

Cultural policy under conditions of economic crisis

Myrsini Zorba

mzorba@otenet.gr

**International Conference on Public Policy
Milan, June 2015**

I would like to present a few introductory remarks on cultural policy under conditions of crisis, as we experience it in my country. Public cultural policy in Greece has been proved fragile and dysfunctional, despite repeated assurances by the respective ministers, starting with Melina Mercouri during the 80s, that it is the "country's heavy industry". The model of cultural policy implemented in recent decades was a model of cultural policy in the narrow sense, centralized and attached strictly to cultural heritage (Zorba, 2009, 2011). Except in a few cases, it did not manage to open a dialogue with society and social needs. In the current crisis conditions, these characteristics exacerbate the problem, inasmuch as the deconstruction of the old statist paradigm is occurring at an explosive rate leaving in its place a residual skeleton: a skeleton that sustains the old structures, shrunken but equally ineffective as before.

It is important to note that during the recent years of crisis the structure of the Ministry has undergone many changes, albeit without any fixed orientation. In 2009 it merged with Tourism, in 2012 it was downgraded to the General Secretariat of the Ministry of Education, in 2013 it became the Ministry of Culture and Sports, and in early 2015 it was again subsumed under the Ministry of Education. Four transformations within five years indicate confusion and the lack of a stable political and cultural orientation. This ambivalence creates doubt, which again increasingly weakens the possibility of cultural planning. The strategic planning regarding cultural policy and its management have been found to be in a constant state of uncertainty in recent years.

I will return later to the question of the crisis. First, however, I would like to address several theoretical issues relating to cultural policy and politics as well as certain problems arising from the position of cultural policy within the framework of public policies. It is my opinion that the present crisis highlights specific features of this problematic relationship and invites renewed discussion regarding the axioms and the challenges of public cultural policy.

The rationales of cultural policy between policy and politics

As early as 1985, Guy Saez had identified the problem, arguing that in the framework of political science "we have only a few studies on cultural policy despite the efforts of Unesco and the Council of Europe". Saez did not attribute this fact to the "residual character" of cultural policy (and the minimal interest of governments that invest a merely a small percentage of their budget to it), although that is certainly the case. For Saez, the main reason was that "the disciplinary field of public policy remains dominated or influenced by North American studies and if, in one form or another, all countries have adopted a cultural policy, the United States is the notable exception in this unanimous concert". As Saez maintains there is no veritable cultural policy in the US but merely a "simple support of the arts"; this leads to a lack of interest on the part of political scientists, who are for the most part North American. Besides, Saez observes, mistrust in policy comes from the ideologies derived from the aesthetics or the sociology of culture, inspired by the great theories. "Science policy has not yet managed to reduce the overriding uncertainty we reported. It leaves to other scientific traditions, older and stronger, the task of illuminating the relationship between culture and policy. The relationship between culture and policy is governed by practices and ideologies that, in accordance with the period, govern the great representations regarding the role of art and artists in social life" (Saez, 1985:388-9).

After the Second World War the institutionalization of cultural policy as part of the welfare state leaves no room for misinterpretation. Cultural policy was a small offshoot of the prevailing new approach on the rights of citizens to public services, including access to culture (Judt, 2005, Poirrier, 2011). The institutionalization of cultural policy as a public policy also manifests the profound difference that distinguishes the relationship of the state with culture in earlier historical phases. The central axis of public policy is no longer the value of art itself and the state patron but the citizens' right to culture (Bennett, 1998, Kennett, 2008). The radically diverse foundations and orientations lead to radically different viewpoints, spheres of activity, management and institutions.

In the late 90s and early 2000s an intense public debate on the integration of Cultural Policy Studies in Cultural Studies took place. Taking part in this were numerous scholars such as Jim McGuigan, Tony Bennett, Justin Lewis, Toby Miller, Stuart Cunningham, etc. (Lewis, Miller, 2003). The dialogues revealed controversial views -- on cultural policy and its definition, its boundaries, its meaning and its role in the broader socio-cultural context. The debate evolved into a deep disagreement regarding the inclusion of Cultural Policy Studies in Cultural Studies. Although the main arguments put forward in this debate are worth mentioning, we must underscore that this dialogue is not conducted within the framework of the discussion of science policy in reference to the public policies of the time. It took place in a context mainly concerned with the broader theoretical conditions of the cultural field and its relationship with power. The reference center was politics; it was not particularly concerned with those policy issues which at that time preoccupied political scientists.

What were the main points of discussion? They focused on certain strategic concepts: the concept of hegemony (Gramsci, 1975), the public sphere (Habermas, 1989, 1992), governmentality (Foucault, 2003). The culture and power relationship was central, but not

the culture and applied governmental policy relationship. The main keywords were civil society, cultural citizenship, public sphere, public interest, the formation of cultural identities, diversity, cultural rights, the democratization of culture, the disciplining of the population, the *mission civilisatrice*, the postcolonial approaches. The debate was, evidently, closer to the sociology of culture and less to the governance, the actors, formulating and implementing policy, the management of culture. For this reason there was no evidence in this dialogue box, either of the methodology and the fundamental rules governing public policies, or the theories of institutions, governance models, networks (Bennett , 1992, 1996, 1998, 2000, Grossberg, Nelson, Treichler, 1992, Cunningham, 1993, McGuigan 2001, 2004, Lewis, Miller, 2003). As McGuigan characteristically noted, the most important issue that arose under the new conditions was how culture would retain its place in the public sphere without threatening to narrow the horizons of analysis and its objectives and without being instrumentalised by the narrow cultural objectives of a public policy. In the same context, some scholars from the field of Cultural Studies expressed fears about the regulatory procedures and the practical commitment involving cultural policy, since it could result in the loss of academic distance and therefore purity of criticism.

Much of the debate focused on the place of culture in the public sphere according to Habermas (McGuigan, 1996) and the concept of governmentality of Foucault, that seemed to welcome public cultural policy more warmly (Bratich, 2003). With Habermas it was important first and foremost to distinguish the intellectual work into two distinct functions: the critical, first, and then the practical (Bennett, 2006). This caused a dichotomy on the theoretical level, which Bennett addresses as a central problem in Habermas's public sphere theory. In the past, the concept of the public sphere had given important tools to cultural policy, such as the regulation of the media towards a certain degree of democracy and diversity in shaping public opinion (Collins, Murrioni, 1996) or the discourse on the legitimization of new forms of public presence for those excluded from civil public sphere groups, such as women (Landes, 1988, Riley, 1988).

But the distinction between criticism and practice did not allow the foundation of any combination that was useful and necessary for public cultural policy, to the extent that Habermas could not recognize "the role played by the institutions of public culture in the development of the modern cultural practices"(Bennett, 2006). To the contrary, Foucault recognized the connection between different forms of knowledge and know-how in organizing diversified governance and social management fields as being of primary importance. This offered the prospect of a better balance between expertise and governance in a wide range of functions, involving practitioners who planned and implemented governmental programs. In this context it was a welcome foundation of cultural policy, as the concept of Foucault's governmentality allowed the possibility of cultural resources as a means of societal intervention to be explored.

As in other debates, there were tensions. The debate was extended to include broader issues such as the appropriateness of the connection between the academic environment and the "practitioners" working in the field of cultural institutions. The important result of this discussion was the linking of theoretical analysis with the concept of public responsibility. It showed the need for a closer interconnection between theory and policy in the field of

culture, which would guarantee open communication between academic environments and political governance, public administration, and management staff and employees in cultural institutions.

Objections to the above were centred on the concept of instrumentalization, which meant the suspicion that public cultural policy could be a tool of propaganda and manipulation whereby the state could enforce discipline and coercive patterns upon the population. This still causes many scholars of cultural policy to refuse to discuss the framework, rules, challenges and new approaches of political science with regard to public policies. They approach cultural policy more as culture and politics and less as a public policy (Miller, Judice 2002).

Nevertheless, the invocation of the peculiarity of cultural policy and its exemption from the rules of public policies is derived from the above problematic. Cultural policy is often projected as the "codification of a dream" – emphasizing the dream aspect and devaluating the codification. Also ignored is the fact that despite the different content and problems, which like any other public policy it must solve, it can only be subject to a common denominator with other policies with regard to shaping agendas, methods, actors, networks, windows of opportunity, the functioning of institutions, etc.

The above are just a few examples of the difficulties of completing the integration of the field of cultural policy into public policy. Gray (2010) describes the problem widely and aptly: «an increasing number of publications that deal with cultural policy, many of which appear to be operating in a set of hermetically sealed analytical silos which are marked by a degree of mutual incomprehension - where, that is, they bother to pay any attention to other approaches at all. The lack of understanding that is displayed derives, in the main from: a failure to comprehend the differences between methodologies of analysis that are employed within and between different disciplines; a failure to engage with the broader literature arising from different disciplines; and the existence of stereotypical images concerning different theories, disciplines, ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies that are often, at best, misleading, and, at worst, simply wrong. “

Indeed, scholars usually come from a broad background of humanities and social sciences: cultural studies, art history, sociology, anthropology, history, aesthetics, economics, geography, heritage studies, literary studies, museum studies, media, urban studies and many more fields. Political scientists are scarcer. This is the reason of focusing more on politics and less on policy. Nevertheless, a public policy begins just where politics ends, as a horizon of a wider discussion on theoretical orientations and options. If politics continue to dominate when discussing the strategy, rules and functioning of public policy, then public policy cannot find a solid ground of consistency and application.

"How we perceive cultural policy depends on how we define culture" argue Lewis and Miller (2003). This could indeed be a starting point for cultural policy, provided that the definition of culture is full and final. The broader the hinterland of the theoretical approach of culture and the clearer the demarcations, the more productive the cultural policy itself. The clearer the objectives of cultural policy are, the more useful the renegotiation of the theoretical framework, after the trials of applied policy, will be. A public policy must verify and update

the theoretical postulates through the practical results obtained: this is the measure of its legitimacy, as long as there is a clear distinction of the limits where they start and where politics ends.

Cultural Policy as a public policy

It is necessary to make the assumption that when we discuss public policies we are actually discussing public policy, whether it be rural, monetary or education policy. A rose is a rose is a rose, as Gertrude Stein wrote. Cultural policy, despite or rather, knowing, its peculiarity, which every public policy claims and is entitled to, cannot be an exception. The structure, models and strategies obey rules and measures with very specific content, as well as, aims of governance (Moran, Rein, Goodin, 2008). The cultural axioms cannot substitute or alter the political ones. Therefore, cultural policy as a public policy should seek answers primarily in a well-defined field of political science (Osborn, 2010, Ferlie, Lynn, Pollitt, 2005). With its own capital, and bringing with it its own weight of cultural content (but not less) cultural policy must be pursued within a framework of rules and following a methodology common to all public policies. It has to speak its own particular language and, at the same time, to use the common terms of other public policies. It is not invited to present an artistic performance but to manage, in the name of the government, important matters concerning the relation between citizens and culture: to frame decisions, to set priorities, to implement a political agenda and a plan in the public interest.

In political science, new theoretical approaches regarding public policies offer rich grounds for reflection, having upset many of the certainties of the past (Bennett, 2004, Mulcahy, 2006). The older, strictly hierarchical schemes on the formulation and implementation of a public policy gave way to concepts such as agency, assemblage, flexibility and networks. According to more recent theories, we are dealing with public action involving the state, civil society and the market (Pollitt, Bouckaert, 2004). Thus the procedure of policy is seen in a context of conformity. A series of cultural policy models were applied in different regions of the world, under different conditions and different government targets. This leads to greater flexibility and adaptability. But where there is no rapprochement between the academic scholars of culture on the one hand, and political scientists on the other, the policy domain of cultural policy, indeed, remains inherently ambiguous (Gray 2014) and imprecise (Dubois 1999).

Governments usually seek to configure, manage and utilize national and regional cultural resources through specific legal, financial and administrative measures, and for this purpose they establish ministries, government departments or agencies (Bennett, 2001, Urfalino, 1996). The history of policy unfolds around constraints and changes motivated by many different causes. The problems evolve, environments change, technologies improve, alliances shift, management goes and comes, and powerful interests are revealed (Moran, 2008). The concept of public policy refers to government will, decision and action. The art of analysis of the political process requires the ability to discern connections by comparing and contrasting

(Hill, 2009). However, the process of policy is always integrated into the power structure of society; it does not function separately but instead is influenced by global developments and power relations.

It is particularly important that the cultural and political analysis find common language. So I will dedicate a few lines to political analysis (Bennett, Frow, 2008). Policy analysis has emerged primarily as a sub-field of political science that tries to understand and build up knowledge of the whole process of public policy beginning from the big picture of global economy through the complex issues of which policies are chosen for inclusion on the political agenda (and which are excluded), who designs them, and how, finally, they are delivered in the classroom, the hospital, the homeless hostels, the prisons of a given country or region.» (Hudson, Lowe, 2004). As Wildalsky emphasizes, "political analysis is an applied sub-field whose content cannot be determined by the boundaries of disciplines but from what occurs in suitable conditions of time and nature of the problem" (1979:15).

During the 19th and 20th c., the implementation of public policy and the functioning of public services theory went through three design and delivery regimes. First came the regime of Public Administration, centralized and authoritative from the late 19th century until the early 1980s. The historical trajectory of the regime of Public Administration reveals its main axes: the rule of law, the management of the rules and guidelines, the central role of the bureaucracy for policy implementation, the separation of policy and administration, increasing budgets and the hegemony of professionals in public services. It reached its peak especially from 1945 to 1979 as the welfare state aspired to respond to economic and social needs of citizens "from the cradle to the grave." It was the magical tool in the brave new world, which guaranteed equal treatment on the basis of strict hierarchy. The system of public policy was closed and what mattered most was the result of policy implementation (Osborne, 2010).

What came next, until the beginning of the 21st century, was the regime of New Public Management. Since the '70s rising costs and financial crises began to put pressure on the welfare state. The philosophy of control of public spending and pressure on the public sector unions, mainly from conservative governments like that of Margaret Thatcher in Great Britain, promised future economic prosperity through austerity measures. The reform of public services took place utilizing a number of strategies, such as control and reduction of public spending, introduction of private sector practices, the reform of policies and management structures and practices, the introduction of competition rules, the diminution of the State through outsourcing and contracting with the private sector (Pollitt, Bouckaert 2000). Business logic and the emphasis on monitoring and evaluation based on cost-benefit rules led to the dismantling of public services. Note that in the field of academic research the distinction between public management and public policy was established. This was the result of neoclassical economics which insisted on limiting the regulatory role of the state and focusing interest on the economic dimension of services and on management. Neoliberalism would reign not only as a policy but, most importantly, as an ideology and a worldview.

Finally, the regime of the New Public Governance emerged (Osborne, 2010). According to this approach, the key factors of public policy are, as we shall see in detail below, the actors, the resources and the institutions (Muller, Surel 2002). The development of theoretical approaches and forms of public action led to a repositioning vis-à-vis the state and government, a term which had been introduced by the Anglo-Saxon tradition and was replaced, under the light of new data, by the term "governance". The latter aims to embrace the entire mechanism of public action and no longer the state apparatus *sensu stricto*. "The issue of governance again raises reviewing the links between civil society, the state and the market, and the additional reconstruction between these different spheres, the boundaries of which regrouped" (Osborne, 2010). According to this new philosophy, the state no longer has absolute power but forms a ground for participation and action, social and political integration, in which the government plays the role of leadership and guidance, and the interface of state, civil society and market broadens before the necessity of reconciling the opposing social demands. The density of information and data requires public action in large compositions and the extraction of data within heterogeneous environments. The socio-organizational environment of public action is dominated by liquidity and instability and the public-private boundaries are unclear. Political life and electoral politics are inconsistent with the "political problems". The consistency of public action can no longer be achieved through centralized and homogeneous management but instead requires the coordination of multiple actors and multiple levels of cooperation, in a common space of meaning that will draw both from the environment surrounding electoral policy and that of policy problems. In this synthetic image with blurred boundaries "current policies mix approaches linked with traditional public management models, new public management and networked community governance"(Osborne,2010).

However, the New Public Governance is open to different approaches through several schools of thought. According to these, interests can be located in the internal procedures and management systems and performance (corporatist governance), in regulatory models derived from the market and applied to public services and international organizations such as the World Bank ("good" governance) or in public governance. Public governance, again, appears to have five key areas: *Socio-political governance*, whereby governments cooperate and interact with other social actors in terms of legitimation and result; *Public policy governance*, according to which the interest lies in the way in which the elites and policy networks create and manage public policy processes; *Administrative governance*, whereby the effective implementation of public administration is looking for ways to meet the complex requirements of the modern state; *Contract governance*, developing the philosophy of contracts with the private sector; and *Network governance*, relating to the way in which "self-organized and inter-organizational networks" provide public services, operating either in collaboration with the government - or not (Osborne, 2010, Rhodes 1996).

In all versions, however, governance is based on Institutional theory and the Network theory (DiMaggio, 1991). It has become widely accepted that multiple interdependent actors contribute to the performance of public services and also that the policy and decision production system is shaped by interrelated processes. "The New Public Governance is thus

a product and a response to the increasingly complex, plural and fragmented nature of public policy implementation and service delivery in the twenty-first century.” (Osborne 2010). A key feature of the New Public Governance is the negotiation of values, meanings and relationships that are replacing the old political decision and the hierarchical implementation of the Public Administration or management model of New Public Management. The hybridization and acceptance of the principle that there is no single or "excellent way" is also pervasive. In conditions of globalization, governance is characterized as a "field of unstructured complexity" (Jessop 2004). In any case, the conclusion is that "solving problems is not the preserve of a central authority able to impose solutions on subordinate agencies and individuals, but the result of the interaction of a plurality of actors, who often have different interests, values, cognitive orientations and power resources"(Held,2003).

With the shift from government to governance, the management of ruling now appears to be merely one player amongst many others in the field of policy. In this way, the field of politics shows visible signs of multiplicity and dispute, involving more actors with less precise boundaries between public and private (Kennett 2008). The national and the global do not exclude one another, while the dynamic of the local also arises (Sassen 2004). New ways of ruling are being explored, with new patterns of interaction between government and society in search of a "socio-political governance" (Jan Kooiman 1993). It is worth remembering that initially, the concept of new governance structures were the known structures with the addition of networks (Kooiman 1993, Rhodes 1996), but now, in the new century, the logic of networks prevailed exclusively (Klijn 2008).

In order not to lose the importance and the meaning of the processes in a seemingly chaotic reality, these innovations require analysts experienced in flexible, broad-spectrum interdisciplinary analysis. However, it is worth at this point to recall that some fundamental phases of the political process, pretty much stable and entrenched, continue to apply. These are: the recognition of a problem, its integration into the government agenda, the formulation of solutions, decision taking, program implementation, evaluation, etc.

Nevertheless, the study of the political process is "the study of the exercise of power in the making of policy, and cannot therefore disregard underlying questions about the sources and nature of that power" (Hill 2009: 25). Therefore, public policies are more than just a decision. The distribution and redistribution of resources, the institutions, the role of social actors and strategies are crucial preconditions for political decisions. Indeed, much of the burden of the "solution" of problems is left on the shoulders of actors and their strategies when managing conflict. In this framework "the construction and conversion of the cognitive space within which the actors bring and (re) define their 'problems' and 'test', ultimately the solutions" is recognized as a fundamental feature of public policies" (Muller, Sured,2002).

In other words, we no longer perceive the exercise of public policy as a narrow mechanism of direct settlement of a visible problem or a technical process, but in its real dimensions, involving the construction of a new representation of problems. The environment of public policies is guided by highly competitive and tight resources. This means that the representation of problems, the mobilization of actors, the pressure methods they use, the alliances they conclude and the publicity they manage to give to their demands play key roles in the policy choices of governments that operate with the clock of the political time. Their success requires a combination of organizational strategies and political participation. This is essentially the interconnection of policy with the concept of public action, with the actors, the politics, and the polity. These are the aspects that make up the lattice of public policy.

During the 80s intense debate developed around institutions. According to this thinking, summarized in theory of Neo-institutionalism, institutions began to be perceived through the prism of the configuration and integration of cultural variables (March, Olsen, 1995, 2002, Redaelli, Haines, 2014). Institutions are in any case a factor of order in political activity, through their rules and routines, their identity, values, meanings and traditions. The archives and libraries, museums, orchestras, theaters, archaeological sites operated steadily as traditional institutions, following specific routines and procedural rules. In some cases hybrid organizations with properties borrowed from different types of institutions also developed. Furthermore, institutions help to shape the meaning given by actors to their deeds. Thanks to this latter function, their policy reflects a worldview, the wider dimension of interpreting the world and life. The new institutionalism also highlights the idea that policy is not only based on selection and rationalism but in construction and interpretation mechanisms of the world, which can be located more in processes than in results of public policies and defining "mental maps» ("*cartes mentales* ") (North, 1990).

Indeed, if not mental maps, what else is necessary for a series of assumptions or beliefs about art, the importance of cultural heritage, the assessment of cultural resources and their linkage with development? In support of this, the cognitive approach argues that public policies are worldviews that introvert action by public and private actors. The patterns consist of exemplary models, belief systems and reporting systems. In this way, central importance is given to ideas, social representations, producing identities, values and the symbolic dimension of politics. Finally, the above play a key role in shaping the social constructions of reality. These latter, in turn, determine the framework and practice of legitimacy. In short, the current global framework for interpretation of the world is that which gives meaning to particular policies. In this way, the beliefs, values and collective representations define the framework of policy guidelines and options.

These processes do not come about naturally, without the mediation of hegemony conflict and discourses of power. Thus, according to the cognitive approach, "a public policy functions as a broad interpretation mechanism of the world, during which, gradually, a world view imposed, accepted and then recognized as 'true' by the majority of the actors, allowing them to understand the changes in their environment, giving them a set of

relationships and causal interpretations that offer them the ability to decode, to decipher the events with which they are confronted »(Muller, Surel 2002). This is a process of forming a dominant interpretation model of the world with special blend of elements of hegemony.

Indeed, the causes that allow this to happen are the ability to understand, interpret and decode data, and not a compulsion imposed from the outside. In this scheme, the State, citizens, public space, public action influence each other through an intense osmosis. Demands and tension between the real and desired require the State to bridge the divergence every time. The social demands facing the State become politicized (Chevalier, 1986). Nevertheless, how one frames the request and which communication code is used is crucial to the answers being sought. References which are formulated differently, such as the invocation of a slack culture or the search for an enlightened elite who will get us out of the crisis or the right of minority groups to cultural expression cannot but produce different agendas. From this perspective, the analysis of public policies no longer sees decisions as a result of rational processes. The State descends from the Hegelian sky of History's Reason, releases it from the iron regulatory framework of bureaucracy and converts it into a subject of political analysis, which leads to the assumption that no single public policy could be considered the only way.

Cultural policy in the narrow and broad sense and the culture of everyday life

The discussion above, which political science offers, greatly facilitates the formulation of cultural policy as a public policy, as it incorporates into mainstream policy analysis many of the viewpoints of cultural analysis. But what are the limits of public policy in such a rich and under constantly renewed environment? Do they identify the responsibilities of a ministry, as in what the government decides to do or not to do? Do they constitute a regulatory framework for action, defining public policy in accordance with the measures which constitute its visible side and which are regulatory, financial, about know-how? As Muller and Surel (2010) affirm, the limits of a policy cannot be considered entrenched, but rather constantly reviewed through the redefinition of the structure and limits of policy areas. However, with regard to cultural policy, as it has evolved in recent decades, I find it important to distinguish two main directions with very important consequences: cultural policy in the narrow sense and cultural policy in the broad sense.

Cultural policy in the narrow sense focusses on national identity, cultural heritage and the arts. It is the oldest classical approach of the Nation-State, which treats its obligations more towards civilization and less towards culture. Cultural policy in the narrow sense leaves out of its framework a series of broader contemporary cultural issues of public interest and, above all, the culture of everyday life. On the other hand, cultural policy in the broad sense has an enlarged scope, addressing contemporary cultural challenges. The transition from the first to the second in several countries is a big step. Every time it happens, the public cultural policy embraces new socio-cultural needs, in areas such as cultural rights, the new cultural phenomena, cultural practices, urban regeneration, sustainable regional cultural

development, etc. The symbolic added value that results is important. It allows the possibility to explore cultural resource options which are often invisible, undervalued or untapped, as well as applications making innovative ideas productive and efficient.

In this way, through cultural policy not only the infrastructures of a city but the access, the uses and functions, participation and different audiences acquire more weight. The concepts of diversity and combating discrimination, social inclusion, the dialogue that develops between the space, the exhibit or the path and the visitor, the viewer, the citizen acquires meaning. Thus we passed by the concept of enlightenment or the civilizing mission in participatory experiential processes, which has integrated cultural policy thanks to its dialogue with anthropology, historical studies, the postcolonial studies, psychology, etc.

Exploring the wider horizon is important because we live in an asymmetric world of cultural diversity that dramatically changed in recent decades -- changes related to the liquidation of the culture of everyday life, with new cultural practices and hybrid identities that emerge in the metropolises of the world, under the geopolitical changes of globalization (Sassen, 2007). And yet, changes made through cultural flow as a consequence of technological developments and globalization. Finally, there are the changes that led to great migration and refugee flows, which have impetuously invaded European history in recent decades.

The new form taken by cultural citizenship in the postwar world was an important landmark. The narrative of the equity of nations and the expanded rights of citizens (1945-'60) was a break with the previous narrative, based on social control and the patronage and protection of the arts (mid 19th to mid 20th century). The focus went from the paternalistic state and national prestige to the citizen and his cultural rights and the rights of minorities. From 1970 onwards it was the market and cultural industry that took action and dominated any cultural relationship (McGuigan, 1996). In all cases, not only the direction of cultural policy but also the framework and the conceptualization of civilization and culture itself changed.

Under the new conditions, cultural policy in the broad sense serves a field rich in scope, including socio-cultural materials, relationships, conflicts and antagonisms. It cannot ignore, for instance, the infringement of liberties of minority groups, ethnic, racial, gender and other discrimination, inequality of access and participation, authoritarian attitudes and mentalities cultivated in society, xenophobic and racist trends, emerging youth culture and experimental art -- in a word all those materials that feed smaller or larger, explicit or implicit, symbolic positions and conflicts within society.

This distinction between cultural policy in the narrow sense and cultural policy in the broad sense enables us to understand the culture of everyday life and its importance better. It also gives us the opportunity to understand the conditions of production and the resistance which is inherent in the culture of everyday life, as well as disparity mechanisms, conflict, discrimination -- and the conditions that favor their growth, and therefore also their mitigation -- through public policy. Bullying, hooliganism, xenophobia, racism, Anti-Semitism, indifference towards disability, lack of respect for the rights of children all require the intervention of a cultural policy in the broad sense. Concerning the culture of everyday life, a

reform based on the solid partnership of many different actors over a length of time is necessary to consolidate the most productive socio-cultural processes and social and cultural cohesion structures (Kiwani, 2007).

In my opinion, the real challenge for cultural policy is its connection with the wider cultural pursuits and ferment of flowing daily life. The challenge is the nascent conception of social and ideological conflicts taking place in public space and its transformation into intervention programs and actions: policy intervention in order to bring osmosis, converting tension into dialogue and achieving the redistribution of cultural resources with greater justice. In this context, it is important to discuss the targeting and the redistributive role of state cultural institutions (Fleury, 2014, Griswold, 2005).

The crisis

As said before, the social importance of a public policy is closely linked to the collective consciousness, the sense of belonging and the production of identities, which end up feeding a cognitive and normative template with the consensus of a significant number of actors. Each exemplary model or reference system feeds the conditions for the production of identities and cultivates for individuals and groups, visions and availabilities. Thus the particular representations and structures that enable reflection, social participation and new roles, whether it concerns social groups, subgroups or professional categories, are produced.

The times of crisis of the exemplar model, which define a public policy, coincide with the intense transformation of identities, which occurs under the new conditions. Identities also change through the activation of reform mechanisms. The process of manufacturing a cognitive model is not neutral, as has sometimes been seen. Instead, power is a process by which actors establish and promote their particular interests as universal. Meaning and power combine in such a way that he who articulates the meaning must be ready to assume leadership, confirming his hegemony (Muller, Surel 2002). This process has tension and dynamism, generated through collisions and interactions, which by taking discourse (production of meaning) and the assumption of power (construction of a field of forces) gradually leads to a more stable balance of power.

The crisis is a mirror in which the attitudes, mindsets, behaviors, fears, expectations and the deadlocks of a society are reflected. The representations generated by sudden momentum in crisis conditions, the power of the residual forms of culture struggling to be rescued at all costs, and the emerging forms all together generate an environment which is fluid, volatile and conducive to experimentation. The shackles of the traditional dominant ideology relax and society is radicalized, possessed by a strong desire for change. Thus an environment that has the materials of destruction as well of regeneration is formed -- an environment which is acting like a kiln of for both destruction and creativity.

This is why the crisis which weakens public policies, including cultural policy, at the same time favors the anthropological concept of culture, as it generates awareness and ideologies

around the broader issues of attitudes and mentalities (Sewell,1999). In search of the causes of the crisis pressure is produced for expanded interpretations and political regulation, requesting intervention by a cultural policy in the broad sense. As the cultural policy in narrow sense can no longer afford state subsidies, criticism in cultural policy occurs with more freedom, independence and selflessness by the actors. At the same time attention turns to the broader cultural environment and the resources that could be drawn from that. The lack of state subsidies leads cultural organizers and artists to think more of their audience, to look more systematically to its own needs and preferences, to support their own participation. In this case, the issue of identities, attitudes, behaviors, representations and diversity takes on particular importance. Attention to the public implies attention to all of the above, which define it (Wallon, 2013, Selwood, 2013).

For this reason, the public debate has been dominated in the recent years of crisis in my country by bundles of interpretations and representations. I will give some examples. One of the most powerful was the package depicting the crisis as a serious illness, searching for the socio-cultural pathologies of Greek society, along with the drugs, treatments and appropriate doctors. Several analysts fantasize a society on the operating table; others an incurable society suffering from chronic disease; others prefer psychiatric references to irrationality, madness and schizophrenia, while yet others already saw the society in helpless death throes. In these representations the reorganization of the public sector from the debt took the form of cleaning and health disinfection.

As a known politician and Commissioner of the country at the European Commission argued, "The Memorandum is the bitter medicine for recovery of the Greek economy from a serious illness that possesses it for 35 years. This is the guilt certificate of an entire political class exercising power either as a government or as opposition. The days of insouciance are gone" (M. Damanaki, Ta Nea, 2 Nov. 2010). The quote above refers also to a second set of representations, which is that of guilt. That package was the moral-punitive, that fantasized a sinful society, delinquent and corrupted, seeking a solution to the representations of guilt, discipline, punishment, hell and catharsis.

Another interesting package was identified with the fight in the jungle, where wild beasts (lenders and usurers as hyenas) attacked and threatened society, ready to drink its blood and devour it. In parallel, a set of interpretations developed with a strong nationalist character that invoked the value of racial distinction, rejected the European idea, considered the foreigners as invaders and the Greeks as conquered peoples, declared war and resistance to foreigners and referred to the ancient Greek glorious civilization, to the three hundred of Leonidas, to Antigone, Alexander the Great, etc. One aspect of this package of interpretations had a strong racist and xenophobic nature, considering that the sole source for the suffering were the foreign immigrants and refugees, and calling for pogroms against them.

The broad spectrum of representations generated by the crisis includes all these typologies encompassing different syndromes and stereotypes about the self and the Other. The composition which has been produced and which continues to be produced is particularly rich in depicting cultural obsessions of fear: apocalyptic and destructionist theories,

dystopian images, demonization, conspiracy theories, cultural trauma and shock, moral panic, historicist analogies, war between generations, cultural pessimism, the David and Goliath syndrome, constant invocation of the exemption, the light and darkness of conflict and so on.

On the other hand, the representations produced outside the country, related mainly to a set of work and ethical interpretations, are also quite numerous and interesting: the Greeks are lazy grasshoppers, late payers, corrupt, undisciplined, have higher wages and pensions in comparison to other Europeans, they all work in the public sector, are privileged, etc. Many of the above are included in statements of European politicians and public servants and in the headlines of the international press. So you see that in place of the concepts related to the financial crisis, such as debt, deficit, reforms, development, social cohesion, we find concepts that represent the crisis in terms of discriminations, cultural pessimism and moral conviction. It is the triumph of cultural representations over rational political and economic analysis.

This expansion of the field of representations is, in my opinion, one of the major changes that occurred during the years of economic crisis: a cultural flood with contradictory images and meanings that challenges the cultural policy. It is important to emphasize that the enormous impact of this ongoing economic and political crisis on cultural policy is not restricted to obvious cuts in the budgets of public artistic institutions of the country or the cessation of a large part of the grants to the theater and cinema, as well as to even merger and elimination services and arms-length bodies. Indeed, crisis has meant the demolition of the welfare state and the support of the arts, it has caused huge uncertainty and insecurity in the field where cultural policy in narrow sense played the leading role. The difficulty of state institutions to respond flexibly to new circumstances, to renew their repertoire, to talk with the problems that preoccupied the citizens shows. Above all, crisis has paved the way for the renegotiation and reconstruction process of identities under the pressure of a wave of new, powerful and contradictory representations. These representations showed how necessary it is to have a cultural policy in the broad sense, one that can interconnect representations with new socio-cultural strategies and aims of cultural policy.

The second element to consider is the emerging cultural actors and networks within civil society (Latour, 2005). The conditions of crisis and unemployment, combined with the high level of education and openness of young Greek scientists and artists on the average, led to an explosion of artistic production, expression and creativity. One can observe the flourishing of the arts and a significant cultural biodiversity in the country. The cinema gave us examples of a new generation of directors who have received significant international and European awards. The theater consistently exceeds two hundred new productions a year solely in Athens, while the music, dance, art exhibitions and performances offered by large and small artistic groups, as well as numerous artistic and cultural events accessible with low ticket prices. The book publishers have suffered recession but have opened a number of new small bookshops, while at the same time a great number of lectures, seminars of all kinds, public debates, street art, and even operatic events take place. Concerts and festivals, too, have adjusted the established artistic practices, reduced ticket prices and ensured their viability. Many of these performances and cultural shows are carried out thanks to the wave

of volunteerism which has developed, and there are, in a large part, politically driven works of art on every field. Finally, a great number of these cultural activities were diffused through social media and new media tools, which particularly favored their dissemination and reproduction. Photos and videos, alternative information, posters, street art, opinion articles and comments have shaped the main reference sources all these years, particularly for young people.

My third point concerns the new role of the big private nonprofit institutions which have appeared or become enlarged during the years of crisis. The emergence of the Titans from the chaos of the crisis could be the working title with regard to the intervention of the big private not-for-profit institutions. The two areas in which the institutions became involved in response to the crisis was charity and culture. It was expected that institutions would address the humanitarian crisis happening in the country because of the recession, the 1.5 million unemployed and the need to give food support to a large number of vulnerable families. More impressive, however, was their intervention in the field of culture. In these recent years we follow the activities of an Arts Center (Onassis Cultural Foundation), a complex being built for the New National Library of Greece and the New Opera (Stavros Niarchos Foundation) and other interventions by the Latsis Foundation (research grants), Neon (artistic interventions in the city), etc. To the above we must add the impressive presence of the cultural institutions of all the German political parties, added to the strong and steady presence of the Goethe Institute. They have developed a strong cultural diplomacy through lectures, conferences, publications, fellowships, meetings of intellectuals: e.g., the Conrad Adenauer (CDU), Friedrich Ebert (SPD), Heinrich Boll (Greens), and Rosa Luxemburg (Die Linke) foundations.

The weakening of cultural policy and, at the same time, the active initiatives of small artistic groups and the strong presence of large institutions posit public cultural policy against the need for new plans of regulation and intervention. Inventing a renewed statutory cultural condition is considered to be necessary. This requires profound changes in the internal administrative structure of the Ministry of Culture but, most importantly, a deployment plan, creative and extroverted with the broad participation of actors.

The canvas of such a plan must rediscover and put on the table the cultural resources of the country, to combine the so-called culture from above and from below, and the relationship of both to the past and present. A new composition, a new assemblage, a new paradigm is needed in these crisis conditions. Together with the dialogue that opens with this goal, is the need to involve public cultural administrators, private cultural and artistic producers, private institutions that have in recent years invested in production and cultural mediation, collectives and groups of consumers of culture, technological cultural hubs, just to indicate the most obvious stakeholders. Under the microscope of the evaluation must enter cultural resources -- material, human and symbolic, the systems of relationships and hierarchies, the discriminations, inequalities and exclusions, in short all the pluses and minuses of the collective symbolic capital available to the country. This evaluation can work, in parallel, as cultural literacy in reference to the developments of the outside world, which should not in any case be lost. For as the crisis absorbs us, we risk losing "the ability to read between the lines of the new, foreign cultural message, and judge it for ourselves, we would either have

missed the message or accepted it uncritically, that is given up control of our historic trajectory” (Stanley, 2003).

This historic trajectory of a society in crisis needs the initiative of the State for a new program, and the more pluralistic, participatory and democratic it is, the better chance of success it will have. The paradigm shift is taking place around us in society, in cultural practices, in the production and distribution of culture, in the symbolic economy of meanings, inequality and discrimination. Unless there is a coordinated plan, the changes risk defaulting on the most vulnerable groups, defaulting on the public interest, at the expense of social solidarity that keeps a society culturally vibrant.

The new governance rules applicable in times of crisis weaken the old cultural certainties with an exaggerated hope of renewal, but it is not certain that they would allow pluralism of actors and the unhindered development of networks. The window of opportunity opened by the crisis requires strength, resilience and commitment to biodiversity. The reorganization and redistribution of resources is also an important parameter. The State must protect the public interest through a plan that pushes the creative forces of society to express themselves, to take initiatives and to converge on strategic objectives. This is its new role and it is irreplaceable. None of the other actors have the power, competence and mandate to take on this political responsibility. The regulatory role, the role of the design guarantor, is adapted to new conditions where the State is forced to share decisions with ever more powerful private actors. It also has the role of the guarantor of compliance with the rules of the game in this period of conflicts and radical upheaval. A new composition, a new assemblage, a new paradigm must arise.

Finally, a few comments about this new paradigm of cultural policy in the broad sense together with its priorities. We have already posited the argument about the redistribution of resources, which means more decentralization, greater emphasis on community culture and the socio-cultural projects targeting the culture of everyday life. The lived culture is an irreplaceable element of cultural participation; it maximizes the role of groups that either did not have access or were literally excluded in the past. It is important that this happens along with the modernization of public cultural institutions. Linking the two strategic objectives could lead to convergence from below and from above. Thus, it could help the processes of representation and the perspectives of integration and reinforce the vision necessary to tackle the difficulties arising from the crisis, making representation and integration more productive. Cultural policy can, in this way, not only keep the state cultural organizations active and broaden their audience but make their usefulness regarding the axis of the dialogue with the whole of the society, on the problems and socio-cultural needs of society, more obvious. It is important that the State cultural and arts organizations converse with contemporary reality, to illuminate the relationship with the past in a new way, to find new partners in groups that are not the traditional audience and to have their efforts articulated by actors of Community culture.

The advancement of new discourses helps to avoid Manicheanism, simplistic logic and, consequently, the polarization from which a society in crisis often suffers, worsening the already difficult situation in which it finds itself. This path towards sustainable cultural

development could be extremely important. It takes into consideration democracy, which in a society in crisis is in danger. It evidences strong concern about the phenomena ranging from the anti-democratic and aggressive behaviors, and the nostalgia of an authoritarian past where discipline and order reigned. All these phenomena lead to the culture of xenophobia, racism and neo-Nazi ideologies. Perhaps the most important issue which a broadly defined cultural policy must address is precisely how such a new model could foster the democratic dimensions of culture, and inhibit the emergence of nationalism, racism and Nazism.

References

- Bennett O., 2004. The Torn Halves of Cultural Policy Research, *The International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 10:2.
- Bennett T., Frow, J., (eds.) 2008. *Cultural Analysis*, Sage.
- Bennett T., 2006. Intellectuals, Culture, Policy: The Technical, the Practical, and the Critical, *Cultural Analysis*, 5.
- Bennett T. 2001. Cultural Policy: Issues of Culture and Governance, *Culture, Society and Market*, Sigtuna.
- Bennett T., 2000. Intellectuals, culture, policy – the technical, the practical and the critical, *Theory, Culture and Society*, 17:6.
- Bennett T., 1998. *Culture: A Reformer's Science*, Sage.
- Bennett T., 1996. Putting Policy into Cultural Studies, in J. Storey (ed), *What is Cultural Studies? A Reader*, Arnold.
- Bennett T., 1992. Putting Policy into Cultural Studies, Grossberg L., Nelson C. and Treichler P., *Cultural Studies*, Routledge.
- Bennett T., 1992. Useful culture, *Cultural Studies* 6:3.
- Bratich J. Z., Packer J., McCarthy C. (eds), 2003. *Foucault, cultural studies and governmentality*, State University of New York Press.
- Chevalier J., 1986. *Science Administrative*, Presses Universitaires de France.
- Collins R., Murroni Chr., 1996. *New Media, New Policies. Media and Communications Strategies for the Future*, Polity Press.
- Cunningham S., 1993. Cultural Studies from the Point of View of Cultural Policy, in Turner, G., (ed.), *Nation, Culture, Text – Australian Cultural and Media Studies*, Routledge.
- Dubois V., 1999. *La politique culturelle*, Belin.

- Fleury L., 2014. *Sociology of Culture and Cultural Practices*, Lexington Books
- Ferlie E., Lynn L., Pollitt Chr. (eds.) 2005. *Public Management*, Oxford University Press.
- Foucault M., 2003. *Society must be defended. Lectures at the College de France, 1975-76*, Picador.
- Gramsci A., 1975. *Quaderni del carcere*, Einaudi.
- Griswold W., 2005. The sociology of culture in Calhoun Cr., Rojek Chr., Turner Br., *Handbook of Sociology*, Sage.
- Grossberg L., Nelson C. and Treichler P., *Cultural Studies*, London, Routledge, 1992.
- Gray C., 2010. Analysing Cultural Policy: incorrigibly plural or ontologically incompatible?, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*.
- Gray C., 2014. *Ambiguity and Cultural Policy* (paper to the 8th International Conference on Cultural Policy Research, Hildesheim)
- Habermas J., 1992. Further Reflections on the Public Sphere in *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, Calhoun Cr. (ed.) , MIT Press.
- Habermas J., 1989. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere – An inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, Polity press.
- Held D., Koenig-Archibugi M., (eds.) 2003. *Taming globalization: frontiers of governance*, Polity Press.
- Hill M., 2009. *The public policy process*, Pearson.
- Hudson J., Lowe St., 2004. *Understanding the policy process. Analysing welfare policy and practice*, Policy Press.
- Judt T., *Postwar, A History of Europe Since 1945*, N. York, Penguin, 2005
- Kennett P. (ed.) 2008. *Governance, globalization and public policy*, Edward Elgar.
- Kiwan N., 2007. When the cultural and the social meet: a critical perspective on socially embedded cultural policy in France”, *The International Journal of cultural Policy*, 13:2.
- Kooniman J. (ed.) 1993. *Modern Governance: New Government-Society Interactions*, Sage.
- Klijn E.-H., 2008. Governance and Governance Networks in Europe: An Assessment of Ten Years of Research on the Theme, *Public Management Review*, 10.
- Latour Br., 2005. *Reassembling the social*, Oxford University Press.
- Landes J. B., 1988. *Women and the Public Sphere in the Age of the French Revolution*, Cornell University Press.
- Lewis J., Miller T., (eds.) 2003. *Critical Cultural Policy Studies*, Blackwell.

- McGuigan J. 2001. Three Discourses of Cultural Policy, in Stevenson N, *Culture and Citizenship*, Sage.
- McGuigan, J., 1996. *Culture and the Public Sphere*, Routledge.
- McGuigan J., 2004. *Rethinking Cultural Policy*, Open University Press.
- March J. G., Olsen J. P., 1995. Institutional Perspectives, in the book by the same authors *Democratic Governance*, The Free Press.
- Miller T., Judice G., 2002. *Cultural policy*, Sage.
- Moran M., Rein M., Goodin R., 2008. *Public policy*, Oxford University Press.
- Muller P., Surel Y., 2002. *L'Analyse des politiques publiques*, Montchrestien.
- Mulcahy K., 2006. *Cultural Policy: Definitions and Theoretical Approaches*, Wien, ICCPR
- North D., 1990. *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*, Cambridge University Press.
- Osborne S. P. (ed.), 2010. *The new public governance*, Routledge.
- Poirrier Ph. (ed.), 2011. *Pour une histoire des politiques culturelles dans le monde, 1945-2011*, La documentation Française.
- Pollitt Chr., Bouckaert, G., 2004. *Public Management Reform*, Oxford University Press.
- Redaelli E., Haines A., 2014. Framing Cultural Resource Policies in Comprehensive Plans: A Neo-Institutional Analysis, *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, Sage.
- Riley Denise. 1988. *Am I That Name? Feminism and the Category of "Women" in History*, Macmillan.
- Rodhes R. A. W., 1996. The New Governance: Governing without Government, *Political Studies*.
- Saez G., 1985. "Les politiques de la culture" in Grawitz M. and Leca J., *Traite de Science Politique*, PUF.
- Sassen S., 2007. *A Sociology of Globalization*, Norton.
- Sewell W., 1999. The Concept(s) of Culture, in Bonnell V., Hunt L., *Beyond the Cultural Turn*, University of California Press.
- Selwood S., 2013. Shaping cultural policy in a time of crisis, Onassis Cultural Centre (<http://www.sgt.gr/players/politistikipolitiki/en/>).
- Stanley D., 2003. The three faces of culture: Why culture is a strategic good requiring government policy attention, in C. Andrew (ed), *Accounting for Culture: Thinking through Cultural Citizenship*, The University of Ottawa Press.

Urfalino Ph., 1996. *L' invention de la politique culturelle*, La Documentation française.

Wallon E., 2013. Shaping cultural policy in a time of crisis, Onassis Cultural Centre (<http://www.sgt.gr/players/politistikipolitiki/en/>)

Wildavsky A., 1994. *Speaking Truth to Power. The Art and Craft of Policy Analysis*, Little Brown.

Zorba M., 2011. La politique culturelle de la Grèce. La culture comme objet de politique publique, in Poirrier Ph. (ed.), *Pour une histoire des politiques culturelles dans le monde, 1945-2011*, La documentation Française.

Zorba M., 2013a. Cultural policy in Greece under the conditions of crisis: the paradigm shift, Panteion university (<http://issuu.com/yannisskarpelos/docs/praktika>).

Zorba M., 2013b. Shaping cultural policy in a time of crisis, Onassis Cultural Centre (<http://www.sgt.gr/players/politistikipolitiki/en/>).

Zorba M., 2009. Conceptualizing Greek Cultural Policy. The non-democratization of public culture, *International Journal of Cultural Policy Research*, 15:3.