



HAL
open science

Analysis of the European historical and political experience in acknowledging and promoting the values of culture

Claire Dedieu, Félix Dupin-Meynard, Eszter György, Emmanuel Négrier, Gábor Oláh, Gábor Sonkoly

► To cite this version:

Claire Dedieu, Félix Dupin-Meynard, Eszter György, Emmanuel Négrier, Gábor Oláh, et al.. Analysis of the European historical and political experience in acknowledging and promoting the values of culture: Deliverable number D1.5. [Research Report] CEPEL; ELTE. 2020. hal-03204448

HAL Id: hal-03204448

<https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-03204448>

Submitted on 21 Apr 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



UNCHARTED

UNCHARTED

Understanding, Capturing and Fostering the Societal Value of Culture



The UNCHARTED project received funding under the Horizon 2020 Programme of the European Union

Grant Agreement number: 870793

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Deliverable number | D1.5 |
| Title | Analysis of the European historical and political experience in acknowledging and promoting the values of culture |

| | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Due date | October 2020 |
| Actual date of delivery to EC | 30 th October, 2020 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Included (indicate as appropriate) | Executive Summary | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Abstract | <input type="checkbox"/> | Table of Contents | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|-------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|

Project Coordinator:

Prof. Arturo Rodriguez Morató

Universitat de Barcelona

Email: rodriguez.morato@ub.edu

Technical Coordinator:

Antonella Fresa

Promoter S.r.l.

Email: fresa@promoter.it

Project WEB site address:

<http://www.Uncharted-culture.eu>

Context:

| | |
|--|--|
| Partner responsible for deliverable | CNRS / ELTE |
| Deliverable author(s) | Claire Dedieu, Félix Dupin-Meynard, Eszter György, Emmanuel Négrier, Gábor Oláh, Gábor Sonkoly |
| Deliverable version number | 1 |
| Dissemination Level | Public |

Statement of originality:

This deliverable contains original unpublished work except where clearly indicated otherwise. Acknowledgement of previously published material and of the work of others has been made through appropriate citation, quotation or both.

CULTURAL VALUES IN ACTION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| Executive Summary..... | 5 |
| Introduction | 6 |
| 1. Measuring the value of Culture | 6 |
| Why is it so difficult to measure the value of culture? | 6 |
| Differentiation/Conciliation | 7 |
| 2. From the catalog of cultural values to the FIVE fingers of valuation..... | 8 |
| 3. The dynamics of valuation | 9 |
| 3.1. The values of "democracy" in European cultural policies | 10 |
| 3.2. Cultural heritage | 11 |
| 3.3. When Culture meets Sustainable Development..... | 13 |
| 4. Conclusion..... | 14 |
| 5. References..... | 15 |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This paper questions the configurations in which European cultural policies attribute values to culture. It begins with a reflection on the meaning of value, then goes on to identify, through the analysis of a corpus of scientific articles, books and research reports as well as press articles, the numerous values identifiable in the history of cultural policies. We propose a principle of classification into 5 major families of values: democracy, identity, well-being, aesthetics and economy. Finally, we describe the dynamics of emergence and transformation of the values attributed to culture in historical configurations, through 3 examples: the valuation of heritage, the conflicts over the values of democracy, and the values underpinning the concept of sustainable development. Our exploratory research shows that values already present in the 20th century are becoming increasingly important in cultural policies, without taking precedence over values with which they can compete or, on the contrary, find a form of compatibility.

INTRODUCTION

In order to document the question of the value of culture, it is at first useful to analyze and gather literature of the value of culture, on the one hand, and to propose an operational definition of it in the perspective of fieldwork, on the other hand (I).

Then, five main cultural values emerged from an empirical corpus based on three main sources (II):

- A) The study of the 20-year summaries of the *International Journal of Cultural Policy and Cultural Trends*. These are two central journals on cultural policy issues, with many references to what can be identified as the value of culture.
- B) The analysis of the national cultural policy profiles gathered in the Compendium of Cultural Policies (45 profiles).
- C) The review of a body of mainly monographic and comparative literature on cultural policies, in which we also considered how the value of culture was identified and understood.

Finally, in order to document how values are born and evolve within socio-historical configurations, we needed to specify the configurations within which the emergence of values (III). These configurations are particularly numerous. We therefore focused on three cases which, after an initial review of the literature, seemed significant to us: the trajectories of heritage enhancement; the democratic value of culture; and the evolution of cultural values in contact with the norm of sustainable development. Each of these three components illustrates a facet of this production of cultural value.

1. MEASURING THE VALUE OF CULTURE

The central reflection of this first part is therefore on how to reconcile the economic, sociological, political and philosophical approaches to value. Beyond the different ways of defining and circumscribing a value, an analysis of the literature quickly convinced us of a consensus around a few elements of definition. This is what will enable us to approach the corpus of values associated with culture, in order to propose a first synthesis work, in the second part.

Why is it so difficult to measure the value of culture?

It is difficult to define what a value is. In fact, several theories of value coexist in the social sciences in general, and particularly in economics: the labour theory of value (Ricardo, Marx), the scarcity value (Walras); utility value (Say, Pareto), etc. In sociology, Nathalie Heinich (2017) shows the difficulty it is to define value. According to her, there are three sources of value: measurement, judgment and attachment. Measurement helps to define a value from an economic viewpoint: price, utility, exchange value, labour. However, in culture, judgment appears to be a competing and complementary way of defining this value: this judgment involves economic criteria (is it worth the price we give it?, a frequent dilemma in the most speculative sectors of contemporary art or the music industry) or non-economic criteria, such as morality, aesthetics, the quality lent to a work or cultural good. But alongside these first two sources of value (measurement, judgment), a third source appears: the subjective attachment that one grants to the cultural good.

The value of culture is therefore not only economic and social, but also political. It is this last dimension that we are going to examine here.

Differentiation/Conciliation

We start from the sociological vision proposed by Nathalie Heinich (2017): value is the principle from which acts, ideas, tangible and intangible goods can be measured, justified and appreciated. It is in line with the vision of Luc Boltanski and Eve Chiapello (2000) of a value defined as a common superior principle. This first definition allows us to hierarchize in the name of a superior principle: if we are in the presence of a value, then we can put it to the test by making it fulfill its functions: to refer to it to judge, estimate, justify goods and acts.

In philosophy, it has long been customary to consider fundamental values around indisputable principles. The "beautiful", the "true", the "just" in Aristotle are precisely values because they do not themselves refer to any higher principle. They are that principle which is valid in itself, which does not depend on another instance. In this sense, a value is said to be "autotelic": it can only refer to itself. The interest of this contribution is that we can classify the different notions according to whether they appear autotelic or not. Some, which pass too quickly for values, will then have to be considered differently.

Halfway between philosophy, economics and sociology, we need to discuss this first autonomous and pure vision of the notion of value. Indeed, according to the visions presented so far, one would be tempted to say that there are on one side values and on the other objects, acts and ideas, the two groups being clearly separated. Here, Dewey helps to loosen the grip of the purity of values by using the notion of "valuation", whereby value is never more than a social construction, which is formed in a given context, by a given social group, in a given time. As a result, as Hilary Putnam proposes, there is no dichotomy between values and facts, but a necessary interweaving between the two. This is the consequence of a consideration of value as a social construction. Amartya Sen (2009) extends the reflection in his approach to capabilities, and his critique of positivist economics. For him, there is a similar entanglement - not separation - between ethics, economics and politics. Values are thus articulated to facts, but also to conventions: this fact/value articulation only works when we share the same understanding of things, or the same culture. The contribution of this discussion on value as a social construction is to open up to the plurality of configurations within which value is born, transformed, and interacts with a context and with other values. All things that are singularly important when discussing the value of ... culture!

To go further, and to develop a political approach to value that takes into account the approaches already cited, it seems to us that the most convincing framework is that of Pierre Muller (2018), a public policy analyst. He has the merit of integrating the notion of value as a social construction, according to a hierarchy of notions that link it to other dimensions, while highlighting its singularity. Pierre Muller speaks of value as the most fundamental representation of what is good, desirable, or bad and undesirable. Value is part of a global framework for public action which then gives rise to norms (which refers to a gap between the perceived real and the desired real), algorithms (a theory of action proposing causal hypotheses "if...then") and images, which are cognitive shortcuts that symbolize this referential set.

The contribution of this vision of value is to allow us to distinguish, among the set of notions that claim the status of values, those that have the characteristics of values from those that have the status of a "norm", an "algorithm" or an "image".

In this sense, value is therefore a political and social construction. Why is this definition specifically important in relation to culture? Because the "valuation" of culture always obeys combinations of judgments, taste preferences, prejudices or class habits. Because it is more objectively indeterminate than other dimensions (education, environment, security, etc.) of social life, culture must take even more account of the tangle between facts and values, ethics and politics, words and things.

D1.5. Analysis of the European historical and political experience in acknowledging and promoting the values of culture

It is with this vision of "values" that we will now examine the cloud of words that represents, in a non-exhaustive way, the values of culture, in order to arrive at a reduction to five fundamental values, both singular and related.

2. FROM THE CATALOG OF CULTURAL VALUES TO THE FIVE FINGERS OF VALUATION

Our survey on assigning value to culture confronts us with an extremely broad list of notions. Even if we reduce the list by bringing together terms that are roughly synonymous, we still end up with more than thirty terms. We thus fall into the catalog syndrome, described above.

A radical way of simplifying the analysis would be to oppose two major "valuations" of culture: intrinsic and extrinsic, consecutive to each other. The first defends the idea that culture is in itself "the" value, justified by itself, autotelic. What is sometimes called "art for art's sake" derives from this conception which, historically, would have been the first to appear. The changes affecting the value of culture would then have consisted in giving culture a value deduced from the importance that is given to it on other levels: its educational, social, economic, environmental capacity. We do not believe in this dichotomy. Behind the self-telling of culture, there are always processes of social, political construction of value that question the idea – or the chimera - of the independence of art (Négrier, 2020). And if the processes of extrinsic valuation of culture can be analyzed (we will do so in the second part), they do not allow us to define, in themselves, sufficiently operative reference values.

For this reason, we propose to retain from our synthetic review of the literature five fundamental values of culture that we envisage as five fingers, fingers that weigh more or less, but always connected in the combination of one hand.


These five values are: aesthetics, democracy, economy, identity, well-being.

These are "autotelic values", comprising sub-values, but also objectives and norms. In the figure below, repetitions and synonyms reflect the nuances and diversity of the values advocated by cultural policies. The grouping choice is a provisional proposal. Categories are not mutually exclusive and some issues remain, such as the choice of the term "democracy" rather than "politics", or the presence of certain values in all categories.

The fieldwork on the valuation of cultural participation (WP2) will allow us to compare the values experienced by the participants in their cultural practices with the values expected by cultural policies, and to reveal conflicts and tensions between values (some of which are developed in the following section). Thus, this scheme is bound to evolve in order to become richer and more representative of valuation dynamics.

Figure: Values assigned to culture by cultural policies - classification proposal

D1.5. Analysis of the European historical and political experience in acknowledging and promoting the values of culture



Legend: The words in white and in color are present in several groups of values

Each of these values implies an internal debate of a hermeneutical (what meaning should be given to democracy, aesthetics, etc.), normative (what is the positive and negative part of these values?), political (what objectives and instruments should be implemented to achieve them?) type. This is what we will see in the second part, working more specifically on three particular issues: the trajectory of heritage "valuation"; the different values of democracy in cultural policies; and the meeting between culture and the sustainable development norm. It is three dimensions of these combinations and internal debates that form and actualize the value of culture.

3. THE DYNAMICS OF VALUATION

Which socio-historical dynamics transform the values attributed to culture by cultural policies? The definition of "values" is neither stable nor unambiguous: starting from an asserted "value", a set of sub-values can be in conflict. The emergence and evolution of dominant values is affected by particular historical configurations - sets of ideas, institutions and actors. We will try to illustrate these dynamics of valuation evolution through three examples: democratic (3.1.), cultural heritage (3.2.) and sustainable development (3.3). values.

3.1. The values of "democracy" in European cultural policies

3.1.1. Democratic values in conflict

The term "democracy" originally referred to a political system in which all citizens participate in political decisions. In the history of European cultural policies, this principle is linked to values that are supposed to be contingent, but are often in contradictory.

Cultural Democratization VS Cultural Democracy, elitism VS relativism?

Within cultural policies, democracy is mainly mobilized as a democratization of "culture", art pieces and artistic practices; a conception linked to the values of equality, civilization, education, fulfillment, emancipation or civism. Confronted with this majority conception, the competing conception of "cultural democracy" does not advocate an equal access to "The culture", but rather to knowledges, expressions and representations of all cultures, through the recognition of cultural rights – a paradigm whose democratic values include recognition, dignity, diversity, pluralism, and citizen participation through "bottom up" policies.

Cultural democratization is accused of elitism, by imposing a cultural hierarchy produced by a dominant group. Conversely, cultural democracy is accused of relativism, by implying an equal legitimacy of a plurality of values and references. This debate cuts across cultural policies: is democracy promoting "the rule of ignorance" or favoring collective intelligence by adding up the "share of excellence" of each citizen? If democracy is a principle that "does not tolerate any power based on the qualities of those who govern" (Rancière, 2005), therefore it is incompatible with the reign of expertise over the definition of legitimate aesthetics.

Autonomy, representation and participation

Democracy can also imply values of freedom of expression and artistic independence. The autonomy of art would be an indicator of a democratic society, and symbolic revolutions would not have been possible without the autonomy of the artistic field. These statements gave rise to the "arm's length" principle, which implies that neither politicians nor public servants are directly involved in subsidy allocation, delegated to independent peer groups. But this "autonomy" can be that of a non-representative and dominant subsector of the society, that can promote cultural values tied to its tastes and interests. Thus, the value of independence can, in the name of democracy, produce anti-democratic values.

Representative democracy principles can suffer from the same risk of non-representativeness, depending on the degrees of concentration of power and the place given to citizens in the decision-making. In response to these risks, cultural policies may also rely on direct democracy modalities - through "participation" mechanisms, that could be described as a "deliberative democracy through value clarification" (Gray, 2012), or through policies that aim at "empowerment" and autonomy of socially dominated people.

3.1.2. Emergence and transformation dynamics

Socio-historical and ideological contexts

The dynamics of democracy's valorizations through cultural policies depends on the socio-historical contexts: evolutions of the relationship between artists and political power; constitution of the nation-state and processes of centralization or local autonomy; posture of the state towards cultural minorities; moral principles from majority religions; prolonged periods of dictatorship; former membership of the USSR;

D1.5. Analysis of the European historical and political experience in acknowledging and promoting the values of culture

former colonizing or colonized countries; historical strength of movements militating for democracy; changes in the ideologies carried by political parties and governments; etc.

As an example, the British state's reluctance to patronize the arts might be explained by a Protestant tradition, which valued a private consumption at the expense of the public sphere, whereas in France, the royal patronage was republicanized and consolidated by the Revolution and its Jacobinism, perpetuating a tradition of interventionism and centralism. In both countries, a "managerial" or "pragmatic" turn took place during the 80's and 90's, favoring economy and attractiveness over social transformation and local democracy. Both countries also gradually opened cultural policies to more diversity; but if they were both colonizing powers, UK valued multiculturalism, whereas France advocated universalism, distrustful of the recognition of minority cultural identities.

In conflicts over the values of democracy, ideological and theoretical references have an influence. If cultural democratization is partly based on the universalist philosophy of the Enlightenment, valuing the reign of "reason", cultural democracy is partly impregnated by Postmodernism or Deconstructionism, Cultural Studies, Postcolonial Studies and Gender Studies, which have nourished criticisms of an ethnocentric and unequal cultural democratization, universalizing the particular position of dominant social groups.

Field dynamics: coalition of interests and international influences

Conflicts between values can be read as power conflicts over the definition of reference values within the field of cultural policies. The conflicts put in opposition the dominant actors (institutional position, legitimacy, symbolic capital), with an interest in the status quo, and the dominated actors, with an interest in subverting the reference values. For example, the actors involved in popular education or artistic sectors with illegitimate aesthetics have often criticized the principle of excellence carried by democratization.

More globally, an "advocacy coalition framework" was gradually formed in favor of cultural democracy, at the regional, national or international level, including not only professionals, but also philosophers, elected officials and political activists. Some of this coalition's demands have also been legitimized by international organizations through their production of normative frameworks and conceptualizations (European Cultural Convention, UNESCO Convention...), which influence the definition of the values, such as the UNESCO definition of culture, used as a reference for cultural rights. However, most of these international law texts don't produce any effectiveness legally. The European Union influence is more direct, via financial support programs (Creative Europe, European Capitals of Culture, European Social Fund...), which are accompanied by evaluation criteria, information systems, training, and produce a common vocabulary, giving legitimacy to certain democratic values (i.e. "citizen engagement", "participation"...).

The weak integration of cultural democracy's values in cultural policies is partly explained by the weakness of its promoters, remaining dominated in the field. Moreover, this coalition faced resistances from most of the professional organizations, based on competing values, guaranteeing the sustainability of their position in the field: competence, professionalism, expertise, independence.

Since the 2000s, however, the crisis of cultural democratization and the increase in citizens' mistrust of their political representatives contributed to the rise in importance of the issues of "participation" and "diversity". Thus, it seems that cultural policies are 'forced' to adopt a new reading of democracy in order to ensure their legitimacy.

3.2. Cultural heritage

Cultural heritage has become an essential concept of contemporary identity formations and, consequently, for the related value-systems too. The history of cultural heritage shows well the paradigm shifts connected

D1.5. Analysis of the European historical and political experience in acknowledging and promoting the values of culture

to the continuous expansion of the field of cultural heritage. The three major shifts, or rather, expansions of the concept of heritage do not only offer an analytical interpretation for its history, but also shows why it became omnipresent. This concept is not replacing but integrating previous developments due to its flexibility. The current regime corresponds to the renewed institutionalisation of cultural heritage characterised by its expansion in terms of concepts, significance and number of heritage sites and elements. From the point of view of universal standardization, the fundamental instrument of this regime is the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (Unesco, 2003), whereas in the European context, the current break-through towards a holistic standardization begins with the European Landscape Convention (2000) and the Faro Convention (2005), which are essential instruments to develop Europe's own heritage concept to offer an alternative instrumental norm in comparison to those, which were developed by UNESCO. In the 2010s, a greater recognition of the importance of cultural heritage and the policy shift at the EU level became evident, and this accelerated interest culminated around the 2018 European Year of Cultural Heritage. It is still growing further, since heritage is a key concept in the Horizon Europe Work Programme.

3.2.1. The complexity of current cultural heritage and the conflict of values

The integrating nature of the two-century-long development of cultural heritage resulted in numerous hidden and not so hidden conflicts of interpretations related to the five values that we selected to analyse. These conflicts can be revealed through the interrelated concepts of *cultural heritage agency* and the *levels of cultural heritage*. The former implies the fact that current cultural heritage is created and interpreted by a growing number of social actors from a great variety of provenances (from monument experts through local actors to cultural tourists). The latter shows it is a widely used concept to describe identity and belonging from local levels up to universal ones (local, urban, national, European, world heritage) as if there were no or not insurmountable conflicts between these interpretations. The interaction between the levels of cultural heritage building shows that the agency of heritage institutions and groups is essential in the realisation of heritage values and norms. The cultural heritage agency can be examined in a matrix, which is determined by the three regimes of cultural heritage and by the multiple levels of heritage interpretations ranging from universal to local.

3.2.2. The fields of conflicting values in the construction of current cultural heritage

Identity constructions always have a *temporality*, which can enter easily in conflict if they are simultaneously History-based, i.e. construct themselves as a result of a rupture in time and Heritage-based, i.e. regards themselves in a solid (, but often threatened) continuity. Cultural heritage acts as an indicator of the deconstructive tendencies of the modern perception of time by integrating the tradition of monument conservation, which is antimodernist in its theory and modernist in its practice, with presentist concepts in order to avoid further loss and catastrophes, under the banner of sustainability or to prepare the survival of heritage communities under the label of resilience.

Identity constructions always have a *territoriality* too. Currently, sites and zones are often coupled with more anthropological denominations as the identity-bearing 'place' and the 'cultural or urban landscape' determined by social regard and use. Heritage is exhibited by its community, which needs a stage to perform the related intangible activities. In the politicized and ideological conflict between 'localists' and 'globalists', any identity formation necessitates heritage places of designations, symbols and rituals. Every level of heritage-building needs to anchor itself through heritage places, which localize and acknowledge its *haut-lieux* and the related values.

Heritage temporalities and territories are determined and used by communities, which are often labelled as heritage communities. These communities are supposed to define their heritage and its territory more autonomously. Due to economic reasons, however, a double expectation is imposed onto the local community: they are expected to ensure inner transmission of heritage and to exhibit themselves to the external gaze (cultural tourists, etc.), which turns their heritage into products. Ideally, the recognition of

D1.5. Analysis of the European historical and political experience in acknowledging and promoting the values of culture

local cultural heritage can engender democratization and integration, but it can also bear a non-critical use of the past in a society with authoritarian reflexes. Since the conceptual expansion and institutionalisation of heritage did not always adhere to the critical standards of social sciences and humanities, current populist and xenophobic identity formations may apply it to avoid scientific control and the reflective interpretations of the past.

The short analysis of current cultural heritage shows that its integrative nature and its essential role in identity constructions bear a great number of inherent conflicts of values, which are blurred behind its seeming neutrality. Current heritage can incorporate authenticity-based and highly selective monument protection with popular/populist reconstructions (aesthetic values) as an expression of co-habiting values related to different levels of heritage/identity-building. Similarly, it is simultaneously used as a reference for cultural diversity and social/cultural integration and emancipation as well as for populist discrimination (democratic values). As the institutionalized form of culture, cultural heritage acts as the first pillar of sustainable development concurrently preserving traditional economic activities and promoting cultural industries and big scale tourism. Based on its holistic nature (including natural heritage that is the environment), culture heritage became essential for the well-being of human communities, as it is stated in the *Convention on the Diversity of Cultural Expressions*: "cultural diversity is as necessary for humankind as biodiversity for nature."

3.3. When Culture meets Sustainable Development

"Sustainable development" is usually defined as "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" (WCED, 1987). It is sometimes understood in the narrow sense of ecologically sustainable development (ESD), sometimes in the broad sense of sustainable development. This latter meaning puts on the same level three pillars: ecological, social and economic. It is therefore less a value, than a concept, even a norm, based on the dialogue of values. Since the end of the 20th century, the interactions between culture and the two meanings of this concept have contributed to the evolution of cultural values (for a typology of these interactions, see Soini, Birkeland, 2014).

3.3.1. Ecologically sustainable development and the changes in the values of culture

The spread of the ESD concept can be seen as a significant explanatory factor for contemporary changes in the values of culture. Since the 2000s, cultural actors (artists, cities...) have been multiplying initiatives to change the practices and representations of professionals in the sector in favour of ESD.

Taking a step towards ESD is partly a matter of valuing culture for itself and renewing the sources of creativity and inspiration (Blanc, Ramos, 2010; Auclair, 2011; Ardenne, 2018). But the actors are also encouraged to conform freely (on this notion, see the work of R. Epstein [2012]) to the wish expressed by other actors (associations, cities, Ministry of Culture, etc.) to act in favour of sustainable development. This can be seen, for example, in the setting up of awards, labels, calls for projects or the promotion of good practices (Hartley, 2009) and norms (ISO 26000 and ISO 20121). The actors are valued by their peers, spectators and public authorities if they take a step towards ecology and sustainability, shows civic-mindedness and sobriety, and reconnects with the territories.

However, the growing discourse on sustainable development is putting the values of ecology, sustainability and sobriety in competition with other values such as the economy, cultural diversity, intercultural dialogue and aesthetic. Since the 1980s in Europe, the value of culture has regularly been judged in terms of the economic wealth it is able to produce (Vestheim, 1994; Colin, 1995; Gioli, 2011; Losseley, 2011). In the field of live music, for example, the number and internationalisation of tours are valued. The circulation of artists

D1.5. Analysis of the European historical and political experience in acknowledging and promoting the values of culture

and works, which is a source of greenhouse gas emissions, is also seen as a means for UNESCO and the European Union (cf. the Europe Creative programme) to strengthen cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue in order to fight against the phenomena of closure and withdrawal. Besides, the dissemination of the concept of ESD in the cultural sphere is reactivating the debate on the usefulness of art. Does a creative ethical work have more value than a merely aesthetic one?

Nevertheless, ESD conveys values that do not replace other a priori competing values, but rather add to them and probably, in the long run, articulate with them to make them mutually compatible.

3.3.2. The introduction of culture in sustainable development

At the same time, actors are seeking to introduce culture into sustainable development. They are doing so in two ways. First, by trying to get culture recognised as the 4th pillar of sustainable development alongside the environment, the economy and social issues, thus highlighting the value of diversity. Secondly, by activating its mediating function in order to relay environmental concerns and raise public awareness, which confirms the political value of art.

With the end of the Cold War and the trend towards the international spread of a single cultural model, the World Commission on Culture and Development (WCCD) is committed to the protection of cultural diversity. It wishes to "affirm the right of each people to pursue different paths of development" (p. 10). The work carried out by UNESCO (UNESCO, 1998; 2000; 2001; 2005) and the "Culture" Committee of the United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG) contribute significantly to highlighting cultural diversity as a value worth defending. Hitherto considered as a brake on development, an obstacle to modernity, progress and democracy, cultural diversity is now presented as a resource for development (Pascual, Meyer-Bisch, 2012).

Culture also interferes in ESD by playing its mediating function. The Earth Art movement in the United States at the end of the 1960s was a precursor movement (Clavel, 2012). Since then, eco-artistic mediation has crossed the Atlantic and has had some success in Europe (see e.g. the "Ice Watch" project of Olafur Eliasson). Eco-artistic mediation is of interest to public entities, nature conservation organisations (Curtis, 2011) or biosphere reserves (Marks et al., 2017) which use art as a means of educating and raising awareness. Environmental art extended, in other forms, the political value of art by placing ecology at the centre alongside the values of truth, education, criticism, civics and education. However, committed art is very often reclaimed by public authorities to enhance the value of a territory and improve its attractiveness (see for example Grondeau, Pondaven, 2018).

Finally, the spread of the concept of sustainable development in Europe has had a significant influence on the evolution of the balance of power between the competing values of culture. Cultural diversity, for example, is, on the one hand, extraordinarily valued by actors. On the other hand, the encouragement of diversity seems contradictory, at first sight, with the deployment of eco-responsible practices in the cultural sector, particularly when these affect the international mobility of artists.

4. CONCLUSION

Cultural policies in Europe have, over the years, assigned many values to culture. In this paper, we have tried to take into account only the values of culture (diversity, democracy...), which are revealed by their autotelic character. We have set aside the roles that politicians wish to give to it (mediation, social transformation...). We have gathered these values into five categories, non-exclusive and not strictly impermeable: democracy, well-being, identity, aesthetics and economy. Only one of these, aesthetics, brings together so-called 'intrinsic' values, to which traditional cultural policies generally refer. On the

D1.5. Analysis of the European historical and political experience in acknowledging and promoting the values of culture

contrary, contemporary debates on the values of culture increasingly refer to the other four categories of values.

Values are in movement as a result of the changing balance of power in the national and international fields of cultural policy. Moreover, the cultural field is impacted by the penetration into the field of ideologies, concepts and struggles from other fields (e.g. the crisis of representative democracies, sustainable development, feminism, debates on migration and national identity, populism, etc.).

Over the recent period, there has been a growing emphasis on values that were already present in the 20th century (ecology, diversity, etc.), but which were previously marginal. These values do not replace the pre-existing dominant values. The logic is more cumulative: depending on the sector, some formerly marginal values become dominant, while previously dominant values continue to exist.

Sometimes these values can coexist or mutually nourish each other, as in the case of ecology and aesthetics. They sometimes prove to be irremediably antagonistic. This is the case, for example, with democratisation through excellence and cultural democracy. Cultural policies should therefore not ignore these contradictions, but seek the right articulation between the different values of culture.

5. REFERENCES

- Abélès, M. (1996). La Communauté européenne : Une perspective anthropologique. *Social Anthropology*, 4(1), 33–45. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8676.1996.tb00312.x>
- Ardenne P., 2018, *Un art écologique. Création plasticienne et anthropocène*, Bruxelles, Le Bord de l'eau.
- Aristotle, 2012, *Politics*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Focus.
- Auclair E., 2011, « Revenir vers les habitants, revenir sur les territoires », *Développement durable et territoire*, vol. 2, n° 2.
- Balansinski J., 2006, « Boycott : les comédiens face à l'état de guerre de 1981 en Pologne », in L. Mathieu, J. Balansinski (dir.), *Art et contestation*, PUR, p. 87-101.
- Becker, H. S., 1982, *Art Worlds*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Behr A., Brennan M., Cloonan M., 2016, "Cultural value and cultural policy: some evidence from the world of live music", IJCP.
- Bendix, R., Peselmann, A., & Eggert, A. (2017). *Heritage Regimes and the State*. Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen.
- Blanc N., Ramos J., 2010, *Ecoplasties, art et environnement*, Manuella Editions.
- Blomgren, R., 2012, "Autonomy or democratic cultural policy: that is the question", *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 18 Issue 5.
- Boltanski L., Chiapello E., 1999, *Le nouvel esprit du capitalisme*, Paris, Gallimard.
- Boltanski L., Thévenot L., 1991, *De la justification. Les économies de la grandeur*, Paris: Gallimard.
- Bonet, L., Négrier, E., 2011, « The End(s) of National Cultures? Cultural Policy in the Face of Diversity », *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, vol.17, n°1, p.1-16.
- Bonet, L. Calvano, G. Carnelli, L., Dupin-Meynard, F. and Négrier, E. (Eds.), 2018, *Be SpectACTIVE! Challenging Participation in Performing Arts*. Editoria & Spettacolo.
- Bourdieu, P., 1992, *Les règles de l'art*, Paris: Seuil.
- Bustamante, M., 2015, « Les politiques culturelles dans le monde, Comparaisons et circulations de modèles nationaux d'action culturelle dans les années 1980 », *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* 2015/1-2 (N° 206-207).
- Chambers, S., 2003, "Deliberative democratic theory", *Annual review of political science*, 6: 307–326.
- Clavel, Joanne. « L'art écologique : une forme de médiation des sciences de la conservation ? », *Natures*

D1.5. Analysis of the European historical and political experience in acknowledging and promoting the values of culture

Sciences Sociétés, vol. 20, no. 4, 2012, pp. 437-447.

Colin, M., 1995, « L'émergence d'un nouveau discours sur la culture, à travers l'évolution d'une municipalité de gauche dans la décennie 1980 », in Poirrier, P. (Ed.), *Jalons pour l'histoire des politiques culturelles locales*, Ministère de la culture, Comité d'histoire.

Culture2030Goal campaign (2019), "Culture in the Implementation of the 2030 Agenda". Published in Barcelona, Paris, Harare, Sydney, Montreal, The Hague and Brussels, in the frame of the first UN SDG Summit taking place on 24-25 September 2019.

Curtis J. D., 2011, « Using the Arts to Raise Awareness and Communicate Environmental Information in the Extension Context », *The Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension. Competence for Rural Innovation and Transformation*, vol. 17, n° 2.

Cusset, F., 2003, *French Theory : Foucault, Derrida, Deleuze, & Cie et les mutations de la vie intellectuelle aux États-Unis*, Paris: La Découverte.

Dewey, J., 1944, « Some Questions About Value », *The Journal of Philosophy*, Volume 41, Issue 17, p. 449-455.

Dubois, V., 1999, *La politique culturelle*. Genèse d'une catégorie d'intervention publique, Paris: Belin.

Dubois, V., 1995, « Pour la culture et contre l'Etat ? La Fédération nationale des centres culturels communaux au début des années 60 », in Poirrier, P. (Ed.), *Jalons pour l'histoire des politiques culturelles locales*, Ministère de la culture, Comité d'histoire.

Dufournet, Hélène, et al. « Art et politique sous le regard des sciences sociales. (introduction) », *Terrains & travaux*, vol. 13, no. 2, 2007, p. 3-12.

Dupin-Meynard, F., Négrier, E. (Eds.), 2020, *Cultural policies in Europe: a participatory Turn?*, Editions de l'Attribut.

Dworkin, G., 1995, "Autonomy", In Goodin, R. E. and Pettit, P. (Eds.), *A companion to contemporary political philosophy*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Epstein R., 2012, « De la différenciation territoriale à la libre conformation », dans *L'action publique dans tous ses états. Différenciation et standardisation*, Paris, L'Harmattan.

Elias, N., 1978, *What is Sociology*, New York : Columbia University Press.

Gioli A., 2011, « La politique culturelle de l'Italie », in Poirrier, *Pour une histoire des politiques culturelles dans le monde (1945-2011)*, La documentation française.

Giraud B., « Zebda : La réinvention des pratiques musicales en mode d'engagement politique critique », in L. Mathieu, J. Balansinski (dir.), *Art et contestation*, PUR, p. 29-45.

Greffe, X., 2010, « L'économie de la culture est-elle particulière ? », *Revue d'économie politique*, n°120, p. 1-34.

Grondeau A., Pondaven F., 2018, « Le *street art*, outil de valorisation territoriale et touristique : l'exemple de la Galeria de Arte Urbana de Lisbonne », *EchoGéo* (44).

Hartley, J., 2009, 'Arts and ecological sustainability', *D'Art Topics in Arts Policy*, No. 34, International Federation of Arts Councils and Culture Agencies - IFACCA, Sydney. Rapport.

Hartog, F. (2015). *Regimes of Historicity: Presentism and Experiences of Time*. New York Chichester, West Sussex: Columbia University Press. <https://doi.org/10.7312/hart16376>

Heimendinger N., Riou G., 2018, « Instrumentalisations de l'art », *Marges*, n° 26, 162 p.

Heinich, N ?, 2017, *Des Valeurs. Une approche sociologique*, Paris: Gallimard

Hillman Chartrand, H., 1989, "The arm's length principle and the arts: an international perspective – past, present and future". In Cummings Jr, M.C. and Davidson Schuster, J.M., (Eds.), *Who's to pay for the arts?*, New York, NY: ACA Books

D1.5. Analysis of the European historical and political experience in acknowledging and promoting the values of culture

Hutter, M., Throsby, D., 2008, *Beyond Price : Value in Culture, Economics and the Arts*, Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

Gaxie, D. 1978, *Le cens caché*, Paris: Seuil.

Gray, C., 2000, *The politics of the arts in Britain*, Basingstoke: Macmillan

Gray, C., 2008, "Arts council England and public value: a critical review", *International journal of cultural policy*, 14: 209–214

Gray, C., 2010, "Analysing cultural policy: incorrigibly plural or ontologically incompatible?", *International journal of cultural policy*, 16: 215–230.

Gray, C., 2012, "Democratic cultural policy: democratic forms and policy consequences", *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 18 (No. 5).

Hall, S., 2007, *Identités et cultures. Politiques des Cultural Studies*, Paris: éditions Amsterdam.

Heinich, N., 2017, *Des valeurs, une approche sociologique*, Paris: Gallimard.

Julie's Bicycle, 2011, *Guide de mobilité verte. Un guide pour le développement durable de la mobilité dans le spectacle vivant*, production pour le compte du réseau On the Move.

Lecler, Romain. « Le succès d'Histoires d'A, « film sur l'avortement ». Une mobilisation croisée de ressources cinématographiques et militantes (enquête) », *Terrains & travaux*, vol. 13, no. 2, 2007, pp. 51-72.

Lefort, C., 1981, *L'Invention démocratique. Les limites de la domination totalitaire*, Paris: Fayard.

Losseley D., 2011, « Le Royaume-Uni », in Poirrier, *Pour une histoire des politiques culturelles dans le monde (1945-2011)*, La documentation française.

Looseley, D., 2011, "Notions of popular culture in cultural policy: a comparative history of France and Britain", *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 17.

Marks M., Chandler L., Baldwin C., 2017, "Environmental art as an innovative medium for environmental education in Biosphere Reserves", *Environmental Education Research*, vol. 23, n° 9.

Mouffe, C., 1992, *Dimensions of Radical Democracy: Pluralism, Citizenship, Community*. London – New York: Verso.

Engberg, J., 2011, "La politique culturelle au Danemark. 1945-2007", in P. Poirrier (Ed.), *Pour une histoire des politiques culturelles dans le monde (1945-2011)*, La Documentation française.

Fribourg (Groupe de), 2007, *Les Droits Culturels, déclaration de Fribourg*.

Johler, R. (2002). Local Europe: The production of cultural heritage and the Europeanisation of places. *Ethnologia Europaea. Journal of European Ethnology*, 32(2), 7–18. Louarn, M., 2017, "L'art en régime démocratique: divergence d'interprétation, Propos recueillis par Vincent Guillon", in *Observatoire des politiques culturelles, L'Observatoire*, 2017/1 (N° 49).

Löfgren, O. (1996). Linking the Local, the National and the Global. *Ethnologia Europaea. Journal of European Ethnology*, 26, 157–168. <https://doi.org/10.16995/EE.858>

Menger, P.-M., 2003, *Portrait de l'artiste en travailleur*, Paris : Le Seuil.

Muller, P., 2018, *Les Politiques publiques*, Paris : PUF (12th edition)

Négrier, E., 2020, « L'indépendance artistique n'existe pas, je l'ai rencontrée », *Nectart*, 2020/2 (N° 11).

Pascual J., Meyer-Bisch P., 2012, « Rio + 20 et la dimension culturelle de la durabilité », *Mouvement. Culture et développement durable (64)*, p. 2-6.

Plato, 2012, *Republic*, London: Penguin.

Poirrier, P., 2011, *Pour une histoire des politiques culturelles dans le monde (1945-2011)*, Paris : La Documentation française.

Poulot, D., 2006, *Une histoire du patrimoine en Occident, XVIII^e XXI^e siècle. Du monument aux valeurs*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France Romainville, C., 2013, *Le droit à la culture, une réalité*

D1.5. Analysis of the European historical and political experience in acknowledging and promoting the values of culture

juridique. Le droit de participer à la vie culturelle en droit constitutionnel et en droit international, Bruxelles, Bruylant.

Romainville C., 2017, « Le droit international des droits culturels au service des politiques culturelles ? », in *Observatoire des politiques culturelles, L'Observatoire*, 2017/1 (N° 49).

Rancière, J., 2005, *Hatred of Democracy*, London: Verso.

Rancière, J., 2009, *The Emancipated Spectator*, London: Verso.

Rancière, J., 2015, *Dissensus: On Politics and Aesthetics*, London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Sabatier, P. A., 2014, « Advocacy Coalition Framework », in Bousaguet, L. (Ed.), *Dictionnaire des politiques publiques*, Paris: Presses de Sciences Po.

Saint-Pierre, A., Audet, C. (Eds.), 2010, *Les tendances et les défis des politiques culturelles - Cas nationaux en perspective*, Presses de l'université de Laval

Sen, A., 2009, *The Idea of Justice*, London : Penguin Books.

Soini, K. and Birkeland, I. 2014. Exploring the scientific discourse of cultural sustainability. *Geoforum* 51, 213–23.

Sonkoly, G., 2017, *Historical Urban Landscape*, New York: Palgrave-Macmillan.

Teillet, P., 2017, “Ce que les droits culturels f(er)ont aux politiques culturelles”, in *Observatoire des politiques culturelles, L'Observatoire*, 2017/1 (N° 49)

Throsby, D., 1994, « The Production and Consumption of the Arts : A View of Cultural Economics », *Journal of Economic Literature*, 32, p. 1-29

Tissot, S., 2019, *Qui a peur du communautarisme ? Réflexions critiques sur une rhétorique réactionnaire*, LMSI.net

Tocqueville, A. de, *De la démocratie en Amérique*, Paris, Flammarion, 1981

UNESCO World Culture Reports of 1998 and 2000, 2001 Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity

UNESCO, 2005, *Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions*, Paris: UNESCO

Vestheim, G., 1994. Instrumental cultural policy in scandinavian countries: a critical historical perspective. *The European journal of cultural policy*, 1 (1), 57–71.

Vestheim, G., 2007, “Cultural policy and democracy. Theoretical reflections”, *International journal of cultural policy*, 13(2): 217–235

Vestheim, G., 2009, "The autonomy of culture and the arts – from the Early Bourgeois Era to Late modern 'Runaway World'", In Pyykkönen, M., Simainen, N. and Sokka, S., (Eds.), *What about cultural policy?*, Helsinki/Jyväskylä: Minerva.

[Vojtíšková, Kateřina](#), [Lorencová, Radmila](#), 2015, “Public funding of culture in the Czech Republic since the fall of the iron curtain: contemporary dilemmas”, *International Journal of Cultural Policies*, vol. 21.

Vuyk, C.M., 2010, “The arts as an instrument? Notes on the controversy surrounding the value of art”, *International journal of cultural policy*, May 2010, Vol. 16

Williams, R., 1989, “The Arts Council”, In Gable, R. (Ed.), *Resources of Hope: Culture, Democracy and Socialism*, London: Verso

Wijkander, K., 2011, "La politique culturelle de la Suède", in P. Poirrier (Ed.), *Pour une histoire des politiques culturelles dans le monde*, La Documentation française.

World Cities Culture Forum, Julie's Bicycle & C40, 2019. *Culture & Climate Change. 14 World Cities Tackling Climate Change Through Culture*.

Zhong-Mengual, E., Morizot, B., 2018, *Esthétique de la rencontre. L'énigme de l'art contemporain*, Paris: Seuil

Zhong-Mengual, E., 2018, *L'art en commun : réinventer les formes du collectif en contexte démocratique*,

D1.5. Analysis of the European historical and political experience in acknowledging and promoting the values of culture

Dijon : Les presses du réel