

# **Does Europe Need a Foreign Cultural Policy?**

**A preliminary work by  
Kathinka Dittrich van Weringh and  
Ernst Schürmann**

**February 2004**

## Table of Contents

Preface.....	4
I. The European Union as internal and external cultural project.....	5
Distorted perception of Europe .....	5
Europe's cultural task .....	6
The EU's own foreign cultural policy - why?.....	8
Europe – a soulless economic area? .....	8
Europe – a bulwark? .....	9
Europe – a new security zone? .....	10
The need for many explanations .....	11
II. European topics in foreign cultural policy– where the EU should become active.....	12
European cultural diversity as a topic.....	12
The EU as a topic .....	12
The EU: initiator of topics .....	14
III. The EU as promoter and supporter of cultural exchange - within the EU and abroad.....	14
The EU: balancing force between large and small member countries .....	15
The EU: promoter of a communications structure .....	15
The EU: promoter of pan-European topics and encounters.....	15
IV. Actors for the implementation of a European foreign cultural policy.....	16
Public cultural actors .....	16
Non-governmental cultural actors .....	16
Cooperation of the Actors.....	17
The EU Commission in a pioneering role .....	17
V. Tools for the implementation of European foreign cultural policy .....	17
Tools on the EU level .....	18
Internal cooperation and coordination.....	18
Emphasis on the cultural component in treaties with third countries.....	18
Active information policy .....	18
Tools for the Commission for promoting cooperation amongst member states .....	21
Stimulant for cooperation .....	21
A European cultural institute?.....	22
The creation of adjustment funds .....	22
Three pilot projects.....	23
Drawing up terms of reference for projects that merit support.....	23
Tools of the Commission in cooperation with non-governmental cultural actors .....	24
Supporting cooperation.....	24
Support of encounter programs .....	25
Tools of the Commission in cooperation with public and non-governmental actors.....	26
Active Information Policy: the Laboratory of European Cultural Cooperation.....	26

VI. Summary .....	26
Proposals for three pilot projects for improved cooperation between the EU Commission and the EU member states on cultural work with third countries, with special consideration for small and/or financially weak EU countries.....	28
Examples of the handling of European topics in the foreign cultural policy from the work of the German Goethe-Institut.....	34
Example of Addressing the European theme by an independent foundation: Fund for Central and East European Book Projects (CEEBP), Amsterdam.....	41
Example of the facilitation of EU trans-border mobility through the independent European Cultural Foundation (ECF), Amsterdam .....	43
Example of the attempt to shape and strengthen the cultural cooperation in Europe from the “bottom-up” – a public-private alliance initiated by the European Cultural Foundation (ECF), Amsterdam.....	44

## Preface

This is a preliminary work for a proposed feasibility study for a European foreign cultural policy that will be gradually developed. It currently exists only in an initial stage. Its necessity and sensibility will be established in this paper. Steps will be suggested for a feasible optimization of the present instruments of all the participating cultural actors.

This preliminary paper is not of a strictly scientific character. Above all, it draws on the empirical knowledge and practical experience that the two authors have gained during their years of experience at the Goethe-Institut in German foreign cultural policy in and outside Europe. The politico-strategic experience of the authors counts towards the front line experience. Both were in positions of responsibility in the Goethe-Institut's central office, one responsible for the guidelines of the Goethe-Institut's programs abroad and one responsible for long-term planning and supervision.

The contacts that grew out of their experiences facilitated the many (sometimes confidential) conversations and interviews with cultural actors from various legal entities from the EU countries as well as non-member countries. The contacts also enabled an evaluation of the Goethe-Institut's worldwide cultural programs from 1997 to 2003 from the perspective of pan-European issues in non-member countries.

Kathinka Dittrich van Weringh's position as head of the cultural department of the city of Cologne brought additional insight into intra-German as well as transnational networks of cities, regions and nations. The view from outside has been put into perspective by the view from inside.

The current position of Kathinka Dittrich van Weringh as committee chairperson of the European Cultural Foundation has deepened her longstanding Europolitical interest and given her access to relevant conferences, conversation partners, and sources.

Both authors have made limited reference to the still limited specialist literature on the topic and to the relevant decisions of the EU Commission as well as of the Council of Europe.

February 2004

Kathinka Dittrich van Weringh  
Ernst Schürmann<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>*Dr. Kathinka Dittrich van Weringh* worked from 1967 to 1994 for the Goethe-Institut in Barcelona, New York, Amsterdam, at the central office in Munich, and finally as founding director in Moscow. From 1994 to 1998 she was head of the cultural department for the city of Cologne. Currently she is committee chairperson of the European Cultural Foundation.

*Ernst Schürmann* worked from 1966 to 1996 for the Goethe-Institut in Helsinki, Teheran, Kabul, San Francisco, Bangkok, and finally as director of the planning and controlling department in the central office of the Goethe-Institut in Munich.

## **I. The European Union as internal and external cultural project**

There was no accord on a European constitution at the European Union Summit in Brussels in December 2003, where the 2004 accession countries were already participating with full rights. The breakdown of talks, and above all the way in which the breakdown occurred, gave a sudden insight into the complexity of the current phase of the European unification process. The decisive importance of understanding the political, economic and cultural differences between the individual member states for the continued integration process was once again demonstrated, as well as the extent to which the varied historical backgrounds have left their marks on expectations and reservations. Ultimately, these cultural findings must be taken into much greater consideration if Europe wants to continue and deepen its integration process. Meanwhile, after the initial disappointment and embitterment, it has been demonstrated that Europe really does want this process. Even after the failure of the draft constitution, no alternative to European integration arose. The goal of giving the European Union a constitution and an accompanying codified identity still exists. "Sooner or later Europe will have a constitution," commented Bertie Ahern, the Irish head of government and president of the European Council for the first half of 2004.<sup>2</sup> As the former French Foreign Minister Dominique de Villepin added in a different context, "A constitution must confer upon Europe the means to take its place in the world of tomorrow."<sup>3</sup>

What place does Europe want and what place is it able to occupy in the world? And how can it continue to grow closer together, not only in its institutions and its regulation mechanisms, but also, as the saying goes, in the heads and hearts of its citizens?

### **Distorted perception of Europe**

The European statistical bureau, Eurostat, confirms a dwindling enthusiasm in Europe. The public debate certainly does not contribute much to a positive image of Europe. The debate has led to a series of negative clichés across Europe: squabbling politicians, egoism, red tape, bureaucracy, cumbersomeness, paternalism, and lack of transparency are the prevalent catch phrases. These negative clichés increasingly hinder awareness of the positive changes in our everyday lives as a result of the unification process. The only key phrases that appear are freedom of travel, mobility, and a common currency. The ease in trans-border travel and dealings within the EU is taken for granted today. Its direct connection to European integration is barely felt anymore. In everyday life, we are now much more European than we realize.

With the discrepancy between the public perception and everyday reality revealed, we can see how far the emergence of a European citizen consciousness lags behind the actual integration of Europe. Without a developed European citizen consciousness and a resilient sense of belonging, the European Union will not only fail to go beyond a pure purpose-based alliance, but the successes of the current union will continually be at stake.

---

<sup>2</sup> Quoted from the *Kölner Stadtanzeiger*, 23 December 2003.

<sup>3</sup> "Die Lehren von Brüssel," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 20 December 2003.

The draft constitution was supposed to provide concrete content for EU citizens' inalienable identification with EU, and to open the path to a form of European constitutional patriotism on the basis of established values and rights. That the governments could let the constitution fail without risking wider protests from their respective populations shows a crucial deficiency in the entire unification process up to now: disregard for the cultural components. European integration is more than just a technocratic-political task. It can only succeed and have a stable future if it is also understood as a cultural task.

We are talking here about a notion of culture that is commonly accepted today: the historically conditioned contacts people have with one another in a particular society. This coexistence, determined by various codes, regulations and written and unwritten laws, finds its most concentrated expression in past and contemporary artistic forms, which will be discussed later. The famous Bulgarian sociologist Tzvetan Todorov writes “[th]e European values above all the diversity of the countries that go to make up Europe: each country has its own language, customs and problems. It was all the more conspicuous to observe the similarity of public opinion in the various countries during the preparations for the Iraq war. This spiritual kinship, [...] what a contrast between the politicians' differences of opinion and the natural consensus among the citizens.”<sup>4</sup> Thus a cultural foundation, little cultivated by politics, exists and could be made consciously realizable.

Reflecting upon topics/values such as rationality, individual freedom, justice, tolerance, institutionalized solidarity, democracy and separation of church and state, Todorov comes to the conclusion that, in contrast to other superpowers, a powerful Europe vested with a defensive army would be more like a “soft power”: “The Europeans legitimize power on an international level through the manner in which they use it; they settle their own borders by entering into contracts and agreements and starting shared institutions. The “silent power” bases itself on this principle.” The “soft power” slowly re-developed in post-war Europe and has today become a characteristic feature of Europe.

### **Europe's cultural task**

“Culture” and “the arts” are emotive words in the European political context and subject to many misunderstandings. The words instinctively arouse fear that Brussels could interfere with the national cultures of member states and endanger their existence through the development of a syncretistic European multiculturalism. Of course the case will not be put for that here. On the contrary: cultural diversity; the richness of traditions, languages, literatures, artistic expressions, and ways of life is a foundation for a united Europe. Protecting this richness is one of the most important tasks of the EU. The real source of the danger, especially for small national and regional cultures, can be seen in the demands within the WTO framework for the unconditional opening of all markets, including markets for cultural property, and in the WTO's practices, which are generally identified with the negative effects of globalization. A strong EU, capable of holding its ground internationally, is more a guarantor for, than a danger to the preservation of European national and regional cultures.

---

<sup>4</sup> Tzvetan Todorov, *Die verhinderte Weltmacht- Reflexionen eines Europäers* (Wilhelm Goldmann Verlag, 2003) 95-104.

It is Europe's task to work on the obvious deficits in the intra-European consciousness and on its pan-European image to the outside world.

An intensification of cultural exchange is necessary between the European countries. Europe's peoples still know too little about each other. Their images of their neighbors are still much too marked by prejudices and stereotypes that often stem from negative historical experiences. Prejudices and stereotypes fuel mistrust. They hinder a positive view of a shared European consciousness, a sort of European belonging.

A further deficit takes aim at Europe as a new unit, as a second subordinate home next to the primary homes of the individual states. We're talking about a European image and concept that is more than the sum of economic community plus subsidies, plus an area of free travel, plus greater ease in daily life. It's a question of making the existing cultural foundation conscious, of seeking opportunities for understanding, and starting from common interests, and of creating the general conditions for this. Intercultural dialogue and the skills required for this are necessary; in our multicultural societies one can already develop these skills at "home," as it were. Artists, cultural mediators, cultural journalists and cultural operators play a dominant part in this regard. Their ability to reflect critically, their renewing force, and their mediating capacities offer, on the one hand, food for thought, and on the other hand facilitate the face-to-face encounters that are the basis for all understanding. And, a dance, film, novel, musical composition, painting, or photograph can have a more powerful effect, can appeal to and touch the "other" more than many a panel discussion.

Exactly because the EU is a work in progress, simultaneously a tangible present and vision of the future, it must continuously reflect on itself on the broadest basis. The EU must see to it that the establishing processes, whether of a verbal argumentative or artistic type, are not paternalistic proceedings from above, that is, on the part of the Commission and the governments of the member states, and is also not experienced or felt as such.

Ideally, Europe's reflection on itself should play out as a broad public discourse:

- Why should we, the citizens of its member states, live in a European community?
- What is the concrete meaning of the constantly used catchword, the "community of values?"
- Why are these values fundamental to the European Union?
- Which forms of coexistence do we want for ourselves as a new community?
- How should the participation of its citizens look and how can participation be guaranteed?

The media and the citizens of Europe, among them many artists and cultural mediators, cultural institutions and cultural networks, have helped to see that this discourse exists, at least at an early stage. The distance that citizens feel between the European business of politicians and bureaucrats and the citizens' reality is still too big, and the emotional attachment to Project Europe is still too weak. The equanimity with which Europe's citizens accepted the failure to give Europe a constitution and thereby to create, for example, enforceable rights, again demonstrated the extent of the failures up to now, and the size and importance of the task. What is needed is a sustained targeted effort on the part of all involved actors and institutions, not just to create a new political culture in Europe that brings the European discourse to the people and addresses their interests. However, the European unification process is also, and primarily, a politico-cultural task with the goal of

re-discovering and conveying Europe as a mutually felt cultural area. A cultural area with which “we” can identify despite all the differences, and where “we” feel at home.

A look at the functioning democracies of the member states shows critical and culturally engaged citizen participation. Why should that not also be possible on the EU level? The Commission, governments, European Parliament, political parties, civic action groups, and, not to forget, the media have a primary task in the future: to sensitively take into account the different cultures and historical backgrounds of the member states.

From this vantage point, the internal connection between the demonstrated levels of Europe’s cultural task also becomes evident. The intensification of cultural exchange amongst the European countries will foster the development of an EU-wide culture of discourse, which in turn is a pre-condition for the formation of a European citizen society and a European identity.

It is because of the singularity of the EU phenomenon that the Europe-related aspects of cultural tasks within the EU are simultaneously cultural foreign policy and domestic policy, at least as long as the EU remains a community of states that maintain their extensive sovereignty.

The continued sovereignty of the member states is also apparent from the fact that they continue to maintain worldwide cultural relations with thoroughly different objectives and instruments.

### **The EU’s own foreign cultural policy - why?**

One must also ask if, in addition to this, the EU should have its own external European foreign cultural policy, and if so, what tasks it would have and in what ways it would (and would have to!) differentiate itself from the cultural relations policies of its member states.

How did de Villepin, the French foreign minister put it? – “A constitution must confer upon Europe the means to take its place in the world of tomorrow.” Actually an astonishing position for the foreign minister of a country that even today maintains its claim to be a superpower, resolutely and without compromise, such as in its veto right on the UN Security Council or as an independent nuclear power. Referring to the constitution clearly defines “Europe” as EU, and it is the constitution to which the French Foreign Minister assigns the role of an active participant in the “world of tomorrow.” That inevitably means an EU foreign policy – and a foreign cultural policy is a traditional component of foreign policy.

Let’s first take a look outside to find out how people there see the EU.

### **Europe – a soulless economic area?**

The further away one goes from Europe, the more markedly one sees the EU primarily as a common economic area that is increasingly determined from Brussels and less so by the legislation of the member states. Interest in the individual member states is not yet decreasing dramatically; however, the desire to understand the regulatory functions of Brussels and Europe as a whole is becoming increasingly strong. Frequently, this



increasingly concrete and sharply outlined outer perception of EU-Europe as a common economic area stands in contrast to very vague images of what the EU is beyond that.

A stable basis of trust, the fertile ground for long-term relationships and emotional ties, will hardly develop from a narrow view of Europe as a cost-performance-calculating economic zone. In the long term this endangers business as well as security policy. The old nations within and outside of Europe have known this for a while and have pursued a more or less intensive foreign cultural policy as an integral component of their foreign policy and thereby also foreign trade policy.

Furthermore, in global competition, the cultural industries, which are consistently gaining in importance, are also in the crossfire of liberalization. It is a European characteristic to protect/subsidize artistically creative forces as a breeding ground for these industries, in its quest for diversity to not completely turn over the cultural industries to the free market, and to support comparable actions in third countries as well. This is also part of Europe's "soft power."

### **Europe – a fortress?**

As a relatively wealthy and stable economic area, the European Union has a strong suction effect on its new, poorer neighbors, and beyond. The income differences are drastically growing between those "outside the EU door" and the new ones "inside," the latter group having increased their competitiveness and the quality of life of their societies through their own reform efforts and EU support measures. With the increasing migration to Europe, it is not just unskilled laborers who come, but rather the intelligentsia is being stripped from these countries, a trend that holds material for conflict.

It is not only Europe's defensive measures against undesirable migration on the one hand, and its selection mechanisms for desirable migration ("brain drain") on the other hand that have an aggravating effect. The accusatory catchword "fortress Europe" expresses the fear of isolationist measures in other areas, such as foreign trade. The agricultural sector provides perhaps the clearest examples. This hits many poor agrarian countries in Africa, South America and in parts of Asia especially hard, but also, time and again, results in serious conflicts with the USA, as we all know.

There is great insecurity in the new neighboring states in Eastern and Southeastern Europe since the EU enlargement. New customs and visa borders are being stretched through formerly porous areas of culture. Beyond trade and work, is the ease of movement being lost on both sides of the border, even regarding traditional family ties, for instance between Poland the Ukraine? What will become of the many cultural, artistic and scholarly contacts and bonds in this area that was, until just recently, largely open? Sound solutions for this must be found to keep dangerous trouble spots from even beginning to develop. The principal objective must be the building of trust and mutual respect. An essential condition is that the new EU external border must not become a cultural border. For this, there needs to be a compensating intensification of cultural exchange with these new neighbors, a group which, not to forget, also includes the large country of Russia.

## Europe – a new security zone?

In hardly any other political field have there recently been such radical changes as in internal and external security. Just 15 years ago, the threat perception was totally focused on the East-West conflict. The countries of Europe were, with few exceptions, members of one of the two large military alliances, NATO and the Warsaw Pact. The power and decision-making centers were located far away from the present-day EU, in Moscow and in Washington. The new EU member states, and to some extent even the older ones, had little influence on important decisions.

NATO continues to exist today, even having expanded to include most of the former Warsaw Pact states within the EU; but for Europe it has a different meaning that is not at all without alternatives. Last but not least, the Iraq conflict, as well as the controversy around the creation of an independent European intervention force, again made that clear.

How will a progressively integrated Europe act in such an environment in the future? As the Iraq war demonstrated, there are still different, conflicting opinions in the realm of security policy. The call for an independent European security policy, with all its consequences, is becoming louder and being heard in the European sphere and across the Atlantic. That European countries could reach agreement on this issue has at least entered the realm of possibilities. What would that mean for the rest of the world, above all for regions adjoining the EU? After all, it concerns an entity with more than 400 million inhabitants, considerable economic and financial power and highly developed technology. A reason for mistrust and fear?

A completely new phenomenon is the threat from international terrorism, against which there are still no convincing defense strategies. How will Europe react to this? Will the EU continue to make cross-border traffic more difficult? Afghanistan and Iraq clearly demonstrate that traditional military means are not enough to get rid of reservations and prejudices. And the “import” of democratic rules does not create a democracy. Politico-cultural strategies that are focused on getting to know each other better could bring long-term solutions, or at least foster such solutions. In the future, foreign cultural policy could become an integral, or rather central component of security policy in a much more concrete sense than up to now.

Europe has a starting point for this. As a “soft power,” it does not strive for a unilateral world order, like the USA, the only remaining superpower since the 1989 collapse of the Soviet Union. Europe “has no ambitions to settle the affairs of the entire world, [...] will not try to bring down unpopular governments as in Cuba, Zimbabwe or Iran by invading the respective country.”<sup>5</sup> Europe is seeking the arduous path of understanding, and that works only via diverse intercultural dialogue. Security policy will have no success without cultural policy.

Certainly the aspects examined here, based on which a large part of the world perceives and critically observes the EU, are not exclusively European characteristics. The economy, border security, and security policy are in the limelight in all large and powerful actors on the world stage. What differentiates the EU is its incompleteness. That is why these areas

---

<sup>5</sup> Tzvetan Todorov, *Die verhinderte Weltmacht-Reflexionen eines Europäers* (Wilhelm Goldmann Verlag, 2003) 90.

in the EU do not fall into line to create a complete picture that has trusted characteristics, and for which one has results based on experience. The recognizable connection is lacking.

### **The need for many explanations**

The consequences are contradictory. On one hand, Europe's incompleteness is an element of the feeling of uncertainty. Uncertainty impedes the establishment of trust. Only the EU as trading partner is increasingly reliable and calculable. This is an insufficient basis for enduring comprehensive stable foreign relations. On the other hand, people are curious and fascinated by what is developing in Europe, increasingly demonstrating Europe's achievement potential. Europe seems to have found answers to the problems of a rapidly changing world in which survival in isolation is increasingly difficult. All over the world we observe a variety of unions, mostly based on economic objectives. NAFTA in North America, Mercosur in South America, GUS in the area of the former Soviet Union, and ASEAN in Southeast Asia are examples. None of these systems has reached the same extent of integration as the EU. Hence the EU offers interesting illustrative material for a wide range of specific problems that can arise in regional unions, even when the integration goals are set at very different levels. Europe has succeeded in overcoming centuries-old wars and feuds in a peaceful way and, in continuous political, economic, and intercultural dialogue with one other, in slowly building a community that could be described as a peace project. This is what constitutes Europe's persuasiveness.

The EU must explain many things to the outside world. It must satisfy

- the enquiry about its experiences with the integration process;
- the enquiry about the interrelationships on which the perceived individual processes are based;
- the enquiry about its own cultural identity.

In principle, this is the same task that the EU also has internally. Europe must explain itself to the outside world: what it is doing and where it wants to go, which value system this goal is based on, what status the economy, security, job security, social obligations, law and order, science, art, culture, etc... have, and how the underlying value system finds concrete expression in these issues. As we have seen, that is a politico-cultural task. Let's recall the remark of the French Foreign Minister: "[a] constitution must confer upon Europe the means to take its place in the world of tomorrow." The core of a constitution is in essence nothing more than what was just said. If therein lies the center of power that confers and secures Europe's position in the world, then de Villepin is not only clarifying the importance of a constitution for Europe, but also demonstrating the tremendous importance of a European foreign cultural policy that is based on dialogue, critical discussion, and cooperation.

Parallel to and building upon the cultural relations work of its member states, a unified Europe has an existential interest in using trust-building measures to convey the EU as a union of states based on values, and in developing a supplementary European foreign cultural policy for this purpose. This development proceeds at the same time as a reinforced strategy to nurture the community-building powers of culture and education within the enlarged EU, since, as has been said, it is the artists and cultural mediators who have the creative-critical and innovative potential. They speak to all the senses, not just to reason, which is not enough by itself. Along with educational institutions, they are an

indispensable bonding agent in intercultural dialogue amongst the people. Government talks and treaties are not enough.

## **II. European topics in foreign cultural policy – where the EU should become active**

### **European cultural diversity as a topic**

Though a politically accepted and conceptually defined EU foreign cultural policy does not yet exist, and the topic will remain controversial in the foreseeable future, there is already a cultural dialogue with non-EU countries on European questions and aspects. There are areas that clearly fall under each member state's cultural and educational sovereignty and should continue to do so, because they are expressions of the respective national cultures. Yet even in these areas, there have long been European appearances on the international stage. This can be seen in the continually increasing number of EU film, theater, dance, media and music festivals, and in the appearances at book fairs under the EU name. The events are constantly expanding into further areas of the world, even though they may sometimes only have an additive character. It's a beginning. Mostly they are organized as joint projects by the cultural institutes representing the member states on location, or by their embassies and consulates. Where there are separate EU delegations, they often take over the coordinating tasks. Given that nothing is as convincing as practical experience, these community events have already helped a great deal in breaking down the fears and reservations of various member states that they would not be able to make their cultural identity visible in a combined European presentation. In any case, the number of member states participating in these programs is steadily growing. Small countries in particular make an impact in mutual appearances that they could not achieve alone. It is often their joint appearance that first makes them visible as vital, independent cultures within the European cultural variety.

This is a win-win situation:

- Smaller EU countries in particular find a platform that they could not find alone, or would only be able to find selectively. On this platform, they can exhibit their cultural independence and present their specific national contributions. They can show that they are competitive in terms of quality and standards.
- The EU profits because these programs convincingly convey to the outside world what this "Europe of Cultures" is in practice, and that it is precisely the EU's cultural diversity and the independence of that diversity within the EU that are specific strengths of this community.

### **The EU as a topic**

In addition, there exists already a practice in foreign cultural relations work in which the EU itself, what it does, and how it acts is a thematic topic. An examination of the reports on the Goethe-Institut's cultural programs from 1997 to 2003 revealed hundreds of such events. There was a certain, surely unsurprising concentration of events in areas directly neighboring the EU. However, there was still hardly any area of the world in which the

topic of the EU was not in demand. As mentioned before, this is only the result for the Goethe-Institut, thus for one member country only. A few examples follow:

In the “new neighbors,” as in Belgrade, people asked anxiously “Why visas? – Schengen: Fortress Europe.” In Bucharest they wanted to discuss “Minority Policy and Protection in Europe and Southeast Europe,” in Istanbul “Migration and Multiculturalism in Germany and Europe” and “The European Agricultural Agreement and Turkey,” and in Izmir “The European Convention on Human Rights and its Application.” In the accession states people were interested in “Who is a European?” “Europe – Unity in Diversity,” or “Economy as the Engine of European Integration” (all in Bratislava); in Budapest “Reform of the Old Age Pension System,” in Prague “International Preservation of Historic Buildings and Monuments in Europe.” Outside of Europe, the topics were “Perspectives of European-Syrian Partnership Programs” in Damascus, in Colombo “Europe and South Asia – Multiple Identities, Multiple Perspectives” or “Challenges to Conflict Resolutions: Europe and Sri Lanka.” In Johannesburg people wanted to talk about “Tendencies in Media Law,” and in Melbourne “Immigration and Human Rights – European Experiences and Australian Resonance” was discussed. For Americans, the important questions were about “Europe and the USA” (Boston) and “Eastward Enlargement of the EU” (Los Angeles). In Tokyo people discussed “The EU in the 21st Century – on the Road to a European Constitution.”<sup>6</sup>

There was also great interest in the importance of art and culture in the EU. In the West African city of Dakar, people were curious about “European Culture on the Internet,” in Buenos Aires, Montevideo and Santiago people wanted to exchange ideas about “The Authority of the State in Post-war Europe to Finance Art and Culture” and about “The Relationship Between Cultural Industries and Subsidized Culture in Comparison to Europe.” In the run-up to EU accession, people in Vilnius wanted to know about “The Role of Book Fairs in Europe.”

Behind most of these and many other topics from the fields of environment, health, social policy, or education, there lies a very concrete interest on the part of the respective host countries. The topics illuminate hopes, fears, uncertainties, and specific domestic problems. They point to thematic starting points for the EU in creating a specific voice in the international fabric, where there is still trust lacking, where the EU has an urgent need for explanation about its motives and plans, and where it can provide support with its own specific experiences. The topics people show interest in could be valuable indicators for corrections and modifications of Europe’s structures, behavior patterns and attitudes in order to improve Europe’s acceptance in the world.

The analysis of the Goethe-Institut reports is not only interesting because it gives clear indications of topics of interest concerning EU-Europe in other countries and regions. The

---

<sup>6</sup> All these listed programs from the work of the Goethe-Institut are cultural programs. They do not seek to primarily exchange know-how, and they do more than just inform. They have a discursive, dialogue, reflective character. They question their thematic subjects, put them in a broader perspective, and examine the relationship between claims and reality. They are open to the critical views of the partner in the host country. They present the concrete reality of a foreign cultural policy as part of the notion of the so-called broader cultural concept as the totality of all expressions of life in a community. The frequent reproach that this plan is actually only a cover in order to have unrestricted content, would hold true only if the reflective element were missing. Because, as should have just been made clear, the authors consider the priority subject matters of a future EU foreign cultural policy in this field, this remark is perhaps useful.

Goethe-Institut, as an instrument of German foreign cultural policy, is not really the natural contact for cooperation requests abroad on purely European questions. The EU does not appear on the stage of international cultural exchange of its own accord, or only in a very limited way, and sometimes it is not allowed to appear at all. Thus, the world has been missing a partner for the many questions it has for the EU. The fact that the Goethe-Institut – and presumably other cultural institutes of European countries do this similarly – takes care of the European questions in the face of this vacuum, can be seen as an indication of how urgent the desire has become in many countries to make contact with Europe and start talking about questions and topics concerning Europe.<sup>7</sup> Shouldn't the EU, in its own best interest, respond to this as soon as possible? The seeds have been sown. We only need to reap the harvest.

### **The EU: initiator of topics**

Europe should not just react to the thematic requests of others, despite the room for explanation and clarification these requests already offer the EU. The experience of the Goethe-Institute suggests that the EU can expect readiness to introduce topics on its own into the cultural dialogue. For example, it should be in the EU's interest to present the consequences of its internal structure as a guarantee for an aggression-free security policy. It has convincing arguments: an EU which is based on the protection and cultivation of its many cultural and ethnic components, which are and are meant to stay in competition with each other, will at best be able to establish a common interest for defense from external threats, but hardly for aggression towards the outside world. Yet this cannot be the place to propose lists of topics. They arise practically by themselves from Europe's particular situation and against the backdrop of the situation described above. Here we attempt to outline a framework in which EU foreign cultural activities and initiatives would be meaningful. We also attempt to show that any objections that such activities could lead to interference in the cultural sovereignty of the member states are unfounded. The sovereignty of the member states regarding their own cultural relations policies will be fully maintained, even with (always limited) responsibility for foreign cultural policy on an EU level.

### **III. The EU as promoter and supporter of cultural exchange - within the EU and abroad**

Since culture, whenever it is an expression of the national and regional members of the European Community, is reserved to the member states and should stay that way, both domestically and abroad, the EU has no responsibilities for content. However, that should not and must not make the EU inactive. It definitely has a series of supporting possibilities and tasks in this area.

---

<sup>7</sup> National foreign cultural policies are constantly changing. That is what is said in the central office of the Goethe-Institut, and surely also by other foreign cultural policy decision-makers: "the Goethe-Institut has broadened its identity. It sees itself as a national as well as a European cultural institute. In the future it will act more European - in Europe and in its worldwide work." The practical consequences of this are the transfer of resources and encouragement for multinational action.

### **The EU: balancing force between large and small member countries**

A characteristic feature of unified Europe is that its member states differ largely in size and economic capacity. This naturally has consequences for the cultural competition within the EU and especially outside the EU. In a time when artistic creativity has long contributed to the overall competitive potential of a country, there can arise significant advantages and disadvantages. It would certainly not be a violation of the non-interference principle if the EU were to act in a supporting and balancing manner. The EU could do this in the realm of cultural foreign work, for example, by using a financial subsidy to enable a small, financially weaker member country to participate in a cultural project abroad, in which multiple member states appear under a European flag and to which this country could make an important contribution.<sup>8</sup>

Support for offsetting competitive disadvantages in cultural exchange could foster the development of a sense of community in the EU, because less culturally visible countries and regions could play a more active part in the European cultural dialogue. That would raise their self-esteem and show them that, as EU members, they have a share in a community of solidarity. It would enrich in concrete terms the experience of being citizens of the European Community, however modestly in individual instances. The public at large would see that Europe's cultural variety is even greater than previously observed.

### **The EU: promoter of a communications structure**

Knowledge contributes to intercultural dialogue within Europe and with the non-European world through available or future communications structures. There is a wealth of incompatible information sources, but there is no summarizing vision that enables artists and cultural mediators to find collaborating partners for their projects and tap into appropriate sources of support. Individual EU states will not take the initiative for this. They are not responsible for this, and they mostly operate bilaterally. Artists and cultural mediators need open space; for them, there are no bilateral limitations. Here great opportunities arise for the EU to support cultural networks and existing European-wide platforms radiating beyond Europe, and to pursue an active information policy.<sup>9</sup> The Internet makes this possible.

### **The EU: promoter of pan-European topics and encounters**

Artists and cultural creators do not just want to meet virtually. Exhibitions, festivals, workshops, book fairs and the like retain their great significance even in the age of the Internet. The EU would have opportunity here to give such encounters more of a European framework, or at least to support them financially. The more that artists and cultural creators can meet under a European set-up and with European topics, the more they will see themselves as European, and the more creative impulses will be exchanged within Europe. They will furthermore bring in more outside stimulation, which again benefits the creative factor in Europe. This creative factor is, as has been repeatedly said, one of the most important raw materials for future international competition. But not only that: it is enrichment.

---

<sup>8</sup> See Annex 1, Pilot Project 1.

<sup>9</sup> See Annexes 1, 3, 4, and 5.

## IV. Actors for the implementation of a European foreign cultural policy

### Public cultural actors

On the public side, there are first the cultural mediators from the EU member countries, such as the British Council, Institut Français, Istituto Italiano, Goethe-Institut, the Czech Centres, Instytut Polski and many more where non-European cultural work does not directly go through embassies and consulates. To this we can add transnational unions, such as the Visegrad-Group consisting of the Czech Republic, Poland, Slovakia and Hungary, who finance EU trans-border cultural and educational work as joint administrators of the mutually financed Visegrad Fund<sup>10</sup> with its seat in Bratislava. Another example is “Ars Baltica”<sup>11</sup> in which there are EU member countries as well as non-European nations, dedicated to multicultural collaboration through many European-wide projects.

The Euro-Med-Foundation should also be considered here. It was planned by the Commission and member states for September 2004 and has been discussed since 1995. Its mission is to create an intercultural dialogue in the Mediterranean region. Many regional and municipal foundations, associations, and networks can be added.<sup>12</sup> Here we will mention only “eurocities,”<sup>13</sup> the European network with a focus reaching beyond Europe. And amongst the many regional public foundations we can mention the “Kunststiftung Nordrhein-Westfalen”<sup>14</sup> with its seat in the German city of Düsseldorf. For these, as well as for other entities in other European regions, it has long been natural to regard regional, artistic, and politico-cultural affairs in an international context and to act correspondingly. This self-image did not exist ten years ago. Making this self-image more widely conscious would strengthen intra-European cohesion and bring to life a non-European demonstration of unity in diversity. Finally, the EU Commission is itself an important actor.

### Non-governmental cultural actors

The importance of non-governmental cultural actors in and beyond Europe has increased dramatically in recent years. By the fall of the Soviet Union, pan-European cultural networks, associations and funds had emerged everywhere. For example, the network “Informal European Theatre Meeting” (IETM)<sup>15</sup> operates in a trans-border way a network of 400 cultural institutions and initiatives in Europe, as well as in African and Latin American countries. The network of networks, “The European Forum for Arts and Heritage” (EFAH), lobbies systematically in Brussels not only for a cultural policy for

---

<sup>10</sup> <[www.visegradfund.org](http://www.visegradfund.org)>

<sup>11</sup> <[www.ars-baltica.net](http://www.ars-baltica.net)> This is an association of the governments of Denmark, Germany, Estonia, Finland, Latvia, Norway, Poland, Russia, and Sweden, founded in 1999.

<sup>12</sup> *Handbook of Cultural Affairs* (3rd edn., Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft / Zentrum für Kulturforschung: Baden-Baden, 2000).

<sup>13</sup> <[www.eurocities.org](http://www.eurocities.org)>

<sup>14</sup> <[www.kunststiftungnrw.de](http://www.kunststiftungnrw.de)>

<sup>15</sup> <[www.ietm.org](http://www.ietm.org)>



Europe, but also for a European foreign cultural policy, especially for the new neighbors.<sup>16</sup> The association “Ecumest,” with its seat in Bucharest, supports the internationalization and professionalization of the cultural sector in Southeast Europe and seeks a pan-European bond.<sup>17</sup> It should also be mentioned that the “Civil Forum” with representatives of various sorts of non-governmental networks, including cultural ones, has set itself the goal of strengthening the civil society sector in the EU Mediterranean policy. The list could go on and on, without even mentioning artist initiatives or foundations.<sup>18</sup>

Next, the few independent European players should be named, such as the “Fund for Central and East European Book Projects”<sup>19</sup> and its parent foundation, the “European Cultural Foundation,”<sup>20</sup> both based in Amsterdam. With grants, projects and politico-cultural lobbying of the EU Commission, the European Cultural Foundation focuses not only on pan-European topics and questions, but is also actively involved in trans-border cooperation with the new neighbors. And it keeps the topic “Europe in the World” in mind.

### **Cooperation of the Actors**

Individually, these and similar cultural actors cannot manage the pan-European task of intercultural dialogue with the non-European world, and certainly cannot do so on a continual basis. The historically determined, politically and economically dictated interests are too different; each actor’s limited responsibilities are too varied; the resources are too limited. Also, as already cited, not all EU member countries have the personnel and financial resources to be able to actively participate in a European foreign cultural policy. The implementation of a pan-European complementary foreign cultural policy is only conceivable in cooperation with as many actors as possible.

### **The EU Commission in a pioneering role**

The EU Commission, supported by the European Parliament, should take a pioneering role in this cooperation. It is in the EU’s best interest to pursue its political, economic and security goals for Europe as a whole and to portray Europe as a consolidating area of culture in intercultural dialogue with third countries. This should always be in addition to the various individual voices of the various actors.

The existing competencies and possibilities of the EU Commission for this complementary foreign cultural policy have not yet been exhausted.

## **V. Tools for the implementation of European foreign cultural policy**

---

<sup>16</sup> <[www.efah.org](http://www.efah.org)>

<sup>17</sup> <[www.ecumest.ro](http://www.ecumest.ro)>

<sup>18</sup> *Handbook of Cultural Affairs* (3rd edn., Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft / Zentrum für Kulturforschung: Baden-Baden, 2000).

<sup>19</sup> <[www.ccebp.org](http://www.ccebp.org)>

<sup>20</sup> <[www.eurocult.org](http://www.eurocult.org)>

## **Tools on the EU level**

The EU commission has a number of tools available, which can be optimized without setting up new administration structures. This is regardless of whether a European foreign ministry with a cultural department will be realized, though such a ministry would undoubtedly contribute to the strengthening of the tools.

### ***Internal cooperation and coordination***

Along with other international organizations, the Council of Europe has for many years pursued cultural policies far beyond the present borders of the EU. Meanwhile, the financial means for this have been sharply reduced. On top of that, the cultural funds and the “Council for Cultural Cooperation” were abolished in 2001. Coordination with the still existing cultural programs in the framework of the Council of Europe’s present priority programs would contribute to an integrated EU foreign cultural policy. In this regard, the Council of Europe’s contacts in third countries, built up over many years, could be very helpful.

A better coordination of the already existing EU programs with cultural components amongst the various directorates of the Commission would make a trust-building foreign cultural policy more plausible. Within the Commission there are, aside from the Directorate for Education and Culture, “about 70 different EU funding programmes from other DGs that offer possibilities for cultural projects, but these are not promoted [...] if cooperation is a priority of the EU it is necessary to find mechanisms for this in the relevant programmes,” according to the report of the European Cultural Contact Points made at the end of 2002.<sup>21</sup> The final recommendation is not surprising: “introduction and emphasis of the cultural dimension, under article 151, in the cooperation programmes with 3rd countries.”

### ***Emphasis on the cultural component in treaties with third countries***

It would be an important tool for the Commission to consistently ensure that cultural programs are not only included in treaties with third countries; it would be just as important to ensure that these are actually implemented, with as many responsible partners as possible.

### ***Active information policy***

As a further tool, a user-friendly electronic information system would reinforce these tools of coordination, with emphasis on the cultural component. The Commission has sufficient competencies for the system’s development. It would need to be made clear who, in which locations, and under which conditions can participate in the available cultural programs with third countries, so that it is no longer said that “they are not promoted.”<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> Requested by DG Education and Culture; presented 17 November 2002 in Copenhagen.

<sup>22</sup> A wealth of information can be found in the book *Europa fördert Kultur – Ein Handbuch zur Kulturförderung der Europäischen Union* (Kulturpolitische Gesellschaft e.V./Deutscher Kulturrat e.V. Klartext Verlag: Essen, 2002) based on the original French edition *Relais Culture Europe* with support from the German foreign ministry. In april 2004 updated electronic version ::[www.europa-foerdert-kultur.info](http://www.europa-foerdert-kultur.info).

The above-mentioned tools are not yet completely effective. Presumably it would be easier for a cultural department in a strong foreign ministry in close collaboration with DG Education and Culture to push through binding forms of collaboration. One could argue that “EuropeAid,” the office for cooperation created in 2001, monitors the strategic coherency of EU actions through its steering committee. The arrangement is that the steering committee takes care of the thematic as well as methodological cooperation in the area of EU development aid. DG Education and Culture has no part in this cooperation, even though it is responsible for cultural issues. How “integrative” is the practice then? The (queried) EU officials have no answers.

With a foreign ministry (including cultural department), it would surely be more promising to insist on the “culture comparability clause” with the commissioners for development and enlargement, where it concerns economic policy with predominantly poor parts of the world that is tolerable for the cultural fields. The power of self-assertion would also be stronger with the Competition Commissioner if topics such as “fixed book prices,” “reduced value-added tax” for cultural goods, and similar issues were touched upon. The latter are not purely intra-European topics. The world envies Europe for its pan-European protection mechanisms for its cultural goods and is therefore interested in learning more about it. In this regard, the interest is rationally about the assessment of cultural industries as a competitive factor.

Indeed, if there were a strong foreign ministry (including a cultural department), it would surely be easier to strengthen the lobby work in the finance and judiciary committees, where laws and expenditures are prepared. The preliminary decisions developed there always have an effect on a cultural policy for Europe and a reflective effect on cultural policy beyond Europe.

A model for how the EU Commission could coordinate thought and action can be found in the Netherlands. The Dutch Foreign Ministry and the Ministry for Education and Culture agreed in 1997, in an agreement approved by the Dutch Parliament, to fund international cultural projects within and outside the country according to mutually drafted guidelines and from a mutual pot of money, the so-called HGIS Geldern;<sup>23</sup> and to tolerate reciprocal personnel exchange, which increases understanding of other points of view. Additionally, in Denmark, and even more so in Sweden, there is close cooperation with development aid, because it is now uncontested that a cultural component contributes to the effectiveness of development measures.<sup>24</sup>

- *To Illustrate: EU: focus on neighbor countries*

For obvious reasons, the tool of coordinated EU programs should, in the spirit of positive discrimination for the new neighbors of the European Union, reach into the east as well as into the south: from Russia, with its very ambivalent interests, through Turkey to Morocco. “I want to see a ring of friends surrounding the Union,” as Commission President Romano Prodi brought it down to the common denominator.<sup>25</sup> The Commission report, “Wider Europe-Neighbourhood. A New Framework for Relations with our Eastern and Southern

---

<sup>23</sup> <[www.minbuza.nl](http://www.minbuza.nl)> or <[www.minocw.nl](http://www.minocw.nl)>

<sup>24</sup> <[www.sida.se](http://www.sida.se)>

<sup>25</sup> Address to the 6th ECSA World Conference, Brussels, 6 December 2002.

Neighbours,”<sup>26</sup> led to the establishment of the “Wider Europe Task Force” whose goal is the strengthening of infrastructures in the new neighbor states and stimulation of trans-border cooperation within the countries as well as with enlarged Europe. However, arts and culture did not find themselves on the list of tasks. A later report, “Paving the Way for a New Neighbourhood Instrument,”<sup>27</sup> emphasized: “[t]his instrument should complement and be coherent with other relevant EU policies and instruments,” but it has not been decided how and by whom the planned, mostly technical, development programs are checked for “cultural compatibility.” When these new neighbors are offered “more than a partnership but less than a membership,”<sup>28</sup> the human encounter, the cultural understanding, and the attempt to create a feeling of mutuality despite dissimilarity must not be disregarded. It is surely heartening that as of 2005 the western Balkan countries shall also have access to the existing EU programs,<sup>29</sup> as has been promulgated so far at least, but even there the word *culture* can only be found in a footnote.

The case appears similar for the cooperation with the southern Mediterranean countries, which the EU Commission put into operation in 1995 with the EU heads of government in the Barcelona Declaration. A lot has been started since then. Nevertheless, the results have been judged only as insufficient from the perspective of observers from the affected countries.<sup>30</sup>

The tool of the previously mentioned Euro-Med-Fund could offer improvement. However, it is still unclear what the concrete contents will be, what the basis of the criteria will be, and who the partners are for implementation. Governments? Civil society institutions? Both? There is still a need for negotiation and clarification here.

- *To illustrate: The EU and other regions of the world*

The following are a few examples of unanswered questions regarding the implementation of an “integrated” European foreign cultural policy in other regions of the world.

The successor republics of the Soviet Union, the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), and Mongolia have profited since 1991 from the EU program TACIS (Technical Assistance to the Commonwealth of Independent States) for the support of economic and political reform processes aiming for the rule of law and a social market economy. A cultural component cannot be recognized. In these countries, however, the cultural consciousness, the pride in their own, and the curiosity in other cultures plays an exceptionally large role.

The countries of Asia and Latin America have access to a number of EU programs, which can incorporate cooperation projects with a cultural character (but do not have to). That frequently, though not always, has no effect, since often no concretizing protocols on the implementation of the individual treaties are signed, with regard to culture. Those in Latin

---

<sup>26</sup> COM (2003) 104, 11 March 2003.

<sup>27</sup> COM (2003) 393, 1 July 2003.

<sup>28</sup> Speech by Romano Prodi at the TEMPUS, MEDA regional conference, Alexandria Library, 12 October 2003.

<sup>29</sup> Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Macedonia, Serbia, Montenegro. See <[www.europa.eu.int/comm/external\\_relations/see/docs/com03\\_748\\_en.pdf](http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/see/docs/com03_748_en.pdf)>

<sup>30</sup> According to nearly all authors in *Confluence Méditerranée, L'élargement de L'Europe vu du Sud*, Revue trimestrielle Nr. 46, été 2003. Editions L'Harmattan, Paris. With support from the European Cultural Foundation.

American countries who are interested in culture feel a particular closeness to Europe. Today they feel increasingly abandoned, and delivered to the only remaining hegemonic power, the USA – also in regards to their cultural industries.<sup>31</sup>

In June 2000, an “integrated” plan was drawn up in the agreement of Contonou for cooperation with the African countries, and the Caribbean and Pacific areas – a plan that should equally take into account the political, economic, social, cultural, and environmental aspects.<sup>32</sup> The tools of the EU, coordination and cooperation, are thus clearly recognized for the pursuit of an integrated foreign policy. The reality on the ground needs further examination. In conversations with cultural politicians and practitioners, doubts were raised.<sup>33</sup>

If the EU takes seriously its role as honest, equal partner without hegemonic intents of an economic or political nature, and if the EU also wants to be seen as such, then it must actively create an integrated foreign cultural policy.

## **Tools for the Commission for promoting cooperation amongst member states**

### *Stimulant for cooperation*

The support of current cooperation and the stimulation of future cooperation amongst the government players is an important and legitimate tool of the EU in its role as facilitator and supporter.

The current practice of cultural cooperation amongst the member states via their governmental and quasi-governmental bodies is contradictory. For instance, a study commissioned by the Commission about “intergovernmental cultural cooperation” in thirty-one European countries established that the predominant practice is that of classical cultural diplomacy in the 19th century tradition.<sup>34</sup> That is a dressed-up exportation of culture, as it should not be carried out today. A further study about cooperation of the EU member states with third countries in the realms of culture and audiovisuals, also commissioned by the Commission, is still in the revision stage. Perhaps it will help paint a more relative picture. In any case, the local practices are often different. The analysis of the worldwide programs of the Goethe-Institut, among others, shows that the adoption of pan-European themes or of the EU as a phenomenon, alone or in association with others, has not only increased sharply in Europe, but has also steadily become a matter of course in third countries.

There are many different types of cooperation in third countries. They range from loose, occasional conversations between the actors (among this group are not only the foreign

---

<sup>31</sup> This arose during conversations between Kathinka Dittrich and governmental cultural actors on all administrative levels as well as private actors at thirteen conferences with pan-Latin American participation in Buenos Aires, Santiago, Cordoba, Asuncion, Montevideo, and Porto Alegre in 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002 und 2003.

<sup>32</sup> *Europa fördert Kultur – Ein Handbuch zur Kulturförderung der Europäischen Union* (Kulturpolitische Gesellschaft e.V./Deutscher Kulturrat e.V. Klartext Verlag: Essen, 2002). See note 22

<sup>33</sup> Such was the case at the “International Consultative Workshop on Ghana’s Cultural Policy” 22-26 April 2002 in Kumasi, with participants from Ghana’s neighboring countries and the artistic and political elite of Ghana. These doubts would need to be verified on a broader level.

<sup>34</sup> <[http://europa.eu.int/comm/culture/eac/sources\\_info/studies\\_evaluation/studies\\_en.html](http://europa.eu.int/comm/culture/eac/sources_info/studies_evaluation/studies_en.html)>

culture institutes, but also culture advisers from embassies and consulates, representatives from political foundations, and EU delegations), to regular meetings, to joint project plans, to cooperation agreements of an almost legally binding character. The most advanced form of cooperation is represented by CICEB, a union of 10 culture institutes bound under Belgian law.<sup>35</sup> This union is supported by the respective parent institutions, at least officially. How far that transfers to reality is another question. In any case, CICEB demonstrates prospects and perspectives, but also exposes still existing deficiencies: an unclear mission, lack of longer-term agreements on topics relevant to Europe, hence lack of continuity and corresponding visibility (no website!), lack of effective commitment on the part of the coordination and organization, and lack of openness to non-governmental cultural bodies. If one reverses these shortcomings, or at least some of them, it would yield a long list of criteria for EU long-term support-worthy cooperation projects. That should not rule out any specific projects relevant to Europe, no matter who they are organized by.

### ***A European cultural institute?***

Beyond the long-term planned and structured cooperation, the call for a European cultural institute is not yet widespread. Such a pan-European cultural institute, if it should ever exist, could only have very limited topical responsibilities, as already described. Additionally, the mentioned shortcomings could be fixed in other ways. In his thoroughly researched book *Ein Kulturinstitut für Europa - Untersuchungen zur Institutionalisierung kultureller Zusammenarbeit*,<sup>36</sup> Robert Peise comes to the following conclusion: “A European culture mediating institute which, as a microcosm of the real Europe, would have space for every European state, is hardly a practicable, integrative interstate model. However, the underlying metaphor of a joint European house remains meaningful for a minimum consensus.” This basic idea is understandable, but it remains doubtful how integrative this house would be, internally and externally. It also remains doubtful whether it is sensible to entrust the corresponding planning and coordinating tasks to one of the cultural advisers dispatched to the European representatives.<sup>37</sup> New structures are not only expensive, but they also provoke bureaucratic obstacles. Would it not be more sensible to fall back on already existing institutes abroad? To motivate these to cooperate using a stimulating EU bonus? Thus motivated, a person could be found to take responsibility on a two-to-three-year cycle. It would be the engine for longer-term planning relevant to Europe, thus for the securing of a European point of view, in contrast to the exploitation of nation-state interests. It could, if necessary with an advisory board, give an expert’s opinion on European relevance, and would be responsible for the final evaluation.

### ***The creation of adjustment funds***

Another of the deficits of the present EU external image is that smaller or financially weaker members have only limited effects. This generates resentments. Only the EU

---

<sup>35</sup> *Consociato Institutorum Culturalium Europaeorum inter Belgas* currently represents Alliance Française, the British Council, the Cervantes Institute, the Danish cultural Institute, the Finnish cultural institute, the Goethe-Institut, the Italian cultural institute, the Louvain Institute, the Austrian Cultural Forum, and the Czech Cultural Center.

<sup>36</sup> See Wolfgang Schneider (ed.), *Studien zur Kulturpolitik*, Vol.1 (Peter Lang Verlag: Frankfurt, 2003).

<sup>37</sup> According to Walter Maaß, Secretary General of the Institute for Foreign Relations, in his speech “Für eine europäische Außenkulturpolitik” at the German-French Dialogue on the Future of Europe, 23 May 2003.

Commission or a European foreign ministry with a cultural department would have the competence and interest to act here in a balancing, supporting, and motivating way. By making a small amount of money from an EU balancing fund available, which would afford these countries information possibilities and grant/subsidy opportunities to participate in cooperation, more pan-European goals could be achieved:

- strengthening of intra-European cohesion, which could be effectively presented in the media;
- portraying Europe in third countries as a cooperating area of culture;
- motivation for actors who have been hesitant up to now to cooperate more closely in third countries;
- repercussion of the intercultural dialogue from third countries on Europe as a confidence-building measure.

As a guiding principle for the allocation of allowances to financially weaker countries interested in cooperation, the same criteria could be used as for the allocation of EU structural support funds for regions with poorly developed infrastructures. To avoid further burdening of the Brussels bureaucracy, the administration of the adjustment funds could be transferred to another qualified and independent body that would also be responsible for the evaluation of the project.

### ***Three pilot projects***

Practical experience for potential further projects can be gathered from the pilot projects more closely described in the annex. Above all, they serve to illustrate what the Commission could do to reach its goals with relatively modest administrative expense and with modest means. A first step. Further steps could follow.

1. Access to information on pan-European planning of cultural projects in third countries. Offer to subsidize the qualified participations from less financially strong EU countries.
2. Creation of a pan-European affiliate visitor program through networking of existing national visitor programs in Europe. EU offer of allowances to less financially strong EU countries for well-founded affiliate trips.
3. Creation of a networked visitor program of the European nation-states in third countries. EU offer of allowances for well-founded invitations from institutions in third countries to cultural creators from financially weaker EU countries.

If one takes seriously what Commission President Prodi offered to the new neighbors, “more than a partnership, less than a membership,” then it follows to extend these pilot projects to the new neighbors.

### ***Drawing up terms of reference for projects that merit support***

Only projects in third countries of pan-European relevance would come under consideration, whether in the scope of the European neighborhood policy or elsewhere in the world. The examples included from the work of the Goethe-Institut<sup>38</sup> demonstrate

---

<sup>38</sup> See Annex 2.

which Europe-related topics could be meaningful in third countries and therefore offer suggestions for the creation of terms of reference for projects that merit EU support. After decades of experience in the culture practice abroad, the authors know that comparable examples could also be found from other cultural relations mediators. It is not only desirable to present these examples, but also necessary in order to put potentially one-sided frames of reference in perspective. However, such further research falls outside the scope of this preliminary work.

## **Tools of the Commission in cooperation with non-governmental cultural actors**

### ***Supporting cooperation***

It is a legitimate EU tool to continue promoting and helping cooperation within the Europe-wide organized “third sector,” and to intensify the third-sector’s cooperation with the national cultural players in projects with pan-European topics.

Non-governmental cultural actors are more flexible in the selection of topics and partners than governmental cultural mediators. They are not dependent on (party) politics and tax money. As already explained, in their independence they often give a more trustworthy impression than cultural representatives from a governmental level. Their work is an important bridge above all to countries with unstable political relations, weakly developed infrastructures, and weak civil societies. That is the case especially for the new EU neighbors, regardless of their diversity, but also for other countries and regions of the world.

Regardless of geographic borders, professional demarcations, and traditionally assigned responsibilities, they strive for stronger cooperation in all fields. A good model for this would be the “Fund for Central and East European Book Projects,” which has been operating the translation program “European History and Integration” since 2001, on request and initiative of publishers and foundations from Eastern and Central European countries.<sup>39</sup> Or, the “Informal Theatre Meeting” devoted itself in 2003 to the topic “Cooperation between governmental cultural mediators and private artistic institutions, associations and foundations.”<sup>40</sup> A job worthy of EU support.

That the “European Forum of Arts and Heritage” tackled the issue “Migration and European Cultural Politics” likewise in 2003, and invited artists and cultural mediators of governmental as well as non-governmental origin from Europe and the neighbor countries to discussions, also illustrates a piece of integrated and support-worthy European domestic as well as foreign cultural policy.<sup>41</sup>

The same is also true for three conferences that the independent European Cultural Foundation organized in 2003 as part of its program series “enlargement of minds” (analogous to enlargement of the European Union 2004). The goal was to build cultural bridges with the southeastern, eastern and southern neighbors. Artists, culture journalists, cultural politicians, cultural mediators representatives from cultural institutions and foundations from the member countries, but above all from the new neighbor countries

---

<sup>39</sup> See Annex 3.

<sup>40</sup> General meeting on 9 October 2003 in Birmingham.

<sup>41</sup> Annual conference in November 2003 in Berlin.



held presentations on the following topics, which speak for themselves: “Crossing Perspectives: Cultural Cooperation with South East Europe,”<sup>42</sup> “Moving Borders: the EU and its New Neighbours”<sup>43</sup> and “Beyond Enlargement - Opening Eastwards, closing Southwards?”<sup>44</sup> All of these were of pan-European relevance and important in their EU support-worthy results. For example, the participants from the Balkan countries formulated the following creed: “[i]n order to ensure an inclusive agenda of cooperation for and with the SEE, a forum of cultural cooperation should be set up, one that would gather together public and non governmental institutions, art institutions and art associations as well as experts from the EU and SEE.” The forum exists today, until now only with moral support from the EU, or more precisely, under the patronage of the European Member of Parliament Doris Pack.

Foundations from political and private enterprise backgrounds are also increasingly willing, despite differing interests, to cooperate with each other and with other bodies. In its first circular, “Europe in the World,” the European Foundation Centre<sup>45</sup> campaigns not just for a European statute for foundations, but also for increased cooperation between foundations within and outside Europe on rather divergent subject areas, including culture/arts. Especially interesting is the study by the Italian foundation Fitzcarraldo,<sup>46</sup> “Cultural Cooperation in Europe: What is the Role of Foundations?” which signalizes the growing readiness of foundations to cooperate within and beyond Europe. For them it is about giving a jump start to innovation within rigid structures. Here as well, the seeds have been sown with consideration for the intra-European cohesion and the corresponding image that Europe as a whole presents to the outside world. Let’s remember: “cooperation is a priority of the EU.”

### ***Support of encounter programs***

This tool could not only put the Commission in closer cooperation with the member countries, as already mentioned; it could also strengthen relevant meeting programs of non-governmental actors. The Commission has recognized the importance of trans-border encounters: they foster intercultural competence and create emotional bonds.

We mentioned in this context only the support-worthy program “STEP *beyond*” of the European Cultural Foundation, which enables artists, cultural managers, cultural journalists, and literary translators to travel from the enlarged EU to the non-accession countries, from the non-accession countries to the accession countries, between the accession countries and between the non-accession countries. This mobility program supplements ECF projects that cross EU borders and its politico-cultural lobbying work. It fits with the neighborhood policy of the EU, thus it serves as an example.<sup>47</sup> It could not be managed by individual European nations, since they would be neither responsible nor interested.

---

<sup>42</sup> Amsterdam, 16-18 June, 2003.

<sup>43</sup> Krakow, 24-26 October, 2003.

<sup>44</sup> Toledo, 13-16 November 2003.

<sup>45</sup> <[www.efc.be](http://www.efc.be)>

<sup>46</sup> <[www.fitzcarraldo.it](http://www.fitzcarraldo.it)>

<sup>47</sup> See Annex 4.

## **Tools of the Commission in cooperation with public and non-governmental actors**

### ***Active Information Policy: the Laboratory of European Cultural Cooperation***

For the optimized use of the above-described Commission tools in cooperation with governmental and non-governmental cultural actors, the tool of a pan-European active information policy is missing. This policy would have as a goal the facilitation of trans-border cooperation within Europe, with the new neighbors, and in other parts of the world.

Despite all recognizable starting points for cooperation between the various bodies, the tendency for each to remain in its own sphere is still easily perceptible. If Europe wants to become a credible public cultural area, it must grow “bottom-up” in cooperation with many actors. This area cannot be constructed from above, that is, from the EU.

A pan-European model project could set a precedent and provide encouragement for further cooperation projects: the “Laboratory of European Cultural Cooperation.”<sup>48</sup> Spearheaded by the European Cultural Foundation; pan-European cultural networks, political and private foundations and, in the second phase, governments of various EU member countries have agreed to tackle the following pilot project: collection, compatible processing, and easily accessible electronic exchange of information on trans-border support-exchange-meeting opportunities for cultural creators, mediators and journalists in Europe. There will also be case studies, successful models, supplementary research, and pilot projects.

This active information tool wants to consciously include the new neighbors, in the spirit of the EU neighborhood policy. Additionally, it could encourage other integrating world regions to take similar action. Despite all the continuing risks, it could become an ideal example of how private and governmental cultural bodies join forces beyond Europe’s borders and in the interest of Europe as a whole. That allows the Commission to join in this public-private partnership as generous supporting partner, something it is also prepared to do.

## **VI. Summary**

1. The European Union has grown beyond a purely economic community, not only factually but also as it is perceived by the world. With a continuously existing independent foreign policy – and the related foreign cultural policies of the member countries – the EU will increasingly be treated as a separate, though limited and unfinished, entity in international relations. With that, expectations and demands on the EU will rise, and this cannot be sufficiently dealt with by the institutions of the foreign cultural policies of the member states, sometimes even where they appear cooperatively under the European name. Increasingly clearer constellations are emerging for the EU itself, which reveal a EU-initiated and EU-navigated policy of trust and security building offered to the outside. This has a number of cultural aspects that reach beyond the principle of subsidiarity. That is what constitutes the pan-European increase in value.

---

<sup>48</sup> See Annex 5.

2. United Europe is not only a community based on cultural diversity; it has a rich and highly differentiated landscape of governmental, quasi-governmental, regional, communal, and private cultural actors with their own trans-border tasks and fields of experience. Amongst these actors there are interactions and cooperation of a most varied nature, which manifest themselves within Europe as well as maintain worldwide contacts. Especially on a non-governmental level, new actors are joining, often specialized or thematically determined Internet networks. A partnering scene is open to the EU, which could be used for European cultural matters and tasks abroad at relatively little organizational and financial cost. The three pilot projects should show how this could look in actual practice.
3. The question then arises as to what tools the EU has available, or would need to create, in order to effectively use the opportunities that the rich scene of cultural actors in EU-Europe offers. These tools would have to comprise financial support opportunities, procedures for issuing requests for project proposals, forms of coordination and networking, and evaluation and clearing authorities. In this regard, one could largely fall back on existing EU institutions with their already existing support sources and institutions in the member countries, or, a delegation of independent bodies should be considered. The additional organizational and financial costs could at least be kept low in the initial phase that should serve as a trial for the opportunities and tools. EU Europe could thus begin with a well thought-out Europe-specific foreign cultural policy without having to create separate culture institutes outside of the EU, such as those that the larger member countries maintain. It can be left to future developments to determine whether an up-and-running foreign cultural policy, complementary to the policies of the member states and under strict application of the subsidiarity principle, would actually lead to a separate organizational structure in the distant future.

In the authors' eyes, it is crucial to put the EU in the position to use the opportunities for initiative and support for a European FCP. The authors are convinced that a joint appearance to the outside world and targeted internal support of trans-border cultural cooperation will strengthen European feelings of solidarity.

**Proposals for three pilot projects for improved cooperation between the EU Commission and the EU member states on cultural work with third countries, with special consideration for small and/or financially weak EU countries**

**First Pilot Project**

**Access to information on pan-European planning in third countries. EU offer of allowances for qualified participation from financially weak EU countries.**

**Project Justification/Background**

Smaller and/or financially weaker EU countries are frequently less represented in non-European locations than the larger EU members. If they maintain cultural institutes at all, they generally do so in Europe and in the directly neighboring countries. That is why they are frequently not informed by the “big ones” about the planning of pan-European cultural events in third countries, and not at all included. This generates inequalities, which damage the internal European cohesion as well as the pan-European image presented to the rest of the world.

**Project Content and Goals**

Two goals are set:

1. The exchange of information about corresponding planning.  
The knowledge itself of such pan-European projects would contribute to the strengthening of the intra-European area, offer suggestions for comparable events in other locations, and underscore the external image of Europe as diversity in unity.
2. The offer to enable qualified representatives from financially weaker EU countries to participate using EU allowances from an EU adjustment fund. The fact alone that such an offer exists, whether or not it is used, would contribute to an intra-European balance and to the general effect beyond Europe.

In addition, it would make it easier for organizers in the locations to invite competent artists/speakers from financially weaker EU countries.

**Project Implementation**

1. The responsible culture institute (embassy, EU delegation) in the location submits on time all relevant information in an agreed-upon format to a centrally administered website in Europe (for example: place, topic, topic’s relevance for EU and for host country, time, duration, partner in the location, artists/speakers who have been invited

up to that time point, status of the planning: completed or open, required qualifications for potential further participants, substantiated request to issue invitations to artists/experts from financially weaker EU countries, etc...)

2. The administrators of the website check the incoming requests or applications with an advisory board and pass their conclusions on to those concerned. If an application comes from a small financially weak EU country or if a qualified participant is requested from there, then an allowance will be offered to the participant, which will be paid out after the event. The information exchange and the evaluation of requested candidates or of those applying on their own behalf could be managed within a period of eight weeks by the responsible parties. That such a short span of time is enough has been demonstrated by highly successful mobility programs of independent European cultural institutions.

### **To Illustrate**

For example, a qualified applicant/requested candidate from Denmark is informed. With the early information, he could play an active part in the planning. On shorter notice, he could participate in the planned event without an EU allowance. His equally accepted colleague from Slovenia, for example, would receive an allowance. The latter should also apply to requested/qualified applicant artists/participants from Serbia or Albania, for example. In the spirit of the EU neighborhood policy, this pilot project should also be extended to the new neighbors.

### **Role of the EU Commission**

1. The EU determines what is to be understood by “financially weaker” EU members. For example, it could apply the criteria of the present support for structurally weaker regions, or it could use the gross national product.
2. The EU builds the website and administers the project, or transfers these tasks to a qualified independent European cultural institution.
3. The EU creates a small adjustment fund, administered by itself or by others, from which the following could be paid:
  - a. a bonus/allowance for the informing event organizers in third countries for their projects;
  - b. overhead costs that might arise if the project is transferred to another party;
  - c. allowances for requested participants, or qualified participants applying independently, from financially weaker EU countries or from the new neighboring countries.

### **Evaluation**

1. The subsidized participants write a report the event.
2. After four years, the entire pilot project will be evaluated by the administrating authority.

## **Second Pilot Project**

**Creation of a pan-European connecting-visitor program by networking the existing national programs in Europe. Allowance offer for financially weaker member states for justified connecting trips.**

### **Project Justification/Background**

Many EU members have a visitor program that is also for cultural actors from third countries. Those of the “bigger countries” are financially better-endowed, while those of the “smaller countries” are often meager. They are not networked. Countries do not inform one another whom they will invite from a third country and when, or if justified wishes for connecting trips exist. Not every invited artist/cultural expert has the contacts and the means to independently organize a connecting trip or to have it organized, especially not in the case of a financially weak EU country. This situation, which seems almost absurd, can be remedied at little expense.

### **Project Contents/Goals**

Two goals are set:

1. EU-wide transfer of information about nationally issued invitations to cultural creators, mediators, journalists, and politicians from third countries when those invited have justified requests for connecting trips.  
Just having this information would contribute to intra-European closeness. And a picture of Europe as communicating within its own borders would be conveyed to the outside world. The Goethe-Institut issues about 100 invitations yearly to cultural creators from all over world. That number is a bit higher for the British Council or the Institut Français. These are manageable quantities. Since not every person invited would want or be able to justify a connecting trip, the number in reality would decrease considerably. In addition, if the visitor departments work together, they will share expenses for long-distance flights, as festivals have long been doing.
2. Subsidized connecting trips to financially weaker EU member countries.  
The offer to enable a connecting trip with allowances in the case of justified interest of an invited person from a third country, or on the basis of a qualified invitation from the financially weaker EU countries, would create a bonding agent for Europe. The result would be a feeling of solidarity, perceived both internally and from outside the EU.

### **Project Implementation**

1. The national inviting visitor program submits to a centrally administered website on time all relevant information of the planned visitor trip in a given format, with connecting trip requests; or directly informs the visitor program of a “richer” EU country in an agreed-upon format: for example, name, address, position of the invited person, reason for the invitation, time and duration of trip, tentative program, expressed

and justified request for a connecting trip with information on the persons/institutions to be visited.

2. For connecting trips to financially weaker EU countries, the administrators of the website/project regulate the allowance in coordination with the responsible institution in the location.

### **To Illustrate**

A real example: an African TV producer was invited to Germany by the Goethe-Institut. He also wanted to visit the ARTE editorial department in Strassburg. Because of budgetary rules, this was not possible. A ticket was only possible to the German border station of Kehl. He would have had to walk over the bridge to Strassburg and to sleep under the bridge. The French visitor program would have been responsible, but it had no idea about the request. Whether it would have paid for the connecting costs can only be surmised. If the African producer would have wanted to visit the film studios in Riga, or if the less financially strong Latvia had wanted him to visit, then the administrator of the adjustment funds, in cooperation with the responsible Latvians, would have arranged an EU allowance. The same would have been valid for a connection trip to Croatia or Montenegro – in the spirit of the previously mentioned European neighborhood policy.

### **Role of the EU Commission**

1. The EU determines what is to be understood by “financially weaker” EU members. For example, it could apply the criteria of the present subsidies for structurally weaker regions, or it could use the gross national product of the countries.
2. The EU builds the website and administers the project, or transfers these tasks to a qualified independent European cultural institution.
3. The EU creates a small adjustment fund, administered by itself or by others, from which the following would have to be paid:
  - a. overhead costs that might arise if the project is transferred to another party/ to the implementing organization;
  - b. allowances for justified connecting trips to financially weaker EU countries.

### **Evaluation**

1. The visitors who were subsidized for their connecting trips write reports on their experiences after the trip.
2. After four years, the entire pilot project will be evaluated by the administrating authority.

## **Third Pilot Project**

**Creation of a networked visitor program of the European nation-states in third countries. Offer of allowances by the EU for justified requests of the candidates or for justified invitations from third countries to cultural creators from financially weaker EU countries.**

### **Project Justification/Background**

It is easier to steer interest towards Europe than to stimulate curiosity about non-European countries, especially when the living conditions there are judged as unattractive. This holds true for many countries. Poorer and structurally weaker third countries are well aware of this lack of interest from Europe. It is in Europe's interest not to let this knowledge about the dissimilarity turn into a burning feeling of inequality.

The financially strong EU countries in particular maintain scholarship programs in third countries for artists and cultural actors. That puts these cultural creators in a position to make contacts and to find, take in, and bring back stimulation. Their colleagues from financially weaker EU countries rarely have this chance.

### **Project Contents/Goals**

Two goals are set:

1. Transmission of information on the so far limited scholarship programs of the EU countries in third countries. Even this bundled information serves as a trust-building measure.
2. Offer to poorer third countries to be able to invite qualified candidates using an EU adjustment fund. The simultaneous offer to richer as well as financially weaker EU countries to use various EU allowance resources to motivate qualified cultural candidates to spend time in less appealing third countries. The feeling of equality within the EU as well as in relationships with third countries would thereby be enhanced. In addition, the EU would appear as a united whole, despite all the differences. And, Europe does not only have things to offer but also needs new, unconventional, not-yet-practiced, unusual ideas for itself.

### **Project Implementation**

1. The EU members (in a possible second phase, also regions, cities, foundations) enter their relevant scholarship programs into a central European website. To ensure compatibility, they follow a given format (e.g. destination, target group, duration of subsidized stay, conditions of the subsidy, etc...)
2. The website administrators ensure a compatible, client-friendly information program. This information system signals under which conditions cultural institutions/media in the third countries can issue invitations with an EU allowance to artists, cultural



researches, cultural mediators, cultural journalists, etc... For an invitation/dispatch from a “poorer” EU country a special “tariff” could be valid.

### **To Illustrate**

A real example: the museum in Kaunas (former capital of Lithuania) would like to invite a museum specialist for a few months to help decipher some of the limitedly decoded museum collection, mostly unsigned from the 19th century. However, there are no scholarships/hospitality/internship programs for this, even though it would not at all be a matter of one-sided EU support. Quite the opposite – one could discover the works of the brilliant symbolist Cuillonis on permanent exhibition at the Kaunas museum, up to now known only to experts. Thus there would be give and take. The same also applies to many museums in South America, and, in limited form, also in Africa; and of course it is not restricted to the world of museums. An open Europe could not only help but also profit a great deal from others.

If a Finnish expert (or a Dutch, Danish, French, etc...) were desired in Kaunas, or willing to go there, then he should receive an EU allowance. In the case of a Polish or Serbian expert, the EU allowance would need to be a bit higher.

### **Role of the EU Commission**

1. The EU determines what is to be understood by “financially weaker” EU members. For example, it could apply the criteria of the present subsidies for structurally weaker regions, or it could use the gross national product.
2. The EU builds the website and administers the project, or transfers these tasks to a qualified independent European cultural institution.
3. The EU creates a small adjustment fund, administered by itself or by others, from which the allowances would be paid.

### **Evaluation**

1. The subsidized travelers write a report at the end of their stay in the third country.
2. After four years, the entire pilot project will be evaluated by the administrating authority.

### Examples of the handling of European topics in the foreign cultural policy from the work of the German Goethe-Institut

#### Overall Considerations

The following five examples from Bratislava, Chicago, Colombo, Dakar, and Melbourne concern three aspects:

1. topics of pan-European relevance, or, the EU as topic;
2. forms of cooperation amongst representatives from the EU countries in these locations;
3. the role of the EU.

The examples demonstrate

- that the discussion of Europe-related topics touches on the need in third countries for an exchange of experience, since they are confronted with similar phenomena, though under different circumstances (especially Colombo, Melbourne);
- that the EU itself is often the topic (especially Bratislava, Chicago, Colombo, Dakar);
- that when the EU member states are responsible for the theme, the cooperative form of organization is optimal (especially Chicago, Melbourne);
- that a cooperative form of organization can nevertheless be questionable if it only has an additive character and does not consider the voices of countries not represented in the location<sup>49</sup> (especially Dakar);
- that the third sector is rarely included (not in any of the examples);
- that the European Union should also serve as partner in the handling of the “EU” phenomenon (in Bratislava, not in Colombo);
- that the EU should appear as sponsor at events in third countries with Europe-related topics (not in Dakar or Chicago but in Melbourne).

The examples are to give indications for terms of reference to be developed by the EU for support-worthy cultural projects in third countries. Further examples from other cultural mediators in third countries could provide additional aspects.

It is in the EU’s interest to support such events, because national thinking still clearly prevails in the organization of events, and the forms of cooperation are often purely coincidental. But the breeding ground is there for a pan-European mentality, supplementary to the national ones.

#### Example 1: Institut Melbourne

**Theme of the Event:** European Year of Languages: Perspectives on Culture, Education and Politics (Symposium).

**Duration:** 1 Day (2001).

---

<sup>49</sup> See Pilot Project 1.

**Participants:** Linguists, decision-makers from school authorities and the ministries for education, teachers.

**Number of Participants/Visitors:** 240.

**Goethe-Institut Partners:**

- a. **In host country:** Contemporary Europe Research Centre;
- b. **EU:** France (Alliance Française), Italy (Italian Institute of Culture), EU delegation.

### **Content/Goals**

The conference brought together participants from research, school, tertiary education, ministries, school authorities and cultural life. They debated the following aspects with experts from the organizing EU countries:

- comparison of guidelines for foreign language acquisition,
- possibilities for foreign language acquisition,
- fields of application,
- connections between foreign language acquisition and cultural life, above all in the Australian context.

In the institute's report it was not specifically mentioned whether the "native language problem" of immigrants was addressed, though it seems to follow from the context that this was the case.

### **Significance for EFCP**

Linguistic diversity is one of the most striking features of the cultural situation in the EU, especially after enlargement. It is simultaneously rich and problematic and therefore needs particular attention in the European unification process. The question of which foreign languages are offered in the education systems of the member states will need discussion for a long time to come. As a classic immigration country, Australia boasts a similar linguistic diversity, but with the very different backdrop of a uniform official language. The majority of EU countries are now in reality also immigration countries and have directly comparable problems in this aspect.

There is an interplay between, on the one hand, preservation of the wealth of linguistic diversity and its importance for the vividness and differentiation of the entire cultural scene, and, on the other hand, the suctioning effect and practical use of a common lingua franca. This is a current topic for both EU and Australia, despite their varying backgrounds and problems.

An event such as the Melbourne symposium shows how an almost uniquely EU characteristic, that of linguistic diversity and the consequences that result for the EU and the EU area, can be fruitful for an exchange of experiences in a country/region with similar phenomena but different problems.

A topic like this is a good example for a cooperative handling by as many member states as possible in the location. Since native language and foreign language acquisition in the EU belong to the member states' field of responsibility, the leadership in the FCP should lie with their mutually cooperating representatives in the host country. The EU level can take part supportively, as occurred in this case.

## **Example 2: Institut Colombo**

**Theme of the Event:** Today's Challenges to Conflict Resolution: Europe and Sri Lanka (not public; pure expert symposium).

**Duration:** 1 day (in 2000).

**Participants:** according to the list of participants itemized in the report, the symposium had high caliber attendance. Managerial staff of topically governmental and private organizations from the host country, and from the press, media, and research spheres discussed topics with experts from Germany.

**Number of participants/visitors:** 21.

**Goethe-Institut Partners:**

- a. **In Host Country:** National Peace Council;
- b. **EU:** none.

### **Content/Goals**

Comparison of strategies in dealing with conflict situations in Sri Lanka and the EU. The background in Sri Lanka is the Tamil conflict. On the European side, the experiences with the interventions in former Yugoslavia, Kosovo, and Macedonia were especially discussed.

The institute's report speaks of one of the most successful and important events put on by the Goethe-Institut Colombo. The participants from both sides emphasized that they had gained important information and encouragement.

### **Significance for EFCP**

One should remember that the collapse of Yugoslavia and the resulting civil wars led to one of the deepest crises in Europe's identity yet. Talk everywhere was not only of the EU's political failure, but also of its moral failure. Since then, the security policy discussion in the EU is closely linked with the discussion about its identity, as a touchstone of its claim to be a community of values.

The topic therefore had an obvious connection to the EU. It would therefore be logical if the EU would act as partner in the international discussions on conflict control and conflict culture.

## **Example 3: Institut Bratislava**

**Theme:** 1001 Europe – Unity and Diversity (series of events).

**Duration:** 1999-2002.

**Participants/Contributors:** Academics, experts, politicians, journalists, and artists from the organizing countries and from the host country.

**Number of visitors:** between 80 and 950 per event; as a rule 100-250.

**Goethe-Institut Partners:**

- a. **In Host Country:** varying, usually Comenius University;
- b. **EU:** French cultural institute, Austrian cultural center, EU delegation.

## **Content/Goals**

In twenty-one thematic individual events (lectures and seminar-style formats) under the above-mentioned motto over the course of three years, the organizers familiarized a relatively broad audience that was, according to reports, relevant to forming public opinion, with important aspects of Slovakia's upcoming EU accession. All events had a closing discussion period, moderated several times by the chancellor or vice-chancellor of Comenius University. The individual topics were as follows (one per event):

- Minorities and their importance for the cultural diversity of Europe
- Ten years after the fall of the iron curtain: Europe's borders today
- Who is a European?
- On the road to the European Union – risks and opportunities
- The future of the institutions in the EU
- The musical borders of Europe
- Ethnic conflicts in central Europe – dealing with contradictions
- Regional development and jobs
- Literary myths in Europe
- Development of the population in Western Europe and in the former socialist states in Central and Eastern Europe
- Borders – conceptual and spatial changes; examples from Europe
- The image of Slovakia in the European media
- The contribution of Judaism to European culture
- No Europe without Central Europe
- Slovakia on the road to the EU
- The future of work in Europe
- Healthcare systems in Europe
- The future of European agriculture
- Multiculturalism in Europe
- Economy as the engine of European integration

The stated number of visitors suggests considerable interest in the event series. It is noticeable that the names of the lecturers and participants quickly became more well-known after the first few events. That points to quickly-won prestige. A few examples can be listed: Rita Süßmuth, Jürgen Habermas, Franz Fischler, Bernd Posselt, Erhard Buzek, Jacques Rupnik. Amongst prominent visitors, the Slovak Minister of Justice was listed and an acceptance from the Slovak president Schuster for a lecture in the series was mentioned (about which there is no report). The reports show that the subsuming of the individual event topics to a general theme, the long, three-year time frame, the regularity of the sequence of individual events, and the temporal relevance due to the upcoming EU accession were an ideal combination for the visibly powerful impact. There were some mentions about putting the lecture notes on the Internet.

## **Significance for EFCP**

The event series demonstrates the possibility to include citizens of a country in the preparation process for EU accession, however limited the participation may be in terms of numbers. On the basis of the reports, it can be assumed that beyond press reports, Internet publications and multiplier effects, a certain additional, wider impact was present. The

prominently moderated and evidently extensive, lively discussions gave the people a voice that, on the purely political level, they are usually denied. The awareness of at least having received an offer to join in the conversation, and not having to completely passively witness the preparations process, should not be underestimated for the people's acceptance of and identification with the EU accession. Certainly events of this type convey much more concrete and clear information on important aspects of future membership in the EU than politicians' speeches, newspaper articles or news reports. The fact that EU members organized the event shows the accession country that member states are interested in the accession country as future member state. How much stronger this signal could be if such an event series were supported by more than just three member countries. In the future, the EU, which in this case gave financial support, should also become organizationally active to recruit more member states as cooperation partners.

#### **Example 4: Institut Chicago**

**Theme:** EU Literature Festival 1999-2002.

**Duration:** 2-3 days each.

**Participants:** from 4 (2002) to 6 (2000) authors, each from an EU country.

**Visitors:** 180 (2000), 160 (1999 and 2001), 70 (2002).

**Goethe-Instituts Partners:**

- a. **In Host Country:** Chicago Humanities Festival and Chicago Sister Cities International Program;
- b. **EU:** EU countries represented in Chicago (up to now: Germany, France, Italy, Spain, Austria, the Netherlands, Belgium, Denmark, Ireland).

#### **Content/Goals**

Cooperative event series of EU countries with consular or cultural representatives in Chicago, initiated due to the great success of the EU film festival, which has been regularly held since 1997. (The 2003 report was not yet available.) If the evaluations are positive, the series will become permanent. Each EU country is called upon to invite one author per year for the joint literature festival. If possible, the works should already have been published in the U.S., though this was often not the case. For two to three consecutive days, readings (with English translations) alternate with discussion times. At the end, there is a joint panel discussion moderated by a well-known American journalist. The stated goal of the organizer is "to demonstrate the cultural components of the European Union," to show "commonalities and variety in Europe's literature scene" and "to stamp the EU as a cultural community into the consciousness of the American public."

#### **Significance for EFCP**

Literature belongs to the field of responsibility of the member states, and it should and will remain there in the future. In this case, the cooperative form of event is the optimal type to present oneself to the non-European world as a cultural community and to pursue cultural exchange with a European background. That considerable impact can be achieved with this is underscored not only in the event reports, but also in the continuation of the event, which must be agreed upon from year to year.

A weak point in terms of having the widest possible participation from the member countries is that only countries with consular or cultural representatives in Chicago are involved. This excludes primarily the smaller and poorer countries. An organizational, but above all a financial assistance at the EU level (e.g. the Commission) would decisively contribute to these countries' future ability to bring their outstanding authors or artists and their artistic achievement into the European context. Events such as these would show that Europe's literary scene (art scene, culture scene) is actually much broader, more diverse, and alive than has been presented up to now. On the other hand, the countries that until now were practically excluded from participation would learn that their inclusion in the cultural dialogue with the world matters to the union, since they too are members of the European community. This is surely a contribution to the strengthening of the European consciousness in these states that cannot be taken lightly.

### **Example 5: Institut: Dakar**

**Theme:** European Culture on the Internet.

**Duration:** 1 day (in 2000).

**Participants/Visitors:** 51.

**Goethe-Institut Partners:**

- a. **In Host Country:** Maison de la Culture Doutra Seck;
- b. **EU:** "Groupe Europe 2000" (Local alliance from 7 EU countries: Germany, France, Great Britain, the Netherlands, Austria, Italy, Portugal).

### **Content/Goals**

Public online projection of Internet websites on European culture. Each participating EU country presented important Internet sites from its country. An annotated directory of web addresses was created and distributed for the event. The relevance for the host country is the rapidly increasing Internet usage in Senegal. The Goethe-Institut report emphasizes the following important results of the event:

- deepening of the cultural cooperation of the EU countries in Senegal;
- demonstration of the variety of European cultures ("Shifting the focal point away from Paris");
- familiarization with independent research techniques for the predominantly student audience.

### **Significance for EFCP**

The cooperative appearance under one European name ("Groupe Europe 2000") is the format prescribed by the subsidiarity principle (cultural sovereignty of the member states). The objective emphasized in the report is surely interesting: to widen the previous focus in Senegal on France to a European perspective. Given that the French were co-organizers, they evidently shared this objective (which would have been highly unusual until very recently!).

According to the report, the event was European only in a very qualified way. Every participating country presented examples from its country. That not only left out the member states not participating, but also conveyed a highly incomplete picture of the

group of transnational private providers in Europe, which are especially important and diverse in the Internet sphere. That is not only a content restriction. In view of the emphasized goal of demonstrating the variety of the European cultural scene, there was an ideal opportunity in this topic formulation to show the rich and multifarious contribution of private and informal actors. The EU could provide decisive support here if it were to provide an information platform about these informal provider scenes and could offer member states not represented in those locations financial support, particularly for small and financially weak countries. These tasks cannot be afforded by or expected from any other institution.



### **Example of Addressing the European theme by an independent foundation: Fund for Central and East European Book Projects (CEEBP), Amsterdam**

**Locations:** Accession countries and “new EU neighbors” in Eastern and Central Europe.

**Theme:** European History and Integration Programme.

**Duration:** since 2001.

**Partners:** Publishers in these Eastern and Central European countries.

#### **Content/Goals**

The current discussion on European integration, on its historic roots, and on its contemporary institutions is very difficult for these ex-communist countries to comprehend. Therefore, the above-mentioned translation program was founded at the request of publishers in those countries. For justified presented works on European history, politics, economy, culture, literature and European law, the publishers receive allowances for translations into the particular national language. The book’s country of origin plays no part. The book may be written by an intellectual from Kosovo or by an author from the USA, England, Germany, etc... A pan-European panel of experts and independent specialists judge each application on the quality of the book, the translator, and the publishing house; and evaluate the sales and marketing opportunities, and the relationship between overhead costs and total costs. This project is about a subsidy in the market economy, an economy that is very new for many publishing houses.

#### **Significance for EFCP**

A few titles illustrate the pan-European relevance:

- Deák, István / Gross, Jan T. / Judt, Tony (ed.): *Europe on Trial. The politics of Retribution in Europe. World War II and its Aftermath*. Translation into Romanian, 2003.
- Russell, Bertrand: *History of Western Philosophy*. Translation into Polish, 2001.
- Smith, Karen: *The Making of EU Foreign Policy. The Case of Eastern Europe*. Translation into Bulgarian, 2002.
- Tolstaya, Tatjana: *Denj (Essays)*. Translation into Albanian, 2003.
- Vidal-Naquet, Pierre: *La démocratie grècque vue d`ailleurs*. Translation into Serbian, 2003.

Many more “East-East” or “West-East” translations could be cited. They help to dig up the buried knowledge about European common interests amongst a generally educated audience and to illustrate the current situation, besides the infrastructure improvements that occur through constant dialogue with the publishers.

Undoubtedly both goals are in the foreign and security policy interests of the EU and its proclaimed neighborhood policy. Translation programs of this kind are worthy of EU

support, particularly since no European state would and could cooperate in such a global way.

## **Example of the facilitation of EU trans-border mobility through the independent European Cultural Foundation (ECF), Amsterdam**

**Locations:** EU countries, accession countries, and non-accession countries in Northeast, Central and Southeast Europe (in the Mediterranean region).

**Theme:** STEP *beyond* (Supporting Travel for European Projects).

**Duration:** since early 2003 (as an extended replacement of an earlier mobility program, APEX).

**Partners and target groups:** professional artists, cultural managers, cultural journalists, literary translators, cultural researchers (no government representatives, no students, no festival or conference guests or those furthering their education).

### **Content/Goals**

1. With allowances (reimbursement of travel/visa expenses, per diem for 7 days maximum), it facilitates the travel of the above mentioned target group from the enlarged EU to the non-accession countries, from the non-accession countries to the EU, and between the accession countries and the non-accession countries in order to
2. find opportunities for meeting and exchange, particularly in the development phase of trans-border artistic-cultural projects (no presentation of completed artistic products), and to
3. thereby have the opportunity to initiate true cooperation that could lead to a longer partnership.

The ECP supports a comparable program for the new southern neighbors, the Mediterranean countries, through the Roberto Cimetta Fund in Brussels.

### **Significance for ECRP**

No EU member country will take responsibility for or even be interested in the special character of this mobility program that crosses many borders. It is obviously in the pan-European interest and falls under the responsibility of the EU Commission in its role as promoter and supporter – indeed, it must be the initiator. The EU has acknowledged the importance of mobility for cultural creators and cultural journalists in order to break down prejudices/misunderstandings and to create opportunities for understanding. Only in this way will the “ring of friends,” as mentioned by Commission president Romano Prodi, have an opportunity to become such a ring of friends. Therefore, absolutely support-worthy.

### **Example of the attempt to shape and strengthen the cultural cooperation in Europe from the “bottom-up” – a public-private alliance initiated by the European Cultural Foundation (ECF), Amsterdam**

**Locations:** Europe in the broadest sense.

**Theme:** The establishment of a “Laboratory of European Cultural Cooperation” (LAB).

**Duration/Time Period:** 2004-2007 (pilot project; continuation depending on results).

**Partners:** Private foundations in Europe, expertise organizations, cultural networks, ministries of culture (from the member and accession countries and others), and the EU Commission.

**Target Groups:**

1. Cultural creators, artists, cultural managers, journalists, and those in the general public who are interested in Europe and culture;
2. Decision-makers in the public cultural administrative authorities in the European countries;
3. European institutions.

#### **Project Justification/Background**

European integration cannot succeed without an increased cultural component, without the guarantee of trans-border cooperation and related discourse. There is a lack of tools to convey a European dimension of thought and action, as well as a lack of mechanisms to coordinate and make accessible the abundance of valuable information. (Compare the results of the feasibility study commissioned by the Commission for an Observatory of Cultural Cooperation.<sup>50</sup>) Picking up on an idea in the European Parliament that in the confusing European cultural landscape a cultural observatory may be necessary, the European Cultural Foundation invested in two studies and intensive expert networking before it finally presented a pragmatic concept for a pilot project. This project should be realized in public-private partnership. The fundamental characteristics of this plan are that it is borne by actors in the field and that the concrete, practical use for the target group has the highest priority.

#### **Content/Goals**

The LAB should be the reference address for everyone who is interested in cultural cooperation in Europe, who wants to participate or has something to contribute; it should serve as a reliable guide through the landscape of European cultural cooperation and should facilitate access to the general public on the cultural aspects of European integration.

---

<sup>50</sup> “However, our research has illustrated that the current situation presents a series of gaps and persisting barriers in relation to the development of cultural cooperation in Europe, both in terms of overall sustainability of the field and in terms of creating a favorable environment for artistic collaboration by individual actors.” *A Feasibility Study Concerning the Creation of a European Observatory of Cultural Cooperation*, 35.

This should initially be made possible through

1. an interactive *portal* that acts as coordination platform and as service and information provider, generates innovative knowledge, makes grant/allowance opportunities accessible, presents and analyzes best-practice examples, and organizes legal information and makes it usable;
2. promotion of the development of a genuinely European debate, a European area of thought, with the help of the *Public European Space* project (in cooperation with European partners): it should open debates and discourses of a European character (in multiple languages), make them accessible, document them, and stimulate them. It should contribute to the formation of a European civil society and contain an up-to-date overview and interactive components that enable and support broad participation; and through
3. action-oriented and goal-focused *research projects* that identify relevant subject areas for the field of cultural cooperation, analyze practices, and turn results into politico-cultural recommendations (for example, in the field of mobility).

### **Project Implementation**

Initiated and developed by the European Cultural Foundation, the LAB will lead to an independent, streamlined institution with innovative guiding structures, which will generate contents and prove its reliability in constant communication with the field. Because of its alliance of private and public partners, it will be able to work independently in terms of content while also having European legitimacy.

### **Significance for EFCP**

This project has a genuinely European character and goes far beyond the idea of an additional (bureaucratic) EU institution. Through its reliability, networked connection with the field, and transparent organizational structure, it will win the trust of a broad audience. Its strength lies in the fact that it developed “bottom-up,” reacts to concrete needs, and will continually fulfill its responsibility to seek and quickly implement innovative solutions. That is how it has the potential to maintain and support real cultural exchange between the individual member countries and to constructively react to constantly changing demands.

On the basis of its pan-European claim and inclusive character, the LAB particularly enables the integrative dialogue between the future EU and the new neighbor countries. The LAB, especially in its function as guide, information and knowledge provider, can furthermore become *the* incentive for non-Europeans to want to learn more about Europe – and to be able to do so in a very simple way.

On the one hand, the LAB will act as intermediary between the field and the EU institutions, but on the other hand it will also serve as role model and information platform for interested non-European countries, and facilitate access to and understanding of the enlarged Europe.