

Cultural Policy in the Polder

Cultural Policy in the Polder

25 years of the Dutch Cultural Policy Act

Edwin van Meerkerk

and

Quirijn Lennert van den Hoogen (eds.)

Amsterdam University Press

Cover illustration: Koopman & Bolink: *Boothuis*, Noordoostpolder. Fotografie: Dirk de Zee.

Cover design: Coördesign, Leiden

Lay-out: Crius Group, Hulshout

ISBN 978 94 6298 625 1

e-ISBN 978 90 4853 747 1

DOI 10.5117/9789462986251

NUR 754 | 757

© The authors / Amsterdam University Press B.V., Amsterdam 2018

All rights reserved. Without limiting the rights under copyright reserved above, no part of this book may be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise) without the written permission of both the copyright owner and the author of the book.

Every effort has been made to obtain permission to use all copyrighted illustrations reproduced in this book. Nonetheless, whosoever believes to have rights to this material is advised to contact the publisher.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| Acknowledgements | 9 |
| An Introduction to Cultural Policy in the Polder <i>Edwin van Meerkerk and Quirijn Lennert van den Hoogen</i> | 11 |
| A Well-Balanced Cultural Policy An Interview with Minister of Culture Ingrid van Engelshoven <i>Marielle Hendriks</i> | 37 |
| 1. Legal Aspects of Cultural Policy <i>Inge van der Vlies</i> | 41 |
| 2. An International Perspective on Dutch Cultural Policy <i>Toine Minnaert</i> | 67 |
| 'A Subsidy to Make a Significant Step Upwards' An Interview with Arjo Klingens <i>André Nuchelmans</i> | 85 |
| 3. The Framing Game Towards Deprovincialising Dutch Cultural Policy <i>Johan Kolsteeg'</i> | 89 |
| 4. Values in Cultural Policymaking Political Values and Policy Advice <i>Quirijn Lennert van den Hoogen and Florine Jonker</i> | 107 |
| An Exercise in Undogmatic Thinking An Interview with Gable Roelofsen <i>Bjorn Schrijen</i> | 131 |
| 5. Towards a Cultural Policy of Trust The Dutch Approach from the Perspective of a Transnational Civil Domain <i>Thijs Lijster, Hanka Otte and Pascal Gielen</i> | 133 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 6. Dutch Media Policy | 151 |
| Towards the End of Reflective Diversity? | |
| <i>Erik Hitters</i> | |
| ‘A More Holistic Approach to Problems’ | 165 |
| An Interview with Hans Poll and Jacqueline Roelofs | |
| <i>Jack van der Leden</i> | |
| 7. Cultural Education Policy | 169 |
| Its Justification and Organisation | |
| <i>Teunis Ijdens and Edwin van Meerkerk</i> | |
| 8. Culture for Everyone | 195 |
| The Value and Feasibility of Stimulating Cultural Participation | |
| <i>Koen van Eijck</i> | |
| ‘A Strong Field Needs Variation and Experimentation’ | 215 |
| An Interview with Saskia Bak | |
| <i>Rogier Brom</i> | |
| 9. The People’s Palaces | 219 |
| Public Libraries in the Information Society | |
| <i>Frank Huysmans and Marjolein Oomes</i> | |
| 10. Cultural Policy at a Crossroads? | 243 |
| How the Matthew Effect, New Sociocultural Oppositions and Digitalisation Challenge Dutch National Cultural Policy | |
| <i>Erik Schrijvers</i> | |
| ‘Production is Preceded by Talent Development’ | 265 |
| An Interview with Sandra den Hamer | |
| <i>Kimberly van Aart</i> | |
| Epilogue: A Systemic View of Dutch Cultural Policy in the Next 25 Years | 269 |
| <i>Quirijn Lennert van den Hoogen and Edwin van Meerkerk'</i> | |
| Overview of Dutch Ministers of / Secretaries for Culture and their most important cultural policy documents | 287 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Appendix | 291 |
| Facts and Figures on Culture and Cultural Policy in the Netherlands <i>Kimberly van Aart, Rogier Brom, Bjorn Schrijen</i> | |
| Authors' Biographies | 315 |
| Index | 319 |

List of Tables and Figures

| | |
|--|-----|
| Figure 4.1: Distribution of values in cultural policy documents | 114 |
| Figure 4.2: Distribution of values in advice by Council for Culture | 114 |
| Table 4.1: Ranking of values in the interviews with committee members of the Council for Culture | 117 |
| Figure 4.3: Evaluation of the policy plans of theatre companies by the Council for Culture | 120 |
| Figure 4.4: Possible evaluation of the policy plans under 'embedded autonomy' | 125 |
| Table 8.1: Trends in <i>passive</i> cultural participation in the Netherlands, 2006-2014 (% of the population who attended at least once in the preceding 12 months) | 204 |
| Table 8.2: Trends in <i>active</i> cultural participation in the Netherlands, 2005-2015 | 205 |
| Figure 9.1: Expansion of the Dutch public library system (in millions) | 224 |
| Table 9.1: Income of Dutch public library organisations, 2005-2016 (in millions of Euros) | 235 |
| Figure 1: Population density in the Netherlands in 2017 | 292 |
| Figure 2: Share of inhabitants with a non-Western foreign background in total population in 2017 | 293 |
| Table 3: Number of municipalities in the Netherlands, 1900-2016 | 294 |
| Table 4: Government expenditures on cultural services in 1995-2016 (in million euros) | 295 |
| Table 5: Number of institutions subsidised on a long-term basis by the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science (OCW) and national funds for culture in 2009-2020 | 296 |
| Figure 6: Overview of institutions in the Basic Infrastructure for Culture (BIS) in 2017 | 297 |

| | | |
|------------|--|-----|
| Figure 7: | Overview of institutions receiving long-term funding from national funds for culture in 2017 | 298 |
| Figure 8: | Share of cultural sectors in BIS subsidies in 2017-2020 (in million euros) | 299 |
| Figure 9: | Share of performing arts subsectors in performing arts BIS subsidies in 2017-2020 (in million euros) | 299 |
| Table 10: | Share of national budget for culture in total national budget in 1993-2015 (in %) | 300 |
| Table 11: | Expenditures on cultural services of general government levels in the Netherlands, in surrounding countries and in the European Union in 2016 | 300 |
| Figure 12: | Share of self-generated income in cultural sectors in the Netherlands in 2015 (in %) | 301 |
| Figure 13: | Overview of museums in 2016 | 302 |
| Figure 14: | Overview of members of the Association for Theatre and Concert Hall Directors (VSCD) on 1 January 2018 | 303 |
| Figure 15: | Overview of members of the Association for Pop Music Venues and Festivals (VNPF) on 1 January 2018 | 304 |
| Figure 16: | Overview of built, non-archaeological national monuments on 31 December 2017 | 305 |
| Table 17: | Labour market in the arts and cultural heritage sector in 2005-2016 | 306 |
| Table 18: | Active and receptive cultural participation from April 2016-April 2017 | 307 |
| Figure 19: | Market shares of public and commercial television channels in total television ratings in 2017 | 307 |
| Figure 20: | Donations to culture from households, bequests, funds, companies and charity lotteries in 1997-2015 (adjusted for inflation, based on the price level of 2015, in million euros) | 308 |
| Table 21: | Donations to culture via crowdfunding platform Voordekunst.nl in 2015-2017, adjusted for inflation, based on the price level of 2015 | 309 |
| Figure 22: | Share of cultural sectors in donations to culture via crowdfunding platform Voordekunst.nl in 2017 (in euros) | 309 |
| Table 23: | Volunteers in museums, libraries and performing arts venues in 2005-2016 | 310 |

Acknowledgements

In February 2016, in the middle of a class on cultural policy, it suddenly dawned on us that in two years' time, the Cultural Policy Act would celebrate its 25th anniversary. This book is the result of that brainwave. Cultural policy researchers from various academic institutes in the country have contributed chapters to this book. The book as a whole, however, is not intended as a historical overview. On the contrary, it is aimed at the future that our students will encounter. In this volume, we have implicitly asked ourselves: for what kind of cultural policy field are we training our students? What do they need to know to be able to participate in that field as academics, future programmers, directors, politicians, curators, researchers or public officials? What topics will shape the debate for the next 25 years?

This book is the first publication of the Dutch Network for Cultural Policy Researchers, which is hosted by the Boekman Foundation in Amsterdam. Twice a year, researchers of Dutch cultural policy from various academic and vocational education institutes in the country meet in the Boekman Foundation's library to discuss the issues they face when teaching and researching cultural policy. Internationalisation is one of the most prominent of these challenges. With a few exceptions, over the course of just a few years, all but one of the Dutch-language programmes offering courses on Dutch cultural policy were transformed into English-language programmes. This poses a challenge that goes far beyond the mere translation of course content: it implies that the empirical material that courses on cultural policy are based on can no longer be in Dutch. For example, the Dutch 'standard' handbook on cultural policy, Roel Pots' *Cultuur, Koningen en Democraten* (Culture, Kings and Democrats) can no longer be prescribed to students in an international classroom. And yet our students still have the ambition to enter the Dutch cultural policy system after finishing their studies. The growing body of international students, however, have no access to the politics that play out behind the cultural field they are a part of while studying in the Netherlands. This book is intended to solve this issue. In doing so, the book also introduces the Dutch cultural policy system to an international (academic) audience.

We are grateful to the many people who have contributed to the publication of this book, first and foremost our colleagues at various Dutch universities and research institutes who were willing to write chapters in this book on the topics we selected. Also, we would like to extend our gratitude to those colleagues who were not able to contribute but who provided

helpful comments along the way. Their collective wisdom is reflected in the contents of this book. Second, we are grateful to the people at the Boekman Foundation who supported the book's publication logistically and who provided the appendix and the interviews with key figures in the Dutch cultural scene. Our thanks are also due to Thijs Hermsen of the Humanities Lab at the Faculty of Arts of Radboud University, who created the insightful maps for the appendix. A special word of acknowledgement goes to Marielle Hendriks for her relentless support and for securing funding for the book's publication as well as the conference where it was presented, and to André Nuchelmans for co-ordinating the efforts of the Boekman Foundation and acting as image editor. And finally, we would like to thank Robert Oosterhuis of the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science for his helpful suggestions and for being the linking pin between the study and practice of Dutch cultural policy.

Edwin van Meerkerk and Quirijn van den Hoogen, April 2018

An Introduction to Cultural Policy in the Polder

Edwin van Meerkerk and Quirijn Lennert van den Hoogen

1. Dutch Cultural Policy Before the Cultural Policy Act

Historically, central public authority in the Netherlands has been considered problematic. The country's origin as a confederate republic without strong central leadership has had the effect that the government usually works in a decentralised manner, giving leeway to provinces and cities. The modern Dutch state still tends to work 'bottom up', as recent trends in social and welfare policies demonstrate. As a result, the Netherlands possesses relatively few national cultural institutions in comparison to other countries. In addition, the national media historically were organised according to the 'pillarised' society, i.e. they were linked to religious and political denominations rather than to the nation-state. Before the Second World War, there was hardly any national cultural policy to speak of, apart from the preservation of cultural heritage, including national monuments and museums, and direct subsidies to a limited number of cultural institutions, such as orchestras and theatre companies. There was no separate department or Minister of culture¹: the arts were administered by the ministry of the interior. The visual arts were supported by stipends and one national prize, the Prix de Rome. The mainstay of governmental support for the cultural sector was taken up by cities, which provided facilities such as libraries, museums, art galleries, concert halls and theatre venues. Art producers such as theatre companies were largely left to their own devices.

A national, centralised cultural policy system gradually developed in the post-war years. In contrast to the centralised bureaucracy built by the Nazis, which sought to bring cultural expressions under political control, this new system, though similar in structure, aimed to support the aesthetic independence and quality of the cultural sector. The new system evolved as a result of pressure from the cultural sector, which feared quality would suffer if left to their own devices—as had been the case before the war—and from city authorities who felt ill-equipped to effectively support arts production in the country. Moreover, there was a general consensus on the need for a cultural, not just economic and architectural, reconstruction of the nation after the Nazi occupation (see the section on the support for

the national system for more details). At the same time, the rise of modern cultural genres—especially cinema—and growing possibilities for mass dissemination through radio and television required stronger oversight over the cultural sector. Over time, a truly intricate web of institutions and subsidies evolved, which ultimately led to a discussion on the desirability of such extensive involvement by the national government in the cultural sector. While the cultural policy system developed into an all-encompassing bureaucratic system over the decades, it was only provided with a legal basis as late as 1993, when the Cultural Policy Act (*Wet op het Specifiek Cultuurbeleid*, CPA) came into effect.

Rather than regulating the cultural sector, the CPA merely defines the government's role towards the sector. It allows the government to fund the sector with specific grants in aid and direct subsidies to institutions. Moreover, the CPA allows for the establishment of funding agencies to provide project subsidies to artists. Furthermore, it stipulates that the government discusses the principles and main direction of cultural policy once every four years with parliament. This was a marked improvement, as it gave parliament a say in cultural policy over a longer period of time. Until 1993, political discussions of cultural policy pertained only to specific parts of the sector and were mostly based on incidents that had arisen within the sector. Moreover, the four-year planning cycle guaranteed a relatively secure basis for the management and planning of cultural institutions, which addressed a pressing need of the sector. Precisely because the CPA does not provide any guidelines regarding the *content* of cultural policy, the Dutch system is known internationally for its stability, transparency and democratic legitimisation (Laermans 2002: 189-191). Such praise exists despite the fact that on an organisational level, the system resembles the architect-state model of Hillman-Chartrand and McCaughey (1989), a model which they define as ill-suited to parliamentary democracies, as it gives politicians too much influence over the content of cultural production. In practice, however, the system relies heavily on expert advice when allocating subsidies. At the same time, this is also a point of criticism, as these experts—who remain outside the scope of democratic control—exert influence on the spending of public funds (Laermans 2002: 192) The national perspective on the system has become increasingly critical: ever since the publication of the third policy document (for 2001-2004), various agents in cultural policy and in the public discourse have argued for either amending or fundamentally redesigning the policy system.

While this volume's focus lies on the national debates that have taken place over the past 25 years and topical issues for Dutch cultural policy in the coming years, we also incorporate an international and comparative perspective on Dutch cultural policy. There are four main reasons for doing so. First and foremost, in the political debates on Dutch cultural policy, international comparisons often serve as arguments both for and against changing the system. Second, as part of a society that is characterised by its open economy, the Dutch cultural sector is continually influenced by international developments, both economically (government budget, art trade), politically (art and culture as part of diplomacy and international trade policy), and aesthetically (as part of a globalised art system). Third, in the context of the European Union and the process of globalisation, the question of how a relatively small nation such as the Netherlands can maintain a *national* policy system has become pressing. Finally, for an academic understanding of Dutch cultural policy, a comparative perspective is necessary to highlight its intricacies and peculiarities. This volume is therefore timely and provides a basis for the debate on cultural policy.

Cultural policy and politics are discursive activities that impact how we think about the role of art and culture in society and how cultural institutions organise themselves and provide a cultural offering to society. The distinction between policy and politics—i.e., between the plans and their execution on the one hand, and on the other hand the system from which these plans originate—will not be made systematically throughout this volume. Yet the authors all endorse the point of view that policy is as much about the organisational context (policy) as it is about the discourse (politics; see also Campbell 2002). As the policy system introduced by the CPA has been in effect for a quarter century, its particular logic shapes the debates and thinking on the societal position of the arts and culture as well. This introduction starts from a historical perspective of the discourse, thus laying the ground for the subsequent chapters in which topical issues and current developments are the focus. It discusses how the CPA came about, describes its key features, and tracks discussions on and changes to the act over the past 25 years. Moreover, we will introduce the key themes and issues for understanding the Dutch cultural policy system, which will form the threads that are woven throughout the book. These issues are taken up in the following chapters, presenting an academic perspective on the current debates and highlighting issues that are likely to be prominent in the coming decades, using the research output of the various departments of Dutch universities that focus on cultural policy research.

2. The Origins of the Dutch Cultural Policy Act

As mentioned above, the Dutch cultural policy system came into being in the aftermath of the Second World War. During the Nazi occupation, a system of monitoring and censoring artists, writers and cultural institutions had been set up, which provided an institutional blueprint for the post-war period. Paradoxically, the call to maintain the infrastructure that had been built during the war came first and foremost from the artists who had been active in the resistance. For example, in the so-called 'Grey Book', clandestinely published in 1942, five leading figures in the Dutch theatre provided a blueprint for the organisation of Dutch theatre.² They envisioned a central authority at the national level that would coordinate the production and distribution of spoken theatre (Van Maanen 1997). After the war, the Artists' Federation took up the cause that the Grey Book had put on the agenda. This Amsterdam-based labour organisation-cum-lobby group that had sprung forth from the left-wing Artists' Resistance Movement put forward a radical, anti-capitalist agenda. The Federation was eyed suspiciously by many politicians as well as by the majority of artists outside of Amsterdam. Only through the efforts of its secretary, the politically talented Jan Kassies, did the group slowly gain influence on national cultural policy (Oosterbaan Martinius 1990, Pots 2010). Kassies' calls were taken up by several politicians from the confessional political parties, such as the Catholic poet and politician Bernhard Verhoeven. Thus when the Socialists and the Catholics joined forces in the first post-war coalition governments, the ground was laid for a more centrally organised cultural policy.

The first result of this collaboration between Socialists and Catholics was the establishment of a preliminary Arts Council in 1947. Half of the Council's members were artists, while the other half consisted of delegates from the 'art-loving public' and representatives of cultural institutions. The Council achieved permanent status in 1955, and in 1958 Kassies became general secretary to the Council. In this new role, Kassies managed to make the ideas of the Federation mainstream. The implementation of the plans, however, would turn out to be an arduous—and ultimately unsuccessful—task. To give but one example: when the first post-war Minister for Education, Sciences and Culture, Gerardus van der Leeuw (Social-Democrat), converted the Council's plans into concrete policy, he faced opposition from the Christian-Democrat parties and was forced to leave office. The Christian-Democrats, from both the Catholic and Protestant parties, were hesitant to give their consent to an all-too-strong central influence on what they regarded as the sphere of the church and the family. However, the seeds for a centralised cultural policy

system had been sown. Despite a mantra of endorsing bottom-up initiatives from within the cultural sector, the government gained an increasingly strong hold on arts and culture from the late 1950s onwards. The extent to which 'the arts' had any influence on public policy was soon limited to the influence of an increasingly institutionalised cultural field that showed strong centrifugal tendencies (cf. Pots 2000: 284-286).

The 1950s saw an intensification of Dutch cultural policy as the economy slowly recovered from the post-war crisis and American youth culture spread over the continent. The growing popularity of cinema and rock 'n roll music made politicians anxious for the loss of 'high' culture, giving more political clout to those arguing in favour of a centralised cultural policy. The edification of the masses, already on the agenda of earlier Socialist politicians, became a central tenet of cultural policy. A decade later, artists and younger generations called for what they saw as a more societally relevant kind of art and for the protection of the individual rights of the artists. Rather than curtailing the influence of national cultural policy, the protests led to an increase in the areas covered by national cultural policy. Cultural policy goals became extended to include welfare goals, financial support for artists, and the further codification of the artistic freedom of institutions and individual artists. Moreover, a more democratic conception of the notion of culture gradually gained ground, which implied that popular music and film became subject to government attention as well. While before the war, policies regarding cinema had long remained confined to the domain of censorship (age control having been decreed in the 1926 Cinema Act), after the war the focus of cinema policy moved towards stimulating film production and supporting the upcoming Dutch film industry, resulting in the establishment of the Film Production Fund in 1956 and the Film Academy in 1958. The first national subsidy for pop music was allocated in 1977.³ In spite of this increasing involvement, the national government remained reluctant to interfere with the arts directly and sought to restrict cultural policy to stimulating indirect conditions.

Government involvement in various areas of life expanded, particularly in health and welfare issues. During the 1960s and 1970s, the emphasis of cultural policy shifted towards welfare rather than education. The expansion of policy themes resulted in a growing set of rules and regulations. As a consequence, the bureaucracy pertaining to the cultural sector grew rapidly, and attempts to curb this growth or at least guarantee its transparency often only resulted in even more bureaucratic institutions (Zijderveld 1983). Whereas in the early post-war years, the interests of artists and the elevation of the public had been the central focus, now social relevance, welfare and

leisure moved to the foreground of cultural policy. This was most clearly visible in the move of the department of culture from the Ministry of Education and Sciences to that of Culture, Recreation and Welfare.⁴ A general Welfare Act was being prepared to provide the legal basis for the ministry. Meanwhile, the relationship between the secretary for culture and the arts sector became tense, as artists rebelled against both institutions in general and against canonical art in particular. The minister for culture in the years 1966-1971, Marga Klompé, must be credited for her role in maintaining the dialogue with protesting artists and for not allowing her political orientation (she was a member of the Catholic party) to interfere with the position of the department. At the end of her term, Klompé had prepared a policy brief on cultural policy in which she encouraged the further democratisation of cultural policy. The brief was published by her successor Piet Engels as the *Discussion Paper on Art Policy (Discussienota Kunstbeleid)* in 1972. In his version of the brief, Engels emphasised that cultural policy ought to be part of welfare policy rather than a domain of its own. The document vehemently argued against a centralised cultural policy (Pots 2000: 298-301).

By contrast, the cultural sector was still greatly in favour of drawing up a separate act to address its relationship to the government, fearing that the inclusion of culture and art in a general Welfare Act would obstruct the focus on artistic or cultural quality (Van IJsselmuiden 1993). Again, left-wing politicians took up this challenge. In 1976, Harry van Doorn of the Radical Pacifist Party sent his policy document *Art and Art Policy (Kunst en Kunstbeleid)* to parliament. The document reflected the contemporary ideals of the 1968 generation, but for many, these ideals were too radical. It was the first policy document describing cultural policy in a systematic way. In three subsequent policy briefs, Van Doorn outlined specific policies for theatre, classical music and museums. Taken together, these four documents represented the increasing rationalisation of Dutch cultural policy. However, *Art and Art Policy* was never approved by parliament due to the fall of the Den Uyl government in 1977.

Alongside the tendency to systematize cultural policy, another current can be distinguished in the relationship between government and the cultural sector. From the early 1950s, with the introduction of the so-called percentage rule, public policy provided financial support for individual (visual) artists. The percentage rule held that 1% of all investments in public infrastructure and government buildings should be spent on public art on site. In addition, in order to provide artists with a basic income, the government established the Visual Artists Scheme (*Beeldend Kunstenaars Regeling*, BKR) in 1956. The number of artists calling upon the scheme grew rapidly after 1965, growing

from 365 in that year to 3,377 in 1982 (Pots 2000: 318). The BKR was not an official part of cultural policy, however, as it was executed (and paid for) by the Department of Social Affairs. The economic crisis of the early 1980s put a stop to the expansion of government involvement, particularly in welfare. From 1982 onwards, the national government strove to take a more efficient and managerial approach to cultural policy, and artistic excellence—rather than the social relevance of art and culture—was re-established as a policy goal. As a result of this new approach, the BKR was repealed in 1987.

In short, discussions in parliament on art and culture oscillated between on the one hand pleas for a restricted role of the government in this particularly sensitive area of society and, on the other hand, a more active involvement in the cultural field in order to stimulate citizens' creative development. Although the political parties did not manage to come to an agreement on an official policy, budgets continued to increase, and the number of artists and institutions receiving government support grew steadily. The latter tendency was also the result of successful protests by artists, mainly in the theatre and music scene, calling for artistic freedom. During the same period, the BKR enabled many sculptors and painters to make a living from their work regardless of public recognition. Partly as a result of this expansion, which to many seemed virtually unchecked, a growing consensus emerged that the ever-expanding government 'interventions' had to be regulated. The time was ripe for the CPA. In a report for the Scientific Council for Government Policy in 1983, Jan Kassies—the godfather of Dutch cultural policy—concluded that the programmes of political parties did not differ in a way that led to conflicting policy orientations with regard to culture (Kassies 1983: 11). A decade later, the same Council concluded that there was no causal link between the ideas of different parties pertaining to culture and their behaviour in political decision-making (Hoefnagel 1992: 103). As a result, *specific* cultural policy as addressed in the CPA is formulated under relative political agreement, as the essential values underlying cultural policy are shared by the dominant political fractions (*ibid.* 105).⁵

Given this political consensus, it is surprising that it took until 1992 for the Act to be passed, becoming effective in 1993. This long delay might be a testament to the sensitive nature of this particular area of government policy, as it does indeed pertain to very personal choices of individuals, but it can also be attributed to the legal intricacies of the policy instruments involved. A legal development provided the final incentive to codify Dutch cultural policy, not the development of the cultural sector. In 1983, the General Administrative Law Act (*Algemene Wet Bestuursrecht*, AWB or GALA) became effective, an act that applied to any interaction between the

government and agents in society. Two general requirements of the GALA are of particular interest in the context of cultural policy. First, the act required that all subsidies be allocated (or denied) with a motivation of the decision. This motivation must refer to the legal basis for the decision, i.e., it requires a formal act. Second, all such decisions on the allocation or denial of subsidies should be open to appeal by any interested party. The primary function of the CPA, therefore, was to provide this legal framework. Thus its final design can be seen as the result of a rather pragmatic legislative process rather than being driven by ideologies (Van IJsselmuiden 1993).

The CPA, however, not only provided the legal basis for Dutch cultural policy, it also codified the roles of all parties involved in cultural policy formation. Professionals from the cultural sector, who had hitherto argued in favour of government intervention in order to ensure artistic and cultural quality, were now cast as advisors to the government on matters of the content of cultural policy. Private individuals, who had previously been an important force behind cultural initiatives, were relegated to the role of members of boards of cultural institutions. Interestingly, the national government was put in the driver's seat of the cultural policy system, a position that also follows from the fact that cultural institutions increasingly became reliant on government support for their survival. Gradually, subsidy levels had risen, in many cases even above 80% of the total income of institutions (Pots 2010). Moreover, local authorities, while still providing two-thirds of the national public budget for arts and culture, started copying the themes of the national policy documents, in many cases adopting the same four-year policy cycle, so they could align local policy with national decisions (Van den Hoogen 2010). The resulting primacy of the national government in the policy system was an unintended consequence of the legislative process (see also Van IJsselmuiden 1993). Paradoxically, while cultural institutions were increasingly bound to the government, both politically and financially, their legal position became more independent. For instance, the national museums were privatised in 1993, the same year that the CPA was introduced, and many national, local and provincial institutions followed suit.⁶

3. The Substance of the Cultural Policy Act

Although the CPA has been amended several times, its core articles have remained unchanged over the past quarter century. Articles 1 to 3 define the responsibilities of the Minister for Culture and the Council for Culture

(*Raad voor Cultuur*). The main responsibility assigned to the Minister for Culture is to provide the conditions for the preservation, development and social and geographic distribution of cultural expressions of national significance. In this, the Minister should follow the principles of excellence and diversity (the latter referring to diversity in disciplines rather than audience, the Dutch wording of Article 2 is 'kwaliteit en verscheidenheid'). While this limits the responsibility of the national government—which was intentional—these limits are not carved in stone: determining what is of national significance (i.e., excellence) is left open for discussion. The discussion on cultural policy as defined in the CPA is institutionalised in the Council for Culture. In establishing the Council, the CPA continued the practice of consulting the advisory councils on cultural heritage, the arts, the media and libraries. In 1995, these four councils would merge into the Council for Culture.

The role of parliament in cultural policy is defined in Article 3. In it, the policy cycle is defined: at least every four years, the Minister for Culture is required to submit a policy plan to parliament. The policy plans should contain a report on the previous policy cycle and developments impacting policy execution (Article 3, sub 2) as well as give general guidelines for the coming years (Article 3, sub 3). In practice, parliament was not satisfied with discussing the general policy guidelines without information on the implications for subsidy allocations. As a result, the policy plan started to function as the starting point of cultural policy formulation, which allowed cultural institutions to apply for subsidy. Subsidies would be allocated in a subsidy plan, which was published in September of the year preceding the new subsidy period. Effectively, this means that the whole procedure, including advice by the Council for Culture, takes almost two years.

Articles 4 to 8 of the CPA define the conditions under which the Minister for Culture is allowed to allocate subsidies to cultural institutions and to issue grants in aid to local authorities or funds. This provision forms the basis for all subsequent procedures for subsidies to cultural institutions at the national level.⁷ In keeping with the consensus model that characterises Dutch politics, these articles imply that the Minister will confer with local partners (provinces and municipalities). This is necessary, as cultural institutions frequently receive subsidies from the national *and* local levels, a situation that the CPA explicitly allows for. It should be noted that the CPA itself does not provide guidelines as to how responsibilities for the cultural sector should be distributed among national, regional and local authorities. In general, the Dutch national government subsidises the *production* of cultural values, and the municipalities provide funds and/or facilities for

the *dissemination* of the arts (theatre and music venues, other art spaces, festivals, museums, amateur arts and cultural participation, cultural education, and local heritage). The larger cities, however, also frequently provide direct support for artistic production. The provincial authorities have a far less clear role in the system, focussing on regional cultural heritage (including dialects and regional languages), cultural planning, and facilities in rural areas. Furthermore, some provinces also provide funds for support functions in amateur arts (e.g., the training of amateur directors and conductors) and public libraries.⁸ This distribution of responsibilities predates the CPA and is subject to constant negotiations, in some cases leading to significant local differences. The CPA merely provides the legal framework to distribute funds according to whatever agreements are reached between authorities. This again demonstrates a very system-oriented way of thinking about cultural policy, without codification of responsibilities regarding the matter. This is in sharp contrast to other policy areas such as welfare, social security and education, where local authorities execute national policies.

Article 8 provides the opportunity to develop criteria for the allocation of subsidies and entitlements through governmental decree. In practice, every four years a new decree is drawn up detailing the format for applications (i.e., what information should be included) and the criteria to be used by the Council for Culture and the national funds when evaluating subsidy applications. This allows for a transparent and flexible procedure. It also allows for the addition of criteria not explicitly formulated in the CPA. This is a peculiarity of the CPA: it shuns explicit directives for all parties involved. The only criteria mentioned in the Act are quality and diversity (in Article 2). However, criteria can be added, and in practice they are.⁹ Only in specific domains do stricter regulations apply, and usually these are governed by particular acts such as the Heritage Act, the Media Act or the Library Act. The general cultural policy seems relatively under-regulated, providing an arena for 'poldering' in the best of Dutch traditions.

The introduction of the four-year policy cycle was one of the major points of debate when the original version of the act was discussed in parliament in 1992. Members of parliament raised questions as to whether a new government could be expected to present its vision on cultural policy relatively shortly after coming into office if subsidy allocations were already fixed for a number of years. Parliament was also concerned about its right to assess the budget, given that the policy plans practically defined the budget for a period of four years. Minister Hedy D'Ancona replied that the CPA does indeed clash with parliament's right to assess budgets, but she claimed that the stability that the four-year policy cycle provides was necessary

for the cultural sector to be able to plan their activities for the longer term, something that was essential for the sector. Principles of good governance also imply that an incumbent administration cannot instantly change allocations made by previous governments. But these issues do not prevent a new Minister of Culture from drafting a new policy document, as long as these documents provide general guidelines for cultural policy and not specific requirements pertaining to specific institutions. In hindsight, Van IJsselmuiden comments, the relative stability provided to cultural institutions is probably the most successful part of the legislation (1993: 286).

Since 1993, several changes have been made to the CPA. Most of them regard technical issues, e.g., changes in the General Administrative Law Act that needed to be implemented in the CPA. The most substantial change to the CPA took place with the introduction of the Basic Infrastructure (*Basisinfrastructuur*, BIS) in 2009. This was the result of discussions regarding what should be the basis for cultural policy: should it focus on cultural institutions as such (as it had until then) or rather on the *function* that institutions perform in the cultural system? Parliament agreed to focus on the latter and approved a proposal for a system that would define types of institutions that are deemed necessary to realise the policy goals derived from the CPA. The list of BIS functions includes knowledge institutes, national museums, institutes for the performing arts, and festivals, and the BIS stipulates the distribution of these institutions over the country. The inclusion of cultural institutions in the BIS can no longer be regarded as recognition of their quality. Rather, these are institutions that guarantee the core of cultural provision in the Netherlands, i.e., the basic functions that should always be maintained. Before 2009, a negative evaluation of a theatre or dance company or orchestra in a city like Groningen or Arnhem could mean the end of support for such a facility in that particular city or region (as the subsidy would go to a positively evaluated institution elsewhere). Now the geographical location of such a facility is fixed, and the evaluation regards the question whether the application is substantial enough to fulfil the particular function. To give an example: the BIS includes the function of a Frisian theatre company to be located somewhere in the province of Friesland (in practice in its capital Leeuwarden). This reflects the position of Frisian, the nation's second official language. In theory, anyone willing to make Frisian-language theatre can apply for the position in the BIS.¹⁰ In reality, the Frisian language area is so small that there are no professional alternatives to the current Frisian-language company, Tryater. However, the BIS does not include Tryater itself, it only includes its function in the system.

In 1995, the statute of the Council for Culture was added in the CPA. The Council for Culture also underwent a significant change over the past two-and-a-half decades. Before 1995, the Arts Council consisted of a large number of artists and representatives from cultural institutions, whereas the new Council for Culture consisted of a core council of nineteen members who are considered experts in one of the artistic disciplines or central fields of cultural policy, most of them presiding over one of fifteen committees for artistic and cultural disciplines, three 'special' committees for archives, monuments, and legal issues, and a potentially unlimited number of ad-hoc committees, usually no more than half a dozen. The resulting bureaucracy, and the fact that experts rather than artists or representatives of the public made the most important decisions, eventually led to a reorganisation of the Council for Culture. As of 2005, the Council consists of only seven members in addition to a president. The Council is supported by a general-secretary, now called director. Each member is selected for his or her expertise but is required to possess a broad overview of the entire cultural field. The new members only advise on general issues and can no longer be members (or presidents) of the committees. The number of permanent committees has been reduced to three. These permanent committees perform functions in the field of monuments and heritage, such as the selection of UNESCO heritage sites. For topical issues, ad hoc committees are established. In addition, the Council for Culture works with policy advisors for particular domains (e.g., cultural education, performing arts or visual arts). These officials are supported by temporary committees of advisors for their sector consisting of experts in their field. All committees give their advice to the Council, which then decides upon the final advice given to the Minister of Culture and to parliament. These changes were incorporated in the CPA in 2014.

A final tendency in Dutch cultural policy, surfacing in the last few years, is the compartmentalisation of the field into separate policy acts. One might hypothesise that a fragmentation of cultural policy and eventual dissolution of the CPA is imminent, but such conclusions cannot yet be drawn. The overall tendency towards discipline-specific policy, however, is unmistakable. One example is the public library system which was included in the CPA (then Article 11) in 1993, indicating the national government had responsibility for a national system of libraries. This implied that public libraries operating independently of the national system lost their title as 'public' library. The recognition that the libraries operate in a national system was important, as it promoted and enabled the development of a common digital framework in which all public libraries are obliged to participate. In 2015, Article 11 was dropped from the CPA when the Public Library Act came into effect.¹¹

The most important example of the tendency towards compartmentalisation, however, is the field of museums and heritage. In 2016, the Heritage Act was effectuated, combining previous legislation on heritage in order to systematise the 'definitions, procedures, and rules for preservation' in prior regulations (OCW 2014). The Heritage Act may be seen as the final stage in a process of emancipation of heritage policy over the past decades. An important stepping stone in this process was the introduction of the State Art Collection (*Collectie Nederland*), a delineated list of objects defining Dutch national identity. The debate on the State Art Collection was sparked by the acquisition of a Mondriaan painting, *Victory Boogie Woogie*, in 1998 by the state (financed by the Dutch National Bank on the occasion of the introduction of the euro). A year earlier, the concept of a national collection was institutionalised in the State Art Collection Institute (*Instituut Collectie Nederland*), a decision that in retrospect could hardly have been more timely. The idea of a collection of art representing Dutch identity struck a chord in Dutch society, resulting in the decision in 2006 to establish a formalised canon of national history and a museum for national history, although the plan for the museum was abolished in 2011. In 2017, the Dutch Open Air Museum in Arnhem opened an (indoor) permanent exhibition representing the canon of Dutch history in 50 'windows' representing people, events and places from the past and the present.

The exhibition in Arnhem was the final result of a long debate in politics and the press on the status of national history in education. Although the plans for a separate Museum of National History were aborted, a standard curriculum for history education was adopted in 2010. The discussion on heritage, history and national identity is part of a broader re-assessment of the value of heritage in society. With the introduction of the Heritage Act, heritage was separated from the rest of cultural policy. The Heritage Act is concerned with all heritage, from monumental buildings to intangible heritage. The State Art Collection mentioned above is also subject to the Act, as are 39 specifically listed museums. The Heritage Act regulates the management of museum collections and finances the museum's accommodation. For other ends and purposes, such as exhibitions and educational programmes, museums are still referred to the regulations resulting from the CPA. For the 39 national museums under the Heritage Act, this provides a high degree of stability. They are no longer subjected to four-year policy cycles and the whims of consecutive Ministers of Culture. Other museums were, and still are, largely dependent on municipal funding for their existence. Because of this development, heritage will not be discussed separately in this volume.

4. Key Themes in 25 Years of Cultural Policy Debate

As indicated above, an important recurring issue in the Dutch debate on cultural policy concerns the balance of influence between the central government and local and regional authorities. Usually, authorities in the periphery, i.e. outside the Rim City (the megalopolis that covers the major cities in the western part of the country: Amsterdam, Utrecht, Rotterdam and The Hague) feel underprivileged, as most central cultural institutions in the Netherlands are located in Amsterdam—such as the Rijksmuseum, the ‘filmmuseum’ EYE and the National Opera—or in Rotterdam, such as the New Institute (*Het Nieuwe Instituut*, the national institute for Architecture and Design). However, Article 2 of the CPA explicitly sets as a goal the geographical spread of cultural facilities. ‘Regional’ representatives have regularly pointed out the uneven distribution of public funds, for example by calculating per capita subsidies per province (e.g. Van Deijck & Raijmakers 1994). However, such calculations have not made a significant impact on the distribution of funds. Whether as a result of the predominance of the Rim City in cultural policy or a wider tendency of the cities in the west to become more dominant, the cultural sector in the Netherlands has gravitated towards Amsterdam. Indeed, many of the institutions located there provide programmes over the whole country. Nonetheless, for local politicians the process of drawing up a cultural policy plan has evolved into lobbying for national support of regionally oriented institutions. And indeed, the success of local policies is measured in terms of national subsidies flowing to peripherally located institutions.

The Council for Culture has recently suggested a redesigning of the policy process so that the process starts with the policy plans of regional authorities rather than a national plan. Instead of the current centralised system with its corollary of regional distribution, the national government should ‘support’ local ambitions. The Council has also advised that a reevaluation take place of what functions should be part of the BIS with a greater focus on the functioning of cultural institutions in their local environment. Taking the local or regional rather than the national perspective as a point of departure might solve some of what the Council denotes as ‘persistent issues’ (Raad voor Cultuur 2015: 21) of cultural politics in the Netherlands which mainly relate to the ineffective interaction of the local and national levels. In a recent publication (Raad voor Cultuur 2017), the Council takes a step back in this debate by suggesting that the government first draw up new goals for the CPA, as the current formulation of Article 2 is very vague and does not guide concrete actions for all agents involved in the policy

process. The Council reasons that if the national and local levels agree on the goals of cultural policy, their joint actions might become more effective. The current government seems to be taking up these suggestions (Van Engelshoven 2018).¹²

One of the issues stressed by the Council for Culture in their suggestion to focus on the local or regional level is cultural participation. This has been a persistent theme in cultural policy ever since 1993. Enhancing cultural participation was one of the goals behind the efforts to reconnect cultural policy and educational policy when the Directorate for Arts and Culture was moved from the Welfare Department to the Ministry of Education and Sciences in 1994. Two years later, Secretary for Culture Aad Nuis (of the Social-Liberal Democrats, D66) launched a new era in arts education policy with his *Culture and School* policy brief (Netelenbos & Nuis 1996). Ever since, the ministry has devised programmes to improve in-school cultural education (see chapter 7). National programmes were meant to entice teachers and school boards to take cultural education to the next level and to improve its quality. As described above, notions of cultural democracy started to become increasingly important in cultural policy from the 1960s onwards. Pop music and film became suitable subjects in cultural education programmes. Moreover, in 1999, Nuis' successor, Rick van der Ploeg (of the Labour Party) introduced a new policy instrument, an 'Action Plan' for cultural participation, which aimed to increase younger generations and ethnic minorities' access to the cultural system. As with the Culture and School programme, the Action Plan relied heavily on the cooperation of provincial and local governments, thus initiating a phase of inter-governmental cooperation. The basis for the Action Plan was a co-funding programme by local authorities and the ministry. This involved the ministry more directly in subsidising culture than had been intended in the CPA. Although the programme was extended for another four years, this level of involvement was deemed undesirable. In 2009, the Cultural Participation Fund (*Fonds Cultuurparticipatie*) was set up to continue the programme, bringing it in line with the requirements of the CPA.

Despite these initiatives on cultural participation, evidence of a substantial rise in participation has not occurred (see also chapter 8). It should be stressed that participation is a particularly difficult issue to address from the national level, as most facilities in the Netherlands are the remit of municipalities. Van Maanen (2008) indicates the split as a particularity of the Dutch performing arts system, a rarity in international comparison, which hinders effective communication between producers and programmers. The

same problem occurs in the visual arts and in heritage, as museums and galleries are nearly all the responsibility of municipalities and provinces. This may be one of the key problems of the policy system: apart from some subsidy schemes directed at 'programming' institutions that are executed by the national funds, the system is oriented towards production, allowing artists to 'ignore' considerations of reach and public attention to a large extent.

The cultural system also turned out to be particularly resistant to government intervention with regard to the inclusion of ethnic minorities. As early as 1999, when Van der Ploeg had published his brief *Make Way for Cultural Diversity (Ruim baan voor culturele diversiteit)*, some politicians explicitly aimed to influence the cultural sector in this respect. However, the proposed policy instruments did not receive much political or public support. It was only as recently as 2010 that the Code of Cultural Diversity (*Code Culturele Diversiteit*) was launched by the cultural sector. The Council for Culture finally employed diversity as a subsidy criterion in 2017 (see chapter 4), when the government had already dropped the issue from the policy agenda. Moreover, as the ethnic diversity of city populations varies greatly in the Netherlands, the Council for Culture's stress on the local or regional position of cultural institutions might make the issue more easily addressable in cultural politics.

Related to the issue of cultural participation and ethnic diversity, cultural governance and entrepreneurialism have been constant concerns of Dutch cultural politics. Secretary for Culture Van der Ploeg introduced the notion of 'cultural entrepreneurship' in 1999 in an effort to attune cultural institutions more towards the needs of their audiences and to seize business opportunities in order to enhance their reach. A knowledge and training institution, Culture+Entrepreneurship (*Cultuur+Ondernemen*), was incorporated in the policy system based on British examples, and a norm for financial self-reliance was introduced. Also, art schools were required to address entrepreneurship in their curriculum. Ever since, cultural entrepreneurship has been present in almost all policy documents. The issue finally became the central tenet of cultural policy in 2011, when secretary Halbe Zijlstra issued his policy brief *More than Quality: A New Vision of Cultural Policy (Meer dan kwaliteit: een nieuwe visie voor cultuurbeleid)*. Here, the notion of entrepreneurship was used to redress the 'addiction' of the cultural sector to subsidies. The (short-lived) minority coalition government of Liberals and Christian-Democrats, supported in parliament by the right-wing populist Freedom Party, cut some 20% of the national budget for arts and cultural.

This austerity measure had an even greater impact on the fine arts and performance sector, as cultural heritage was spared.¹³ The budget cuts were accompanied by a Gift and Inheritance Tax Act (*Geefwet*), which tried to promote private donations to the arts by introducing tax benefits for donors. Interestingly, the Act put the tax incentive on the side of the donor rather than the cultural institution. Even though the act was presented as a way to offset the accompanying austerity measures, no significant rise in the volume of donations has been recorded (meaning that only donors have benefited from the act).

It is important to note that for the first time, criteria regarding cultural entrepreneurship and cultural governance were made *equally important* to criteria regarding artistic quality or public reach. Although Zijlstra's successor, Jet Bussemaker, eased the focus on economic profits for cultural institutions to encompass what she calls 'societal value', entrepreneurial criteria still play a crucial role in evaluations by the Council for Culture and the national Performing Arts Funds, for instance (see chapter 4). The introduction of entrepreneurship and cultural governance in cultural politics can be regarded as a reflection of the growing focus on professionalisation in Dutch cultural policy. Increasingly, the government has taken an interest in how cultural institutions are managed, how (and what kind of) audiences are reached, and how subsidised institutions manage their risks. In 2003, a handbook for cultural governance was published, which was replaced by the Code of Cultural Governance in 2006. In 2013, the code was updated by experts from the field. Currently, the code provides guidelines for the rules of conduct of the boards and management of cultural institutions and their accountability towards subsidisers and the society at large. The code is enforced not only by the ministry and national funds; private cultural funds such as the Prince Bernhard Cultural Fund (*Prins Bernhard Cultuurfonds*) also expect recipients of subsidies to respect the code. The fact that the code has been developed by representatives from the sector itself, however, suggests that the issue also reflects the professionalisation of the sector itself.

One of the constant threads in the legitimisation of cultural policy has been the economic impact of arts and culture. This issue is particularly relevant for local governments, as the economic impact of the arts and heritage mostly accrue to local economies. The heritage in cities such as Amsterdam, Delft or Den Bosch attracts many tourists. Their spending mostly leads to local tax income, while salaries earned in the tourism industry also lead to tax income for the national government. Large-scale art facilities also attract tourists to cities. Since the 1980s, cities have focused on cultural facilities

in their promotion campaigns, often focussing on particular facilities. For example, Arnhem has a focus on fashion; Eindhoven (home to the Philips company) specialises in light, technology and design; and Amsterdam has the heritage of the Dutch Golden Age and world-famous dance music. Frequently, economic arguments are the driving motives behind local government investments in large cultural facilities.

The 'classical' argument of economic impact has been losing its appeal as an argument in cultural policy. Originally, the notion of the creative class and the creative city (Florida 2002, 2004) was taken up wholesale in Dutch cultural politics, particularly at the local level (Van den Hoogen 2010). Around the turn of the millennium, national cultural policy also began to be influenced by these ideas. The core argument was that the variety of cultural facilities rather than their size is what determines (economic) impact. The cultural sector came to be considered an asset in the creative economy. In 2005, Secretary Medy Van der Laan took up this idea in a policy document she drew up together with her colleague at the Ministry of Economic Affairs. *Our Creative Capital (Ons Creatieve Vermogen*, Van der Laan & Van Gennip 2005) is the first policy brief to investigate the possibilities of connecting cultural and economic policies. Ever since, both ministries have regularly published policy briefs on the subject. Arts and culture have been considered part of the creative sector, one of the top priorities in the national economic Top Sector Policy.

Economic aspects of cultural policy also relate to the income of artists. Apart from the social policy regarding individual artists (BKR) mentioned above, several measures to improve the income of artists have been implemented and also withdrawn. After the end of the BKR, initiatives such as the Artists Income Provision Act (*Wet Inkomen Kunstenaars*, WIK) and its successor the Labour and Income Provision for Artists Act (*Wet Werk en Inkomen Kunstenaars*, WWIK) sought to provide provisions to the general unemployment regulations. These acts provided artists with a basic income, allowing them to build a career in the arts. The WWIK was repealed in 2012. Parliament felt that artists should not be regarded any differently than other professionals. Just like the BKR, this specific legislature was not part of cultural policy and fell under the remit of the Ministry for Social Affairs. With the repeal of the WWIK, efforts to support artists via social policy came to an end.

This, however, had not resolved the problems that artists faced. In 2016, the Social and Economic Council (*Sociaal-Economische Raad*, SER) and the Council for Culture published an alarming report on the income of

Dutch artists, concluding that artists could hardly make a living from their activities. 42% of all artists are self-employed. Many others are on unemployment benefits and have only short-term engagements or combine such engagements with a job on the side. Although this is in line with a growing flexibilisation of the labour market as a whole, the arts seem to be taking the brunt of the burden. Not without merit, Pascal Gielen (2013) has argued that cultural workers have been the model employees for the new post-Fordist economy. Minister of Culture Jet Bussemaker acknowledged the problem and took up criteria for ‘good employership’ in her regulations. This implies that the proper payment of cultural workers has become a matter of good governance on the part of cultural institutions. As Bussemaker was not able to supply additional funds to implement the measures, the issue has been left to the sector to solve. Bussemaker’s reaction does present a deviation from earlier government involvement with the issue of artists’ income. Moreover, the CPA does not address the issue at all. Nor does it address economic impact in general. However, cultural policy officials have increasingly busied themselves with these issues, blurring the lines between cultural policies—geared towards the quality and diversity of cultural expressions—and issues of income and economic impact.

A final recurrent theme in debates on Dutch cultural policy regards the international position of Dutch art. The theme is already present in the first policy document published under the CPA. As a former member of the European Parliament, Minister of Culture Hedy D’Ancona was acutely aware of the international perspective on Dutch art and culture. Representation of Dutch culture abroad is facilitated through Dutch cultural institutes. The Foundation for International Cultural Activities (SICA, now DutchCulture) was set up in 1999 to promote the international activities of Dutch cultural institutes and to organise cultural exchange initiatives. The organisation is funded by both the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. International cultural policy aspires to achieve two aims: to support Dutch artists and cultural institutions in their efforts to gain an international audience and to use art and culture to enhance international relations. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs also hosts the department for international cultural cooperation, a unit that facilitates the activities of cultural attachés employed at Dutch embassies and consulates. International cultural policy is coordinated by the department, reporting to both the Minister for Culture and the Minister of Foreign Affairs. Specific policy briefs on the topic are produced on a regular basis. As a result, the general cultural policy documents devote little attention to the matter.

International cultural policy is discussed in more detail in chapter 2 of this book.

5. The Structure of This Book

As the following chapters focus on particular issues within the debates sketched above, the chapters do not describe the policy system itself, nor do they give an overview of the data underlying the system. To provide the background necessary to follow the discussion surrounding Dutch cultural policy, the basic structure of the cultural policy system has been described in an appendix. Furthermore, the appendix provides a shorthand dataset on the functioning of art and culture in the Netherlands. The data available at cultuurindex.nl is the basis for this overview. This is where the geographical distribution of the supply and use of art and culture is provided per sector. Topical data can also be acquired at www.cultuurindex.nl, a website devoted to statistics related to Dutch cultural policy. The appendix is authored by employees of the Boekman Foundation (*Boekmanstichting*), the institute that documents Dutch cultural policy and academic research conducted on the discipline. Interspersed throughout the book are six interviews with cultural leaders of the Dutch cultural sector, which provide the perspective from ‘the floor’, so to speak. The interviews, conducted by the Boekman Foundation, lay out the view of these leaders on the developments of the Dutch cultural sector in the coming decades.

The chapters in this volume are written by Dutch cultural policy researchers from various academic institutes in the country devoting departments to this area of study. The volume is organised in three parts. The first part focuses on the legal and organisational arrangements and the intended outcomes of Dutch cultural policy. Inge van der Vlies discusses the legal framework of Dutch cultural policy in chapter 1. The framework is rather peculiar from an international perspective, as the discussion above may also have indicated. In chapter 2, Toine Minnaert addresses the international perspective by discussing the extent to which ‘the Dutch model’ differs from other national models. He also explains the Dutch perspective on international cultural policy and cooperation. In chapter 3, Johan Kolstee examines cultural entrepreneurship and the conflicting responsibilities that its inclusion in cultural politics has entailed for management of cultural institutions. Chapter 4 focuses on the interplay between cultural politics and expert advice. Quirijn van den Hoogen and Florine Jonker explain how value orientations of the policy documents have changed and whether and how

these have impacted the evaluation of subsidy applications by the Council for Culture. In chapter 5, Thijs Lijster, Hanka Otte and Pascal Gielen discuss how cultural policies relate to the public sphere and how notions of the arts as a public sphere are represented in Dutch cultural policies in practice.

The second part looks at typical issues that have come up during the last decades and will remain issues for the coming years. This part includes two chapters focusing on a particular sector of the cultural field: one on public media by Erik Hitters (chapter 6) and one on public libraries by Frank Huysmans and Marjolein Oomes (chapter 9). It is an important insight into Dutch cultural policy that these fields, as in the case of heritage policy, are no longer subject to the CPA. Each domain has, more or less recently, received its separate legal arrangement. Nonetheless, these fields are frequently discussed in cultural policy documents and are seen as an integral part of the country's cultural infrastructure. Hence, not including these in this volume would have been an omission. The chapters discuss the particular rules that apply to these domains and the main developments expected in the coming decades. Furthermore, Part II discusses one of the most prominent topics in Dutch cultural policy in recent decades: accessibility. Teunis IJdens and Edwin van Meerkerk shed light on how cultural education policies evolved in the Netherlands and discuss the key issues to be addressed in the coming years. Koen van Eijck addresses cultural participation in the Netherlands in chapter 8 and the type of research that is necessary to properly evaluate the success of cultural policy in this respect.

In Part III of the book, the threads connecting previous chapters are picked up. Chapter 10 takes a long-term perspective. Erik Schrijvers, one of the authors of *Reassessing Culture (Cultuur herwaarderen)*, a recent report on Dutch cultural policy by the Scientific Council for Government Policy (*Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid, WRR*), addresses key tensions that he believes will determine the coming decades, focussing on the impact of digitalisation, the growing unease within Dutch society about its cultural roots, which introduces difficult questions as to how cultural policy can and should deal with those who feel 'culturally insecure'.

In the epilogue, we apply a systemic approach to Dutch cultural policy, discussing its bureaucratic tendencies and linking these up with the current debate on the redesign of the policy system. We hope this book contributes to the debate on the future of Dutch national cultural policy, or at least its future for the next 25 years.

Notes

1. Throughout this book two titles are used to indicate the person responsible for cultural policy in the Dutch government. 'Minister of Culture' is used to indicate those members of government with the rank of *minister*, 'Secretary for Culture' for *staatssecretaris*. There is no essential difference between their roles or legal position other than the minister's final responsibility for the budget (see the overview of Ministers of / Secretaries for Culture at the end of the book).
2. This booklet was written by five authors from the artist resistance movements but was also discussed in a wider committee of theatre practitioners, amongst them well-known actors and directors (Van Maanen 1997: 47). Therefore the booklet's contents can be regarded as a vision of Dutch spoken theatre shared by the profession.
3. The subsidy was allocated to the Pop Music Foundation Netherlands (*Stichting Popmuziek Nederland*). Its aim was to realise a pop music institute that would develop several artists, lobby pop music interests and act as impresario. However, the first subsidies did not allow for the realisation of this ambition (Nuchelmans 2002).
4. In 1982, the Ministry of CRM was reorganised into the Ministry of Welfare, Public Health and Culture (*Welzijn, Volksgezondheid en Cultuur*, WVC). In 1994, cultural policy 'returned' to the Ministry of Education and Sciences which henceforth has been renamed OCW (*Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap*).
5. However, slight differences still exist. Traditionally, the Christian-Democrats focus on amateur arts and the geographical distribution of cultural facilities, the Social-Democrats focus on the social reach of facilities, and the Liberals traditionally focus on artistic quality and the autonomy of the sector (and its consumers). Also, parties employ different phrasings on cultural policy: the Liberals tend to use more economical and legal reasoning than the other parties do, whereas Christian-Democrats stress the responsibility of communities, for instance (Hoefnagel 1992: 105).
6. The CPA is deeply affected by notions of New Public Management which have risen to prominence in Dutch public administration from the 1980s. See chapter 4 for more information on this topic.
7. The possibility to set up funds was only introduced by Minister D'Ancona in the final reading of the CPA in parliament. In doing so, she incorporated a general principle of the Lubbers government (1989-1994), which was to devolve decision-making power from the central authority either to local authorities (geographical decentralisation) or to private foundations set up for specific purposes (functional decentralisation). National funds were set up for the performing arts, the visual arts and design and film, and for amateur arts. A literature fund was already effective. At first these funds allocated project subsidies and bursaries to artists, but in later years they were also allowed to provide two or four-year funding to cultural institutions.

8. The distribution of responsibilities regarding cultural education is different. While the content of education programmes is the responsibility of the schools, in line with the national education policy, the national government determines the end levels to be achieved by students. These include end levels for musical and cultural education. Although the nationally subsidised cultural institutions are evaluated by the Council for Culture based on how they develop educational programmes, the connection between the cultural and education sectors is facilitated mostly by local authorities who in many cases develop elaborate cultural education programmes and provide funds for instating liaison officers in schools. Moreover, local authorities subsidise institutions for cultural education outside schools.
9. It is worth mentioning that criteria regarding the management of cultural institutions or cultural entrepreneurship have become very important in the last decade. Since 2013, criteria of cultural entrepreneurship—in practice, financial criteria—have become as important as the evaluation of subsidy applications. Until 2013, they had always been criteria that were assessed *after* quality had been established, but now they are calculated prior to the quality assessment. See chapter 4 for a discussion of the implications of such changes over time.
10. The Frisian language is recognised as an official language by the Dutch state at the level of Chapter II of the European Charter for Minority Languages. All other Dutch regional languages are merely recognised at the level of Chapter III. In practice, this means they are dialects, while Frisian can be used in official government documents and in court.
11. See chapter 9 for a discussion of Dutch public libraries.
12. This current debate is not fully discussed in this book, as all chapters were written prior to the publication of Secretary Van Engelshoven's policy document *Cultuur in een Open Samenleving (Culture in an Open Society)*. We will revisit the current debate in the epilogue.
13. Although the cultural budget had been pruned by earlier governments in times of economic crisis, e.g. during the 1980s and the early 2000s, the cultural sector was always spared to some extent; in percentage terms, budget cuts were always relatively mild in relation to reductions of the total government budget. In 2011, austerity measures amounted to 10% of government spending while in the cultural sector they ran up to 20%. The media budget was reduced by similar percentages.

Bibliography

- Campbell, John L. 2002. "Ideas, Politics, and Public Policy", *Annual Review of Sociology*, vol. 28: 21-38.
- Gielen, Pascal. 2013. *Creativity and Other Fundamentalisms*. Amsterdam: Mondriaanfonds.

- Florida, Richard. 2002. *The Rise of the Creative Class And How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life*. New York: Perseus Book Group.
- . 2004. *Cities and the Creative Class*. Abingdon: Taylor & Francis.
- Hillman-Chartrand, Harry, and Claire McCaughey. 1989. "The Arm's Length Principle: An International Perspective". In: Milton C. Cummings Jr. and J. Mark Davidson Shuster (eds.), *Who is to Pay for the Arts. The International Search for Models of Arts Support*, pp. 43-79. New York: American Council for the Arts.
- Hoefnagel, Frans J.P.M. 1992. *Cultuurpolitiek: het mogen en het moeten* [Cultural Politics: Between What One Might and Should Do]. The Hague: Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid [Scientific Council for Government Policy].
- Kassies, Jan. (1983) *Nottities over een heroriëntatie van het kunstbeleid* [Notes on Reorienting Arts Policy]. The Hague: Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid [Scientific Council for Government Policy].
- Laermans, Rudi. (2002) *Het cultureel regiem. Cultuur en beleid in Vlaanderen* [The Cultural Regime. Culture and Policy in Flanders]. Tiel: Lannoo
- Netelenbos, Tineke, and Aad Nuis. 1996. *Cultuur en School* [Culture and School]. The Hague: SDU.
- Nuchelmans, André. 2002. *Dit gebonk dient tot het laatste toe te worden bestreden* [This Pounding Must Be Fought to the Very Last Moment]. Amsterdam: Boekmanstudies.
- Pots, Roel. 2010. *Cultuur, Koningen en Democraten. Overheid en Cultuur in Nederland* [Culture, Kings and Democrats. Government and Culture in the Netherlands]. Amsterdam: Boom.
- Oosterbaan Martinius, Warna. 1990. *Schoonheid, Welzijn, Kwaliteit; Kunstbeleid en verantwoording na 1945* [Beauty, Welfare, Quality; Art Policy and Legitimation after 1945]. The Hague: SDU.
- Raad voor Cultuur [Council for Culture]. 2015. *Agenda Cultuur 2017-2020 en verder* [Agenda for Culture 2017-2020 and Beyond]. The Hague: Raad voor Cultuur.
- . 2017. *Cultuur voor stad, land en regio, de rol van stedelijke regio's in het cultuurbestel* [Culture for City, Land and Region. The Role of Urban Regions in the Cultural System]. The Hague: Raad voor Cultuur [Council for Culture].
- Sociaal-Economische Raad and Raad voor Cultuur. 2016. *Verkenning Arbeidsmarkt Cultuursector* [Enquiry Labour Market for the Cultural Sector]. The Hague: SER and Raad voor Cultuur [Social-Economic Council and Council for Culture]. Available at https://www.ser.nl/~media/files/internet/publicaties/overige/2010_2019/2016/verkenning-arbeidsmarkt-cultuursector/verkenning-arbeidsmarkt-cultuursector.ashx (downloaded 27 February 2018).
- Van Deijck-Hofmeester, Carla, and Willem-Jan Raijmakers. 1994. *Er is meer tussen stad en staat; de provincie: partner in kunst- en cultuurbeleid* [Between City and State; The Province: Partner in Art and Culture Policies]. The Hague: IPO.
- Van den Hoogen, Quirijn Lennert. 2010. *Performing Arts and the City; Municipal Cultural Policy in the Brave New World of Evidence-Based Policy*. PhD dissertation, Groningen University.
- Van der Laan, Medy, and Carien van Gennip. 2005. *Ons Creatieve Vermogen* [Our Creative Capital]. The Hague: Ministerie van OCW en EZ [Ministry of Education, Culture and Science & Ministry of Economic Affairs]. Available at <https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten/rapporten/2009/08/26/ons-creatief-vermogen-brief-cultuur-en-economie> (downloaded 27 February 2018).
- Van Engelshoven, Ingrid. 2018. *Cultuur in een Open Samenleving* [Culture in an Open Society]. The Hague: Ministerie van OCW [Ministry of Education, Culture and Science].
- Van Ijsselmuiden, Peter. 1993. "Gevonden Waarheden. De ontstaansgeschiedenis van de Wet op het specifiek cultuurbeleid" [Found Truths. The Genesis of the Cultural Policy Act], *Boekmancahier* 5 (17): 280-292.

- Van Maanen, Hans. 1997. *Het Nederlandse Toneelbestel van 1945 tot 1995* [The Dutch Theatre System between 1945 and 1995]. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- . 2008. "A World of Independents in the Dutch Theatre System". In: Cas Smithuijsen and Ineke van Hamersveld (eds), *State on Stage. The Impact of Public Policies on the Performing Arts in Europe*, pp. 122-138. Amsterdam: Boekman Foundation.
- Winsemius, Aletta. 1999. *De overheid in spagaat: theorie en praktijk van het Nederlandse kunstbeleid* [Government Doing the Splits: Theory and Practice of Dutch Art Policy]. Amsterdam: Thela Thesis.
- Zijderveld, Anton C. 1983. "Transformatie van de verzorgingsstaat. De moeilijke balans van vrijheid, gelijkheid en solidariteit" [Transformation of the Welfare State. The Difficult Balance of Freedom, Equality and Solidarity]. In: Philip Abraham Idenburg (ed.), *De nadagen van de verzorgingsstaat. Kansen en perspectieven voor morgen* [The Latter Years of the Welfare State. Opportunities and Threats for Tomorrow]. Amsterdam: Meulenhoff.