

**A Critical Analysis of the Autonomy of Art in  
Finnish Cultural Policy 1978–2011**

Laura Norppa  
Master's Thesis  
Department of Arts Management  
Sibelius Academy  
University of the Arts Helsinki  
Fall 2013

## Table of Contents

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1. Background of The Study	5
1.2. Previous Research on the Subject	7
1.3. Aim of the Study and Research Questions	9
1.4. Research Approach	10
1.5. The Structure of the Study	10
<b>2. Theoretical Framework</b>	<b>12</b>
2.1. Early Conceptions of Art	12
2.2. Autonomy of Art	13
2.3. Critical Theory and the Frankfurt School	15
2.4. Critical Theory and Art	16
2.5. Adorno and the Autonomy of Art	18
2.6. Cultural Policy and the Autonomy of Art	19
2.7. The Instrumentalism of Cultural Policy	20
2.8. Neo-liberalism and Cultural Policy	21
<b>3. Methodology</b>	<b>24</b>
3.1. Research Method and Approach	24
3.2. The Critical Orientation	25
3.3. Critical Discourse Analysis	25
3.4. Content Analysis	26
3.5. The Data	27
3.6. The Analysis Process	29
3.7. Critical Reflections of the Study	30
<b>4. Analysis of the Autonomy of Art in Finnish Cultural Policy</b>	<b>32</b>
4.1. Art Embedded in Society – the Analysis of the 1978 Report	33
4.1.1. Discourse I – Art as a Promoter of the Aims of Social Policy	34
4.1.2. Discourse II – Art as an Agent for Societal Change	36
4.1.3. Discourse III – Art as an Aim in Itself	38
4.2. Art Between Economy and the State – the Analysis of the 1993 Report	39
4.2.1. Discourse I – Art as the Servant of Economy	40
4.2.2. Discourse II – Art as a Burden for Public Economy	42
4.2.3. Discourse III – Art as a Means for a Successful Society	45
4.2.4. Considerations Concerning the Autonomy of Art in the 1993 Report	47
4.3. Towards an Applied Future of Art and Culture – The Analysis of the 2011 Report	48
4.3.1. Discourse I – Art as Applications	49
4.3.2. Discourse II – Art as a Means for a Competitive Society	51
4.3.3. Discourse III – Art as Creative Capital	53
<b>5. Conclusions and Discussion</b>	<b>56</b>
5.1. From Societal to Economic Instrumentalism – the Changes of Finnish Cultural Policy from 1970s to the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	57
5.2. Towards Economic Instrumentalism	58
5.3. Applications and Increasing Economic Aims – Instrumentalism in the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	60
5.4. Neo-liberal Developments Influencing the Economic Instrumentalism	61
5.5. Implications on the Autonomy of Art	63
5.6. Summary of the Findings and Concluding Remarks	64
5.7. Further Studies on the Subject	65

**References ..... 67**

# 1. Introduction

It is self-evident that nothing concerning art is self-evident anymore, not its inner life, not its relation to the world, not even its right to exist. (Adorno, 1970: 1.)

What is the meaning and position of art in today's society? Is it a means for opening up new horizons, contributing to a broader understanding? Or is it merely a tool for creating added value to other sectors such as health care, business and national economy? Is art urged to justify its existence through external incentives or is it valued as such?

At the outset of this study is the concern of art becoming more and more a means to achieve extra-artistic aims with the expense of the autonomy of art. Cultural policy has a crucial position as a governmental promoter of the arts. Cultural policy can either support or diminish the autonomy of art, thus bringing forth an instrumental approach towards art and art policy.

The autonomy of art refers to art's self-evident value of its own, which is not necessary to justify on any other grounds. The concept has its origins in the works of Immanuel Kant and his inquiries of aesthetics. Kant established the view that aesthetic judgement has an autonomous character (Harrington 2004: 14).

Theodor W. Adorno – a German critical theorist and member of the Frankfurt school – continued to develop theories of the autonomy of art and adopted it as a part of his philosophical works during the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. As a critical theorist, Adorno was particularly interested in the relation between art and society. Adorno perceived artworks as bringing forth another world by detaching themselves from the empirical world (Adorno 1970: 1). Adorno defended what he saw as the essence of art, namely its autonomy. Adorno opposed himself critical towards capitalism and culture industry, which he perceived to diminish the autonomy of art. The effect of culture industry, according to Adorno, is that it emphasizes economic values at the expense of the content (Adorno 1981: 99).

Although the world of today distinguishes from the world of Adorno, yet the same concerns remain within new frameworks. Art is to an increasing extent perceived as creating added value to other branches than the artistic. It is, in fact, more and more becoming a requirement and a justification for its existence. Moreover, an increasing instrumental approach is visible in the realm of arts and cultural policy.

Many critical cultural policy scholars have identified these as economic/market-driven developments. McGuigan (2004) refers to this age as dominated by economic reason. Gray

(2007) has developed the commodification thesis in order to address the instrumentalised cultural policy. Caust (2003) elaborates on issues concerning the impact economic and managerial ideologies have on art. Belfiore (2004) examines the role of New Public Management in the instrumentalisation of cultural policy within a British framework.

In the context of Finnish cultural policy these developments have been defined by e.g. Koivunen & Marsio (2006: 45) who claim that the prevailing hegemonic neo-liberalism of the last decades has proliferated the instrumentalism and the economic application of art, which in turn have signified a diminishing of the autonomy of art and its intrinsic value.

The applied use of art is indeed a reality of the arts field of today. Art-based methods are increasingly utilized in for instance the health care and education sectors. Not to mention projects such as Guggenheim Helsinki where the main focus is set on all the economic benefits to be gained and where art – the core function of a museum – is left at the bottom of all the estimations, budgets and reports (see e.g., Concept and Development Study for Guggenheim Helsinki, 2011).

Art-based knowledge is valued and artists are turning into consults for corporations who wish to increase their productiveness through art-based solutions. What is wrong with this development, one might ask. Artists are offered new opportunities to earn a living and at the same time give back to the society.

The problem is not the use of art as applications *per se*, to utilize the knowledge of artists or even to perceive that art may have beneficial effects on the wellbeing. The dilemma is that the use of art as applications becomes the primary significance, the justification for its existence and the requirement of state funding. In this way, its instrumental value and the benefits it generates becomes the focus, compromising the autonomy of art and its position as a self-evident part of the welfare state.

The prevailing instrumentalist discourses in cultural policy appear to become stronger and stronger. Previously the autonomy of art has been seen as something worth to value and to nurture. The change of paradigm has brought forth values that accentuate utility and exchange value over intrinsic value (see e.g., Caust 2003; Koivunen & Marsio 2006; Lampela 2012).

This leads us to the question of what the meaning, value and position of art and culture in today's society in fact is? Is art perceived to be valuable as such – as a basic expression of humanity – or is it merely subordinated as means for other, more significant, aims such as economic success and social welfare issues? The different interest groups of art have deviating

opinions of what the meaning, value and position of art in today's society is. Many artists embrace a view on art that values its intrinsic value. Developments of commercialization and marketization of the artistic sphere that have been going on for the past decades evoke rejection among many. The freedom and independence – the autonomy of art – are perceived as focal premises for its existence.

Politicians have their own views on art and the general public have theirs. Art has even been used as strategic tool in populist political games<sup>1</sup>. Art is an easy target when it comes to convincing the people of what a waste of public money art is. In the populist domain the funds of art is often on the same line as funds for health care. A more thorough insight into the state budget and the allocation of public funds would easily invalidate those kinds of statements.

Guidelines of cultural policy ought to be considered as ground rules that have influence and power. The meaning of cultural policy to the survival of art is invaluable. Some may say that the funds distributed by the state are only a fraction of the money that the private foundations are allocating. Nevertheless, the role of the state as the funder of art is not to be replaced by private foundations because firstly, the foundations are more prone to fluctuations of the markets and secondly, they do not have the mandate to secure the financing of art in our society as the state has as they operate in the market sphere. Therefore, it is crucial that the state remains as the salient supporter of art. The recent developments, however, imply that the state starts to annex ideologies of the market, undermining its previous welfare state status as the patron of art.

This study examines the development of Finnish cultural policy in terms of how the autonomy of art is supported or diminished. Moreover, it scrutinizes the role of instrumentalism in these developments.

## 1.1. Background of The Study

The Finnish system of financing the arts dates back to the early 1960s. In 1962 the Finnish Government appointed a committee, which was bound to prepare a white paper for the stabilization of supporting art. The paper was ready three years later and served as a ground for the law concerning the organization of art promotion (*laki taiteen edistämisen järjestelystä*) enacted in 1968. That white paper provided the first guidelines for Finnish art promotion on

---

<sup>1</sup> One recent example of this is the Finns Party's political program from 2011, which caused controversy with statements that the state should not support postmodern art but art, which express nationalistic ideas. It further entailed that subsidies to art should be distributed based on political decisions not on peer review. Later leader of the Finns Party Timo Soini admitted that most of the content concerning art and culture were meant as provocation.

state level. The cultural policy report of 1978 follows the presented directions and values set by that report. (Sevänen 1998: 350.)

Finnish cultural policy has for the majority of its existence followed the ideology of the welfare state. Starting from the 1960s until the 1980s, a strong ethos of democratizing culture and cultural democracy prevailed in the welfare cultural policies. Through policy guidelines and directives every citizen was entitled and encouraged to participate in public cultural services provided by the state, regardless of economical or social status. The concept of public cultural services emerged during the same era and were vigorously promoted as part of the evenly distribution of culture to everyone. Citizens were also encouraged to participate in doing art themselves and services that enabled activities of the sort were developed and provided for. The idea of the democratization of culture was reinforced with the prevalent value of inclusivity. Welfare cultural policy was directed by the thinking that art and culture were something that everyone had the right to take part in (Duelund 2008: 7).

In the 1990s the Finnish state became increasingly a part of global policies concerned with competitiveness and market logic, which indicated the rise of neo-liberalism. Neo-liberalism brought about structural as well as ideological changes in the state policy sphere. Liikkanen (2012) defines the shift in regimes as being a change from welfare state to competition state. The most prevailing aspect became the economic. As a part of this change also cultural policy became more entangled with general social and economic policies, losing its earlier position as an independent domain (Liikkanen 2012). Thus, cultural policy became a part of the overall state agenda of privatization and marketization. The membership in the European Union in 1995 opened up many new possibilities but brought forth also unexpected influences and policy directions. Suddenly the relatively closed Finnish state became a part of the global community. Globalisation, that was ongoing on a larger scale, concerned also Finland. Buzzwords with the epithets of 'creative' and 'innovation' started to emerge: creative economy, creative industries and innovation policies became the new terms to direct Finnish policy and consequently cultural policy.

Hence, this study will examine the implications of these eras to Finnish cultural policy. How has the neo-liberal era of public policy affected the manifestation of autonomy/instrumentalism in cultural policy in relation to the autonomy/instrumentalism during the welfare state era? In retrospective it is possible to see the causations. This study takes particular interest in examining the developments that brought us to the point we are at the moment. Moreover, it aims at increasing the consciousness of the current situation and hopefully contributing to both a better understanding and decisions of tomorrow. The ideological ground of this study is that the autonomy of art and culture is necessary for truly diverse voices of truth to emerge. Art and

culture require policies that recognize and nurture their inherent, autonomous potential. This study is concerned with the question of what will be the future of art and culture if they are reduced to the status of products, to mere commodities that are branded and sold?

## 1.2. Previous Research on the Subject

Previous research on the notion of cultural policy and the changed meaning and position of art and culture include works by for instance Kangas (1999); Ahponen and Kangas (2004); McGuigan (2004 and 2005); Bauman (2011); Lampela (2012); Liikkanen (2012) and Caust (2003).

Kangas (1999: 170) states that the new aims and practices of cultural policy are best described as the commodification of culture (*kulttuurin tavaroistuminen*). This implies, according to Kangas, that culture to a wider extent is part of the process of economic or social development. Various impact studies on the benefits of culture are becoming natural parts of the everyday life of arts and cultural institutions. McGuigan (2004) highlights that in cultural policy, the previously predominant notion of cultural value has been replaced by a pervasive economic rationale not seen before. McGuigan (2005) further pinpoints this paradigm shift as a result of the hegemonic ideology of neo-liberalism. He argues that neo-liberalism has brought forth “the language of branding, consumer sovereignty, market reasoning and management” (Ibid., 233). Ahponen and Kangas (2004) pertinently point out that the cultural sector has been subject to various general societal processes such as market liberalisation, privatization and deregulation. This as well implies that the previously solid system of state patronage is facing changes as a result of cut backs in the government budget. Alternative ways of funding the cultural sector becomes increasingly relevant. Bauman (2011) raises his concerns on the position of culture in our society. The name of his essay *Culture between state and market* perspicaciously describes his view on the current status of culture. Bauman elaborates on the character of the market and how art and culture may succeed to survive on their own terms.

Lampela (2012) has researched how visual artists perceive the utilization of art in society. He argues that the utilisation of art in the 21<sup>st</sup> century is by and large to be understood as evaluating art on economic grounds. Nevertheless, he claims that this is not the only form of utilization but it manifests in various ways. Lampela highlights the change in cultural policy arguing that the shift from a welfare state driven cultural policy to a neo-liberal, market-driven cultural policy is part of a wider set of changes of the social policies of Western civilizations (Lampela 2012: 23). He continues that in a society like this art has assimilated, becoming a part of mass culture, mass media, design and the aesthetisation of everyday life (Lampela 2012: 24). According to

Lampela, the new trend in cultural policy has not meant the end of the political-administrational system supporting the arts but rather a change of form and objectives (Ibid.).

According to the results of his research, the majority of the artists pose themselves critical towards the utilization of art, seeing it as a threat to the autonomy of art. It further reveals that the utilization of art is based on the economic principles of business and work life.

Liikkanen (2012) refers to the same changes in Finnish – and also European – cultural policy as Lampela. Liikkanen analyzes the courses of development through a green paper produced by the European Commission in 2010 *Unlocking the potential of cultural and creative industries*. The paper argues for a use of culture and the creative industries for the benefits of keeping Europe competitive. Liikkanen sees that culture has lost its intrinsic value and is increasingly perceived as generating merely economic growth and wellbeing. She defines this point of time we live in as the time of economic dominance (Liikkanen 2012: 1).

Liikkanen claims that culture and other public institution have lost their special position in society. They are understood as yet another sectors of business among others. Consequently, cultural policy is coming more and more a part of the social, economic and urban planning policies (Ibid., 2).

Within an Australian context, Caust (2003) has researched discourses of arts policy and its placement within an economic paradigm. Caust (2003: 61) asserts, "Over the past twenty years government support for the arts has been dominated by the desire to prove that art has other benefits, particularly economic ones." Moreover, Caust argues, arts funding agencies are reoriented to follow a market-driven rather than an arts-driven agenda (Ibid., 51). Caust claims that the problem with adopting economic values as justifiers for governmental support is that it proliferates the perception of the ultimate purpose of art as a generator of economic growth for the state (Ibid., 54).

As one may see, changes and shifts in paradigms concerning arts and culture have been recognized. The aforementioned scholars have indentified the change from a welfare-oriented cultural policy to a cultural policy with market-oriented and neo-liberal connotations. However, although the notion of these changes in cultural policy may be considered as shared assumptions, there does not exist much research on the development of Finnish cultural policy in terms of the impact these developments have had on the autonomy of art.

Therefore, the contribution of this study lies in the empirical research of Finnish cultural policy through the lens of critical discourse analysis, critical theory and ideas on neo-liberalism.

Hitherto Finnish cultural policy research has meritoriously outlined the historical development and identified the mega trends.

Nonetheless, critical examinations of the recent development in terms of the autonomy of art and the instrumentalism of cultural policy have not as such been in the focus of Finnish cultural policy research. Consequently, this study wishes to contribute to this particular part of Finnish cultural policy research through a historical overview. This knowledge further contributes to the understanding of how the changes in cultural policy have affected the perception of art in cultural policy.

With regards to the field of arts management this study contributes with insights into the ideological power structures that direct cultural policy and arts funding. It offers means to understand the underlying ideas, which in turn influence the arts organizations and the arts management field.

Moreover, this study seeks to serve as a provider of understanding concerning the development of Finnish cultural policy and thus, to deepen the knowledge of this crucial part of arts management. Further, with its critical orientation, this study seeks to illuminate latent power mechanisms and structures that otherwise would be left unquestioned and perceived as given.

### **1.3. Aim of the Study and Research Questions**

This study aims at critically examining the development of Finnish cultural policy over three decades, from 1978 to 2011. With reference to the theoretical and ideological justifications previously outlined, the primary focus of the study is on how the autonomy of art has been perceived in Finnish cultural policy. The autonomy of art is juxtaposed with instrumentalism and the instrumental aspects of cultural policy are scrutinized.

Through analyzing the discourses of Finnish cultural policy, this study seeks to find how the autonomy of art has been affected by instrumentalist endeavours and how this has changed the perception of the autonomy. The chosen time span comprises two major ideologies, the pro-welfare state social democracy of the 1970s and the neo-liberalism of the 1990s and onwards, which both have influenced Finnish cultural policy. This study is concerned with examining how these influences affect the autonomy of art.

Consequently, the research question of the study is the following: how has the autonomy of art been perceived in Finnish cultural policy during 1978–2011?

## 1.4. Research Approach

This study adopts an overall critical research approach. As McGuigan (2004: 3) claims: “Criticism is actually an indispensable dynamic in the production of knowledge and the project of human betterment.” McGuigan further defines criticism as questioning the issues that are taken for granted i.e. that are part of the hegemonic sphere (Ibid., 143).

Adopting a critical orientation, the theoretical framework of this study is critical theory with reference to the Frankfurt school and especially the theories of Theodor W. Adorno. Adorno is justified as a source of theory since he has comprehensively dealt with issues particularly concerning the autonomy of art apart from also theories of art at large.

This study adopts a qualitative research strategy with an interdisciplinary approach employing both content analysis and critical discourse analysis. In the qualitative framework this study falls within the interpretative discipline. The data consists of the cultural policy reports from 1978, 1993 and 2011 prepared for the Finnish Government.

Content analysis is used in the first phase of the analysis in order to find the underlying themes of the texts and to classify them into appropriate categories. Discourse analysis is applied as a framework of analyzing the sets of discourses that emerges from the data. The defined discourses are analyzed through the frame of critical theory.

## 1.5. The Structure of the Study

The study consists of five chapters. Initially an inquiry of the theoretical framework is made. That chapter consist of an overview of early conceptions of art, introducing the concept of the autonomy of art. Further, critical theory and the Frankfurt school are presented with a short inquiry into its history. An outline of the connection between critical theory and art is also included, which leads to one of the main points of the chapter, namely Adorno and the autonomy of art. In the sequences that follows the aspect of cultural policy is scrutinized in relation to the autonomy of art and instrumentalism. Finally the relation between instrumentalism and neo-liberalism is examined.

The methodology chapter introduces the research method and approach elaborating also the critical orientation. The main aspects of the two employed methods, critical discourse analysis and content analysis, are presented. Furthermore, the data and the analysis process are explored and finally ethical considerations of this study are elaborated.

In the analysis chapter the reports are analyzed and consequently emerging discourses are examined. References to the theoretical framework are already made in the analysis sequence.

To conclude, the results of the analysis are presented and implications are discussed upon in the last chapter. Suggestions for further research are defined in the last part of the study.

## 2. Theoretical Framework

This chapter presents the central theoretical viewpoints of the study. The aim is to offer means that both justify and deepen the analysis and the conclusions by giving them context and relevance. Moreover, the aim is to define the focal terms and concepts, which are adopted by this study.

At the outset the early conceptions of art is scoped and the birth of the concept of autonomous art is illustrated. Consequently, the views of the Frankfurt school theorist Theodor W. Adorno contribute to these particular theoretical considerations concerning the nature of art and culture, and their societal and aesthetic position. Hereafter, cultural policy is scrutinized through the works of Nordic and European cultural policy scholars such as Eleonora Belfiore, Clive Gray, Geir Vestheim and Jim McGuigan who propose theoretical insights on the instrumentalism of cultural policy and its past and present manifestations. Moreover, connections between neo-liberalism, cultural policy, art and culture are presented in the light of recent research.

### 2.1. Early Conceptions of Art

Philosophical concerns about the character of art and its position in society date back to Plato. His claims came to form the early Western tradition of conceiving art. According to Plato, the function of art in society was to contribute to elevate the minds of the people through creating beauty. It is notable that the word “art” in the time of ancient Greek did not have the connotation of creative expression of today but instead referred to skills (*technē*). Moreover, artists carried a low social status likened with other craftsmen. (Harrington 2004: 10.) Nevertheless, art was appreciated for its quality to communicate special knowledge. Works of Homer, for instance, were perceived as respected source of knowledge. This conception is a deeply rooted assumption in Western thinking. Plato, however, did not think highly of the arts or the artists. In *The Republic* (from c.360 BC) Plato disregards the conception of art works communicating special knowledge and understanding of the world. (Belfiore & Bennett 2007: 141.)

The platonic ideas of standardized beauty constituted the Italian Renaissance and became institutionalized in the Baroque period as a result of the foundation of the royal academies of art (Ibid.). A contemporary of Plato, Aristotle, whose ideas of mimesis constituted another prevalent conception in pre-modern understanding of art, approached the ideal of art imitating the original beauty of nature (Harrington 2004: 11). Art was perceived as a representation of reality. Aristotle further introduced one concept, which might be considered as one of the most influential ones, namely catharsis. Aristotle considered art as having a particular quality that

generated mechanisms of purification in people experiencing art. Aristotle's deliberation concerned dramatic art but has later been adapted to all art forms. This cathartic transformation process has in fact been the subject of theorizing ever since and came to form the conception, which in modern times is referred to as the cultivating and healing impact of the arts. The transformative powers of art have constituted the grounds for using art in contexts of social and educational policy (Belfiore and Bennett 2007: 143–144).

The European Enlightenment led to a shift from the Platonic and Aristotelian ideas to subjective perceptions of art and furthermore, a science of aesthetics (Harrington 2004: 12). Aesthetics is the inquiry concerned with judgments of taste about sensory objects known as works of art. The growing popularity of the view that art was something to appreciate and to contemplate over opened up a whole new perspective. The science of aesthetics went hand in hand with the general sceptical outlook concerning the previously commonly shared understandings dictated by the church (Ibid., 13). The progressive spirit of the Enlightenment brought forth several renowned works with critical undertones concerning civilization, education and the human nature in general, affirming a new, scientific worldview.

The Prussian philosopher Immanuel Kant brought forth the most influential contributions to aesthetics. Kant proposed a thorough aesthetic analysis in *The Critique of Judgement*, published in 1790 that were to be the source of inspiration for various philosophers, art and social theorists to come. In his concerns of the subjective act of perceiving something as beautiful, Kant asserts that a person does not make a strict claim of the being of the object nor does the person state the usefulness of it. Thus, Kant believed that the aesthetic experience and the judgement of something aesthetic have an autonomous character (Harrington 2004: 14).

The hereafter established autonomy tradition constitutes perhaps the most disputed conception of art. In the part that follows, this outlook is scrutinized in more detail.

## 2.2. Autonomy of Art

Theories regarding the autonomy of art rest on the assumption that aesthetic values as such constitute the value and significance of a work of art (Belfiore and Bennett 2007: 145). This affirms that there is no need to search for other forms of legitimacy of the value of art. This view proliferated as a result of the aforementioned theories of Kant. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century the influence of Kant's theories on the autonomous character of aesthetic judgement soon started to concern also the autonomy of art. Art was perceived to have a given, self-evident value, communicating specific kind of insights of the world. German idealist thinkers such as G.W.F.

Hegel perceived art as a means of accessing the ultimate truth, alongside philosophy and religion (Harrington 2004: 14).

Later on in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, this view manifested in a movement termed as art for art's sake (*l'art pour l'art*). Art was seen as a means of mythical and transcendental self-understanding. Moreover, art was perceived as a source of spiritual salvation and a counterforce to powers that corrupted society (Harrington 2004: 14). Most often, the concept of art for art's sake is mistakenly understood as an equivalent to the autonomy of art. A historical perspective, however, rejects this view. Art for art's sake theorists adopt the view proposed by Kant that art works do not have any purpose outside themselves, defining art as "purposiveness without a purpose". Nevertheless, they popularised and distorted Kant's ideas by separating art and morality, which was not the intent of Kant. Kant perceived the aesthetic dimension as possessing both a cognitive and moral value. The art for art's sake proponents also denied art of any educational or civilizing function (Belfiore and Bennett 2007: 145–146.)

Alongside the vast adoption of the Kantian idea of the autonomy, it has also been subject to critique. In his theories, Kant was not concerned with the historical or social premises that form the ways in which art are valued. Kant's negligence of the social dimension of art was confronted by opposite views. Theorists, in particular historians and sociologists, asserted that art and its appreciation does in fact serve secondary purposes, which were connected to the social premises of different classes and status groups. They argued that art and in particular art consumption comprise means of marking social status and group identity, hence serving social interests. These views entail that art in fact is not autonomous but heteronomous, as it serves also other purposes than merely aesthetic ones. (Harrington 2004: 88.)

The dichotomy of autonomous versus heteronomous art remains one of the prevalent subjects of debate in discussions concerning the significance of art. Heteronomy refers to external forces, which are imposed on something, in this case on art. Harrington (2004: 111) perceives the split as two perspectives on the autonomy of art: transcendentalism, representing the Kantian view of the validity of art works, which is in no relation to social facts, and relativism, which argues that the only validity works of art hold is social facts. Harrington (2004) proposes that in order to reach a sensible analysis between the two opposite aspects, they ought to be approached through dialectics. Dialectics is defined as logical procedures that aim at solving antinomies. Antinomies occur when two arguments, irrefutable in their own terms, stand in contradiction to one another (Harrington 2004: 111). The dialectical character of the autonomy of art resides in the two-folded notions of art relating to and being independent from social premises. Critical theory engages in theorising these perceptions. Consequently, the following parts will present critical theory and the Frankfurt School with reference to the autonomy of art.

### 2.3. Critical Theory and the Frankfurt School

Critical theory is a tradition of thinking that dates back to 1923 when the Institute of Social Research (Institut für Sozialforschung) was established in Frankfurt by Felix Weil, a son of a wealthy merchant (Held 1980: 29). The Institute was formally attached to the University of Frankfurt but due to its prosperous patron, it possessed significant autonomy (Ibid.). During its first years Carl Grünberg, who brought forth the strong Marxist tradition that continues to characterize critical theory, directed the Institute.

In 1930 Max Horkheimer became the director of the Institute and most of the theorists that later became known as the members of the Frankfurt school started to contribute to the Institute's research activities (Ibid.). Horkheimer pivotally contributed to the development of critical theory with his essay from 1937 *Traditional and Critical Theory* (Harrington 2004: 113). The critical thinking of the theorists refers to critique defined by Kant in *Critique of Pure Reason*. Kant defines critique as exploring "the conditions of possibility of knowledge and experience of the world." (Ibid., 113). Further, the essential aim of the critical theorists was to seek a critical perspective to all social practices, thus contributing "to the development of a non-authoritarian and non-bureaucratic politics" (Held 1980: 16). Critical theory was in its time of inception a reaction to traditional theory. Traditional theory was by the critical theorists referred to the scientific outlook on the world that had been the prevailing way of thinking since the Renaissance (Kotkavirta 1991: 169). The essential point of critique was the concept and perception of reason. Through their work, the critical theorists sought to expand the traditional, instrumental concept of reason to a means of social critique (Ibid., 170–171).

In the quest of revising the concept of reason, critical theorists drew inspiration from the philosophical traditions of German idealism – drawing from Hegel's and Kant's theories on the concept of rationality, as well as from Marxian theory of capitalism and emancipation (Kotkavirta 1991: 170–171). Works of Max Weber, György Lukács and Sigmund Freud also constituted inspirational sources for the critical theorists (Held 1980: 16). The Marxism that the critical theorists drew from refers to the 20<sup>th</sup> century humanist branch of Marxian thinking (Harrington 2004: 113).

Due to the Marxist connection, critical theory has been referred to as Western Marxism. However, the Institute itself rejected explicit political affiliations, rather emphasizing political independence (Kotkavirta 1991: 171 and 177). Nonetheless, critical theory became the political inspiration and the key to self-understanding of the New Left movement during the 1960s and 1970s (Held 1980: 13). Despite of the political connotations, critical theory withdrew from the

two dominant political movements of its time: capitalism and socialism, in order to remain free to pose critique on all social practices, including politics (Held 1980: 14).

## 2.4. Critical Theory and Art

(...) Art represents the ultimate goal of all revolutions: the freedom and happiness of the individual. (Herbert Marcuse 1978: 69.)

In its critical inquiries of society and human existence, critical theory has contributed extensively to the analysis of art and culture. The Institute's approach to research was interdisciplinary, which meant that beyond social sciences also psychology and culture were part of its researcher's interests. Critical theorists were concerned with how popular culture transmitted beliefs and thoughts, thus they sought to develop "a sociology of mass culture" (Held 1980: 77). The emerging entertainment industry and the reorganization of free time were among some of the incentives that urged the critical theorists to scope the evolving aspects of culture (Ibid., 78).

In particular critical theorists such as Walter Benjamin, Ernst Bloch, György Lukács and the Frankfurt School theorists Theodor W. Adorno, Max Horkheimer, Herbert Marcuse and Jürgen Habermas contributed to the development of the dialectics of autonomy of art. The critical theorists argue that "works of art are not only conditioned by society; they are *about* society" (Harrington 2004: 114). They pose themselves critical towards the societal conditions under which art exists. They criticize the structures of industrial and rationalized capitalism, which the critical theorists claim to reduce cultural life to mere consumer commodities.

As representatives of critical theory their mission was to critically scrutinize every phenomenon in society, including art and culture. Adorno, Horkheimer and Marcuse shared the view that art and culture in their most sublime form means to critical participation in society. They believed that with its subversive quality, art denied the prevailing societal order, making it truly revolutionary.

(...) Art can create images of beauty and order or contradiction and dissonance – an aesthetic realm which at once leaves and highlights reality. Art's object world is derived from the established order, but it portrays this order in a non-conventional manner. (...) The structure of art forms *enacts* an alternative vision. As such art has a cognitive and subversive character. (Held 1980: 81.)

According to the Frankfurt school representatives' art and culture resist assimilating to the existing world order, instead evoking something that has the qualities of being subversive,

emancipatory and true. These qualities are interrelated to the concept of autonomy. Autonomy is required for art to be truly free from pressure to assimilate to the existing world order. For critical theorists, autonomy of art resists the processes that turn art into a commodity (Harrington 2004: 116).

The quality of autonomy is, according to Horkheimer, Marcuse and in particular Adorno, a certain feature that is common for art and culture across time and place (Held 1980: 81). The concept of autonomy is the most central concepts in aesthetic theory. It refers to self-governed art and culture, which do not fulfil the wants, requirements and desires of anyone or anything else than art and culture itself. In the very essence of the notion of autonomous art is according to Marcuse and Adorno art's critical and emancipatory potential: To them "art provided a medium for critical thinking by upholding images of life which contradicted the existent" (Held 1980: 84).

The theory of the autonomy of art primarily takes a stance to the meaning and function of art. According to Adorno and Horkheimer, art first became truly autonomous when it separated from the pre-capitalist patronage system, at the same time losing its direct social functions, serving the purposes of the royal courts or the church (Held 1980: 84). Hamilton (2009: 254) further elaborates on the matter of the increasing independence of the artists. The ascending bourgeois culture of the late 18<sup>th</sup> century meant novel possibilities for artists to produce and sell works that expressed their own values, not prescribed by patrons. Hence, the engagement in the market brought forth independence and autonomy, which were hitherto inexperienced. From this perspective it was paradoxically the market and the commodification of art works that contributed to the autonomy of artists. However, although capitalism emancipates from feudalism it simultaneously reifies new oppressing structures. (Hamilton 2009: 254.)

The sharp social critique of Adorno and Horkheimer was directed at the phenomena of their time – a world trying to recover from immense tragedies, seeking hope from progression. Although we now live in a whole different era some things do not change and the points made several decades ago may still be considered relevant. The commodification and marketization of art and culture has not ceased to exist – quite the opposite. We live in a time when policies of innovation, creativity and branding are penetrating every possible domain. As a result art and culture are increasingly being given new functions, meanings and purposes – justifications for their existence. The next section will continue to elaborate on Adorno's views on the autonomy of art. The following sequences will further examine the relationship between autonomy and instrumentalism of art and cultural policy.

## 2.5. Adorno and the Autonomy of Art

The concept of the autonomy of art constitutes a pervasive standing point in the theories of Adorno. For Adorno, the autonomy of art is nourished by the idea of humanity and as society became less human, the autonomy is shattered (Adorno 1970: 1). Thus, Adorno sees the interrelation between the autonomy of art and society: society either supports or undermines the autonomy of art. Nevertheless, he claims that the autonomy of art remains irrevocable (Ibid.).

The Frankfurt school with Adorno in the forefront took an especially critical stance towards the culture industry, which started to emerge during the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Adorno criticised that “most art and music in the twentieth century has become ‘functional’ for a world of commodity production (Held 1980: 89). He argued that the autonomy of art works is eliminated by the culture industry (Adorno 1981: 99). Also other representatives of critical theory and the Frankfurt school shared the concerns of the increasing commodification of the art and cultural domains. According to Horkheimer and Adorno they were the first to use the concept ‘culture industry’ in *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (1947). In the first drafts they used the term ‘mass culture’ but later replaced it with culture industry. Adorno explains that the focal difference between the two terms is that mass culture is something that arises spontaneously from the masses themselves whereas the products of culture industry are tailored for consumption by the masses and manufactured according to plan (Adorno 1981: 98).

Adorno’s and Horkheimer’s principal concern of the culture industry was that the products of culture industry were “bound by purposes set by the market” (Held 1980: 93). As opposite to autonomous work of art, products of the culture industry were now characterised by standardisation and pseudo-individualisation (Ibid.). Standardisation refers to both the process of production i.e. mass production as well as the standardised and automatised patterns of reactions, which the products aim at. Pseudo-individualisation appears in the numerous reproductions of a similar product whose intent is to appear as novel, bestowing its possessor with an aura of uniqueness.

Adorno was in particular concerned with the threat commodity production was to autonomous art (Hamilton 2009: 254). He feared that art as a result would merely serve as entertainment, thus losing its critical potential. However, Adorno believed that art of autonomous and critical nature would survive if it consciously or unconsciously were to react against market requirements (Ibid.).

Adorno states, that the meaning of art is its functionlessness (Held 1980: 83). By this he implies that the meaning of truly autonomous art transcends any external expectations. Adorno

explicates this as art having a social situation but not a social function. He claims that all efforts to give art a social function are doomed (Adorno 1970: 1). Art does not have an external purpose, as it is an end itself (Hamilton 2009: 251). This view embraces the assumption of art as independent from extra-artistic values such as social or political. In fact, Adorno did not sympathise with art that tried to create a political or didactic effect. He claimed that if art tries to do so, it on the contrary loses its significance (Held 1980: 83).

Adorno's renowned theories on mass culture and culture industry are still prevailing in contemporary cultural studies. Works such as *Aesthetic Theory* (1970) and *The Culture Industry* (compiling texts from 1972 and 1976) have made their mark as some of the most influential works on these matters. The essay on culture industry was first introduced as part of *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. There Adorno and Horkheimer elaborate on focal matters of the culture industry scrutinising in particular the consequences of mechanical reproduction of art and its connections to capitalism: "The culture industry gears itself almost entirely to the development of cultural forms which are compatible with the preservation of capitalism" (Held 1980: 92). They further claim that art in the culture industry is bound by purposes set by the markets in contrast to its previous form of existence as purposiveness without purpose (Ibid., 93). Purposiveness without purpose originates from Kant, who is perceived to constitute the philosophical origins of the autonomy of art (Hamilton 2009: 252).

## 2.6. Cultural Policy and the Autonomy of Art

Cultural policy is a form of public policy that supports the production, distribution and consumption of art and culture. The prevailing societal, economic and political orders influence the objectives of cultural policy. In the post-war era for instance, the Nordic welfare countries engaged in common efforts to ensure artistic freedom and cultural democracy through cultural policy, referred to as *The Nordic Cultural Model* (Duelund 2008: 7). Rautiainen (2007: 51) pinpoints the characteristic features of the Nordic welfare model of cultural policy as a twofold objective of creating arts promotion structures that both ensure the realisation of cultural democracy and the freedom of art, which can be identified as its autonomy.

In Finnish cultural policy, the autonomy of art has explicitly been secured through previously mentioned administrative efforts. The law enacted in the late 1960s concerning the organisation of arts promotion, *laki taiteen edistämisen järjestelyistä* (328/1967<sup>2</sup>) aimed at securing the working conditions of artists (Ibid., 49). Also the peer review system of grants and subsidies that is a focal aspect of the development of the art councils since the mid 1970s is an administrative measure asserting the autonomy of art by separating political affiliations and

---

<sup>2</sup> This law was abrogated in 2012 by the enacted law of the Arts Promotion Centre (657/2012).

preferences from artistic decision-making. It has been one of the most central features when discussing the autonomy of art supported by cultural policy.

The autonomy of art has always been subject to debate in the field of art. When the Arts Promotion Centre Finland was in the process of replacing the former Arts Council of Finland, artist organisations raised their concerns on how the autonomy of art will be assured especially in terms of securing the peer review system (Helsingin Sanomat 17.5.2012). The feared outcome was that the decision-making power would move into the hands of civil servants. However, the reorganisation retained the peer review system as a central part of the decision-making process concerning grants and subsidies.

As a political instrument, cultural policy sets guidelines and implements measures that both directly and indirectly influence the production, distribution and consumption of art and culture in society. As such it is evident to claim that cultural policy is instrumental. The question that follows is thus not if cultural policy is instrumental or not, but rather what different forms the instrumentalism undertakes and how this ultimately affects art and culture. The previously mentioned examples of cultural policy securing the autonomy of art display measures of cultural policy as an instrument in relation to the autonomy of art.

Many scholars claim that the previous objectives of cultural policy securing the position of art – in both the Nordic and the European countries – have changed (see e.g. Belfiore 2002; McGuigan 2004 and 2005; Gray 2007; Vestheim 2007; and Duelund 2008). Gray (2007: 203) sees the changes in cultural policy as a development of an increasing emphasis on the use of cultural and art as tools for attaining non-cultural, non-arts aims. He perceives the development as a process, which has been going on since the late 1970s.

McGuigan (2005) brings forth an ideological hypothesis. He argues that the societal condition of the last decades is characterised by the hegemonic condition of neo-liberalism, influencing to a great extent also cultural policy. McGuigan identifies one of the features of neo-liberal development as issues of social policy translating into questions of cultural policy (McGuigan 2005: 238). These developments of contemporary cultural policy are in cultural policy literature often referred to as instrumentalism. The following part will examine this notion with regards to what the implications might be for the autonomy of art.

## **2.7. The Instrumentalism of Cultural Policy**

The concept of instrumentalism expresses the counterpart of autonomy. Instrumentalism of art refers to the extra-artistic and -cultural meanings and functions that are given to art and culture. As hitherto has been displayed, the autonomy is a quintessential aspect of art. Further, the

relation between autonomy and instrumentality is going to be elaborated with regards to art and culture in the neo-liberal context.

Gray (2007) asserts that instrumentality is always part of public policy, but it is, however, important what form it undertakes. Gray further argues that the emphasis in arts and cultural policies has increasingly been placed on the need to show that they “generate a benefit over and above the aesthetic” and that this has recently become a dominant trend within political systems (2007: 203).

Also Vestheim (2009: 56) argues that all cultural policy is instrumental. He implies that it is instrumental in the meaning of always thriving to attain other goals than merely artistic or cultural. Further Vestheim affirms that due to the integrated instrumental character of (cultural) policy the intrinsic value of culture is in fact illogical. According to Vestheim, the goal of cultural policy is to influence citizens through creating platforms and spaces for them to encounter culture in various forms. He claims that seen from a policy point of view, culture has no intrinsic value.

The role of cultural policy is to support certain forms of culture and make them available to citizens. The question of the autonomy vis-à-vis dependency of culture and art stands in relation to conflicting interests between different parties that can be defined as the cultural policy system, producers and other intermediaries, and publics (Vestheim 2010: 89). As in any form of policy, the notion of power is present in cultural policy. Through supporting certain forms of culture, cultural policy influences the tastes of the public.

## **2.8. Neo-liberalism and Cultural Policy**

Neo-liberalism is a theory of political economy, which connects the freedom of markets and of trade as a guarantee of individual freedom (Harvey 2005: 7). The neo-liberal doctrine opposed state interventionist theories, which were represented by Keynesian economics. Moreover, the role of the state in the neo-liberal idea was to keep its intervention with the markets as minor as possible (Ibid., 20). In the past thirty years neo-liberalism has become one of the most influential forms of political economy and political ideology (Gamble 2001: 127).

Both Gamble (Ibid., 133) and McGuigan (2005: 229) refer to neo-liberalism as a hegemonic condition. The years of 1978–1980 constitute the turning point of the social and economic development worldwide (Harvey 2005: 1). The central ideas of neo-liberal thought, deregulation, privatization, and withdrawal of the state from many areas of social provision, undermine the welfare state, making the markets the principal domain for all human action (Harvey 2004: 2–3).

As a result of the global liberation of the financial markets in the 1980s, also Finland entered the era of neo-liberalism. In the recession of the 1990s, neo-liberalism had already managed to reach a leading position in the Finnish political ideology. A politics of competitiveness started to prevail as a primary principle in society. (Patomäki 2007: 55.)

The idea of prevailing market mechanisms in all domains brings forth commodification as a salient feature connected to neo-liberalism. “The commodification of everything” (Harvey 2005: 165) is the imperative, which implies that everything can be treated as a commodity meaning that anything from processes to social relations may be priced, privately owned and traded. Gray (2007: 203) argues that the political, social and economic changes that started in the early 1980s resulted in ideological conditions where exchange-value exceeds use-value. He further claims that the process of commodification has led to the instrumentalisation of arts and cultural policies (Ibid., 204). Also Adorno (1981: 99), although perhaps not with neo-liberalism in mind, argues that the cultural commodities are governed by the principle of realisation as value (exchange-value), not by their own specific content (use-value).

The shift from use-value towards exchange-value constitutes the central argument of the commodification thesis termed by Gray (2007). The thesis provides a way of understanding the advancement of instrumental policy forms. The essence of the instrumentalisation of policy is that the focus is extensively starting to shift towards considerations external to the content of the policy sector itself (Gray 2007: 201). Through the commodification thesis Gray affirms that the initial reason for the shift towards external factors is the ideological re-focusing towards exchange-value. As a result the focus moves away from the internal details of the policy itself and towards how policy contributes to commodified forms of exchange relationships (Ibid., 210). Moreover, Gray argues, this ideological change is embedded in policymaking, thus ensuring that the content external to the policy receives amplified attention (Ibid.). Examples of this are to be found e.g. in the various cultural projects that are discussed in terms of urban regeneration, tourism and social cohesion.

McGuigan (2005: 232) further proposes that the effects of neo-liberalism on cultural policy in general and culture in particular need to be considered through the ideological mediation of culture and economy:

Theoretical critique of neo-liberal thought and practice is necessary, but what catches attention most from a cultural analysis rather than a strictly political economy perspective is the command of neo-liberalism over popular consciousness and everyday life.

The effect of having the command of popular consciousness and everyday life, as McGuigan puts it, is the same as the effect of a discourse. According to Young (1981: 48) discourses makes “it virtually impossible to think outside of them”. The connection between discourse and neo-liberalism is relevant since neo-liberalism proliferates the use of a certain type of language. According to McGuigan (2005: 233) neo-liberalism brings forth the language of branding, consumer sovereignty and market reasoning. Bourdieu and Wacquant (2001) term the new language as ‘NewLiberalSpeak’. This new vocabulary seems to have ‘sprung out of nowhere’ and contains terms such as: globalization, flexibility, exclusion and new economy. It is noticeable that everyone including researchers, writers and artists adopts this Speak. (Ibid., 2.) This only asserts the pervasive nature of discourses.

Neo-liberalism has contributed to a shift in paradigm, bringing forth a prevailing economic reason in all practices of social life. In cultural policy this has meant an increasing emphasis on the instrumental value of art in the sense of its economic and social benefits. The social impacts of art may also be considered as economic. When policy measures seek to increase wellbeing, prevent social exclusion or decrease unemployment rates through art, the ultimate aim is often in fact to save money.

\*

Adorno (1981: 99) claims that the culture industry eliminates the autonomy of art. When it comes to art and its position in society the social critics seem to agree that there are powers that threaten the autonomy of art.

Art – beginning as a simple, human means of communication – has become the matter of many controversies during centuries. Not with the same altitude as religion but still constituting one of the most disputed topics of social science and philosophy. More or less influential figures throughout history have had their say on what the value of art is, what its purpose is and how it should be supported. But the time we live in now, distinguishes itself in many ways from any time before. Matters of technology, to name one, has changed the pace and forms of communication, distribution and production. Market forces dominate and with its powerful mechanisms easily invade domains that earlier were exempt from its influence. Therefore, an examination of what the value and position of art in the 21<sup>st</sup> century is and how it has changed appears justified.

## 3. Methodology

The aim of the methodology chapter is to present the premises of the analysis and to justify the philosophical ground on which the research is based. It further presents the data of the study and offers insights to the research strategy and presents the phases of the analysis process. As such the methodology chapter provides the reader with a roadmap, offering a context for the research and elaborating the justifications for the choices made by the researcher.

### 3.1. Research Method and Approach

This study adopts an interdisciplinary, qualitative research strategy, which employs methods from content and discourse analysis. Content analysis is applied in the first phase of the analysis as a method to notice the prevalent themes of the data by labelling and categorizing the data. In the second phase of the analysis the themes are developed into discourses and further analyzed from the critical perspective set forth by discourse analysis. The discourse analysis is thus part of the interpretative approach of the study.

According to Miles and Huberman (1994) the interpretative approach is one of the three major research approaches to qualitative data analysis alongside the social anthropological approaches and collaborative social research approaches. In the interpretative orientation social and human action may be perceived as text i.e. symbols that express layers of meaning.

Qualitative analysis often seems to suffer from a stepchild dilemma – most often overshadowed and diminished by quantitative methods. Murdock (1997: 178) claims that the problem according to the proponents of quantitative analysis methods is that “qualitative materials are seen as too imprecise, value laden, and particularistic to be of much use in generating general or causal explanations”. The qualitative research approach is to some extent always interpretative, which makes the question of validity focal. In order to make a valid research the researcher ought at all times to be conscious of e.g. how ones own values influences the analysis. However, it may be noted that this orientation is also applicable to quantitative methods. It is a commonly shared assumption that everything related to numerical data and natural science is absolutely reliable. Nonetheless, also quantitative and positivistic research is a result of the researcher’s framing, which already is a more or less value laden choice, not to mention the interpretation of figures, which is not exempt from the researcher’s influence. The difference between qualitative research with a critical orientation and quantitative research is that qualitative research acknowledges this fact, not even seeking to claim itself as neutral. This increases the validity of the qualitative research.

As Alasuutari (1994: 39) points out, qualitative analysis is not conducted because of the lack of resources of applying quantitative methods. Qualitative analysis is applied in cases where a vast cohort or the argumentation based on statistics is not relevant for the purposes of the study. As the aim of this study is to critically examine the developments of the discourses of cultural policy in terms of the autonomy of art, a qualitative methodology appears most appropriate for the purposes set forth by this study.

### **3.2. The Critical Orientation**

A critical orientation may be defined as a questioning of the past, finding deficiencies in current arguments and thinking independently (McGuigan 2004: 3). This study adopts a critical orientation as a pivotal part of its research approach. In order to critically assess the development of Finnish cultural policy with regard to the autonomy of art it adopts notions of two critical approaches – critical discourse analysis and critical theory. Discourse analysis is applied since it provides a medium that uncovers the prevalent discourses and consequently the dominant values and ideologies of the data. Critical theory, as presented in more detail in the theory chapter, provides a comprising framework of critical cultural studies that in particular focuses on the role of art in society and the concept of autonomy.

Critical discourse analysis shares the perspective common to all critical research methods and approaches, which are ultimately concerned with making social phenomena visible, revealing interconnectedness, power structures and chain of cause (Wodak 2001: 2). McGuigan (2004: 113) argues that “a critical and reflexive cultural policy analysis needs to (...) go beneath the surface to examine structures and processes that may not be immediately evident.” Following the guidelines of critical analysis, this study seeks to reveal the otherwise covert yet prevailing discourses in the cultural policy reports and to discuss their implications on the autonomy of art.

Critique requires a stance taking of the researcher. This study explicitly claims to be a result of the interpretation of the researcher and in that sense, biased. Van Dijk (2001: 96) argues that because research is biased it does not per definition mean bad scholarship. In fact in the case of critical discourse analysis, the point is to explicitly define and defend the socio-political position of the research. The next section will present the orientation of critical discourse analysis in more detail.

### **3.3. Critical Discourse Analysis**

To express it simply, discourse is language in a social context including characteristic statements and expressions in a specific context (McGuigan 2004: 144). In the framework of critical discourse analysis, discourse is understood in a broad sense as a 'communicative event,

including conversational interaction, written text as well as associated gestures, face work, typographical layout, images and any other semiotic or multimedia dimension of signification (van Dijk 2001: 98). Fairclough (2001) terms all the aforementioned elements as semiosis.

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) takes particular interest in the relation between language and power i.e. how – opaque as well as transparent – structures of dominance, social inequality and power are constituted and expressed in language (Wodak 2001: 2). It further perceives ideology as crucial in establishing and maintaining unequal power relations. Therefore, CDA seeks to decipher ideologies and to demystify discourses (Ibid., 10).

In many branches of discourse analysis text remains the only unit of analysis. DCA, however, adopts a broader perspective comprising the whole social system including the social processes, which produces the texts into its focus of inquiry (Ibid., 3).

According to CDA discourse is historically interpreted and produced (Ibid.). This means that groups with power legitimize the dominant power structures, creating a sort of status quo, which is almost impossible for someone outside the power group to question or to resist. A certain feature of a discourse is that it makes it impossible to think outside of it. This is the result of iteration, a process of reifying through repetition. Another feature of a discourse is naturalizing and stabilizing truths by making them given. Discourses create hegemony of thought, which result in the lack of imagining alternative worlds.

As the aim of this study is to critically examine how the understanding of the autonomy of art has changed in the context of Finnish cultural policy, CDA as a framework of analyzing power structures provides a suitable approach to reach that objective.

CDA constitutes more of an overall research approach than a strict method to employ. CDA consists of various forms of methodologies differing from scholar to scholar (Wodak 2001: 3). It is further generally agreed among CDA scholars that it is not to be understood as a single method but as an approach (Wodak 2001: 14).

### **3.4. Content Analysis**

Content analysis is a method that scrutinizes artefacts of social communication including written texts and transcriptions of recorded communication. The research approach of content analysis may be quantitative or qualitative. One of the strengths of content analysis is that it is possible to research processes and trends in society over a long period of time. The units of analysis may be any element of a text e.g. words, phrases, sentences, themes, concepts, chapters, ideological stances or subject topics. (Berg 1988: 240–258.)

In content analysis the contents to analyze are termed as either manifest or latent. The manifest content stands for the countable, physically existing elements whereas the latent content comprises the underlying meanings resulting from the researcher's interpretation. The manifest content may further be defined as the surface structure of the text and the latent content is the deep, structural meaning. (Ibid., 242.)

Although content analysis and discourse analysis both operate in the domains of human communication and texts, there exists distinct differences in terms of approach and orientation. Perhaps the most prevalent difference is the inherent critical approach that defines discourse analysis and which is not as explicit in content analysis. In content analysis the latent content is more subordinated to the manifest content whereas in discourse analysis the focus is mainly on the covert meanings and connotations. The surface structure of the text is also a part of the discourse analysis but the analysis focus on the how the structure expresses unjust power relations.

With regard to the critical orientation of this study discourse analysis offers an approach, which helps to analyze the data in a critical manner, revealing hidden ideas and agendas. Content analysis provides a method that displays the major themes of the data and thus contributes with a thorough overview of the prevalent guidelines.

### **3.5. The Data**

The data of this study consist of cultural policy documents of the Finnish government from 1978, 1993 and 2011. The documents represent the same type of policy document, which directs the general guidelines of Finnish cultural policy. Apart from the already mentioned reports, additionally one cultural policy document was published in 1982 as complementary to the 1978 report. Initially, this report was going to be included as the data of this study. However, due to the nature of the document, after consideration, it was left out of the scope of this study, as it did not offer the kind of information that was relevant with regards to the interests of this study. The cultural policy report of 1982 did not deal with questions concerning art but addressed mainly administrative measures of cultural policy in terms of regional cultural administration, the spaces of culture and leisure time, the employees of culture and leisure activities, international cultural cooperation, art education and copyright issues. Hence, it was regarded as not offering relevant data for the purposes of this study.

The cultural policy documents set forth the major guidelines of Finnish cultural policy. They define the focus points of how the state funds ought to be allocated but do not determine how much money is allocated where, which is outlined in the state budget. The significance and

impact of these documents are the more tacit ideological directions that are constructed and reproduced.

Officials of the Ministry of Education and Culture prepare the cultural policy documents. Moreover, also experts representing different positions in the arts and cultural fields are involved in the process.

As the data are governmental documents, which ought to be easily accessed by citizens, the accessibility of the data did not constitute a problem. However, since the first document dates back to the late 1970s, the acquiring of that required more effort. Ultimately the library of the Ministry of Education and Culture provided a copy of the report. The 1993 report is to be found in the selection of the Library of the Parliament and the latest document is accessible online. Furthermore, the data may be termed naturally occurring data since it exists despite of the conduction of this study (Alasuutari 1999: 84). The data all in all consisted of approximately 128 pages.

The report of 1978 is intentionally framed to deal with issues of art policy in particular. The report states that the preparation of a cultural policy report would require a thorough cross-administrative cooperation. Moreover, the demand for a report of arts policy is higher due to several reform projects and problems concerning art funding (Arts policy report 1978: 8).

The incentive towards defining the aims and objectives of art policy was delivered in the white paper (*komiteamietintö*) published in 1965. These propositions came to form the current arts promotions system of Finland (Sevänen 1998: 350).

The following reports of 1993 and 2011 are termed cultural policy reports. Nevertheless, they also address matters concerning art policy. The use of the concepts of art and culture alternate in all the reports and the conceptual focus is not always clear. In the context of the reports this study chooses to see art and culture as synonyms. However, the use of the term 'art' is favoured, as the theoretical focus of this study is the concept of the autonomy of art.

The cultural policy documents represent the most influential policy guidelines for the Finnish arts and cultural life. Even though in terms of Euros the funds allocated by the state is less than the patronage of private foundations, the significance of state financed art is non-arguable. Moreover, what the Finnish state defines as the general guidelines for art and culture and what measures are proposed in order to support or undermine it, have an influence on the public opinion. Therefore, this study perceives this data as the most appropriate source of information in order to get an overview on the past and present status quo of art in our society.

Inside each report text patterns and consistencies were easily notable. The reports communicated distinct atmospheres, which were constructed through choices of words and terms and uses of expressions, which appeared to be strongly connected to each period of time. It was prevalent how the reports distinctively represent a particular *zeitgeist* and communicate the ambiance of society.

The report of 1978 represented the most distinctive report of the three. The textual style deviated from the two later reports. It was explicitly political with evident leftist sympathies. This reflects the overall atmosphere of the Finnish art scene of the 1960s and 1970s, which was characterized by political affiliations. Even the Marxist term estrangement (*Entfremdung*) in the connection to the theory of alienation was used as a focal concept in the report, with reference to the condition of the society at the time. According to the report, art was to save the people from the corrupting effects of mass culture. Here one may perceive echoes also from critical theory. Naturally the major themes of the Finnish cultural policy of the 1960s and onwards, democracy of culture and cultural democracy, were well represented.

The reports of 1993 and 2011 present a different kind of society. The 1993 report is influenced by the economic recession, which manifest in a stricter attitude towards state financed culture. One may detect traces of neo-liberal ideologies in the suggested measures. The position of the welfare state is not as solid as it used to be and propositions of market logic are little by little introduced to the field of cultural policy. Scarce economic times make the solutions of market economy more tempting.

In the report of 2011 the gloominess of 1993 is gone and the economic rationale has tightened its grip as a prevailing ideology of Finnish cultural policy. We have entered the era of exploiting creativity and art in every possible way. The language is filled with new terms and expressions that tend to be drained of actual meaning. A world full of empty words with underlying economic aspirations is the leading tone of the 2011 report.

### **3.6. The Analysis Process**

At the outset of the analysis, the contents of the texts were analyzed on a macro level, report by report. The first phase of the analysis was to outline the text segments that communicated something relevant in terms of the aim of the study. The intent was to find similarities and deviations of the segments and then categorizing them under the emerging themes. The themes were identified through finding related topics and reoccurring arguments and propositions. The parts of the text that did not appear relevant were left outside the scope of the analysis.

The aim of this first phase in the analysis was to pinpoint the most prevalent themes of the text in order to get a thorough overview of the data. At this point, discourses as such were not considered as a primary focus of the analysis but became the issue of the next analysis phase.

After the initial phase, the themes were analyzed once again now with the focus on the emerging discourses. The difference between labelling the themes and identifying discourses is that the theme exists on a general level and a discourse is a normative statement. In order to grasp and distinguish the discourses from the themes, a critical stance was to be taken. This, in turn, required a change in orientation. Finding the major themes of each report was rather effortless but to trace the discourses required analytical work. In order to uncover discourses one needs to truly go deeper into the text and not to settle with what is offered at first sight.

In the analysis of the discourses the focus was on the covert meaning of the used words and expressions. The discourses were identified as statements of the documents – what is the document actually saying when it e.g. argues for using art as applications? In other words, what is the tacit ideology of each report?

The analysis was guided by the question how does cultural policy perceive art? In order to get to the bottom of the subject also other supporting questions were used such as how is art positioned in relation to other aspects in society such as economy, healthcare and education? How is cultural policy positioned in relation to other policies? Thus, the analysis moved on both the level of cultural policy and on the level of art. The purpose of these aiding questions was to support the original research question: how has the autonomy of art been perceived in Finnish cultural policy during 1978–2011?

### **3.7. Critical Reflections of the Study**

As for any qualitative study the biases of the researcher may cause some doubts about the validity and reliability of the study. However, the chosen critical and interpretative research orientation per definition requires a deliberation and consequently, interpretation of the researcher. As van Dijk (2001) states, bias does not necessarily mean bad scholarship.

The validity as well as the reliability of this study is taken into consideration both when choosing the data and in the process of analysis. The data represent a time span reaching from 1978 to 2011, offering a long enough perspective to draw conclusions of the development of Finnish cultural policy. The nature of the data from each decade represents the same type of reports, reifying the validity.

Furthermore, the reliability of the study is assured through providing a broad and detailed theoretical framework to support the analysis. Moreover, in order to increase the reliability, the researcher applies a reflexive and critical orientation.

A matter that is inherent to the critical approach of discourse analysis is that the analysis is always the result of historically formed discourses and is as such not based on truth but represents a position, which is the result of a discursive process (Jäger 2001: 34). By acknowledging this position, the researcher is able to conduct the study without questioning its validity and reliability.

In terms of generalizability, the standard view concerning qualitative methods is that they provide in-depth but poorly representative results (Alasuutari 1995: 143). However, the requirement of generalizability of a study only applies for research with specific ideals (Ibid.). The aim of cultural studies, which primarily are concerned with the interrelation of culture and power (McGuigan 2004: 15), is not primarily seeking to prove something right or wrong but rather to engage in critical and explorative examination of the society (Alasuutari 1995: 145).

A fact, which also applies for this study is that cultural studies are often interested in studying things that we already know but have not yet conceptualized. This, however, does not imply that the researcher would be hesitant of showing generalizability of the study. The relevance of the explanation the study offers is measured through the recognition the readers' experiences. If readers recognize the presented phenomena the generalization is not an issue. (Ibid.)

Due to the nature of the data and method of this study, ethical concerns such as confidentiality that rise in methodologies that acquire data through interviews or observation are not applicable for this study (for further inquiry on ethical issues in research see e.g. Berg 2009: 60–100).

## 4. Analysis of the Autonomy of Art in Finnish Cultural Policy

The analysis comprises three parts that proceed in a chronological order. The analysis starts from the 1978 report and ends with the 2011 report. The analysis of the respective reports starts with a brief overview of the identified discourses, which thereafter are presented starting from the most prevalent and comprising discourse. Each report that is analysed follows the same structure.

The analysis is primarily guided by the research question: how has the autonomy of art been perceived in Finnish cultural policy during 1978–2011? Additionally, supporting questions direct the focus of the analysis such as how is art perceived in terms of its value, meaning and function in the context of cultural policy? The theoretical framework together with the methodological approach constitutes the ground for the analysis. The analysis will already at this point discuss with the theory, which means that the conclusion and discussion chapter will include less elaboration on theory *per se*.

The identified discourses are termed in a consequent manner throughout the analysis. The title of the discourses begins with *Art as...* and displays a sort of normative stance taking of how art is perceived in cultural policy. The discourses are numbered in a hierarchical descending order where number one represents the most dominant discourse.

The time span offers perspectives that convey the development of cultural policy in terms of the autonomy of art together with objectives of instrumentalism. The *zeitgeist* of each era is reflected through each report, displaying distinct, time-specific features. Although the discourses mirror each period, similar characteristics of the discourses that reach over the decades are nonetheless visible.

The 1978 report presents the most unanimous discourses, whereas the report from 2011 conveys more multifaceted discourses entailing a language of paradoxes and contradictions. The discourses also reflect distinct changes in use of words and expressions. The reports from 1993 and 2011 contain rather similar types of terms from an economic realm, whereas the 1978 report deviates in terms of use of wordings as well as the prevalent ethos of social consciousness.

The aim of the analysis is to find the characteristics of each discourse in each report. Thus, seeking to find clear-cut discursive entities. Yet, discourses do not exist in vacuum nor are they definite but rather in a constant interaction with the social context that reproduces them. Hence, the discourses are overlapping, showing signs of similarities and reoccurring patterns.

#### 4.1. Art Embedded in Society – the Analysis of the 1978 Report

The analysis of the 1978 report resulted in three prevalent discourses that express different aspects of how the autonomy vis-à-vis the instrumentality of art manifests: discourse I – Art as a promoter of the aims of social policy, discourse II – Art as an agent for societal change and discourse III – Art as an aim in itself. The discourses are to some extent overlapping but even so distinguished by particular characteristics.

An especially characteristic feature concerning the discourses of the 1978 report is that art is appreciated for its intrinsic values although arts policy in general and art in particular are predominantly perceived as means for social change. Art is seen as having intrinsic value, that is, value that does not stand into relation to any other quality.

Moreover, the two seemingly opposite functions – the autonomy of art and art promoting the aims of public policy are not necessarily contradictory. The report defines the aims of both arts and public policy as supporting one other. The report further entails a sort of symbiotic, interdependent relation between arts and public policy. General premises in society such as equality are perceived as crucial for attaining prosperous conditions for art and culture. Moreover, it is stated that actions promoting the arts ought to be secured with not only good arts policy but also with sufficient public policy.

When discussing the function and meaning of art the 1978 report refers to white papers that have outlined the meaning and function of art, and which comprise the ethical ground of arts policy. The text segments in the 1978 report that deal with these kinds of questions are by and large paraphrased from the white papers 1965: A 8, 1973: 52 and 1974: 2. For instance chapter four in the 1978 report, General aims of arts policy, consists solely of paraphrases from these white papers. Although it is not explicated, it is to be understood that the 1978 report shares and adopts the same views. They are integrated as part of the major guidelines that comprise the main policy recommendations of the report.

The discourses outlined in the analysis highlight the prevailing social ethos that art and consequently arts policy are parts of. A comprising agenda of the report is to lobby cultural policy in general and arts policy in particular to be legitimate parts of public and social policies. The report takes the stance already in the very beginning by stating that cultural services have not been able to respond to the rapid infrastructural changes that Finland faced after the Second World War. The explicit assumption is that cultural policy ought to react to these changes.

#### 4.1.1. Discourse I – Art as a Promoter of the Aims of Social Policy

Discourse I – Art as a promoter of the aims of social policy is the most dominant discourse of the report. In this discourse art is perceived as an integral part of public policy and moreover, as a foremost promoter of the aims of social policy. Arts and cultural policy are seen as integral parts of general public policy and perceived as means to impact the society with cultural policy as an essential part of social policy: “Through active cultural policy it is possible to both react and influence conditions in society” (1978: 2).<sup>i</sup> Furthermore, art and culture are perceived as means for achieving social change and are thus prescribed important factors:

Art and other cultural activities amplify and expand social activity and communication inside the society. With arts policy, it is possible to indirectly remove or alleviate the societal estrangement and spiritual numbness that are results of the expansive migration movement and feeling of lack of origin, the stimulus-drained environments of home and work, the automation of working life and the accelerating work pace, un- or underemployment or the pressure of poor commercial mass entertainment. Hence, the significance and the impact of arts policy radiate to a much wider domain than merely art life and cultural activities (1978: 26<sup>3</sup>).<sup>ii</sup>

This discourse entails that the function of arts policy and consequently art is to have an impact on society. The effect of arts policy is not only restricted to comprise the artistic and cultural domains – its opportunities to influence are perceived as much broader than this. The discourse communicates that art and arts policy is an extension of social policy. This evokes the question of why is not the impact of arts policy on the artistic and cultural domains enough to verify its importance? The argumentation of the wide impact of arts policy legitimates the existence and supporting of art.

At first it may appear as if art and arts policy are appreciated since the impact is described as comprising the whole societal domain. Yet, on the contrary the discourse reveals that arts policy is in fact in a weaker position and subordinated to social policy. Arts policy needs the justification from a more legitimate form of policy, namely social policy. A hierarchy of policies becomes visible. The displayed positive effects of art and culture are depicted as solutions for numerous social problems. The discourse seeks to justify the existence of arts policy and in particular to legitimate the use of public resources for art policy. By displaying positive impact of arts policy on society, any opposition concerning the uselessness of art is easily extinguished.

---

<sup>3</sup> The original texts in Finnish are to be found in the end references of this study. The author has conducted the translations.

Gray (2007: 210) offers an explanation to why arts policies have the need to justify their existence through external impact. He argues that cultural and arts policies suffer from structural weaknesses such as limited political interest, limited expenditures and lack of political significance. Due to these structural weaknesses they are easy targets for instrumentalist endeavours. Gray further claims that if the survival of cultural policy depends on its ability to demonstrate the contribution to other concerns of greater political, social or economic significance, it comes as no surprise that it seeks to do so.

The report highlights some severe societal problems, entailing a rather hopeless view of the current state of the society. Arts policy is perceived as the solution for these acute structural problems – unemployment and changes in working life among others. Hope and faith is put in the power of art and culture that rescues the society and its citizens from the dystopian present. Once again arts policy is justified through its extrinsic impact. Art and arts policy carry tasks that in fact ought to be issues of social policy. This not only takes the focus away from what arts policy should be about, namely ensuring the continuance and the premises of art, but also makes for insufficient social policy. Moreover, arts policy should not have to legitimate its existence through social policy. This discourse reveals the political agenda of the report: the justification and legitimation of arts policy through promoting its impact on social aspects. Arts policy is displayed as a tool to achieve aims in public and social policy.

Reforms in arts policy have on the other hand indirect, positive impact on other domains of public policy. In the last few years it has become clear that public funds invested in art and cultural activity return in different ways e.g. as increasing the overall activity level and wellbeing or as actual savings that can be directed for the development of society. Active measures in this field result in the proliferation of equality, the expansion of democracy and improvements in general functioning of the society (1978: 26–27).<sup>iii</sup>

This discourse exemplifies how art during this time was – at least from a policy point of view – perceived as an antidote to various social problems of the time. Art and arts policy were seen as parts of the agenda of public policy, answering to the challenges set forth by structural changes of the society. Nevertheless, it is notable that although the discourse of embedding art as a tool for social policy and thereby a prevalent instrumentalist approach is to be traced, references for seeking explicit economic benefits through art are scarce.

The analysis of the following reports is going to portray a considerable increase of economic-driven discourses. In 1978, the Finnish society was not yet permeated by the economic reason

that has been dominating the social, political and cultural domains during the last three decades. (Patomäki 2007: 55.)

#### 4.1.2. Discourse II – Art as an Agent for Societal Change

Discourse II – Art as an agent for societal change displays the social mission of art, which can be considered as one of the prevalent discourses of the time. This discourse is strongly related to discourse I as they both reinforce the perception of art and culture as means of achieving social aims. Hence, discourse II follows discourse I in prescribing art a societal function and mission. However, discourse II distinguishes from the first by bringing forth a more ideological aspect to the function, and meaning, of art. Where discourse I perceives art and arts policy as means for social change on a pragmatic level, as a tool for e.g. unemployment, discourse II reveals the ideological level of art's societal function.

The societal function of art (*taiteen yhteiskunnallinen tehtävä*) is a concept used in the report and is defined as the: (...) reformation of values and raising the societal consciousness (1978: 20–21).<sup>iv</sup> It is notable that these same expressions are used when discussing the impact of cultural policy: cultural policy in particular influences the valuations in society and the societal consciousness of people (1978: 20).<sup>v</sup> The meaning of art and the aim of cultural policy are juxtaposed. The interrelation between the two becomes palpable.

It is notable that freedom of expression is also mentioned as a prerequisite for art's societal function (1978: 20).<sup>vi</sup> Nurturing the freedom of expression could thus be understood as a measure to nurture the autonomy of art. However, in the spirit of Adorno, for art to remain autonomous, a social function should not be its primary *raison d'être*. Stating that art is an agent for social change displays instrumental aims. Adorno distinguishes between the social situation and the social function of art. He stresses that art has a double character as both autonomous and entailing a social situation. This, Adorno claims, is reproduced on the level of its autonomy (1970: 6). Hence, according to the views of Adorno, art is at the same time coming from the empirical world and, through its autonomous character, turning its back to this world.

However, the matters of social consciousness and human progress addressed in the report could also be conceived as something intrinsic to art, even in the framework of Adorno. With reference to this, one could see it as questionable that the intrinsic value of art and its autonomy is distinguishable from its societal function. It could rather be considered as a question of what the context is. According to the Frankfurt school the very quintessence of art is to be critical towards society and by so doing it fulfils its function as art. On the other hand, according to the theories of Adorno, art at its most autonomous is without an externally defined purpose. For

Adorno only art without a set purpose is truly free and can open up new worlds. The only purpose art has is the one that springs from its own being.

Cultural policy can respect the autonomy of art in at least two senses. First, by setting aims for art that are in line with its autonomy and second, by not setting any aims at all but letting art be art. If cultural policy imposes itself on art, setting external objectives that are contradictory to the intrinsic value of art or requires certain outcomes, it is diminishing the autonomy of art.

Societal consciousness is a concept that is an important part of the language of the report. As such it is also an expression that pertinently reveals the *zeitgeist*. Today, it would be difficult to imagine a governmental report emphasizing the importance of raising the citizen's societal consciousness to the same extent. This report, however, displays this as the all-encompassing aim. Following the spirit of the welfare state, the state is taking care of its citizens, nurturing and ensuring not only the material but also the immaterial conditions. This discourse clearly mirrors the overall societal discourse of a strong state that commenced to prevail during the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. It entailed the idea of state intervention on every domain, comprising everything from economy to the cultivating of ideal citizens (McGuigan 2004: 36). By prescribing art and arts policy a societal function the discourse enhances the aspirations of the state to support and ensure the progress of its citizens:

The ultimate aspiration of arts policy is to secure the members of society prospects for human progress and a meaningful, rich and conscious life. With arts policy it is possible to improve citizens' opportunities and to increase their abilities and means to control themselves and the surrounding reality and to actively influence and participate in the society (1978: 26).<sup>vii</sup>

It comes as no surprise that the endeavours of arts policy are parallel to those of social policy, which are presented in the report as: the spiritual and material wellbeing of the citizens, freedom, safety, satisfaction and ensuring their diverse development (1978: 19).<sup>viii</sup> The aspirations of arts policy reflect the prevailing aims of the ideal citizen as active and participating in society. This ideal is even prevalent in today's society. Discussion about social exclusion of young people understandingly evokes concerns. Using art and arts policy, as means to alleviate concerns like these are still prevailing.

A peculiar detail of the report is the serious warnings of passivity and estrangement from society that results from commercial entertainment or mass entertainment solely produced with the aim to promote sales.<sup>ix</sup> Art is perceived as a means to help people to become conscious citizens. The division of entertainment and art refers to the cultural quarrel, which was going on

during that period of time. The rise of mass culture was by many seen as a serious threat that could lead to the degeneration of the people. One finds meeting points between the agenda of the report and the views of Adorno and Horkheimer – the ultimate critics of the effects of cultural industry and mass culture.

\*

The meaning and width of this discourse is two-fold. Firstly, this discourse connects on a broader level to general ideas and discourses connected to the role of the nation state, and arts and cultural policy that were prevalent in Europe during that period of time. Secondly, it supports and reinforces the overall agenda of the report, namely to establish the status of arts policy and to justify the use of public funding.

Displaying art as having a societal function legitimizes the presented policy recommendations and makes arts policy more relevant as a public policy. By bringing forth the societal function of art, it is claimed to have an impact that reaches beyond the boundaries of merely art. The discourse perceives art as something useful for society due to its ideological functions.

#### **4.1.3. Discourse III – Art as an Aim in Itself**

Hitherto the two previous discourses of art as an instrument for social purposes have been presented but does there leave any room for the autonomy of art? What is said about art as an aim in itself? Art is on various occasions discussed as a tool to increase the social consciousness of the people, preventing the decadent impact of entertainment and art's positive impact on pragmatic social problems. Nevertheless, the report directly discusses the intrinsic value of art at two occasions: [Art] is a necessary and irreplaceable expression of the existence of a nation and justified to receive a worthy established status and the support of society.<sup>x</sup> And, art is perceived as a sort of intrinsic value.<sup>xi</sup> Although dimension of nation building is brought forth, these pieces reflect an appreciation for art's intrinsic value. No outer justifications are needed to legitimate the status or the support of art – art is necessary and it has intrinsic value.

However, intrinsic value may also be looked from elsewhere. Arts policy recommendations and the aims of arts policy are as well entailing either the support for or the undermining of the intrinsic value of art. Is art as such worthy of the support of the state or does it have to prove its worthiness? Therefore, measures to support and ensure artistic endeavours may be conceived as indirect expressions of acknowledging the intrinsic value and autonomy of art.

Among others, the recommendation to increase public funding to arts policy is a palpable measure to ensure conditions for artists and institutions to produce and to distribute art and

culture. Arts policy is further prescribed the task to develop the material conditions of art production and ensuring the emergence of new forms of expressions<sup>xii</sup> – likewise a manifestation of the appreciation of the intrinsic value of art. By ensuring material conditions of art production such as artist’s livelihood, the premises of art’s existence are secured:

(...) The mission of arts policy is to develop the material premises of arts production and to ensure that new forms of expression emerge. (...) The focal prerequisite for arts production and the regeneration of forms of expression is seen to be freedom of expression.<sup>xiii</sup>

Freedom of expression may as well be perceived as the equivalent to the freedom of art. By bestowing art its freedom, its intrinsic value is appreciated. When discussing the intrinsic value of art, the concept of freedom is inseparable from the discussion. Freedom conveys the meaning as the opposite of interdependence, i.e. freedom to exist with regards to its own logic, which is a focal aspect of the autonomy of art. Significant yet simple questions follow: Is there space for art to exist and develop according to its own rules? Or is art bound to always serve outer aspirations and extrinsic aims? Where is art left in the intersecting logics of economy and politics?

Freedom of expression is connected to the societal mission of art, as presented in discourse II as the prerequisite for art to fulfil its societal function. An interesting question emerges from this meeting point: is the societal function of art separable from its intrinsic value? According to Adorno, art is enmeshed in reality, which means that the autonomy of art is never total but only relative. The situation of art is thus recognized – art has undeniably a social origin, which defines it. Art has a social situation; it does not emerge from thin air. The social situation of art is however distinguishable from its social function. Thus, following the heritage of Adorno, truly autonomous art ought not to have any other purpose than what springs from its own existence and logic.

The discourses of the 1978 report display art as a tool for achieving aims of public and social policy. The autonomy of art is to some extent supported and recognized through the suggested measures of cultural policy. The discourses lack economic origin but come instead from a social domain, reflecting the values of the welfare state. The following report from 1993 mirrors a different society with increasing economic requirements permeating the cultural realm.

## **4.2. Art Between Economy and the State – the Analysis of the 1993 Report**

The analysis of the 1993 report presents a society fifteen years later facing challenges of deep economic depression and future membership of the European Union. These societal conditions

can be considered as the most influential premises with regard to the cultural policy of that time. The identified discourses reflect how art and culture increasingly become part of other realms, in particular, the economic. The previously emphasized social dimensions of the function of art are replaced with discourses stemming from an economic origin. Notions of art and culture are becoming embedded in the economic context with the purpose of serving economic aims.

The prevalent economic approach is perhaps most clearly noticeable through the economic concepts, which the report brings forth: assessment, productivity, efficacy and evaluation invade the cultural domain. The increased use of economic language is notable since the report of 1978 almost totally lacked language of this kind. This indicates a significant ideological shift in the Finnish cultural policy, which implies that art and culture are increasingly perceived from the point of view of economic benefit.

The report advocates the various unexplored opportunities that art and culture beholds. Actors in the field of art and culture are required to *re-evaluate* and to *constantly assess* their activities in order to achieve efficacy. The struggling economic times are reflected as a language of economic necessities where art and culture are seen as burdens of the national economy.

The analysis brought forth three different discourses that all reflect different aspects of the ideological ground of the discourse. Discourse I – Art as the servant of economy most clearly portrays the discourse of the perceived – and expected – economic benefits of art and culture. This discourse is defined by expressions such as art and culture as investments, their economic impact on the national economy, economic benefits and ripple effects of art and culture. Discourse II – Art as the burden of public economy highlights demands of efficacy and productivity in the fields of art and culture. In discourse III – Art as a means for a successful society, art and culture are seen as instruments for the society in its quest to win the international race of competitiveness and successfulness. An enough solid discourse of bestowing art its autonomy and intrinsic value was not detected in this report. Nevertheless, some traces of this existed. This aspect is elaborated in the chapter Considerations concerning the autonomy of art in the 1993 report.

#### **4.2.1. Discourse I – Art as the Servant of Economy**

Now it is asked, for instance, what is the economic benefit and quality of art and culture. Various reports have shown that culture generates more money to the society than it takes. The arts creates jobs, brings tax income, export returns, income from tourism to municipalities and to the whole country (1993: 1).<sup>xiv</sup>

This discourse portrays art and culture from an economic perspective – as beneficial and productive. The main point of advocacy is the perceived benefits of investing in art and culture on a level of national economy. The perceived returns that come out of these investments are stated to be, apart from income in many forms, also jobs. In comparison to the 1978 report where art and culture were argued to generate welfare, equality and a sense of empowerment, the 1993 report offers a different perspective by stating that culture generates more money to society than it uses. This statement justifies the funding of art and culture and is also a political statement, as difficult economic times require justifications of that kind. The ways of justification and legitimating always reflect the current state of the society. In 1978 the public funding and thereby the existence of art and culture were justified through their social impact, in 1993, the justifications are economic.

The economic opportunities of culture can be capitalized better than before and the ripple effects of supporting culture ought to be strongly taken into account when developing all the levels of public policy.<sup>xv</sup>

This discourse entails concepts and expressions that imply the economization of culture: culture increases competitiveness, the productivity of art and culture, culture as a factor of production, the ripple effects of art and culture. For a reader of today, the language appears familiar. This discourse has become a self-evident part of how we conceive the domain of art and culture today. Both individuals and institutions have internalized the economic discourse. It is rarely questioned and has as a result become a hegemonic condition. McGuigan (2005: 229) argues that the market-orientation that has occupied the domain of culture is ruling out ways of thinking outside the limits set by this hegemonic condition. Gamble (2001: 133) sees that the development of neo-liberalism, which has contributed to the ubiquitous economic discourse, began in the 1990s to ‘take on the mantle of a new hegemonic creed’.

Culture is a significant factor of production, which is comparable to other sectors of industries. The production that emerges through creative activity is relevant to national economy (1993: 69–70).<sup>xvi</sup>

A particularly revealing feature of this discourse is that art and culture are brought to the realms of production and industry. Although the concept of culture industry is not as such used, art and culture is often mentioned in the same context as production and industry and are claimed to be comparable to other sectors of industries. Further, it is argued that art and culture are sectors among others that are part of the production chain, creating, producing and distributing cultural products.

To perceive art and culture as an industry is not by any means a new phenomenon. Already in the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century Adorno created his own theory of the culture industry. Adorno (1981: 98) elaborates the characteristics of a capitalist society that produces goods for the sake of acquiring capital. He argues that such systems replace the intrinsic values with extrinsic: the cultural commodities of the industry are governed (...) by the principle of their realization as value, not by their own specific content and harmonious formation (Ibid.). The original notion of culture industry is claimed by Adorno himself to initially appear in his and Horkheimer's work *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (1947) where they replaced the earlier term of mass culture with culture industry (1981: 97). Currently one may perceive that the term culture industry is replaced by creative economy. Creative economy comprises all branches that have knowledge or creativity as their core. It may also be understood as attempts to capitalize on creativity and knowledge.

The significance of public support of culture has lately been emphasized through its notable economic impact. Culture has an enhancing effect on the international competitiveness, increasing of productivity, and for the employment and tourism industry. Culture also attracts educated people to the municipalities (...) Finland ought to increase the economic research of culture. There are a great number of people working in tasks to create, produce, distribute and disseminate cultural products, and cultural construction projects and the investments of the cultural industry are often significant (1993: 69–70).<sup>xvii</sup>

This discourse sets forth a use of the word culture, which drains it from its initial meaning. Culture could in many cases be replaced with any form of industry without remarkably changing the content. Culture is perceived as merely another sector of industry, which exists for the purpose of generating income and revitalising the economy. The agenda to bring culture into the sphere of economy and industry becomes evident through this discourse.

Further, this discourse displays how the hegemony of economic and market reasoning, which has become even more pivotal during the last decades, started to become a focal part of policy making already in the beginning of the 1990s.

#### **4.2.2. Discourse II – Art as a Burden for Public Economy**

As a contrast to the first discourse, discourse II – Art as a burden for public economy does not present art and culture from the point of the view of the economic benefits to be gained but as straining elements on the already difficult economic situation. This discourse displays the influence of neo-liberalism in policy making. The main characteristics of neo-liberalism,

namely privatisation, belief in free market logics and undermining of welfare ideals are all inextricable parts of this discourse. The language is permeated with words that indicate a clear-cut shift in the spirit of society and policy.

This discourse implies that the public funding of art and culture is at stake and it should be rethought. This discourse conveys economic necessities that perhaps most accurately demonstrate the neo-liberal idea of the rationalisation of public economy. Following the infamous expression of Margaret Thatcher, there is no alternative, this discourse entails that the welfare state cannot go on forever with the current rate of expenditures, making it therefore necessary to re-evaluate activities. In reality this means cutting off unproductive and inefficient operations. These measures of rationalisation evidently affect also the art and cultural sectors, which also is visible in this report.

The expansion of art and cultural institutions are for now over. After expanding the structures, the focus is on the flexibility, productivity and quality of activities, openness and unprejudiced activity. The mission, division of responsibility and profile of cultural and art institutions are to be clarified. New forms of operation and financing are needed; the activity is to be constantly evaluated (1993: 6).<sup>xviii</sup>

In the discourse of art as a burden for public economy, art and culture institutions are increasingly perceived as businesses. Institutions that previously were outside the business realm are prompted to create a clear mission, to clarify their profile and to evaluate operations. Currently we can see how various corporate ventures such as strategy documents, marketing and communications plans, human resource planning and vision statements among others are self-evident parts of the everyday life of any arts and cultural institution. Although this development in its entirety reflects the increased level of professionalism in the fields of art and culture the points of critique should be directed to the mediation of ideology, which the phenomenon of managerialisation entails. Managerialism is to be understood as a development connected to neo-liberalism (Beckmann, Cooper & Hill 2009). New managerialism is fueled by a belief in business management practices. McGuigan (2005: 233) argues: “[N]eo-liberalism promotes the language of branding, consumer sovereignty, market reasoning and management.” Moreover, Caust (2003: 60) claims that the intervention of managerial or governmental policies into the objectives and practices of arts organization is problematic, since the nature of the measurement means for evaluating these policies are usually quantitative, emphasising on economic or political outcomes.

What this discourse in fact advocates by perceiving art and cultural institutions as business-like practices is to diminish the role of the state as a primal financier of art and culture. This is a

notable ideological shift, as art and culture are previously conceived to exist outside the profit-seeking domain. The discourse implies that the aim is to embed art and culture into this domain, meaning that the support from the welfare state has ceased to be self-evident.

The most significant funders of culture are the municipality and the consumers of culture. The cultural industry and the private sector also funds cultural services. It is time to put effort into economic research of culture in order to examine these connections (1993:18).<sup>xix</sup>

This discourse questions the hitherto self-evident status quo of the state as the main supporter and promoter of art and culture. References to market economy and to the limits of the growth of the welfare state suggest that art and culture increasingly ought to consider new forms of funding. Nevertheless, the report states that the state will continue to have a focal position as a funder of Finnish culture. Still, it is further stated that the development of the financial support will be realized within the boundaries that are set by the resources of the state economy (1993: 18).<sup>xx</sup>

This aspect conveys a palpable change in comparison to the 1978 report where art was granted the whole financial support of the state regardless of economic fluctuations. Now, the position of the state support is reconsidered. The state seeks to delegate the responsibility of funding art and culture to the municipalities, the consumers, the cultural industry and the private sector. It is implied that art and culture must start to take care of themselves and not to rely on the help from the nurturing state. The caretaker role of the welfare state is shifting to a neo-liberal state that adopts the logics of the markets.

As a result of the societal change the growth of the welfare state of culture is not possible during this decade in the same manner and width as in the last decade. Also, the share of the market economy will increasingly start to be more visible in the cultural sector. The line between commercial and non-commercial culture is not that visible anymore. The quality and productiveness of culture are increasingly emphasized. When evaluating quality and results one ought to bear in mind that the indicators of the quality of culture and art cannot be the ones that measure economic and financial values (1993: 2).<sup>xxi</sup>

Apart from questions of re-arrangements of funding, matters of quality, efficacy and in particular productiveness are also focal matters for this discourse. The first discourse advocated the positive impact of art and culture in increasing productivity but now culture itself is urged to be productive and efficient.

What is then actually meant by productivity? Productiveness is connected to results. When something or someone is productive it produces and generates a useful end product in an efficient manner. The logic seems to be that as culture generates positive results for the society such as tax revenue, employment and tourism it must make sure it continues to do so by monitoring its productivity in order to maintain its usefulness.

The integration of productivity with art and culture is related to the instrumentalism of art and culture. Emphasizing productiveness triggers the question of how art and culture might best be utilised for the benefit of society. The most productive and consequently useful forms of art and culture are the ones that are appreciated by policy makers. Therefore, the aspects of art and culture that generate visible results are the most appreciated ones. Hence, the positive economic impacts are stressed. With regard to this discourse this implies that art and culture are obliged to take care of the usefulness of their outputs and by doing so, they legitimate their existence.

#### **4.2.3. Discourse III – Art as a Means for a Successful Society**

Discourse III – Art as a means for a successful society displays how cultural policy is perceived as an integral part of the aims of public policy. It further describes art and culture as valuable means for building a successful nation. The title of this discourse refers to how cultural policy is used as an instrument for increasing the nation's competitiveness and thereby creating a successful and thriving society.

The policy makers have realised the potential of art and culture in the quest for enhancing the national image in the eyes of the rest of the world. The discourse displays how public policy in Finland at this point started to become more and more concerned with an image building that make use of art and culture. This is the rising neo-liberal form of instrumentalism of art and culture – a development, which was going on in many European countries at the time. The traditional industrial economy was replaced with knowledge-driven and creative economy where art and culture play integral roles. The exploitation of art and culture is not yet as systematic as in the late 1990s and in the 21<sup>st</sup> century but the origins of that tendency are identifiable already at this point.

Building a successful society continues the previous ethos of the building of the nation-state, which has been a perennial trend in the history of cultural policy (McGuigan 2004: 34). Now, building a success story of a nation and communicating it to the rest of the world become the number one priority for any self-respecting country. And for a nation struggling in economic depression an objective like this becomes even more crucial. Art, culture and cultural policy are perceived as focal means for achieving these aims. In fact, culture is perceived as a saviour of

the nation. Culture helps to build a positive image due to the various positive attributes attached to it: culture raises the level of knowledge; it increases wellbeing and various skills such as problem solving and interaction. There is not much that culture cannot improve or alleviate if we ask the policy makers.

Culture is part of everything we do. Through culture we constantly increase the level of knowledge, creativity and quality. It helps us to understand phenomena without boundaries, as part of a wider context. That is why it is a Finnish survival strategy. Without culture people do not have a value base or an identity (1993:1).<sup>xxii</sup>

Art, culture, cultural policy and nation building have always to some extent been interconnected. This makes art and culture inevitably matters of policy and – in a wider context – politics. Moreover, in the case of state funded art and culture funded within the frame of a welfare ideology, the questions of what art and culture to support and on what grounds become inescapable matters.

The most important grounds for the public support of culture are connected to the building of a national culture and a balanced and sustainable public policy. As a part of it, cultural policy is a focal tool to maintain a pluralistic and a mentally healthy society and to develop and utilize the creative resources of the nation. Culture is also a starting point for the building of the future society: values, identity, creative problem solving, readiness of diverse know-how and interaction are built through culture. Culture creates and maintains the mental survival strategies of the individual and the nation in an increasingly multifaceted world (1993: 69–70).<sup>xxiii</sup>

The report offers varied grounds for the state to support culture. According to this discourse, the most important grounds for the public support of culture are connected to the building of a national culture, and a balanced and sound public policy. It is curious that these two aspects are mentioned as the most important grounds for public support of culture. The implication of this is that the public support of culture exists, because of two reasons: to build national culture and to have one more instrument for good public policy. This view comes rather far from the appreciation of art and culture as such, not to mention nurturing the autonomy of the art. It certainly becomes evident that cultural policy, and thereby art and culture, are instruments serving the various aims of the state.

#### 4.2.4. Considerations Concerning the Autonomy of Art in the 1993 Report

The report does not directly address the matter of the autonomy of art. Some elements concerning the intrinsic value of art are briefly referred to. However, when matters of art are addressed they are connected to outcomes, benefits and results: the arts are an essential part of the resources, creativity and mental wellbeing of a nation (1993: 9)<sup>xxiv</sup>.

The consciousness of the weakening of the intrinsic value of art is explicitly expressed in the forewords of the report. It states that art in the late 1960s art was considered as having an intrinsic value. Later the concept of art expanded and culture was referred to as a service. The change of ethos has been a result of the problems connected to the carrying capacity of the welfare state and the change of the concept of culture and the whole society (1993).

In the report of 1978 there clearly emerged a discourse, which acknowledged the intrinsic value of art and thus, its autonomy. In this report, traces of that discourse are to be found. These traces are not, however, enough in order to make it justified referring to a discourse. Since, what characterises a discourse is not simply a bundle of statements and expressions but its feature as serving certain ends and thus exercising power (Jäger 2001: 34).

One could argue that the autonomy of art is manifested through the support of the premises of artistic work. Without the support to the artists there is no art. Nonetheless, one cannot know on the base of this data what the real intentions of supporting the work of artists in fact are. It is therefore not reasonable to claim that the attempts of securing artists' working conditions are in direct relation to the supporting of the autonomy of art.

In the 1978 report, the guidelines that secured the material premises of the artists were in line with the rest of the measures, prompting to secure the financing of art regardless of the economic situation. In this report, the guidelines entail an opposite position. It expresses that the previous welfare model of supporting culture has reached its limits. The change of the societal atmosphere becomes tangible. The core perception of art as valuable societal phenomena remains but the structures around them have altered. All Western societies faced the structural changes caused by the transition into a post-industrial era in the 1990s. New economic constraints due to these changes impacted the guidelines of governments that embraced the ideas of neo-liberalism and new public management (McGuigan 2005: 236). The language emphasising aspects of more flexible and cost-effective administration is only a by-product of this macro level development.

The question of the state support of art is closely connected to its status in society. In times when the support is questioned the status is belittled. This report entails discourses, which

perceive art as the feature of a civilized nation and as part of the resources, creativity and mental wellbeing of a nation. Art is perceived as an instrument serving the state.

Furthermore, the discourses of the 1993 report are controversial. The report states that supporting the cultural production and promoting the appreciation for creative work are the main aims of cultural policy. However, at the same time the report proposes that the most important grounds for the public support of culture are connected to the building of a national culture and a balanced and sound public policy. When examining the statements closer it becomes clear that the economic aims are in fact also behind the aims of supporting the cultural production and appreciation for creative work. Therefore, it becomes apparent that the autonomy of art must make way for the prevailing economic rationale of policy.

In the 2011 report the gap between the autonomy of art and the instrumental use of art becomes even more visible through the prevalent economic emphasis. The increasing use of applications of art comes to the fore.

### **4.3. Towards an Applied Future of Art and Culture – The Analysis of the 2011 Report**

The report of 2011 offers an insightful perspective on the prevailing values, ideas and central focus points of current Finnish cultural policy. The main focus of the report is on the future of culture. The overall orientation is optimistic and forward looking – not much is said about limited resources. The values and the meanings of art and culture and, consequently, their position and relevance in society are elaborated. Art and culture are apprehended as valuable for society with regards to their abilities to influence the development of communities and the society and how they are associated with mental, social and economic resources. The applied use of art and culture for the benefit of other societal sectors is a pervasive feature of the report. Moreover, the discourses portray an ideological shift in how art and culture are perceived increasingly as means to achieve success on a national and international level, as economic objectives and as adding value to society.

The language represents the prevalent art and culture jargon. Terms such as creative and cultural capital, fair culture, creative economy, community, cultural intensity, culture entrepreneurship, glocalization and applications are frequently used and connected to the notions of art and culture. As Caust (2003: 56) pertinently states: “Language is a powerful tool for re-invention of a world order where former valued ideals have disappeared and new one given precedence”. It is characteristic for this language to adopt concepts and expressions from the economic and managerial realm (Ibid., 62). Another characteristic of this vocabulary is its vagueness. It is less

anchored in reality and more concerned with an abundant use of buzzwords whose meanings remain empty.

As a result of the analysis three major discourses on the function of art and culture were identified. Discourse I – Art as applications promotes the utilizing of art and culture as applications that positively impact various societal phenomena. Art and culture as means for a competitive society is displayed in discourse II, which emphasizes the aspects of art and culture that stimulate prosperity to the nation. This discourse is related to the first but distinguishes with a more global outlook, bringing forth competitiveness that is comparable to other nations. Discourse III – Art and culture as creative capital displays how the value of art and culture is bestowed through the creative potential they possess. Creativity and innovation are juxtaposed with the favourable impacts they contribute to society.

#### **4.3.1. Discourse I – Art as Applications**

The general impact of art and culture is not yet recognized in public policy. In particular, the applications of art and culture have a vast significance in several sectors of public policy and administration (2011: 11).<sup>xxv</sup>

The report is by and large characterized by an ethos of the applied use of art and culture for the benefit of the sectors in public policy. Discourse I distinctly displays this conceptual frame that includes an emphasis on the ripple effects of the applications of art and thereby the beneficial impact on society in general. It is stated that especially the applications of art and culture have a widespread relevance to many different sectors of public policy and administration. In fact, one main aim of the report is to implement a cross-sectional collaboration, with the aim to support the production and implementation of applications of art and culture.

The report defines the shared interfaces of the sectors of art and culture with sectors of public policy as for instance the wellbeing effects of art and culture, the contents and methods of education, creative economy, innovation systems, cultural entrepreneurship and export, employment, technological applications, community and urban planning, preparations for crisis situations, development of population, minority questions, multiculturalism, prevention of social exclusion and food culture. One may see that alongside the more traditional areas of application that are familiar from the previous reports – wellbeing, employment and prevention of social exclusion – new forms of application areas have emerged.

It is noticed that art and culture have a significant impact on wellbeing. They give life a sense of meaning, empower, involve and strengthen the agency in everyday life, promote social cohesion and prevent social exclusion. Art and culture may

successfully be utilized in for instance care taking and nursing, healthcare, working life, therapy and social integration. When applications of art and culture are produced in these areas, the realization of cultural rights is promoted, the independent engagement in cultural activities in the free time is increased and expenses in other sectors in society are saved (2011: 14).<sup>xxvi</sup>

In order to understand how art and culture have become all-around notions applicable to every possible realm one has to go to the core, namely to creativity and more precisely the capitalisation on creativity. Creativity is also at the core of innovation – even this a concept frequently attached to art. Creativity, innovation and art are creative capital, and are perceived as quintessential to the functioning of a contemporary capitalist society. Capitalising on creativity has during the last decades become the new form of profit and benefit seeking.

McGuigan (2009: 297) points out that the notion of creativity is perceived to be the same in both the arts and business practices. It appears as a paradox that in the contexts of public policy, administration and management, creativity is most often connected to issues of increasing efficacy, results and impact. In the arts creativity is the source of freedom, boundlessness and spontaneity.

The exchange and dissemination of meanings of art and culture creates activity in different sectors, influencing economic activities directly and through applications (2011: 8).<sup>xxvii</sup>

The societal impact of art and culture is comprehended as pivotal in cultural policy. Impact studies are conducted and indicators of impact are developed. This consequently raises questions of how to measure the effects of art and culture? Impact, in this context, most often refers to the positive effects that art and culture have on other areas. Ripple effects are a commonly used term in the framework of cultural policy. In the discussions of applications of art, impact plays a focal role. The very essence behind the idea of applications of art and culture is to reach a broad area of impact. The report states: “Art reaches people through applications; they are part of the distribution, availability and the communication of the community”. This implies that art would not reach people as such, through its own means. Art should be attached to another context and it will reach out to the people and thus automatically communicate. This point is associated with the dilemma of art as elite and hard to grasp. Therefore, art is seen as easier to understand when camouflaged as something else.

The problem with producing application of art is that it cannot replace the artistic experience, which takes place in the context of art. Moreover, it is dubious if applying art in order to attain extra-artistic aims is letting the core of art be, that is, respecting its autonomy.

The aim is to develop opportunities to utilize and promote the social impact and interaction of art and culture and the positive ripple effects and application opportunities in different operations by creating functional and efficient forms of collaborations among different parties (2011: 11).<sup>xxviii</sup>

The terms tool and instrument, are connected to the concept of application. When art is turned into applications it is used as a tool to achieve something other than its primary aim. The applied use of art is a palpable example of the implementation of the instrumentalism of art.

When defining instrumental cultural policy Vestheim (1994: 65) states:

Briefly defined, instrumental cultural policy can be said to mean to use cultural ventures and cultural investments as a means or instrument to attain goals in other than cultural areas. (...) The instrumental aspect lies in emphasizing culture and cultural ventures as a means and not an end in itself.

Gray (2007: 203) further asserts that the recent development in arts and cultural policies has placed increasing emphasis upon the instrumental use of art and culture for the attainment of goals and objectives of non-cultural and non-artistic origin. The development, Gray argues, is due to a wider set of political, social and economic changes dating back to the late 1970s – a development that by many is termed as neo-liberalism.

The effect of neo-liberalism is that it brings forth an economic rationale that permeates every societal layer. This rationale in turn urges every activity to seek for benefit. Moreover, in the context of cultural policy, the economic-driven thinking proliferates the perception of art as worthy only if it can prove to be useful.

#### **4.3.2. Discourse II – Art as a Means for a Competitive Society**

The significance of culture on a national economic level is not to be measured only by the turnover of corporations or employment rates. The significant impacts of culture on a national economic level are the effects on the mental wellbeing of people and prevention of social exclusion and the promotion of tolerance, mutual understanding and trust in a multicultural Finland. Culture is an important part of the

international image of Finland that promotes the competitiveness of Finland, tourism and export industry on the international markets (2011: 22).<sup>xxix</sup>

The second discourse – Art as a means for a competitive society, is closely related to the first discourse. As the above-presented citation imply, applications of art and culture aim at developing the society towards a competitive and, consequently, a successful society. Competitiveness and success are self-evidently interrelated concepts. Competitiveness is part of the policy hegemony that propagates the emphasis on evaluation and efficacy. It is also connected to the position the state has in comparison to other states. The EU membership made this intercity competition and comparison even more poignant.

The success of a country is measured through various indicators, scales and ranking lists. In this context, the economic aspect of success appears to be the most important. In fact, the economic emphasis is most often connected to aspects of wellbeing hence, making the economic rationale intertwined with wellbeing aspects. What is interesting from a discourse analysis point of view is not only what or how something is explicated, but in what context. The report emphasises that important is not to measure the impact of culture by hard facts, such as the turnover of corporations, but also through the soft impact, meaning e.g. wellbeing and promotion of tolerance. Economic aspects are nevertheless emphasized in the following sentences. The attributes associated to art and culture (soft values) is used as buffers in order to promote the economic benefits (hard values). It makes the message easier to receive.

Utilizing know-how from art in other sectors such as social and health care and education increases exchange and develops the culture intense society of tomorrow, productions, markets and employment (2011: 22).<sup>xxx</sup>

A language that uses words, which are time-specific, creating also wordings of its own, characterizes the report. It is also characteristic that the new words are not explained. Culture intense is one of these frequently used concepts. Culture intense society is used in the meaning of how culture is increasingly becoming the core of the economic life, i.e. productions, markets and employment.

The instrumentalist dimension and the economic rationale of art are prevalent through the report. As it appears, cultural policy is less about art and more about social and public policy and promoting the welfare of the society. When proponents and opponents of ‘art as such’ versus ‘art as a means for something else’ discuss the debate is often polarized, leaving little room for sincere deliberation. Belfiore (2002: 14) explains that problem with the argument of

using art as a source of e.g. urban regeneration or to perceive public subsidy as an investment, is that it degrades art into being merely an instrument and “a matter of value of money”.

### 4.3.3. Discourse III – Art as Creative Capital

The most important success factor of the future is creative capital (2011: 24).<sup>xxx1</sup>

The third discourse – Art as creative capital comprises perhaps one of the most essential discourses of our time namely, capitalizing on art, culture and creativity. At the latest this discourse shows that Finnish cultural policy is no longer to be perceived as merely a national policy but as a policy that to a high extent is intertwined with European and international policy strategies. Capitalizing on art and creativity is at the essence of the ubiquitous concept of creative economy. An immense amount of reports (see e.g. The United Nation’s Creative Economy report from 2010) have been conducted on the subject that has capitalizing on creativity as its focal matter. A domestic example is the report conducted by the Ministry of Education in 2009 Creative Economy and Culture at the Core of Innovation Policy (*Luova talous ja kulttuuri innovaatiopolitikan ytimessä*). Although this report is clearly separated from other cultural policy reports of the Ministry of Education and Culture, including the report at hand, similarities in the use of language and on a wider level, the discourses, are to be found.

Creative capital is part of the social capital of a nation and the core of spiritual and economic wellbeing and innovating that give birth to novelty and have a permeating effect on the functions of society. (...) Creative capital produces social and economic interaction, cultural productions, services and exchange (2011: 10).<sup>xxxii</sup>

At the core of this discourse is the emphasis on creative capital as the main element in building a competitive national economy. The essence of creative capital is art and culture since – it is presumed – they generate innovations, and innovations is a focal factor of economy. Creativity, art and culture are intertwined in a conceptual and ideological net, which aims to promote all that there is to be capitalised on creative capital.

In the context of the cultural policy reports, the term ‘capital’ occurs here for the first time. The report states that creative capital is part of social capital and the core of mental and economic wellbeing and innovating. As Farr (2004: 6) points out, social capital is one of our trendiest terms. Farr (Ibid.) further argues that the excess use of the term is proliferating meanings.

The same could also be argued in terms of creative capital. As creativity is at the core of art and culture they are juxtaposed with one another. In the age of creative economy, when creativity and innovation became obsessions in the political domain, art and culture as creative capital

entered the picture. This says more about the developments in public policy and economy on a larger scale than about the evolvement of cultural policy. Or, more precisely, this reflects the overall entanglement and interconnectedness of different policies, which are grounded in an economic ideology. Creative capital, art and culture as parts of it are utilized for the benefits of economic aims and for a prosperity of a nation.

McGuigan (2009: 295) argues that creative economy has become the driver of economic policy. As an effect the role of the cultural policy discourse has been influenced by economic reasoning and turned into a branch of economic policy.

Creativity is the ability to combine things and meanings into new mixtures in a yet inexperienced manner. The premises for creativity are the mental mobility of people and the vastness of thinking, the diversity of the life environment and flexibility and the opportunity to play and experiment. Creativity is associated with every human activity but in art, culture and science it has an intrinsic significance and a professional ground. The basic knowledge of creative self-expression and cultural literacy are central parts of the creative capital of a nation. They promote the attachment to community, active citizenship and prevent social exclusion. Creativity may be promoted, its prerequisites improved and its results utilized. Creative artistic work also needs support (2011: 15).<sup>xxxiii</sup>

How is then art and culture portrayed as part of creativity and creative capital? Creativity, it is claimed, has an intrinsic significance for art and culture. However, this discourse withholds the assumption that all creativity creates something new and is therefore a catalyst to innovation. Herein lays the motive to capitalise on creativity, art and culture. The problem with this logic is that creativity in art and culture is not always generating innovation. Especially culture and to some account also art might as well be about preserving traditions, not necessarily creating new. Art and culture can create sensory experiences by evoking thoughts, emotions, associations and insights. These are not, however, innovations but aesthetic experiences. There appears to exist a preoccupation of creativity, art and culture as generators of innovation. This, in turn, results in discussions concerning the ripple effects of creativity: how numerous positive benefits are generated by creativity.

The creative capital discourse represents one manifestation of the new paradigm of cultural policy, which emphasises the instrumentalism of art for economic benefits.

\*

The discourses of 1978 to 2011 entail the changes in society in general and the understanding of art and its autonomy in particular. The discourses in cultural policy have evolved from art as a promoter of the aims of social policy to art as applications.

The last chapter will elaborate on the findings of the analysis and discuss their possible implications together with offering suggestions for further research.

## 5. Conclusions and Discussion

It is evident that Finnish cultural policy has gone through a notable change during the past decades. From the ideological era of the 1970s propagating art as a means to increase societal consciousness to the ambiguous 21<sup>st</sup> century where art is portrayed as applicable to every thinkable area of society, it is palpable that cultural policy is not what it used to be. Nevertheless, the changes are merely reflections of the rapid advancement of our society. Nothing about art is self-evident anymore, as Adorno stated, appears more current than ever. In the age of economisation and measurability, where the value of everything is measured through economic outcomes and efficacy, also art is under pressure to justify its existence. Thus, is the self-evident, intrinsic value and the autonomy of art questioned. This has implications for the artists who create art, arts organisations which distribute it, and consequently on art as such.

The aim of this study was to shed light on these aforementioned developments, seeking to understand the reasons behind them and to pinpoint the connections to the overall societal structures. The time-span of the reports reaching from 1978 to 2011 provided a unique perspective into the changes of the last decades, offering at the same time a cross-section of the advancement of the Finnish society at large. In an increasingly globalizing world, the developments in cultural policy are connected to the major – political, economic, cultural and social – trends of other Nordic and European countries. As a member of the European Union since 1995, Finland and its cultural policy has in wide extent been influenced by the Union's policy guidelines. This implies that despite of national guidelines, the transnational policies continue to have an extensive impact on also domestic policies. Therefore, it is apparent that the findings of this study also echo European policy trends at large.

The results of the analysis portray a clear change in terms of how art is conceived and consequently, how the autonomy of art is secured or diminished. The findings display that the instrumentalism of art has been a prevalent feature of Finnish cultural policy since the late 1970s with a diminishing emphasis on the autonomy of art. Art is perceived as a political and societal means for promoting societal aims, to increase societal consciousness, to serve economic aims and to boost the competitiveness factors of society. Moreover, art – in the context of cultural policy – has been considered as another policy tool, helping to attain societal and political goals.

Thus, the instrumentalism of art becomes evident. What then becomes the focus of interest are the different forms of instrumentalism and how they have affected the autonomy of art. The instrumentalism in the 1970s differs from the instrumentalism of the 1990s and from that of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Consequently, the effects on the autonomy of art deviate according to the era in

question. The changes comprise societal forms of instrumentalism to increasingly economic and other utilitarian manifestations.

In the 1970s the instrumentalism may be termed as societal. Art is perceived as a means to attain both ideological and concrete social aims. During the early 1990s the instrumentalism becomes increasingly economic. Requirements of boosted efficacy and results define the discourses of that era. However, neither of the reports conveys forms of instrumentalism, which seek to interfere with the essence of art, including accelerating needs to exploit it for economic objectives. This will come to form the prevailing feature of the report of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, bringing forth the economic instrumentalism that characterizes cultural policy of this era.

This chapter presents the different forms of instrumentalism in more detail and seeks to discuss possible reasons behind the changes, drawing from research, which perceive neo-liberalism as a focal factor in the development towards a dominating economic rationale. Moreover, the implications of instrumentalism on the autonomy of art are elaborated. Finally, questions concerning possible threats of certain forms of instrumentalism with regards to the autonomy of art are raised together with a concluding remarks and suggestions for further research.

### **5.1. From Societal to Economic Instrumentalism – the Changes of Finnish Cultural Policy from 1970s to the 21<sup>st</sup> Century**

The most notable change concerning the different forms of instrumentalism is the transition from societal instrumentalism to economic instrumentalism. The societal instrumentalism of the 1970s is directed to enhance all the aspects of art that highlight it as a crucial means for public policy. Art is seen as focal for the people in the midst of societal changes, which in the 1970s were characterised by migration and urbanisation. Moreover, art is perceived as the communicator and the creator of the values of society. Art is thus instrumental to the aims of the society. The atmosphere in policy at the time was by and large characterised by a pervasive ideological ambience and the aim of cultural policy was to propagate art as part of public policy. The instrumentalism of this time is manifested through the enhancement of the societal relevance of art. Thus, accentuating the aspects of art that makes it useful for public policy. Art is given a significant role as a supporter and a promoter of the aims of social policy: alleviating problems from structural changes such as unemployment and the feeling of estrangement to providing cultivating effects as an alternative to the harmful mass-produced entertainment.

The societal instrumentalism comes with prevalent ideological connotations. The social mission of art may be seen as one of the most dominant ideas of the 1970s' cultural policy. Art was supposed to raise the societal consciousness of citizens, providing them a means to be active,

participative, empowered and conscious citizens. This idea of the ideal citizen is propagated through cultural policy.

This viewpoint serves as an interesting aspect with regards to the Adornian view on art. Although Adorno did not approve with political art as it, according to him, loses its autonomy if it serves any external aims, this outlook nevertheless tangents Adorno's ideas of art as a critical force. It needs to be explicated that the difference between instrumentalism and seeing art as having a function as an opener of new worlds and ways of imagine is that blunt instrumentalism contains an imposing aspect. By perceiving art as influencing the ways of thinking *per se*, proliferating critical viewpoints or widening experience horizons, art is not, however, used for an external purpose that is set outside the artistic realm. It is merely the effect of art when it is let be as it is. When an outer force imposes itself on art expecting a particular outcome it becomes an instrument.

The cultural policy of the 1970s may not be seen as manifesting the sort of instrumentalism that seeks to impose itself on art in order to achieve a certain objective or outcome. Rather, it perceived the potential of art as something to take advantage of but did not try to turn art into anything else it already was: the intrinsic value of art was appreciated. Hence, it may be stated that the societal instrumentalism did not diminish the autonomy of art to the same extent than the following form of instrumentalism.

## **5.2. Towards Economic Instrumentalism**

Art in the cultural policy of the 1970s was seen as a tool for attaining societal purposes but did not refer to any economic agendas. The economic objectives started to become prevalent during the time of the 1990s. Thus, the societal instrumentalism of the 1970s shifted towards an orientation of economic instrumentalism in the 1990s. The economic instrumentalism is characterised by an increasing demand of proving efficacy, concrete benefits and results. The report of 1993 may be seen as a turning point where art no longer was seen as a necessary part of societal life and its previously secured public funding was questioned. Evidently, the economic situation of Finland at the time affected the tone of voice but one may see that this development has continued even in better economic times.

During the 1990s, the economic benefits of art were raised as a question of cultural policy. The arts were propagated as a significant branch of industry, generating different sorts of income. This brought art into the discourse of economy. The end of an era of high ideals one might say, a natural course of development, would another claim. Whatever stance one would take, it is clear that the economisation of art had already begun before the time of the second report. The

1980s meant the beginning of a new, neo-liberal era (Patomäki 2007: 55). New discourses arose and art started to be perceived as a tool for a competitive and thriving society and, moreover, according to the report, as a survival strategy.

As a result of the economisation, art increasingly becomes the servant of economy. Art continues to be the tool for public policy but now with the emphasis on how it can generate more income in forms of taxes and tourism, increase the employment and also serve as an enhancer of the nation's image. Art in the 1970s' cultural policy also served as a tool of foreign policy to keep good foreign relations, particularly with the former Soviet Union. After its collapse and the EU membership, Finland started to turn to the west and search for ways to become part of the Western world. A thriving art life was seen as ways of keeping up a good appearance and communicating values of cultivation and civilization.

Competitiveness entered the picture and became to form one of the most important societal objectives. As a servant of economy, art at the same time became the tool for raising the competitiveness. At this time, also the conceptions of creativity and knowledge as capital were connected to art. Although the word 'capital' did not yet occur in the 1993 report, signs of that kind of thinking are traceable. Art-based knowledge is seen as a focal resource for the building of a Finnish success story.

Although art was recognized as important from an economic point of view, art was not allowed to be a free rider. Arts organizations and other actors in the arts sector were urged to re-evaluate their activities and to be flexible, which in fact meant to be cost-effective. The self-evident public funding was questioned and recommendations of finding new means of financing were given: market thinking was introduced. The waves of neo-liberalism were hitting the shore, undermining the welfare model as the dominating economic and political model. The rationalisation of public economy, meaning cuts in public spending, was the result of this political ideology. Efficacy and cutting off unproductive activities in all sectors were seen as necessary actions.

However, art and economic logic are, in some sense, antonyms. To apply economic logic on art is like trying to fit the square into a round hole. It is impossible to demand artistic endeavours to be efficient and productive. It is not valid to measure the value of art through its necessity. When economy is applied to the domain of art, things inevitably start to go wrong. The nature of art is to be free, spontaneous and creative. Setting economic objectives and demands of efficacy on art are bound to be counter-productive.

Currently, impact measurement may be seen as one manifestation of the economic ethos. Arts organizations are prompted to measure the impact of their activities, providing quantitative evidence on the outcomes of their actions. Also ways of measuring artistic quality are included, bringing forth complex questions of defining the quality of art. This may be understood as a development that has started with applying the logic of economy to art with the aim of turning art into measurable and quantitative entities.

When comparing the report's perception of art, one may see that the changes are tangible. Art in the 1970s societal instrumentalism was first and foremost perceived as a political tool in terms of being an agent of societal change and enhancer of the societal consciousness. This conception of art is part of the discourse that emphasizes the social impacts of art. Belfiore and Bennet (2007: 138) argue that the belief in, which they term the "transformative powers of the arts", is a prevalent tradition of Western understanding of the arts. The conviction of art as cathartic, healing and empowering characterise also the Nordic welfare model of cultural policy and consequently, the Finnish cultural policy of the late 1970s. The conception in this era was that art could make a difference on both the level of the individual and the social.

When moving to the early 1990s, traces of the ideological thinking of the 1970s are still present but overshadowed by stronger voices of economic rationalism and economic instrumentalism. Cultural policy starts to stipulate that art should prove its efficacy and seek ways how to defend its existence. The increasing economic objectives and demands that comprise the whole society set art in the context of an economic rationale. Although, the discourses reflect a drastic change in the conception of art, the actual policy measures still provide for the continuance of the financing of art. The economic instrumentalism, which started to manifest itself on a discourse level, starts to take on new turns in the century to come. The main point in terms of the differences between the societal instrumentalism of the 1970s and the economic instrumentalism of the 1990s is that the societal instrumentalism is less harmful to the autonomy of art than the economic instrumentalism. Harmful refers to effects of disregarding the autonomy of art for the sake of non-artistic aims.

The following chapters will further elaborate on the characteristics of the increasing economic aims of cultural policy and the implications of these on the autonomy of art.

### **5.3. Applications and Increasing Economic Aims – Instrumentalism in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century**

When moving to the 21<sup>st</sup> century the economic instrumentalism takes on new forms. The application of art starts to dominate the discourses of cultural policy. Art is again prevailing as

the tool for public policy as in the 1970s but with the applications in the focus. Now, policy is about the ripple effects of art-related applications in other sectors in society. The positive effects on wellbeing through art become one of the leading subjects of the early 21<sup>st</sup> century cultural policy. Also the beneficial influence on other social policy areas such as prevention of exclusion, integration of immigrants and increasing employment are seen as matters of art and cultural policy. A revival of the 1970s doctrine of art as an important catalyst of societal change is traceable in the discourses of the 2011 report. This time the touch is more practical and focused on attaining the positive effects through developing applications of art. Art-related methods are applied to e.g. health care, education, business innovations and working life.

Cultural policy justifies the use of applications through the ripple effects they generate. The report talks about culture intensity, which is claimed to increase at all sectors: in production, product development, and as new services and concepts. It is not explicated that the focus on the positive effects on wellbeing is ultimately also about economic benefit. Nevertheless, implicitly the comprehensive economic rationale is prominent, which also the discourses entail.

Art continues to be a tool for a successful society with an increasing emphasis on benefits such as tourism and international image building. Now, the focus is on the competitiveness. This discourse was prevalently present in the first discussion about the planned Guggenheim Helsinki (see e.g. Taipale 2012). Art and artistic aims were merely side products in the discussion of the potential museum, which focused on aspects of increasing tourist flows and the promotion of the Finnish brand.

At some point creativity became the new buzzword of policy. Everything and everyone were prompted to be creative: organizations, buildings, solutions and businesses. In this discourse everything connected to creativity is without reservations seen as something positive and generating nothing except good outcomes. Creativity may altogether be perceived as a political and societal whim connected to the pursuit of innovations. At the core of discourses of creativity and innovation is the agenda of gaining benefits with preferably economic epithets.

The art as creative capital discourse may be perceived as a result of this mega trend. In this discourse art is perceived as a resource, which accumulates capital. Creativity and art are at the core of this discourse. Consequently, everything that is connected to creativity – including art – has turned into a subject of capitalising.

#### **5.4. Neo-liberal Developments Influencing the Economic Instrumentalism**

The different forms of instrumentalism – societal and economic instrumentalism – have differing effects on the autonomy on art. What can be stated is that all instrumentalist efforts are

more or less a threat to the autonomy of art: some more than others. For instance the economic instrumentalism completely disregards the autonomy of art, merely perceiving it as a means to achieve economically beneficial outcomes. In this sense the societal instrumentalism is not as clear-cut as the economic one. The societal instrumentalism in the form of the late 1970s considers art as autonomous. Its inherent qualities are appreciated and although the policy seeks to utilize art for the good of the society, it does not want to turn art into anything else than it already is. The urge to turn art into applications for all sectors and moulding it into the form that is best serves other purposes, is not present in the societal instrumentalism of the 1970s.

The main difference between the societal instrumentalism in the 2011 report with art as applications, and the societal instrumentalism in the 1970s is that in 2011 it is closer to economic instrumentalism. It aspires to turn art into something else, to apply the core qualities of art into different contexts in order to gain utility value. Moreover, the economic instrumentalism urges to gain value other than the artistic. This is the essence of instrumentalist thinking: to perceive art as a product for acquiring profits outside the inherent effects art as such promotes. The threat, which the economic instrumentalism constitutes to the autonomy of art, involves aspirations of seeing art as merely beneficial for economic purposes. To base cultural policy on such assumptions diminishes the autonomy of art. However, to solely claim that art has economic impact is not yet interfering with the autonomy of art. But when the measures are directed towards endeavours that seek to acquire economic benefits, the autonomy of art is at stake.

What are then the reasons behind the increasing economic rationale that so persistently has permeated the domain of art? McGuigan (2005 and 2004) argues that our time is characterised by the hegemonic condition of neo-liberal ideology. This economic reason, he states, has to a wide extent influenced cultural policy and the domains of art and culture. Gray (2007: 204) claims that the instrumentalist approach to cultural/arts policy in general and the arts/culture in particular is a result of extensive political, social and economic changes that have been going on since the late 1970s. As McGuigan (2005: 238) points out, a distinctive feature of neo-liberal development is that issues of social policy are translated into questions of cultural policy, which results in cultural policy that is not about culture at all.

This study finds that the first signs of neo-liberalism in Finnish cultural policy emerge in the 1993 report. The reformation of public provision with attempts of undermining the public funding of the art, demands of efficacy and economic impact are all features of neo-liberalism. Later in 2011, the neo-liberal development takes on new forms. Applications of art together with discourses of art as creative capital proliferate the ideology of neo-liberalism, which seeks to disguise it into polished solutions.

In the light of the findings of this study and the presented arguments of scholars, one may draw the conclusion that the instrumentalist developments of cultural policy towards increased economic instrumentalism are part of the rise of neo-liberalism, which started to become one of the most prevalent economic ideologies and practices in the 1980s in Western societies. In Finland, the inception of neo-liberalism as part of the political sphere began around the same time. State administration adopted influences from the market and started to resemble commercial enterprises (Patomäki 2007: 12). This development continued during the time of the recession in the beginning of the 1990s and resulted in rigorous saving strategies.

Therefore, the latest two reports reflect the ambiance of neo-liberalism whereas the first report represents the welfare state oriented policy of the 1970s. These circumstances are related to the characteristics of the societal vis-à-vis the economic instrumentalism and consequently, to the different implications on the autonomy of art.

### 5.5. Implications on the Autonomy of Art

This part seeks to answer the research question and to further elaborate on matters concerning the implications of the different forms of instrumentalism on the autonomy of art: can it be considered that some forms of instrumentalism are lesser a threat for the autonomy of art than others?

It may be stated that all instrumentalist endeavours in terms of art are to some extent problematic from the point of view of the autonomy of art. In the spirit of the critical theorists, the autonomy of art is a state where no outer force is allowed to impose itself on art. It is a state where art exists out of its own logic, its own purpose and its own reason. In the autonomous state of art, art is as it is and should not be altered by external aims and objectives.

Nevertheless, it is possible to distinguish between instrumentalism and instrumentality. To use art as an ideological tool for purposes that to some extent follow and respect the autonomy of art is less threatening than to see art as merely a tool for economic benefits. The logics of economy with its prerequisite of measurable results and efficacy are almost exclusively affecting art in a way that violates its autonomy. When it comes to softer forms of instrumentalism, such as seeking to raise the consciousness of people through art, the aims do not violate the autonomy of art to the same extent.

It is evident that all instrumentalist endeavours seek particular results. The nature of instrumentality is to use something as a tool to achieve another aim or objective. Instrumentality is not good or bad *per se*. In some way or another instrumentality is needed to attain and to accomplish certain outcomes. Instrumentality takes something as a tool and uses it

for some purposes, be they good or bad. The point is, however, if the purposes or externalities sought after are inherent to a certain practice or not. In this case the nature of art is not to produce profit or measurable benefits. This does not exclude the fact that it is possible to claim that art has positive effects. But the point of art in the context of critical thinking is not to have merely positive effects but rather to serve as a means to introduce alternative ways of thinking and perceiving the world.

Endeavours of instrumentalism see the possibilities art bears. That is why so many interest groups want their own share out of art. Many parties have created a sort of exploitative relationship to art. The forms of instrumentalism that emerge from the policy reports are one strong indicator of this phenomenon.

## **5.6. Summary of the Findings and Concluding Remarks**

The focal findings of this study show that Finnish cultural policy from 1978 to 2011 has been instrumental in its relationship to art. The instrumentalism has not remained the same but has changed and been influenced by the prevalent societal and political trends. The 1970s political realm with idealist and leftist features altered during the course of the 1990s into neo-liberal and right wing ideologies putting increasing emphasis on economic rationality and results. In the societal instrumentalism of the 1970s the autonomy of art was more secured than in the following economic instrumentalism when it on the contrary was diminished as a result of increasing economic rationales that set new requirements on the useful and beneficial qualities of art.

Consequently, some forms of instrumentalism have a more undermining effect on the autonomy of art than others. The societal instrumentalism has not diminished the autonomy of art to such a wide extent as the economic instrumentalism has. The societal instrumentalism perceives art as a means for societal change on both an individual and social level. Thus, the character of this form of instrumentalism is more in line with the character of autonomous art. Economic instrumentalism diminishes the autonomy of art by imposing aims that have nothing to do with art itself.

With regards to the research question “how has the autonomy of art been perceived in Finnish cultural policy during 1978–2011?” the findings display that the autonomy of art was more secured in the 1970s and it has been undermined during the last two decades through increasing economic objectives and requirements. The study has shown that the autonomy of art has never been fully acknowledged in Finnish cultural policy during 1978–2011. However, the prevalent objectives of the 1970s’ cultural policy, especially the aim to increase the societal consciousness

through art, are more in line with the principle of the autonomy of art. The objectives of the cultural policy of the 1990s and onwards have, as a result of neo-liberalism, brought forth forms of economic instrumentalism, which almost completely disregard the autonomy of art.

When examining the findings in an Adornian sense, the diminishing of the autonomy of art means that art is no longer free to fulfil its own purpose. If art is regarded as a means to achieve economic aims, improve the international position of Finland or provide savings for the health care sector where does that leave art? Endeavours that undermine the autonomy of art by requiring quantitative outcomes should not be considered as a natural course of development. It is important to understand that there are power structures behind these efforts, which seek to promote a specific agenda. The agenda is not to support the existence of art but to advance the objectives of other sectors of policy.

The implications of the findings of this study are that arguments for the autonomy of art are needed and should be voiced more fiercely. Further, the general public should be made aware of the recent trends in cultural policy. From the basis of this study it is evident that cultural policy has treated art increasingly as an instrument for boosting Finnish economy. It is, however, questionable whether the public is aware of this change and whether it would regard the change as desirable.

### **5.7. Further Studies on the Subject**

Kangas (1999: 159) argues that the strongest area of the research tradition of (Finnish) cultural policy comprise studies, which define long lines or typologies of cultural policy. The focus of these studies has been on the changes in the roles of cultural consumers, the systems or organizations of cultural policy or the development of economy with regards to cultural policy. Finnish cultural policy research has identified various developments and phenomena that this study brings forth such as the neo-liberal influences on cultural policy and the commodification of culture (see e.g. Kangas 1999: 156–176). However, Finnish cultural policy research has not yet shed light on how cultural policy has influenced the autonomy of art, which is the central contribution of this study.

In order to conduct an exhaustive research on the subject a more comprehensive set of data including other cultural policy reports, white and working papers from the same time span would be required. This could display the consistency of the discourses and entail also other discourses, which were left out of the scope of this study.

Further studies on the subject could also be implemented on the level of the actual actors in the field of the arts. Through conducting interviews or surveys one could research whether or not

the policy discourses are in some way palpable in the everyday action of e.g. established arts organisations, artists groups or freelance artists. A study, which juxtaposes discourses of cultural policy with discourses of the artists could entail how internalised they in fact are.

## References

- Adorno, Theodor W., (1991) [1981] *The Culture Industry – Selected Essays on Mass Culture*, London and New York: Routledge Classics.
- Adorno, Theodor W., (1997) [1970] Gretel Adorno and Rolf Tiedemann (eds.) *Aesthetic Theory*, London: Continuum.
- Adorno, Theodor W., Max Horkheimer, Herbert Marcuse, translated and edited by Jussi Kotkavirta (1991) *Järjen kritiikki*, Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Ahponen, Pirkkoliisa (2004) “Dilemma of Cultivation: Cultural Politics between Critical Theory and Cultural Studies”, pp. 223–244. In Pirkkoliisa Ahponen and Anita Kangas (eds.) *Construction of Cultural Policy*, Jyväskylä: SoPhi.
- Alasuutari, Pentti (2009) *Laadullinen tutkimus*, Jyväskylä: Vastapaino.
- Alasuutari, Pentti (1995) *Researching Culture – Qualitative Method and Cultural Studies*, London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Bauman, Zygmunt (2011) *Culture in a Liquid Modern World*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Beckmann, Andrea, Charlie Cooper and Dave Hill (2009) “Neoliberalization and managerialization of ‘education’ in England and Wales – a case for reconstructing education”, *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies* 7.2, pp. 311–345.
- Belfiore, Eleonora (2002) “Art as a Means of Alleviating Social Exclusion: Does it really Work? A Critique of Instrumental Cultural Policies and Social Impact Studies in the UK”, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 8, No.1, pp. 91–106.
- Belfiore, Eleonora and Oliver Bennet (2007) “Rethinking the Social Impacts of the Arts”, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 13, No. 2, pp. 135–151.
- Berg, Bruce L., (1988) *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*, Boston (MA): Allyn and Bacon.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1998) “A Reasoned Utopia and Economic Fatalism”, *New Left Review* 227, pp. 125–130.
- Bourdieu, Pierre and Loïc Wacquant (2001) “NewLiberalSpeak: notes on the new planetary vulgate”, *Radical Philosophy* 105, pp. 1–6.
- Caust, Jo (2003) “Putting the “art” back into arts policy making: how arts policy has been “captured” by the economists and the marketers”, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 9 (1), pp. 51–63.
- van Dijk, Teun A., (2001) “Multidisciplinary CDA: a plea for diversity”, pp. 95–120. In Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer (2001) (eds.) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, London: Sage Publications.
- Duelund, Peter (2003) “Cultural Policy: An Overview”, pp. 13–30. In Peter Duelund (ed.) *The*

- Nordic Cultural Model—Nordic cultural policy in transition*, Copenhagen: Nordic cultural institute.
- Duelund, Peter (2008) “Nordic Cultural Policies: A Critical View”, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol.14, No.1, pp. 7–24.
- Fairclough, Norman (2001) “The dialectics of discourse”, *Textus* 14.2, pp. 231–242.
- Farr, James (2004) “Social Capital: A Conceptual History”, *Political Theory*, Vol. 32, No. 1, pp. 6–33.
- Gamble, Andrew (2001) “Neo-Liberalism”, *Capital and Class* 71, pp. 127–134.
- Gray, Clive (2007) “Commodification and Instrumentality in Cultural Policy”, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 13, No. 2, pp. 203–215.
- Hamilton, Andy (2009) “Adorno and the Autonomy of Art”, pp. 287–304. In Stefano Giacchetti (ed.) *Nostalgia for a Redeemed Future: Critical Theory*, Rome: John Cabot University Press.
- Harrington, Austin (2004) *Art and Social Theory*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Harvey, David (2005) *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Held, David (1980) “The Culture Industry: critical theory and aesthetics”, pp. 77–109. In David Held *Introduction to Critical Theory – Horkheimer to Habermas*, Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Jäger, Siegfried (2001) “Discourse and knowledge: theoretical and methodological aspects of a critical discourse and dispositive analysis”, pp. 32–62. In Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer (2001) (eds.) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, London: Sage Publications.
- Kangas, Anita (1999) “Kulttuuripolitiikan uudet vaatteet”, pp. 156–178. In Anita Kangas and Juha Virkki (eds.) *Kulttuuripolitiikan uudet vaatteet*, Jyväskylä: SoPhi.
- Koivunen, Hannele and Leena Marsio (2006) *Reilu kulttuuri? – Kulttuuripolitiikan eettinen ulottuvuus ja kulttuuriset oikeudet*, Opetusministeriön julkaisuja 2006:50.
- Lampela, Kalle (2012) *Taiteilijoita tarvitaan ihan toisenlaisiin hommiin*, Acta Electronica Universtitatis Lapponiensis.
- Liikkanen, Marja (2011) 2.12.2012 “Yleisöstä tietämisen politiikka”  
<http://www.fng.fi/arvoisayleiso/museojayleisovuorovaikutuksessa/yleisoistatietamisenpolitiikka>
- Luukka, Teemu (2012) “Uusi taidevirasto käyntiin ehkä jo 2013”, *Helsingin Sanomat*, 17.5.2012.
- Mangset, Per et al. (2008) “Nordic cultural policy”, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol.14, No.1, pp. 1–5.
- Marcuse, Herbert (1978) *The Aesthetic Dimension – Toward a Critique of Marxist Aesthetics*, London: The Macmillan Press Ltd.
- McGuigan, Jim (2004) *Rethinking Cultural Policy*, United Kingdom: Open University Press.

McGuigan, Jim (2005) "Neo-Liberalism, Culture and Policy", *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 11, No. 3, pp. 229–241.

McGuigan, Jim (2009) "Doing a Florida thing: the creative class thesis and cultural policy", *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 15, No. 3, pp. 291–300.

Miles, B. Matthew and A. Michael Huberman (1994) *Qualitative analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Murdock, Graham (1997) "Thin Descriptions: Questions of Method in Cultural Analysis", pp. 178–192. In Jim McGuigan (ed.) *Cultural Methodologies*, London: Sage Publications.

Patomäki, Heikki (2007) *Uusliberalismi Suomessa – Lyhyt historia ja tulevaisuuden vaihtoehdot*, Helsinki: WSOY.

Rautiainen, Pauli (2007) *Taiteen vapaus perusoikeutena*, Taiteen keskustoimikunta, Tutkimusyksikön julkaisuja n:o 33, Helsinki.

Sevänen, Erkki (1998) *Taide instituutiona ja järjestelmänä – Modernin taide-elämän historiallis-sosiologiset mallit*, Vaasa: Suomen kirjallisuuden seura.

Taipale, Kaarin (ed.) (2012) *Guggenheimin varjossa*, Into Kustannus.

Vestheim, Geir (2009) "All kulturpolitikk er instrumentell". In Svante Beckman and Sten Månsson (eds.) *KulturSverige: Problemanalys och statistik*, pp. 56–63, Linköping: Swedish Cultural Policy Research Observatory.

Vestheim, Geir (2007) "Cultural policy and democracy: theoretical reflections", *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 13, No. 2, pp. 217–236.

Vestheim, Geir (2010) "Kulturens och konstens autonomi: Från den tidiga borgerliga epoken till den senmoderna "skenande världen". In Anders Frenander (ed.) *Arkitekter på armlängds avstånd? Att studera kulturpolitik*, pp. 88–100, Borås: University of Borås.

Wodak, Ruth (2001) "What CDA is about – a summary of its history, important concepts and its development", pp. 1–13. In Wodak, Ruth and Michael Meyer (eds.) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, London: Sage Publications.

Young, Robert (1981) (ed.) *Untying the Text*, London: Routledge.

### **Cultural Policy Reports:**

*Hallituksen taidepoliittinen selonteko eduskunnalle*, 1978

*Valtioneuvoston kulttuuripoliittinen selonteko eduskunnalle*, 1993

*Valtioneuvoston selonteko kulttuurin tulevaisuudesta*, Opetus- ja kulttuuriministeriön julkaisuja 2011:8

---

## Endnotes to chapter 4: original text excerpts from the reports. (The author has conducted the translation from Finnish to English.)

<sup>i</sup> Kulttuuripolitiikka on yleisen yhteiskuntapolitiikan olennainen osa. Aktiivisen kulttuuripolitiikan avulla on mahdollista sekä reagoida että vaikuttaa yhteiskunnallisiin oloihin.

<sup>ii</sup> Taide- ja muu kulttuuritoiminta syventävät ja laajentavat sosiaalista kanssakäymistä ja vuorovaikutusta yhteiskunnan sisällä. Taidepolitiikan avulla voidaan välillisesti poistaa tai lieventää sitä yhteiskunnallista vieraantumista ja henkistä turtumista, joka johtuu mm. laajan muuttoliikkeen aiheuttamasta juurettomuudesta, asuin- ja työympäristön virikkeettömyydestä, työelämän automatisoitumisesta ja työtahdin kiristymisestä, työttömyydestä tai vajaatyöllisyydestä sekä heikkomaisen kaupallisen massaviihteen tarjontapaineesta. Taidepolitiikan merkitys ja vaikutukset säteilevät näin ollen huomattavasti laajemmalle alueella kuin pelkästään taide-elämään ja kulttuuritoimintaan.

<sup>iii</sup> Taidepoliittisilla uudistuksilla on toisaalta välillisiä, myönteisiä vaikutuksia muilla yhteiskuntapolitiikan lohkoilla. Viime vuosina on yhä selvemmin alettu nähdä, että taiteeseen ja kulttuuritoimintaan sijoitetut julkiset varat palautuvat mitä moninaisimpia teitä, esim. yleisen aktiviteetin ja viihtyvyyden lisääntymisenä tai suoranaisina säästöinä yhteiskunnan kehitykseen. Aktiiviset toimet tällä alueella johtavat yleiseen tasa-arvon lisääntymiseen, kansanvallan laajentumiseen ja yhteiskunnan toiminnallisiin parannuksiin.

<sup>iv</sup> (...) taide voi täyttää myös yhteiskunnallisen tehtävänsä: arvojen uudistamisen ja yhteiskunnallisen tietoisuuden lisäämisen.

<sup>v</sup> (...) kulttuuripolitiikan avulla vaikutetaan erityisesti yhteiskunnassa esiintyviin arvostuksiin ja ihmisten yhteiskunnalliseen tietoisuuteen.

<sup>vi</sup> Taiteen tuotannon ja taiteen ilmaisukeinojen uudistumisen keskeisenä henkisenä edellytyksenä nähtiin ilmaisunvapaus. Ilmaisunvapauden vallitessa taide voi täyttää myös yhteiskunnallisen tehtävänsä: arvojen uudistamisen ja yhteiskunnallisen tietoisuuden lisäämisen.

<sup>vii</sup> Taidepolitiikan perimmäisenä pyrkimyksenä on turvata yhteiskunnan jäsenille tilaisuus henkiseen kasvuun sekä sisällöltään rikkaaseen ja tietoiseen elämään. Taidepolitiikan avulla voidaan osaltaan parantaa kansalaisten mahdollisuuksia ja lisätä heidän kykyään ja välineitään hallita itseään ja ympäröivää todellisuutta sekä aktiivisesti vaikuttaa ja osallistua yhteiskuntaan.

<sup>viii</sup> Yhteiskunnan jäsenten henkinen ja aineellinen hyvinvointi, vapaus, turvallisuus, viihtyvyys sekä heidän monipuolisen kehityksensä turvaaminen (...).

<sup>ix</sup> (...) yksipuolisesti myynninedistämistarkoituksessa valmistetun massaviihteen (...).

<sup>x</sup> [Taide] on kansakunnan olemassaolon välttämätön ja korvaamaton ilmaus ja oikeutettu saamaan tämän mukaisen vakiinnutetun aseman ja yhteiskunnan tuen.

<sup>xi</sup> Taide nähtiin mietinnössä eräänlaisena itseisarvona.

<sup>xii</sup> (...) taidepolitiikan tehtävänä on kehittää taiteen tuotannon aineellisia edellytyksiä sekä turvata uusien ilmaisunmuotojen esiinpääsy (...)

<sup>xiii</sup> (Komitea katsoi, että) taidepolitiikan tehtävänä on kehittää taiteen tuotannon aineellisia edellytyksiä sekä turvata uusien ilmaisumuotojen esiinpääsy (tavoitteena perinteitä kehittävä ja uutta luova kansallinen kulttuuri). Taiteen tuotannon ja taiteen ilmaisukeinojen uudistumisen keskeisenä henkisenä edellytyksenä nähtiin ilmaisunvapaus.

<sup>xiv</sup> Nyt kysytään esimerkiksi mikä on taiteen ja kulttuurin taloudellinen hyöty ja laatu. Erilaiset selvitykset ovat osoittaneet, että kulttuuri tuo yhteiskunnalle rahaa enemmän kuin vie. Taide luo työpaikkoja, tuo verotuloja, vientituloja, matkailutuloja kuntiin ja koko maahan.

<sup>xv</sup> Kulttuurin taloudellisia mahdollisuuksia voidaan hyödyntää nykyistä paremmin ja kulttuurin tukemisen kerrannaisvaikutukset on syytä ottaa painokkaasti huomioon yhteiskuntapolitiikan kehittämisen kaikilla tasoilla.

---

<sup>xvi</sup> Kulttuuri on merkittävä tuotannontekijä, joka on verrattavissa muihin teollisuudenaloihin. Luovan toiminnan varassa syntyvällä tuotannolla on kansantaloudellista merkitystä.

<sup>xvii</sup> Viime aikoina on kulttuurin julkisen tuen merkitystä korostettu myös sen merkittävän taloudellisen vaikutuksen perusteella. Kulttuurilla on edistävä vaikutus kansainväliseen kilpailukykyyn, tuottavuuden lisäämiseen, työllistämiseen ja matkailuelinkeinoon. Kulttuuri myös houkuttelee kuntiin koulutettuja ihmisiä. (...) Suomessa on myös syytä lisätä kulttuurin taloustutkimusta. Kulttuurituotteiden luomisen, tuottamisen, jakelun ja levityksen tehtävissä toimii suuri joukko ihmisiä ja kulttuurialan rakennushankkeet ja kulttuuriteollisuuden investoinnit ovat usein merkittäviä.

<sup>xviii</sup> Taide- ja kulttuurilaitosten laajenemisen aika on kuitenkin tällä erää ohitse. Rakenteiden laajenemisen jälkeen huomio kiinnitetään toiminnan joustavuuteen, tuloksellisuuteen ja laatuun, avoimuuteen ja ennakkoluulottomaan yhteistyöhön. Kulttuuri- ja taidelaitosten toiminta-ajatuksia, vastuunjako ja profiilia on syytä selkeyttää. Tarvitaan uusia toimintamuotoja ja rahoitustapoja, toimintaa on arvioitava jatkuvasti.

<sup>xix</sup> Kulttuurin merkittävien rahoittajien on kunta ja kulttuurin kuluttajat. Kulttuuriteollisuus ja yksityissektori rahoittavat myös kulttuuripalveluita. Näiden yhteyksien selvittämiseksi on syytä panostaa kulttuurin taloustutkimukseen.

<sup>xx</sup> Valtiolla on jatkossakin keskeinen merkitys suomalaisen kulttuurin rahoittajana. Tuen kehittäminen toteutetaan kuitenkin valtiontaloudellisten voimavarojen mahdollistamissa rajoissa.

<sup>xxi</sup> Yhteiskunnallisen muutoksen vuoksi kulttuurin hyvinvointivaltion kasvu viime vuosikymmenen merkityksessä ja laajuudessa ei enää tällä vuosikymmenellä ole mahdollinen. Myös kulttuurin alalla markkinatalouden osuus tulee näkymään aiempaa enemmän. Kaupallisen ja ei-kaupallisen kulttuurin raja on yhä useammin viirretty piirretty viiva. Kulttuurin laatua ja tuloksellisuutta korostetaan yhä enemmän. Laatua ja tuloksia arvioitaessa on syytä muistaa, että taloudelliset ja rahassa mitattavat arvot eivät voi olla kulttuurin ja taiteen laadun määrittäviä mittareita.

<sup>xxii</sup> Kulttuuri on osa kaikkea toimintaamme, sen avulla kohotamme jatkuvasti osaamisen tasoa, luovuutta ja laatua. Se auttaa meitä ymmärtämään ilmiöt ilman raja-aitoja, osana laajempaa kokonaisuutta. Siksi se on suomalainen selviytymisstrategia. Ilman kulttuuria ihmisillä ei ole arvoperustaa ja identiteettiä.

<sup>xxiii</sup> Kulttuurin julkisen tuen tärkeimmät perusteet liittyvät kansallisen kulttuurin rakentamiseen sekä tasapainoisen ja kestäväen yhteiskuntapolitiikan kehityksen toteuttamiseen. Sen osana kulttuuripolitiikka on keskeinen väline moniarvoisen ja henkisesti hyvinvoivan yhteiskunnan ylläpitämisessä ja kansakunnan luovien voimavarojen kehittämisessä ja hyödyntämisessä. Kulttuuri on myös lähtökohta tulevaisuuden yhteiskunnan rakentamisessa: kulttuurin avulla rakennetaan arvoja, identiteettiä, luovaa ongelmanratkaisukykyä, valmiuksia monipuoliseen osaamiseen ja vuorovaikutukseen. Kulttuuri luo ja ylläpitää yksilön ja kansakunnan henkisiä selviytymisstrategioita entistä monitahoisemmassa maailmassa.

<sup>xxiv</sup> Taide on olennainen osa kansakunnan voimavaroja, luovuutta ja henkistä hyvinvointia.

<sup>xxv</sup> Yhteiskuntapolitiikassa ei vielä tunnisteta taiteen ja kulttuurin kokonaisvaikuttavuutta. Erityisesti taiteen ja kulttuurin sovelluksilla on laaja-alaista merkitystä monilla eri yhteiskuntapolitiikan ja hallinnon aloilla.

<sup>xxvi</sup> Taiteella ja kulttuurilla on todettu olevan merkittäviä hyvinvointia lisääviä vaikutuksia. Ne tuovat merkityksellisyyttä elämään, voimauttavat, osallistavat ja vahvistavat arjen toimijuutta, edistävät sosiaalista koheesiota ja ehkäisevät syrjäytymistä. Taidetta ja kulttuuria voidaan hyödyntää menestyksellisesti esimerkiksi hoito- ja hoivatyössä, terveydenhuollossa, työelämässä, terapiassa ja kotouttamisessa. Kun tuotetaan taiteen ja kulttuurin sovelluksia näillä toiminnan alueilla, edistetään kulttuuristen oikeuksien toteutumista, lisääntyy kulttuurin omaehtoista harrastamista ja säästetään kustannuksia muilla yhteiskunnallisen toiminnan alueilla.

<sup>xxvii</sup> Taiteen ja kulttuurin merkitysten vaihdanta ja levittäminen synnyttävät aktiivista toimintaa eri aloilla ja vaikuttavat siten sekä suoraan että sovelluksina taloudelliseen toimintaan.

<sup>xxviii</sup> Tavoitteena on kehittää mahdollisuuksia hyödyntää ja edistää taiteen ja kulttuurin yhteiskunnallista vaikuttavuutta ja vuorovaikutusta sekä positiivisia heijastusvaikutuksia ja sovellusmahdollisuuksia eri toiminnoissa luomalla toimivia ja tehokkaita yhteistyömuotoja eri tahojen kesken.

<sup>xxix</sup> Kulttuurin kansantaloudellista merkitystä ei voi mitata ainoastaan yritysten liikevaihdon tai työllistymislukujen mukaan. Kansantaloudellisesti merkittäviä ovat kulttuurin vaikutukset ihmisten henkiseen hyvinvointiin ja syrjäytymisen ehkäisemiseen sekä suvaitsevaisuuden ja keskinäisen ymmärryksen ja luottamuksen edistämiseen monikulttuurisessa Suomessa. Kulttuuri on tärkeä osa kansainvälistä Suomi-kuvaa, joka voi edistää Suomen kilpailukykyä, matkailuelinkeinoa ja vientiteollisuutta kansainvälisillä markkinoilla.

---

<sup>xxx</sup> Taidetaustaisen osaamisen hyödyntäminen muilla sektoreilla, kuten sosiaali- ja terveydenhuollossa ja koulutuksessa lisää vaihdantaa sekä kehittää tulevaisuuden kulttuuri-intensiivistä yhteiskuntaa, tuotantoja, markkinoita ja työllisyyttä.

<sup>xxx<sup>i</sup></sup> Tulevaisuuden tärkein menestystekijä on luova pääoma.

<sup>xxx<sup>ii</sup></sup> Luova pääoma on osa kansakunnan sosiaalista pääomaa sekä henkisen ja taloudellisen hyvinvoinnin ja innovoinnin ydin, joka synnyttää uutta ja vaikuttaa läpäisevästi kaikkiin yhteiskunnan toimintoihin. (...) Luova pääoma tuottaa sosiaalista ja taloudellista vuorovaikutusta, kulttuurituotantoja, -palveluja ja vaihdantaa.

<sup>xxx<sup>iii</sup></sup> Luovuus on kyky yhdistellä asioita ja merkityksiä uusiksi kokonaisuuksiksi ennen kokemattomalla tavalla. Luovuuden edellytyksiä ovat ihmisten henkinen liikkuvuus ja ajattelun avaruus, elämänympäristön monimuotoisuus ja joustavuus sekä mahdollisuus leikkiin ja kokeiluun. Luovuus liittyy kaikkeen inhimilliseen toimintaan, mutta taiteen, kulttuurin ja tieteen alueilla sillä on itseisarvoinen sisällöllinen merkitys ja ammatillinen perusta. Luovan itseilmaisun sekä kulttuurisen lukutaidon perustiedot ja taidot ovat keskeinen osa kansakunnan luovaa pääomaa. Ne edistävät yhteisöön kiinnittymistä, aktiivista kansalaisuutta ja ehkäisevät syrjäytymistä. Luovuttaa voidaan edistää, sen edellytyksiä parantaa ja tuloksia hyödyntää. Luova taiteellinen työ tarvitsee myös tukea.