DutchCu
|ture
|

|

Sharing, Listening and Caring:

European values from policy to practice

Professional Document
DutchCulture – University of Groningen
ReMa Cultural Leadership

Mette Kramer

Supervisor University of Groningen: Dr. Q.L. van den Hoogen
Supervisor DutchCulture: M. Feil

April 2023

|

l   Executive Summary

Finding the common elements within Europe can be very difficult, as there are many different angles. The concept of 'Unity in Diversity' has become the key phrase of the European Union, building unity by acknowledging its national differences. The common ground should be found in the sharing of values, written down under Article 2 in the Treaty of European Union, namely human rights, democracy, equality, and the rule of law.

The focus of this report is however the national level. Especially focusing on the role of European values regarding international cultural cooperation. The Dutch International cultural policy framework is compared to that of Denmark and Austria, who both also advocate European cooperation and explicitly state European values within their policies. The three different countries have different cultural policy traditions, with Denmark being less contrasting to that of the Dutch than Austria. In both Denmark and the Netherlands is ICP a shared responsibility of the Ministry of Culture and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In Austria, the policy is formed and executed by the Foreign Ministry with the consultation of the Cultural Ministry.

European values can for example refer to the founding narrative of the European Union, creating the free market. However, it can also relate to geographic proximity, recognizing common values because somebody is your neighbour. The other narrative relates to the constitutional values above and lastly, it is discussed that European values could refer to something as a European community or European identity. The focus in the policy framework was mostly on that proximity and the availability of opportunities due to the open market and borders. However, a good amount of European references within ICP were also focused on the cooperation of themes also portrayed in the European Agenda.
Lastly, the report looks into the implementation of these values in praxis. What are concrete examples, where we can see European values at work? Again this can be a variety of things, for example, diplomatic or economic outcomes. However, after the different interviews with people working in the field of ICP and international cultural cooperation, most connections were made with social and developmental outcomes. As international cultural cooperation is an exchange process, there was a focus on the sharing of values as well as listening to other reflections. International cultural cooperation, therefore, was often linked to the process of intercultural dialogue, a way to create mutual understanding.

For further implementation of European values in their work in the field of international cultural policy, DutchCulture (and other organisations) could consider
- whether to focus on bilateral or multilateral cooperation,
- whether intercultural dialogue is valuable before, during or after the cultural experience,
- whether to focus on comfortable or challenging experiences.

This report is written by Mette Kramer as part of a research traineeship at DutchCulture for the Research Master 'Cultural Leadership' of the University of Groningen.

Ⅰ   Table of Content

l   Introduction

Europe has many different angles, from geographic, economic, and political to historical and cultural. It can be characterized as one entity with a shared history and culture, or as nothing but a unification based on economic and political strategies. It is a back-and-forth between a Europe as a "policy machine serving at best the interest of the citizens" or a Europe with an identity that predates nation-states sharing common values and narratives (Foret & Calligaro, 2018, p. 2). However, finding the common elements that unify Europe can be challenging with the many different countries and cultures that Europe entails. The concept of 'Unity in Diversity' has become a key phrase by the European Union to capture its unique identity (Lähdesmäki & Wagener, 2015). This motto emphasises the importance of building unity through shared values and goals, acknowledging the national differences of the countries. These shared values of the European community are written down under Article 2 in the Treaty of European Union, namely human rights, democracy, equality, and the rule of law (European Parliament, n.d.).

The current Dutch International Cultural Policy (ICP) framework (2021-2024) is in the middle of its effect. In this policy, there is a clear focus on European countries, with for example 10 of the 24 focus countries being European[1]. Therefore, it can be a good moment to take a look at how this policy is interpreted and functions, especially in comparison to that of other countries. This report examines the different perspectives of Europe and especially European values within ICP, as well as its translation into international cultural cooperation. From the start, I asked the question 'How are common European values translated from ICP to international cultural cooperation?'. With this question, I tried to find out whether and to what extent cultural cooperation depends on or benefits from a society where the above values are leading (or should be leading).

Austria and Denmark are compared to the Dutch framework and execution of international cultural cooperation in Europe, researching whether they have comparable or contrasting ideas. This report starts with an overview of the different ICP frameworks of the countries and then follows with a reflection on whether and how European values are defined in ICP. Thereafter the different perspectives of European values in international cultural cooperation are discussed. The report finishes with a selection of consideration for DutchCulture with regard to the further implementation of European values.

This report is established as a part of a traineeship for the Research-Master Cultural Leadership of the Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, taking place from November to May at DutchCulture. DutchCulture is the network and knowledge organisation for international cultural cooperation in the Netherlands. In the role of 'verkenner' (explorer), DutchCulture explores and researches different themes and domains that are relevant for successful cooperation (DutchCulture, 2020). As global developments can affect the content and practices of collaborations, different themes are used to place accents on the information provided, the connections made and the topics explored (DutchCulture, 2020). This report is especially written regarding the organisation's thematic focus on the European Union and Europe. "Europe is, also for the arts, the designated domain to collaborate and face global challenges such as climate change, migration and the restriction of artistic freedom" ([own translation] DutchCulture, 2020, p. 10). The purpose of this report is to therefore to explore the topic of international cultural cooperation as a condition or a consequence of these European values.

---

[1] This includes Belgium, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Poland. Also Russia, United Kingdom and (the recently added) Ukraine are counted here.

I   Frameworks of International Cultural Policy

This report focuses on the national frameworks of ICP, which sets out "the role of culture in foreign relations and the presentation of the nation abroad" (Minnaert, 2014, p. 100). The role and use of this policy can differ per country with diverging conceptions or institutional structures. Therefore this section sets out the different contexts of ICP for Austria, Denmark and the Netherlands. These cases were selected foremostly for their substantial and explicit focus on Europe, particularly pointing to European values and/or the value of European cooperation. Moreover, they all have a recent policy framework that is written in English.[2]

Netherlands

The Dutch government wants to strengthen international cultural exchange and cooperation "as it nurtures us with new influences and in the same way the work and subjects of Dutch artists and cultural institutions are a source of inspiration and knowledge in other countries" (Ministerie van Algemene Zaken, 2014). The government does recognize that a lot of cooperation happens without their cooperation but sees their possible role to stimulate by taking away any obstacles and to support when chances are not taken by their full potential (Ministerie van Algemene Zaken, 2022). From the policy documents, it is clear that next to a focus on artistic quality, also international diplomatic relations and economic interest are taken into account (Minnaert, 2014). This can be explained by the shared responsibility between the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science (Ministrie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap, OCW), Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken, BZ) and the Ministry of Trade and Development Cooperation (Ministerie van Handel en Ontwikkelingssamenwerking, BHOS) on the topic of ICP. Together these ministries publish a four-year framework that sets out the goals and objectives for those years. This research takes into account the last two frameworks, with both three objectives.

Three Objectives 2017-2020	Three Objectives 2021-2024
- A strong cultural sector, where international exchange and sustainable cooperation ensure increasingly higher quality, and which is recognised and valued abroad. - More room for the arts to contribute to a safe, just, future-proof world. - Culture will be used effectively as a tool of modern diplomacy.	- The Dutch cultural sector will occupy a strong position abroad through visibility, exchanges and long-term partnerships. - Dutch cultural expressions will be used to support bilateral relationships with other countries. - We will harness the power of the cultural sector and creative industries in efforts to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals, particularly in connection with the BHOS agenda in focus regions.
(Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap & Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken, 2016a, 2019)	

The interdepartmental policy is desirable to coordinate the many players involved and the various instruments. Typical Dutch is the poldering of the executing structure, separating strategy and practice with the triangular relationship of DutchCulture – cultural representatives abroad – cultural funds (Minnaert, 2020). Concerning funding allocation it mostly resonates with the patron state model, upholding the arm's length principle through the allocation by embassies and cultural funds. However,

---

[2] See appendix page 19 for further justification of the case studies

it is also merged with the architect model with the ministries allocating budgets as well. Showing both a social-democratic and laissez-faire cultural policy tradition.[3]

DutchCulture
The research is especially focused on the role of DutchCulture, the organisation that supports and stimulates the internationalisation of cultural cooperation. The organisation offers advice to cultural and creative professionals and networks, public authorities, and diplomatic professionals operating, or aspiring to operate, in the international area (DutchCulture, 2020). In its Activities Plan for 2021-2024, DutchCulture profiles themselves as the organisation that "invests in reflection, debate and research to interpret influential developments in the international cultural playing field and translate them into better services for our target groups and stakeholders" ([own translation] DutchCulture, 2020, p. 6).

Denmark

Since 2009 the Danish government formed an inter-ministerial committee consisting of the representatives of the Ministry of Culture (Kulturministeriet), the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Udenrignsministeriet), the Ministry of Economic and Business Affairs and the Ministry of Finance to work on international cultural exchange (Kulturministeriet, 2010). In 2010 they presented the government's internationalisation strategy, mapping out Denmark's current international cultural exchange and presenting proposals for how the existing funding system could contribute to strengthening the internationalisation of Danish cultural life (Kulturministeriet, 2010). For future coordination and increased cooperation, the International Cultural Panel (Internationale Kulturpanel, IKP) was established, which was a shared responsibility framework with the Ministry of Culture and Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The last IKP was formed for 2017-2021, and in 2022 the Ministries renewed their cooperation on international cultural relations in a Collaboration Agreement (Kulturministeriet, 2022). This agreement led to a change in the framework, establishing a Steering Group with sectoral institutes that put out a two-year strategic framework. The obligations of the ministries have foremostly stayed the same, it is restricted to formulating a broad strategy, assigning priorities and facilitating key government organisations for the Danish ICP (European Cultural Foundation, 2021). The steering group ensures the collective formulation of the common principles (Kulturministeriet, 2010).[4] The ministries value consensus and therefore "continuously consider methods for involving participants to secure a broad basis for the framework's priorities" (Slots- og Kulturstyrelsen, 2022). Lastly, they take into account the arm's length principle, a framework that is comparable to that of the Netherlands. It resonates with the strong social-democratic tradition the state has, with an architect model.[5]

Four Objectives 2017-2021	Four Objectives of the Cooperation Agreement
- Developing and renewing Danish art and culture - Marketing the Danish nation as a brand - Promoting and supporting cultural exports - Promoting intercultural dialogue	- Denmark's cultural exports - Intercultural dialogue between participants in Denmark and abroad - Marketing of Denmark as a country - Renewal of Danish art and culture through international collaboration
(Kulturministeriet, 2017; Kulturministeriet & Udenrigsministeriet, 2022a)	

---

[3] See appendix pages 17-18 for the theoretical explanation of these models and traditions
[4] Formed by councils, expert committees and art professional centres, such as the Danish Cultural Institute, the Danish Arts Foundation, the Danish Film Institute, the Danish Design Centre, the Danish Architecture Centre, the Agency for Culture and Palaces and VisitDenmark (Kulturministeriet, 2010; Ministry of Culture Denmark, 2023).
[5] See appendix pages 17-18 for the theoretical explanation of these models and traditions

This research is mostly based on the policy framework from 2017 to 2021. Which may be considered outdated, as a new framework has been established. However, during a conversation with Danish Cultural Institute, it was pointed out that these objectives are still relevant as well. This can also be seen in the similarity of the objects of the Cooperation Agreement, as stated in the table above.

The two-year strategic framework supports a coordinated direction of Denmark's international cultural activities in line with current political priorities. Professional Danish cultural actors and representations abroad of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs can apply for funding under this framework. Overall, the focus for 2023-2024 (also 2021-2022) is on three themes: 'sustainability and the green transition', 'technology and the democratic dialogue', and 'rural and urban areas'. "These themes relate to core Danish values that international cultural activities should manifest, develop and address through dialogue around the world" (Kulturministeriet & Udenrigsministeriet, 2022b, p. 4).

Danish Cultural Institute
For this research, I have looked especially at the role of the Danish Cultural Institute (DCI). It is, as DutchCulture, the organisation supported by the Ministries to stimulate international cultural cooperation. For the support of cultural exchange and creating long-term cultural relations, DCI has a network of institutes in different countries (Danish Cultural Institute, n.d.-a). The DCI was already established in 1940 by the Ministry of Culture, with the mission to provide the further international understanding and providing information about Denmark by arranging cultural exchanges (European Cultural Foundation, 2021). Together with partners they develop international activities that should inspire, challenge boundaries, and create mutual value on topics such as equal rights, education, sustainable development, democracy and active citizenship (Danish Cultural Institute, n.d.-a). Important to note here is that the institute uses a very wide conceptualisation of culture, meaning that projects cover topics from "food to urban development, active citizenship to theatre, literature, and contemporary art" (Danish Cultural Institute, n.d.-b)

Austria

Auslandskulturpolitik (international cultural policy, ICP) has played an important role in Austria's foreign policy for decades (Markovic, 2021). Under the leadership of the Austrian Foreign Ministry, Austria's cultural presence abroad has been expanding since the 1970s. The end of the Cold War was the moment that the budget and role of cultural diplomacy increased substantially (Brix, 2013). At that point, ICP was there to "simply create and transmit a 'positive image' of the country towards making good use of images and stereotypes for the formation of trust and the fostering of dialogue" (Brix, 2013, p. 105). In 2007 the Austrian Foreign Ministry changed its official name to the 'Federal Ministry for European and International Affairs (BMEIA)', a change also reflected in the goals of international cultural activities. The ICP defined in 2011 had the goal to showcase the innovative-creative potential of Austrian cultural players, but moreover noted the importance of projects that contribute to fostering European integration according to the idea of Europe as 'Unity in diversity'. (Bundesministerium Europäische und Internationale Angelegenheiten, 2012).

Currently, it is the 'Cultural Policy Department' of the BMEIA together with the 'European and International Cultural Policy Department' of the Federal Ministry for Arts, Culture, the Civil Service and Sport (BMKOES) that are responsible for the Austrian ICP. Important to note is that within Austria's framework education and science have a larger role than the two countries mentioned before. The Ministry of Education, Science and Research (BMBWF) is jointly responsible with the other Ministries for the development of international scientific exchange. This research is based on the two most recent guiding ICP documents, firstly the Foreign Culture Concept 2015-2018 and secondly the Basic Document published in 2020, which builds on the previous, but revised concepts, added new topics and focal areas to be up-to-date (Bundesministerium Europäische und Internationale Angelegenheiten, 2020). The key

areas are presented as "part of Austrian identity" and suitable themes/matters for international exchange.

Primary Objectives 2015-2018	Key areas from 2020
- Presenting Austria on the international stage as an innovative and creative nation that is historically diverse and rich in culture and scientific know-how - Contributing pro-actively to promoting the process of European integration ("Unity in Diversity") - Making a sustainable contribution to building trust and securing peace on a global level by launching initiatives in the field of intercultural and interreligious dialogue	- Culture, innovation and ecology - Digitalisation and "Digital Humanism" - Science Cooperation and Science Diplomacy - Intercultural Dialogue - Culture and Human Rights - The EU and EUNIC - Women in Art, Culture and the Sciences
(Bundesministerium Europäische und Internationale Angelegenheiten, 2013, 2020)	

Austrian cultural forums
The practical implementation of the policy is the network of 30 Austrian cultural forums (Kulturforen) in a total of 28 countries an important actors (Bundesministerium Europäische und Internationale Angelegenheiten, n.d.). Austrian cultural forums are decentralized centres for Austrian cultural work abroad. They develop locally coordinated programs and projects with creative artists and cultural institutions from the fields of culture and science in the respective host countries. In addition, they work as service points by supporting cultural professionals and scientists in their efforts to establish contacts and networks abroad. "Each year, they organize and support a large part of more than 6000 cultural and scientific projects" (Bundesministerium Europäische und Internationale Angelegenheiten, 2020, p. 38). Austria does not follow the arm's length principle, as they set up 10 different priority programmes for different cultural sectors and goals. For example, among others, "the NewAustrian Sound of Music" is a programme started by the Ministry of European and International Affairs for talented young musicians or "Creative Austrians – Innovators for the Society of the Future" a programme to promote a creative engagement with processes of social change (Bundesministerium Europäische und Internationale Angelegenheiten, 2020). This framework shows a correlation with both the cultural state and social democracy tradition. Although there is a strong decentralized focus on implementation, Austria mostly resonates with the architect-state model.[6]

l   Europe Values within International Cultural Policy

Netherlands

In the 2017-2021 policy framework it is acknowledged that government authorities and representatives in the cultural sector "already work closely together at multilateral and European level, through the Creative Europe programme and UNESCO, for instance" (Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap & Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken, 2016b, p. 2). With the focus on Europe, this policy points to the binding role culture can play internationally. Especially, within the second objective on the role of arts to contribute to a safe, just, future-proof world is Europe mentioned. The pressure on its security and stability means pressure on the relations between the European countries, as well as a diminishing scope for cultural expression (Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap & Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken, 2016b). This policy framework does not refer to European values

---

[6] See appendix pages 17-18 for the theoretical explanation of these models and traditions

but sees culture and creativity as a way to create mutual understanding and dialogue, as well as help in efforts to seek alternatives and solutions for social issues. Therefore it could be said that the focus on Europe leaned more towards the underpinning of its political and economic stability.

Already in the introduction of the policy framework of 2021-2024, it is mentioned that it is built upon the standards, values and cooperation in the European context (Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap & Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken, 2019). Interestingly, in the English version, it is translated to "cooperation in the European Union as well as UNESCO", which interestingly refers to only the supranational organisations and not the whole European context as mentioned in the Dutch version. Europe and the European Union are the first priorities mentioned within this framework, next to heritage and the Sustainable Development Goals. The considerable interest the Netherlands has in European countries is because they are the main trading partners and allies, "with which we have a great deal in common" (Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap & Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken, 2019, p. 9). This, in comparison with the previous framework, shows an interest in Europe because of geographical proximity, as well as access to the European market and good infrastructure.[7] However, a stronger focus on Europe is also mentioned because of current developments such as migration and Brexit. The choice for adding Hungary and Poland as focus countries (and recently Ukraine) also shows an interest in Europe because of social and political difficulties. Moreover, in comparison to the previous framework, the level of European cooperation has been mentioned more. One of the principles of the framework points to upholding the principle of subsidiarity, but at the same time recognises the benefits of the European cultural agenda (Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap & Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken, 2019).[8] The Dutch ICP admits to the importance of this agenda that "does justice to shared values like human rights, diversity, tolerance and the protection of cultural heritage; a policy that moreover promotes innovation and creativity" (Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap & Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken, 2019). Moreover, thematic priorities set by the European Commission, although not mentioned with direct linkage, are mentioned as well. Lastly, the Dutch ICP is largely focused on bilateral relations, which was pointed out different times during the interviews with the Dutch ministries. The role of European multilateral cooperation is therefore limited within this policy framework.

Denmark

As the European Cultural Foundation pointed out, "Denmark is generally in favour of reinforcing European cultural cooperation" (European Cultural Foundation, 2021, p. 1). This we can first see in their geographical focus on the neighbouring countries, particularly Nordic and Baltic countries including Russia. But secondly, it is clear from the fact that eight of the Danish Cultural Institutes are housed in European countries, such as Belgium, Hungary, Poland, Germany, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, the United Kingdom and Russia (European Cultural Foundation, 2021). Like the Netherlands, Denmark refers to Brexit and other recent events as a challenge to Europe. However, Denmark also refers to it being a threat to a European sense of community (Kulturministeriet, 2017). In this regard, culture is mentioned as the foundation for promoting peace and establishing a shared identity. It can weave "the national and the European together into a shared narrative about what we have built together and what we have in common" (Kulturministeriet, 2017, p. 13).

Interestingly, it is mentioned that cultural initiatives are more effective if they are based on a shared narrative. Saying that with a wider value narrative, the impact of an initiative or project can be multiplied (Kulturministeriet, 2017, p. 7). There are different examples of values given within the policy framework.

---

[7] See appendix page 22-24 for analytical data

[8] This principle should ensure that decisions are taken at the lowest possible level (as close as possible to the citizen). A decision should be taken at the European level only if it cannot be done properly at the national, provincial or municipal level (European Commission, n.d.).

The values mentioned in the policy document are seen as Danish, but not exclusively. Although the European narrative is not mentioned here, the different core Danish values mentioned do resonate with the European. For example the focus on 'social cohesion, transparency and democracy', 'freedom of expression and openness to dialogue, inclusion and criticism' (Kulturministeriet, 2017, p. 8). The current strategic framework shows the same interest in creating common narratives for directing international cultural activities. "The themes relate to the core Danish values that international cultural activities should help manifest, develop and address through dialogue around the world" (Kulturministeriet & Udenrigsministeriet, 2022b, p. 4). Concerning democracy, for example, the current strategic framework focuses on its connection to technology. It points out that the technological process can enhance democratic dialogue but also undermine basic rights with restrictions on freedom and surveillance. "International cultural collaboration aims to elevate, inspire and broaden the conversation about possibilities and challenges and support the diplomatic dialogue about democracy and Danish values" (Kulturministeriet & Udenrigsministeriet, 2022b, p. 6). The current framework is less elaborate than the previous one, giving less explanation of why certain policy choices were made. Moreover, within the last framework, no argumentation was made with regard to a European sense of community or identity, but the focus switched to particular thematic priorities.

Austria

The position of Austria in Europe is different from the previous two. As a country in the middle of Europe, it does not necessarily acts as a "neutral outpost of the West" anymore, but as a member state of the European Union and "promotor of Central European cooperation" with an interest in the integration of Eastern European and Balkan countries into European structures (Brix, 2013, p. 99). This focus can also be seen in Austria's ICP, where after the end of the Cold War a strategic shift happened towards (re)establishing cultural networks and cooperation with the Central and Eastern European region. Markovic (2021) and Riegler (2018) stated it being a cautious re-evaluation with geographical and historical sensitivies, taking in mind the rule of the Austrian monarchy. This meant that policies got a more cultural discourse about the politics of memory and politics of identity. In the 2015-2018 framework, Austria's neighbouring states and western Balkan countries were the geographic priorities (Bundesministerium Europäische und Internationale Angelegenheiten, 2013). Currently, in the basic framework, this is mentioned as a focus on Austria's *extended* neighbourhood in Europe and countries of South-East Europe (Bundesministerium Europäische und Internationale Angelegenheiten, 2020).

This interest in identity was also reflected in the context of European integration, which after 1989 moved towards the East. The BMEIA started focusing on "Europe as a cultural project" (Brix, 2013, p. 100), hoping to support the new democracies in Central and Eastern Europe in the European integration process. Austria specifically refers to the European integration process in their policy frameworks. In 2015-2018 their second priority stated that their ICP should contribute to the pro-active promotion of the European integration process (Bundesministerium Europäische und Internationale Angelegenheiten, 2013). Especially referring to strengthening a common sense of EU identity twice. Moreover, intercultural dialogue as the focus of the third priority contributes to a strengthening democracy, and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms (Bundesministerium Europäische und Internationale Angelegenheiten, 2013). Intercultural dialogue is linked to the artistic communication of cultural values in this regard. Although democracy, freedom and human right are connected to European values, this is not necessarily mentioned.

The current, more elaborated, ICP framework notes that the core concerns for international cultural activities are "above all the importance of effective multilateralism, including an active participation as an EU member state and a commitment to promoting human rights" (Bundesministerium Europäische und Internationale Angelegenheiten, 2020, p. 9). Three of the 7 key areas will be highlighted here, as they correlate with the context of European values. First, and foremostly, Austria's ICP commitment to

the "development and protection of European values and the European way of life" (Bundesministerium Europäische und Internationale Angelegenheiten, 2020, p. 12). Stating cultural cooperation in Europe as one of the key goals of Austrian International Cultural Relations. It is especially focused on the notion of intercultural dialogue and cultural diversity, as they are "anchored in the EU's value system" (Bundesministerium Europäische und Internationale Angelegenheiten, 2020, p. 23). A value system that is highlighted in the key area of culture and human rights as well. Austria sees the support of cultural policy as "the driving force for democracy, peace, stability and sustainable socioeconomic development" (Bundesministerium Europäische und Internationale Angelegenheiten, 2020, p. 23). This framework shows a strong focus on fundamental principles, such as "justice, equality, freedom and peaceful coexistence" (Bundesministerium Europäische und Internationale Angelegenheiten, 2020, p. 21). But in comparison to the other countries, also sets out a much clearer vision of European cooperation. Often stating the importance of working with European partners, like the European Union National Institutes of Cultures (EUNIC) network, but also noting the European agenda and mentioning different thematic priorities of the European Commission.

To summarise, the different countries all have a clear focus on Europe and the European Union. For mostly, based on the geographical proximity and social-political history. However, the further argumentation and do differs between the countries. Where the Netherlands mostly focus on upholding good relationships, because of commonalities or difficult socio-political developments, do Austria and Denmark really focus on this idea of creating a shared narrative based on values. Especially Austria's policy framework takes an in-depth approach to the notion of intercultural dialogue in this regard. Denmark also references to this idea of opening/keeping the conversation going, especially related to democracy. The Dutch policy framework, in this respect, does merely mention to keep the European values in mind. Lastly, there is a clear difference between the focus in Dutch policy on bilateral cooperation, in comparison to Denmark and Austria who more often mention the multilateral possibilities.

l   Conclusions and considerations

During the many different conversations I had on and off the record, it has become clear that European values cannot be explained with one example, one concept or one experience. It is everywhere and nowhere at the same time. It may take some time to reflect on what they are and what can be pointed out as an actual European value. One example, inspired by a reflection of a colleague on the topic, is that the articulation of European values can be viewed as a turned triangle. The notion of European values by the EU is the narrow tip of the triangle, but more aspects and perspectives are built on to that For example the addition of national policy approaches, the implementing parties at different level, and even individual perspectives. Therefore the primary focus of the EU is broadened and even possible changed. Moreover, during my time at DutchCulture, I also got some critical reflections. 'Why the focus on European values, aren't they universal?'. I hope that this report gave some insight into the different interpretations of European values, as well as their role in international cultural cooperation. It partly being the facilitator, making it the logical first step due to its open borders. But moreover, the condition of international cultural cooperation is reflected in the idea of creating cultural exchanges on an equal basis. The focus is not only on the sharing of values but on the dialogical aspect. Caring about the perspectives of others, taking time to listen and learn, and creating mutual understanding.

To conclude this report I want to highlight three considerations that DutchCulture (and others) could reflect when further implementing European values in their work. They are based on different insights from the comparing of the Dutch framework with that of Austria and Denmark. These considerations are not mutually exclusive but show deliberative aspects.

1. Bilateral or multilateral?

During my research, it became clear that Austria and Denmark have a larger focus on multilateral cooperation. Where Danish Cultural Institute focuses on partnerships in a multilateral context, the Austrian Ministry mentions the need for European cooperation multiple times in their framework. In the Dutch context, most international cultural cooperation happens bilaterally. It can therefore be discussed whether a cooperation with France, Germany or Poland can be called European, solely because they are European countries. Or does working within a European context mean the cooperation with multiple countries?

In the context of European cultural cooperation, benefits and drawback could be identified to both approaches. Multilateral cooperation allows for a wider range of perspectives and resources, representing more diverse perspectives and experiences in the cultural sector than with bilateral cooperation. The focused and targeted approach of bilateral cooperation can be more valuable in comparison to the more complex multilateral coordination. Although not necessarily mentioned in the previous sections, EUNIC role can be considered here as well.

2. Intercultural dialogue before, during, after?

This consideration is about the notion of intercultural dialogue, as it was one of the most prominent practical indications of European values. With intercultural dialogue there is still a lot of room for interpretation. It could mean the creative materialist matter that artistic use to express themselves, but also the dialogue happening before and after the cultural experience by its participants and audience. Therefore, when referring to intercultural dialogue within international cultural cooperation, it could be useful (for later assessment) to find out when this intercultural dialogue takes place and who participates. The different interactions can have different values for intercultural cooperation, but also have different or same levels of relevance. Although, it is logical that the creative expression is very important with respect to the cultural sector, it could also be discussed whether the dialogical aspects prior and after cultural collaboration are or can be taken into account.

3. Comfortable or challenging?

Often during the interviews it was mentioned that within the European context, cultural experiences should bring new insights, should be inspiring and show what may has been taken for granted. Moreover, international cultural cooperation is seen as a way to build social cohesion through the bridging of ties. Therefore constituting an idea that you have to have challenging experiences in order to be aware of values. This may be a right indication, but comfortable cultural experiences could be more effortless in creating mutual understanding.[9] This is about the choice of type of contacts, between those with confirming your values or ones that are the opposite. Moreover, it is the question of impact that can be created by creating dialogue with those opposing your values and beliefs, or supporting those that share your values and beliefs. The former perspective gives the opportunity to show what you stand for in the hope to affect, motive or trigger others. Moreover, challenging experiences can also go in the other direction, thereby learning from other perspectives. The latter, comfortable experiences, can be favourable when wanting to bundle strengths and confirm social structures. In times of crisis, focusing on those that share your values can also bring hope and a feeling of being heard for those in need.

---

[9] See appendix page 18 for theoretical background on the notion of challenging and comfortable cultural experiences

l   Appendix

Theoretical framework: the functioning of cultural policy in international context

European Values
Although the notion of European values within national cultural policy has not been discussed that much yet, it has been very prominent in the debate on the European Union's *raison d'être* (Bréchon & Gonthier, 2017; Luijkx et al., 2016). The debate on European values is set in light of different challenges and crises that happened over the last decades in Europe. For example, the financial crisis in 2008 triggered debates over the interpretation of solidarity between Northern and Southern member states, the refugee crisis that gave rise to growing Euroscepticism and nationalism in comparison to a European community, and lastly a crisis on the rule of law in Poland and Hungary showing that democracy and human rights are being contested by member state governments (Akaliyski et al., 2022; Meijen, 2020). There is however not one conceptualisation of the notion of European values, also because they are used in different debates. Within this research, the conceptualisation of European values is categorized into three different narratives, following the construction of Toggerburg. The narratives are not mutually exclusive, as they do overlap and relate to each other.

First, European values can refer to the original political and economic motivations of the European Union. These so-called 'founding values' refer to the commonplace created at the start of the European Union. These consist of the creation of a political area opposed to the experience of the two World Wars and the commitment to a common European market economy. These are for example visible through the four fundamental freedoms, where the EU enabled the movement of people, goods, capital and services. Founding values that allowed closer exchange between the member states (Akaliyski et al., 2022). These European values have a political nature, as they boil down to the first treaty obligations of the European Union. However, European values can also refer to commitments and convictions that are more difficult to be identified in treaty provisions. Toggenburg (2004) refers to these values as 'European ideas', which sketch the ideological agenda or the cultural backbone of the European integration process. European values in this regard refer to the notion of a European identity or European culture. This conceptualisation is normative, as European ideas can relate to certain political (or geographical) affinities. Meijen points out that the promotion of European values can also propagate a certain myth of Europe. Creating a state-like identity based on shared values and experiences can be difficult and contentious, ignoring the different historical experiences of European countries. Not all social trends and majority-accepted values can be interpreted as conditions of or for a European community (Brix, 2013). However, identity formation and culture-building have become political objectives in the promotion of the European Union (Dewey, 2010). The European Union has stressed the importance of a European community but in the search for common elements acknowledging the cultural diversity of the member states (Calligaro, 2014). Since the 2000s 'Unity in diversity' has been the signifying motto in finding a common EU identity (Lähdesmäki & Wagener, 2015). Lastly, European values also refer to the commitment to common legal principles. Since the 1992 Treaty of Maastricht, common legal principles such as human rights, democracy and the rule of law were enshrined in the European Union. However, since the 2007 Treaty of Lisbon, the notion of values became prominent in the EU legal framework. Under Article 2 of the Treaty on European Union, it is stated that the EU is "founded on the values of respect of human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights, including the rights of persons belonging to minorities" (European Parliament, n.d.). These 'constitutional values' not only express a common conviction of the Union but also establish the legal commitment to values for every member state (Toggenburg, 2004). The introduction of these principles, and later values, was against the background of the end of the Cold War. Therefore also becoming an essential element of membership in the European community, as the Copenhagen Criteria, for the post-dictatorial democracies in East Europe (Vos, 2017). In this regard, Akaliyski et al (2022) point out that values such as democracy and human rights can wrongly be claimed to have universal validity. However, values are abstract and allow for a variety of specific interpretations differing from the originally intended (Akaliyski et al., 2022). For example, democracy is universally accepted as the preferred government, but principles can be allocated to it. The idea of 'liberal democracy' in Western Europe, can have different implications than the acknowledged form of democracy in other European countries.

Next to these narratives, European values can also be interpreted as the strategic framework of the European Union. This refers to the priorities that the European Commission sets out as a guide for the

EU's policy-making and actions. Under the current strategic framework for 2019 to 2024 there is a focus on a climate-neutral continent, digital developments, economic development, global presence, justice and democracy (European Commission, 2019). Moreover, with the 2018 New European Agenda for Culture adopted by the Commission, a framework was created that focused on the positive contribution that culture could bring to Europe's society, economy and international relations. Every four years different priorities are defined to set a political strategy for cultural cooperation. Additionally, Creative Europe has been the only EU programme that is specifically devoted to supporting culture. With the programme, investments are made to reinforce cultural diversity and respond to the needs and challenges of the cultural and creative sectors (European Commission, 2022).

The notion of European values can therefore be understood as a (collective) metal representation of what is worth begin appreciated, also imposing particular certainties and (hierarchical) meanings (Foret & Calligaro, 2018). In turn, they can also represent those values enshrined in the EU treaties and agendas (Meijen, 2020).

Cultural policy: models and traditions
When researching cultural policies it is important to reflect on the social context it is created, understanding the history and worldview of the nation (Strandvad & Van den Hoogen, 2021b). Mulcahy (2017) categorizes different ideal types of policy traditions that reflect a nation's legitimization for supporting cultural activities through public intervention, or not. Three of them are relevant to this research. First, 'cultural states' claim a hegemonic status of their culture, claiming preservation and emulation of their language, literature, philosophy, and or fine arts as universally worthy. These countries are very self-conscious about their cultural identities and see often see the spreading of their culture abroad as a common goal (Strandvad & Van den Hoogen, 2021b). Secondly, the 'social-democratic' type sees cultural policy as part of a much broader governmental effort to provide high-quality life accessible, sustainable and representative for everyone (Strandvad & Van den Hoogen, 2021b). This type can be linked to the role a government has in a welfare state, seeing culture as a right to which all citizens are entitled. Lastly, states with a type of 'laissez-faire' conceptualise culture as a private matter with a restricted role of the government in the support of the cultural field (Strandvad & Van den Hoogen, 2021b). This can be in different forms, with no state involvement or development of cultural policy outside the governmental bureaucracy by an independent art council.

The type of legitimisation of cultural policies also has implications regarding the allocation of subsidies, about who decides and how it is decided. Hillman-Chartrand and McCaughey provide four ideal models that describe this relationship between the cultural sector and its political organisation of it (Strandvad & Van den Hoogen, 2021b). Most European countries follow the 'patron state model,' taking into account the 'arm's length' principle. This principle refers to the process where the allocation of the government budget to the cultural field is left to committees of experts on art and culture. This can be realized by the establishment of art councils or art funds that receive money from the government. This model ensures that the cultural scene cannot be influenced or controlled by political interest, as well as ensures excellence and professional standards of the arts. Another model is the one of an 'architect state', where the responsibility of subsidy allocation lays with a central ministry for art or culture. The arm's length principle is less prominent within this model, however, can be upheld as well with the establishment of an advice council (Srakar & Vecco, 2021). Within the third model, 'engineer state,' the production and/or distribution of arts is owned by the government. This model could be put in a more ideological perspective, however, there are also examples where ideology does not have a prominent role. Lastly, a 'facilitator state' funds arts through tax reductions for private donors to the arts. An indirect way to support the cultural field without any influence of the state but leaving it the sponsorship of those eligible.

The two different theoretical models presented above represent ideal types, therefore it could be difficult to make a perfect align it to a country's framework. However, they are helpful instruments to make sense of the different organisational structures of countries concerning cultural policy.

Cultural values
This section will provide a systematic overview of cultural policy legitimisation within international context. Both intrinsic and instrumental values are discussed from a functionalist perspective. First, intrinsic values are about the specific nature of aesthetic experiences. Culture can provide a particular type of experience that allows for particular individual or societal consequences (Strandvad & Van den Hoogen, 2021b). This is sometimes difficult to put in words, but van Maanen (2009) defines these values as the result of mental engagement with the art. This can for example be the use of imaginative powers or the use of your emotional system. These engagements with art can have two different experiences, namely comfortable and challenging. The former is the experience that confirms your perceptions of the world, and the latter opposes and possibly changes them (Van Maanen, 2009). These can have personal or societal outcomes, such as the individual development/confirmation of identity or skills, or the change/confirmation of social structure or cohesion.

From this functionalist perspective, instrumental values of art are not the result of mental engagement but refer to other beneficial outcomes as a result of the organisation of aesthetic events in society (Strandvad & Van den Hoogen, 2021a). Different values can be allocated as instrumental, for example, Van Maanen lists relaxation, economic, social and information (Strandvad & Van den Hoogen, 2021a). Economic impact can for example refer to salaries generated related to the artistic experience, or indirect economic growth generated due to the cultural facilitation. Then social values can refer to the participating role culture can have for society, thereby preventing social exclusion. But it can also be linked to civic action or social change, because of new perceptions created through art. Moreover, culture could have benefits for education as well, improving your capabilities and learning new skills. Within the context of ICP other culture has been instrumentalized for other goals as well, namely for diplomatic reasons (Kizlari, 2019). Culture can be used in this regard for the creation of a certain image about a country, or the strengthening of bilateral relations, but for the execution of development goals. Where the former is more about the belief of own cultural capacity to change perception, the latter is more modest and sees the role of culture as one that contributes to certain perceptions (Minnaert, 2014; Paschalidis, 2009). The use of culture within diplomacy is seen as a form of 'soft power', which can go from access to cultural opportunities to cultural exchange (Schneider, 2010; Wyszomirski et al., 2003).

I   Bibliography

Akaliyski, P., Welzel, C., & Hien, J. (2022). A community of shared values? Dimensions and dynamics

of cultural integration in the European Union. *Journal of European Integration*, *44*(4), 569–

590. https://doi.org/10.1080/07036337.2021.1956915

Bréchon, P., & Gonthier, F. (Eds.). (2017). *European values: Trends and divides over thirty years*. Brill.

http://brill.com/view/title/34523

Brix, E. (2013). Austrian Cultural and Public Diplomacy After the End of the Cold War. In G. Bischof &

F. Karlhofer (Eds.), *Austria's International Position after the End of the Cold War* (Vol. 22, pp.

95–107). University of New Orleans Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1n2txd9.6

Bundesministerium Europäische und Internationale Angelegenheiten. (n.d.). *Kulturforen*.

Auslandkultur. Retrieved 23 March 2023, from

https://www.bmeia.gv.at/themen/auslandskultur/kulturforen/

Bundesministerium Europäische und Internationale Angelegenheiten. (2012). *Foreign and European*

Policy Report 2011 (pp. 1–348) [Policy paper].

https://www.bmeia.gv.at/fileadmin/user_upload/Zentrale/Publikationen/AEPB/foreign_and

_european_policy_report_2011.pdf

Bundesministerium Europäische und Internationale Angelegenheiten. (2013). *International Cultural*

Policy Concept 2015-2018 (pp. 1–14) [Policy paper].

https://www.bmeia.gv.at/fileadmin/user_upload/Zentrale/Kultur/Aufmacher/International_

Cultural_Policy_Concept_2015-2018.pdf

Bundesministerium Europäische und Internationale Angelegenheiten. (2020). *The International*

Cultural Relations at the Federal Ministry of European and International Affairs (BMEIA):

Basic principles, key areas and programmes (p. 52) [Policy paper]. Bundesministerium

Europäische und Internationale Angelegenheiten.

https://www.bmeia.gv.at/fileadmin/user_upload/Zentrale/Kultur/Publikationen/Basic_Docu

ment.pdf

Calligaro, O. (2014). From 'European cultural heritage' to 'cultural diversity'?: The changing core values of European cultural policy. *Politique Européenne*, *45*, 60–85.

Danish Cultural Institute. (n.d.-a). *About Danish Cultural Institute: Culture on the Edge*. About Us / Organisation. Retrieved 17 April 2023, from https://www.danishculture.com/about-danish-cultural-institute/

Danish Cultural Institute. (n.d.-b). *How we work at Danish Cultural Institute*. How We Work. Retrieved 17 April 2023, from https://www.danishculture.com/how-we-work/

Dewey, P. (2010). Power in European Union Cultural Policy. In J. P. Singh (Ed.), *International Cultural Policies and Power* (pp. 113–126). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230278011_10

DutchCulture. (2020). *DutchCulture Activiteitenplan 2021-2024* (p. 31).

European Commission. (n.d.). *EU Competences in the Field of Culture*. Culture and Creativity / Policies. Retrieved 1 November 2021, from https://ec.europa.eu/culture/node/63

European Commission. (2019). *Political guidelines of the Commission 2019-2024* (p. 24). https://commission.europa.eu/strategy-and-policy/priorities-2019-2024_en

European Commission. (2022). *About the Creative Europe programme*. Culture and Creativity. https://culture.ec.europa.eu/node/819

European Cultural Foundation. (2021). *Country profiles: Denmark* (p. 4). https://culturalfoundation.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/Denmark.pdf

European Parliament. (n.d.). *The protection of Article 2 TEU values in the EU*. Fact Sheets on the European Union. Retrieved 20 January 2023, from https://www.europarl.europa.eu/factsheets/en/sheet/146/the-protection-of-fundamental-rights-in-the-eu

Foret, F., & Calligaro, O. (2018). *European Values: Challenges and Opportunities for EU Governance*. Routledge. https://www.routledge.com/European-Values-Challenges-and-Opportunities-for-EU-Governance/Foret-Calligaro/p/book/9780367589509

Kizlari, D. (2019). *Foreign Cultural Policy through the work of the National Institutes of Culture: A comparative study on instrumentalism*. University College London.

Kulturministeriet. (2010). *Regeringens strategi for styrket internationalisering af Dansk Kulturliv* (pp. 1–78).

Kulturministeriet. (2017). *International Cultural Panel: Strategy 2017-2020* (p. 14).

Kulturministeriet. (2022, December 14). *Internationalt kultursamarbejde*. Kulturområder / Kultursamarbejde Og -Aftaler. https://kum.dk/kulturomraader/kultursamarbejde-og-aftaler/internationalt-kultursamarbejde

Kulturministeriet, & Udenrigsministeriet. (2022a). *Collaboration agreement between the ministry of culture and the ministry of foreign affairs of Denmark on Denmark's international cultural collaboration* (p. 2) [Policy paper].

Kulturministeriet, & Udenrigsministeriet. (2022b). *Strategic framework for the collaboration agreement between the Ministry of Culture and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark on Denmark's international cultural cooperation* (p. 8).

Lähdesmäki, T., & Wagener, A. (2015). Discourses on governing diversity in Europe: Critical analysis of the White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *44*, 13–28. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2014.11.002

Luijkx, R., Halman, L., Sieben, I., Brislinger, E., & Quandt, M. (2016). *European values in numbers: Trends and traditions at the turn of the century*. Brill. http://brill.com/view/title/33813

Markovic, D. (2021). *Austria Country Report* (11; The External Cultural Policy Monitor, pp. 1–18). Institut für Auslandsbeziehungen.

Meijen, J. (2020). Exporting European values? Political myths of liberal democracy and cultural diversity in creative Europe's literary translation projects. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, *26*(7), 942–958. https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2020.1801659

Ministerie van Algemene Zaken. (2014). *International cultural policy* [Government of the Netherlands / Topics]. Ministerie van Algemene Zaken. https://www.government.nl/topics/international-cultural-cooperation/international-cultural-policy

Ministerie van Algemene Zaken. (2022). *Internationaal cultuurbeleid* [Rijksoverheid / Onderwerpen]. Ministerie van Algemene Zaken. https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/internationale-culturele-samenwerking/internationaal-cultuurbeleid

Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap, & Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken. (2016a). *Beleidskader Internationaal Cultuurbeleid 2017-2020* (pp. 1–12) [Beleidsnota]. Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap. https://www.cultureelerfgoed.nl/publicaties/publicaties/2016/01/01/beleidskader-internationaal-cultuurbeleid-2017-2020

Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap, & Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken. (2016b). *International Cultural Policy Framework 2017-2020* (pp. 1–19) [Beleidsnota]. https://dutchculture.nl/sites/default/files/atoms/files/International%20Cultural%20Policy%20Framework%202017-2020%20-%20eng.pdf

Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap, & Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken. (2019). *Beleidskader Internationaal Cultuurbeleid 2021-2024* (pp. 1–18) [Beleidsnota].

Ministry of Culture Denmark. (2023, March 15). *International Exchange and Cooperation*. Cultural Policy. https://kum.dk/english/cultural-policy/cultural-policy/international-exchange-and-cooperation

Minnaert, T. (2014). Footprint or fingerprint: International cultural policy as identity policy. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, *20*(1), 99–113. https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2012.722997

Minnaert, T. (2020). Vijftig jaar ICB-beleid: De stand van zaken. *Boekman: 50 jaar Internationaal Cultuurbeleid*, *125*. https://www.boekman.nl/tijdschrift/boekman-125-50-jaar-internationaal-cultuurbeleid/

Mulcahy, K. V. (2017). *Public Culture, Cultural Identity, Cultural Policy*. Palgrave Macmillan US. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-43543-9

Paschalidis, G. (2009). Exporting national culture: Histories of Cultural Institutes abroad. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, *15*(3), 275–289. https://doi.org/10.1080/10286630902811148

Riegler, C. (2018). *Comparing Dutch and Austrian Soft Power: On the Driving Factors of International Cultural Policy* [Universiteit of Leiden]. https://hdl.handle.net/1887/65643

Schneider, C. P. (2010). Cultural Diplomacy: The Humanizing Factor. In J. P. Singh (Ed.), *International Cultural Policies and Power* (pp. 101–112). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230278011_9

Slots- og Kulturstyrelsen. (2022, September 6). *The collaboration with embassies and cultural institutes*. About International Collaboration. https://slks.dk/english/work-areas/international-focus/about-international-cooperation/cooperation-with-embassies-and-cultural-institutes

Srakar, A., & Vecco, M. (2021). Assessing the validity of cultural policy typologies for Central-Eastern European countries. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, *27*(2), 218–232. https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2021.1873967

Strandvad, S. M., & Van den Hoogen, Q. L. (2021a). Chapter 5 The Value of Art in and for Society. In *Sociology About Art*.

Strandvad, S. M., & Van den Hoogen, Q. L. (2021b). Chapter 8 Art and Public Cultural Policy. In *Sociology About Art*.

Toggenburg, G. N. (2004). The debate on European values and the case of cultural diversity. *European Diversity and Autonomy Papers*, *1*, 24.

Van Maanen, H. (2009). *How to Study Art Worlds: On the Societal Functioning of aesthetic Values*. Amsterdam University Press. https://doi.org/10.5117/9789089641526

Vos, C. (2017). European integration through 'soft conditionality'. The contribution of culture to EU

enlargement in Southeast Europe. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, *23*(6), 675–689.

https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2016.1276577

Wyszomirski, M. J., Burgess, C., & Peila, C. (2003). *International Cultural Relations: A Multi-Country*

Comparison. Americans for the Arts.