Cultural Diversity Programmes:

Challenges and Solutions in Scandinavia

Leena Marsio

MA thesis

Sibelius Academy

Arts management

Autumn 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. BACKGROUND OF THE THESIS AND CENTRAL CONCEPTS

1.1 Introduction

Nordic countries are facing big changes in their structure and population. Societies that used to be fairly monocultural are becoming more diverse due to the increasing flow of immigrants to our countries. Cultural diversity has become one of the biggest themes in international cultural policy of today. This situation poses Nordic cultural policies a big challenge for these policies still mainly reflect the tastes and preferences of the majority and have not adjusted to the new situation. The shift from monocultural into diversity as a new social norm requires rethinking also in cultural policy, its norms, processes and mechanisms which are necessary for the democratic development of these policies in culturally diverse societies.

This thesis is about finding the challenges of cultural diversity policies in the Nordic Countries. The main focus will be placed on Sweden, Norway and Denmark, which all have had a long-term programme of cultural diversity policies implemented either by their ministry of culture or the arts council. My first idea was to see the situation of cultural diversity in the arts on the grass-roots level and NGO's but I chose to take the governmental level for my research as this is the level where policies are designed and most of the funding given in the Nordic welfare societies.

I will leave Finland out of my thesis as my main focus is on these programmes and their means of grasping the theme of cultural diversity. The other three Nordic countries and their administrational models are similar enough to make these comparisons reasonable. United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Canada and Australia would have been interesting cases too, but I felt their scope and ways of tackling the issue would have been too different from the Nordic ones.

In this thesis I ask what are the main challenges to the promotion of cultural

diversity in the arts and cultural policy of the Nordic countries. What is the role of cultural institutions in the work for cultural diversity in the arts? Where are the Nordic institutions now when it comes to integrating cultural diversity as part of their work? What kind of ways does networking offer? In which levels of administration should the work for diversity take place? These are the questions I will try to find answers to in my research.

Through my research I have found three big themes to be most significant in promoting cultural diversity and these are affecting on institutions, emphasising networking and supporting decentralisation. In order for the cultural policies and arts world to change to be more inclusive, these are the main issues to grasp. The main materials for my thesis have been the evaluations of the three long-term Nordic programmes and other literature with the combination of cultural diversity and the arts. In addition to this, I have done extensive literature review on cultural diversity drawing from various fields of research: cultural policy, aesthetics, philosophy, sociology and political science.

The purpose of my thesis has been to grasp the issue of cultural diversity in the Nordic countries and to particularly see what the actions for supporting cultural diversity in the field of cultural policy have been. My interest has been the practical side of implementing these policies. One option would have been to analyse the rhetoric of the programmes but my interest was more on the practical side: what has actually, in practise, been done. One aspiration behind this research has been to see what Finland could learn from other Nordic countries about this issue and how to develop our policies further.

Who should receive funding for artistic activities and projects? Whose experiences and stories should be seen and heard in our theatres, concert halls or museums? Who should gain access to platforms of arts as audience, performers or participants to our institutions? What is the role of "new" citizens of the Nordic countries in the arts, do they get their share? These are some of the questions that cultural policies need to address in the present day.

I will begin my thesis by shedding some light to the role of cultural diversity in

present day cultural policy in international level. I will then briefly going through some of the most significant concepts related to cultural diversity. In the second chapter I will present three Scandinavian programmes on governmental cultural policy that have focused on cultural diversity, namely *Mosaikk* in Norway, *Forum för Världskultur* in Sweden and *Cultural Ministry's Development Fund KUF* in Denmark. In chapter three I will look for challenges and solutions in these programmes and try to find the bottle-necks of cultural diversity policies. These bottle-necks can also be seen as corner stones: in order to change the arts world to be more open to cultural diversity, what is it that the cultural policies need to focus on. I'll look for solutions from projects supported by these programmes and try to grasp how they have tried to solve certain issues. I will present three different case studies that all reflect the issue from a bit different angles. After this I will briefly touch upon the situation in Finland when it comes to cultural diversity and cultural policy. In the end I will present my own vision of what should be done in Finland in order to promote cultural diversity.

1.2 Research Approach

The subject of my thesis is of growing importance in the Nordic countries, in policy making across government and the public sector. The discussion about cultural diversity in the Nordic countries still mainly concentrates on social policy, where as the arts and cultural policy still play a minor role in this debate. Research data with the combination of cultural diversity and cultural policy has been fairly difficult to find.

My method is literature review where I use research material in the area of cultural diversity. The research of this thesis will be theoretical in nature as it is build on reading significant literature in the field and research. The approach that I use in this research is multidisciplinary in nature. Cultural diversity is an area that has been researched and discussed from a range of different areas of knowledge. Therefore, in order to understand the topic better one needs to have a multifaceted and interdisciplinary discussion. For this reason, my

research will draw from a range of fields: cultural policy research, aesthetics, philosophy, political science and sociology.

My position as a researcher wells from my work as an arts manager in various cultural projects of a culturally diverse nature; Roma (Gypsy) literature, immigrant arts in Finland, international cultural co-operation and developmental projects in the Balkan region. In this work I have had the change to take a closer look at the field of culturally diverse arts and to see the possibilities as well as challenges that this kind of work entails. However, I have wanted to take my knowledge of this area into a more strategic and conceptual level, that is, the level of cultural policy and its practical implementation.

My research orientation is socio-cultural. I am interested in the artistic and cultural side of cultural diversity, but I see the social side of the arts as equally important. I see the arts as having a great value in it self but I am also interested in the possibilities and the power that arts have used as a tool for democratic processes such as integration. I agree with Mitchell (2003, 459) stating that "cultural policy is not worth being called a policy, if it is not intended to have a role in economic and social development of European societies, regions and local communities. In more general terms, effective cultural policy is expected to strike the right balance between the traditional promotion of the arts and culture and their contribution to economic and social development."

The most important material used for this study has been the evaluations for the programmes of *Mosaikk, Cultural Ministry's Development Fund KUF* and *Forum för Världskultur.* With *Mosaikk* the results of the programme has been covered best, as there exists two different reports made by independent evaluators. With *KUF* I have had two status reports, one implementation report and one evaluation made by two independent researchers. About *Forum för Världskultur* I have two reports made by the committee for the programme. I have also used secondary material form the field, such as articles, journals and web pages of various organisations in the field.

In addition to the Nordic countries, case examples and literature from Great

Britain have been a source of inspiration in my work. Lectures in the City University, London, during spring 2005 and possibility to their use extensive library have contributed to my research. I also conducted informal interviews in Finland among professionals from the Arts Council of Finland, Ministry of Education, Cupore (Cultural Policy Research Centre) and Nifca (Nordic Institute for Contemporary Art) which have given me new ideas and inspiration.

My main research question is to find out what are the main challenges of cultural diversity policies in the arts in the Nordic Countries. I will approach this question through long-term programmes focusing on cultural diversity: *Mosaikk* in Norway, *Forum för Världskultur* in Sweden and *KUF* in Denmark. Through my research I have found three themes, key factors or processes to be most significant in promoting cultural diversity. These are affecting on institutions, emphasising networking and supporting decentralisation. These are the things that rise time and time again from the material that I have used for my research. I will approach each of these themes through a project that was supported by some of the three programmes.

1.3 Setting the Context for Cultural Diversity

Cultural diversity is one of the core concepts of our time. The notion of culturally diverse globe has existed for long but in the turn of the millennium the topic has gained more recognition than ever. In this part I will shed some light on the role of cultural diversity in the present day world. I will refer to notable reports and international declarations that have paved the way for cultural diversity. I refer to globalisation as one of the dynamic forces posing us in front of this new situation. I will then take a look on some of the most prominent themes on cultural policies that all support the notion of cultural diversity, namely accessibility, participation, social cohesion, international co-operation and innovation. Lastly, I will take a brief look on the discussion about quality as it so often mentioned related to the discussion about culturally diverse art.

First turning points in the discussion were reports such as *Our Creative*

Diversity (UNESCO 1995) and *In From the Margins* (Council of Europe 1997). They examined cultural diversity rather extensively and brought up its importance in the international discussion. The first mentioned was also among the first to emphasize the role of culture in sustainable development.

Council of Europe adopted their Declaration on Cultural Diversity in 2000. This was felt to be necessary in the changed situation where national procedures where not enough to handle diversity, but a European-wide strategy and shared view of the issue was needed. The declaration stated that cultural diversity has always been a dominant European characteristic and a fundamental political objective in the process of European construction, and that it assumes particular importance in the 21st Century.

In 2001, UNESCO adopted its Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity which was not legally binding, but helped in defining a common global understanding of cultural diversity. The Declaration emphasized the principles of pluralism, respect for human rights, promotion of creativity, and international solidarity. The declaration underlined that diversity of cultures; tolerance, dialogue and cooperation, in a climate of mutual trust and understanding, are among the best guarantees of international peace and security. The declaration brought up diversity as the common heritage of humanity and an essential part of development.

Although Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity was a welcomed step towards international co-operation on diversity, it seemed to be insufficient in fighting against the threats to diversity in the globalized world. Therefore, in 2005 UNESCO drafted a Convention on Cultural Diversity. The convention would be an international legal agreement to secure and to promote cultural diversity. The basic idea is that culture cannot be reduced to a commodity. The convention aims at assuring and protecting the diversity of cultural contents and artistic expressions, to ease the protection of the diversity of cultural policies and to promote wider international cultural co-operation. If all goes as planned, this convention will be signed in the end of 2005.

Globalisation

Globalisation is one big process behind the fact that our societies are becoming more culturally diverse. Globalisation is mainly associated with the transnational flow of money. However, decolonisation, refugee flows and the need for new workers, have also contributed to globalisation. When internationalisation spread some strong majority cultures around the world, globalisation has the power to bring all cultures close, next to each other and conflating. Yet, also in globalisation there lies a danger that the big eat the small. Many feel that globalisation is all about the "Americanisation" of the world.

According to Danish cultural policy researcher Dorte Skot-Hansen, the counterbalance to economic globalisation has been political, but the response to migration cultural. The debate about "the others" has become a cultural discussion where social and political questions have been explained in a template form in cultural terms (Skot-Hansen 2002, 198). The effects of globalisation move us all and new echoes can also be seen in cultural policy. For example the Swedish Department of Culture states that all homogenous explanation models are worn-out and possibilities of the future lie in the capability to benefit and live with diversities. (Kulturdepartementet 2000 b, 9)

The grounds for supporting cultural diversity can be found in the basis of Nordic cultural policies when it comes to accessibility, participation, social cohesion, international co-operation and supporting innovations. However, there is still a lot of work to do to combine these ideas with the notion of diversity.

As Ritva Mitchell, Finnish pioneer in cultural policy research (2003, 466-467) notes for the diversity issue, the Nordic countries have remained in the traditional camp focusing on artistic and cultural development mainly as an independent element in overall structural development. For her, the progressiveness of the Nordic cultural policy model has been most distinctively reflected in domain of the rights of cultural minorities, refugees and migrants.

The Nordic countries have ratified major international legal instruments in these areas, have provided financing and cultural service and for national minorities, even cultural autonomy. However, the inclusion of members on equal footing in the mainstream of the national art and cultural policies has been "less progressive - or nonexistent might be a more appropriate term". (Mitchell 2003, 467) There has been action and programmes for diversity, but there has been a tendency to keep the national system of arts as a closed fortress. Mitchell continues that this tendency has scarcely been intended, but is based on governance structures, especially those maintaining quality criteria, "artistic excellence", and peer evaluation for art and funding of cultural projects. (Ibid. 467)

The task of cultural policy is no longer to build up national unity or support the typical national forms of expression. It is more to support innovations, finding new forms and ways to express the present world in the era of globalisation. Many actors, artists and researchers in the field demand that the new policies should incorporate the idea that ethnic minorities and their artistic expressions have the chance to equally take part in the life of our societies, also in the field of arts and culture. Baeker & Oliver note that the whole language and conceptualisation of contemporary cultural policy is bound up in 19th century European assumptions about the existence of homogeneous and historically-based communities. This has profoundly affected our view of "identity," "ethnicity," "centres and margins," etc. These assumptions have established narrative forms, intentions, and practices that, despite claims to the contrary, act to deny difference." (Baeker & Oliver in Ellmeier, undated)

Ellmeier urges that the connection between cultural diversity and cultural policy has to be addressed to the national and urban cultural administration. In this context European legislation is relevant throughout, for example, the EU pushing the matter of anti-discrimination policies, but the active transformation processes must be achieved at local level. (Ellmeier, undated)

I wll now move on to presenting some of the most prominent themes on cultural

policies that all support the notion of cultural diversity. These themes are accessibility, participation, social cohesion, international co-operation and innovation. I do this in order to illuminate some of the connections that the topic of diversity has.

Accessibility

Another prominent theme on cultural policy with close connection to cultural diversity is accessibility. One of the goals of national cultural policies in each of the Nordic countries is to give all citizens a possibility to take part in cultural life as participants, audiences and creators. Accessibility is related to attitudes, physics, and economics, social and cultural aspects. Physical accessibility refers to e.g. plateau routes and elevators big enough for wheelchairs. Accessibility related to different senses, for deaf or blind people, is part of this aspect of accessibility. Economic accessibility refers for example to graduated ticket prices. Social and cultural accessibility refers to the content of activities, so that the supply of arts organisations would reflect the diversity of different groups in the society. (Taide tarjolle - Kulttuuri kaikille 'Arts for Offer, Culture for All' 2002, 10-11) This last aspect of accessibility is mostly related to cultural diversity in its ethnic meaning, which is the focus of my thesis.

However, artists from minority backgrounds often meet obstacles in relation to public art institutions which were established in the first place to fulfil policies regarding national cultural objectives. Many artists from minority backgrounds experience being outside the established art institutions. This is why it is not enough to simply support individual cultural projects or ad hoc initiatives, but a more stuctural, long-term approach is needed. According to the Council of Europe, programmes are needed to encourage the cultural development of non-European and indigenous minorities. These should have sufficient funding at their disposal to enable them to maintain and control their own institutions. To be effective, they should be accompanied by monitoring systems and the dissemination of knowledge and good practise. (In from the Margins 1997, 141)

Participation

Third theme, participation, is a key issue in order to change the arts scene to be more inclusive. In this context, I see participation as improving the practical conditions for members of ethnic and cultural minorities to participate in the art world as artists, audience and producers. *In from the Margins* raises participation as one of the key objectives of cultural policy. Participation means that the public should have a real opportunity to benefit from cultural activity through being actively involved in the creative process and the distribution of cultural goods and services. Council of Europe states, that the division between those who use it and those who make it and distribute it should be eliminated; culture should belong to everybody, not just a social elite or a circle of specialists. (In from the Margins 1997, 49)

International co-operation

Fourth theme, international co-operation, is an important goal for promoting and encouraging the encountering of different cultural processes within the countries. For me, this means that also the processes resulted from migration should be given space and nourishing.

In arts and cultural life there are certain areas where diversity is a present day fact, for example in pop and rock music. Here the cultural diversity of the cultural form is marked by commercial powers rather than cultural political actions. The problem with commercialisation in most cases is the homogenisation of the genre where marginal groups find it very hard to get their voices heard. Diversity can perhaps be only seen in the skin colour of the artists, but the content seems to be somewhat the same.

Social Cohesion

Culture is at present also regarded as a factor in social cohesion which I take here as the fifth theme in cultural policy with close connection to cultural diversity. Arts can make a useful contribution to the social and cultural

integration of immigrant or minority communities and the disadvantaged. The arts can help to promote social harmony, improve the quality of life and renew urban areas. Culture can help to unite Europe as well as maintain its diversity, but it also contributes to exclusive assertions of social, national and ethnic identities. Indigenous minorities in Western Europe are gradually attaining greater autonomy and a fair share of national resources, as the Sami people in the Nordic countries. This is not the case with groups whose origins lie in former colonies or countries outside Western Europe. (In From the Margins 1997, 53, 61, 100)

There is a growing instrumentalism of the arts, a process which sees the arts practised for very specific purposes in a variety of fields such as development, political purposes, economics and education. However important arts can be in these processes, there is a risk of reducing art into a mere commodity that can be exploited for all kinds of political purposes.

In the UK there is a whole sector, "the arts and social inclusion" devoted to the issues of social cohesion. There are a lot of activities in this sector and achievements across the social policy spectrum. The fast growth of this sector has awakened complains about instrumentalism of arts policy in the "arts-for-arts-sake" brigade. However, only less than two percent of the Arts Council England's budget for regularly funded organisations 2003-2006 went to the arts and social inclusion sector. (Gould 2005, 5)

 On the other hand, it must be noted that arts, separated form culture, will probably always have a marginal position in the society. There are fears that the instrumentalism of arts will in the end leave only little space for art. This does not of course deny the fact conceptions about audiences should be widened and artists should take a closer connection to the surrounding world.

Quality

Lastly, sixth major topic in the discussion about cultural policy and cultural diversity with special connections to funding has for a long time been quality, as

the support has been given to the artist or project "with the best quality". Now the new situation poses us with questions like whose quality and whose quality criteria? According to Karttunen, the ambiguous concept of quality works in public culture administration "as the black box of protecting the autonomy of the arts field, a box whose content can be determined and known only by artists and accepted experts inside the system". This means that the gatekeepers of the arts world allow us to understand that identifying a good artist and 'real' art is fairly unproblematic (Karttunen 2002, 83). Karttunen notices that the problematical nature of the concepts and lack of exact definitions makes it harder for example to evaluate discrimination in the arts world. Though discrimination has not been researched, the possibilities for artists from different ethnic backgrounds are known to be limited. Lagerkvist (in Egeland 2003, 88) notes, that what is seen as artistic quality is all the time in a process of change and for this is reason it can best be researched from the perspective of power.

According to Tony Van Dijk, the notion of quality has so many meanings and is so complex that it should be used with the utmost care, especially in the arts. He sees art embodying two aspects: on one had, art is judged on quality, but on the other, art itself is the main source that generates and transforms the notion of quality in our culture. Quality is not universal and taste and views are constantly subject to change. (Dijk in Cultural... 1993, 77) In different cultures in different parts of the world very different ideas on quality may be upheld at the same time. What may be considerer as a good painting or book in Amsterdam may well be judged less interesting by a group somewhere else.

Skot-Hansen points out that nowhere does the dilemma of artistic quality appear so acutely as in the evaluation of ethnic and cross-cultural art. Pavis argues that questioning Western universalism in order to allow room for cultural differences and their relativity, one risks losing every sense of value and levelling all cultural expression (Pavis 1996, in Skot-Hansen 2002, 203). Skot-Hansen asserts that it is therefore a difficult process to find a new platform for artistic evaluation, and it is virtually impossible to indicate a clear strategy which lies between "the Western-Oriented universalistic quality criteria which have

dominated the international art world and a relativistic criteria which place all cultures and thereby all their cultural expressions on an equal footing." (Skot-Hansen 2002, 203) She also emphasises the competence needed from the side of the evaluators. If one believes that artistic quality is defined on the basis of the traditions and aesthetic conventions on which the works derives, that is , *differentiated* concept of quality, it is a problem if the evaluator is not familiar with the tradition of which the art in question is based.

The task of cultural diversity is especially challenging for the Nordic countries. Danish Art Historian Stine Hoholt points out that we need to learn that other cultural and artistic expressions have qualities that can not be judged by our standards. 'Quality' should not be regarded as synonymous with 'canon', because the Western canon in art history has excluded non-European art. Making canon our point of departure for decades, we have been unable to see the qualities evidenced by, e.g. Brazilian avant-garde art. It has been seen as a "poor copy" of the avant-garde of the West, while it actually may represent enrichment and an expansion to the very concept of avant-garde (in Träskman 2001, 15).

In conclusion, cultural diversity has become a crucial concept in today's international cultural policy. It has risen to the top agenda of many organisations, especially UNESCO and Council of Europe. Globalisation is one of the main reasons of the fact that our societies are becoming more culturally diverse. The Nordic societies have changed, but in cultural policy the reaction to this change was shown mostly in the end of the millennium. Themes like accessibility, participation, social cohesion, international co-operation and innovation are all closely connected to the theme of cultural diversity and these connections I have tried to illuminate in the previous. The discussion about quality is one of the central and provoking ones in the field.

1.4 Research on Cultural Diversity

I will now take a closer look on research on cultural diversity in the arts. This research creates a background for my own work and sheds some light to the

history of cultural diversity. It also shows how new the issue in fact is on the field of cultural policy research.

Research about cultural diversity policies first emerged in Great Britain and particularly England. General awareness of this previously little-known field came through the publication of the very first research report into that area. *The Arts Britain Ignores* (1976) by Naseem Khan helped to uncover a vast amount of art projects and actions that were taking place within immigrant communities, from Polish children's theatre to West Indian choirs and Urdu poetry events, from Indian dance to Chinese music. Virtually every major urban centre was found to be hosting some form of `ethnic minorities' arts. The report brought new forms of art into the consciousness of a political and cultural structure, which had become aware of the community arts, but still "saw the world from very determinedly European eyes, that could not see art as a street celebration, that could not see earth based movement as a valid form of dance, nor could its ears hear that the strumming-up a sitar was classical music" (Khan 2003, 81). This report in short began Britain's journey towards an accepted and publicly supported diverse world of art. (Ibid.) Another landmark was *The Glory of the Garden: The Development of the Arts in England; A Strategy for a Decade* (1984) by Luke Rittner from the Arts Council of England. The report helped to change much of the Council's strategy. Policies on funding the arts outside of London, multicultural arts, and supporting arts activities for and by people with disabilities highlighted a commitment to access. United Kingdom has been producing lot of research in this area. Some of these results I have used in my study but I have tried to concentrate on Nordic countries as much as possible.

Since the 80's and especially 90's the research on cultural diversity has increased significantly. The Council of Europe has carried out a big transversal project *Cultural policy and cultural diversity* between 2001 and 2003. In the first phase, research focused primarily on Western Europe, with studies on diversity undertaken in seven countries (Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Luxembourg, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and also, for comparative purposes, Canada). In the second and third phases, eight further studies were undertaken, with an emphasis on diversity in different parts of Eastern Europe

(Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Hungary, Romania, Russia, Serbia and Ukraine). It is truly a pity that the Nordic countries have not been involved in this study.

The goal of the study made by the Council of Europe was to understand and support the development of democratic cultural policy in the context of culturally diverse societies. The individual reports have been published as paperback and can be found from the Internet (see references Council of Europe 2001). D*iffering Diversities – Cultural Policy and Cultural Diversity* (2001) edited by Professor Tony Bennett, is an important contribution that helps to map and to clarify core issues related to cultural policy and cultural diversity. It explores that challenges on how to accommodate existing policies into diversity instead of homogeneity as the normative policy footing. It situates the study within a larger context of European dynamics and discussions concerning globalization, cultural diversity, cultural democracy and cultural citizenship.

In the Nordic countries, research on cultural diversity in the arts has so far been quite rare. The most fruitful material for me in this matter has been the evaluations of the Nordic programmes which I will come back to later in chapter two of this thesis. Along with evaluating these programmes or various projects, the researchers have commented on central issues of cultural diversity policies. International seminars held in Europe about the topic have also produced conference reports on the issue. Rest of my sources have been articles located from journals, anthologies or the internet. It is notable that there is a lack of through research in this area in the Nordic countries. Therefore writing this thesis has been a way for me to gather up this information and hopefully to offer new knowledge for other actors within the fields of arts management and cultural policy.

1.5 Concepts Related to Cultural Diversity

In this chapter I will go through the core concepts related to cultural diversity. In

this way also the history of cultural diversity policies will be reflected. I will start by defining ethnicity and then move on to assimilation, integration and marginalisation which all are on the one hand strategies of the individual to adjust to the society and on the other hand, strategies by which the societies try to make inhabitants, especially immigrants, part of the society. After this, I will go through international shifts in policy approaches towards ethnic groups, relating to ethnic minorities, multiculturalism and cultural diversity. I will also briefly go through related concepts such as monocultural, hybrid, majority and minority.

Through this part and by grasping cultural diversity on a theoretical and conceptual level it is easier to understand the practical level. This conceptual level forms also the basis for policies on cultural diversity. These concepts can even be seen as tools to deal with cultural diversity. The gathering of material for this part of my thesis I have not restricted to Nordic countries. I feel that the conceptual level and theoretical discussion is quite the same on a global level and therefore I have used authors from elsewhere in Europe and Canada.

Ethnically-marked cultural differences

In my thesis I will concentrate on ethnically and culturally marked differences. Bennet speaks about *ethnically-marked cultural differences* which he distinguishes from other diversities by

> "the respects in which they challenge the basic grammar of national cultures that emerges from relations between peoples, histories, cultures and territories which are not national projects. They also involve forms of differences that have been entangled with the histories of racism and colonialism which have played so crucial part in the processes of nation formation." (Bennet 2001, 17)

I feel that the concept 'culture' should be used side by side with the term ethnical as it alone can be too narrow. Cultural diversity refers to the multiple components that make up today's diverse society. These can be gender, age, religion, ability, cultural -, social - or ethnic background and so on. Ethnicity is

one of these components, and it is this aspect of cultural diversity, which is the focus of my thesis.

Yet, I am also aware that ethnicity forms just one part of the identity of a person. An individual is a gridlock of identities: at the same time a person can be both a mother, grandmother, wife, teacher as well as a Chinese. According to Stuart Hall (1999), the late-modern subject consists of many identities that can even be contradictory with each other. These identities vary according to time and place. Hall sees that these hybrid identities are taking the place of national identities.

There has also been a shift in cultural policy, for example in Sweden. In the 1970's the immigrants were identified as "neglected groups" with special needs in cultural life, but in the 1990's it was stressed that immigrants are not a homogenous group and therefore support can not be targeted to groups or individuals just because they are immigrants. (Lagerkvist in Egeland 2003, 80)

Assimilation, Integration and Pluralism

Assimilation, integration and pluralism are different strategies that states have used towards immigrants or ethnic minorities in the particular country. Cultural policy is one part of the work of including or excluding cultural minorities in the society. Inclusion can work either in the form of assimilation, integration or pluralism. France and the U.S are known to be favouring the strategy of assimilation, Sweden and the Netherlands integration and Canada, India and Australia of pluralism. Marginalisation is the opposite of integration. In this part I will go through each of these, define them and see what these different strategies mean in practise.

British political scientist Bikhu Parekh defines *assimilation* in the following way. According to assimilationists, the state can only be stable and cohesive when its members share a common national culture, including common values, ideas of excellence, moral beliefs and social practises. The state works as a guardian

of the society's ways of life, and has both a right and duty to ensure that its cultural minorities assimilate or merge into the prevailing national culture. If minorities wish to become part of and wish to be treated like the rest of the community, they should live and think like the majority does. If they insist on retaining their separate cultures, they should not complain if they are treated differently. Henry Rousseau (1844 - 1910), J. G. Herder (1744 - 1803) and nationalist writers are its most significant spokesmen. This model has dominated France since 1789. (Parekh 1998, 2)

Parekh introduces several forms of assimilation. One might argue that minorities should adopt the majority way of life. One might go further and demand that they should also intermarry with and become socially and biologically assimilated to the majority community. One might go yet further and insist that they should "love" and show unconditional "loyalty" to the community, and accept its history as their own. The last form Parekh calls nationalist assimilation. (Ibid.)

In the arts this means, according to Dutch arts Historian Ria Lavrijsen, that the defenders of the policy of assimilation feel that the multicultural issue will be solved when minority artists adjust to the dominant national and European culture and European based definitions of quality and forms of expression (Lavrijsen 2001, 19). Assimilation assesses that people from different cultures and ethnic backgrounds should adjust to the dominant national or European cultures. Supporters of assimilation require artists to adjust to European based definitions of quality and ways of communication in the arts and art education. But the crucial question is, whether or not there is such a thing as homogenous national or European culture.

Lavrijsen sees the idea of one European culture as a myth. Europe has always been a continent consisting of historical, cultural and experimental differences within and between communities, nations, regions and cities. However, because of power structures within art world and its increasing orientation towards commercial and market demands and mass media, there is a tendency towards homogenisation in national, European and global cultures. (Lavrijsen in

Cultural... 1993, 16) Also Parekh sees assimilation as an incoherent doctrine for it is not clear what the minorities are to be assimilated into as a society is never a homogenous or unified whole. It is rather an unplanned whole product of history and made up of diverse and conflicting traditions, it consist of values and practises which can be interpreted in several different ways. The assimilationist has to ignore all this in order to arrive at a homogenised version of a national culture. (Parekh 1998, 7)

According to Parekh, among all the researchers I have encountered in my work, assimilation is not an option for liberal societies as they are based on the thought of equal respect for persons. In a liberal society different cultures should be understood and appreciated in their own terms, they should not be suppressed only because they are different and criticism of them should be based on criteria they can comprehend and in principle share. (Parekh 1998, 7) According to Norwegian sociologist Grete Brochmann (2003, 27) assimilation is generally considered as a negative concept or strategy pursued by many states in which violence, repression and other means of coercion were used to make minorities and immigrants as part of the society. In assimilation as ideological tradition, immigrant and minority groups are perceived as a number of individuals sharing the same problem of not adjusting to a monolithic majority culture, if there is such a thing. Assimilation as a strategy easily becomes authoritarian. United States has been especially influential in applying assimilationist strategy. Milton Gordon, an American classicist in the field of migration research, has applied the following measure of successful adjustment: once a person has accepted "the middle class cultural patterns of White Protestant Anglo-Saxon Americans." (in Brochmann 2003, 27)

In the 1970s a new strategy, *integration*, was formulated as a result of political radicalisation that brought cultural roots, identity and ethnicity into focus. The concept of integration is one of the basic ones in sociology. Brochmann defines integration in sociological sense meaning the learning of, and adjustment to, society's values creating belonging and loyalty. Integration is based on the notion that that the society is divided into various groups that are part of the

totality. Immigrants are considered as members of ethnic groups, not just as individuals, entailing the conception that it is these groups that need to be integrated. Individuals also acquire rights associated with the group they belong to. (Brochmann 2003, 27-28)

Integration is what Parekh calls *partial assimilation* or *bifurcation.* According to Parekh, in this model minorities should accept and therefore become assimilated into the political culture of the community but remain free to live the way they like. In this view the private - public distinction plays a crucial role. The unity of the society is located in the public realm, whereas diversity belongs to the private realm which includes family, neighbourhood and communal associations. John Locke (1632 - 1704), John Rawls (1921 - 2002) and Jürgen Habermas (1929 -) have been the ones writing about this model. (Parekh 1998, 2-3, 5) This model has been favoured by Great Britain and the United States and also all of the Nordic countries.

Critical voices have been raised against integration. Brochmann asks (2003, 37) if integration is merely a postponement of a long-term assimilation process. If society as such changes character in a more multicultural direction, all inhabitants will be socialised in new ways, both natives and newcomers. Everyone must then be assimilated into a more open society.

Parekh sees this model as an attempt to combine a monocultural public realm with a multicultural private realm and it will likely undermine the latter. In every society the public realm enjoys considerable dignity and prestige, which generally far outweighs those of the private realm. When one culture becomes the official culture of the community, the excluded cultures come to be seen as marginal, peripheral, even deviant and inferior, only worth practising outside the public realm and in the privacy of family and communal associations. Lacking power, resources and collective encouragement the youth often choose the easier path of assimilation. (Parekh 1998, 8-9)

Lavrijsen has a more positive view of integration and she sees integration as a policy aimed at heterogeneity, pluralism and intercultural exchange. According

to her, this policy is based on the idea that a society cannot be divided into ethnic segments, but is made up of communities and individuals with their specific historic, cultural, social and economic backgrounds. She sees assimilation and integration as two options for cultural policy and the third one is ethnicity as a criteria. For Lavrijsen the objective of integration is to compensate people who have suffered from migration, racism or colonial oppression. The problem is that though this type of policy should be aimed at disadvantaged communities, it tends to target specific ethnic groups and thus other groups with histories of exclusion are easily overlooked. This way ethnicity may become a dangerously central criterion with the idea of these groups' fixed identity. To this is also related the burden of representation of the immigrant artist. On the one hand, there is a pressure to assimilate; on the other hand there are people who 'otherise' the artist by prescribing how to represent 'otherness' (Lavrijsen 2003, 19 - 20).

Advocates of *pluralist* mode of integration feel that rather than assimilate minorities into the political culture of the community, the latter should be pluralized by acknowledging their presence and embodying their values and aspirations. If the otherwise disadvantaged minorities are to survive and flourish, they need public recognition, encouragement and material support. Charles Taylor, Canadian political scientist; Will Kymlica, Canadian philosopher and Austrian political scientist Rainer Bauböck have proposed various versions of pluralism in the last decades. This model has found favour in India, Canada and Australia which all are self-consciously multicultural societies. (Parekh 1998, 3, 5)

For Parekh, the pluralist mode seems to be like a vision of harmonious multicultural society. He sees that the pluralist model cherishes both unity and diversity and privileges neither. It appreciates the interplay of these two and does not assign them to separate realms. The multicultural public realm that it seeks to create, publicly recognises and accepts minority cultures as legitimate and valuable part of the community, and makes it easier for them to identify with it. In doing so, according to Parekh, the society "acquires both the right to

demand their loyalty and support and the power to mobilise their moral and emotional energies" (Parekh 1998, 9). The multiculturally constituted public realm institutionalises and embodies diversity in the very self-conception of the community and makes it as a normal and collective part of the collective life. The pluralist model minimises assimilationist pressure and enables minorities freely to negotiate their relations with the dominant culture. Since minorities do not need to be particularly protective of their ethnic identity, they are more likely to enter into a dialogue with each other and with the majority culture. The pluralist model is based on a vision of society in which its different cultural communities create a rich, plural and collective culture affirmed alike in all areas of life. (Ibid. 9-11)

Unesco underlines the shift from praising diversity to building pluralism. Policies that seek the integration and participation of all citizens are an earnest of social cohesion, vitality of civil society and peace. Defined in this way, Unesco sees that cultural pluralism is the policy offshoot of cultural diversity. Since it is inseparable from a democratic context, cultural pluralism is conducive to cultural exchange and the flowering of the creative potential that sustains life in society. (Unesco 2005)

This vision is not easy to realise and as Parekh (1998, 9-11) notes, it also includes problems. Some cultural communities might not be open to participate in this dialogue and rather keep the gates closed, such as some aboriginal people in Canada, Australia and elsewhere. A multicultural society needs to respect also these wishes. Furthermore, the minority communities might sometimes be hostile to and penalise the choices of their nonconformist members. Then the wider society needs to find ways of reconciling the legitimate demands of both. Pluralism presupposes both the willingness to live with differences and the ability to find one's way around in them, and these qualities are not generally readily available. Some might think that tolerance has gone too far and some might think it has not gone far enough. This means that a plural society needs to evolve a broad consensus on the value and limits of diversity, which is not an easy task to do.

Lavrijsen sees pluralism and integration as somewhat synonymous terms. According to her, a policy aimed at integration and pluralism is founded on the principle that a society is made up of individuals each with a specific historical and cultural background. In this view there is recognition that cultural identity is determined by a number of factors: ethnicity, aspects of the culture of the former home country and the new one, class, sex, religious orientations, sexual orientation and aspects or rural or urban culture. This view also recognises that different European countries, regions and ethnic communities may have something in common as well as cultural differences. Such differences are non-hierarchical in a pluralist society. The dominant national and European cultures will modify and also the cultures of the ethnic communities will undergo a change. Lavrijsen notes that supporters of integration and pluralism will speak in terms of *qualities* as opposed to quality. (Lavrijsen in Cultural... 1993, 16)

Parekh (1998, 3) is able to find problems also from this model. The problem with pluralism is that it places the community's political culture beyond negotiation and revision and expects minorities to become assimilated with it. Since the political culture does not reflect the presence and values of minorities, they would not be able to identify with it and offer their support. In a society dominated by a specific culture, minority cultures suffer from obvious structural disadvantages and need more than tolerance to flourish or even survive.

According to Parekh's view, the pluralist model better reconciles the legitimate demands of unity and diversity than the others and therefore it is best suited to multicultural societies. The assimilationist model ignores the cultural claims of minorities, takes an impossibly stringent view of integration and threats the unity of a state by locating it to a non-existent uniform national culture and by provoking minority resistance. The integrationist (or bifurcationist) model does nothing to relieve the alienation of cultural minorities from the public realm and cannot provide a stable basis for unity and since it does nothing to reduce the structural disadvantages of minorities, it runs the risk of encouraging fundamentalism among its nervous minorities. Although Parekh sees the pluralist model better than rest, it cannot be held as an ideal model for all

societies. Rather each society need to start from where they are and choose a model that best coheres with its history, traditions, self-understanding, moral and cultural resources, level of economic and political development, the nature, number and demands of its cultural minorities and so on. (Parekh 1998, 12)

To conclude, assimilation, integration and pluralism are all strategies that states have used towards immigrants or ethnic minorities. Assimilation is still in use for example in France and the U.S., but according to the researchers it is not an option for liberal societies. However, I see that assimilation still has a strong foot hold in the Nordic countries and one point where this can be seen clearly is the discussion about quality. The idea of the superiority of the European based tradition and conceptions about quality holds its position fast. Integration is the model favoured by the Nordic countries, but the big question is what is that the minorities need to be integrated into? There is no such a thing as a monolithic majority culture and identities are never fixed but in constant change. Pluralism is the model that Parekh appraises the most, but even this model has its problems as we have seen in the case of Canada.

Ethnic Minority, Multiculturalism and Cultural Diversity

In addition to assimilation, integration and pluralism, there is another way to conceptualize the position of immigrants or ethnically-marked differences in the society. Bennett (2001) divides three stages characterising the international shifts in policy approaches to ethnically marked cultural differences: first, support for ethnic minorities, second, multiculturalism, and third, support for cultural diversity.

First positive references to some form of cultural diversity or multiculturalism in cultural policy emerged in the end of 1960's. The notion of taking into account cultural differences ran parallel to new social movements after 1968, together with feminist, peace, gender and the ecology green movement.

First there was support for "*ethnic minority*" cultures with the idea that immigrant communities were in danger of losing their distinctive cultures without government support. The support was directed to the maintenance of ethnic cultures as separate enclaves, disconnected from the national culture and supported by a social dynamic that was seen as essentially defensive. (Bennett 2001, 58)

'Ethnic' is a word that is used in many different meanings. Specialists use it to describe a group of people whose members have common origins, a shared sense of history, a shared culture and a sense of collective identity. All human beings belong to an ethnic group in this sense. In popular use the term ethnic implies "not - western" (as in 'ethnic food'), not-classical ('ethnic music') and not-white ('ethnic communities'). (Parekh et al. 2002, xxiii) Skot-Hansen notes that the concept "ethnic" is often used about "the others" as a social and historical construction which confines the foreigner to their ethnicity, for better or worse: "either as the exotic creature who can nourish our own dreams and self-presentation or as the primitive and pre-modern to whom we can confidently feel superior to." (Skot-Hansen 2002, 198)

A pair of concepts, *minority* and *majority*, are often used when talking about cultural diversity. According to Parekh et al. (2002, xxiii) the term minority has connotations of "less important" or "marginal". In many setting it is insulting and also mathematically misleading or inaccurate to use this concept. Parekh et al. see that these concepts are used for perpetuating "the myth of white homogeneity, the notion that everyone who does not belong to a minority is a token member of the majority, where there are no differences or tensions". Also *In from the Margins,* by Council of Europe, questions these two terms. Belonging to a minority implies being marginal or exiled in an enclave, whereas all cultures should be central and deserve to be seen as such. From this perspective, diversity policies should do more than guarantee respect for minorities. It would be logical for them to be available for every kind of cultural grouping, large or small, each of which has a legitimate interest in promoting subsidiarity and counteracting centralisation. (Council of Europe 1997, 47) In this thesis, however, I will at some points use these concepts as they simply

sometimes make it easier to express certain things or to refer to certain groups.

Second phase, "*multiculturalism*", arose from criticism towards the designation of the "ethnic minorities" as unique ethnicised groups committed to separatist cultural strategies, supporting the belief that majorities are somehow not ethnic or separatist. Multiculturalism seeks to foster social dynamic in which the national culture is seen as being made up from independent cultures existing side by side and being of equal value (Bennet 2001, 58). Multiculturalism as an ideology has been a step forward in breaking cultural hegemony. It has been necessary to break with the power of established national cultures by highlighting the marginal cultures (Skot-Hansen 2002, 207). 'Multicultural` is one of the key concepts in many of the programs but at the same time most unclear.

Shanti Brahmachari from Norwegian Arts Council (2004, 95-96) sees that in the multicultural model all cultures in society must have equal opportunities to express their culture on their own premises. But the problem with this concept is that it implies that immigrants are multicultural and the members of the majority are monocultural. He also states that this concept shows cultures as separate or isolated, that they do not necessarily communicate with each other. These separate cultures can be seen as monocultures that live beside each other without any mutual communication. Council of Europe (In From the Margins 1997, 129) takes a critical view to multicultural policies as well. They are often designed to "protect and promote" distinct cultural attributes, or various forms of "otherness". They encourage "the preconception that within any given society there is a number of artistic styles that fit a classic definition of culture, and endorse notions of quality consistent with the conventions of the western mainstream rather than those appropriate to the context. "According to Norwegian/Pakistani Artistic Director Khalid Salimi (1999, 6) it is misleading to say that our countries have become multicultural because of immigration. All cultures are many-sided; each and every culture is multicultural. Rashed Araeen, British artist and activist, (2002, 17) states that multiculturalism has a specific and limited function that is not defined by the values of different

cultures in the Western societies today, but the "West's own view of other cultures and re-constitution of these communities".

According to Anne-Brit Gran, Norwegian theatre scientist, (2002, 26) the multicultural society is an opposition to and comes after the monocultural society, that in practise in the first place was the white American culture. The concept was created in the centre, the monocultural white America that was not part of multiculturalism. Multicultural is defined to be different or strange from the white norm. The Other is like this or that, this is why it is different from Us white (Ibid.). Ghassan Hage takes even more critical point of view to multiculturalism. He sees "zoo multiculturalism" serving as a means of exhibiting diversity as a public testimony to the state's support for liberal and pluralist values (Hage 1998 in Bennett 2001, 26). Paul Gilroy criticises "corporate multiculturalism" in which major international corporations use racial signifiers of difference as a means of constructing a brand image of "timeliness, vitality, inclusion and global reach" (Gilroy 2000 in Bennett 2001, 26). In the context of this thesis, "monocultural" can also be used in a neutral way, referring to activities or projects made by one particular immigrant or minority group. Multicultural, in opposition, means activities made by representatives of at least two cultures.

At present, the politically correct concept is "*cultural diversity*", that Bennet describes as "the intersections of, and crossovers between, different cultural perspectives and traditions that produce the social dynamics" (Bennet 2001, 58). It is this dynamic of diversity that cultural policies are now, while still pursuing aspects of the earlier stages. Cultural diversity embraces differences of class, culture, region, language, religion, gender, age and abilities. The term is connected with larger themes of equal access for multiple groups within society.

Brahmachari (2004, 95) states that the idea of cultural diversity is to cross borders between cultures, allow us ourselves to be open and incorporate new elements from other cultures to our own. In multicultural model the policies

should provide minority cultures arenas for work without having any effect on institutions. Contrary to this, cultural diversity urges for the change in power relations and conceptions of art, also for the main national arenas and institutions. Naseem Khan, pioneer in promoting cultural diversity and the former Head of Diversity in the Arts Council of England, (2002, 118) describes cultural diversity as a subtle term. He sees it as a principle that refers to far more than ethnically-based diversity. As the guidance produced for the Museums and Galleries Commission in 1998 (`Responding to Cultural Diversity') put it:

> "Cultural diversity refers to the complex composition of society. It acknowledges that society is made up of interest groups which are often very distinct, whilst still holding to a general commonality. These interest groups may be region-based, gender-based, ability-based and so on. Each can have its own sense of history, its own values and a specific `language' or form of self-expression. Put together they are responsible for the rich layering that constitutes society." (in Khan 2003, 118)

Khalid Salimi, Pakistani-Norwegian artist and journalist, (1997, 2) sees cultural diversity as a better option to multiculturalism because it gives room to new variations, and it is a starting point for new forms of expression. The idea with cultural diversity is to leave the ethnic identity to background, so that artists can first of all be artists. Lavrijsen emphasizes that the terms "migrant" or "minority arts" are too readily associated with ethnic backgrounds and country of origin and tend to suggest the existence of a homogenous migrant or minority culture. (Cultural... 1993, 17)

Andrea Ellmeier, Austrian cultural researcher, notes that the term "cultural diversity" is in itself extremely open and still often unclear. Cultural diversity is actually cultural diversities, and it always returns to the question of representation and participation of non-mainstream groups at local, regional, national, supra- and international levels. Broadly defined by Ellmeier, cultural diversity politics is cross section politics which can reach into many political fields: social policy, citizenship matters (internal affairs), legal policy (equal

opportunities issues), education, science, art and culture policies. (Ellmeier, undated) Egeland (2003,78) notes, that the concept of diversity has further different meanings whether it is discussed in the field of cultural-, social-, working- or media policies.

For some years now cultural diversity has been one of the four strategic areas of the Council of Europe, alongside with human rights, democracy and the rule of law. What does cultural diversity mean then? Bernard Wicht (2001, 20-21) has identified main ideas or concepts covered by cultural diversity.

- "Cultural diversity means *cultural exception*, that is, in the relationship between culture and trade. Cultural goods and services must not be regarded as sole commodities and they should enjoy a special status in agreements of large-scale economic and trade treaties. This status should enable states to maintain their national system for encouraging and supporting culture." This is the point that is emphasized in the becoming Unesco Convention on Cultural Diversity.
- "Cultural diversity means *cultural rights*. This is the area of human rights that is related to the individual's rights to his/her identity and heritage. This element complements with the political and social right, making culture an area that deserves protection in the same way as others. "
- "Cultural diversity means *protection of minorities and regional and minority languages*. Cultural diversity means relationship between culture and development. "This is how the concept is defined by UNESCO in the report *"Our Creative Diversity"*.
- "Cultural diversity means *peaceful coexistence* of mutual understanding among groups and communities that do not share the same culture (language, religion, etc) within one country or society. " Switzerland has taken this approach, where diversity firstly means harmony and good will among the various component of the totality. The ideal here is not to affirm the rights of one group in relation to another, but to seek exchange and dialogue that would lead to mutual understanding and peaceful coexistence.
- "Cultural diversity means *cultural policy*. The principle is that a country's

cultural policy should reflect the different cultures and civilisations present in that country. Thus cultural policy should not solely portray the image of the dominant parts of the society, but ensure that artistic productions in different disciplines (exhibitions, theatre, museums, cinema, music, etc) reflect all the cultures represented among the population."

Here we can see that cultural diversity has various aspects and it is an integral part of the present society. Cultural diversity is linked with economics, human rights, protection of minorities, development, peaceful coexistence and cultural policy.

These three phases - ethnic minorities, multiculturalism and cultural diversity - have characterised the approaches to ethnical and cultural differences. There are still few more concepts that need to be presented here in order to understand the issue of diversity deeper and also to shed light on the newest approaches.

'*Hybrid*', concept originally by American postcolonial researcher Homi Bhabba, is a core concept in the present international aesthetic discourse that is used to express diversity. Gran (2002, 33) notes that hybrid has become the preferred figure when discussion takes place on artistic crossovers or cultural crossroads. Fock & Skot-Hansen (2003, 77) see hybrid art as something that is created in a culturally diverse society that forms a new unit where one can no more separate or tell one part's origin from the other. The concept is part of the global, post modern art scene (Ibid.). One can even say that all the countries and all art is hybrid in today's global village. Brahmachari sees hybrid as the ideal formation of cultural diversity. This intercultural model has a normative aspect that cultures should let themselves be influenced by other cultures. Through this encounter with the "Other" happens a change where something new is created. Brahmachari sees in hybrids a chance to be freed from the monocultural chains of institutions. The objective is to get artists to cross over the boarders of art forms and ethnic lines and by doing so, to develop new forms of art. (Brachmachari 2004, 102) It should also be noted that traditions

that used to signify 'the West' now co-exist with hybrid cultural forms. Relationships are constantly being negotiated, between men and women, the younger and the older generations, faith and secularism. Cultures are frequently affected by each other and by memories and experiences of colonisation, oppression, marginalisation, resistance, emancipation and liberation. No culture whatsoever lives in a vacuum. (Parekh et al. 2002, 164)

"*New Internationalism*" is a concept by Gavin Jantjes. He sees new internationalism as inclusive opposed to the old exclusive 'modernist internationalism'. Its focus is on the contemporary work of artists all over the world, with emphasis on the art neglected by art history because of race, gender or cultural difference. According to Jantjes, in cultural policy this means that the national culture is being placed in perspective of the global. (Jantjes 1994, 38)

Skot-Hansen (2002, 204-205) takes some of these stages and concepts together to represent strategies for the ethnic expression. This I think is very interesting in relation to the arts and cultural policy. *Ethnic revival* emphasises ethnic and cultural purity, which can even lead to a certain type of fundamentalism in artistic expression. This cultivation of roots and authenticity derives primarily from the ethnic artists themselves as a reaction to oppression and lack of acceptance because of their cultural background. This strategy can also be found among the public who desire "the real thing". This emphasis on tradition builds, according to Skot-Hansen, upon the idea of multiculturalism. The second strategy is what Skot-Hansen calls *interculturalism* which builds upon a dialogue between the cultures. With this approach it is the cultural encounter itself which is at the centre, which can be seen as barter, exchanging goods or expressions between equal partners. The third strategy is *hybridisation*, the development of entirely new forms of artistic expressions.

All these concepts may seem confusing, but as *Forum för Världskultur* points out in the end report (Kulturdepartementet 2000 b, 23) is that important is not to find a unambiguous definition for cultural diversity but to adopt a process like thinking around what can be seen to fit into the concept.

Sweden uses the concept of ' multicultural' (*mångkultur*) alongside with 'cultural diversity' (*kulturell mångfald*) and 'world cultures' (*världskultur*). In Denmark the concept of 'cultural diversity' (*kulturel mangfoldighet)* is in frequent use, as also in Norway (*kulturelt mangfold).*

My own view of these concepts and particularly cultural diversity is that in the cultural policy of the Nordic countries the concept is still mainly used in connection with immigrants and ethnic minorities. Despite the actual meaning of the concept our countries still seem to use it to mean the same as multiculturalism. We should perhaps look more into finding room for real cultural diversity where it would mean co-operation and participation in the arts between different genders, age groups, regions, abilities, religions, cultural and ethnic backgrounds. I do agree that there is a need to target specific groups in order to change the society, cultural policy or arts world, but the ultimate aim should not be to separate different groups to enclaves but to celebrate diversity.

2. CULTURAL DIVERSITY PROGRAMMES IN SCANDINAVIA

The main data for my research have been the reports and evaluations for pilot programmes on governmental level related to promoting cultural diversity in the arts: *Mosaikk* in Norway*, Forum för Världskultur* in Sweden and *Cultural Ministry's Development Fund KUF* in Denmark. As mentioned before, I chose to take the governmental level as the focus for my research as this is the level where policies are designed and most of the funding given in the Nordic welfare societies. Cultural policy is made on all political levels but the governmental one is the most influential. In order for the arts scene to change more inclusive and approving towards cultural diversity the process needs to start from both sides: the grass-roots field and the governmental level. These two should be in a constant dialogue with each other. I feel that these programmes do have an important place in the Nordic societies to show an example of including the idea of cultural diversity.

I will start this part by going briefly through these three programmes. They will form the background for my case studies analysed later in this thesis. I think they are also useful in understanding the position of cultural diversity in the Nordic cultural policy.

Many of the programmes have wanted to emphasize that though they work for integration of immigrants and minorities into the society, they are first and foremost art programmes. For example in the outlines of *Mosaikk* (Norsk Kulturråd 1999, 3) "to promote and integrate multicultural expression" has replaced all the questions about ethnicity, immigration, nationality, minority and identity issues.

What is a culturally diverse project then? One could argue that a play by Shakespeare in Sweden is multicultural as it has English and Swedish culture involved. But the focus in the following programmes and projects is in the persons involved and actively participating. Cultural diversity need not be the theme in the arts work produced but is about the persons involved in the

process. This is a point emphasised for example in the following actions in Norway after *Mosaikk.*

I will take a brief look at the number and percentage of immigrants in each of the three countries. I will present the main goals and focus areas of the programmes as these also show what each of the country of their ministries have felt to be the most significant themes in promoting cultural diversity. These goals create the basis for the three corner stones of promoting cultural diversity in the arts presented later in this thesis. I also take a look at the sort of projects that these programmes have funded. Lastly, I will present the main points, successes and failures that came out in the evaluations of these programmes.

2.1 Mosaikk in Norway

Norway has a population of 4,5 million and 7,3 percent, 333 000, of them are immigrants. The immigrant population is here defined as persons with two parents born abroad. The immigrant population thus consists of first generation immigrants (277 300) and people who are born in Norway of two foreign-born parents (55 500) in year 2003 (Statistics Norway).

The *Mosaikk* programme was initiated by the Norwegian Council of Cultural Affairs and it existed from 1998 to 2001. The financial framework of the programme was NOK 5 millions (590 000 euros) per year for initiatives that will a) promote and integrate multicultural expressions under previously established schemes in the fields of art and culture, b) enhance the opportunities for minorities to develop and participate in artistic and cultural life on their own terms.

The idea of the programme was to develop strategies for the recognition of cultural diversity by:
1. Working to promote and integrate multicultural expression through established policies within the artistic, cultural and educational sphere, and everyday activities of art institutions

2. Enhancing the opportunities of minorities to engage in cultural activities on their own terms

3. Increasing minority participation in the arts and cultural life as participants, members of the public, and professionals

The Norwegian Council of Cultural Affairs placed special focus on four areas:

1. Accessibility and arenas for cultural exchange
2. Recruitment, qualification and professionalism
3. Local and regional development projects
4. Information, dialogue and development of knowledge

(Norsk Kulturråd 1999, 3)

Mosaikk supported 120 different projects. Gran categorises the activities of the programme in the following way: (2002, 20)

- Art projects: focus on the production and provision art, objectives artistic invention and multicultural expression, applicants are from the art institutions
- Children and youth: focus on the goal to familiarize children and youth in the arts world of multicultural society, applicants work with children and youth
- Educational projects; focus in pedagogic, the objective is to get diversity aspect into pedagogic, applicants are education institutes
- Culture political projects: focus on cultural politics, the objective is to change politics to be more open to diversity, applicants are organisational actors or civil servants in the field of culture policy
- festivals and other similar events: focus on temporary cultural activities, the objective is social or artistic, depending on the nature of the event, applicants are organisations or culture political actors
- seminars and workshops: focus on learning, the objective is to learn more about theoretical or practical multicultural issues, applicants are artistic, academic or culture political actors
- Meeting places and workshops: focus on getting different cultures to meet each other, the objective is to create dialogue and understanding between cultures, applicants are single persons and organisations
- Others: projects that do not fit in the above mentioned categories

Categories of projects supported by Mosaikk 1998-2000

Year	1998		1999		2000	
1NOK=0,12€	kr	%	kr	%	kr	%
arts	319 000	6,5	516 000	10,5	1 481 000	29,5
children	824 000	17	704 000	14	585 000	12
education	25 000	0,5	150 000	3	250 000	5
culture policy	1 225 000	25	2 160 000	43	1 410 000	28
festivals	1 185 000	24	545 000	11	365 000	7
workshops	450 700	9	105 000	2	385 000	7,5
meeting	745 000	15	485 000	10	539 500	11
others total	15 000	3	325 000	6,5	0	0
	4 788 700	100	4 990 000	100	5 015 500	100

(Gran 2002, 21)

The *Mosaikk* programme has been evaluated by Anne-Britt Gran in *Mosaikk –
Når forskjellen forener. Evaluering av programmet for kunst og det flerkulturelle
samfunn* ('Mosaikk – When Differences Unite. Evaluation of the Programme for
Arts and the Multicultural Society') (2002) from the Institute for Music and
Theatre and by Bergljot Baklien and Unni Krogh in *Evaluering av Mosaikk – et
program under Norsk Kulturråd* ('Evaluation of *Mosaikk* – a Programme Under
Norwegian Council of Cultural Affairs') (2002) from the Norwegian Institute of
Urban and Regional Research (NIBR). Baklien & Krogh focus their report on
the local aspects of the programme. They see a relation between instrumental
thinking and orientation towards developmental investment locally and the
importance of culture political investment that can promote the arts with its own
premises. Gran analyses the politics, rhetoric and aesthetical dimensions of
Mosaikk. She debates *Mosaikk* in the tension between artistic quality and the
goals of culture policy. Gran points out central dilemmas in the political and

cultural rhetoric that are in the background of the programme. Her starting point is to make room for pragmatic diversity in the whole arts system in order to promote multicultural expressions.

According to the two evaluations made, *Mosaikk* has been fairly successful in its actions. The evaluators felt that the programme has been important in changing attitudes towards supporting and making culturally diverse art and artist visible in Norway. To enhance recruitment, qualification and professionalism of talents from minority background, many of the projects in *Mosaikk* have concentrated on children and youth. For adults, seminars and workshops have been the most used form of working. Local and regional development projects were many and they were anchored to the administrational system of the communities. For information, dialogue and development of knowledge was mainly realised by Artists in Motions (AIM) that among others made artist profiles, conveyed assignments and translated application forms and instructions.

To fulfil the aim of integrating multicultural expressions to the everyday activities of art institutions has been difficult. In 2000 Kulturrådet decided to change its own routines by introducing and integrating multicultural aspect in to its functions. According to Gran (2002, 46) this might be the biggest effect of *Mosaikk*. The reports underline that trying to change the big cultural institutions is hard work and there is not that much to do with Councils means. Both of the reports recommend that projects coming "from the ground" should be supported, initiated by artists or resource persons having a minority background themselves or so that they are invited into equal cooperation. This way of working would better secure the point of doing it "on their own terms". The functioning activities in the field, with cultural diversity as their central goal or managed by persons with minority background should be prioritised in funding.

The project was ambitious, even too ambitious in its time frame of supporting 100 projects within three years. The biggest problem in Mosaikk was that the goals as a starting point were unclear and they also changed along the way. This caused that the goals were hard to translate into practical level (Baklien &

Krogh 2002, 141). In practise this meant that the outcomes that locally were felt to be successful were in the other level interpreted as being out of the projects goals. This was felt as demotivating by the local actors.

According to Komissar (2004), it was problematic to operate within a specific programme that only consists of things related to cultural diversity, separated from the other functions of the institution. The result is that "multicultural projects" appear as own category of projects and this creates doubts if these projects are handled according to the same quality criteria as other projects. In the Norwegian Council of Cultural Affairs, the traditional departments were very little involved in *Mosaikk* programme.

After *Mosaikk* programme ended in 2001 the Arts Council continued to support cultural diversity in the arts by mainstreaming: the Council let each art section (visual art, music, theatre, literature, cultural heritage, art for children, etc) to work out a strategy for cultural diversity that takes into account the difficulties that are specific to each field. Number of projects supported has increased from 89 in 2001 to 137 in 2003. The sum of money given to support cultural diversity in 2003 was 15, 5 million NOK (1 840 000 €), a lot more than the 5 million NOK that was the yearly budget of *Mosaikk*. The trend has been to support projects where cultural diversity in an integrated part, rather than "clear" multicultural projects. (Komissar 2004) In 2003 the Norwegian government presented a cultural recommendation report "*Cultural Policy up to 2014*" where encouraging cultural diversity and internationalization is one of the foundational principles.

2.2 Forum för Världskultur in Sweden

The number of immigrants in Sweden has steadily risen in the past two decades. Out of 9 million inhabitants, approximately eleven percent is first generation immigrants, which makes about one million inhabitants. Second-generation immigrants, children born in Sweden with at least one parent from abroad, are another 800 000 persons. This makes altogether 20 per cent. In twenty years, every fourth child is born in Sweden will have an immigrant

background (Statistics Sweden). Sweden has adopted a policy of integration where the perspective of cultural diversity means creating social and cultural inclusion among the population.

Forum för Världskultur ('Forum for World Culture') was a pilot project initiated by the Swedish Government and it existed 1998-2000. The Government, the City of Stockholm and Stockholm County Council were partners on this and it was run as a committee within the Department for Culture (Kulturdepartementet). A programme advisory comprising of five experts with a cultural background was part of the committee.

The project aimed at increasing the artistic and cultural diversity in Sweden by taking initiative in and co-ordinating the presentation of expressions of cultures from throughout the world. The aim was to give all of Sweden's population, regardless of ethnic or cultural background, new possibilities to convey or experience the diversity of cultural expressions. The forum had the following main tasks:

1. To initiate, stimulate and co-ordinate activities within existing institutions and organisations
2. To realise own projects aimed at presenting culture in different forms from throughout the world, whereby large scope was given to new cross-ethnic and cross-cultural expression
3. To arrange meetings between artists and cultural workers with experience of different cultures
4. To inform about world cultural events
5. To take the initiative in cultural societal debate in different forms
6. To develop co-operation with cultural institutions, cultural associations and municipalities across the land with the purpose of drawing up proposals for a plan of action for a multicultural cultural policy, which has the aim of building a new cultural community in Sweden. (SOU 2000,15)

This programme has been evaluated by *Kulturdepartementet* in *Delrapport. Forum för världskultur.* ('Part Report. Forum for World Cultures.') (2000) and in

Jag vill leva, jag vill dö I Norden - Slutbetänkande av kommitten Forum för Världskultur. (2000) ('I want to live, I want to die in Norden – End report by the Committee of Forum for World Culture.') Both reports have been made by the same people who have been working within the project which does not necessarily make the starting point as objective as it could be.

According to the reports, the outcomes for the project have been good. During the years *Forum för Världskultur* supported 50 projects with a total budget of SEK 10 million (1 080 000 €). The support of the project has created conditions for realisation of many culturally diverse initiatives. In addition to economic support, *Forum för Världskultur* engaged in many ways to these projects: as a partner, advisor and assistant. The programme was directed by a conception that a wider supply in culturally diverse arts creates preconditions for artistic development and improves possibilities to meet other cultures and new audiences. Central idea was not to support projects that aimed at "exotising" the other but to have artistic competence and quality on the foreground. (Kulturdepartementet 2000 b)

The programme supported four bigger projects that became the "fixed stars" for Forum för Världskultur. These projects were *Världsteaterprojekt* ('World theatre project'), *Världsmusik och dans* ('World music and dance'), *Gud har 99 namn* ('God has 99 names') and *Världsmusiktältet* ('World music tent'). In theatre and dance seminars such as *Världen på svenska scener* ('World on Swedish stages') was organised with Swedish Theatre Union. City Theatre of Stockholm organised a series of evenings called *Under samma himmel* ('Under the same sky'). In music, *Världsmusiklaboratoriet* ('World music laboratory') and *Världsmusik och dans i Kulturskolan* ('World music and dance in the culture school') were the biggest and most fruitful projects. Third category in the programme was meeting places, aimed particularly at creative producers. This meant among others supporting networking magazine *Korsdrag* ('Crosscurrents'), series of seminars *Ny publik – nya grepp* ('New public – new grip') and international co-productions such as Hotel Europa by Intercult. (Ibid. 50-69)

Because of the short period of the project the committee did not want to draw any certain results about long-term effects in their report, but rather discusses about experiences and findings. The committee sees the programme as a laboratory or a greenhouse to nourish ideas and initiatives in the culturally diverse arts. The programme established contacts with most of the central cultural institutions in Sweden, organisations and actors relevant in the field.

No doubt, *Forum för Världskultur* has had effects on cultural life in Sweden. Still, after reading the two evaluations, I feel like missing the actual results. I believe that this situation mirrors wider the problem in the cultural field for not having enough expertise on how to measure the effects of a policy. This leads back to setting correct and concrete goals and targets for policies and programmes. If there is no clear vision about where one is heading, it is not possible either to set the goals nor to measure it.

After *Forum för Världskultur* the Swedish government has invested on multicultural consultants ('mångkulturkonsulenter'). Seven consultants have been working in different regions of Sweden since 2002. Multicultural consultants act as inspirators of regional development and the aim is to give the whole population a possibility to experience or take part in culturally diverse artistic expressions. The Council takes responsibility of half of the expenses of the consultants and the rest is cared by regional authorities. The budget for these consultants has been 3 million SEK (323 700 €) and in addition the National Council for Cultural Affairs (Kulturradet) has given 1,3 million SEK (140 530 €) for education and development work around cultural diversity. In addition to this, it is stated that cultural diversity should penetrate all actions within the Council. The Governments Department of Culture (Kulturdepartementet) has announced year 2006 to be a multicultural year ('Mångkulturår') to further promote and strengthen cultural diversity in the cultural life of Sweden.

2.3 Cultural Ministry's Development Fund KUF in Denmark

Denmark has a population of 5, 4 million inhabitants. The number of immigrants is about 400 000 which includes descendants. This makes 13,5 percent of the

population. The figure has doubled in the last twenty years. This figure is expected to be 700 000 immigrants in the year 2021. (Statistics Denmark)

In 1998-2001 the Danish Ministry of Culture had a Development Fund (Kulturministeriets Udviklingsfond, KUF) with the vision to ensure active development of Danish Arts and Cultural life by supporting and implementing initiatives of an innovative or interdisciplinary nature. The fund concentrated on supporting artistic initiatives that are experimental in their content and form. *KUF* also wanted to support projects that move on an unproved borderline and that fall out of the existing means of support. The criteria to give support were professionalism, fostering talent, continuity, distribution and international dialogue.

The fund had two focus areas:

1. The digital multimedia (the use of two or several media in forms of expression - text, film, animation, graphics, sound, music, light effects. These expressions must be integrated or reworked with a digital processor).

2. Ethnic and cross-cultural sector with the emphasis of development and co-operation between ethnic and Danish art with ethnic origins.

(KUF 2004)

for *KUF* was 23, 9 million crowns (3 150 000 €) in 1998, 19, 3 million crowns (2 545 000 The budget €) in 1999 and 25,1 million crowns (3 310 000 €) in 2000. (Balling et al. 2001, 6) In addition to supporting projects, the fund had initiatives of its own. In the ethnic and cross-cultural sector it had a project on mapping artists with non-Danish background. It also organised a series of international artists' meetings under the name Copenhagen Sessions.

In the following chart are presented the projects supported in the ethnic and cross-cultural area. It would have been interesting to know how the funding was divided between different art forms but as the reports did not include that kind of a chart we can only take a brief a look and see the rough results. Generally it can be said that the projects covers a wide spectrum of cultural and artistic projects that are experimental either in their content or form.

(Balling et al. 2001)

Projects supported in the ethnic- and cross cultural sector

		DKK
Children of Fate	Body Brain Unlimited	1 000 000
Metro	Sfinx Film/TV	1 000 000
The United African Ballet of Denmark	The United African Ballet of Denmark	600 000
World Music Center	World Music Center	436 475
Women of the world	Foreningen Freja	400 000
Vi er fodt under samme sol	Udviklingscentret Odsherred	350 000
Braendstof 2001 crossing	Kobenhavns amt - kulturel forvaltning	345 000
Stjerneskud/kunstkomet	Shambala	300 000
Forstadens konge - Danmark ver. 2000	Axel Film	300 000
Danskere-Arabere-Billeder-Lyd-Ord	Sammenslutningen Assununu	300 000
Perpetual Fusions/ passionate friction - et forum	Teater- og kulturinstitut Terra nova	297 500
Interactive Urban Landscapes	Terra Nova	297 500
Ourselves and Others - The Danish Story	Ida Wanjiku Brandt	261 000
Ego Faust	Kanonhallen	250 000
Center for Urbanitet, Dialog og Information	Lasse Lau	200 000
Verdens Kulturfestival '99	Verdens kulturfestival	200 000
Erindringslandskaper	Teatret OM	200 000
The Tango Room	Mucca Divina	200 000
Connection 2000	Fonden Shambala	150 000
Flamenco-i.-dk	Thierry Boisdon	140 000
Vibes II	Verdens kulturfestival	135 000
Forstadens konge	Axel Film	126 000
Uno Mundo	Ramon Avenando	125 000
Lysfortaellinger	Igor Kolabaric	120 000
Koncert mellom to have 2001	Pedro Godoy	106 000
Klüvers Big Band	Verdens kulturfestival	100 000
Etnodrama	Lars Bo Kujahn	100 000
Genopsaetning of vidareforelse af smuds	Kadhim Faraj	100 000
Ost i Vest 2000	Skolen for verdensmusik i Kbh.	94 000
Koncert mellom to have	Pedro Godoy	80 000
Smuds	Cafe Teatret	80 000
Sikup Sinnani	Else Danielsen	75 000
Dem og Os	Lise poulsen	70 850
Kulturelle prismer - ojne på Danmark	Thomas Henriksen	67 992
Ord Uden Graenser	Majken Sanchez	63 000
Braendstof 2000 spillesstedsprojekt	Kobenhavns amt - kulturel forvaltning	60 000
I Danmark er jeg fodt	Camilla Buttingsrud	55 000
Spider Mummification	Stine Hoxbroe	53 600
Site Spesifique - non Spesifique	Thierry Geoffroy-Colonel	52 000
Den censurerede Kunstudstilling	Kulturvaerkstedet Dagmar	50 000
Etnisk musikskole i Kobenhavn	Etnisk musikskole i Kobenhavn	50 000
Vokalensemblet PAVA	Vokalensemblet PAVA	50 000
Del Norte Y Tropical	Jorge cordero	45 000
Ved bjergenes fod og hvor havet bruser	Munin Teatret	44 864
Skulptur projekt	Khaled Ramadan	35 000
Copenhagen Winter Festival	Zapolski Kvartetten	30 000
Nomade	Miguel Vega Olivaires	22 000
Peace of Art	Nathalie Boss	20 000
		9 237 781

The Fund has been evaluated by Balling, Fazakerley and Skot-Hansen in 2001 *KUF i det uprøvede grænsefelt – en midtvejsevaluering af Kulturministeriets Udviklingsfond* ('KUF in the unproved borderline - midway evaluation of Cultural Ministry's Development fund'). The result of this evaluation was that KUF has functioned as an important initiative for the experimental and cross-sectoral arts field. The programme supported many relevant projects that could not have been realised without the support from *KUF*.

On the artistic side *KUF* has awaked important discussion about different concepts of quality. The fund used a contextualised or differentiated quality concept which connects quality with the traditions and aesthetic conventions of the particular art form. Instead of using or trying to use a universal quality concept, opera and hip hop are evaluated after different parameters. *KUF* influenced in getting the issue of cultural diversity in the agenda of governmental cultural policy through discussions with focus groups, departments and ministries. Through supporting policies *KUF* made arts and artists with other than Danish background more visible and this way shifted the image of Danish art scene more manifold. The support and success were mainly seen in the field of music and visual arts. With the mapping of artists from different ethnic background made a more qualified basis for supporting this area. (Balling et al. 2001, 121)

But the Fund was not without problems though. The cross-cultural area was said to be the black spot of the fund. It was mainly seen to be closer to integration policy than to culture or arts policy. The area is a very complex one and a three year project like this made visible all the problems that there are in policies concerning cultural diversity. The fund did not have an easy task to tackle all this challenges within the narrow plan of action.

Concrete this was shown as there were not enough qualified applications in the cross-cultural area. Only ten per cent of the subsidies went to promoting cultural diversity in 1998-1999 and in 2000 the figure was 20 per cent. Yet between1998 - 2000 KUF supported the cross-cultural area with 9 million crowns (1 187 100 €). (Balling et al. 2001, 12, 103)

One of the biggest problems is related to the definition of concept 'ethnic'. In the fund's plan of action ethnic is defined as "non-Danish, different from the native people" (in Balling et al. 2001, 96). Here we come back to the definition of this concept that I touched upon in chapter four and that Baling et al. ask too. All of these words include many possible ways of interpretation. What does different mean? What are native people? And is it only non-Danish that are ethnic? Are the Danish not ethnic and do we need the word for describing the exotic or primitive? (Ibid.)

On the strategic side it was not all clear if the fund should be Ministry of Culture's Development Fund or a fund for developing arts and culture. By this Balling et al. (2001, 16-17) mean that should the fund be filling the "holes" that the ministry does not support or really to concentrate on leading initiatives that give the arts field a chance to develop by making their own prioritising and focus areas? One question remaining open is that should the fund stake on artistic quality or geographic decentralisation. In KUF Copenhagen and Århus were over-represented. Also projects in the capital area got in average much bigger sums than projects in the provinces. (Balling et al. 2001, 120)

In the ethnic and cross-cultural sector the evaluators recommended that there should be more help from consultants in developing competence in the strategic and organisational areas for the applicants. The evaluators also noted that the management of the fund did not have deep enough competence on the focus areas. To make this kind of programme work better, there should be consultants in helping with applications, marketing strategies, fundraising and evaluation of the projects. There should also be workshops, seminars and courses to familiarize the applicants with the Danish cultural bureaucracy and arts field. Also the institutions should be motivated to take cultural diversity as part of their work. New culturally diverse creative milieus outside the institutionalised arts should be stimulated through networks, also in international level. (Balling et al. 2001, 20-21)

In year 2001 the Liberal-Conservatives Party won the elections with the

immigrant-hostile Danish People's Party as supporting party. As Skot-Hansen notes (2002, 209) the campaign focused on the problems of immigration and ethnic conflict. The new government set new priorities and the Development Fund was closed down. In 2002 there was no formalised support for the ethnic or cross-cultural area in the Government's cultural policy, neither in terms of grants schemes, councils, boards, nor as expressed in policy goals or declarations of intent. (Skot-Hansen 2002, 209) The situation is still the same at 2005 as there are no initiatives to support cultural diversity on governmental level in the field of cultural policy.

3. ANALYSIS: CHALLENGES AND SOLUTIONS

The promotion of cultural diversity is a challenging task. After reading the evaluations of the Nordic programmes and getting acquainted with the literature and research made in the field, I have noticed that there are certain topics that arise from time and time again as being most crucial points in promoting cultural diversity. Other way I have tried to grasp this issue has been to familiarise myself with Nordic cultural policy in general in order to see what are the mainstays of these policies.

Drawing from the previous literature review, I suggest that there three themes are most important in the work for promoting cultural diversity in the arts: institutions, networking and decentralisation. The deeper grounds for each of these will follow in each section. Though I have separated these issues in the structure of my thesis, it must be said that they overlap and intertwine with each other.

Institutions form the core of cultural life in the Nordic countries and they receive a lion's share of public subsidies. This places a lot of responsibility on institutions. The material that I have gone through supports the views of many in the culturally diverse arts field that the institutions have still a lot to do to

include cultural diversity as part of their actions for the changed situation of our societies.

Networking is a crucial process and dynamic in changing the arts scene more culturally diverse. Networks play an important role as intermediary between governmental institutions and the cultural sector. Networking is a channel for the actors in the field to enter into a dialogue with each other cross-sectorally and also over the borders of institutions, governmental level and civil society.

Decentralisation is the third pillar in the promotion of cultural diversity. In this context decentralisation means that the notion of diversity should cut across the whole society. It is not enough to implement separate actions in the capital area, but actions are needed in all levels and all regions of the society. This means co-operation between different levels of the society, administration of state, region and communities and also across sectors.

Another key area in changing the arts world is education. I feel that professional, formal arts education should be the fourth basic pillar in promoting cultural diversity in the arts. However, I was not able to locate enough literature on arts education and cultural diversity and therefore I had to leave this topic out. In Sweden and Denmark for example there is already a generation of immigrants who has got education on their own field and this is shown in their success in the arts. However, this is a slow process that needs to start now.

3.1 Institutions - Basic Pillar of the Arts World in the Nordic Countries

In this part I will take a closer look at the role of cultural institutions in the work of including cultural diversity as a norm in their work. First I will see what the importance of these institutions is in the Nordic cultural policy and arts scene. I will then present the outcomes of three different studies made recently on the position of cultural diversity in the actual work of Nordic institutions. After this I will introduce some of the views of researchers and actors in the field of how

cultural institutions could better take diversity into account in their work. Audience development is one important part of this work and this is the field of practise I will take a brief look upon. Lastly, I will present Norwegian project *Open Scene* as my first case study and through this case I aim to illuminate some of the possibilities and difficulties related to the changing the structures and practises of cultural institutions.

3.1.1 Role of Cultural Institutions in the Nordic Countries

Cultural institutions have played a major role in the Nordic cultural policy for the last thirty years as Irjala and Eikås (1996) note in *State, Culture and Decentralisation.* Since 1970's, cultural services have been distributed throughout the country which was done in each of the Nordic countries by establishing systematically a network of regional cultural institutions: theatres, orchestras, music schools, art museums or travelling exhibitions, adult education centres, art galleries and cultural centres. Even today these institutions form the core of the cultural policy in the Nordic countries. (Irjala & Eikås 1996, 6-7) The Nordic countries have been in favour of institutionalised form of activities, which in turn has most likely forced some of the cultural activities to be institutionalised against their nature, in order to avoid falling outside the subsidy system. It can be argued, that the decentralisation efforts in the cultural sector have been realized by institutionalising the field (Ibid. 121-122).

The strong position on cultural institutions is somewhat the same in all of the Nordic countries. In Sweden, cultural institutions are the core of regional cultural life. The creation of a network of institutions and the safeguarding of their functions has been one of the main objectives of Swedish national cultural policy since the 1970's. Sweden has had a basic grant system that has given permanent or "automatic" support to the institutions involved. There has been criticism against this automation and that state should set up more definite criteria for desired achievement from the institutions. The demands within the

existing system have been too general to have a governing effect (Ibid. 102-103). I will come back later to this question of criteria in this chapter. In Denmark, the small geographical area and high density of population has helped the state to create a system of cultural networks with broad accessibility. (1996, 31) In Norway, the trend of administration centralisation is stronger than that of decentralisation. (Ibid. 83-84)

If institutions form the core of cultural life in the Nordic countries they also have a lot of responsibility in distributing the arts in a democratic manner and incorporating cultural diversity in their work. This has not been the case with most of the institutions. This is why both the Swedish and Norwegian programme I have presented, has taken affecting on institutions as one of their key aims.

Forum för Världskultur takes the transformation of institutions as one of their starting points. The Swedish Department of Culture notes that within the cultural institutions there is sleeping potential for a persistent promotion of culturally diverse initiatives. That's why the programme wanted to inspire the existing institutions and organisations to increasingly take in the culturally diverse perspective as a crucial part of their work. Also the lesson learnt from the three-year project was that long-term development work should grow from existing arts institutions and authorities. This requires renewing the work of these institutions (Kulturdepartementet 2000 b, 10 -11) *Forum för Världskultur* showed in many cases that alliances between institutions and external producers have brought in new actions and audience groups. (Ibid. 85)

One of the objectives of *Mosaikk* was to work for promoting and integrating multicultural expressions in the everyday activities of art institutions. The policy document by Norwegian Parliament behind Mosaikk, *Om innvandring og det flerkulturelle Norge* ('About immigration and the multicultural Norway') (1996-1997) notes that the institutionalised cultural life in Norway does not reflect the immigrant communities in the country. One of the challenges in coming years is to create conditions where more persons with immigrant background could take part in cultural life. It must be secured that persons with immigrant background

have a possibility to participate in regional, local and national cultural institutions work, both as users, executors, directors and administrators.

These activities should be more open from non-western art forms and artistic traditions. This also means that persons with immigrant background should be recruited to educational system, cultural institutions and their decision making bodies, and to fight against prejudices and barriers of recruitment. (Om Invandring...)

There have been a lot of critical voices coming from the field that the institutions are simply not doing enough for the matter. Brahmachari takes a critical view to the performing arts institutions in his article *Monokulturer eller kulturelt Mangfold?* ('Monocultures or Cultural Diversity?') (2004, 96-97). He writes about the criticism towards performing arts and theatre, which is supported the most by the state but still it has biased programmes that exclude diverse audiences. He claims that the artists presenting the biggest institutions and their representatives in for example media, politics and research have the position to define what good art is and should be, what is quality, and what is seen on the stage. "By building big, strong institutions it is defined what is included and what is excluded." In practise, Brahmachari states, art and artists that use other ways of expression than that of the monoculture, should have a possibility to influence on what happens on the big stages of opera, theatre and dance.

Parekh calls for addressing institutional obstacles in all the main arts bodies. He claims that institutional racism is widespread but denied. Parekh suggests that major arts organisations should commission an independent audit of its programmes, output, employment profile, representation of wider society and financial investment. (Parekh et al. 2002, 162-166) Director of Swedish Intercult, Chris Torch (2001) argues that "the problem arises in such an institutionalized and well-organized map when new impulses enter the arena. The world around us changes, the population changes, the tools change – but the organization of the artistic work remains essentially the same."

According to British - South-African curator Gavin Jantjes, Western institutes pronounce certain practises and artefacts as belonging to the proper realm of 'culture' and as being the Culture that the educated public ought to know about (in Träskman 2001, 12). Tuula Arkio, General Director of the National Art Galleries in Finland, points out that art institutions should look themselves in the mirror, because she sees the institution in itself is not an absolute value. She notes that during the last decades the world has changed much, so the institutions can not live in a vacuum, but constant interaction and dialogue needs to happen. Arkio calls after interaction and monitoring the surrounding world, through which culture can renew itself. "If the institutions don't see what is happening around them and if they don't react, it may create damage, delay and motionless that will not benefit anyone. Power coincides with responsibility" (in Träskman 2001, 14)

To sum it up, cultural institutions undoubtedly play a crucial role in Nordic cultural policies. However, criticism has been raised in the field that these institutions ate not doing what they should to include cultural diversity in their actions. Therefore, both *Mosaikk* and *Forum för Världskultur* took effecting on institutions as one of their key aims.

3.1.2 Research Results on Cultural diversity and Arts Institutions

The comments from the field seem to favour the opinion that cultural institutions are not doing enough for the inclusion of cultural diversity as a part of their work. But does research on the field support this statement? The answer is yes.

I was able to locate three studies regarding institutions and cultural diversity in the Nordic countries. Pripp et al. have made a research *Tid för Mångfald* ('Time for diversity') (2004) that studies the work of Swedish governmentally funded cultural institutions related to ethnic and cultural diversity. Hvenegaard Rasmussen & Høirup (2000) made a similar study of Danish cultural institutions *Kulturinstitutionernes bidrag til det kulturelt mangfoldige Danmark - en undersøgelse af kunst- og kulturformidlingsinstitutioners tilbud til og inddragelse af de etniske minoriteter* ('Cultural institutions' support for the culturally diverse

Denmark - a study of art and cultural institutions offer to and inclusion of the ethnic minorities.'). The third study, *CON:fusions – et kunstnerisk udviklingsprojekt del 1. Kortlaegning af centrale udfordringer i forhold til kulturel mangfoldighed i nordisk scenekunst.* ('CON:fusions – an artistic development project part 1. Mapping of central challenges in relation to cultural diversity in the Nordic performing arts.') (2004), was carried out by Nordscen, Nordic Centre for Performing Arts and it takes a look on cultural diversity in performing art institutions in the Nordic countries. I will first present the outcomes of the Swedish study more profoundly, and see what the results were in general terms, and then related to organisation, production and audience.

The Swedish study is extensive and based on a quantitative poll among 63 cultural institutions, mapping of these institutions' annual reports for 2002 and 2003 and interviews with 55 managers in 18 bureaus and institutions. The results of this study are very illustrative and I think many of the issues are applicable also to other Nordic countries. In the next I will present the results of this study. (Pripp et al. 2004, 16-21)

The mapping of annual reports showed that there are a lot of activities related to cultural diversity taking place in the governmental cultural institutions. The issue is taken up and handled on many different frontiers. However, among the respondents there was awareness that the question of cultural diversity had not been taken seriously enough. There were also relatively big differences between organisations. The question of representation was given low priority which refers to engaging or employing persons with foreign background.

In the poll, the institutions stated that they have fulfilled the national cultural political aims in their work. They made clear that persons with foreign background are an important target group for institutions. They admitted though that the institutions do not do enough to make this target group interested in their activities. The institutions demanded more economical resources and ear-marked funds to the work with cultural diversity.

The mapping showed that cultural institutions do not mirror the society of today. The composition of their personnel does not represent the ethnic or cultural viewpoint of today. The annual reports show very little concrete results on cultural diversity. The total input to this issue is mentioned in occasional comments in the end. The same comments can even be repeated many years consecutively.

Organisation

Majority of the institutions had a lack of a plan or policy on cultural diversity. As the most common reason for this was mentioned that the institutions were too small, they are working for a policy or that they do not feel there is a need for such a policy. Persons with foreign background were usually employed on the lowest level of the organisation. One fourth of the organisations felt that it is hard to get people with foreign background interested in working for their institution. Majority of the institutions took a negative view on quotas as a method to change representation in the institutions.

Internal work for ethnic and cultural diversity has a low priority. Few institutions have measures or results of internal diversity work and few of the authorities comment the question. The awareness of the issue had risen in 2003 as there was demand for accounting the competences of the organisation. Many have started to pay more attention to recruitment of persons with non-Swedish background.

There is a lack of analyses on the position of diversity. In the annual reports it was very seldom mentioned where in the institution people with foreign background stand. In the mapping it came out that issues related to people with foreign background like, are there any in leading positions, what is the situation like among people who work with the arts and are responsible for planning, or have received support, were undervalued.

The interviews showed that diversity questions had a low priority and they were poorly anchored to the actions of the institutions. The recruiting of the institutions happened mainly through informal networks and channels. These networks seldom included people over ethnic borders. When announces of positions available were made, quite often there was a wish for wider diversity.

Productions and Programming

The interest of the public and demand for productions on cultural diversity was considered to be relatively high. The focus of the diversity perspective in these institutions was on producing programme and activities on the theme of cultural diversity. The next priority after this was in the ambitions of doing this for a culturally diverse audience. To a certain extent productions were made with national minorities or persons with foreign background. The lowest priority was in the representation of wide ethnic and cultural background among those who plan, decide, produce, create and implement. It was most often amateurs and laymen that ware invited to co-operation. This varied according to the arts form. The representation was lowest in theatres, museums, heritage and handicrafts; higher in visual arts and highest in dance and music.

The interviewed preferred productions that handle the topic of ethnic and cultural diversity whereas productions with persons with foreign or minority background were less common. There was obscurity about the concepts and methods of diversity which created arbitrariness and discontinuity. Questions about diversity awaked suspicion about lack of quality, competence and professionalism.

Audience

Only half of the respondents saw that diversity perspective is at present an integrated part in their institution's work with audience or users. Ethnic and

cultural diversity was often seen as a synonym for schooling and education. Cooperation with children and youth through schools was the most usually appearing form of audience work in the annual reports. In general, there were little results of diversity when it comes to audience or users of these institutions.

Goals concerning the audience were seen more as visions than realistic goals. Many of the mentioned barriers were based on problematic view about culturally diverse audience, regardless of whether the obstacles were within the institution or out in the society.

The Danish study got similar results. Although the field of cultural diversity is starting to develop and gain more space, only few cultural institutions have incorporated cultural diversity into their activity at all levels, i.e. in organisation, content, and its relation to the public. According to the study, especially art museums still reject the idea of supporting ethnic minority artists by using the "demand for quality" as a shield. The study indicated that cultural historical museums and libraries seem to be more successful in integrating the cross-cultural aspect, both in the content of their exhibitions and in terms of reaching the audience. (Hvenegaard Rasmussen & Hoirupp 2001)

The third study, a report by Nordscen, is a part of their project called *CON:fusions*. It is an artistic and cultural-political development process with the main aims to create better opportunities for the integration of performing artists from ethnic and cultural minorities into mainstream Nordic cultural life and to create the conditions for a more varied, socially oriented and artistically interesting arts and cultural life in the Nordic region. The starting point of this project is that the established performing arts institutions do not mirror the multicultural society that the Nordic countries are at present. This is the case especially with theatre institutions (CON:fusions 2004, 9). The CON:fusions report takes a look on the cultural political statement of national scenes in the Nordic countries.

In the Danish *Det Kongelige Teater* there are some mentions about the cultural diversity aspect. First "to create ground for a fruitful meeting between the

Danish culture and the many foreign influences, meaning for example immigrants". Second, "in *Det Konglige Teatret* we shall be as we have been - and at the same time confront with foreign and new Danish productions." The values of The Danish national theatre are manifested implicitly. Though the rhetoric is not explicitly exclusive, are the formulations of goals build on around a contrast between "the Danish" and "the foreign" and the "confrontation" between these two. (Ibid. 29-30)

In Sweden *Kungliga Dramatiska Teatern* takes also some position to the theme. "The goal is to promote society development that is characterised by social equality, equality between women and men, respect and tolerance where ethnic-, cultural-, lingual- and religious diversity are seen as a positive force and also to diminish discrimination, xenophobia and racism." The aims of the national theatre are strongly on preserving and using cultural tradition, but also the words "for all" and "broad" come into foreground. (Ibid. 31)

The Norwegian *Nationaltheatret* says to be promoting both Norwegian and foreign expressions. The theatre wants "to be attractive and accessible for existing and new audiences, especially children and youth and audiences from the multicultural Norway". Here the cultural diversity aspect is explicitly mentioned, but only as audience, not as participating artists. (Ibid. 32)

To sum it up, the research results on cultural institutions clearly show that cultural diversity could be taken better into account in their work. The notion of diversity has been paid attention to and there are actions to promote it, but there are big differences between institutions. Ethnic diversity of the audience is seen to be of some importance, but the institutions are not working actively to change the situation to be more inclusive. Diversity of staff and taking ethnicity into account in recruiting is seen to have value, but the people with different ethnic background than the majority are mostly employed in the lowest level of the organisations. The work that has been done concerning programming has mainly been productions with the theme of diversity, in some cases even targeted to culturally diverse audiences, but it is not yet so common to do these

projects with culturally diverse artists. The work for widening the audience is still seen mainly as schooling for children and youth. The idea of new audiences seems to be more like visions, not realistic goals.

No doubt, there are practical reasons for the institutions to be in the state of the work for cultural diversity where they are now. The issue of cultural diversity in this scale is still fairly new in many parts of the Nordic countries. In some areas it is not even be relevant to target for a non-existent minority. One big issue is, as always, the lack of money for doing this kind of special work. The small size of many cultural organisations is also an understandable reason: in most cultural institutions there is a small staff only for the day to day activities to keep the company running.

However, for me these are not good enough reasons to neglect the work for cultural diversity. Our Nordic societies are at the moment in a position that a growing part of our population are of different ethnic and cultural background. In order to continue our existence as democratic welfare states, we need to take all the groups living in our societies into account. In areas where there the population consists of a substantial amount of ethnic minorities, these people need to be included in the work of cultural institutions, especially when these institutions are funded by public means.

3.1.3 Way Forward for Institutions in a Culturally Diverse Society

What can then be done to change the institutions to reflect the needs of a culturally diverse society? In this chapter I will highlight some of the suggestions coming from the researchers and actors in the field. The sources for these recommendation come mainly from Pripp et al. (2004, 22-24), Norwegian arts Councils *Kulturelt mangfold og kulturpolitikken* ('Cultural diversity and Cultural Policy') (2002), Swedish Arts Council (Statens Kulturråd 2003) and also my own views are included.

There has also been contradictory comments about emphasising the role of institutions. As we saw in chapter 2.1, the evaluators of Mosaikk noted that trying to change big cultural institutions is hard work and there is not that much to do with Councils means. Both the reports recommend that rather projects coming "from the ground" should be prioritised. After doing this research I must disagree with this statement. In the next I will bring out some means what there are to do.

First, I would like to stress the view presented by Brahmachari (2001, 11) that the real significance in cultural diversity lies in the ability of equal opportunities to generate genuine change within arts organisations and institutions, rather than to be viewed as bureaucratic constraints. This forms a parallel to Nordic countries success and commitment to politicising the importance of women's representation in politics and other sectors, or the importance of regional representation. Yet, for many, this equality principle still seems difficult to translate to cultural diversity.

Internal work

To start with, the concepts of ethnic and cultural diversity, multiculturalism etc. should be developed and discussed. This wide definition of the concepts can even be counter productive in the way that they are used as an excuse for not to take into account and deepen knowledge that would lead to inclusion of today's excluded groups.

Deeper anchoring is needed. The institutions should develop internal programmes and routines that strengthen the anchoring of knowledge and positive attitudes within all parts of the organisations. The institutions should develop more operative diversity plans for the parts of the organisation that have personnel movement where the institutions hire or take in trainees, producers, project managers, artists, etc.

The concrete starting point should be to give cultural institutions the task of analysing what possibilities and obstacles there are in reaching the goals of cultural diversity. First step from the side of the council has to be to ordain reporting demand as a condition for getting support. This demand should be formed so that the institutions make a proper analysis of what their actions are and what needs there are to develop intercultural competence.

Representation

The question of representation should be given a higher status. As noted before, there is under-presentation of persons with foreign and minority background in the organisations, productions and as audiences. Related to this, recruiting procedures should be developed. The institutions should intensify their recruitment work from the perspective of diversity by creating routines and instruments for a complementary network in the field. The institutions should take more responsibility in finding new information channels, verify competence descriptions, cooperate more and influence on education institutions with the objective of widening recruitment base.

Institutions should nominate representatives of minorities to boards, committees and other organs that make decisions. They should work out strategies for recruiting artistic and administrative staff with minority background.

Professional diversity should be included in the actions of the institutions. Artists, producers and managers with minority or foreign background should be part of the work of the institutions. This would complete the cooperation that already exists in many reference groups, organisations, associations, schools, etc. This could also abolish the picture that diversity would be understood as amateurism.

Education and courses on diversity issues should be given to managers and employees of the institutions. The competence in this issue seemed to be low

in the Pripp et al. (2004) research and therefore it is recommended that Human Resource Development departments would work for a programme to develop and strengthen the employee's level of knowledge on issues of cultural and ethnic diversity.

Co-operation

Forms of more intensive cooperation should be developed. Special co-operation groups of diversity should be established consisting of managers for state financed cultural institutions. The task of these groups would be to co-operate, complement and inspire each other on the theme of diversity. Another option would be to have mentor groups with advisors that have worked on similar issues and projects in other countries. The institutions should develop more operative diversity plans for the parts of the organisation that have personnel movement where the institutions hire or take in trainees, producers, project managers, artists, etc. More cooperation with independent groups is needed. Institutions should more involve themselves with projects where they can widen their network and gain competence on diversity issues.

Work for diversity should be combined with international cooperation. In the Nordic countries there are lots of people with extensive international networks. These networks should be combined to the work for diversity inside the country borders.

Affirmative action

Affirmative action is a policy of positive discrimination to increase opportunities for certain social groups in employment, business, government, and other areas. The policy is designed to counter the effects of long-term discrimination against groups such as women, disabled people, and minority ethnic groups. The Nordic countries, Belgium and the Netherlands actively promote affirmative action through legal and financial incentives. Most of the work on affirmative action and best results has been gained related to gender equality and the better position of women in the society.

One part of the work of affirmative work in institutions and encouraging their policies on cultural diversity could be quotas. In practise this would mean that state funded cultural institutions would need to spend a certain percent of their budget for work on cultural diversity.

Both Pripp. et al (2004), Swedish (Statens Kulturråd 2003) and Norwegian arts councils notes (*Kulturelt mangfold og kulturpolitikken* 2002*)* support the idea that governmental cultural policy should give goals and demands for the position of diversity within the institutions. This means on one hand observing that in which scale the issue and forms of diversity are presented, and on the other, in which scale productions are made by and for persons with foreign or minority background. Setting goals and reporting on them should be tied to funding. The governments should, in giving the funds, prioritise investments on development that take cultural diversity and new audiences into account and those who do this work well, should be given some extra support for their work, rather economical.

The system of quotas was in use in England in the 1980's when the Arts Council asked all departments and organisations it funded, from theatre companies, arts centres, regional arts associations, to work towards spending minimum of four percent of their expenses to 'ethnic arts'. The aim there was to shift set patterns of funding and to create a window that was still absent. (Khan 2001, 18)

Setting quotas is not however an unproblematic way of handling the issue and is one of the most controversial topics under discussion. In England this procedure freed up some money for these purposes, but did not quite work out as the initiative was not regularly monitored, reviewed and acted on. Some organisations found an easy way to get around the rule by engaging in one specific activity, while the base line of regular activities and attitudes remained unchanged. Some organisations felt unfairly leaned on and many Black artists themselves did not like the impression of being protected, they wanted their

success to be achieved as a result of their work's quality, not their ethnicity. (Khan 2001, 18)

I see this as one of the most effective ways of changing the work of cultural institutions. In order to change the institutions, the notion of cultural diversity and actions for cherishing it, need to be in the result responsibility of state funded organisations.

When it comes to improving the position of women in the society this system has worked out well. However, the question of cultural diversity does pose different kind of questions and more research on the issue is needed before any concrete actions.

Developing new audiences is one big topic related to changing the institutions to be more open for cultural diversity. This is such a big topic that I will dedicate the next part for this issue.

3.1.4 Audience Development

Audience development is a significant topic related to cultural institutions. Cajsa Lagerkvist (2001), curator in the Museum of World Culture in Sweden, notes that it is a well known fact that the audiences at European cultural institutions do not correspond to society at large. Audiences are often made up of a rather homogeneous group, white well educated middle-class people. Lagerkvist draws on from the experience of Sweden where attempts have been made to broaden and diversify the audiences of theatres and museums and sometimes with good results. However, she states, all too often the attempts tend to be short-term projects that do not change the profile of the core audience that do not change the institutions from within. Lagerkvist (2001) calls after responsibility from the side of the people allocating funds to cultural projects that they should be more aware of the importance and implications of audience development. Projects aiming at reaching underrepresented groups should be seen as one step in a long process to change audience profiles. They will not

gain from short-term investments for the sake of political correctness. Audience development is a question of democracy and inclusion. If cultural institutions continue to argue that art is important and enhances the life value of people, they simply have to work so that everyone has the same opportunity to experience it. (Lagerkvist 2001)

A qualitative research made in the U.K. by Jermyn & Desai, *Arts – What's in a Word? Ethnic minorities & the Arts* (2000), found out that that the dominant images people had of the arts were opera, ballet, Shakespearean theatre, classical music and art in galleries (particularly abstract modern art). Many of the interviewed found this image "off-putting and elitist, and assumed that such events were mainly for "posh" people, those over 35, and White people". (Ibid. ii) People who were not interested in mainstream arts were however interested in arts related to their own cultural heritage (which they sometimes did not regard as "arts" in the first place). Many who showed little or no interest in mainstream arts were very involved in Black, Asian and Chinese arts. There was a significant amount of creative activity in the ethnic minority communities and a variety of activities were mentioned. Often arts activities were part of larger social, religious or cultural occasions such as festivals, religious occasions or weddings. (Ibid.)

Lagerkvist defines audience development as "the process by which an institution seeks to create greater access to its services by an identified group of people" (2001). She suggests that this process should take its start in the very group that is wished to be reached. It is not a coincidence that today's arts audiences are made up of people with a similar cultural, social, ethnical and economical background, rather it is simply a mirror of what is being served by the institutions today. She goes further that the repertory, the themes discussed on stage, the language used in information and marketing materials, the way people are targeted, the atmosphere of the building, the prices and the dress code are all equally important. All this together will influence who will come, who will feel at ease and most importantly, who will have a good experience which will turn them into regular theatre-goers and also make them recommend

others to go. The crucial thing is that if people don't feel that cultural experiences are something that has to do with their own lives, they simply will not go. (Lagerkvist 2001)

Owens et al. in *Creative Tensions* (1998) notes that audience development, or audience education, has strong links with cultural equity and cultural rights concerning "self-expression, in particular the opportunity for those from the 'minority' cultures to engage with and express something of their own culture." (Owens et al. 1998, 25) Education programmes attempt to correct the picture by placing more emphasis on the individual cultural backgrounds of participants, rather than by reinforcing the dominant culture. According to Owens et al. 'education' can refer to work with the education sector, or with young people, or to events aimed at the general public to provide context and interpretation. Other related concepts are *'outreach'* meaning covering activities aimed at specific groups in the local community, and *'access'* meaning providing experience of the arts which would otherwise be denied from groups or individuals. (Ibid. 7) Access is based on an idea that it is not enough for an arts organisation simply to present the arts: active efforts are need to be made to engage with particular groups of people in particular ways. (Ibid. 32)

However, Jonson et al. in *New Audiences Final Report* (2004) notes that minority ethnic communities are not homogenous groups, but extremely diverse. The communities can be targeted in a number of ways: along demographic or geographic lines, language, religion, or consumer behaviour. Jonson suggests that organisations should get to know the communities concerned if they are to develop effective communication and marketing strategies, and present an approach that actively promotes inclusiveness from an informed perspective. (Jonson et al. 2004, 95-96)

Lavrijsen agrees, stating that the challenge in cultural diversity and participation is to understand the people's frame of reference. Many factors are relevant to participation: factors connected with family environment, social background, geographic location, religion, etc. People from different cultures have different histories and possess different kind of cultural capital, but still "ethnicity" or

"race" are perhaps not the essence of a person's cultural identity. Dealing with "cultural difference" does not mean dealing with ethnicity, but with social, cultural, economic and historic differences, as the issues of gender and generation as well. (Lavrijsen 2001, 22-23)

What could then be concrete measures to go about changing the audience profiles? First, Lagerkvist (2001) suggests that there should be deeper analyses about audiences and users from the perspective of diversity. In this way more effective preconditions for reaching new audiences could be secured. Lagerkvist calls after concrete goals and working methods for the employees of any arts institution. This includes working towards improved access by defining and learning more about the groups that are under-represented in audience profiles, be it young people, socially excluded or groups with a non-Nordic background. The programming and the internal culture of the institution should be adapted in order to cater for these groups. Audience development can also mean targeting certain groups in their own environment through outreach and community-linking projects. (Lagerkvist 2001) Pripp et al. (2004) remind about developing clearer indicators how the institutions have reached a diversified audience. This does not mean ethnic registration, but asking for mothers tongue, post number, part of the world where one comes from, etc.

It must be noted though that audience development is not an easy task. The percentage of population in general that goes for example to art museums, is a minor one, and will perhaps always be so. I see audience development as part of the new strategies of art in general that takes art to people and not vice versa.

3.1.5 Case: Open Scene

I will now move on to my first case study, whereby I'll try to highlight some of the issues and challenges related to introducing the strategy of cultural diversity as a common part of the work of cultural institutions.

The most direct way to introduce this strategy in the performing arts of Norway was a pilot project called *Open Scene* from 1998 to 2000. Open Scene was a collaborative project between *Det Norske Teatret* and the Council of Cultural Affairs. The Ministry of Cultural Affairs initiated the idea in 1997 with the aim of integrating a multicultural dimension into the theatrical arts. The project has been evaluated by Odd Are Berkaak (2002) *Fri for fremmende. En evaluering av signalprosjekt Open Scene* ('Without Strangers/Foreigners'). Evaluation of Signal Project Open Scene) for Norwegian Council of Cultural Affairs.

Open Scene had three types of projects: auditions, workshops and productions. Auditions were held throughout the project period. The main idea with the auditions from the project leader's side was to map the multicultural scene milieu and to build the basis for multicultural actors' catalogue. In each of the workshops there were about 60 participants, most immigrants, but also Norwegian actors with education or working experience from other countries. In the jury there were representatives of Theatre High School, *Det Norske Teatret* and Nordic Black Theatre. Many of the participants felt the auditions beforehand as a possibility to come to the arena but they soon saw that they did not get any further with the process. Though people were chosen, it did not mean anything and many felt themselves frustrated. (Berkaak 2002, 42) It was obvious that the participants were not familiar with the Norwegian system and expectations were unclear.

Five workshops were held during the project. The workshops lasted about three to five days and were instructed by various professional directors and actors. In the evaluation came out that both auditions and workshops were unpleasant experiences for the immigrants about being an outsider. This was partly due to personal and subjective reasons but also due the way that the workshops developed. Immigrant participants came to the workshops with high hopes and enthusiasm, and the first thing they noticed was that all the Norwegian participants were greeting each other like old mates. Many experienced they had come to a private meeting, where everyone new each other beforehand, except one self. This is a bad starting point for inclusion and co-operation. The problem was also that many of the foreign actors had their background in

physical theatre and some had never before based their acting on text. Many reported that they were used to collective working methods, but the workshops totally focused on individual facilities and prestige.

One big problem was the lack of intercultural competences of the instructors. Multicultural stereotypes were used in many occasions. One of the participants, born in Sweden but having her artistic roots in India through her parents, was asked to dance in an Indian way. When she started, she was soon stopped because her dance was something not what the instructor expected. The instructor had expected something he understood with "folklore" but which was something that the dancer could not identify herself with. (Berkaak 2002, 45)

Four premiers were held as part of the Open Scene. In 1999 premiered Ibsen's *A Doll house* where third-year drama students from Norway's Theatre high school and eight young Pakistani theatre amateurs collaborated on the stage. Many different nationalities also appeared in Carlo Gozzi's Turandot at the same year. Also plays *Blekkhusets natt*, 'Night of the Plate House' and *Angsten ett sjela*, 'Anxiety of the soul' were produced.

As a general criticism Berkaak states that there were all too little people with non-Norwegian background in the management, also as instructors and as set designers. Many participants had also critical views on using amateurs in the productions. For example in the Dolls house, amateurs were used only in the "multicultural side" and the Norwegians were all professionals. This could be seen as a negative signal that only strengthen prejudices that the Other is not professional enough to take part in the Norwegian theatre scene (Berkaak 2002, 49) Turandot was the most successful project from working side of the process. The participants reported about an inspiring milieu where the background of the artist did not cause any problems. Turandot was the only production that was led by instructor with immigrant background. This also made it the only production with balance in power relations.

None of the participants described Open Scene as a success. Those who were most satisfied with the results said that the project started an important process

in the Norwegian public. In the conclusion Berkaak (2002, 66) claims that this example shows that theatre artists from other traditions than the western culture, are not accepted in the Norwegian theatre world because of their background. This practise is the same thing as racism. Berkaak is not accusing the theatre world to be more racist than the rest of the population, but just points at the relativity of cultural differences that lie behind multicultural ideology and come to conflict with the classical western understanding of art. In practise it was also hard to fulfil the wish about subjectivity political initiators had hoped for. When the participants did not feel they had a position of a subject in the process, they did not identify with it either.

In Open Scene there was also ideological inconsistency. The operative arena based their decisions on, what Berkaak calls "integration", meaning that the multicultural participants should learn the Norwegian codes and playing rules. The multicultural participants in contrast were for, what Berkaak calls "incorporation", so that their traditions and ways of action should be taken as seriously as the Norwegian ones in the project. The problem on the organisational side was that the political initiators were not at all part of the actual implementation and thereby the original ideas and ideologies were not transmitted to the project level.

The evaluator Berkaak makes also several recommendations in his report. The ambitions should be adjusted to a more realistic level: the goal could for example simply be to establish a theatrical art milieu where background no longer is a relevant factor for participation. The objectives should also be operationalized more precise, in practical terms, so that they fit in the concrete frames of the project and also at the same time give methods for implementation. The strategy should also be step-by-step. First the majority should get used to otherness and second the multicultural actors should get room to develop and have control on factors like repertoire, casting and directing. Berkaak also emphasizes education: the level of professionalism should be nourished on the immigrants' side. He also states that maybe the institutional theatres are not yet the right arenas for this kind of change. It might also be waste of time and money to try to change the institutions instead of

creating new vital milieus. In the later stage it might be better to involve institution theatres as partners and not to invite multicultural individuals inside the institutions power relations. For Berkaak, Open Scene has showed that they are too strong to establish equal dialogues. (Berkaak 2002)

Although Open Scene was not a great success, I think there are a lot of lessons to learn from it. I felt it was a good idea to choose such a project to present the actual situation in the institutions today. The reality is still in many cases very far from the visions of governmental strategies. And often, problems are a good way to lean about difficult issues - as long as there is a possibility to overcome them.

I think Open scene is a good attempt, but clearly shows that it is not sensible to start a project like this without having deep knowledge about working with intercultural groups in the arts. In practise this means profound base research and employing people with expertise on the issue. Working in an intercultural environment requires special skills especially form the side of the leaders and instructors of the process. Especially challenging this is in the arts where people really put their whole personalities at stake.

I would also like to emphasize the importance of finding a common working ground and meeting half way through. In Open scene the project had just the Norwegian point of view as a starting point. A more fruitful solution would be to give up all previously made assumptions of working methods and to see what could be the particular working method, structure and language for this particular group of people.

This case also underlines that fact that in order to do projects of culturally diverse nature, this diversity needs to be anchored in all levels of the project. Here the participants with ethnic minority background were mainly just in the level of actors and not integrated into administration, directing or other staff. The most successful part of the project was the one where also the director was of non-Norwegian background.

In this case also the different views and traditions of art and quality encounter. The Nordic/European/ Western way of viewing the arts is not the only truth, but just one part of it. Here we come back to the concept of *qualities* instead of quality. Perhaps a better way in arts projects of culturally diverse nature would be, not to try to assimilate the "others" in "our" way of working, but to find a new hybrid form of doing things. This is what Nordic Black Theatre in Norway has been working on, developing an intercultural method and language for the stage.

3.2 Networking - Crucial Dynamics for Diversity

I will now move on to the next corner stone of promoting cultural diversity in the arts, namely networking. Cultural networks are structures of civil society, and as such their actions and objectives come under the acknowledged role of a "third way". Networks play an important role as intermediary between governmental institutions and the cultural sector. I see networking as a way to connect the actors within the arts field. It means connections, co-operation and networks between artists and cultural workers within the culturally diverse arts field, among actors with non-western background and between the non-Nordic and the majority population. First of all, I see networking as a tool to build channels for co-operation, develop competence of individuals and organisations and simply to have a bigger influence on important matters as people join their forces. Although I present networking as a separate chapter from institutions, I want to point out that it is a parallel means and very closely connected to the work of institutions. Networking even has a close connection to decentralisation that is third pillar in the work for cultural diversity. Mitchell (2003, 448)mentions networking as a new type of decentralisation that started to shape national and European cultural policies in the 1980s.

Networking has been one of the big words since mid 1990's. *'Network society'*, concept by Manuel Castells (1996) has gained wide attention. Network society is a global information society that organises its operations and processes more

distinctively in the form of networks. A network society is build around different kind of '*flows'*, as Castells call them, of information, resources and images.

The field of cultural cooperation has become multi-dimensional to such an extent that the old structures no longer reflect the needs of the actors in the field. The networks have begun to overturn these old structures by introducing greater identity, communication, links and information. They link individuals in the system, projects and ideas, and introduce new ways and structures. (Mitchell 2003) According to *In from the Margins,* (1997) European-wide networks established by regions and cities are more effective than national cultural agreement and politically inspired exchanges. The report sees that in the future bureaucratically administered structural regional policies will be substituted with new flexibly funded network-based cooperation, which will level regional inequalities and alleviate inter-ethnic tensions and social exclusions. (Ibid. 99)

The report emphasizes that the third sector will assume a considerable importance in the years to come in the cultural sector. (Ibid.164)

I will start by presenting briefly what networking has to do with cultural diversity. I will then introduce some definitions of networking in order to illuminate these dynamics a bit more. After this I will present some of the benefits of networking and also touch upon problems and barriers related to it. Lastly, I will use Swedish Intercult and their project "*Production Centre for Intercultural Performing Arts"* as a case study about creating a network between established arts institutions.

The main material for this chapter has been Gudrun Pehns *Networking Culture, The Role of European Cultural Networks* (1999) and *IETM Study on the Effects of Networking* (2001).

3.2.1 Networking and Cultural Diversity

Both the Swedish and the Danish programme have taken networking as one of the crucial focus points in changing the arts scene more culturally diverse.

Forum för Världskultur takes networking as one of the top priorities in creating preconditions for culturally diverse arts world. The end report emphasizes the meaning of networks as an instrument in creating informal structures for co-operation and changing of information. The report suggests that the national cultural policy should create room and be sensitive for the needs that can be articulated through different networks. The report also refers to a research made in Sweden where it came out that most crucial factor in getting funding for a project was that the applicant had access to and was part of a wide network. It is a big risk that the actors within the culturally diverse arts field can not benefit from existing networks. In this perspective it is a question of knowledge and an important task to spread information about the existing networks. (Kulturdepartementet 2000 b, 88 - 89)

Cultural Ministry's Development Fund KUF had the emphasis of "development and co-operation between ethnic and Danish art with ethnic origins". Mapping and creating a network of non-Danish artists was one part of their work. This work was seen to create the background for the appreciation of cross-cultural art. KUF sees networking as an instrument that together with concrete meetings between artists, workshops and development of competence, can make the non-Danish artists visible. Creating the database and strengthening the network was one of the biggest successes of KUF. (Balling et al 2001, 13)

In addition to these programmes, the importance of networking has also been noted elsewhere in the field. *Cultural Diversity in the Arts* takes networking as one of their priorities in developing culturally diverse policies, changing the arts scene and encouraging governments to facilitate culturally diverse networks to exchange information between artists and cultural institutions. (Cultural...1993, 107-108) Also Isabelle Schwarz (2000, 3) sees networking as a catalyst fostering cultural participation and balancing cultural diversity and identity. Networking helps to create dialogue and understanding between minority groups in a certain region and at the same time to preserve and to promote cultural uniqueness. According to the *IETM Study on the Effects of Networking* (2001, 77), networking is important because it "helps to maintain the process of

dialogue and intercultural exchange that magnifies the specificities and differences and at the same time increases understanding of different cultures."

In promoting cultural diversity in the arts world of Great Britain, networking has played an important role. It was one of the earliest activities embraced by Black Arts in the 1970's in order to conquer isolation and gain a sense of being part of a wider society. Later, professionally-oriented networks have arisen in order to cater to specialist needs and enhance the opportunities of professionals. (The Landscape of Fact 1997, 25)

3.2.2 Defining a network

What is a network then? Mignot-Lefebvre defines network as "a set of links for the exchange of information, goods, services, between entities, persons, enterprises, institutions, but excluding strict contractual relations" (Mignot-Lefebvre in Pehn 1999, 10). According to the *Manifesto of European Cultural Networks* (in Pehn 1999, 36), a network is "neither an association nor a federation. It is an organism, a structure, a way of organising rather than an organisation as such. Its specific added value comes from its flexibility, its approach, the process and the spirit of network". To say it another way, a network consists of a set of people who establish specific relations between each other. They are people who work in the same field, who recognise each other as having a certain level of competence, capacity to influence and a personality such that relations based on force disappear. (Pehn 1999, 25)

The IETM study notes (2001, 11-13) that the term networking has a double role. On one hand, it describes the web of contacts. On the other hand it is a metaphorical term that creates an "environment". The network is perceived either as a constant web of contacts or as a context, where things happen. Each member experiences the network only partially by participating in informal subgroups formed by personal interests or individual points of view.

Network is a virtual place of exchange. Pehn (1999, 8) sees that it does not impose a philosophy but creates one out of the sum of its members' philosophies, which all must be reflected in it. A network exists only if the memebers have motivation to give life to it. Therefore, it must be built around a strong theme that can arouse that solid common motivation.

Networks are an impulse to bring minds together. Pehn argues that today's society operates on a system of knowledge retention which is based on the logic of competition. The society is thus boxed into classes of citizens worthy of knowledge or excluded from knowledge, unworthy of taking part in the functioning of society itself. This is the logic that networks seek to challenge and here lies also the core for the importance of networks in changing cultural policy into more diverse: network is based on the idea and recognition that everyone has knowledge and is capable of passing on that knowledge. The more knowledge circulates, the more it weaves the bonds of solidarity and co-responsibility. The main resistance for this philosophy is the fear of losing one's power by sharing knowledge with each other. (Pehn 1999, 26)

As Pehn (1999, 8) says, experience shows that a network grows through direct contact between people who respect and appreciate each other. It is this aspect that facilities the emergence of group projects and makes very delicate structures so effective. It is difficult to use the services of a network without participating or not getting involved. For those who make the effort, what they get out is much more than they put in.

Characteristic for a network is that it is created by the actors themselves and for the purposes they have. In the past there have been many examples of networks initiated by authorities to develop contacts or co-operation. Many of these have failed and ended to a deadlock even if the purpose was good in the first place. The initiative needs to come within the field as this is the only way to make them live.

3.2.3 Benefits and Problems of Networking

In this part I will take a brief look on the benefits of networking. In the end of this part I will also reflect upon some of the criticism raised against networking and may own experiences about it.

According to Schwarz, networking is increasingly being recognised as a way to relate effectively and efficiently with complementary players of development. Here are some of the benefits that Schwarz (2000, 3) presents.

- *Networking encourages links between citizens and the arts. It means building bridges between different professional fields and facilitating dialogue between citizens.* Here, when it comes to fostering dialogue between different cultures and ethnicities, networking becomes vital.

- *Networking fosters cultural participation in attracting, sustaining and increasing audiences for artistic events and cultural projects.* Here is the connection between audience development and networking that I have already covered in chapter 3.1.4.

- *Networking develops arts and cultural markets and it is an important way of internationalisation of projects.* This aspect of networking brings the international aspects of cultural diversity and hybridity into foreground. It also emphasises the benefits gained by the national arts scene through cultural diversity.

- *Networking enhances the civil society in playing an important role in encouraging non-profit and non-governmental cultural initiatives and projects.* This is a way to build up a new positive image of the third sector in the society, to act as a bridge between the state and the business sector. In promoting cultural diversity, this is really the sector where a lot of the actions and changes should take place.

- *Networking works against unemployment in the arts as the involvement in networks helps identification of job and training opportunities. Networks facilitate the design and implementation of projects that create, enhance or enable employment, such as co-productions, exchanges and programming.* This is a crucial part for artists with non-western

background too, as the unemployment ratio is even bigger among them as with majority artists.

- *Networking builds bridges between generations. For young arts managers or cultural workers and artists, it is a great way of entering the professional world.* This I think is related to training and internships that could be an effective way for young people from culturally diverse backgrounds to enter in to the field.

According to the *IETM Study* (2001, 77), It is important to stimulate artistic creativity at a transnational level and enhance the role of the arts and culture through collaborative relations and partnerships at the European and international level. Networking offers a space for liberal and independent confrontation and dialogue which is not restricted by attempts to fulfil specific objectives determined a priori. It is also important to enhance the role of arts and culture through confrontation of national, regional and cultural heritage. According to the study, networking represents an extremely efficient means for all this to happen. Interesting in networks such as IETM is that the individuals present themselves, their work and their organisations, not their city, country, etc. High level of autonomy is given to the individuals by their organisations, which allows for a rich exchange on equal footing.

Networks offer a different form of cooperation in contrast to the classical systems. It offers important advantages such as the informal nature of contacts, flexibility of decision making, speed of exchanges and action and allows implementation of joint projects in a short period of time. Networks are tools that can access the international scene without going through the national institutional level. (Weber in Pehn 1999, 47) Network is a place to inform and be informed about current trends in aesthetic matters, management practises, sources and possibilities of financing, international funds, to influence on cultural policy and find new partners and collaborators on national and especially international level. All this proves the crucial role of networks in the cultural life. (Pehn 1999, 47)

The intangible effects are considered most important, such as broadening of personal horizons, new knowledge, deeper understanding, discussion of values and increased individual skills. In concrete these means contacts, co-operation and job opportunities. Networking creates confidence by the sense of belonging to a circle which at its best combines prestigious experience, personalities, innovators, young professionals and important institutions. One benefit is the reinforcement of one's own local or national territory because of the ability to realise projects on many levels: local, regional, national or international. Networking also offers material benefits such as invitations to festivals and performances, collaborations and individual performances (IETM 2001, 23-24).

Networking has strong connections to local development as Schwarz (2000) notes. This is very important in relation to promoting cultural diversity as I will present later in this thesis in the part concerning decentralisation and co-operation in regional and local levels.

Networks are needed by institutions and vice versa. Institutions offer financial support and a certain official framework to facilitate implementation of projects and guidance on priorities. The networks offer their expertise, grass-root contacts, precise information and links between projects and the institutions. (Pehn 1999, 79) Networking provides many kinds of benefits for the individual or organisation taking part in it.

All the before said, accentuates the crucial role of networks in today's society and the arts world. In order for an artist from non-Nordic background to gain a footing in the arts scene, it is essential to be part in the networks. As I claimed in the earlier chapter, institutions form the core of Nordic cultural life. They also often form the biggest barrier of entering to the established arts world with their excluding policies. This is why alternative ways of getting there are needed.

There are however problems and barriers in networking. Lack of time can be one barrier. Most often small cultural organisations have time and staff just for the day-to-day operations and this leaves no time for other work, even if it would mean benefits in the longer term. In countries, where distances are long,

this might be a barrier for some to attend. Although many networks exist in the virtual reality through internet, my own experience is that regular face-to-face meetings are needed. Often networks gather people and organisations living near big cities and this excludes the actors in provinces even more. Lack of money is an understandable barrier. Small organisations or individual artists have often difficulties in attending to international seminars. This is where public travel grants could be of help. Lack of knowledge about networks and organisations participating are another barrier.

Different actors and organisations in the field see often themselves as competitors of funding, connections or projects. Therefore, giving information out might mean losing their competitive advantages. Sometimes the work load is not shared equally: some people do most of the work and others get the honour of doing it. As networking should be based of equal and transparent way of working, power struggles within networks might be destructive for the spirit. It is crucial that the network reflects the identity of the participating member or organisation and brings some added value to them. The opposite of this has been "networking for the sake of networking".

In some cases networks may even form "mafia-like" structures where it is extremely hard to get in for an outsider. In this sense a network becomes an old boy network which works exclusively and may narrow perspectives. As mentioned before, this was also one of the results in the Swedish study, *Tid för Mångfald*, (Pripp et al. 2004) about institutions and networking: the recruiting of the institutions happened mainly through informal networks and channels, but these networks seldom included people over ethnic borders.

Often networking happens only horizontally, with people from ones own art form or sphere of working. Therefore, cross-sectoral networking is needed. In the area of cultural diversity there are already networks consisting of people devoted to the topic. However, this means no development in structures of the arts world or cultural policies in general unless also people from institutions or decision making organs are part of these networks.

3.2.4 Case: Intercult

In the next I will present Swedish Intercult as an example of networking in the
culturally diverse arts scene. I mainly focus on their work with networking in
Scandinavian level. Intercult has also projects in European and global level. I
feel that Intercult serves as a good example of sustainable networking as the
initiative has come directly from the field and they have gained concrete results.
I will focus on their project "*Production Centre for Intercultural Performing Arts*"
which I think is an interesting case study about creating a network between
established arts institutions. Thus, this case might as well serve as an example
for the previous part on institutions and also shows how all is connected in this
field and overlaps with each other.

Intercult is a production group that was established in Stockholm 1992 and was
developed further under the artistic leadership of Chris Torch. Intercult is a
centre for local, regional and international activities. Internationally the focus is
on the Balkans and Baltic countries with large-scale co-productions, culture
political meetings in the European cities and their transcultural experiences.
Locally and nationally Intercult carries out own productions, guest
performances, acts as intermediary to artists, highlights development questions
and works for the development of culture policy by proposals and through their
magazine *Korsdrag*, 'Crosscurrents'. Intercult organises different kind of
discussion forums about strategies and visions for the present and future.

Networking is one of the key actions of Intercult and they actively take part in
creating international, national and local networks. Intercult focuses on creating
a platform for current artistic work, wants to ease the availability of work and
projects for the artists and to work as a mediator and helping hand. One
important part of this work is to create artist networks through a database.
Intercult, together with Baltic Sea Culture Centre, the Danish Center for Culture
and Development, the House of World Cultures and Visiting Arts, have recently
launched a database, *culturebase.net*, on contemporary international artists
from all fields. *culturebase.net* features practitioners and experts from

geographical regions as diverse as Asia, Africa, Latin America, Middle East, Central and Eastern Europe. (http:// www.culturebase.net/)

Intercult also works for the new and wider audience linked to age and background. It tries in various ways to stimulate growing participation by organising further training and seminars for other cultural workers: dramaturges, publicists and producers. Intercult emphasizes that when new audience takes its' place beside the traditional, we will get new kind of repertoire and contents that mirror today's society. The slogan of Intercult is: "new audience, new grip".

Intercult sees culture as a democratic power that changes the society. The institute creates conditions for meetings and exchange of ideas. For example when a guest performance is touring, they try to create dialog with the audience by meetings, discussions and seminars. In the Balkans and Baltic countries they directly support culture organisations, organise exchange programmes for project leaders and work towards long-term cooperation by supporting development and rebuilding.

Intercult is supported by Swedish National Council for Cultural Affairs, Stockholm's Culture Council and Stockholm's Province Council. Their projects have as well been supported by Foundation Culture of the Future, The Swedish Institute, Sida (the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency) and EU's Caleidoscope/ Culture 2000. (http://www.intercult.se/)

Production Centre for Intercultural Performing Arts ('*Producktionscentra för Interkulturell scenkonst*') was a three year project between Intercult, Angered Theatre, Malmö Drama Theatre and Norrlands Opera. Although *Forum för Världskultur* funded actions of Intercult, this project was mainly funded by the '*Stiftelsen Framtidens Kultur'* ('Foundation Culture of the Future'). Along the project all of the participating institutions made long-term changes in three main areas that were defined together by the partners: audience, repertoire and production. This work took place both locally, within each organisation, and nationally, between the organisations. Intercult worked as a coordinator of the

network and called common meetings. Intercult has also evaluated the project in 2005 and this report (Intercult 2005) has been my main source along with their web pages. The report was rather modest and made by the organisation itself, and as such may not provide the most waterproof results, but I still want to present it, as it serves as an interesting example on the field.

The project first started as a one year project "New production models" ('*Nya produktionsmodeller*') and then continued two next years under the name "Productions Centre for Intercultural Performing Arts". Under the project, three bigger theatre productions were made. *I skuggan av en diktator* ('In the Shadow of a Dictator') was a play produced by Angereds Theatre with the help of the project. In addition to Angered, it was performed in Norrlands Opera in Göteborg and in Stockholm. The play was performed by Swedish Iranian actors and aimed at Swedish-Iranian audience. Another co-production was "Alice" with Intercult and City Theatre of Belgrade. Third bigger production was "Clandestino" in Stockholm by a culturally diverse ensemble.

Several audience development workshops were held in Umeå, Göteborg and Malmö, both for participating organisations and for other cultural institutions and cultural workers active in the area. Two workshops or lectures were held in Stockholm with the themes of "Role of theatre in a multicultural city" and "Europe as a democratic and culture political project". Two further training courses for artists, projects managers and set designers were organised. In a set of meetings with artists, directors, set designers and playwrights Intercult has tried to develop new production ideas. Also Södermalm International Arts biennale was held and a short film "Super Pure" was produced under the project.

The most fruitful parts of the project were the further training courses for future artists and managers. The possibility to offer participants practical guidance and also to combine local and international workshop leaders' stake have both given good results.

Not so good results were achieved in the artistic side of some parts of the project. "In the Shadow of the Dictator" was not a success from this perspective, but it did have value on serving the local Swedish-Iranian community. Problems have also arisen from changes in the management of the participating institutions. Project's initial visions were not transformed to the followers and this caused both logistical and skill related difficulties. Malmö Drama Theatre dropped out from the project. The report did not explain the reasons further than just mention about "existing structural problems".

I see that Intercult is doing important work in many ways. Their network emerges from the arts field itself and works both in local, national and international levels. Especially I like the way how Intercult combines their practical work, making artistic productions, with active work for the development of cultural policy. It works on many different frontiers, which of course may as well be problematic if the actions are not focused enough. For me it seemed a bit problematic that although the project was about performing arts, instead of focusing to the core area, it seemed to be doing everything from arts biennale to short films.

However, the organisations webpage and modest evaluation leaves me with more questions than answers. It would be interesting to know how much the network worked on the level of these organisations. Was the "network" just between the top management of these organisations with performances made in separate places just touring between the cities. If yes, this does not yet fulfil the criteria of a network. Or did the network continue to exist after the project ended or was it just a one-off thing for this project?

In general, I think that this project reflects the nature of networks in general: they are in a constant move with new members coming in and others dropping out as the network or their members change. Thus, Production centre is just one part of the network for Intercult.

However, without more profound evaluation, it is no use doing any deeper conclusions about how well Production Centre for Intercultural Performing Arts worked as a network for cultural diversity. To look at Intercult on a general level as a networking organisation would no doubt been a more fruitful case study, but as no evaluation on the whole organisation exists, this was not possible.

3.3 Decentralisation - Working in All Levels for Cultural Diversity

Cultural diversity is a big process that calls for actions in all levels of the society. It is not enough to implement separate actions in the capital, but actions are needed in all levels and all regions of the society where diversity exists. It also requires work, not only in the level of topmost authorities in the national and international fields, but actions need to be taken also in regional and local levels.

In this chapter I will see the local and regional aspects of the promotion for cultural diversity. As mentioned before, big city centres tend to be also centres for artistic activities. Most of the institutions and administratively central actors are within cities and bigger towns and most of the money flows to the capital areas. But it should be noted that a lot of activities take place and could to a bigger extent take place in the regions. Decentralisation has been one of the big processes occurring in the governance of the Nordic countries. In order to promote cultural diversity in the Nordic countries, co-operation between different authorities and actors in the field is needed. As decentralisation is one crucial dynamics in the cultural policies of the Nordic countries, it forms a great possibility to the work for cultural diversity. I emphasise that decentralisation as such does not promote cultural diversity, but it could be one effective way of working for this cause. There are still barriers that need to be braken down before this works properly. Sweden has taken a strong focus on this aspect of cultural diversity by investing in multicultural consultants throughout the country.

I will first define what decentralisation is, take a brief look on the aspects that cultural diversity has to decentralisation and then see what the consequences of decentralisation have been. I will use *Mosaikk i Buskerud* ('Mosaikk in Buskerud') as a case example of decentralisation and co-operation between different authorities and actors on a regional level. The main sources for this chapter have been Ilkka Heiskanen's *Decentralisation: trends in European cultural policies* (2001) and State*, Culture and Decentralisation. A comparative study of decentralisation processes in Nordic cultural policy* (1996) by Auli Irjala and Magne Eikås.

3.3.1 Defining Decentralisation

In this part I will bring forward some central definitions on decentralisation. I will also highlight the history of this process a bit in order to shed light to the influence of this process to cultural diversity.

I see that the concept of decentralisation is essential when we think about implementing cultural diversity policies in the regional or national levels. Matarasso and Landry include decentralisation among the major strategic themes of cultural policy in Europe (in Heiskanen 2001, 5). Decentralisation is part of the Nordic structural reform and institutional changes. As Mitchell (2003, 441) notes, the role of national cultural policies and the ministries of culture in the guidance of cultural development is becoming more and more limited. Recent developments have underlined the role of other actors in shaping cultural development. This, Mitchell sees, is reflected in the increased use of the term "*cultural governance*". The term refers to the complex network of organisations and decision-makers that jointly give direction to cultural development. These include institutions from different sectors (public and private, profit and non-profit) and policy fields (cultural, economical, social, etc.) organised in different legal forms (public enterprises, private companies, voluntary associations, foundations, etc.) and operating at different geographical and administrative levels (transnational, national, regional, local and organisational). I feel that this change in our societies and cultural policies

supports the view of taking decentralisation as the third pillar in the work for nurturing cultural diversity. Also Mitchell (2003, 446) sees decentralisation as a line leading to greater diversity.

Decentralisation has been a part of the Nordic welfare policy since the 1960's, but until the mid-1980's it was more geographical decentralisation than a delegation of authority to the lower levels of government. The expansion of the welfare state in the 1960's and 1970's led to increased centralisation that peaked in the end of 70's. This development strengthened networks of local and regional cultural institutions and can be seen as a centrally guided process of democratisation of culture. The 1980's was the time to implement the "new cultural policy" of the welfare state that emphasised regional aspects and people's own efforts. The welfare ideology was realized through decentralisation of cultural services, supporting people's participation and access to culture by large investments in new cultural institutions. Amateur activities were brought within the sphere of public finance, for example through grants for voluntary organisations. This new cultural policy also wanted to define the concept of "culture" against an elitist definition of "the arts". More emphasis was placed on multiculturalism and minority cultures in the cultural policy, especially in Sweden and Denmark. (Irjala & Eikås 1996, 1-3) However, in the 1980's in the reforms of the grant system and municipal cultural administration cultural sector lost much of its former protection by the state. In the late 1990's major cities became important financiers and facility providers and in this way challenged the leadership of the state. (Heiskanen 2001, 21-23)

Decentralisation can be seen to happen both vertically and horizontally. Heiskanen (2001, 9) defines *vertical decentralisation* as "moving opportunities, power and resources downward and bringing decisions closer to people". Mitchell (2003, 451) says the same thing another way, "the transfer of power to regional and local levels of government and administration". She further notes that vertical decentralisation was perceived in the 1980s as a furthering of the process of cultural democracy and democratisation of culture initiated in the 1960s.

Horizontal decentralisation works sideways and pertains to "the delegation of tasks and authority from the centre (for instance a ministry) to special agencies or expert bodies (quasi-governmental organisations, arm's-length bodies)". (Heiskanen 2001, 9) Horizontal decentralisation can be used to dismantle power concentrations on strong sectoral administrative hierarchies, economically and socially powerful sectors and geographical concentration. (Ibid. 44) These are all crucial factors in promoting cultural diversity.

Irjala & Eikås (1996, 10) further distinguish between two types of decentralisation: administrative (or geographical) and political decentralisation. *Administrative decentralisation* refers to a process where national administrative authority is geographically extended to local and regional levels. This can also be called *deconcentration*, as the central administration has only local branches. *Political decentralisation* includes processes where power to decide about the priority on services and tasks are given to the regional and local political levels. The dominant form of decentralisation may differ between the different countries and time periods. Administrative decentralisation was a central objective in cultural policy in the Nordic countries in the 1970's. The most visible and important result of the implementation of this policy was the establishment of professional cultural institutions and of local and regional cultural authorities. In the 1990's political decentralisation had taken the place of geographical decentralisation in priorities. (Ibid. iii).

Heiskanen suggests some central principles that define how decentralisation can counterbalance the centralised use of power. With *autonomy* Heiskanen refers to "zoning off a geographical area or a domain of social activities from centralised control, while *self-governance* presupposes independence in respect of goal setting, use of resources and the regulation of people and organisations." The idea of autonomy has been replaced at least in principle by the concept of *subsidiarity*, which supposes that decisions are taken at the most local competent level. (Heiskanen 2001, 9-10)

According to Irjala and Eikås (1996, 10-11) there are three different values that the process of political decentralisation is supposed to realise: democracy,

efficiency and freedom. *Democracy*, as it is interpreted as the possibilities of citizens to participate and influence political decision-making, is believed to be strengthened by the process of political decentralisation. When the authority is moved from the central to the local level, the possibilities of ordinary people to influence on issues concerning their own lives is greater.

Yet there is always a danger that strong and well organised groups have better access to the centre of political power than more weakly organised groups. This leads us back to the policy of cultural diversity, immigrants and ethnic minorities, who generally speaking have weaker access to political power. Also among these groups there are differences, if we compare for example immigrants from West-Europe or Arabic countries. Some political scientists (Selle 1990, in Irjala & Eikås 1996, 10) have even argued that the interests of groups with less power might best be protected by civil servants in a centralised bureaucracy.

Efficiency in this context refers to the fact that best knowledge of local needs is to be found at the local level, not at national. I think this can well be seen in the case study of *Mosaikk in Buskerud* later in this chapter. The adaptation of local resources to local preferences is therefore held to be the most suitable way of allocating scarce resources. This is opposite to the paternalistic view that a national elite knows best what kind of services should be offered at the local level.

Freedom can be divided into freedom *to* and freedom *from*. Freedom is not only freedom from state interference but freedom to act according to one's own interests and wishes. The development of the 1990's decentralisation process had the trend of giving the local levels more freedom from the state, but it actually resulted in a greater variety of services offered at the local level, that is more inequality in standards and accessibility. (Irjala & Eikås 1996, 11)

To sum it up, the process of decentralisation has been one of the central ones in the Nordic countries since 1960s. For me, this process, in co-operation with

growing importance of cultural governance, could be playing a key role in the promotion of cultural diversity. The meaning of active work in all levels of the society, both geographically and administratively should be emphasised. The responsibility of working for the diversity issue must not be only in the shoulders of the state and cultural ministries, but should spread to actors across the society.

3.3.2 Cultural Diversity and Decentralisation

What has decentralisation to do with cultural diversity then? According to Heiskanen (2001, 7-8), decentralisation is concerned with:

- Providing equal opportunities for all citizens
- Educating people by involving them in cultural policy decision making
  and administrative practises.
- Maintaining transparent communication and just and effective balance of
  power and responsibilities between different levels of government.
- Organising efficient allocation of resources for artistic and cultural
  production.
- Optimising the division of sectoral jurisdictions in cultural administration.
- Optimising the allocation of resources and the distribution of cultural
  values through politics, the market and the voluntary sector.

These points are related to traditional cultural policy objectives. The first point pertain to the democratisation of culture, the second to participatory cultural democracy and the third to organisation of democratic, just and effective cultural administration. The other points are related to enhancing the co-ordination, efficiency and optimisation of resource allocation. (Ibid. 7-8). All these principles are closely related to enabling cultural diversity.

Forum för Världskultur calls after awareness among all actors within cultural policy. The state cultural policy should collaborate with the local level in order to persuade and support initiatives that have preconditions to grow and flourish. Investments on culturally diverse projects and initiatives can have conditions to

diminish marginalisation in cultural life and to create wider programming and participation. (Kulturdepartementet 2000 b, 45-46) The report discusses about growing regionalisation. This may also have negative consequences: areas that are lacking strong regional spokesmen for cultural diversity run the risk of marginalising these areas for other local, more traditional and well anchored questions. (Ibid. 92)

The end report for *Forum för Världskultur* notes that the national cultural policy has created national structures with democratic goals that in this way become also openings for culturally diverse processes. Within these structures regional and local organs have the task to find ways in their own area to realise the culture political objectives. One part of the problem is that relatively big part of the economical resources and the professional arts life are within city centres, whereas the centre for most of the people in the periphery means a relationship to resources and professionalism. This means a lead for the central and established and a difficulty for new perspectives, like cultural diversity, and the local level. (Kulturdepartementet 2000 b, 45-46)

For *Mosaikk*, one of the four focus areas was local and regional development projects. Five of six regional projects have been with children and youth and in all of them social integration of the immigrants was a central aspect.
The evaluation by Baklien et al. also notes that local and regional art institutions and communities represent an important part of cultural life. In co-operation with municipalities and counties it is crucial that the projects are rooted in the objectives of each region. (Baklien et al. 2002)

I see the most important connection between decentralisation and cultural diversity in its ability to ensure equal opportunities for all citizens. Immigrants and ethnic minorities should get a change to participate in cultural life where ever they live, not only in the capital region. In order for this to happen, the responsibility for providing these possibilities should be in all levels of the society.

Decentralisation also means involving people in cultural policy decision making. Here we come again back to the issue that ethnic and cultural minorities should themselves have the power and possibility to decide, plan and implement the projects and policies that concern them. One of the clearest and most frequent reasons for intercultural projects to fail, has been the ignorance of this fact.

3.3.3 Consequences of Decentralisation

The consequences of decentralisation has been manifold and the process obviously has both its positive and negative sides. *In from the Margins* notes that policies of decentralisation and the slimming down of the public sector have had major consequences. Ministries of culture and arts councils are placing their emphasis on strategic guidance rather than day-to-day management. The old ministries once committed to central planning are expected to distribute many of their powers in favour of municipalities and regional governments. In West European countries power has often been handed down to smaller units of administration, but not always with the necessary resources. Many arts organisations which have been publicly owned and managed have been either privatised or made administratively independent. Performing companies, art galleries and museums are increasingly being cut loose from direct government control. (In from the Margins 1997, 205) The Council of Europe sees that in the future regionalisation will be balanced by a new federalisation, namely the invention and adaptation of institutional structures for intra- and inter-regional cooperation in general and for the maintenance of democratic processes and the protection of the human and cultural rights of minorities. (In form the Margins 1997, 226)

Matarasso and Landry identify the concepts core dilemma: how to find the right balance between decentralisation and hierarchical control. Decentralisation is needed for "a closer correlation between provision and local needs, greater opportunity for cultural diversity and an empowerment of local action and participation in cultural activity" (in Heiskanen 2001, 5). Hierarchical control in turn acts as " a guarantee of control, perhaps of standards, and a consistency

of approach, it may also reflect a greater governmental commitment to culture".
(Ibid.)

Irjala & Eikås note that the process of decentralisation has meant in a broader sense three things to the cultural sectors: first, the division of financial responsibility for culture between the state, regions and municipalities; second, more financial and political responsibility for regional cultural institutions; third, reorganisation of local cultural public administration. (Irjala & Eikås 1996, 5) As a result of the deregulation process, the regional and municipal authorities are free to organise their public administration almost in any way they like. This has caused doubts and fears among the cultural spheres that the politicians may not give cultural activities enough priority and reduce the resources. (Ibid. 6-7) This shows that the power of implementing the cultural policies really lies in the hands of the local and regional administrations, also when it comes to cultural diversity policies.

Heiskanen (2001, 21) notes though that decentralisation of cultural policy does not always work for the benefit of arts and culture. The arts have historically thrived in the protection of a central authority and felt that state is the safe heaven. Artists, arts managers and cultural workers often fear that decentralisation can brake up this symbiotic relationship.

Also I see the latter mentioned as the biggest downside of decentralisation. If and when the power and responsibility of the promotion of cultural diversity is handed down to other administrative level than the state, how can one make sure that concrete actions actually take place? It is a well known fact that the communities struggling with budgetary problems most easily cut out their funding for arts and culture. And within this sector, cherishing cultural diversity is scarcely a top priority. Therefore, I would like to refer back to ear-marked funding: in order for governmental cultural policies to create living conditions for cultural diversity in addition to strategies and guidelines there should be ear-marked funding for the cause.

3.3.4 Case: Mosaikk in Buskerud

I now move on to present Mosaikk in Buskerud as an example of decentralisation and how it worked for the promotion of cultural diversity. Though it is presented in relation to decentralisation, it serves as an example of institutions grasping the theme of cultural diversity and might as well be put forward in the chapter related to networking. This case well reflects the importance of all these three corner stones and how they are inseparably connected with each other.

Buskerud county in Norway has a large proportion of non-European immigrants, Drammen community for example 10, 3 per cent, and due to this, multicultural projects have been given priority since 1993. Buskerud was one of the communities that took part in the *Mosaikk* programme with their own actions. It was chosen on the part of Kulturrådet among other reasons because it was a wide co-operative project between Buskerud community, Drammen community and Drammen museum for art and arts history. Through this initiative they wanted to support cultural activities among minorities and drive change of attitudes among cultural majority in Norway to fight against xenophobia and racism (Baklien 2002, 62). Artistic expression and quality was thus in the background and they were more used as a tool for other purposes.

Mosaikk in Buskerud became an umbrella project for many other projects in Buskerud. Drammen community had a project under their program *Kultur gir helse*, 'Culture gives health'. Together with Drammen theatre the community had a project for a professional touring theatre and the Drammen museum also wanted to introduce non-European art in its exhibitions. *Mosaikk in Buskerud* was tightly knit in the visions of the community and was on a general level mainly tied up to societal consequences, but the different parts of the project were more anchored to the arts. *Mosaikk in Buskerud* wanted mostly to invest on already existing organisations and to see that they mirror the culturally diverse Norway of today.

Target groups were general audience in Buskerud, especially primary and secondary schools, participants were organisations and institutions. The responsible organisations were Drammen community, Buskerud county community and Drammen's museum. The project got 400 000 NOK (47 500 €) from the *Mosaikk* programme. The funds were divided 120 000 NOK for theatre project, 120 000 for the museum, 70 000 for the Drammen community. The rest of the money was used for the county project (Baklien 2002, 78).

Culture office of the Buskerud County had the responsibility of the project and a project leader was nominated. The people who had designed and applied for funding for the project, were no longer available and thus the written information, experiences or network did not move on to the actual project leader, who had no previous experience on project leadership. Thus, neither the organisational or actor related preconditions for the project were good. The other sections of the project, Drammen community, museum and theatre, in contrast, had better organisational conditions and more experienced leaders (Baklien 2002, 80). There seemed to be little correspondence between the aims of the project and real possibilities to fulfil these aims. A lot of time was used to get the project on its feet, to write reports and new applications, but little time to develop the network in the county or to involve other communities with the project. Strong project segments and weak overall management resulted in that Buskerud county cultural office functioned more as a distributor of money than a leader for the project. It was also problematic to get reports from the projects segments that lived their own independent lives without communication with the county (Baklien 2002, 88). It is hard to find concrete results in the project of the county except the results of the project segments.

One part of the project was to establish a professional theatre to Buskerud, later called the *Brageteatre*t. This initiative was already going on when the funding from *Mosaikk* was granted. The aim of the theatre was to make theatre with the perspective of children and youth and of multiculturalism and to create co-operation between professionals and amateurs. The project leader had many years' experience as a theatre director and he generated a good network.

The theatre was successful in building connections between children and youth from both Norwegian and immigrant backgrounds through primary and secondary schools and further education. The play *St Halvardspillet* involved many actors with immigrant background. In 2000 the theatre became a permanent theatre, got the name *Brageteatret* and the former project leader became the director. The theatre had many premiers, first of them *Kål&Karri*, 'Cabbage and Curry', that shed light to the Norwegians perceptions about immigrants. Summer 2000 saw the premiere of St. Hallvardspillet with 100 participants, 20 of them immigrants. To the theatre was hired a person to make contact with schools, organisations, recourse persons and cultural workers. The theatre has got good response from the audience, critics and teachers. The teachers have been especially happy that the theatre allows the youth to raise themes in their lives that are hard to talk about otherwise. Seven other counties have showed interest for co-operation with the theatre. The work of the theatre has been project oriented but it aims in creating more permanent basis and to hire 3-4 actors with yearly contracts. In 2002 the theatre had got permanent support from the state (Ibid. 108). Where the theatre should still work, were the connections to immigrant associations in Drammen.

Drammen community got 70 000 NKR from *Mosaikk* to develop further the ongoing *Kultur gir helse*, 'Culture gives health' programme and to put emphasis on culturally diverse dimensions. When *Kultur gir helse* ended in 1999 continued the project 100 per cent as *Mosaikk*. Also in this part of the project the leader was competent and qualified but loaded with work. A working group of eight with different nationalities was established. They brought together their contacts, each of which brought various milieus within reach. In the project a contact was created to the Norwegian school where immigrants were taught in Norwegian, to map the capabilities and experiences in the arts and culture. Informants in the evaluation saw that the festivals organised during the project were the most important visible results. Though a festival took place once a year, it meant one year's work for many artist, cultural workers, children and youth. Also separate concerts were organised.

Drammen museum got 120 000 NKR from *Mosaikk*. The project leader was a

head conservator in the department of visual art of the museum. He had a good network, many years' experience as an intendant in big art associations, also among non-European artists and projects. The *Mosaikk* project of the museum was implemented as a part of the museums work. The first project of the museum within *Mosaikk* was *Kubanske uker* 'Cuban weeks'. In the museum there was an exhibition about present Cuban visual art and a dance performance was produced to the Drammen theatre with performers of Cuban background living in Norway. Also a Palestinian, Mesopotamian and Tibetan exhibition took place as a part of the project. Without further funding from *Mosaikk*, it seemed that the museum could no longer prioritise such projects. In the research there were no statistics available on visitors, but the impression was that it was still the white Norwegian population who went to see the exhibitions. (Baklien 2002, 108-109).

The *Mosaikk in Buskerud* was well anchored to the local practises. It was accepted in the County Council despite the opposition of two extreme right-wing parties. Organisationally it was given a low priority in the administration of the county. The project did not succeed in creating a good network among the Buskerud's non-Norwegian inhabitants or to find a reference group with representatives of the non-Norwegian milieus to work and the contact with project segments got weaker during the project. The aim was to connect many communities to the project, but only Sigdal community and its museum joined (Baklien 2002, 99).

For me, *Mosaikk in Buskerud* seems like a successful example on decentralisation and the work for cultural diversity. The community had an internal need to do something about the situation, to create possibilities for immigrant inhabitants to participate cultural life. The initiative started from a real call and based in the visions of the community and I feel this is one of the main reasons for its success. I really liked the idea about the community cultural institutions working together and the work for diversity happening in many different frontiers at the same time. I think this kind of model of co-operation could be used more widely in communities and regions to actively promote the

issue of diversity. Such co-operation would offer many kinds of benefits related to for example production, financing and marketing. The project worked on many different levels and was bound to more general development issues in the county.

I see that the greatest deficiency in the project was the lack of genuine co-operation with local immigrants and ethnic minorities. To say it once more, it simply is not enough to create projects with the *content* reflecting the issue of diversity, but the whole *process* and the participants should reflect it. To take the museum as an example, although they organised exhibitions presenting arts from different countries where the immigrants in Drammen come from, they did not manage to get the actual target group in. This highlights the complex nature of the issue if diversity and calls for expertise on many areas, such as audience development.

4. WAY FORWARD IN FINLAND

As I mentioned in the beginning of this thesis, one of my main aspiration and inspiration for doing this research, was to find out what the Nordic countries apart from Finland have been doing in the field of cultural diversity in cultural policy in order to understand how to develop our policies on this further. At this point I would like to try to adapt the Nordic models on cultural policy and cultural diversity into the Finnish system and make a sketch of what should be done in Finland.

Norway, Sweden and Denmark have all had long-term programmes of cultural diversity policies. *Mosaikk* in Norway, *Forum för Världskultur* in Sweden and *Cultural Ministry's Development Fund KUF* in Denmark have showed the way to include the aspect of diversity into the national cultural policies. The position of Finland is still far behind in the matter and the actions made for promoting cultural diversity are still very modest. One answer to this is the relatively small number of immigrants in the country, but this is not the whole truth.

Especially in the capital area the number is high, in some housing areas more than ten percent of the population. The number of immigrants has steadily risen in Finland since 1990's. In 1990 we had 26 255 immigrants, but in 2004 the figure was 108 346. (Statistics Finland) Finland has also four traditional cultural minorities: indigenous Sami people (7 000), Roma people (10 000), the Jews (1 500) and Tatars (1 000).

On paper, in the strategies of the Ministry of Education, it seems that there is a lot of good will and intentions. (Ministry of Education 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005) Yet, in the concrete level, Finland is in a very early stage when it comes to promoting cultural diversity. Though the number of immigrants and people with minority background is small, there is need for action as Finland is getting more culturally diverse every day. In principle, all the forms of support are available for all citizens despite their ethnic background. The problem is that arts and cultural services in our country are built in the era of monoculture and from the

viewpoint of the Finnish majority. This means that in practise the threshold for minority groups to use these cultural services is high.

The main form of supporting cultural diversity in the arts is the Ministry of Educations' *Grant for supporting multiculturalism and fighting against racism*. In 2004 the total amount granted was 252 000 € and in 2005 it was 400 000 €. This year the amount of money granted was increased for the first time since 1997. The grants are intended for cultural, art and youth activities for immigrants and national minorities. The purpose is to cherish and develop cultural minorities' own identity and to promote contacts between cultural minorities and the mainstream culture. The foremost grant recipients are immigrants' and refugees' own associations and activity groups, including artist associations. Other ethnic groups entitled to the support include Finland's traditional minorities, such as the Roma and Jews. In 2004, 79 applications out of 184 received funding. But by taking a brief look on who has received funding and for what purposes it can be said that roughly ten per cent has a connection with the arts. (Ministry of Education 2005 b)

This means that artists from different ethnic groups must apply for the grants from the Arts Council or private foundations and are in the same line with all the other applicants. So far only members of the Finnish majority have been members of the arts councils and decided for the funds given. The councils are formed after suggestions of established, big arts organisations where Finnish majority has the leading and only role. Still, as it is stated in the strategies of the ministry, one of the key topics on the agenda is promoting cultural diversity. This means that actions need to be taken now.

Drawing from my observations presented in this research, I will now present my own vision on how Finland should proceed with supporting cultural diversity in the arts. I think Finland could learn a lot from the other Nordic programmes. It may be so that in Finland the number of immigrants is still just too small for such a big long-term programme as in Scandinavian countries. I think the lesson would mainly be in the themes and ways of tackling the issue.

First of all, in order to go forward with a policy of culturally diverse arts in Finland, a mapping should be made about the number and characteristics of artists with foreign background. At the moment there is no data about this. Under the Taru-project (www.taru.info) and EU-MAN, European Union Migrant Artist Network (www.eu-man.org), some information has been gathered, but no extensive research has been made. We would need to know who these people are and what they do in order to know what we are missing at the moment without decent support for them.

My suggestion is that a subcommittee for culturally diverse arts projects and artists should be established. This committee should be set up by the Central Arts Council for example for three years' period at the time and should consist of members of the National Councils of Arts and other experts of the field. Here the emphasis should be on the experts in the field, who really know the culturally diverse arts scene in Finland. This subcommittee would award project grants for culturally diverse projects and artists annually. The committee could also establish a state prize for Cultural Diversity in the Arts that would be awarded annually. This prize would bring publicity to the scene.

The project grants for cultural diversity should given for the realisation of a working plan; the compensation of working costs; performance, presentation and publishing costs; and research in the field of arts. It would be given for private artists, two or more artists jointly or project-specific work groups or associations. On special grounds this grant would also be for critics, teachers in art institutions and other art teachers and researchers of art and art history. It would be open to all cultural groups working professionally in the field of arts.

I suggest the special subsidies for cultural diversity should be used for:

a) Promoting and integrating cultural diversity as a part of everyday activities of cultural institutions through established policies
b) Promoting interaction between different cultural groups through networks for exchanging information, nourishing dialogue and advancing knowledge

c) Developing co-operation between municipalities, cultural institutions and cultural associations in all levels on administration across Finland with the purpose of promoting cultural diversity

d) Increasing participation of cultural minorities in the arts and cultural life as participants, members of the public, and professionals

The best solution would naturally be mainstreaming, bringing diversity as a natural part of the work inside the ministry and councils, but Finland still has a long way to get there. *Mosaikk*, a programme aimed specially for culturally diverse projects, was the first big step in Norway, but after that they have moved on to mainstreaming and now the responsibility for supporting cultural diversity is within each arts form section in the ministry. But to get there will take time also in Finland and this is why we need to start with a subcommittee.

The eventual solution should naturally be mainstreaming: the actions made and funds granted should be part of the ministry's other actions and national arts councils work. Before that there is a lot to be done in changing the attitudes and promoting cultural diversity. The staff of the Ministry and members of the National Arts Council need to be educated on issues concerning cultural diversity. Artists with non-Finnish background should be included in the arts councils. Furthermore, cultural diversity should be one of the aspects included in the result responsibility of state funded arts organisations.

Now the problem in Finland really is that cultural diversity is not something that people would connect with the Arts but rather with social projects and instrumentalisation. This still seems to be the view of the government as culturally diverse projects are supported mainly though social projects or related to fighting against racism and xenophobia. I feel that the responsibility on this should be both in the hands of the Ministry as well as the Arts Council. In the Ministry the issue is closer to the political decision making process but now a closer tie with the arts and artists is needed.

There are however some reservations and problems related to cultural diversity policies that need to be mentioned. According to Parekh et al. there should be greater clarity about what the notion of reflecting and respecting cultural diversity involves in practise. It does not and cannot mean only recognising 'ethnic' traditions separate from the mainstream 'Western' canon. The focus should not be on conserving and valuing the past rather than on promoting new creativity in the present. (Parekh et al. 2002, 162-166) Here I would also like to refer back to the strategies of ethnic revival by Skot-Hansen (2002, 204-205) that I presented on page 31 in this thesis.

At the same time when ear-marked programmes and funding needs to be encouraged, the danger of ghettoism should in some way be avoided. It is too easy to approach artists with minority backgrounds with Western stereotypes that reduce individual artists to representatives of exotic cultures. The more professional the artist is, the less interested s/he is to get support for art projects from segregated programmes for minority- or immigrant artists, from the so called "ghetto funds". (Gran 2002, 44)

We should learn the lesson from other countries examples in building a policy for cultural diversity. I think the main tensions and problems from Great Britain should be taken into consideration (Khan 2001 in Ellmeier) and applied to Nordic countries. One should really think through how to build up strategies which would balance traditions and cultures without privileging one or alienating others. The relationship between `new' cultures and `indigenous' cultures may be problematic: the major debate is between strong indigenous cultures and the newcomers, quite often the needs of latter mentioned tend to be ignored. There is a strong need to create a sense of common ownership and a context in which all differing traditions can feel free to practise their own cultures, if they wish.

The new cultural policies must be based on the understanding that culture is not something given or steady but a process that is in constant change, something that is continuously created and recreated in the cross roads of different cultural meetings. The change is here and now, leading to new

aesthetic understanding. Today the question is not, whose culture, but rather what values do we believe are worth maintaining? The role and responsibility of arts and cultural institutions and the artists is to help to achieve a fair change.

Skot-Hansen suggests that

> "we need a cultural policy which does not rely on cultural diversity as a means of categorising, cultivating and placing labels on them and us, but which allows us to acknowledge that we can all contribute and learn in a cultural space which is being constantly redefined. We must acknowledge this new hybridity, where nothing is pure or authentic anymore, if it ever was. Cultural diversity concerns us all." (Ibid. 208)

In my opinion its is not enough to establish short term programmes or share from a pool of money which rubber stamps any projects with the label of "ethnic minorities" or "multicultural art". Even establishing quotas for ethnic projects is not enough. The entire public cultural system should open up for discussion and new thinking in terms of cultural diversity, from ministries, councils and funding boards to publicly supported cultural institutions. Skot-Hansen sees that the primary need is for an an open discussion about quality and diversity,

> "such that the concept of quality is not limited to promoting the familiar and the domestic to the exclusion of the foreign and distant. The concept of artistic quality must be viewed in a cultural context and this perspective requires and interest in and knowledge of the qualities and forms of expressions of other cultures." (Ibid. 208)

This means the formulation of Nordic cultural policy that focuses upon a generalised goal of cultural diversity, that Skot-Hansen has well encapsulated:
- A more multifaceted concept of quality places greater emphasis on evaluating artistic quality in a cultural context
- An expanded dialogue with the global and international art and culture community, including the dissemination abroad of realistic picture of Nordic countries as multicultural societies.
- Inclusion of the art and culture on minorities in our cultural heritage.

- A broad-based emphasis on dissemination of new hybrid cultural and artistic forms.
- Strengthening networks and dissemination of cross-cultural experiences between cultural institutions and their surroundings. (Skot-Hansen 2002, 208)

Culture policy in the future can not be based solely on common past, identity or heritage, but it has a broader meaning as *Kulturelt mangfold og kulturpolitikken* (2002) notes. It should be built upon values tied to individual citizen's right and duties, human rights, freedom of speech, tolerance and respect to each other. The goal of cultural policy should be to promote equality and equal opportunities to participate in different arenas of arts and cultural life. This can be formulated as a right and possibility to express oneself and as a right to cultivate own traditions.

So, despite the dangers of separation, ghettoism, stereotyping or fixing identities, also Finland needs to go forward with its cultural policy on cultural diversity. For the fear of doing mistakes or hiding behind the big back of quality, it is not justified to change the policies. The legal and strategical basis for making concrete steps for promoting cultural diversity are already there, now we just need to take action.

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

I have now come to the last part of my thesis, namely, discussion and conclusion. I will first look back to the aims of this thesis and how I have managed to fulfil them. After this I will see what the main results of my thesis have been. I will look into what the offerings for my research for cultural policy might be. Lastly, I will evaluate the process and outcomes of this research.

Aims and Research Questions of This Thesis

The main aim of my research was to find out what are the main challenges to the promotion of cultural diversity in the arts and cultural policy of the Nordic countries. I particularly wanted to see what the concrete actions for supporting cultural diversity in the field of cultural policy have been. I looked into cultural diversity programmes in Sweden, Norway and Denmark to see what their aims have been and how they have tried to fulfil these aims. From the rhetorical and conceptual level of cultural policy I went all the way to researching implementation of projects of culturally diverse nature in order to take a more specific look on how the mainstays of these programmes work in practise.

I started my research with an open mind, but with working experience from the culturally diverse arts field and therefore also some presumptions. I wanted to find answers on questions related to different kind of aspects of cultural diversity policies in the arts. I wanted to know what could be the corner stones of such policies in order to nourish and preserve cultural diversity. I needed to locate the players and dynamics in the field of culture and arts that have the needed influence and power to do this.

After starting off with the literature review, some central themes emerged time and time again and so my research questions started to take on a more precise form. The role of institutions seemed to be one of particular interests of the

cultural diversity policies at hand. I was also interested in finding out what is the role of cultural diversity in the work of cultural institutions at present. Literature supported my own view about the significance of networks and in the research I wanted to cling deeper to this topic. And how was the question of decentralisation of power to different players in the society related to the topic concerned? Many of the programmes emphasised this aspect. My own experience in my work was that for cultural diversity were mainly working small NGO's, but I felt that their work alone is not enough.

One of the aims of this study was to find models from other Nordic countries to show example and to be put to use in Finland. The Nordic countries are similar in many ways and therefore I felt that the best examples could be obtained from these near neighbours and not to go looking for solutions for example from the U.K. or Netherlands whose societies and ways of governing differ so much from ours. I feel Finland can learn a lot form the successes and failures of the cultural diversity policies in other Nordic countries.

Research Results

I will now proceed to presenting the main research results of this thesis. In chapter one, I entered into the context of cultural diversity. I noticed that cultural diversity is one of the big themes of international cultural policy today. It is now top on the agenda of UNESCO, Council of Europe and even European Union. The fact is that we are all living in multicultural societies and in order to continue co-existence in a peaceful manner, we need to learn to live together. Culture and arts can play a significant part in this process and can they can form one mainstay for development.

The discussion around cultural diversity has produced many concepts and analyses about the issue. Assimilation, integration and marginalisation are on the one hand strategies of the individual to adjust to the society and on the other hand, strategies by which the societies try to make inhabitants, especially immigrants, part of the society. There have been international shifts in policy approaches towards ethnic groups, relating to ethnic minorities, multiculturalism

and cultural diversity. Also concepts such as ethnicity, monocultural, hybrid, majority and minority are important in this discussion. These concepts form the background for the policies on cultural diversity. However, the concepts were not put to use as properly as they could and should in the Scandinavian programmes and often their content was not even clear to the actors behind the programmes. A sad example of this was the use of the word "ethnic" in the Danish programme to mean non-Danish people as it in fact refers to all people.

In chapter two I presented the three big Scandinavian governmental programmes to promote cultural diversity in the arts and culture: *Mosaikk* in Norway, *Forum för Världskultur* in Sweden and *Cultural Ministry's Development Fund KUF* in Denmark. These programmes have all supported cultural diversity in the arts and cultural life of their countries in somewhat similar way but with a little bit different focus areas. The evaluations of these programmes were central references in my research.

In chapter three I moved on to challenges and solutions of these programmes. I was able to crystallize three corner stones of these policies that seem to be the most crucial and often used focal points to promote and preserve cultural diversity. These corner stones are affecting on institutions, emphasising networking and supporting decentralisation. All these topics are closely connected with each other.

Institutions form the core of cultural life of the Nordic countries and they receive most of the public subsidies. They are in a key role in changing the arts scene to be more open to diversity, but the research results show that they have a long way to get there. The problem is that these institutions have been built in the time of ethnic monoculture, or in believe to such a thing, to promote national unity. Now these institutions have a lot to do to change their working scope from unity into diversity. The research showed that long-term development work should grow from institutions. Cultural institutions should analyse what their possibilities and problems related to cultural diversity are and then make strategies that are put into work for the needed change. One crucial part in changing the institutions would be to make room for participation of different

ethnic groups: both as artists, users, administrators as well as artists. Developing audiences to reflect the Nordic population at present is one essential part of this work. The state and governmental cultural policy plays another key role in this change: institutions that receive public subsidies should have the responsibility to include cultural diversity in their actions. The gamut of cultures should be as equally presented in the work of the cultural institutions as is the case with gender equality. The role of governmental cultural policy should be to encourage and in some cases even to urge actions for cultural diversity.

Networking forms a crucial dynamics for the promotion of cultural diversity. They work as intermediate between governmental institutions and the grass-roots cultural field, between different art forms, professions and levels of cultural life. In this way networks seemed to be better suiting the needs of today's multidimensional cultural field. The meaning of networking is growing as bureaucratically administrated structural policies are being replaced by more flexible network-based co-operation. In the research it was shown that being part of networks is one of the biggest reasons to get funding or build co-operation is to be part of cultural networks. It also came out that networking has close ties to cultural diversity: networking can enhance dialogue and understanding between cultures and encourage participation. From the side of cultural policy this means that policy makers should see networking as one crucial dynamic for the work for diversity and support this kind of actions in the field.

Decentralisation calls after awareness and actions in all levels of the society. In addition to the strong role of institutions, decentralisation has been a significant process in the cultural policy of the Nordic countries. A lot of the power of implementing cultural policies in practise lies in the hands of regional and local actors. This is why the awareness and responsibility of including cultural diversity as a norm in cultural life should be in all levels of the society: from ministries and arts councils to regional and local authorities. All these levels need to find their own way of realising the goals of cultural diversity policies. However, as we have in so many cases seen, the regions and municipalities

easily cut the money from arts and culture, not even to mention about a more specific sector within these fields such as cultural diversity. Therefore, a balance should be found between decentralisation and control: the regional and local levels should take responsibility on implementing these policies, but the governmental level should have some form of control to this, be it ear-marked funding for culturally diverse projects or a prerequisite for receiving funding.

On chapter four I presented my own suggestion about how to go forward with developing our cultural policy in relation to cultural diversity. My suggestion is that a subcommittee for art and artists should be established to the Finnish arts Council. In order to go forward with improving the position of cultural diversity in the arts in Finland, the three themes about institutions, networking and decentralisation should be taken into account. The fourth issue on this should be to stake on arts education that takes diversity into account.

Evaluation

The value of this thesis has been in making a compilation of what has been done to promoting cultural diversity in cultural policies of Scandinavia. I presented the three programmes and then crystallised the issues that they had tries to grasp into three corner stones.

There is very little literature and research made on this area in the Nordic countries. However, there is a need to such research and therefore I feel that my research has been able to fill even a little gap on this field. I think the research I have made can offer new thoughts about cultural diversity in the arts both for policy makers, administrators as well as artists in the field.

The problems in my work were mainly related to the approach I chose, or even to say, the lack of any systematical method. With discourse analysis or narrowing my topic more I would have perhaps got more out of it. The literature on this programmes and cultural diversity in the arts in the Nordic countries was scarce in general, so I had to resort to material from other countries as well. Sometimes I did feel like trying to explain a too broad of a field to myself and to

the reader. However, my intention was to get a general view over the field of cultural diversity policies in Scandinavia and more precisely, to see what issues this in practise means. My working experience as an arts manager in this field has helped my in many cases and hopefully given more depth to my comments. At the same time, because of this background it has at times been very hard for me to stay in the role of a researcher instead of a policy maker.

In the future it would be interesting to research on Finland, my home country, and to see more thoroughly how could we implement such a policy in Finland. Here I have presented just a small sketch for a model. It would also be worth researching on how the policies in Scandinavia have developed since these programmes, particularly mainstreaming in Norway and investing on multicultural consultant in Sweden and to see what kind of development has happened.

Lastly, the programmes and projects presented in this thesis give evidence of a larger potential of invention and development. In order to succeed in creating a more systematic, long-term policy, both specific initiatives and administrative methods must be considered. The living fact is that we live in societies that are culturally diverse. As democratic welfare societies the Nordic countries are obliged to count in their new and old members with different ethnic or cultural background and to see that they have the possibility to equally take part in the life of their societies. Culture and arts form and reflect the soul of people and therefore actions can not be only in the level of education, housing or social service, however important these are. I urge for actions for cultural diversity in cultural policy and in the arts.

REFERENCES

Araeen, Rashed (2002). "*What is Wrong With Multiculturalism?*". In Under [De]Construction. Perspectives on Cultural Diversity in Visual and Performing Arts. NIFCA.

Baklien, Bergljot and Krogh, Unni (2002) *Evaluering av Mosaikk – et program under Norsk Kulturråd.* Norsk Kulturråd. Oslo

Balling, Gert; Fazakerley, Susan; Skot-Hansen, Dorte (2001) *KUF i det uprøvede grænsefelt – en midtvejsevaluering af Kulturministeriets Udviklingsfond.* "KUF in the unknown borderline - midway evaluation of Cultural Ministry's Developmentfund. Center for Kulturpolitiske Studier, Danmarks Biblioteksskole. http://www.gertballing.dk/artikler/KUF.pdf

Bennett, Tony (2001) *Differing Diversities – Cultural Policy and Cultural Diversity.* Strasbourg Cedex. Council of Europe Publishing.

Berkaak, Odd Are (2002) *Fri for fremmede. En evaluering av signalprosjekt Open Scene.* Notat nr 46. Norsk kulturråd.

Brahmachari, Shanti (2004) *Monokulturer eller kulturelt Mangfold?* In RISIKOSONER Om kunst, makt og endring. Ed. Siri Meyer og Svein Bjørkås. Norsk kulturråd. Rapport nr 33

Brochmann, Grete (2003) *Welfare state, integration and legitimacy of the majority – the case of Norway.* p. 25-43. In Cultural diversity and integration in the Nordic Welfare states. Ed. Forsander, Annika; Similä, Matti. SSKH. Helsinki.

Castells, Manuel (1996) *The Rise of the Network Society.* Cambridge. Blackwell.

CON:fusions – et kunstnerisk udviklingsprojekt del 1. Kortlaegning af centrale udfordinger i forhold til kulturel mangfoldighed i nordisk scenekunst. (2004) Norscen.

Council of Europe (2000) Declaration on Cultural Diversity http://www.coe.int/T/E/Human_Rights/media/4_Documentary_Resources/CM/Dec(2000)Diversity_en.asp 12.5.2005

Council of Europe (2003) Comparative Reports on Cultural Diversity http://www.coe.int/T/E/Cultural_Co-operation/Culture/Cultural_policies/Comparative_reviews/Reports 28.9.2004

Cultural Diversity in the Arts. Art, art policies and the facelift of Europe. (1993) ed. Lavrijsen, Ria. Royal Tropical Institute. The Netherlands.

Ellmeier, Andrea (undated, Internet 21.2.05) *Cultural Policy and Cultural Diversity.* http://comedia.kolibrie.net/template.asp?path=033a57eu

Fock, Eva & Skot-Hansen, Dorte. (2003) *Brændstof til kulturlivet? En evaluering af Københavns Amts projekt Brændstof 2000-2002.* Copenhagen.

Gould, Helen (2005) *The Cultural Policy Revolution.* In Arts Professional 28 February 2005. p. 5-6.

Grann, Anne-Britt. (2002) *Mosaikk – Når forskjellen forener. Evaluering av programmet for kunst og det flerkulturelle samfunn.* Norsk Kulturråd. Oslo

Hall, Stuart (1999) *Identiteetti.* Vastapaino. Tampere.

Heiskanen, Ilkka (2001) *Decentralisation: trends in European cultural policies.* Culture - policy Note 9. Council of Europe Publishing.

Hvenegaard Rasmussen, Casper & Høirup, Charlotte Lee (2000) K*ulturinstitutionernes bidrag til det kulturelt mangfoldige Danmark*

- en undersøgelse af kunst- og kulturformidlingsinstitutioners
tilbud til og inddragelse af de etniske minoriteter. ('Cultural institutions support for the culturally diverse Denmark - a study of art and cultural institutions offer to and inclusion of the ethnic minorities.') Center for Kulturpolitiske Studier. Danmarks Biblioteksskole. www.db.dk 31.3.2005

IETM Study on the Effects of Networking (2001) Informal European Theatre Meeting; Fodazione Fitzcarraldo; Arts Council of Finland. Arts Council of Finland.

In from the margins - A contribution to the debate on Culture and Development in Europe (1997) Council of Europe. Strasbourg.

Intercult (2004) http://www.intercult.se/ 7.9.2004

Intercult (2005) Rapport. *Produktionscentra för interkulturell scenkonst 2003.* Stockholm.

Irjala, Auli; Eikås, Magne (1996) *State, Culture and Decentralisation. A comparative study of decentralisation processes in Nordic cultural policy.* Art Council of Finland and Western Norway Research Institute.

Jantjes, Gavin (1994) *Towards a New Internationalism in Europe: The Artist, Cultural Diversity and Equality.* In Human Rights and Cultural Policies in Changing Europe. The Right to Participate in Cultural Life. Eds Fisher et al. Arts Council of Finland.

Jermyn, Helen; Desai, Philly (2000) *Arts – What's in a Word? Ethnic minorities & the Arts.* Arts Council of England.

Johnson, Gill; Pfrommer, Pam; Stewart, Sue; Glinkowski, Paul; Fenn, Clare; Skelton, Adrienne; Joy, Alan (2004) *New Audiences Final Report.* Arts Council of England.

Khan, Naseem (1976) *The Arts Britain Ignores: The arts of Ethnic minoiritie sin Britain.* Community Relations Commission.
Khan, Naseem (2001) *Can We Dispense With "Diversity?" From Preservation to Contemporary Arts.* in Arsis 03/2001. Arts Council of Finland. Helsinki.

Khan, Naseem. (2002) *Towards a greater diversity. Results and legacy of the Art Council of England's cultural diversity action plan.* Arts Council of England. SPY Design & Publishing Ltd., London

Khan, Naseem (2001) *National Report on Cultural Diversity.* Arts Council of England. www.coe.int/T/E/Cultural_Co-operation/Culture/Cultural_policies/ Comparative_reviews/Reports/unitedktrans.asp

Karttunen, Sari (2002) *Taiteilijan määrittely: refleksiivisyyden esteitä ja edellytyksiä taidepoliittisessa tutkimuksessa.* 'Defining an artist: obstacles and preconditions in the art political research'. University of Joensuu.

Komissar, Mariann (2004) *Norsk Kulturråds strategier for kulturelt mangfold med spesiell vekt på feltene scenekunts/musikk.* Tune in – conference in Stockholm 2004. unpublished.

KUF (2004) http://www.kum.dk/sw1858.asp

Kulturdepartementet (2000 a) *Delrapport. Forum för världskultur.* ('Part Report. Forum for World Cultures.') SOU 2000:15. http://www.regeringen.se/content/1/c4/03/54/268fde62.pdf

Kulturdepartementet (2000 b) *Jag vill leva, jag vill dö I Norden - Slutbetänkande av kommitten Forum för Världskultur.* (2000) ('I want to live, I want to die in

Norden – End report by the Committee of Forum for World Culture.') SOU 2000:118. http://www.regeringen.se/content/1/c4/14/27/ad43aadb.pdf

Kulturelt mangfold og kulturpolitikken (2002) Note from a working group established by the Ministry of Culture and Church Affairs. unpublished.

Mångfald i Kulturlivet (2004) Ed. Oscar Pripp. Mångkulturellt centrum. Botkyrka. http://www.mkc.botkyrka.se/

Norsk Kulturråd (1999) *Presentation of the Mosaikk Programme*. The Norwegian Council for Cultural Affairs. Oslo.

Lagerkvist, Cajsa (2001) *Audience and Diversity*. In KORSDRAG/Crosscurrents 4-5, 2001. Intercult. Sweden.

Lavrijsen, Ria (2001) *Investing in ethics: Developing culturally diverse action plans*. p.18-25. in 1+1=3 Conference Report. Eds. Clarke, Gavin; Traasdahl, Jaan Ole. The Intercultural Network. Denmark.

Lundberg, Dan ; Malm, Krister; Ronström, Owe (2003) *Music Media Multiculture – Changing Musicscapes*. Svenskt visarkiv. http://www.visarkiv.se/mmm/book/index.htm

Ministry of Education (2002) *Art is possibilities. Arts and artist policy programme.* 'Taide on mahdollisuuksia. Taide- ja taiteilijapoliittinen ohjelma' http://www.minedu.fi/opm/hankkeet/tao/tao_toimenpideehdotukset.pdf

Ministry of Education (2003) *The Strategy of Education Ministry 2015.* 'Opetusministeriön strategia 2015' http://www.minedu.fi/julkaisut/hallinto/opm11/opm11.pdf

The Ministry of Education (2003) *Definitions for Immigrants policy.* 'Opetusministeriön maahanmuuttopoliittiset linjaukset' http://www.minedu.fi/julkaisut/pdf/maahanmuuttopol.pdf

Ministry of Education (2005) *Action plan and Budget 2006-2009.* 'Toiminta- ja taloussuunitelma 2006-2009'.
http://www.minedu.fi/julkaisut/hallinto/2005/opm04.pdf

Ministry of Education (2005b)
http://www.minedu.fi/opm/avustukset/multiculturalism.html

Ministry of Education (2004) *Profit Plan 2005.* 'Tulossuunnitelma 2005'
http://www.minedu.fi/julkaisut/hallinto/2005/opm02.pdf

Mitchell, Ritva (2003) *Nordic and European Cultural Policies.* The Nordic Cultural Model. Ed. Peter Duelund. Nordic Cultural Institute.

Moustache, Cliff (2001) *Nordic Black Theatre: A Dream Or the Future Reality?* in Arsis 3/2001. p.26-27. The Arts Council of Finland. Helsinki.

Nordscen (2004) http://www.nordscen.org/ 7.12.2004

Om innvandring og det flerkulturelle Norge ('About immigration and the multicultural Norway') Stortingsmelding nr 17 (1996- 97)
http://odin.dep.no/krd/norsk/dok/regpubl/stmeld/036005-040001/hov008-bn.html#8.1

Owens, Paul; Burns, Josephine; Corner, Lee.(1998) *Creative Tensions.* British American Arts Association.

Parekh et al. (2002) *The Future of Multiethnic Britain.* The Runnymede Trust. London.

Parekh, Bhikhu (1998) *Integrating Minorities.* In Race Relations in Britain. A developing Agenda. Eds. Backstone, Tessa; Parekh, Bhikhu; Sanders, Peter. London.

Pehn, Gudrun (1999) *Networking Culture, The Role of European Cultural Networks.* Council of Europe Publishing. Strasbourg.

Pripp, Oscar; Plisch, Emil; Prinz Werner, Saara (2004) *Tid för Mångfald.* Mångkulturellt Centrum.Botkyrka. http://www.mkc.botkyrka.se/ 17.12.2004

Rittner, Luke (1084) *The Glory of the Garden: The Development of the Arts in England; A Strategy for a Decade.* Arts Council of England.

Salimi, Khalid (1999) *Adapted to Change*. in Presentation of the Mosaikk Programme. The Norwegian Council for Cultural Affairs. Oslo.

Skot-Hansen, Dorte (2002) *Danish Cultural Policy – From Monoculture Towards Cultural Diversity.* In International Journal of Cultural Policy. 2002 Vol. 8 (2). pp.197-210. Routlegde.

Schwarz, Isabelle (2000) *Linking Cultural Management Training to Local Development.* unpublished. Include Project.

Statens Kulturråd. Lindblad-Nieminen, Annika (2003) Mångkultur. 0733-100165.

Statistics Norway (2004) http://www.ssb.no/english/subjects/02/sa_innvand_en/ 28.9.2004

Statistics Sweden (2005) http://www.scb.se/ 30.3.2005

Taide tarjolle, kulttuuri kaikille ('Arts for Offer, Culture for All') (2004) Salovaara, Sari; Jeronen, Eeva; Lindroos, Outi. Ministry of Education. Finland.

The Future of Multiethnic Britain. The Parekh Report. (2002) The Runnymede Trust. London.

The Landscape of Fact (1997) Arts Council of England.

Torch, Chris (2001) *Production Models and Diversity*. In KORSDRAG/ Crosscurrents 4-5, 2001. Intercult. Sweden.

Träskman, Tomas (2001) *Access denied*. In Arsis 03/2001. p. 12-15. The Arts Council of Finland. Helsinki.

Unesco (2001) Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity
http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001271/127160m.pdf

Unesco (2005)
http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/ev.php-
URL_ID=11281&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html

Wicht, Bernard (2001) Cultural Diversity On the Agenda Of the International Institutions. In Arsis 03/2001. p. 20-21. The Arts Council of Finland. Helsinki.