

Public Culture, Cultural Identity, Cultural Policy

Kevin V. Mulcahy

Public Culture, Cultural Identity, Cultural Policy

Comparative Perspectives

palgrave
macmillan

Kevin V. Mulcahy
Political Science
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana, USA

ISBN 978-1-137-39861-1 ISBN 978-1-137-43543-9 (eBook)
DOI 10.1057/978-1-137-43543-9

Library of Congress Control Number: 2016946974

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s) 2017

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use. The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made.

Cover illustration: Cover icon created by Andrew Hainen from the Noun Project

Printed on acid-free paper

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by Springer Nature
The registered company is Nature America Inc. New York

*With Thanks
to all
My Undergraduate
Research Assistants*

FOREWORD

WHAT IS CULTURAL POLICY?

Perhaps because of the illusive nature of what constitutes culture, public cultural policies lack clear, definitive, commonly agreed-upon goals. Indeed, as will be seen in this book, these goals vary considerably depending upon the nature of the political system and the ideological values that they embody. These variables influence how culture is defined and understood. This Foreword seeks to provide some focus for understanding the various forms of cultural patronage and politics that are discussed herein.

Among the issues involved with cultural policy, the following are emphasized to explain and operationalize the elusive notion of culture and what is entailed in a cultural policy. These are (1) to reveal the relationship between political cultures and the particular expressions of public cultures; (2) to give an overview of what is entailed in public culture as a public policy; (3) to outline the objectives and justifications of public culture that are surveyed; (4) to consider how culture is defined and its implications for formulating a public policy; and finally, a coda to provide some sense of future trends in cultural policy with particular reference to the American model of patronage.

PUBLIC CULTURE AND POLITICAL CULTURE

As a broad generalization, a nation's public policies reflect the historical experiences and value systems that have characterized its social development. This orientation toward politics involving "general attitudes about

the system and specific attitudes about the role of the self in the system” is termed a nation’s political culture (Almond and Verba 1965: 13). The argument being made is that “to understand the cultural politics of a country, one must first understand its political culture. Accordingly, state policies toward the arts are shaped by wider beliefs about how government ought to be conducted and what it should try to do” (Ridley 1987: 225). Depending on their political cultures, governments vary in the ways that their cultural policies are conceptualized and implemented. “This variety reflects not only differing national traditions in the organization of public functions and the delivery of public services, but differing philosophies and objectives regarding the whole area of culture and the arts” (Cummins and Katz 1987: 4). Cultural policies, then, need to be understood not simply as administrative matters, but as reflections of what is called a *Weltanschauung*, that is, a worldview that defines the character of a society and how its citizenry define themselves.

With regard to the variety of institutions and programs that have been created to implement a cultural policy, their aesthetic values reflect popular perceptions about what is acceptable. In this sense, cultural policies represent a microcosm of broader social and political worldviews. At the risk of oversimplification, certain Weberian “ideal types” of cultural patronage rooted in different socio-historical traditions can be identified (Mulcahy 2000b; Zimmer and Toepler 1996). These ideal types are useful for understanding why nations attach an importance to supporting cultural activities through public intervention, or why they choose not to do so. However, it is important to remember that any ideal type is a generalized construction that may not reflect particularized exceptions. With these caveats in mind, certain cultural value systems can be analyzed to highlight the political values that are entailed. These are: culture states, cultural protectionism, social-democratic cultures, and *laissez-faire* cultures.

Culture States

The hegemonic status of French culture—that is, the claim of its language, literature, philosophy, and fine arts are universal accomplishments worthy of preservation and emulation—has been a widely accepted principle of French political discourse. André Malraux (1959–1969) in de Gaulle’s government or the Socialist Jack Lang (1981–1986 and 1988–1993) and François Mitterrand, French ministers of culture, have often employed assertive policies to promote these hegemonic claims. “Ostensibly, Lang

challenged Malraux, substantially rewriting the department's initial mission statement in order to place creativity and creation above democratisation, though in practice there was a good deal of continuity between the two pioneers" (Looseley 2003: 228, 1995).

French intellectuals frequently position themselves as the last exponents of high culture and aesthetic discernment in the face of the onslaught of mass-entertainment culture appealing to the lowest common denominator of taste. In particular, it is American popular culture that is identified as the enemy of aesthetic excellence and French cultural traditions (Ahearne 2002). For many French intellectuals, Euro-Disney was not just a theme park, but a cultural Chernobyl. Resistance to Americanization and the loosening of the standards to be maintained in a national cultural policy has been the subject of serious intellectual debate (Fumaroli 1999).

In all the rhetorical hyperbole, what is important to note is that the French see culture as an essential part of national *sens civique*, that is, a sense of civic solidarity that has distinguished French society. Although there is constant debate about the content of French cultural policy, "at least there are cultural policies, at least there is public patronage of the arts, both national and local, at least the French remain self-conscious about their creative genius" (Gildea 1996: 232). Other nations may debate about whether to have a cultural policy; in France, the question is what form this cultural policy should take. As will be discussed, the contemporary challenge to French culture involves the region of North Africa in a unified French culture (termed *laïciste*), established with the Revolution and enshrined as its cultural consciousness thereafter.

France may be the preeminent state patron in the preservation and promotion of its cultural heritage: *l'Etat Culturel*. However, Austria could also be described as a "*Kulturstaat*" (culture state). Also, Italy is endowed with so rich a cultural heritage that its preservation absorbs almost all of the public resources available. Each of these nations pursues a cultural policy in which its patrimony is a central concern. This is realized through a highly developed system of subsidies for the arts throughout the country and direct management of national cultural institutions. There also exists a codified cultural consensus that informs the programmatic activities of the cultural policies.

Cultural patrimony is a defining element in a national political culture that defines a sense of self for the citizenry. As observed in a book on Italian identity, "What other people of comparable numbers can lay claim to such an extraordinary number of [cultural] achievements?" (Hooper 2015: 3).

France, Austria, Italy, certainly Germany, Spain, and Portugal have highly self-conscious cultural identities.

Cultural Protectionism

What is most notable about Canada's cultural policy is the importance in political discourse of the relationship between cultural identity and political sovereignty. For the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, chaired by Vincent Massey from 1949 to 1951, it was an article of intellectual faith that there was an identifiable Canadian identity (Litt 1992). In particular, opposition to American mass culture was the basis of its cultural identity (Meisel 1989: 22–23). Many Canadians argue persistently about the need for protectionist policies to counter American cultural intrusion.

This cultural “crisis-mentality” is understandable in a nation of 37 million adjacent to one of some 320 million whose popular culture dominates the world's entertainment venues. The fear of “cultural annexation” can best be understood when one realizes that 95 percent of Canadian movies, 75 percent of their prime-time television, 70 percent of radio air-time (despite the latter two media having Canadian-content quotas), 80 percent of magazines, and 70 percent of books are American products (Acheson and Maule 1999: 16).

As The issues of Canadian cultural identity, with a vertical cleavage of asymmetry with the USA, are compounded by a horizontal cleavage with Quebec and its 7 million francophones. It may be that an unanticipated consequence of the Massey Commission's efforts to create a distinct Canadian culture was to encourage artists and intellectuals in Quebec to achieve a “*société distincte*,” that is, to assert the distinctiveness of their francophone culture and separate identity. Since the “quiet revolution” of the 1960s, the Quebecois developed an outward-looking cultural awareness along with strong cultural institutions. Quebec's Ministeres des Affaires Culturelles have actively supported the *épanouissement* (blossoming) of its arts and literature (Mulcahy 1995c, d). Canada may be termed a “culturally consociational society” (Lijphart 1977), meaning that it must formulate its cultural policies to respect the special status of a large, historically recognized cultural region.

And, as noted, the predominant anglophone population requires measures to promote the groundwork of its cultural activities. To guarantee a chance for success, there are demands for greater “shelf space” for

Canadian creativity, opposition to American bookstore claims, strong support for the nationally bi-lingual Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, reverence for hockey as a sports culture that is quintessentially Canadian.

Social-Democratic Culture

The four nations surrounding the Baltic Sea, as well as Iceland, represent a distinctive economic and political unity in their shared commitment to social-democratic principles and the welfare state. Each is a small nation; each has a huge measure of ethnic and religious homogeneity; their militaries are small; their foreign relations are pacific and are distinguished by high per-capita levels of humanitarian assistance to the international community. Most notably, there is a common commitment to equality, egalitarianism, and equity that is realized through long-standing public policies. Cultural policy is part of a much broader array of governmental efforts to provide a high-level quality of life that is accessible, sustainable, and representative. The Nordic cultural model reflects this ideological superstructure; cultural democracy is an analogue of an overall social democracy (Dueland 2003).

For example, Norway is a social-democratic state with a well-articulated policy of cultural democratization and a strong emphasis on promoting maximum feasible accessibility to its national cultural heritage. Funding for culture in Norway is rooted in a social-democratic ideology that views government as the primary actor for providing social goods. “The welfare state’s task is to make sure that the good are present, meaning that they are created or made, and that the goods are distributed equally among the population” (Bakke 1994: 124).

Norwegian governments in the post-World War II era have accepted responsibility for public culture as a logical extension of the welfare state. “The welfare ideology implied that ‘cultural goods’ should be fairly distributed throughout the country, and that the population should have extended influence upon decisions affecting the cultural life of its own community” (Mangset 1995: 68). The welfare principle also applies to the artists’ right to economic security and recognizes that cultural activities—the crafts as well as the fine arts—are “a national resource for social and economic development” (Kangas and Onser-Franzen 1996: 19).

The social-democratic model views culture as one of those rights to which all citizens are “entitled,” that is, having a defined right, in the same sense that they have to other benefits of the welfare state. As a cultural-policy

commitment, the state intervenes to correct free-market inequalities in the distribution of cultural products and opportunities through subsidies to national cultural institutions, through sinecures to guarantee the status of artists, and through support for local cultural heritage as well as for opportunities for individual self-expression.

There have been adjustments to social programs under neo-liberal governments, but the broad social-democratic commitment has remained in place. Finland may enjoy the status (admittedly hard to measure precisely) of being the most generous per capita provider of public subvention for the arts and culture.

Laissez-Faire

Unlike France and other European states, there is no ministry of culture in the USA, that is, a Cabinet-level department responsible for comprehensive cultural policymaking and for administering a wide range of artistic activities. (The NEA is most decidedly not a ministry of culture.) The cultural programs of the federal government are highly fragmented, established through a variety of administrative agencies, overseen by different congressional committees, supported by and responsive to a variety of interests and articulate the policy perspectives of discrete segments of the cultural constituency (Cherbo 1992). This institutional fragmentation reflects both the diffuse nature of artistic activity in the USA and a fear of the effects that a unified cultural bureaucracy might have on the independence of artistic expression (Shattuck 2005).

Overall, government is a minority stockholder in the business of culture (Mulcahy 1992). Generally, public subsidy from all levels of government accounts for about 6 percent of the resources of performing arts organizations and 30 percent for museums. The American cultural organization is typically a private, not-for-profit entity—termed a 500(C) (3) in the tax codesupported by earned income, individual philanthropy and corporate sponsorships, and limited government grants. These institutions are neither public agencies nor ones that are largely supported by public funds (public museums are an exception). These private, non-profit institutions are the defining characteristic of the greatest number with support provided by tax-exempt charitable deductions. This exemption is the crucial element in sustaining American museums, local arts councils, public television stations, public radio stations, community

theaters, and symphony orchestras among other components of the cultural infrastructure.

The US government promotes culture most significantly through philanthropy, that is, support for non-profit arts organizations through special preferences in its tax code (Heilbrun and Gray 1993). For example, like all non-profit 501(C) (3)s, cultural organizations benefit from provisions allowing corporations, foundations, and individuals to deduct the full amount of their charitable contributions when filing taxes. Also, non-profit art organizations benefit from exemptions from sales taxes on what they buy and sell and real estate taxes. In fact, many cultural institutions are sited on real estate tax-free public lands, such as parks. The sales tax exemptions have aided a huge growth in museum gift shops and their mail-order catalogues. The result can be seen as the merchandizing of museums. As will be discussed in various places, this *laissez-faire* model presents contentious issues for a public culture. One is the commercialization of culture just mentioned. The philanthropic model also raises concerns about the accountability of tax-supported donations. Is the public interest in cultural affairs best served by the preferences of individual donors, especially when large gifts have strings attached?

PUBLIC CULTURE AS PUBLIC POLICY

Cultural policy can be most usefully considered as the totality of a government's activities "with respect to the arts (including the for-profit cultural industries), the humanities, and the heritage" (Schuster 2003: 1). Cultural policy, then, involves governmental strategies and activities that promote "the production, dissemination, marketing, and consumption of the arts" (Rentschler 2002: 17). In viewing public policy as programs that seek to achieve certain outcomes in a specific field, one may miss goals that are embedded in the policy's programs, whatever the expressed intention (Schuster 2003: 1).

Using the metaphor of "mapping," Mark Schuster argues that understanding a policy requires viewing its programmatic activities as "spheres of influence." For example, various actions that a state takes may affect the cultural life of its citizens, whether directly or indirectly, whether intentionally or unintentionally. This totality of programs constitutes the real cultural policy of a state and a state's cultural policy "can best be understood once one has an atlas of such maps" (Schuster 2003: 3).

First, there are many more agencies involved in cultural policy than is publically understood or, for that matter, fully understood by the agency involved. Second, it is not common that one would think of the aggregation of these agencies and their activities as constituting a conceptual whole. Third, much of cultural policy is the result “of actions and decisions taken without expressed policy intention.” Fourth, much of cultural policy is not just the result of direct financial support, but of a wide variety of administrative interventions (Schuster 2003: 8–9).

Moreover, cultural policy encompasses a much broader array of activities than has been traditionally associated with an arts policy. The latter typically involves public support for museums, the visual arts (painting, sculpture, and pottery), the performing arts (symphonic, chamber and choral music, jazz, modern dance, opera and musical theater, “serious” theater), historic preservation, and humanities programs (such as creative writing and poetry). A cultural policy would involve support not only for all the aforementioned activities, but also other publicly supported institutions such as libraries and archives; battlefield sites, zoos, botanical gardens, arboretums, aquariums, parks; community celebrations, fairs, and festivals; folklore activities such as quilting, country music, folk dancing, crafts; and perhaps certain varieties of circus performances, rodeos, and marching bands. This is not to forget the educational programs in the arts and humanities offered by public schools and universities.

Television and radio, although considered separately as two branches of broadcasting, have long functioned as “major supporters of the arts by purchasing the work of performing artists on a massive scale, by developing audiences for live performances, and sometimes even by making direct grants to artistic organizations. Moreover, television and radio have become major vehicles for delivery of the arts” (Cummings and Katz 1987: 359). With the prominent exception of the USA, where the Broadcasting Act of 1920 essentially licensed the airwaves to commercial networks, broadcasting was from its earliest days considered a public responsibility. Governments often saw broadcasting as a means of fostering national bonds (e.g., the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation with both French and English programming) and sponsoring shared national rituals (such as the sovereign’s Christmas address on the British Broadcasting Corporation). Official control, however, is often delimited by the creation of some sort of autonomous governing board.

It should also be noted that “public” broadcasting in the USA is provided programmatically by the Public Broadcasting System (PBS) and National

Public Radio (NPR). These are both 501(C) (3) s, that is, private, not-for-profit organizations. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) is a quasi-autonomous, government corporation that provides limited funding to local stations for technical assistance and program acquisitions; however, CPB is forbidden by law from producing programming. Public radio and television in the USA is essentially a confederation of independent entities, which are free to schedule such programming as they deem appropriate. Moreover, each station is responsible for its own financial support. In essence, American public broadcasting rests on a bedrock of localism in both administration and funding. There is no public broadcasting system that is national in scope.

Another important example of a broad net cast by the concept of cultural policy is the role of the education community. There is a natural affinity between education and culture. In countries with well-established and widely recognized cultural traditions, cultural offerings are core components of the educational curricula. The USA is an exception again with arts and cultural offerings being highly limited and much endangered. Moreover, there are decided benefits from an alliance between the cultural and educational communities (Cummings and Katz 1987: 358). First, it is an example of coalition-building to broaden the constituency in support of the arts and culture. Second, exposure to cultural activities at any level of the educational system has been found to dramatically increase the likelihood of future participation and, consequently, broader support for a public cultural policy.

Finally, it can be noted that many countries support what is known as “cultural industries,” or what is known in the USA as the “entertainment business.” This may be because of a cultural heritage to be preserved and/or a nascent culture to be developed. Overall, there is a clear association between culture and civic identity. Consequently, the subvention of film, book, music, and audiovisual production is an important political issue (Perret and Saez 1996; Rouet and Dupin 1991). In France, the Ministry of Culture has become “a sort of ministry of cultural industry in which the cultural policy is integrated into a total strategy of the French government” (Saez 1996: 135). Many American states also offer generous tax incentives to attract movie and television production. This is argued to be local economic stimulus.

The juxtaposition of the terms cultural industries and entertainment business speaks loudly about the valuational differences between a worldview that exults in its popular-cultural hegemony and that of nations which feel threatened by the diminution, or outright annexation, of their

cultural identity. Some nations (notably Canada and France) have claimed a “cultural exemption” predicated on the absence of a correspondence of artistic products with general goods and services as part of free-trade agreements. Consequently, the issue of “American cultural imperialism” becomes an important aspect of many discussions of what is “exempted” from such understandings. What this range of aesthetic and heritage concerns indicates is that culture is at the heart of much of what constitutes public life and civil society in many countries (Pratt 2005). The union of joint leadership in France, which works to preserve its culture, and Canada, which feels it necessary to promote its culture, was an interesting phenomenon. Both countries worked to create the UNESCO accord on cultural diversity that had decided protectionism. The UNESCO accord will be discussed in greater detail presently.

OBJECTIVES AND JUSTIFICATIONS OF PUBLIC CULTURE

Cultural policy, while a small part of the budgets of even the most generous of public patrons, is a sector of immense policy complexity. It entails “a large, heterogeneous set of individuals and organizations engaged in the creation, production, presentation, distribution, and preservations of and education about aesthetic heritage, and entertainment activities, products and artifacts” (Wyszomirski 2002: 187). Although this is specifically a description of the American cultural landscape, it is more generally applicable. What follows are examples of the purposes for which cultural policies have been formulated. These represent a number of justifications for a variety of programs imbued with cultural objectives.

Culture as Glorification

While it is the policies of the post–World War II era that are largely of concern herein, it is important to recognize the historical antecedents of contemporary cultural policy. From the period of the Renaissance until well into the twentieth century, cultural patronage was the manifestation of the taste and connoisseurship of great potentates. These might be kings, aristocrats, ecclesiastics, or merchant princes. While the motivations of personal patronage varied in this reputed golden age, there is no doubt that self-glorification and/or national glorification played a role (Cummings and Katz 1987: 6). Louis XIV’s Versailles reflected both the personal grandeur of the Sun King himself and the power of the state

that he had created. As a royal residence, Versailles symbolized the king's personal rule and was widely imitated as such by other European monarchs and princelings for this reason.

For the great mercantile princes of the nineteenth and early twentieth century, cultural patronage also represented a form of glorification. Admittedly, the question of motivation is complex, but great palaces of culture in the form of museums open to the public represented a grandness of philanthropic spirit and created edifices that visually bespoke the donors' personal grandeur. Interestingly, the donor of the National Gallery of Art in Washington, Andrew Mellon, gave his large art collection and John Russell Pope's building (the world's largest marble structure) as a gift to the American public in 1936, to be called the National Gallery of Art (Harris 2013: 41–44). Support for the arts could also serve to legitimize these “robber-barons” and confirm the social status of the *nouveaux riches*. As with royal patronage, the art forms subsidized were a matter of personal taste preferences. Often, the donor's personal collection was the basis of the museum. A few examples include the Broad Museum in Los Angeles, and more famously, the Frick Museum in New York and the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum in Boston.

Democratic Cultural Orientations

A democratic state cannot be seen as simply indulging the aesthetic preferences of a few, however enlightened. Serving an overtly ideological end is not consistent with the principles of democratic policies and aesthetic freedom. Consequently, a democratic cultural policy must articulate its purposes in ways that demonstrate how the public interest is being served. Lamentably, this has been a necessity that the cultural world often seems to find difficult to accept and/or to fulfill.

Since culture is a “good,” and one that is “good for you,” governments have pursued programs to promote greater public accessibility. In this conceptualization, significant aesthetic works should be made broadly available to the public. In other words, “high culture” should not be the exclusive preserve of a particular social class or of a metropolitan location. Rather, the benefits of the highest reaches of cultural excellence should be made available broadly and widely. National cultural treasures should be accessible without regard to the impediments of class circumstances, educational attainment, or place of habitation.

Typically, the cultural programs following this policy formulation have been vertical in nature, that is, top-down; center-periphery. For example, Norway is a large, sparsely populated country with its cultural institutions concentrated in Oslo, the largest city and capital city. With public subsidies, these national institutions have extensive touring programs to bring symphonic music, opera, ballet, and theater to the remotest regions of the country and to culturally underserved areas within cities (Bakke 1994: 115). Under Charles de Gaulle, the first Minister of Culture, André Malraux, established a network of *maisons de la culture* throughout the French provinces. As “beacons of hope” in the provincial darkness, these cultural agencies would serve as venues for Parisian and international offerings as well as showcases for high-quality local productions (Lebovics 1999). Malraux was said to be of the mind that when “a peasant from the Auvergne” encountered a great masterpiece, the result would be an immediate aesthetic epiphany.

The basic objective of cultural democratization is the aesthetic enlightenment, enhanced dignity, and educational development of the general citizenry. “Dissemination was the key concept with the aim of establishing equal opportunity for all citizens to participate in publicly organized and financed cultural activities” (Dueland 2001: 41). To further this goal, performances and exhibitions are low cost; public art education promotes equality of aesthetic opportunity; national institutions tour and perform in work places, retirement homes, housing complexes.

Cultural Democracy

As indicated, the democratization of culture is a top-down approach that essentially privileges certain forms of cultural programming that are deemed to be a public good. Clearly, such an objective is open to criticism of what is termed cultural elitism, that is, the assumption that some aesthetic expressions are inherently superior—at least as determined by a *cognoscenti* concerned with the acquisition of cultural capital (Bourdieu 1984). “The problem with this policy was that, fundamentally, it intended to create larger audiences for performances whose content was based on the experience of society’s privileged groups. In sum, it has been taken for granted that the cultural needs of all society’s members were alike” (Langsted 1990: 17). The objective of cultural democracy, however, is to provide for a more populist approach in the definition and provision of cultural opportunities.

In essence, cultural democracy is a shift from a top-down to a bottom-up policy; that is, the government's responsibility is to provide equal opportunities for citizens to be culturally active on their own terms. This shift involves a broad interpretation of cultural activities that comprises popular entertainment, folk festival, amateur sports, choral societies, and dancing schools. As an alternative, or complement, to a strategy of fine-arts dissemination, cultural democracy provides a stronger legitimization of the principle of state subsidy with the concept of culture as a "process in which we are all participatory" (Dueland 2001: 22). The programmatic emphases recognize the diversity of cultural differences among regions, between urban and rural areas, among social groups. Emphasizing a strategy of cultural decentralization, cultural democracy substitutes a pluralistic for a monocultural concept of artistic activities. Jack Lang, Minister of Culture during most of Socialist François Mitterrand's presidency (1979–1983), advocated a more representative culture in public subvention for rap music as the voice of the underclass and street performances for a symbolic *Fete de la Musique* on June 21 throughout France.

It should also be noted that the coupling of cultural democracy to the democratization of culture has a pragmatic, as well as a philosophical, component. Cultural patronage in democratic governments is markedly different from patronage by individuals. Private patrons are responsible only to themselves and are free to indulge their taste preferences. Democratic governments, however, are responsible to the electorate and are held accountable for their policy decisions. Moreover, there is no political immunity for cultural policy—despite what its advocates often claim. Culture needs an interested constituency as do all special interests.

Given that the fine-arts audience is a small percent of the population, and by the nature of its aesthetic demands will likely remain so even if its demographic characteristics could be rendered more representative (DiMaggio and Ostrower 1992; Robinson 1993), cultural policy is an easy (and often attractive) target for ideological and budgetary attack (Wyszomirski 1995a). "An important lesson the advocates of support for 'high culture' had to learn was that it is politically advantageous to expand the definition of culture to include more popular art forms and activities" (Cummings and Katz 1987: 357). "Highbrow" cultural activities can expand their base of support when coupled with cultural pursuits with a more "lowbrow" orientation.

The two objectives just discussed—dissemination of high culture and subvention for a broader range of cultural activities—highlight the debate

about the content of public culture: “elitist” or “populist.” Proponents of the elitist position argue that cultural policy should emphasize aesthetic quality as the determining criterion for public subvention. This view is typically supported by the major cultural organizations, creative artists in the traditionally defined field of the fine arts, cultural critics, and the well-educated, well-to-do audiences for these art forms. Ronald Dworkin has termed this the “lofty approach,” which “insists that art and culture must reach a certain degree of sophistication, richness, and excellence in order for human nature to flourish, and that the state must provide this excellence if the people will not or cannot provide it for themselves” (Dworkin 1985: 221).

By contrast, the populist position advocates defining culture broadly and making this culture broadly available. The populist approach emphasizes a less traditional and more pluralist notion of artistic merit and consciously seeks to create a policy of cultural diversity. With a focus on personal enhancement, the populist’s position posits very limited boundaries between amateur and professional arts activities. The goal is to provide recognition for those outside the professional mainstream and accessibility for these who are not members of the cultural *cognoscenti*.

“Proponents of populism are frequently advocates of minority arts, folk arts, ethnic arts, or counter-cultural activities” (Wyszomirski in Mulcahy and Swaim 1982: 13–14). Cultural “elitists,” however, argue in support of excellence over amateurism and favor an emphasis on aesthetic discipline over “culture as everything.” There are “two key tensions for national cultural policy between the goals of excellence versus access, and between government roles as facilitator versus architect” (Craik et al. 2003: 29). In effect, elitism is to democratization as populism is to cultural democracy.

Unfortunately, there has been a tendency to see these positions as mutually exclusive, rather than complementary. “Elitists” are denounced as “highbrow snobs” advocating an esoteric culture; populists are dismissed as “pandering philistines” promoting a trivialized and commercialized culture. However, these mutual stereotypes belie complementariness between two bookends of an artistically autonomous and politically accountable cultural policy. There is a synthesis that can be termed a “latitudinarian approach” to public culture, that is, one which is aesthetically inclusive and broadly accessible (Mulcahy 1995a: 180–181, b: 223–224).

A latitudinarian public-cultural policy would remain faithful to the highest standards of excellence from a broad range of aesthetic

expressions while providing the widest possible access to people from different geographic locales, socio-economic strata, and educational background (Mulcahy 1991: 22–24). In conceiving of public policy as an opportunity to provide alternatives not readily available in the marketplace, public cultural agencies would be better positioned to complement the efforts of the private sector rather than duplicate their activities and enhance the range of alternatives. Similarly, cultural agencies can promote community development by supporting artistic heritages that are at a competitive disadvantage in a cultural world that is increasingly homogenized given the necessities of profit. Excellence is recast as the achievements of greatness from a horizontal, rather than a vertical perspective, and cultural policy reframed as supporting the totality of these varieties of excellence.

Cultural Utilitarianism

Governments have traditionally supported the arts and culture for their “intrinsic value” in the fulfillment of the human potential of their citizens. Art and culture are, from this perspective, “essential elements to a life that is worth living” (Cummings and Katz 1987: 351). It can be argued that there is parity between the state’s responsibility for its citizens’ social-economic-physical needs and their access to culture and opportunities for artistic self-expression. However, the aesthetic dimension of public policy has never been widely perceived as intuitively obvious or politically imperative. Accordingly, the cultural sector has often argued its case from the ancillary benefits that result from public support for programs that are seemingly only aesthetic in nature. Cultural policy is not justified solely on the grounds that it is a good-in-itself, but rather that it yields other good results. Culture is also good because of its utilitarian value, not just for its inherent value.

The most commonly invoked argument from utility is the “economic impact of the arts.” As a staple of political advocacy, such data are a veritable cottage industry of commissioned studies that document the contributions of arts organizations to the local economy and dispel any notion that cultural subsidies are a “handout.” A quantitative justification is provided demonstrating that every expenditure on arts activities produces a multiplier that ripples through the local economy with increased spending on hotels, restaurants, taxis/car parks; also, arts organizations buy supplies from local vendors and employ people who pay taxes and consume goods and services (Cohen, et al. 2003; Myerscough 1988). There is no

doubt as to the important economic contribution that culture can make. However, the methodology of these economic-impact studies, as well as the uncritical nature of their findings, has come under attack by many economists (Sterngold 2004; Bianchini and Parkinson 1993).

The methodological issues that flaw economic-impact studies may, however, be a secondary objection. The real problem is the displacement of the intrinsic by the extrinsic (Caust 2003). Arguments from economic utility might tell us how valuable the arts are as goods, but not why they are good things (Mulcahy 2004). Economic-impact studies are understandably valued given the controversies over the arts and culture as merit goods as has been long recognized by cultural economists (Netzer 1978; Cwi 1982). Yet the politically expedient justification for cultural policy is an appeal to the numbers, not to its values. Questions of value “remain at the heart of cultural policy even when they have been strangely silenced by the relativizing language of economics and markets” (McGuigan 1996: 71).

What an ideology of cultural utilitarianism does not articulate, for example, is an understanding of the role that a cultural policy can play in preserving, transmitting, and expanding a community’s cultural heritage. An alternative ideology of merit good could argue that the arts and culture, “like parks, libraries and schools, provide benefits all out of proportion to the amount of their subsidies and merit support because of their contributions to the general welfare” (Mulcahy 1986: 46). But difficult questions remain concerning how and by whom such a culturally infused conception of the general welfare is to be determined. And what is the definition of culture that must be provided to merit public support?

WHAT IS CULTURE?

Culture, according to Raymond Williams, is one of the two or three most complicated words in the English language (Williams 1977: 76). It is worth noting that the root of the word is from the Latin *colere*, to till. There is the cultivation of a field as there is the cultivation of intellectual and aesthetic sensibilities. Culture is the process of becoming educated, polished, refined, that is, the state of being civilized. In this sense, culture suggests a process for the deliberate and systematic acquisition of an intellectual sensibility.

The *American Heritage Dictionary* first defines culture as “the totality of socially transmitted behavior patterns, arts, beliefs, institutions, and all other products of work and thought.” These are the predominant

attitudes and behavior that “characterize the functioning of a group or organization.” Second, culture is “intellectual and artistic activity and the works produced by it.” This is predicted on a high degree of taste and refinement formed by aesthetic and intellectual training.

The *Oxford English Dictionary* also first defines culture with reference to tillage. Culture is the cultivation and refinement of the mind; “the artistic and intellectual side of civilization”; and, culture involves “the distinctive customs, achievements, production, outlooks, etc., of a society or group; the way of life of a society or group.” The latter definition can be characterized as the “anthropological” sense of culture. The former is the notion of culture as the fine arts.

As a policy, public culture differs substantially from standard public administration criteria if only because the programs funded are often markedly atypical and the societal impacts difficult (if not impossible) to assess (Bennett 2004). For example, what is a cultured society? Moreover, is there a role for a public policy in promoting such a goal? If culture does not denote exclusively the “high arts,” but a broader array of opportunities, is the programmatic issue its quality or accessibility; or is the goal the promotion of “cultural populism” with programs to support artistic representativeness? Are cultural programs a matter of taste preferences and better left to market forces (Gans 1999)? Or are there aesthetic expressions that for reasons of national heritage, social cohesion, and intellectual value and communal integration have a claim on public attention?

The general difficulty of determining an agreed upon definition of culture, the susceptibility of public culture to ideological coloration, and the politically sensitive nature of cultural programs has been the cause for arguments that cultural policy should be formulated and implemented “at arm’s-length” (Mangest 2009; Chartrand and McCaughey 1989). Arm’s-length administration has the overall cultural budget determined by the government with decisions about specific allocations being made by a quasi-autonomous council. These arts councils are often appointed by the government for fixed, staggered, limited terms to ensure some semblance of political independence. The members, however, are typically artists, cultural administrators, and philanthropists who have vested aesthetic interests (Mulcahy 2002). In the cultural milieu, as in other policy milieux, “such bodies end to be dominated by a confined group of individuals, selected from similar backgrounds, sharing similar values, and supporting, in general, a rather top-down notion of what cultural policies should be and how culture should be used” (Gray 2012: 513).

Fundamentally, a public policy is whatever a government chooses to do, or chooses not to do, with direct and indirect intervention as well as non-intervention. The American government takes a *laissez-faire* approach where culture is indirectly supported by allowing individuals, through tax incentives, to shape the nature of cultural activities. What is being decided is what constitutes “good art” in the sense of what art is good for the public? Whether such a privatized public culture best serves the public’s interest in public culture is a question of political values.

There are many cultural policies that are imbedded in a wide variety of public actions that would not usually be considered cultural. Urban policies may enhance the attractiveness of localities for what Richard Florida called the, “creative class”: by offer stimulating cultural environments, “street-level culture—a teeming blend of cafes, sidewalk musicians, and small galleries and bistros”; various “hybrid spaces” and “small venues” exist like coffee shops, restaurants and bars, art galleries, bookstores, alternative theaters for film and live performances (Florida 2002: 95, 166, 183). Of course, there is an underlying political question concerning the privileging of the supposed cultural preferences of a particular social stratum if at the expense of others.

Finally, there is a dimension of cultural policy that explains “the less acknowledged but nevertheless powerful forms of cultural action that are also deeply implicated in the shaping of attitudes and behaviors” (Bennett 2009: 156). Displays of state power, such as the Queen’s opening of Parliament, “are just as much a form of cultural policy, though not acknowledged as such, as any policy initiatives of a ministry of arts or culture.” (Bennett 2009: 156). The aesthetics of the Catholic Reformation, where the Baroque style promoted Tridentine tenets of faith, suggests a way of looking at all aesthetic programs that involve forms of display (Mulcahy 2011). What is involved is the instrumental use of culture to implicitly legitimize a value system. That these values can be religious, civic, educational, ideological, among others, suggests that a wide range of cultural policies have been implemented as part of “a trans-historical imperative for all political orders” (Ahearne 2004: 114).

The speech from the throne and the Trooping the Colour invests the British sovereign with the status of the representative of natural continuity. The neo-classical style that predominates in the architecture of Washington, D.C. and federal courthouses and state capitals throughout the USA makes a visual statement of republican political principles. In his

discussion of politics and culture in “Fin de Siècle Vienna,” Carl Schorske observes that the late nineteenth-century *Ringstrasse* development highlighted “buildings of splendor” housing constitutional, governmental, educational higher culture activities (Schorske 1981). This same dynamic can be extended to the so-called edifice complex of large corporations to visually project their societal importance through a landmark tower (Sudjic 2005). American examples such as the Seagman Building, Sears Tower, Trans-America Building, Rockefeller Center can be noted. Increasingly, museum architecture is designed to create the “Bilbao Effect” where Frank Gehry’s building is credited with putting a decaying city on the international cultural map.

CODA: THE USA AND THE REST

The conventional wisdom of comparative cultural policy has traditionally compared the reputedly deplorable condition of public support for cultural activities in the USA with an idealized conception of European public culture (Schuster 1989). Like most observations about comparative public policies, however, broad generalizations often disguise substantial exceptions. The nature of a country’s democratic processes may have decided consequences for the production of cultural policies (Gray 2012). The USA is a particularly good example of a policymaking particularism.

First, the universe of funded culture is very different outside of the USA as this includes support for what is primarily commercial in the USA. This includes film, broadcasting, books and audiovisual products. This is the privatized American model as distinct from cultural *dirigisme*. In contrast, many European nations are considering the reputed virtues of privatization and searching for alternative sources of support for cultural activities.

Second, the role of the not-for-profit sector distinguishes the American case from that of other nations. To an extent unknown elsewhere, the American government through its tax code has delegated broad policy-making powers to private institutions in the pursuit of various eleemosynary goals. The essence of the American model of capital patronage demands a high degree of institutional self-reliance.

Third, non-American cultural institutions are less constrained by the need to maintain diversified revenue streams that demand high levels of earned income and individual and corporate donations to compensate for limited government appropriations. However, cultural

institutions everywhere are increasingly market-driven in their need for supplementary funds and as a justification for continued public support. Hence, the American model of an essentially privatized culture can be attractive.

Fourth, for many countries, however, public culture is strongly associated with identity and heritage, with how people define their communities and see themselves in the world and in history. Consequently, a cultural policy would support a broad array of activities that could promote a sense of communal continuity and distinctiveness without a determinate cost-benefit cultural analysis. This mandates a broad societal responsibility in which culture is at the heart of public policymaking.

“The rest” may regard public culture as activities that contribute to individual self-worth and community definition even if counting for less in the economic bottom-line. At root, a cultural policy is about creating public spheres that are not exclusively dependent upon profit motives nor essentially valorized by commercial values. American identity may be best viewed as either a melting pot or a mosaic. (Both conceptions are characteristically unresponsive to the cultural condition of the marginalized, especially the former.) American identity is not constructed through a public culture. In the *laissez-faire* American system, the determination of any such consciousness is not a collective political decision, but one that is best approximated as the summation of individual choices. When identity requires the maintenance of diversity, however, the cultural policy imperative is very different.

There is no question that the American system has much that can be recommended as demonstrated by its cultural vitality, even if this a commercialized exuberance. What is less addressed is what may be central for “the rest”—the need for a public culture that addresses the question of the preservation and promotion of identity consciousness.

What may be fairly contested is whether culture is a policy that is best determined by communitarian politics or market Darwinism. Is culture a commodity or a value? Does culture comprise objects to be monetized or activities to valorize patrimony? If popular culture is meant to satisfy our wants is public culture meant to fulfill our needs? If so, who are ordained to do so, by whom, with what criteria of cultural justice?

REFERENCES

- Acheson, Keith, and Christopher Maule. 1999. *Much Ado about culture: North American trade disputes*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Ahearne, Jeremy. 2002. *French cultural policy debates: A reader*. New York: Routledge.
- Ahearne, Jeremy. 2004. *Between cultural theory and policy: the cultural policy thinking of Pierre Boudieu, Michel de Certeau and Régis Debray*. Coventry: Centre for Cultural Policy Studies, University of Warwick.
- Almond, Gabriel A., and Sidney Verba. 1965. *The civic culture: Political attitudes and democracy in five nations*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Anderson, James E. 1975. *Public policy-making*. New York: Praeger.
- Bakke, Marit. 1994. Centralized decentralization in norwegian cultural policy. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society* 24: 111–127.
- Bennett, Oliver. 2004. The torn halves of cultural policy research. *The International Journal of Cultural Policy* 10: 237–248.
- Bennett, Oliver. 2009. On religion and cultural policy: Notes on the Roman Catholic Church. *International Journal of Cultural Policy Research* 15(2): 156–168.
- Bianchini, Franco, and Parkinson, Michael (eds.). 1993. *Cultural policy and urban regeneration: The West European experience*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. *Distinction: A social critique of the judgment of taste*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Caust, Jo. 2003. Putting the “art” back into arts policy making: How arts policy has been “captured” by the economists and the marketers. *The International Journal of Cultural Policy* 9: 51–59.
- Chartrand, Harry Hillman, and Claire McCaughey. 1989. The arm’s length principle and the arts: An international perspective – Past, present, and future. In *Who’s to pay for the arts?: The international search for models of arts support*, eds. Milton C. Cummings Jr. and J. Mark Davidson Schuster. New York: ACA Books.
- Cherbo, Joni M. 1992. A department of cultural resources: A perspective on the arts. *Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society* 22: 44–62.
- Cherbo, Joni M., and Margaret J. Wyszomirski. 2000. *The public life of the arts in America*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Cohen, Randy, William Schaffer, and Benjamin Davidson. 2003. Arts and economic prosperity: The economic impact of nonprofit arts organizations and their audiences. *Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society* 33 (1): 17–31.
- Craik, Jennifer, Libby McAllister and Glyn Davis. 2003. Paradoxes and contradictions in government approaches to contemporary cultural policy: An Australian perspective. *The International Journal of Cultural Policy* 9: 17–34.

- Cummings, Jr., Milton C. 1982. To change a nation's cultural policy. In *Public policy and the arts*, eds. Kevin V. Mulcahy and C. Richard Swaim. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Cummings, Jr., Milton C. 1991. Government and the arts: An overview. In *Public money and the muse*, ed. Stephen Benedict. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Cummings, Jr., Milton C., and Richard S. Katz. 1987. *The patron state*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cwi, David. 1982. Merit good or market failure: Justifying and analyzing public support for the arts. In *Public policy and the arts*, ed. Kevin V. Mulcahy and C. Richard Swaim. Boulder: Westview Press.
- DiMaggio, Paul J., and Francie Ostrower. 1992. *Race, ethnicity, and participation in the arts*. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts and Seven Locks Press.
- Dorian, Frederick. 1964. *Commitment to culture*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Dorn, Charles M. 1995. Privatization of the arts and the public interest: An issue for local arts for local arts agencies. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society* 25: 182–91.
- Dueland, Peter. 2001. Cultural policy in Denmark. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society* 31: 34–57.
- Dueland, Peter. 2003. *Nordic cultural model*. Copenhagen: Nordic Cultural Institute.
- Dworkin, Ronald. 1985. Can a liberal state support art?. In *A matter of principle*, ed. Ronald Dworkin, 221–233. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Dye, Thomas R. 2005. *Understanding public policy*, 11th edn. Upper Saddle River: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Florida, Richard. 2002. *The rise of the creative class*. New York: Basic Books.
- Foucault, Michel. 1991. Governmentality. In *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality*. Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Fumaroli, Marc. 1999. *L'Etat Culturel: Une Religion Moderne*. Paris: Fallois.
- Galligan, Ann. 1993. The politicization of peer review panels. In *Paying the piper: Causes and consequences of arts patronage*, ed. Judith H. Balfe. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Gans, Herbert J. 1999. *Popular culture and high culture: An analysis and evaluation of taste, revised and updated edition*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gildea, Robert. 1996. *France since 1945*. New York: University of Oxford Press.
- Gray, Clive. Democratic cultural policy: Democratic forms and policy consequences. *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 18: 505–512.
- Heilbrun, James, and Charles Gray. 1993. *The economics of art and culture: An American perspective*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Kangas, Anita, and Jill Onsér-Franzén. 1996. Is there a need for a new cultural policy strategy in the nordic welfare state? *The International Journal of Cultural Policy* 3: 15–26.
- Katz, Richard S. 1982. Public broadcasting and the arts in Britain and the United States. In *Public policy and the arts*, ed. Kevin V. Mulcahy and C. Richard Swaim. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Konig, Hans. 1995. A French mirror. *Atlantic Monthly*. December.
- Langsted, Jorn (ed.). 1990. *Strategies. Studies in modern cultural policy*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.
- Lebovics, Herman. 1999. *Mona Lisa's Escort: André Malraux and the reinvention of French culture*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Lijphart, Arend. 1977. *Democracy in plural societies*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Litt, Paul. 1992. *The muses, the masses, and the massey commission*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Looseley, David. 1995. *The politics of fun: Cultural policy and debate in contemporary France*. Washington DC: Berg.
- Looseley, David. 2003. Back to the future: Rethinking French cultural policy, 1997–2002. *The International Journal of Cultural Policy* 9: 227–234.
- Mangset, Per. 1995. Risks and benefits of decentralisation: The development of local cultural administration in Norway. *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 2: 67–86.
- McGuigan, Jim. 1996. *Culture and the public sphere*. New York: Routledge.
- Meisel, John. 1989. Government and the arts in Canada. In *Who's to pay for the arts*, eds. Milton C. Cummings, Jr. and J. Mark Davidson Schuster. New York: American Council for the Arts.
- Miller, Toby, and George Yudice. 2002. *Cultural policy*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Mulcahy, Kevin V. 1982. Culture and the cities. In *Public policy and the arts*, ed. Kevin V. Mulcahy and C. Richard Swaim. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Mulcahy, Kevin V. 1985. The NEA as public patron of the arts. In *Art, ideology, and politics*, eds. Judith H. Balfe and Margaret Jane Wyszomirski. New York: Praeger.
- Mulcahy, Kevin V. 1986. The arts and their economic impact: The values of utility. *Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society* 16: 33–39.
- Mulcahy, Kevin V. 1991. The public interest in public culture. *Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society* 21: 5–25.
- Mulcahy, Kevin V. 1992. Government and the arts in the United States. In *Public policy and the aesthetic interest*, eds. Ralph A. Smith and Ronald Berman. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Mulcahy, Kevin V. 1995a. The NEA and the reauthorization process: Congress and arts policy issues. In *America's commitment to culture*, ed. Mulcahy and Wyszomirski. Boulder: Westview Press.

- Mulcahy, Kevin V. 1995b. The public interest and arts policy. In *America's commitment to culture*, ed. Kevin V. Mulcahy and Margaret Jane Wyszomirski. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Mulcahy, Kevin V. 1995c. Public culture and political culture. In *Quebec under free trade: Making public policy in America*, ed. Guy Lachapelle. Quebec: Presses de l'Université du Québec.
- Mulcahy, Kevin V. 1995d. Public culture and political culture: La Politique Culturelle du Québec. *Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society* 25: 25–49.
- Mulcahy, Kevin V. 2000a. Cultural imperialism and cultural sovereignty: U.S.–Canadian cultural relations. *The American Review of Canadian Studies* 30: 181–206.
- Mulcahy, Kevin V. 2000b. The government and cultural patronage: A comparative analysis of cultural patronage in the United States, France, Norway, and Canada. In *The public life of the arts in America*, ed. Joni M. Cherbo and Margaret J. Wyszomirski. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Mulcahy, Kevin V. 2002. The state arts agency: An overview of cultural federalism in the United States. *Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society* 32: 67–80.
- Mulcahy, Kevin V. 2006. Cultural policy. In *Handbook of public policy*, 265–279. London: Sage.
- Mulcahy, Kevin V. 2011. Counter-reformation cultural policy: The case of St. Peter's. *International Journal of Cultural Policy Research* 17: 131–152.
- Mulcahy, Kevin V., and C. Richard Swaim. 1982. *Public policy and the arts*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Mulcahy, Kevin V., and Margaret Jane Wyszomirski. 1995. *America's commitment to culture*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Myerscough, John. 1988. *The economic impact of the arts in Britain*. London: Policy Studies Institute.
- Netzer, Dick. 1978. *The subsidized muse: Public support for the arts in the United States*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Perret, Jacques, and Guy Saez. 1996. *Institutions et vie culturelles*. Paris: La Documentation Française.
- Peters, B. Guy. 1996. *American public policy: Promise and performance*, 4th edn. Totowa: Chatham House.
- Peters, B. Guy, and Jon Pierre. 2006. *Handbook of public policy*. London/Thousand Oaks/New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- Pratt, Andy C. 2005. Cultural industries and public policy: An oxymoron?. *The International Journal of Cultural Policy* 11: 31–44.
- President's Committee on the Arts and Humanities. 1997b. *Creative America: A Report to the President*. Washington, DC: President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities.

- Public Law 89–209. 1965. *Congressional declaration of purpose establishing the national endowment for the humanities and the national endowment for the arts; national Foundation on the arts and humanities act of 1965*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Rafool, Mandy, and Laura Loyacono. 1995 *Creative solutions for funding the arts*. Washington, DC: National Conference of State Legislatures.
- Rentschler, Ruth. 2002. *The entrepreneurial arts leader: Cultural policy, change and reinvention*. Brisbane: University of Queensland Press.
- Ridley, F.F. 1987. Tradition, change, and crisis in Great Britain. In *The patron state*, Milton C. Cummings, Jr. and Richard S. Katz. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Robinson, P. John. 1993. *Arts participation in America, 1982–1992: A report of the National Endowment for the Arts*. NEA Report no. 27. Prepared by Jack Faucett Associates.
- Rouet, Francois and Xavier Dupin. 1991. *Le Soutien Aux Industries Culturelles*. Paris: Department des Etudes et de la Prospective.
- Saez, Guy. 1996. Les politiques culturelles des villes. In *Institutions et vie culturelles*, eds. Jacques Perret and Guy Saez. Paris: La documentation Francaise.
- Schorske, Carl. 1981. *Fin-De-Siecle Vienna: Politics and Culture*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Schuster, J. Mark Davidson. 1989. The search for international models: Results from recent comparative research in arts policy. In *Who's to pay for the arts?*, eds. Milton C. Cummings, Jr. and J. Mark Davidson Schuster. New York: American Council for the Arts.
- Schuster, J. Mark. 2003. *Mapping state cultural policy: The state of Washington*. Chicago: The University of Chicago, Cultural Policy Center.
- Shattuck, Roger. 2005. In the thick of things. *New York Review of Books*, May 26: 19–22.
- Stanbridge, Alan. 2002. Detour or dead-end? Contemporary cultural theory and the search for new cultural policy models. *The International Journal of Cultural Policy* 8: 121–134.
- Sterngold, Arthur R. 2004. Do economic impact studies misrepresent the benefits of arts and cultural organizations?. *Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society* 34: 166–188.
- Sudjic, Deyan. 2005. *The edifice complex*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Warner, Marina. 1976. *Alone of all her sex*. New York: Random House.
- Williams, Raymond. 1977. *Keywords: A vocabulary of culture and society*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wyszomirski, Margaret J. 1982. Controversies in arts policymaking. In *Public Policy and the Arts*, eds. Kevin V. Mulcahy and C. Richard Swaim. Boulder: Westview Press.

- Wyszomirski, Margaret J. 1995a. Federal cultural support: Toward a new paradigm?. *Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society* 25: 69–83.
- Wyszomirski, Margaret J. 1995b. From accord to discord: Arts policy during and after the culture wars. In *America's commitment to culture*, eds. Kevin V. Mulcahy and Margaret Jane Wyszomirski. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Wyszomirski, Margaret J. 2002. Arts and culture. In *The state of nonprofit America*, ed. Lester M. Salamon. Washington, DC: Brookings University Press.
- Wyszomirski, Margaret J. 2004. From public support for the arts to cultural policy. *Review of Policy Research* 21: 469–484.
- Zimmer, Annette, and Stefan Toepler. 1996. Cultural policies and the welfare state: The cases of Sweden, Germany, and the United States. *Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society* 26: 167–193.

PREFACE: WHY READ ABOUT PUBLIC CULTURE?

The above is not a question! It is an affirmation of the importance of non-commercial culture.

This is not simply to say that the Disneyfication of our experience is a bad thing because of its annexation of one's childhood identity. (This is admittedly a provocation.) What is argued is that public culture provides alternatives to commercial entertainment with its greater representations of aesthetic expressions that are minoritarian, communitarian, avant-garde, and transgressive.

None of this should suggest an hierarchy of taste preferences. It does reflect a philosophical stance that "entertainment" gives us what we "want"; "culture" gives us what we "need." The distinction between wants and needs is obviously not one that is easily determined. The entertainment business rests on market choices; public culture would cite responsibility and social necessity. The former can claim that one is at liberty to choose leisure-time pursuits; the latter might assert that we would be free to achieve self-realization through education and aesthetic diversity, as well as scientific study.

Education (as life-time learning), the arts, science (as the scientific method)—is the name of the Austrian ministry for cultural affairs. The State of Louisiana's cultural agency is the Department of Culture, Research, and Tourism, which emphasizes the state's Arts Council and Affairs of Historic Preservation as well as visitor promotion (an important part of the state's economy) and the state park system, which has some historic sites.

The spirit of these bureaucratic examples is not an exercise in public administration, but is meant to suggest the complexity of public culture, that is, governmental programs that support certain qualitative goals in a society, particularly the aesthetic dimension that informs a citizenry's sense of self. What was called *Public Policy and the Arts* (Westview, 1983) denoted the study of public arts agencies, principally the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), and not-for-profit performing arts and most museums. In the last two decades, the concern of public culture has been broadened to include a wider array of activities to be considered cultural policy. This book is an effort to elaborate the forms of public cultural patronage and the varieties of cultural identity that become part of cultural debate.

PART I: POLITICS AND PATRONAGE

The following three examples include forms of state subvention of cultural policies; each is different. While these hardly exhaust the variables of public patronage, each represents a different manner in which cultural policies are projected. First, they address different dimensions of public culture. Second, they reflect different concepts of public culture.

Public patronage entails programs that reflect beliefs about the nature of what constitutes culture. France is the most directive in its statist centralism. The USA, as indicated, has a hidden-hand cultural patronage. The convergence of the celebration of national identity in globalized sports spectacles is a form of patronage that is becoming increasingly prominent because of media saturation.

1. American public policy generally delimits public responsibility. Culture is politically marginalized, especially at the national level. Yet, a vibrant US cultural scene is facilitated by a tax code valorizing private philanthropy and the tax-exempt status of private non-profits that comprise all the performing arts and three-quarters of museums. The USA might not have a national cultural policy, but it does have a national tax policy whose provisions enable a cultural sector dominated by institutional non-profits and private philanthropy. This is a "hidden-hand" cultural policy that is consistent with an American political culture of limited government, delimited public responsibilities and devolved privatizations.

2. French cultural diplomacy is long standing and informed unequivocally with a messianic goal to promote the status of the French language and, by extension, its international prestige. France has encouraged the development of its “brand” as a marker of statues to be exported. As reflects a long tradition of administrative centralization, cultural diplomacy is centered in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, rather than a more “arm’s-length” arrangement such as the British Council. And, reflecting also the prestige that culture enjoys within France, French cultural diplomacy promotes its brand as an important contribution to international understanding as well as a means for maintaining international prestige.
3. The Olympic Opening Ceremony is a more curious case of cultural policy; these events are funded by the host country and are a traditional part of the choreography of the Games. Ostensibly, under the purview of the local Olympic organizing committee (that would possess variable degrees of governmental autonomy), these presentations are sanctioned to introduce the host country and its sense of national identity. Regardless of the question of state subvention, the production values and ideological content are orchestrated to send a message about national identity through cultural expressions. Neither public diplomacy nor public culture, the Olympic Opening Ceremony is an internationally recognized platform for a country to tell the world about itself. The growth of the Games into a global televised spectacle has rendered the Opening Ceremony an invaluable cultural vehicle for defining a national brand in an entertainment venue.

PART 2: IDEOLOGY AND IDENTITY

This part discusses three different examples of where cultural identity has been intertwined with political values. All three chapters, especially the first two (Chaps. 4 and 5), argue for the salience of “coloniality” in the articulation of national self-assessment. Chapter 4 discusses countries that have had to define themselves in the face of a history of hegemonic domination, that is, a cultural subordination to a more powerful entity. Chapter 5 presents examples of subnational areas (regions) that seek to create an identity within a state that is itself a powerful hegemon. Chapter 6 concerns the maintenance of a “cultural space,” which is a distinct territory, but one without any urge for independence.

What is termed a cultural space refers to small geographic subnational areas bound by some sense of a shared past. Rather than their size and population, they are important for not having experienced the harshness of coloniality. Some of these cultural spaces are Newfoundland and the Maritime Provinces of Canada; Normandy and Provence in France (Corsica is more volatile); Bavaria and Baden-Württemberg in Germany; Sardinia and Sicily in Italy; Cornwall and Yorkshire in the UK (Wales may arguably be a cultural region); and New Mexico, Hawaii, and Louisiana Acadiana in the USA.

Chapter 4 highlights the efforts of four independent countries to transcend the effects of coloniality and the long-lasting consequences of subjugation and subordination. This is the persistence of hegemonic values that define another country's cultural identity. A variant of the classic who/whom political formulation "who rules whom", coloniality asks: "who defines whom." The discrimination brought about by imperialism persists as local voices struggle to control the discourse of identity. The absence of cultural sovereignty excludes or delimits political independence. The four countries discussed—Mexico, Canada, South Africa, and Ukraine—present different variations on the struggle against cultural hegemony.

Mexico initiated a formidable cultural policy after the Populist Revolution of 1910 to recreate Mexican identity. This particularly involved the valorization of indigenous culture through the Muralist Movement. By visual means a new Mexico was created.

Canada had a more benign colonial history and created its own cultural institutions, and, if belatedly, what has posed more challenges is the dominance of American popular culture. The saturation of Canada by American entertainment products raises the specter of identity compromised by the seductive appeals of US cultural imperialism.

South Africa has had a notable degree of success in rediscovering a national identity since the end of apartheid. Battling European values and white-centric public culture, South Africa has reconstructed a sense of its lost cultural identity with that which purports to be authentic.

Ukraine is a cautionary tale of defining an independent identity in the face of geopolitical reality and a contested history of cultural distinctiveness. This is complicated by the nature of Ukraine's population, which is linguistically and ethically Russian. A national identity cannot be imposed as a requirement of political independence.

Chapter 5 elaborates the cultural and political issues associated with internal coloniality. In this situation, the hegemonic domination is by

the state of which the distinct region is a part. Despite measures granting various degrees of regional autonomy and self-rule, there is palpable resentment of the government and alienation from it as it is considered the historic enemy of cultural identity. Quebec may be an example of a successful assertion of its distinct identity while remaining in the Canadian Confederation. This followed two closely fought referenda. The French language as a marker of Quebec's social and cultural heritage appears to have more than survived and has achieved a successful viability within a vast anglophone sea. If perceived as a colony (despite commonwealth status), Puerto Rico has a strong claim for independence as a requirement for self-defined identity. There is, however, no majority backing for such a step.

Catalonia and Scotland have never been colonies, but have been part of Spain and Great Britain for hundreds of years as a result of dynastic unions. Catalonia has support for independence from the suppression of its language and traditions, although currently enjoying governmental and cultural autonomy. Scotland, joined by inheritance to England in 1603 and becoming part of Great Britain in the union of 1707 has retained its local distinctiveness in the church, schools, and laws. Demands for formal independence have grown persistently in both nations to preserve cultural identity and self-definition.

The examples discussed in Chap. 6 are of the Cajun homeland with the French-Canadian cultural tradition in the Acadian territory of Southwest Louisiana. A possible subject for future discussion, the survival of this distinctive heritage within the powerful homogenization of American life is remarkable and rare. It is a testimony to accommodation and adaptation as well as resistance and a certain fortuitous benign neglect.

The overall effort has been to provide a broad sense of the complexities of cultural policy, if at times with broad brush. Though perhaps a particularly American trait, there is generally an exclusive interest in the policies and politics peculiar to one's country. The nature of comparative analysis is to redress such myopia. If not a case study, which certainly is not without merit for its detailed specificity, but lacking generalizability, meaningful analysis must be comparative. This entails referencing historical, geographic, and conceptual variability. Culture, and the nature of its public importance, particularly requires a comparative analysis given its inherently elusive quality. This in turn gives cultural policy a distinctively contested standing as a public responsibility.

The complexities of culture that goes beyond a specific country has been an interesting research lacuna in cultural policy analysis. A distinct

exception was a 1987 book, *The Patron State: Government and the Arts in Europe, North America and Japan* edited by Milton C. Cummings and Richard S. Katz (1987). *The Patron State* purports to address the range of public arts policies, programs, and politics found in so-called developed nations. (In the interest of full disclosure, this author wrote the US chapter.) The introduction and conclusion remain a superb depository of hypotheses that are still suggestive for research thirty years later. A recurring criticism of *The Patron State*, however, has been that, though a useful compendium of national cultural policies, there is an absence of an overall analytical framework.

Public Culture and Cultural Policy: Comparative Perspectives will place the study of public support for the arts and culture within the scholarly framework of public policy and administration. Most important, the analysis will be explicitly comparative in casting cultural policy within a broad international, socio-political and historical framework. Comparative analyses would explain the wide variability in modes of cultural policy as a reflection of broader political ideologies and administrative traditions. This research will constitute an effort to theorize broadly about public culture as a public policy with an emphasis on political objectives and distinct administrative contexts.

Public Culture and Cultural Policy: Comparative Perspectives brings the theoretical concerns that have basically informed public policy and administration to a policy sector that needs to continue to develop a literature of analysis and evaluation that is common in other areas of government. Moreover, the discussion will have a distinctively international focus, as the effort is to contrast and contextualize the wide variety of public activities associated with the arts and culture. Necessarily, much of the analysis in-depth of particular cultural regimes and institutions can only be summarized. However, the discussion focuses on concepts and models that will perhaps animate the generalized analysis that will stimulate more theoretical development. This does not pretend to be the “last word” on cultural policy analysis. Rather, it seeks to problematize a substantial body of literature that has been largely focused on important, specialized concerns. Descriptions and prescriptions without a comparative focus, however, do not facilitate overarching conceptual frameworks. My goal is to synthesize the existing literature, broaden the theoretical context, and set some research suggestions for the next generation of cultural policy scholarship.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would first like to thank my editors at Palgrave Macmillan. Chris Robinson has provided incredible encouragement to bring this manuscript to see the light of day. Brian O'Connor originally encouraged this work and deserves my heartfelt thanks. Both saw the broad interdisciplinary appeal that this discussion of cultural policy would have. My thanks also go to Elaine Fan, of the Palgrave Macmillan team, who kept close track of my work.

There are a number of debts that I owe to my academic home for the past 35 years, Louisiana State University. Most recently, this would include my current department chair, Dr. William Clark, and his predecessor, Dr. James Stoner. This acknowledgement should also include my colleague and current dean, Dr. Stacia Haynie. I also benefited from the receipt of an Atlas grant that provided a year's leave as an Award for Louisiana Artists and Scholars.

Ann Galligan, editor of the *Journal of Arts, Management, Law and Society*, and Oliver Bennet, the editor of the *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, longtime colleagues and friends, have been of extraordinary help in animating this book. Also, these journals and the associated conferences, the Conference on Social Theory, Politics, and the Arts and the International Conference of Cultural Policy Research, have been invaluable venues for learning and sharing knowledge about cultural policy.

Special recognition is owed to my colleague and friend of 40 years, Dr. Margaret Wyszomirski. She has been the animator of the cultural policy discipline in the USA with unstinting energy. Her scholarly commitment has been a constant source of inspiration and assistance.

There have been literally a host of international friends who have been incredibly generous with their collegial support. What follows is an attempt to recognize these colleagues as organized by country.

Australia Stephen Boyle; Jo Caust; Ruth Rentschler; David Throsby

Austria Michael Wimmer

Canada Monica Gattinger; Jonathan Paquette; Diane St-Pierre

China Yurong Huang

Denmark Peter Duelund

Finland Anita Kangas

France Anne-Marie Autissier; Elodie Bordat-Chauvin; Vincent DuBois; Guy Saez; Fabrice Thuriot

Iran Foad Izadi

Israel Estee Du-Nour

Norway Marit Bakke; Per Mangset, Telemark

Portugal Christina Montalvao; Patricia Oliveira; Carlos Vargas

Romania Dan Eugen Ratiu

Serbia Milena Dragicevic Sestic

South Africa Mziwoxolo Sirayi

Taiwan Shang-Ying Chin; Jay Tzeng

United Kingdom Jeremy Ethern; Lisanne Gibson; Clive Gray; David Looseley

United States Joni Cherbo; Patricia Dewey; Aimee Fullman; John Harper; Javier Hernandez; Donald Hodge; J.P. Singh; Stefan Toepler; Ximena Varela

As the dedication of the book indicates, I have an incalculable debt to the undergraduate research assistants who have aided me in my professional (as well as personal) work. There is no way that I can list all of these students from over the years without risking the terrible oversight of forgetting a name. Consequently, my thanks goes to all collectively as a small recognition of their indefatigable labors.

Finally, I wish to express my thanks to the entire team at Mary Bird Perkins Cancer Center, Our Lady of the Lake Hospital Baton Rouge, for their ongoing support over the past two years. Particular thanks go to the team leaders: Dr. Bienvenu, Dr. Di Leo, and Dr. Fields.

CONTENTS

Part I	Politics and Patronage	1
1	Hidden-Hand Culture: The American System of Cultural Patronage	3
	<i>The City of Washington</i>	4
	<i>The New Deal</i>	5
	<i>Interlude: 1943–1965</i>	6
	<i>The Great Society</i>	6
	<i>General Observations</i>	7
	<i>Part I. National Approaches to Public Culture</i>	8
	<i>Part II: Administration of Cultural Policy</i>	14
	<i>References</i>	29
2	Exporting Civilization: French Cultural Diplomacy	33
	<i>Soft Power and Cultural Diplomacy</i>	34
	<i>La Civilization Française</i>	37
	<i>Promoting French Culture Before 1940</i>	45
	<i>French Cultural Diplomacy after 1945</i>	47
	<i>Defending French and French Civilization</i>	51
	<i>Reorganization and Reconceptualization</i>	54
	<i>Coda: Which France Is Exported?</i>	58
	<i>References</i>	62

3 Patronizing Mega-events to Globalize Identity: The Olympic Opening Ceremony as a Cultural Policy	65
<i>Spectacle and the Olympics</i>	65
<i>References</i>	90
Part II Ideology and Identity	93
4 Coloniality: The Cultural Policy of Post-colonialism	95
<i>Cultural Reassertion: Mexico after the 1920 Revolution</i>	98
<i>Cultural Restatement: Canada</i>	102
<i>Cultural Reconstruction: South Africa</i>	107
<i>Cultural Referendum: Ukraine</i>	110
<i>References</i>	119
5 Internal Coloniality: Cultural Regions and the Politics of Nationalism	125
<i>What Is a Cultural Region?</i>	125
<i>References</i>	148
6 Acadiana and the Cajun Cultural Space: Adaptation, Accommodation, and Authenticity	151
<i>The Uniqueness of the Louisiana Cajuns</i>	152
<i>Acadiana—The Cajun Homeland in Louisiana</i>	155
<i>Cajun and Cajunness</i>	159
<i>Cajun Folk Heritage</i>	163
<i>The Cajun Patrimony</i>	173
<i>Coda: The King Cake</i>	176
<i>References</i>	178
Afterword: Configuring Cultural Policy	181
Index	191

KEYWORDS

It is customary to proclaim an authoritorial avoidance of jargon. This should be non-debatable. It is also true, however, that an intellectual specialization develops a particularized form of discourse (meaning written and oral communication) that convey defining concepts that inform the decisive and related disputations. This argot (the non-criminal cant of professional groups) is not necessarily off-putting as much as a shorthand necessary to focus discussions. The *patois* is a shared professional dialect; one cannot avoid it and maybe should not. But, since the reader is not necessarily acquainted with this specialized vocabulary, certain key words that are used frequently are discussed. This is not meant to be exhaustive, but to provide a sense of the major concepts discussed.

TERMS

Autonomy	A self-governing state, community, or group.
Colonialism	The policy or practice of a powerful nation's maintaining control over other countries, including cultural identity.
Coloniality	An experience involving a dominating influence by a power over a subject state.
Commodity	A product or service that is indistinguishable from ones manufactured or provided by competing companies and that therefore

	sells primarily on the basis of price rather than quality or style.
Cultural Asymmetry	Lack of symmetry between cultures.
Cultural Capital	The collection of symbolic elements such as skills, tastes, posture, clothing, mannerisms, material belongings, credentials, and so on that one acquires through being part of a particular social class.
Cultural Commodification	Cultural expressions, revolutionary or post-modern, that can be sold to the dominant culture.
Cultural Darwinism	Applies biological concepts of natural selection and survival of the fittest to sociology and politics and by extension to the survival of art institutions.
Cultural Diplomacy	A course of actions, which are based on and utilize the exchange of ideas, values, traditions and other aspects of culture or identity, whether to strengthen relationships, enhance socio-cultural cooperation or promote the national interest.
Cultural Genocide	The systematic destruction of traditions, values, and language that make a group distinct.
Cultural Pluralism	A condition in which minority groups participate fully in the dominant society, yet maintain their cultural differences.
Cultural Policy	The area of public policymaking that governs activities related to the arts and culture.
Deracination	To have one's native traditions and culture and destroyed.
Hegemony	The predominance of one state or social group over others.
Hegemonic	Ruling or dominant ideology in a political or social context, but also cultural.
Heterogeneity	Composed of parts of different kinds; having widely dissimilar elements or constituents.
Homogeneity	The quality of being similar or comparable in kind or nature.

Identity	That by which a person or thing is definitively recognizable or known by itself and others.
Imperialism	The extension of a nation's authority by the establishment of economic, political, and cultural dominance over other nations.
Nation	A people who share common customs, origins, history, and frequently language; a nationality.
Nation-State	A political unit consisting of an autonomous state inhabited predominantly by a people sharing a common culture, history, and language.
Nations-State	Is one where large minorities are not conscious of a common identity and do not share the same culture.
Nationalism	Devotion, especially excessive or indiscriminating devotion, to the interests or culture of a particular nation-state.
Post-colonialism	An initial awareness of the social, psychological, and cultural inferiority enforced by being in a colonized state.
Patrimony	An inheritance or legacy; heritage.
Patronage	The support or encouragement of a patron, as for an institution or cause.
Sovereignty	Complete independence and self-government including cultural independence.
State	The supreme public power within a sovereign political entity; the sphere of supreme civil power within a given polity.
Subvention	An endowment or a subsidy, as that given by a government to an institution for research; a grant of financial aid.

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure A.1	Equally Balanced Cultural Policy	182
Figure A.2	Democratization of Cultural Policy Model	183
Figure A.3	Cultural Democracy as a Cultural Policy Model	184

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1	Sources of support for local arts in the USA (in rounded %)	22
Table 1.2	Total arts spending by level of government (in millions)	23
Table 1.3	Charitable giving by category of sources and recipients	24