

# **Policies for Culture**

## **Workshop dossier**

**Bistritsa, Bulgaria**  
18-20 January 2001

**NOTHING IN THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE REPRODUCED WITHOUT THE PRIOR  
APPROVAL OF THE ECF IN AMSTERDAM**

**This workshop has been made possible by funding and in kind contributions from  
the European Cultural Foundation  
the Arts and Culture Network Programme of the Soros Foundation Network  
the Ministry of Culture of Bulgaria**

**And with the kind help of the Euro-Bulgarian Cultural Centre in Sofia**

# Contents

## **Part 1: The Workshop in Bulgaria**

- 1.1 Agenda
- 1.2 List of Participants
- 1.3 Points of departure

## **Part 2: The Project ‘Policies for Culture’**

- 2.1 The Bulgarian Steering Committee

## **Part 3: Bulgarian Cultural Policy**

- 3.1 Cultural Policy in Bulgaria (*Cultural Policies in Europe: A Compendium of Basic Facts and Trends*, ERICarts and Council of Europe)\*
- 3.2 Legislative acts\*  
The Protection and Development of Culture Act

## **Part 4: Decentralisation**

- 4.1 Decentralisation. Towards a common vocabulary for issues of decentralisation - by Oana Radu, Romania
- 4.2 Report of the seminar “Administration in Culture in the Decentralised Environment”, MOSAIC workshop held in Zagreb, October 2000

## **Part 5: “Notes” on aspects of cultural policy-making responsibilities in the countries represented at the workshop**

## **Part 6: Case studies**

- The texts of all case studies and presentations at the workshop.
- 6.1 The Process of Development of the Bulgarian Cultural Policy – By Rossitza Arkova, Bulgaria
  - 6.2 The ‘third’ sector: Different roles which cultural organisations, administrators and artists can play in the policy development process - by Christopher Gordon, UK
  - 6.3 Decentralization Processes in Bulgaria – by Dr Raina Cherneva, Bulgaria
  - 6.4 Decentralization of Culture in Plovdiv - by Vessela Ilieva, Bulgaria
  - 6.5 Cultural Policy on Local (municipal) Level - by Iliana Shenevska, Bulgaria
  - 6.6 New Funding Initiatives and Partnerships - by Geoffrey Brown, UK

### **Sources**

Sources used to compile the material in this dossier include:

- 1) *Cultural Policy in Bulgaria: European Programme of National Cultural Policy Reviews*, Council for Cultural Co-operation, Council of Europe, Strasbourg 1999
- 2) *Cultural Policies in Europe: A Compendium of Basic Facts and Trends*, ERICarts and Council of Europe, Bonn 2000

---

\* All the documents included in this dossier are to be considered as relevant to the time the workshop took place (2001).

# **Part 1: The Workshop**

## 1.1 Workshop agenda

### Introductory Remark

At the Bulgarian Steering Committee Meeting for the Programme *Policies for Culture* that was held in Sofia on 2 October 2000, the topic of decentralisation was agreed upon for the Bulgarian workshop.

Since Bulgaria is hosting this workshop, the Bulgarian context has been taken as a point of departure for structuring the agenda. However, the issue of decentralisation is an important and topical one in all the countries participating in this workshop and we have attempted to keep the subjects under discussion as general as possible, specific to no one country in particular.

The information/statements presented in the boxes for each session have been taken from the Council of Europe's *Cultural Policy Report of a European Panel of Examiners*, written by Charles Landry and published in 1998, as well as from the ERICarts *Compendium of Cultural Policies in Europe*. These are intended to serve as a point of departure. The presentations on each case study by experts and practitioners from the field will provide information and reflection on the most up to date developments in the field of decentralisation in Bulgaria and elsewhere in Europe.

For each case study / topic we have provided some focus points, to stimulate discussion. These are printed in italics. Please feel free to add to these in the working groups and to present examples from your own country as comparative material and food for thought.

---

The workshop has been divided over 3 days.

*Day 1* is intended primarily for the third sector, but policy-makers and (local) government officials are welcome to attend.

*Days 2 & 3* are dedicated to the topic of decentralisation, treating:

- Partnership between the different central and local bodies in making and implementing cultural policy;
- Working together locally to stimulate cultural activity in the regions
- Decentralised funding and local investment in culture
- Sharing financial responsibility
- New funding initiatives and new partnerships
- The role of the media in the cultural policy-making process

Days 2 & 3 are intended for all participants.

Thursday 18 January, 2001

**Session 1: Developing cultural policy in partnership**

*(intended primarily for the third sector: cultural administrators, organisations, professionals and artists)*

Plenary

Chair:

**Dr R.Stephan, Secretary General, European Cultural Foundation\***

14.30 – 14.45

**Introduction**

◇ *Word of Welcome:* Mrs Emma Moskova, Minister of Culture [Bulgaria]\*

14.45 – 15.30

**Presentation of the programme ‘Policies for Culture’**

◇ *Presentations:* Mrs O.Chenal, Mrs C.Suteu, Mrs S. Hallenga, Mrs H.Weeda\*

**The importance of partnership in cultural policy-making in the European context**

Chair:

**Mrs C.Suteu, Director ECUME [France]\***

15.30 – 16.30

**The Bulgarian policy development process**

Cultural Policy is executed by a Council of Ministers through the Ministry of Culture. A major vehicle to develop and implement cultural policy is a series of specialist national centres. At the local level there is self-determination.

◇ *Presentation:* Mrs R.Arkova, Department of Analysis, Ministry of Culture [Bulgaria]\*

◇ *Short comment:* Prof. D.Dimov, President of the Apollonia Art Foundation, Deputy National Assembly (Euroleft Party) [Bulgaria]\*

Discussion

➤ **Focus for discussion:**

- **How and where is policy made?**
- **At what points can cultural organisations influence and enter into the policy-making process and influence or comment on legislative and policy drafts?**
- **Lobbying.**
- **Constructive dialogue between policy makers and the third sector.**

16.30 – 16.45

Coffee break

16.45 – 17.45

**The different roles that cultural organisations, administrators and professionals can play in the policy development process, both centrally and locally**

In many countries, the policy-making process has been largely internal, concerning only the departmental civil servants and the politicians. Elsewhere, there have been successful attempts to consult the public on a regular basis about policy issues. Current practice in most democratic states, lies somewhere between informing, consultation and active participation.

- ◇ *Presentation:* Mr C.Gordon, Executive Director, Regional Arts Board [UK]\*
- ◇ *Short comment:* Mr L.Boyadjiev, Artist [Bulgaria]\*

Discussion

➤ *Focus for discussion:*

- **What are the structures and mechanisms to make one's professional voice heard?**
- **Arts councils. Councils for culture. Associations of artists.**
- **Is the third sector organised in Bulgaria?**
- **How can this be compared with other countries of the region?**

17.45 – 18.15 Conclusions and formulation of recommendations of day 1

19.00 Dinner

### **Friday 19 January, 2001**

08.30 Departure of bus to Bistritsa from Council of Minister's Hotel, Sofia

### *Session 2: The Decentralisation process. Implications and Opportunities*

#### **Plenary**

#### **Chair:**

**Mr D.Dimov, Deputy of the National Assembly [Bulgaria]\***

#### **Co-chair:**

**Mrs O.Chenal, Director, European Cultural Foundation [NL]\***

09.30 – 10.00 *Welcome:* ◇ Mrs Rajna Gavrilova, Deputy Minister of Culture [Bulgaria]  
 ◇ Mr R.Stephan, Secretary General, ECF\*

◇ *Short presentation of the programme:* The Consortium\*

◇ *Conclusions of day 1:* Mrs T.Puig, Rapporteur [Spain]\*

10.00 – 10.15 ◇ *Presentation:* Mr R.Weber, Director of Culture and Cultural and Natural Heritage, Council of Europe\*

10.15 – 11.00 **Introduction to Decentralisation in the Cultural sector in Bulgaria**

The main principles of Bulgarian cultural policy have been described as de-étatisation, decentralisation and democracy, within a context of efficient, effective and economic management...

◇ *Presentation:* Mrs R.Cherneva, Head of the Department for Analysis, Ministry of Culture [Bulgaria]\*

◇ *Short comment:* Mr S.Raichevski, Deputy of the National Assembly (SDS Party) [Bulgaria]  
 Mr Guy Saez, Director CERET [France]\*

Discussion

➤ *Focus for discussion:*

- *What have been the latest developments in decentralisation in Bulgaria?*

- *The Protection and Development of Culture Act: What has been the impact of decentralisation on the cultural sector?*
- *How far has the decentralisation process developed?*
- *What have been / are the major obstacles?*
- *How does this compare with other countries?*

11.00 – 11.30 Coffee break

11.30 **Introductory presentations of case studies**

Two case studies will be presented on the topic of decentralisation. Each case study will be introduced by a guest speaker.

11.30 – 12.00 **Case study 1. Partnership and shared financial responsibility between national (central), regional and local authorities**

*Please note that there will be enough time (2 hours) for questions and discussion on this topic in the working groups.*

Today the State's main partners in cultural policy implementation are the municipal departments of culture...  
 The Ministry has adopted mixed state-municipal financing as a contemporary form of financing culture. The signing of case-by-case agreements with municipalities in the form of 'joint subsidies' makes it possible to take into account the specificity of each institution, the available resources and the geographic and demographic peculiarities of the respective region, the purpose being to find the optimum proportion of the financial contributions given by the State and the municipalities.

◇ *Presentation:* Mrs V.Ilieva, Head of the Musical Activities Department, Plovdiv municipality [Bulgaria]\*

◇ *Comment:* Mr R.Weber, Director of Culture and Cultural and Natural Heritage, Council of Europe\*

➤ *Focus for the working group:*

- *How is the balance guaranteed between local and central action to secure both local interest and national policy?*
- *Instruments for governance from the centre: legislative, contractual, financial, administrative...*
- *What is the role of the intermediate level (planning regions)?*
- *What is the role of the media as a communication tool in ensuring transparency?*
- *Joint financing (state/municipal for example) - how is this organised?*
- *Who is responsible for deciding how public monies are to be allocated?*
- *What is the nature of the funding relationship between agents distributing money and the recipients of funding?*

12.00 – 12.30 **Case study 2. Cultural Policy at the local (municipal) level**

*Please note that there will be enough time (2 hours) for questions and discussion on this topic in the working groups.*

The lower levels of cultural competence correspond to the constitutional division of the Bulgaria into units of territorial administration: 28 districts and 4,217 municipalities. The main unit of territorial administration is the municipality (obshtina), which is legally independent, has property rights and freedom of association. At the municipal level, cultural competence is exercised in the form of local self-government, financial included and distributed among the respective municipal bodies.

The cultural competence of the intermediate district is yet to be clarified.

Any unit of territorial administration may apply for support or enter a cultural competition organised by central government.

◇ *Presentation:* Mrs I.Shenevska, Head of the Culture Department of Sevlievo Municipality [Bulgaria]\*

◇ *Comment:* Mrs V.Čopič, Head of the Cultural Policy Department, Ministry of Culture [Slovenia]\*

➤ *Focus for the working group:*

→ *Who decides about cultural matters at the local level?*

→ *Participation of local actors in decision making.*

→ *What is the potential role of the chitalishte to become multi-purpose arts and education centres?*

→ *The importance of arts and culture management.*

→ *How can culture be given a prominent place in the media?*

→ *The responsibility of cultural critics in providing the public with competent selection criteria in the supply of cultural products.*

12.30 – 14.00

Lunch

### **Working groups**

14.00 – 16.00

#### **Group 1 – case study 1**

◇ *Moderator:* Mrs D.Mucica, Secretary General Ministry of Culture [Romania]\*

◇ *Co-moderator:* Mr Y.Koynakov, Director Euro-Bul. Cultural Centre [Bulgaria]

◇ *Comment:* Mr S.Dragojevic, Fac. of Pol. Science [Croatia]\*

◇ *Rapporteur:* Mrs V.Ilieva [Bulgaria]

#### **Group 2 – case study 2**

◇ *Moderator:* Mr J.Pascual I Ruiz, Institute of Culture Barcelona [Spain]\*

◇ *Co-moderator:* Mrs E.Poptodorova, Deputy (Euroleft Party) [Bulgaria]\*

◇ *Comment:* Mrs A. Ginina, Ministry of Culture [Bulgaria]\*

◇ *Rapporteur:* Mrs I.Shenevska [Bulgaria]\*

***Each working group should try to formulate concrete conclusions and recommendations to bring to plenary.***



16.00 – 16.30 Coffee break

**Plenary**

**Chair:**

**Mrs N.Balic, Assistant Minister of Culture [Croatia]**

**Co-chair:**

**Kalina Wagenstein, Director Pro Helvetia [Bulgaria]**

16.30 – 17.30 Feedback from the groups and discussion of recommendations  
Conclusions of day 2.

17.30 Announcements

18.00 Cocktail / buffet

Transport to Sofia

**Saturday 20 January, 2001**

08.30 Departure of bus to Bistritsa from Council of Minister's Hotel, Sofia

**Session 3: Decentralised funding of culture and local investment in culture**

**Plenary**

**Chair:**

**Mrs D.Gavrilova, Director, The Red House [Bulgaria]\***

**Co-chair:**

**Mrs S.Hallenga, Programme Co-ordinator, EWPPP\***

09.30 **Introductory presentations of case studies**

Two case studies will be presented on the topic of decentralised funding of culture. Each case study will be introduced in 15 minutes by a guest speaker.

09.30 – 10.00 **Case study 3. Working together to stimulate cultural activity**

*Please note that there will be enough time (2 hours) for questions and discussion on this topic in the working groups.*

Municipalities are beginning to set up associations to lobby and pursue joint interests. In particular, these include tourism development and marketing initiatives of direct relevance to cultural tourism.

◇ *Presentation:* Mr. M.Vogt, Director of the Institut für Kulturelle Infrastruktur, Sachsen [Germany]\*

◇ *Comment:* Mr I.Atanassov, Deputy of the Bulgarian National Assembly (BSP Party) [Bulgaria]

➤ *Focus for the working group:*

- *Can municipalities source their potential in culture to make their territorial units attractive for tourism and business and thus contribute to greater economic and social development?*
- *Spontaneous grass-roots initiatives.*
- *Do the local/regional authorities have a cultural policy in place, is there a concrete planning of cultural activities to attract investment?*
- *EU regional development funds.*

10.00 – 10.30

#### **Case study 4. New funding initiatives and new partnerships**

*Please note that there will be enough time (2 hours) for questions and discussion on this topic in the working groups.*

The current arts funding system is based on the principal of competition for distribution of state grants.

- ◇ *Presentation 1:* Mr C.Smithuijsen, Director Boekman Foundation [NL]\*
- ◇ *Presentation 2:* Mr G.Brown, Director EUCLID [UK]\*

#### ➤ *Focus for the working group:*

- *Grant funding is the most common form of state funding, but what about programme funding, competition funding, loans, voucher funding, tax incentives, endowment funds and cross subsidisation?*
- *New partnerships – beyond the state!*
- *Local investment in culture*
- *Attracting funding from the business sector.*

10.30 – 11.00

Coffee break

#### **Working groups**

11.00 – 13.00

#### **Group 1 – case study 3 (room ...)**

- ◇ *Moderator:* Mr P.Schreiber, Senior Advisory, Cultural Policy Directorate, Ministry of Education, Culture and Science [NL]\*
- ◇ *Co-moderator:* Mrs D.Danailova, Ministry of Culture [Bulgaria]
- ◇ *Comment:* Mr: Peter Inkei [Hungary]
- ◇ *Rapporteur:* Mr M.Vogt [Germany]\*

#### **Group 2 – case study 4 (room ...)**

- ◇ *Moderator:* Mr O.Minchev, Iris [Bulgaria]\*
- ◇ *Co-moderator:* Mrs R.Mitchell, Head of Research Dep., Arts Council [Finland]
- ◇ *Comment:* Mr. Ljudmil Beshkov (SDS Party) [Bulgaria]
- ◇ *Rapporteur:* Mr C.Smithuijsen [NL]\* / Mr G.Brown [UK]\*

***Each working group should try to formulate concrete conclusions and recommendations***

13.00 – 14.30 Lunch

**Plenary**

**Chair:**

**Mrs O.Chenal, Director of Programmes and Grants, ECF\***

**Co-chair:**

**Mrs H.Weeda, Programme officer, ECF\***

14.30 – 15.30 Feedback from the groups and discussion of recommendations  
Conclusions of day 3

15.30 – 16.00 Rapporteur's report  
Closing remarks –  
◊ Mrs Maria Russinova, Secretary General [Bulgaria]\*  
◊ The Consortium - follow up

16.00 Departure buses to Sofia

19.00 Dinner in Boyana

---

Sunday 21 July, 2001

09.00 Cultural trip Sofia and Boyana

Departure foreign participants

## 1.2 List of Participants

### Bulgaria

ALEXANDROVA, Alena (Mrs)

Programme Co-ordinator, Regional and International Research Institute

ALEXIEV, Stoyan (Mr)

Actor, Varna Dramatic Theatre "Stoyan Bachvarov"

ANDONOVA, Nevena (Mrs)

Director, Culture and Education Department, Bulgarian National Television

ARKOVA, Rossitza (Mrs)

Senior expert, Department of Analysis, Ministry of Culture

ATANASSOV, Ivo (Mr)

Deputy (BSP Party), Bulgarian National Assembly, Committee on Culture and Media

ATANASSOVA, Marianna (Mrs)

Secretary, Public relations expert, Regional Council of Cultural, Pazardjik District

BALINOVA, Silvia (Mrs)

President, Chitalishte "Zora", Dupnitsa

BESHKOV, Ludmil (Mr)

Deputy (SDS Party), Bulgarian National Assembly, Committee on Culture and Media

BOUBNOVA, Iaroslava (Mrs)

Director (critic, curator, visual arts), Institute of Contemporary Art

BOYADJIEV, Lachezar (Mr)

Artist

CHERNEVA, Raina (Mrs)

Head of Department for Analysis, Ministry of Culture

CHIPEV, Igor (Mr)

Director, National Book Centre

CHOBANOVA, Nadejda (Mrs)

Journalist, New Television "Time for Culture" Programme

DANAILOV, Boris (Mr)

Director, National Centre for Museums, Heritage and Fine Arts

DANAILOVA, Deiana (Mrs)

Director of International Cultural Policy Department, Ministry of Culture

DEBOCHICHKI, Valentin (Mr)

Director, Regional Museum, Kjustendil

DELEVA, Milena (Mrs)

Project coordinator, Soros Centre for the Arts – Sofia

DIMITROVA, Galia (Mrs)

Project manager, InterSpace Media Art Center

DIMOV, Dimo (Mr)

Deputy (Euroleft Party), Vice chairman of the Committee on Culture and Media, Bulgarian National Assembly; President of Apollonia Art Foundation

DONOVA, Margarita (Mrs)

Cultural expert, Sofia Municipality

FILIPOVA, Krasimira (Mrs)

Director, National Centre for Theatre

FILKOVA, Fedja (Mrs)

Chief Advisor of Foreign Affairs, Presidency of Bulgaria

GAVRILOVA, Dessy (Mrs)

Director, The Red House - Centre for Culture and Debate

GAVRILOVA, Raina (Mrs)

Deputy Minister of Culture

GEORGIEV, Momchil (Mr)

Director, National Centre of Music and Dance

GEORGIEVA, Ruska (Mrs)

General Secretary, Chitalishte "Elin Pelin", Elin Pelin

GININA, Antoinetta (Mrs)

Head, Regional Cultural Policy Department, Ministry of Culture

ILIEVA, Dora (Mrs)

General Secretary, Chitalishte "Rodina", Stara Zagora

ILIEVA, Pavlina (Mrs)

President, International Association "Etcetera"

ILIEVA, Vessela (Mrs)

Head of Musicial Activities Department of Plovdiv Municipality

IOSSIFOVA, Tsvetelina (Mrs)

Senior coordinator, Soros Centre for the Arts – Sofia

JONKOVA, Elena (Mrs)

General Secretary, Chitalishte "Suglasie", Granitovo, Elhovo District

KALINOVA, Jechka (Mrs)

Director, Ljuben Karavelov Library, Rousse

KALUDOVA-LAPACHKA, Siika (Mrs)

Music Management Agency, Varna

KARAVASILEV, Ljudmil (Mr)

Manager PR Department, Union Bulgarian Bank

KOYNAKOV, Yavor (Mr)

Director, Euro-Bulgarian Cultural Centre

KRASTEV, Krastyo (Mr)

Director, Rhodope Dramatic Theatre, Smolyen

KRUSTEV, Miroslav (Mr)

Director, Vidin Philharmonic Orchestra

LICHEVA, Milena (Mrs)

Head of Culture and Education Department of Svishtov Municipality

MESTAN, Lufti (Mr)

Deputy (ONS Party), Bulgarian National Assembly, Committee on Culture and Mass Media, Committee of Education and Science

MILADINOV, Petar (Mr)

Senior Expert; Former expert PHARE PMU for Culture, Regional Cultural Policy Department, Ministry of Culture

MILEV, Rossen (Mr)

President, Balkanmedia Association

MILKOVA, Emilia (Mrs)

Director, Regional Library "Pencho Slaveykov", Varna

MISIRKOV, Boris (Mr)

Photographer, curator, Bulgarian Photographers' Association (KEVA)

MOSKOVA, Emma (Mrs)

Minister of Culture

NESTOROV, Nestor (Mr)

President, Association of Bulgarian Chitalishta

NIAGOLOVA, Maya (Mrs)

Director, National Film Centre

OSMAN, Remzi (Mr)

Deputy (DPS Party), National Assembly of Bulgaria, Committee on Local Self-Government, Regional Policy and Public Works

PETKOV, Sasho (Mr)

Chief Artistic Director, Youth Experimental Theatre A'PART, Plovdiv

PETKOV, Pavel (Mr)

President St.Joan Predtecha Foundation; Director Historical Museum, Kardjali

PETKOVA, Stefka (Mrs)

Expert, Culture, Education and Ethnical Affairs Department, Local Administration, Targovishte

POPOVA, Diana (Mrs)

Journalist, Culture Newspaper

POPTODOROVA, Elena (Mrs)

Deputy (Euroleft Party), Bulgarian National Assembly, Committee on European Integration

RADUSHEV, Ivan (Mr)

Local administration, Razgrad

RAICHEVSKI, Stoyan (Mr)

Deputy (SDS), Chairman of the Culture and Media Committee, Bulgarian National Assembly

ROUSSINOVA, Maria (Mrs)

Secretary General of Ministry of Culture

SACHEV, Evgeni (Mr)

Director, Architectural-ethnographic Complex "Old Dobritch"

SHENEVSKA, Iliana (Mrs)

Head of the Culture Department of Sevlievo municipality

SIMOV, Valentin (Mr)

Deputy (Independent), National Assembly of Bulgaria, Committee on Local Self-Government, Regional Policy and Public Works

STANILOV, Vassil (Mr)

Deputy (SDS Party), National Assembly of Bulgaria, Committee on Culture and Media

STOYCHEV, Valentin (Mr)

Director 199 Theatre

TSONEVA, Plamena (Mrs)  
Production manager / Expert (musicologist), Varna Summer International Music  
Festival / Culture Department of Varna Municipality

VULCHEV, Georgi (Mr)  
Senior Expert , Local Cultural Department, Stara Zagora

VLASHKI, Mladen (Mr)  
Deputy (SDS Party), Bulgarian National Assembly, Committee on Culture and  
Media

VULKOVSKI, Juri (Mr)  
Researcher, academic

WAGENSTEIN, Kalina (Mrs)  
Director of the Office, Pro-Helvetia (Arts Council of Switzerland)

### **Croatia**

BALIĆ, Naima (Mrs)  
Assistant Minister of Culture, Ministry of Culture

DRAGOJEVIC, Sanjin (Mrs)  
Lecturer, Faculty of Political Science, Zagreb

SIMONIĆ, Ante (Mr)  
Deputy (HSS Party: Croatian Peasant Party), Chairman of the Committee on  
Education, Science and Culture, Parliament of Croatia

### **Finland**

MITCHELL, Ritva (Mrs)  
Head of Research Department, Arts Council of Finland

### **France**

ROCHE, François (Mr)  
Secretary General, European College for Cultural Cooperation (Florence)

SAEZ, Guy (Mr)  
Director, Institut d'Etudes Politiques de Grenoble (CERAT-IEP)



## **Germany**

VOGT, Matthias (Mr)  
Director, Institut für Kulturelle Infrastruktur Sachsen

## **Hungary**

INKEI, Péter (Mr)  
Director, Regional Observatory on Financing Culture in East-Central Europe (The Budapest Observatory)

RONAI, Ivan (Mr)  
Head of Department, Ministry of Cultural Heritage

## **Macedonia**

SMILEVSKI, Blasko (Mr)  
Secretary International, Music Information Centre For Youth

## **Moldova**

CHEIANU, Constantin (Mr)  
Head of Performing Arts and Music Department, Ministry of Culture

MIRON, Victoria (Mrs)  
Co-ordinator Arts and Culture Programme, Soros Foundation

REABCINSCHI, Veceaslav (Mr)  
Manager, E.Ionescu Theatre; Director, New Alternative Association

## **Netherlands**

SCHREIBER, Peter (Mr)  
Senior Advisory, Cultural Policy Directorate,  
Ministry of Education, Culture and Science of the Netherlands

SMITHUIJSEN, Cas (Mr)  
Director, Boekman Foundation

## **Romania**

MARTON, Árpád (Mr)  
Deputy, Chamber of Deputies of Romania (.. Party)

MUCICA, Delia (Mrs)  
Secretary General, Ministry of Culture

NITULESCU, Virgil Stefan (Mr)  
Parliamentary Expert, Committee on Culture, Arts and Mass Media, Chamber of  
Deputies of Romania

### **Slovenia**

COPIC, Vesna (Mrs)  
Head of Cultural Policy Department, Ministry of Culture

### **Spain**

PASCUAL I RUIZ, Jordi (Mr)  
Co-ordinator of the strategic plan on culture of Barcelona, Institute of Culture of  
Barcelona

PUIG-BORRAS, Tina (Mrs)  
Rapporteur "Policies for Culture"

### **United Kingdom**

BROWN, Geoffrey (Mr)  
Director, EUCLID

GORDON, Christopher (Mr)  
Chief executive, English Regional Arts Boards

### **Yugoslavia**

ANDJELKOVIC, Branka (Mrs)  
President of the CCAb Board, Centre for Contemporary Arts

### **The Consortium of Policies for Culture**

ANDREEVA, Tsveta (Mrs)  
Local project co-ordinator "Policies for Culture"

CHENAL, Odile (Mrs)  
Director of Grants and Programmes, European Cultural Foundation

HALLENGA, Saskia (Mrs)  
Project co-ordinator, East-West Parliamentary Practice Project

RADU, Oana (Mrs)  
Local project coordinator, Policies for Culture

SUTEU, Corina (Mrs)  
Director ECUME; President ECUMEST

STEPHAN, Rüdiger (Mr)  
Secretary General , European Cultural Foundation

WEEDA, Hanneloes (Mrs)  
Programme Officer, European Cultural Foundation

### **Council of Europe**

MAKELA, Laura (Mrs)  
Head of MOSAIC Project, Cultural Policy and Action Department, Council of Europe

WEBER, Raymond (Mr)  
Director of Culture and Cultural Heritage, Council of Europe

## **1.3 Points of Departure**

### **Contents**

- I. Towards Policy Through Partnership
- II. Legislation or Policy?
- III. The Mechanisms of Partnership
- IV. The Ministry of Culture
- V. Non-Governmental and Governmental Advisory and Funding Bodies and the Third Sector
- VI. The Parliament

# I Towards Policy Through Partnership

*What is meant by the term “policy”?*

The word ‘policy’ implies the steering mechanisms – the rules, measures and means that need to be in place to achieve the goals in cultural development. Policy starts with political (+ public) debate and leads to the setting of objectives. From these objectives a strategy is derived. The strategy highlights priorities, which are implemented by structures, procedures, rules and laws.

The processes of making policies for culture in Europe’s democracies differ from country to country, depending on such factors as the country’s individual history and the nature of its government. The countries to be reviewed in the framework of this programme each have their very own manner of answering to the practice of cultural policy planning. Every government addresses the dialogue and partnership between the executive, parliament and the third sector, or the involvement of the third sector in the establishment of new policy initiatives, in quite a unique way.

The applicability of the existing policy-making methodologies must be carefully assessed in the local contexts of each South-Eastern European country participating in the programme before these methodologies can be used as examples from which these countries can draw. It is ultimately up to the decision-makers and the artistic communities in South-Eastern Europe themselves to find solutions that are appropriate to their needs. This will depend on the political, economic and social context. Nevertheless, there are common principles of partnership (between the executive, the legislature and the third sector) that underlie the way cultural policies are made in most European countries, which, although they may be implemented in distinctly different ways, remain similar in their outset.

The approach to these common principles offered in this document aims to pave the way towards addressing fundamental questions of partnership between politicians, central government executives, the executive at local level and the third sector.

## **Questions**

*What are the mechanisms through which cultural organisations and professionals can initiate policy?*

*How does the Ministry of Culture launch policy initiatives?*

*What is the role and effect of organised interest groups?*

*What are the institutionalised and informal channels of communication between the Ministry of Culture and cultural organisations of the third sector?*

*How can feedback on proposed initiatives be sought by the legislature and provided by the third sector?*

*How easy is the access to Parliament and the Executive for the professional?*

*How can Parliament hear the feedback of cultural organisations?*

*How useful can cultural organisations and professionals be in alleviating the burden of cultural policy making?*

## II Legislation or Policy?

It is being generally acknowledged that in many countries legislation is used far too frequently as an end in its own right, rather than as a tool, or instrument to implement and facilitate aspects of a well-defined cultural policy. As Mrs Vesna Copic, State Undersecretary for Culture in Slovenia puts it in her paper *Legislation: a threat or an opportunity*:

‘A law may not be a formal substitute for an effectively stable and well-regulated financing system, nor an alibi for the absence of a development-oriented vision of cultural policy. Law is in fact, merely one instrument for the realisation of this vision’ [Ljubljana May 1999].

Laws are needed to justify decisions and to fulfil strategic policy objectives. A law is not a policy in itself, but an instrument of regulation. For legislation to be effective, it has to respond to the objectives formulated in the national cultural policy or strategy.

There are several other ways of managing aspects of one’s cultural policies besides by law. One could think of agreements, programmes, and regulations to act as steering devices and that lie below the status of law.

There often exists the tendency to solve every problem by drafting a new law. Furthermore, artists and professionals tend to demand laws to guarantee their artistic freedom and social security, when this may not always in fact be necessary. A web of laws covering every aspect of cultural society will improve neither transparency, understanding, nor adherence and leads to massive legal backlogs.

### III The Mechanisms of Partnership

The appearance of the welfare state in many Western European countries after the Second World War stimulated politicians to start thinking about the benefits of cultural policy. To realise their policies, the governments of the Western European democracies gradually began to work through and with a broad range of public, private and independent organisations and partners in the cultural sector. The advantages to the democratic process of governance of such a partnership are obvious and have been formulated by François Matarasso and Charles Landry in the Council of Europe's policy note *Balancing Act: 21 Strategic Dilemmas in Cultural Policy* as follows:

'The creation of policy through a real partnership between a cultural ministry, its constituency and the wider public offers major advantages. A policy that has been developed in partnership with the sector on which its implementation depends obviously has a better chance of being successful in practice, since it will reflect the experience and the concerns of people working in all sectors. It is also likely to be more creative and imaginative, since it results from open-minded thinking and dialogue reflecting a wide range of views rather than just internal planning. The policy goals and standards of success, which are developed through such a partnership, will be closer to the shared aspirations of many people. Finally, the process itself is an important element of civil society, enabling and encouraging citizens to take responsibility in an area where most people have an opinion and are not afraid, in the right circumstances to voice it.' [p.21-22, Policy Note No.4, April 1999].

Creating a vision for cultural policy cannot happen in isolation: it needs to be shared by the parliament, government and the whole of the cultural sector. Various different structural and organisational relationships between government and the cultural sector exist to ensure that cultural policy is conceived, formulated and implemented in a manner most suited to each country at hand.

## IV The Ministry of Culture

All Ministries of Culture strive to create the necessary climate and conditions for the cultural market to operate efficiently. The focus for every Minister of Culture must therefore be to understand where the market does not operate as well as it could and to assess what action should be taken to remedy any deficiencies. In order to manage this process, active consultation with the cultural constituency is considered to be essential.

### *The legislative context*

The primary task of the Ministry of Culture is to provide the legislative context and framework within which culture can develop. This means creating core legislation that allows cultural activities to develop within a specific framework of rules and importantly applying, adapting or interpreting existing general laws, so that they are relevant to the cultural sector. In many countries, there exists the tendency to produce a law on every specific detail that needs to be regulated. This creates massive legal backlogs. Furthermore, too many laws lead to a lack of transparency and effectiveness. The focus of the Ministry's work should also lie on the development of regulation that lies beyond the status of law. The main argument for this is that the Ministry does not then need to go back to Parliament with its lengthy procedures and that regulations can be changed more quickly should the need arise.

### *The role of the Ministry of Culture*

The Ministry is the encourager, facilitator, protector and advocate for culture, whose activities and products are carried out by others. Its role is not to "create culture", nor to make money out of culture, but to generate general resources and income that can be redistributed along policy guidelines. The laws and regulations made and implemented in and by the Ministry then are the instruments of cultural policy. The Minister of Culture also takes into consideration all other fields of government, which relate to culture. By identifying the importance of culture for other sectors and by creating precious links with other ministries, the budget of the Ministry can expand.

Governments should ideally involve the cultural sector (to the mutual benefit of both the sector and the government itself) in the fundamental debate about the direction in which cultural policy is developing. Cultural actors and organisations can provide decision-makers with first-hand experience and feedback; cultural debate allows key issues such as civic participation, social cohesion and community capacity building, which are of priority to the Government, to be addressed and stimulated. Throwing open the debate on cultural policy strengthens the general commitment to culture.



## V Non-Governmental and Governmental Advisory and Funding Bodies and the Third Sector

The third sector is a term that is widely used today to refer to the independent zone of activity, which lies somewhere between the field of government on the one hand, and the field of commerce (the profit or business sector) on the other. It includes the non-commercial, non-profit and independent organisations, foundations, institutions and professional individuals. Third sector institutions operate at their best when they remain as independent as possible (even if they are heavily dependent on subsidy), but run as if they were a commercial enterprise.

(Nowadays the boundaries of this independent zone are becoming slowly ever vaguer. Some successful third sector institutions are those which operate in public-private partnership).

The Maastricht Treaty affirmed the principle of subsidiarity in Europe, stating that decision-making should take place as close to the citizen as possible. This can be applied to cultural policy, as it can to any political sphere, allowing regional and local administrations, non-governmental bodies and organised citizen groups to participate in the policy-making process. To this end, the Netherlands and Slovenia, for example, have a Council for Culture which has an important advisory role in many political discussions. The British Government partners with the Arts Councils and other semi-independent bodies with clear advisory and financial roles. France on the other hand makes use of its Regional Directorates of Cultural Affairs.

In many countries, the policy-making process has been largely internal, concerning only the departmental civil servants and the politicians. Elsewhere, there have been successful attempts to consult the public on a regular basis about policy issues. Current practice in most democratic states, lies somewhere between informing, consultation and active participation.

The web of civil society organisations and individuals, aside from its role as a potential user of culture, plays a crucial role in helping to develop and comment on cultural policy. Many civil organisations may themselves be culturally oriented and their activities are thus an integral part of the cultural spectrum. The benefits of a strong civil society should be realised in all European countries, even in the established democracies. There are cultural activists and critics who help to create new legislation, suggesting new types of institutions or even forcing their views on to politicians. However, there is often a lack of priority in encouraging NGOs within the cultural sector. Their active participation would engender a more urgent debate and action on radical decentralisation.

Discussion on cultural issues naturally takes place within specific sectors or the Ministry, but often not jointly between politicians, professionals, academics, the commercial sector and communities as to what levels of support can be achieved and afforded. There is felt to be the lack of a wide-ranging public debate about the future of public investment in culture amongst all interested parties.

## VI The Parliament

Members of Parliament (or the ‘Lower House’ in bicameral systems) do much of their work in committees. Generally speaking, the composition of these committees is a faithful reflection of the division of power in the parliament. In consultations on government papers, the committee members of parliament discuss all possible documents with members of the government (memoranda, reviews, letters and the like). During consultations of this kind, all kinds of specialist and technical aspects of one or more pieces of draft legislation may come up for discussion. Every deputy has the constitutional right to ask a minister or state secretary questions. This can be done in writing or orally. However, committees do not confine themselves to such forms of consultation alone. They regularly conduct hearings and pay working visits, for example to ascertain how interested parties think of certain pieces of draft legislation or a government paper.

In some of the parliaments in the new democracies, there exists a general lack of trust towards civil society. Parliamentary representatives often assert that NGOs tend to only criticise their work and, thus, if consulted have little positive to add. In other parliaments a degree of trust exists, but real communication and co-operation is generally weak. Although some parliamentary committees have begun to work with NGOs on legislative development, other committees in the same parliaments continue to believe that they can get the work done just as well without input from outside organisations and experts. At the same time, parliamentary representatives are usually understaffed and don’t have enough experts or researchers to effectively plough through and comment on legislation being developed. What’s more, parliaments fear that as they move closer to the EU, the amount of legislation to adopt, change and debate will only increase – to numbers unmanageable for their modest staff.

Representatives of the cultural field often feel left out of the legislative process. If the artist or the professional cannot communicate feelings of frustration and helplessness, then they will not feel connected to the decisions coming out of the parliament. Lack of co-operation between parliaments and the cultural constituency translates into a huge, and unnecessary, gap in communication with the general electorate.

All European parliaments can truly benefit by improving their relationships with civil society. Civil society can support parliamentary missions in developing effective legislation and in communicating the results to the public. If included as an integral part of the process, civil society will have an investment in the success of the legislation and an interest in communicating to the people that the laws have been well considered and will be effective. Parliamentarians could go far out of their way to make clear to their constituency what the various choices and alternatives are, and exactly why they are making the choices they do. Paying working visits, for example, to ascertain how interested parties and cultural organisations feel about certain pieces of draft legislation or a government paper, or inviting NGO representatives who are specialised in the topic at hand, can provide an invaluable source of feedback for the parliament.

## Part 2: The Project

### The Bulgarian Steering Committee

The aim of the Steering Committee is to assist the Consortium managing 'Policies for Culture' to steer and evaluate the programme as it progresses in Romania and to form the 'face' of the programme to the other countries participating.

<b>Position in SC</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Current position</b>
National Assembly	<b>Mr S.Raichevski</b>	Bulgaria	Deputy, Chairman of the Culture and Media Committee (SDS)
National Assembly	<b>Mr D.Dimov</b>	Bulgaria	Deputy, Vice-Chairman of the Culture and Media Committee (Euroleft)
Ministry of Culture	<b>Mrs M.Roussinova</b>	Bulgaria	Secretary General of the Ministry of Culture
Ministry of Culture	<b>Mrs D.Danailova</b>	Bulgaria	Head of the Department "International Co-operation and European Integration"
Ministry of Culture	<b>Mrs R.Cherneva</b>	Bulgaria	Head of the Department for Analysis
Presidency of Bulgaria	<b>Mrs F.Filkova</b>	Bulgaria	Chief Advisor of Foreign Affairs
Open Society Institute Budapest	<b>Mrs L.Varbanova</b>	Bulgaria	Programme Director of the Arts and Culture Network Programme
Artist	<b>Mr L.Boyadjiev</b>	Bulgaria	Artist
The Red House - Centre for Culture and Debate	<b>Mrs D.Gavrilova</b>	Bulgaria	Director
Soros Centre for Arts	<b>Mrs M.Deleva</b>	Bulgaria	Project co-ordinator
ECUMEst	<b>Mrs T.Andreeva</b>	Bulgaria	Local project co-ordinator
European Cultural Foundation	<b>Mrs O.Chenal</b>	NL	Director of Programmes and Grants
ECUME, Masters in Cultural Management	<b>Mrs C.Suteu</b>	France / Romania	Director
Policies for Culture, ECF	<b>Mrs H.Weeda</b>	NL	Programme Officer

# **Part 3: Bulgarian Cultural Policy – a summary**

### 3.1 Cultural Policy in Bulgaria

*/ Keep in mind that this information is valid by year 2000. For information up-to-date, please refer to [www.culturalpolicies.org/](http://www.culturalpolicies.org/) /*

The following information is taken directly from *Cultural Policies in Europe: A Compendium of Basic Facts and Trends*, ERICarts and Council of Europe, Bonn 2000  
With the kind permission of EricArts

#### 1. Historical Perspective: Cultural Policies and Instruments

Two radically different cultural policy models have been applied in Bulgaria in the past 50 years. All cultural institutions were nationalised in 1948, when a rigid, centralised communist government system was established in the country. The Bulgarian Communist Party's Central Committee and all government ministries, committees and other institutions under its control became the main cultural policy decision-maker and they were the ones to decide on "correct" definitions of culture and cultural content. The state-and-party apparatus set the guidelines top-down and played the role of a "filter" which censored contemporary arts, cultural heritage and information.

The creative unions (*tvorcheski soyuzi*) became the transmitter of the state monopoly on culture and controlled the entire process of creation and dissemination of works of art, and virtually ruled out individual independent expression. The idea of artistic freedom was replaced by ideological and political control; voluntary ideological association by compulsory membership, and democracy by centralism. The creative artists became wholly dependent on the Communist Party-State and *de facto* turned into civil servants. A small independent cultural scene could only develop underground or often in the disguise of irony, wit and humour.

A new cultural policy model has been adopted since the changes in 1989. Its key effects have been:

- liberation of artistic creativity and cultural life including a changing role for professional organisations;
- decentralisation (municipalities are increasingly involved in cultural policies);
- growing diversity of cultural aspirations through greater outside contacts and access to modern commercial cultural industries;
- new actors have emerged on the cultural scene: foundations, private cultural institutions, new professional associations;
- more emphasis on traditional Bulgarian culture and equal participation of minority groups.

The deep economic crisis with a declining GDP, rampant inflation and an ongoing impoverishment of the population has had an adverse influence on the cultural sector which inevitably has taken a "back seat" to realities of basic living conditions. Large parts of the vast cultural infrastructure are now lying idle, while the staff has to be deployed or remain employed at very low wages. Many cultural institutions had to be closed down due to lack of funds, buildings are dilapidated and libraries and museums have not been able to replenish their stocks for years.

A new vision of Bulgarian cultural policy still needs to be created, putting emphasis on investment in culture as a means to contribute to solving Bulgaria's general crisis.

## 2. Overall Description of the System

The *National Assembly* sets the guidelines of and safeguards cultural policy through legislation. Legislation is drafted by the *Parliament's Committee on Culture and the Media*. The *Council of Ministers* implements cultural policy through the *Ministry of Culture* and in co-ordination with other government ministries and public institutions.

The Ministry of Culture is headed by the Minister, Deputy Ministers and Chief Secretary. The Office of the Minister has a Protocol Service and a Secretariat. The Ministry's Collegium is the main consultative body of the Minister.

The Ministry comprises 4 directorates (Legal and Economic, International Co-operation and European Integration, National Cultural Institutes and Arts Centres), various departments (Museums, Galleries and Visual Arts) and divisions (Art Schools, Libraries and Community Culture Clubs, and Copyright). The Ministry also has an Institute of Culturology.

Several national Arts Centres are under the Ministry's jurisdiction including:

- theatre
- film
- music and dance
- books
- cultural monuments

These centres are arm's-length bodies with an independent legal status and budget, which pursue specific cultural policies in their respective sphere. The activity of each centre is guided by a programme approved by the Minister of Culture and conducted by Directors who are answerable to the Ministry.

The lower levels of cultural competence correspond to the constitutional division of Bulgaria into units of territorial administration: 28 districts and 4 217 municipalities. The main unit of territorial administration is the municipality (*obshtina*), which is legally independent, has property rights and freedom of association. At the municipal level, cultural competence is exercised in the form of local self-government, financial included, and distributed among the respective municipal bodies: the councils on culture.

The cultural competence of the intermediate district level is yet to be clarified. Notably, cultural competence is shared by the central government and local self-governments. The central government may support a certain type or types of cultural activity, and control specific cultural activities such as those associated with cultural landmarks. Any unit of territorial administration may apply for support or enter a cultural competition organised by the central government.

### ***Inter-ministerial or Inter-governmental C-operation***

Along with the administrative breakdown of cultural competence, there are structures co-ordinating central government activities. Culture is just a part of the general competence of those interdepartmental commissions, which are in charge of, for instance, education, foreign policy, youth, tourism, and ecology.

There are standing and interim interdepartmental commissions and they have consultative capacities and the right to initiate legislation. There is a consultative Council of Culture reporting to the President of the Republic.

### **3. General Objectives and Principles of Cultural Policy**

#### ***Main Elements of the Current National Cultural Policy Model***

In line with Bulgaria's transition to a market economy and democracy, a series of cultural reforms have been conducted in the past few years with the following objectives:

- decentralisation of the administration and financing of culture;
- freedom of action and formation of market-oriented attitudes of cultural institutions and subjects;
- amendments to cultural legislation which have been streamlined to meet the new socio-economic conditions;
- approximation to European Union legislation;
- establishment of an administrative and executive environment facilitating cultural development and European integration;
- guarantees of the equality of state, municipal and private cultural institutions;
- a greater role of the non-governmental sector.

#### ***National Definition of Culture***

The recently passed *Protection and Development of Culture Act* defines culture as:

*"the activity associated with the creation, study, dissemination and protection of cultural values, as well as the results of this activity."*

This definition applies to culture in the narrow sense and tends to serve cultural institutions, the arts and activities associated with them. Culture in the broad sense, generally associated with humans and human development, has attracted considerable attention in the past few years. In this sense, culture is an essential resource capable of improving the quality of life, of ensuring sustainable development and democratic thinking. In the present period of transition, culture may become a main propellant of democratic processes and a mainstay of civil society.

## **4. Current Issues in Cultural Policy Development and Debate**

### ***Cultural Policy Priorities in the Past 5 Years***

Until 1997, the rapid change in government and state strategies on national development did not allow the pursuit of a consistent cultural policy and, in some cases, the elaboration of a strategy on cultural development. Cultural policy was confined to the administration of state institutions, which decreased considerably due to the "de-monopolisation" of culture.

The watershed in Bulgaria's cultural policy came in 1997. An incumbent team of the Ministry of Culture took over when resources were almost nil and most structures were idle. The team had to decide how to press ahead with or jump-start reforms, and develop a longer-term cultural strategy.

### ***Recent Policy Issues and Debates***

A Council of Europe-sponsored National Debate on Cultural Policy, held in November 1998, discussed the main policy issues as noted below.

#### ***Decentralisation Versus Centrality***

Decentralisation, regarded as the top priority at the start of transition, has remained a controversial issue both for cultural circles and the general public.

At present, there are three sources of confrontation between decentralisation and centralisation:

- the Government and the legislature which, on the one hand, are decentralising the financing and administration of cultural institutions while, on the other, maintaining partial control over the latter;
- local government, which is eager for greater autonomy but still prefers most of the financing and accountability to be borne by the central government;
- NGOs, which are the most active centre of decentralisation, but are still weak in terms of networking on a voluntary basis and potential for influence (initiating legislation) and opinion making.

#### ***New Forms of International Cultural Co-operation***

In recent years, Bulgaria's international cultural policy has been characterised by openness, dialogue and a priority on integration into international cultural structures and organisations. Bulgaria is open to European and world culture, and at the same time promotes the top achievements of national culture abroad.

Bulgaria is involved in the European Union's cultural co-operation programmes Kaleidoscope 2000, Ariane, mainly via support to translations; and RAPHAEL. 19 projects came under the first, 12 under the second and three under the third programme in 1998. Bulgaria is also preparing for the EU's Culture 2000 Programme (2000-2004).

International cultural collaboration is effected in various forms. In a number of cases, large-scale cultural events - such as the Plovdiv 1999 European Month of Culture Programme - are launched with the co-ordinated efforts of public, private, non-governmental organisations and interdepartmental groups.



### Heritage development

The horizontal and vertical structure of heritage administration remains unbalanced. Paradoxically, the State has acquired greater control including legislative and investment powers. State funding has declined, and there are no clear rules of interaction between the central and municipal governments. The restoration and conservation market is still in an embryonic state, and there is little if any competition.

The status of the three forms of property (private, state and municipal) has been regulated, but there are no financial incentives or tax relief to support them. Experts are currently working on laws on moveable and immovable monuments of culture, which are expected to deal with the shortcomings of the system of heritage protection, control and funding.

### Strategies to Stimulate Employment in the Cultural Sector

The main issues in employment in the cultural sector are low pay and a declining number of state-subsidised cultural institutions. Overstaffing is a legacy of the communist area, and subsidised cultural institutions still keep many of their former staff – underemployed and underpaid.

As traditional expertise proves inadequate for running cultural institutions under the changed conditions of a market economy, there is a skills gap and a major need for training especially on management skills (strategic planning, marketing, entrepreneurial skills).

These factors have led to a brain drain, since many gifted young people have preferred better jobs abroad. That is why a national strategy stimulating employment is required urgently.

### Language Issues Problems

According to the Constitution of the Republic of Bulgaria, the official language is Bulgarian. The issue of "mother tongues" (the term "minority language" is not used in Bulgarian constitutional practice, which regards "mother tongue" as the more relevant term) is dealt with in two specific laws. The first aspect of this issue is associated with radio and TV broadcasting, and is regulated by the Radio and Television Act [Article 12 (2)], which lists the cases in which programmes may be broadcast in a language other than the official one: 1) when they are aired for educational purposes and 2) when they are meant for Bulgarian citizens whose mother tongue is not Bulgarian.

The second aspect, the status of the "mother tongue" as a subject in Bulgarian schools, is regulated by the *Syllabus and Minimum Comprehensive Education Bill* (passed by Parliament at first reading). Under this Bill, the mother tongue is a "compulsory optional subject", which means that if students want to study their mother tongue, the municipality or the State are obliged to provide them with this opportunity. This is relevant especially for the ethnic minorities, the most important of which are Turkish, Greek and Romany speaking.

### Relations between Media and Culture

The right of free expression and the right to diffuse individual opinion by spoken and written word is guaranteed by the Constitution of Bulgaria (Articles 39, 40 and 41).

The former direct state control and monopoly on media has been abolished. There are state-owned radio and television networks with national coverage, but a number of licences have been granted to private television and broadcasting companies, which are, however, not yet nation-wide in their coverage.

Setting media policy priorities, development of media legislation and a structural reform of the national TV and broadcasting system, are still on the agenda.

The press is now wholly private-owned, with a mushrooming of new papers during the transition period following 1989

### Equality Issues and Cultural Policies

Underprivileged groups are on the agenda of both the executive and NGOs, some of which deal primarily with cultural policies on the integration of such groups into society.

The national cultural policy promotes projects of artists from those groups, or initiatives on the effective integration of underprivileged groups into cultural processes.

### Arts Education: Programmes and Models

Two types of arts education are offered in Bulgaria: comprehensive arts education, which covers arts courses from grades 1 to 12 in all schools, and specialised arts education. At comprehensive schools, however, the priority is still on the classical forms of the arts. A contemporary arts and culture curriculum may include avant-garde arts, cultural heritage, design, culture of the urban environment, photography and, last but not least, audio-visual arts.

Specialised education offers continuous training in the arts at high-school (grades 8 to 12) and university levels. The main problem of graduates is limited job opportunities.

### Cultural Industries: Development Programmes and Partnerships

Against the background of a limited and chaotic market, Bulgaria's cultural industries have been developing at a shaky pace.

The **film industry** relies on state subsidies and support from foundations, international organisations and sponsors. Most co-productions are with European countries (especially Germany, France and Greece). The Ministry of Culture's National Film Centre allocates state subsidies on a competitive basis. The Centre's main partner is the Bulgarian National Television, which spends part of its budget on Bulgarian film production.

There are several private film distributing companies, three of which - *Sunny Films*, *Alexandra Films* and *Duga Films* - are the Bulgarian partners of the top seven international companies.

The Ministry's Book Centre promotes the publishing of non-commercial Bulgarian and translated **literature**. A Book Aid Programme (1991-1997) financed publishers of certain types of literature on a competitive basis: contemporary Bulgarian literature and literary heritage; Bulgarian human studies, reference works and encyclopaedias, and translated human studies literature. There are partnership programmes with French, German and British cultural institutions supporting the publication of translated literature.

Bulgaria's major **recording companies** have licensing contracts with international companies such as Sony, PolyGram, BMG and EMI, exercising strict control over the copyright of authors, producers and composers.

### *Cultural Minorities: Special Legal Provisions; Community Arts Programmes*

Parliament ratified the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (Council of Europe) in 1999. The executive has identified the integration of minorities as a national policy priority, along with decentralisation of functions supporting minority education and culture through the establishment of councils for ethnic and demographic affairs at the regional government level. These councils will include representatives of the respective local minority community (communities).

In the course of the 1998 National Debate on Bulgaria's Cultural Policy, the executive and non-governmental organisations stressed their view of minority culture as an integral part of the national cultural heritage. Despite its limited budget, the Ministry of Culture offers financial support to minority cultural events (the Roma Cultural Centre, Turkish theatre shows, festivals of ethnic groups).

NGOs (such as the Open Society Fund, the Interethnic Initiative for Human Rights, SEGA, the International Centre for Minority Studies and Intercultural Relations) provide support mainly for minority periodicals and media events, as well as the creation of live culture, since sociological surveys show that the role of minority communities in culture is being increasingly confined to that of consumers of cultural products.

## **5. Main Legal Provisions in the Cultural Field**

### *Overview of Legal Competence*

The Protection and Development of Culture Act classifies cultural institutions by form of ownership: state, municipal, private and mixed ownership. All are free to determine their tasks and structure depending on their core activity. State and municipal cultural institutions are established by special statute or by a statutory act of the executive or local government. They are legal persons financed by the national or municipal budget, but may also engage in for-profit activities associated with their core activity, spending and accounting for the extra revenues by the procedure applicable to extra-budgetary funds.

Private cultural institutions are incorporated and terminated on the motion of natural and/or private legal persons in line with the provisions of the Commercial Code or the Persons and Family Act. Mixed cultural institutions are established by the State, municipalities, legal and natural persons, and all matters associated with their organisation, administration and financing are regulated by the deed of incorporation.

## ***Legal Frameworks for Artists***

### **Social Security / Labour Relations**

Social security for artists is regulated by the Labour Code and the Ordinance on Social Security of Persons Who Practise a Liberal Profession or Engage in Trade, or Work without Entering into an Employment Relationship. Under these laws, artists practising a liberal profession are treated equally with those who have registered companies as sole traders or partners in commercial corporations under the Commercial Code. In all three cases, artists have two options. First, to pay compulsory social security contributions for all types of retirement insurance (retirement, old-age, disability, survivor's pension) at the rate of 22% of an income of their choice, which may not be less than two or more than eight national minimum wages. Second, to pay voluntary contributions at the rate of 32% for all types of social insurance (pensions, sickness benefits, monthly child benefits).

Artists (just like all other employees) who have signed a contract of employment (e.g. an artist employed by an advertising agency) are subject to compulsory social security contributions at the rate of 37% of their gross salary, payable by the employer, and 2% payable by the employee. Another contribution is due to the Occupational Training and Unemployment Fund. In view of the specificity of the work performed by artists, who usually practise a liberal profession, the Transitional and Final Provisions of the Protection and Development of Culture Act entitles artists who have worked for at least 4 of the past 12 months (without entering into an employment relationship in artistic associations) to unemployment benefits

### **Taxes**

Artists pay taxes under the Personal Income Tax Act, which allows them to deduct 50% of their expenses from the taxable income for the creation of works of art, science and culture, folk arts and crafts, and copyright royalties. Furthermore, taking into account the specificity of creative work, the legislation provides an opportunity for income averaging derived from creative work performed in the course of more than one year (e.g., the writing of a book), but not exceeding four years. Artists thus avoid the progressive annual income tax.

To encourage private persons and companies to sponsor the development of the arts and culture, the legislator has offered resident and non-resident natural and legal persons a tax deduction up to 5% for donations for cultural purposes, as well as for conservation and restoration of historical and cultural monuments, or for grants

## ***Cultural Industries / Film / TV***

### **TV Quotas**

The Radio and Television Act sets the following programming quotas: at least 50% of the total annual programme time, excluding newscasts, sports shows, radio and TV games, commercials and the radio and TV market, for European and Bulgarian programming. Bulgarian National Television must allocate at least 10% of the national budget and Radio and Television Fund subsidies for Bulgarian TV films.

### Language Laws

There are no specific language laws in the Republic of Bulgaria except the regulations on broadcasting and language of instructions in schools mentioned in chapter 4.2.5.

### Film or Other Promotion Laws

There are no specific laws on film production and distribution, which are regulated by the general statutory framework. A currently drafted Bulgarian Film Bill will establish an extra-budgetary Film Production and Distribution Fund that will raise extra funds, including from levies on own activities, and thus make the industry self-sustainable. The Bill will also regulate licensing of film producers and cinemas.

### **Copyright Amendments**

#### Authors Rights

The Copyright and Neighbouring Rights Act, passed in 1993, protects a maximum range of copyright and neighbouring rights. The Act is due to be amended in line with European legal principles, taking into account national law and established artistic practises.

In a move towards approximation of national intellectual property rights legislation, Parliament ratified the Rome Convention and the Geneva Convention in 1995.

#### Blank Tape Levies

Blank tape levies are regulated by Article 26 of the Copyright and Neighbouring Rights Act. According to Article 26 (1), "any author of a work recorded on audio- or video-recording media, any performer [...], as well as any producer of any such phonogramme, shall have the right to a compensatory royalty..." Paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 identify the payers, recipients and rates of royalties due under Paragraph 1.

#### Public Lending Rights

The Act mentioned under 5.4.2 defines public lending as "distribution of a work, which means the sale, exchange, donation, rental or lending, import and export, as well as the offer for sale or rental of any originals and copies of the work" [Supplementary Provisions, Clause 2 (4)].

### **Cultural Heritage and Properties**

At present cultural heritage is the responsibility of the state (national and local level) as well as of the private sector. State property may be managed by local and municipal structures, as well as by separate legal persons. The currently drafted cultural heritage laws provide concessions to private owners on the condition that the status of the respective monuments is preserved.

Export of cultural heritage, irrespective of the form of ownership, is restricted and banned in the case of registered monuments.

## ***Legal Incentives for Public-Private Partnerships***

Public-private partnership in the creation of culture and cultural heritage protection is implicitly vested in a number of statutory acts. The *Protection and Development of Culture Act* places public and private cultural institutions on an equal footing in competitions for financial support for cultural programmes and projects from the National Culture Fund, municipal culture funds and national centres of the arts and cultural activities. The public-cum-expert councils and commissions supporting these activities are made up of representatives of state and municipal institutions, professional and non-profit associations, individual artists and experts.

## **6. Financing of Culture**

### ***Short overview***

The Ministry of Culture has adopted mixed state-municipal financing as a contemporary form of financing culture. The signing of case-by-case agreements with municipalities in the form of "joint subsidies" makes it possible to take into account the specificity of each institution, the available resources, and the geographic and demographic peculiarities of the respective region, the purpose being to find the optimum proportion of the financial contributions given by the State and by the municipalities. This form of financing is applied to theatre, music and dance.

While public contributions in general have risen 10 times between 1990 and 1995, the Examiners' report "Cultural Policy in Bulgaria", Strasbourg 1998, sees a decline by 80% in real terms during that time.

### ***Public Cultural Expenditure Broken Down by Level of Government***

*Public cultural expenditure by level of financing authority (in thousands of Bulgarian leva)*

<b>Level of Government</b>	<b>1996</b>		<b>1998</b>	
	Total expenditure	in %	Total expenditure	in %
Total central government	4 750 332	62.3	73 924 081	58.0
Provincial / regional governments	1 000	0.01	7 200	0.01
Municipal and other local authorities	2 877 400	37.7	49 935 800	42.0
<b>T O T A L</b>	<b>7 628 732</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>123 867 081</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: ERICarts questionnaire 1999

## ***Sectoral Breakdown***

*Public cultural expenditure 1996 and 1998 by activity (in thousands of Bulgarian leva and in %)*

<b>Cultural activity</b>	<b>1996</b>		<b>1998</b>	
	Total expenditure	in %	Total expenditure	in %
1. Museums and archives	183 506	3.3	2 639 159	3.3
2. Monuments and sites	14 910	0.3	216 169	0.3
3. Literature		0		0.0
4. Libraries	143 276	2.6	1 296 885	1.6
5. Press		0		0.0
6. Music	209 080	3.7	3 456 855	4.3
7. Performing arts	1 093 168	19.6	16 485 293	20.5
8. Visual arts		0		0.0
9. Film/Bulgarian film library	13 745	0.2	275 000	0.3
10. Radio/television	3 005 250	53.8	40 153 305	49.8
11. Socio-cultural activities	215 431	3.9	2 903 765	3.6
12. Education and training	518 034	9.3	6 408 019	7.9
13. General administration	59 145	1.1	4 523 748	5.6
14. National centres	127 882	2.3	2 249 419	2.8
<b>T O T A L</b>	<b>5 583 427</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>80 607 617</b>	<b>100</b>

*Source: ERICarts questionnaire 1999*

There are no state-subsidised structures in the film and publishing industries, where the state subsidises support projects on a competitive basis only.

## **7. Cultural Institutions and New Partnerships**

### ***Reallocation of Public Responsibilities***

As a result of the dominance of the State, public cultural institutions have retained their leading role and main responsibility for the development of culture in Bulgaria.

At the same time, by steadily cutting annual public spending on culture, the State is gradually relinquishing its former "total" responsibility for culture, thus jeopardising the very survival of state cultural institutions. In the past few years, the State has given priority to decentralisation of responsibilities to the local level, without changing the status of state cultural institutions.

Given the absence of a specific statutory framework and clear agenda of cultural reform, private enterprise aimed at divestment and establishment of non-governmental for-profit (and partly non-profit) organisations was haphazard and confined to certain spheres of culture only, foremost the media and cultural industries, where a free market of cultural products and services was partly established.

Support for culture in Bulgaria is also derived from outside sources or partners including the Open Society Fund, various European Union programmes such as RAPHAEL, Ariane

and Kaleidoscope 2000, and donations from numerous foreign funds and foundations, as well as from expatriate Bulgarians.

Today there are new actors in cultural policies who have diversified the notion of who is responsible for the development of contemporary Bulgarian culture and who is changing the hierarchy of public responsibilities in this area

### ***Status, Role and Development of Major Cultural Institutions***

The Protection and Development of Culture Act supports the decentralisation of cultural institutions in Bulgaria. It identifies various "classifications" for cultural institutions including:

- "state institutions of national importance" financed wholly and with priority by the Ministry of Culture budget;
- "state institutions" financed by the Ministry of Culture and municipalities;
- "departmental institutions" financed "wholly or partly by the respective department" (when they are institutions of a government department);
- "municipal institutions" financed by the municipal budget;
- "regional cultural institutions", financed by the respective municipality on whose territory they are located. The municipalities in the region make contributions and supplementary funds are set on an annual basis by the National Budget Act.

NGOs employed in culture vary greatly by definition (the terms used in their names) from: alliances, societies, associations, foundations, funds, unions, committees, centres, festivals, academies, community culture clubs, trustees, independent theatres, federations, institutes, etc. Depending on their function, Bulgarian non-governmental organisations may be classified mainly as operational and community NGOs. A law regulating their activity is due to be passed

### ***Emerging Partnerships and Co-operations***

Today the State's main partners in cultural policy implementation are the municipal departments of culture and the councils on culture at municipal councils (the local parliaments). They also have their own, local cultural calendar; approve and follow their own cultural budgets; support municipal cultural institutions and contribute to the financing of state cultural institutions as agreed with the Ministry of Culture. There are many forms of collaboration with NGOs: recruitment of NGO activists and experts to the standing and interim commissions of municipal councils; inviting NGO representatives to expound their views on issues of regional and local relevance; assigning definite tasks to NGOs and providing the necessary resources; organisation of joint events with joint activities and responsibilities, etc.

The Ministry of Culture promotes partnerships between the governmental and non-governmental sectors. There are joint financing programmes and common activities or projects among the Ministry and NGOs, however, few among the government and the private sector specifically.



## **8. Support to Creativity**

### ***Direct and Indirect Support***

#### *Special Artists Support Schemes*

There are no special artists support schemes at the national, regional or local level. Indirect support is limited to general social assistance and creativity promotion programmes of professional organisations and foundations.

Professional organisations are currently lobbying the Parliament for favourable social and labour legislation on their respective professions, as well as for passage of specific legislation facilitating the emergence of a market for works of art. They have social funds offering members lumpsum aid or monthly supplements to recipients of pensions below the poverty threshold. Members of professional organisations are entitled to discounts on goods and services from "organisation-owned shops, enterprises or recreation facilities". Some organisations negotiate threshold rates of payment for certain professions with potential employers. Only a few organisations have a special fund for creative support which pays part of the cost of creative activity and handles marketing

#### *Status of the Artist Legislation or Relevant Policy Initiatives*

State measures supporting artists and creativity are reflected in various laws with separate provisions for: employment relations, social protection in unemployment, income taxation, incentives for donations for cultural activities, social security, etc. Notably, all laws are currently being amended

#### *Grants or Other Schemes for Artists*

Foundations offer three main forms of support to artists:

- talent scouting and arrangement of exhibitions, shows, competitions, and other forums for young hopefuls;
- creation and improvement of working and training conditions (facilities, workshops, courses, etc.);
- grants for education.

One of Bulgaria's largest foundations, the SS Cyril and Methodius, provided financial support to 38 people in 1997 (mainly for specialisations, doctorates and student grants). The Tsennosti Foundation offered 12 grants in 1998, and the Soros Centre of the Arts only one in 1997. Foundations are also supporting various cultural programmes, projects and events.

### ***Participation Trends***

#### *Audience Figures*

A sociological survey on "Public Opinion on Cultural Life, the Status of Artists and Cultural Reform" conducted in 1997 found that an insignificant proportion of Bulgaria's population (from 0.3% to 6% depending on the particular art form) take part in arts activities several times a month. If we add the proportion of people who go to the movies,

theatre, etc. once every few months, we will arrive at a higher figure of about 10 to 15% of the population. It was found that approximately 70-88% of the population do not actively participate in cultural life (of course this depends on the activity, however these figures include attendance at the cinema, theatre, opera, concerts or art exhibitions).

The majority of the population (56%) own 100 to 500 books, 6% to 7% are active "book collectors," and 74% could not cite the name of the author or title of the last book they bought.

In recent years there has been a tremendous change in the traditional forms of cultural participation. There are two main reasons for this phenomenon: economic hardship and a massive swing towards newer and more individualised forms of dissemination of cultural consumption: TV, video, cables, satellites. This distinct trend is associated with substantial changes not only in the frequency, but also in the forms, standards and criteria for cultural participation

### ***Programme or Policy Initiatives to Promote Participation in Cultural Life***

For the time being, such programmes or policy initiatives are implemented mainly by the Ministry of Culture via the Arts Centres, which subsidise cultural programmes and artistic projects promoting cultural participation. The Ministry provides consistent, albeit limited financial support to educational concerts, festivals, competitions and amateur arts.

### ***The Role of Cultural Associations / Amateur Arts***

Amateur arts in Bulgaria have been associated with community culture clubs (*chitalishte*) ever since their genesis. There has been a drastic slump in the number of amateur art companies, performers and viewers (especially since 1990). The past three or four years have seen the beginning of a more stabilised environment for amateur arts which is evidenced in the growing number of amateur events, festivals, competitions, traditional feasts, mostly of folk arts and original folklore (40 in 1999 alone).

Some cultural policy analysts put great hope on the *chitalishte* as possible cores for new cultural policy visions for the country. There might be a possibility for an increase in the number and importance of these culture clubs as modern multi-purpose arts and informal education centres similar to a community college, especially if they embrace the new media.

Amateur arts are supported foremost by municipalities, partly by the Ministry of Culture and by sponsors - foundations and members of the public. The number of local cultural festivals of amateur arts has been on the rise.

## 3.2 Legislative Acts\*

### **The Protection and Development of Culture Act**

#### **LAW on Protection and Development of culture**

##### Chapter one GENERAL PROVISIONS

Art. 1. This law shall determine the basic principles and priorities of the national cultural policy, the culture organisations and the bodies for protection of culture, of its national identity and the ways for support and financing of culture activity and creators.

Art. 2. The basic principles of the national cultural policy shall be:

1. democratism of the cultural policy, freedom of artistic creative activity and not admitting censorship;
2. decentralisation of the management and the financing of the cultural activities;
3. equal position of the artists and of the cultural organisations;
4. preservation and enrichment of the cultural and historic heritage, preservation of the Bulgarian literary language, traditions and habits;
5. protection of the national cultural identity and the culture of the Bulgarian communities abroad;
6. encouragement of the cultural multiformity at preservation of the unity of national culture;
7. encouragement of the cultural industry and the market of the articles of art and stimulation of the production in the field of culture;
8. uncovering, support and training of young talents in the field of culture;
9. encouragement of granting, patronage and sponsorship in the field of culture;
10. development and improvement of the education in the field of arts and culture.

##### Chapter two

##### CULTURAL ORGANISATIONS

Art. 3.(1) The cultural organisations shall implement activities for creating, dissemination and preservation of cultural values.

(2) The cultural organisations as form of ownership shall be state, municipal, private and with mixed participation.

Art. 4.(1) Cultural institutes shall be state or municipal cultural organisations established with a special law or with an act of a body of the executive power or local authority.

(2) The cultural institutes shall:

---

\*

All the documents included in this dossier are to be considered as relevant to the time the Workshop took place.

1. determine independently their tasks and structure according to the subject of their activity;
  2. be able to implement additional activities including economic ones connected with the basic ones the received additional funds remaining in the cultural institute that has realised them;
  3. (revoked – SG issue 1, 2000)
  4. be able to collect state fees for implementing services and for issuing documents and copies in extent determined with a tariff of the Council of Ministers 50 percent of the revenues remaining for the cultural institutes and the other part being paid to fund “Culture”.
- (3) At restored right of ownership in immovable property conceded for use to state or municipal cultural institute the regional governor or the municipal council shall concede by the due order another equal property – state or municipal ownership.

Art. 5.(1) The state cultural institutes shall be corporate bodies at budget maintenance which shall be established, transformed and closed by the Council of Ministers at a proposal by the Minister of Culture or with a law.

(2) The state cultural institutes shall be financed from the budget of the Ministry of Culture entirely or partially, with resources from the municipal budgets on the basis of concluded contracts with the Ministry of Culture or with the participation of other corporate bodies or individuals.

(3) The directors of the state cultural institutes shall be appointed by the Minister of Culture after conducting a competition, according testament system and by an order determined by the Minister of Culture.

Art. 6.(1) The state cultural institutes at departments out of the Ministry of Culture shall be established, transformed and closed by the Council of Ministers at a proposal by the chief of the corresponding department in coordination with the Minister of Culture.

(2) The state cultural institutes of para 1 shall be financed entirely or partially by the budget of the corresponding department.

(3) The directors of the cultural institutes of para 1 shall be appointed by the chief of the corresponding department after conducting a competition.

Art. 7.(1) State cultural institutes of national importance shall be these cultural institutes implementing national and representative functions for creating, permanent preservation and dissemination of cultural and historic values.

(2) The conditions and the order for acquisition and taking away statute of state cultural institute of national importance shall be determined with an ordinance by the Council of Ministers at a proposal by the Minister of Culture.

(3) The state cultural institutes of national importance shall be financed entirely and with priority from the budget of the Ministry of Culture.

Art. 8.(1) The municipal cultural institutes shall be corporate bodies with independent budget which shall be established, transformed and closed with a decision of the municipal council coordinated with the Minister of Culture.

(2) The municipal cultural institutes shall be financed by the municipal budget.

(3) At compiling the municipal budgets for the corresponding year the extent of the subsidy for each of the municipal cultural institutes shall not be possible to be

lower than this of the previous year regardless of the realised revenues from their activity.

(4) The determining of the subsidy of para 3 shall be at extent of the expenses not lower than the amount of the determined in the budget for the previous year.

(5) The directors of the municipal cultural institutes shall be appointed by the mayor of the municipality after conducting a competition according to a testimony system defined by the Minister of Culture.

Art. 9.(1) The regional cultural institutes shall be corporate bodies with independent budget which shall implement cultural activity basically on the territory defined with the act for their establishment.

(2) The regional cultural institutes shall be established, transformed and closed by the Council of Ministers at a proposal by the Minister of Culture in coordination with the regional governor after a decision of the municipal council on which territory their headquarters are.

(3) The regional cultural institutes shall be financed by:

1. the municipalities on which territory their headquarters are for their maintenance being purposed ensured additional funds from the republican budget;

2. payments made to their budgets also the municipalities on which territory the regional cultural institutes develop their activity the extent being defined every year with a decision by the corresponding municipal councils.

(4) The extent of the additional funds from the republican budget of para , item 1 shall be determined every year with the Law for the state budget of the Republic of Bulgaria at a proposal by the Minister of Culture.

(5) The directors of the regional cultural institutes shall be appointed by the mayors of the municipalities on which their headquarters are after conducting a competition.

(6) The conditions of the competition shall be coordinated with the Ministry of Culture.

Art. 10.(1) The private cultural organisations shall be established, transformed and closed at initiative of individuals and/or private corporate bodies by the order of the Commercial law or the Law for the persons and the family.

(2) The creative unions shall be voluntary associations with non profit objective uniting persons implementing similar creative activity in the field of culture. The creative unions shall be able to approve tariffs for the minimum extent of the remuneration for their members being free lance.

Art. 11.(1) The cultural organisations with mixed participation shall be established between the state, the municipalities, corporate bodies and individuals or between some of them.

(2) The relations between the parties of para 1 shall be provided with a foundation act.

Art. 12. The private cultural organisations and the organisations with mixed participation shall equally participate with all the rest in the competitions for subsidy for creative projects and programmes under the conditions and by the order of this law.

Art. 13. State cultural institutes shall also be the schools for arts and culture. They shall ensure the professional preparedness and training in the field of arts and culture and are under the direct management and methodical ruling of the Minister of Culture funded by the budget of the Ministry of Culture.

### Chapter three

#### BODIES AND ORGANISATIONS FOR PROTECTION OF CULTURE

Art. 14.(1) The Ministry of Culture shall conduct policy for protection and development of culture in compliance with its functions and powers and observing the principles of this law.

(2) The activity of para 1 the Ministry of Culture shall implement through:

1. financial support of cultural initiatives, purposed programmes, creative projects and like after conducting competitions;
2. funding entirely or partially from the republican budget cultural institutes;
3. ensuring conditions for professional training of creators and specialists in the field of culture and the management of the secondary schools in arts and culture;
4. development of the international cultural cooperation with state, municipal, private and international organisations;
5. information supply for participation in international programmes and funds;
6. support of the activity of organisation structures established with objective ensuring employment, professional qualification and encouragement of the independent activity of those working in the field of culture;
7. developing normative acts for ensuring preservation of the cultural activities and of the creators.

(3) The Ministry of Culture shall ensure publicity at developing and conducting of its policy for preservation and developing of culture through:

1. access the information about its activity by an order defined by the Minister if Culture;
2. publishing every year reports for its activity and the intentions in three months after the end of the financial year;
3. meetings with creators, activists of culture and experts for actual issues of cultural policy.

(4) The Ministry of Culture shall create and maintain an information register of the cultural organisations and institutes, which shall in two months after establishing submit an application for entering into the register.

Art. 15.(1) The national centres for arts and cultural activities shall be established, transformed and closed by the Council of Ministers at a proposal by the Minister of Culture who shall approve regulations for the structure, the tasks and the activity of the national centres.

(2) The national centres shall be corporate bodies at budget maintenance at the Ministry of Culture implementing the cultural policy in the corresponding cultural sphere.

(3) The national centres shall conduct competitions for financial support of cultural programmes and creative projects where could participate all cultural organisations and individual creators.

(4) The directors of the national centres shall be appointed by the Minister of

Culture under the conditions of art. 5, para 3.

(5) (revoked – SG issue 1, 2000)

(6) (revoked – SG issue 1, 2000)

(7) The national centres shall render methodical support to the amateur art.

Art. 16.(1) At implementing its functions the Ministry of Culture and the national centres shall be supported by public – expert councils and commissions in which participate representatives of the creative unions, the interested departments and organisations as well as separate creators and experts.

(2) The public – expert councils and commissions shall be consultative bodies created for defined cultural directions and for determined period of time with an order by the Minister of Culture or the director of the corresponding centre.

(3) The public – expert councils shall discuss important and current issues of the corresponding directions, express opinions and give recommendations about them to the management of the Ministry of Culture, consider and make proposals for projects and normative acts.

(4) The public – expert councils shall be able to express opinions in cases when certain works of art and culture impede the good morals, openly promote violence, pornography, racial, religious and national intolerance or threaten the development of the young.

Art. 17.(1) The Bulgarian cultural institutes abroad shall be state cultural institutes and shall be methodically and financially managed by the Ministry of Culture. They shall be established and implement their activity in compliance with bilateral international agreements.

(2) The Bulgarian cultural institutes abroad shall promote the national cultural values in the corresponding countries and cooperate for the expansion of the participation of the Republic of Bulgaria in the different forms of international cooperation.

3) The directors of the Bulgarian cultural institutes abroad shall be appointed by the Minister of Culture under the conditions of art. 5, para 2.

Art. 18.(1) The municipalities shall form and realise their policy for protection and development of culture combining the principles of the national cultural policy with the local conditions and traditions.

(2) The municipal council shall take decisions about:

1. financing of the municipal cultural institutes from the municipal budgets;
2. determining the extent of the local fees stimulating for the development of the cultural organisations in the municipality;
3. conducting competitions for cultural initiatives, creative projects, purposed programmes etc. financed by the municipal budget;
4. participation of the municipality in companies for joint activity, municipal foundations and associations for implementing cultural activities;
5. establishing, transformation and closing of regional cultural institutes with headquarters in the municipality by the order of art. 9, para 2;
6. granting creative scholarships for supporting young authors in culture;
7. establishing rewards for contribution and achievements in the sphere of culture;
8. supporting the development of amateur art, knowledge about the locality and the fatherland;

9. creating programmes for preservation of folk art.

(3) At implementing their functions the municipalities shall be supported by public - expert councils and commissions where participate representatives of creative unions, interested departments and organisations as well as individual authors and experts.

(4) The public - expert councils and commissions shall be consultative bodies established for certain period with an order by the mayor of the municipality.

(5) The public - expert councils shall give opinions and assessments about the activity of the municipal cultural institutes, the regional cultural institutes, about combination of the principles of the national cultural policy with the local conditions and traditions, about individual works of art and culture which could impair the spiritual health of children and youths.

#### Chapter Four

### PROTECTION OF THE NATIONAL CULTURAL IDENTITY AND SPIRITUAL VALUES

Art. 19. For stimulation of authors and performers of works connected with the Bulgarian history and traditions shall be established annual state reward, which shall be handed over by the Prime Minister.

Art. 20. For affirmation the spiritual values of the nation and the human standards and morale:

1. The Minister of Culture and the general directors of the Bulgarian National Radio and the Bulgarian National TV shall conclude every year contracts for programmes and broadcasts in the field of culture, including TV films, radio and TV theatre in the contracts being defined the obligations of the Bulgarian National Radio and the Bulgarian National TV for the creation, presentation and dissemination of the cultural values with priority presence of highly artistic Bulgarian production;
2. The Minister of Culture, the Minister of Education and Science, the Minister of Defence and the chairman of the Committee for youth, physical training and sport shall propose every year to the Council of Ministers cultural-educational programmes for children and youths which financing is provided in the budgets of the corresponding departments.

Art. 21.(1) The Minister of Culture shall propose every year to the Council of Ministers cultural calendar for national events and commemorations of events and prominent persons. Their financing shall be provided in the budget of the Ministry of Culture for the corresponding year.

(2) The national cultural calendar shall be approved by the Council of Ministers.

Art. 22.(1) for promotion of national culture at temporary export of valuable articles of the cultural – historic heritage and arts the corresponding guarantee shall be taken by the state through the Ministry of Finance.

(2) The decision of para 1 for each separate case shall be taken by the Council of Ministers at a proposal by the Minister of Culture.

Art. 23. Visual and audio cultural products of national importance shall be preserved



at the National film library and the National collection of records and tapes which shall be state cultural institutes.

## Chapter five

### FINANCIAL SUPPORT OF CULTURE

Art. 24.(1) National fund “Culture” shall be established.

(2) The National fund “Culture” shall be corporate body with off budget account and headquarters in Sofia.

(3) The fund shall support the development of culture collecting, managing and spending resources designated for the conducting of the national policy in the field of culture.

(4) The fund shall be able to possess immovable properties and chattels only as grant or testament.

(5) The Ministry of Culture shall ensure conditions for the activity of the fund.

Art. 25. Bodies of the fund shall be the management council, the control council and the executive director.

Art. 26.(1) The management council shall consist of chairman and 10 members.

(2) Chairman of the management council shall be the Minister of Culture.

(3) Members of the management council shall be: representatives of the organisations with non profit objective in the field of culture, creative professional organisations, culture activists, academic communities – connected with the culture, the municipalities and one representative of the Ministry of Culture and the Ministry of Finance.

(4) The members of the management council shall be appointed with an order by the Minister of Culture for a term of two years.

(5) Member of the management council shall be possible to be discharged before the elapse of the mandate:

1. at his request;
2. at durable physical impossibility to implement his obligations more than three months;
3. if the ground for his appointment falls away;
4. after entered into force verdict for premeditated crime;
5. at decease.

Art. 27.(1) The management council shall manage the activity of the fund. For this purpose it shall approve:

1. rules for organisation of its work;
2. strategy and programme for the activity of the fund;
3. decisions for conducting competitions for financing of cultural initiatives, purposed programmes, creative projects etc.;
4. annual report about the activity of the fund;
5. decision for election of executive director;
6. structure of the administration of the fund;
7. other decisions connected with the management of the fund.

(2) The management council shall have sessions in the presence of two third of its members. The decisions shall be taken with a majority of more than half of all the

members.

(3) The members of the management council shall receive remuneration determined with an order by the Minister of Culture.

(4) The management council shall be able to have sessions also at request by more than half of its members.

Art. 28. The chairman of the management council shall:

1. summon and manage the session of the management council;
2. conclude and terminate the employment contract with the executive director with a decision of the management council.

Art. 29.(1) The executive director shall:

1. represent the fund;
2. implement the operational management of the fund;
3. ensure the implementation of the decisions of the management council;
4. prepare and submit to the management council the annual accounting report;
5. prepare and submit to the management council annual report about the activity of the fund and ensure its publication.

(2) The executive director shall not be possible to be member of the management council. He shall participate in the sessions of the management council with consultative vote.

Art. 30.(1) The control council shall consist of chairman and two members.

(2) Chairman of the control council shall be representative of the Ministry of Finance.

(3) Members of the control council shall be representatives of the Ministry of Culture and of the Ministry of Justice and Legal European Integration.

(4) The control council shall implement the control, the collecting and the management of the resources of the National fund “Culture”.

Art. 31.(1) The resources of the fund shall be collected from:

1. fifty percent of the fines of art. 98, para 4 of the Law for copyright and the related rights;
2. ten percent of the incomes from rents received from the commercial companies with state participation in the field of culture the deductions being made before the division of the rent between the landlord and the republican budget;
3. the sums of art. 33, first sentence of the Law for copyright and the related rights;
4. the sums of art. 26, para 3, second sentence of the Law for copyright and the related rights;
5. the fees of art. 24, para 2 of the Law for the cultural heritage and museums;
6. the fines of art. 34 and 35 of the Law for the cultural heritage and museums imposed with punitive decisions issued by the Minister of Culture;
7. the sanctions of art. 37;
8. ten percent of the contracted price for rent of articles – movable cultural monuments ownership of the state, included in exhibitions out of the country;
9. the sums of art. 33, para 4;
10. fifty percent of the revenues from the fees of art. 4, para 2, item 4;
11. grants, testaments and sponsorship by Bulgarian and foreign individuals and

- corporate bodies;
  - 12. interests from the accounts of the fund;
  - 13. subsidy determined in the Law for the state budget of the Republic of Bulgaria for the corresponding budget year;
  - 14. other sources determined with a law or with an act by the Council of Ministers.
- (2) The resources of the fund shall be spent for:
1. projects and programmes with national, international and municipal importance for creating, preservation and dissemination of works of art and culture as well as for preservation and promotion of our cultural – historic heritage;
  2. scientific research activity in the field of culture;
  3. support of cultural events and initiatives with national and international importance;
  4. programmes and projects for expanding the international cultural activity;
  5. programmes and projects for new experimental forms of cultural activity;
  6. programmes and projects for protection of the freedom for cultural events of the citizens in this number ethnic, religious and language communities;
  7. educational programmes and projects in the field of culture, improvement and development of the structure and the quality of the education in the field of art and culture;
  8. creative scholarship for support of young and prominent authors and other young specialists in the field of culture with duration up to 2 years;
  9. programmes and projects for research, preservation and promotion of the cultural – historic heritage;
  10. programmes and projects for protection and development the culture of Bulgarian communities abroad;
  11. programmes and projects for expanding the access of children and youth to cultural activities;
  12. rewards for high achievements in the field of culture;
  13. programmes and projects for stimulation of the amateur art.
- (3) The resources of the fund shall be conceded after conducting a competition and on the basis of the proposals made by expert commissions in the corresponding cultural field. The term for submitting the proposals and the announcement of the decision as well as the guarantee of the public character of this process shall be determined under conditions and by order defined by the Minister of Culture.

Art. 32.(1) The resources of the fund shall be preserved in off budget accounts in levs and in foreign currency at the Bulgarian National Bank.

(2) The excess of the incomes over the expenses at the end of the year shall be a transitional remainder and shall be used during the following year for its designation.

Art. 33.(1) For receiving resources from the fund shall be able to apply all cultural organisations including also organisations with non profit objective as well as individual cultural activists.

(2) Persons and organisations sanctioned under the order of art. 37 shall not have the right to apply for resources from the fund.

(3) The resources of the fund shall be conceded on the basis of concluded

contracts under the conditions of art. 31, para 3.

(4) The persons spending the resources received from the fund not for their designation shall restore them in full extent with interest equal to the basic interest rate of the Bulgarian National Bank increased with 10 points.

Art. 34. In three months term after the end of the calendar year the fund shall publish detailed report about its activity and intentions.

Art. 35.(1) Individuals or corporate bodies and sole entrepreneurs shall be able to establish scholarships for education of students in Bulgarian art schools. The conditions for receiving scholarships shall be coordinated with the corresponding educational establishment.

(2) Individuals or corporate bodies and sole entrepreneurs shall be able to ensure the activity of the cultural organisations. The conditions under which is implemented the ensuring shall be agreed in writing between the parties.

Art. 36.(1) The municipal council shall create municipal fund “Culture” and approve regulation for its work.

(2) The resources of the fund shall be collected from:

1. resources conceded in implementation of purposed programmes and projects in the field of culture;
2. grants, testaments and sponsorship from Bulgarian and foreign individuals and corporate bodies;
3. interests from the accounts of the fund;
4. other sources determined with a decision of the municipal council.

(3) The resources of the fund shall be spent for:

1. implementation of projects and programmes in the field of culture;
2. support of the conducting of cultural events;
3. participation in joint financing with individuals and corporate bodies of cultural initiatives with Bulgarian and international participation;
4. support of the amateur art;
5. ensuring creative scholarships for talented children and youths.

## Chapter six

### ADMINISTRATIVE AND PUNITIVE PROVISIONS

Art. 37.(1) An individual or corporate body who does not fulfil his obligations under art. 31, para 1, items 2, 4, 5 and 8 shall be punished with a fine, respectively with proprietary sanction double in extent of the due sum.

(2) At second breach the fine, respectively proprietary sanction shall be four times the due sum.

Art. 38.(1) The acts for establishing the breaches shall be compiled by officials of the Ministry of Culture empowered by the Minister of Culture.

(2) The punitive decisions shall be issued by the Minister of Culture or official empowered by him.

(3) The establishing of the violations, the issuing, appealing and execution of the punitive decisions shall be implemented by the order of the Law for the administrative breaches and penalties.

## ADDITIONAL PROVISION

§1. In the sense of this law:

1. “Culture” is the activity for creating. Research, dissemination and preservation of cultural values as well as the results of this activity.
2. “Cultural value” is authentic material evidence for human existence and activity which has importance for the development of the culture and is socially important.
3. “Cultural organisation” is a structure registered under the Law for the persons and the family or under the Commercial law or that has been established with an act of a body of the executive power or local authorities which subject of activity is creating, dissemination and preservation of cultural values in the field of theatre, music, cinema, audiovision, literature, fiction translation, dance, circus, plastic arts, architecture, design, folklore.
4. “Creator” is a person who creates and/or performs works of art.
5. “Amateur art” is cultural activity implemented by a person or a group of persons not professionally engaged in the field of art.
6. “Cultural – historic heritage” is a totality of cultural values that carry historic memory.
7. “Free lance profession” is the profession of persons exercised in the field of culture which is implemented independently.

## TRANSITIONAL AND CONCLUDING PROVISIONS

§2. In six months term after the law enters into force:

1. The Council of Ministers shall at a proposal by the Minister of Culture approve the acts pointed out in this law for determining the statute of the cultural institutes.
2. The Minister of Culture shall prepare and submit to approval to the Council of Ministers a draft tariff for the fees which the cultural institutes could collect.

§3. The cultural organisations and institutes found by this law shall in six months after the law enters into force submit applications for entering into the information register of the Ministry of Culture.

§4. In the Law for the cultural heritage and the museums (prom. SG 29/69; amend. and suppl. SG 29/73, SG 36/79, SG 87/80, SG 102/81, SG 45/84, SG 45/89, SG 10, 14/90, SG 112/95, SG 31/96 – Decision No 5 of the Constitutional Court ; amend. SG 44/96, SG 117/97, SG 153/98) shall be made the following amendments and supplements:

1. Art. 12 shall be amended as follows:
  - a) the previous text shall become para 1 and in item a) at the end shall be added “and the declared by the National institute for cultural heritage”;
  - b) created shall be para 2: “(2) The order for announcement and declaring of para 1, item a) shall be determined with an ordinance by the Minister of Culture.”
2. In art. 24 shall be made the following amendments and supplements:
  - a) the previous text shall become para 1;
  - b) created shall be para 2: “(2)”For production of goods, labels and design solutions having images of a cultural monument shall be issued a permission by the Ministry of Culture for which shall be collected

annual fee in extent determined with a tariff of the Council of Ministers.”

3. In art. 34 the figures 10 000 and 100 000 shall be substituted respectively by 50 000 and 1 000 000.

4. In art. 35 the words “up to 20 000” shall be substituted by “from 50 000 to 500 000”.

§5. In the Law for protection at unemployment and encouragement of employment (prom. SG 120/97; amend. SG 155/98, SG 26/99) shall be made the following supplements:

1. In art. 18 shall be created item 7: “7. Obligatory participation of those working without employment legal relations in the artistic companies of drama, musical and puppet theatres, film productions, operas, ballet, philharmonic, symphonic and chamber orchestras, choirs and folk ensembles.”

2. In art. 20, para 1 after the words “with employment contract” shall be added “or from the gross remuneration of the performers of art. 18, item 7”.

3. In art. 23, para 1 after the words “their general meeting” shall be added “without employment legal relations in the artistic companies of professional drama, musical and puppet theatres, circuses, film productions, operas, ballet, philharmonic, symphonic and chamber orchestras, choirs and folk ensembles” and after the words “the employer” shall be put a comma and added “the assignor”.

4. In art. 67 shall be made the following supplements:

a) in para 3 after the words “with employment contract” shall be put a comma and added “as well as artist – performers worked with employment contract during the corresponding calendar year”;

b) created shall be para 4:

“(4) Right to money indemnification for unemployment shall have also the unemployed who have worked without employment legal relations in the artistic companies of drama, musical and puppet theatres, film productions, operas, ballet, philharmonic, symphonic and chamber orchestras, choirs and folk ensembles who are insured or have been subject to insuring for unemployment for a term at least 4 of the last 12 months.”

5. in art. 69 shall be created para 5:

“(5) The extent of the money indemnification for the persons of art. 67, para 4 shall be 60 percent of the received average monthly remuneration but not less than 80 percent of the minimum working salary established for the country.”

6. In art. 71 shall be created para 6:

“(6) The persons of art. 67, para 4 shall receive indemnification for unemployment for a term of 6 months.”

7. In art. 72, para 1 shall be created item 7:

“7. Works with new non employment legal relations in the artistic companies of drama, musical and puppet theatres, film productions, operas, ballet, philharmonic, symphonic and chamber orchestras, choirs and folk ensembles.”

§6. In art. 23, para 3 of the Law for the corporate income levying (prom. SG 115/97; corr. SG 19/98; amend. SG 21, 153/98, SG 12/99) shall be created items 13 and 14:

“13. the extent of the established and conceded scholarships for education of students in the Bulgarian art schools; 14. the extent of the gratuitously conceded resources for ensuring the activity of the cultural organisations in the calendar year.”

§7. In art. 22, para 1 of the Law for levying the incomes of individuals (prom. SG 118/97; SG 35/98 – Decision No 6 of the Constitutional Court of 1998; amend. SG 71, 153/98) shall be created items 4 and 5: “4. the extent of the established and conceded scholarships for education of students in the Bulgarian art schools; 5. the extent of the gratuitously conceded resources for ensuring the activity of the cultural organisations in the calendar year.”

§8. This law shall repeal the Edict for theatres (SG 145/49).

§9. The provisions of §5, 6 and 7 shall enter into force from January 1, 2000.

§10. The implementation of the law shall be assigned to the Minister of Culture.

# **Part 4: Decentralisation**



## 4.1 Decentralisation (By Oana Radu)

### Towards a common vocabulary for issues of decentralisation<sup>1</sup>

**Oana Radu**

Nowadays decentralisation is frequently included as a goal in the cultural policy of many European countries. But from one country to another and from one period to the other, different views and meanings are attached to this term, which tallies with practices and attitudes of various types. Therefore, before any further analysis or discussion on the decentralisation process takes place, *a clarification of concepts and terms is required*. The aim is not to come up with a unique definition of this complex term, but to draw a map of concepts and levels of understanding, a framework for the analysis of the different practical approaches to decentralisation in a broad meaning.

In doing this it is important, first of all, to make a distinction between 1) decentralisation as a goal of cultural policy and 2) the practice of decentralisation as the means of achieving other goals such as ‘equity’, ‘democratisation’, ‘efficiency’ and so on. Thus, the term decentralisation can and is used when referring to a **decentralisation of cultural opportunities** from certain centres (the capital and other big cities) to the entire territory of a country or region. Seen as such, decentralisation might be a **goal** of cultural policy and various means might be put in place in order to achieve it.

But the most common use of the term decentralisation refers to the process connected with the mechanisms of defining and implementing cultural policies. In this respect, decentralisation is mainly a means enabling the achievement of other goals of cultural policy. I would label this type ‘*institutional decentralisation*’, which represents the distribution of certain competencies and responsibilities and the means to fulfil them from the centre to other actors in the cultural policy field, or by enhancing existing powers of these non-central actors. This institutional decentralisation has, in its turn, a variety of forms and degrees of decentralisation, depending on the nature of the actors to whom new powers are transferred, as well as on the resources transferred to them.

Thus, a first and essential characteristic of the decentralisation process concerns **the nature of the power** transferred to the non-central actors. Thus, we can talk about a transfer of:

- policy implementing power (administrative decision making)<sup>2</sup>
- policy making power (which enables non-central actors to conduct a cultural policy autonomously)<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> This text is adapted from Radu, Oana – *AWAY FROM THE CENTRE: Decentralisation in cultural policy*, Professional thesis for graduation of the Mastère Spécialisé Européen en Management des Entreprises Culturelles, Dijon, 2000

<sup>2</sup> Also known as delegation; or administrative decentralisation.

<sup>3</sup> Also known as devolution; or political decentralisation

As pointed out above, the various types and degrees of institutional decentralisation also depend upon the **resources** that are transferred from the centre, their nature and the different mix of these resources, as presented below.

In examining the functions and the role of ‘sub-central government’ in British politics, Rhodes<sup>4</sup> identifies five resources central to exchange within sub-national government, respectively:

1. **authority** – the mandatory and discretionary rights to carry out functions or services commonly vested in and between public sector organisations by statute or other constitutional means;
2. **money** – the funds raised by a public sector / political organisation from taxes (or precept), service charges or fees, borrowing, or some combination thereof;
3. **legitimacy** – access to public decision-making structures and the right to build public support conferred either by the legitimacy deriving from election or by other accepted means;
4. **information** – the possession of data and control over either its collection or its dissemination or both, and
5. **organisation** – the possession of people, skills, land, building materials and equipment and hence the ability to act directly rather than through intermediaries.

The other element which determines the type and degree of decentralisation is the **nature of the actors to whom the transfer of competencies and resources is made**. Thus, there are a variety of actors that could benefit from the institutional decentralisation process, which actually represents *a diversification and multiplication of actors in cultural policy*, namely:

<i>Type of actors</i>	<i>Actors</i>
<b>Public sector</b>	
1. Elected bodies	the public authorities at the local, regional and other intermediate level
2. Non-elected (appointed) bodies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the deconcentrated units of central authority in the territory</li> <li>• autonomous public bodies<sup>5</sup></li> </ul>
<b>Non-government sector</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the commercial sector</li> <li>• the voluntary sector</li> <li>• private individuals</li> </ul>

<sup>4</sup> Rhodes, R. A. W. (1992) – *Beyond Westminster and Whitehall*, reprinted edition. London: Routledge, quoted by Kawashima, Nobuko (1997) – „Theorising Decentralisation in Cultural Policy: Concepts, Values and Strategies”. *European Journal of Cultural Policy*, 3, 2, pp341-359

<sup>5</sup> These bodies have received various names, from intermediary bodies to quangos, from fringe bodies to arm’s length bodies, etc. and have been established in many countries, in various forms (councils, funds, foundations, associations, etc.) and with various competences and functions.

The transfer of resources and competencies can thus be done:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• between different tiers of government (central-regional-local) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to an elected body</li> <li>• to an appointed body</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<i>territorial decentralisation</i> <i>territorial deconcentration</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• among different bodies within a single tier of government</li> </ul>	<i>horizontal decentralisation</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• from a governmental body to an autonomous public body</li> </ul>	<i>functional deconcentration</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• from the public sector to the non-governmental one</li> </ul>	<i>'extreme' decentralisation</i> <sup>6</sup>

Depending on nature of the power being diffused and of the actors being enabled by it, we can thus clearly make a difference between the above-mentioned types of institutional decentralisation, further detailed in the table below. It must be also noted that within each type of decentralisation there are important variations from country to country or from one period to another due to differences of views and practices, which ultimately lead to a diversified landscape of practices in cultural policy in Europe.

---

<sup>6</sup> It is true and it must not be forgotten that the non-governmental sector has always been an essential producer, distributor and financer of culture. Its participation in the decentralisation process in cultural policy is, however, of a different nature. The responsibilities and competences transferred to the non-governmental sector are very limited and can be roughly considered as an increased democratisation process aimed at involving the citizens into the decision-making about the use of the public money. This is the reason for not referring to these actors in the below 'framework' of institutional decentralisation which maps only the public sector.

## The conceptual framework of decentralisation

<i>Type of decentralisation</i>	<i>Definition</i>	<i>Sub-types</i>
<b>Decentralisation of cultural opportunities</b>	the goal of reducing cultural disparities (in terms of cultural facilities, cultural institutions, cultural activities in general) between different regions, particularly between the capital or other important cultural centres and the rest of the country. It is a goal in cultural policy, which can be achieved through non-institutional or institutional decentralisation.	
<b>Non-institutional decentralisation</b>	it is a means of addressing the goal of decentralisation of opportunities in geographical terms, which does not assume any change in the administrative or decision-making process in cultural policy (no institutional decentralisation)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the creation of local/regional cultural organisations and facilities</li> <li>2. the “diffusion”/distribution of culture in the territory (e.g. touring of art exhibitions or performances nationwide)</li> </ol>
Institutional decentralisation within the public sector	the distribution (even spreading) of tasks and competencies in the cultural policy field between a plurality of public legal actors and the enhancement of their powers	
Territorial decentralisation	it is a political decentralisation, concerning the transfer of decision-making responsibilities and competencies from the central authorities to other territorial public authorities (local and other ‘intermediate’ authorities) or the enhancement of their power; it is considered <i>the very</i> decentralisation, or decentralisation <i>stricto sensu</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. to the local level</li> <li>2. to an intermediate level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ there can be more than one intermediate level (e.g. France: the regions and the <i>départements</i>)</li> <li>○ do not confuse it with territorial deconcentration</li> </ul> </li> </ol>
Territorial deconcentration	locating a part of the administrative activities of the Ministry of Culture at the regional (or even local) level. It actually represents a geographical extension of the central administrative authority to the regional and local	

	level.	
Functional deconcentration	the devolution of certain ‘functions’ of the central authority to autonomous public bodies, along with the means of achieving them	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the use of a variety of intermediary bodies, which are public autonomous bodies “taking over some of the tasks the government does not want to handle directly itself” (e.g. UK – the Arts Councils, France – <i>établissement public</i>, Bulgaria – arts centres, Estonia – the Estonian Cultural Endowment)</li> <li>2. changing the status or increasing the autonomy of public cultural institutions</li> </ol>
‘Horizontal’ decentralisation	the power and responsibilities are transferred among units within a tier of government.	N.B. Certain countries have seen during the last decade a “centralisation” of cultural responsibilities within a ministry/department of culture (e.g. UK, Ireland, Germany)

## **4.2 Report of the seminar “Administration in Culture in the Decentralised Environment”, MOSAIC workshop held in Zagreb, October 2000**

**We would like to thank Mrs Naima Balic Vice-Minister of Culture of Croatia and the Council of Europe for their permission to include this report in our workshop dossier.**

The Seminar “Administration in Culture in the Decentralised Environment” was held in Zagreb, on 27<sup>th</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup> October, organised by the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Croatia and the Council of Europe. The Seminar was intended for administrators in culture at county level, so that most of the participants came from the county offices for culture. In addition to them the representatives of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Croatia and of the Council of Europe were also present, as well as experts who presented introductory words at the beginning of each session. The seminar was headed by Corina Suteu, director of postgraduate studies in cultural management in Dijon. The Seminar was opened by Naima Balić, M.Sc., assistant to the Minister of Culture, stressing in her introductory word the advantages of the decentralised system for the development of Croatian culture, and pointing out that to strive for the realisation of a decentralised system is being a part of cultural policy of the Ministry of Culture. On behalf of the Council of Europe the participants of the Seminar were addressed by Laura Mäkelä, project manager of the MOSAIC<sup>7</sup> project.

During the Seminar several topics turned out to be especially important for the process of decentralisation in Croatian culture, such as: models and the level of decentralisation, communication between central and local authorities, the process of bringing decisions and mechanisms of funds expense control, and connecting the field of culture with other fields, first of all with tourism.

### **MODELS OF DECENTRALISATION**

In the discussion on the models of decentralisation it was emphasised that in the sense of organisation there exists the infrastructure for quick implementation of such a policy. That is to say, within each county offices for culture operate as a part of the state administration system, while county divisions for culture are parts of local self-government administration. But the question is whom to transfer authority to? Should decentralisation be implemented in the direction of a lower level of the state authority or in the direction of local self-government? Of course, only the latter solution means decentralisation in full sense, but it is necessary to find a role for county offices for culture within this process. The idea crystallised out in the discussion, articulated by Mik Flood, art consultant from London and a Council of Europe expert, it is a question of keeping up minimal cultural standards in each county. According to that idea, county

---

<sup>7</sup> MOSAIC project was established with the aim to help the South-East European countries (such as Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Albania, Macedonia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Moldavia) in the field of cultural activities such as organization of seminars, expert aid in the field of legislation, translation of publications etc.

offices for culture would represent the bodies of state administration dealing with implementation of minimal cultural standards defined at the level of the state (for example buying books for a library, theatre tours, organisation of concerts, etc.).

## **COMMUNICATION BETWEEN LOCAL AND CENTRAL AUTHORITIES**

This communication does not exist, respectively has not existed. Most of the participants of the Seminar expressed such an opinion. This problem has emerged because the duties of county offices have not been clearly defined or have been defined too abstractly, in such a way as the syntagm “executes administrative control”. So, county offices have found themselves in a situation that their role is unidentifiable. Therefore, communication with central authorities, respectively with the Ministry of Culture, as well as with representatives of local self-government, has failed to take place. Furthermore, neither horizontal communication between the offices exists so that administrators in these offices declare that “in their up to now activity with authorities representatives they have had the status of penguins on an ice-flow” as worded by Milorad Kovačević from the County office of the Koprivnica-Križevci County. Co-operation was agreed upon at the Seminar between the Ministry of Culture and the county offices for culture on the organisation of a series of seminars on cultural management.

## **DECISION MAKING PROCESS**

A general opinion expressed during the Seminar was that the decision making process has not up to now been transparent. Incompetent persons often participate in the process of decision making, and the whole process has been carried out within a wider context, so the decisions on culture are carried out together with decisions on sport and education, while culture is considered the least important activity. Those problems shall be partly solved by the *Law on Culture Councils* being in the procedure of passing, as deputy minister Biserka Cvjetičanin, Ph.D, pointed out in the discussion.

Then, there is the problem of programme implementation control as there are no mechanisms within the procedure of an administrative control over cultural institutions that would make particular institutions to fulfil their obligations. This is what impedes the activity of county councils for culture whose role has been defined, but the means to achieve results have not been defined.

## **Part 5: “Notes” on aspects of cultural policy-making responsibilities in the countries represented at the workshop**

These notes are not exhaustive. They aimed merely to provide **some brief background information** certain institutional aspects of country models on the countries represented in this workshop: Austria, Croatia, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain, Hungary, Portugal, Slovenia.

*Information up to date is available on [www.culturalpolicies.net](http://www.culturalpolicies.net)*



# Part 6: Case Studies & Presentations of the workshop

## 6.1 The Process of Development of the Bulgarian Cultural Policy

By Dr. Rossitsa Arkova, Senior Research Associate, Chief Expert in the Analyses and Forecasts, Department of the Ministry of Culture  
18 January 2001

Madame Chairperson,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

In my presentation I shall try to outline briefly the principles and objectives of the cultural policy of my country, the mechanisms of its formation and formulation, as well as the changes which have occurred in this sphere in the past years.

The cultural policy is the necessary formulation of the aims and objectives of the cultural life and the rational impacts on it. It comprises: awareness of the chances of culture, prediction of what would ensue with or without our intervention, outlining of the boundaries and opportunities with a view to making the future more favourable; protection of the cultural creativity and values against the impacts undermining them; maintenance, support, patronage, incentives for cultural constructiveness; norms, regulations and guidance of the cultural practices towards humanitarian constructiveness and full value; stratification of the influences and hierarchy of the goals. From them and on their basis a strategy is built, which defines the structures, procedures, rules and laws.

Civil society attributes a new role to management and organization, and a new type of participation of the state in the sphere of culture: the action of the subject of management (the institutions forming the management infrastructure) is complemented by a broad informal impact and by generation of a cultural policy on the part of the cultural institutes themselves (artistic, scientific, educational, mass media), as well as of the informal aggregate subject of culture - the creative intelligentsia and civil society - which generate a cultural policy through their influence on public opinion.

The place and the functions of the state in the development of Bulgarian culture and the arts, its gradual retreat from the "direct subsidizing" function and **attaining a balance between the National Centres for the Arts, the local governments, the non-governmental organizations and the different groups of creative individuals in the realization of the cultural activities, have been the leading policy in the past years.**

In the course of the work of this team, the structure of the expenditures of the Ministry of Culture was changed in such a way that a part of the funds spent for supporting cultural institutions were re-allocated for supporting projects for concrete activities. For decades the financial policy of the executive power was reduced to subsidizing the inherited hyperdeveloped network of the very numerous cultural institutions, which in a time of economic crisis and budget restrictions deprived them more and more of financial resources for their principal activities. Apart from the meager funds which the state has at its disposal during a period of transition, an obstacle for the productive functioning of the system of cultural institutions could be seen in the actual principle of financing, whereby the funds were allocated not for activities but for

maintenance. The Ministry made efforts to change that principle, and - although with certain difficulties - the results of that change are already beginning to be seen. In the past several years, the Ministry of Culture started introducing the competitive principle for the financing of the cultural activities, which allows differentiated support for certain cultural institutes on the basis of the significance of their cultural presence, as well as the artistic and economic results of their activities. The essence of this new way of financing consists in the **transfer of a part of the state support from financing of structures to financing of activities by means of competitive subsidizing of creative projects, based on equality of the applicants for support.** The Ministry of Culture accepted the **mixed state and municipal financing** as a modern form of financing of the structures. Agreements were signed with the municipal authorities for joint financing of the cultural institutes, which makes it possible to take into account the specificity of each institute, its available material base, the aim being to seek optimum proportions for the participation of the state, the municipality and the institute's own revenues. Practice has shown that in most cases the local authorities and the local communities supported their cultural institutes. This form of financing was applied in the sphere of the theatre, music and dance. In the cinema and book publishing there are no structures subsidized out of the state budget: in these spheres the participation of the state consists in the subsidizing of competing projects.

**The statute of the Centres for the Arts as autonomous legal persons - state non-profit organizations - was restored.** The aim of this act was to separate the decision-making on the allocation of public finances for culture from the political decisions on the granting of these financial means, i.e., this means the decisions on the distribution of the subsidies to be taken not by the politicians and by the cultural administration, but by public councils and councils of experts, in which the representatives of the artistic world and of the general public would be the principal decision-makers. The positive effects of such a principle of organization are manifested along three lines: first, a broader involvement of artists in the decision-making process on the development of culture is ensured; second, cultural and not political arguments prevail in the decision-making; third, longer-term and more stable activity of the Centres is guaranteed, because the government changes usually do not coincide with the terms of office of the artists in these structures, which in the Bulgarian case have the form of expert and public councils. Apart from the direct evaluation of the submitted projects, their function is to discuss important issues in the respective sectors and to give recommendations about them before the leadership of the Ministry of Culture, to examine and to make recommendations and suggestions for norms, regulations and draft legislation. Currently there are five National Centres: for theatre, music and dance; for books; for museums, galleries and the visual arts; a film center; and the National Institute for the Monuments of Culture. All of these centres have their public and expert councils, composed of representatives of the so-called unions of creative artists, of interested institutions, organizations and agencies, as well as individual artists and experts. The Centres organize sessions for project financing periodically (usually twice a year).

All these management decisions were not simply a materialization of the ideas of the present leading figures in the Ministry of Culture, **their formulation was preceded by their broad public discussion.** Bulgaria was one of the countries included in the programme for the reviewing of the national cultural policies within the Council of Europe. A national report and a report by a group of experts of the Cultural Cooperation Commission were drafted and they became the basis for a national debate on the cultural policy of the Republic of Bulgaria at the end of 1998, in which 250 people took part: specialists and artists from all spheres of the country's cultural life, members of

Parliament, representatives of non-governmental organizations (a total of 39, of which 12 were representatives of foundations working in the sphere of culture), people from the cultural administration at national and regional levels (78), of the unions of creative artists (19), of private cultural institutions (20), researchers and university lecturers in the field of theory and history of culture (26). The aim of the meeting was to have a discussion with a maximally broad participation on the basis of the ideas and recommendations contained in the two reports, and that discussion to outline the main aims, objectives, trends and priorities of the national cultural policy, which in turn would serve as the basis for the cultural strategy of the Ministry of Culture. The national debate was assessed by Minister Emma Moskova as "part of the steps which Bulgarian society is making towards a new thinking, whose priorities are decentralization, the new role of the municipalities, changes in the infrastructure of the cultural institutions, and interaction with the non-governmental organizations and the civil society structures. The debate highlighted the challenges of the transition: privatization, decentralization, finding of new sources of financing, implementation of new management strategies, new criteria for supporting creativity and a broader access to culture.

The network of civil organizations and individual artists assisted the drafting and discussion of the cultural policy. The so-called **subsidiarity principle** plays an essential role in the current understanding of the Ministry of Culture about the mechanisms of formulation and implementation of the cultural policy. This principle presupposes shared commitments and responsibilities for the public good between the institutions and the individual citizens, not only and not simply in their capacity of taxpayers, but also through the voluntary dedication of a part of their time, energy and imagination to these problems. During the period of transition that we live in, the idea about subsidiarity could assist the withdrawal of the state and the freeing of scope not for chaos, but for a new type of civic attitude. Consultations and dialogue are essential in the shaping of the public policy under the conditions of democracy. They involve the people in the discussion process, they guarantee that the policy reflects or has an insight into the needs and problems of the target groups, and contribute to the emergence of commitment to the development of the process and to its outcome. They provide information on the people and organizations; help to take into account their attitude to one contemplated measure or another; involve the people by engaging them in the decision-making process.

The discussions during the national debate on the country's cultural policy were conducted by a wide range of people with different positions in the system of culture, which gives a certain security about its representative character and about the trends for the utilization of the public investments for culture.

The **basic principles** of the national cultural policy are stipulated by the **Law on the Protection and Development of Culture**.

This law guarantees the non-intervention by the Ministry of Culture or by any other administrative body in the creative plans of the cultural institutions and individual artists. The Law on the Protection and Development of Culture protects the artists by changing the mechanisms for their incentives. The Ministry of Culture does not give assignments and orders. It gives an opportunity to the artists to compete with projects on an equitable basis, whereby the qualities of these projects remain the only criterion in the selection process. The Law also seriously facilitates the social security status of the artists and provides more favourable conditions for receiving unemployment benefits.

The Ministry of Culture is making efforts to combine two principal roles in its work: as a coordinating factor among all spheres of public life, which jointly shape man's culture, and as an immediate instrument assisting the development of the arts, the cultural activities, the protection and preservation of the cultural heritage, traditions and folklore.

The main aim of the cultural policy is to **create conditions for the participation of all in the cultural life**. In this respect, it is worth noting the efforts of the Ministry of Culture for the equitable integration of the minorities. At the same time, the work of the Ministry of Culture takes into account the circumstance that cultural diversity is not only ethnically determined: special attention is devoted to the cultural participation of the young people, drafting for the purpose special programmes jointly with the Ministry of Education, the Agency for Youth and the Sports, and the Ministry of Defence.

The principal challenge before the institutions responsible for the cultural policy, such as the Ministry of Culture, should be sought in the transition from principles to practice. The present team in the Ministry of Culture started from the lowest point in terms of resource availability. The country had just emerged from hyperinflation and it was placed almost immediately under the conditions of a currency board. Hence the problems with the most difficult solutions were connected with the scarce resources.

### Financing

Several objective indicators have been adopted in European practice, reflecting the parameters of the financing of culture, the most important of which is the relative share of the expenditures for culture out of all costs in the state budget and out of the country's GDP. The dynamics of these data is as follows: the money spent on culture in the country's consolidated budget (in US dollars) more than doubled between 1996 and 1999.

Culture	1996	1997	1998	1999
Costs in the consolidated budget, in million US\$	43.904	46.690	86.822	97.317
% of the GDP	0.4466	0.4492	0.7059	0.7849
% of the total costs in the consolidated budget	0.8927	0.8785	1.81	-

The following conclusions can be made on the basis of the cited data: there are grounds to think that the stable tendency towards relative decrease in the public spending for culture, which was unswerving since 1990, was reversed at long last in 1998. These expenditures had their absolute minimum in 1996 and 1997, when at the same time the lowest GDP values for the country were recorded and the lowest percentage of spending for culture out of the GDP. Of course, the expenditures have not increased in absolute terms, insofar as even in 1999 the absolute value of the expenditures for 1990 had not yet been reached; nevertheless, the fact of their relative increase is very important. In 1998, a substantial increase of the share of the expenditures for culture in the country's consolidated budget was observed for the first time, almost reaching the 1990 level when their percentage was 1.84% (1.83 for 1998).

The share of these costs from the GDP is a more significant indicator: unfortunately, the 1990 level has not been reached yet (1.09% of the GDP), but this can be easily explained with the existence of a currency board and severe restrictions for the entire budget sphere. Nevertheless, it is very important to note that the percentage share of the GDP for the expenditures for culture demonstrates a tendency to grow, that growth being considerable for 1998 and 1999: from 0.44-0.45 in 1996 and 1997, it reached 0.78 in 1999, which is an increase of about 73%. Here it is also necessary to bear in mind the data on the GDP dynamics, which manifested real growth in 1998, which in turn means

that only after 1998 there was a real growth in the culture expenditures: both in terms of percentage, and in absolute terms as a part of a growing GDP.

An important indicator of the changed model of financing can be seen in the relative share of resources allocated for support of projects to the overall expenditures of the respective National Centre and to the total amount of the state subsidy for the respective sector. From 1997 to 1999, the dynamics of these resources was as follows: in the sphere of theatre, music and dance, the Centres spent for support of projects accordingly 69.08% in 1997, 72.8% in 1998 and 82.7 % of the financial resources at their disposal. The share of these funds out of the total amount of the state subsidy for these sectors, distributed by the Ministry of Culture, also grew: from 1.02% (1997) through 4.08% (1998) to 4.24% in 1999. "... Non-governmental sponsors (corporations, foundations and non-governmental associations, as well as other non-profit organizations) are the alternative to state financing, and their share in the overall culture costs has increased in the past years, tending to increase in absolute terms as well. This observation was made in the report of the World Commission for Culture and Development, drafted by a wide range of experts as the balance of the UN World Decade for Culture and Development, and entitled *Our Creative Diversity*. It is important to emphasize that Bulgaria is following the same tendency as well: in the 1996-1999 period the non-governmental sector financed projects in the sphere of culture with at least 8,018,408 US dollars – I am using the words "at least" because the data on the participation of the third sector are rather incomplete and cover the contribution of the biggest organizations only (the Open Society Foundation, accordingly the Soros Centre for the Arts, which became a separate entity at the end of 1997, the Future for Bulgaria Foundation, the 13 Centuries Bulgaria Fund, and financing under the PHARE Programme). Over the same period, the ratio between the state subsidy and the money given to support culture by non-governmental organizations was approximately 9:1 (74,882,857 US\$ to 8,018,408 US\$), i.e., at least one lev out of ten, invested in cultural projects, has been made available by some non-governmental organization. This ratio exceeds the customary values for most European countries with a better developed legislation, strong traditions and a powerful capital, and where the financial expression of the funds for sponsorship varies between 1 and 6 % (according to data reported in 1999 at the Bulgarian-German Seminar: *Culture and Economics - Kinship by Choice or Marriage of Convenience?* For Germany the value of that indicator was 5% for 1998).

These data suggest not only the involvement of the third sector with the problems of Bulgarian culture, but also the increased activity of the people and of the institutions which create cultural products while seeking opportunities to implement their ideas and projects. This means that a new thinking is already gaining ground, in which the artist's own activity and initiative for securing the necessary funds acquire a greater weight, and is no longer perceived only as the necessary evil, but also as expansion of the possibilities for creative independence.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Dear colleagues,

I did not intend to give you a report on the work of the Ministry of Culture in the past few years, therefore many substantial topics were not at all addressed in my presentation, notably the issues related to the international cultural policy and the country's preparations for EU membership, the cultural cooperation with the Council of Europe and many other important things. My intention was to try and outline the changed attitude of the Ministry of Culture as an institution to the participation of society in the drafting and implementation of the national cultural policy, and its openness for an

ongoing public debate on all its key issues. It is my hope that such a conversation will also be forthcoming over the next days within the framework of the present meeting.

---

## **6.2 The ‘third’ sector: Different roles which cultural organisations, administrators and artists can play in the policy development process (both centrally and locally)**

**By Christopher Gordon**  
18 January 2001

For about 30 years from the end of the Second World War, most western European countries had relatively stable cultural policies – largely based on the more established arts and heritage institutions, and upon central government paternalism. Policy (whether overtly expressed or not) tended to derive from the assumption that ‘government knew what was best’. This was related to both the general public (the taxpayer) and to the content and quality of artistic output. It also happened to coincide with the vested interests of the (usually fairly conservative) cultural institutions.

This ‘stability’ was then seriously challenged from two main sources, the first economic, the second social and political. (1) Late in 1973 the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) unilaterally declared a 70% increase in oil prices. Immediately thereafter OPEC set a further 130% rise as a political weapon in response to the western nations’ having backed Israel against its Arab neighbours in the Yom Kippur War. With subsequent increases announced almost annually, a barrel of crude oil which cost US \$3 in 1973, cost \$30 by 1980. Apart from this driving western governments to think more seriously about alternative energy sources for their future economic and domestic needs, this unforeseen crisis signalled to developed countries with sophisticated ‘welfare’ systems that public finance from tax and other revenues was finite, and that hard choices could no longer be avoided. (2) Also from the early 1970s, the rising ‘community arts’ movement (or *animation socio-culturelle*) began to gather critical mass, and argued that individual creativity and participation - which had until then been largely ignored by public governmental systems – was of greater value and importance than maintaining the traditional bourgeois cultural infrastructure bequeathed from the past.

These challenges to the old status quo have continued, which also means that the formulation and implementation of cultural policy has had to become more collaborative, taking account of the shifts in power perceptions between government at central, regional and local levels, between the private and ‘third’ sectors, and reflecting the attitudes of the cultural sector itself with regard to competing visions of the role of culture in modern society. One inevitable consequence of the decentralisation of power and responsibility (not necessarily always accompanied by the necessary resources...) from central government has been a greater reflection in policy of the needs and desires of the public. As the elected representatives of democratic systems are likely to be more immediately accessible at the local than the central level, the views of the taxpaying public will tend to have an increased influence, since they may in due course be translated into votes at the ballot box. Central government, on the whole, acting paternalistically or simply to

maintain tradition, had often not reflected very deeply on the fact that tax revenues (drawn from the total population) tended overwhelmingly to subsidise the cultural habits of the educated and wealthier middle classes, whilst those lower down the social scale were more prone to ‘consume’ their culture through products and experiences in an unsubsidised commercial market.

In thinking about appropriate roles in relation to cultural policy therefore, it seems important to me to reflect upon what has happened over these years, in order that we can recognise the subtle, but constant, shifts in the power balances. A crude summary of the main players might go something like this:

- Central government – its ability to make things happen directly is increasingly circumscribed;
- Regional, municipal and local government – for both economic and social reasons is having to take an increasingly ‘holistic’ view of its legal and statutory responsibilities;
- Private sector – as competition in the market for customers intensifies, the importance of businesses projecting a positive image (e.g. in relation to the environment or culture) also increases;
- Third sector – as public tax-based revenues decline as an absolute proportion of the economy (at least in acceptability to taxpayers), politicians are laying increasing emphasis and responsibility on others in society to provide public and community services;
- Cultural sector – with the importance of the ‘paying customer’ and multiple choice more generally acknowledged, and public resources increasingly constrained, the internal arguments about priorities between ‘heritage’ or contemporary, and ‘bourgeois’ versus participatory continue, but can prove sterile and counter-productive.

The arts and heritage, from a less secure public financial base, are having to compete more for a share of the public’s free time and disposable income. The fundamental structures of our lives are changing, with leisure time becoming fragmented and constrained. The old traditional patterns of family life are weakening under the influence of irresistible external economic and social forces. Furthermore, in an increasingly global and commercial/electronic market, the cultural ‘providers’ are less and less certain of what they are competing with, and what their own audience actually is. The policy of government (whether at central or lower levels) which traditionally in western, central and eastern Europe has treated culture as being ‘outside’ the market, now has to take account of supply, demand and distribution issues. The audience, the paying customer, is now as vital as the consumer in the purely commercial marketplace.

Because of the risk that the elected politicians who are ultimately responsible for distributing public money to support cultural creation and production might find the easiest and most attractive refuge in supporting national symbols (i.e. institutions), and overtly populist manifestations, or else those which deliver other secondary (i.e. economic or social) benefits, I would argue that it is vital for the creative and challenging cultural sector to involve itself as actively as possible at all political levels. There is no advantage to be gained from standing on the sidelines, nurturing ‘pure’ cultural ideals, and then retrospectively bemoaning the fact that the public money necessary to ensure survival has gone to some other politically prioritised area. Nobody likes backing losers,

and public systems increasingly like to be supporting success – helping those who help themselves.

I do not believe there is a single solution which can be imposed. Each society has to work out its own appropriate answers in the light of the very complex factors prevailing. One of the clearest attempts to do this on a rational basis that I have come across is a document produced in Latvia in the early 1990s by a broad cross-sector of artists, writers and performers. Entitled ‘Main Cultural Policy Postulates of Latvia’ this was in effect a manifesto put out by activists in the sector. They foresaw the risk that their new-found freedoms might well be ignored by government because of other, more visibly pressing, economic priorities. Those who had led the struggle for liberty and freedom of expression spelled out to their new government the legal, economic and social conditions which they now hoped for. The document, which had some influence on the Latvian Parliament, summarised the main instruments that would be required for putting a new cultural policy into practice, namely:

- Legislation
- Finance
- Organisational and management structures
- Information and research
- Development of public opinion and support.

An important lesson to be drawn from the Latvian initiative is that the starting point was a broad lobby for culture. This meant that the government, had it chosen to do so, would have had enormous difficulty in playing off (on grounds of limited finance, say) heritage interests against those of drama, or music against the contemporary visual arts. By breaking down the apparently massive volume of change in practice and attitudes necessary at the time into manageable and functional headings, the cultural sector was better able to identify those areas in which it could make an impact on developing policy and systems.

As with planning and strategy, so it should be with policy at the highest level. Shared ownership is vitally important. A policy for the cultural sector, but in which the cultural operators and artists do not believe, will have immense difficulty in delivering effectively. I would contend therefore that the ‘third’ and cultural sectors need to be lobbying, and influencing, policy at all levels. Not just directly into the democratic political process (although that is important), but also harnessing the support of the public, the audience, and the private sector, both of which can have a crucial influence on government attitudes. Culture and identity – as we know from the Balkan region – can be terribly abused for divisive reasons, but they can and should also be employed to assist social cohesion and community capacity building. Policy models which reflect the realities of civil society are more likely to be rooted and effective than something which is imposed from the centre. The holistic and ‘horizontal’ (bottom up) model is much more likely to succeed than the ‘vertical’ (top down) one, which will always be more vulnerable to sudden unexpected change, or even to the whims of particular politicians when in power.

Culture, or so it seems to me from my ‘western’ perspective, is often too modest in owning up to, and claiming the benefits of, its ‘instrumental’ qualities. Much has been written and published internationally about the contribution of culture to urban



regeneration. Although some might now claim this has been overemphasised, I see no reason to doubt the central truths of the contributory roles of culture in ‘re-imaging’ cities in industrial decline, or in helping create a lively environment which is more likely to attract the interest of potential inward investors (for example Barcelona, Birmingham, Glasgow and Helsinki are well documented). For the influence to work effectively, culture needs to engage and consult dynamically with its community and its political representatives in order to secure its rightful place in broad cross-sector corporate strategies. This is a lesson which the cultural institutions in many western European countries have been slow to learn in relation to the available European Union funds, but is now becoming standard practice. In central and eastern European countries, of course, the sector has a key role to play in helping to rebuild shattered value systems in a positive manner, to counteract post-communist cynicism or fatalism.

I conclude with a summarised example of one attempt to produce a ‘holistic’ policy and delivery system for the UK – not because I think it is in any way ideal, but because I am very familiar with it. Nevertheless, within Europe it is one of cultural policy models which is closest to civil society in its policy formulation and delivery, based as it is on a decentralised and ‘arm’s length’ system. Less than ten years ago, a very senior civil servant in our Culture Ministry (working for the Conservative government at that time) stated publicly that the government’s cultural policy consisted of *not* having a cultural policy. Since 1997 however, the Labour government has created the most articulate cultural policy of any modern British government, combined with serious attempts further to decentralise policy making responsibility and delivery. The Ministry is at the centre of a complex structure which distributes public money and supports activity in a range of sectors, all of which fall within a broad definition of ‘culture’ (arts, museums, film, press and broadcasting, tourism, sport, the National Lottery etc.). The role of the Government department is to provide the strategic leadership so that the numerous independent ‘arm’s length’ bodies, which actually make the decisions on resource allocation to their specific subject areas, are accountable and approximately in tune with overall government policy. The four current major unifying policy themes of central government, as interpreted by the Ministry for Culture, Media and Sport are these:

1. The promotion of access for the many, not just the few (= social objective)
2. The pursuit of excellence and innovation (= creative and artistic objective)
3. The nurturing of educational opportunity (= cultural and educational objective)
4. The fostering of the creative industries (= economic objective) – NB this sector represents 4% of the UK’s GDP, or £60 billion.

The Ministry passes on around 90% of its total resources from the Treasury (Finance Ministry) to the relevant ‘arm’s length’ bodies. In return for being allocated these funds, these bodies (e.g. Arts Councils of England, Scotland and Wales, the Sports Councils etc.) are required under a financial memorandum to demonstrate how their policy and expenditure plans for the next three-year period will broadly (though not in detail) reflect the government’s stated priorities. Attempts are being made to put in place a system of ‘performance indicators’ whereby some valid measurement of annual progress can be made.

To extend the analysis, The Arts Council of England as part of the devolutionary trend now immediately hands over (on the basis of agreed plans and strategies) more than half of its financial allocation from central government to the ten Regional Arts Boards, which

are the key organisations working in partnership with local government and a variety of regional agencies, plus the private and voluntary sectors. There is therefore a great deal of opportunity for individual cultural organisations or – more effectively perhaps – groups or networks of cultural organisations, to try to influence policy at all levels, and through a variety of routes where there is common interest. With the introduction of its thematic policy for the first time, the government and the Arts Council have come in for particular criticism from the long-established ‘bourgeois’, almost all London-based, institutions and their spokesmen. The reason is not difficult to work out. Whereas previously they might have felt that their regular receipt of increasing annual subsidy was relatively secure under category (2), the additional requirements made of them under (1) and (3) will inevitably put their demands into direct competition with a much larger number of cultural organisations which had never previously been accorded much importance under the old ‘artist’ focused policies. What the new government cultural policy framework has created is legitimised space for a broader public debate about the role of culture in society, and how public spending should lead, or respond to it.

---

### **6.3 Decentralization Processes in Bulgaria**

**By Dr Raina Cherneva**, Head of Analysis and Prognosis Department, Ministry of Culture

19 January 2001

With political and social changes underway in 1990 in Bulgaria I imagined cultural life becoming free and developed overnight and out of all those rigid ideological grids we have had for year. I imagined municipalities bidding for the honor of having the best conductor of director in town. I imagined the artistic community taking over the initiative for local cultural policies and local social and cultural entities becoming the building block of civil society.

Looking back from today’s perspective, a large part of all this is already there or on the way to, but it took a long and thorny route. Bulgaria’s political meandering over the past eleven years has left its mark on all sectors including culture.

Decentralization along with abolishing state monopoly in cultural production and distribution became the essential principals for developing new cultural policies. Irrespective of their political commitments, each one of the eight ministers of culture and their ministerial team after 1990 have been announcing exactly these two priorities, their practical implementation however initiated with cosmetic administrative changes was either rejected or placed on the back burner by the next team in office.

A point to note here is that from a broader perspective decentralization is not necessarily identical to democratization. Decentralization is model of administration. The French centralized model is not an undemocratic one although it is now being decentralized. In the former socialist – block countries however decentralization was linked with cultural processes democratization because of the former ideological and control by extremely efficient central machine in state government and culture in particular.

The first step towards decentralization was to set up centers for arts and cultural activities operating “at an arm’s length” from government authorities. They started a policy of

autonomy and degovernmentalisation but were closed down in 1995 and brought directly under the Ministry of Culture. Two years later they were given back their status of independent legal persons.

The second step was to reestablish the legal autonomy of cultural institutes. Until 1990 Bulgaria's cultural institutes had never been independent legal entities. The state had de facto always had the final word in their finances and ownership. Their new status now allowed for managing their finances and auxiliary operations to increase available funds.

The present leadership in the Ministry of Culture came to office following a two-year interruption of reforms. Bulgaria had just avoided hyperinflation and was soon to move to a currency board. It was a difficult period but the Ministry went ahead with a strategy for cultural policies focused on genuine decentralization. Its work was along two parallel lines drafting new bills and updating existing laws together with a structural reform to bring about decentralization in real terms.

The Culture Protection and Development Act has now been adopted. The word "protection" in the title is a bit pathetic. However that is exactly what culture in Bulgaria needs at this moment. Financial stagnation has been tremendously detrimental to cultural processes. Culture (apart from culture industries) is not a profit-making activity. This Act has put in place a framework for cultural processes for quite a long period ahead. It prescribes the state's commitments as regards the institutes makes provisions for devolving powers to local authorities, and creates mechanisms for divestiture and decentralization.

We also made our first steps towards funding arrangements to support the reform. The theatres were reorganized into three categories: state theatres entirely subsidized from the central budget; municipal theatres most of which are on mixed funding from both the central budget and the municipalities; and open-stage theatres. Private companies and groups are also entitled to support where they have won competition open to all.

The operas and philharmonic orchestras in four cities were reorganized in Opera and Philharmonic Societies with cuts in administration staff and better opportunities to make a more efficient use of music formations in the respective area.

District museums and libraries had their status raised to regional entities by an act of parliament. The state delegated its rights to local structures, which apart from their normal functions assist methodologically and organizationally the smaller museums and libraries in the region.

Decentralization is not an easy job. Each transferal to or sharing of responsibilities with local government is a slow and difficult process. Negotiations with municipalities have to be conducted by top ministry officials and center directors and it takes long to reach agreements.

The Ministry has so far decentralized administration as much as it could but only within its functions and powers. The cultural policies pursued by the municipalities are financed from local budgets, which are controlled centrally by the Ministry of Finance (as required under the currency board).

Don't take me to mean that municipalities are not willing to have cultural institutes in their area. No, they would love to but their financial potential is limited. Their small budgets are first allocated for schools, hospitals and those out of job. Quite often their dilemma is choose between education or health and culture.

At this juncture it's worth mentioning the experience in the museum town of Koprivshtitsa described by its mayor at the Cultural Policy Debate two years ago. To implement its cultural policies the municipality there set up a Municipal Heritage Fund to accumulate and allocate their own revenue. That fund was closed after the currency-board prohibition of off-balance accounts. Together with some local NGOs the municipalities founded Koprivshtitsa Foundation with the purpose of supporting development in the town and adjacent villages through actively involving the public in cultural recovery and promoting Koprivshtitsa as a centre of international tourism. I think this is an excellent example of local cultural policies. Last year Koprivshtitsa had its National Traditional Art Festival with over 17 000 performers and visitors from Bulgaria and abroad. For a couple of years now the foundation has been an associated member of the Open Society Clubs in Bulgaria. Through this arrangement they can apply for various projects and supplementary funding. This example shows that broad community participation, good organization of own resources and making use of NGO mechanisms and potential can generate conditions for implementing modern local cultural policies.

In our discussion later we ought to look at the issue of funding local cultural policies and tell each other of various sources of funds and joint initiatives with NGOs and other civil entities.

Let me now briefly examine local cultural policies per se because decentralization is not merely and not only finding someone to foot the bills of theatres, orchestras, libraries and museums. Subsidies from the central and local budgets are ultimately paid by the taxpayer. The other goal of decentralization is to allow for developing local cultural policies and strategies, regions and municipalities are most close to the public. They know about the needs, cultural identity and aspirations in the community. They have therefore to become a driving force participation, creativity, identity and pluralism in culture. They can also build the bridges to other economic sectors such as tourism, education, public works, NGOs and raise more funds, as well as actively involving more people in the cultural processes. That's exactly what has been happening in Koprivshtitsa and other places in Bulgaria. Quite often however such joint activities and two-way support happen only occasionally. The "formal event" syndrome is still present. Almost every town and many villages have recently started or reestablish a festival, a competition, a feast or a cultural event of their own. It is organized jointly by people from different sectors, NGOs, the business community, etc and the event is declared a success in the end.

This however is not a cultural policy proper. Local cultural policies should not only come up with decisions and solutions on funding theatres, orchestras, libraries, traditional crafts, amateur arts, but also to support minority cultures, quality of life and be a driving force in developing a civil society. Local cultural policies are also expected to promote local cultural identity and traditions and resist the big broom of globalization.

Our workshop is an excellent opportunity to discuss decentralization from the perspective of local cultural policies. Among us are people from the legislature, from central and

local government bodies and from various cultural institutions, as well as experts from the Council of Europe and neighboring countries, which might be faced with or have addressed similar problems. The workshop will be another modest step towards democratization and decentralization in culture and society.

---

#### **6.4 Decentralization of Culture in Plovdiv**

**By Vessela Ilieva**, Director of the Municipal Institute for Museum Activities – Plovdiv  
19 January 2001

When talking about the decentralization of culture, it is necessary to bear in mind the two lines along which this process takes place: along the line of administration and financing of culture, and along the line of the initiation of cultural events, as well as through the interaction of different factors - state, municipal and private - in determining the cultural policy in a certain region (the Plovdiv municipality in the concrete case). The development of culture and of its concomitant activities does not differ substantially from the remaining regions, but recently characteristic processes have been observed in the determination and course of the cultural processes and phenomena.

Following the line of administration and financing of culture in Plovdiv, one can see mixed state and municipal financing for the Opera and Philharmonic Society, and since 2000 - of the Plovdiv Drama Theatre as well. Bilateral contracts based on the Budget Law, which permits mixed financing, have been concluded between the Ministry of Culture and the Plovdiv Municipality concerning the Opera and Philharmonic Society, and the Plovdiv Drama Theatre. These contracts stipulate the sums and the provisions of the law under which the municipal subsidy is to be spent, as well as the obligations of the state institutions to the Municipality. The money is basically spent on salaries and insurances, and in the contract signed with the Plovdiv Drama Theatre - for maintenance of the theatre as well. A remarkable element in the contracts concluded between state structures and the Plovdiv Municipality is that the obligations run only along the line of the municipal structures, whereas the rights are reserved for the state structures. The good contacts are built on the basis of the good old relations between the opera, the philharmonic orchestra and the theatre on the one side, and the Plovdiv Municipality - on the other.

Some of the state formations changed entirely to municipal financing (e.g., the Trakia Folk Ensemble), and many of the traditional events for the cultural life of the city involve interaction of the state institutions and the municipal structures for their financing and organization: the Golden Chest International Festival for TV Films (jointly with the Bulgarian National TV), the Gold Rhyton and the Christo G. Danov National Prize (jointly with the Book Centre of the Ministry of Culture). The Easter Music Festival is an annual event owing to the concerted efforts of the Plovdiv Municipality and the Plovdiv Opera and Philharmonic Society, and the puppet festival under the motto "Two Is Company, Three Is a Crowd" is organized jointly with the Plovdiv Puppet Theatre.

The decentralization of culture in the city in terms of its administration develops also with the elimination of some formations from the municipal structures, which formally became private structures and continued their existence by managing to achieve even greater successes. The Plovdiv Municipality offered to them its facilities, which they managed until then under the most favourable terms for them, with a view to

perpetrating their artistic activities and as a manifestation of good will and outstretched hand for further cooperation as well: the jazz formation White, Green and Red - the City Hall of Culture, the Philippopolis Chamber Ensemble for Ancient Chants - premises in the old part of Plovdiv and the Brass Band.

In this respect, the problem with the culture clubs was subject to a slightly more specific treatment, because the decentralization has been constituted in the Law on the Culture Clubs itself, under which they are autonomous self-governing legal persons receiving subsidies only from the municipal budget. The municipal subsidy is used in accordance with the decisions to that effect of the Club's Board. There are 21 culture clubs on the territory of the Plovdiv Municipality and their development in that respect does not differ compared to other cities. Municipal facilities and premises have been made available to all of them and they are using them to suit their aims and objectives. Perhaps the only difference is that on the discretion of the Club's Board the budget subsidy is used to pay the salaries of the full-time staff members of the clubs. The Club Boards determine their policy autonomously and the Municipality assists their activities, whenever possible.

The other line along which the decentralization of culture takes place and where this process is more manifest is in its initiation. Plovdiv can be cited as an example in this respect. The European Month of Culture - Plovdiv 1999 is the most lucid example, but it will be discussed separately. In the other cases this was manifested with the establishing of foundations with the participation of the Plovdiv Municipality, expressed in the form of a separate subsidy or making municipal facilities available for their functioning.

The Art Today Foundation was registered with the aim of establishing a Centre for Modern Art with the "Ancient Bath" as its base - a 17<sup>th</sup> century architectural culture monument of local significance. The Foundation has implemented several significant projects so far, one of which is the setting up of a multi-media laboratory. Every year there is an item in the plan of the Culture Directorate entitled Modern Art Week. A part of the events under this project are prepared and organized by the Foundation.

The good contacts of the Culture Directorate of the Plovdiv Municipality with non-governmental organizations and unions of creative artists are also manifested in the various other cultural events on the agenda of the Plovdiv Municipality.

Jointly with the Society of the Plovdiv Artists, a statute and contracts have been drafted for cooperation in the organizing of an open-air event of graphic art, which runs the year round, National Autumn Exhibitions, an International Open-Air Event of Painting, the Annual Exhibition of the Society, International Sculpture Symposium, etc. The role of the Plovdiv Municipality for these events consists in their financing, the initiative for the character of the concrete event being entirely left to the Society of the Plovdiv Artists.

Separate contracts for reading of poetry and prose, celebration of anniversaries, etc. have been signed with the Society of the Plovdiv Writers, which are quite numerous in the city.

An international theatre festival has been organized for several years in Plovdiv, entitled Stage on a Crossroads (jointly with the Avant-Scene Foundation), which became one of the most popular cultural events in the city.

The Film Nights in Philippopolis are a good example of interaction between the Plovdiv Municipality, the private company called Participation With and the Art Today Foundation.

An International Chamber Music Festival has been organized for 35 years jointly with the Music Agency, the most characteristic feature of this cultural event being the existence of an artistic council that determines the tendencies and the repertory of the

concrete annual festival, and which consists of prominent musicians from Plovdiv. The situation is the same with the annual international folklore festival, whose artistic council is composed of the most famous choreographers in the city.

The International Competition and Festival of Classical Guitar will be held for the eighth time on the initiative of the Classical Guitar Foundation, which has its seat in Plovdiv. For several years already this internationally recognized festival has enjoyed material and moral support by the Plovdiv Municipality, which has secured in this way its annual occurrence.

The plan of the Culture Directorate of the Plovdiv Municipality also features every year a Photography Week, organized jointly with the Association of Photographers in Bulgaria, registered in Plovdiv, as well as with other associations and artistic organizations of photographers from all over the country.

Apart from the good end results, everything listed so far is accompanied by numerous problems as well, concomitant to the process of attaining the end culture product. These problems stem mainly from the communication and from the understanding of the roles of the different participants in the process of interaction. An old inherited view is that the Municipality as a whole should only give, that different things should be demanded of it and that it has a duty to give. However, the new conditions and the new realities give new vistas both to the creative initiative and to the initiative in the quest for new ways of financing and material assistance for culture. It is an indisputable fact that the conscience of artists and eminent culture figures has changed in a positive direction with respect to the creative initiative, but has not progressed an inch with respect to financing. And this leads to problems in the communication, in spite of the good will of the Plovdiv Municipality. Naturally, this does not refer to all artists and creative individuals.

As I said already, the European Month of Culture - Plovdiv 1999 and of the foundation bearing the same name is a case in itself.

In 1996, the Plovdiv Municipality applied under the EU Programme on the Cultural Capitals of Europe to become concomitant city for 1999. In 1997 Plovdiv was selected to be the concomitant city of the European cultural capital Weimar. This is an indisputable success not only for the cultural community of Plovdiv, but for the entire country as well, because the international competition in such cases is enormous.

The preparations for the biggest cultural event in the history of Plovdiv started immediately after the Public Council was established with the task of determining the trends of the policy of the Month of Culture, as well as the exercising of public control over the driving forces and the performers of the cultural programme. This Public Council consisted of 30 outstanding figures of culture and science from the city, among whom were artist Dimiter Kirov, Associate Professor Cleo Protochristova, Borislav Ivanov, and others.

The entire artistic and technical staff of the Culture Department of the Plovdiv Municipality were mobilized and they bore the burden of organizing and initiating many of the cultural events.

A Municipal Foundation European Month of Culture - Plovdiv 1999 was established. Its Board of Directors was elected by the Municipal Council of the city of Plovdiv, and that foundation was actually the executive body in the concrete case.

A council was also established within the Ministry of Culture, consisting of representatives of the Plovdiv Municipality, the Municipal Foundation European Month of Culture - Plovdiv 1999, representatives of the various centres of the Ministry of Culture, representatives of the Presidency, of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, of the economy, of tourism, etc. The objectives of this Council were also first and foremost to

assist and to control the programme of this unique cultural event in the country. Owing to the efforts of the Ministry of Culture and of this Council, the Council of Ministers reached a decision to grant a target subsidy amounting to 1 billion (= 1 million new) Bulgarian levs.

The efforts of the entire artistic potential of the city were harnessed for the success of the Month of Culture. The more than 400 projects included in the Month of Culture were selected on the competitive principle.

Other private sources of financing are also sought in the form of sponsors and donors, as well as through advertising. A number of international programmes were approached for financial support of the event. The Municipality plans to allocate 1 million levs out of its budget for the Month of Culture, which is under the supervision of the Culture Department of the Plovdiv Municipality. Many good contacts have been established with the cultural offices of the embassies of more than 30 countries, to which we owe most of the international participation in the programme.

The Month of Culture ended on August 10, 1999. The overall assessment for it is highly positive.

The question remains about the existence of the Foundation. Opinions on this are divided: a part of the cultural community believes that the Foundation has already fulfilled its functions, while another part (the majority) is in favour of the idea to perpetuate the Foundation's existence, because it has gained considerable experience and can become the backbone of the cultural life in the city,

At the end of January 2000, the Municipal Council of Plovdiv decided to continue the activities of the Foundation and to transform the European Month of Culture into a Month of Culture - Plovdiv, which is to be organized every year. A new Board of Directors of the Foundation was elected, followed by the preparations for the Month of Culture - Plovdiv 2000. More than 90 cultural events were organized in the period between May 25 and July 10, 2000, again selected on the competitive principle. This time the financing was entirely with funds raised through sponsorship, advertising and projects under international programmes. The assistance on the part of the Plovdiv Municipality consisted in making the premises and facilities of the Municipality available free of charge for the cultural events.

The Month of Culture in Plovdiv gradually became a key and leading cultural event in the life of the citizens of Plovdiv throughout the year.

---

## **6.5 Cultural Policy on Local (municipal) Level**

**By Iliana Shenevska**, Culture Department, Sevlievo Municipality – Bulgaria  
19 January 2001

Sevlievo is a municipality center in Central Northern Bulgaria, situated in Gabrovo region. The municipality incorporates 52 settlements with a population of about 49,000 people. There are over 30 large and medium-sized industrial enterprises in the municipality in various industrial sectors. There are also a number of small family companies. A couple of foreign strategic investors have been attracted to the municipality in recent years, which has led to a significant improvement in its economic condition. According to statistical data, Sevlievo has the lowest unemployment rate in the country and its per capita income is well above the average level. The per capita foreign investments are also the highest in the country. The following are the major industrial plants and joint ventures in Sevlievo: “American Standard” –USA; two sanitary



appliances and one sanitary faience manufacturing plants; “ABB”- Switzerland – for electrical circuit-breakers and units; “Eagle”-USA for high precision aluminum castings. The Bulgarian manufacturing plants without foreign participation also have satisfactory economic indicators.

Sevlievo is a small, but beautiful, town, with a history of more than 1,000 years. It is a modern town with a heroic past and its citizens have the ambition to turn it not only into a well-developed economically settlement, but also into a town with cultural traditions from the time of the Revival period and a town of rich spiritual life.

For a number of decades the cultural life of the municipality used to be concentrated in its reading rooms. There is one reading room in Sevlievo and another 24 in the neighboring villages, which have a cultural life of their own in line with the cultural traditions and with the new quests of the community. In addition to the educational activity, which is the function of the library stock, there are a number of amateur groups in most of the reading rooms, which draw upon the genuine local folklore to restore traditional customs, rites and songs. The reading room in Sevlievo engages in various cultural activities: there is a children’s music and arts school with a class of fine arts and a music class, in which some 150 children learn how to play different musical instruments every year, such as piano, accordion, mandolin and the guitar. There is a theatrical company with a history of over 130 years, and a youth theater group which was set up only a few years ago. The puppet theater, which is in no way inferior to any professional puppet theater in the country, contributes to the well-being of the youngest citizens of the town. The town choir was also established a long time ago. The dancing company has a history of over 40 years. It preserves and maintains the traditions of local and national folklore, and spreads the fame of Sevlievo in many countries around the world. There is a children’s dancing group, too, and a dancers’ training school.

The “Sevlievo” municipal pop brass band is an independent amateur group, which is the successor of the town’s old brass band. Some ten years ago, the town’s pop group joined the brass band, thus making it possible to diversify the repertoire of the two groups.

The newly-built cultural center, with its modern and functional halls, stage and lobbies, receives and accommodates the performances and concerts of visiting theaters, ensembles and other companies from the country and abroad. The town library has also been accommodated in this beautiful building. The library has over 5,000 readers and a stock of over 200,000 books.

The preservation and promotion of the cultural and historical heritage of the region is a priority of the town’s museum of history. It is accommodated in a unique architectural unit, made up of three houses, dating back to the time of the Bulgarian Revival period. They have all been restored to present today the interior of the urban and rural lifestyle in Sevlievo region of over 150 years ago. The first secular school in the town, built by the Sevlievo merchant Hadji Stoyan, accommodates today the permanent exhibition of the museum, that traces back the history of the town from the New Stone Age, through Thracian times, up to the Bulgarian Middle Age and the Revival period. The permanent exhibition of the “tabak” craft, i.e. leather processing, is unique in its nature and is the only one in the country. Leather processing was typical of the Sevlievo region at the time. The archaeological excavations at the medieval town and fortress of “Khotalich” attest to the millennium-old history of Sevlievo.

There are three exhibition halls in the town, two private and one municipally-owned. Painters and applied artists from all over the country stage there their exhibitions of fine and applied arts here. Special attention is allotted to local painters and artists and especially to talented children.

All this variety of cultural activities and the functioning of the cultural institutions in the municipality are funded in two main ways: from the municipal budget and from donations of local sponsors.

The cultural policy of the municipality is managed on a couple of levels. The first, and the highest level, is the Municipal Council, which is supported in its activities by the Standing Committee on Culture, Education and Youth Activities. Its members are renowned local activists in the domain of education and culture, public figures and experts. The Municipal Council sets the main lines of cultural policy within the municipality. It endorses the municipal budgeted funds, that are to finance the cultural events proposed by the municipal administration.

Wherever there is a reading room in the country, the cultural policy is managed and implemented under the guidance of the reading room board of trustees.

The role of the municipal administration in the management and performance of the budget-financed cultural activities includes:

- preparation of materials and submitting them to the Municipal Council for a decision;
- execution of the decisions thus made;
- organizational activity in the preparation and staging of cultural events;
- coordination of the activities of individual cultural institutions;
- expert and methodological support and assistance in performing individual activities and implementing individual projects.

The activities and projects funded by donations from individuals, legal entities and NGOs largely contribute to the overall image of the cultural policy of the municipality. The “Sevlievo - XXI Century” Society is the main sponsor of all cultural activities in the municipality. It is the successor of the town’s employers’ union, set up in 1992. Members of the Society are 70 large, medium-sized and small companies and institutions in the town.

The villages within the municipality rely primarily on the municipal budget subsidy, on membership fees, and very seldom on funds or materials received from donors - small local enterprises.

The decisions on the municipal budget financed cultural events and activities under the general cultural policy of the municipality are made as follows:

The municipal administration draws up a draft budget and a plan for the forthcoming year on the basis of statutory documents, of its own experience, of traditions, and of proposals made by the reading rooms boards of trustees, the governance of the cultural institutions, the NGOs, the individual citizens, etc. These are then submitted for approval to the Municipal Council through the Standing Committee on Culture, Education and Youth

Activities. In addition, the municipal administration submits to the Municipal Council in the relevant current year operative proposals related to all cultural activities. Upon approval by the Municipal Council, the proposals are then assigned for implementation to the municipal administration.

The expert in charge of culture within the municipal administration prepares a calendar plan every month. This plan includes municipal cultural events of the local cultural institutions. The plan is then discussed with the governance of these institutions and afterwards assigned for implementation. When the municipal cultural activities are performed, reliance is put on: the partnership between the municipal cultural institutions and their national counterparts; on the local, regional and national media; on the NGOs; on the individual persons who take interest in these activities. I would like to stress it here that when making its decisions, the municipality has a leading role and seeks a dialogue with a single purpose in view – to satisfy the cultural needs of the population. There are numerous examples of a successful dialogue in this respect: the municipality has had traditional good relations with the Union of Bulgarian Writers and the “Bulgarian Writer” Publishing House when organizing celebrations to commemorate the poets Penyo Penev and Mara Belcheva who were born in Sevlievo region. The Union of Bulgarian Musicians and Dancers and the Union of Bulgarian Composers have always supported the municipality to organize the traditional festivities of the town’s brass bands and have offered methodological assistance to the “Sevlievo” pop and brass band. Another example of long-standing cooperation with the municipality are the Russian, Hungarian and Polish cultural and information centers in Bulgaria.

Over the past few years, we have regularly concluded contracts for joint activity with the “Aleko Konstantinov” Satirical Theater and the results achieved so far are to the satisfaction of both parties.

As regards the media, there are two private cable TVs, one municipal newspaper, one municipal and one private radio station in the municipality. The journalists in the municipal media have always been conducive to its cultural policy. They also provide the feed back, which we need in our activity so badly. The cultural activities of the municipality are also covered by the national electronic and press media.

The Sevlievo municipality has established long-standing good partnership with the reading rooms boards of trustees in the town and in the surrounding villages. At the request of the reading rooms boards of trustees, the municipal administration renders technical, methodological and, whenever needed, additional financial assistance in cases of large-scale cultural events of local significance.

The Sevlievo municipality also tries to find suitable partners in the social and cultural domain abroad. We have negotiated contracts for joint activities with the towns of Sophades in Greece and Bobroysk in Belarus, with a particular accent on cultural activities.

The municipal budget funds allocated for cultural activities go primarily to sustain the cultural institutions within the municipality. It is difficult for the municipality to allocate any funds for the maintenance of the historical heritage within the region. The economic entities in the town got aware of this fact on time, and as early as 1992 they set up a non-governmental organization, i.e. the Union of Employers. Three years ago, the Union

was registered as a legal entity named “Sevlievo – XXI Century” Association. The municipality is a full member of the Association. One of the main objectives of the Association, which is stipulated in its Articles of Association, too, is to render assistance to the cultural life of the municipality in terms of cash and materials. It is a satisfactory fact, that this objective did not remain only on paper, but has been implemented quite tangibly for the past eight years. Every year, the General Assembly of the Association takes a decision on the cultural activities that it is going to support. The funds are raised on the basis of deductions from the companies’ profit compliance with the current legislation. This is how the list of sites to be funded also included the major cultural and historical heritage in the region threatened by deterioration. Over the past four years, funds have been regularly allotted for the restoration of the mural paintings of the “St. Prophet Illia” old church. After the restoration has been completed, the woodcarvings and the icons at the altar will also be restored. Upon completion of the whole restoration process we could believe, that this valuable monument of the time of the Revival period in Sevlievo will be preserved in the way it was constructed some 160 years ago.

Similar are the procedures with regard to the funding of the largest archaeological site within the municipality, i.e. the medieval town and fortress of “Khotalich”. On an area of 60 decares, there are the remains of old churches, housing and farming buildings, a citadel with defensive walls, some towers and gates. The funds allocated from the municipal budget in the past couple of years for excavations and for the preservation of the archaeological site, have been supplemented by funds, donated by the Association. It is the idea of the municipality to turn this archaeological site into a national, international, environmental, and historical tourist site.

The repair of the public buildings, that are considered to be architectural heritage, is funded entirely by Association-member companies.

The Sevlievo businesses have rendered great services to enriching the cultural life of the town by focusing on reliable and talented young people. The “Sevlievo – XXI Century” Association has helped publish the children’s “Prozorets” (Window) newspaper for over a year, which was launched at the initiative of pupils from secondary schools in the town.

For the past three years, the “Vidima” AD company has helped sustain the “Vidima” art gallery. This is the place where professional and amateur painters and applied artist from the region and the country stage their exhibitions. In the year 2000, a Children’s Fine Arts Center was set up at the gallery, which center joins the efforts of the two fine arts schools at the Sevlievo reading room and the town’s Children’s Center. The latter helps the two schools to participate in competitions, festivals and exhibitions both in the country and abroad. The “Vidima” cultural club organizes meetings with interesting personalities – writers, poets and painters.

The financial support of the companies also helped publish a couple of books by Sevlievo authors, which cover the history and the modern development of both the town and the region.

It is only natural that the municipal administration cannot stay idle in this process. The municipal experts and facilities are invaluable for the Association to implement its projects and attain its objectives.

In conclusion, I could say that the experience of the municipality of Sevlievo in combining the business interests with those of society at large in the cultural domain has yielded excellent results. Despite these results, however, the municipality of Sevlievo has its specific problems in the cultural policy it implements, which are mostly associated with the funding and personnel it needs to implement more and diverse local, national and international cultural projects.

Key words:

Cultural policy of the municipality of Sevlievo  
Budget-funded activities  
Municipal Council  
Committee on Culture  
Sponsor-funded activities  
“Sevlievo – XXI Century” Association and other NGOs  
Municipal administration  
Citizens and NGOs  
Reading room Boards of Trustees  
Municipally-owned cultural institutions  
Cultural activities and projects

---

## **6.6 New Funding Initiatives and Partnerships**

**By Geoffrey Brown, EUCLID – UK**  
20 January 2001

### **Economic Context**

#### **GENERATING NEW JOBS**

1997: 17m unemployed in Europe

#### **CHANGES IN CULTURAL EMPLOYMENT**

Spain: +24% - 1987-94

France: +37 – 1982-90

UK: +34% - 1981-91

Germany: +23% 1980-94

#### **AVOIDING GRANT DEPENDENCY**

“The multiplier effect of structural resources should be increased by greater use of other forms of assistance than grants (interest rate subsidies, guarantees, venture capital holdings, other holdings)”

*Agenda 2000: For a stronger & wider union (15 July 97)*

\*\*\*

## Characteristics of Sector

### **CULTURAL BUSINESSES**

**few very large**

**huge number of small companies**  
(except in museums & heritage)

**few medium sized businesses**

<b>MICRO-BUSINESSES</b>
-------------------------

\*\*\*

## Characteristics of Sector

### ARTISTS

Seasonal variations

Discontinuous career development

Short-term contracts

Part-time working

Extended working hours

Vocational ethos

Multiple jobs

(accumulation of work and expertise)

\*\*\*

## ACCESS TO FINANCE

### Current

#### STATE / PUBLIC INVESTMENT

Public investment in culture  
Generic business support & finance schemes  
State benefits to individuals

#### DONOR FUNDING

Individual and corporate  
Voluntary/charitable

#### PROFIT DRIVEN INVESTMENT

By commercial sector

\*\*\*

## Third System Financial Organisations

Social and ethical banks

Membership organisations

Mutuals

Enterprise networks

Local venture capital companies

Public/private partnerships

Credit unions

Micro-credit organisations

Etc.

\*\*\*

## Some Examples

### **Investment Vehicles**

GLS: philharmonic savings bond

### **Equity**

Moving Image Development Agency

### **Debt**

Clann Credo Ltd: loan guarantee fund

### **New Money**

©ARTS

\*\*\*

## SUMMARY

- New approaches are needed
- Credit, equity & new money have potential
- Self-employed & micro-businesses could access micro-credit, & also “new money”
- Impact of globalisation & new technologies and the potential of venture capital

\*\*\*

## WHAT TO DO ?

- Act to support the creation of a range of new financial instruments at local, regional and national level
- Create a positive entrepreneurial climate for micro-entrepreneurs in their start-up phase



- Consider cultural tax credits to enable private investors to benefit from tax breaks on investment in the cultural sector and social enterprise
- Develop vertical and horizontal partnerships linking levels of government with the cultural sector, SME support infrastructure and private finance through regional Culture Bank implementation partnerships.

\*\*\*