

The (Dis)location of Cultural Policy: Two Swedish Cases

Jenny Johannisson

Doctoral Student

Veronica Trépagny

Doctoral Student

Goteborg University

Jenny Johannisson was educated at Goteborg University and majored in Cultural Studies. Since 1995, she has been employed as a lecturer on cultural policy issues at the Swedish School of Library and Information Science. Currently, she is working on her doctoral thesis which deals with local cultural policy in a transnational era. She is also the editorial secretary of The Nordic Journal of Cultural Policy.

Veronica Trépagny was educated at Goteborg University and majored in Cultural Studies. A major interest in her work has been the international aspect of cultural policy and the dynamics between cultural policy and other societal and policy domains, i.e. globalization processes and cooperation. In her doctoral thesis she compares the cultural policy of two European subnational regions: The Region Vastra Gotaland in Sweden and Région Midi-Pyrénées in France.

Abstract

In this paper, the consequences of globalization processes for power relations between governmental levels in the cultural policy field is explored by examining two Swedish subnational cases: The Region Vastra Gotaland and the city of Goteborg. The comparison between different levels is carried out within the framework of the cultural policy models developed by Harry Hillman Chartrand and Claire McCaughey in 1989. We conclude that the models are too rigid to be directly applied, but that they are quite useful in comparing cultural policy at different levels, and also in clarifying the complexity of the policy field at hand. Concerning the analysis of power shifts between different levels, and between different policy fields, however, the models are insufficient in that they focus too exclusively on the national level and on the professional fine arts.

Keywords

Cultural policy, decentralization, globalization, cultural policy models, Sweden

Introduction

Contemporary discussions on cultural policy, in Sweden as in other Western societies, increasingly take as their point of departure the assumption that cultural policy as a nation-state project is a project on the decline (e.g. Bennett 2001, p. 26). The idea of globalization processes often forms the backdrop to these discussions that take place in political, administrative, academic and civic arenas. These processes are said to bring about changes in the traditional political systems, creating new divisions of responsibility between the national, regional and local levels of government within nation-states. In addition, local and regional communities increasingly transcend national borders and create or sustain new transnational, or supranational, networks, thereby usurping power from the national level. In a Swedish context, it has been suggested that one such supranational network is the European Union.

While the importance of the local and regional levels in the field of cultural policy is stressed more often, research on local and regional cultural policy is fairly undeveloped. One reason for this is of course the fact that research on cultural policy as a whole is quite marginal. But as Mark Schuster (2002) points out, the research that has been carried out is heavily biased towards the national level. This paper is a contribution to research on the subnational levels, concentrating on two Swedish cases: the Region Vastra Gotaland and the municipality/city of Goteborg. These cases constitute the empirical bulk of our doctoral dissertations respectively.

The objective of the paper is twofold: First we intend to relate one of the few existing cultural policy models, namely the Hillman Chartrand and McCaughey models, to local and regional levels in Sweden. We will use them as analytical tools and assess their possibilities and/or limitations as such in the contexts of public cultural policy in the region Vastra Gotaland and the city of Goteborg. More than a decade ago, the Canadian economists Hillman Chartrand and McCaughey (1989) presented an article in which they argued for the arm's length principle in public cultural policy. The arm's length principle, perhaps most clearly expressed in the Arts Council of Great Britain, is a principle about the relation between the sphere of governmental regulation and the sphere of cultural production and dissemination, which states that this relation should be characterized by a certain distance; an 'arm's length'. With this principle as their point of departure, they develop four different models of governmental intervention in the cultural field. The models have been intensely discussed and criticized in a Nordic context (e.g. Mangset 1995, Vestheim 1997, Nilsson 1999) and we will relate to these criticisms in our conclusions.

Secondly, we intend to assess the consequences of globalization processes in a subnational context. Since our own research is focused on the local context as related to the national and/or global levels and on the regional context as related to the supranational and/or global levels respectively, this paper will help us to relate the local and the regional levels to each other as well as to the question of the (dis-)location of power in the cultural policy field. Discourse analysis constitutes the methodological point of departure, and the empirical material that is put under scrutiny consists of interviews and cultural policy documents produced in local, regional, national, supranational and global contexts.

After a brief introduction to theories on globalization of interest to this article, and a short presentation of the cultural policy models that are applied, the article offers a presentation of Swedish cultural policy in general. This serves as a general background to the sections on the Region Vastra Gotaland and the City of Goteborg that follow in relation to the Hillman Chartrand and McCaughey models. In the paper's concluding part, we relate the cultural policy of the studied levels to each other as well as to the national and international contexts. In doing this the (dis-)location of power in the cultural policy field will be discussed.

Globalization Processes and Cultural Policy Models

In this paper, a basic assumption is that, in cultural policy research, different levels of government should be studied in relation to one another, since they are interactively contributing to each other's formation, reproduction and transformation (cf. Massey 1999, p. 121; McGuigan 1996, p. 96). "Jumping scales may be an economic, political, or cultural strategy for transforming local or national power relations" (Smith 2001, p. 109), and in Western societies of today, the idea of globalization processes is an important way of describing this 'jumping of scales'. When defined as the increased mobilization of

capital across national borders, globalization processes are depicted as making geographical territories less important, since economic power, and in capitalist societies therefore also political power, is transferred to international commercial networks, existing in a global “space of flow” (Castells 1996). From this perspective, a few local sites act as nodes in an abstract network of power, inaccessible to the ordinary citizen, creating a global homogenization of economic, political and cultural expressions. In this view, regionalization processes are about the often futile attempts of regional and local sites to seize some of the power that is usurped from the national level. In a post-Fordist society (cf. Vestheim 1998, p. 137), where focus is increasingly put on the production, dissemination and consumption of symbolic expressions, cultural policy becomes an area of interest in these attempts. But, in a Swedish context, it has been suggested that what is described in positive terms as the regionalization and decentralization of cultural policy to the regional and local levels, are in fact processes of concentration of power to a new, transnational, level of government, namely the European Union (Larsson 2002). Hence, the national and subnational levels of government are rendered equally bereft of power in the field of cultural policy, leaving the battle to agents of a more global character.


While not debating that globalization processes contribute to an increased homogenization and a power shift in favour of transnational networks, we still want to make a case for cultural policy as a means for regional and local sites to actively take charge of their own future development. Parallel with tendencies of homogenization in Western cultural policy run processes of an increased heterogeneity, fuelled by the notion that the value that cultural policy is supposed to distribute, i.e. culture, is growing more and more difficult to use in any uniting way (Featherstone & Lash 1999, p. 1). From this perspective, cultural policy is increasingly linked to particular geographical *places*, and not only to abstract *spaces*. These regional and local sites exist and interact within the context of a nation-state, the latter being in a state of flux, but retaining a lot of power over financial and political institutions within the national territory. In addition, the regional and local sites increasingly interact with other regional and local sites across national borders, rendering the same importance to *trans/local* relations as to *transnational* ones (Smith 2001, p.19, 59). Against this backdrop, the interesting research question is how regional and local sites handle and use the transforming relations between different levels of government within the field of cultural policy. In order to carry out such a study, an analytical tool which enables comparisons between cultural policy at different levels is needed. Since cultural policy as a research field reflects the youth of the policy area it encompasses, the tools at hand are not abundant. In this paper, we have decided to assess the analytical possibilities and/or limitations of Hillman Chartrand’s and McCaughey’s models of cultural policy.

The main question for Hillman Chartrand & McCaughey is to assess the possibilities of the arm’s length principle in guaranteeing continued support to the professional fine arts in times of a recession in public finances. According to Hillman Chartrand and McCaughey (1989, p. 58-61), an ‘arm’s length arts council’ deals mainly with the fine arts, is run by a board of trustees which guarantees that the arm’s length is upheld, bases its granting decisions on the assessments of peer evaluators, and has artists and art organizations as its clients. Hence, their line of reasoning is narrowed down to the *professional fine arts*, even though they see these as interacting with amateur and commercial arts (ibid., p. 45-48). They also focus on the *national* level in developing four dominating models and trends in public cultural policy in the northern hemisphere: the state as facilitator, patron, architect or engineer. The countries given as examples of each model are the United States, the United Kingdom, France and the former Soviet Union, respectively. In briefly introducing these models, as they are presented by Hillman Chartrand and McCaughey (ibid., p. 48-53), we will focus on the different components of the models – i.e. policy objectives, funding, policy dynamic, artistic

standards, status of the artist – and will relate to our empirical material further on. We will further concentrate on the critical assessment of the models in relation to the cultural policies of the Region Vastra Gotaland and the City of Goteborg. We are aware of the fact that Harry Hillman Chartrand has published several articles and books on cultural economic policies at different governmental levels since 1989, but since it is the article from 1989 that has gained the greatest impact in a Nordic context, we limit ourselves to the said article.

In the Facilitator model, the policy objective for supporting the arts is to create a diversity of artistic expressions. This is achieved mainly through private funding, which is facilitated by private donations being tax deductible. Hence, both the policy dynamic and the artistic standards in this model are of a random character, since they are dependent on box office appeal and the tastes and financial situation of the private donors. This is somewhat the case also in the Patron model, which is complemented by funding through grants administered by arm's length arts councils. This puts a focus on professional qualities in the model's artistic standards. The policy objective in this model is that of artistic excellence, guaranteed by the arm's length principle, and the policy dynamic therefore tends to render the artistic activities an evolutionary character. In the Architect model, the arts are more closely related to the rest of society, which brings with it a policy dynamic of a more revolutionary kind, where the artistic standards are closely linked to social needs in the surrounding community. The policy objective is that of using the arts as a means of creating an overall social welfare, and direct government funding is supplied by a Ministry of Culture. In the Engineer model, government has complete control and ownership of the artistic means of production and the policy dynamic becomes revisionary. The policy objective is that of politically educating the citizens through artistic activities, and the artistic standards are politically determined. Hence, the four models are on a gliding scale between minimal and maximal governmental intervention in the cultural field, and between supporting processes of creativity and supporting the production of specific artistic products. In the figure below, the models are illustrated in relation to this scale.

Figure 1. Extent of state intervention in relation to the Hillman Chartrand & McCaughey models.

Minimal state		Welfare state		Totalitarian state
				
Facilitator	Patron		Architect	Engineer

Hillman Chartrand and McCaughey (ibid., p. 48) emphasize that the “roles and objectives are not mutually exclusive, that is, a single government may play more than one role and may seek to achieve more than one objective”. Shifts between, and within, the models are already identified by Hillman Chartrand and McCaughey in the countries they use as examples, and since their article was written almost fifteen years ago, new shifts are sure to be at hand. In relating the models to the cultural policies of Region Vastra Gotaland and the City of Goteborg, we want to assess the models in the light of changes brought about by the globalization processes outlined above. But since one of the basic assumptions in this paper is that cultural policy carried out at different levels

should be studied in relation to one another, we will start with a short summary of Swedish cultural policy from an overall perspective.

Swedish Cultural Policy in Brief

Within the Swedish political system with its adherent administration, cultural policy is defined as “an ordered, structured means for expressing official endeavours in this area of public responsibility” (Swedish National Council for Cultural Affairs 1997, p. 8). This framework presupposes long-term objectives, resources, methods and agents for its implementation. The definition originates from the formation of cultural policy as a policy area among others in 1974, when a united parliament supported the cultural policy visions of a social democratic government. In the same year, measures to fulfil this vision were also taken. Of central importance to the organisation of cultural policy in Sweden is the division of political and administrative responsibility between three levels of government, each with its own decision-making agencies and power of taxation. At the national level you can thus identify the state, at the subnational level the counties and at the local level, the municipalities.

At the national government level, the field of cultural policy is limited to expressions within the areas of literature, theatre, music, the media, popular education and cultural heritage (Swedish National Council for Cultural Affairs 1990, p. 22). Activities supported by the national government are thus mainly confined to the sphere of the fine arts and cultural heritage, mostly produced, distributed and consumed in an institutional context, even though activities are also carried out in more independent settings. Since 1991, the Swedish government includes a Ministry of Culture, and the parliament includes a Committee on Cultural Affairs. Four central authorities are responsible for the implementation of national cultural policy: The National Council for Cultural Affairs, The National Heritage Board, The National Archives and The Swedish Film Institute. Regarding the media, the national government concentrates its support on public service activities. Popular education, which has a unique design and position in Sweden and the other Nordic countries, enjoys national government funding and co-ordination. Every activity supported by the national government should be in accordance with the seven goals that the Swedish parliament set for national cultural policy in 1996, which included a very moderate revision of the goals of 1974. These goals concentrate on the freedom of expression, artistic quality and non-commercialization, pluralism and development, an increased participation in cultural activities, internationalization, education and the preservation and revitalization of cultural heritage (Swedish National Council for Cultural Affairs 1997, p. 13). The national government has the overall responsibility for goals, funding, investigation and information within the cultural policy sector. It is also responsible for legislation, which in Swedish cultural policy is limited to the areas of cultural heritage, the broadcasting media and the library system. In the year 2000, the national government answered for 47 % (or approximately 80 million Euro) of total public expenses within the cultural sector (Swedish National Council for Cultural Affairs 2002, p. 15). This figure includes contributions to cultural activities on the regional and local levels. According to Hillman Chartrand and McCaughey (1989, p. 64), Swedish national cultural policy is best described by the Architect model, even though elements from the Patron model are visible, expressed, for example, in the National Council for Cultural Affairs.

The regional level is organized in 19 traditional counties, two new forms of regions (the regions of Västmanland and of Skåne), and one bigger municipality (Gotland). The counties aim at regional development, and public health constitutes the major bulk of their budgets (approximately 80 %). Culture has long been a policy issue at the regional

level, since the counties have been responsible for county libraries and the distribution of funds to popular education, as well as for the support to and organization of certain regional cultural institutions. As a response to national regionalization trends following the cultural policy decisions of 1974, the interest organizations of the Swedish counties and the counties in general have formulated cultural policy strategies of their own (Landstingsförbundet 1976, Nilsson 1982). In the year 2000, the counties answered for 10 % (or approximately 17 million Euro) of total public expenses within the cultural sector (Swedish National Council for Cultural Affairs 2002, p. 15). The debate on regional cultural policy has been heated by the experiments with political and administrative regionalization that have been carried out in Sweden from 1997 and onwards, experiments that are closely related to the fact that Sweden entered the European Union in 1995. The experiments consist of the amalgamation of counties into larger regions, which not only co-ordinate their own activities, but are also granted responsibilities that previously belonged to the national government. The Region Västra Götaland, created in 1999, is one of these regions.

As at the regional level, it is impossible to give a general account of local cultural policy as carried out in Sweden's 290 municipalities. Of great importance is the right of self-determination that has been granted to Swedish municipalities since 1862, where a distinction is made between duties that the municipalities are obliged, by the national government, to fulfil, and duties that are voluntary on the part of the municipalities. Cultural policy is part of the latter, apart from the public library system and parts of the cultural heritage sphere that fall under national government legislation. Funding of public libraries is also the key responsibility at the local level, supplemented with funding in the areas of popular education, music schools and cultural environment. On an average, cultural activities take 3 % of the municipal budgets, while public education and social services are the dominant items of expenditure. The city of Göteborg is no exception to this rule. In the year 2000, the municipalities answered for 43 % (or approximately 74 million Euro) of total public expenses within the cultural sector (Swedish National Council for Cultural Affairs 2002, p. 15). We will now move on to the cases of the cultural policies of the Region Västra Götaland and the city of Göteborg.

The Region Västra Götaland

The Region Västra Götaland was created in 1999 and is the result of the merging of three former county councils and the health care decision-making functions of the municipality of Göteborg. Göteborg is the region's largest municipality and has almost one third of its 1,5 million inhabitants. Even though public health takes up 90% of the region's budget, the region decided early on to create a cultural policy of its own and to give culture the role of a regional developmental factor in its own right. In the creation process of the Region Västra Götaland (whose initial experimental phase has now been expanded), it was decided that the region should take over the responsibility of the former counties in the field of culture, while it was also free to take initiatives of its own in this field. A cultural affairs committee as well as a cultural policy administration were created even prior to a group consisting of one representative from each of the seven major political parties and two civil servants, formulated a cultural policy strategy, *Kulturpolitisk strategi för Västra Götalandsregionen* (Cultural Policy Strategy for the Region Västra Götaland, henceforth referred to as CPSR). This was adopted by the regional parliament in 2001. Throughout the process, the region has had a lively dialogue with the Swedish National Council for Cultural Affairs, a dialogue that continues.

Regional cultural policy has traditionally followed the national recommendations of the 1974 cultural policy goals. This policy aimed at the decentralization of administration and functions in the cultural field, as well as supplementing the municipalities' competences and actions in this field. As in the case of other policy fields, many municipalities were too small for the realisation of certain cultural policy goals. Coordinating art institutions and art organisations at the regional level were seen as a solution to this problem. In the Swedish context though, our impression is that there has often been confusion between regionalization and decentralization (Kawashima 1997, Trépagny 2003). The Region Vastra Gotaland has its own definition of cultural policy: "Cultural policy may be described as an activity that with the help of political means endeavours to provide the conditions necessary for culture to be a positive power in society" (Vastragotalandsregionen 2001, p. 5). The overall policy objectives for funding culture in the Region Vastra Gotaland are in sum to supplement municipal activity and to act as an intermediary between the local, national and international levels. It should support the creation and mediation of culture and culture subsidized by regional funds should be of regional and strategic interest.

Regional Objectives for Funding and Supporting Culture

In the cultural policy strategy adopted in 2001, the region integrates the ideas of national cultural policy, with an emphasis on the democratic potential of culture, with regional development goals and objectives. (Vastragotalandsregionen 2001, p. 5). The discussion of the concept of culture takes as its point of departure a reflection on "culture in its own right", which is followed up with a discussion of culture in an anthropological sense. This is a clear reference to Unesco's World Commission on Culture and Development report *Our Creative diversity* of 1996, where culture is described as having other values important to development than the economically measurable factors that are so commonly associated with it. The CPSR does not aim at any given definition of culture or art, and states that "art and culture should never have to be motivated in other terms than their own innate value" (Vastragotalandsregionen 2001, p. 1). Culture is also discussed in terms of its power in what might be another reference to the work of UNESCO. For instance, a conference following up the work of the World Commission on Culture and Development had this as its theme ("The Power of Culture – Intergovernmental Conference on Cultural Policies for Development"). At this conference, organized in Stockholm, a cultural action plan was discussed and accepted by member states (UNESCO 1998). The importance of bringing culture into the heart of policy-making for development was one of its conclusions. In the CPSR the importance of culture for development is stressed. The CPSR is a serious attempt to merge regional and national goals with international trends and ideas, and its conception of culture is broad. In this it might also be a bit vague – but that is not the point here.

The policy objectives for the Swedish county councils to support activities in the cultural field, have since the 1970's been welfare oriented (Nilsson 1982, 1999). Today's Region Vastra Gotaland defines itself as "the region of the municipalities". The regional cultural policy supplements local initiatives. It cooperates with and builds on local cultural policy, and cooperates with the national level. Regional documents and agents speak of the region in terms of a network with certain named nodal points, or as a vast place with important hubs or centers. In addition to Goteborg, several cities are mentioned. Through these, the citizens should have a chance to participate and take part in the region's cultural life. Regional development and democracy are the two most important policy objectives for funding culture in the Region Vastra Gotaland. Interconnection, networking and civil society building are goals stated, where cultural projects should play a strategic regional role. The infrastructure of culture and the mediation of it in the region

as a whole are – as a consequence – seen as important regional strategies in the cultural field.

What is considered strategic is perhaps easiest to identify in the field of the film and cultural industries. While regional cultural policy in Sweden, until recently, did not mention media or the commercial aspects of culture and the cultural industry as something having positive potentials, the Region Vastra Gotaland stresses the importance of media and cultural industries. The support to the cultural industry can be seen as having a strategic and instrumental intent. Here culture and other policy areas work together and the developmental importance given to culture is clear. They help the region to make its voice heard in a world of competing regions and agents that have to act beyond the national borders (Habermas 2001).

The policy objectives of the Region Vastra Gotaland are closest to Hillman Chartrand's and McCaughey's Architect model. The policy is citizen oriented and aims at democracy. Culture and access to culture are seen as part of the regional welfare system. At the same time, the regional model recommends and supports a diversity of expressions. Artistic excellence is mentioned in the CPSR. From our point of view this rather illustrates the fact that no cultural policy model is one dimensional. Many agents in the region have impact on the cultural field and blur the initiatives taken by the region. The region's importance in the field of culture is not yet fully established. There exists, therefore, a great difference between rhetoric and practice in the cultural field. The region's cultural policy strategy supports artistic and other processes, while at the same time it asks for certain regional products. These, said to be strategic, are in fact instrumental and not entirely focused on culture in its own right. The power of culture becomes a developmental factor, but culture is also understood in economic terms instead of focusing on the power of culture as understood and discussed by the UNESCO (World Commission on Culture and Development 1996). Partly due to the fact that culture is dependent on many other policy fields, the objectives become more economic than democratic. The cultural policy field is also dependent on other policy fields in a way that is not sufficiently analyzed by Hillman Chartrand and McCaughey in their article from 1989.

Organisation and Funding

Concerning the organisation and funding of cultural policy in the Region Vastra Gotaland, the cultural committee reflects the political proportions of the region's parliament and is sorted under its government, where right wing parties collaborate with the left. The administration prepares and executes the policy carried out. The present administration has, from the start, been headed by one of the administrators that formulated the CPSR. A "preparation group for culture", consisting of 15 representatives of the region and 12 of its municipalities, discusses, initiates and prepares questions of policy, but can only serve as an advisory body in that it has no decision making power. One could state that the Region Vastra Gotaland in many ways resembles the architect model, in that the preparation group for culture only finds itself at half an arm's length distance from the political and decision making body, and in that it has no real power. Bureaucrats have also an important role for the outcome of the policy. The image is blurred, however, by the fact that the region finds itself not only in between a local and a national level, but also by the existence of the European Union (EU). The EU's influence on the cultural policy of the region is not direct, however. The agents in the region do not, for instance, refer to the cultural commissioner, and neither to any treaty. Further, representatives of both the administration and the committee mean that the EU does not really have any cultural policy. But, and this can not be ignored, the EU inspires cultural agents, organisations and institutions of the region to seek funding within the union's

structural funds. These agents are often funded by the region as well, and are thus dependent on several donors.

The region finances cultural agents, organisations and institutions that carry out projects of regional strategic interest. Popular education has always been, and still is, dependent on the region, but other agents in the fields of theatre/music/dance, natural and cultural heritage and art/design/film are often funded by several agents and it is often their ambition to reach the inhabitants of the region that are so recompensated. As responsible for the county libraries as well as for hospital libraries, one would assume that cultural policy in the library field would be less complicated. But at the time of writing, the mere existence of the hospital libraries in the region is threatened by the region's own policy in another field, namely its healthcare policy. According to the CPSR, the hospitals of the region should have libraries, but deficits in healthcare administration and functions inspire health care politicians to ignore the CPSR and to recommend their closure.

In its own funding system and process, the region acts as an architect, while, in other ways, it suggests the facilitator: the diversity of activities in the cultural sphere is one example. Private donations and sponsoring are a strong tradition and quite common in the western parts of Sweden, and the Region Vastra Gotaland can be said to encourage it. It supports the Goteborg Symphony Orchestra, which is in turn sponsored by Volvo. The Opera House of Goteborg is another example. As in the case of the national level in many Western countries, internationalization and globalization challenge cultural institutions as well as decision makers in the cultural policy field. New competition forces the region to declare itself and to make visible certain branches of culture and the cultural industry.

Policy Dynamic, Artistic Standards and Status of the Artist

The cultural policy of the Region Vastra Gotaland is rather new, a fact that makes it hard to study its actual policy dynamics. And, it might prove necessary to separate policy dynamics from actual cultural dynamics, to separate policy from the climate it is able to create. At the rhetorical level, however, cultural policy dynamics tends to be revolutionary as in the architect model. It supports culture that aspires to meet needs in the regional community. Given the region's peculiar situation in between two levels of government with perhaps greater impact on the cultural field, this development could also be described as quite random. If not dependent exclusively on private donors, cultural agents are dependent on the changing tastes and priorities of different agents: sponsors, municipalities, the region, the state and the EU whose impact on the projects carried out in the region can not be neglected. Shifts in funding policy at the European level have direct consequences for projects in the cultural field. Artists and cultural agents in the region tend to turn to their cities and/or communities for funding, but at the same time they apply for funding from the region and the EU. Institutions and museums supported by the region also turn to the EU for funding, but the bureaucracy and amount of documentation that has to be completed often impedes further exploitation of this funding possibility.

The financial status of the artists and cultural workers is not a major concern for the Region Vastra Gotaland, even though it deems it necessary that professionals in the field of culture are able to live, work, develop and meet their audiences in the region. At this level we would state that the cities/municipalities are of greater importance for the cultural agents except in the case of professionals in the contexts of regional museums and libraries. These are, of course, fully dependent on regional funding. In the case of popular education, support from the region is also of great importance. The region could

therefore be seen as an architect. But this does not encompass all of its cultural agents and professionals. Many are dependent on different agents.

Regional Cultural Policy and Others

When studying cultural policy at the regional level as in the case of the Region Vastra Gotaland, it soon becomes clear that other policy areas must be taken into account and analyzed. This is clearly the case for the hospital libraries in the region. The fact that other public agents than the region are of importance, and that the cultural policy of these, in some cases, might influence cultural life to a greater extent, is also clear. Hillman Chartrand and McCaughey do take into account the existence of many agents. This is in fact a precondition in the facilitator model. But these agents are identified in a national context and are mostly of the private – as opposed to national – kind. In our context, and in our times, it is very clear that other agents influencing cultural policy might also be public ones (other governmental levels of decision) within the nation and outside (the EU). The dichotomy between private as opposed to public is not subtle enough, for, as we have seen, public agents might also challenge other public agents. Nationally delimited models are also too restricted to capture the dynamics of cultural policy and need to be completed by international dimensions. If the models proposed by Hillman Chartrand and McCaughey are too limited for a direct application in a regional context, they are very helpful in another manner: they highlight the fact that a manifold of agents in a field needs to be included in a study.

The cultural policy strategy of the Region Vastra Gotaland is clearly influenced by an international document such as *Our creative diversity* (World Commission on Culture and Development 1996), and agents within the region are, at different levels, dependent on financial aid from the EU.

The City of Goteborg

During the 1990's, the cultural policy program of Goteborg, Sweden's second largest city with about 470,000 inhabitants, underwent revision and reformation. In 1993, the recently established cultural affairs committee started working on a new cultural policy program for the city of Goteborg, a process that was initiated by the municipal council in 1992. The committee had many factors to consider; the present cultural policy program was developed in the late 1960's and it needed updating and adjusting to the social conditions of the 1990's. In addition, the political structure and its adherent administration had undergone many changes during the period. 21 district committees had been enforced in 1990, and their responsibilities included cultural activities. Hence, the responsibilities of these committees, based on geographical territories, in relation to the responsibilities of the central cultural affairs committee had to be made clear. The municipal council did not accept the proposal for a new program, developed by the central cultural affairs committee, until 1998. The prolonged time frame for this process reflects that there were important issues concerning both the content and organization of the city's cultural policy at stake. The new cultural policy program that was accepted in 1998 is called *Strategy of Cultural Policy – version 1.0* (we will henceforth refer to it as SCP), and it includes, in a Swedish context unique, model of generating future cultural policy at the local level. After briefly introducing this model, we will assess the model in relation to the components of Hillman Chartrand's and McCaughey's models.

By way of introduction, it is stated that SCP is a strategy; i.e. a statement of overall aims, and not a detailed, and therefore quickly outdated, program. According to SCP, a society

in constant change demands flexible policy documents. After this statement, the national cultural policy aims are quoted before the cultural policy aims of Goteborg are introduced and declared to be the following:

- to promote a rich artistic life of high quality,
- to expand citizens' cultural competence,
- to give priority to those cultural activities involving children and the young,
- to create an attractive living environment. (City of Goteborg, 1998, p. 6)

It is in order to achieve these goals, that a model for enacting cultural policy is presented. This model divides cultural policy into three different sectors; one cultural policy sector that should promote the cultural competence of the citizens, one arts policy sector that should develop and promote artistic quality, and one cultural planning sector that should have an overall grip of the city's cultural resources. Finally, art mediation is included in the model, as the intermediary between the arts and audiences. In addition to the overall aims quoted above, every sector, including art mediation, thus has its own specific aims. The model is presented as a circle, with art mediation in the middle and the other sectors placed around this center. All lines between the sectors are dotted instead of continuous, indicating that interactivity between the different sectors is desired. In SCP, no explicit division of responsibility as to who should be in charge of each of the sectors is stated. Still, implicit consequences can be identified, since all the activities generated by arts policy fall under the central cultural affairs committee, and all the examples given of cultural policy fall under the city district committees. Cultural planning is to be the responsibility of both central and district committees. This division of responsibility was also implemented in practice.

Local Objectives for Funding and Supporting Culture

Concerning policy objectives, all of Hillman Chartrand's and McCaughey's models are present in the SCP model. The Architect's objective of social welfare is perhaps the most dominant theme, at least rhetorically, in SCP, and especially regarding the objectives of the cultural policy sector. This sector focuses on the perspective of citizenship, and, with reference to Pierre Bourdieu's concept of cultural capital, 'cultural competence' is defined as "the individual's inclination, motivation, interest and ability to take advantage of and participate in cultural activities" (City of Goteborg 1998, p. 8). 'Cultural competence is defined as a necessity for citizens in today's societies, since cultural capital is thought of as increasingly replacing economic capital. Therefore, cultural policy should enforce activities that fall within the definition of "the sets of values, traditions and ways of life which unite a group, a population or a community in a social entity" (City of Goteborg 1998, p. 12). This is an anthropological concept of culture as a system of thought and value brought into play, with its focus on the ability of the citizens to function in a democratic system of thought and value. The activities included within the sector of cultural policy are, among others, amateur activities, intercultural projects, popular education, teaching, popular movements, and sports. Groups of citizens that should be given special priority are citizens of foreign background (which constitutes a quarter of Goteborg's population), children, young people, and senior citizens. Sometimes SCP comes close to the Engineer model's objective of political education through culture, since there is a tendency to regard the municipality as 'the educator' of 'the people'.

The Patron model's focus on artistic excellence is also clearly visible in SCP's version of arts policy. The arts policy sector focuses on professional art of high quality, and art is in this context defined as "experiences, ideas and knowledge in artistic form within the fields of literature, visual art, architecture, handicraft, music, theatre, dance, opera, film,

video, photography, multimedia, design, interdisciplinary artistic projects etc” (City of Goteborg 1998, p. 21). The traditional aesthetic concept of culture as the ‘fine arts’ is thus employed, even though the definition is somewhat broader than at the Swedish national level. Still, when examples of activities in Goteborg that are regarded as belonging to the arts policy sector are given, focus lies on activities performed in the traditional context of the fine arts, namely institutions (such as the Goteborg Opera House, the Goteborg Symphony Orchestra, the Goteborg Art Gallery and the Municipal Theatre). Independent art life is also to be supported by public means, but the rapid growth of the art industry and cultural tourism is also related to as means of improving the working conditions of independent artists. The proposed combination of artistic activities financed by public and private grants, respectively, opens up for the Facilitator model’s focus on a diversity in expressions achieved by a diversity of financing modes as the objective of political regulation of the cultural field.

The Facilitator’s vision of diversity is also present in the objectives for the cultural planning sector. ‘Cultural planning’, a concept brought into SCP from the works of Franco Bianchini (e.g. 1993), is based on the widest definition possible of the anthropological concept of culture, i.e. culture as a ‘way of life’. Cultural planning includes everything “from the traditional art forms to the media, handicrafts, fashion, design, sports, town planning, historic monuments, tourism, cooking traditions, entertainments, and local history” (City of Goteborg 1998, p. 28). It focuses on the city as an artefact brought to life by human activity, an activity through which the city becomes a living organism, a subject with its own identity. Therefore, a holistic perspective is necessary in this sector, and all boundaries should be transgressed; the public sector should meet the private sector, popular culture should meet culture favoured by the ‘elite’, different professional artistic groups and institutions should work together, etc. In granting this holistic perspective, SCP grants that the policy objectives of social welfare and artistic excellence are actualized in the cultural planning sector, too. And the holistic perspective also implies that different policy sectors within the municipality (e.g. educational policy, city planning, health policy, financial policy) should increasingly interact with one another, an aspect that is not discussed in Hillman Chartrand’s and McCoughey’s models.

As related above, art mediation is to be the link between cultural policy, arts policy, and cultural planning. But in its definition of art mediation, namely that of “the professional supplying of professional art works” (City of Goteborg 1998, p. 25), the efficiency of this link can be questioned. Since SCP’s definition of art is limited mainly to the traditional fine arts, focus lies on the objective of artistic excellence, even though the objectives of social welfare and diversity are introduced through those institutions that mediate the fine arts; e.g. libraries, museums, marketing/information, galleries, art distributors (such as bookshops and cinemas), the media and seminars/lectures. Noteworthy is the fact that SCP emphasizes the importance of increasing the number of professional mediating groups, since the ones existing today are not adjusted to today’s demands. Interestingly, a private firm in the publishing business today runs a cultural management training program in cooperation both with the city of Goteborg and the national government.

Organization and Funding

As Bianchini (1993, p. 5-6) notes, cities in West European countries have experienced “a clear shift in the policy rationale from social/political priorities to economic development objectives” since the 1980’s, due to the recession in public finances. In the city of Goteborg, the organization of cultural policy follows the overall Swedish model of political and administrative structures. The popularly elected municipal council sets the overall aims and budget, and it also decides which individuals should sit on the city’s

committees in the cultural field. Both the central cultural affairs committee and the city district committees are answerable to the municipal council, where left wing parties held the majority in the time period studied. The boards of the city's different art institutions apply for funding to the cultural affairs committee. All of these committees and boards have their own administrations, which play a crucial role in the decision making process (cf. Hannesson 2004, forthcoming). Hence, the model of funding in Goteborg most clearly resembles that of the Architect model. Still, due to the shifts in policy objectives mentioned above, there is a clear tendency that the Facilitator model is gaining ground. Sponsorships, for example, in the case of the Goteborg Opera House and the Goteborg Symphony Orchestra, illustrate this tendency. But perhaps more interesting is the tendency to regard cultural policy as part of an overall development – as a way of making the city visible in a world of global competition (cf. Johannisson 2003). These discussions are inspired both by arguments put forward in the 80's concerning the value of culture as a means of promoting financial development (e.g. Lindeborg 1991), but also by international cultural policy documents which emphasize the role of culture in promoting sustainable development in a more holistic way (e.g. World Commission on culture and development 1995, Council of Europe 1997).

Policy Dynamic, Artistic Standards and Status of the Artist

Due to the diversity of objectives in the cultural policy model of Goteborg, the dynamic of the policy enacted can also be said to be of a multifaceted character. Due to the fact that the bulk of the city's financial resources are spent within the arts policy sector, the policy dynamic is mainly that of promoting certain artistic expressions in an evolutionary manner. But since the arts policy sector includes art mediating institutions such as libraries, the dynamic is also of a revolutionary character. This is enforced through the cultural policy sector, which aims at giving the citizens the possibility of changing their circumstances through providing artistic and cultural activities. But since agents from the private sector are invited to complement public subsidies in the cultural field, the dynamic also tends to be rather random.

Again, the cultural policy model of Goteborg inspires artistic standards from all the models of Hillman Chartrand and McCaughey. Interesting in this context is that SCP states that art never can be used in any instrumental way, i.e. as a vehicle for financial, social, religious or political aims, without losing its 'essence', credibility and quality. Culture, on the other hand, can be used in this way without losing any inherent qualities. Hence, in the arts policy sector it is the professional standards of artistic quality that is promoted, while the cultural policy sector encompasses standards that focus on the well-being of the citizens and their community. A narrow selection of professional artists are to be supported by public means, while the majority of cultural workers have to depend on funding from a range of different agencies, such as the region, the state, the European Union and private bodies.

Local Cultural Policy and Others

Cultural policy in the Swedish municipalities has since the 1970's tended to follow national cultural policy goals very closely. Goteborg's cultural policy strategy of 1998 is an explicit example of a shift in this trend, and the city is often referred to as a forerunner in attempts to create a local cultural policy independent of the national level. Still, Goteborg's model lies fairly close to the national cultural policy model, at least in practice. At the rhetorical level, SCP states that inspiration is mainly gained from international research on cultural policy (Bianchini, Bourdieu) and from international cultural policy discussions (Unesco, Council of Europe). Goteborg is also a member of

EUROCITIES, a lobby organization furthering the interests of Europe's larger cities in relation to the European Union. It is the regional level that is perhaps depicted as the greatest threat to the independence and success of Goteborg's cultural policy. In SCP, no mention at all is made of Region Vastra Gotaland, even though the region was under formation during the same period that SCP was developed. Cultural policy agents in Goteborg also emphasize that they can see no particular point in regional cultural policy, since its purported aims are achieved at the local level.

Conclusions

In this paper, we have tried to re-use one of the few existing analytical tools for the comparison of different approaches to the organisation and funding of cultural policy. Well aware of the fact that other aspects of cultural policy might be studied more in detail, the Hillman Chartrand and McCaughey models offered us an "all inclusive" framework for our examination of cultural policy strategies in a Swedish context. Our examples, however, were not of a national kind but located in a subnational context. We concentrated on the Region Vastra Gotaland and its biggest municipality, the city of Goteborg. In doing this we could relate the studied levels to each other and last, but not least, raise and examine the question of the location or dislocation of power in a cultural policy context. In the following, we will shortly summarize our conclusions.

- Even though the Hillman Chartrand and McCaughey models are too rigid to be used as such, they are of some use in the analysis of regional and local cultural policy. They will, however, not be useful in any kind of categorization, but rather in an illustration of how complex this policy field is. In the cases of the Region Vastra Gotaland and the city of Goteborg, their cultural policies contain all the roles proposed by the scheme, ranging from the facilitator to the engineer, with an emphasis on the region and the city as architects.
- Others have debated the usefulness and validity of the Hillman Chartrand and McCaughey models (e.g. Mangset 1995, Vestheim 1997). Mangset, for instance, states that the "typology is insufficient – if not misleading as an analytical tool in the comparison of cultural policy in different nations" (1995, p. 35). His critique includes the models' point of departure in national organization and contexts, and the fact that the influence of interest organizations on cultural policy is not sufficiently captured or possible to analyze with the help of the proposed models. In our cases, we have been able to state that the cultural policy of the region Vastra Gotaland, as well as the local cultural policy of the City of Goteborg, both share characteristics with the national one. National cultural policy in Sweden has for a long time been welfare oriented. In their citizen oriented and democratic objectives they have much in common with the Architect model, while they also tend to share characteristics with the Facilitator. So far, the models proved helpful. But both the Region Vastra Gotaland and the city of Goteborg are at the same time open to international trends and have adopted ideas to be found in documents like *Our creative diversity* (World Commission on Culture and Development 1996).
- In a new post-national constellation (Habermas 2001) in which the subnational regions are given more responsibility, these also see themselves as forced to navigate in the world beyond national borders and thus to develop their own territories in competition with other regions. As an effect, the cultural policies of the region and the city seem to be instrumental in that they have to define concise goals for their cultural developments. In times of recession in public

finances, it is necessary to turn to other funding agencies than public ones and both the Region Vastra Gotaland and the city of Goteborg therefore tend toward the Facilitator model. Other means of funding are not only important in sustaining already existing artistic activities and institutions, but also in developing a more visible profile in a world of global competition.

- The Region Vastra Gotaland stresses the importance of the city of Goteborg, as the hub of the region's social, cultural and industrial life. But it also stresses the fact that there should be several cultural nodal points and regional scenes, and that all citizens of the region should gain as equal access as possible to cultural life. The city of Goteborg, on the other hand, sees the region as a threat to its role as an independent and unique center in the geographical area. Hence, there are potential conflicts between the regional and local levels, which could potentially obstruct the attainment of the otherwise quite similar cultural policy aims of the region and the city. It also illustrates the fact that the region has limited power in the field of cultural policy.

The supranational level of government, as represented by the European Union, is gaining power over the Swedish national level, but not over cultural policy as it is defined by cultural policy agents in a Swedish context. Instead, the increase in power is exercised through measures in other policy areas such as economic policy and development policy, thereby indirectly governing the cultural policy area. This is evident both in the Region Vastra Gotaland and the city of Goteborg, and cultural policy at the national level is perhaps most at threat. These shifts are not discussed by Hillman Chartrand and McCaughey, and we therefore conclude that their models are somewhat insufficient in analyzing the power shifts between different levels of government, and between different policy fields.

References

- Bennett, T. 2001. "Cultural Policy: Issues of Culture and Governance," *Culture, Society and Market. The Swedish Research Seminar held at Sigtuna, January 24-25, 2000*, in F. Snickars, ed., Stockholm: National Council for Cultural Affairs and The Bank of Sweden Tercentenary Foundation, p.13-28.
- Bianchini, F. 1993. "Remaking European Cities: The Role of Cultural Policies," in *Cultural Policy and Urban Regeneration: The West European Experience*, F. Bianchini and Michael Parkinson, eds., Manchester: Manchester University Press, p. 1-20.
- Castells, M. 1996. *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture*. Vol.1, *The Rise of the Network Society*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- City of Goteborg 1998. *Strategy of Cultural Policy: Version 1.0*. Goteborg:Goteborgs stad.
- Council of Europe/The European Task Force on Culture and Development 1997. *In from the Margins: A Contribution to the Debate on Culture and Development in Europe*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Featherstone, M. & Lash, S. 1999. "Introduction," in *Spaces of Culture: City – Nation – World*, M. Featherstone and S. Lash, eds., London: Sage, p. 1-13.
- Habermas, J. 2001. *The Postnational Constellation: Political Essays*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Hillman-Chartrand, H. & McCaughey, C. 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 Support*, M.C. Cummings and J. M. D. Schuster, eds., New York: American Council for the Arts, p. 43-80.
- Johannisson, J. 2003. "Att sätta kulturpolitiken på plats: Kulturplaneringens roll i Göteborg" [To Put Cultural Policy in its Place: The Role of Cultural Planning in Goteborg], in *Kultur, plats, identitet: Det lokals betydelse i en globaliserad värld* [Culture, Place, Identity: Local Sites in a Global World], H. Egeland and J. Johannisson, eds., Nora: Nya Doxa.

- Kawashima, N. 1997. "Theorizing Decentralization in Cultural Policy: Concepts, Values and Strategies". *International Journal on Cultural Policy*, Vol. 3, n°. 2, 1997.
- Landstingsförbundet 1976. *Landstingen och kulturpolitiken. Underlag för landstingens kulturpolitiska arbete* [The Counties and the Cultural Policy. Foundations for the Counties' Cultural Policy Program Work]. Stockholm: Landstingsförbundet.
- Larsson, T. 2002. "På väg mot ett starkare EU: Decentralisering hotar den nationella kulturpolitiken" [Towards a More Powerful European Union: Decentralization as a Threat to National Cultural Policy]. *Kultur & Politik* n° 7-8, 2002, p. 10-15.
- Lindeborg, L. 1991. *Kultur som lokaliseringsfaktor: Erfarenheter från Tyskland* [Culture as a Factor of Localization: Experiences from Germany]. Stockholm: Allmänna Förlaget.
- Mangset, P. 1995. "Kulturpolitiska modeller i Vest-Europa" [Cultural Policy Models in Western Europe], in *Kulturråboka*, Oslo: Det norske samlaget.
- Nilsson, S. 1982. *Landstingen i Kulturpolitiken. Den regionala rollen* [The Counties in Cultural Policy. The Regional Role]. Stockholm: Landstingsförbundet.
- Nilsson, S. 1999. *Kulturens vägar* [The Ways of Culture]. Malmö: Polyvalent.
- Sassen, S. 1991. *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Schuster, M. 2002. "Subnational Cultural Policy – Where the Action Is: Mapping State Cultural Policy in the United States." *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 8 n°. 2, 2002, p. 181-195.
- Smith, M.P. 2001. *Transnational Urbanism: Locating Globalization*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Swedish Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs 1990. *Swedish State Cultural Policy: Objectives, Measures and Results*. Stockholm: Allmänna Förlaget AB.
- Swedish National Council for Cultural Affairs 1997. *Swedish Cultural Policy: A Brief Review of National Measures*. Stockholm: Swedish National Council for Cultural Affairs.
- Swedish National Council for Cultural Affairs 2002. *Kulturstatistik 2002* [Cultural Statistics 2002]. Stockholm: Swedish National Council for Cultural Affairs.
- Trépagny, V. 2003. "Att formge regioner – identitetsproduktion i kulturpolitisk information" [Designing Regions – Identity Production in Cultural Policy Information], in *Kultur, Plats, Identitet. Det lokals betydelse i en globaliserad värld* [Culture, Place, Identity: Local Sites in a Global World], H. Egeland and J. Johannisson, eds., Nora: Nya Döxa.
- Vastragötalandsregionen 2001. *Kulturpolitisk strategi för Västra Götalandsregionen* [Cultural Policy Strategy for the Region Västra Götaland].
- Vestheim, G. 1997. *Fornuft, kultur og velferd. En historisk-sociologisk studie av norsk folkebibliotekpolitikk* [Reason, Culture and Welfare. An Historical-sociological Study of Norwegian Public Library Policy]. Oslo: Det Norske Samlaget.
- Vestheim, G. 1998. "Ideological Dilemmas in Norwegian Public Cultural Policy." *The International Journal of Cultural Policy*, vol, 5, n° 1, 1998, p. 129-149.
- World Commission on Culture and Development 1996. *Our Creative Diversity: Report of the World Commission on Culture and Development*. Paris: Unesco.