product had merit as something that was "good of its kind."

**Catherine Tasca** said that when cultural events moved outside big cities, the local inhabitants embraced the events and took ownership of them. Cultural interventions in rural areas, in which social isolation could be marked, needed to be supported. The biggest successes here were artistic ones.

**Doreen Foster** (Chief Executive, Bernie Grant Arts Centre), said that it was important to understand that different artistic standards need not be set for different audiences. In her particular case, an opera based on the life of Mary Seacole, the nineteenth-century pioneer of nursing, was premiered in Tottenham, a working-class and ethnically diverse area of London. It was sold out before the first night. Only 5% of the audience had experienced opera before. This sort of venture could be supported if larger institutions were more prepared to co-operate.

**Jacques Martial**, (Président, l'établissement public du Parc et de la Grande Halle de La Villette), said that the flourishing of culture in La Villette showed how culture could be democratised. Everyone had a right to culture. La Villette, occupying 35 hectares, was a culturally complex space. Audiences were historically excluded by history and geography. Hip-hop, now flourishing at taxpayers' expense, had extended itself from fashion into a form of art.

**Ann Kenrick** said that different ways of reaching non-traditional audiences should be considered. There were standard methods - for instance, in the case of the Mary Seacole opera, music of the Caribbean was highlighted. It was important

to find ways of challenging people by surprising them, while at the same time recognising that people also put a high value on traditional forms of art.

## **Session III Cultural economy: how can we create a more sustainable arts and cultural sector?**

**Andrew Dixon** began the session by talking about Newcastle Gateshead. Historically, there had been no cultural endowment here. Industry had moved out. Now, it had been named as one of the 8 most creative cities in the world by Newsweek. In the past, the arts and culture did not travel. This was due to a lack of opportunity rather than a lack of enthusiasm. Over a ten-year plan, costing £250m, the city was transformed. It had hosted a World Summit on Culture, for instance.

The NG initiative started above all as a social programme. What began as a capital programme was seen above all as a social programme. Expansion of arts and culture depended on a notion of its sustainability. When the expansion had reached a certain level, it attained critical mass and could keep itself going. An example of publicly-funded art in the North-East was Antony Gormley's sculpture *The Angel of the North*. It was criticized in advance, but immediately popular once it was in place. In this case, art created a regional identity.

Sustainability came from regional commitment. The scale of events was important. Here, there were twenty new or improved cultural products over ten years. The result was a creative industry which now employed more people than the old heavy industries did in their heyday. Civic authorities had taken to paying creative figures directly.

**Anne Gombault** said that the terms in the discussion should be defined. Sustainable development, decentralization, de-industrialization and repartitioning were all important concepts at the centre of the paradigm of the creative industries. These ranged from pure artistic productions to industries where creative input plays only a small part. In the 1990s entrepreneurial dynamics were observable. The effects on local authorities were noted. Culture could be regarded as a resource, offering competitive advantage for the regions, mobilizing functions. The United Kingdom was a pioneer in conceptualization, creating zones for creative dimensions, although this had not happened in France yet. In the French cultural landscape, new economics were emerging, including festivals, increasing investment in the middle-size towns, territorial development of the major institutions (the Louvre in Abu Dhabi and Beaubourg in Shanghai), biennales and competition between World Heritage Sites and European Cities of Culture. In discussing decentralization, legally diversified instruments offered more regional autonomy. New public management offered greater autonomy, strategy and performance, as well as responsibility. Sponsors took part in a stakeholder culture. The logic of events on the ground was affected by a confusion between hedonistic motivation and long-term sustainable policies. The festival in Lille in 2004 had not been entirely successful as it had been imposed rather than developed locally. Public funding was effective, though approaches needed to be harmonized.

**Jérôme Kohler** (Director, L'Initiative Philanthropique), looking more to the private sector said that in France there was a fall in the level of public subsidies and a rise in different methods of funding. For instance, the whole area of

philanthropy should be considered by cultural institutions; the concept of very rich individuals supporting culture had crossed the Atlantic effectively.

**Anwar Akhtar** said there was a tradition in Britain of subsidizing such things as orchestras and operas, but not of commercial club culture. There was a complicated set of relationships here, and culture could have an effect on regeneration and the value of property.

**Fabrice Hergott** (Director, Musée d'Art moderne de la Ville de Paris), said the French were in a transition period, in which national identity was opening up. Free events, which increased access, were very important and should not be despised as having no value because they had no cost for the consumer. Philanthropy and corporate sponsorship was taking more of a place.

**Philippe Meyer** said that culture assisted each person to achieve their potential. There was a danger inherent in regional funding of merely strengthening local politicians. There should be a hierarchy of genres and a sense of different aesthetic importance attaching to different manifestations of culture. It was important not to spend money on purely frivolous projects. Public funding had attracted a loss of responsibility.

**Philip Hensher** added that, of course, much of the arts could not possibly be carried on without public subsidy. However, as a practising novelist, he would conclude that he had failed utterly if he depended on public subsidy, and could not imagine any sane person proposing that novelists ought to be subsidized. In his view, no practising artist ought ever to be subsidized directly. Anyone who thought that contemporary creators benefited from handouts needed to demonstrate a correlation between cultures of high public subsidy and high artistic standards. Such examination would almost certainly tend to show that direct public subsidy diminished the quality of the art produced over long periods.

The key subject, it seemed to him, was one of access and participation, and the important factor not the levels of participation, but the general direction over time. Clearly the internet is a vital factor in propagating the work of museums, theatre and so on, but it will always be the stick in the swill-bucket rather than the substance itself.

**Bonnie Greer** (Playwright), said that it must not be overlooked that culture was going to need defending, especially in an ageing society where funds were stretched. Institutions should think more about possibilities of synergy. The connections between the British Museum and the Internet, for instance, or connections between the Barbican and a small-scale theatre at Stratford East. One challenge to great institutions was to diversify their Boards of Trustees. Culture could be seen as a too-well-defended bastion and reform was needed if it was going to survive. Individual artists were valuable presences within the institutions: they could bring news of developing culture to those institutions.

**Francine Mariani-Ducray** referred to an experiment of making admissions free for a period of 6 months. It would be interesting to analyse the impact on the type and number of admissions.

**Olivier de Rohan** (President, Société des Amis de Versailles), wanted to dismiss the notion that the French had no tradition of private benefaction. The

State often asked for the donation of private money without stipulation as to its use. He himself had found that the common French idea that Americans enjoy giving money was not quite correct. His preferred approach was to offer potential donors a share in a project, a business deal, an advertising opportunity or exchange. Donations of furniture and sometimes of money often tended to appeal to the idealistic notions of the wealthy.

**Keith Khan** (Head of Culture, 2012 Olympics), said that, speaking as an artist, he had been hugely impressed by cultural systems and work which he had seen in France. He aspired to reproduce the sense of freedom which he had found there. He also stressed that more work needed to be done on the question of how to gain new audiences.

**Rt Hon Baroness Quin** (Chair, FBC British Section), said that the work in Gateshead was both a recognition of the past and an incentive to the future. Councillors tended to have a background in heavy industry, but readily saw the possibilities of culture when it was presented to them. The initial ridicule of the proposed Angel of the North actually gave the councillors firmer resolve.

## Conclusions

**Jean Guéguinou** (Chair, FBC French Section), felt that the seminar had fulfilled the mission of the FBC; there had been new thoughts, no repetition, a genuine exchange of experience. Fifteen years ago it would have been impossible to have such an exchange; such was the divergence between the countries' arts policies.

**Jerome Kohler** emphasised how challenging it was to try to sum up the day's discussion as the debate had ranged far and wide. However all had agreed that culture was inherent to the individual and their role in society. There was a need to rethink private-public partnerships in a time of shortage of public subsidies and, more precisely the role of corporate and individual philanthropy in the development of cultural institutions. More globally, the need for new resources may also be a way to tackle the issue of how to develop new audiences and to thrive accessibility and perhaps positive discrimination was required. **Jo Hedley** (Curator, National Gallery), added that the role of institutions was critical and their governance needed review – the make up of boards of trustees should reflect the artists and the preoccupations of the audiences, not just those able to sign large cheques. There was also a more subtle need to open institutions up to civil society beyond a simple reflection of their audiences. Questions of territorial implementation would continue to present challenges – maybe the Louvre in Abu Dhabi would work better than the Musée de St Petersburg. It was also important to be open to new technology – the internet and iPod might mean that individuals could create their own personal catalogue of works of art.

**Nicholas Kenyon** closed the meeting by thanking the participants and suggesting that a smaller follow up group should be convened to look at some of the issues in more detail.

## Appendix i

### What value do we place on Culture?

#### Speech given over lunch by Rt Hon Lord Smith of Finsbury

*'Health is a sine qua non, culture is a raison d'être'*

Barthes spoke of how culture is where we tell each other stories, where we speak to the heart, to the mind and to the imagination, where we explore ideas of truth and beauty. Culture provides the framework.

President John F Kennedy, less than a month before his assassination, gave a speech in which he said: *I look forward to an America which will of will reward achievement in the arts as we reward achievement in business or statecraft. I look forward to an America which will steadily raise the standards of artistic accomplishment and which will steadily enlarge cultural opportunities for all of our citizens. And I look forward to an America which commands respect throughout the world not only for its strength but for its civilisation as well.*

On the whole governments don't recognise the centrality of this. Our own is certainly no exception although I tried to make efforts to change this. Certainly when I arrived at the Department for Culture it was viewed as: 'something to be patted on the head from time to time.' France is perhaps different, as is Ireland and New Zealand. The prime minister of New Zealand announced when she took office that she was also going to be Minister for the Arts. That's one way to send out a huge message and make people understand the central importance of culture.

Hazlitt said: *Scotland is of all other countries in the world perhaps the one in which the questions 'what is the use of that?' is asked the oftenest. But where this is the case, the Fine Arts cannot flourish, or attain their high and palmy state, or scarcely creep out of the ground to expose themselves to the 'eager and nipping air' of this kind of rigid catechising scrutiny; for they are their own sole end and use and in themselves 'sum all delight'. It may be said of the Fine Arts that 'they toil not, neither do they spin,' but are like the lilies of the valley, lovely in themselves, graceful and beautiful, and precious in the sight of all but the blind. They do not furnish us with food or raiment, it is true but they please the eye, they haunt the imagination, they solace the heart. If after that you ask the question, Cui bono? There is no answer to be returned. And of course that ought to be, and could be the end of the story. But of course it isn't. If I am going to negotiate with the Treasury as Minister of Culture for more funding, more arguments are needed.*

- We need to believe in the value of the development of artistic ability in the education of an individual – artistic expression whether in dance, song or painting comes naturally to the young and the risk is that we almost drive out this instinct and restrict it by teaching logic and reason. We need to nurture the framework of creativity – to recognise its value in creating self esteem and a sense of self worth.

- We need to wake up our governments to the fact that the Arts are not just aesthetically important. Before I came in as Secretary of State at the DCMS no-one had any idea of what the creative sector was worth. In the debate on the intrinsic value of the economy and health services we can lose sight of the central importance of art. At the same time we need to appreciate the contribution of the culture sector. It produces 7-8% of GDP and employs millions of people. It is also growing at twice the rate of the rest of the economy. But there is always the danger of complacency. The fact is that we cannot have a flourishing economic centre without a flourishing cultural environment – just think of the contribution of designers, filmmakers and musicians. And then there is also the social and educational value of the arts.
- Culture gives us a sense of who we are – as individuals and as a society – it feeds into this thing that is a ‘nation’. Scotland has known this for a long time developing its identity through song, music language and poetry. It is remarkable but in Britain you can’t really talk about a thing called culture. It is rather a fusion of different influences and traditions.

So culture contributes massively to education, to the economy and to our identity. But none of this should be allowed to detract from the central point. For many people culture is associated with many different things. I like to think that it is something that you grow people in.

## Appendix ii

# The cultural economy and cultural activities in France and the United Kingdom

### 1.Characteristics of cultural employment

#### Cultural employment, 2005

	Cultural employment		% of workers with tertiary education*		% of workers with temporary jobs		% of workers, non-employee**	
	Workers (1000s)	% of total empl.	Cultural empl.	Total empl.	Cultural empl.	Total empl.	Cultural empl.	Total empl.
<b>EU27</b>	<b>4 940.3</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>47.7</b>	<b>25.9</b>	<b>16.4</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>29.0</b>	<b>13.7</b>
<b>France</b>	487.9	2.0	53.5	28.8	24.9	12.0	20.1	9.0
<b>United Kingdom</b>	870.0	3.1	47.7	30.8	7.4	5.5	29.7	12.5

\* Tertiary education. ISCED level 5-6.

\*\* Employers, self-employed and family workers

### 2. Publishing sector and external trade in arts and antiques most significant in the United Kingdom

#### Selection of indicators from the cultural sector

	Tertiary students in arts*, 2004/2005		The publishing sector** 2004		Trade in art and antiques*** 2006		Cinema admissions**** 2006	
	1000s	% of total tertiary students	Enterprises (1000s)	% of total manuf. value added	Imports (million euro)	Exports (million euro)	(millions)	Per inhabitant
<b>EU27</b>	:	<b>3.9</b>	<b>55.1</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>3 033.6</b>	<b>4 719.7</b>	<b>929.2</b>	<b>1.9</b>
<b>France</b>	:	:	9.7	2.7	340.2	896.5	188.7	3.0
<b>United Kingdom</b>	148.4	6.5	5.3	5.5	1 870.7	3 153.1	156.6	2.6

\* Tertiary students: ISCED level 5-6. Arts: Fine arts, Music and performing arts, Audio-visual techniques and media production, Design, Craft skills. EU27 is based on the available data.

\*\* 'Publishing' means 'Publishing of books, newspapers, journals and periodicals'. EU27 aggregates for the publishing sector are estimated.

\*\*\* EU27 figure includes only extra EU27 trade. Member States' figures include both extra- and intra-EU27 trade. Includes Paintings; Original engravings, prints and lithographs; Original sculptures; Stamps; Collectors' pieces of zoological, botanical, mineralogical, anatomical, historical, archaeological, paleontological, ethnographic or numismatic interest as well as Antiques of an age exceeding 100 years.

\*\*\*\* Source: Media Salles. DE: Including municipal cinemas. IT: Based on Società Italiana degli Autori ed Editori data referring to screens with more than 60 days of activity per year. NL: Not including data for some small distributors.

: Data not available.

### 3. Enjoying culture by reading a book is the most common cultural activity both in France and in the UK

#### EU27 citizens' participation in cultural activities, 2007

	% of respondents who in the last 12 months have at least once:								
	Watched culture on TV/radio	Read a book	Visited a historical monument	Been to the cinema	Visited museums or galleries	Been to a concert	Visited a public library	Been to the theatre	Been to the ballet or opera
<b>EU27</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>France</b>	64	71	54	63	43	35	33	23	19
<b>UK</b>	77	82	61	53	49	40	53	41	20

Source: European Commission - Special Eurobarometer 278.

**Cultural employment** covers both cultural occupations in the whole economy and any employment in cultural sectors of the economy (cultural economic activities). **Cultural occupations** are professional activities with a cultural dimension, such as librarians, writers, performing artists, architects, etc. The occupation is defined as a subset of the ISCO classification. All these occupations are taken into account, whatever the main activity of the employer. **Cultural activities** are defined as a subset of the NACE classification, and include e.g. publishing, motion picture and video activity, wholesale and retail of cultural goods. In these activities, all employment is taken into account, whatever the occupation (artistic, technical, administrative, managerial), because they are all required for the operation of the "cultural industry".

ISCO stands for International Standard Classification of Occupations.

NACE is the Statistical Classification of Economic Activities in the European Community.

Eurostat Pocketbooks "**Cultural statistics: 2007 Edition**", PDF version available free of charge from Eurostat website. Available in English only.

European Commission - Special Eurobarometer 278, wave EB67.1: "European Cultural Values".

Available from:

[http://ec.europa.eu/public\\_opinion/archives/eb\\_special\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb_special_en.htm)

Source Eurostat News Release

146/2007 - 29 October 2007

## Appendix iii

### Committing to Culture

- |   |     |
|---|-----|
| 1. Conclusions of the 2000 report on Arts Funding in Britain and France (Committing to Culture) | p20 |
| 2. Summary of the Paris meeting to discuss the report in June 2000                              | p22 |
| 3. 2006 Update on situation in Britain and France   | p23 |
| 4. Glossary of acronyms   | p32 |

#### 1. Conclusions of original study in 2000

(The full report can be accessed at [www.francobritishcouncil.org.uk/reports/artsfunding.pdf](http://www.francobritishcouncil.org.uk/reports/artsfunding.pdf))

This study has concentrated on two main areas:

1. The funding support available for culture in the two countries; and
2. The governmental and quasi-governmental systems designed to deliver it

Perhaps not surprisingly, our analysis has confirmed the fact that France puts significantly more resources into supporting culture than does the UK. At a national level, the French Government contributes about 25% more than the British out of tax-raised funds to the revenue operations of its arts institutions and museums. If the arts alone are considered, the disparity is much more marked with France investing about 60% more than the UK.

On the capital side, France also has a far stronger tradition of making significant investments in arts buildings. Only in the years 1995-98, when the Lottery in the UK was producing plentiful returns and the Lottery distributors were temporarily distributing capital *largesse* at an unprecedented level, was that disparity moderated. Even at its peak, however, the UK Arts Councils were only distributing an average of about £275m per year for capital projects compared with, say, the French Ministry's allocation of about £350m in 1998<sup>3</sup>. With the reduction in Lottery funds available for capital purposes, the ratio has declined to about 1 in 4.

A considerable amount of that French expenditure, however, was incurred in the service of the Grands Projets, almost exclusively in Paris. The British Lottery investment, on the other hand, has sought to distribute funds throughout the country (although the existence of very large projects such as the Royal Opera House, the Royal Albert Hall and the Royal Court has skewed the picture in favour of London).

In general, both countries spend a disproportionate percentage of every type of funding in their capital cities, as is to be expected given those cities' importance in political, economic and creative terms. As a raw percentage, the UK spends a higher proportion of its national funds in London than France does in Paris but when those spends are set against the populations of the two cities, the position is reversed.

In both countries, the rhetoric of government is concerned with delegating responsibilities to the regions, putting new emphasis on participation and redistributing funds from the *vaches sacrées* to a range of smaller and more varied organisations. To that effect, both systems have tried to strengthen their regional mechanisms (DRACs and RABs). However, to date, the *vaches sacrées* remain determinedly at the top of the pyramid. Indeed, some of the very largest institutions have considerable socio-political significance (particularly, the *Comédie Française* and the Royal Opera House) and, consequently, remain at the heart of the countries' establishments.

Complementing the resources made available from central government, regionally-generated funds are distributed by local governments in both countries. Here, there is a very marked difference in the sums available with the three tiers of French regional government contributing substantially more than central government to the arts and about four times the amount provided by their British equivalents (at 1993 prices).

We prefaced this study by noting that the ways in which statistical information is presented vary

---

<sup>3</sup> across all its activities

considerably between the two countries (and between different elements within them). Also, the most recent years for which up-to-date information is available can range from 1992 to 1998. Despite this, we can make an order of magnitude estimate of the funds available for arts and museums in the two countries.

**Table 34 : National and regional summary**

	National Museums	National Arts	Local	Capital	Lottery	Total
France (MF)	620	4,420	14,390	3,484		22,914
UK (£m)	267	270	406		196	1,139

The French system, therefore, appears to provide about 22,914MF to the arts and museums sector (£2,269m at present exchange rates) – almost exactly twice as much as the British.

Over the years, the British system has dealt with this comparative under-funding by developing a plural funding base, including partnerships with the private sector and a constantly improving box-office performance. As the constraints draw tighter on arts funding in France and the days of almost exclusive reliance on public subsidy start to disappear, French organisations are following the same course.

This new more market-driven environment is asking questions of France's traditional *dirigisme* in the arts. Concepts such as *déconcentration*, new audiences, more diverse artwork and financial rigour are trying to take hold. In many ways, the French model is becoming more British.

At the same time, the Blair government in London claims to be putting culture at the heart of its project. Interventions such as the Creative Industries Task Force and the significant increase in DCMS funding attest to this. Whilst the old British attitude of feeding the arts with a few crumbs is not yet in retreat, the Government is beginning to lock cultural activity into much of its broader agenda (Social Exclusion, Urban Regeneration, Healthy Living etc.) and, consequently, politicians and civil servants are becoming more involved than ever before. So the British approach is becoming Gallicised.

The two systems, which were once so completely different from one another, are showing some signs of converging, at least a little. There are undoubtedly many ways in which they can usefully learn from one and we hope that this study may prove a useful tool in helping to encourage the dialogue between them.

Finally, lest these last sentences have conjured up an alarming image of a homogenous Euro-model for cultural support which swamps the distinctive strengths of the individual systems, we shall end with two observations from Jacques Rigaud which illustrate the way in which the two countries' cultural identities are robustly rooted in their national character. Of Britain, he says:

"No one has ever heard a British Prime Minister present a policy for culture, and although everyone one knows the Queen likes orchids and horses, no one knows exactly what she thinks about the Vermeers and Rembrandts in the Royal Art Collection; only Prince Charles has dared to express some common-sense though somewhat reactionary opinions on architecture and town planning".

On the other hand, M. Rigaud points out that, whereas the French have separated the State and the Church, no-one in France has ever considered the possibility of separating the State and Culture.

Finally, Rigaud concludes that: "Whilst the French model seems, at least superficially, to be easier to imitate, the pragmatism and flexibility of the British may, perhaps, be easier to adopt".

## 2. Report on a meeting held on 6 June 2000 in Paris

The meeting brought together a small group of key arts professionals from both countries (names are at Annex 2) to consider the findings of this study. It was chaired by Jacques Viot, President of the French section of the Council. This is a summary of the meeting.

### i. Objectives and methods of funding the arts

Jacques Rigaud emphasised the unique nature of French cultural policy in this regard. First, despite more than two centuries of political and social instability, cultural institutions are characterised by remarkable continuity. He cited as examples the Collège de France, the Académie Française, and the Manufactures nationales. Second, as a result of the French Revolution, the royal family, the nobility and the clergy lost some or all of their wealth, which became the nation's heritage, requiring the creation of many museums and libraries. Third, there has always been a complex relationship between the intellectual and the government, based on mutual attraction and mistrust. As a consequence, cultural policy is at the very heart of French government policy.

While French cultural policy is markedly different from that of neighbouring countries, it is also true that in Europe as a whole there is a strong link between culture and politics, a link that is historically absent from politics elsewhere, for example in Japan or the USA.

So, are France and the UK as different in the area of culture and government policy as they are often said to be? Recent developments show the two systems converging. The UK now has a Department of Culture and is increasing its support for cultural activities. Does the UK's method of funding, which favours indirect intervention, allow more room for manoeuvre than French government funding methods? This is still a debatable point, even though, according to Julia Peyton-Jones, British artists were able to express themselves without constraint even under Mrs Thatcher's government.

The methods are not the same, but are the objectives different? Perhaps more account is taken of cultural matters in France than in England. Certainly in France the arts are not just the concern of ministers of the various political administrations, since there is a constant and quite widespread public interest in culture. In this respect, in France more than in other countries, state policy as a whole has a cultural dimension. However, observers such as John Tod noted many indications of a similar interest appearing in the UK.

### ii. The place of the cultural policy of the two governments within the framework of their general policy: relations between the Ministry of Culture and the other government departments

Discussion focused on the very important question of whether culture should be the exclusive concern of the Ministry of Culture. France has had a Ministry of Culture for a long time, whilst Britain created one much later on. But the speakers were unanimous in their view that culture, its development and its place in national life should not be the sole province of only one ministry, even if that ministry is the best equipped to understand the country's cultural needs.

It was noted that many government departments have a role to play in the spread of culture, the education department being the most obvious but not the only department. Some speakers said that no government activity could be "disconnected" from its cultural dimension. The justice department is involved, for example, because more cultural activities could be introduced into the prisons. For 1995 French cultural expenditure from all sources has been calculated at 6.700 francs per household per year. But as yet there is no method of obtaining comparable statistics for cultural expenditure in the other European countries.

There is no interdepartmental structure to support and monitor cultural matters across the various government departments.

### iii. Non-governmental sources of arts funding: the role of the private sector, foundations, the Lottery, support from regional and local authorities

Jacques Rigaud observed that attitudes to arts funding in France and the UK are converging because in both countries there are three sources of finance: public funding, the commercial sector and sponsorship.

As far as public funding is concerned, one must highlight the real change that has taken place in France as a result of regional and municipal support. A beneficial kind of competition has developed, as mayors, departmental councillors and regional councillors vie with one another to make a significant contribution to cultural activities, because of decentralisation. Gone are the days when all decisions were made in Paris. The regions distribute sums which in total are equivalent to the funds of the Ministry of Culture plus funds from other ministries that support cultural projects. The budgets are 16,000 million francs for the Ministry of Culture, 20,000MF for the other ministries and 36,000MF for the regions, departments and municipalities.

Despite the size of these budgets, it must not be forgotten that the market provides the main source of arts funding in the form of entrance fees for museums, theatre and cinema tickets, the sale of works of art, and so on.

There have been mixed reactions to Lottery funding for the arts in Britain. It has financed a number of activities, but it can have the drawback of providing funds on a temporary basis. In spite of its flexibility, Lottery funding is much less satisfactory than funding from the state budget.

As far as sponsorship is concerned, contrary to common preconceptions, France is about level with the UK. Sponsorship has different priorities in the two countries, but ultimately produces broadly similar results.

There was some regret that the French policy of supporting the film industry was not reported on in the study, since this was a very successful initiative which has saved the industry in France. Similarly, it was regretted that there was no analysis of how the National Trust operates, since this organisation, which has no equivalent in France, has ensured the upkeep of many important properties in Britain.

## 3. 2006 Update on Committing to Culture

The original edition of ***Committing To Culture***, published in 2000, outlined the history of the development of support for culture in France and the U.K. along with an analysis of the pattern of funding in recent years. In it, we concluded that “*France puts significantly more resources into supporting culture than does the U.K..... the rhetoric of government is concerned with delegating responsibilities to the regions, putting new emphasis on participation and redistributing funds from the vaches sacrées to a range of smaller and more varied organisations [and] both systems have tried to strengthen their regional mechanisms (DRACs and RABs)*”. We also noted that “*the British system has dealt with its comparative under-funding by developing a plural funding base, including partnerships with the private sector and a constantly improving box-office performance*” and that, in recent years, French organisations have begun to follow the same course. Overall, we suggested that “*the two systems, which were once so completely different from one another, are showing some signs of converging, at least a little*”.

In the five years that have passed since that original report, much has changed in the wider world. The events of 9/11, increased oil prices, the accession of a raft of new member states to the EU and varying forms of political unrest in both countries are only some of the new factors which influence the political and economic contexts in which cultural institutions and activities operate. In these circumstances, we have been asked to update our earlier work to provide an up-to-date

snapshot of the situation in 2006.

Our first report contained much detailed analysis of historical and current funding pattern which it would be needlessly repetitive to replicate here. This short update, therefore, concentrates on the narrative of the principal politico-cultural developments in each country over the past half-decade along with the headline figures for the financial support of arts and museums.

## The U.K.

Very shortly after the publication of **Committing To Culture**, the U.K. Government took the unprecedented step of publishing a “Green Paper”, **Culture and Creativity: The Next Ten Years**. Whilst this was not strictly speaking a true Green Paper (which traditionally is a precursor to primary legislation), it was still an earnest of the Government’s continuing acknowledgement of the importance of the ‘creative industries’ in the economy and in society as a whole. In addition to a range of general observations and aspirations, **C&C** included a number of specific commitments. Some of these applied to sectors outside the remit of our original study (i.e. broadcasting, digital initiatives and libraries) but many were directly relevant, chiefly:

- The establishment of Creative Partnerships, a programme administered by the Arts Council designed to enable schools, professional cultural organisations and individual artists to work together. Starting as 16 ‘pilots’, this scheme has now expanded into 36 areas.
- A new emphasis on individual artists, which has been reflected in a broadening of Arts Council schemes to allow many who were previously ineligible to benefit.
- A ‘*new funding deal*’ for excellent subsidized organisations more based on trust than on ‘*bureaucratic box-ticking*’. The Green Paper suggested that this might lead to longer (six-year) funding agreements which would enable organisations to plan and manage their finances more creatively. This specific aim is yet to be realised and, in practice, the aspiration for a light-touch approach remains trammelled by the demands of accountability and the Arts Council’s continuing need to match its spending and achievements against its PSA<sup>4</sup> targets.
- ‘*Cutting Red Tape*’, making the funding system ‘*simpler, less bureaucratic and more cost-effective*’. The major changes have taken place in this system since 2000 are discussed below.
- The continuation of the arts and culture as recipients of National Lottery funding.
- Free access to national museums and galleries.

These very welcome initiatives offered the potential for a more ‘joined up’ (and interventionist) approach to the support of culture and, as such, seem to support our observation in 2000 that the British and French systems showed signs of convergence. However, over this period, the creation of the Scottish Executive and the Welsh Assembly, both of which have authority over cultural affairs, has resulted in a less coherent political-cultural approach across the U.K. as a whole. As a result, the policies for culture contained in **C&C: The Next Ten Years** only apply to England<sup>5</sup>.

The aspirations of the Green Paper clearly required funding. As our original report demonstrated, the ‘revenue’ budget available for the Department of Culture Media and Sport<sup>6</sup> rose from £692.1m in 1996 to £1,063.6m in 2000. The following table shows the development of that budget since:

Table 1: The DCMS Budget

£ millions	1999/2000 Actuals	2002/03 Actuals	2003/04 Actuals	2004/05 Estimate	2007/08 Plans
DCMS	£1,038.7 <sup>7</sup>	£1,252.2	£1,791.3	£1,542.4	£1,669.2
National Lottery	£1,169.4	£1,512.2	£1,079.3	£ 960.0	£1,121.7

<sup>4</sup> Public Service Agreement – the framework against which the spending of Government Departments and Non Departmental Public Bodies (such as ACE) is measured.

<sup>5</sup> Except for the National Lottery and the areas of broadcasting and media.

<sup>6</sup> Formerly the Department of National Heritage

<sup>7</sup> this differs from the figure quoted in 2000 since, as in every year, the NDPB resource accounts vary from original estimates.

total	£2,208.1	£2,764.5	£2,870.6	£2,502.4	£2,790.9
-------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

As always with Departmental budgets, particular anomalies (one-off expenses, shifts in accounting practice etc.) prevent detailed analysis at this headline level. Nevertheless, it is clear that the grant-in-aid available increased significantly over the first part of this period, thanks to very favourable settlements in the spending rounds of 2000 and 2002 and that this progress was significantly slowed by a less expansive outcome in 2004. Over the same period, the funds available through the National Lottery have reduced significantly as a result of decreased ticket sales.

The following table indicates how, over those years, the Department has allocated funds to those areas of its remit covered by this study.

**Table 2: Grant-in-aid funding for arts and museums**

£m	Actuals					Estimates	Plans		
	1999/2000	2000/2001	2001/2002	2002/2003	2003/2004		2004/2005	2005/2006	2006/2007
Arts	230.1	238.7	254.2	285.7	327.7	378.8	411.5	418.5	419.5
MLAC <sup>8</sup>	16.3	16.8	24.1	25.1	29.2	36.5	45.8	45.8	45.8
Museums & Galleries	270.2	293.6	172.7	262.6	310.0	411.9	399.6	417.1	436.1

The arts benefited significantly from the success of the 2002 and 2004 Spending Rounds with an increase in the six years to 2005/06 of £181.4m - almost 70%. Yet again, however, this headline observation must be qualified: some of the increase consisted of 'hypothecated' funds (i.e. money ear-marked for specific purposes such as the aforementioned Creative Partnerships which began with a two year budget of £40m from 2002-03); also, as noted above with respect to the overall DCMS budget, this increase in grant-in-aid has been accompanied by lower receipts from the National Lottery and this decrease has been exacerbated, in the case of the arts, by an increased demand on the funds available from additional (or re-prioritised) Good Causes.

Within this financial envelope, a number of other changes took place at Governmental level. After the 2001 election, the Secretary of State, Chris Smith, left Government and his place was taken by Tessa Jowell who, in 2004, published a pamphlet *Government and the Value of Culture* which extolled the value of the arts in and of themselves and attacked the artificial polarity of 'access' and 'excellence'. As promised in the Green Paper, the Government renewed its commitment to the arts as a Good Cause (although, as we have seen, the quantum of support available was reduced). It also took an increased interest in the effectiveness, management and governance of its Non-Departmental Public Bodies (NDPBs). Although QUEST, which was established as a 'watchdog' in 2000, was wound down by the new Secretary of State, new mechanisms to encourage 'joined-up' working were introduced and a system of peer reviews was put in place through which the strategic role, performance and potential of NDPBs can be assessed.

A number of other initiatives were put in train (or developed further) by the Government in order to address specific perceived needs, among them:

- The continuation of two Lottery-funded organisations - Youth Music and NESTA (with an additional endowment)
- The Dance and Drama awards scheme (in conjunction with the Department for Education and Skills): this addresses the difficulty that many young people experience in affording training for a professional career by offering financial assistance to individuals over 16 who want to become professional dancers, actors or stage managers.
- The DCMS/Wolfson Museums and Galleries Improvement Fund aimed at improving the quality of displays, public spaces, environmental controls and access for disabled visitors in museums and galleries across England.
- A Quality and Innovation Fund, aimed at nurturing young talent and improving access for young people with an emphasis on rewarding innovative thinking, and fresh ideas from all areas of the cultural world

<sup>8</sup> Museums, Libraries and Archives Council

- The Invest To Save Programme (a non-culture specific initiative from the Treasury and Cabinet Office which some cultural projects have accessed) which provides funding to help organisations change the way they work in order to be more 'sustainable' and deliver a better public service.
- A £12m (over two years) fund from the Treasury for developing and improving cultural leadership
- An extension of free admission to include University museums
- A Strategic Commissioning Programme encouraging education-focused partnerships between national and regional museums in areas of deprivation

These Government-led initiatives have been complemented by a number of more particular projects developed by NDPBs, such as:

- Renaissance in the Regions, an MLA scheme aimed at revitalizing regional museums and the Designation Challenge Fund, targeted at enhancing Museums' collections that are designated as being of national importance.
- A new ACE Lottery scheme, Grants for the Arts, designed to be simpler than its predecessors and to meet the Green Paper objective of *Cutting Red Tape* by reducing the number of grant schemes from over 100 to just 5.
- Artsmark; a national award scheme for schools which show a commitment to the full range of arts - music, dance, drama and art & design.
- A national young people's Arts Award - the first accredited youth arts scheme to recognize and support the development of young artists and arts leaders

Apart from the increase in funding that has become available over the past five years, the most radical recent change in the arts landscape has probably been the re-structuring of the Arts Council itself. Our original report traced the trend over the last half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century towards regionalisation and local decision-making in the arts, reflected by the growth of quasi-autonomous Regional Arts Boards. In 2000/01, the Arts Council of England announced that it wished to change the basis of this settlement by pursuing a merger with the ten RABs.

The ensuing negotiations were challenging but successful and on April 1<sup>st</sup> 2002, the eleven funding bodies became a single organisation with one national and nine regional offices. By 2005/06, almost all grant award-making and monitoring of individual arts organisations were the responsibility of the regional offices. At the time of writing (summer 2006), a further stage of this re-structure is underway with a thorough-going review of ACE's national office.

As noted in our original report, the funding for the arts that emanates from central government is only part of the story. Local government too plays an important part. In 2000, we estimated that U.K. local government in 1995/96 expended about £406m on arts and museums. We do not have estimates of current spend in those particular areas but DCMS data suggest that the current (i.e. revenue) spending by local authorities on all areas of DCMS activity (i.e. including media and sport) was £1.618m in 1999/2000 rising to an estimated £1,840m in 2004/05 and planned to increase to £2,102m in 2007/08, a real terms increase of approximately 15%. Anecdotal evidence suggests that overall, the arts and museums sectors have probably seen a comparable pattern in their funding although the pattern is not consistent. Some authorities (e.g. Salford and Newcastle/Gateshead) have developed major new arts facilities with concomitant investment implications; others have chosen to cut back. The fact that local authority investment in arts and museums has, in many instances, held up is probably due in no small measure to the requirement that, although these aspects of culture may not be a statutory responsibility, they are now included in the comparative performance assessment through which councils are evaluated: cutting back on these areas is, therefore, no longer a no-pain option. Moreover, an increased emphasis on the civic benefits and regenerative potential of culture has ensured that the U.K is currently experiencing a new (almost French) phenomenon of celebratory local and regional projects including Liverpool's European Capital of Culture Year in 2008 and an Urban Cultural Programme in 19 areas (funded to the tune of £19.5m by ACE and the Millennium Commission). Above all, perhaps, East London is set to experience an enormous cultural transformation in the years leading up to the Olympics of 2012.

The third main leg of the infrastructural support for the arts is the private sector. Despite the vagaries of the international financial situation and perceptions of comparatively slow growth, there is a common perception that parts of the UK (in particular the City of London) are significantly wealthier than ever before. Arts & Business data on cultural giving would seem to bear this out. The following table indicates levels of private investment (including individual, trusts & foundations

and business giving) for Arts and Heritage in the UK in the last five years:

**Table 3: Overall Private Sector support for Arts & Heritage in the U.K.**

2000/20001	2001/02	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05	
£356.5 m.	£347.1m	£375.8m	£438.5m	£452.1m	

This general trend contains within it, a remarkable shift in emphasis. The following table demonstrates that, whilst business sponsorship has remained broadly consistent over the past five years, funds provided by trusts and foundations have reduced by about 60% and individual giving has increased by about 360% - beginning to emulate the American model.

**Table 4: Private Sector Support by source**

	Business	Individual	Trusts and Foundations
2000/01	101.8	52.9	201.8
2001/02	99.3	69.7	178.1
2002/03	109.2	76.3	190.3
2003/04	112.3	222.0	104.2
2004/05	119.2	244.2	88.7

As noted at the beginning of this supplement, public policy and practice in England (with which the previous paragraphs have been concerned) is quite different from the models that have evolved over recent years in Scotland and Wales.

In both those countries, recent relationships between the national government and its arms-length body have been fraught:

- Following a review of the Scottish Arts Council, the Executive announced in January 2006 that SAC would be merged with Scottish Screen into a new agency (**Creative Scotland**), whilst the national performing arts companies (Scottish Ballet, Scottish Opera, the Royal Scottish National Orchestra, the Scottish Chamber Orchestra and the new Scottish National theatre) would in future be funded direct from Government. It further announced that it would redefine the definition of 'national arts companies' according to transparent criteria in order to allow other organisations (including youth companies) to acquire that status in time. This approach borrows from the Australian model.
- In Wales, too, the Assembly proposed transferring six of the Arts Council's largest 'clients' to direct funding status, although political opposition to this proposal has left its implementation uncertain at the time of writing. In addition, the Minister decided in January 2006 not to renew the current Chair for a second term. In response to these decisions, the Vice Chair wrote to the Minister observing that *"these actions seriously compromise the necessary independence of the Arts Council of Wales and will adversely affect our ability to carry out our proper function....At the core of this issue is the arm's length principle.* ACW is intending to undertake a review of its operations in autumn 2006.

Both these proposals seem to erode the traditional British mechanism of arm's-length funding, replacing it, at least in part, with a hybrid model in which central government assumes financial responsibility for the largest (perhaps most prestigious) organisations whilst allowing the remainder, including developmental activity, to be distributed by an NDPB. It will be interesting to see how these experiments pan out.

The Scottish Executive has accompanied its re-structuring of the funding system with additional funds. Total grants to the arts and culture (including sport) have risen from £120m in 2000/01 to £187m in 2005/06 with a further increase (to £234m) indicated for 2007/08 and beyond, of which an additional £2.1m is allocated to the five National companies (an uplift of 14%). The Welsh Assembly has also increased funding to culture in recent years, allocating in 2006/07 £27.25m to ACW (set to rise to £27.992m in 2008/09) and £41.668m to the National Museums and galleries (rising to £43.431m in the same period).

## FRANCE

The last six years have been unsettling for France - politically, socially and economically. Whilst the UK has had the same Secretary of State for Culture for the last five years, there have been three Ministers of Culture and Communications in France since *Committing to Culture* was first published: Catherine Tasca held the brief from 2000 – 2002; she was succeeded by Jean-Jacques Aillagon 2002 – 2004; and in 2004, his place was taken by the present incumbent, Renaud Donnedieu de Vabres.

The social and economic context in which the Ministers have been working has been very different from that of their UK counterpart. In 2000, GDP in France was ahead of Britain, but it has fallen well behind over the last five years. Disposable income is lower: for example, as the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) announced in March 2006, average household spending on recreation and culture as a percentage of gross domestic product (GDP) is 7.9% in the U.K. compared to 5.2% in France. These “average” figures suggest that not only do individuals spend less on culture, but also that the number of people contributing to the cultural economy may possibly be in decline. For instance, we heard anecdotally that whilst total attendances for theatre in France are holding up, the venues are very dependent on core subscribers, and the number of individual spectators attending throughout the year is reducing.

There are other factors which are having an impact on the well-being and finances of the cultural sector. Unemployment in France is high at 9.2%, (almost double the rate in Britain), and youth unemployment is about 23%, rising to close to 50% for young people in immigrant families<sup>9</sup>. Consequently, job creation and mobility have become major concerns for the French government, but attempts to introduce a new social contract and to modernise employment law have met with serious resistance. In summer 2005, violent riots spread across France, most of them emanating from socially and economically disadvantaged, culturally diverse communities in the suburbs of major cities; the following spring there were extensive demonstrations on the streets and in the universities about proposed changes to labour law.

As a result, this has been a challenging period for the development of cultural policy in France. Catherine Tasca, who was Minister of Culture from March 2000 to May 2002, maintained the principal strands of the State’s cultural policy, namely access and participation. Among her initiatives, she created a new senior position within the Ministry with responsibility for Heritage and Cultural Decentralisation, to which she appointed Michel Duffour. He brought together a task group to investigate the increasing number of independent grass-roots initiatives developing at a local level, many of them housed in former industrial buildings such as warehouses and factories. The group’s report found that most of these projects did not focus on single art forms, but brought together creative activity across different disciplines, including hip-hop, digital technology and techno music; they blurred the boundaries between amateur and professional, and enabled communities to find their own form of cultural expression. “The public attending these events and participating in the workshops, the local residents are not consumers of culture; they are partners in art, themselves involved in the initiative and the creative process”<sup>10</sup>. In artistic, operational and financial terms, these initiatives were seen as being much more flexible than conventional models. For example, many succeeded in attracting funding from the private as well as the public sector; on average, they depended on local authorities for about 25% of their income and on the State for a similar percentage.

In the light of these developments, and in recognition of wider changes happening in society, France’s cultural policies are increasingly crystallizing around specific priorities: “Démocratisation culturelle, diversité culturelle, cohésion sociale” are the three themes highlighted by the current Minister<sup>11</sup>.

During the period in which Catherine Tasca held the brief for culture, these policies were already evident - for example in the promotion of emergent urban culture, the furtherance of plans for a Museum of Immigration (currently scheduled to open in April 2007) and the initiation of work on the 300,000 objects which would form the central collection for Le Musée du Quai Branly, Jacques Chirac’s *grand projet* which aims to celebrate cultures beyond Europe. It would, the President said,

---

<sup>9</sup> *Datastream*, published in *The Guardian* April 10 2006

<sup>10</sup> The report compiled by Fabrice Lextrait is available at La Documentation Française and in the Ministry of Culture’s website: <http://www.culture.fr/culture/actualites/index.htm>

<sup>11</sup> *Culture et Recherche*, Ministère de la Culture et de la communication, December 2005

show “France’s faith in the virtues of cultural diversity and dialogue”.

Tasca’s successor was Jean-Jacques Aillagon, former Director of the Centre Georges Pompidou. In addition to access, his policy priorities included historic monuments and new work. Examples of this included the announcement of a budget of 135 M Euros over 7 years for improvements to Versailles, including disabled access; a focus on new work by young people; greater distribution of visual arts and photographic exhibitions across the country; and the modernisation of the library network and the development of local médiathèques.

The main challenge of Aillagon’s period in office was industrial action by the “intermittants” in the performing arts and film industry, which devastated the French summer festivals in 2003, including the Avignon Festival itself. The original intermittants programme had enabled those who worked part-time in film, theatre and music to have easier access to unemployment benefits. However, by 2003, there were more than 120,000 workers falling into this category, putting huge financial pressure on the government. The increase can be explained in part by the growth of the cultural industries, particularly in the audio-visual field, but also by the fact that many arts groups found it less expensive to maintain the intermittent status of staff than put them on the regular payroll. In effect, the programme was helping to subsidise arts activities, particularly creative development by independent arts organisations engaged in new work. Aillagon had first-hand knowledge of the arts, but even he was unable to find a solution to the problem of the special unemployment insurance for workers in the arts. Although the government made some concessions, at the time of writing the issue had still not been fully resolved.

Renaud Donnedieu de Vabres had not only to handle the crisis of the intermittents, he also took on the challenge of introducing DADSVI ( Loi sur le droit d'auteur et les droits voisins dans la société de l'information), a controversial new copyright law. The legislation initially proposed setting a monthly fee for internet usage, enabling users to download films and music, with the intention of using the fee to reimburse artists. However, significant amendments to the bill had to be made. The proposed law was strongly opposed by film organisations, software providers and the music recording industry, not least of all because it restricted copying of copyrighted works for private use and for peer-to-peer exchange through free software. It generated considerable international controversy and public debate before being substantially amended..

The following table records the revenue budgets for the Ministry of Culture from 1999 to 2006<sup>12</sup>.

Table 5 : Revenue Budget for the Ministry of Culture and Communication (millions d’euros)

Year	Amount	Annual %age shift	Increase from 1999
1999	2,395		
2000	2,452	2.4	2.4
2001	2,549	4.0	6.4
2002	2,610	2.4	9.0
2003	2,497	(4.3)	4.3
2004	2,639	5.7	10.2
2005	2,795	5.9	16.7
2006	2,886 <sup>13</sup>	3.3	20.5

The French and British data summarised in Tables 1-5 above cannot be directly compared (as they do not measure the same things). It is, however, still interesting to note that the budget for the Ministry of Culture in France grew by 20.5% between 1999 and 2006; over the broadly equivalent seven year period, funding for the arts and museums in England has risen by 70%.

The French budget for 2006 was unveiled in stages: in September 2005, the Minister described an increased role for government-owned television stations in arts broadcasting; in October 2005, he spoke of initiatives to support new work in theatre, the building of dance centres in Aix-en-Provence and Rilleux-la-Pape and audience development strategies for contemporary dance; and in the same month the Prime Minister Dominique de Villepin announced that a new concert auditorium would be built at La Villette in Paris. The three year development programme for street arts,

<sup>12</sup> from Chiffres Clés 2006 and a press release from the Ministère, 28<sup>th</sup> September 2005

<sup>13</sup> 138 M euros of inter-departmental research funds were also available

initiated in 2005, is set to continue, including support for nine recently created National Centres for Street Arts (CNARs).

In his general announcement about the 2006 budget, Donnedieu de Vabres spoke of the contribution culture makes to the lives of ordinary citizens, to social cohesion, to the economic competitiveness of the nation and to the future of France itself. He reminded the public that employment and cultural economy (including the creative industries) are major government concerns. He also talked about the drive towards accountability within the Ministry and the requirement to be results-driven. His budget announcement spells out very clearly –and quantifies in budgetary terms - the main priority areas, which are heritage (36%), creativity (33%) and access (31%). Clear objectives are set for each priority area, with 41 indicators showing how performance will be monitored through the introduction of 197 contracts with budget holders (e.g. DRAC) and with national institutions such as the Opéra de Paris. For instance, in the area of creativity, one of the objectives is to give a solid economic and financial base to new work. The indicators for this are: average ticket income, the proportion of budgets allocated to fixed costs and the percentage of organisations hosting residencies by artists. As far as the Ministry itself is concerned, there are targets set to cut management costs (savings of 13% are proposed in the 2006 budget), essentially through restructuring and relocation. In England, the reorganisation of non-departmental public bodies such as the Arts Council and Museums, Libraries and Archives has been predicated on a desire to slim down administrative staffing; in France, by contrast, the aim has been to create rather than to lose jobs. The Ministry's *Chiffres Clés*, published in 2006, show the number of budgeted jobs in the Ministry rising between 2000 and 2005 from 22,742 to 25, 657.

The French move towards greater transparency and performance measurement is in keeping with the requirement of LOLF (*Loi organique relative aux lois de finances*), a law introduced across all government departments in 2001, and much more in line with the processes of arts bureaucracies in the UK. Examples of this “Modernisation” of French administrative procedures has included continuing *déconcentration* to the regions. For example, the Minister has established regional *Pôles culture*, co-ordinated by DRACs, and bringing together DRACs, SDAPs (*services départementaux de l'architecture et du patrimoine*), museums, national monuments and major theatres to co-ordinate the implementation of the State's priorities for culture.

Whilst budgets for culture have been growing in recent years, there are indications that this growth will not be sustainable. In Britain, there are the same fears, but for different reasons. Whereas professionals in the UK's cultural sector point to competing demands on the budget of the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (e.g. the 2012 Olympics) and recognise the pressure on the Treasury from defence, education and health policies, France – as indicated above - is having to address more extensive social and economic challenges at both national and local level. Consequently, over the last few years, French arts organisations have become increasingly aware of the need to seek funding from sources other than the state, region and local councils. We heard that grants were not rising as fast as fixed costs and that more and more organisations are seeing business as a way of helping them realise their artistic programme.

ADMICAL<sup>14</sup> which was set up in 1979 to encourage business support for a wide range of activities, including culture, has been campaigning for many years for changes in the law in order to simplify the mechanisms for corporate giving, and provide an incentive in the form of tax breaks. Progress was made in August 2003 when a law was passed to help both individual donors and business supporters. The effect of the law has been to double the tax advantages for the corporate giver, with even greater concessions for funding of works of art (provided they are defined as national treasures). This particular mechanism has been used to great advantage by the Louvre, Musée d'Orsay and Versailles. At the same time the government has also eased the way for the establishment of trusts and foundations. According to Admical, 60 of the 180 foundations in France have been established since 2004.

Admical estimates that, in 2005, one milliard Euros were given by business (for all areas including culture), and that 52% of business “patrons” support culture. The following table<sup>15</sup> provides an historical context for that support.

---

<sup>14</sup> Association pour le Développement due Mécénat Industriel et Commercial

<sup>15</sup> data from Admical/DEPS

Table 6: Private Sector giving for culture in France 1998-2002

Year	Millions d'euros
1998	168
1999	198
2002	195

Jacques Rigaud, Chairman of Admical, has cited examples of organisations which had been able to develop their artistic programmes in ways which would not have been possible without business support. These have included the Louvre, whose exhibition on Roman France had proved to be far more successful than anticipated: the breadth and quality of the exhibition was due in part to the support given by Crédit Agricole. Similarly, some choreographers have been given their first opportunity to create new work thanks to the Fondation BNP PARIBAS; and the quality of choirs such as ACCENTUS has been possible because of the funding given by France TELECOM. Business also supports many projects in the areas of disability, youth, social inclusion and older people.

In policy terms, France and the UK share some common interests, including support for individual artists, for participation and for delivery at local and regional level. The mechanisms for achieving that delivery are now much closer than they were five years ago. It might indeed be said that, in many ways, the French are increasingly shifting towards some of the characteristics of the British arts funding system, including accountability and plural funding whilst both countries are seeking to establish closer relationships between their cultural and socio-economic policies. As was noted above, the socio-economic issues confronting the two countries have been different over the period under discussion. As a result, the historic perception that France funds its culture far more generously than the UK (*"they order...this matter better in France"*) is no longer self-evidently true.

As our original report and this update have shown, there have been significant changes in the support of culture in both countries over the last ten years. On both sides of the Channel, however, there is a sense that yet further change is imminent. For example, we heard, anecdotally, from those to whom we spoke, that the French cultural scene is poised to shift, as the next generation of artists and arts administrators succeed the current incumbents – and, in the UK, there is genuine concern that the recent cultural cycle of growing cultural investment may be ending, to be replaced by a more austere funding regime that could reverse many of the gains of recent years.

In both countries, then, it seems likely that the next five years will see even more substantial change both in artistic expression and the cultural economy than we have seen in the last five.

#### 4. Glossary of acronyms/terms

ACE	Arts Council of England
ACGB	Arts Council of Great Britain
ACNI	Arts Council of Northern Ireland
ACW	Arts Council of Wales

AFAA	Association Française d'Action Artistique
CAC	Centre d'Action Culturelle
CD	Compagnie Dramatique
CDN	Centre Dramatique Régional
CEREC	Conseil Européen pour le Rapprochement de l'entreprise et de la culture
DCMS	Department for Culture, Media and Sport
DNH	Department of National Heritage
DRACS	Directions Régionales des Affaires Culturelles
EP	Etablissement Public
Mécénat	Corporate sponsorship
MGC	Museums and Galleries Commission
MLAC	Museums Libraries and Archives Council
NDPB	Non-departmental Public Body
ONDA	Office National de Diffusion Artistique
RAB	Regional Arts Board
RNT	Royal National Theatre
RSC	Royal Shakespeare Company
SAC	Scottish Arts Council
SN	Scènes Nationales

## Appendix iv

### BRITISH PARTICIPANTS

**Chair: Nicholas Kenyon**  
Director, Barbican Centre

**Anwar Akhtar**  
CEO, Cultural Industries  
Development Agency

**Caroline Collier**  
Director, Tate National, Tate

**Andrew Dixon,**  
Chief Executive,  
NewcastleGateshead Initiative

**Paul De Quincey**  
Director, British Council, Paris

**Doreen Foster**  
Chief Executive  
Bernie Grant Arts Centre

**Maurice Fraser**  
FBC Trustee, Fellow in European  
Politics, LSE

**Paul Goodwin**  
Research Fellow, Centre for Urban  
and Community Studies, Goldsmiths

**Bonnie Greer**  
Author, playwright and broadcaster  
Trustee of the British museum

**Jo Hedley**  
Consultant Curator, National Gallery

**Sue Hoyle**  
Deputy Director, Clore Leadership  
Programme

**Mark Jones**  
Director, Victoria and Albert Museum

**Keith Khan**  
Head of Culture, 2012 Olympics

**Appendix v**

**Ann Kenrick**  
Secretary-General, FBC

**Professor David Looseley**  
Professor of Contemporary French  
Culture, Leeds University

**Neil MacGregor**  
Director, British Museum

**Helen Marriage**  
Director, Artichoke Productions

**Jonathan Meth**  
Director, Writernet

**Henry Paker**  
Publications Officer, FBC

**Rt Hon Lord Prosser**  
FBC Trustee and Former Senator of  
the College of Justice in Scotland

**Rt Hon James Purnell**  
Secretary of State for Culture, Media  
and Sport

**Rt Hon Baroness Quin**  
Chair, Franco-British Council

**Rt Hon Lord Smith**  
Chairman, Clore Leadership  
Programme, Fomer Culture Minister

**Belinda Thomson**  
Art Historian and Independent  
Curator  
Honorary Fellow, University of  
Edinburgh

**Philip Hensher** (rapporteur)  
Journalist, the Independent

## **FRENCH PARTICIPANTS**

Coprésident du colloque :

**Philippe MEYER**  
Journaliste

**Olivier ALDEANO**

Administrateur de la Danse  
Opéra de Paris

**Laurence AUER**

Conseiller culturel  
Directeur de l'Institut français du  
Royaume-Uni

**Sylvie BLUMENKRANTZ**

Sous-directrice de la Section  
française du Conseil franco-  
britannique

**Jean-Pierre GHUYSEN**

Inspecteur général de l'Équipement  
Ancien Président de la commission  
intergouvernementale franco-  
britannique au tunnel sous la Manche

**Anne GOMBAULT**

Professeur de sciences de gestion  
Responsable de la chaire Arts,  
Culture et Management en Europe  
BEM-Bordeaux Management School

**Jean GUÉGUINOU**

Ambassadeur de France  
Président de la Section française du  
Conseil franco-britannique

**Fabrice HERGOTT**

Directeur du Musée d'Art moderne de  
la Ville de Paris

**Jérôme KOHLER**

Directeur de L'Initiative  
Philanthropique  
Agence conseil en stratégie de  
mécénat et création de fondation

**Jean-Pierre LANGELLIER**

Editorialiste au journal Le Monde  
Ancien correspondant du Monde à  
Londres (2001-2007)

**Francine MARIANI-DUCRAY**

Directrice des musées de France

**Jacques MARTIAL**

Président de l'établissement public du  
Parc et de la Grande Halle de La  
Villette

**Olivier de ROHAN**

Président de la Société des Amis de  
Versailles, Président de La  
sauvegarde de l'Art français

**Yann RIVOAL**

Directeur du Festival « Les Vieilles  
Charrues »

**Gérard ROUBICHOU**

Secrétaire général de la Section  
française du Conseil franco-  
britannique

**Maryvonne de SAINT-PULGENT**

Conseiller d'Etat, Président du  
Théâtre national de l'Opéra comique  
Ancien Directeur du patrimoine au  
Ministère de la Culture et de la  
Communication

**Catherine TASCA**

Ancien Ministre  
Sénatrice des Yvelines

**Marin de VIRY**

Critique littéraire