

BIGGER... BETTER... BEAUTIFUL?

CONFERENCE ON THE IMPACT OF EU ENLARGEMENT ON CULTURAL OPPORTUNITIES ACROSS EUROPE

Budapest, 14-17 February, 2002

FINAL REPORT

ORGANISED BY

Budapest Observatory
Cultural Contact Point Hungary
Euclid, UK

THE ORGANISING TEAM

Geoffrey Brown, Zsófia Földesi, Gyöngyvér Huszár,
Péter Inkei, Zita Lévai, Nikolett Tóth, Attila Zongor

The aims of this conference were twofold – to develop further links, both theoretical and practical, between the cultural sectors of the European Union and the accession countries and to discuss the impact of enlargement on the wider Europe.

The conference brought together over 150 participants from 29 countries who explored issues ranging from the prospects of expanding the cultural links and interaction amongst the proposed 25 (or even more) members of the enlarged EU to the need to support and sustain cultural diversity through fostering identity at national, regional and local level, and the impact of the enlargement on European cultural integrity, as well as on global issues. In addition, the conference explored the development of partnerships, exchanges and other links, using examples of good practice and case studies.

The conference did not ignore the challenges that enlargement is likely to highlight and which will need to be addressed and overcome: ranging from national and European bureaucracy to the differences in traditions, cultures, languages – both within the enlarged European Union and in respect of those European countries which are not currently applying for EU membership.

For the existing members of the EU, there were sessions which address the changes likely as a result of the eventual reduction of the current levels of Structural Funds, which have provided considerable support for the cultural sector over the past decade. For the accession countries, there were opportunities to learn from the experiences of the Member States in benefiting from the support available from these Funds.

The conference generated ideas and suggestions for future developments, and these are included at the end of this report. In addition, the success of the conference has stimulated a demand for future events that further progress this debate and also provide a wider platform for opportunities to meet, exchange and learn. These will be a further demonstration that each country's pride in its cultural identity and achievements are no barrier to exchange and partnership, and to an enlarged European Union that will indeed be bigger, but also better and more beautiful...

SETTING THE SCENE...

PRESENTATION: ION CARAMITRU, President of Uniter, Bucharest, former Minister of Culture of Romania,
AT THE OPENING SESSION

I must admit it's much better to be a former minister, than an active one. As a former minister – I try to entertain you, instead of discussing politics.

The problem that my colleagues and I are facing is ourselves. Running around and around – maybe, endlessly – to try and find our identity within Europe. Counting the years, queuing for admission. And who knows what the future brings?

12 years is a quite a lot, since 1989 – a year which gave Europe a new dimension and our country a new reason to exist.

I used to say in 1992 that in a world I come from, a generation was born and lived besieged in its own country – and understood that culture was the only way out.

To overcome a deep sense of metaphysical fear, this generation formed deep and trusting friendships, visited the theatre, searched for books, and made great efforts to learn foreign languages. I think there's an indefinite something which comes from the spark of infinity, which grows together in every people – no matter where he is, or where he comes from.

To illustrate that indefinite feeling I'd like to recite from Marin Sorescu, a Romanian poet, who died recently:

A whim

Every night I collect from my neighbours
All the available chairs
And I read verses to them.
The chairs are very receptive to poetry
If you know how to arrange them.
That's why I get excited and during a few hours
I tell them how beautifully my soul died
During the daytime.
Our meetings are usually sober
without any stupid enthusiasm.
In any case that means –
That each of us performs his duty
and that – we may go on.

During the years of terror in my country our theatre expressed itself most powerfully and it was more effective not in long speeches, but in its long silences. If one is familiar with poetry one knows that the beauty of words lies in its pauses and its spaces. Actors and audiences co-habiting for many years were yearning for better times.

Then, better times arrived.

And nothing happened. What to do, now?

But going back to the reason why we're here – we have to investigate the political aspects of the European enlargement. During my years as Minister of Culture, while I was representing Romania – we were always waiting for an introduction to the continent.

However, even before our introduction we were already classified as well as all the other countries. First world, second world, occasionally third world, military superpower, medium military power, stupid power, and so on. But no one expressed the truth about the culture.

There's no classification of countries in the field of culture.

We are equal – and the most important thing is the specific contribution of each country to the European cultural identity. So, if we start this political important event, which is the enlargement process, and re-create Europe, we have to take this into account – in this very important part of our history, culture is a strong aspect of our identity, our treasure, heritage and spirit...

To give you another real example by using a manuscript from our national poet Mihai Eminescu, who wrote it aged 16–17 sometime during 1966–67. All aspects of relativity are described vividly in this poem, which was introduced to the world by another famous man later on in a more mathematical sense.

Caesar

Let us imagine Caesar living on a celestial body, far from us, whose beams only reach us in a thousand years. Let us imagine Brutus killing him today and us looking to that star through a telescope. Today we see nothing, there is only in a thousand years we shall see what is happening today on that remote star.

On the other hand let us imagine that all people from all celestial bodies keep their eyeglasses aimed at us, some of them at a smaller distance, others further away. And today Caesar falls by the hand of Brutus. People living on the moon will see this today, those on remoter stars tomorrow, others further away the day after tomorrow, those on the remotest valleys of the universe in a thousand years.

The ray of light which beams on his dying face travels through the universe and reaches all stars of the infinite within millions, or millions of millions of years, in turn, so why Caesar's tragedy occurs again and again, endlessly. This tragedy is alive but always in a new environment. Everywhere it is a moment which is not, which becomes, which remains, which defines and then...

But let's finish such literary speech... I couldn't stop myself from improvising a little. But back to the political declaration.

We the Romanians feel we have the right to be accepted as true Europeans, once again. To become again Europeans, we survived an ordeal, which lasted almost than half a century. But during that ordeal a new breath of fresh air was born, which was coming from a generation of kamikaze people obsessed with passing on their most precious treasure: the spirit and their love of culture.

Thank you.

“What can an international organisation like the EU do for European culture without ever harming national interests? Where to draw the limits of national jurisdiction and how to separate the common responsibilities the Union bears? How to be just in distributing the common funds and for what purposes?”

This conference promises to be a forum for an open discussion between the EU member states and the candidate countries on the benefits and disadvantages of enlargement. I am confident that the outcome of this discussion will help the work of the Commission.”

László Baán at the Opening Plenary

REPORTS ON THE SESSIONS

PLENARY 1

THE CULTURAL LANDSCAPE IN TODAY'S EUROPE

CHAIR: MIKLÓS MARSCHALL, Transparency International, Berlin

SPEAKERS: FERENC MISZLIVETZ, Institute of Sociology, Budapest / VERA BOLTHO, Head of Cultural Policy And Action Department, Council of Europe / KIRILL RAZLOGOV, Director, Russian Institute for Cultural Research, Moscow

A sarcastic Eurocrat put the dilemma of enlargement this way: “We (the EU) pretend as if we would enlarge, you pretend as if you would be ready”. Miszlivetz expressed concern that the relationship between the nation-states and the transnational institutions in the New Europe is still unclear. One of the most vulnerable points of the EU is that its institutions lack sufficient transparency and democratic legitimacy. The fact that an important part of the European continent is still excluded from the EU and that there are great discrepancies between official declarations and everyday practice vis-à-vis Eastern enlargement does not help in overcoming this lack of democratic legitimacy. The central question is how can trust in democratic institutions be created in the newly democratising countries of East-Central Europe? How do we change some negative perceptions such as exclusive nationalisms and xenophobia, which still exist within the European nations? According to Miszlivetz, culture is the hope. It contains all encompassing meaning but it needs new institutions and networks that will truly symbolise the new European cultural belonging.

Kirill Razlogov argued that the real unifying force between nations is popular culture, not high culture. This popular culture is not European but rather the world's culture. People embrace this culture almost everywhere in the world and it becomes trans-national mass culture. Another issue raised by Razlogov is the fact that there is no more money in the West or real creativity in the East to overcome existing gaps. But he believes that there are misunderstandings not only in relations between East and West but also within the current members of the EU. European citizens have to realise that other cultures are not “out there” but that they are within each and every member country of the EU itself. The only future for Europe is to overcome old clichés and to re-think and re-assess the European culture as a culture ready to recognise, tolerate and embrace all diversities that exist within.

Vera Boltho identified two major players dealing with culture, the Council of Europe and the European Union. The Council of Europe is 50 years old and has 50 members representing almost all of Europe. Its main objective has always been to bring the countries closer. In terms of policy, the Council of Europe was not promoting European cultural policy, but has always been creating and opening space for dialogue, thus contributing to the promotion of common European identity. The European Union is very different and its policy is strongly dominated by the principle of subsidiarity. Still the objectives are similar and both the EU and the Council of Europe have been moving in the same direction where one of the key issues is the relation between the preservation of the identity of the European continent vis-à-vis globalization. Boltho believes that it is not necessary to have a cultural policy as such, but that there should be a space for the promotion of new policies (especially around the core cultural industries such as cinema or media as well as policies aimed at the promotion of medium and small-size enterprises in the field of culture). However, it is important to bear in mind that it does not make sense to promote cultural cooperation if it does not embrace the totality of the European culture.

DISCUSSION

Irina Boulin-Ghica disagreed with Mr. Razlogov's point that there was no money in the West or creativity in the East, and argued that four countries belonging to the G7 were members of the European Union. As for Mr. Razlogov's concern regarding the dominance of popular culture, Ms Boulin-Ghica expressed her belief that the driving forces are no longer high or popular culture, but rather education and political will.

In response to Ms Boulin-Ghica's intervention, Kirill Razlogov agreed that there was money, but expressed his concern that very little is being spent on culture. Ms Boltho did not share his pessimism and stated that, in her perception, in terms of policy the most important goal is to have diversified culture. She believes that, in a way, the demand is also

created by what is on offer and this is where she sees the intervention of cultural policy, to support what is on offer in order to help create the demand. Mr. Miszlivetz noted that we still have this perception of Europe as being white, Christian, democratic, successful and prosperous. He believes that rising GDP and living standard will eventually lead to the development of so-called "higher culture". He supports this concept that the "demand" for higher culture or culture in general is a process dependant on many factors and that this can be promoted from outside.

"Europe defines itself by its culture rather than its institutions. You only have to look at the new euro banknotes: the symbols of power – heads of state, monarchs, generals – are gone. Instead we show bridges and gateways which over and above their symbolic value are also expressions of Europe's cultural heritage.

Our national, regional and local cultures live side by side sometimes in competition, sometimes in concord. It is that harmony in diversity that the Commission is determined to preserve... The thrust of EU policy is to maintain diversity, to highlight the valuable differences which spark off new ideas and products through interaction.

Europe is an opportunity and not a threat. There is no European cultural equivalent of Big Mac and Coca Cola which is waiting to swamp you. There are just other artists and performers waiting to be met, other audiences to be conquered and other lines of approach to be discovered."

Thomas Glaser at the Opening Plenary

WORKSHOP SESSIONS

1A - THE ARTS

CHAIR: **GYÖRGY SZABÓ**, Director of Trafó, Budapest / SPEAKER: **MIK FLOOD**, Deputy Director, Euclid, London

György Szabó pointed out that “The Arts” is a very broad notion. He noted out that initially the conference organisers had planned separate sessions on visual arts and performing arts but that, as often happens, the arts was packed together in one session making the task at hand more difficult.

Mik Flood began his presentation noting there were three points to remember.

- First, the question of accession is interesting but it is not something that will happen overnight. Accession will happen at different times. 2004 will incorporate some countries but not all of them and accession will be a gradual process.
- Second, the definition of “culture” is a problem – as this word means different things at different times. For example, in some places it refers to “culture and the arts” and in others it includes “culture, commerce and industry, etc.”.
- Third, the arts are marginalised if compared to other areas of culture such as the audio-visual industries or cultural heritage.

EU countries can be categorised as having:

1. generally a high level of cultural output
2. relatively high but reducing levels of state funding
3. “mainstream art” as the priority
4. high production, labour and transport costs
5. few available resources for research and development
6. some potential for alternative sources of finance (i.e. sponsorship, televising, lotteries etc.)

In contrast, accession countries can be categorised as having:

1. generally low levels of cultural output (meaning the quantity of output – not the quality of the output)
2. low and reducing levels of state funding
3. elements of former state cultural apparatus still in place – draining funds
4. resistance to change
5. economic conditions not yet ready to permit more entrepreneurial approaches
6. few alternative sources of funding
7. restrictions on mobility in some countries

There are some exceptions to these – for example, the exceptional investment in contemporary art being made in Slovenia and Croatia, but on the whole or as a general overview these factors are accurate. The Schengen agreement was supposed to make mobility easier but this hasn't helped with the accession countries – in fact with regard to East-East collaborations it was easier in communist times to move across borders.

Regarding the arts and the European Union, historically the responsibility for culture rests with the member states – and this has been reiterated in the principle of “subsidiarity”. The Kaleidoscope / Culture 2000 programmes were “emblematic” programmes and not strategic. The arts are vastly under-resourced especially if compared with other aspects of culture i.e. heritage or the audio-visual field. There are no special opportunities for accession countries within Culture 2000. Other programmes have special support systems for accession countries but not Culture 2000. The implications of all this for the arts are as follows:

1. mobility of cultural products favours those produced by large institutions where economies of scale operate – i.e. big companies with big sponsorship potential.
2. the result of this first point is that there is a resulting disincentive for new creation.
3. the independent sector is marginalised.
4. the potential for dialogue, networking and collaborations are reduced.
5. a European mono-culture (globalisation) is favoured in these conditions i.e. the same big exhibitions touring different cities.

There needs to be a vision which encompasses:

1. A statement of strategic objectives
2. A programme to support mobility
3. A programme to support research and development
4. Targeted production funding for accession countries
5. An ending to Commission conceived “emblematic” cultural projects. He called for them to stop thinking of doing projects themselves – because they don't do it well!

DISCUSSION

Mary Ann DeVlieg pointed out that Ministries of Culture are insisting on programmes that we would be ashamed of and so she would shift the emphasis (in the last point 5 above) from the Commission to our own ministries. We must therefore lobby our own representatives at home to stop these Commission-led emblematic projects.

Godfrey Brand raised the point that some good initiatives have had no follow through – he cited a case where, after much research, artists were brought together and then nothing happened. All those efforts to bring these people together were later lost. He felt there was a need to provide a platform for links to be built and developed amongst artists from different countries.

Jolyon Laycock added that we should be supporting popular culture as this is the real culture. It was often grassroots/indigenous culture versus commercialised culture. He said he didn't fear a European monoculture but rather commercialised culture.

Naima Balić pointed out that central and eastern Europe have an incredibly rich culture but the problem is with dissemination and marketing. Legislation for culture seems to revolve around audio-visual issues and intellectual property rights. The rest, she pointed out, is left to member countries (with the exception of legislation on cultural goods). She also pointed out that with integration of new countries into the European Union, those countries that are left out will face new problems.

Ion Caramitru added some points to the “vision statement”:

- we should target production within accession countries to counter-act the increase in visiting western arts.
- we should also create companies of young people to work together on joint projects
- It is time to work together on our continent – our identity – the new Europe working against the monster America.

Mik asked for visionary political action despite the fact that culture does not have a high profile. He wondered if the problem is that culture does not have voter appeal.

Paul Kelly added that we must not assume that the western countries of Europe have got models for supporting culture right. Central and eastern Europe should not be allowed to follow the example of western European models for arts support. New models for arts support are needed and these new models should not be about structures but about values and processes.

Dragan Klaić added that we should have a vision for after 2004. What do we want to succeed the Culture 2000 programme? Who will define the strategic objectives of the next programme? The cultural field must start lobbying now for the criteria that will set the future objectives for the future programme. Dragan supported the call for mobility support – both for artists and for arts objects. Money should not be given to state prestigious or emblematic projects that could find other sources of funding. The proposal for a research and development programme is good and this could be divided into various sub-sections:

- a need for information flow and access
- a need for research and links with academia
- a space for reflection and debate in Europe, i.e. within this – support for existing networks because they build links, provide inspiration and they will help avoid making the same mistakes twice.

Dragan felt it would be difficult to get the EU to give up their emblematic projects. Finally, there was a need for specific support to speed up accession countries' arts production – but he said that this needs to come from the cultural operators themselves.

Corina Şuteu asked us to note the increasing tendency in accession countries to centralise culture in the cities with the result that provincial areas are becoming poorer. Little in the way of strategic thinking has ever taken place in accession countries because of the frequency of successive governments coming to power which left no room for long term planning.

Claude Véron added that if language diversity is important then translation programmes are crucial and should be structurally funded – he asked if this could be added to the vision statement.

Miklós Marschall intervened that he could see some positive effects of globalisation, as he felt that the public was becoming more interested in diversity. There was the case of a marginalised Hungarian writer called Sándor Márai whose work has recently become famous in several countries thanks to the marketing and distribution tools of the commercialised publishing sector. There is therefore also a positive side to globalisation which is to do with exchange and more access to unusual or less known artists. We should not trash globalisation and commercialisation too easily. The state could have poured money into promoting Márai but it would never have had the same effect as the commercial companies – who do it better.

Perhaps we were also too obsessed with lobbying governments when their power in culture is in fact diminishing. There are exciting things happening in urban policy and urban development policies would be much more important in the future. We should talk to a matrix of policy-makers. Finally, we should pay attention to more mundane issues such as labour conditions. There is concern about the artistic drain when the accession countries are integrated in Europe. As an example, the Hungarian Symphonic Orchestra currently holds the best Hungarian musicians, but when the European Union opens up, it is likely there will be an exodus when they see that they can earn ten times the salary in a western country. Perhaps a practical solution would be a fund to top up wages/salaries.

Ugo Bacchella noted the importance of civil society and “joined up” civil society action.

Luba Blaškovičová added that a fund was needed to support companies that are participating in culture 2000 programmes or the like because they could not co-operate if they are not sustainable for the duration of the project.

1B – MEDIA AND CINEMA

CHAIR: IRINA BOULIN-GHICA, Head of European and International Affairs Department of the Prime Minister's Office, Paris, France / SPEAKER: WOLFGANG CLOSS, Audiovisual Observatory, Strasbourg

Ms Boulin-Ghica highlighted three main challenges for the future of Europe:

1. Integrated internal market – culture should not be forgotten because it is on culture that we build our values and it is a pity that Europe started with coal and steel and not with culture
2. Enlargement – culture is even more important in this attempt to re-unify a continent that was divided. The fact is that there are many peoples in Europe but that there is still such thing as one European identity. Though we are diverse we share something common from the history. The cultural diversity is one of the main and fundamental values of democracy.
3. Globalization – it has both positive and negative aspects. It creates interesting markets but should not represent the death of cultural diversity. This is particularly sensitive issue in the field of media or audio-visual.

Culture stands for identity, it comes before the act of creation, it transports values and identity. Eventually culture becomes something that has economic value but it never becomes just a product. The issue of cultural diversity has at least two aspects:

- cultural diversity as a goal / task
- cultural exception (a French initiative) which is not defensive and protective but rather represents a way for opening space for cultural products

Ms Boulin-Ghica spoke about the principle of unanimity confirmed at the Nice summit, which should guarantee the continuation of the policy of cultural exception. The question remains as to which steps should be taken in order to integrate these concerns for the protection of diversity in the European Convention. One solution would be to add the whole chapter to the Treaty or include new provisions in article 151, which is at the moment based on subsidiarity. Another option is to open discussion on articles 86 and 87 dealing with the state aid.

Wolfgang Closs believes that the media should be discussed within the framework of cultural diversity. It is sometimes difficult to defend that issues related to the audio-visual sector should be discussed within the framework of culture. Mr. Closs presented the work of the European Audio-Visual Observatory. The European Commission itself is one of the 35 members of the Observatory. In today's Europe, there exists some 500 laws that regulate audio-visual sector (broadcasting, film, video and DVD, and new media) and that there are more than 250 different funding programs.

DISCUSSION

Rod Fisher spoke of the Ruffolo report and raised the concern on how secure this unanimity clause was in light of the fact that the WTO negotiations were not in the competence of culture ministers but of the ministers responsible for trade.

Vera Boltho mentioned Euroimages as an important institution because it includes both production and distribution. There is also the Convention on Co-production in Cinema, the Declaration on Cultural Diversity as well as other protective measures both within the Council of Europe and the European Union.

Ms Boulin-Ghica pointed out that there is a great difference between the treatment of goods under the GATT and services that fall under GATS.

Risto Kivelä highlighted that in this process of integration into the common market there are many implications for candidate countries to be aware of.

Kazimierz Krzysztofek highlighted that cultural diversity was fundamental for democracy and that it was directly linked with the issue of social cohesion. He questioned the principle of cultural exception in new media, especially interactive television.

Delia Mucica thought that special attention should be placed on linguistic issues in the distribution of cultural products (translations, dubbing, etc.). Another limiting factor aside from the possible lack of interest is related to costs and the fact that candidate countries are still not eligible for all EU funding programmes. Another issue to highlight was the position of independent producers.

At the end of the workshop an idea of introducing special supporting mechanisms for student films was presented by an UK representative. He argued that young people, at least in UK, are very diverse and that as a consequence, if properly supported, they will produce films which will reflect this diversity.

1C – CULTURAL HERITAGE

CHAIR: GEOFFREY BROWN, Director, Euclid, London / SPEAKER: SANJIN DRAGOJEVIĆ, Faculty of Political Science, Zagreb

Since 1983, a greater concern for culture has been shown within the EU at the time when the notion of the European citizen arises. Core values are identified which are part of the cultural identity: freedom, democracy, tolerance and solidarity are the basis for the preservation of cultural diversity in Europe. Three tendencies arose within the EU:

1. to be more and more inclusive of cultural matters, including the financing aspects;
2. in the form of an overall framework, to facilitate cultural issues within one programme – Culture 2000;
3. the importance of the digital issues of culture, and the interrelationship between e-culture and cultural heritage.

Some ten years ago, the EU used to bypass discussions on culture, particularly because of financial matters, but now the situation is changed. Culture 2000 sets priority areas, one of which is cultural heritage. An example in this area is the EU Prize for Cultural Heritage Preservation, which covers:

- a) restoration of single buildings or the complex of buildings with the intention to use or re-use it giving it some other function, as for example in education;
- b) preservation of landscape;
- c) preservation of private artistic objects to be presented for general public;
- d) preservation of archaeological sites;
- e) researchers in the field of cultural heritage;
- f) individuals or groups of people for their previous achievements in the field.

A number of research projects have been initiated in the field of cultural heritage, such as Save Art Projects, the Archaeo Project (focusing on climate changes) and projects concerning the seismic activities that can affect the cultural heritage. In the field of digital culture, a new initiative was born, the CULTIVATE programme, which connects e-culture and cultural heritage.

There exist other programmes in the fields of Education and Training (such as SOCRATES, TEMPUS, YOUTH); Information society (e-culture, Information Society for All, e-continent, etc.); Regional and Structural Policy (Regional Development Fund, European Social Fund); Research and Development Programmes (ESPRIT, Telematics Application, etc.); Cooperation with Third Countries (PHARE, TACIS, MEDA). There are also specific EU agreements concerning technology or science but also involving cultural heritage issues.

The basic questions are:

1. What is the interrelationship between human and political developments in Europe, when talking about minority groups, for example?
2. What is the role of cultural heritage in economic and social development? (Can digital culture raise employment in the field of cultural heritage?)
3. What is the role of public sector, private sector and NGOs in cultural heritage issues and enlargement?

Geoffrey Brown stated that we would all agree that cultural heritage was not in itself a controversial subject: heritage has to be preserved and therefore, it needs support. Since the EU is an economic engine, the question is how can heritage take advantage of opportunities that may not be specifically focused on heritage itself. Is it realistic for eastern European countries to consider the EU as a source for funding their cultural heritage?

Pavel Černoch suggested it is a question of perspective: while the material heritage may well get help from the EU, the issue is how EU cultural programmes can strengthen cultural identities. How can we make people feel more European through preserving their national identities?

Karel Mulder asked about how to deal with financing in practice? It is easy to establish a programme like Culture 2000, but in practice it's difficult to lead a project to a successful conclusion due to a lack of co-financing. It can be very difficult to find sponsors. The Cultural Contact Points were mentioned as places where potential projects can get advice. Other options include finding other enthusiasts, benefactors, commercial sponsors, or support in kind. Funding from other sectors and trans-national partnerships were seen as a new trend since local or national support is often lacking. Jon Price (Northumbria University, Cultural Management Unit, Newcastle upon Tyne) expressed the fear that chasing the finance just makes things more Europeanised and does not help to preserve national identities.

Mr Mulder also noted that there are projects which do not fit easily in any of the above mentioned categories within the EU programmes. Where does one apply for a musicology project, for example? EU cultural heritage categories are limited and do not cover many aspects of cultural heritage, such as immaterial, or intangible heritage. Therefore, there is still the issue of finding sponsors from elsewhere.

Katalin Wollák expressed her fear about the position of cultural heritage in the future Europe in the light of the regulations for protection of cultural goods. She wanted to hear the experiences of the countries who are already in the EU.

Peter Curman stressed that in the time of great changes, cultural heritage becomes very important. One can never claim to possess his/her own culture. Programmes of cooperation are needed more than ever and a wall in the area of culture should not be built around new countries. Culture should be allowed and preserved.

Sanjin Dragojević provided the Slovenian example: agencies have been created which help potential projects. These agencies advise those who have project ideas but don't know how to finalise the project. Investors give financial support to such agencies, which then support projects. It was suggested that this role might be given to CCPs, although some felt this may not be the best solution because they only focus on the Culture 2000 programme. Still, there may be a next stage...

PLENARY 2

CULTURE AND REFORMING OF EUROPEAN GOVERNANCE

CHAIR: DRAGAN KLAIĆ, President of EFAH, Amsterdam

SPEAKERS: PAVEL ČERNOCH, Jean Monnet Lecturer, Charles University, Prague / MARY ANN DeVLIEG, Director of IETM, Brussels / RACHEL GUGLIELMO, Project Director, Open Society Institute, Budapest

This is a very ambitious topic. How to make the complex process of European integration more manageable with respect to culture is a very difficult question. As opposed to the far-reaching promises about accession to the European Union, there may well be an institutional blockade instead. Much depends on how the upcoming Convention is going to work. Will civil society get a greater say in the institutional reform of the EU? How many new members will the EU take on? How will the structural funds be utilised in the regions, and to what extent will they be used for culture?

The EU is obsessed with the building up of EU identity, while among the candidate countries scepticism and even hostility characterises attitudes towards the idea of a united Europe. Therefore it is very important to draw attention to the inclusive and divisive capacities of culture even within the EU.

Pavel Černoch noted that the Europe we want is very different from the one that we have. The EU is about financing linked to a political process, and we have to handle this as an opportunity ahead of us. The EU will not do things for us, unless we are courageous enough and create initiatives. As physical borders are disappearing, an active cultural approach is needed. EU integration serves the purpose of changing mental attitudes. It exerts pressure on people to make them think in dimensions in which they have not thought before. A very basic example for this is a pressure for people to learn English.

But how can this all be relevant for culture? Culture is what binds Europe into this common space. However, what we see in our shared history is that culture was used to serve national interests and to turn nations against one another. A united Europe should be the guarantee that this will not happen again. It is noted that culture can go where politics and the economy cannot enter. The EU is able to impact beyond its borders, and culture is the only means of overcoming the notion of “fortress Europe”. We have to work on ways in which Europe can enter our lives. We do not have to reinvent the wheel, but we do need to be brave and experiment. To start with, two languages should be mandatory in all accession countries, and priority should be given to mobility above all other things.

Mary Ann DeVlieg, admitted to providing a “subjective and unscientific” speech to outline reforms necessary in the EU:

- The EU should set up a commission to monitor the language and words used when speaking about the integration process. Some words are ready to go into the garbage. The word „diversity” is one such word. It could be replaced by „respect” or by „curiosity”, in order to eliminate the contradiction in terms between integration and diversity. The word „visibility” should be redefined, as it actually means a change in attitude over a period of time.
- Another commission should be set up to monitor the level of curiosity in the people of the Member States. Those countries where interest in the EU drops below a certain level, should be sanctioned.
- Mental reforms are also necessary in order to stop the Member States from pursuing their national interests, and to make them start working for common goals.
- The *acquis communautaire* is far too big. Taking it seriously would demand several changes. This applies to the implementation of Article 151 as well.
- The EU should have a cultural policy or a cultural program because there is a need for a real framework. It should be simple, based on subsidiarity, but it should require active participation on behalf of Member States.
- The EU should forget about prizes – these should be left to sponsors.
- The bottom-up flow of information should be encouraged.
- The EU should see not only to what people want to do in the cultural field but also to how they want to do things.

- In the Council of Ministers, “thought control” should be introduced. Those ministers who pursue narrow national interests need to be replaced.
- In the European Parliament, a mandatory IQ test should be introduced before membership.
- The role of the media should be increased, and debates should more frequently be televised.
- People sitting in the Commission should have worked in the sector for which they are responsible for 5 years.
- The major issue in thinking about institutional reforms in the EU is: what place for civil society?

Rachel Guglielmo explained that the Open Society Institute (OSI), Budapest had established a program in 2000 to assess the impact of the EU accession process on policy development within states, recognising that there were very few guidelines available. The starting point was that while the Commission considers the fulfilment of the political criteria as a precondition for accession, the fact is that the political criteria are ideals and they can never actually be met. The OSI's EU Accession Program has developed a monitoring mechanism for selected aspects of the accession process, where in some cases there are no standards available. The programme contributes to the Commission's own evaluations, fosters public awareness of the accession process generally and of the political criteria in particular, and underlines the importance of independent monitoring as a necessary tool for the consolidation of a free society both during the accession process and beyond.

It is civil society organizations that should assess the process. The programme also engages people from the candidate countries in the assessment process. The finalised reports are presented not only to the Commission but to the general public as well. The basic aim was twofold: to encourage input from the candidate countries, and to provoke some thought in the Commission as well. However, culture is unfortunately one of the insufficiently explored elements of the political criteria.

DISCUSSION

Are we facing a window of opportunity in terms of EU integration? It seems that there is not enough thorough thinking on the cultural aspect of EU integration. They need us, and we also need them. This was unfortunately not reflected at this conference as the EU was not involved. In this way we are missing opportunities. However, the EU misses opportunities as well.

“Ours is a strong identity but by no means a homogeneous identity. Hungarian identity is actually a diverse identity of several cultures and in the best periods of our history, of our cultural and historic development we have been able to make the most of these various cultures and their contributions to our culture and identity. And this is, I think, the greatest contribution that we can make and that we want to make to a truly united Europe. What makes it very natural and very easy for us to join the EU is that we find there the same diverse culture and the same richness and the same strength in diversity that we can find in our own culture.”

Béla Szombati at the Opening Plenary

WORKSHOP SESSIONS

2A - CULTURE 2000

CHAIR: **AGNĖ MARTIKONIENĖ**, Head, Lithuanian Cultural Contact Point, Vilnius / SPEAKER: **THEODOSSIOS MASTROMINAS**, Principal Administrator, European Commission, Brussels

Culture 2000 is a growing program accessible to 28 countries at the moment. From next year on it will be accessible to Malta and Cyprus as well, which will make the number of beneficiaries 30. Culture 2000 is not a structural fund as it deals with EU projects and not with national ones. It does not subsidise projects on the national level but national authorities may be involved to implement projects on a national or regional level. The program unit itself has nothing to do with the selection of projects, which is done by a group of experts, who make recommendations to the Commission. The EP also has the opportunity to express its opinion. It takes a long time until decisions are made.

The program encourages cooperation. Cultural Contact Point offices were established in order to help cultural operators in their countries contact cultural operators of other countries. Projects should have a European added value, and should not repeat something that has already been realised. The program also provides support for mobility.

There is very strict control over who gets money for what, and for this reason the program is often criticised for being too rigid. Still, Culture 2000 is a huge possibility for the candidate countries to start training themselves to be able to meet the EU criteria. Unfortunately in the cultural sphere nobody cares for the preparation for accession but Culture 2000 serves exactly this purpose. It offers a lesson to be learned.

DISCUSSION

The following points were made by the audience for this workshop:

- There should be a feasibility phase built into the procedure.
- The Commission should do something about delays in contracting and making payment.
- The first payment should be more than 50% given the lengthy delay that exists in receiving the final payment
- The deadlines should be set earlier.
- A special mobility fund should be set up within Culture 2000.
- The program should target "not yet candidate" countries as well.
- In order to respond to cultural initiatives, enthusiasm is needed on both sides, and this is not the case when one is faced with administrators.
- Culture 2000 is a generous programme overall.
- Culture 2000 was planned for 4 years in advance. However in the meantime several new members will join the EU. Has the Commission taken this into account?

2B - THE FUTURE OF OTHER EU INITIATIVES AND THE TRANS-NATIONAL FUNDS

CHAIR: **JOSÉ PÉREZ LÁZARO**, Deputy Director, Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports, Spain / SPEAKER: **GEOFFREY BROWN**, Euclid, Liverpool

This workshop was introduced by José Pérez, who gave a brief introduction to the three main priorities of the Spanish Presidency concerning culture. These can be summarised as:

1. Reflection on the implementation means of article 151 - it is ten years since a legal base for culture was implemented and so reflection and debate are proposed. Reflection is expected on the measures so far taken and still needed to implement article 151.
2. The application of new technologies for our heritage - an aim of the presidency is to link better information / knowledge based systems to heritage. Particular emphasis will be given to digital content of our heritage for future generations.
3. The production and dissemination of European cinema - discussion is planned on the circulation and distribution of European cinema, giving attention to legal aspects of the sector, classifications and supported initiatives. The aim is to develop dialogue and cultural exchanges through cinematic projects both within the EU and with other geographical regions such as Latin America and the Caribbean countries.

Geoffrey Brown noted that the key priorities of the EU are to increase competitiveness and encourage co-operation and collaboration. Through a number of charts and graphs, the low amount of funds earmarked for culture was demonstrated. EU expenditure can be broken down:

- 45% - spent on agricultural policy
- 35% - structural funds
- 1% - culture, training, youth, audio-visual, media, information and other social operations, including:
- 0.1% - culture

However, it was also noted that 80% of the EU money coming for culture into the UK, for example, comes from the structural funds.

Broad distinctions between the structural funds and trans-national funds were then noted:

Structural Funds (including the ERDF and ESF community initiatives):

1. geographically focussed
2. partners not needed
3. local decision making (i.e. local and regional committees decide on goals and criteria)
4. large funds can be accessed
5. focus on capital works or people based activities

Trans-national Funds:

1. pan-European focus
2. partners from different countries essential
3. decisions made in Brussels
4. small to medium size grants
5. focus on projects (1-3yrs maximum - i.e. not revenue funding)

The Trans-National Funds include Culture 2000, Media Plus, Leonardo da Vinci, Socrates, Youth, Life III (environment), New Technologies and Research (through the 5th framework programme) and other programmes such as the minority languages programme and programmes through external relations which support links with countries outside the EU.

These latter include the Phare programme which is helping accession countries in the process leading to EU enlargement. In theory, when the enlargement process is complete, the Phare funds will be replaced by structural funds. However, in theory the structural funds will also one day disappear when all regions of Europe have obtained a minimum economic level.

5,35% of the structural funds are dedicated to the Community Initiatives:

- INTERREG - support for cross border collaborations
- URBAN - support for regeneration projects in urban areas
- LEADER - support for development in rural areas
- EQUAL - for new ways of tackling exclusion, discrimination and inequality in relation to the labour market.

The trans-national and structural funds will be most important for culture and therefore there should be lobbying to make culture more important within these programmes.

DISCUSSION

Mr Kivelä said that there was another difference between the structural and trans-national funds to do with how objectives are set within these programmes:

- Trans-national funds have culture, quality and added European value as criteria
- Structural funds have regional development, job creation and regeneration as criteria

While the breadth of cultural projects supported by the structural funds is exciting there is little visibility for culture. Jordi Pascual wanted cultural projects that won funding from the structural or the trans-national funds to be better identified. He said that visibility of these cultural projects was important and maybe this should be the job of an observatory of culture and/or should be part of an EU portal for culture. He said that monitoring and visibility are needed otherwise culture will never be a driving force.

The group heard of some efforts to identify cultural projects supported by the structural funds such as EUCLID's proposed Culture Tracker service, and the group were told how difficult it was to secure and update this information.

A number of participants stressed the need to support mobility and cultural exchange, and Jennifer Williams indicated that the Centre for Creative Communities was currently surveying policies that encourage cross-sector collaborations.

PLENARY SESSION 3

EU REGIONAL POLICY: THE PLACE OF CULTURE IN THE STRUCTURAL FUNDS

CHAIR: RITVA MITCHELL, ERICArts, Helsinki

SPEAKERS: COLIN MERCER, Centre for Cultural Policy Research, University of Nottingham / ANDREAS WIESAND, ERICArts, Bonn / CORINA ŞUTEU, ECUMEST, Bucharest

Ritva Mitchell identified the role of this Plenary as being to answer the question ‘What are the implications of structural funding for the cultural sector?’ The Structural Funds can change the way we think about cultural policies and cultural development. The cultural sector is forced to think in another way: Structural Funds normally help some other sectors, such as urban or rural development for example, and culture is often included under some other headings (development, sustainability, tourism, etc.). Culture is actually “disguised” in order to be applicable for funding. That is why the cultural sector must cooperate with other partners / sectors, which previously has not been the case.

Colin Mercer explained that Structural Funds have been used for:

- Incubating cultural industry businesses;
- Providing flexible education and training;
- Providing venture capital funding;
- Establishing cultural/creative industry development services on a partnership process between local and regional authorities, education and training, etc.;
- Encouraging cross-sectoral policy and planning frameworks at local and regional levels linking physical, economic, social and cultural regeneration and development strategies.

Structural Funds have established preconditions for “joined up thinking”, have enabled the consolidation of a level of local and regional decision making and strategic planning, and have enabled us to think and practice cultural policy as an economic policy, an employment policy, a regeneration policy. Therefore, they have helped to integrate a cultural dimension into broader strategic planning frameworks. This has acted as a powerful incentive to cross-sectoral, multidisciplinary, and cross-cutting policy and planning ‘architectures’ at local and regional levels.

Andreas Wiesand wanted to firstly consider a methodological problem: how to measure development? Not only GDP acts as an indicator of successful development but a quality of life in a broader sense. Therefore, the culture and media sectors must gain a more prominent place in the EU Structural Funds. One solution could be to adopt a ‘cultural mainstreaming strategy’. Accession countries should be prepared for the type of planning, fund management and evaluation which is commonly employed in connection with the EU Structural Funds in the present Member States. It is necessary to overcome political opposition to an extension of the Structural Funds programme after 2006, which would also benefit applicant countries.

Corina Şuteu identified the Structural Funds as instruments of development, which are not supposed to be operational. They can be good instruments if we understand the context we live in, and the context should be determined by the cultural sector. The way Structural Funds or PHARE are implemented may prove to be “operationally effective” but there is no evidence yet of their regional impact or of their capacity to create partnerships between civil society and private sector. Generally, a mistrust in regional expertise is also present, which deepens the negative image we already have about east-central European societies compared to the West. There is a lack of knowledge among the wider public about the accession process: this process should be made more understandable for all cultural players, and explained through education, media, and civil society.

DISCUSSION

Pirkko Rainesalo presented the Finnish case of estimated EU support benefiting the cultural sector and concluded that Structural Funds will be even more important for accession countries.

Pavel Černoch wanted to know why east-central European experts are project team leaders since in many cases funds have been misused. The answer from Andreas identified similar cases in the West, also.

WORKSHOP SESSIONS

3A - URBAN CULTURE

CHAIR: PÉTER INKEI, Director, Budapest Observatory / SPEAKER: MARIANNA KAJANTIE, Helsinki Municipality

Marianna Kajantie introduced the focus as exploring the cultural aspects or the role of culture in urban development. Ms Kajantie gave an overview of some projects and activities launched and realised under the patronage, or through the initiative, of Helsinki Municipality. She presented some general data regarding funding, especially distribution of funds from the Municipal budget. She also spoke about projects that were funded through the structural funds (including the Community Initiatives: Urban I and II, Equal). It is obvious that the cultural segment of urban development can be funded from various sources. Ms Kajantie expressed her belief that culture would find its place in structural funds more often in the future.

DISCUSSION

One of the first issues raised was the trend of serious cuts in local budgets and the effect on the preservation of cultural institutions. It was highlighted that cultural institutions had to adapt to the changed context. It seems that few cultural institutions benefit from the structural funds, but they might receive some funding through Culture 2000. In this context the phenomenon of „institutional fatigue” was raised. In addition, the anachronistic typology of cultural institutions dating back to the 19th century requires new forms of policy – the „opened door policy” as mentioned by one of the speakers. Innovative financing schemes, such as structural funds, might help to overcome this situation and provoke the reshaping of cultural institutions.

It is obvious that culture should be a very important segment of urban development, but it is a task of Ministries of Culture and others active in this sector to initiate changes. The EU policy agenda, both at the EU and national level, is about equality, social cohesion or civil society, which all refer to culture as a key element. The cultural sector should realise that it is an integral part of society. It is very often the case that other sectors want to introduce a cultural dimension in order to add value to their projects and priorities.

The lack of policies that would, in a systematic way, address the role of culture in urban development was obvious from examples observed in several countries regarding arts projects in former industrial areas. Very often artists take over some run-down areas and turn them into interesting centers for the arts. The process that follows is that the area, once neglected – and cheap in terms of rental costs – becomes attractive for investors. Consequently there is a rise of rental and other related costs in that area. Eventually artists can no longer afford to stay in those re-born neighborhoods even though they were the ones who initiated the regeneration process. Is there a policy that could address this? It is obvious that a process of urban regeneration has to establish links with relevant sectors and areas of development.

Another important dilemma is the sustainability of the trend of decentralization when local authorities are entrusted with new responsibilities without adequate financial support. The trend of decentralization is not always in line with taxation policies that often remain the exclusive privilege of the central government or state.

Still, at the end of the working group it was highlighted that there is a reason for optimism because five or six years ago culture was not mentioned at all in any of the EU funding programs and the situation today is much better.

3B - CULTURE AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

CHAIR: PIRKKO RAINESALO, Counsellor for Cultural Affairs, Ministry of Education, Finland / SPEAKER: CLAUDE VÉRON, Director, Relais-Culture-Europe, Paris

This workshop aimed to identify problems and opportunities within the structural funds. The definition of culture was considered an area of difficulty when defining cultural led projects within the structural funds. In one country culture would mean one thing and in another it would be something quite different. This is one reason why making a study of cultural projects supported by the structural funds is so difficult – even on the funding application forms culture is disguised under headings such as “local” or “development”.

Claude Véron introduced two European cultural projects that he is personally engaged with and he talked about how these projects had mobilised structural funds under article 6 of the ESF funds. One problem with these funds is that there is a lack of information available about the projects funded. There is also little in the way of follow-up and management of projects funded by the structural funds.

There is no legal basis or document that allows for culture to be considered within the structural funds. However, culture can be funded if it is part of a development project for the region. Some participants called for a new recognition of the arts and cultural sector while others warned that currently culture does not have a profile and therefore arts and cultural projects are being urged to “smuggle” themselves in under other headings to do with development issues.

Claude pointed out that decisions on the criteria for funding for the structural funds are taken at three different territorial levels before the final programme arrives at a grass-roots level. European Union, national and then regional or local levels of administration have their input before cultural organisations can even apply for funding. He suggested that the structural funds should only be administered at a regional level and others felt that, not only should you be able to apply at a regional level, you should be able to apply in your own language.

In France there are 26 regions with many differences in approach. It was interesting however that the French President wrote to the regions and stressed culture as a driving force to be included in the criteria for the allocation of the structural funds at the regional level: the regions were told “not to forget culture”. One participant from the floor suggested that we should ask Commissioner Viviane Reding to write to the presidents of all states urging them to do the same. It was considered that this would be a great stimulus, particularly for regions in the accession countries

The question of monitoring the effects of cultural projects for regional development was raised. We know that cultural projects can attract visitors who in turn provide work and custom for restaurants, hotels and other surrounding businesses. How to monitor this is less clear – it is a problem of long-term measurement.

The Ruffolo Report asks for an EU observatory and it was suggested that one aim might be for this observatory to study the structural funds.

It was suggested that the criteria for these funding calls should be written by people from the sector. It was pointed out that others, for example from small and medium size businesses and the transport sector, had been consulted on writing the criteria and goals of the call. There was a clear recommendation that people from the arts and culture sector need to be at the table when criteria for funding are being written.

It was made clear that the structural funds (apart from the INTERREG Community Initiative) are not for cross-border collaborations – the trans-national funds are for that.

The EU is in a management position by default because it has lots of money. The structural funds are temporary – in theory they will be abolished when regions are all at a relatively even level of GDP and development. Then something will replace the structural funds but we do not know what that will be.

It was suggested that the concept of a European Cultural Policy would be impossible before the structural funds disappear.

3C – CULTURAL TOURISM

CHAIR: ILDIKÓ SZABÓ, Ministry of Cultural Heritage, Budapest / **SPEAKER: FRANCESC BADIA**, Interarts Foundation, Barcelona

Francesc Badia defined the concept of cultural tourism. The notion of cultural tourism developed recently but is widely used in planning within the EU. Compared to mass tourism, cultural tourism represents “elite tourists”. Today’s researchers claim that all tourism is cultural because the motivation for travelling is very difficult to be separated from culture. Almost every traveller has culture as a background motivation.

Cultural tourism is the most rapidly growing type of tourism in the EU, which is also the most important cultural tourism consumer. Some statistics of cultural tourism within the EU were presented which rank this type of tourism very high especially as an economic and social force, for example creating new jobs. Since there is an increase in leisure time and in the general overall level of education, it is realistic to expect the increase in cultural tourism activities.

The question remains: how to support these initiatives? There are those who think that tourism, being an important economic generator, needs no funding at all as it is self-sustainable. Still, cultural tourism needs seed capital for which Structural Funds might be of great importance. The Fifth Framework Programme can be another way of financing cultural tourism projects since it includes key elements for the development of the city, its identity, buildings, quality of life, attractiveness, etc. Culture 2000 is also a fund which supports such projects.

A shift from the SSS (Sun, Sand and Sea) tourism has been made to the big C tourism (Culture), which can have a great role in making Europe Bigger, Better and Beautiful.

DISCUSSION

Ildikó Szabó spoke of a great change in Hungarian tourism policy. Culture is seen to have the potential to attract more support in economic terms, especially from the tourism sector. Special competitions have been organised for museums, in areas of the marketing of world heritage sites, etc. Some 50 million has been spent recently on the cultural tourism sector.

Sonia Greiner (Europa Cantat, Bonn) presented some German examples and said that every euro invested in cultural tourism comes back seven times. There is a lot for the accession countries to discover in this field.

Peter Curman (Swedish Joint Committee for Literary and Artistic Professionals, Stockholm) presented some Swedish cultural

tourism projects underlying their importance in extending the season for tourists. An issue of intimacy arose, since there are events that should not be shared with tourists such as weddings, funerals, baptism, etc.

A certain doubt in the benefits of events such as Cultural Capital was expressed: although they make economic profit and make the city more lively and attractive, cultural workers / artists are often disappointed with them because they show artificial and not authentic culture. Often, such events are organised by private enterprise and not the city itself and due to bad planning or ignorance an inappropriate image is shown, which is not the same as that felt by the citizens themselves.

Miklós Marschall believes the wrong image is often promoted for the Central-Eastern European countries – which presents them as too cheap (it is a mixed blessing that erotic films are now made in Budapest and other central and eastern European locations). He also reported on a Hungarian World Heritage Site being in a film that presented Berlin with no acknowledgement that this site was in fact in Hungary. He therefore thinks that cultural tourism is important because many accession countries struggle with the problem of overcoming the misperception that they are simply “cheap countries”.

Carla Bodo warned that careful planning of cultural tourism projects needs to be made in advance. A coordination between supply and demand has to be made.

Kazimierz Krzysztofek said that cultural tourism is sometimes a heritage industry and there is a danger of creating artificial heritage. He asked for EU experiences concerning theme parks – in response, Spain categorised their theme park as another type of tourism, and not cultural.

Paul Kelly stressed the importance of linking grass roots and policies since culture is driven from the grass roots.

Francesc Badia explained that the EU integrated approach consists of:

- shaping a local distinctive image;
- qualified employment;
- production of economic externalities;
- increasing of local culture and education activities.

A need to create an image for accession countries was stressed. It is a long process but is worth taking. Rural tourism was identified as being of great potential since most of a nation’s culture originates from these roots. It was noted that tourism does not consist in selling spaces but selling stories and that therefore there is a need for the animation of cultural heritage places. Museums are not museums any more but places for interpretation.

“I am convinced that the enlarged EU will not be any bigger but rather greater. Cultural diversity on a larger scale means not only a larger number of cultures present on the stage, it means another view based on greater understanding and larger horizons. Let us not ask what benefits we shall gain from the enlarged EU, let us rather state that the EU will no doubt benefit culturally from enlargement.”

Orsolya Kőrösi at the Closing Plenary

PLENARY SESSION 4

CULTURAL CO-OPERATION AND MOBILITY IN AN ENLARGED EUROPE

THIS SESSION WAS ORGANISED INCONJUNCTION WITH CIRCLE (CULTURAL INFORMATION AND RESEARCH CENTRES LIAISON IN EUROPE)

CHAIR: DOROTA ILCZUK, President of Circle, Warsaw

SPEAKERS: ROD FISHER, Director, International Intelligence on Culture, London / ROBERT LACOMBE, Deputy Director, French Institute, Budapest / KAZIMIERZ KRZYSZTOFEK, Professor of Sociology, University of Białystok, Poland

This session aimed to address a number of questions regarding mobility and the exchange of both cultural practitioners and cultural goods in and throughout the European Union and Central and Eastern Europe (CEE).

Dorota Ilczuk introduced the theme with three principal questions: are we ready to collaborate in Europe? do we have the tools to collaborate? and do we have a common language to aid our collaboration?

She pointed out that these points are interesting not just for pre-accession CEE countries but also for fully fledged members of the EU. Two topics dominate discussion in pre-accession countries however and these are 1) how to make legal structures to support exchange and dialogue and 2) how to absorb money in a clearly defined manner. Dorota challenged the audience to look for new initiatives such as an EU lobby for culture. She firmly supported this idea due to the fact that culture has a minimised status in EU discussions today.

The European Union was considered as an important tool for fostering mobility but not the first. We were asked to remember that cultural networks have been operating for many years, exchanging, facilitating mobility and offering cross-cultural dialogue. Therefore as cultural operators we should use the potential of existing cultural and artistic networks to stimulate mobility and support the aim to improve the status of the networks which are, after all, the most obvious meeting points for European artistic practitioners. Furthermore, Dorota reminded us, the networks have been operating for many years and have built a trust and language agreement during this time, the implication being that they are the most prepared for cultural dialogue. Networks, she said, are also full of positive people who are ready and able to culturally co-operate.

Rod Fisher reminded us that there is already a global audience for culture. With the penetration of satellite and cable TV, globalisation has accelerated, eroding geographical barriers and providing cultural exchange. He challenged us that despite concerns about globally marketed cultural goods – these global goods promote a global unity more than any well-meaning political policy. Consumerism he stated, binds us together.

Rod went on to give us a brief European “theatrical” history, in order to demonstrate that many of the concerns we have now are reflected in our past and so we can learn by looking at our history. He pointed out that in 1991 exchange with the west was the only aim coming from CEE Europe but now change is occurring and we gradually see more and more East-East exchanges. This was viewed as very positive and similar to Nordic collaborations or Mediterranean collaborations that strengthen the sub-European area and build common grounds.

The Ruffolo Report calls for an end to the paralysis on culture, and calls for a EU cultural policy. Rod Fisher shared his doubts about the use of this, again drawing on his experience from the past and the 1984 European declaration which was ineffective.

Despite a 1999 resolution on mobility, Rod Fisher pointed out that there are still enormous problems with regards to issues such as tax arrangements, job information, salary differences, social protection etc. Moreover Rod Fisher said that there was a lack of investment in people with ideas and called for a ‘risk fund’ – which would be used to invest in people with new ideas. Rod said also that the lack of value that is currently placed on networking is having a detrimental effect on mobility in Europe. Rod concluded that if we understand that integration is an on-going project then we can understand the importance of cultural mobility.

Robert Lacombe spoke about mobility as witnessed and promoted from a foreign institute, in his case the French Institute, Budapest. He pointed out that EU co-operation was not the objective of foreign institutes, however he felt that through his work he could give a perspective as an outsider working in CEE. He felt that CEE countries considered

themselves and are considered by others to be the other half of Europe. There is a strong sense that Europe is cut in two and that there are two identities. However, he asked us to move away from this idea. After all, cultural co-operation does not start with the EU. There are many cultural organisations and networks that have existed much longer than the EU. There should be a renovation of the cultural networks that have been active for many years.

In addition to EU cultural exchange, there is state support for cultural co-operation and dialogue, albeit alongside the underlying political objectives of this type of exchange. In order to support more mobility, he questioned what the impact of all these mobility programmes are, particularly when artists return home? He then went on to discuss practical problems hindering mobility such as the seven year freeze on labour movement imposed by Austria and Germany which might restrict also the movement of artists. Finally, he identified cultural tourism as a new area that fosters exchange and dialogue and asked for help in identifying attractive programmes and exploiting existing systems and resources.

Kazimierz Krzysztofek, provided a philosophical discourse upon the role of culture. The role of culture will increase when symbolic differences are taken away – they will be replaced by culture in an anthropological and sociological context. The multi-cultural face of culture will change because of pressures to support multi-culturalism. Cultural policy in this last century has moved in two directions:

1. Culture as a nation state building tool – used to give high arts prestige.
2. Culture as used to provide a European education to the masses

This second strand of cultural policy is no longer legitimate. Intellectuals are no longer in touch with what the masses want. We can no longer impose but must respond to the wishes of the masses.

Kazimierz took issue with the idea that the internet is the new tool of globalisation. It is a clearly universal tool but one which is more and more nationalised – using a variety of languages and letters. He even cited the advantages of the internet – saying that he could search for information related to Slovak culture much more easily in Slovak than in English. He rather saw the internet as a good tool for smaller countries. He went on to ask what levels of democratisation would inter-active TV bring? He concluded by asking if CEE have an opportunity for cultural communication? He asked if CEE countries needed a European sub space or whether it was sufficient to be merged into the western Europe.

DISCUSSION

Andreas Wiesand pointed out that there is more cultural mainstreaming for culture and development. He added that funds for solidarity should not be one-way streets. He used the Nordic countries as a good example of a European sub-space for cultural collaboration, whereby Nordic countries collaborate extensively for common cultural programmes and are successful.

Miklós Marschall noted that small CEE regions used to co-operate and he hoped that this would start again.

Kirill Razlogov suggested that Europe is much more culturally divided North-South than East-West. He pointed out that we already have a number of cultural policies at many levels from EU, nation state, region, city and arts sector. What is important is that we must convey our messages clearly to national and European funding bodies. To do that, we need to be sure about the results of mobility.

Another participant noted that in terms of an enlarged Europe, there are now increased possibilities for CEE countries to participate in exchange and dialogue but do they consider themselves equal enough to join in the debates and dialogue? The analogy used was that CEE countries are rather like friends invited to join others at the cinema but then, they sleep through the film and are not able to take part in the conversation and debate after the film. CEE countries were therefore asked to consider that they are equal partners in the debate and dialogue for the future Europe.

“Quindi quello che accade con l’integrazione europea è per l’Ungheria un ritorno della sua storia e nella logica della sua storia dentro l’Europa. Ma deve essere un ritorno con un paracadute che sia di impedire l’accaduta della sua civiltà per identificarsi con un’immagine che sia identica a quella di altre grandi città europee...”

Vittorio Sgarbi at the Closing Plenary

WORKSHOP SESSIONS

4A – STATE ADMINISTRATIONS AND INTER-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

CHAIR: **VESNA ČOPIČ**, Deputy State Secretary, Ministry of Culture, Ljubljana / SPEAKER: **COSTIS DALLAS**, Professor, Panteion University, Athens

At the beginning of the workshop, Ms. Čopič expressed her concern that this type of gatherings almost never tackled the governments and administrations, both national and international, who are very important players and whose role should be systematically analyzed.

In his introductory speech Mr. Dallas raised many questions relevant to the issue of cultural cooperation and mobility in an enlarged Europe, in particular related to the role of the state administrations and inter-governmental organizations. He started with the notion of culture and cultural cooperation and the dilemma of whether co-operation should focus on building common cultural policies. How will relationships between the EU countries and countries outside the enlargement process evolve? Is it possible to define mobility in European, rather than international, terms? Ministries of culture are different in scope outside the core domain of cultural heritage and creativity, which represents another challenge for the predicted effect of EU cultural policy instruments and practice. It is necessary to analyze if state administrations are changing adequately and to explore the role of international and inter-governmental organizations in this process.

Building on an „active” understanding of subsidiarity, the question remains whether EU member states can develop stronger mechanisms of information exchange and co-operation that bridge the national and EU level. It is however important to keep in mind all stakeholders (NGOs, national cultural institutions, cultural networks and organizations, cultural workers, artists, writers as well as cultural industries) and observe the role of intergovernmental organizations relevant for them. It is crucial to integrate cultural policies with social or media policies, to face the challenge of privatization and the EU's concept of regions related to processes of decentralization. It is important to support the expansion of multilateral bridges beyond the European Union. Special attention should be focused on the role of the Council of Europe. If an EU cultural policy becomes a reality, would that render inter-governmental organizations such as the Council of Europe redundant, at least partially? Issues of cultural rights, cultural equity and cultural diversity should be put in the center of all debates.

DISCUSSION

In the discussion that followed participants reacted to the questions raised in the introduction. Reforming of European governments is one of the key issues. Everybody has to change. We should no longer talk about policies, but rather about the role of governance (governments on all levels) as well as the private and the third sectors. In many countries there has been a shift of emphasis and ministries of culture do not allocate funds any more but rather focus on the development of strategies. This is a radical change of the role of the ministries of culture, and operators trained to administer funds now have to become intellectuals, policy planners and negotiators.

EU policies are also promoting this transversal thinking. Even though in many countries ministries still have the traditional role as principal funding bodies, they are facing many challenges related to policy planning and the development of strategies. As culture is not regarded as an EU priority it is in a way marginalised. A direct consequence of this lack of priority given to culture is the lack of technical assistance – although this is much needed, particularly in accession countries. One effort to overcome this situation was the focus of an application to the PHARE program. In Romania, for example, the Ministry of Culture received funds for institutional building and developing strategies for drafting new cultural policies.

4B – CULTURAL INDUSTRIES

CHAIR: **DELIA MUCICA**, Media Division, Ministry of Culture, Bucharest / SPEAKER: **JORDI PASCUAL I RUIZ**, Institute of Culture, Barcelona City Council

Starting with the title of this working group, Delia Mucica expressed her dissatisfaction, saying that “cultural industries” is a somewhat old-fashioned term focused on traditional artistic industries. A new term was proposed: creative industries, which incorporates creative efforts including the software industry, advertising, audio-visual and new media content. Another separation is felt when dividing these two terms: cultural industries are those which need subsidies, tax relief, fiscal and financial incentives in order to survive, while creative industries (software, new media, advertising) do very well without any of these. These separations also lead us to another one: high culture vs. mass culture.

All those industries operate in a legal environment. On one hand, there is specific, sectoral or the so called vertical legislation. These are the international legally binding instruments (copyright, tax legislation, labour legislation, etc.), which

have to be incorporated into national legislation. On the other hand there is general or transversal legislation (competition, fiscality – VAT) all related to a free international market. The greatest problem seems to be enforcing the existing legislation. The role of the state is to formulate policies, adopt and enforce legislation (both vertical and transversal) taking into account the specific problems and needs in each given country, such as linguistic areas of distribution, employment problems, financial and fiscal measures, incentives, even special support funds, mobility and cooperation.

When speaking of the three Bs (Bigger, Better, Beautiful), special attention needs to be drawn to the issue of mobility in an enlarged Europe. It is both applied to the free movement of goods and services but also to the free movement of cultural actors. A legal environment is needed allowing for the free movement of creators, covering the regulating of labour conditions, trade unions, social protection, taxation (avoidance of double taxation), etc.

Jordi Pascual outlined the situation at the local level. Creative industries include TV, radio, newspapers, but also designers, tourism related business, shops, even food. The borders of the arts become smoother: for example, there are techno music experts or net artists today. There is a need for an inter-sectoral approach: the creative industries sector needs to include education and training measures, labour and funding measures, policy measures, etc. It should cooperate with partners making links to other sectors, and vice versa – all these need to increase their technological knowledge. The key actors in this process are the SMEs within the cultural system.

Local authorities have to provide universal services, they are responsible for creating a creative milieu and should link culture with other sectors such as welfare, housing, transportation, etc. Their responsibility consists in creating an image of the city.

The discussion opened with the issue of partnerships to be made stronger between cities. Via twinning of the cities, a lot could be learned from others' experience, especially on the subject of mobility. Still, Jordi doesn't believe in twinings but in networks.

DISCUSSION

Jolyon Laycock stressed the need for sustainable projects. Jordi Pascual believes that there is no doubt that sustainability is important but it is very difficult to talk about sustainability in the sector of cultural industries. This sector is extremely dynamic, a new age is coming and certain projects are unlikely to exist more than three years or so because of the changing technologies, etc. Such projects should find their own way in the market after three or so years of support.

Paul Kelly stressed the problem of the cultural industries in east-central European countries now that the markets have been privatised. Cultural industries were state owned in CEE countries and now it is all privatised; completely new private enterprises have emerged, – for example, publishing houses appear and disappear as a consequence of the free market. He asked for practical programmes to be highlighted that can help develop sustainable local creative industries. It was very difficult to identify concrete projects, but a few examples in Barcelona were given, stressing the good practice of involving community in culture, which served as a creative activity and was felt as a way of life.

Jon Price stressed the need for public-private partnerships. He gave an example of an organization which operates on this basis helping people to develop their skills they are lacking.

Kazimierz Krzysztofek explained the logic which occurs in the east-central European countries: all that has been state owned must be privatised, it is a question of mentality, although it doesn't necessarily have to be good. Another issue which is detrimental for sustainable cultural development is that social partnerships often don't work.

Colin Mercer outlined the dichotomy between the public and private sectors since privatization has occurred: cultural consumption is in private sector, content of a library / opera / theatre is a product of a private sector. National economies became myths.

Michael O'Donnell talked about the world wide web, which will become a very vast market in near future, freed from PCs. Limitless possibilities open up there for the sector of cultural industries. Delia Mucica recognised his statement but also expressed her concern because there are some negative aspects of it – for example, threats to the protection of works published on the Internet (copyright, intellectual property).

Peter Miladinov expressed his concern for the preservation of cultural industries when part of the business world. How could they be used without losing their cultural value?

Paul Kelly does not put too much faith in the Internet since a lot of stuff presented there is only a reproduction of old material. New content should be encouraged on the Internet. This is why the public sector likes it, as it is an excellent source of information, and the private sector doesn't consider it as a threat.

4C – THIRD SECTOR ORGANISATIONS AND CIVIL SOCIETY

CHAIR: **LIDIA VARBANOVA** Open Society Institute, Budapest / SPEAKER: **UGO BACCHELLA**, President, Fitzcarraldo Foundation, Torino

Lidia Varbanova gave a brief introduction to definitions of the “third sector” and to the principle differences between:

1. Associations, networks, clubs etc. – which are based on links between people
2. Foundations – which can be a source of funding and produce project led activities.

Lidia pointed out that in most CEE countries there has been an explosion of third sector activities. Before 1992 people formed in groups to actively organise things but 1992–1996 saw the real emergence of non-governmental organisations (NGOs). In Bulgaria there are around 6,000 registered NGOs and in Hungary 30,000. She points out that there are many more civil initiatives that are not registered legally.

Lidia raised a number of issues for discussion including:

- Money for and from the 3rd sector
- What will happen with infrastructures and capacity building (differences).
- People – what competencies and training do they need, mobility, volunteers
- Legislation
- Lobbying and decision-making
- Programming and audiences – what are the products? Who are we delivering them to?

Ugo Bacchella then gave a short introduction to his foundation – which is an independent foundation with long-term partnerships with funding bodies. He said that the arts and cultural sector had failed as a sector. The arts and culture has a social dimension and therefore the arts and culture is part of civil society (what he termed as the domain between family and state led or commercial activities). He said that it is within this space that most arts and cultural organisations are to be found.

Ugo believed that it was wrong to pressure for recognition of an arts and culture sector. He felt it is time to change our strategy and invest our time in building partnerships across the third sector. He felt that it would be much more impressive for the arts and culture to work across a broad spectrum of civil society concerns. He felt that we should join together and demand recognition as a whole sector – the third sector. This he said would be much more beneficial – no longer an arts network asking for money but a partnership of civil society organisations. Ugo gave examples of success stories using this strategy: where 12 representatives from associations lobbied and changed a decision to cut funding to a festival. Those 12 people represented over 130 associations.

All arts organisations fulfil public goals and all:

- have low assets
- don't match traditional lines of funding
- are fragile
- not interested in the competencies of territorial – social issues

He proclaimed that there would be great benefits from new spaces and scope for building partnerships.

He tried to answer the question of why a foundation model was a good one. He told us that there are more than 2,000,000 foundations in the EU, with political long-term policies. Ugo suggested that a number of measures were necessary to improve the arts and mobility including:

- “risk funds”
- “pilot project to test policies”
- “structural long term tools for long term strategies”
- “collaborations”
- “monitoring, evaluation”

He lamented the lack of communication between the arts and cultural non-profit organisations and other civil society initiatives. He called for fewer meetings between arts and cultural organisations and more dialogue with other areas of civil society.

Mik Flood intervened that he felt there was a problem of definition – who do we align ourselves with, he asked. The public? Clarification is needed. He also called into question whether Italian laws made the foundation model so attractive and that he wanted to be clear that there are two different types of foundation – those that provide money and those that are project orientated. It was agreed that the “lack of co-operation” was depressing and we heard a call for a lobby for culture which would represent networks and civil society.

Krassimira Teneva raised the point that special funds are needed for cultural production in CEE as arts organisations can't be expected to co-operate with their EU partners if they are not sustainable for the duration of the project.

It was suggested that European NGOs not EU institutions should manage EU funds.

It was agreed that it would be a very pragmatic aim to support NGOs. It was pointed out that EFAH was already doing this type of work, both lobbying and trying to find a dialogue with NGOs. However we were told that many networks also had a

difficult choice between co-operation and competition for limited resources. If networks or NGOs are applying for the same funds then there can be rivalry instead of co-operation.

Roger Fox pointed out that not all cultural organisations could be part of civil society. In fact many are immune to the idea of civil society and social change, particularly larger arts organisations.

A number of participants expressed frustration at so much talk and so little action amongst us. It was felt that a practical solution is needed. The EU is not interested in enlargement from a cultural standpoint – in fact many states are trying to prevent money sliding from west to east – so it is up to the NGOs to make bi-lateral and multi-lateral co-operation.

One practical goal for lobbying would be support for translation – which is needed if connections are to happen. To build co-operation an organisation only needs an e-mail and a foreign speaking staff member but this must be sustainable, as without the foreign speaking staff member the co-operation is lost. It was decided that it is time for the EU to take a stand on language learning.

It was pointed out that most funding agencies for arts and culture do not fund the administration and office costs of an organisation and this makes life increasingly difficult for cultural operators.

Also, EU grants often arrive much later than when the project is due to start. Bridging loans are needed to cover the period between the contract starting and the money becoming available. Lidia pointed out that this is a new initiative of the Soros Foundation in Bulgaria where the legal system allows this type of action. These operate as a business loan but with low interest rates.

We were warned that the criteria for culture 2005 were being discussed now and so we must act if we are to influence our ministers. We were all asked to take the recommendations from the conference home and start to lobby our own ministers and EU representatives.

“This conference on the impact of European enlargement on culture has bigger, better and beautiful in its title. And it could be bigger Europe, better Europe, beautiful Europe. But also it could be bigger expectations, better cultural environment and beautiful cultural life.”

Naima Balić at the Closing Plenary

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The following is not a formal declaration from the overall conference, but rather a summary of key recommendations that emerged from the discussions in various sessions, where support was evident from the majority of the participants.

1. There needs to be an EU vision for culture which encompasses:
 - A statement of strategic objectives,
 - A programme to support mobility,
 - A programme to support research and development,
 - Targeted production funding for accession countries,
 - An ending to Commission conceived “emblematic” cultural projects.
2. If the EU believes language diversity to be important, then translation programmes are crucial and should be funded.
3. The cultural sector should lobby a matrix of policy-makers, not just those from the cultural sector.
4. The cultural sector should also pay attention to basic issues such as labour conditions, particularly in the CEE countries (noting that a practical solution would be a fund to top up wages/salaries in CEE countries).
5. Regarding Culture 2000:
 - A possible feasibility phase should be explored,
 - More needs to be done about delays in contracting and making payment,
 - The first payment should be more than 50% given the lengthy delay that exists in receiving the final payment,
 - The deadlines should be set earlier so that projects for the year in question can begin at the beginning of that year,
 - A special mobility fund should be part of the programme,
 - The program should target “not yet candidate” countries as well,
 - In order to respond to cultural initiatives, enthusiasm is needed on both sides, and this is not the case when one is faced with administrators.
6. The cultural sector must start lobbying now to influence the objectives and criteria for the successor to the Culture 2000 programme.
7. The culture and media sectors must gain a more prominent place in the EU Structural Funds. Accession countries should be prepared for the type of planning, fund management and evaluation which is commonly employed in connection with the EU Structural Funds in the present Member States.
8. Cultural projects funded from the structural or the trans-national funds need to be better identified and promoted.
9. Commissioner Viviane Reding should write to the heads of state of all Member States and the accession countries urging them to write to those responsible at the regional level for allocating the Structural Funds to note the importance of the cultural sector.
10. There should be a 'risk fund' - which would be used to invest in people with new ideas.
11. Practical programmes that can help develop sustainable local creative industries should be highlighted.
12. Follow-up to this event was essential, and a further conference in 2003 should be seriously investigated.

Delegates were asked to take these recommendations, as appropriate, away with them and use them as the basis for lobbying their national and European representatives.

BRAVE NEW EUROPE?

CONCLUDING SPEECH: ERHARD BUSEK, Special Co-ordinator of the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe AT THE FINAL SESSION

Thinking of Europe and enlargement of the EU and thinking of culture - perhaps not a concluding speech. This work is continuous and thus it is not possible to step aside and simply say we are not satisfied. Speaking in this building and in this city, I can say sometimes we are not aware of the opportunities we are living through. There is Euroscepticism, sometimes mentioned as Euro-fatigue, that this is a complicated process, as well as a tiring one, and how horrible are the problems and how difficult it is for Europe to enlarge and so on.

As a neighbouring Austrian - and one who is old enough to remember - I am well aware that it was a completely different situation not so long ago. Thinking back to 1989, nobody would have thought then that we would be able to undertake this conference here under the auspices of European enlargement and focusing on what is going on in culture, in the globalisation process and so on.

I think we all know these facts, but at the same time sometimes it is necessary to remember the window of opportunities in which we are living. It is quite a change from '89, when I personally brought a printing machine to Gabor Demszky, who is now the mayor of Budapest, for him to print the samizdat - for him to have the possibility to print literature, which was forbidden. To articulate the words of those who were dissidents in this time.

I also remember my old friend Antall József, who organised a conference in Esztergom, the second conference of Magyar Demokrata Fórum (the then governing political party), concerning the water power plant of Gabčíkovo-Dunakiliti - and concerning its sustainability, which was a "cultural challenge", and in fact a political one also.

Lot of things have changed since.

We have to learn by our pessimism - not that any is present in this conference - but pessimism in general - that it is possible to change things in a positive way for a better common future. The title of the conference includes the word "better" - and it is better now in Europe. Not good, but already better. Development is possible - and possible in the right direction.

I think therefore we should be happy to be here and to have the possibility to discuss everything that is one the agenda for this conference. I want to focus on three questions or problems of development:

First, I would like to follow up an expression used by André Malraux, who said that we are living in a "musée d'imaginaire" - I think that's the right expression for Europe. Everything that is happening in Europe - be it history, culture or anything else - is happening side by side. If we look across Europe, we can see how rich it is, but also how problematic some things are at the same time.

I confess that the division of East-West does still exist. Not a division by the iron curtain but by the Schengen -border arrangements, and by the difficulty of an open understanding of the situation of others. I can give you one example - the re-learning of geography. As I told you I am Viennese - and still my fellow citizen would, if you asked the question: "which direction are you going if you are going from Vienna to Prague?", would reply: "to the east". But look at the map - it is in fact north west.

It's a primitive example, but it is a connotation of the inner feeling which still exists. The expression of "Eastern enlargement" is wrong, because we would thus need to presume a centre for Europe. I have to confess that the expression "East" is to many a pejorative expression. "He is coming out of the East". A Westerner may say this, but it would be wrong to do so.

We therefore have to face the fact that old dividing lines still exist. I always remember president Ronald Reagan once explaining how the world is. He said: "On one side in the West are the good guys, and on the other side in the East are the bad guys". And he added: "the evil empire".

I understand that such explanations are very cosy for politics. Because you can say that you are on the good side, and those guys on the bad side. Such views are still around.

Nowadays, we have the so-called clash of civilizations - perhaps because it is so easy to "explain" that there's the Catholic world, there's the Protestant world, there's the Orthodox world, there's the Islamic world and so on. The reality is - it is a real mixture. For example, thinking of our Greek friends within the EU, obviously their cultural influences are very much from the Orthodox church and from Orthodox thinking, and yet they are certainly part of Europe.

It is unnecessary to keep these dividing lines, because we have to be aware that today many of our citizens are a mixture of different cultures with various roots and they all have to face the challenge of living together.

After September 11, for a short time - I'm glad only for a short time - it was normal to speak about the conflict between "crusaders" and Jihad. It's easy to explain. In everyday life tensions are in fact higher between poor and rich than between religious symbols and groups. But religion is sometimes used as an excuse for arguments. I realise we have a broader problem in general on this subject, which I don't want to touch upon here.

Other dividing lines are created by history. We mustn't forget this because, for example, as far as south-east Europe is concerned, we have a special responsibility. If you are looking through the history textbooks of the countries in the region - it's a nightmare. There is

continuous talk about Greater Serbia, and Greater Albania, and greater this, and greater that. If you are coming from a country which suffered the consequences of being part of the "greater Germany", you know it's wrong. It is most definitely wrong.

The answer is: let's work on culture. That gives us a better understanding of history. It makes no sense to push history aside, which is sometimes done.

But how do we understand history? It is wrong to have the arrogant approach of: "oh leave them alone, they have lots of problems". We have to assist to develop mutual understanding, to understand issues such as the rights of minorities and ethnic cleansing.

I, as an Austrian, can say we are responsible for many Serbs living in Krajina, Croatia. They were brought out during the second siege of Vienna, when the Hapsburg army took the Serbs to Krajina. My fellow citizens are not aware of this fact. What's more the orthodox Serbian churches of Szentendre are also connected to this action.

This is not to say that we should be living in a museum. No, we live in a vivid present – which we have to live in a vivid way. This is the "musée d'imaginaire" on one side. But how we have to handle the objects?

How to understand them is of a bigger importance.

The other side in the "musée imaginaire" is the question of language. Don't misunderstand me, we can handle our problems via interpreters and translators quite well. The problem is rather how we understand the content of each other's languages. There's a very good saying – albeit a cynical one – by the writer Krauss, from around the first world war: "Austrian and Germans are speaking the same language. And that's the difference." This is very much my point. Not to blame each other, but to try and understand each other's language.

The Old Testament mentions the Tower of Babel – and this is our world today. But the answer is in the New Testament: we are waiting for Jesus Christ, and the spirit arrives and as a result everyone is able understand the other in his language.

Here you can see the importance of language: we have to have an empathy to understand each other and this means a great cultural fact in itself, which is definitely needed.

Another point aside from the "musée d'imaginaire": a lot of discussion was going on after 1989 about the "finalité d'Europe". We should be able to focus, not only on the enlargement process and on the pre-accession countries – but on the other parts of Europe too.

We have to look at the neighbouring problems, to be able to decide how to take the next steps, and to see what is necessary in order to develop understanding. And this may hurt some countries. I'm very glad that Bulgaria and Slovenia are candidates, and I think it's not right that Croatia is not a candidate. Some issues are connected with problems which we haven't solved.

Some of the problems concerning the integration of Europe can occur as a result of migration, or from globalisation, causing misunderstandings – and people ask "just who is that person wearing a chador?". These are European problems, not only in a political sense but also in a cultural sense.

This is actually a question of dealing with globalisation. Signor Sgarbi mentioned McDonald's as a type of international "civilization". But the question is not how we should oppose this, but how we are dealing with this, and living with this. McDonald's can also represent the expression of what is the lowest common denominator, indicating, for example, that we may need to take a new look at cooking. But we shouldn't blame the Americans for creating McDonald's, but rather we ourselves should be taking steps in the right direction to address such challenges.

So, what is our contribution to Europe? At the national level, at the level of minority groups – this is the question of the impact of European enlargement on culture. How a diverse culture can contribute towards the goal of developing this common Europe?

If I would have the opportunity of starting again the integration process from scratch, perhaps it would be more efficient if it was started by cultural integration. The unification of Europe and the integration of culture together. But I'm not blaming the politicians. This process can best be done by writers and actors. Governments can't say: "now we are integrating culture." If governments did that, I would fear for the outcome of the process. These are broader issues, linked to what we are doing now. There is the question of the heritage of civilisations. Concerning enlargement we have to admit that the contribution of the accession countries will be a big one. First, at the moment, there is no Slavic language in the current EU. Second we have to admit, there's no example of a smaller language, such as Hungarian. How we are handling this? How we are handling the smaller countries?

I learned from an experience recently when I referred to the Baltic States – but they want to be referred as Estonians, Lithuanians, Latvians. It's understandable. They have been fighting for their own independence for a long time and this has to be understood and accepted.

After the first and second point of talking about the musee imaginaire and the finalite of Europe I want to touch on a third question: what is Europe?

We have very good economic development through EMU, which is a great step forward. But in the U.S. the EU is summoned up in one sentence: "The European Union is a global payer, but not a global player."

That's true. And you can't blame the Americans for it. It's our problem to develop the political instruments to be able to act. This is not a cultural question, but it is a bit connected with what Europe is. Are we able in the development process to overcome old imaginations concerning the nation state? It is quite necessary to do so. What is European responsibility, what is the nation state responsibility? What is the responsibility of the region? And it's very much connected with culture. Because when the European integration process was started, culture, education and science were not part of responsibility of Europe. This exclusion was perhaps understandable for the five,

nine and now the 15 member countries. But a broader Europe – encompassing global development, and a common European development – it is necessary to have “competence” at this level.

The articles 126–127–128 in the Maastricht Treaty and the further articles 139 through 151 in the Amsterdam Treaty indicate competence through subsidiarity. What we need for European culture, European science and European education, is common responsibility. This is not destroying national responsibility. Certainly not. There’s a lot to do.

To give you an example in culture: the EU has decided that TV stations of the EU member countries should be showing a maximum of 50% of non-European movies. That’s very well. But the question is about the European movies, the other 50% – what are these like? Are we really promoting them a broad sense, or are we limiting them by ourselves?

It has to be done not only by the government – they provide the framework – but it also has to be done by us – writers, artists, performers – and by the creation of a European public.

What we need is the possibility of European discussion as you are doing here. Because it is necessary to learn the acceptance of variety and to learn the avoidance of uniformity. We have to do it for ourselves and by ourselves. Therefore you may understand that it is a continuous exercise and a conclusion is never possible.

Thank you very much.

“Mobility is important, but not in the potentially narrow sense of exchange, the exchange of students or of artists, but as a way of promoting a curiosity of culture, of diversity.

We really have missed one partner from our discussions: the representatives from the European Union. Well, if the mountain won’t come to Mohammed, then we must approach them and convey our message; use the charisma from these meetings when you go home and spread the news and convince the decision makers.”

Péter Inkei at the Closing Plenary

BIOGRAPHICAL DETAILS OF SPEAKERS AND PRESENTERS

BAÁN, László — Born in 1961 in Budapest. Graduated from Karl Marx University of Economics (MKKE) in 1985, then received a master's in philosophy from Lóránd Eötvös University (ELTE) in 1986. In 1988 he earned a doctor's degree (MKKE). Between 1986 and 1989 he held an academic scholarship (MTA, political science).

1998–2002: first deputy, then administrative state secretary at the Ministry of Cultural Heritage. The administrative state secretary manages the official apparatus of the ministry, under the guidance of the minister, in accordance with the legal acts and professional requirements.

BACCHELLA, Ugo — Founder and President of Fitzcarraldo Foundation, an international independent centre for research, training, planning, and documentation on cultural, arts and media management, economics and policies.

Got his Bachelor degree in Historical and Social Sciences at the University of Turin in 1977. Works as Director of Training Programmes in cultural management in Turin since 1993 and he was the Partner of Fitzcarraldo Consulting srl, (formerly Chief executive and manager, 1986–1999). Mr. Bacchella is an Expert in cultural policies for the Council of Europe and Board member of ERICArts (European Research Institute for cultural Affairs and Arts) as well.

BADIA, Francesc — Born in Mexico D.F. in 1960. He graduated in Socio-Linguistics and Semiotics at the University of California at Berkeley and started his carrier at a Publishing house called Umbra Editora in Bcelona, Spain. Between 1986–1991 worked for Hungarotex Espanola S.A., a foreign trade company as a co-director. Mr. Badia founded and co-directed the Badia Trading SCP and Frisch Trading Co. Ltd. Later in 1998 he was area manager and political advisor at the Economical and Sociological Research Bureau in Barcelona. Finally he become the general manager Interarts Foundation for International Cultural Cooperation. At the same time he has been leading different studies like "Reaarch Project on Urban Cultural Indicators" (EUROFACTUS), "Cultural Development and Connected Intelligence" for UNESCO etc.

BALIĆ, Naima — All the schooling (Lyceum, Music School, Faculty of Philosophy, M.A.) she finished in Zagreb. After her university diploma she studied in Germany, Great Britain, France, and was Fulbright lecturer in USA. Ms. Balic has 17 years active teaching experience at the School of Applied Art in Zagreb.

She is also an Executive Board member of Jeunesses Musicales Europe and president of Jeunesses Musicales Croatia and she is a member of the National Council for Education on Human Rights the Cultural Committee of the Council of Europe. From 2001 she is a vice-chair of Committee for Culture of the Council for Cultural Cooperation of Council of Europe and she takes part in the work of Steering Committee of CIVITAS as well as member of European Movement Croatia, Société Européenne de culture (S.E.C.)

At the moment she has a position of vice minister in the Ministry of Culture responsible for international cooperation.

BOLTHO, Vera — Born in Rome, was educated in Germany and Italy (Humanities), USA (Social Sciences), Norway and France (Public Health).

In her capacity of Head of the Cultural Policy and Action Department of the Council of Europe, Strasbourg, France, Vera Boltho has overall responsibility for the audits of national cultural policies undertaken throughout Europe, particularly in central and eastern European countries. In previous positions Vera Boltho has been concerned with public policies in the areas of education, higher education, health and social issues. Ms Boltho is regularly invited to be chairperson, general rapporteur, speaker and special guest lecturer at conferences, seminars, university courses and other events; and author of numerous articles.

BOULIN-GHICA, Irina — She has been trained at the National School of Administration (ENA, 1992–1994). She is holder of CAPES (competitive exam for teaching applicants) and Master's degree in English (Paris-Sorbonne, 1980). She has earned B.A in English, Spanish and Art History (University of Paris-Sorbonne, 1979).

In the years 1981–1990 she worked as a journalist, first at BBC World Service in London, then at Reuter's News Agency.

Since January 2001 she has been nominated Head of European and International Bureau, Directorate for Media Development (Prime Minister's Office). Previously she worked at the City of Paris first at the Department for Cultural Affairs (in charge of the Budget), then the Department for International relations.

BROWN, Geoffrey — Born in 1952, completed General Management Course for Senior Arts Executives, Sydney (1980), Drama Fellowship, University of Sydney (1977), BA (Drama & Theatre Studies), University of New South Wales (1974).

He founded EUCLID on 1 April 1993 and has been its Director since. EUCLID hosts a web-site (www.euclid.co.uk) with extensive international cultural information, and produces a number of e-mail and printed newsletters and bulletins, covering international cultural research, European funding opportunities, and other key topics. EUCLID also organised a major European conference on "Creativity, Culture and Employment" (London, May 1998) as part of the UK Presidency of the European Union.

BUSEK, Erhard — Born in 1941, Vienna, Austria. He is the Chairman of the Institute for the Danube Region and Central Europe (IDM) and Special Co-ordinator of the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe.

Dr. Busek was General Secretary at the Austrian Federal of Trade and Commerce (1972-1976) later he became the Chairman of Austrian People's Party. From 1978-1987 he was Deputy Major and City Councillor at the City of Vienna. His carrier was continued at the Ministry for Science and Research and at the Ministry for Education. At the same time Mr. Busek was the Vice Chancellor of Republic of Austria and, from 1991, the Chairman of Austrian People's Party. In 2000 and 2001 Mr. Busek was Special Representative of the Austrian Government for the Enlargement of the EU. He has also been taking part in the activity of Southeast European Cooperative Initiative (SECI).

Dr. Busek studied at the University of Vienna at the Faculty of Law.

CARAMITRU, Ion — Born in Bucharest in 1942; is married, has three children. He graduated in "Ion Luca Caragiale" Theatre and Film Institute, Bucharest in 1964.

As a theatre actor his debut was in 1964 at the National Theatre, in Bucharest. Was actor and director at "Lucia Sturdza Bulandra" Theatre in Bucharest (1965-1993). In 1975, 1979, 1981, 1985 received Prizes for theatre interpretation in Romania.

Since 1976 has been Professor of Drama at the Theatre and Film Academy in Bucharest; Founder and President of the UNITER Romania (Union of Theatre Professionals) since 1990.

In his political career, Ion Caramitru was emblematic figure of the Romanian Revolution on 22 December, 1989;

Between December 1996-November 2000 Minister of Culture in the Governments.

ČERNOCH, Pavel — He is currently teaching European integration at the Jean Monnet Centre, Faculty of Social Sciences of Charles University in Prague, Czech Republic. He studied History and Political Science at Erlangen/Nuremberg University and was president of the European students' association AEGEE-Europe in 1993.

He spent the academic year 2000/2001 as a visiting professor at Grinnell College in Iowa/USA.

In 2001/2002 he is a policy fellow of the Open Society Institute, working on a research paper about the relations of the European Union with South-East Europe and the Black Sea Region. His wide range of interests revolve around languages, cultures and history, he is particularly focused on the future of the European Union and the role of Europe in the world in general.

Pavel grew up both in Germany and the Czech Republic, has traveled extensively.

CLOSS, Wolfgang — Born in 1949 in Perl/Sehndorf, Germany. Graduated in Law from the University of Saarland. Holder of VWA Diploma - Graduate of the Academy for Business and Administration (VWA), Rhineland-Palatinate.

Between 1972-1991 he held a variety of high-level public service positions in the Ministry of Home Affairs and Ministry of the Environment of the Government of the Saarland.

Until August 2000 (from 1994) he worked as General Manager of the Institute of European Media Law (EMR) Saarbrücken/Brussels/Berne as well as member of various national and international committees of experts in the Media field. Since September 2000 he has been Executive Director of the European Audiovisual Observatory, Strasbourg.

ČOPIČ, Vesna — graduated at the Faculty of Law at the University of Ljubljana. In the 90's she prepared the legislation in the sphere of culture for the Ministry of Culture. In 1995 she participated in an international group of experts of the Council of Europe evaluating the culture policy of Italy and in 1999 she was engaged as the legal expert in the Thematic study on “*Desetatisation and Privatisation of National Cultural Institutions in Transition*”.

She participates as an expert in the MOSAIC program of Council of Europe and in the program of ECF Towards New Cultural Policies. She publishes in the scientific journal at home and abroad. She is also an assistant lecturing cultural policy and cultural management in the Faculty of Social Sciences at the University in Ljubljana.

CSANÁDI, Andrea — Program Coordinator of the Arts and Culture Network Program at the Open Society Institute Budapest.

Ms. Csanádi earned her Bachelor's Degree in General Economics and Management in 1995 and got a Master Diploma of Political Science and Economics in 1997. She parallelly completed her studies at the Budapest University of Economic and Social Sciences. Between 1998-1999 she was a student of Central European University at the Department of Arts in International Relations and European Studies and got her degree in 1999.

She started her carrier at the M&H Communications Public Relations Consulting Agency, Budapest, Hungary (a member of The European Partnership for Public Communication) as Account Executive.

DALLAS, Costis — Is a Lecturer in Cultural Heritage Management and Advanced Technologies at the Department of Communication, Media and Culture of Panteion University. He is also Chairman and Principal Research Officer of Critical Publics, a group of companies active in the field of strategic communications, creative design and technology.

He has been co-founder and Chair of the Multimedia Working Group of the International Council of Museums (CIDOC/ICOM), Head of Documentation and Systems of the Benaki Museum, General Director of the Foundation of the Hellenic World, Special Secretary of Libraries, Archives and Educational Media in the Greek Ministry of Education, and Special Advisor of the Greek Foreign Minister on cultural affairs. Costis holds MPhil and DPhil degrees from the University of Oxford.

DE VLIEG, Mary Ann — Born in Detroit, Michigan; American, married (to a British citizen). Education: Teacher Training at Western Michigan University; Multicultural/Early Childhood Education at San Francisco City College; Linguistics at University of California, Berkeley; Accounting, Management and Finance at City of London Polytechnic; European Cultural Policy and Administration at University of Warwick; M.A. in European Cultural Policy and Administration.

Since 1994 to date Network Co-ordinator (Secrétaire Générale) of IETM (Informal European Theatre Meeting). In 1993-1994 Founder/Director of Dance Services, Arnolfini, Bristol (England). Former or actual member of Conseil d'administration et Bureau (Trésorier) Fonds Roberto Cimetta, Co-president and Executive Committee member (Trésorier) of EFAH/FEAP (European Forum for the Arts and Heritage), Conseil d'administration of DACOR, Lille (regional cultural development organisation).

DODD, Diane — Co-ordinates and manages the European think-tank, CIRCLE (Cultural Information and Research Centres Liaison in Europe) which she combines with her work as a freelance researcher, editor and consultant in the field of European cultural policy. In addition, she is also the co-ordinator of CPRO (Culture Policy Research Online), the co-ordinator of a network of cultural policy documentation centres called RECAP.

Previously she worked as a consultant for the European League of Institutes of the Arts (ELIA) and the London School of Economics.

From 1995-2000 she was employed by INTERARTS Observatory in Barcelona. Before starting her career as a researcher of cultural policy Diane managed a Community Theatre Company called EnTelechy and performed as well as directed theatre and dance productions.

DRAGOJEVIĆ, Sanjin — Studied philosophy, comparative literature, and computer science at the Faculty of Philosophy, the University of Zagreb, and he graduated in 1986. In period 1987-1993, he has been working at the Institute for Development and International Relations, Zagreb. He has been participating in the Culturelink network. He finished post-graduate study in Information Sciences at the Zagreb University. In 1992 he became the winner of the Pergamon Press Prize in European studies.

Between 1993–1998 he was working on a wide range of projects for the KulturKontakt, Austria and for the Central European University, Prague and for Croatian Ministry of Science and Technology and for Unesco. In the period 1995–1998 he was a Head of Department for Bilateral Cultural Co-operation at the Croatian Ministry of Culture.

At the moment he is lecturer at the Faculty of Political Science in Zagreb, University of Zagreb, teaching subjects Sociology of Mass Communication and Sociology of Culture.

GLASER, Thomas Martin — Born in 1956, has become a counsellor to the European Commission`s Delegation to Hungary.

He started working for the EC Commission in 1975, in the Training Division. From 1993, he was a unit head at the Enlargement Information Office. Between 1990 and 1993, he took part in setting up and running the Information Unit DG XVI. His previous operational post within the Commission, which he took up in 1984, involved editing and writing on trade and development topics for the ACP-EEC Courier. Before that, he worked at the Management and Organization Division. His last private-sector job was in the public affairs department of Esso Petroleum, where he worked from 1974 to 1975. He graduated from the University of Cambridge with a BA in history in 1965. He then obtained an MA in International Relations and Political Sciences from the University of Pennsylvania in 1966.

GUGLIELMO, Rachel — Guglielmo, Rachel is the director of the European Union Accession Monitoring Program at the Open Society Institute in Budapest.

Ms. Guglielmo joined OSI after four years with the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe – first in Bosnia as an elections monitor, and later as a project manager for Central/Eastern Europe and the Balkan with the High Commissioner on National Minorities.

In graduate school at the Fletcher School for Law & Diplomacy in Boston, Ms. Guglielmo focused on international human rights law and security studies, with a particular research interest in Central/Eastern Europe. Prior to graduate school, she lived and worked for three years in Hungary as a US Peace Corps volunteer, including two years as a high-school English teacher in Nagykanizsa and a year helping establish the Gandhi Gimnázium in Pécs.

INKEL, Péter — Born in 1945 in Budapest, is the Director of the Budapest Observatory: Regional Observatory on Financing Culture in East-Central Europe; he is a consultant in cultural policy and serves on the Board of Cultural Information and Research Centres Liaison in Europe (CIRCLE).

Previously, he had held many positions in the civil service, including deputy minister for culture (1996–1998), general director for publishing (Ministry of Culture), and his first job at the National Commission for UNESCO. He has also worked in publishing – actually with Central European University Press.

His original training was English and Spanish at Budapest Eötvös University.

JELINČIĆ, Daniela Angelina — She received M.A. in 2000 in the field of cultural anthropology at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Zagreb. In 1999 completed a course in the summer school 'Lorenzo il Magnifico'. In 1995 she earned B.A. in two major subject studies: cultural anthropology/Italian language and literature at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Zagreb.

She worked and currently works on various projects in the following subject: Position of Croatia in International Communication and Cultural Environment, International Relations of Croatia, Publishing Legislation Online Project-PLOP which was for the Open Society Institute Hungary.

In the year 1997 a member of the editorial board of the Culturelink review.

KAJANTIE, Marianna — Marianna Kajantie is deputy cultural director of the cultural office of city of Helsinki. Her responsibilities are for cultural policies, EU projects and subsidies to the Arts. She is director of Alexander theatre, municipally run receiving venue, and managing director of Lasipalatsi Media Centre, independent structure Urban Pilot Project of DG XVI 1997–99.

Other EU involvements are memberships in networks and partner in some culture 2000 programmes. She has masters's degree from the University of Helsinki.

KAZIMIERZ, Krzysztofek — His fields of research include: the cultural aspects of European integration; cultural adaptation to

change in Eastern and Central Europe; the impact of information technology on the arts; the implications of small markets for cultural industries and culture production, distribution, and consumption; and community cultures and civil society.

Since 1994 (until 2000) he worked at the Institute of Culture as Director for Research. He has been Professor of Sociology at the University of Białystok since 1997, and a member of the Polish Academy of Science Committee for Forecasting “Poland 2000Plus” since 1995. Since 2000 he has been professor of sociology in the Warsaw School of Advanced Sociology in Warsaw. He is also a member of the International Studies Association, as well as a member and former board member of CIRCLE.

He has published widely and received numerous awards and honours.

KLAIĆ, Dragan — He is Professor of Theater Studies at the University of Amsterdam. From 1992 until summer 2001 he was Director of Theater Instituut Nederland. Educated in dramaturgy in Belgrade and with a doctorate in theater history and dramatic criticism from Yale University.

Before leaving Yugoslavia in 1991 he was Professor at the University of Arts in Belgrade and the founding Co-Editor of *Euromaske*, the European Theater Quarterly. Among his books are several works published in the former Yugoslavia. His articles appeared in many periodicals in several languages.

Klaić is a Contributing Editor of the *Theater* magazine (USA), President of the European Forum of Arts & Heritage (EFAH, Brussels), board member of Praemium Erasmianum (Amsterdam) and Transeuropeennes (Paris) and member of the advisory boards of the Nexus Institute (Tilburg), Kunsten 92, the Fund for the Central & East European Book Project (Amsterdam) and of the Marcel Hicter European Diploma training program (Brussels).

KÓRÖSI, Orsolya — Born in Veszprém, Hungary. 1980–88: studied at Eötvös University ELTE in Budapest, majoring in Hungarian language and literature and history and later also in Portuguese. 1997–2000: school for certified public accountants. Participated in post-graduate scholarships and study trips in Lisbon, Dubrovnik, Rome and Paris.

1987–88: lecturer and librarian at the Department of Portuguese language and literature. 1989–97: Ministry of Culture and Education – International Center of Hungarian Studies: editor, deputy director, later director. 1997–2000: executive director of the National Association of Hungarian Journalists. Since February, 2000: deputy state secretary of the Ministry of Cultural Heritage, responsible for arts and international affairs.

LACOMBE, Robert — Deputy Director of the French Institute and cultural attaché in Budapest since 1998. Between 1994–1998 fulfilled similar positions in Hanoi, Vietnam.

Studied philosophy and political sciences, graduated at the ‘Ecole Normale Supérieure de Fontenay Saint-Cloud’ in 1994.

MISZLIVETZ, Ferenc — Director of the Szombathely-based Institute of Social and European Studies at Dániel Berzsenyi College and Senior Research Fellow at the Institute of Political Science of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, professor Miszlivetz has received first degree at Karl Marx University of Economics (1978) and majored in history at Eötvös Loránd University in Budapest (1982).

Since 1983 he has been Ph.D. in Twentieth Century European History (Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest) and Candidate of Science in Sociology (Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest) since 1994.

Main research topics include Social Movements, Emerging Civil Societies and Participation, New Political Parties and Human rights in Eastern Europe during the Transition Period, European Integration, European Security and The Eastern Enlargement of the European Union.

NASTOPKAITĖ-MARTIKONIENĖ, Agnė — She graduated from Vilnius University (1987–88), M. Lomonosov Moscow University (1988–1991). Furthermore, earned Degree in Classical Philology; ISTI a.s.b.l. (Haute école de Bruxelles), Le Centre d’Etude des Relations Européennes 1998–1999, diploma with distinction.

Since 1999 she has been director of the European cultural programs center/ Lithuanian Cultural Contact Point. Between 1996–1999 she was editor of the Lithuanian version of “European Dialogue, simultaneously, in 1997–1999, she was Brussels-based correspondent for Lithuanian daily “Respublika” and Radio Free Europe Lithuanian

Direction. Formerly, in 1991–1992, she taught Latin and Greek at Vilnius University. Recently she has published *Nastopkaitė A., Petrauskis K. Ar yra alternatyva ES? (Is there an alternative to EU?)*, Vilnius, 2000

MARSCHALL, Miklós — Mr. Marschall was born in 1953. He is the executive director of Transparency International, a global NGO fighting against corruption. His responsibility includes East- and Central-Europe and the former Soviet Union. Between 1994 and 1998, he was the executive director of CIVICUS: a global network of NGOs and foundations to promote civil society. In 1991–1994, he served as deputy mayor of Budapest, Hungary.

Mr. Marschall serves on the boards of several international and Hungarian NGOs including International Intelligence on Culture. He is the chair of the Hungarian Nonprofit Information and Training Center (NIOK).

He also serves as the chair of the Board of the Budapest Festival Orchestra. He was the founding chair of the Budapest Observatory. Mr. Marschall graduated from the Karl Marx University of Economics in Budapest in 1977 and received his doctorate from the same university in 1984. In 1988/89, he was a Fulbright visiting fellow at Yale, studying the American non-profit sector.

MERCER, Colin — He is the UK's first Professor of Cultural Policy and Director of The Cultural Policy and Planning Research Unit (CPPRU) at The Nottingham Trent University. Prior to his return to the UK in 1998 he spent 14 years in Australia where he developed extensive expertise in the field of integrated and strategic cultural development and planning at local, State (provincial) and national levels.

MITCHELL, Ritva — Head of Research at the Arts Council of Finland; President of CIRCLE-network; President of EricArts; Former programme advisor at the Council of Europe (1992–1997); Member of the Orientation Board of the European Diploma of Cultural Management; Lecturer at the Sibelius Academy of Music, Helsinki; Lecturer at the University of Jyväskylä. Has written a number of books and articles on cultural policies and cultural development in Europe.

MUCICA, Delia Ruxandra — Graduated the Law Faculty of the University of Bucharest in 1975 and she has just completed a PhD in Romanian economic history. For more than 13 years she was a scientific researcher with the Economics Institute of the Romanian Academy. She also worked at the Kriterion Publishing House, and the Standing Committee for Culture, Arts and Mass Media of the Chamber of Deputies. Fulfilled various jobs at of the Ministry of Culture: General Secretary, and since 2001 Director of the Division for Harmonization, Media, Audiovisual and Evaluation.

She published two books on Romanian copyright legislation and a series of articles on cultural legislation. Since 1996 she is associated professor at the High School for Journalism and the University of Theatre and Film, Bucharest, teaching courses on audiovisual legislation, cultural legislation and copyright.

OBULJEN, Nina — She is a member of the Culturelink team, works as a research assistant at the Institute for International Relations in Zagreb, Croatia. She graduated both from the Academy of Music and the Faculty of Arts at the University of Zagreb. She finished a one-year programme at the Diplomatic Academy in Zagreb. Her professional experiences include the positions of the Chief of Cabinet to the Minister of Culture of the Republic of Croatia and the Coordinator for UNESCO at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

She worked as a consultant for the Unit for the Promotion of the Status of Women and Gender Equality (UNESCO, Paris), the Dubrovnik Summer Festival, the International Children's Institute (Montreal) and several other NGOs and cultural institutions. She is currently enrolled in a Comparative Politics post-graduate programme at the Faculty of Political Sciences at the University of Zagreb.

PASCUAL I RUIZ, Jordi — Born in Catalonia in 1968, is an urban geographer. After the degree in Geography (1992). He completed his MA Thesis in 1996 on "Marriage market and migration in Spain". He spent seven years involved in research projects at the university "Autónoma de Barcelona" (1993–1997) and the Interarts Foundation for international cultural co-operation (1996–2000). His field of expertise is the place of culture in urban development and the creation of suitable indicators to analyse policies and programmes. In 1999 he joined the Institute of Culture of Barcelona as a delegate for analysis and prospective.

RAINESALO, Pirkko — Counsellor for Cultural Affairs at the Finnish Ministry of Education, Department for Cultural, Sport and Youth Policy since 1989, before that e.g. Secretary General of the Arts Council of Finland 1981–1989.

Since 1996 national responsibility for the Council of Europe Culture Committee, where elected vice chair 1998–2000 and acting chair since September 2000. Earlier work in different working and expert groups of the culture committee include e.g. membership in the Culture and Regions group 1984–1990, and the expert group evaluating Slovenian cultural policy in 1996. Expert on competences and practices in European Local and Regional Cultural Policy to the Working Group on Culture, Education and Media of the Council of Europe Congress of Local and Regional Authorities in Europe, Studies and texts, No 69/CLRAE.

RAZLOGOV, Kirill — He was born in 1946, M.A. in art history (Moscow University), professor, Ph.D. in cultural studies, Director of the Russian Institute for Cultural Research, author of 14 books and more than 300 articles on art history, film and the media, cultural policy and development.

Organiser of film festivals and TV programmes on film and art. Previous positions: researcher at the Russian Film Archive (Gosfilmofond), special assistant to the president of the State Film Committee, professor of film history, media and cultural studies at the State Film Institute (VGIK), High courses for film directors and script writers and the Institute for European culture in Moscow.

SGARBI, Vittorio — Born in 1952, Ferrara, Italy. He got his degree in philosophy at the University of Bologna. He is the Director of the Board of Supervision of Venice Artificial and Historical Values. He is a well-known essayist and television announcer as well. Mr. Sgarbi is author of numerous art historian works such as “Carpaccio”, “Palladio and Manierism”, “Universal Art History” etc.

He was announcer of the so-called “Daily Sgarbi” television programme from 1992–1999; awarded him by the Flaiano International Television Prize.

He also works for many daily, weekly news and magazines e.g. “Il Giornale”, “L’Espresso”, “Panorama”, “Arte e Documento”.

He has been working actively in the Italian Parliament as Member of the Parliament and as Cultural Under-Secretary of the State.

ȘUTEU, Corina — Earned MA in Romanian and English language at the University of Bucharest. She has been a member of the following professional bodies: president of the Forum of European Cultural Networks, member of IETM, member of ENCATC (European Network of Training Centres for Cultural administration). Currently, she presides ECUMEST association.

She has a vast record (from 1995) of training experience i.e. setting up, together with the European Cultural Foundation, Amsterdam, the Policies for Culture Project and coordinating it (France, Holland, Romania), and holding a trainer and coordinator position for the core training inside the Phare scheme.

She has published several times diverse articles in Romanian magazines: “TEATRUL”, “TEATRUL AZI”, “COTIDIANUL Romania literara”, “22”, “Steaua”, “Orizont”; articles in “Economía de la Cultura”, “Observatoire des politiques culturelles”, “Culture Europe”.

SZABÓ, György — Born in 1959, in Budapest and graduated at the Marx Károly University of Economic, and at the Eötvös Loránd University, at the Faculty of Arts Management.

Started his carrier at the so-called “Youth Organisational Office” and at the same time he was the manager of the youth club of his first University called “KÖZGÁZ Klub”. From 1985 he became the art manager of PECSA (a main youth and cultural center of Budapest) As a result of his work he achieved a reputation internationally in the field of Hungarian Contemporary Dance.

In the meanwhile he founded the “Workshop Foundation” (1996). Then he has been later he became director of the Club of Young Artist and he has been directing “TRAFÓ” (Contemporary Art Center).

Won the Hevesi Sándor Prize in 1998 and the Gyórfy Miklós Prize in 2001.

SZABÓ, Ilkó — Cultural tourism Councilor, head of department, Ministry of Cultural Heritage. Hungary. Previously she was

set designer and assistant editor at the Hungarian Film Studio from 1979 to 1987 and later project manager in the field of architect. In 1990 she was department head at the Prime Minister's Office and became the director of special events and programming of EXPO '96 Ltd. In 1994. Among others she worked for Hungarian Tourism Services Rt.(artistic director) and for Budapest Spring Festival (advisor) and joined the Ministry of Culture and Public Education in 1997 as cultural councilor.

Ms. Szabó earned her B.A degree in architecture at Ybl Miklós Technical Collage (Budapest) and got an art manager diploma at University of Applied Arts (Budapest).

SZOMBATI, Béla — Born in Tel-Aviv in 1955, the son of a career diplomat. He received higher education at London University and Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, graduated in 1980. Then he entered the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA), where he worked at the Department of International Security, MFA. He has been Attaché, later Secretary of the Hungarian Embassy in Hanoi. Back in Hungary, in 1986–1988, he worked as US Desk Officer in Department One, MFA (North America and part of Western Europe).

He has been nominated Secretary of the Hungarian Embassy in Washington, D.C. dealing with cultural affairs between 1988–1991 and Foreign Policy Advisor to the President of the Republic and Head of the Foreign Relations Department of the President's Office, Budapest between 1991–1994.

In 1994–1999 represented Hungary as Ambassador of the Republic of Hungary in Paris. From 1999 (Aug) he has been Deputy Head of the State Secretariat for Integration.

VARBANOVA, Lidia — Currently, she is Program Director of Arts and Culture Network at Open Society Institute, Budapest (2000); Head of Department of Social and Cultural Management and Economics at University of National and World Economy, Sofia (1995–); and Member of the Board of CIRCLE.

She has been awarded numerous grants and fellowships in 1991–2001, among others Fulbright fellowship in economics.

Areas of teaching, consultancy and research include cultural policy in Central and Eastern Europe cultural marketing, fundraising and sponsorship, cultural economics and non-profit management.

She is holder of Ph.D. degree in Economics; MA in Industrial Management; and Minor in Journalism.

She has published 3 books on sponsorship, HR and arts management and lot of articles in Bulgarian and international scientific journals and periodicals.

VERON, Claude — Born in 1945, married, educated in educational science, sociology and cultural management.

In his professional career he has been a teacher, co-ordinator of the Popular Education Movement, co-ordinator of Marseille Objective Danse, Director of Pépinières européennes pour Jeunes Artistes and actually Director of Relais-Culture-Europe.

Mr Veron has been member of the Informal European Theatre Meeting since 1988, was co-founder of the European Forum for the Arts and Heritage (EFAH), where he served as board member between 1993–2001.

WIESAND, Andreas Johannes — Born in 1945, completed studies in politics, sociology and education with a Ph.D. He worked first in broadcasting, at *Rowohlt* publishing house and at *DER SPIEGEL*. Since 1972, he directs the *Zentrum für Kulturforschung* in Bonn; since 1993 he is Secretary General of the *European Research Institute for Comparative Cultural Policy and the Arts (ERICarts)* and professor for arts administration at the *State College for Music and Theatre*, Hamburg. Prof. Wiesand specializes in empirical studies on European cultural issues and in surveying the arts and media professions.

Currently, he heads a five-year state best-practice programme on arts education and new technologies (cf. www.kubim.de). He is author or responsible editor of over 40 publications. He has served as chairman of the board of a copyright licensing society, as Secretary General of the *German Arts Council* (1982–93) and in similar voluntary positions.

ZONGOR, Attila – Director of KultúrPont Iroda, the Hungarian Cultural Contact Point which was established in 2000. Also currently employed as a Financial Adviser to the Hungarian Ministry of Culture. Graduate of the University of Economic Sciences in Budapest with a degree in International Relations and EU Affairs. Also a graduate of the Liszt Ferenc Academy of Music and a qualified Choir Master.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

NAME	COUNTRY	INSTITUTION	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Aradi, Mária	Hungary	Euro-Info Point	aradim@freemail.hu
Baán, László	Hungary	Ministry of Cultural Heritage	
Bacchela, Ugo	Italy	Fitzcarraldo Foundation	ugobac@fitzcarraldo.it
Badia i Dalmasas, Francesc	Spain	Interarts Foundation	fbadia@interarts.net
Bajdor, Tünde	Hungary	Brandenburg Technical University	tbajdor@planetclub.org
Balázs, Dóra	Hungary	Budapest University of Economic Sciences	bdorka@yahoo.com
Balić, Naima	Croatia	Ministry of Culture	naima.balic@min-kulture.hr
Bardiaux, Matthieu	Hungary	French Institute	m.bardiaux@inst-france.hu
Barrett, Nancy	United Kingdom	Trafford MBC	nancy.barrett@trafford.gov.uk
Benke, Dorottya	Hungary	Berzsenyi Dániel Főiskola	
Bernadska, Anna	Ukraine	International Renaissance (Soros) Foundation in Ukraine	bernadska@irf.kiev.ua
Bertalan, Tamás	Hungary	M-Érték 67	
Besze, Barbara	Hungary	Eötvös Loránd University, Faculty of Elementary Teachers' and Nurseries' Training	
Bibic, Bratko	Slovenia	Peace Institute	bratko.bibic@guest.arnes.si
Bíró Kovács, Ágnes	Hungary	Ministry of Cultural Heritage	agnes.biro@nkom.gov.hu
Black, Michael	United Kingdom	EuropaWriting	mwilblack@cs.com
Blakemore, David	United Kingdom	Akademi South Asian Dance Company	dblakem220@aol.com
Blanchet, Adrien	France	Sciences Po	
Blaškovičova, Luba	Slovakia	Gremium of the Third Sector + Old Downtown Theatre Kosice	lubapeto@shadow-net.sk
Bodo, Carla	Italy	Associazione dell'Economia della Cultura	segreteria@economiadellacultura.it
Boltho, Vera	France	Head of Cultural Policy and Action Department, Council of Europe	vera.boltho@coe.int
Boni, Milena Isabella	Italy	Università di Torino	boni@econ.unito.it
Boulin-Ghica, Irina	France	Prime Minister's Office, Paris, France	irina.boulin-ghica@ddmedias.pm.gouv.fr
Bősze, Brigitta	Hungary	SZTE GTK	
Brandt, Godfrey	United Kingdom	Arts Management, Faculty of Continuing Education, Birkbeck University of London	g.brandt@bbk.ac.uk, godfrey.brandt@virgin.net
Brown, Geoffrey	United Kingdom	Euclid	info@euclid.co.uk
Budai, Katalin	Hungary	Ministry of Cultural Heritage	katalin.budai@nkom.gov.hu
Busek, Erhard	Austria	Austrian Commissioner for EU Enlargement	seci@osce.org
Caramitru, Ion	Romania	Uniter, Romanian Theater Association	uniter@fx.ro
Černoch, Pavel	Czech Republic	Charles University, Prague	pavel.cernoch@usa.net
Chabaud, Frédérique	Belgium	European Forum for the Arts and Heritage	efah@skynet.be
Cliche, Danielle	Germany	ERICArts	cliche@ericarts.org
Closs, Wolfgang	France	Audiovisual Observatory, Strasbourg	Wolfgang.Closs@obs.coe.int
Čopič, Vesna	Slovenia	Ministry of Culture	vesna.copic@gov.si
Cullinan, Eve-Anne	Ireland	Digital Media Development	ecullinan@thedigitalhub.com

NAME	COUNTRY	INSTITUTION	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Curman, Peter	Sweden	Swedish Joint Committee for Literary and Artistic Professionals (KLYS)	council@klys.se
Cvetković, Marijana	Yugoslavia	Balkankult	marijana@balkankult.org
Czibók, Zsuzsanna	Hungary	BKÁE	
Csanádi, Andrea	Hungary	Open Society Institute, Arts and Culture Network Programme	acsanadi@osi.hu
Csiki, Ottília	Hungary	Berzsenyi Dániel Főiskola	
Csontos, Anita	Hungary	College of Foreign Trade	
Csurdi, Gábor	Hungary	HIFA - Hungarian Irish Friends' Association	gcsurdi@hotmail.com
Dallas, Costis	Greece	Panteion University, Athens	cdallas@panteion.gr
Dávid, Ágota	Hungary	BKÁE	deakagota@yahoo.com
de Rijk, Klaus	Hungary	Royal Netherlands Embassy, Budapest	klaus-de.rijk@minbuza.nl
de Vlieg, Mary Ann	Belgium	European Forum for the Arts and Heritage	ietm@ietm.org
Deák, Ildikó	Hungary	Ministry of Cultural Heritage	
Deés, Szilvia	Hungary	College for Modern Business Studies	dees.szilvia@mutf.hu
Deme, Péter	Hungary	Hungarian National Museum	demep@hnm.hu
Descotes, Bernard	France	EMMEN	apejs@club-internet.fr
Deutsch, Iulia	Romania	Delegation of the European Commission in Romania	iulia.deutsch@delrom.cec.eu.int
Dickinson, Neil	United Kingdom	Freelance	neilax@hotmail.com
Dienes, Gedeon	Hungary	Hungarian Society for Choreology	
Dobó, Orsolya	Hungary	Berzsenyi Dániel Főiskola	
Dodd, Diane	Spain	CIRCLE	diane.dodd@eresmas.net
Dragojević, Sanjin	Croatia	Zagreb University	vera@mairmo.irmo.hr
Egervári, Anna	Hungary	Berzsenyi Dániel Főiskola	
Egri, Katalin	Hungary	Berzsenyi Dániel Főiskola	
Eller, Eike	Estonia	Ministry of Culture	eike.eller@kul.ee
Eriksson, Claes	Sweden	Ministry of Culture	claes.eriksson@culture.ministry.se
Ernyey, Katalin	Hungary	Bureau for the Protection of Cultural Heritage	ernyey@nsi.koi.hu
Fábián, Dalma	Hungary	Berzsenyi Dániel Főiskola	
Fábián, Eszter	Hungary	Ministry of Economic Affairs	
Farkas, Csilla	Hungary	University of Szeged	
Fisher, Rod	United Kingdom	International Intelligence on Culture	rodfisher@intelculture.org
Flaskár, Adrienn	Hungary	College of Nyíregyháza	
Flood, Mik	United Kingdom	Euclid	mik@euclid.co.uk
Fodor, Éva	Hungary	University of Foreign Trade	
Fox, Roger	United Kingdom	Voluntary Arts Network	roger@voluntaryarts.org
Földesi, Zsófia	Hungary	Budapest Observatory	z@budobs.org
Gallardo, Jean-Yves	Norway	Norwegian Council for Cultural Affairs	jean-yves.gallardo@kulturrad.dep.no
Gáspár, Miklós	Hungary	student	
Gieles, Yvette	The Netherlands	SICA - Service Centre for International Cultural Activities	ccpnl@sicastica.nl
Glaser, Thomas	Hungary	European Delegation to Hungary	
Göndör, Krisztina	Hungary	Euro-Info Point	gondorkrisztina@hotmail.com
Göz, László	Hungary	BMC Hungary	

NAME	COUNTRY	INSTITUTION	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Grahl, Robert	Germany	Kulturstiftung des Freistaates Sachsen	robert.grahl@kss.smwk.sachsen.de
Greiner, Sonja	Germany	Europa Cantat	info@europacantat.org
Grodska, Ilona	Latvia	Ministry of Culture	
Grüber, Petra	Hungary	Berzsenyi Dániel Főiskola	
Guglielmo, Rachel	Hungary	Open Society Institute, Budapest	RGuglielmo@osi.hu
Gurmai, Beáta	Hungary		
Hámori, Hanna	Hungary	ELTE-TÓFK	sherry@freemail.hu
Helston, Michael	United Kingdom	Department for Culture, Media and Sport	michael.helston@culture.gsi.gov.uk
Hlács, András	Hungary		
Hofecker, Franz-Otto	Austria	Institute for Cultural Management	hofecker@mdw.ac.at
Horváth, Zsófia	Hungary		horvath.zsofia@freemail.hu
Huszár, Gyöngyvér	Hungary	CCP Hungary	info@kulturpont.hu
Ignáth, Éva	Hungary	Teleki Institute	
Ihász, Orsolya	Hungary	Berzsenyi Dániel Főiskola	
Ilczuk, Dorota	Poland	Institute of Public Affairs, Jagiellonian University in Cracow	dilczuk@post.pl
Inkei, Péter	Hungary	Budapest Observatory	bo@budobs.org
Jankovich-Bésán, Dénes	Hungary	Office for the Protection of Cultural Heritage	
Jelinčić, Daniela	Croatia	Culturelink/IMO	daniela@irmo.hr
Jordan, Julia Nedda	Hungary	College for Modern Business Studies	jjnedda@ax.hu
Kajantie, Marianna	Finland	Helsinki City Council	marianna.kajantie@hel.fi
Kandikó, József	Hungary	College for Modern Business Studies	kandiko.jozsef@mutf.hu
Kaser, Daniela	Austria	ÖKS - Österreichischer Kultur-Service	daniela.kaser@oks.at
Kazimierz, Krzysztofek	Poland	Department of Social Communication, University of Bialystok	kkristof@warman.com.pl k.krzysztofek@chello.pl
Kelly, Paul	United Kingdom		paul.kelly20@virgin.net
Kincses, Ágnes	Hungary	Directorate of Hungarian Cultural Institutes	
King, Annie	Ireland	K2ARTS	k2arts@eircom.net
Kishegyi, Viktória	Hungary	Hungarian Institute for Culture	
Kiss, Attila	Hungary	Hajdúböszörmény Önkormányzata	
Kivelä, Risto	Finland	Ministry of Education and Culture	risto.kivela@minedu.fi
Klaić, Dragan	Belgium	European Forum for the Arts and Heritage	balakla@worldonline.nl
Kóczyán-Szentpéteri, Erzsébet	Hungary	Ministry of Cultural Heritage	erzsebet.koczianszentpeteri@nkom.gov.hu
Koczkás, Anikó	Hungary	Hungarian National Tourist Office	koczkas@hungarytourism.hu
Kollarová, Lucia	Slovakia	Ministry of Education	lucia@education.gov.sk
Koncz, Judit Anikó	Hungary	College of Nyíregyháza	
Kovács, Ágnes	Hungary	Ministry of Cultural Heritage	
Kovács, Zita	Hungary	Ministry of Cultural Heritage	
Kőrösi, Orsolya	Hungary	Ministry of Cultural Heritage	
Kriaszter, Attila	Hungary	Budapest Festival Orchestra Foundation	
Kukusik, Ágnes	Hungary	Ministry of Cultural Heritage	
Lacombe, Robert	Hungary	French Institute	inst-france@inst-france.hu
Laycock, Jolyon	United Kingdom	The Rainbow Foundation	jolyon@1paradiserow.fsnet.co.uk
Lévai, Zita	Hungary	Budapest Observatory	z@budobs.org

NAME	COUNTRY	INSTITUTION	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Lujanschi, Mioara	Romania	Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs	mioara@eurocult.ro
Lukášová, Eva	Czech Republic	State Institute for the Preservation of the Cultural Heritage	lukasova.e@supp.cz
Lyddiard, Alan	United Kingdom	Northern Stage	directors@northernstage.com
Lynch, Martin	Northern Ireland	Imagine Belfast 2008.	info@imaginebelfast2008.com
Maguire, Brian	Ireland	National College of Art and Design	maguireb@ncad.ie
Mance, Marijana	Croatia	Ministry of Culture	marijana.mance@min-kulture.hr
Marschall, Miklós	Germany	Transparency International	marschall@compuserve.com
Martikoniene, Agne	Lithuania	Lithuanian CCP	agne@durys.org
Mastrominas, Theodossios	Belgium	European Commission, Directorate-General for Education and Culture	Theodossios.Mastrominas@cec.eu.int
Matić, Slavko	Yugoslavia	Secretariat for Culture, Education and Science of Vojvodina Province	matits@EUnet.yu
Menyhért, Anna	Hungary	Attila József Circle of Young Writers	
Mercer, Colin	United Kingdom	University of Nottingham	colin.mercer@ntu.ac.uk
Michalíková, Viera	Slovakia	Foundation – Center for Contemporary Arts	viera@scca.sk
Mikelsone, Jolanta	Latvia	Ministry of Culture	jolanta.mikelsone@km.gov.lv
Miladinov, Peter	Bulgaria	Ministry of Culture	peter_miladinov@yahoo.com
Milohnic, Aldo	Slovenia	Peace Institute	aldo.milohnic@mirovni-institut.si
Miszlivetz, Ferenc	Hungary	European Institute at Berzsényi College	fmszlivetz@axelero.hu
Mitchell, Ritva	Finland	ERICArts, Helsinki	ekvit@saunalahti.fi, ritva.mitchell@minedu.fi
Moldovai, Viktor	Hungary	Hungarofest Public Benefit Company	
More, James	United Kingdom	University of Northumbria at Newcastle	james.more@unn.ac.uk
Mucica, Delia	Romania	Media Division, Ministry of Culture	delia.mucica@cultura.ro
Mulder, Karel	The Netherlands	Contract Groep Holland	k.mulder@hsholland.nl
Nagy, Mihály	Hungary	Ministry of Cultural Heritage	
Netter, Dóra	Hungary	Partnership of Hungarian Local Government Associations	
Nógrádi, Csilla	Hungary	Totem Publishing Ltd.	nogradicsilla@hotmail.com
Obuljen, Nina	Croatia	Culturelink / IMO	nina@irmo.hr
O'Donnell, Michael	Northern Ireland, U.K.	Making Music, The National Federation of Music Societies	mod@classicfm.net
Ohlau, Jürgen Uwe	Germany	Kulturstiftung des Freistaates Sachsen	robert.grahl@kss.smwk.sachsen.de
Olafsson, Thorgeir	Iceland	Ministry of Education, Science and Culture	thorgeir.olafsson@mrn.stjr.is
Orlandi, Giorgio	Italy	Gina Lollobrigida Agent	
Pálóczy-Horváth, Viktória	Hungary	Ministry of Cultural Heritage	viktoria.paloczi@nkom.gov.hu
Pap, István	Hungary	Békés Megye Képviselő-Testülete Megyei Művelődési Központja és Kézműves Szakiskolája	mmkmail@bekes-mmk.hu
Papp, Emese	Hungary	Ministry of Cultural Heritage	emese.papp@nkom.gov.hu
Parker, Mike	Wales, U. K.	Earthfall	earthfall@earthfall.org.uk
Pascual i Ruiz, Jordi	Spain	Institute of Culture, Barcelona City Council	Jpascual@pangea.org
Pecoraro, Sergio	Italy	CORUS s.r.l.	

NAME	COUNTRY	INSTITUTION	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Pérez Lázaro, José	Spain	Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deport, Secretaría de Estado de Cultura	jose.perez@dgcc.mcu.es
Péter, Ágnes	Denmark	European Council of Artists	dkr-eca@inet.uni2.dk
Péter, Katalin	Hungary		
Podgaiska, Inese	Belgium	Mission of the Republic of Latvia to the EU	
Pordány, Sarolta	Hungary	Ministry of Cultural Heritage, Dept. of Non-Formal Education and Cultural Activities	sarolta.pordany@nkom.gov.hu
Preston, Anthony	United Kingdom	North West Arts Board	apreston@nwarts.co.uk
Price, Jon	United Kingdom	Cultural Management Unit, Northumbria University	jon.price@unn.ac.uk
Puczkó, László	Hungary	KPMG	
Pulver, Marvi	Estonia	Cultural Service, Tartu City Government	marvi.pulver@raad.tartu.ee
Rácz, Jolán	Hungary	Bureau for the Protection of Cultural Heritage	
Raffay, Zoltán	Hungary	Hungarian Academy of Sciences	raffay@dti.rkk.hu
Rainesalo, Pirkko	Finland	Ministry of Education and Culture	pirkko.rainesalo@minedu.fi
Razlogov, Kirill	Russia	Russian Institute for Cultural Research	razlog@hotmail.com
Rich, J. Dennis	Illinois, USA	Arts, Entertainment and Media Management, Columbia College Chicago	jdrieh@popmail.colum.edu
Riczko, István	Hungary	University of Szeged	riczko.istvan@stud.u-szeged.hu
Robinson, Sue	United Kingdom	Spot On, Lancashire's Rural Touring Network	spoton@communityfutures.org.uk
Rónai, Iván	Hungary	Ministry of Cultural Heritage	ivan.ronai@nkom.gov.hu
Roper, Gerda	United Kingdom	University of Northumbria	gerda.roper@unn.ac.uk
Rose, Martin	Belgium	British Council Brussels	martin.rose@britishcouncil.be
Rothwell, Andrew	United Kingdom	Newcastle City Council	andrew.rothwell@newcastle.gov.uk
Rózsa, Mihály	Hungary	Freelance	rozsa@telnet.hu
Rubovszky, Rita	Hungary	Hungarofest Public Benefit Company	
Sarkadi, Tünde	Hungary	Hungarian National Tourist Office	sarkadi@hungarytourism.hu
Schultz, Mikael	Sweden	Project manager	mikael.schultz@si.se
Sgarbi, Vittorio	Italy	Ministry of Culture	
Sólyom, Anna	Hungary	ELTE-TÓFK	
Sundkvist, Leif	Sweden	CCP Sweden	leif.sundkvist@kur.se
Şuteu, Corina	Romania	ECUMEST	corina.suteu@wanadoo.fr
Svenson, Per	Sweden	Swedish National Council for Cultural Affairs	per.svenson@kur.se
Szabó, Ildikó	Hungary	Ministry of Cultural Heritage	ildiko.szabo@nkom.gov.hu
Szabó, Márta	Hungary	Hungarian National Commission for UNESCO	marta.szabo@om.hu
Szabó, György	Hungary	TRAFÓ	gyuri@trafo.hu
Szabó-Pap, Gabriella	Hungary	Ministry of Cultural Heritage	gabriella.szabopap@nkom.gov.hu
Szendi, Zsuzsa	Hungary	CCC+Bogner	
Szijjártó, Csaba	Hungary	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	
Szombati, Béla	Hungary	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	
Szűcsné dr. Sebestyén, Irén	Hungary	Local Governmental Office of Hajdúnánás Town	

NAME	COUNTRY	INSTITUTION	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Teneva, Krassimira	Bulgaria	The Red House Centre for Culture and Debate	kteneva@redhouse-sofia.org
Tengerdi, Zita	Hungary	College for Modern Business Studies	tengerdi@freemail.hu
Thingstad, Silje	Norway	Cultural Department, Ministry of Culture	silje.thingstad@kd.dep.no
Tibor, Ágnes	Hungary	Hungarian University of Craft and Design, Management Institute	tiboragi@mail.datanet.hu
Tiensuu-Nylund, Mervi	Finland	Ministry of Education and Culture	mervi.tiensuu-nylund@minedu.fi
Tóth, Nikolett	Hungary	CCP Hungary	toth@kulturpont.hu
Ursillo, Anna Maria	Italy	CORUS s.r.l.	
Varbanova, Lidia	Hungary	Open Society Institute	Varbanova@osi.hu
Varga, István	Hungary	Monostori Erőd Military Culture Centre	info@fort-monostor.hu
Varslot, Tone	Norway	Ministry of Cultural Affairs	
Véron, Claude	France	Relais-Culture-Europe	cveron@relais-culture-europe.org
Vida, Eszter	Hungary	Hungarian Music Council Music Information Centre	
Vincent, Jean	France	International Federation of Musicians (FIM)	fimparis@compuserve.com
Vinická, Markéta	Czech Republic	Ministry of Culture	vinickam@mkcr.cz
Vujadinović, Dimitrije	Yugoslavia	Balkankult	info@balkankult.org
Wagner, Gottfried	The Netherlands	European Cultural Foundation	abijker@eurocult.org
Wallis, Ann	United Kingdom	Yorkshire Arts	ann.wallis@yarts.co.uk
Weidebaum, Reet	Estonia	Ministry of Culture	reet.weidebaum@kul.ee
Wiesand, Andreas	Germany	ERICArts	wiesand@ericarts.org
Williams, Jennifer	United Kingdom	Centre for Creative Communities	info@creativecommunities.org.uk
Wollák, Katalin	Hungary	National Office of Cultural Heritage	wollak@koi.hu
Womela, Piotr	Poland	Ministry of Culture	womela@mk.gov.pl
Wyszomirski, Pawel	Poland	National Heritage Institute	ccp@idn.pl
Žáková, Eva	Czech Republic	Theatre Institute	eva.zakova@divadlo.cz
Zongor, Attila	Hungary	CCP Hungary	zongor@kulturpont.hu
Zuchniak, Monika	Poland	National Heritage Institute	ccp@idn.pl

MAIN CONFERENCE SPONSOR



Ministry of Cultural Heritage Hungary

CONFERENCE ALSO SUPPORTED BY



United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization



SPECIAL THANKS TO

Austrian Science and Research Liaison Office

House of Parliament

Hungarian Academy of Sciences

Hungarian National Museum

Millenáris Park

Hungarian National Commission for UNESCO

and to all speakers and contributors

PROGRAMME

THURSDAY, 14TH FEBRUARY, NATIONAL MUSEUM

OPENING PLENARY – Greetings and introductory speeches

CHAIR: Attila Zongor / **SPEAKERS:** László Baán, Thomas Glaser, Béla Szombati, Ion Caramitru

FRIDAY, 15TH FEBRUARY, ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

PLENARY 1 – The cultural landscape in today's Europe

CHAIR: Miklós Marschall / **SPEAKERS:** Ferenc Miszlivetz, Vera Boltho, Kirill Razlogov

WORKING GROUP 1A – The arts

CHAIR: György Szabó / **SPEAKER:** Mik Flood

WORKING GROUP 1B – Media and cinema

CHAIR: Irina Boulin-Ghica / **SPEAKER:** Wolfgang Closs

WORKING GROUP 1C – Cultural heritage

CHAIR: Geoffrey Brown / **SPEAKER:** Sanjin Dragojević

PLENARY 2 – Culture and the reforming of European governance

CHAIR: Dragan Klaić / **SPEAKERS:** Pavel Černoch, Mary Ann DeVlieg, Rachel Guglielmo

WORKING GROUP 2A – Culture 2000

CHAIR: Agnè Martikonienė / **SPEAKER:** Theodossios Mastrominas

WORKING GROUP 2B – The future of other EU initiatives and the trans-national funds

CHAIR: José Pérez Lázaro / **SPEAKER:** Geoffrey Brown

SATURDAY, 16TH FEBRUARY, ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

PLENARY 3 – Focusing on EU regional policy: the place of culture in the Structural Funds

CHAIR: Ritva Mitchell / **SPEAKERS:** Colin Mercer, Corina Şuteu, Andreas Wiesand

WORKING GROUP 3A – Urban culture

CHAIR: Péter Inkei / **SPEAKER:** Marianna Kajantie

WORKING GROUP 3B – Culture and regional development

CHAIR: Pirkko Rainesalo / **SPEAKER:** Claude Véron

WORKING GROUP 3C – Cultural tourism

CHAIR: Ildikó Szabó / **SPEAKER:** Francesc Badia

PLENARY 4 – Cultural cooperation and mobility in an enlarged Europe

CHAIR: Dorota Ilczuk / **SPEAKERS:** Rod Fisher, Robert Lacombe, Kazimierz Krzysztofek

WORKING GROUP 4A – State administrations and inter-governmental organisations

CHAIR: Vesna Čopič / **SPEAKER:** Costis Dallas

WORKING GROUP 4B – Cultural industries

CHAIR: Delia Mucica / **SPEAKER:** Jordi Pascual Ruiz

WORKING GROUP 4C – Third sector organisations and civil society

CHAIR: Lidia Varbanova / **SPEAKER:** Ugo Bacchela

SUNDAY, 17TH FEBRUARY, HOUSE OF PARLIAMENT

CLOSING PLENARY – Brave New Europe?

CHAIR: Naima Balić / **SPEAKER:** Vittorio Sgarbi / **RAPORTEURS:** Andrea Csanádi, Diane Dodd, Daniela Jelinčić, Nina

Obuljen / CONCLUDING SPEECH: Erhard Busek / **FAREWELL SPEECH:** Orsolya Kőrösi