The arts and culture: a financial burden or a way out of the crisis? [1]

Jean-Michel Tobelem,
Option Culture, France

ABSTRACT

With the financial crisis, followed by the economic and social crisis which spread from the United States to Europe, the trend towards less and less public spending being allocated to culture has accelerated. At the same time, however, public officials affirm that the arts, culture and, more broadly, the creative industries, constitute one of the most reliable means available to contemporary developed societies to overcome the crisis.

How can such a paradox be understood? Are public authorities schizophrenic? Is there a contradiction in the definition and the implementation of public policies? Conversely, can one hypothesize that public action has a logical underpinning? What would be its basis?

The answer may be identified on two levels: on the one hand, there is an increasing instrumentalisation of artistic and cultural activities, which are used for ends which are at least partly foreign to them (in particular, to economic and diplomatic ends). On the other hand, a reorientation of public policies concerning the creative and cultural industries is occurring. It would seem that it is in this sense that the engagement of a growing number of CEOs and leaders in favor of the cultural industries may be understood.

This policy choice, even if it appears to offer certain strategic opportunities to the artistic and cultural sector, seems nevertheless to involve serious risks for cultural creation, artistic experimentation and "scientific" activities undertaken by museums. Furthermore, it risks accentuating the trend of concentrating public and private funds on the most prominent museums and historical sites, thereby threatening to accentuate the implementation of a two-tier system in France, as well as in the UK.

Keywords:

Museum

Heritage

Cultural Policy

Creative Industries

Instrumentalisation

France

United Kingdom

United States

[1] This paper was selected and edited through the double-blind review process of the review. The author would like to thank Cécile Doustaly for the first feed-back on this paper given at the conference she organized in December 2011: The Arts In Times of Crisis: British and French Perspectives (with the generous support of the CICC-Université de Cergy-Pontoise, Fondation de l'université de Cergy-Pontoise, Centre for Cultural Policy Studies-Warwick University, Musée Rodin, Fondation Pierre Bergé-Yves Saint Laurent, Musée du Louvre, Courtauld Institute of Arts, The Henry Moore Foundation). The author wishes to thank Sharon Golec and Susan Pickford for translating parts of the article.

[2] Due to the current lack of consolidated data at the European level, it can only be stressed that there have been some sharp cuts in countries like Italy, Spain or the UK in recent years. So far, France enjoys a relatively more favorable situation with a limited decrease at the national level, but a more important one at the local level (cities, départements, regions).

Introduction

Times are difficult for culture and the arts, and the situation may worsen as the current financial, economic, and social crisis deepens. Government budgets and private sponsorship alike are facing cuts. A recent survey showed that arts sponsorship funds have decreased sharply in France in recent years (Admical 2011) and the current crisis is likely to be just one factor. Sponsorship for the arts in now facing competition from various other social, humanitarian or environmental causes and, increasingly, with universities, research centres, hospitals, and other public sector organisations now turning to fundraising in their own right. At the same time, the concepts of corporate social responsibility and sustainable development focus less on cultural sponsorship than on social and environmental issues. Yet politicians, public servants, and corporate leaders contend that culture offers a way out of the crisis. The then French President Nicolas Sarkozy argued in Avignon on November 18, 2011 that “France’s response to the crisis is to invest massively in culture, because France considers that cultural goods are essential. Culture is an investment that will lead us out of crisis and not an expenditure that needs to be cut”. The present article sets out to explore this paradox by focusing on culture’s potential to save “Old Europe”. It asks whether European countries are prepared to devote sufficient resources to fostering the arts and culture and, more broadly, to strengthening the cultural industries and the creative sector. It explores the hypothesis of a newly emergent contradiction between public discourse and actual decision-making on the ground.

The first part of the article studies the reasons behind the funding crisis impacting cultural institutions, while the second analyses the role of private funding in response to this crisis. The third part explores aspects of the relationship between the arts and culture, the cultural and creative industries, and the media and communication sectors.

Culture and economic crisis

The starting point for the article is a twofold hypothesis. On the one hand, the arts and culture are increasingly being instrumentalised for various purposes, including educational, social, strategic, and economic aims, as well as tourism and diplomacy. In other words, the notion of “art for art’s sake” is losing ground. On the other hand, the very definition of culture has changed: the definition of creativity enshrined in the “traditional” arts is being replaced by a broader definition that covers not only the long-standing “cultural” industries, but also “creative” sectors such as haute cuisine, video games, fashion, software, architecture, and the like.

Instrumentalising culture

As is clear in a number of countries, cultural expenditure is no longer considered justifiable on the grounds of a democratic right to access to culture, as enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 10, 1948: “Everyone, as a member of society, has the right to social security and is entitled to realization, through national effort and international co-operation and in accordance with the organization and resources of each State, of the economic, social and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of his personality” (article 22) and “Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits” (article 27).

Many cultural and artistic projects are now justified on a range of other grounds (Museums Deliver 2010; Regourd 2012; Selwood 2010). These include urban centres seeking to develop their attractiveness as a means to economic growth: examples include Metz, which recently opened its regional branch of the Pompidou Centre, and the new branch of the Louvre in Lens, a site selected by the French government to promote cultural decentralisation but principally financed by the Nord-Pas-de-Calais region. A second category involves urban planning projects, such as the Musée des Confluences in Lyon, located on a spit of land that is undergoing considerable redevelopment; a third draws on strategies to develop tourism, including projects such as the Wine Cultural Centre in Bordeaux, the Alésia museum and archaeological park in Burgundy, and the Vulcania theme park in Auvergne. Such projects do, of course, have clear scientific, cultural, artistic, and educational objectives, but these were not the primary drivers behind them. The principal challenge facing project developers in the arts world is how to create a sensitive alliance between the project’s cultural remit and its place in a regional economic development programme, without making the scientific and cultural objectives secondary to the expected economic returns, which are always difficult to gauge (Learning to Live… 2009; Stevenson, Rowe and McKay 2010; Values and Vision… 2006).

The changing meaning of “culture”

At the same time, the cultural field is losing its specificity, becoming merged in the broader category of creative industries (A creative future… 1993; Creative Industry… 1999; Museums and Galleries in Britain… 2006). While this potentially offers artists strategic leverage, this shift is not insignificant. There is, of course, no denying that there is a creative dimension to sectors such as haute cuisine, fashion, and design. However, this does not necessarily mean that such activities should be assimilated with artistic creation, with all its connotations of experimentation, research, and uncompromising originality.

> "THE PRINCIPAL CHALLENGE FACING PROJECT DEVELOPERS IN THE ARTS WORLD IS HOW TO CREATE A SENSITIVE ALLIANCE BETWEEN THE PROJECT'S CULTURAL REMIT AND ITS PLACE IN A REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME, WITHOUT MAKING THE SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL OBJECTIVES SECONDARY TO THE EXPECTED ECONOMIC RETURNS, WHICH ARE ALWAYS DIFFICULT TO GAUGE."

Furthermore, it is apparent that the cultural industries – represented by private companies in competition with each other and targeting financially solvent markets – follow a different logic to that governing non-profit-making cultural institutions, which would not survive in an open market. Such institutions owe their ongoing existence to donations from the private sector, foundations, and private individuals, promoted by tax exemptions and breaks in the Anglo-American world and also to grants from the public purse in mainland Europe. The logic of profit in the publishing, music, and film industries – heightened in recent years by the increasing concentration of capital and the creation of vast conglomerates in the industry and service sectors – has highlighted contradictions in terms of the rise of new talents, the diversity of artistic endeavour, and the capacity to offer concrete access to cultural products aimed at anything other than a mass market (Création et diversité… 2006).

It is also clear that this logic of profit produces considerable financial backing for "blockbuster" movies, top recording artists, and best-selling books (Schiffrin 1999). Likewise, the distribution structures of the leading commercial chains promote swift stock rotation, while sales become concentrated around leading artists (Ivey 2008) – despite the "long tail" effect created by Internet sales (Anderson 2006). This is clearly not the aim of a cultural policy that sets out to counter market pressure and promote access to new cultural forms, encouraging audiences to discover new art forms for which they may develop an appreciation, the way Jean Vilar and Antoine Vitez sought to bring theatre to the people (Temkine 1992). In the final analysis, this is what justifies public funding, both direct (in the form of grants) and indirect (through the tax system) for non-profit-making cultural institutions: their role is to provide access to a diverse range of artistic endeavours, introducing audiences to new, unfamiliar forms of culture and making art a means of education for large sectors of the population (Anderson 1996 et 1999; Fleming 1996; Lang 2001).

At the same time, the increasing tendency to instrumentalise cultural projects and expand the field of culture to include the creative industries is driving a rapprochement with the private sector.

Private patronage and funding in the arts

Public authorities across Europe, particularly in France and Britain, are encouraging cultural institutions to diversify their sources of income, increase their own resources, and seek private donors, implementing favourable tax regimes to encourage patronage and philanthropy (Allinne and Carrier 2010; Private Giving for the Public Good 2008; Rozier 2010).

The role and limits of private patronage

The hoped-for rapprochement between art and enterprise and between culture and the economy could also be behind the increasing prevalence of appeals for private funding to finance cultural institutions. The arts are increasingly viewed as an investment vehicle for firms looking to improve their image and profile, and for urban centres seeking to improve their attractiveness. Indeed, if cultural institutions are able to secure funds from the private sector, there is no reason why they should not, as long as doing so does not contradict their remit and their professional code of ethics. However, it is doubtful that sponsorship will ever fully make up for cuts in public funding. It has not done so in the past, and it will doubtless not do so in the future, for a number of reasons. Tax deductions cost government budgets a lot, even when the expected leveraging effect is taken into account (Les musées nationaux… 2010). Sponsorship is not the primary task of corporations; the crisis means that budgets for advertising, communication and sponsorship are being cut. In addition, corporate social responsibility and sustainable development policies are downplaying the importance of sponsorship, in part because it is not taken into account by rating agencies.

There is a difference in how France and the UK fund culture: public responsibility for culture is more significant in the former, while private funding from companies, foundations, and private individuals plays a greater role in the latter (Ballé and Poulot 2004; Doustaly 2007; Longman 1996; Losseley 2011; Tait 1989). The two share some trends, however: tax breaks for donors weigh on the public purse in both countries, while money inevitably gravitates to major institutions with international reputations. Similarly, the withdrawal of public funding discourages private donors, as Jacques Rigaud, a leading promoter of business sponsorship of the arts in France, rightly pointed out: "Patronage is and is set to remain marginal. Its main benefit lies in providing a few tens of thousands of euros to enable an artist to bring a project to fruition, or in providing the first lump sum that will jump-start access to other sources of funding [...] The role of patronage is not to help impoverished states make ends meet [...] The state withdrawing from the cultural domain would indirectly penalise patronage" (Le Monde, 14.02.2008). Cutting state funding for the arts short-changes institutions in two ways. Firstly, not all cultural institutions have the same capacity to raise private funding: some do not have the human resources required to raise funds, while others suffer from a lack of visibility or prestige that hampers their efforts to raise a significant level of donations from private enterprise. Secondly, those institutions that do succeed in developing private sources of funding are by no means guaranteed against having an equivalent sum cut from their public funding, thereby penalising their efforts to increase their global resources.

The rise of philanthropy

Patronage has now begun to take on a more "entrepreneurial" connotation through the notion of "venture philanthropy" (Letts, Ryan and Grossman 1999; Tobelem 2011), in which donations are under greater pressure to lead to results or even a "return" on investment. While there are undoubtedly positive aspects to patronage, such as supporting project developers throughout the funding period, professionalising the management of directing cultural institutions, and implementing strategies to prepare for the period following the end of the philanthropic funding, it remains the case that patronage can lead to donations gravitating towards those organisations that are the most professional in outlook and hence the most likely to attract the attention of the "new philanthropists". However, it should be acknowledged that this evolution is partially inevitable, corresponding as it does to deep-rooted shifts in contemporary developed societies, including the increasing concentration of assets and fortunes, the social and reputational importance of donations, and the international nature of philanthropy. In other words, not lending too much credit to the role of philanthropy is by no means incompatible with seeking to gain the maximum potential from its increasingly significant role.

In terms of political sociology, how culture is financed represents a major ideological battleground, with the United States – and the UK as its bridgehead in Europe – seeking to export the Anglo-American model of philanthropy to Europe and Asia, albeit with limited success in China for the time being, particularly through the example of figures such as Bill Gates and Warren Buffett (Bertho-Huidal 2012; Mason 2000; Zunz 2012).

It would indeed be naive to see this as simply encouraging private individuals to be more generous. The key issue at stake is the predominance of the "US" model of dismantling public policy and splintering the wider public interest into a broad array of private stakeholders, including companies, foundations, and private individuals – all against a backdrop of increasing social inequality and the concentration of wealth in the hands of an ever smaller group. The dazzling success of America's leading cultural institutions should not overshadow other, less positive aspects of cultural funding in the United States – how fragile it is in times of crisis, the relative lack of support for experimental and avant-garde projects, and the absence of any overall vision of the stakes of art and culture at a national level (Martel 2006; Tobelem 1990).

Sources of funding

Museums and historic sites are being encouraged to increase their earned revenue (Bromwich 1997; De la Rocha-Mille 2002; Fopp 1997; Misiura 2006). This raises the question of levers. Increasing admission fees appears to contradict the ideals of "democratising" access to cultural institutions, education, and social inclusion. Museum shops and restaurants are useful, but there is a limit to their net financial contribution. Above all, the practice of renting travelling exhibitions and collections, as officially endorsed by several French national museums, is a potential risk, quite apart from the fact that it does not seem to be authorised by either the French or the ICOM (International Council of Museums) code of ethics. The risk arises from the fact that members of parliament, mindful of pressing social costs (unemployment, retirement pensions, social security and so on), may in the future be encouraged to cut museum budgets on the grounds that museums can raise their own funds (Livre blanc des musées 2011).

Capitalising on museum "brands", as in the Louvre-Abu Dhabi, raises a number of questions. Are such practices driven by pure commercial spirit? Do they contradict the notion of "cultural exception"? Is the Middle East as stable as might be hoped? Do such projects represent a new form of cultural diplomacy, rendering co-operation and exchange obsolete? Will museums become increasingly driven by funding needs rather than by their core mission?

One possible solution to the financial crisis affecting cultural institutions would be to increase their resources via partnerships, synergies, pooled resources, and networking with other institutions, as long as this does not negatively impact their mission. A further solution would be to implement suitable management techniques in terms of strategy, marketing, empowering personnel and human resources management, organisation, benchmarking, cost control, productivity, and assessment. Such managerial tools should not be seen as enemies by the non-profit sector, but rather as a means for artistic or scientific staff (curators) to retain their role in charge of cultural institutions, rather than being replaced by business or administrative personnel, as has been the case for many French museums and heritage sites. The stakes are high, because, as Pettigrew's 1997 New Public Management makes clear, more performance indicators, reporting, and management do not always mean greater imagination, adaptation and efficiency; on the contrary, they can lead to increased rigidity, control and bureaucracy as the British case illustrates (Doustaly, Gray 2010). Finally, and most importantly, there is a need to highlight the key role played by cultural institutions in some of the primary objectives shared by government and local authorities – education, social inclusion, tourism, attractiveness, event creation, and image.

Such solutions are far from easy or ideal. However, they would nonetheless be an improvement on the shared illusion that the private sector will provide the answer to funding difficulties in the arts – a solution likely to widen the gap between prestigious and lower-profile institutions. There are already some signs of a two-tier system emerging in France and the UK, with the largest museums enjoying a number of advantages, including the ability to raise funds and attract members, volunteers, and corporations, foundations, and individuals as donors; expertise in revenue generation; significant PR budgets; and the capacity to host events that drive up attendance figures and increase visitor expenditure through facilities such as shops, restaurants, room hire, and so on.

"ONE POSSIBLE SOLUTION TO THE FINANCIAL CRISIS AFFECTING CULTURAL INSTITUTIONS WOULD BE TO INCREASE THEIR RESOURCES VIA PARTNERSHIPS, SYNERGIES, POOLED RESOURCES, AND NETWORKING WITH OTHER INSTITUTIONS, AS LONG AS THIS DOES NOT NEGATIVELY IMPACT THEIR MISSION."

Culture and the cultural / creative industries

Art and industry

Certain intellectuals and media figures are currently advocating more "mainstream" culture, which doubtless refers simply to a more market-oriented definition of culture, reducing culture's role as a force for education, citizenship, and emancipation (Martel 2011). Such a stance overlooks the way mass consumption already dominates the cultural sector through TV shows, pop singers, blockbuster movies, popular video games, and best-selling books; likewise, it fails to acknowledge that the French cultural industry is already active in this arena, for example through the TV channels TF1 and M6, Vivendi Universal Music, Hachette publishing, Pathé Cinéma, and so on. However, what needs to be protected and possibly subsidised is not popular culture in the form of Hollywood movies, best-sellers and chart-topping artists, but rather more demanding, innovative, experimental, and avant-garde forms of art. Popular culture represents a solvent market, with customers ready to pay for what they want on existing markets; in the case of more rarefied art forms, there are generally not enough customers in a position to purchase art that they may not even know they need.

This sheds light on the reasons why prominent figures from the corporate world and the advertising industry, as seen in the Avignon Forum (Les stratégies culturelles pour un nouveau monde 2010) and the "purple economy" manifesto A new alliance between culture and the economy (www.economie-mauve.org), support the idea of culture as an engine for growth in France and indeed across Europe. What such figures doubtless have in mind are the cultural industries and the creative sector rather than the arts; they see culture as driving growth in an increasingly intangible economy based on symbols, forms, creativity, images, innovation, values, and brands (Caldwell 2000; Scott 2000; Twitchell 2004; Wallace 2006).

Culture and the intangible economy

Jean-Pierre Jouyet, the then head of the French financial markets regulator, and Maurice Lévy, director of the Publicis advertising agency, published a report on the immaterial economy in 2006 that made two key propositions (Lévy and Jouyet 2006). The first of these was to "authorise museums to assign the right to use their name to third parties under certain very strict conditions" on the grounds that "several French museums enjoy outstanding prestige, which remains largely under-exploited to this day. Following the examples of the Guggenheim museum in Bilbao and the project for a major museum of Islamic art [sic] in Abu Dhabi, the leading national museums should be encouraged to develop policies to raise the international profile of their brands, offering to assign countries with richly dynamic cultural policies the right to use their name. Any such deal would of course be framed by a strict remit guaranteeing the quality of the collections, the brand image, and that any works lent by French museums would be shown in suitable conditions". The second proposition was that museums should be allowed to "hire out or sell certain works from their collections". This potentially explosive proposition was hedged with precautions: "Museums do not currently own their works and are not in a position to manage their collections to their full potential, either by hiring out or selling works. The current situation places a number of constraints on museums, particularly in terms of development and acquisitions policies. The commission holds that it would be appropriate to consider an alternative system that would protect the national interest and preserve national treasures, while renewing collections and enabling museums to organise their management as they see fit. Artworks should be classed in two categories – national treasures and works free to use. Those works deemed free to use would be counted as disposable assets of the museum".

It may seem surprising that economists and business leaders should place such importance on maximising revenue potential from cultural goods while at the same time denying that their approach to culture is overly market-oriented. The answer may lie in the notion that their role is less to serve the arts and culture than it is to use them to further objectives that are not directly connected to their remit or that may even contradict it.

Culture and economy

Several leading cultural and economic figures signed an opinion piece in Le Monde on May 19, 2011 under the title "The purple economy: a new alliance between culture and economy". The signatories included Jean-Jacques Aillagon and Renaud Donnedieu de Vabres, both former Culture ministers, Mercedes Erra of the Euro RSCG and Havas advertising agencies, Pierre-Antoine Gailly, head of the Paris Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Jean-Hervé Lorenzi, director of the Cercle des économistes, Alain Dominique Perrin, chairman of the Cartier Foundation for Contemporary Art, and Pierre Simon, director of the Greater Paris Investment Agency. The piece argued that "Culture is no longer a luxury to be enjoyed by the rich or entertainment for the idle. It feeds into all modern processes of production. […] There can be no genuine creativity, whether artistic, economic, or even political, without a solid cultural underpinning. […] The time has come to imagine a virtuous circle connecting culture and economy – both fundamental undertakings – which does not simply resort to instrumentalising the former and uselessly stigmatising the latter". It is interesting to note that culture itself is not defined as a concept, doubtless because the signatories see it as such a broad category that it is difficult to grasp in concrete terms. The promoters of a purple economy argue that it is a "new alliance between culture and economy, committed to fostering dynamic interaction between the two spheres of activity insofar as every aspect of the economy involves cultural elements in its processes, productions, and modes of organisation, thereby impacting the cultural environment at the same time. The purple economy aims to enrich cultural diversity by underlining our capacity to give globalisation a human face and to promote new growth on an ethical, sustainable, and cultural basis". The movement refers to cultural diversity, digital technology, sustainable growth, communication, ethics, fashion, intercultural management and mediation, but art scarcely warrants a mention. As the website homepage states, "'The Purple economy is far more than laying claim to a new term. It is about looking beyond the economic value of cultural outputs to encompass the cultural dimension of any asset or service. Purple economy is part of a wider ethical approach. It contributes to a richer and more diverse cultural environment. Such wealth and diversity are decidedly drivers for progress". It remains to be seen whether such a vague definition of culture – admittedly a highly polysemic term – will lead to a greater recognition of the role of art and cultural activities and therefore to an increase in support and a higher profile.

Culture, media and PR

The Forum d'Avignon has played host to annual international meetings on culture, the economy and the media since 2008. It defines itself as "a think tank dedicated to culture" whose aim is "strengthening the links between culture and the economy, suggesting subjects for reflection at global, European and local levels", focusing on issues including culture, financing and economic models, culture and regional attractiveness, culture and digital technology, and culture and innovation. The organisers define the Forum's objectives as fostering links between the worlds of culture, the economy, and the media – three sectors whose synergy plays a vital role in all cultural projects. The Forum sums up its stance in the slogan "culture as a factor for growth".

The significance of the culture and media industries within the think tank is clear from the profiles of its board members. They include Nicolas Seydoux, CEO of Gaumont, Hervé Digne, chairman of Postmedia Finance, the publisher Axel Ganz, Emmanuel Hoog, chairman of Agence France-Presse, Patricia Barbizet, managing director of Financière Pinault, Alain Kouck, CEO of Editis, and Véronique Morali, president of Fimalac Développement. The Forum's steering committee is led by Christian de Boissieu, chairman of the Council of Economic Analysis that advises the French prime minister; its other members are Christine Albanel of Télécom-Orange, Sylvie Forbin of Vivendi, Amit Khanna, chairman of Reliance, Carlo d'Asaro Biondo of Google, Irène Braam of Bertelsmann, and Carolina Lorenzon of Mediaset. This raises the question of whether men and women in such positions are likely to argue in favour of support for artistic creation and measures promoting democratic access to culture, given that their aim appears rather to be to act as a pressure group lobbying for the development of the culture, PR, and media industries.

Similarly, while culture is offered as a way out of the crisis, the details of how this is to be achieved are somewhat vague. It is not clear whether the aim is to encourage significant investment in education, training, and research, and in developing participation in art and culture, or whether the Forum's purpose is above all to seek new outlets for European economies whose model for growth will in the future be more firmly rooted in innovation, creativity, design and exploiting intangible assets such as knowledge, images, symbols, and brands. In other words, is the goal to work with the shift in developed societies towards mass market products and services (broadcasting, publishing, music, film, software, and video games) offered by the content industries rather than to promote democratic access to art and culture?

Questions of ethics

In this context, it is interesting to note that the wealthy American businessman and art collector Robert Rubin, former chairman of the Centre Pompidou Foundation, recently explicitly warned against an inappropriate approach to culture, particularly the tendency to appoint administrators or political advisers to direct major cultural institutions. He told Le Monde that "I can understand that museums hire out works occasionally. It's business. It disheartens me that museums make it a rule not to lend out works without sending along a bill. [...] I find it dispiriting that museum directors are now travelling salesmen, touting out ready-to-run exhibitions all over the world". Asked "Should museum directors be curators?", his answer was "Yes. That's how it is in American museums. MoMA and the Met are good examples. Their directors, Glenn Lowry and Thomas Campbell, are both art historians with authority over the activities and programmes. Of course they should be in charge, it's a museum! Under them they have an administrator in charge of management, who oversees projects and keeps an eye on the accounts. But the curator answers only to the board members, who have no hesitation in entrusting overall responsibility to an art specialist. Because they know that it is easier for a curator to learn management skills than it is for a manager to become an art expert". He concludes that the situation in France is "all the more serious when the people parachuted into these jobs are not content merely to manage, but also seek to intervene in broader issues – choosing exhibitions, allocating budgets, and commenting... again, all these should be the responsibility of a curator. A decision-maker from a political background may have priorities and a career plan that do not necessarily dovetail with the museum's curatorial needs, particularly in times of

"CULTURE IS OFFERED AS A WAY OUT OF THE CRISIS BUT IT IS NOT CLEAR WHETHER THE AIM IS TO ENCOURAGE SIGNIFICANT INVESTMENT IN EDUCATION, TRAINING, AND RESEARCH, AND IN DEVELOPING PARTICIPATION IN ART AND CULTURE, OR WHETHER IT IS ABOVE ALL TO SEEK NEW OUTLETS FOR EUROPEAN ECONOMIES WHOSE MODEL FOR GROWTH WILL IN THE FUTURE BE MORE FIRMLY ROOTED IN INNOVATION, CREATIVITY AND DESIGN..."

crisis"[3]. This is a useful reminder of the importance both of a museum code of ethics and of entrusting cultural institutions to the people best fitted for the task – specialists in the field in question, as long as they have demonstrated the requisite management skills. The predicted consequences of entrusting a major cultural institution to a non-specialist have now become reality: a greater emphasis on PR and event management, a new focus on the director as an individual, influence on arts programming, a lowering of ethical standards when it comes to partnerships, and a management approach based on driving up visitor numbers and ticket prices rather than defining strategic priorities and optimising the resources available, among other things.

Conclusion

Museums and the arts sector may seize the opportunity offered by the concept of creative industries and oppose attempts to instrumentalise them that run counter to their remits. They could therefore argue that giving effective support to the arts and heritage would be beneficial to growth sectors of the tertiary and service economy, including the design, education, broadcasting, tourism, luxury, and software industries. Nevertheless, such a political strategy, while providing opportunities for the artistic and cultural sectors, may appear to entail significant risks for cultural creation, experimental art, and the curatorial activities carried out by museums and historic monuments.

The arts sector should also adopt a cautious approach to commissioning economic impact studies, which may not provide a suitable answer to the crisis: while culture may be profitable, it also has a cost. It should be borne in mind that all activities have an impact on their environment: the key question is whether culture produces more economic value than other activities, which is far from certain (Benhamou 2012).

The arts sector could take those who see culture as a way out of the crisis at their word and build broad alliances and coalitions to secure funding for the arts and culture on the grounds that health, education, research, and culture represent the future of developed economies.

REFERENCES

A CREATIVE FUTURE. THE WAY FORWARD FOR THE ARTS, CRAFTS AND MEDIA IN ENGLAND, 1993, Co-ordinated by the Arts Council of Great Britain on behalf of the English arts funding system, HSMO, London.

ADMICAL-CSA, 2011, Le mécénat d'entreprise en France en 2010, Paris, ADMICAL.

ALLINNE, Jean-Pierre and Carrier, Renaud (eds), 2010, La culture au risque du marché, le mécénat face à ses acteurs, Paris, L'Harmattan.

ANDERSON, Chris, 2006, The Long Tail: Why the Future of Business is Selling Less of More, New York, HYPERION.

ANDERSON, David, 1996, "L'expérience du musée Victoria and Albert", in Musées, gérer autrement, un regard international, edited by Jean-Michel Tobelem, La documentation française, Paris.

ANDERSON, David, 1999, A Common Wealth: Museums in the Learning Age, report to the Department for Culture, Media and Sport, The Stationery Office, London.

BALLÉ, Catherine et Poulot, Dominique, 2004, Musées en Europe, La Documentation française.

BENHAMOU, Françoise, 2012, L'économie du patrimoine, La découverte, Paris.

BERTHO-HUIDAL, Michelle, 2012, Charity Business. Le grand marché de la santé mondiale, Vendémiaire, Paris.

BROMWICH, James S., 1997, "Comparaison de politiques de marketing françaises et britanniques", in Marketing et musées, edited by Jean-Michel Tobelem, Publics et Musées, n° 11-12, Presses universitaires de Lyon, Lyon.

CALDWELL, N.G., 2000, The Emergence of Museum Brands, International Journal of Arts Management, vol. 2, n° 3, Spring.

CRÉATION ET DIVERSITÉ AU MIROIR DES INDUSTRIES CULTURELLES, 2006, Actes des journées d'économie de la culture, edited by Xavier Greffe, La documentation française, Paris.

CREATIVE INDUSTRY. GENERATING INCOME FOR MUSEUMS AND GALLERIES, 1999, Museums & Galleries Commission, London.

DE LA ROCHA-MILLE, Raymond, 2002, "Cultures et gestion des musées", in Politique et musées, Groupe de recherche sur les musées et le patrimoine (GRMP), L'Harmattan, Paris.

DOUSTALY Cécile, GRAY, Clive, 2010, "Labour and the Arts : Managing Transformation ?", "Nouvelle gestion publique et réforme des services publics sous le New Labour", Journal of Contemporary British Studies, n° 8, 319-338. http://osb.revues.org/953

DOUSTALY, Cécile, 2011, "Growing Similarities in Cultural policies and politics in Britain and in France", Teaching Visual Arts in the UK and in France: a Comparative Perspective, International Conference organised by the Courtauld Institute of Art, the French Institute, the French Embassy in London,

[1] Le Monde, 25 février 2012, quote translated from French.

and the Haut Conseil de l'éducation artistique et culturelle, 14-15 June 2010, Courtauld Institute, London.

FLEMING, David, 1996, "Le musée urbain : une nouvelle vocation culturelle", in Musées, gérer autrement, un regard international, edited by Jean-Michel Tobelem, La documentation française, Paris.

FOPP, Michael A., 1997, Managing Museums and Galleries, Routledge.

IVEY, Bill, 2008, Arts, Inc.: How Greed and Neglect Have Destroyed Our Cultural Rights, University of California Press, Berkeley.

LANG, Caroline, 2001, "Action éducative et amélioration de l'accessibilité des musées pour une diversification du public", in L'avenir des musées, edited by Jean Galard, 2001, Réunion des musées nationaux, musée du Louvre, Paris.

LEARNING TO LIVE. MUSEUMS, YOUNG PEOPLE AND EDUCATION, 2009, edited by Kate Bellamy and Carey Oppenheim, Institute for Public Policy Research and National Museum Directors' Conference, London.

LES MUSÉES NATIONAUX APRÈS UNE DÉCENNIE DE TRANSFORMATIONS (2000-2010), 2011, public report, Cour des comptes, Paris.

LES STRATÉGIES CULTURELLES POUR UN NOUVEAU MONDE, 2010, Actes du Forum d'Avignon. Culture, économie, médias, 2009, Gallimard, Paris.

LETTS, C. W., Ryan, W. P. & Grossman, A, 1999, High Performance Nonprofit Organizations. Managing Upstream for Greater Impact, Wiley Nonprofit Series.

LÉVY, Maurice and Jouyet, Jean-Pierre, 2006, L'économie de l'immatériel : la croissance de demain, ministère de l'Economie, des Finances et de l'Industrie, Paris.

LIVRE BLANC DES MUSÉES, 2011, Association Générale des Conservateurs des Collections Publiques de France (AGCCPF), Paris.

LONGMAN, Peter, 1996, "La Grande-Bretagne", in Musées, gérer autrement, un regard international, edited by Jean-Michel Tobelem, La documentation française, Paris.

LOSSELEY, David, 2011, "Le Royaume-Uni", in Histoire comparée des politiques culturelles, edited by Philippe Poirrier, La Documentation française, Paris.

MARTEL, Frédéric, 2006, De la culture en Amérique, Gallimard, Paris.

MARTEL, Frédéric, 2010, Mainstream, Flammarion, Paris.

MASON, B. S., 2000, "How the Royal Academy, Tate, British Museum and the National Gallery compete for US dollars", The Art Newspaper, 18 August 2000.

MISIURA, Shashi, 2006, Heritage marketing, Elsevier, Oxford.

MUSEUMS AND GALLERIES IN BRITAIN: ECONOMIC, CREATIVE AND SOCIAL IMPACTS, 2006, Report jointly commissioned the National Museum Directors' Council (NMDC) and the Museums, Libraries and Archives Council (MLA), London.

MUSEUMS DELIVER, 2010, National Museum Directors' Conference, London.

PETTIGREW, Andrew, 1997, "Le new public management conduit à un nouveau modèle hybride public-privé", in Public-privé, special issue, Revue française de gestion, 115, September-October 1997.

Private Giving for the Public Good, 2008, National Museum Directors' Conference, London.

REGOURD, Martine (ed), 2012, Musées en mutation. Un espace public à revisiter, L'Harmattan.

ROZIER, Sabine, 2010, "Mécènes et pouvoirs publics : des relations ambivalentes", in Politiques et pratiques de la culture (edited by Philippe Poirrier), Les notices, La Documentation française, Paris.

SAUMAREZ SMITH, Charles, 2001, "The Nation's Museums: Politics and Policies", Museum Management and Curatorship, vol. 19, n° 2, Pergamon, Elsevier.

SCHIFFRIN, André, 1999, L'édition sans éditeurs, La Fabrique éditions, Paris.

SCOTT, Carol, 2000, Branding: Positioning Museums in the 21st Century, International Journal of Arts Management, vol. 2, n° 3, Spring.

SELWOOD, Sara, 2010, Making a difference: the cultural impact of museums, National Museum Directors' Council (NMDC), London.

STEVENSON, Deborah, Rowe, David and McKay, Kieryn, 2010, "Convergence in British Cultural Policy: The Social, the Cultural, and the Economic", The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society, 40:4.

TAIT, Simon, 1989, Palaces of Discovery: The Changing World of Britain's Museums, Quiller Press, London.

TEMKINE, Raymonde, 1992, Le Théâtre en l'état, éditions théâtrales, Paris.

TOBELEM, Jean-Michel, 1990, Musées et culture, le financement à l'américaine, Presses Universitaires de Lyon, Lyon.

TOBELEM, Jean-Michel, 2010, Le nouvel âge des musées. Les institutions culturelles au défi de la gestion, Armand Colin, Paris [first edition 2005].

TOBELEM, Jean-Michel, 2011, Du mécénat au capital-risque philanthropique. La professionnalisation de la collecte de fonds dans les organisations culturelles, paper presented at the 11th conference on arts and cultural management (AIMAC 2011), Antwerp, Belgium, 3-6 July 2011.

TWITCHELL, J.B., 2004, Branded Nation. The Marketing of Megachurch, College, Inc., and Museumworld, Simon & Schuster.

VALUES AND VISION: THE CONTRIBUTION OF CULTURE, 2006, National Museum Directors' Conference, London.

WALLACE, M.A., 2006, Museum Branding, AltaMira Press, Lanham.

ZUNZ, Olivier, 2012, La philanthropie en Amérique, Fayard, Paris.