

ANNEX 2

FRANCE

Alain Sancerne

I Context

A s t r o n g c u l t u r a l e n g a g e m e n t o f F r a n c e

France is characterised by an old, strong and systematic cultural policy: both inside and outside. Its Ministry of Culture is certainly the most developed in Europe, and makes culture a significant field and instrument of the public utility.

The foreign policy of France reproduces this passion for culture. It started from the end of the 19th century, at the time of the European imperial competitions and colonisations: if it has lost the original spirit, it has preserved some (in its modern evolutions) of the forms and the missions.

The running of the external cultural policy of France is ensured almost exclusively by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs (MAE) and its internal or closely associated networks: it is a general and centralised action which leaves little place for the other institutions concerned (Ministry of Culture, the local communities or the independent operators). It is spread primarily in two dimensions: diffusion of French culture abroad and cultural co-operation with Third or, more recently, the emerging countries.

D i f f u s i o n a n d p r o m o t i o n p o l i c y

The dissemination externally consists in addressing an image of France, its culture, its values, its civilisation and its cultural productions. To develop them and, if necessary, to sell them: the political impact had certainly more weight at the beginning than it does today where the economic dimension prevails. It comprises two strong thrusts: on the one hand dissemination of the French language in the world, on the other hand the promotion of French cultural products on the outside: thought, performing arts, heritage, literature, visual arts, fashion, etc

If the thrust of the language is universal, and is addressed to the whole world, with opportunist preferences according to historical contexts, the thrust of the diffusion of cultural products is more naturally directed towards the main purchaser countries i.e., outside of Europe (which remains the first market and prime objective for France), the United States and Japan and, increasingly today, China, India, Brazil and emerging countries. The most recent evolution moves the contents of the traditional productions towards cultural industries: cinema, publishing, music, etc.

C o - o p e r a t i o n p o l i c y

Co-operation concerns initially the policy of colonial valorisation of France which, indeed, had stressed the valorisation of its colonies and of its colonial model in general (Colonial Exhibition, 1931), and more particularly the valorisation of the cultures and the traditions of its Empire. It thus encouraged the research (ethnology, oral traditions), the cultural expression, the creation and the development of the artistic and technical capacities, as regards theatre arts, literature, visual arts, craft industry or cinema, in the countries which today form part of the ACP group (Africa, the Caribbean, the Pacific) and, to a lesser extent, of the Mediterranean area.

This policy evolved to the broader themes, largely shared by Europe, of the dialogue of cultures, national or local identities and (sustainable) development.

E u r o p e a n a n d i n t e r n a t i o n a l c o n v e r g e n c e

Today, France is no longer a major power, but as it took part in the European adventure in the context of the globalisation of exchanges, its policy adapted and became integrated, while preserving its basic characteristics, in the new conditions, the new stakes and the new themes: cultural diversity, intercultural and social dialogue, the development of societies, the European Neighbourhood policy, international and multilateral co-operation.

E u r o p e a n p o l i c y a n d F r a n c e

France testifies, at the political level, but also in its public opinion, to a strong and constant commitment in favour of Europe: as a founder and organiser country on the one hand, and as a country which became, on the other hand, a medium size power and, as such, subject to the necessity to find a durable political, economic and strategic environment. The formal and initial answer to the question posed can thus be clearly formulated: yes, France wishes for a European external cultural policy.

II The cultural policy of France: objectives and implementation

M a j o r o b j e c t i v e s

France's priorities remain the dissemination of language, creation and markets, cultural industries and a university presence. This diffusion is more balanced than is apparent in official documents. Music, for a long time the poor relative, has been part of this policy landscape since the end of the 1990s with the creation, under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, of the Office of Musical Industries. The approach became more sophisticated and modernised by, for example, Years of France in partner countries. In parallel, or reciprocally, France accommodates Years of partner countries (e.g. Brazil and India). This is within the framework of the increasingly present dimension of cultural exchanges and intercultural dialogue, of which the basis can be economic (China) or political (the Mediterranean), or part of major world issues (bio-ethics, environment, the peace making process).

The third priority, cultural co-operation, is hugely related to the old countries of influence in Africa or in Asia, to the Francophonie and, by extension, the ACP and under developed countries: it is a matter of exchanging with these countries and of developing their heritage and creativity, performing arts, visual arts and cinema. It also seeks to reinforce their institutional capacities, but is far from the model of EU cultural co-operation, which endeavours to lie within the scope of the Millennium Development Goals. Today, the whole of this policy is reflected in the issue of cultural diversity, which fully summarises and nourishes the aspirations of France to maintain its position, to strengthen bonds of exchange and partnership, and to be integrated in European and international co-operation.

T h e c u r r e n t i n s t i t u t i o n a l o r g a n i s a t i o n

French external policy is led by its Ministries, mainly by Foreign Affairs. The Ministry for Culture plays a secondary part, and the regions, the local authorities, associations, foundations and private sector have a marginal role.

a) The Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Ministère des Affaires Etrangères – MAE):

The MAE constitutes a huge system, which leaves little place for other types of institution. It defines the policy of France and its priorities, organises the methods of execution, and implements it while drawing on a few bodies closely related to its actions (French Cultural Centres and Institutes, the Alliances Françaises, Culturesfrance, formerly French Association of Artistic Action – AFAA, etc).

It has at its own disposal an extremely developed diplomatic cultural network of high quality, of which the Cultural Attachés up to now have usually come from the Ministry for Education (language, schools), more rarely from the Ministry of Culture, and increasingly today from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs itself: this evolution, which ‘diplomatizes’ the function while de-professionalizing it, is neither without significance, nor without risk.

The MAE and its attachés draw on the strong French Cultural Centres and Institutes network, whose central role is cultural dissemination, library and cultural exchanges, local traditions and the arts. The Alliances Françaises, spread throughout the world, supplement this system, and follow French interests abroad. With very great flexibility as regards their organisation and policy, they adapt to all socio-political situations. Their first mission remains the teaching of the French, their second, the diffusion of cultural activity. Currently, they are expanding especially in China and in the European neighbourhood (e.g. Ukraine). In recent years, they have engaged resolutely in the dialogue of cultures on broad global topics: diversity, environment, bio-ethics, etc. They also support a local policy of partnership and sponsoring, to compensate for the reduction in French financing.

The associative MAE, Culturesfrance carries out, through local operators, the programmes of the Ministry: foreign countries’ ‘Years in France’ or ‘Years of France Abroad’, exhibitions, projects of ‘Africa in Creation’, and soon the ‘Caribbean in Creation’, in the fields of: visual arts, performing arts and architecture. AFAA, now amalgamated (2006) with the Association for the Diffusion of the French Thought (ADPF), under the new name of Culturesfrance, is a major agency for cultural exchanges, and ambitions, inter alia, to develop its European dimension (as opposed to national orientation) as regards cultural exchanges.

The general tendency since the end of the 1990s, and which especially seems to reflect the reduction of financial resources as well as the considerable reduction in the number of external experts, has been a concentration of means: absorption of the Ministry for Co-operation by that of Foreign Affairs, merger of positions (cultural attachés / directors of cultural centres), merger of institutions (cultural centres / Alliances Françaises, or suppression of one of both), creation of Culturesfrance, etc. Whatever the advantages or disadvantages, this concentration reinforces the centralisation of the French system. Perhaps it gives more coherence, but it may also contribute to its isolation and its rigidity.

b) The Ministry of Culture:

The Ministry of Culture focuses its foreign relations on the export countries as regards markets for art, cultural industries and exhibitions: the USA, Japan and China. With its institutions and diverse partners it has access to an expertise and know-how at a very high level in all the cultural fields (heritage, cultural industries, legal frameworks, etc), but has limited means of its own to maximise and to deploy at an international level these human and technical resources. Exemplary and effective actions are carried out in the fields of books and publishing, audio-visual and the cinema. The integration of a publishing sector in Culturesfrance (from “ADPF”) worries the Ministry of Culture. The Heritage National Institute (INP), in spite of its technical capabilities, is weakly positioned internationally, and little supported by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Generally, caught between the omnipresence of the MAE in French external cultural policy and the stakes or risks of globalisation, the Ministry of Culture welcomes with enthusiasm the prospect of a cultural component of the European foreign policy.

c) Local communities, civil society:

The whole of the French decentralised system has little weight in French external cultural policy: the regions have little political consistency and few means. The MAE does not turn naturally to civil society and the local communities. Private foundations, associations and private companies are not as developed as they are in some countries elsewhere in Europe. They are not very integrated in cultural networks. They lack the experience and even the culture for this and a number of setbacks in the implementation of European Commission Programmes have sometimes dampened their local expectations. Culturesfrance, which could play the interface between the MAE and the local communities, does not provide this link.

E f f e c t i v e n e s s o f t h e
i m p l e m e n t a t i o n

As regards effectiveness and results, France offers a contrasted landscape. It has considerable assets: its long tradition and the concentration of its means, its global system which ensures it a proximity presence everywhere in the world, its high level human, institutional and technological expertise, and its image which remains strong in this field.

France obtains convincing results in several fields including the French language, which constitutes a good vector for diffusion and exchanges, being able to adapt and modernise its approach. Other areas include the cultural industries, where some of its models are fully recognised; cultural exchanges with the Alliance Françaises (e.g. the reciprocal 'Years of France'), among others.

But despite everything, France is under-achieving, considering its resources as well as its ambitions: the reduction of its means in terms of personnel and financing is not compensated by other resources, provided by international funds or the private sector.

Its cultural co-operation instruments have been adapted and refined, but they are of another age and insufficient to fully meet the new logics and challenges of international co-operation: an enlarging EU Europe, sustainable development and multilateral approaches. Their concentration does not prevent the fragmentation of services and actions: institutional fragmentation between the Ministries, compartmentalisation within the Ministries (fine arts, cinema, heritage, etc), which results in competition over territories and which leave little place for more cross-sectoral actions, synergies and mutual benefit. Communication is not made from one service to another, from one sector to another, from one action to another. This fragmentation, heavy in terms of costs of transaction, leaves to the individuals a disproportionate degree of initiative to interpret the general direction and logic of national policy.

Even more problematic, the vertical communication seems very difficult from one level to another, particularly within the MAE: the strong and sound political message which is delivered at the highest level (ministerial or director) does not filter down, or not entirely. The Services do not entirely translate this message into corresponding programmes: for lack of commitment or prospects, perhaps, because of the division of institutional responsibilities or the competition which it induces. Two consequences are the relative opposition to progress of the Ministry and the significant isolation of French policy.

France, through its own actions, seems unaware of the multilateral field, and especially of the European dimension, in which it does not actually take part – especially the further down the hierarchy of responsibilities for delivery: its system, traditionally focused on bilateral action and effects of dissemination, does not present a European façade. It meets difficulties in opening to new approaches. The cultural centres at best, show only an embryonic and sporadic interest in the European Commission, which they generally do not know. Hitherto l'AFFA has been very focused on its own action and its constraints and which remains tied by an exclusive bond with

the MAE. It has approached Europe step by step in search of opportunist and specific financing. This random approach is costly in energy and it deprives it of long-term European prospects: the question is now to see whether the new agency, Culturesfrance, will be able to answer its new and very laudable ambitions.

C o n c l u s i o n

This 'absence' of Europe is unanimously recognised within the French services. A European foreign policy as regards culture is highly desired for France. It would have the side, but essential, effect of getting France "used" to Europe, which would be a benefit for both, and would put at the service of Europe an authentic and great tradition.

III France and Europe: which reservations?

The reservations that France may voice about such a European policy vary according to the institutions, the sectors and the levels of government. There are certainly actual limits, which come from the situation and the constraints of France (see 2.3). These limitations include technical bottlenecks, to which are added a certain number of difficulties produced by the European Commission itself and its management. In the positive proposals of the definition of a European policy, thematic and fundamental reservations arise and are expressed which are linked to the principles of sovereignty, subsidiarity and specificity, but which does not call into question the overall commitment of France.

T e c h n i c a l r e s e r v a t i o n s

The majority of the EU countries have encountered constraints with the Commission, much as France has, and from the weight of their systems or their past. Many of these countries have a vision of cultural policy, which, if not negative, is at least very limited, sometimes does not concern the public sector, or which is lost entirely in the field of European subsidiarity. Germany or Belgium run up against linguistic or regional devolution. The new European countries do not have access to cultural industries, and concentrate on the heritage, the fine arts and the visual arts. EU Europe does not proceed from only one step; its interests are diverse, and the implementation of a common policy can be a shared desire: it is not an obvious practical necessity.

To work together with several European States is not an innovation, but it has often proved to be difficult, despite the best intentions. Co-ordination with several countries implies harmonisation of actions, responsibilities, calendars, procedures, etc, and is heavy and complex, not necessarily producing economic benefit and synergy.

The decentralised French operators are wary of Europe, which they know through the European Commission: they often met with unwieldiness and slowness disproportionate to the financial stakes. Concerns about European bureaucracy are also shared by the French governmental institutions (Culturesfrance, Ministries) - perhaps even more so as it is multiplied by the ignorance of EU procedures.

Moreover, the European administration itself does not grant to culture the place, which it claims to give it. The European Commission integrates little with Member States' policies and the European population in the implementation of its policy. It functions in isolation and in a too bureaucratic way, at headquarters as well as in the field. Culture remains a 'negative priority': strongly asserted as a dimension of European foreign policy (diversity, intercultural dialogue, cultural identities, cultural industries, etc), but only suggested in specific, stereotyped and closed

programmes. The Commission does not have sufficient staff trained for external cultural actions, nor a service specifically organised to this end, either in Brussels or in the Delegations.

In other words, if France strongly supports the initiative of a European foreign cultural policy, it does not consider it possible without a transformation of the operating modes of the EU and Member States' institutions.

T h e m a t i c r e s e r v a t i o n s

There are few sectors in France where the principle of subsidiarity and its sovereignty would limit the sphere of activity of Europe. Broadly, subsidiarity remains the regulating principle. Upstream, it is a question of establishing the functional relation between Europe and the Member States.

The EU should not substitute its values, even if shared, for France's own. Under a common policy, the European countries will continue their national policy, and will integrate common values characteristic of the European level: diversity in unity, the dialogue of cultures, the culture of peace, human rights, etc. It is not a matter of amalgamating or dissociating, but of articulating and supplementing. Downstream, France estimates that the majority of the sectors are appropriate for external Community action: heritage, visual arts, performing arts, cultural industries, cinema, etc. Two areas only are considered as outside European Union competence:

a) Language and linguistic policy:

The MAE and the Alliance Française consider that this field does not give any place for sharing with the EU, as policy in this area is most closely related to the interests of Member States.

b) Radio and television:

The French opinion is almost unanimous: the audio-visual, radio and television sectors should not enter within the European framework. Organisations like RFI, the BBC or DW, have a national identity too strongly established to give up to Europe. Through these instruments, France, United Kingdom, Germany, etc. carry their national image, not universally, but in areas where their presence and their interests are important. Admittedly, common programmes exist, but they remain symbolic and superficial. The Ministry of Culture considers, however, that if the bodies (RFI, BBC, DW, etc) must develop their own policy in a distinct and national way, a European action could usefully support and promote outside Europe 'European contents' (films and TV series, documentaries, programmes), in particular, as regards television, by supporting translation and dissemination.

IV Europe: which role according to France?

E u r o p e a n a d d i t i o n a l v a l u e s

France wants each EU country to be able to follow its own policy under its own colours, and that the EU intervenes at the same time in a complementary (complémentaire) way and in an additional (supplémentaire) way by adding values that only Europe as a whole can carry:

'diversity in unity', the capacity of dialogue and conflict resolution and the capacity of harmonising differences without erasing them or diverting them, etc. The Ministry of Culture insists on this characteristic of Europe: its capacity of meeting the 'Other', of knowing and recognising the 'Other', and of assimilating its culture and not having a closed off identity. A capacity of 'otherness' (altérité) qualifies Europe in a very strong way and should constitute a major and constructive topic of its foreign policy.

Europe must also 'equalise' its image on the outside, i.e. in terms of representation, without taking account of the differences in size, all the nations and the cultures which it gathers: it is also one of the functions of its external cultural policy to carry all Europe at the same time.

Finally, the EU can make it possible to escape the too particular and sometimes negative relationship of European countries with other countries or areas of the world: for reasons of history or circumstances, some of the countries have a negative image, or an embarrassing familiarity. Europe can then propose itself, especially through culture, as a more neutral, more attractive and non-conflictual vehicle.

C o m p l e m e n t a r y v a l u e o f E u r o p e

At all levels, Europe is needed for the complementary financing that it brings (under the conditions of “European” projects) to the Member States: in order to ‘Europeanise’ such cultural projects in their dimension and standards, to allow them broader circulation and impact, to endow them with a ‘European’ quality (label), and also to support the integration of small or new Member States in shared programmes. The EU, in a role of regulation, could ensure co-ordination of joint programmes, producing savings in costs of transactions and time. It would thus obtain a better overall visibility.

The EU would not limit itself to support or make visible small or new Member States: it would have also the invaluable capacity to attenuate with the outside world the bilateral difficulties encountered by some of its Member States, and so to contribute to solving, by the means of its cultural policy, particular conflicts. By the means of its multiple relations and alliances, it would help some its external partners to reduce their own conflicts (e.g. Israel/Palestine).

It is not simply financial resource or logistic benefits: France (MAE, Ministry of Culture) is conscious of the quality and of the exemplarity of a certain number of its own models and good practices, just as there are good models elsewhere in Europe. Book and publishing policy, cinema, audio-visual and, more recently, the musical industry: these models could be adopted by the EU, and adapted to its general policy. France has shown itself very attentive to this question.

The action of Europe, in this same spirit, is also wished by the local communities and the private operators in France: the EU can stimulate the emergence of local actors in international co-operation who, without it, would remain at micro level and without means. This could be achieved by bringing them together, supporting them more systematically, more specifically and more efficiently.

The French services stress that the foreign policy of Europe as regards culture must be quite distinct and well dissociated from the support programmes for culture within the framework of external development aid: these programmes are part of the bilateral policy of the European Commission, and come under the policies of partner states, not under EU foreign policy.

S u g g e s t e d M e a s u r e s

The proposals and expressed wishes or the outlined prospects referred to here come from the various ministries, organisations and operators that have been interviewed: it does not form an action plan for France as a whole, but it provides a landscape for all the points of view which emerged from the talks. The Ministry for Culture, it should be noted, has a great capacity for proposals, but also a tendency not to have the institutional and financial means of a substantial policy.

a) European cultural system and support to the cultural industries and the arts market: Europe must support European productions and cultural industries in the world, i.e. primarily in the buyer countries (the United States, Japan, China, etc). For that, it must install a targeted network of Cultural Attachés and Offices for Promotion such as the EMO (European Music Office) in New York, which is an excellent success model. The concerned fields are the visual arts, the performing arts, the book and publishing, the music and, of course, the cinema, including TV programmes. The USA organises a powerful lobbying of Brussels in the field of cinema. Europe

must accompany the European productions by a systematic programme of translation: cinema, book, theatre and performing arts (opera, etc), using new technologies. The Ministry of Culture gives special attention to opera, as the European art par excellence, as it gathers multinational technical and artistic competences in its performances.

b) Mobility of artists and operators:

All the French organisations insist on the importance of the mobility of artists and operators: certainly in Europe, but also at the borders of Europe, in and with the neighbourhood countries (Central and Eastern Europe and the Mediterranean), then in the rest of the world. Mobility makes it possible to associate European partners with those outside and to facilitate multiple exchanges.

c) Networks

France is weak in the European networks. It favourably considers the reinforcement of the cultural networks in Europe, not only because they have become, thanks to new technologies, the ideal support for co-ordination and knowledge (through websites and forums): they are also relays of action and of information, driving forces of decisive communication and integration, and factors of sustainable development. Networks could finally play a complementary role supporting most of the initiatives taken by the EU: co-ordinating promotion offices, the mobility programmes, etc.

The creation of a new form of 'European sponsorship', based on European values, which would be accompanied by tax incentives and legal facilities, and which would include the new Member States in particular, is part of this reflection on the necessary co-ordination and 're-dimensioning' of the partnerships and the networks.

d) Heritage:

Europe, because of its history, its situation and its experience, should play a major part in the world as regards conservation, restoration and development of the heritage. There are sites of high value everywhere in the world that the concerned States do not have the means of restoring nor developing (e.g. Angkor Wat). Europe could give itself the mission of doing this, thus favouring the dialogue of cultures and cultural diversity, supporting the identities of the countries' partners, and reinforcing their image with its own. It would support local and international employment (research, restoration sites), as well as the association of European competences and expertise (restoration, development, technologies, etc).

It would also create the conditions for cultural tourism; i.e. of an industry strongly creative of diversified employment and additional resources, carrying technologies, capacities and innovation, and which is itself based on the dialogue of cultures.

Heritage building sites can be opportunities to gather young Europeans: excavations, restoration and installations, animation and cultural platforms. Once restored and arranged, they are places of meetings, where traditional or modern performances (dance, concerts, performances, etc) can take place combining the richness of the past with new technologies. Europe could create a 'European label' of the sites and restorations in the world.

e) Platforms of the major European festivals and cultural events:

Principal festivals in Europe should or could become - if organised in networks and within the framework of EU foreign policy - European platforms of promotion and dissemination. The Festival of Avignon is already such a platform. It receives and presents celebrated European names and carries out international meetings and forums, which the EU could still develop and

systematise. The greatest European events in the various cultural fields could be the object of this policy.

The support already brought to the European book forums and stands could also be reinforced as part of a more methodical strategy, including a constant policy of translation and co-editions for external destinations.

f) Support to combined actions:

France is generally favourable to the support of combined actions of several countries of Europe, including the smaller ones and/or new Member States. However, the MAE and its network are cautious: they fear the unwieldiness of such actions and local competitions between countries or institutions for visibility. On the other hand, the local communities and the decentralised operators show themselves much more enthusiastic about projects that would reinforce European links, while allowing them an action of a greater scale outside Europe. Such initiatives could make it possible in particular to establish bridges between the European local communities, the decentralised operators, the regions, and thus to reduce the weight of the centralised agencies and policies.

g) Support to the European local initiatives and populations:

European support to communities and local operators would be much welcome. In France, they are not taken into consideration in institutional co-operation. Their technical or financial capacity does not enable them to access sufficiently or regularly European or international programmes. More systematic and well targeted support would enable them to develop long term action, and would facilitate the instigation of a dialogue (to date very sporadic although necessary) between populations, and between European regions and regions of the world.

M e t h o d o l o g y a n d f o r m s o f
i n t e r v e n t i o n o f E u r o p e

a) To avoid the bureaucratic obstructions:

France, at its various levels, fears European bureaucracy, the obstructive procedures and the delays that go with it, and wishes to avoid them. It does not consider that the quasi-monopoly exerted by the Commission is the best or the only solution. In the field of culture, it considers that the European Commission is doing a work of "co-operation", not of "foreign policy": the programmes in favour of the ACP countries, for example, reflect the cultural policy of the ACP countries, not that of Europe.

France does not wish for central organisation alone: nor new structures added to existing ones and leading to duplication. This would add confusion and opacity to the EC heaviness, and would ignore national or European systems that have proved reliable.

It would be advisable to reduce the procedures, to associate as much as possible the Member States (in particular the new ones), as well as the decentralised communities and operators, so that they feel committed individually to the European policy.

The model generally preferred is that of financing directly allotted to programmes or projects which would meet "European" criteria: in terms of objectives, contents territorial scope (i.e. the number of associated European countries). In order to avoid complications (expensive in time and resources) related to modes of organisation, the Ministry of Culture proposes the model of the PESC (SCEP): a country, an institution or an operator are appointed among the partners, as the leader, and it ensures the co-ordination by using the capacities of all.

b) Logic of the sectors and the institutions:

The cultural centres and national institutes of the Member States can be useful relays: but it is not a question of transforming them into “European cultural centres”, for which they do not have the vocation nor ability: they could more effectively become supporters of shared projects and contents, partners on common and occasional actions.

Similarly in the field of musical industries (Office of Musical Industries, MAE), it would be absurd from a commercial point of view to mix on the same record singers of different European countries. The intervention of Europe must come upstream, on the capacities and the methods of production, and downstream on promotion, distribution and sale of the labels. These are two examples, which show that the conjugation of Europe should not be done without coherence and prudence.

It must also be done with suitable human resources: to date the European Commission has not managed to obtain a body of civil servants, even in a limited number, which would be able to deal with cultural policy and projects: to identify and to formulate, to negotiate with EC external partners, to set up and to follow up programmes. The EC Delegations do not have the type of personnel, i.e. cultural attachés or advisers, in the way it has economic or trade, political or development advisers. This is a serious and even crippling deficiency for the implementation of a foreign policy as regards culture. France considers that the Cultural Attachés of the Member States could contribute to fill this gap (except for France’s target countries such as the United States and Japan, etc), and on the condition that the cultural attachés of these Member States have a sufficient knowledge of Europe.

c) Political dimension:

Three aspects of a political nature crop up in the conversations:

- The small and new Member States must be systematically integrated in European projects. The cultural dimension for them is the means of having a dialogue on the same level with the large or founder EU States. Their resources do not enable them to act directly to a significant degree, whereas their contribution to the image and the values of Europe is essential from now on.
- The European Parliament has a representativeness, which it seems necessary to associate with the European cultural policy (i.e. a policy needs legitimacy).
- The EC Neighbourhood Policy is completely associated with European thought and culture, and must be with its actions. The surrounding countries of Mediterranean and Eastern Europe must be able to take part to the projects of mobility, of archaeological and restoration sites (heritage, youth, etc), as with the various European combined actions.

d) To build an inner dimension:

The EU foreign cultural policy cannot do without its interior dimension for reasons due to the European conscience and its solidarity, but also, and perhaps more essentially, for practical and strategic reasons. The mobility of artists cannot be carried out outside successfully if it does not exist massively inside, and if the movement does not include both together. The same applies to the networks: Europe cannot consolidate the networks outside if they are not inside. Europe of the outside has no meaning and no foundation without a Europe of the inside.

The case of cultural industries is even more obvious: the indispensable condition for the promotion of the European cultural productions outside is the existence of a strong and developed domestic market, in the fields of the cinema, visual arts, tourism, books and music, and other performing arts. The American cinema dominates the European market and, in what remains in Europe of its own market, the national markets leave a marginal place for the other European countries. The European market should be the first market of the European countries, if Europe still wants to maintain hope of widening its audience in the world. Domestic markets and

external markets are, in fact, the two indissociable faces of the same coin, and the political leaders must take heed of it, if they intend to move away from the logic (or the absence of logic) of ad hoc projects. It is thus quite essential to establish between these two dimensions – interior and exterior - an articulated solidarity.

v Examples of european projects

France has little experience of large European projects, which would be used as models. Until now, AFAA was satisfied to knock at the door of the European Commission, often at the wrong moment, to collect or not from it specific financing for external relations projects, e.g. the Biennial of the Photography of Bamako or African Choreographies. The European Commission intervenes for the Film Festival of Ouagadougou (Burkina Faso), to support it financially and give a European Prize, but there is no 'European' dimension nor impact without the involvement of the Member States. The only European visibility is the EC logo. Examples of this type are numerous.

The French Cultural Centres and Institutes do not work often or systematically with the EC Delegations. The small European Film Festivals that they organise here and there do not constitute European film policy.

The EMO (European Music Office) of New York is mentioned several times like an excellent initiative and a model of success.

The Anna Lindh Euro-Mediterranean Foundation raises hopes, or raised them, but gives an uncertain image: the idea appears good, but the means available and the weight of the Foundation are insufficient, and its organisation and its functioning remain problematic.

The programme '25 plus plus', co-ordinated by Culturesfrance, is also presented as a success: it avoids heaviness of procedure and joins together all European competences around a project of mobility of artworks and artists in support of the neighbouring countries of Eastern Europe. Culturesfrance proposes another project with a properly European dimension: an exhibition of old photos from Arab countries. Europe would be used as a common façade for the Member States which, individually, may have a difficult or dubious relationship with the Arab world. The project, starting from the relatively neutral photographic medium, would encourage intercultural dialogue between Europe and the Arab world. The form of the exhibition would provide a practical support for circulation and exchanges.

Lastly, French decentralised operators often have only a limited European experience, even though financing is European. The projects, which they have led are not significant as models for a European policy, even if the acquired experiences are very favourably received on the whole.