



EUROPEAN
CULTURAL
FOUNDATION



**'CROSSING PERSPECTIVES:
CULTURAL COOPERATION
WITH SOUTH EASTERN
EUROPE'**

An ECF Seminar

Netherlands Theatre Institute, Amsterdam, 16-18 June 2003

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION
by **Corina Suteu**, President of ECUMEST

PART I **INTERVIEWS**

METHODOLOGY
by **Vjeran Katunaric**, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Zagreb, Croatia

<i>Interviews</i>	ALBANIA Vladimir Gjonjaj , Head of Culture, Youth and Sport, Ministry of Culture Xhevet Ilosi , former Director of the Centre of the Albanian Encyclopedia at the Academy of Sciences Piro Misha , Director of the Books and Communication House in Tirana
<i>Synthesis</i>	Anne-Marie Autissier , Lecturer at the 'Institut d'Etudes européennes' (Paris) in the fields of Cultural Sociology and European Cultural Policies
<i>Interviews</i>	BULGARIA Yavor Koinakov , Director Euro-Bulgarian Cultural Centre Biliana Tomova , Lecturer in Cultural Economics at the University of National and World Economy, Sofia Neviana Viacheva , Expert in International relations, the National Theatre Centre, Ministry of Culture, Bulgaria
<i>Synthesis</i>	Lidia Varbanova , Programme Director, Arts and Culture network, Open Society Institute, Budapest

CROATIA

Interviews

Biserka Cvjeticanin,

Croatian Deputy Minister of Culture,
Senior researcher in the Institute for International Relations, Zagreb

Agar Pata,

Co-ordinator of cultural programmes, Open Society Institute in Croatia
and Programme co-ordinator of the Film Centre in Zagreb

Ivo Skrabaló,

Member of the Croatian Parliament,
Chairman of the Sub-Committee for Co-operation with the European Parliament, former
Deputy Minister of Education, Culture and Sport

Synthesis

Vjeran Katunaric

ROMANIA

Interviews

Vintila Mihailescu,

Professor of anthropology at the University of Bucharest, Writer

Mona Musca,

Member of the Commission for Culture, Arts and Mass Media in the Lower Chamber,
Member of Parliament

Alexandru Tocilescu,

Theatre Director, BULANDRA, Bucarest

Synthesis

Magdalena Boiangiu,

Deputy Chief Editor 'Dilema' magazine, Theatre Critic, Translator

SERBIA

Interviews

Nevenka Dakovic,

Academic working in Film Studies

Darka Radosavljevic,

Founder and Director of Remont, independent art association

Ljiljana Stojiljkovic,

Deputy Minister of Culture and Media for international relations
and European integration

Synthesis

Milena Dragicevic-Sesic,

Professeur et Recteur de l'Université d'Art de Belgrade

GENERAL SYNTHESIS

by Vjeran Katunaric

Part II

CULTURAL COOPERATION – POLICIES & PRACTICES

**MAPPING CULTURAL COOPERATION IN SOUTH EASTERN EUROPE,
an exercise on internationalisation of cultural policies**
by Milena Dragicevic-Sesic and Corina Suteu

**SURVEY ON EXEMPLARY CASE STUDIES
of collaborative cultural projects between West and South-East Europeans**
by Mary Ann de Vlieg assisted by Milica Ilic

PART III

CULTURAL POLICY IN TRANSITION – SOME DILEMMAS IN SLOVENIA

By Vesna Copic

PART IV

SEMINAR DETAILS

DEFINITIVE PROGRAMME

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

SHORT BIOGRAPHIES OF SPEAKERS

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

ANNEX

Inventory of projects supported through Open Society Institutes linking cultural ambitions and civil-society building objectives by Sonja Licht, Vladimir Milcin and Beka Vuko

PART I

INTERVIEWS

METHODOLOGICAL PRINCIPLES

Three key persons in cultural co-operation in each country were to be interviewed. Each person represents one of the three fields of cultural co-operation: politics or higher (governmental) administration, civil society (NGO-s), and the academic or research community.

Three topics were chosen as the subjects for the interviews:

- 1) The consequences of 2004 accession on culture
- 2) New cultural co-operation instruments
- 3) European cultural citizenship

A preliminary draft of the interview questionnaire

(Self) description of the competence and role of the interviewee in (international) cultural co-operation (in one short sentence)

To your mind, is culture recognised as a major factor in the European enlargement process, or do other factors determine this process?

Which of the fears and concerns of the effects of enlargement are real? For example, assimilation, on the one hand, versus exclusion, on the other. Or is it more realistic to expect some new continuum between these two poles as a consequence of enlargement?

Which changes, including the negative, neutral or positive consequences of the enlargement of the EU in 2004, do you expect to see on your own work, the work of your institution, or in the case of your country, on cultural co-operation with (actual or potential) partners in:

- the actual EU-member countries?
- the new member countries?
- the non-member countries?
- the rest of the world?

Would you please explain your position, i.e., why such consequences will ensue (following the year 2004)? For example, IF the co-operation links with any of the categories of countries will significantly change due to accession (e.g., co-operation funds and programmes in the EU become more exclusive or completely inaccessible to non-EU members, and more flexible and approachable

to the member countries) - why is this so? Why should they change?

Do you think that your co-operation links with partners in the EU countries, including your actually running projects or plans with them, might be revised or suffer significant changes as a consequence of enlargement?

Would you, please, explain your reasons for such expectations?

Which instruments of cultural policy co-operation do you see as being the most appropriate for adapting to the new situation?

Can the established co-operation programmes and instruments (funding, mobility schemes, training and research) be continued or sustained in the future?

What do you think about the idea of "European cultural citizenship"? It assumes that Europe in a cultural sense, in the sense of cultural diversity and the preparedness to follow the principles of democracy, intercultural co-operation and creative response to developmental problems, will be larger and will remain larger than the European Union. It assumes that, in other words, the spirit of creativity, mutual understanding and human rights does not necessarily coincide with nation-state borders or the geographical map of the European continent.

How can co-operation lines between core and periphery areas in our continent be urgently developed, which overrun the borders of the EU?

How can regional interfaces, including the existing co-operation links between new member countries and non-member countries, become new centres for certain cultural cross-border co-operation and communication activities? Would the participation and co-operation of some older EU-members in such activities be indispensable or wishful in order to validate the real European networking and purpose of such activities? For example, one old member plus one or two new members, plus several non-members in a common cultural programme of activity to be a rule?

ALBANIA

Interview with Vladimir Gjonjaj, Head of Culture, Youth and Sport in the Albanian Ministry of Culture.

Vladimir Gjonjaj (51) studied literature at the Sorbonne in Paris. He returned to Albania in 1976, writing French high-school textbooks before becoming a researcher at the Albanian Sciences Academy (1982 to 1990). After the fall of Communism, he worked as a journalist for Swiss Roman Radio and for the French magazine *Diagonales Est-Ouest*. He ran a decentralisation programme in Albania with the support of the Swiss government. In October 2001, after a spell at the Albanian Ministry of Public Works and Tourism, he joined the cabinet of the Culture Minister, Mrs Arta Dade.

In your opinion, is Culture recognised as a major factor in the Enlargement process?

Enlargement constitutes a new era, one that is already in progress. In this context, culture could represent both Europe's diversity and its unity. One would need to be aware of one's own identity before being able to feel a part of the EU. Unfortunately, the Enlargement agenda has priorities other than culture. I personally think that culture should be a major consideration in this process. For instance, it is useless to accelerate the Law process (affecting penal and civil codes) without ensuring that everybody has understood the changes and will be able to comply with them. And this is also a cultural question.

What are your fears and concerns regarding the effects of Enlargement? For example, do you fear a stark choice between assimilation on the one hand and exclusion on the other? Or is it more realistic to expect that some equilibrium between the two will be achieved?

I would say that more fears come from the Western side – especially the fear of being invaded by immigrants. As far as Albania is concerned, it has to face a major challenge: we must end abuses and corruption and commit ourselves to 'playing the game according to the rules'; by this I mean respecting human rights and democracy. And we must also accept that, in the short term, even if we abide by democratic norms our standard of living will not necessarily improve. In Albania, people fear neither assimilation nor exclusion. Of course, one or two major languages will have to be adopted for the sake of European communication. But nobody has the feeling that Albanian culture will disappear for this reason. Most feel that they rely on a solid basis of tradition and established cultural practices which will be somehow permanent. At the moment, the desire to end Albania's isolation is stronger than any fear of assimilation.

What changes – good, bad, or indifferent – do you expect Enlargement to bring to Albania, especially where your current responsibilities are concerned?

Changes are always good. At the moment, Albania is often perceived as the kingdom of drug trafficking, prostitution, and other forms of criminality. But it is also a place where people live and work. We need to take advantage of all opportunities to promote Albanian music, literature, and heritage – including the opportunity afforded by Enlargement. Any example of direct cultural encounter can contribute to changing Albania's image for the better.

Do you think that your links with partners in EU countries, including ongoing projects and plans, might have to be revised or undergo significant changes as a consequence of Enlargement?

I do not expect many changes on the bilateral aspects which have their own rules and constraints. As far as multilateral relations are concerned, there could be significant changes since few professionals and civil servants currently manage this type of cooperation, especially in the cultural field. Therefore the rules that will now apply to our new EU neighbours will require Albanian actors to reform substantially their own working system or management organization. It will be a challenge, but one we would have had to face sooner or later anyway.

What instruments of cultural policy cooperation do you regard as the most appropriate for Albania in adapting to the new situation: funding, mobility schemes, training and research, or some other instruments?

Good business needs good partners. First of all, approaches to management and other practices must be improved. The active participation of all concerned is needed. Of course subsidies are necessary, but so are reciprocity and shared responsibility. For example, an Albanian musical group travels to another European country in an exchange visit, bringing certain advantages to the group. The same advantages should be provided to any European group when it travels to Albania. One must absolutely end this paternalistic idea that Albanians must be assisted and supported and not give anything back just because they are 'poor' and underdeveloped. Albania must play a proactive role and be able to make proposals. We must be in a position to invite to Albania specialists in the field of cultural and art management, legislation, associations' or NGOs' statutes, and so on. We must learn how to use external competences in the framework of our own projects.

What do you think of the idea of 'European cultural citizenship'? Can a 'European citizen' exist without being granted formal EU membership, and if so, which institutional forms to promote such 'citizenship' should be

cultivated (even before other mechanisms of EU integration and enlargement are brought into play)? Albania is European. But people have a general historical feeling for or about Europe without such feeling having consequences for them in the present. They still do not see themselves as European citizens because they hardly see themselves as Albanian citizens. Albanians currently possess an irrational, caricatured view of politics. Let's say it's a 'black and white' view. Grey should come first – a more rational and concrete vision of democracy – rather than all the colours of the spectrum all at once!

For this reason a crucial step towards this sense of European citizenship could occur within the framework of Balkans integration, which should be supported from a cultural point of view. Albanians have to face the fact that in the new Europe they will be collaborating with Serbs, Croats... A free market space can be a good experience in this regard. But it must be extended to cultural goods, cultural meetings and so on. If Albanians succeed in experiencing a feeling of South-East European citizenship, they would more easily integrate into a wider group.

The EU should be careful about the Balkans, since two major conflicts arose in this area. Any measure leading to a direct relationship between Balkan cultural actors has to be welcomed. In this respect, the post-war German-French dialogue – with its city twinning, youth exchanges and so on – seems to be a good model.

How could we develop lines of cooperation between core and periphery areas in our continent, beyond the borders of the EU? And how could regional interfaces be created (incorporating the existing links between new and non-member countries) which could become new centres of cross-border co-operation and communication?

If we are to ensure the real Europe-wide significance of such activities, is the participation of some older EU-members indispensable? For example, there could be a rule that one established EU-member plus one or two new members plus a few non-members must take part in a common cultural programme or project.

As I said before, I think that a programme should be set up first in the Balkans to promote itinerant festivals, regular exchanges, seminars and workshops. Furthermore, I think it is an excellent idea to have mixed projects between members, new members and non-members. This would definitely help to speed up knowledge transfer, the establishing of contacts and so on. It would allow information to be delivered directly. Thus Albanians could make up for lost time. Furthermore, it would help current EU members to discover the realities experienced by non-members as well as their talents: they also have things to learn. Finally, I repeat that Albania *must* commit itself to welcoming European professionals

and creative people and learn how to manage all manner of events properly. This would be a way to escape from the margins and become part of the centre of Europe.

Interview with Professor Xhevat Lloshi

Born in 1938, Xhevat Lloshi graduated from Tirana University in 1958 with a BA in Russian Language and Literature. In 1985 he obtained a Ph.D. with a thesis on 'A stylistic Analysis of the Albanian Lexicon'. After teaching in secondary schools and working at the Department of Lexicography at the Academy of Sciences, in 1980 he became editor-in-chief of *Drita*, a weekly magazine on literature, arts and culture (1980-1982). From 1982 up to 1992, he was Head of the Department of the Albanian Encyclopaedia at the Academy of Sciences. He was a member of the Albanian Parliament from 1992 up to 1996 and in 1997 he became Director of the Centre of the Albanian Encyclopaedia at the Academy of Sciences. In 1998 he was appointed professor.

In your opinion, is culture recognised as a major factor in the Enlargement process?

Culture is one of the most important factors in the Enlargement process. Free trade or an organisation such as Interpol can readily be introduced by adopting new laws. You cannot, however, create cultural identities by passing new laws. In the long term this will pose far greater problems

What are your fears and concerns regarding the effects of Enlargement? For example, do you fear a stark choice between assimilation on the one hand and exclusion on the other? Or is it more realistic to expect that some equilibrium between the two will be achieved?

Albania's prospects of joining the EU in the near future are slender. The Enlargement with other Balkan countries such as Romania and Bulgaria is however a step in the right direction, as it will then become easier for the remaining countries to join the EU. It will also become vital to act expeditiously.

What changes – good, bad, or indifferent – do you expect Enlargement to bring to Albania, especially where your current responsibilities are concerned?

All Albanians expect the Enlargement to bring changes for the good, to the extent that there is no debate on the possible negative aspects. My field of activity will most likely benefit from the Enlargement process. Europeans concerned with the immigration problems do not understand what it is like for an Albanian professor living under the constant threat of imprisonment, for whom it requires a great deal of effort to obtain a Schengen visa.

Do you think that your links with partners in EU countries, including ongoing projects and plans, might have to be revised or undergo significant changes as a consequence of Enlargement?

After the Enlargement the co-operation with EU partners will probably not be subject to any significant

developments. In the past, the 'Albanian enigma' attracted a great deal of attention from all kinds of fields. During the last decade, after having come to a climax during the Kosova crisis, people have started to lose interest in the 'Albanian complex'. We have an obligation to progress in the right direction in order to entertain a partnership within a normal framework. If not so, Albania will be subject to new marginalization.

What instruments of cultural policy co-operation do you regard as the most appropriate for Albania in adapting to the new situation: funding, mobility schemes, training and research, or some other instruments?

If we are to take the matter seriously of a new generation of Albanian specialists and scholars, then a professional framework and proper research programmes are surely the way to go about it. The older generation followed the Russian system, and was strictly cut off from contacts with the West. Our Academy of Sciences is the only remaining institution left based on the Russian concept.

What do you think of the idea of 'European cultural citizenship'? Can a 'European citizen' exist without being granted formal EU membership, and if so, which institutional forms to promote such 'citizenship' should be cultivated (even before other mechanisms of EU integration and enlargement are brought into play)?

It is possible to be a European citizen without actually being a formal member of the EU. Yet again, the decisive factor is Culture. Cultural institutions therefore must play the part of being promoters of the European spirit. Unfortunately, we are in the paradoxical situation that although both the British Council Centre and the Centro Culturale Italiano are present in Albania and notwithstanding their activities are most welcome, neither centre concentrates on representing European culture. The situation is worse in regards to Greece. Nothing 'European' ever seems to come from our only EU neighbour.

How could we develop lines of co-operation between core and periphery areas in our continent, beyond the borders of the EU? And how could regional interfaces be created (incorporating the existing links between new and non-member countries) which could be become new centres of cross-border co-operation and communication?

If we are to ensure the real Europe-wide significance of such activities, is the participation of some older EU-members indispensable? For example, there could be a rule that one established EU-member plus one or two members plus a few non-members must take part in a common cultural programme or project.

Albania represents a prime area for cross-border co-operation. An outstanding example of a common project that I would like to mention is the South-Eastern University recently opened in Tetovo, with an excellent campus. It is

impossible for me to elaborate on the educational, research and cultural opportunities that a university can offer to a large number of young people. As an example of how not to do things, I would also like to mention the proposed Catholic University, which is to be opened in Albania. A European Cultural Centre would also be welcome in Albania.

European states are reluctant to accept Albanians even in sports programmes, because of the fear that some of the sportsmen will not return home. The solution would be: more European activities in Albania! Recurrent common projects based in Albania are the key to successfully and expeditiously developing forms of co-operation. Albania is a suitable meeting ground for citizens of EU members, new EU members and non-EU members.

Interview with Piro Misha, Director of the Books and Communication House in Tirana

Piro Misha has been active in the field of Philosophy, Social Sciences and Philosophy for many years now. He was the founder of the Books and Communication House in Tirana, a centre for the translation of major European literature on Social Sciences into the Albanian language. The centre also organizes debates in Tirana with a view to inform people in an informal way about current international debates, including discussions involving mediterranean countries. A further objective is to support 'popular academies', open to all kinds of people, especially young persons, be they students or not. The Books and Communication House was founded with the support of the Soros Foundation and Pro Helvetia. Piro Misha recently received funds from the European Cultural Foundation to develop a 'Babel Site' for the Books and Communication House. The centre also houses a coffee shop and a library, at which European magazines are available. The Books and Communication House is located in the Pyramide and has the advantage of a rent rebate, thanks to the support of the Albanian Ministry of Culture.

In your opinion, is Culture recognised as a major factor in the Enlargement process?

In the current Enlargement process culture is certainly an underestimated factor, even though culture is an excellent means of bringing people from other countries together and facilitating direct encounters. In the broadest sense, culture is a cheap and wonderful vehicle for sharing ideas and bringing people together. Therefore, I find it most regrettable that culture is an underestimated factor.

What are your fears and concerns regarding the effects of Enlargement? For example, do you fear a stark choice between assimilation on the one hand and exclusion on the other? Or is it more realistic to expect that some equilibrium between the two will be achieved?

The risk of exclusion is a major concern for us. For example, since the Schengen Treaty, it has become more difficult for Albanians to travel to Romania. Nowadays, they need a visa. I have the feeling that the Enlargement is dividing the Balkans, when it desperately needs to be a

common space, given the importance of closer ties. In my view, this new situation is contradictory with the idea of 'leaving together'. Nevertheless, people have high expectations of the EU. The Albanian Government has willingly entered into a Co-operation Treaty with the EU, even if EU membership is a long-term objective.

What changes – good, bad, or indifferent – do you expect Enlargement to bring to Albania, especially where your current responsibilities are concerned?

After the Enlargement, Albania should feel it has become part of a large family – even if it is not formally a member. But I am afraid that some people may feel disappointed. Albania must be encouraged to participate in common projects, albeit under certain conditions: better management, improved legislation...

Do you think that your links with partners in EU countries, including ongoing projects and plans, might have to be revised or undergo significant changes as a consequence of Enlargement?

Of course, Albania cannot meet the current criteria. However, as I already said, this new situation may lead to further exclusion. Therefore, Albanian partners should be admitted to some – if not all – of the projects, so that they can learn how to be part of a group. That way, they could benefit from it in a concrete manner and at the same time meet the necessity of being professionally involved.

What instruments of cultural policy co-operation do you regard as the most appropriate for Albania in adapting to the new situation: funding, mobility schemes, training and research, or some other instruments?

All of the instruments mentioned above take priority, but I would say that mobility funds are crucial. Perhaps it would be an idea to combine two instruments – that is to say to combine mobility and training, which is also a crucial instrument.

What do you think of the idea of 'European cultural citizenship'? Can a 'European citizen' exist without being granted formal EU membership, and if so, which institutional forms to promote such 'citizenship' should be cultivated (even before other mechanisms of EU integration and enlargement are brought into play)?

The European feeling is very strong, but the EU is not an articulate concept. European citizenship is still a very abstract idea. Albania has suffered greatly as a result of decades of isolation. At this moment Albania would very much like to overcome this isolation, but it does not know how to, nor does it know what it exactly means to be a European citizen. Culture can be an ideal means of introducing European values, if it is part of the educational programme. Albanians need to transform their self-image first in order to be able to feel part of the European

community. Building up an Albanian civil society will be a long process. Direct contacts, conferences, discussions, inviting all kinds of specialists to Albania – and not only to Tirana – are therefore of the utmost importance.

How could we develop lines of co-operation between core and periphery areas in our continent, beyond the borders of the EU? And how could regional interfaces be created (incorporating the existing links between new and non-member countries) which could become new centres of cross-border co-operation and communication?

If we are to ensure the real Europe-wide significance of such activities, is the participation of some older EU-members indispensable? For example, there could be a rule that one established EU-member plus one or two members plus a few non-members must take part in a common cultural programme or project.

Bringing together current EU-members, new EU-members and non-members is an excellent idea. Although access to funding is important, the essential issue is that Albanian actors must learn to work together with partners, learn how to become real partners. They need to be able to confront others, enter into discussions and exchange ideas with others. A form of partnership training is imperative. Another major point is that national and local authorities must recognize the need for a public forum that is open to debate. In this respect, recurrent projects may further our capacity to have differing opinions in a democratic discourse.

SYNTHESIS

By Anne-Marie Autissier

Anne-Marie Autissier is lecturer at the Institut d'Etudes européennes at the University of Paris VIII in the fields of Cultural Sociology and European Cultural Policies. Since 1998, she has been Editor of *Culture Europe*. She also works as an expert for various European and French organizations as the European Cultural Fondation (Amsterdam), the European Community (1993 and 1995), and AFAA (L'Association française d'Action artistique, 2001).

Back to Albanian specificity

Any prospect of European multilateral co-operation – cultural or otherwise – should embrace the following three key Albanian realities.

1. Isolation

Since the Second World War, Albania has become more and more isolated. Any attempts to establish links with international artistic and cultural movements – like in the seventies – were broken off abruptly, and sometimes resulted in the imprisonment of writers, theatre directors, actors and professors. In this respect, the fact that Albania has produced an outstanding writer such as Ismail Kadare seems to be a miracle or an 'enigma'. Albanians are less

afraid of assimilation than they are of marginalization – be it economical or cultural.

2. Lack of Self-image as a National Community

In the meantime, Albanian totalitarianism created a specific mixture of harsh nationalism and a supposed adherence to the basic principles of communism. Albanian dictatorship 'invented' a system of coalescing the Party and the people, selecting some aspects of Albanian traditions and eliminating others. The totalitarian regime used to rely on a rhetorical image of the national community, when in fact the government's main goal was to gain absolute power over the community. In this respect, although Enver Hoxha offered rhetorical support to the Kosovars in their struggle for autonomy, especially in the eighties, in truth he never intended to give the Kosovars concrete support, since he had the feeling that he would not have complete control over the 'external' community. Similarly, Albanian immigrants were stigmatised as 'enemies' of the Albanian communist nation.

Once the curtain was drawn over, the deception and lies of the regime came to light, generating feelings of self-hatred, animosity and guilt. As a result of this situation, the National government lost control over certain tribal groups. And even nowadays, to a certain extent, it still has no sway over various groups. Which accounts for the huge mistrust displayed by our Albanian interlocutors towards any form of politics. Although he is involved in politics, Vladimir Gjonaj talks about an irrational 'black and white' vision on politics and Piro Misha covers every field of Social Sciences 'except politics'.

This general attitude partly explains why the emphasis is put on Culture as a 'socialization tool'. However, this could be dangerously overestimated. Especially if the anthropological view of culture and the comprehensive notion of culture as knowledge and art are mixed up.

3. The need for a 'self-(re)building' process within a regional framework

Our interlocutors focus on regional co-operation – with the Balkans and Southeast Europe – and hardly dwell upon the 2004 Enlargement in itself (in spite of our repeated questions). They rather concentrate on the accession of Romania and Bulgaria. As far as Albania is concerned, the focus of the self-(re)-building process should lie on accepting the new relationship with its immediate neighbours, and should include reconciliation, common projects, youth exchanges and so on, with a clear reference to the post-war German-French dialogue. At the same time, Piro Misha lays emphasis on the discrepancy between the notion of Balkan co-operation and the fact

that, in his view, the Enlargement has yet again divided Southeast Europe.

PROPOSALS

1. The necessity of a European dialogue inside and throughout Albania

In one way or another, our three interlocutors insist on the necessity of a European presence in Albania. Piro Misha already applies these principles, by inviting European specialists like Jacques Lacarrière. Professor Lloshi makes the point clearly by welcoming the idea of a 'European Cultural Centre' in Albania. Vladimir Gjonaj stresses the importance of enabling Albanian artists and professionals to host European events and to offer European groups that travel to Albania the same kind of advantages that Albanian groups enjoy elsewhere.

2. 'Intellectual Mobility' and 'Partnership Learning'

The situation in hand leads to paradoxical proposals. On the one hand, mobility as such is advantageous in regards to Albania if it is combined with training and education. On the other hand, Albanian professionals, students and artists have to start taking responsibility for things – by hosting European events and spreading information and knowledge throughout their own country. In this sense, 'intellectual mobility', in a manner of speaking, can pave the way for 'psychical mobility', which will not amount to escaping, but will offer Albania fruitful experiences.

3. European Cultural Citizenship

As it turns out, although the European feeling is strong in Albania, for the moment the European Union is still a very abstract concept, or, to put it in Piro Misha's words, 'not an articulate concept'. The notion of citizenship still remains an abstraction. It is therefore important that workshops and common projects deal with the matter of citizenship in relation to 'European citizenship', as a set of values, including, of course, cultural rights and cultural diversity. However, as far as Albania is concerned, one should try and avoid separating cultural issues as such from a general and specific perception of such other issues as public education, public health, ecological issues, women's participation, human rights and effective democracy. If not so, Albania will run the risk of again tending to want to impose a set, homogeneous, traditional culture (even though three religions and one minority group were traditionally present in Albania and despite the fact that there is also an 'immigration' culture in Albania, and that there are Albanian communities in Europe, the USA and other countries).

4. Co-operation under Certain Conditions

Our three interlocutors stress the necessity for Albanian professionals to dispel the fallacy that they need assistance, so that they can become an equal partner. The Albanian population has to learn to shoulder responsibility. There is call for special educational methods demonstrating the concrete advantages of a society in which there is mutual respect, in which laws are complied with, in which there are rules of management and so on. Albania is certainly not the only country having to deal with the problem of corruption. In the case of Albania, however, corruption is able to fill the void created by the absence of a frame of reference and by the Albanian population's total underestimation of its own potential. We must not forget that before the Second World War, Albania's standard of living and outlook was based on that of Greece – at least insofar as urban Albania is concerned. Albanians somehow feel guilty about having missed out. From guilt to despair and unlawfulness – one thing easily leads to another. It is for reasons such as these that Vladimir Gjonjaj and Piro Misha stress the importance of a 'micro-project' strategy, given the fact that they are easier to manage and control, and can be realized with a smaller budget. Beside multilateral projects, another strategy that deserves serious consideration is that of PSIC ('Programmes de soutien aux initiatives culturelles', run within the framework of the EU/ACP programmes): PSICs are managed by a local agency appointed by the government and EU representatives, after a general application procedure, and run for several years.

5. To 'Rebuild' Links Regarding EU-Participation

All our interlocutors strongly welcome the idea of common projects involving 'old' EU-members, new EU-members and non-members. However, at the same time professor Lloshi has underlined the fact that EU-members such as the UK, Italy and Greece are not propagating the European culture in Albania. European professionals from Western Europe invited to Albania could contribute to filling the gap. EU-member states present in Albania could also become more involved in all kinds of multilateral events. In this respect, it would certainly be interesting to compare notes with the 'Patrimoine sans frontières', which operates with the support of EU CARDS and which has entered into a contract with the Albanian Minister of Culture. Finally, the case of Albania stresses the need for considering European cultural co-operation as a means to adopt formal EU criteria and to gradually involve representatives of the future Albanian civil society.

BULGARIA

Interview with Yavor Koinakov, Director of the Euro-Bulgarian Cultural Centre

Yavor Koinakov is director of the Euro-Bulgarian Cultural Centre, an NGO founded with the support of the European Union Phare programme and under the auspices of the Bulgarian Ministry of Culture. Its main aim is to provide general information on culture and arts in Bulgaria and Europe and thus to provide means and facilities for co-operation projects.

In your opinion, is culture recognised as a major factor in the European Enlargement process?

Bulgaria is not part of 2004 Enlargement and it is interesting that more and more accession programmes recognize that cultural issues are a key element of the accession process. Culture is seen as a significant factor, a flexible (and not very expensive) tool for changes in the society in the accession process. To cultural actors in Bulgaria 'Europe' means more strength to face free market forces and a chance to develop different forms of cultural expression. For general political aims the idea of diversity can be seen as a platform for expressing the cultural identity of different groups – not only ethnical minorities, but also social groups. Newly emerging generations are more active in this process, as they are looking for new cultural identities and ways of creativity. The trouble with regard to this process is the fact of the easily obtained models and styles and the lack of specific individual/national features. This goes hand in hand with a lot of misunderstanding and a lack of dialog between new and mainstream culture and artistic experience. 'Europe' in a cultural sense is not a geographically bounded territory or a divided civilization – mobility and sharing experiences (on a European level) foster the interest in diversity on all levels – as regards to regional and distant cultures. The general outcome of this 'European' process is perhaps to provide more arguments for the relevance of culture (and education) with regard to the vision of the new society. However, this is a lengthy process, while meanwhile the sectors are suffering from the withdrawal of public funds.

What are your fears and concerns regarding the effects of Enlargement? For example, do you fear a stark choice between assimilation on the one hand and exclusion on the other? Or is it more realistic to expect that some equilibrium between the two will be achieved?

Speculations on assimilation threats can be considered rare, or some kind of nationalistic approach. The real threat is the opening of the market. Unprepared cultural operators will find themselves rock bottom. This has already happened on the internal market with the invasion

of a new entertainment industry and new media as opposed to the traditional cultural activities. Maybe Bulgaria and Romania will have more opportunities to adapt their culture so as to be able to overcome these threats in the years leading up to their accession.

What changes – good, bad, or indifferent – do you expect Enlargement to bring to Bulgaria, especially where your current responsibilities are concerned?

Until now Bulgarian cultural operators participated in cooperative projects on an institutional level. I anticipate that there will be more direct contacts with partners from all the groups mentioned and that there will be no special affiliations to any specific countries. What is lacking is perhaps co-operation with neighbouring countries in the region. But in the perspective of the European process this will be overcome.

Could you please elaborate upon your views and explain why these changes will take place?

Of course closer ties will be maintained with the actual member countries and with new-member states. One of the reasons will be access to co-operation funds, but an even greater incentive will be the flow of information. In recent years regional programmes for cross-border co-operation with a cultural component were successfully implemented in Bulgaria. One of the problems they encountered was a lack of information and already established partnerships between cultural operators in neighbouring countries.

Do you think that your links with partners in EU countries, including ongoing projects and plans, might have to be revised or undergo significant changes as a consequence of Enlargement?

A higher data flow, transfer of know-how, methods of operating in a more regulated environment, independent operation of cultural institutions, knowledge of creative industry processes and co-operation in regard thereto are all vital issues.

What instruments of cultural policy co-operation do you regard as the most appropriate for Bulgaria in adapting to the new situation: funding, mobility schemes, training and research, or some other instruments?

Long-term partnerships and large-scale projects are appropriate instruments.

What do you think of the idea of 'European cultural citizenship'? Can a 'European citizen' exist without being granted formal EU membership, and if so, which institutional forms to promote such 'citizenship' should be cultivated (even before other mechanisms of EU integration and enlargement are brought into play)?

Even now (before Bulgaria's real accession) the notion strengthens cultural operators in their demand for more respect for culture and in their call for a greater role in the development of the society. 'European cultural citizenship' also means another possibility for citizens to participate, whilst a lack of political involvement of citizens can be registered in all democracies.

How could we develop lines of co-operation between core and periphery areas in our continent, beyond the borders of the EU? And how could regional interfaces be created (incorporating the existing links between new and non-member countries) which could become new centres of cross-border co-operation and communication?

Culture – even as a diversity keeper, or as a co-operation driven mechanism - is obviously a strong motivation for establishing stronger links within the Union as well as with newcomers and neighbouring or distant partners. Such changes were already implemented in the Culture 2000 programme. Perhaps it is necessary to develop more programmes supporting long-term co-operation and partnership focusing on regional development (including cultural co-operation) or supporting different creative projects.



Interview with Bilyana Tomova, lecturer in Cultural Economics at the University of National and World Economy, Sofia

Bilyana Tomova is a lecturer in Cultural Economics at the University of National and World Economy, Sofia and an economic expert at the National Civil Forum of Culture. Furthermore, she is an International Policy Fellow on Market Mechanisms of Financing Culture in selected EU accession countries and a member of CIRCLE.

In your opinion, is culture recognised as a major factor in the European Enlargement process?

The answer to the question: 'Is culture recognized as a major factor in the EU Enlargement process?' from an economic perspective is: how much funding goes to certain cultural activities and areas on a European level. The statistics show that the budget for international cultural co-operation (Article 151) is only 0,03% of the EU budget. An instrument for receiving this money is the Culture 2000 program of the EU. There are other indirect funding tools for culture, coming from other alternative financial mechanisms and programs (like the structural funds), but they are not more than 0,7 % of the overall EU annual budget. Europe now is mainly a 'common trade zone'; there is a serious absence of a 'common European cultural space'. This is an issue in times to come. In fact, the European cultural unification has always existed, as the outcome of man's spirit and intellect capacity throughout the centuries -- Europe is a continent with a

common history and culture. But nowadays that no longer suffices.

What are your fears and concerns regarding the effects of Enlargement? For example, do you fear a stark choice between assimilation on the one hand and exclusion on the other? Or is it more realistic to expect that some equilibrium between the two will be achieved?

The world development shows that each process has its pros and cons. But when talking about European enlargement, we should not forget that this is a 'manageable process', that is to say we can forecast and prevent any pitfalls and mistakes. The most likely to benefit from the Enlargement process will probably be the cultural industries – it will create better markets and possibilities for 'large-scale economies'. Cultural and intellectual fields might benefit if they succeed in unifying their cultural products and services, nationally and globally. The broader understanding of culture as a 'creative sector', in which there is a mixture of new technologies, tourism, intellectual and creative abilities, the characteristics of the 'new economy', would also benefit from the freedom of movement of people, ideas, capital and goods. It is up to each national cultural policy to what extent these cultural products will preserve their uniqueness within each national identity.

What changes – good, bad, or indifferent – do you expect Enlargement to bring to Bulgaria, especially where your current responsibilities are concerned?

In the academic field I expect the Enlargement to bring a number of possibilities for student and professor exchanges between universities in the field of culture, arts, cultural management and related areas, joint educational programs and internships.

As regards the service sector I anticipate better possibilities for regional co-operation on the NGO level. This process requires stimulation of young, emerging organizations.

In the field of international projects I expect people to share experiences, and case studies on East-West, North-South and vice versa.

Could you please elaborate upon your views and explain why these changes will take place?

The 'Enlargement of Mind'-questionnaire shows the need for clarification of the positions, functions, opportunities and threats with regards to European cultural co-operation. For example, some of the negative features, such as the unequal positions of the countries and too many requirements in the guidelines of some European programs (such as Culture 2000), should be done away with.

Do you think that your links with partners in EU countries, including ongoing projects and plans, might have to be revised or undergo significant changes as a consequence of Enlargement?

Cultural funds on a European level are not sufficient, and have drastically decreased, especially in the last year. The OSI Arts and Culture Network program is going to be closed soon, support from European organizations to some major European networks is also diminishing, some old existing cultural mobility funds have been closed (for example the APEX fund of the European Cultural Foundation). These are all negative trends, as is the fact that there is no strong partnership between business and culture in Europe. In many countries there is also insufficient money on a national level for international cultural co-operation. A future stagnation of the cultural sector on an international and European level is therefore inevitable.

What instruments of cultural policy co-operation do you regard as the most appropriate for Bulgaria in adapting to the new situation: funding, mobility schemes, training and research, or some other instruments?

The Culture 2000 Program is the only European program for cultural co-operation at the moment.

What do you think of the idea of 'European cultural citizenship'? Can a 'European citizen' exist without being granted formal EU membership, and if so, which institutional forms to promote such 'citizenship' should be cultivated (even before other mechanisms of EU integration and enlargement are brought into play)?

The 'common European cultural space' is not a phenomenon of contemporary society – it is something that has been built up throughout the centuries, given that it is a state of the mind and soul. Culture today is a powerful instrument for political consolidation, but decision-makers and political figures often ignore it. The social and economic effects of culture are sometimes recognized by the business sector; the relations between culture and business are mainly maintained via the cultural industries and the media. The expectation is that the European Union will facilitate the creation of a 'European cultural citizenship' by preserving the uniqueness of small nations, which prevail in Europe. The term 'inter-cultural skills' is used more and more nowadays – it is about understanding 'otherness'. Such understanding is brought about by:

- establishing specialized educational funds on a European level;
- common European funds for specific fields of arts (a good example of such a fund is in the audiovisual sector);

- development of more cultural networks for the freedom of movement of creators, artists and researchers.

How could we develop lines of co-operation between core and periphery areas in our continent, beyond the borders of the EU? And how could regional interfaces be created (incorporating the existing links between new and non-member countries) which could become new centres of cross-border co-operation and communication?

There is no 'centre' and 'periphery' in culture, seeing that every European country is important and unique in terms of its cultural achievements. Common interests should be a priority for choosing partners. The main rules for participating in projects on behalf of a country have to be flexible, optional but not obligatory conditions. This includes the current condition of having an organization from an 'old' EU member state as a partner in the project.



Interview with Neviana Viatcheva

Neviana Viatcheva is an expert on international relations and is director of the National Theatre Centre (Ministry of Culture) in Bulgaria

In your opinion, is culture recognised as a major factor in the European Enlargement process?

Culture is the major factor in the European Enlargement process. The history of the modern world is the history of the self-realization of the European idea. This is a long and complex process with at the centre of it the variable person and his relations with the universe. Relations have grown as a rational compromise between spirit and pragmatism – emanating from centuries of religious, cultural, moral, political and scientific developments. Surely that is culture?

Europe (though not in a topographical sense) is a cultural fact in half of the world. It is not surprising that in some respects there are Asian countries (no need to mention the USA or Australia) that look more 'European' than some parts of Europe itself. And it is not because of the enormous results achieved as a result of new technologies or because of the impetuously developing economy. It is vice versa: the economical, political and social development is a result of the cultural ideal for the active person, who is responsible for his life and who leads his life with the confidence of a demigod.

Culture does not need to be recognized as a major factor of the Enlargement process. Culture (and the education in culture) needs support and investments, and the understanding that in the long run every penny invested in cultural activities could yield profits beyond all expectations.

What are your fears and concerns regarding the effects of Enlargement? For example, do you fear a stark choice between assimilation on the one hand and exclusion on the other? Or is it more realistic to expect that some equilibrium between the two will be achieved?

Both assimilation and exclusion pose a threat to individuals and social groups with 'shortfalls' in their educational and professional background. A lack of education and qualifications can lead either to a tendency to embrace common cultural values and to totally adopt the 'other culture' (as has occurred amongst some 'new' European social groups) or – on the other hand – to nihilistic and even xenophobic trends (amongst some 'old' European social groups).

On the one hand, a large number 'newcomers' will not be ready to cope with the new challenges. Some of them will choose total cultural assimilation, which would help them to 'disappear'. Others will adopt a role familiar to them from the totalitarian years, namely that of the "misunderstood genius". On the other hand, the prosperity of the average western citizen will be disturbed by the influx of well-educated, informed and ambitious 'new Goths', who on top of it all are accustomed to discomfort and material shortage. The Western material paradise inherited by their ancestors will be rocked and its inhabitants will be put to the test. Some of them who are not prepared to compete with the Eastern Europeans' knowledge and qualifications will lean towards the social group of the 'excluded'. Some of them will feel intimidated by the unwanted foreigners, who will pose a real threat to their jobs, prosperity and self-respect.

I anticipate that the competitive, educated professionals from both sides will easily adapt to the new realities without causing stress, exclusion or assimilation.

What changes – good, bad, or indifferent – do you expect Enlargement to bring to Bulgaria, especially where your current responsibilities are concerned?

After the acceptance of the first group of new EU countries (Bulgaria is not in this group) I expect that:

- the relations with the actual EU-member countries and partner organizations will continue to be more active on the part of Bulgaria than on the part of the potential EU partners;
- the relations with the new member countries will unfortunately deteriorate due to new-raised opportunities on the EU market;
- as far as the non-member countries are in the southeast region are concerned, the regional contacts will increase and develop;
- the contacts with the rest of the world will remain within the same borders (more active in regards to North America and some Asian countries and almost no contacts with South America and Africa).

Could you please elaborate upon your views and explain why these changes will take place?

I expect that the most significant change in cultural co-operation will be the deterioration of contacts with newly acceded member countries. This will be caused by: the increased number of opportunities and funding for them within the framework of their new European community, their willingness to establish their EU cultural identification, and their reluctance to go back to the family of the 'non-members'.

Another concern to me is that the current EU-member countries will be inundated with proposals for co-operation from the side of the new-member countries. This could have a long-term negative effect on the countries of the 'second accession group' (like Bulgaria) and could reduce the interest in co-operation and funding for them.

The contacts with Bulgaria's neighbouring countries are traditionally good and are the most likely to develop in the future, firstly because of the cultural, economic and political similarities, and secondly because they remain outside the EU borders.

Do you think that your links with partners in EU countries, including ongoing projects and plans, might have to be revised or undergo significant changes as a consequence of Enlargement?

Funds for 'actual cultural activities' will probably decrease pro rata the increase of funds for social activities. Cultural projects will be forced either to prove their social significance (which is not new) or to tend to cultural industries as far as possible. The national cultural policy is likely to give priority to the protection of the traditional local cultures, the creation of 'high-level' cultural products and the development of the cultural process. Such initiatives are not likely to find support outside the national borders. But the products of such cultural activities can compete on the EU market and could even yield a profit (especially in the case of folklore and traditional arts and crafts). Culture will be supported more as a part of the tourist and leisure industry and less as an intellectual effort with results in the field of aesthetics.

I do not think that the ongoing projects will be subject to changes. Perhaps some funding programs will be created for promoting co-projects on a regional or new- EU members/non-EU members, or old EU-members /non-EU-members basis.

I am afraid that after the euphoria of the 2004 accession, the countries in the second group (for 2007) will remain neglected in terms of funding opportunities and programmes (which are not abundant even now).

What instruments of cultural policy co-operation do you regard as the most appropriate for Bulgaria in adapting to

the new situation: funding, mobility schemes, training and research, or some other instruments?

It is important that the mobility schemes are developed in the future. It will facilitate mutual understanding and will help clarify other people's viewpoints. The exchange programs, training and research programs can contribute to the unification of professional standards. I think that an emphasis should be laid on exchange programs between cultural and educational institutions for temporary exchange of professionals and students in the field of culture. Such programs will overcome the differences in the administration of culture and the subsequent stress that will be caused by the discovery of different professional standards (after the accession to the EU).

What do you think of the idea of 'European cultural citizenship'? Can a 'European citizen' exist without being granted formal EU membership, and if so, which institutional forms to promote such 'citizenship' should be cultivated (even before other mechanisms of EU integration and enlargement are brought into play)?

I have already touched upon the problem of Europe not being a geographically determined location but a composition of values and ideas for the universe and for life. We all know that 'European citizenship' (notwithstanding the administrative definition) is a form of social behaviour that can be found all over the world. There are people in America, in Asia, in Australia and in Africa who share the values of democracy, creativity, humanism and so on. And at the same time there are people living on the European continent (including in the current EU countries) who do not even understand these terms.

To my mind, when somebody is formally and administratively granted the title of 'European citizen', this does not mean that he or she is automatically impregnated with what we call European culture. I believe in the strength of education and art. I believe that the only effective way of creating a European point of view is by means of education (in its broadest sense). I am afraid that the idea of 'European citizenship' sounds a little pretentious, pompous and Eurocentric.

How could we develop lines of co-operation between core and periphery areas in our continent, beyond the borders of the EU? And how could regional interfaces be created (incorporating the existing links between new and non-member countries) which could become new centres of cross-border co-operation and communication?

Today's centre is a result of historical, cultural, political and financial circumstances. The accumulation of material and spiritual factors transformed today's centre into what it is: it was not just because of the material culture; it was 'in the air'. The peripheries are not just a product of a lack of historical opportunities. Their provincial complex has also

played a large role. If they are to be transformed into 'significant' places, then it is first of all necessary to build up their self-respect and to convince them that there is no such thing as large and small cultures.

The role of regional cooperation should not be overestimated, as it remains very local. Regional cooperation is mostly for regional consumption. I am not in favour of the idea of including several countries in a stereotypic conception of 'regional cultural peculiarities' because it bears the risk of generalization, which should be avoided. The co-operation between different parts of the continent should take the form of equal participation in cultural projects and the participants should be regarded as independent cultural agents and not as representatives of regional or local cultures. But as far as the form and the way of participation in a project defines the size of the assimilated recourses, I am afraid that the schemes for participating countries will be determined by the financially independent group, that is to say by the current EU members.

SYNTHESIS

By Lidia varbanova

Is Culture recognised as a major factor in the Enlargement process?

The three interviewees represent three different approaches to the questions above and below: an 'economic-academic' approach, a 'pragmatic-operational' approach and 'philosophical-policy orientated' approach. All three are of the opinion that culture does not just need recognition in the EU Enlargement process, but that it needs investments and support. The amount of money currently being spent on European cultural co-operation is not sufficient and it shows that culture is still being neglected. International discussions on Enlargement are still limited to financial markets, implementation of the EURO, political negotiations, and very few debates are devoted to culture, social issues and the service sector. In theory, culture is recognized as one of the major factors in the Enlargement process, but there is little practical consideration for the tools, mechanisms and consequences.

Possible answers to this question also depend on the way culture is defined – are we talking about the traditional cultures and cultural heritage, or about new innovative artistic experiences and contemporary artistic forms, or about the cultural industries? Culture in the broader sense is linked to religions, traditions, languages, education, and there is still very little room for these issues in the European discussions on Enlargement and its consequences. All countries strive to preserve their

cultural uniqueness, for which people fear when Enlargement is brought into play. On another hand, Enlargement might bring better opportunities for exchange of cultural projects, goods, ideas and talents.

Fears and concerns regarding the effects of the Enlargement

The Enlargement process will certainly influence the opening of art markets, cultural industries and businesses, something which economists regard as a positive effect. But it could also excite all kinds of fears, some of which have been identified as follows:

- huge exodus of talent and artists to more developed countries, where they might find better employment opportunities, with better wages;
- a lack of skills and competence in cultural agents as regards to how to face the new open markets;
- cultural infrastructure and management not ready to meet important criteria for accession;
- flow of cultural goods and projects to countries with more favorable legislation for sponsorship, corporate sponsorship, individual support for culture, and development of cultural businesses;
- absence of well synchronized cultural legislation on a European level.

There are lots of frustrations, not only in the cultural sector, but also in society in general. Some of them are:

- the mentality of people who are not ready to face changes and come unprepared;
- the expectation that real salaries will devaluate in the accession countries because of implementation of the Euro and price increases;
- the very bureaucratic procedures in the public sector and the service sector in some of the accession countries;
- the fact that the accession countries have different, unique languages, and that the overall population is not fully prepared to accept and use a 'common' language, such as English.

Oddly enough (or not), on the current Euro banknote there are only 12 stars and there is no room left for the others... Obviously, after the Enlargement, the EU should issue a new banknote with more stars on it.

The optimistic view is that the EU accession is a manageable process, which can be forecast, and that contingency plans can be developed if there is a common understanding that the process might lead to negative trends, and not only to positive developments. It is up to each cultural policy to implement effective instruments for entering an expanded Europe, together with preserving the unique cultural achievements of each country.

I personally have not come across any research data pinpointing those groups in society that will seriously be frustrated by the forthcoming changes, and those groups that will get off scot-free. Also, it is difficult to predict any processes of assimilation or exclusion at the moment.

Possible changes as a result of the accession process

The overall expectation is that the changes for the actual EU-member countries will not be significant. The European assistance to acceding countries might raise the question of the necessity of having to spend a huge part of the taxpayers' money on the Enlargement and co-operation process.

As I have already mentioned, for some of the new member countries, there will be an inevitable price increase as a result of the implementation of the Euro, as well as a devaluation of people's salaries in many fields, including that of culture. Spending part of the national budget on health care, education and social instruments will be a priority, and culture will still stay behind. These countries will look to improve their relations with the actual EU member countries, and will focus less on their neighbouring countries (an example is the relations between Hungary and Ukraine). In some cases the implementation of the new visa regimes between acceding countries and their non-acceding neighbours will seriously prevent cultural co-operation.

As regards the non-member countries, it is too early to predict what the changes will be. As of yet, they are not ready to fulfil the criteria for accession, and on a national level they face a lot of unsolved political, economic and social problems.

As far as the Soros Foundation's network is concerned, significant changes have already been implemented in the new member countries: in some of the countries the Soros foundations have already closed (Slovenia). In Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia the foundations have cut their funding and personnel by 70-80%. As a result of a good fundraising and matching funds from other sources, in some cases the national Soros foundations will continue to exist (as will the Stefan Batory foundation in Poland). A significant decrease in funds from Soros has taken place in the Czech Republic and in Slovakia. In some countries, a large number of spin-off organizations have already been established as a result of Soros funding, and they are bargaining that the national governments or other funds will take them over after the Soros's support has come to an end.

Expectations in regards to cultural funding in Europe

The overall vision of the interviewees is that in the future the European programs for culture should become much

more flexible, less bureaucratic, without the necessary requirement of involving at least one partner from a EU member state. Regional co-operation in the field of culture should be strengthened, as it has shown very good results in recent years. Another expectation is that the contacts between the acceding and non-acceding countries will lessen, as the acceding countries will look to new opportunities for partnerships with organizations from the traditional EU member states.

There should be higher-level and better managed financial schemes at European and national levels for:

- young talent – to travel, present, exchange experiences and ideas;
- newcomers in the arts - works of art appearing for the first time, 'risk funding' for culture;
- new mobility schemes for all forms of art;
- support for semi-professionals and amateur artists;
- support for exchange of projects between emerging small artistic organizations and innovative artistic forms;
- exploring other alternative methods of financing culture, such as lotteries, shares, loan funds et cetera;
- support for research and comparative analysis in regards to cultural policy issues.

Little importance is attached to all these issues in the current schemes for financing cross-cultural co-operation in Europe.

All the research currently been done by different European organizations on cultural co-operation and the role of governments and foundations in the Enlargement process, show the necessity to clarify the positions, functions, and opportunities regarding European cultural co-operation. It might also indicate that Europe is starting to feel uncomfortable about the lack of information on this subject and about the unpredictability of the future.

Reflection of accession process on current projects, cultural operators and organizations

The answer to this question depends on the level we are discussing - individual, organizational, or national. For many organizations the future plans will change as a consequence of the Enlargement - their priorities, partners, audiences, products, fundraising schemes will inevitably change. I anticipate that more attention will be paid to culture in relation with other areas such as education, social issues and tourism. The fact that the Soros foundations are drastically decreasing the funds for culture and cultural co-operation, that a large number of other mobility schemes are no longer operational, and that the national governments are only spending a fraction of the national budget on international relations, is a cause for concern in regards to the future of cultural co-operation in Europe.

The interviewees mention that they would like to see long-term partnerships and larger scale projects, rather than 'ad-hoc' cultural exchanges. Also, that the Enlargement process will expand cultural markets and will probably lead to higher profits for some business-orientated cultural organisations. The non-profit sector will certainly benefit from this process, as lead to better opportunities for exchanges. The traditional cultural institutions will not change significantly. Individual projects will probably increase due to more flexible conditions for joint cross-border initiatives. On an individual level, the accession process will not bring significant changes. As always, there will be 'active' and 'passive' cultural operators and individuals. Another expectation is that the European cultural networks will become much more active players, not only furthering the exchange of ideas, projects and knowledge, but also attracting more funds for culture and lobbying more intensively on the political scene.

Instruments of cultural policy co-operation

There is a serious need for comparative research on the current instruments for cultural policy co-operation of the EU member countries and acceding countries, in order to ascertain which instruments would be the most appropriate to adapt to the new situation. I believe that the current Study on Cultural Co-operation in Europe in Various Cultural and Artistic fields, undertaken by the European Forum for the Arts and Heritage (EFAH) and the Interarts Foundation on behalf of the European Commission, will highlight the shortfalls in information and will provide the necessary information. Mobility programs, grants for training and research, support for young artists are much-needed instruments, which should be incorporated in future state policies regarding culture. There should also be a process of validation and synchronization of cultural legislation (for example on sponsorship and taxation, copyrights, the import-export regime of cultural goods and services, labour law for cultural operators and so on).

The current existing programs for European cultural co-operation, such as Culture 2000, are still not flexible or suitable for emerging artistic initiatives, individual artists' mobility or the amateur arts. Based on the above research data, Europe should reconsider its traditional ways of funding culture. New financial instruments for supporting culture should also be found. Until now the main financiers (big foundations, governments, pan-European institutions) have not considered creating a consortium for financing culture – most of them have their own priorities in regards to the funds, without considering joint programs and initiatives.

The idea of 'European cultural citizenship'

I agree with the interviewees that granting someone the title 'European citizen' will not automatically mean that he or she will adopt the European cultural values and achievements. As they have stated, the so-called 'common European cultural space' is not a new phenomenon, as it has been built up during the centuries. In a way 'European cultural citizenship' is a strange and pretentious term, a bit Euro-centric. On a more optimistic note, if this term is accepted, it might be interpreted in several different ways:

- In general, the term 'citizenship' is always connected to certain rights and obligations. Being a 'cultural citizen' could mean providing equal access to all citizens to cultural events and projects, not only in the 'centres' but also in the 'peripheries'.
- This term could be similar to the way in which European citizens understand the common European values and implement them in everyday life.
- The term could be used to emphasise how culture reflects on the everyday life of citizens, with better links between arts and communities, using art forms and events for social changes and for building up democratic principles.
- It could mean a better and more stable cultural legislation framework, providing flexibility and freedom to artists and audiences to exchange cultural experiences and products.
- It could be a special 'European cultural card' given to outstanding artists and cultural professionals as a special privilege, in recognition of their status and achievements;
- It could be a special 'cultural passport', provided to targeted customers and clients for specific benefits when attending cultural organizations.

Core and periphery areas

The three interviews show that culture does not have a 'centre' and a 'periphery' – it is a distinction that only exists in peoples' minds. All cultural players should be considered as equal, and not as representatives of regional or local cultures. Certainly, Paris is not a better cultural 'centre' than Budapest. Some countries, like Poland, try to lay emphasis on their regionalisation policy, spending most of the national cultural budget on a regional and local level, with better decision making and flexibility. Still, in all the acceding countries, the majority of cultural events take place in the capital. In small cities and isolated regions in Europe, both in the current EU member states and in the acceding countries, the cultural life will not change significantly as a result of the Enlargement process.

CROATIA

Interview with Biserka Cvjeticanin, Deputy Minister of Culture in the Republic of Croatia

Biserka Cvjeticanin is Deputy Minister of Culture in the Croatian government. Therefore, she is not just responsible for one cultural discipline, such as theatre or music, or cultural heritage, but for the whole (institutional) field of culture. Biserka Cvjeticanin has been entrusted with the implementation of the cultural policy, which is complementary to the Strategy of cultural development which the Government of the Republic of Croatia introduced in 2001, as part of the general framework of the Strategy of Development of Croatia in the 21st century.

In your opinion, is Culture recognised as a major factor in the Enlargement process?

If we define culture as a way of life, then we can say that it is entangled in all kinds of processes of integration, in the field of agriculture, trade, (cultural) industry and so on. If, however, culture is defined by sectors, then we must make a real effort to ensure that culture is one of the main factors in the process of integration. In fact this is what some non-governmental organisations such as the EFAH (European Forum for the Arts and Heritage) are doing right now.

What are your fears and concerns regarding the effects of Enlargement? For example, do you fear a stark choice between assimilation on the one hand and exclusion on the other? Or is it more realistic to expect that some equilibrium between the two will be achieved?

People mostly express concern with regard to two notions: assimilation and exclusion. In regards to assimilation, there is the fear of loss of identity – both collective and individual. Exclusion, on the other hand, means isolation, that is to say non-participation in development. Of course this is a subjective, biased view. Nonetheless, the key issue is how institutions will cope with the changing conditions. If we are to worry about something with good reason, then it should be about the institutional adaptation, that is to say the practical accommodation of institutions as well as individuals to the new conditions of the market economy.

What changes – good, bad, or indifferent – do you expect Enlargement to bring to Croatia, especially where your current responsibilities are concerned?

In my view, the Enlargement of the EU in 2004 can only be to our advantage – primarily a more dynamic communication in Europe and the world. Communication between, co-operation with and mobility of our cultural actors will become more intensive on a European level, and our cultural values and the range of our creativity will be better recognised. As a result of the Enlargement

Croatia will find partners both among the actual members and among acceding countries. This will lead to new forms of networking and new links between cultural institutions of different profiles. It will allow for the circulation of new ideas and the amassment of new knowledge. Common projects involving several institutions from various countries could perhaps serve this purpose. Besides, the EU already has special programmes of co-operation with a number of non-EU countries around the world, including Brazil, Argentina, the countries of North Africa and ACP countries. By doing so, the EU brings new international partners into our sphere as well. The *Strategy of Development of Croatia in the 21st century* rightly emphasises that 'the highway of integration of Croatia into the European Union brings a set of possibilities for cultural development on a multilateral basis, which will contribute to the affirmation of cultural identity and culturally sustained development'.

Could you please elaborate upon your views and explain why these changes will take place?

Due to the EU Enlargement, communication will run more smoothly and more efficiently. I expect the co-operation with all categories of countries to improve as a result of the Enlargement. As far as the funds and programmes of the EU are concerned, it is important to note that up till now they have never been available to non-EU member countries or to countries which, for example, could not enter into the Culture 2000 programme (the programme that has launched the funding of culture for the period 2000-2004). However, this did not prevent these countries from developing different forms of co-operation with member countries of the EU, in accordance with the objectives of the Culture 2000 programme, which are: promotion of the common European cultural space, cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue.

Do you think that your links with partners in EU countries, including ongoing projects and plans, might have to be revised or undergo significant changes as a consequence of Enlargement?

Given the fact that Croatia will soon submit its application for the accession to the EU membership, Croatian activities are currently focused on the task of meeting a number of conditions, such as the passing of new laws on Croatian Radio-Television, media, electronic media and so on. Croatia is also involved in several multilateral projects, such as Quadrilateral, the Alps-Adriatic Working Association, the Danube River Working Association, Interregional III et cetera. This way, the EU Enlargement will have a favourable impact on further co-operation between Croatia and her current partners and will also open possibilities for other countries to qualify for funds on an equal basis.

What instruments of cultural policy co-operation do you regard as the most appropriate for Croatia in adapting to the new situation: funding, mobility schemes, training and research, or some other instruments?

Since international co-operation with regards to cultural policy is one of the main priorities of the Republic of Croatia, programmes and instruments will certainly be continued and sustained. Nevertheless, 'continuation and sustainability' are not goals in themselves; the real goals are programmes for exchange and mobility, research and education. In order to approach the EU, the candidate countries to a certain extent must revise their cultural policies and make a shift from exclusive state funding toward proactive policies that foster development and self-sustainability of the cultural sector.

What do you think of the idea of 'European cultural citizenship'? Can a 'European citizen' exist without being granted formal EU membership, and if so, which institutional forms to promote such 'citizenship' should be cultivated (even before other mechanisms of EU integration and enlargement are brought into play)?

The idea of 'European cultural citizenship' is an abstract value judgement, given that the EU is a political project which is put into effect in terms of economic integration. Countries and individuals who do not fall under the EU (take, for example, Norway) can therefore share the same European values on an equal basis.

How could we develop lines of co-operation between core and periphery areas in our continent, beyond the borders of the EU? And how could regional interfaces be created (incorporating the existing links between new and non-member countries) which could become new centres of cross-border co-operation and communication?

If we are to ensure the real Europe-wide significance of such activities, is the participation of some older EU-members indispensable? For example, there could be a rule that one established EU-member plus one or two members plus a few non-members must take part in a common cultural programme or project.

As a community of cultures Europe is essentially interested in developing cultural diversity. However, in order to ensure that the cultural heritage will be protected under the new conditions, the many different interests in development need to be carefully co-ordinated. New forms of cultural expression, creativity and communication, as well as the development of human interests and culturally designed products and services will help make this large community, that is to say Europe, less prone to conflict and more receptive to co-operation and communication between different peoples and cultures. Subsequently, less attention will be paid to peripheral areas as a subject of discussion. Accordingly, intercultural co-operation is taking place or will take place on different grounds.

Furthermore, it is no longer necessary to distinguish the old member states from the new member states, seeing that in the cultural sector the difference is by no means noticeable - cultural links last for a long period of time and one must look ahead into the future. In other words, divisions and categories are no longer needed nowadays, including the 'rule' that an old member, a few new EU-members and several non-members should work together on a common cultural project. In the present-day conditions of networking, communications are established in a completely different way – everybody can co-operate with each other, regardless of the seniority or the non-membership status.



Interview with Agar Pata

Interview with Agar Pata, Programmer of Culture at the Open Society Institute

Agar Pata has been working at the Open Society Institute (OSI) since the beginning of 1993, first as a secretary, but soon thereafter as a coordinator of the East-East Programme, of the Roma Programme, of the Culture and Arts programme, and of the Students Resource Centres. From 1996 she has exclusively run the programme of culture at the OSI-Croatia.

The activities of the foundation as well as its mission are now coming to an end. OSI will conclude all its programmes, and its grant schemes will soon finish completely. Nevertheless, it is possible to transform the foundation and such a process has already commenced.

In your opinion, is Culture recognised as a major factor in the Enlargement process?

From my work at the Soros-foundation I have learned that culture is one of the main factors of integration and Enlargement of any union, including the European. Culture can remove misunderstandings between individuals and the community in the countries of Southeast Europe, which face many transitional problems, both in social and political areas. Though culture is primarily and mostly associated with states and nations, and with the awareness of and co-operation between various cultures and traditions, the immediate encounters between artists and artistic groups from different regions, as well as the exchange of experiences, are of the utmost importance. Such mobility often results in an exchange of positive experiences. For years, this was the main task of the OSI Link Programme within the Soros-network, which, unfortunately, came to an end last year. A similar mobility programme of the ECF, Apex Change, has also been terminated. It seems that in a short period the few funds reserved for these kinds of exchanges have disappeared altogether. Fortunately, the ECF has announced a new programme called STEP, which enables mobility not only among the EU countries, but also among those countries, which will soon become members of EU, as well as among those countries, which will not obtain the status for the time being.

Now I would like to explain briefly the role and the importance of OSI in Croatia, just to point out how big the void is that emerged as a consequence of the termination of the OSI Programme in our country. In Croatia, there are a number of NGO-s that have been active for quite some time. However, the OSI is the only NGO that considerably financed cultural projects and programmes. The funds of the OSI were always allocated primarily to projects that did not have any funds of their own, or just the bare minimum from state or city resources, but which supported the idea of an *open society* and contributed to democratisation on the whole. For years, the funds were

channelled to a large number of smaller projects from a variety of fields. This enabled a large variety of cultural activities to persist, keeping up certain standards in culture. However, it came to light that it was necessary to carry through fundamental changes in regards to the financing of cultural and artistic projects: instead of the initial distribution of financial funds among a large number of small projects and individual grants, it was necessary to move toward the incorporation of donations in major infrastructural projects. In fact it has been demonstrated that in the long run it is more useful to invest in the material infrastructure, which will secure the continuity of conditions of production for particular projects.

The foundation has found an excellent partner in the state institutions, thanks to the change of government in Croatia in the year 2000, which opened the possibility for implementing some major and important projects. But, against all expectations, the leadership of the foundation has decided to reduce their programmes and financing and to gradually close down all programmes and the very institution! And so in our country a foundation will disappear which alone financed very diverse cultural projects and which not only funded the programme costs, but the institutional costs as well.

What are your fears and concerns regarding the effects of Enlargement? For example, do you fear a stark choice between assimilation on the one hand and exclusion on the other? Or is it more realistic to expect that some equilibrium between the two will be achieved?

The Enlargement of EU is obviously a necessary geo-strategic goal, which is of the utmost importance to European countries. It is no longer a utopian tendency, but simply a geopolitical interest concerning all the countries in Europe. The realisation of this goal is the only real guarantee of world peace, which is best achieved through a balance of power of all political subjects. The fear of cultural assimilation is indeed understandable, although it cannot be entirely justified. Only a United Europe, for instance, will be able to properly resist an overall Americanisation of mass popular culture, which can only be achieved by the Enlargement and by the systematic development of co-operation between all its diversified cultural factors.

What changes – good, bad, or indifferent – do you expect Enlargement to bring to Croatia, especially where your current responsibilities are concerned?

As I will soon be working in a city institution, I myself do not expect to see any negative changes as a result of the EU Enlargement, because we are fully financed by the city and partly by the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Croatia. I anticipate a positive change in regards to the new programmes of institutions and foundations in EU

member countries that will include non-member countries as well (such as the abovementioned STEP-programme), in which institutions such as the Film Centre (in Croatia) will be able to participate with their projects and programmes.

Could you please elaborate upon your views and explain why these changes will take place?

I hope that the guiding thought in regards to the foundations will be to maintain networks and links not only with the members of the EU, but also with acceding countries and with countries that will become members in a more distant future (see for example the STEP Programme, and Euroimages, which accepts non-EU members).

Do you think that your links with partners in EU countries, including ongoing projects and plans, might have to be revised or undergo significant changes as a consequence of Enlargement?

There will probably be some significant changes as a consequence of the Enlargement. The countries with which we have collaborated until now will be increasingly oriented toward multilateral co-operation, the flux of information and cultural links will certainly be intensified, and so by collaborating with one country we will probably have the opportunity to be reconnected with cultural programmes that are structured on many levels and in complementary and comparative ways.

What instruments of cultural policy co-operation do you regard as the most appropriate for Croatia in adapting to the new situation: funding, mobility schemes, training and research, or some other instruments?

I guess that all instruments of co-operation may be sustained for further implementation and that we need to work on quickly adapting all of our legislation (regarding copyrights, so that the import and export of cultural goods runs more smoothly – as a result of the current legislation, when we borrow from the Yugoslav Film Archive, we have to go through a rather long and slow procedure of customising and control, as is the case with any other commodity; it is also necessary to harmonise the education systems, so that diplomas will be more easily recognised and so on).

What do you think of the idea of 'European cultural citizenship'? Can a 'European citizen' exist without being granted formal EU membership, and if so, which institutional forms to promote such 'citizenship' should be cultivated (even before other mechanisms of EU integration and enlargement are brought into play)?

Of course, I have no doubt that one can be a 'European citizen' without being a formal member of EU. I would like to explain this by comparing the definition of the idea of an

open society with the idea of a cultural community (of a state or a community of states): in an open society there is no ultimate truth or ultimate goal. Everything is subjected to creative discussion and change, and is based on tolerance and the recognition of different opinions and different groups within a community (Ariah Neyer). This idea could form a new approach to culture: laying the emphasis on projects, and not on institutions. What is important is the process rather than the result. Co-operation is more important than exchange alone. We need to avoid exclusiveness, to insist on co-operation, flexibility and dialogue. We need to respect the needs of the environment in which a project or program takes place.

How could we develop lines of co-operation between core and periphery areas in our continent, beyond the borders of the EU? And how could regional interfaces be created (incorporating the existing links between new and non-member countries) which could become new centres of cross-border co-operation and communication?

If we are to ensure the real Europe-wide significance of such activities, is the participation of some older EU-members indispensable? For example, there could be a rule that one established EU-member plus one or two members plus a few non-members must take part in a common cultural programme or project.

The co-operation between the core and peripheral countries of Europe is something that will increasingly be down for consideration. I actually expect that the core areas will become more interested in the cultural products of the periphery. The reason is simple: the latter, unlike the former, has been less in a position and has had fewer opportunities to bring out its cultural products. Now, the time has come for things to move in reverse direction. It will be particularly interesting to see how the links between different and remote peripheries can be realised. As of yet, this is unlikely to materialize without significant mediation by the core, which itself must learn more about and accumulate more information on the periphery.

Interview with Ivo Skrabalo, Member of the Croatian Parliament

Ivo Skrabalo is a member of the Croatian Parliament and of the Croatian Delegation in the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe. He is also a member of the Committee for Foreign Affairs of the Croatian Parliament and President of its Subcommittee for Relations with the European Parliament. Although he is not responsible for cultural policy at present, from 1991 up to 1992, at the beginning of the building up the independent Croatian state, he was Deputy Minister of Education, Culture and Sport for eighteen months. Before that he worked in the film industry for decades, in various different capacities: as a scriptwriter, film director, distributor, director of a film festival, author of a book on cinema history, editor of a journal, and as a university teacher.

In your opinion, is Culture recognised as a major factor in the Enlargement process?

It is difficult to give a precise and unequivocal answer to this question. To be sure, people certainly recognise the need for transcending historical divisions between European states and nations by means of economic co-operation, tolerance, the administration of law, the affirmation of human rights and by rejecting the idea of supremacy, in order to promote and realise the principle of 'unity in diversity'. In short, these are the ingredients of a real new European culture, which surpasses the conventional restricted definition of culture. However, I understand that your question focuses on exactly this, namely culture as the essential feature of human creativity and of personal and national identity. In this sense, it is difficult to recognise culture as a main factor in the process of integration and enlargement of the EU, which is primarily a political process. Nonetheless, I hope that culture will turn out to be the winner!

What are your fears and concerns regarding the effects of Enlargement? For example, do you fear a stark choice between assimilation on the one hand and exclusion on the other? Or is it more realistic to expect that some equilibrium between the two will be achieved?

European integration probably appeals to a majority of the European population (from the old 'arch enemies' France and Germany, to the small and somewhat 'forgotten' historical population groups, like the Croats, the Slovaks, the Slovenes and other groups, who survived without their own states for centuries) because it has never been presented as a derivative of the American *melting pot*, as a machinery of assimilation allegedly producing a new European super-nation. The danger of assimilation does not apply to the EU, since the principle of the 'unity in diversity' has a rather different purpose... If the principle is not misinterpreted or misused, then nobody will be excluded from the European patchwork of cultures – unless, of course, somebody actually wants to be excluded!

What changes – good, bad, or indifferent – do you expect Enlargement to bring to Croatia, especially where your current responsibilities are concerned?

Due to historical circumstances, especially in the second half and the end of the 20th century, Croatia feels it can relate to the problems which the acceding countries (ten of them) are facing in regards to the integration. However, the centuries-old ties between Croatia and the 'old European core' (the current 15 members) will most certainly be an incentive, in the sense that Croatia is most likely to benefit from the actual enlargement of the EU in 2004 – provided that Croatia recognises this opportunity on time and is in the position to be integrated in the field of culture. I am not speaking from the standpoint of a particular institution (seeing that I do not belong to one), but as a politician with roots in (film) culture. In my view, it is extremely important that we are part of the network of European foundations and similar institutions in order to arrest the powerful economical inundation of cultural products from the other side of the Atlantic Ocean. I am confident that some positive measures will be taken, such as upgrading the knowledge and skills with regard to cultural management through the exchange of know-how and of experts, and by additional training. These could enhance the possibility of participating in common cultural projects and could facilitate further information exchange. It is also important to look at the way other countries approach things. It is not necessary to reinvent something that already exists or has already been experienced and which may contribute to the export as well as the promotion of Croatian cultural products in other countries. In Europe, cultural development is not entirely subject to market forces. Still, the cultural market does exist and it is of important relevance to us in which way and to what extent we can gain access to the entire space of the European culture, whereby the latter can be seen as potential 'consumer' of our cultural goods as well as the place for much-needed mutual exchange.

Could you please elaborate upon your views and explain why these changes will take place?

I am, perhaps, an uninformed optimist. However, I do not expect further exclusion or a restricted access to funds and programmes of the EU. Until now, the programmes were drawn up to exclude non-eligible applicants, but they were flexible enough to embrace new ideas and fresh talents, irrespective of whether they had a European passport or not. In general, Europe does not want to restrict itself to the membership of 15 or 25 states, given that the Council of Europe, which is the original institution of the new European mind, amounts to 44 member-states. It takes important measures in the field of European languages and cultural communication. The borders and boundaries of Europe are not geographically determined,

and are sufficiently flexible as a result of the dissemination of a new European culture of peace, tolerance and respect for human rights, which is nourished by the values of the various (national) cultures, which are perceived related to their neighbours (which often belong to Europe as such, in a literal sense), and which want to co-operate within the European framework.

Do you think that your links with partners in EU countries, including ongoing projects and plans, might have to be revised or undergo significant changes as a consequence of Enlargement?

No. I do not deem the EU enlargement as a potential cause for the restriction of its activities and of its mission vis-à-vis the others, including those living on the edges of the continent or outside its present-day structure.

What instruments of cultural policy co-operation do you regard as the most appropriate for Croatia in adapting to the new situation: funding, mobility schemes, training and research, or some other instruments?

Yes, indeed, I don't see any reason not to continue with the programmes set-up so far, which of course need to be supplemented and adapted, if occasion calls for it.

What do you think of the idea of 'European cultural citizenship'? Can a 'European citizen' exist without being granted formal EU membership, and if so, which institutional forms to promote such 'citizenship' should be cultivated (even before other mechanisms of EU integration and enlargement are brought into play)?

To be a 'European citizen' is a person's personal choice, especially insofar as 'European cultural citizenship' is concerned. Of course European culture did not begin nor does it end with the formation and development of European communities and the European Union. In fact it has existed not for centuries, but for over a thousand years, although it would be very difficult to define its longevity or to put it into a typology. Today's development of the integration process would be impossible without the existence of a European culture throughout history. Therefore it is logical to assume that political boundaries do not coincide with the areas of culture, which are hidden from sight, but can be grasped in the mind's eye. In order to advance the expansion of the European culture behind the 'Schengen borders' of the EU (and without the austerity of police protection against intruders!), it is first of all necessary to promote a certain decentralisation or regionalism of cultural programmes, since Europe has recognisable regions with specific features, and there are countries in these regions which are not embraced by the political integration. Besides Scandinavian/Nordic or Mediterranean areas, there are for example 'inter-spaces' such as *Mitteleuropa*. For some people in the West, perhaps, Central Europe seems outmoded. Nevertheless,

as a geographical and cultural-historical crossroads for three regions: the Mediterranean, the Balkan and the Pannonian region, Central Europe will be discovered again and again by Croatia. For Croatia feels at home in all three regions, in the old, but also in the new Central Europe with its tradition of multicultural, communal life and tolerance.

How could we develop lines of co-operation between core and periphery areas in our continent, beyond the borders of the EU? And how could regional interfaces be created (incorporating the existing links between new and non-member countries) which could become new centres of cross-border co-operation and communication?

If we are to ensure the real Europe-wide significance of such activities, is the participation of some older EU-members indispensable? For example, there could be a rule that one established EU-member plus one or two members plus a few non-members must take part in a common cultural programme or project.

One of the advantages of good old Europe is that throughout history it has been a polycentric place, therefore always lacking a province in the proper sense, or at least in the sense that it has been beyond dispute. A number of cultural centres (by which I don't mean megalopolises) allow us to live in a spirit of competition, in which particular zones enjoy the freedom of orienting toward different centres, including the possibility of changing their orientation from time to time. In the periphery of political Europe a new zone of communication has opened up with countries that have applied to accede. This periphery is not a desert, for it consists of a bounded territory of European countries or regions which have influenced their (non-European) neighbours in the past, and which have been subject to European influence as well. It is therefore important to take advantage of the positive side of the heritage and to establish zones of cultural osmosis by means of cross-border co-operation, where miscommunication and reluctance to accept diversity will eventually be overcome. This can be done by giving a kind of 'workshops' aimed at systematically removing the potential sources of xenophobia or a 'clash of civilisations' (as wrongly understood by those who did not accept the universality of the European principles of peace and tolerance!). Such mini-zones of intercultural exchange and communication may play an immensely positive role in this age of globalisation, and can further cultural as well as political polycentrism – as an alternative to the threat of polarisation based on the black-and-white system of differences. In such projects it would certainly be important to include several European countries as well, in order to secure the European dimension of the projects, to remove the concerns regarding regional co-operation and mutual interchange, and to overcome prejudices.

SYNTHESIS

by Vjeran Katunaric

Interviewed persons:

Biserka Cvjeticanin, Deputy Minister, Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Croatia; Senior researcher in the Institute for International Relations, Zagreb; Editor of the journal *Culturelink*

Ivo Skrabalo, Member of the Croatian Parliament; Chairman of the Sub-Committee for Co-operation with the European Parliament; Former Deputy-Minister for Culture, film director and expert in film history

Agar Pata, Co-ordinator of cultural programmes in the Open Society Institute- Croatia; Programme co-ordinator of the Film Centre in Zagreb

Introductory note

The views expressed by the Croatian respondents are rather general and pretty optimistic in all regards. Of course, the questions were mostly formulated in a general manner and they thus elicited a general response. Nevertheless, save in one case, the respondents did not display a proper insight in the overall situation of international cultural co-operation of the Croatian institutions, projects or individuals. They articulated their opinions on the basis of their personal experiences, which is limited in this respect, and mostly from their normative expectations, i.e., what culture and cultural policy ought to be in a future Europe. In the case of the respondent with a broader competence and insight in this area, the responses combined both considerable background knowledge of the virtues and vices of international cultural co-operation in Croatia and a strong normative optimism with regard to future development in this area. Below, responses concerning five major topics are summarised and occasionally commented upon.

1. The role of culture in the European enlargement process

This aspect was most critically reflected upon by the respondents. Two of them agreed that culture plays a more important role in the sphere of NGO activity in Europe, than it does in the official sector and on the political and economic playgrounds of the European Union. Even if the definition of culture is extended to its social or anthropological format, as a way of life – then so what, is the response? It still does not contribute to the prestige and influence of the cultural sector, as this is officially represented. Perhaps, as the third interlocutor said, culture may emerge as a winner of the whole process, when a more enlarged process of political and economic integration of the EU finally takes place. Only

then, he asserted, will the idea or the ideal of “unity in diversity” come true. Does this mean that culture must “wait” for the other and presumably more important sectors to achieve their objectives, before it can have its turn? Is this mechanism of development really reliable?

2. Fears and concerns of enlargement

Perhaps this question is partly answered by a remark of one respondent who described a rather amazing case of cultural (NGO run) programmes, which achieved so much in cultural sector and the prospects of which lie completely open right now, ending, when the co-operation with the government in this area has finally been established after a decade of failures. Yet, although emptiness emerges, rather than an upgrading of governmental-NGO relations, this must not be seen as the end of future prospects. By the same token, expectations are now directed towards the new momentum of the EU that will come about as a result of enlargement.

All interviewed stress that there is no real danger of cultural assimilation, which is often seen as being a major consequence of EU enlargement. The real danger is rather seen to be the “Americanisation” of our cultures”. Another respondent reminded us that Europe has never been, nor will it now be imagined as a “melting pot” of different cultures. And the third respondent saw no obstacles, but only constraints in this process. This means that no problem is foreseen with the after-accession situation. Problems may arise with particular institutions (in Croatia), i.e., their incapability or unprepared state to adapt to the new situation. However this aspect was not specified, i.e., which prerequisites do such institutions lack in order to be better equipped to face the new situation. It seems obvious from the further questions in the interview, that their strongest disadvantage is too much state paternalism or dependence on the government.

3. Specific changes expected as a consequence of 2004

For one interlocutor, the new situation will not bring about a profound change, nor will it be selective in a new way, but only proverbially: those institutions who worked well until now will continue to work as such and will successfully adapt to the new situation. What about the others? For another interlocutor, the new situation will bring better opportunities for everyone in every aspect of international cultural relations: communication, co-operation and mobility-schemes. Croatia will especially profit from this. The EU cultural programme 2000-2004 will be consolidated and will provide new opportunities for both members and non-members of the EU. Above all, the new situation will accelerate the shift from exclusively state-funded to a mixed funded culture.

To highlight this peak of optimism, the third interlocutor saw the after-accession follow up as a splendid

opportunity for Croatia to expand its export of cultural products. Eventually, he added, cultural co-operation is not determined by borders & boundaries. Somehow, this became the tenor of the rest of the interview, although it is not entirely clear whether equal respect for all cultures and their products is pertinent to market relations and the cultural industries' search for an expedient public and customers. My apology for this remark, but this is to prepare for the following and to be clear with what the Croatian interlocutors – as well as most interlocutors in other countries as well – mean when they resolutely assert that there is no such thing as cultural centre(s) and periphery/peripheries – in Europe. How is this so? When the old model has faded away? Or, is it that it seems sacrilegious to say that cultures are equal, but their products, both highbrow and lowbrow, are not (at least from the viewpoint and on the basis of tastes of those who do not belong to the 0.001 % of the cultural connoisseurs)? Yet, let us move to the last two sections and hope that cultural Europeanisation does not bring meanings and proportions equal to cultural globalisation so far, that market and popular tastes – let alone the old geo-cultural strategies – will represent a *quantite negligeable* in this case. Wishful thinking?

4. The idea of “European cultural citizenship” (ECC)

It seems that we would have done better not to ask about this. It has triggered bitter reactions of rejection – much more so in other than the Croatian case – and it seems nearly embarrassing, although less so than in Bulgaria, for example. For one Croatian respondent, ECC is too abstract. It is superfluous, for Norway, for example, is a non-member country, but is typically European. Other respondents grasped it in a way that is closer to the original meaning of the question and to the idea of ECC, i.e., not as a formal membership in any association or institution, but as a state of the civic culture of citizens. It reminded one interviewee of the idea of the “open society”. To the other, it was like a wave of cultural interest in others, incongruent with *Schengen*-borders, or a regional Europe, but without strict frontiers, such as *Mittel-Europa* which, through history, is well intermingled, so to speak, with Ottoman Europe or, before that, with Byzantine Europe; or the Scandinavian region with northern Russia, etc.

Given that I am the constructor of the question – yet, not the one who coined the term ECC – it is necessary just to add a few remarks in order to avoid unnecessary misunderstandings. It was obviously not intended to put forward any racist or other exclusive connotation. On the contrary. But what does it really mean and how, should it be dealt with in relation to “ordinary citizenship”, national and European? Well, basically it means that a cross-section of the values and interests of the population and of the institutional leaderships in Europe, will give us several

“Europe’s”, as well as several nations within a particular nation, which does not coincide with any official map of Europe and its nation-states, but represents a “processual” and rather “horizontal” mindscape of people’s values, tastes and interests. As far as the practical aspects of ECC are concerned, it is beyond our possible imagination, at least far from the immediate future, for we are the citizens and compatriots of some people with whom we sometimes or permanently do not want to co-operate, but with whom we are forced or compelled to stay together, and often to share, unwillingly, the same institutions, leaders, funds, plans or visions. Cultural life might be, as it always used to be, a productive way out or a niche that takes us away from bad commonality. Insofar as to the extent to which ECC may operate in practical terms, a good reasoning was given by Lidia Varbanova in her synthesis of this question, in the case of Bulgaria. This may be good to start or to finalise any further discussion on this issue. It depends on the mood of other participants at the *Crossing Perspective* conference. I myself would not like to insist on it, esp. if this term is perceived to have a “surplus of utopianism”.

Which links and instruments of co-operation now?

Again, according to our interlocutors, the next period will almost get rid of the peripheries. Cultural co-operation will bring former peripheries closer to the centre. One respondent added, moreover, that the coming period would reverse the status of the peripheries. Another respondent said that there is no difference at all between EU-members and non-members in the cultural sector. Excuse me, again. How can it be that such a poly-archic status of culture has been achieved independently of the hard facts, which indicate unequal exchange in industrial and economic development and in political prestige, and in popular culture (e.g., British production is more popular, or at least more known, in Croatia, than Romanian production, although I doubt that the former has produced a profoundly better quality from the latter)? It may suffice to take a look at the proportions of international cultural exchange and co-operation in any country: distributions of cultural and cultural policy interests are apparently far from being flattened. However, I sincerely support this expression of good hope. Only a good argument is missing to underpin what the cultural sector in the former peripheries must do to change its makeup and policy instruments and to revolutionise the local cultural capital and production.

Yet, one respondent warned us about the real cultural situation, as if it pleads for soberness. He sees the xenophobic attitudes in South Eastern Europe as a major threat to closer cultural co-operation. He describes it as the opposite end of assimilation fear, and this fear is real, strongly confirmed in the recent history of armed conflict in the area. Therefore, he proposes a series of workshops

aimed at removing xenophobia, as a primary task for a sound cultural co-operation.

A concluding remark

My understanding of the role of culture and of cultural co-operation in Europe is generated in a rather different milieu from that of our interlocutors. It is merely academic, with some occasional experiences that brought me closer to the actual policy making staff in Croatia. This is, of course, inappropriate to understand all the important views expressed by our interlocutors, who are mainly people from policy and practice. Hence a gap between the somewhat sceptical comments, added off record on my part, and their optimism, which seemed to me more official than grounded. Eventually, both approaches are biased in their own ways, and a more careful examination and a free discussion about the state of the art with the consequences of 2004 will be more than welcome.

ROMANIA



Interview with Vintila Mihailescu, Anthropologist and Professor

Vintila Mihailescu is an anthropologist involved in different European networks and projects and has been appointed professor at various western universities.

In your opinion, is culture recognised as a major factor in the European Enlargement process?

It is quite recently that Romano Prodi launched a project called 'The Spiritual and Cultural Dimension of Europe'. A 'reflection group', which is the core of this project, is 'aimed at initiating a pan-European discussion process on what Europe could or should be beyond a political, economic and monetary alliance'. In other words, to a certain extent 'culture' is a latecomer in regards to the concerns of the EU Enlargement process and is 'beyond political, economic and monetary' dimensions of the process.

On a different level of concern, say more academic, 'Europe has the shape of my brain', as a Romanian writer said, by which he meant that Europe is part of our intellectual social (albeit diverse) heritage. We are all children of Europe. However, seemingly on one condition: that the name of our father is not made public. When this is done anyway, the ancestors wage war and the various 'true' Europes clash, as was the case when the project of European Museum(s) was launched.

What are your fears and concerns regarding the effects of Enlargement? For example, do you fear a stark choice between assimilation on the one hand and exclusion on the other? Or is it more realistic to expect that some equilibrium between the two will be achieved?

Fears are 'real' insofar as they are fears, regardless of whether there is ground for these fears. In this respect, concerns regarding assimilation and/or exclusion are real because they exist. On the other hand, as far I can tell, there are much stronger fears in Western Europe than in Eastern Europe – and they have nothing to do with either assimilation or exclusion. All of them are equally important because they can all be (mis)used politically. However, in my opinion the main concern regards the (mis)use of the very Enlargement: selective use of its opportunities by 'eastern' societies (parts of these societies), therefore dividing them into winners and losers of the EU Enlargement, and selective access to these opportunities by 'western' societies via various forms of open or hidden protectionism. A landscape of (multiple) European continuums and (again multiple) divided national and regional entities seems to me a rather plausible picture.

What changes – good, bad, or indifferent – do you expect Enlargement to bring to Romania, especially where your current responsibilities are concerned?

If I am correct and if we consider a longer time span (for Romania to accede), then I do not expect the accession to bring any negative changes insofar as my institution or my country's cultural co-operation programmes are concerned. For an anthropologist, this could even have (wishful thinking?) a positive effect: the possibility of being able to fieldwork wherever my topic leads me and not just to write authoritatively on Romania.

Do you think that your links with partners in EU countries, including ongoing projects and plans, might have to be revised or undergo significant changes as a consequence of Enlargement?

Romania has to wait until after the 2004 accession. If the existing co-operation strategies with non EU countries significantly change after this date, then of course this will have significant consequences for my country's and my institution's co-operation with EU countries. However, this does not seem to be the case, and with good reason, as it would mean stinting on the Enlargement, which of course cannot be considered a good solution.

What instruments of cultural policy co-operation do you regard as the most appropriate for Romania in adapting to the new situation: funding, mobility schemes, training and research, or some other instruments?

The existing programs and instruments have been designed in order to promote strategic co-operation between strategic partners and according to strategic Enlargement interests and schedules. Once the Enlargement has been completed, these programs and instruments can and should change. Cultural policy should then turn to less centralized and more flexible and 'user-friendly' kinds of co-operation instruments.

What do you think of the idea of 'European cultural citizenship'? Can a 'European citizen' exist without being granted formal EU membership, and if so, which institutional forms to promote such 'citizenship' should be cultivated (even before other mechanisms of EU integration and enlargement are brought into play)?

To be honest, I have no idea. The Schengen space was – and still is – an indirect yet efficient instrument for the 'Enlargement of minds'.

How could we develop lines of co-operation between core and periphery areas in our continent, beyond the borders of the EU? And how could regional interfaces be created (incorporating the existing links between new and non-member countries) which could become new centres of cross-border co-operation and communication?

Your example is, of course, a good possibility – and, in fact, a common strategy. I would rather point out the need for more balanced projects in terms of East-West locations. For instance, scholars from Eastern Europe aren't usually given the opportunity to do social research in western societies, western students are not very interested in and are given less opportunities to spend time at universities in Eastern Europe (regardless of the fact that some programmes, such as the Socrates programs, do suppose such reciprocity), books of common interest and produced by teams from both East and West Europe are usually published in Western Europe rather than in Eastern Europe, important international conferences rather take place in Western Europe, and so on.



Interview with Mona Musca, Member of Parliament in Romania

As a member of the Commission for Culture, Art and Mass Media in the Deputy Chamber of the Romanian Parliament, (as well as of the legislature Commission from 1996 until 2000), Mona Musca deals chiefly with the problems concerning Romanian culture and its external promotion, including programmes regarding international cultural co-operation. As a Member of Parliament, Musca is also interested in the principles that form the basis of international legislation and the ways in which the best solutions could be applied to the specific case of Romanian cultural institutions and projects.

Culture is not recognised as a major factor in the Enlargement process, because the main factors are economic and political. All the same, politics is based on cultural values (because the principles that form the basis of politics are related to the cultural background of each community). Europe will expand towards the boundaries that have the same cultural values. From this point of view, the cultural sector will precede, *de facto*, any EU Enlargements, even if culture is not a criterion for joining the EU. Therefore, in my opinion culture can play an important role in the process of European integration. If the future of the European Union is understood to entail the federalisation and subsidisation concepts, then culture will become a major factor from two perspectives: on the one hand, I think we can talk about a European 'culture', with everything it implies, including the mentalities, political culture and civic values; on the other hand, a federal Europe will not necessarily encroach on the cultural individualism and particularity of the member states. The new European identity will mean a certain common cultural identity, which transcends the geographical boundaries. The mission of the cultural sector will be that of facilitating the integration process by defining the common cultural values, as long as the candidate countries set great store by culture.

What are your fears and concerns regarding the effects of Enlargement? For example, do you fear a stark choice between assimilation on the one hand and exclusion on the other? Or is it more realistic to expect that some equilibrium between the two will be achieved?

I suppose the alternative of some kind of equilibrium is more realistic. One cannot talk about assimilation and exclusion in absolute terms. The process of European integration is most likely to involve changes, including on an institutional and legislative level, in order to fulfil the requirements to join the EU and to fulfil the need for harmonisation with European legislation. As far as the ongoing projects are concerned, the integration process can have positive effects on their achievements and even in regards to their development.

What changes – good, bad, or indifferent – do you expect Enlargement to bring to Romania, especially where your current responsibilities are concerned?

I do not think that negative changes will occur, unless the Government tries to adopt, without solid grounds, stipulations that are designed to look like they are in compliance with the EU, but which lack the essence. Otherwise, one can assume that the shift of the EU boundaries towards Romania will encourage general reflection on common issues within the Romanian society as well as in the field of culture. A positive effect will probably be the increase of inter-parliamentary co-operation with new EU member states. Cultural exchanges between member states can also develop, and perhaps even relations with the rest of the world will not suffer much either.

Do you think that your links with partners in EU countries, including ongoing projects and plans, might have to be revised or undergo significant changes as a consequence of Enlargement?

After 2004, Romania and Bulgaria will be the only countries to benefit from the pre-joining funds (and probably Turkey and Croatia). This could generate a certain increase in funds available to Romania, and the extra funding could be used for cultural purposes. On the other hand, the number of potential EU partners will rise, of which some are traditional partners at the moment, but not members. For these reasons, Romania's actual resources for countries outside EU after 2004 will diminish significantly.

Could you please elaborate upon your views and explain why these changes will take place?

As Romania's EU accession date draws near, changes will naturally occur, as well as an increase in cultural relations with EU states. I anticipate a change in the attitude towards culture in Romania until 2004, starting at the governmental and institutional level. And I emphasise

this because, as long as we do not show enough interest in the strength of the Romanian culture, I do not see how we can persuade the European partners to give us cultural support.

What instruments of cultural policy co-operation do you regard as the most appropriate for Romania in adapting to the new situation: funding, mobility schemes, training and research, or some other instruments?

The most appropriate instruments of co-operation in the field of cultural policy are exchange programmes, training and co-operation in regards to specific cultural projects with countries with experience in this field.

What do you think of the idea of 'European cultural citizenship'? Can a 'European citizen' exist without being granted formal EU membership, and if so, which institutional forms to promote such 'citizenship' should be cultivated (even before other mechanisms of EU integration and enlargement are brought into play)? Within the context of European integration, concepts such as state, nation and citizenship need to be redefined. Nation should not be taken in its traditional meaning – ethnic – but should come to mean 'civic nation', which includes all citizens, regardless of their background, be it ethnical or religious or otherwise. In the Europe of the future, European citizenship will imply endorsing certain values, especially democratic values, and patriotism will be crystallized in a 'constitutional' form, as defined by Jurgen Habermas – loyalty to a certain set of democratic and constitutional values and principles. On this basis, 'European cultural citizenship' is strongly related to the process of European cultural integration, which can be achieved *de facto* before the political or economic integration.

How could we develop lines of co-operation between core and periphery areas in our continent, beyond the borders of the EU? And how could regional interfaces be created (incorporating the existing links between new and non-member countries) which could become new centres of cross-border co-operation and communication?

Common cultural programs and projects with old EU member states could facilitate the cultural development of new members and especially of the candidate countries, by promoting European values in these countries. Countries with a cultural background could be the centres for regional and inter-regional cultural co-operation, as the new member states and the candidate countries need direct guidance.

SYNTHESIS

By Magdalena Boiangiu

Left in the hands of politicians and experts, economic integration only seldom becomes a subject for public debate and rarely generates reactions, even though the consequences of the decisions affect a lot of people. The general idea is that by joining the European Union, everybody will have a better life. The reality is that – leaving aside the richer classes – people are worse off and also lose by it in terms of access to cultural values. Many decisions that have unpleasant consequences for people, like closing down various bankrupt industrial units, are regarded, implicitly or explicitly, as consequences of the Brussels treaty. The official political language is pro-European and organisations (such as unions or guilds), which could formulate a clear anti-EU message, are, for the time being, siding with the authorities. However, there is a possibility that the provincial towns will rise against the practical aspects of the European integration, and that this will happen sooner rather than later – given that in the provincial towns power stations no longer provide any heating, the population, who are mostly unemployed, can only buy meat once a month and school dropouts are of the order of the day.

In this respect, the uncertainties regarding the discussion about cultural integration can provide arguments for the manipulation of the unprivileged masses.

Teachers and priests, doctors and agriculturists, those who are intellectually active outside the capital and who should be the main 'propagators' of integration, are not committed to the European cause (nor to the cause of democracy). Cultural policies should primarily target them, in order to avoid that politics overlook the majority, which is a real danger in this part of the world.

To a large extent there is the contradictory fact that the economic space is linked to civilisation and that both are linked to culture. On the other hand, public bodies go to great expense to paint a generalised and in fact unreal picture of an idyllic Romania abroad and especially in Europe, a picture which, seen from a distance, is appealing to investors. People are slow to invest, civilisation is not advancing, artists are not being done justice with shiny albums and exhibitions without visitors, and theatre tours may have an impact on the Romanian Diaspora, but are of no real significance for the theatre movement itself. Instead of being regarded as complementary, the activities of cultural networks connected to European foundations and organisations are considered a counterpart of the authorities. Without going into details, I would like to stress that in the first phase, the

projects of the Soros Foundation helped the intellectuals who were against the government, against the neo-communist power. This strengthened the perception of cultural policies as a screen for 'real' politics. Various initiatives (I would like to mention the Romanian-French Theatre and Romanian-American Theatre) did not pass the phase of rotten boards thrown over the precipice, without building a real bridge.

Although it is an abstract field and does not influence the price level or the unemployment level, cultural integration does raise doubts and fears, and affects the self-esteem and superiority complexes of influential intellectuals. The cultural policies were marked by a lot of clumsiness. Fear of homogeneity can be discerned in the words of the intellectuals, in the words of those manipulated by the propaganda under Ceausescu's regime, but also in the words of those who consider the communist decades a simple intermission and who plead for the comeback of 'pure' nationalism from the inter-bellum (how pure is another story). The strongest argument for the restrictions that are proposed more or less openly, is that of the harmfulness of the 'consumer culture', which has sprung up in the acceding countries of its own accord, without any network, through the 'invisible hand of the market'.

People do not know about our culture

Violent films, songs with obscene texts, travel books are theoretically speaking opposed to the great works of the Romanian culture: Eminescu and Caragiale, Brâncuși and Enescu; the fact that Europe does not know them or recognise their value, puts the problem of cultural integration on a hierarchical scale, with the superior Romanian culture at the top – with its respect for moral ideals, it is condemned to anonymity because of the imperial instincts of a Europe accepted by politicians without a cultural horizon.

When it is known, it is slandered

Closely related to the first problem is the issue of building on the legacy of some great important intellectuals of the inter-bellum: Eliade, Cioran, Nae Ionescu and others – close to the far right in their youth, which its well-known history in Western Europe, they are now for the most part associated with the far right by the 'politically correct' European elite. With unrecognised great values, and with other great values 'condemned to infamy', Romanians feel they have come off worst in this matter and look suspiciously at the discussions involving both politics and culture.

National kitsch competing with European kitsch

Those who legitimately suffer from the difficulties of transition do not often raise their voices. Cultural institutions from the province have disappeared: cultural village halls where in the olden days people could watch a

film and where amateur artists performed (theatre, dance), have become pubs and discos; libraries in villages, small towns and counties cannot afford to buy new books, while the old ones have been destroyed or have disappeared. Compared with the deterioration of the primary and secondary school system, this reality opens new perspectives. The advantages gained by combating illiteracy, by ensuring that the population enjoys a good education, by creating a large audience that is familiar with art and the complexities of the reception process, have all been lost. Although the European networks have obviously had a positive effect on the artists' lives (avant-garde or otherwise), and have given them a more positive outlook in regards to Europe and the world, the internal audience is in decline and is losing contact – accidentally, though it could prove to be a symptom of an irreversible evolution – with contemporary forms of art and has become the victim of national or widespread kitsch.

As far as the development of cultural policies is concerned, people should focus on the contradictions on an irrational and rational level. On the one hand, the fact that the authorities are intervening (in one way or another) by dictating and unfolding the artistic process is considered a new attempt (after the fairly successful communist attempt) to transform creation into propaganda. On the other hand, marginalizing artists in transitional societies (submissive artists used to enjoy both status and money) creates resentment. The absence of transparency in the actions of some cultural networks strengthens the assumption of partiality and preference, which generates conflicts and maintains hostility towards foreigners and their Romanian 'servants'.

One cannot ask the European network to shoulder the Government's responsibilities. However, their activities could probably become more widely known and would probably be more welcomed by those who have heard of them, if they were associated more with transparency, sustainable interest in maintaining access to culture for those without access and with raising interest in culture among those have yet to come on the scene.

SERBIA



Interview with Nevenka Dakovic

Dr Nevena Dakovic (1964) is currently associate professor of Film Theory at the Faculty of Drama Arts/University of Arts in Belgrade. She acts as the Head of the Department for Theory and History. She also teaches at the MA Studies of the University, AEEN and is the member of the Board of the PhD Studies in Arts and Media that are to start the following academic year.

She was guest lecturer at Oxford, Riga, Madison, Ljubljana, and is member and coordinator of national and international research project teams (CAS, British Academy, MNTR), author of three books, multimedia publications and number of essays.

In your opinion, is Culture recognised as a major factor in the Enlargement process?

In my view, Culture is recognized as one of the factors of medium /limited importance, like for example sport or the academic world. In other words, the institutional framework – such as festivals, conferences and exchanges – functions and expands regardless of the political restrictions and conditions. However, hegemony still exists, even as a result of the Enlargement process, given that the ‘added or newly included’ regions (such as Eastern Europe, which has become Central Europe and the Balkans, which is called Southeast Europe and so on) are distinctly qualified as different from the EU, which remains the heart of ‘Europe’.

One of the ‘side’-effects of cultural cooperation and exchange, which still exists even under the most difficult circumstances (isolation, political turmoil), is that the term culture and cultural gains the widest possible meaning. It is also enhanced as a political instrument or by means of communication.

What are your fears and concerns regarding the effects of Enlargement? For example, do you fear a stark choice between assimilation on the one hand and exclusion on the other? Or is it more realistic to expect that some equilibrium between the two will be achieved?

The fears regarding the effects of Enlargement amount to fear of loss of control on one hand and, to a lesser extent, fear of ‘assimilation’ or loss of identity on the other hand. However, Europe aims to be truly multicultural and intercultural on all fronts and the politics of culture have been organized accordingly. Sometimes it is more a case of adaptation of co-optative liberal pluralism than true (polycentric) multiculturalism - more about ‘having’ than ‘being’ a multicultural society.

What changes – good, bad, or indifferent – do you expect Enlargement to bring to Serbia, especially where your current responsibilities are concerned?

I for my part do not expect significant changes, except perhaps improvement of the cooperation with ex-Yugoslav (acceding and non member) countries. As a result of the changes in their status, the relations with Yugoslavia will be modified to emphasize their new (better or improved) position, simultaneously rearticulating and reevaluating all other forms of relations. As far as institutions are concerned, one should hope for some sort of the standardization of the relations with both EU and non-EU countries. However, in my view, the process will be significantly modified and determined by the capacities and abilities of the institution themselves. Furthermore, new member and acceding member countries usually display more eagerness and initiative (sometimes being solicited by the demands of the EU projects).

Could you please elaborate upon your views and explain why these changes will take place?

As far as individual cooperation is concerned, in many cases the administrative obstacles (coming from non- EU member countries) have been elegantly removed – I for example am affiliated with an eligible group. But the exclusiveness and limited scope of the programs and funding (enhanced and strengthened by the Yugoslav isolation, which lasted more than a decade) on a broader (institutional) level are difficult to solve. In the years to come the ‘ghettoisation’ of the region might materialize even further. Maybe some aspects of the answer to question 2 are relevant here as well. However, perhaps some other basic assumption of international and other cultural relations in Europe could come to light as well, for example with reference to past (whether good or bad) experiences in the field.

Do you think that your links with partners in EU countries, including ongoing projects and plans, might have to be revised or undergo significant changes as a consequence of Enlargement?

No, I do not expect any significant changes to take place. Perhaps that some segments and possibilities of co-operation will be narrowed and others expanded. For example, if one country from the region becomes a member of the EU, it will become easier for other neighbouring countries to participate in projects than if these countries have to establish relations with countries that are further away.

What instruments of cultural policy co-operation do you regard as the most appropriate for Serbia in adapting to the new situation: funding, mobility schemes, training and research, or some other instruments?

Certainly all programs should continue focusing on the formation of ‘consortiums’ and ‘professional project teams’ and should be easy of access to both individuals and institutions. Most importantly, developments should center

on transforming the individual into the institutional – instruments for spontaneously widening the co-operational framework. The inertia of institutions can be overcome by stipulated procedures for establishing wider co-operation and exchange. For example: conference presentations could include the presence of an artist with his or her work; festival presentations could include the participation of theorists, critics and academics – thus giving an overall picture of our national profile. A person should only obtain a network grant under the express condition that it develops into a common project for the whole group or institution. Finally, it is necessary to strengthen the hierarchy or strata terms of cooperation. In order to improve student mobility it is sometimes necessary to establish networks on the level of professors and lecturers.

What do you think of the idea of 'European cultural citizenship'? Can a 'European citizen' exist without being granted formal EU membership, and if so, which institutional forms to promote such 'citizenship' should be cultivated (even before other mechanisms of EU integration and enlargement are brought into play)?

European cultural citizenship is a variation on the premise or idea of cultural and (inherent) artistic cosmopolitanism. The institutional forms that need cultivating are the formal inclusion (or membership) of the institutions and individuals in European professional organizations and their work. However, I must add that I am a skeptic as far as the practical dissociation of culture from politics and finances is concerned. There is the possibility that the membership will stay only nominal and that most of the rights will never be put into practice.

How could we develop lines of co-operation between core and periphery areas in our continent, beyond the borders of the EU? And how could regional interfaces be created (incorporating the existing links between new and non-member countries) which could become new centres of cross-border co-operation and communication?

If we are to ensure the real Europe-wide significance of such activities, is the participation of some older EU-members indispensable? For example, there could be a rule that one established EU-member plus one or two members plus a few non-members must take part in a common cultural programme or project.

This is a multiple-choice question. The formation of new (regional) centers for co-operation is conditioned by the financial resources. Naturally, even without formalization, the old EU member participation and sponsorship rules still form the basis. Even so, spontaneous, non-formal solutions are sometimes more beneficial. Strict rules and bureaucratic procedures sometimes have an opposite effect – indecision as regards a project because of the complicated application and organizational procedures. Given the fact that human (as well as other) resources of

non- EU (that is to say: non-developed or poor) countries are limited, the right strategy is not to exhaust all the forces in one go.

I have to apologize for laying so much emphasis on the form of individual cooperation. However, I am simply speaking from my own personal experience. The implied and inevitable team framework is negligible in most cases, unless you are an official deputy or representative of an association or institution (which is not so in my case). The team references are mainly important under the heading: affiliation. The better the institution is, the more the possibility that it will improve cooperation with others; and subsequently the more likely it will expand into other collective forms.



Interview with Ljiljana Stojiljkovic, Deputy Minister of Culture and Media in the Republic of Serbia

After having graduated from the University of Belgrade in 1981, Ljiljana Stojiljkovic went on to become an assistant at the Institute for political studies Faculty for political sciences. From 1984 until 1987 she was Head of Staff of the President at the Chamber of Commerce in Belgrade. From 1987 until 1997 she was general manager of Hermes Company. In 2001 Ljiljana Stojiljkovic became Deputy Minister of Culture and Media (Public Information). Her portfolio includes international relations and European integration in the Republic of Serbia. She is a member of the National Committee for WTO Accession and of the National Committee for the Stabilization and Accession to the EU.

In your opinion, is culture recognised as a major factor in the European Enlargement process?

Culture is not a major factor in the European enlargement process. The economic and political dimensions that the EU offers to the acceding states are far more 'appealing'. Nevertheless, European cultural co-operation is undergoing a radical and fast transformation and for Southeast Europe it could be a 'turning point' in accession efforts.

What are your fears and concerns regarding the effects of Enlargement? For example, do you fear a stark choice between assimilation on the one hand and exclusion on the other? Or is it more realistic to expect that some equilibrium between the two will be achieved?

Generally, the support for the Enlargement in acceding countries as well as in member states is evident. However, there are many fears and concerns regarding the effects of the Enlargement. Some of them are more evident in the EU member states, others in the acceding countries. Although it seems that the Enlargement process will not bring significant changes to the legal status of the cultural policy (it remains subject to the principle of subsidiarity), the interest shown in and the importance of

culture and cultural co-operation within the integration process aiming to build a 'united Europe' are constantly growing. However, the economic, political, technological and cultural development, and then mainly along the east-west border, is marked by disproportion and imbalance. This could influence the development of cultural co-operation. These problems are comparatively long-standing compared to the expected effects of closer cultural co-operation, and, at the same time often have nothing to do cultural 'identity' (to give an example: the complications regarding the integration of the citizens of the former DDR into the BRD).

What changes – good, bad, or indifferent – do you expect Enlargement to bring to Serbia, especially where your current responsibilities are concerned?

Cultural co-operation is undergoing radical and fast transformation brought about by communications technology and socio-political change. Therefore, some of the issues are common problems, shared by all the countries, regardless of the Enlargement process. On the other hand, the EU is not a 'closed system' in terms of culture. Membership should not result in less strong ties in the field of culture with non-member countries or regions. Various EU funds and programmes could contribute to the awareness of the common cultural heritage, especially because these programmes do not call for countries to ignore their national self-consciousness.

Could you please elaborate upon your views and explain why these changes will take place?

Cultural co-operation has certainly flourished in the new era, with some unexpected challenges as well as new obligations. For example, people have had to co-operate with new, less known or completely unknown and undiscovered cultures. Integration as well as co-operation are processes, and cultural 'integration and co-operation' are very much connected to issues such as multiculturalism, international communication, trans-national or (cross-border) contacts et cetera. Each of these terms has its own distinctive meaning, but for the general public they all mean roughly the same. These processes need to be given time, especially now, when Europe and the world are in a period of major social transformation caused by the globalisation of international economies and new information technologies. Any step in the wrong direction could have dramatic consequences, while every well-conceived step is a step in the right direction. The ideal of a united Europe, enriched by new cultures, will gradually bring about renewed intercultural co-operation in other countries.

Do you think that your links with partners in EU countries, including ongoing projects and plans, might have to be

revised or undergo significant changes as a consequence of Enlargement?

As a consequence of the Enlargement, the cultural links with different EU partners will be intensified, and the actual plans and projects will be revised. However, the revision will be a positive development.

The EU has some very good co-operation programmes (Culture 2000, MEDIA) and instruments for the implementation of its policy. However, it seems that the cultural policy of the EU has shortcomings with regards to two integral parts: the 'marketing' of the common cultural heritage and the subsequent national support in every member state. These two problems represent very sensitive issues (for example, in terms of national identity) and they should be handled with due diligence.

What do you think of the idea of 'European cultural citizenship'? Can a 'European citizen' exist without being granted formal EU membership, and if so, which institutional forms to promote such 'citizenship' should be cultivated (even before other mechanisms of EU integration and enlargement are brought into play)?

European citizenship can exist without granting formal EU membership. In fact, the notion of a common European heritage and idea of sharing a set of 'European values' existed well before the foundation of the EU. In the past the need for uniting Europeans has often been propagated by various politicians, economists and leaders. Despite the cultural barriers, in general there has been a gradual increase in co-operation based on common roots, along with a definite notion that we should search for a new 'cultural identity' rather than nostalgically dream of (absolute) 'national sovereignty'. This change is already being brought about, in line with similar local situations in various other European countries. We can witness better and closer co-operation not just between different nations and ethnic groups but also between different communities within the same ethnic groups, which were until recently forced to live in isolation from each other.

How could we develop lines of co-operation between core and periphery areas in our continent, beyond the borders of the EU? And how could regional interfaces be created (incorporating the existing links between new and non-member countries) which could become new centres of cross-border co-operation and communication?

If we are to ensure the real Europe-wide significance of such activities, is the participation of some older EU-members indispensable? For example, there could be a rule that one established EU-member plus one or two members plus a few non-members must take part in a common cultural programme or project.

The framework of cultural co-operation that needs to be developed in the new Europe must be distinguished not only by new definitions but also by a new flexibility and bi-

and multilateral receptiveness. We should remember that co-operation is a process that cannot be regulated merely through state intervention, through institutionalisation, or by a stream of documents and agreements, although they can more or less create a good basis and positive climate for cultural co-operation. In the short term measures can be taken to develop popular European culture by developing co-production projects and by supporting national artists in the field of music, art, theatre, cinema, multimedia and so on.

Interview with Darka Radosavljevic, Director of Remont, an Independent Art Association

Darka Radosavljevic is the conceptual creator, founder and director of Remont, an independent art association. She has also participated in several scientific projects and has initiated various regional projects.

In your opinion, is culture recognised as a major factor in the European Enlargement process?

A very unusual question. Is anyone in two minds about it? Of course not. It is clear that other factors are far more important: political, economical, trade, law.

What are your fears and concerns regarding the effects of Enlargement? For example, do you fear a stark choice between assimilation on the one hand and exclusion on the other? Or is it more realistic to expect that some equilibrium between the two will be achieved?

In my opinion, a new form of colonization poses the greatest threat. That the developed, more affluent countries will impose their rules and views, that they will dictate trends and set work policies. Another concern is the timing, that new European programs will be initiated prematurely in order to facilitate a more expeditious integration. It often happens that the country for which the programs are intended is not ready to accept it at that moment. By the time the country has developed sufficiently to adopt the program, it has sometimes been abolished due to lack of success.

What changes – good, bad, or indifferent – do you expect Enlargement to bring to Serbia, especially where your current responsibilities are concerned?

There is a fair chance that nothing will change on the level of individual relations/links/communications with EU-members. Our partners do however seem to be increasingly losing interest in cooperation as regards to our country. In other words, the consequences of the Yugoslav isolation are seemingly gradually disappearing and as a result of the disappearance of the factors that have caused the problems and specific work systems, the

local environment will too soon be treated as any other non-EU country, thereby losing its specific potential before it has even been given a chance to develop.

We anticipate problems with regards to the co-operation with new member countries as well, in the sense that there will be a significantly reduced number of common projects. The acceding countries are likely to focus their activities on getting closer to and assimilating with the current EU members, so as to prove themselves equal members. They will break off contact with non-members in order to prove that they are 'better', more progressive, more 'cultured' (compare it to human behaviour: successful individuals from a school or from a small provincial town will go to great lengths to avoid having contact with their past, and if they perchance run into someone, they will emphasise the differences, their success... looking with disdain or pity on their former 'friends').

With respect to the previous groups, we also anticipate new problems related to the visa regime, including lack of harmonization of standards and of operating procedures.

As far as the non-EU members are concerned, we anticipate a closer co-operation with countries that undergo the same feeling of 'rejection'. Perhaps it will even lead to the creation of new fronts, new networks, somewhat focusing on outside of the EU, within the context of recognition of each countries' own distinct features.

As regards the rest of the world, much will remain unchanged. The communication will be on an individual basis and devoted to researching the exotic, specific characteristics of other cultures. When it comes to the world, there are no feelings of envy or pretentiousness. It just sheer curiosity.

Could you please elaborate upon your views and explain why these changes will take place?

In the past, there were concerns about communication and about the way in which artists from this region were treated by EU institutions. We were treated as individuals who rank below the others, who were lucky to be present at manifestations and events at all – as a country where projects could be implemented with little investment, yet with visible results. There is a danger of intensified differentiation between the countries that will accede the EU and those "waiting in line". Furthermore, many projects such as the Regional program OSI have been abandoned, and the ramifications of that are yet to be felt.

Do you think that your links with partners in EU countries, including ongoing projects and plans, might have to be revised or undergo significant changes as a consequence of Enlargement?

Well-organised and realistic projects will not suffer any consequences. Any well- conceived project with a clear position, objectives and purpose, particularly the context within which the project is to be realized, should have no problems. However, the projects will have to adapt to the new situation.

What instruments of cultural policy co-operation do you regard as the most appropriate for Serbia in adapting to the new situation: funding, mobility schemes, training and research, or some other instruments?

Careful planning of new programs, preceded by research with regard to the possibilities and needs, constitutes an essential instrument.

- **On a local level – decentralizing**

Keeping up with the actual needs and initiatives – support of local initiatives regardless of how naive and incomplete they might seem at a first glance. (Capable individuals still only trust their respective local ministry. They have not had the chance to gain an overview of the international options. Education and information on local initiatives are required, as well as the support of the transfer of know-how.)

- **On an international level – decentralizing**

Forming specialized programs, centres dealing first on a local, and then on a regional and international level with the promotion of new ideas, education, linking the local population and the international art scene to emancipation, and focusing on the acceptance of new art forms.

- For example: if specialized international centres for the production of art and culture (new media, music, literature, theatre, involving local individuals who could be relied on) were formed in Central Serbia and if the foreigners were to become a part of the local population in everyday life, this would have a direct effect on the feelings of xenophobia and on the integration of the local population in the international community.

- Linking individuals from the international scene with projects actually taking place in small environments within the provincial area of a non-member country.

- Facilities within multinational companies for investment in cultural production in less-developed countries.

It is important to continue and to intensify the support of projects focused on the development of cooperation.

What do you think of the idea of 'European cultural citizenship'? Can a 'European citizen' exist without being granted formal EU membership, and if so, which institutional forms to promote such 'citizenship' should be cultivated (even before other mechanisms of EU integration and enlargement are brought into play)?

There is no way of getting round this concept and people have been trying to realize it for centuries, although unofficially and without a plan. The thing that seems to check the development the most is politics in general.

How could we develop lines of co-operation between core and periphery areas in our continent, beyond the borders of the EU? And how could regional interfaces be created (incorporating the existing links between new and non-member countries) which could become new centres of cross-border co-operation and communication?

I have already answered this question in 'instruments of cultural policy'. EU member countries certainly need to be present in all kinds of international projects, with a view to facilitate the transfer of know-how as well as to further the emancipation of regional participants, organizers and the population as a whole. But it is also extremely important that we avoid imposing rules of exclusivity and limitation such as 'one old member plus one or two new members plus several non-members', because by insisting on this form of co-operation the project might drift away from its very essence. In the long run some projects may be more successful if they are prepared by one organization, which involves a great number of individuals from other countries, without enumerating the origin of the participants.

GENERAL SYNTHESIS

by Vjeran Katunarić

1. EUROPEAN “TIME-ZONES” OR CREATIVE CO-OPERATIONS?

European modernity is characterised as much by the assumption that cultures exist in different “time zones”, as it is by the opposite assumption that cultures have fundamentally equal values and products, or that they tend to equality through exchange and co-operation. The shift towards EU enlargement has invigorated both assumptions. On the one hand, the “time zones” are reinforced by virtue of EU membership and exclusion. A number of European countries, including a majority of SEE countries, have been left outside the doors of the EU, some of them for a shorter and some for a longer time. The whole set of their actual achievements – legal, political and economic – have made them ineligible. On the other hand, it is completely in line with the universalistic and optimistic European mind to consider the indisposition of the SEE region as being transitional. The creative potential of culture in the SEE countries especially should not be underestimated, lest culture should be treated only as a set of beliefs and values legitimating the “time zones” and other assumptions that rationalise old and new gaps between European regions and countries. However, does the idea of culture matter, where culture is conceived as being a major source of overall, “continental” creativity, a common roof that is supported by many different pillars, and not just by one? The assumption that culture is a major source of creativity – which is, indeed, one of the key elements in the definition of culture – underlies the time-zones perspective from the very coinage of “culture”, in terms of High (European) Culture/s/. Here culture in the first zone was, is and may continue to be the prime source of creativity. Cultures in other time zones are rather take-overs of the creative blueprints. Culture was, therefore, the key inventor of the stage of a new era of state & society, which came into being well before the stage took to the streets and was put at the service of revolutionary processes. The most prominent invention was the overturn of the meaning of “sovereignty” in the 18th and 19th centuries, thanks to the French, English and American writers of the time. This programme spread throughout the world, as did another invention very similar to this, namely the conversion of “people’s sovereignty” into “national sovereignty” and “national self-determination”, which opened the way to nation building and nationalism. Is culture still such a powerful inventor that resonates in all the “time zones”? One cannot any longer be so sure. Current inventive work such as cultural or creative

industries are no longer originally ‘cultural’, although they have produced the hallmarks of a “cultural turn”, a “virtual reality” and other media-scape signifiers. The inventions of the “new cultural age” are rather based on generic technologies that come from Silicon Valley, a conurbation far removed from the cultural milieu of historical Paris or London. Furthermore, the new invention does not elicit imitative success in the outer zones, which would match the European train of sovereignty & nationalism. Cultures now seem to follow paths of development pre-empted by spirits that are no longer idealistic or romantic. The new driving force engenders profit-making, rent-seeking, populist fervour and other such devices. These look like “shortcuts”, as opposed to the landscapes of mind and society created in the inspirational age of Europe. Now inspirational principles, such as democracy without xenophobia, administration without corruption, or industry without pollution, have been incorporated into legalistic and routine procedures (as democracy, development and production are themselves parts of a formal procedure rather than having substantial meanings) that hardly delight anyone. Regrettably we cannot perceive any enthusiasm for the EU that matches the enthusiasm for democracy and nation building in the “former” epoch(s). Besides, cultural creativity seems to be less important than ever, even in the first zone. Instead, culture seems to provide audio-visual and rhetorical designs for states, corporations, armies and other leading agencies with their own pretty heedless agendas. Has the EU become primarily a matter of making business, whether economic, financial or legal, that will be tempting only to those Eastern Europeans who see it as they do NATO, as an opportunity to ultimately run away from the threat of the restoration of systems akin to the USSR or SFR Yugoslavia?

Although somewhat exaggerated, this interpretation of the actual European context resonates behind the interviews made with professionals from the cultural sector in five South Eastern European countries. All the interviews were introduced with the question “Is culture recognised as a major factor in the European enlargement process or do other factors dominate the foreground?” The answers were not culturally pessimistic, nor did the interviewees accept the time zones, centre-periphery or similar hierarchical perspectives, as we shall see. They believe in the creative power of culture and the basic equality of different cultures when it comes to values and pride. Yet, this remains an idealistic, one-sided view of European modernity as a complex and basically contradictory process. Nevertheless, the normatively elevated view of culture is legitimate, as it postulates different grounds for Europe to build on, to make it a different and more inclusive region, in which the many-sided perspectives

and creative impulses, from the centre and from the (former?) “edges”, might be cross-fertilised. In this sense, our first interview question was not formulated properly. We did not specify the meanings of culture, and some respondents warned us politely that culture contains both creative heights and destructive lows. Well, we intended both meanings, but mostly culture as a public institutional sector, both in the governmental and non-governmental sphere, with all its virtues and vices.

It is several years ago that the new enlargement agenda was defined, bringing hope for new, soon-to-be members of the EU, and frustrations to the rest. The criteria for EU-membership are clear, numerous and hard to meet. They have very little to do with the old time-zones, namely the unique “European-ness” of the past, such as the Christian anti-Ottoman coalition from the 16th century onwards, for example, or anti-Communism in the 20th century. Yet, on a good part of Eastern Europe’s political stage such historical references may serve as a symbolic unifier that neutralise the dividing time zones. For here we assume that our Eastern European ancestors held the frontlines in the battles for Europe. And this discourse still matters in political rhetoric. It occasionally emerges in our interviews as well, although without discharging any of the old prejudices against the “more Eastern” neighbours. Historical references, however, seem obsolete now, for they cannot prompt the EU-train towards the other European zones. Instead they may obscure the actual agenda which is highly secular, present-oriented and essentially legalistic. It is based on principles of liberal democracy, pluralism and tolerance, indeed, but accompanied by thousands of pages of formal documents, the criteria of which, including the requirements of harsh economic or ecological standards, are hard to meet. In order to reconcile the symbolic and pragmatic aspects of European identity, the long-held dream of European belonging and the sense that the EU is still far from having been realised, we put forward in our interviews the idea of “European cultural citizenship” to try and shorten the perceived distance by retrieving an idea of a culture without borders or time zones. However, the responses of our interlocutors were mixed in terms of acceptance, as will be shown below.

Notwithstanding this, we do expect that the cultural policies of the SEE countries, with their current achievements in international co-operation, should provide some ideas, instruments and experiences that could be helpful to bridge the gap between the EU and the SEE countries, as well as between the SEE countries themselves. This again reopens the question of the time zones. Are cultures, or their parts, able to communicate and interact across borders & boundaries, or, would it be

better, or just easier, to stick with the realistic assumption that culture is condemned to share her time zone with the fate of the rest of the country, for culture does not seem to have any comparative advantages above other sectors in this regard? If this is true, then we have to face another serious consequence of the divisions in Europe, not only between EU-members and non-members, but also further subdivisions within the SEE countries themselves. This region actually consists of an old member (Greece), the 2007 club (Romania, Bulgaria, perhaps Croatia and Turkey), and the rest. Such a context may be even more conducive to a relegation of the pejorative “Balkan” and the meliorated “Europe”. It takes the shape of a scale of stereotypes, namely who-is-who, who is more or less “Balkan”, more or less “European”. This context burgeons rhetoric and playgrounds both at home and in international relations, resurrects old political resentments and is highly unfavourable for regional co-operation. Is it necessary then to wait until all SEE countries have entered the EU one day, before continuing with regional co-operation, which is obviously hampered now by differential “European-ness”? Otherwise, why is regional co-operation needed at all at the present time? Would the international links in the region not be better if they remained purely dependent on their choice of partners? On the other hand, we know that it is much more difficult to find partners in a country which has no reliable prospects to join the EU. Such a country, however, needs partners most desperately and right now. Couldn’t cultures and cultural policies in the other time zones better understand this urgency than other sectors, such as commercial businesses or big politics?

2. Interviews

Our interviews were aimed at elucidating the actual European situation as being too serious to be simply taken for granted or premeditated, i.e., as being more than a consequence of political decisions made in the first zone and approved by a series of referenda among elected countries in the (formerly) second zone. We contemplated that the whole process must be carefully scrutinised, and the role of culture in particular. As is well known, the role of culture was generally neglected at the beginning of the 1990s, before it was noted by the Maastricht Treaty. After this, culture was placed in the arms of “diversity” tier, accompanied by a set of legislative initiatives aimed at protecting national cultural industries and markets and above all national languages. How do cultural experts and cultural policy makers in the SEE countries see the present-day situation? Does it bring a new impetus to rethink the overall role of culture in the European integration process? The interviews as such are a methodological tool that enables articulated reflection of the actual condition, and, in this case, a possibility for

elaboration of some new ground for culture and cultural policies, if such a possibility is perceived.

Our interlocutors have not seen the first wave of enlargement in 2004 as a first-order event, matching that of 1945 or 1989, for instance. Nevertheless, the interviews unfold that 2004 has outgrown its importance, prompting “chronic” issues, such as incomplete infrastructure and a lack of proper skills and competence among cultural practitioners needed for European cultural co-operation. Above all, to remain at the Golden Gate for some years to come is an uneasy position. To be left outside much longer than that amounts to national disaster. These interregnums must be explained and justified somehow, but to create a meaningful policy in the meantime is most difficult. This is the real challenge facing cultural and other policies, as it may destroy the meaningfulness and compound the disappointments of majorities in the SEE countries, who are already distressed by the failures of transition, primarily in the economic area.

Respondents were chosen as a small focus group consisting of experts and policy makers in international cultural co-operation. As will be shown below, their attitudes and explanations of the ongoing processes and possible future scenarios of cultural co-operation are varied rather than mono-typical, but they are certainly highly qualified and well thought through.

3. Topics and highlights

The interviews included the following topics:

1. The role of culture in the European enlargement process
2. Fears and concerns of the effects of enlargement
3. Possible changes as a result of EU enlargement
4. Expectation for cultural funding in Europe
5. Further instruments of cultural co-operation
6. The idea of “European cultural citizenship”
7. Will the cultural centre-periphery model in Europe survive?

The interviewees elaborated to varying degrees in their answers. Some of them omitted answers to particular questions, understanding that their responses have already been contained in previous answers. This strategy was dependent on the level of expertise of the interlocutor and his/her selection of priorities.

Below, some highlights from the interviews will be presented. In order to demonstrate the scope of the views expressed, including particular similarities or typical traits, the topics have been titled by phrases that reflect a predominant opinion. Nevertheless, this is not a proper

survey, nor were our respondents chosen as representatives of the sectors in which they actually work, or by their professions. Therefore, the following presentation is by no means a statistical or methodological exercise.

In order to provide a basic methodological point of departure, however, the interviewees were subdivided by country and by professional or policy competence. Yet, this does not reflect a country or a sectoral approach. We cannot hypothesize, therefore, that the views of the interlocutors are predictable according to their country's (cultural-political) interpretation of 2004, for no such interpretation exists to our knowledge. Likewise, no specific reflections conditioned by the sectors in which the interlocutors actually work (government, cultural institution, university, NGO) could be hypothesized or observed, especially after the closure of the *Open Society Institute* programmes in culture in most of the SEE countries, due to which many activities in the non-governmental sector have become increasingly dependent on government funding. What we may have hypothesized, instead, is that individual views will be affected by the actual “timetable” of EU enlargement, that allots different paths, i.e., “time zones”, to different SEE countries. This has determined some differences in views, indeed. Also, the fact remains that the greatest part of the programmes and activities of the national cultural institutions, both among the 2007-group and the others, will actually remain outside the EU and thus may predetermine the follow-up, such as bifurcation between pro-European and anti-European proponents in culture, whatever this might mean.

Let us now take a closer look at the typicalities and differences in the answers.

3.1. Culture is important, but...

Virtually all interviewees emphasized that culture is, or ought to be a major European asset. In fact, this depends on the different perspectives and meanings of culture. For some, Europe is a splendid hybrid of idealism and realism, of spiritual and pragmatic forces. For others, it is a huge marketplace and political arena, rather than a meeting place of different cultures and creativity. For the rest, culture, as a sector, and especially in economic terms, is a lesser goddess. Culture is relatively cheap as an activity, although it is not without esteem. It is an excellent tool for bringing people(s) together, but this quality will only become visible in the future, not right now. Even then, culture's mission remains precarious: it is about a never to be accomplished balance between different collective identities and prides, called “unity in diversity”.

3.2. Fears and hopes of enlargement are not so specific...

... as the concerns for culture are embedded elsewhere. Some interlocutors indicated, for example, that the rhetoric for or against assimilation already dominates the political scene in their countries, and thus predates the issue of enlargement. Also, the negative impacts of the invasion of the entertainment industry were felt long before. Finally, the gap between internationally reputed individuals in culture and those who are “not-understood geniuses” is not a new phenomenon either. These and other interlocutors, however, stress that enlargement will certify quality production and market orientation, rather than protectionism and state-dependency in culture. Not all of the old fears are specifically Eastern. As two interlocutors said, it is now West Europeans who seem to be genuinely afraid of enlargement. It is because of the threat of the new wave of immigrants, probably including a lot of job seekers from the cultural sector of Eastern Europe.

In short, no national culture will lose its identity or face due to the pressures of European harmonization and/or assimilation, and due to enlargement. Only those that maintain old (state) privileges may become losers in the new process.

On the other hand, those countries that remain behind the 2007 agenda will experience more obstacles than before, according to interlocutors from Albania and Serbia & Montenegro, and cultural institutions or individual projects will hardly be able to avoid the predicament of these countries as a whole.

3.3. Enlargement may invigorate better adaptive responses

With some exceptions, the interviewees provided a whole array of positive responses to enlargement, including:

- improvement in exchange and partnerships between all countries, both members and non-members of EU,
- a better understanding of the logic of EU funding and programs, including their multilateralism,
- further acquisition of knowledge and skills in cultural management through the adoption of know-how and through additional training-programmes,
- increased funding, esp. for 2007 countries.

Yet, some reservations were expressed even by interlocutors in 2007 bystander countries. They explained that future funding of co-operation in Europe, particularly in 2007 countries, may be a zero-sum game, that funds may run out where cooperation with non-member

countries is concerned. In other words, the latter will not be a priority.

This is strongly underlined by more pessimistic interlocutors from non-bystander countries. They noticed an “elitist” treatment of 2004 and 2007-rounders by the EU, and a discriminatory treatment of the artists or cultural operators from other SEE countries. Ironically, the interlocutors expect more solidarity and co-operation from the “rejected” in the region, although this is not looked upon as a matter of choice, but necessity.

3.4. More or less funds from the EU?

The closing of the OSI programmes for culture in the SEE countries is a major blow to cultural funding prospects in those countries. Hence more is expected from EU funds. Croatian interlocutors are entirely optimistic about such prospects. Bulgarian and Rumanian interlocutors are more cautious. Their answers commence with “if”:

- if the EU funds will be saturated with too many requests, and
- if the applicants will be persuasive enough to make EU-partners really interested in their national cultural needs (and if the national applicants will be interested enough in the faith of their culture...).

Thus, the hope for new funds is double-sided, with the disappearance of OSI interest in culture and with the hypothetical size of EU funding.

As for the Serbia & Montenegro and Albanian “time-zone”, there seem to be major difficulties in this respect. Survival of the fittest? New marginalities? Only fears were expressed, but they are not groundless. Let us look at the next and apparently constructive topic.

3.5. Instrumental ideas for co-operation abound

No interlocutor expressed his/her scepticism towards the need for more and better instruments of co-operation. Even though the Culture 2000 Programme is the only European programme at the moment, more emphasis has been given to the continuation of existing bilateral or multilateral programs, and also to the need for more examples of good practice. This includes:

- Exchange programs and/or mobility schemes with countries more experienced in international co-operation, combined with training,
- Relaxing the centralist grip on international co-operation and giving more space to decentralized and local activities,
- Making more, longer-term partnerships,
- A growing internationalisation of cultural activities that may lead to their self-sustainability vis-à-vis the national governments,
- Research in potentials for co-operation must predate careful planning of the cooperation, and

- Securing facilities within multinational corporations for investments in cultural production in less developed areas!

The last two propositions deserve more attention. Research is needed to find out which motives, instruments and actual programs of co-operation really exist or should be put into practice. The part of multinational corporations might look utopian at a first glance, esp. when taking into account how much the, entirely liberalized, WTO policies are far from meeting local conditions and particularly cultural needs and sustainable development in general. Nevertheless, it is worth discussing, at least because the survival of the public sector, let alone its expansion, becomes hardly thinkable without addressing the goals of the expanding commercial sector. What if a completely liberalized market policy wipes out the need for funding cultural activities that are not accustomed to “survival of the fittest” and similar evolutionary games?

3.6. “European cultural citizenship” (ECC)

Since this idea turned out to be the most controversial, let us present in brief responses given by interviewed:

- No: ECC is a somewhat pretentious, pompous and Euro-centric idea. Practical needs for more education in arts and culture already exist and should be advanced, for these may contribute a lot to European integration.
- No: it is too abstract and irrelevant. Europe already gives everyone who is prepared to participate, or already participates in European projects, a sense or possibility of being its citizen or “citizen”.
- Yes: it is needed to establish educational and artistic funds on a European level as well as to facilitate an all-European mobility of artists and researchers.
- Yes: it means giving a greater role to culture and providing a different way of civic participation that is otherwise lacking in Europe.
- Yes, but: it is an old idea among Europeans.
- Yes, but: it reminds me of the (older) idea of the “open society”.
- Yes, but: this country must first be integrated into South Eastern Europe before being involved in a broader European community.
- Yes, but: building up a civil society in this country, which still has a long way to go, is a prerequisite for any broader notion of citizenship.
- Yes, but: so far nothing “European” has come from the European cultural centres detached in this country, nor does our closest neighbour, an EU

member country, behave toward us in a European way.

- Yes, but: it is centuries-old idea, in fact, but is ever latent and today it is hindered by (big) politics.
- Neutral: The European space, as created by the Schengen Treaty is an indirect, but most efficient tailor of the “Enlargement of minds”.

Obviously, the idea of ECC was not discarded by most of the interviewees, but varied in meaning and practical aspects. What we had in mind was not really intended as a Euro-centric approach. Basically, being European is not the same as being “Euro-Union”, a formal member of EU. Bearing this in mind – and this may be further discussed at the *Crossing Perspectives* seminar – the concept of *citoyen*, which is essentially cosmopolitan, endowed with the principles of creativity, democracy, participation, pluralism and other such values, has been put into practice practically everywhere in Europe – although not in the same proportions and with same effectiveness. We have to realise that it is not congruent with nation-states or with EU membership. Also, Europe as a project containing such values cannot end up in an outer circle of countries, a “final frontier”. On the contrary, different cultural layers, from the creative potentials, to the habits of political culture, exist within and outside the European Union and Europe as a whole. Characteristics of these layers are more similar across than within the existing borders & boundaries. Very often, the strugglers for such principles, who live in countries where hegemonic cultural layers or official policies are different – undemocratic, uncreative or non-participant – are exposed to much harsher conditions to live up to these principles than their, more comfortable, counterparts in the first zone of Europe.

Nevertheless, this is not an excuse for the paucity of the idea. For example, it may imply an introduction of a European “cultural passport” or similar devices, as Lidia Varbanova succinctly put in her comment.

3.7. Centre-periphery model withering away?

Our final question in elicited some turns of heightened optimism and gloomy realism, again depending mostly on which “club” of SEE countries, interviewees belonged to. Our question offered the idea that future cultural cooperation in the region may take place according to a formula that combines participation of one old EU member-country plus two new members and several non-members. This question also tackles the issue of existence of peripheries, i.e., the cultural “time-zones”. One interlocutor from a “2007 country” accepted the formula, and one interlocutor from a country that does not belong to the 2007 club discarded the formula. In all other cases, responses followed the pattern. Namely,

interlocutors from the “2007 club” are against the idea as much as they reject the notion of “periphery” where cultural matters are concerned. On the other hand, two interlocutors from Albania accept it either as “an excellent idea” or as one of the ways to serve an imperative need, as one interlocutor said, “to bring European activities to Albania”. Consequently, the notion of periphery is accepted or implied by the latter as being realistic and is not contested at all.

This may be taken as further evidence that the idea of culture in general, and the more concrete cultural policy ideas are primarily context-bound. Respectively, the sense of interlocutors from Bulgaria, Romania and Croatia, that the centre-periphery model is withering away can be understood within the same context, but mostly as matter of a project endowed with a good optimism, yet to be substantiated.

4. Comments

The comments of our interviewers were made independently of each other and include commentators' own observations and remarks on the topics. Here, some of them are highlighted.

4.1. Making European programs more flexible

Lidia Varbanova (in charge of interviews in Bulgaria) reminded that even on the current EURO banknote only 12 stars appear with no empty space for others. This is certainly a sign of the retention of the older time-zones division. In general, she underlines the overall expectation that “the changes for actual EU-member countries would not be significant”, and that these changes will surely be bigger for the accession countries, for there are many unsolved problems in these countries, although it is too early to specify them. The same is true for the cultural process. It is difficult to predict the amount or intensity of assimilation and exclusion due to accession and integration.

Yet, the major changes that really hit these and other countries in the sphere of cultural funding are the considerable cuts or complete closing of support by Soros foundations, moreover because lots of spin-off organizations, mobility schemes notwithstanding, were established as a result of this funding.

On the other hand, the existing programs for European cultural cooperation, e.g., Culture 2000, are not flexible enough, nor useful for the emerging needs among artists, so that some new financial instruments should be assisted, such as a Consortium of larger governmental and non-governmental foundations. Besides, comparative

research is needed to find out what the current instruments in cultural cooperation in the member countries and in the accession countries are.

Finally, the term “European cultural citizenship” looks pretentious and Euro-centric rather than helpful when expanding or diversifying the instruments of cooperation. At best, it may be understood as a special set of privileged means granted to outstanding persons in arts and culture for accessing a variety of instances, from funds to customers.

If so, does this mean that the time zones will perpetuate and become an underlying European cultural constitution?

4.2. Beyond kitsch encounters

The comment made by Magdalena Boiangiu (in charge of Romanian interviews) is a short essay on the actual cultural and cultural policy situation in Romania. She emphasizes the uncertainties surrounding the rhetoric about cultural cooperation and integration in Europe. Cultural policy operators in the provinces especially, as the local elites, are not convinced by the European cause. On the other hand, the central state elite fosters an outdated, “idyllic” image of Romania which it presents abroad. General cultural policy concerns seem to surpass harsh reality, the poor socio-economic condition of society, and, as such, threaten to use cultural means for sheer propaganda objectives.

The most critical note illustrates the populist momentum of the Romanians, where, as Mrs. Boiangiu put it, domestic Kitsch is joined with European Kitsch. At the same time, Romanian high culture is “slandered”, confined to theoretical discussions, or, as in the case of great Romanian inter-war artists and intellectuals, condemned to adapt itself to the “politically correct” European elite, as well as to a suspicious domestic cocktail of culture and politics. Otherwise, artists have to face being marginalized.

If these are “ways out” or simply false solutions, which include the further emigration of artists, where then is the “voice”? This is probably to be found in a more developed link between Europe and SEE as a whole: the European network should stimulate SEE governments to make its actions “better known to those who had not heard of them, and better received by those who had heard; ... and sustainable interest for maintaining access to culture for those who lost it and for raising interest in culture for those who come afterwards”.

4.3. For a Europe at home

Anne-Marie Autissier (the interviewer for Albania) departs in her comment from a realistic assessment of the Albanian context. It is marked by a rather long isolation from the rest of Europe, by a lack of collective self-confidence (a peculiar mixture of clannish loyalties and distrust toward politics), and by a strong sense that the country has, once again, been put in the chimney corner of Europe, this time due to enlargement. Consequently, 2004 is hardly an issue in itself in Albania. Its impact does not encourage the adoption of any elaborate position. The commentator's proposals, following the assessment, stress the necessity for a stronger and larger presence in Albania, by forwarding the idea of an interlocutor that should establish a European Cultural Centre in Albania. Mobility schemes, combined with education and training may essentially contribute to the growth of a "European mentality" in the country. Furthermore, common workshops and projects may be a better and more appropriate solution – under the condition of reciprocity in exchange and less money spending – than would be the case with abstract notion of "European cultural citizenship". Last, but not least, cultural cooperation may certainly be considered as an excellent prelude, as well as the preparation of state and civil society, for meeting the strongest criteria of EU membership. The last proposal is a strong idea. It encourages a policy agenda for a non-accession country, and deserves to be more elaborated during the *Crossing Perspective* conference.

4.4. Heightened optimism

The Croatian interviews (made and commented by Vjerran Katunarić) radiate a spirit of optimism. This stems, however, from two critical opposites. One is that the European agenda is still far from using the potentials of cultural co-operation, and the other is, already well known to us, the lacuna left by the withdrawal of the Soros programmes for culture. Still, culture goes on and things seem to be more beneficial than threatening (e.g., assimilation) and unavailable (e.g., EU cultural programme 2000-2004). Above all, it seems that Croatia may be better off than ever before with regard to European cultural exchange and co-operation and cultural industry production. And this is not seen as a unidirectional process or relationship either. The country may further foster and develop many-sided co-operation links, including Mediterranean and other, not strictly European, links. And eventually, the next period in European cultural development may well get rid of the peripheries. How come?

Although necessary arguments in favour of such an optimism are lacking – except that optimistic views by themselves make for a good argument – it is, indeed,

much more difficult to overcome difficulties when there is a dark mood among the experts or policy makers who are expected to find solutions. A debate combined with more elaborate and informed insights into the existing state of the art of cultural co-operation may certainly consolidate the optimistic core and its practical reliabilities.

1. Summary and conclusions

- 1.1. Europe balances on the scales of the time-zones consisting of the old members of EU, the 2004 newcomers, the 2007 possible newcomers, and the rest (scheduled for 2010?, 2015?, later than that or never?). We have considered the last two categories, the 2007 rounders and those outside a reliable agenda of enlargement. Such a context has, in a way, predetermined the answers in the interviews. They follow two different patterns. Interlocutors from Bulgaria, Romania and Croatia – countries that obviously cherish a hope for the 2007 round of enlargement – were considerably more optimistic, and occasionally more elaborated, in their reflections than their colleagues from Albania and Serbia & Montenegro for example. Reasons for this are self-evident. In every case, however, they did not discourage thinking about cultural future in Europe in a proactive sense.
- 1.2. The commentators have identified different patterns as well. Even more so, the commentators presented a host of proposals – their own, combined with proposals given by the interviewed. This demonstrates a common will to transcend the predicament of the time zones. Especially welcome proposals are those aimed at vibrating and expanding forms of cultural cooperation that have already been proven best. Obstacles and constraints to this exist, however, and seem to come both from the EU, as well as the SEE countries, although for different reasons (e.g., the "immigration scare" in the EU, and populist in combination with statist mentality in the SEE countries). But, general and practical ideas forwarded in this case indicate that the cultural mind does not tolerate zero-sum thinking, or the *fait accompli*.
- 1.3. Amid the pending bifurcation of the 2007-rounders and the rest, interlocutors from both groups of countries did not demonstrate a Groupthink. First of all, there are no Bulgarian, Serbian & Montenegrin, Romanian, Albanian or

Croatian official documents, nor unofficial “platforms”, in view of 2004, and no such have been suggested in the interviews. Secondly, the emerging reactions are context-bound rather than idiosyncratic. Interlocutors from Albania and Serbia & Montenegro were, indeed, much more critical and dissatisfied with the consequences of 2004, than the others. They are often overwhelmed by feelings of stereotyping and “rejection” on the part of the EU, whereby 2004 was taken as an evidence for this, rather than as a new chapter in cultural policy. The bottom line, however, may well be different and we will take the freedom to reinterpret their message. The collective, *pars pro toto*, treatment of a country or a group of countries is probably unavoidable, but is logically and ethically questionable. It is maybe wrong and unjust. It is improper to the basic principles of creativity, pluralism and democracy that all the countries or the region as a whole, should suffer or be punished because of the sins of some echelons among their compatriots. Thus, the nation-state, an organizing principle invented in the first time-zone, seems now to provide an excuse, both in the EU and among anti-Europeans in the SEE countries, to keep these countries away from the EU. Must “European cultural citizenship, that cuts across borders & boundaries, really be discarded just because it is seen to be impractical or disturbing to the restfulness of the “time zones”?

countries can be better off when crossing their creative perspectives and whilst gradually abandoning the inertia of the time zones. The latter should firstly disappear from the cultural sphere.

- 1.4. Individual variations in answers are most prominent. This is not a stylish feature of the discourse of the interviewees, but a substantial given. It may be taken as evidence – or at least a premonition – that cultural and policy minds in the “fringes” of Europe exhibit one remarkable characteristic of the European core. It is a thoughtful restlessness in the search for better solutions. These are not just any solutions, but only those which would make sustainable opposites out of seemingly contradictory and mutually exclusive requests: culture for democracy and pluralism vs. identity, culture for development and solidarity vs. culture for economy, state protected culture vs. culture surviving in a competitive market environment, diversity vs. homogeneity, European culture vs. national cultures, etc. Let us hope that the threads of cultural policy thinking recorded here, creative by intentions and well articulated, will not be broken down when facing the coming obstacles, both at home and in the EU, within the cultural sector and outside. The EU and the SEE

PART II

CULTURAL COOPERATION – POLICIES & PRACTICES

1. MAPPING CULTURAL COOPERATION IN SOUTH EASTERN EUROPE: THE INTERNATIONALIZATION OF CULTURAL POLICIES¹

By Milena Dragicevic Sestic, Corina Suteu

*"Everything is simple
So simple that it becomes incomprehensible..." (Nichita Stanescu, 'Eleventh elegy')*

PART ONE Context for cultural cooperation in South Eastern Europe

The cultural cooperation logic marking the last 14 years in South Eastern Europe has to be regarded from a broad perspective as driven not only by the consequences of the collapse of the communist institutional order, but also as a result of the general transformations taking place at a European and international level: the challenges resulting from the liberalization of markets, globalisation processes and technological revolution (new technologies, information support for knowledge, deepening inequality north/south, the redefinition of the role of culture and the growing tendency towards transversal governance, replacing the pyramidal paradigm of authority). In the beginning of the 1990's the discussion about the need for radical restructuring of the heavy institutional cultural legacy began, primarily in central and eastern Europe. What was ignored however, was how unprepared western Europe was institutionally and politically for the new geopolitical order and how culturally ill-equipped it was to cope with the isolated nations that the fall of the Berlin wall broke free upon the world.

¹ This exercise is exclusively aimed at pointing out a certain number of important issues and basic statements that influenced the design of cultural cooperation policy in the region in the previous decade; it is far from an exhaustive analysis; its aim is to challenge and explain the importance of Western European and SE European cultural policies approach to one another by what the French Euro deputy Olivier Duhamel called in his speech about the European convention: "Trying to give up the protective illusions cradled by our certitudes and launch ourselves in the courage of consensus" (French original, European convention debate, 15th of May 2003)

In order to discuss the above, we have first to consider the following:

First, it is hard to realise and therefore comprehend the exact process that, more or less, influenced the last 14 years of cultural policy in SE Europe. Some of the factors are internal and inherent to the region's history and geography, some are purely administrative legacies of a former regime. Others are related to the logic of change i.e. too many cultural ministries were relayed in; Romania had 10 Ministers of culture, Bulgaria 8 and Albania 11, between 1990 and 2003. The cultural administration could not immediately be replaced, therefore culture was - shortly after 1990 - put in a secondary position on all governmental agendas, economic and social priorities took precedence over cultural ones that were too closely associated with ideology.

Also, the notion of 'state' was in crisis and the degree of it being representative and recognized as a legitimate authority took years to recover in the eyes of the community. It is still considered today in the region, that the Ministries of culture alone are 'the guilty ones' for all that is lacking in the cultural sector, from legislation to salaries, institutional disorder to the degree of funding. Very few cultural operators consider the finance ministry or the social affairs ministry responsible for the lack of civil initiatives, or the incompetence of the cultural commissions in parliament, or even the administrative chaos resulting from the collapse of a highly stiff regime.

Second, we have to consider that the effort made by South Eastern European cultural communities at a political and civil level was immense, in spite of shortage of time and various difficulties. The wish for recuperation, rebuilding, rejoining democratic values was highly important. From this perspective, western Europe often failed to give the correct long term response and prove its understanding of the real significance of this effort. It would have surely been more appropriate, instead of employing a humanitarian aid approach (thus reinforcing the 'assisted' mentality of the 'newly liberated societies') to develop a tutoring, accompanying kind of attitude, which would surely have had more success in bringing a sense of autonomy sooner to the region.

The idea of a 'Marshall plan' would have probably worked well, although its successful implementation would have been essential to empower the local communities on a long-term basis as opposed to reinforcing their sense of inferiority - but a new 'Marshall plan did not exist'! Nevertheless, on a short term basis, the power and importance of the Council of Europe, Unesco, French agencies such as AFAA and in Britain the Arts Council

and British Council and Goethe Institute was never in doubt, at least, the cultural public policy levels (administration) in the region. UNESCO's actions were directed towards the heritage rebuilding, the Council of Europe programme of evaluation of cultural policies, the Mozaic programme was dedicated to training, cultural diversity and relations with the civil sector, the mobility bursaries for cultural managers, but also the bilateral programs run by French institutes. The British Council and Goethe Institute were of great "tutoring" importance in the revival of a sense of common values and mobility opportunities. For the civil sector, the Soros Foundation and the cultural networks played an accompanying role and played it successfully in as much as the artistic exchange, mobility and modernization of taste or emergence of contemporary forms go.

Last, but not least, in an interesting interview about the notion of post communist 'third Europe', American Scholar Tony Judt observes that after the fall of the Berlin wall, the notion of central Europe might become, at its turn, an isolationistic one (Romanians would not accept Bessarabia as a part of central Europe and Croats would not accept Serbia in the same circle)¹. Of course, this lecture is rather radical, but we have to admit that the South Eastern European geographical and cultural borders are not one and the same, according to the criteria one applies in 'reading' this territory. This is the reason why, in the following, we draw out an artificial classification, separating those eastern European countries according to the only criteria (exterior and technocratic one) of that part of the continent that will not yet enter the EU accession process before 2007.

Typologies

This being said, we will nevertheless risk ourselves to consider further an empirical split between three categories of countries in SE Europe:

a/Romania and Bulgaria,

b/Yugoslavia-Serbia, Croatia, Montenegro, Macedonia, Bosnia-Herzegovina

c/ Albania.

While the countries in **group a** went through a very hard form of communist domination (Romania even totalitarian and Bulgaria conservative, strongly dominated by Soviet influence), despite the traditional relation they formerly had with the western Europe, Yugoslavia, **group b**, was formed of countries who had lived together since World War I, long before communism, sharing similar languages, life styles and habits, thus sharing a 'sense of belonging'

to the Europe of 19th century and first half of 20th century and even, we might say, starting with Tito's times, a sense of participation in the 60's and the 70's to the main world trends (in the sense of having a say at international level, in intercultural communications etc.).

Finally, Albania, (**group c**) was isolated within the eastern European block, separated from all other neighbours, victim of a totalitarian communist policy even more radical than that of Causcescu's. Historically, the Albanian population was not mobile (contrary to Greeks, Armenians, even Serbs). They had not moved throughout the Balkans, neither had they accepted larger groups of immigrants – thus the number of intercultural contacts, throughout history was relatively limited. While Serbs, Romanians, Croats, Bulgarians left already in 19th century to study abroad – mostly in Germany, Austria, France, engaging in both commercial and intellectual exchange - for Albanians it was the exception.

While neighbouring governments since the 19th century, have tried to attract foreign "investment" and the educated "human resource" – so that a number of artisan, people with different skills (like printers, publishers, doctors, musicians etc.) arrived from the Austro-Hungarian empire, throughout the Balkans, Albania is still not entering this process.

This largely explains the chronic isolation the country is still a victim of today, after the end of communism, as well as its genuine lack of capacity to recover a sense of European openness and enter, as Romania, Bulgaria and former Yugoslav countries did, cultural cooperation as a natural process.

PART TWO

Internationalism and cultural cooperation in the Balkans

The 'artistic' versus the 'bureaucratic' time

Ralph Darendorf says that while political change of post communist countries can be achieved in six months, economical change in six years, cultural change ¹ needs 60 years to be achieved. This is because cultural change implies change in the scale of values. Along the same line, the director of the alternative space *La belle de mai* in France speaks about the "time of artists" as compared to the "bureaucratic time" and Milan Kundera ponders in his "Intimate journal" that the only thing that will remain from Europe will not be its "repetitive factual history", which has no value in itself, but the history of its arts", because art is not the "Orpheum, accompanying History's March" but art creates its own history, at its own pace, and this is the only history that

¹ Judt, Tony, Europa iluziilor, ed Polirom, Iasi 2000, pg. 44,

¹ Dragicevic, 1997, cultural policies in Central and eastern Europe

counts.¹

These largely shared opinions stress the extent the time factor has to be taken into account in the impressive mutation taking place culturally during the post communist period. The measure of a successful transformation being not so much the political reforms and their bureaucratic shape, but the genuine reinvention of artistic forms. In other words, the reconstruction of cultural identities of post communist societies has to be identified in the rhythm of artistic resurrection.

Recapitulating the aims of cultural cooperation, Raymond Weber, former director general of the directorate of culture and cultural heritage in the Council of Europe, identifies five: "reconciliation, reciprocal recognition, creation of a common discourse, imagining common solutions, awareness awaking of multicultural challenges". He is underlining that "while in western Europe these values had the time to develop and install during half a century, the western community is waiting from central and eastern Europe to acquire them in only some years".²

It seems, indeed, that the above quoted aims of cultural cooperation (valid for post world war II western Europe) are still not valid today for the Balkans. The process of *reconciliation* had been started from the top-down and is, therefore, not achieved. Albanians from Kosovo and Serbs are supposed to get together because of international pressure more than because of grass rooted intercultural incentive exchange. The three nations of Bosnia compromised, but that society did not find reconciliation with post-war (1993) trauma. Neither was *reciprocal recognition* achieved truly between Macedonians and Greeks. The 'common discourse' is not created, like in western Europe, through partnership, debate and public dialogue. *Common discourse* is imposed from above - vocabulary such as interculturalism, multicultural society, cultural diversity, truth and reconciliation, capacity building, sustainability, re-training of cultural administrators, policy issues etc. came "from the top" and were imposed as key words on cultural actors in the region. Those who wanted to enter "the game" had to learn and to adopt this vocabulary, without having the time to independently discover, integrate and assimilate it internally and organically. . Hence, it might be interesting to describe the phases of cultural cooperation in the region in a rather different

manner than what one might expect, starting from before the fall of communism. They are:

1945 –1948 – participation in the building world's communist utopia

1948 – 1965 – walls in between Balkan countries (even with pursuing of minorities –Serbian in Romania, Montenegrin and even Albanian orthodox in Albania, Macedonian in Greece)

1965 – 1989 – officially implemented limited number of contacts (bilateral ones); minority policies now stimulates cooperation (Serbs in Romania and Romanians in Serbia actively participate in bridging one culture to another)

1989 –1995 – concentrated on itself – looking for cooperation out of the former communist block (independent cultural operators start to cooperate on ad-hoc basis, the official cooperation between ministries collapses and needs time to rebuild)

1995 – 2002 – a freshly born new agenda of international cooperation is imposed to SE European governments by the Council of Europe, western European cultural cooperation agencies, UNESCO, EU –regional NGOs emerge and start developing authentic Balkan networks (the civil sector is largely supported by Art and Culture network OSI program in Budapest).

2002... onwards –reshaping of the cooperation logic according to mainly EU reshaping priorities and the enlargement process (accession countries and the others)

After 1989, we can, however notice that there are two key contradictory demands in cultural policies that had both specific and not always positive influences on the cultural cooperation measures within the region.

The first one – **identity questioning** could seem as the one leading to greater mutual regional cooperation, but in fact, this one constituted itself in a barrier and was more of a constraint, because identity in the region is built on traditionally accepted differences, not on strong characteristics. On the other hand, each nation wanted to rediscover the 'old roots of common identity' with western Europe or other regions outside the Balkans representing strong historical reference. Those links between

e.g. Romania and France, Croatia and Germany; Serbia & Russia, even Belorussia, Armenia, Bosnia and Austria, Montenegro and Italy were all out of the SE European territory.

Links and historical roots which are important among Albania and Serbia, Greece and Macedonia, Croatia and Serbia, etc. for mainly political reasons, had been expelled not only from school programs and history books, but also from museum exhibition projects, festivals etc.

In opposition to this quest for a lost national identity, the second characteristic, the **need of integration in the**

¹ Kundera, Milan, Intimate Journal, Le monde, July 1999

² Weber raymond, key note speech, interministerial conference about the SEEurope and the mediteranian region, Vienna, 2000

world, was also “destimulative” for Balkan cultural cooperation. To become present in Paris, London and New York, became a crucial demand and guaranteed the feeling of being acknowledged as part of the world, of global culture, of the values that count, i.e. values recognized abroad.

These two aspects explain why, during a first phase of post communist transition (1989-1995), the number of regional exchanges, touring, translations and book publishing, had extremely diminished, while the number of books translated from English had risen by up to ten times. For some cultures that were isolated for a long period, e.g. Romania, it was also a necessity. They had already quite a lot of translations from the neighbouring countries, but that was linked to the 60`s and 70`s. The new generation of artists and art activities ceased to communicate, because bilateral cultural conventions expired and new ones had not been created in the region. Therefore, the transition focus of public policy was toward the west: entering the francophone space, exploring possibilities of British Council/Visiting Arts, Goethe Institutes etc. Neighbouring countries did not have their cultural centres or agencies to stimulate regional cooperation and the situation of cultural policies was still unstable up to the end of the 90`s in all South Eastern European countries.

A new phase started only after the Dayton treaty (1995), when the Stability Pact imposed on the Balkans regional cooperation as a precondition for financing. It was again a top-down measure aimed to re-launch regional cultural cooperation.

Strategies for South Eastern European cultural regional¹ and international cooperation

At the level of South Eastern European cultural governments, the regional cooperation issues do not represent a priority line between 1989 and 2003 and international cooperation programs are much more strategically oriented to joining western partnership and intergovernmental organisations programmes, or to be acceptable for the ‘EU’ requirements, than to engage in artistic collaboration with neighbours.

The important artistic public institutions are suffering deeply from a lack of resources and the economic transition and restructuring of social and economical mechanisms does not encourage a quick restoration of the social and economic function of these public institutions. Again, a helping hand is required from western Europe or other wealthy foreign partners (USA, Japan).

SE European ministries meet often, e.g. in 2000 because the Council of Europe took the initiative and the Austrian government offered the money, or recently, because the Slovenian Minister of Culture gathered the Slavonic SE European countries, creating a new relationship between Slavonic and non Slavonic SE Europe or, closer to central Europe, because the Hungarian Ministry of Culture supported the Budapest observatory meeting and included Romania and Bulgaria among its guests (in a meeting about accession countries) etc. But all these initiatives have an ad-hoc aspect and their result remains patchy for the region’s cultural development.

To support this, the cultural policy evaluation program of the council of Europe brings important data. We can thus find in the Romanian, Croat and Serb one, the following quotes : “Due to the breaking of all international contact in previous years one of the most important tasks of the Ministry of Culture was re-establishing the broken links with all international institutions and organizations” (Serb national report), the past history legitimizes Croatia to see itself as a future Western European country and defines the present transition as a “coming back to Europe” (...) “the frequent partners of Cultural cooperation are : Italy, France, Germany, UK, Austria, followed by Poland, Hungary, Slovenia, Netherlands and Slovakia” (Croat national report, 1998), Coe Doc, pg 39, French version) ; or : “special efforts are made to prepare and organize the Ministry and cultural institutions for pre-accession process of entering the WTO and EU” or that “the Ministry is also very active in initiating and designing new models of bilateral agreements of cultural co-operation. A special attention has been paid to stimulate institutions to enter regional and international co-operation projects or networking (information distribution), but there are no special mobility funds or funding for network fees or international projects”(Serbia) or “ set up of a think tank to define a new image of Romania abroad and the role that culture can play in this regard “ (Romania, international experts report, CoE, English version, 2000, pg.30) Albania limited itself to founding an “International cultural center”, cautioning it with a cultural cooperation action line.

Interestingly enough, Bulgaria is the only country in the region that explicitly affirms that the priorities in cultural cooperation are both with western Europe and the Balkan region: “bilateral cultural relations with Balkan countries have a particular significance for the republic of Bulgaria”, stressing however that the “foreign policy aim of Bulgaria today is to be a stabilizing factor in turbulent Balkans and insisting upon the fact that it is developing relations with Greece, Turkey, Romania, and particularly actively with Albania”, links which are only “threatened by the big

¹ In our context, « regional » means SE European, « balkanic »

financial challenges we face" (Bulgarian national report, English version, CoE, 1997, pg 224)¹

One can observe that even the methodology of the evaluation of cultural policies in itself marginalizes the importance of international cultural cooperation (only 4.2 out of 55 themes approximately treated!)². Also, too much attention is placed on WTO and the EU and to use UNESCO, CEI, Stability pact as donors, instead of trying to develop coherent cultural relations with neighbouring countries. We will also note a strong tendency to restore the bilateral cooperation instead of multilateral schemes.

This may all be considered natural, after such a long period of ideological contamination and cultural isolation, *if* the region still didn't have to solve a huge 'memory black hole' that the communist period succeeded in creating and didn't urgently need the restoration of internal bridges before the building of external ones. This delicate point is one of the keys to prospective thinking in the programming of future cultural cooperation policies in the South Eastern European region. Stability and accepted diversity, a democratic policy towards minorities, the sustainable economic and social development of the region and its positioning in a stronger and 'broader' Europe, but also in a redesigned global landscape, will all depend on the capacity to develop interregional grass-root cultural cooperation successfully. This has to complete the legislative, administrative and financial regulations that the EU accession top-down action already achieved. "A strong state and a strong civil society" is the model that Slovene policy maker Vesna Copic is putting forward as a guarantee for inner reconstruction of South Eastern European countries.¹

Cultural cooperation and the partnership between Ministries and the civil society

Related to what was previously said, the idea of partnership between the public and the civil cultural sector was introduced via the Council of Europe policy guidelines and gained a place at the end of the 90's in the emerging South Eastern European democracies. This lapse of time was also necessary in order to develop the national cultural NGO's in Romania, Bulgaria, Serbia, Croatia and Macedonia.

The Council of Europe also imposed participation of the civil sector in the process of writing (not only debating) cultural legislation – especially in the field of media, which

¹ In her well known book 'Imagining the Balkans', Maria Todorova considers that Bulgarians are the only people in the region to have a positive idea about the notion of 'balkans' and about a regional identity

² Compendium of cultural policies www.culturalpolicies.net

¹ Copic, Vesna, CEI meeting, Policies for culture, May, Romania, 2003

the international community considers crucial for the development of democratic institutions.

Still, governments finally used to offer the Parliament their versions of a law, and sometimes even ignored the proposals of the civil cultural sector. A good example of this is in Serbia and Romania, where the specialized unions (Romanian Uniter and Serb Union of theater people) were not listened to in the process of the drafting of the theater law. Bulgaria diplomatically avoided the problem by proposing the "law for the protection and development of culture" (2001/2002-source PFC), too general to create sectorial civil sector frustrations.

One of the most successful examples of regional cultural cooperation projects, including the partnership between the public sector at national and local level, the civil society and the legislators, remains, since year 2000, ***Policies for culture*** (www.policiesforculture.org). Jointly initiated by the European Cultural Foundation, Amsterdam and the Ecumest association (operating from Amsterdam and Bucharest in all SE regions), *Policies for culture* combines a public policy approach towards the sensitivities of civil society to the legislative problems related to culture, to the public authority responsibilities but also to the civil sector empowerment instruments in the design of Cultural policies.

Today, PFC has a great platform of representation, contacts and antennas, gathering ministry representatives, independent cultural organizations and legislators, as well as experts from South Eastern Europe. It gained recognition from the Central European Initiative, it is frequently quoted, but its key success is the idea to bring together both ends (the top-down and the bottom-up approach) and make it for the entire region, not for any artificial split between Slavonic, Orthodox, Balkan east or west etc.

Together with the Mozaic program for the Council of Europe and the Soros long term initiatives - like the cultural policy component of Art and Culture program, (and, of course, inspired and catalyzed by them), PFC is the only one genuinely created by an east/west equal cooperation and by two politically independent 'European' entities.

The impact of international operators and programs on cultural cooperation policies

Complementing previous observations, we can now return and see the extent to which cultural cooperation dynamics in south east Europe have mostly been initiated in the last 14 years by "outside actors" – European institutions such as the Council of Europe, European Parliament and the European states (especially through the Stability Pact), but also independently through bodies such as

KulturKontakt (Austria), French Cultural centers and the Goethe institute, or Pro Helvetia. These bodies have launched programs not only of bilateral, but of regional character. Examples are numerous. Among them, the seminar for managers of music festivals from the region, organized by the Goethe Institute created an approach which stimulated cooperation; sometimes they suggested a "regional touring" component to the applicants, paying, specifically, the costs of the project, the British council's "seeding a network" project and NOROC French "la danse en voyage" and the French/Romanian theatre, Austrian KulturKontakt programs for cultural management training and visual arts etc.

It is an important feature that these kind of programs were mostly used by the independent cultural organizations, capable of dealing with the grant forms and to adapt to the managerial requirements better than the decaying, undersubsidized and over-staffed public cultural institutions.

The efforts of independent international foundations and of European networks had been important and very effective. Foundations and associations such as the European cultural foundation (Amsterdam), Soros network (Open Society Institutes), Felix Merits foundation, Transeuropéennes, etc. developed specific projects for South Eastern Europe or had this region as a priority area in their project which covered central and eastern Europe. Many of them gathered together in matching funds to reinforce the impact in the region, such as Gulliver connect programme, which was realized between 1998/2003 through joint efforts of OSI Budapest (Soros), KulturKontakt (Austria) and Felix Meritis (Amsterdam), or programs like Art for Social Change and Kultura Nova (capacity building for NGOs) which were developed by ECF and the national Soros offices in Croatia, Montenegro, Serbia and Macedonia.

The European networks, created during the mid 80's, in the beginning had few members from South Eastern Europe (mostly from Yugoslavia – in IETM, pre-ENCATC phase, etc.). However from 1989 onwards, they approached this area quite actively (IETM, ELIA). Some organizations even created specific networks or subdivisions within themselves or during their general assemblies (ENCATC Balkan platform, Banlieues d'Europe). Romanian antenna for SE European region, IETM and Relais CULTURE Europe 'balkan express' in cooperation with PAC multimedia in Macedonia, Trans Europe Halles (TEH) integrating new SE European members, CIRCLE asking eastern European members to join the executive committee, The Forum of cultural European networks dedicating three specific platforms between 1998 and 2001 to the Balkan region, EFAH

integrating more and more the accompanying solutions for future EU accession countries). Specific networks for South Eastern Europe were created (Appolonia, SEECAN, etc.). Some networks have developed specific fundraising activities to secure and enable participation of the members from CEE in network projects (Thomassen Fund in ENCATC).

As a result of this cross-fertilization, many autonomous Balkan networks and independent organizations were created: BAP (Balkan association of publishers) and BAN (Balkan art network), two networks created after the Sarajevo conference.¹

A special mention has to be made about the Sarajevo conference formerly quoted, "Reconstructing cultural productivity in the Balkans", initiated by Ericarts and other local and international organizations, as a proof of the catalytic effect this kind of event, well timed and well placed can have on the acceleration of constructive processes.

The ICAN, network of ex/SCCAs is also an example of an outside initiated network.

Those networks started their work together, mostly trying to achieve greater European presence. BAP's main activity is their presence at the Frankfurt book fair, while BAN organized exhibitions in Brussels "Balkan art generator" in 2000 (for the Cultural capital). Now, this network is mostly concentrating its efforts on bringing artists from the Balkans to Harald Szeeman, for his exhibitions of contemporary Balkan art - Blood and Honey. (The name of Szeemann was needed to raise visibility and marketing impact of the project, because a Balkan art generator with a Balkan curator had passed completely unnoticed in Brussels!)

The spirit of "networking" had provoked many other NGOs in the region to create their own authentic entities, such as Balkankult in Belgrade, Ecumest in Bucharest, Project DCM, centers like the 'Red house' in Sofia, 'Mama' in Zagreb, PAC multimedia in Macedonia, 'Rex' in Belgrade, MAD and UNITER in Bucharest, acting as informal hosts of other networks or other numerous programs and projects of European and regional scale. This process is, however, recent and strongly installed in the year 2000.

Of course, for many among them who had their own program production, it was also the way to raise more publicity, to facilitate fundraising, but in essence, it was evident that they had developed, through networking,

¹ conference organized in Sarajevo in 1999 by ERicarts, FINN Ekvit, Blue dragon, Culturelink and supported by UNESCO, the Finnish ministry of education and Culture, in the context of the Finnish Presidency of EU, Kulturkontakt, Austrian Federal chancellery, the German Ministry of Foreign affairs

many projects which had no official support. Despite this, the NGO's found ways to go on.

Needless to say that for all these programmes and projects, the existence of SOROS and the ARTS and Culture network programme with its initiatives 'culture link' and 'looking inside' (two mobility programs), was of extreme importance.

Media networks had also been of crucial effectiveness, not only for bringing democracy and promoting human rights (ANEM), but also by stimulating a greater sense of involvement by the younger generation, like 'Cross radio', which is mainly focussed on stimulating cultural cooperation and promoting urban cultures.

Many of these media networks had an impact on the interest shown in Europe for the region (as a region of conflicts and isolation), and developed specific "communication projects". Many reviews had been created like Balkanmedia (Sofia), Balkan umbrella (Remont, Belgrade), Balkanis (Ljubljana Slovenia), Sarajevske, Biljeznice/Sveske/ cahiers etc.

Many Balkan festivals, such as Skomrahi in Skopje (festival of Drama schools from the region), Thesaloniki manifestations, visual art exhibitions, concentrate mostly on presentations and basic communication, while on the other hand workshops and summer schools communicate directly with art and work with the youth of the Balkans (summer school of the University of Arts in Belgrade, summer schools for art students in Bulgaria, Buntovna proza – UNESCO Bosnia project, Bucharest dance east/west project, Sibiu International theater festival (Romania), Eurobulgarian Center Film Festival etc.).

These initiatives generate new networks and new projects, such as Counter-rhythm Arts Summer school in Subotica in 2002 – which regroups students from different schools from the region, participating in self-created follow-up projects.

The importance of festivals like Skomrahi or Belef, is apparent in that for the first time, and long before the politicians, artists and arts organizations from the region could be presented and seen together (first appearance of Sarajevo artists in Belgrade had been during Belef festival - Ambrosia; the first links with Albanian artists through Balkankult conferences or during summer schools, etc.) or festivals like Urban festival in Zagreb organized by "Local base for refreshing culture (BLOK)" regrouped new and fresh initiatives from the region, contributing to present in this way each other's work in areas usually not very popular for policy makers. Some manifestations focus on the region itself, helping in areas such as knowledge transfer and creating a new synergy. They are often focussed on politically engaged art and artists whose projects are relevant for the region only. Others are more "open" and address thematic issues, but focus on methods – experiments, laboratory works etc.

This rich capital is now present and growing.

Western expertise and influence had positive outcomes at the level of cultural administration and legislation.

The lottery model, inspired by the UK and the Netherlands to the Hungarians and Romanians, drew respective governments to try innovative models for the funding of culture. French laws on heritage and taxation or copyright were used, sometimes successfully, by many eastern European countries. The law on cinema in Serbia was drafted with French expertise and the creation recently of a National Serb Cinema Center is entirely due to this influence.

The problem of foreign expertise appeared when missing links became apparent. When the necessary time was not taken for a process to mature and all its components to become accomplished. We have numerous examples of using foreign expertise for completely un-adapted situations, but also of potentially good expertise that had to be implemented in too short a time or with missing data. This created in the long run a sense of distrust in SE European Ministries of culture and among cultural operators about the reliability of the 'western models'. It is clear that both immediate post communist euphoria regarding these models and post-wakening rejection of them are both wrong and superficial. Inspiration for cultural policy and legislation can be reliable, but has to take the necessary time and allow reciprocal understanding and questioning. For the time being this was more of an approach for cultural operators, but not for the cultural policy levels (nationally and internationally).

Of course, EU, Council of Europe and UNESCO initiatives in cultural institutional strengthening and their impact on the cultural cooperation logic cannot be ignored. The Phare (EU) and Mozaic programs (Council of Europe), the ICOM network and ICOMOS publication acting in the heritage sector resulted in:

⇒ Bulgaria in the creation of the Eurobulgarian center, in Romania in the formulation of a first complete 10 years strategy for the Ministry of culture and in the performing of a comprehensive training for cultural administrators in five Romanian regions as well as in support for independent cultural projects focused on cooperation and diversity (PHARE Bulgaria and Romania)

⇒ important legislative and administrative measures and fundraising realised for Museums, heritage restoration and new managerial organisation for the museum sector (the Romanian Brancusi triptych was restored also via UNESCO support ; UNESCO positions stopped dangerous initiatives of destruction of national and regional heritage (Rosia Montana, Dracula Parc (Romania), Sarajevo, Vukovar, Kosovo), and engaged international responsibility in the rebuilding of Yugoslav regions touched by war.

⇒ Council of Europe Mozaic project and the program of evaluation of Cultural policies provided, between 1996/2002 the ground for important advancement in the awareness about the needs and key weaknesses of the transition period and its impact on cultural policies, thus preserving the cultural subject on the South Eastern European agendas and training the national public authorities in the region to an open, democratic and developed approach to the complex issues of the enlarged Europe.

The only general reproach that can be put forward about these programs would be that they were too short sighted (between 1 to 3 years) and that their indirect impact was more important than their visibility in the large socio economic SE European audiences (public and independent), thus their follow ups were weak and their direct action was limited to those who had direct contact with them (the already discussed top-down syndrome). Partnership with civil society operators was in all cases more formal, rhetoric, than real and effective. And this prevented these initiatives becoming as important as their initial potential led us to believe.

Last, but not least, European training courses in cultural administration and management allowed the participation of SE European students and educated and empowered some of the leading cultural young figures, by giving them the instruments for the necessary institutional transformation and by facilitating them with the international contacts in order to render an open perspective in the South Eastern European region: the Marcel Hicter Certificate in Belgium, the Masters degree in Dijon (ECUMEST program), the Formation internationale Culture in Paris, ARSEC in Lyon, AMSU in Amsterdam, ICCA in Salzburg (with Kulturkontakt support), the Warwick university in UK being only a few examples. Others are organizations like the Interarts Observatory where many South Eastern European students found an ideal in-learning place to develop vision and skills in cultural cooperation logic and in understanding the importance of the correct reading of a global context to inform local action.

Special mention must be made of the Belgrade University of Arts, which was the first in SE Europe to include a cultural cooperation perspective in the syllabus of its MA in cultural management, already in 1991.

To complete the picture of the importance of the foreign impact and its sometimes ambiguous consequences on the cultural institutional balance between the public and the civil sector, we will use the following example. During the 90's we saw that a number of exchanges between SE Europe and western Europe and joint projects had been developed. Still, we observe too often that the differences & inequalities in the region had been reinforced. New

divisions entered the game, resulting from the momentous "popularity" of a certain country.

Bosnia is a cruel example of such a policy. During the siege of Sarajevo the whole world had taken Sarajevo as a symbol, many artists and intellectuals went there to see and to be seen as giving support, and many foundations entered directly after Dayton in 1995. Of course they invested in the development of the NGO sector – leaving the public sector in their political divisions and administrative confusion and lack of know-how. This created the most particular artificially created situation where a country has a highly developed civil sector, with salaries 10 times greater than the public, creating the final exodus of the remaining artists and intellectuals from the public sector to NGOs, weakening further the stability & quality of work in the public sector. Five years after Dayton, nearly all the foundations agencies left Sarajevo, leaving behind an unaccomplished system of public institutions, an unsustainable NGO system with very qualified staff, but active in the context where services and activities of NGO cannot be financed neither from public nor from the underdeveloped private sector. At the end of this year the UNESCO office will be closed and the majority of the foundations passed in 2000 in Serbia, when the 5th October "revolution" made Serbia very "trendy" all of a sudden.

Many donors (in fact, their representatives in the region), had been aware of the mistakes committed in Bosnia, but had no authority or possibility to persuade decision-making bodies of their foundations or agencies, that its policy had to be reshaped as well as the operating methods. Of course the popularity of investing in the civil sector cannot be compared with the feeble "attractiveness" of giving money to the public sector, but without good public museums, libraries, art education etc., we will not have a high quality art scene, only at the NGO level, or it will be for a very limited and short period of time.

This brings us back to the 'Strong state and strong civil society balance desiderata' Copic is speaking about.

PART THREE

A challenging synthesis: what are the missing links / A prospective conclusion

The descriptive overview provided brings about the formulation of what we consider today as the most important topics that the cultural cooperation policies have to urgently address, from both a prospective and a pragmatic perspective, in order to include South Eastern Europe organically in the enlarged European process and avoid the repetition of past errors with long term consequences.

- ⇒ As formerly demonstrated, one of the crucial problems of cultural cooperation in the region can be considered as 'ethical'. Misbalance and unequal treatment can be felt at different levels and translates in various ways. If and when the cooperation project is launched by a western European organization, the eastern European local partners can usually assume that they are chosen mainly because they are facilitating easy fundraising for the western partner. In the cooperation process the dominating western logic has to take the lead in terms of main choices, orientation or profile of the project and the weak financial resource that usually the eastern partner has at his disposal reinforces the strong/weak opposition of the so called institutional partnership. In most cases of the training sessions organized with local and international expertise, local experts are usually paid much less than the western ones, at the same time, it is often the case that the western experts are not as knowledgeable of the specifics of the region (how could a good British marketing expert teach this in his UK lecture to a Kosovan and Bosnian or Bulgarian and Romanian manager, when in the SE European countries, all economic mechanisms are still in transition from a purely centralized infrastructure, the system inherited is a mix of post Austro-Hungarian and Russian legacy and the liberal market NEVER existed really.)
- ⇒ a second crucial aspect would be the danger of the normalisation of this top-down approach and mentality of the western model of cooperation (rhetorical encouragement of cultural diversity and annihilation, for understandable pragmatic reasons, of the complex problems emerging in cooperation with the Balkans). It is significant the extent to which the rhetoric and model of cooperation of western agencies are the same throughout the world. Western governments are not real partners for dialogue, but exporters of national models in the cultural field and by now, South Eastern European Countries understood that the French cultural administration is very different from the British and German one, the Dutch, Italians and Spanish, not to mention the Belgian and Swiss! But western European countries had become used to ignoring other western cultural models apart from their own, therefore their praise of 'openness' and consensus at times seem doubtful and contradictory to the SE European eye. Today, the South Eastern Europeans know to what extent, for example, the liberal British model of cultural management is adaptable to their centralized institutional legacy, but also how to avoid replacing the former communist bureaucratic cultural administration with the heavy Italian or French one.
- ⇒ a third point is that it is worrying to see, at high political EU levels, the strong link between cultural cooperation and the rebinding of social ties, inter-culturally and

placing culture center stage in the support of social reconstruction in the Balkans is IGNORED. The multicultural and multiethnic societies in the Balkans are an ideal laboratory for finding challenging reconciliation formulas, but also a vision of an enlarged Balkan region, not limited to Yugoslavia and some of its neighbours, but including Greece and Turkey (not as developed, already 'European' countries, but as cultural partners and historically binding communities). Greece should stop excluding Macedonia from artistic cooperation, for example, and European and Balkan reconciliation would gain an important step forward. Instead of perpetrating an image of conflict and tension around the Balkans, the encouragement of a perception of the region as a 'laboratory' for the future and as a 'potential world', as compared to the western 'saturated world' (Liiceanu) would be desirable.

- ⇒ cultural cooperation policies should be engaged with broader time and space limits: long term sustainable programs and cooperation with countries beyond Europe would be desirable. South Eastern European countries don't know much about southern Europe or about for example African, Asian, Arab cultures. Perhaps their different socio-economic and cultural behavior from western Europe would revitalise and inspire the regeneration process of the SE European region, presenting a new, unexpected and unexplored perspective, issues that are up until today exclusively regarded from a east/west confrontational point of view. This would also help demystify the western model (still so present in eastern Europe) and deepen the understanding of global mechanisms that drive the world cultural and economic dynamic. At the same time, cultural cooperation of the region beyond Europe might facilitate the dissolution of nationalism and bring a conscience about European roots of the Balkan people as compared to Arab, Asian, African ones.

What we would need :

- ◆ Mobility schemes, providing not only scholars and students, but also cultural professionals with the possibility to study and understand foreign culture inside and outside the region, inside and outside Europe.
- ◆ That European instances and national governments in the region, together with the most representative NGO's (today easy to identify) to gather regularly and formulate a long term agenda for cultural cooperation, reshaping and redistributing responsibilities and re-balancing the outdated idea of the ignorance of the region facing the international challenge.
- ◆ Understand and apply strategies to encourage efficiency and support the 'human capital' in the SE

European region, thus preventing its disappearance; it is a very positive step to see this issue underlined by parliamentarian Doris Paak, president of the delegation of EU parliament for SE Europe in her speech to the EU parliament¹; because supporting the human capital means supporting the diversity of the cultural and spiritual asset of the Balkan region.

It is obvious that cultural cooperation is today dependent more on the global factors engendered by the technological advancement, material resource providing, access to information and rapidity than by conventional accords and complicated bureaucratic programs; this aspect has to be taken into account if we want SE Europe to share and acquire the European democratic values and not orient itself to other more tempting overseas 'ready to help' partners. It is by developing a culturally and economically rich South Eastern Europe that it will begin to have responsibility.

Last, but not least, despite our conscience that the Balkans are an extremely complex region, our task is to end the stereotypes and prejudices and to recreate collective memory beyond political division, wars, unachieved compromise, etc.

Yes, the Balkans is a bridge and a crossroads at the same time.

It is therefore *our* task to build our bridges, because only we will know the best emplacement for them; we cannot wait for people from the outside to come and build these bridges for us, they may be very nice bridges, but far away from our customary paths of communication. The danger is that we will only use them on rare occasions, for nice promenades, not for our daily, operational, *real* cultural existence.

¹ source : Serb daily Danas, 19th of May, 2003