

ANNEX 1

DENMARK

Bent-Erik Rasmussen and Christian Have

I Introduction - The research frame and conditions

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

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

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

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

- 1 State administration (three persons including the Minister of Culture)
- 2 Politicians (four culture spokespersons from key political parties)
- 3 National culture institutions (five persons representing significant institutions)
- 4 Artists, institutions and organisations (ten individuals and organisation representatives)

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

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

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

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

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

II Summary and conclusions

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

B a c k g r o u n d

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

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

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

The EU as a European culture factor

In general the key person's panel – with a few distinct exceptions – finds that the EU should be active in the culture area. This is a positive response demonstrating a general change in attitude from what would have been the response 10 – 15 years ago. It cannot be interpreted as a very positive factor in favour of EU per se – but the positive response is based on the viewpoint that the EU is a fact – as it is for the culture area – and the only practical and realistic response to that de facto situation is to include the culture areas in this growing and, in some areas, dominating factor.

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

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

On the more practical side, several key people' point out that the EU needs a culture policy in order to define the borders between commercial areas (where national financial support is forbidden) and culture areas (where national financial support is vital). The borders between

commercial art and non-commercial culture activities are challenged today in several ways and without the culture dimension the EU lacks a forum for solving this kind of question.

The importance of EU- and international collaboration in general

In general, the key person's panel – with a few exceptions – finds and expects a strongly positive effect related to culture projects, both as to national profile and the effect on the culture environment and the institutions.

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

Denmark's position and function in EU culture activities

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

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

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

EU activities vs. other international culture activities

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

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

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

Have opinions on EU culture activities changed?

In general, those interviewed do not feel a change, but they feel more confident in their own position and, as stated earlier, the majority of the key person's panel were positive about an increase in an EU culture focus. So the change of attitudes over the past five years is not significant – but if there has been a change it has grown in a positive direction. Nevertheless, this

should also be understood in the context of traditional Danish scepticism. In this perspective, the attitude towards the establishment of an EU culture dimension – with an external focus – seems to have changed from a negative to a positive position. It might not be ‘a love affair’, but more of a practical attitude: the EU is here to stay and, given that reality, culture should not be forgotten – on the contrary.

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

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

III The seven research areas and responses

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

1 The EU as a European culture factor

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

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

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

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

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

A representative of the negative opinion gave this answer:

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

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

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

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

- I. Should the EU support culture projects or should it initiate its own culture projects?
- II. Should the EU formulate a general culture policy?

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

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

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

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

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

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

The comments highlight the reasons for this distinct difference:

- The EU as an operator will be, in the best cases, a supporting factor and in the worst cases a very negative bureaucratic factor, which has been learned from experience.

- Such projects are in general used as EU PR political stunts. And the problem is that such projects do not necessarily reflect a culture need and lack of quality can also become a problem, as has been seen.

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

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

- The EU should declare a general culture policy

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

As the attitudes in Denmark towards international culture projects have changed over the years, it was relevant to ask the panel what attitude or functional profile Denmark should have towards the

EU culture collaboration environment. This refers both to 'internal' European projects and 'external' global projects. Three typical attitudes were tested:

What attitude should Denmark have in the EU collaboration environment?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

IV Final remarks

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

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

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

State administration

Poul Bache, Director, Danish Arts Agency

Erik Farsø Madsen, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, communication department

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

Politicians

Mogens Jensen, Cultural spokesperson – Social Democratic Party

Ellen Thrane Nørby, Cultural spokesperson – Liberal Party

Ole Sohn, Cultural spokesperson – Socialist Peoples Party

Jakob Axel Nielsen, Cultural spokesperson – The Conservative Peoples Party

National culture institutions

Finn Andersen, Secretary General, The Danish Cultural Institute

Michael Christiansen, Head of Theatre, The Royal Danish Theatre

Allis Helleland, Director, National Museum for Art

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

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

Artists, institutions and organisations

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

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

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

Litten Hansen, Director, Copy Dan

Mogens Holm, Chairman, FAST – Union of Small Theatres

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

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

Bjørn Nørgaard, sculptor

Henrik Oschner, Head of Administration, Århus Festival

Peter Schaufuss, Head of Schaufuss Ballet